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The Implementation Plan provides guidance for revising and updating the *New Mexico Comprehensive Transportation Safety Plan, 2010 Update* (CTSP) with respect to methodology, data needs, and details needed to implement the research results. This includes how well are strategies, performance measures in the CTSP aligned with the crash data, performance data, and national best practices. Detailed recommendations for improvement are provided. A suggested framework for the CTSP revision/update process is presented in a step-by-step format. Recommendations and considerations are presented for the creation of a system that tracks and monitors safety improvements for use in program development, implementation, and evaluating CTSP recommendations.
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PREFACE

The research reported herein describes the implementation process to update the current New Mexico Comprehensive Traffic Safety Plan (CTSP). The purpose of this work was to develop an implementation plan to meet the traffic safety guidelines and requirements as set forth by the Federal Highway Administration and the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) legislation.

NOTICE

The United States Government and the State of New Mexico do not endorse products or manufacturers. Trade or manufacturers’ names appear herein solely because they are considered essential to the object of this report. This information is available in alternative accessible formats. To obtain an alternative format, contact the NMDOT Research Bureau, 7500B Pan American Freeway NE, Albuquerque, NM 87109 (PO Box 94690).

DISCLAIMER

This report presents the results of research conducted by the author(s) and does not necessarily reflect the views of the New Mexico Department of Transportation. This report does not constitute a standard or specification.
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Implementation Plan (plan) is to provide guidance for revising and updating the New Mexico Comprehensive Transportation Safety Plan, 2010 Update (CTSP) (1). The suggested revisions are based on the results of a qualitative assessment of the CTSP. The suggestions include refinements, additions, and deletions to the current CTSP as well as general guidance for creating a statewide transportation safety program structure that promotes ongoing stakeholder engagement and synergy among the agencies tasked with implementing the CTSP. Inclusion of the suggested revisions into the procedures and processes conducted by the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT) and other key state agencies would provide the opportunity to more effectively manage the implementation of safety strategies and subsequent evaluation processes within existing agency resources and constraints.

Nationally, highway safety institutions and programs, and new legislation such as Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) (2) to improve and guide traffic safety have evolved significantly in the last ten years toward science-based approaches to identifying and addressing traffic safety issues. The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have advocated a Toward Zero Deaths approach to reducing traffic fatalities and serious injuries that includes cultural changes that embrace the necessity of addressing traffic safety issues. These dramatic changes will drive the need to consider science-based approaches, investment strategies, performance measurement, and the potential structure and intensity of interagency coordination.

With the goal of reducing severe crashes, the NMDOT initiated the development of the first CTSP in 2004. This occurred a year prior to the August 2005 issuance of the federal requirement in through the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) that all states develop and implement strategic highway safety plans. The initial CTSP was designed to include in a comprehensive manner the activities of various agencies into one master plan to work together toward achieving the overarching goal of reducing the state fatality rate by 20 percent by the year 2010. The initial CTSP was updated in 2008 based on direction from the CTSP Leadership Council to determine which strategies were being implemented and which could be revised to improve their effectiveness. The 2008 version was updated in 2010 to reflect strategy revisions that align with the updated goal to reduce highway fatalities by 50 percent by the year 2030. Additional strategies were subsequently added and others revised in March 2012 to produce the current version of the CTSP. (1)

The scope of the current CTSP is intended to be comprehensive. The 12 emphasis areas incorporate 46 strategies to be carried out through 168 action steps and evaluated with 89 performance measures. Approximately 20 agencies and stakeholders are tasked with implementing the action steps along with all tribal governments and metropolitan/regional planning organizations within New Mexico. (1)

This Implementation Plan describes on more detail below the steps for this effort. Presented first are the results of the assessment of the current CTSP strategies and performance measures based on:

- Alignment with of strategies and performance measures with national best practices
- Availability of relevant and measurable data related to performance measure
- Recommendations and appropriate refinements to include Strategy and Performance Measures in future CTSPs
- Action steps are also assessed in a similar manner but in general are recommended to be incorporated in agency specific documents
Next, a suggested framework for the revision/update process is presented in a step-by-step format. Recommendations and considerations are then presented for the creation of a system that tracks and monitors safety improvements for use in evaluating future versions of the CTSP.

The Implementation Plan provides insights for attainment of effective implementation of future versions of the CTSP and identifies challenges to address for the design of an effective traffic safety program. Guidelines for revising and updating the CTSP are then presented along with a discussion about the estimated budget and staff resources that will be necessary for this effort. The final section presents considerations for developing a statewide traffic safety structure that aligns with national best practices, which include enhancements to provide a multidisciplinary, multiagency safety structure to include various working groups, steering committees, dedicated regional program coordinators, and dedicated agency staff support.
The purpose of the assessment is to evaluate if the strategies and associated performance measures, and action steps align with nationally proven traffic safety strategies and/or recommended national best practice and if relevant and measurable data are available. The emphasis areas were not assessed for their alignment with national best practices as their development is based on a data-driven and a stakeholder-directed process. More detail and guidance for revising the CTSP is presented below. Discussed is a recommended national best practice of following a data-driven process to identify critical safety issues to identify emphasis areas that can serve as the prime focus of a strategic highway safety plan.

This assessment effort incorporates and conforms to federal requirements issued in MAP-21. Note that at this time further federal guidance is being developed related to SHSP conformance with MAP-21. However, as indicated above, it is important that SHSPs follow a data-driven process that provides the NMDOT and other state agencies and stakeholders the means to focus efforts where they can be most effective at reducing fatalities and serious injuries and provides a recommended plan that can be implemented with existing resources and within existing constraints.

The CTSP was assessed on a qualitative basis by comparing the strategies and their associated performance measures/action steps to a set of defined assessment criteria and data attributes. The assessment criteria are alignment with national best practices, proven or priority strategies, and recommendations identified in publications from USDOT agencies such as the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). The attributes of the data used in the assessment are the availability of relevant/measurable data to realistically conduct an assessment, and the need to gather data to comply with federal reporting requirements.

At this time, it is not possible to perform a detailed quantitative evaluation of the CTSP’s effectiveness at reducing traffic fatalities and serious injuries. This is because of a limited amount of available information about when and which strategies were implemented, the specific locations where the strategies were implemented, and the availability of data for use in measuring performance. Without this information, data cannot be assembled to perform a detailed quantitative comparison to determine the effectiveness of the CTSP at reducing traffic fatalities and serious injuries. The Final Report includes a quantitative assessment of the effectiveness of the CTSP through the review and discussion of data trend lines for the emphasis areas with available data.

The assessment of each strategy and its associated performance measures/action steps is summarized in a Strategy Table. Tables were developed for each of the 47 strategies (Attachment A). The tables offer recommendations for consideration in the development of the next update of the CTSP. Each table lists the resources and references consulted to perform the assessment of that strategy. The following list summarizes the information presented in each column:

- **Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps:** Identifies the components of the strategy; the text is copied directly from the 2010 CTSP Update and 2012 amendments.

- **Alignment and/or Assessment of Effectiveness:** Indicates the national perspective about the strategy – whether it is proven, tried, experimental, recommended, etc.; assesses if the performance measure is appropriate for the given strategy and emphasis area; indicates if the action steps align with nationally proven and/or priority strategies and recommended best practices.

- **Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data:** Identifies known New Mexico data sources that are pertinent to the performance measure.
- **Include in Future CTSP:** Offers suggestions to enhance an update of the next CTSP by retaining only those strategies and performance measures that align with national best practices and are effective to the effort to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

- **Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP:** Offers suggestions to improve current strategies and performance measures so they better align with national best practices.

- **Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP:** Offers suggestions to enhance an update of the next CTSP by adding effective strategies and performance measures that align with national best practices and are efficient for contributing to the effort to reduce fatalities and serious injuries.

- **Include in Agency-Specific Plans:** Recommends whether to retain or refine this action step in an update of an agency specific plan.

- **Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans:** Offers suggestions to stakeholder agencies for refining the action steps currently shown in the CTSP and for adding action steps into their plans that align with proven and/or national best practices to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries.

In general, most of the strategies are in alignment with proven strategies or national best practices or recommendations. Likewise, most of the performance measures are valid for a particular strategy. Action steps are recommended for inclusion in agency-specific plans for the entities that are responsible for performing the action step. The supporting strategy tables offer specific improvement suggestions to strengthen the alignment of some strategies and performance measures with national best practices and proven strategies. Several of these suggestions incorporate the MAP-21 requirements identified to date.
PROPOSED CTSP UPDATE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The suggested methods and process to facilitate the preparation of New Mexico’s CTSP update follow the guidance contained in two key FHWA SHSP resources: *A Champion’s Guide to Saving Lives* (Figure 1) (3) and *Strategic Highway Safety Plan Implementation Process Model* (4).

The guidance provided in these documents is integrated into a recommended New Mexico CTSP update development process. Similar to the development of the 2010 New Mexico CTSP, the recommended CTSP update process is a collaborative process structured to accomplish the following key goals:

- Be consistent with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) SHSP procedural guidance.
- Identify incremental traffic safety goals to advance the state toward the nation’s longer-term *Toward Zero Deaths* goal of reducing fatalities by 2030 to 227.
- Address safety issues related to both driver behavior and road infrastructure.
- Address the primary factors contributing to fatalities and incapacitating injuries in New Mexico through a comprehensive traffic safety approach including the 4Es of safety – engineering, education, enforcement, and emergency medical services.
- Conduct a data-driven process that is focused on severe crashes (fatal and serious injuries)
- Address safety issues on all roads.
- Incorporate input provided by safety partners representing national, state, tribal, and local agencies, academia, private industry, and non-profit safety advocacy groups.
- Utilize performance measures consistent with MAP-21 guidance and requirements
- Guide future traffic safety investments

*FIGURE 1 Key Considerations for Strategic Highway Safety Plans.*

FHWA’s *Champion’s Guide to Saving Lives* documents guidance for preparing SHSPs and identifies five key considerations:

1. SHSPs should be the result of a collaborative process.
2. SHSPs should be data driven.
3. SHSPs must address safety needs on ALL public roads.
4. SHSPs must be comprehensive – integrates the 4E’s – Engineering, Education, Enforcement and Emergency Medical Services.
5. SHSPs guide investment decisions to achieve reductions in highway fatalities and serious injuries through the implementation of high priority safety strategies.
In short, the recommended CTSP update should be chiefly a prioritization process designed to focus the agency’s safety planning efforts and safety investments where they have the greatest chance of reducing the greatest number of fatal and severe injury crashes. The recommended three-dimensional prioritization process identifies:

1. The **priority crash types and safety emphasis areas** representing the greatest opportunity to save lives and reduce severe injuries are identified.

2. The **priority safety strategies** that have demonstrated effectiveness at reducing crashes (with a bias towards proven effectiveness and lower cost to implement) are selected building from stakeholder input.

3. The **priority road systems** on which priority crash types most frequently occur based on characteristics of jurisdiction, facility type, and crash locations and to more effectively drive future implementation are identified.

The recommended CTSP update framework incorporates and expands the three-dimensional prioritization process as follows:

1. **Confirm CTSP Update Leadership Structure and Core Work Team**
   - Traffic Safety Management Team (TSMT)
   - CTSP Leadership Council
   - Core CTSP Update Work Team

2. **In-Depth Crash Analysis and Overall Safety Program Review**
   - Literature review of state traffic safety documents
   - Stakeholder interviews
   - Analysis of crash data and creation of data “crash trees” (the disaggregation of crash data by crash jurisdiction, facility type, and crash location characteristics)

3. **Identify Critical Emphasis Areas and Suggested Safety Strategies**
   - Critical traffic safety emphasis areas to focus updated CTSP
   - Evidenced-based infrastructure and behavior-related safety strategies to reflect a multidisciplinary Toward Zero Deaths approach to improving safety

4. **Engage Stakeholders to Obtain Input Into the Updated CTSP**
   - Introductory stakeholder webinar
   - Statewide CTSP Update Safety Summit (data presentation, safety education, prioritization of strategies)

5. **Identify Short List of Critical Safety Strategies, Key Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods**
   - Incorporate stakeholder input to critical safety strategies
   - Advisory Team selection of critical infrastructure and behavior-related safety strategies, interim safety goals, CTSP performance measures and supporting evaluation data requirements
6. **Prepare the Updated Strategic Highway Safety Plan**
   - Prepare draft Updated CTSP plan including implementation plans
   - Stakeholder CTSP webinar
   - Revise plan based on stakeholder feedback

7. **Implement and Monitor CTSP Update**
   - Implement plans to communicate CTSP and agency commitments
   - Advisory team on-going monitoring and evaluation
   - Safety program modifications based on monitoring/evaluation results
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MONITORING AND TRACKING SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AND EVALUATING FUTURE VERSIONS OF THE CTSP

The CTSP should be evaluated to measure the progress toward implementing the strategies (such as status of implementation of each strategy, number of route miles with rumble strips, number of citations issued) and to assess the outcome of the improvements (such as number of severe crashes overall and by emphasis area, implementation cost). Thus, evaluation results provide insight useful for improving the program structure and implementation processes followed as well as improving outcomes. Furthermore, a prominent highlight of MAP-21 is its focus on performance and the expenditure of highway funding for improvements that result in reduced traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. In addition to compliance with Federal guidelines, evaluating the performance of safety initiatives is beneficial because the results allow for an assessment of the return on investment and the contribution of the strategies to the crash reduction goals of New Mexico. The findings allow the NMDOT and other state agencies to assess whether the implemented safety improvements would be beneficial for future projects and continued inclusion in future CTSPs. Elimination of funding for strategies that prove to be ineffective provides an opportunity to refocus resource allocation in a manner that maximizes the potential for reducing traffic fatalities and serious injuries. Thus, evaluating the impact of safety improvement projects is an important part of a comprehensive approach to traffic safety in New Mexico. A critical piece of the evaluation effort is a structure through which the information can be disseminated and then reviewed by leadership and stakeholders. The CTSP implementation efforts must be monitored to measure progress and to collect the information required for evaluation.

CTSP TRACKING SYSTEM

The monitoring of safety improvements implemented through the CTSP can be accomplished with a tracking system in the form of a microcomputer-based spreadsheet program. Staff in the various offices within the NMDOT and other state agencies can use the system to record documentation vital to the monitoring process. The expectation is that the effort required can be completed within existing job capacities and with existing computer resources.

The recommended documentation for CTSP outcomes generally includes implementation information (such as date and cost), data (i.e. crashes and traffic volumes from before and after the improvement is implemented), quantitative calculations, qualitative opinions, and conclusions about the safety improvement’s effectiveness. Specific information may vary depending upon the type of improvement (engineering, enforcement, education, or emergency medical services). This information enables assessments of the improvements’ effectiveness to be made using current industry standards and incorporates elements from national guidelines such as the *Highway Safety Manual* (AASHTO) (5), the *Highway Safety Improvement Program Manual* (HSIP) (FHWA) (6), and results from the Evaluations of Low-Cost Safety Improvements Pooled Fund Study (FHWA) (7).

Inclusion of the following improvement attributes while developing the tracking system during the revision process for the CTSP should result in a useful system that maintains a record of progress with implementing CTSP strategies and the effectiveness of the strategies. This will permit comparison of the estimated effectiveness of the planned safety investments compared to the results of implemented safety projects and initiative:

- **Record ID:** An identification number or code for each improvement being monitored.
- **Location:** Describe the intersection, roadway segment, or specific location where an improvement is to be implemented (latitude/longitude coordinates, beginning and ending mileposts, intersecting routes).
• **Improvement:** Describe the improvement implemented. Provide a description of the improvement; a description of the performance measure; the date the improvement was implemented (first day after completion of construction or the timeframe for enforcement and education campaigns); and the cost to implement the improvement. For enforcement improvements, detail the effort involved in terms of locations, personnel, hours invested, and associated media campaigns. For education improvements, detail the messages conveyed and where/how often they were disseminated.

• **Existing Site Geometry & Characteristics (Before Implementation):** Describes the site geometry and other characteristics before the safety improvements were implemented.

• **Modified Site Geometry & Characteristics (After Implementation):** Describes the site geometry and other characteristics after the safety improvements were implemented.

• **Traffic Volume (Before Implementation):** The traffic volume data can be either from recent agency records or from a traffic count conducted before implementing the improvement. The traffic count could be conducted as part of the project scoping and design activities and included in the project cost. Traffic counts conducted within 3 years prior to the start of construction would be valid. Traffic volume counts should not be conducted during construction. It may be necessary to consider adjusting the traffic data due to seasonal variation and other similar attributes.

• **Traffic Volume (After Implementation):** One traffic volume count conducted midway through the 3-year after period would be, at a minimum, representative of the traffic volume after implementation. (Due to budget considerations, only one traffic volume count is suggested for the after period.) To develop yearly volumes for use in the assessments, assume a uniform percent change per year between the count data collected in the before and after periods. Traffic volume counts should be conducted in the same locations as the before-period counts. If possible, include the source of the volume data and/or location and date of the traffic count. It may be necessary to consider adjustments of traffic data due to seasonal variation and other similar attributes.

• **Relevant Crash Data (Before Implementation):** Record the annual crash data by month (type and severity) that is relevant to the performance measure and location for the particular improvement. If appropriate, the crash data relating to particular improvements should be organized to permit appropriate comparisons, for instance by crash type. Crashes should be recorded for the 3 years prior to the first year of construction or initiation of enforcement / education efforts. Crash data does not need to be recorded for the construction period because it will not be used in the evaluation. The data from the crash records could be stored in separate worksheets within the monitoring spreadsheet, with one worksheet representing each year in the before period.

• **Relevant Crash Data (After Implementation):** Record the annual crash data (type and severity) that is relevant to the performance measure and location for the particular improvement. Crashes should be recorded for the 3-year period after construction was completed. The data from the crash records could be stored in separate worksheets within the monitoring spreadsheet, with one worksheet representing each year in the after period. The crash data located within the limits of resurfacing projects should be entered in a separate column from the rest of the crash data. This column should be identified with the beginning-and-ending mileposts for the resurfacing project.

• **Campaign or Outreach Efforts (Before Implementation):** Record the extent of efforts to disseminate public information messages or campaigns conducted relative to the particular improvement (length of time and location for displays on variable message signs, number and content of advertising spots on radio or TV, or prior enforcement campaigns on same roadway segment).
• **Comments:** Record any relevant observations made during the monitoring process. Comments can include information noted about the review of the site after improvements are implemented. Comments can include anecdotal evidence about changes in road user attitudes and behaviors as a result of the improvement. Comments can include opinions about the implementation process and suggestions for revisions along with any resulting shifts in the implementing agency’s business practices.

• **Results:** Record the results of the improvement assessment. The information should include conclusions about the effectiveness of the improvement and recommendations for its continued implementation in the state.

These recommendations for a monitoring process will enhance the analysis process and support a scientific, but realistic, assessment of the effectiveness (impact) of safety improvements in achieving the state’s safety goals. In accordance with MAP-21 requirements, FHWA is in the process of developing guidelines for state DOTs to follow as they prepare updates to their strategic highway safety plans. Any guidance provided relative to monitoring and evaluating safety improvements should be incorporated into the tracking system as it is developed during the next effort to revise the CTSP. (Attachment B contains a disk with a sample tracking system.)

**USE OF THE TRACKING SYSTEM FOR EVALUATION OF THE CTSP**

Ideally, staff in each NMDOT office or state agency most closely associated with the conduct of the action step can monitor the improvements implemented in their region or with their staff and report the results to the NMDOT Traffic Technical Support Bureau. The monitoring effort would include inserting information into the tracking system spreadsheet at least annually, but could be done as the information becomes available (i.e. the dates construction of an improvement begins and ends, the date traffic volume data is recorded). The results would include the quantitative conclusions based on the assessment and qualitative observations about the safety improvement implementation and effectiveness. The conclusions should be specific to the targeted crash type or improvement.

After the individual results are transmitted to the Traffic Technical Support Bureau, the NMDOT can aggregate the results and assess the impact of the CTSP strategies and associated improvements toward achieving the state’s crash-reduction goals. The Traffic Technical Support Bureau can periodically present the results to the CTSP Leadership Council for review and comment. Leadership Council actions could include recommendations for continued implementation, modification, or discontinuance of a particular strategy, suggestions for future revisions to the CTSP, recommendations for future evaluation needs, modifications to funding practices, or modifications to the monitoring process and tracking system. Ultimately, the CTSP Leadership Council should have oversight responsibilities related to the use and maintenance of the tracking system.
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PROMOTING CTSP IMPLEMENTATION SUCCESS AND ADDRESSING CHALLENGES/POTENTIAL BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTATION

The FHWA Strategic Highway Safety Plan Implementation Process Model (4) presents fundamental elements supporting all SHSP implementation practices: leadership, collaboration, communication, and data collection and analysis. An added dimension—ensure accountability for the CTSP commitments—has been included to explore additional CTSP implementation needs. Similarly, the SHSP Evaluation Process Model (8) provides insights to qualitatively assess CTSP program management components including leadership; collaboration and communication; and data collection, management, and analysis. Examination of each foundational element provides helpful insight to effective implementation of the Updated CTSP and challenges to address.

ACTIVE AND ENGAGED CTSP LEADERSHIP

Visible, committed, and engaged leadership is essential to CTSP implementation. New Mexico’s Transportation Safety Management Team (TSMT) was created to track CTSP implementation progress, identify new initiatives to further safety, and to address barriers to safety program implementation.

Recognizing the importance of effective interagency collaboration, a Memorandum of Understanding was created to help ensure ongoing interagency partnerships and commitment to the CTSP. The CTSP Leadership Council, an interagency steering committee comprised of senior leadership from the partner agencies and TSMT, was created to institutionalize the partnership relationship and to review progress toward achieving CTSP goals, identify gaps in performance, identify additional strategies and programs, and address challenges.

The following recommendations can be used to address potential challenges and/or barriers to active and engaged CTSP leadership:

- Defined and distinct CTSP leadership and accountability roles between the CTSP Leadership Council and the Transportation Safety Management Team.
- Executive level and appointed leaders change roles during the CTSP process. It is often difficult to educate new leaders and bring them into the process mid-stream. It is also challenging to sustain progress and keep the momentum when there are leadership changes.
- Focus on most critical safety emphasis areas and highest priority strategies. Challenge of effectively implementing and monitoring progress of 12 emphasis areas and 48 priority strategies.
- Varying levels of engagement and support from one or more key CTSP lead agencies.
- Gaining the necessary support and political momentum to implement key policy initiatives proven to reduce traffic fatalities and severe injuries.
- Maintaining implementation momentum and enthusiasm when safety countermeasure results are long-term.

STRONG AGENCY AND PARTNER COLLABORATION AND COMMUNICATION

Strong internal and external collaborations among CTSP safety partners are essential for effective CTSP implementation and progress monitoring. The interdisciplinary approach to improving traffic safety recognizes the responsibility for effective strategy implementation is shared among multiple partners. Therefore, agencies and safety partners must clearly identify initiatives to effectively support the CTSP safety priorities and are responsible for monitoring the progress of those initiatives. Communication
mechanisms such as online status reports, focused progress meetings, and clear problem/solving and decision-making structure maintains effective CTSP communication.

Strong CTSP collaborations include cost sharing opportunities, leveraging program resources, and the integration of CTSP priorities into other traffic safety-related plans such as state Highway Safety Improvement Programs (HSIPs), behavioral Highway Safety Plans (HSPs), Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) Strategic Plan, Commercial Vehicle Safety Plans (CVSPs), and the State Transportation Improvement Programs (STIPs). These plans should align with and support the overarching traffic safety priorities outlined in the updated CTSP and reflect the safety plan integration required by MAP-21 as well as its enhanced funding flexibility among safety partners. New Mexico helps facilitate interagency and safety partner collaborations through both the TSMT and the CTSP Leadership Council.

The following recommendations can be used to address potential challenges and/or barriers to strong collaboration and communication:

- Integration of CTSP priorities and plan elements into partner safety planning documents. Consistent alignment of program- or agency-specific safety investment priorities with CTSP priorities.
- Regular and consistent communication to share progress on implementation efforts, challenges and successes.
- Consistent goals or a clear Toward Zero Deaths goal helps to maintain focus and coordinate efforts to address the common goal(s).
- The CTSP process should engage all of the safety partners so that they know why they are part of the process and how they can contribute to the success of the program. This will help to coordinate funding resources and maximize the effectiveness of implementation.
- Education/public outreach and enforcement programs need to be coordinated for maximum effectiveness.

**EFFECTIVE DATA COLLECTION FOR IMPLEMENTATION ANALYSIS**

Crash data is the foundation of the CTSP development and update process and the strength of the CTSP is not only in New Mexico’s ability to collect, analyze, prioritize, and evaluate reliable data for crash analysis, but in its ability to apply data analysis to monitor and assess priority safety improvements implemented through the CTSP. In addition, when determining strategy performance measures, it is essential that data that is both relevant and measurable are available including, when necessary, pre and post-implementation data of deployed safety countermeasures. Because the CTSP is a comprehensive safety strategy incorporating engineering, enforcement, education, and emergency medical response, highly integrated data collection and analysis is required. New Mexico’s network of CTSP safety partners must draw from a broad base of data sources—beyond the boundaries of individual organization data—to analyze the safety impact of CTSP priority safety strategies.

The following recommendations can be used to address potential challenges and/or barriers to effective data collection for implementation analysis:

- Relevant data gathering and documentation early in the CTSP planning process to measure and record CTSP strategy performance (safety improvements made).
- Assigned staff roles to collect and analyze strategy implementation data.
- Sufficient resources secured for ongoing CTSP monitoring and evaluation.
• Local agency access to crash data as well as sufficient understanding of traffic safety analysis and countermeasure approaches.

• Crash data maintained on a regular basis to continually monitor and update key data elements.

ENSURE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CTSP COMMITMENTS

Preparing an updated CTSP is an important component of the safety improvement process, but it is not the creation of the plan that ultimately saves lives. Reducing the number of fatalities and severe injuries is the result of effectively implementing the most promising safety strategies targeting the locations and behaviors most at risk. It is the agency and partner commitments to implementing CTSP strategies that makes the life-saving difference. Effective CTSP leadership should assign strategy oversight responsibilities, ensure agency-level action steps are identified, and provide an established, regular, monitoring process – such as scheduled progress status reports on implementation milestones--to track strategy follow-up and ensure accountability for CTSP agency and partner commitments.

The following recommendations can be used to address potential challenges and/or barriers to ensure accountability for CTSP commitments:

• Defined and regularly occurring reporting processes established including defined responsibilities for generating and distributing status and progress reports.

• Consistent reporting formats on which to compare progress results.

• Online tracking tools for successful monitoring of the implementation process.

• Engaged leadership to determine performance metrics and monitor implementation accountability.
GUIDELINES FOR FUTURE CTSP PROCESSES

This section offers guidelines to effectively manage future efforts to revise and update the CTSP to enhance its ability to meet severe crash reduction goals, as well as for facilitating the implementation and evaluation of the revised CTSP. These guidelines result from lessons learned and knowledge gained while performing research for and assessing the current CTSP. The guidelines include recommendations from FHWA’s Draft Evaluation Process Model (8) document. All are in alignment with national best practices and recommendations.

MAP-21 GUIDELINES

- FHWA is in the process of developing guidelines for state DOTs to follow as they prepare updates to their strategic highway safety plans. The following lists the general guidance presented to date. Any further guidance provided should be incorporated into the next effort to revise the CTSP.
  - Data-driven
  - Include all public roads (state and local systems)
  - Focus on severe crashes (fatal and serious injury)
  - Address both driver behavior and infrastructure related crashes
  - Focus resources on areas of greatest need
  - Maximize opportunities to advance safety
  - Prioritize

- MAP-21 performance measures (as currently defined):
  - Focus on fatal and serious injury data
  - All fatality measures reported as a 5-year moving average to account for fluctuations that may obscure trends:
    - Number of traffic fatalities
    - Fatality rate (fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled)
    - Rural fatality rate (rural fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled)
    - Urban fatality rate (urban fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled)
    - Number of serious injuries
    - Serious injury rate (serious injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled)
    - Number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities
    - Number of fatalities in crashes involving a driver or motorcycle operator with a BAC of 0.08 and above
    - Number of speeding-related fatalities
    - Number of motorcyclist fatalities
    - Number of un-helmeted motorcyclist fatalities
    - Number of motor vehicle occupants age 20 or younger involved in fatal crashes
    - Number of older drivers age 65 or greater involved in fatal crashes
- Fatality rate of older drivers age 65 or greater (fatalities age 65 or greater per 100 million vehicle miles traveled)
- Number of pedestrian fatalities
- Observed seat belt use for passenger vehicles, front seat outboard occupants

- Consistent terminology for plan name
  - The country’s highway safety plan developed by the AASHTO and numerous other safety stakeholders is called the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (9). Most state departments of transportation follow this naming convention and call their plans by this name. Consider changing the title to the “New Mexico Strategic Highway Safety Plan” for consistency with the industry’s national best practices.

- Considerations for statewide Traffic Safety Program Structure
  - To provide leadership oversight of the CTSP, New Mexico adopted the recommended two-tiered leadership structure composed of the CTSP Leadership Council and the Transportation Safety Management Team (TSMT). While this leadership structure is essential for successful CTSP implementation, state models exist that expand the multidisciplinary, multiagency, organizational safety structure to include a program implementation team, program working groups, regional steering committees led by local engineering and enforcement leadership, dedicated regional program coordinators, and dedicated agency staff support.

  - One nationally recognized, award-winning safety program model is the Minnesota Toward Zero Deaths Program Structure (10). The Minnesota Toward Zero Deaths Program is co-chaired by leadership from the Minnesota DOT, Minnesota Department of Public Safety, and Minnesota Department of Health, and facilitated by the Center for Transportation Studies at the University of Minnesota. The program includes the above mentioned structure components as well as an annual cycle of Toward Zero Deaths meetings and events to maintain stakeholder engagement, including:

    - Annual executive advisory commission
    - Monthly leadership team meetings
    - Quarterly program team meetings
    - Monthly working groups
    - Quarterly stakeholder breakfasts
    - Regional Toward Zero Deaths workshops
    - Annual statewide Toward Zero Deaths conference (over 900 participants at the 2012 conference)

Attachment C contains the full text of the Minnesota Toward Zero Deaths Program.

**EMPHASIS AREAS**

- Select emphasis areas based on the results of a data-driven analysis of the fatal and serious injury crashes. Conduct data analysis techniques such as a crash tree diagram to facilitate the selection of emphasis areas that are based on the greatest safety need and provide the opportunities to maximize the potential to reduce fatalities and severe injuries.
• Redefine aggressive driving so queries of the crash database return more reliable and accurate results for data pertinent to this crash type. Aggressive driving could be defined as a speeding-related crash. (NOTE: The Crash Data Collection recommendation for crash data reports to distinguish between various driving behaviors.)

• Delete Public Information and Education as a standalone emphasis area. This effort should be included in the action steps for agency-specific plans as appropriate.

STRATEGIES

• Review nationally published research reports and agency websites to identify the effectiveness of a proposed strategy prior to selecting it for inclusion.

• Strategies should consider but not explicitly incorporate separate safety plans produced by state agencies or other safety stakeholders.

• Strategies should provide a direction rather than consist of a specific task that can be included in agency-specific plans as an action step.

• Prioritize potential strategies based on safety effectiveness, ability to implement, investment capability, and select a reasonable number that focuses resources on the areas of greatest safety need.

• The name, objective, expected outcome, and performance measure components of a strategy should be as consistent as possible with national best practices, measurable, and complementary the emphasis area, to provide clear guidance about the intent and desired effectiveness of the strategy.

• The CTSP definition of a lane-departure crash is not clear. Although the emphasis area is called “Lane-Departure Crashes”, the definition suggests roadway departure or lane departure to the opposite travel lanes only. The definition and the related crash numbers presented in the CTSP do not include sideswipe same-direction crashes, which is a type of lane-departure crash. The definition of this emphasis area could be modified to match FHWA’s definitions for lane-departure and roadway-departure crashes. According FHWA, a roadway-departure crash is a non-intersection crash in which a vehicle crosses an edge line, a centerline, or leaves the traveled way (11). A lane-departure crash occurs when a vehicle crosses a lane line in the same direction of travel. Revised definitions such as this example would permit more accurate query results for use in identifying locations of concern.

• Based on the numbers of fatalities presented in the CTSP figures, the definitions in the text do not match the query results for the alcohol and lane-departure emphasis areas. Suggest modifying definitions to match numbers of fatalities and serious injuries presented in CTSP.

• Suggest change name of Special Users emphasis area to Other Users (includes bicycles, pedestrians, etc.).

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

• Include performance measures that are recommended in nationally published research and fulfill federal reporting requirements.

• Select performance measures that are relevant to the strategy and consistent with the stated objective and expected outcomes of the strategy.

• Select performance measures for which data are readily available for use in assessing strategy performance.

• Include a performance measure for severe crashes related to bicyclists. In addition to performance measures required by MAP-21, states have the discretion to include performance measures based on their own unique traffic safety issues and concerns.
ACTION STEPS

- The CTSP should be an over-arching document that effectively identifies and communicates the critical safety emphasis areas and recommends priority strategies that will reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries within the state. All other agency traffic safety plans should align with these emphasis areas/strategies and identify action steps that can be conducted by the agencies to support the CTSP efforts (for example, Highway Safety Plan, Traffic Records Strategic Plan, Highway Safety Improvement Program plans).

EVALUATION

- Evaluation of the effectiveness of the CTSP should be conducted with relevant data that can be entered into a tracking system.

- Data trend lines should include at least ten years of crash data to account for short-term, random variations in crash patterns. Use trend line comparisons to assess overall safety performance rather than the effectiveness of a particular safety improvement.

- Comparisons to assess the effectiveness of strategies should use similar datasets to provide a more accurate and efficient indication of the effect of a strategy. For example, data from a limited number of locations or roadway miles for which an improvement was implemented should not be compared to data for the entire state. For engineering strategies, data comparisons should be made only for locations that received the treatment and for control sites. Likewise, data comparisons for enforcement strategies should be made only for locations where the enforcement campaigns occurred.

- Evaluation efforts should formulate recommendations to revise and improve the CTSP processes, projects and programs.

- Include various sources of information in the evaluation such as data analysis results, implementation cost, progress toward achieving goals and objectives, and efficiency of processes established to work across agencies and share data.

- Disseminate evaluation results to leadership, those charged with implementing the CTSP at all levels within agencies, stakeholders, the public, and media. Use a consistent format to present results. Consistent with MAP-21 guidance the CTSP should be a transparent public document.

- Share results for both successful and deficient programs and projects early in the process. Sharing of results provides the opportunity to make modifications that will result in more desirable outcomes, educate the public and build support for the efforts, and encourage officials to provide additional funding for safety efforts.

- Develop an action plan to implement the results and recommendations from the evaluation efforts to continually improve CTSP efficiency and effectiveness.

- Develop a plan to regularly disseminate evaluation results to decision makers.
TRAFFIC SAFETY DATA COLLECTION AND STORAGE

- Implement data collection and storage improvements identified in the Statewide Traffic Records System Strategic Plan (12) and the Comprehensive Transportation Safety Plan Final Report (13) before using data to identify critical emphasis areas or to measure performance.

- Evaluate the effectiveness of strategies. Higher quality data can provide a more accurate portrayal of traffic safety issues.

- Adopt the latest Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria Guideline (Fourth Edition, introduced on July 2, 2012) (14) recommendations to collect crash data relevant to EMS vehicles/personnel involved in crashes and to distinguish between reckless/aggressive driving behaviors and inattentive/careless/negligent/erratic driving behaviors as contributing factors to crashes. More specific data for these types of crashes will provide the opportunity to evaluate strategies in the Emergency Services Response and Aggressive Driving emphasis areas.

- Collect, transfer, and store traffic safety data in accordance with the model performance measures for timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility.
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ESTIMATED IMPLEMENTATION BUDGET, SCOPE, AND STAFFING TO UPDATE THE CTSP FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

The following tasks are recommended for updating the CTSP:

- Task 1: Conduct Kickoff Meeting
- Task 2: Establish Teams and Coordination Meetings
- Task 3: Conduct Comprehensive Review of CTSP, New Mexico CTSP Research Implementation Plan and Related Documents
- Task 4: Review and Analyze Statewide Data
- Task 6: Identify MAP-21 Requirements and NMDOT Performance Measures
- Task 7: Identify Updated Critical Emphasis Areas and Conduct Stakeholder Safety Launch
- Task 8: Identify Proposed Priority Safety Strategies
- Task 9: Determine and Finalize Performance Measures and Conduct Stakeholder Meeting – Safety Summit
- Task 10: Prepare Draft SHSP
- Task 11: Prepare Draft Implementation Plan and Evaluation Plans (add into final SHSP)
- Task 12: Prepare Final SHSP Report
- Task 13: Prepare Communications Plan
- Task 14: Contingent Services for Unplanned Work
- Task 15: Project Management and Quality Control

SUGGESTED BUDGET

The suggested budget to update the CTSP is $300,000 to $350,000 for consultant support.

SUGGESTED CONSULTANT TEAM STAFFING

The following consultant team staff are recommended for updating the CTSP:

- Consultant Team Leader
- Project Manager
- Safety Engineering Team Leader
- Crash Data Analysis Engineer
- Safety Engineering Support
- Behavioral Safety Team Leader
- Behavioral Safety Support
- Technical Editor
- Communications/Marketing Support
Note: Staffing for a consultant supported SHSP update is a function of the design of the team, which is based on the final scope of work and expected level of effort.

SUGGESTED TRAFFIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT BUREAU STAFFING

From a state perspective, it is estimated that at least one staff member dedicating 50-percent time is desirable as the development and coordination of the updated SHSP is complex and multidimensional process involving a broad range of safety stakeholders.
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## Emphasis Area: Aggressive Driving and Speeding

### Strategy AG-1: Implement 100 Days and Nights of Summer Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Strategy: Implement 100 Days and Nights of Summer Program</th>
<th>Alignment* and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of arrests and citations June 1 through September 8 compared to the previous 3-year average</td>
<td>Moderate evidence of effectiveness: Tried (1), 2 stars (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Modify text to specify the comparison should be made specifically for the sections of roadway along which the targeted enforcement was implemented.</td>
<td>5 stars (2) Automated enforcement strategies (Red Light Running and automated speed enforcement cameras)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities and serious injuries from June 1 through September 8 compared to the previous 3-year average</td>
<td>Relevant data is available in the NMDOT crash database.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Modify text to specify the comparison should be made specifically for the sections of roadway along which the targeted enforcement was implemented.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Action Steps

1. **Negotiate with law enforcement agencies during this time period.**
   - Aligns
   - Yes, with refinement
   - Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans:
     - Conduct high-visibility enforcement in targeted locations for high-risk populations.
     - Use location and crash data to inform and direct high-visibility enforcement activity.

2. **Develop a focus and theme for the public awareness campaign.**
   - Recommended national best practice (1), (3)
   - Moderate evidence of effectiveness: 3 stars (2) – Public information supporting enforcement
   - Yes
   - Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans:
     - Campaign is to support the enforcement efforts.
     - Add an Action Step to implement the public awareness campaign.

3. **Report results.**
   - Yes
   - None

---

*Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.

1. NCHRP Report 500 Series, Volume 1: A Guide for Addressing Aggressive-Driving Collisions, National Cooperative Highway Research Program / Transportation Research Board, 2003: “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.

   - 5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
   - 4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
   - 3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
   - 2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
   - 1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence

### Emphasis Area: Aggressive Driving and Speeding

**Strategy AG-2: Develop and Implement Comprehensive Programs/Laws to Deter Aggressive Driving**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategy: Develop and Implement Comprehensive Programs/Laws to Deter Aggressive Driving** | Varied evidence of effectiveness:  
- Tried (1) – Use of in-pavement technologies to communicate the need to reduce speeds  
- Tried (1) – Implement variable message signs  
- Tried (1) Automated speed enforcement  
- 5 stars (2) – Automated enforcement technologies  
- 1 star (1) – aggressive driving laws  
Aligns with nationally recommended best practice (4), (5) | Yes | Compliment a comprehensive speed management program including traffic engineering, judiciary outreach, enforcement, and public outreach about the enforcement (4) | Strategically address speeders, locations, and conditions most common or most hazardous in speeding-related crashes though a data-driven, targeted enforcement approach (5) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Number of aggressive driving arrests and citations** | Aligns with emphasis area  
Aligns with strategy  
Aligns with federal requirement to report speeding citations issued during grant-funded enforcement activities | Yes | None |
| **Number of fatalities and serious injuries related to aggressive driving** | Aligns with emphasis area  
Aligns with strategy  
Aligns with federal requirements (3) | Relevant data is available in the NMDOT crash database | Yes | None |

**Action Steps**

1. Research and establish a definition of aggressive driving and its characteristics.  
   - Aligns with emphasis area  
   - Aligns with strategy  
   - Aligns with federal requirement to report speeding citations issued during grant-funded enforcement activities  
   - Yes, include in future CTSP until the definition is established.  
   - None

2. Develop a comprehensive aggressive driving program, including promoting the use of advanced technology to support enforcement efforts.  
   - Tried (1) – Use of in-pavement technologies to communicate the need to reduce speeds  
   - Tried (1) – Implement variable message signs  
   - Tried (1) – Automated speed enforcement  
   - 5 stars (2) – Automated Enforcement (automated red-light running and speed enforcement cameras)  
   - Yes, include in future CTSP until the program is developed.  
   - None

3. Author the law and seek a sponsor.  
   - Not clear which law being proposed  
   - Yes, include in future CTSP until the law is passed.  
   - Clarify law(s) to be introduced.
4. Seek support from law enforcement (e.g., New Mexico Municipal Chief's Association and New Mexico Sheriffs and Police Association).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aligns</th>
<th>Yes, include in future CTSP until the law is passed.</th>
<th>Clarify “support” from law enforcement (e.g., educate elected officials on the safety benefits of speed enforcement technology)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Notes:
1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
   - 5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
   - 4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
   - 3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
   - 2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
   - 1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence
4. Speed Enforcement Camera Systems Operational Guidelines, Federal Highway Administration and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT HS 810 916, March 2008 [13] (Automated speed enforcement (ASE) systems are an important element in speed management and can be a very effective countermeasure to prevent speeding-related crashes. However, when used, ASE is a supplement to, not a replacement for, traditional enforcement operations.)
## Emphasis Area: Aggressive Driving and Speeding

### Strategy AG-3: Increase Fines for Speeding Violations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment¹ and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Increase Fines for Speeding Violations</td>
<td>Moderate evidence of effectiveness: 2 stars (1) for general traffic offenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Important to increase public perceived risk of being stopped and fined by coupling enforcement with public outreach (see comment below).</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of speeding arrests and citations</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy. Partially aligns with federal requirement to report speeding citations issued during grant-funded enforcement activities (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Consider measure more directly related to successful passage of law to increase fines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of speeding-related fatalities and serious injuries</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy. Aligns with federal requirements to report traffic crash fatalities and serious injuries data (2)</td>
<td>Yes, relevant data is available in the NMDOT crash database</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Consider measure more directly related to successful passage of law to increase fines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Research and evaluate speeding fines in New Mexico and other states in the region.</td>
<td>Moderate evidence of effectiveness: 2 stars (1) for general traffic offenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gather information to demonstrate the impact of increased fines for exceeding the speed limit.</td>
<td>Moderate evidence of effectiveness: 2 stars (1) for general traffic offenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Public tends to hold an elevated perception of crash risk, being stopped, and increased fines in work zones and school zones, but less so in safety corridors unless accompanied by high-visibility enforcement and strong public information outreach about the enforcement (3)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Author the law and seek a sponsor.</td>
<td>Moderate evidence of effectiveness: 2 stars (1) for general traffic offenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Seek support from law enforcement (e.g., New Mexico Municipal Chief’s Association and New Mexico Sheriffs and Police Association).</td>
<td>Moderate evidence of effectiveness: 2 stars (1) for general traffic offenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.

   - 5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
   - 4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
   - 3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
   - 2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
   - 1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence


   - (3) Effectiveness of Double Fines as a Speed Control Measure in Safety Corridors, FHWA-OR-DF-03-10, Oregon Department of Transportation Research Group, December 2002 [21]
## Emphasis Area: Aggressive Driving and Speeding

### Strategy AG-4: Raise Traffic Safety Enforcement and Education Fee (TSEEF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Calculate the cost and benefit of increasing the TSEEF fee and publish the results.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gather information to demonstrate the need and value of increasing the TSEEF fee.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Author the law and seek a state legislator or the Governor to sponsor it.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Seek support from law enforcement (e.g., New Mexico Municipal Chief's Association and New Mexico Sheriffs and Police Association).</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of funding through TSEEF</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Suggest broadening strategy, such as, &quot;Strengthen sufficiency of funds dedicated to improving traffic safety.&quot;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects and programs funded with TSEEF funds</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Indicate percent of increase in funding as the performance measure.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Action Steps

1. Calculate the cost and benefit of increasing the TSEEF fee and publish the results.
2. Gather information to demonstrate the need and value of increasing the TSEEF fee.
3. Author the law and seek a state legislator or the Governor to sponsor it.
4. Seek support from law enforcement (e.g., New Mexico Municipal Chief's Association and New Mexico Sheriffs and Police Association).

### Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.


(2) Speeding and Aggressive Driving Survey of the States, Governors Highway Safety Association, March 1, 2012 [50]

(3) Community How To Guides On… Underage Drinking Prevention, Guide 8: Self Sufficiency, DOT HS 809 209, March 2001 [34] (Resource features self-sufficiency funding strategies including earmarked, fee-based public funds such as Traffic Safety Education and Enforcement Fund [TSEEF].)
### Emphasis Area: Aggressive Driving and Speeding

#### Strategy AG-5: Update NMDOT District Traffic Safety Corridor Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment(^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Update NMDOT District Traffic Safety Corridor Programs</td>
<td>Moderate evidence of effectiveness Tried (1) 2 stars (2)</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Alignment(^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of speeding-related citations and arrests for each designated safety corridor</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Aligns with federal requirement to report speeding citations issued during grant-funded enforcement activities (3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of speeding-related fatalities and serious injuries for each designated safety corridor</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Aligns with federal requirements to report traffic crash fatalities and serious injuries data (3)</td>
<td>Relevant data is available in the NMDOT crash database</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Meet with each district to reevaluate and designate new safety corridors where warranted.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Analyze speed data related to fatal and serious injury crashes.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
2. NCHRP Report 500 Series, Volume 1: A Guide for Addressing Aggressive-Driving Collisions, National Cooperative Highway Research Programs/Transportation Research Board, 2003 [39]: “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.
3. NCHRP Report 500 Series, Volume 1: A Guide for Addressing Aggressive-Driving Collisions, National Cooperative Highway Research Programs/Transportation Research Board, 2003 [39]: “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.
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### Emphasis Area: Alcohol-Related/Alcohol-Impaired Driving

#### Strategy AL-1: Conduct Aggressive, High Visibility DWI Enforcement Campaigns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategy:** Conduct Aggressive, High Visibility DWI Enforcement Campaigns | Demonstrated Effective: 4 stars (2) Saturation patrols; 3 stars (1) Traid (1) | Yes | Yes | None | • 5 stars (2) Enhanced use of sobriety checkpoints  
• 3 stars (2) Drugged driving enforcement  
• Enhanced night time seat belt enforcement – recommended best practice*** |
| **Performance Measures** | | | | | |
| DWI citations, arrests, and convictions | Aligns with emphasis area  
Aligns with strategy  
Aligns with federal requirements (3) | Yes | Yes | Existing federal requirement: Percentage of DWI arrests that are convictions | • Existing federal requirement: Number of arrests during grant-funded enforcement  
• Reduction in alcohol-related crashes in communities checkpoints are held |
| Alcohol impaired driving-related fatalities and serious injuries | Aligns with emphasis area  
Aligns with strategy  
Aligns with federal requirements (3) | Yes | Yes | Incorporate 0.08 BAC or higher only (not “alcohol-related” or “alcohol-involved”) | MAP-21 requirement – Include average impaired driving fatality rate (number of impaired driving fatalities of 0.08 BAC or higher per 100 million vehicle miles traveled using the most recent 3 years of FARS data). In addition, MAP-21 excludes impaired pedestrians and bicyclists from fatality reporting. |

#### Action Steps

1. Work with law enforcement agencies to negotiate contracts for high-visibility enforcement efforts, emphasizing checkpoints.  
   - Demonstrated Effective: 5 stars (2) Sobriety checkpoints; 4 stars (2) Saturation patrols  
   - Proven (1)  
   - Aligns**  
   - Yes  
   - Focus on highest risk counties for enforcement campaigns. |
2. Collaborate and provide analysis for San Juan County, McKinley County, Navajo Nation, and State Police in implementing law enforcement task forces to enforce DWI laws across jurisdictional lines.  
   - Demonstrated Effective: 5 stars (2) Sobriety checkpoints; 4 stars (2) Saturation patrols  
   - Proven (1)  
   - Aligns**  
   - Yes  
   - • Define “provide analysis for”  
   - • Lessons learned from San Juan County DWI Task Force evaluation effort? |
3. Support the Special Investigations Division to enforce the Liquor Control Act and the Regulations and Licensing Dept to prosecute violators.  
   - Demonstrated Effective: 2 stars (2) Responsible beverage service  
   - Proven (1)  
   - Aligns**  
   - Yes  
   - None |
4. Support the Superblitz and the State Police program to achieve a higher reduction in alcohol-related crashes and fatalities.  
   - Demonstrated Effective: 5 stars (2) Sobriety checkpoints; 4 stars (2) Saturation patrols (“Superblitz” = belt + alcohol)  
   - Proven (1)  
   - Aligns**  
   - Yes  
   - Define “support” |
5. Evaluate Full-time law enforcement efforts to determine the feasibility of continued funding.  
   - Aligns**  
   - Yes  
   - None |
6. Provide DWI information and training to all persons involved in DWI-related police traffic services.  
   - Aligns**  
   - Yes  
   - None |
Alignment performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.

1. NCHRP Report 500 Series: Volume 16, A Guide for Reducing Alcohol-Related Collisions, National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board, 2005 [14]. “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.


Further investigation/research needed to confirm. However, Tallahassee, Florida DUI Enforcement Program in 2010 experienced a 58% increase in DUI arrests due in part to enhanced officer training to identify impaired drivers.

*** Alcohol-impaired drivers comprised more than two-thirds of fatally injured drivers killed at night, and only 26% of these drivers were belted at night. Daytime and Nighttime Seat Belt Use by Fatally Injured Passenger Vehicle Occupants, DOT HS 811 281, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2010. [52]
## Emphasis Area: Alcohol-Related/Alcohol-Impaired Driving

### Strategy AL-2: Improve the Effectiveness of Alcohol-Impaired Driving Sanctions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Strategy: Improve the Effectiveness of Alcohol-Impaired Driving Sanctions</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Highly Effective: 5 stars (2) Alcohol Assessment and Treatment, Mandatory Ignition Interlock Proven (1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consider conducting a comprehensive assessment to strengthen impaired driving criminal penalties and license sanctions. Include multidisciplinary stakeholders. (2)</td>
<td>Highly Effective: • Administrative License Suspension Upon Arrest; ER/Trauma Center Alcohol Screening and Brief Intervention; 5 stars (2) • Vehicle/License Plate Seizure, Lower BAC Limit for Repeat Offenders; 4 stars (2) • Administrative License Suspension Upon Arrest, Vehicle/License Plate Seizure; Proven (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>moderately Effective</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUI convictions and sanctioning behavior</strong></td>
<td>Align with emphasis area</td>
<td>Align with national best practice</td>
<td>Percentage of DWI arrests that are convictions; Note: Don’t include “sanctioning behavior,” too broad to measure effectively</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of convictions resulting in ignition interlock installation</strong></td>
<td>Align with emphasis area</td>
<td>Align with national best practice</td>
<td>Proportion of sentences completed</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of sentences completed</strong></td>
<td>Align with emphasis area</td>
<td>Align with national best practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol impaired driving-related fatalities and serious injuries</strong></td>
<td>Align with emphasis area</td>
<td>Align with national best practice</td>
<td>Incorporate 0.08 BAC or higher only (not “alcohol-related” or “alcohol-involved”)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Action Steps

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of new laws and policy changes.
   - **Highly to Moderately Effective:** Range from 3 stars to 5 stars based on safety policy (1), (2), (3)
   - **Considerations for Agency-Specific Plans:** • Define priority safety policies to evaluate • Consider pre and post-crash data surrounding policy implementation and enforcement • MAP-21 includes incentive grant programs to encourage states to adopt stronger state impaired driving laws
2. Determine the extent to which treatment and other mandatory sanctions are part of the judgment and sentence.
   - **Highly Effective:** Proven (1) – Alcohol Assessment and Treatment, Mandatory Ignition Interlock 5 stars (2) Alcohol Assessment and Treatment, Mandatory Ignition Interlock
   - **Considerations for Agency-Specific Plans:** Define “other mandatory sanctions”
3. Continue the Court Monitoring Program focusing on courts in counties at high risk for DWI crashes.
   - **Moderately Effective:** Tried (1) – Eliminate Diversion Programs and Plea Agreements to Lesser Offenses 3 stars (2) Court Monitoring
   - **Considerations for Agency-Specific Plans:** None
4. Provide funding for DWI/Drug Courts and continue to review and evaluate New Mexico’s DWI/Drug Court statistics.  

**Highly Effective:**

- Proven (1) – DWI Courts, DWI Offender Monitoring
  - 4 stars (2) DWI Courts, DWI Offender Monitoring

- Consider available DWI/Drug court statistics/offender data into program performance measures
- Lessons learned from evaluation efforts?

5. Continue training and educating prosecutors and law enforcement through the Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor (TSRP) Program.

- Aligns with recommended national best practice**
- Research limited regarding TSRP effectiveness**

6. Partner with UNM to develop and provide prosecution and practice training for UNM law students.

- N/A
- Research limited regarding prosecutor training**

Notes:

1 Alignment performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended measures. Alignment of strategy and action steps with national guidance.

(1) NCHRP Report 500 Series: Volume 16, A Guide for Reducing Alcohol-Related Collisions, National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board, 2005. “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.


5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence


** Further research needed to confirm. However, a 2002 study by the Traffic Injury Research Foundation (TIRF) reports that 48% of prosecutors surveyed believe the training they receive prior to assuming their positions is inadequate. Ensuring adequate training and sharing of knowledge among prosecutors who handle DWI cases is essential for the effective prosecution and disposition of DWI cases.
**Strategy AL-3: Coordinate and Implement Initiatives Included in All Impaired Driving Plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment¹ and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Coordinate and Implement Initiatives Included in All Impaired Driving Plans</td>
<td>CTSP does not identify specific agency/tribal government initiatives implemented</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Align key priority, strategy-level agency and tribal government safety commitments to updated SHSP impaired-driving emphasis area.</td>
<td>Strategy-level, agency and tribal government commitments to reduce impaired driving fatalities and serious injuries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of impaired driving initiatives implemented from the HSP and the Tribal DWI Task Force Plan</td>
<td>CTSP does not identify specific agency/tribal government initiatives implemented</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Align agency and tribal government-specific performance measures with the updated SHSP performance measures</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWI citations, arrests, and convictions</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Aligns with federal requirements (1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Existing Federal Requirement: Percentage of DWI arrests that are convictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol impaired driving-related fatalities and serious injuries</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Aligns with strategy</td>
<td>Aligns with federal requirements (1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Incorporate 0.08 BAC or higher only (not “alcohol-related” or “alcohol-involved”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Steps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Implement impaired driving projects outlined in the FY 2011 HSP.</td>
<td>Effectiveness Undetermined: Level of effectiveness based on strategies deployed in the Highway Safety Plan (HSP)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Align priority, strategy-level (not specific action steps) agency HSP commitments to reduce impaired driving fatalities and serious injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implement (as resources allow) the Tribal Task Force Plan.</td>
<td>Effectiveness Undetermined: Level of effectiveness based on strategies deployed in the Tribal Task Force Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Align priority, strategy-level (not specific action steps) tribal government commitments to reduce impaired driving fatalities and serious injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

¹ Alignment performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practice.
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## Emphasis Area: Emergency Services Response

### Strategy EM-1: Improve Traffic Flow and Scene Safety for Motor Vehicle Collisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Accessibility of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Improve Traffic Flow and Scene Safety for Motor Vehicle Collisions</td>
<td>Aligns with national recommended best practice (1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of incidents that result in secondary collisions</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Not currently available in NMDOT crash database or EMSTARS database</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Complete recommended crash reporting and database modifications to provide this data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Number and severity of injuries to incident responders                        | Aligns with emphasis area                     | Not currently available in NMDOT crash database or EMSTARS database | Yes, with refinements                        | • Review frequency of these occurrences to determine magnitude of issue  
| Action Steps                                                                 |                                               |                        |                                         | • Complete recommended crash scene procedures |
| 1. Research and analyze how many EMS responders are injured in secondary crashes when responding to an emergency. | Aligns                                        |                        |                                        |                                                |
| 2. Document NMDOT resources available to assist with scene safety.            | Aligns                                        |                        |                                        |                                                |
| 3. Develop and implement procedures for requesting NMDOT assistance.          | Aligns                                        |                        |                                        |                                                |

### Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.


## Emphasis Area: Emergency Services Response

### Strategy EM-2: Maintain and Expand the New Mexico Emergency Medical Services Tracking and Reporting System (NM EMSTARS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measure/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment(^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Strategy:** Maintain and Expand the New Mexico Emergency Medical Services Tracking and Reporting System (NM EMSTARS)

- Aligns with national recommended best practice (2), (3)
- Yes
- None

**Performance Measure**

- Number and proportion of participating EMS service agencies

- Aligns with emphasis area
- Aligns with strategy
- Aligns with recommended national best practices
- Yes
- Yes
- None
- None

**Action Steps**

1. Implement a phased statewide data collection plan.
   - Recommended (2), (3)
   - Tried (1)
   - Yes
   - Collect data recommended in most current version of NHTSA Prehospital Dataset

2. Assess data quality through routine analyses and reporting.
   - Recommended (3)
   - Yes
   - None

3. Identify possible funding sources to expand data collection training and analyses.
   - Aligns
   - Yes
   - Include in future CTSP until funding sources are identified
   - None

4. Partner with NMDOT to identify and analyze data on victims of motor vehicle crashes.
   - Tried (1)
   - Yes
   - None

---

\(^1\) Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.

1. NCHRP Report 500 Series, Volume 15: A Guide for Enhancing Rural Emergency Medical Services, National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board, 2005 [53]: “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.
2. Resolution 2003-03: Member States Agreement to Conform to NHTSA Uniform Prehospital Dataset, Version 2.0, National Association of State EMS Officials, October 18, 2003 [26]
3. National EMS Information System (NEMSIS) website [27]
Emphasis Area: Emergency Services Response

Strategy EM-3: Develop Information on the Extent of Injury and Circumstances of People Treated in Trauma Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment1 and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Develop Information on the Extent of Injury and Circumstances of People Treated in Trauma Centers</td>
<td>Aligns with recommended national best practices (2)</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>National best practices recommend ongoing coordination between EMS providers and the public health community. (2)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of trauma centers and volunteer hospitals reporting data</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of trauma centers and volunteer hospitals reporting high-quality data</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligns with strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Steps</td>
<td>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</td>
<td>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintain and build the trauma registry.</td>
<td>Aligns with recommended national best practices (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assess data quality and provide status reports to participating hospitals and the injury prevention community.</td>
<td>Moderate to low effectiveness: Tried (1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Partner with NMDOT to identify and analyze data on victims of motor vehicle crashes.</td>
<td>Moderate to low effectiveness: Tried (1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1 Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
2 “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; "Tried" strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment¹ and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Develop an EMS Management Curriculum</td>
<td>Aligns with national recommended best practice (1), (2)</td>
<td>Yes, include in future plan until program is developed.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Once the curriculum is developed, change strategy to &quot;Implement ongoing evaluation and revision of curriculum as necessary.&quot; Aligns with national recommended best practices. (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program development status</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Aligns with strategy</td>
<td>Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td>Yes, include in future plan until program is developed.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants enrolled in EMS Management Curriculum</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Aligns with strategy</td>
<td>Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Determine the status of educational programs at Eastern New Mexico University-Roswell and the UNM EMS Academy.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes, include in future plans until the status is determined.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct a needs assessment to identify specific additional areas for EMS manager development.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes, include in future plans until the needs assessment is conducted.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop curriculum and supporting educational materials.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes, include in future plans until the curriculum and materials are established.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop a program implementation plan to reach the target audience.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes, include in future plans until the implementation plan is developed.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop a program evaluation plan.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes, include in future plans until the evaluation plan is developed.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Implement the program with ongoing evaluation and revision as necessary.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
¹ Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
(1) Inaugural Meeting Report Draft #2, National EMS Management Curriculum Committee, October 31 & November 1, 2006 and December 14-16, 2006 [28]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Aim</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify and implement engineering countermeasures to reduce fatigued and distracted driving</td>
<td>Various levels of effectiveness: Proven/Tried/Experimental (1)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities and serious injuries related to fatigued and distracted driving</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Tried (1) – Add a performance measure for efforts to improve and add rest areas. Could include observations of the number of users during daytime and nighttime hours, average duration of a stop, number and percentage of parking spaces occupied, number and types of crimes reported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify funding available to continue rumble strip installation and construct or remodel rest areas.</td>
<td>Proven (1) for edgeline rumble strips on freeways</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Add an Action Step relative to collecting before and after data for the specific roadway segments that receive the engineering-related treatments to facilitate a more accurate assessment of the strategy effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop methods for encouraging the development of new technologies to improve traveler safety without adding to driver distraction.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
- (1) NCHRP Report 500 Series, Volume 14: A Guide for Reducing Crashes Involving Drowsy and Distracted Drivers, National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board, 2005 [51]: “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available, “Experimental” strategies have been suggested and implemented by at least one agency in one location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy: Increase Public Awareness on Fatigued and Distracted Driving</th>
<th>Alignment 1 and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Increase Public Awareness on Fatigued and Distracted Driving</td>
<td>Moderate to low effectiveness:</td>
<td>Aligns with strategy</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Modify to include text specifically related to conducting a media campaign.</td>
<td>Add a strategy for additions or changes to laws related to distracted driving such as texting/cell phone use [2 stars (2)], and graduated driver licensing for beginning drivers [5 stars (2)]. Add a strategy for encouraging employers to offer fatigue management programs for employees who work rotating shifts or the nighttime shift. – Proven (1). Add a strategy for enhanced enforcement of commercial motor vehicle hours of service regulations. – Proven (1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of public awareness educational packets distributed</th>
<th>Aligns with emphasis area</th>
<th>Yes, with refinements</th>
<th>Revise to “Percentage of the targeted audience who report being aware of the campaign and are knowledgeable of its messages”. Tried (1)</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Change in policy or law

| Aligns with emphasis area | Yes |

### Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify funding and oversee campaign development.</td>
<td>Moderate to low effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identify a vendor to develop the campaign.</td>
<td>Moderate to low effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review, finalize, and implement the campaign.</td>
<td>Moderate to low effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices. (1) NCHRP Report 500 Series, Volume 14: A Guide for Reducing Crashes Involving Drowsy and Distracted Drivers, National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board, 2005 (51): “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.


### Emphasis Area: Intersection Crashes

**Strategy IN-1: Develop and Implement Safety Countermeasures to Reduce Intersection-Related Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/ Performance Measure/ Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment(^2) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Develop and Implement Safety Countermeasures to Reduce Intersection-Related Crashes</td>
<td>Various levels of effectiveness: Proven/Tried/Experimental (1)</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Divide this strategy into two separate strategies – one for urban intersections and one for rural intersections</td>
<td>Consider adding a strategy for reducing at-grade railroad crossing collisions. (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance Measure

| Number of fatal and serious injury crashes at urban and rural intersections | Aligns with emphasis area | Relevant data is available in the NMDOT crash database. | Yes, with refinements | Revise text to refer to urban intersections for the urban intersection strategy. | None |

#### Action Steps

1. Following the procedures of the NM Highway Safety Improvement Program, plan, program, design, implement, and evaluate engineering type stand-alone safety improvement projects to reduce intersection-related fatalities and serious injuries by employing any of (but not limited to) the following countermeasures:

   - Intersection lighting
   - Intersection-related pavement markings
   - Intersection-related warning signs
   - Intersection-related regulatory signs
   - Roundabouts
   - Signalizing an unsignalized intersection
   - Warning flashing signals on approaches to intersections
   - Horizontal and vertical curve realignment
   - Intersection relocation to reduce hazards of potential traffic collisions
   - Enhanced crosswalk pavement markings and signing to reduce pedestrian involved crashes
   - Community pedestrian travel demand study
   - Install signs, sidewalks, curb and gutter, median refuges, pedestrian detectors, and other devices to reduce pedestrian involved crashes
   - Urban travel lane bus stop relocation to reduce vehicle queuing in intersection
   - Improved geometry of horizontal curves* 
   - Improvements to existing traffic signal devices
   - Channelizing intersections
   - Construct acceleration and deceleration lanes at intersections
   - Augmenting Section 130 highway – railroad crossing safety funds with additional HSIP funds for improved crossing signals, gates, pavement markings, signs, crossing surface, and lighting at highway-railroad at-grade crossings
   - New generation pedestrian count-down signals at pedestrian crosswalks or intersections
   - Install fencing to prevent unauthorized pedestrian travel and to separate pedestrians from vehicular traffic
   - Construct relatively low construction cost pedestrian crossing grade separations for relatively high pedestrian traffic volume benefit

   Alignment with nationally recommended strategies is noted for each countermeasure. Those noted with an asterisk are not nationally recommended best practice for reducing intersection crashes:

   - Intersection lighting [Proven (1)]
   - Intersection-related pavement markings [Tried (1)]
   - Intersection-related warning signs [Tried (1)]
   - Intersection-related regulatory signs [Tried (1)]
   - Roundabouts [Proven (1)]
   - Signalizing an unsignalized intersection*
   - Warning flashing signals on approaches to intersections [Tried (1)]
   - Horizontal and vertical curve realignment [Proven (1)]
   - Intersection relocation to reduce hazards of potential traffic collisions [Tried (1)]
   - Enhanced crosswalk pavement markings and signing to reduce pedestrian involved crashes [Proven and Tried (1)]
   - Community pedestrian travel demand study [Recommended (2)]
   - Install signs, sidewalks, curb and gutter, median refuges, pedestrian detectors, and other devices to reduce pedestrian involved crashes [Proven and Tried (1)]
   - Improved geometry of horizontal curves [Proven (1)]

   Yes, with refinements

   - Include proven countermeasures applicable to urban intersections in the urban intersection strategy.
   - Include proven countermeasures applicable to rural intersections in the urban intersection strategy.
   - Include proven countermeasures applicable to at-grade railroad crossings in the at-grade railroad crossing strategy.
   - Revise text for “signalizing an unsignalized intersection” to add “where recommended by the MUTCD and recommended by an engineering study”.
   - Revise text for “improved geometry of horizontal curves” to state “relocate or improve sight distance for intersections along horizontal curves”.
   - Revise text for “new generation pedestrian count-down signals at pedestrian crosswalks or intersections” to delete “or intersections”.
   - Pedestrian signal heads should be provided only where marked crosswalks exist.
   - Revise text for “construct relatively low construction cost pedestrian crossing grade separations for relatively high pedestrian traffic volume benefit” to add “where recommended by an engineering study”.
   - Add countermeasure: automated enforcement of red-light running for signalized intersections [Proven (1)].
   - Add countermeasure: provide targeted speed enforcement for unsignalized intersections [Proven (1)].
- Improvements to existing traffic signal devices [Tried (1)]
- Channelizing intersections [Proven (1)]
- Construct acceleration and deceleration lanes at intersections [Tried (1)]
- Augmenting Section 130 highway – railroad crossing safety funds with additional HSIP funds for improved crossing signals, gates, pavement markings, signs, crossing surface, and lighting at highway-railroad at-grade crossings [Recommended (3)]
- New generation pedestrian countdown signals at pedestrian crosswalks or intersections [Tried (1)]
- Install fencing to prevent unauthorized pedestrian travel and to separate pedestrians from vehicular traffic*
- Construct relatively low construction cost pedestrian crossing grade separations for relatively high pedestrian traffic volume benefit [Proven (1)]

2. Use available data resources, including, but not limited to, Annual New Mexico Transparency Report (5 % Most Severe Safety Needs), Mid-Region COG Annual Crash and Safety Report and NM Annual Traffic Crash Report to identify problem intersections.

   Aligns

   Yes, with refinements

   Revise Action Step to include direction about how to disseminate the lists of problem intersections to the appropriate jurisdictions.

3. Develop a prioritization process to identify focus intersections and communicate results to appropriate agencies.

   Aligns

   Yes

   None

4. From the data analysis performed, develop project proposals using safety countermeasures with either proven effectiveness or the potential to reduce future hazards at identified intersection.

   Aligns

   Yes

   None

Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.


2. Federal Highway Administration, Office of Safety website [12]

**Emphasis Area: Lane Departure Crashes**

**Strategy LD-1: Develop and Implement Safety Countermeasures to Reduce Lane Departure Crashes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measure/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment &amp; Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy: Develop and Implement Safety Countermeasures to Reduce Lane Departure Crashes</strong></td>
<td>Various levels of effectiveness: Proven/Tried/Experimental (1), (2)</td>
<td>Relevant data is available in the NMDOT crash database.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Measure**

- Number of fatal and serious injuries related to lane departure crashes
  - Aligns with emphasis area
  - Aligns with strategy
  - Aligns with federal requirements

**Action Steps**

1. Following the procedures of the NM Highway Safety Improvement Program, plan, program, design, implement, and evaluate engineering type stand-alone safety improvement projects to reduce lane departure-related fatalities and serious injuries by employing any of (but not limited to) the following countermeasures:
   - Pavement markings
   - Warning signs
   - Regulatory signs
   - Chevrons
   - Delineators
   - Cable median barriers
   - Concrete median barriers
   - Median and shoulder guardrail and attenuation devices
   - Roadway lighting
   - Longitudinal shoulder rumble strips on rural high-speed roadways with 4-foot or wider shoulders
   - Fencing to reduce wild life and livestock animal hits in rural areas
   - Horizontal and vertical curve realignment
   - Cut back overhanging vegetation in roadside obstructing travel lanes
   - Cut back vegetation in roadside to reduce severity of lane departure fixed object crashes
   - Cut back vegetation in roadside to increase visibility and avoidance of animals in roadway to reduce animal hit crashes
   - Re-grade unpaved shoulders to eliminate travel lane pavement drop off
   - Overlay paved shoulders to eliminate higher level paved travel lane drop off to lower level paved shoulder
   - Striping centerlines of poorly maintained rural county roads and tribal roads to reduce likelihood of head-on crashes and lane departure crashes
   - Improved geometry of horizontal curves
   - Widen roadside clear zones, by removing, delineating, shielding or relocating fixed objects or other hazardous objects

   Alignment with nationally recommended strategies is noted for each countermeasure. The countermeasure noted with an asterisk is not a nationally recommended strategy for reducing lane departure crashes:
   - Pavement markings [Tried (1), Recommended (2), (4)]
   - Warning signs [Proven (1), Recommended (2), (4)]
   - Regulatory signs [Proven (1), Recommended (2), (4)]
   - Chevrons [Proven (1), Recommended (2), (4)]
   - Delineators [Proven (1), Effective (4)]
   - Cable median barriers [Tried (1)]
   - Concrete median barriers [Tried (1)]
   - Median and shoulder guardrail and attenuation devices [Tried (1)]
   - Roadway lighting [Recommended (2)]
   - Longitudinal shoulder rumble strips on rural high-speed roadways with 4 feet or wider shoulders [Proven (2), Effective (4)]
   - Fencing to reduce wild life and livestock animal hits in rural areas [Recommended (3)]
   - Horizontal and vertical curve realignment [Proven (1)]
   - Cut back overhanging vegetation in roadside obstructing travel lanes [Proven (1)]
   - Cut back vegetation in roadside to reduce severity of lane-departure fixed object crashes [Proven (1)]

   Add a similar Action Step relative to incorporating engineering-type countermeasures into the planning, design, and implementation of roadway and bridge resurfacing, rehabilitation, and reconstruction projects.
   Add a countermeasure for enhanced delineation and friction for horizontal curves [Proven (2)]
   Add a countermeasure for edge lines on rural county and tribal roads [Effective (4)]

   Yes
| 2. Use available data resources, including, but not limited to, Annual New Mexico Transparency Report (5 % Most Severe Safety Needs), Mid-Region COG Annual Crash and Safety Report and NM Annual Traffic Crash Report to identify problem intersections. | Aligns | Yes, with refinements | • Revise text to refer to problem roadway segments, not intersections.  
• Revise Action Step to include direction about how to disseminate the lists of problem roadway segments to the appropriate jurisdictions. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Establish a tracking program to monitor HSIP project completion since 2007.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Consider collecting before and after data for the specific roadway segments that receive the engineering-related treatments to facilitate a more accurate assessment of the strategy effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Based on lane departure data collected, develop a statewide policy of systemic engineering safety countermeasures to reduce the number of lane departure fatal and serious injury crashes. Such countermeasures introduced as proposed stand-alone safety project applications will receive year-round review and automatic approval, constrained by available budgeted federal HSIP funds, for programming in the STIP and immediate implementation.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>• Revise text in first sentence to state: “Based on lane departure data collected, follow the procedures detailed in FHWA’s “Systemic Safety Project Selection Tool” to develop a prioritized list of safety projects to reduce the number of lane departure fatal and serious injury crashes.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1 Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
2 Federal Highway Administration, Office of Safety website [12]
4 Low-Cost Treatments for Horizontal Curve Safety, Federal Highway Administration, December 2006 [24]
### Emphasis Area: Lane Departure Crashes

#### Strategy LD-2: Develop and Implement Wrong Way Driving Countermeasures For Interstates and Four Lane Divided Highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measure/Action Step</th>
<th>Alignment(^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Develop and Implement Wrong Way Driving Countermeasures For Interstates and Four Lane Divided Highways</td>
<td>Recommended (1)</td>
<td>Relevant data is available in the NMDOT crash database</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Measure:</strong> Number of fatal and serious injuries related to wrong way driving</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Relevant data is available in the NMDOT crash database</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Action Step

1. Following the procedures of the NM Highway Safety Improvement Program, plan, program, design, implement, and evaluate engineering type stand-alone safety improvement projects to reduce lane departure related fatalities and serious injuries specifically related to wrong way driving on controlled access Interstate routes and four-lane divided highways. Such projects will employ any of (but not limited to) the following countermeasures:
   - Install larger sign face and more numerous density sets of chevrons, delineators, raised pavement markers (buttons);
   - Install striping and signs facing wrong-way travel on exit ramps or facing wrong way travel on divided highway travel lanes; or facing wrong-way travel on one-way streets or facing wrong-way travel on one-way frontage roads;
   - Re-mount closer to the ground for better visibility at night to impaired drivers existing Do Not Enter and Wrong Way signs.

#### Notes:

\(^{1}\) Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.

(1) NCHRP Report 500 Series, Volume 6: A Guide for Reducing Run-Off-Road Collisions (2003) [43] and Volume 20: A Guide for Reducing Head-On Crashes on Freeways (2008) [44], National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board: "Proven" strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; "Tried" strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available, "Experimental" strategies have been suggested and implemented by at least one agency in one location.

(2) Federal Highway Administration, Office of Safety website [12]
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## Emphasis Area: Lane Departure Crashes

### Strategy LD-3: Develop and Implement ITS Plan and Countermeasures for the Reduction of Secondary Crashes on Interstates and Major Commuter Routes in Accordance with the Adopted Statewide ITS Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Alignment and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Develop and Implement ITS Plan and Countermeasures for the Reduction of Secondary Crashes on Interstates and Major Commuter Routes in Accordance with the Adopted Statewide ITS Infrastructure</td>
<td>Not a nationally recommended strategy to reduce lane-departure crashes [1], [2]</td>
<td>Information relative to a secondary crash would most likely be included in the narrative portion of a crash report, which is not readily available in the NMDOT crash database.</td>
<td>No, not within this emphasis area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider a separate emphasis area for ITS which includes primary, secondary, and inclement weather crashes, and other ITS related incidents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measure

Number of secondary crashes on Interstates and major commuter routes

- Aligns with emphasis area
- Aligns with strategy
- Aligns with federal requirements to report crash data

### Action Step

1. Following the procedures of the NM Highway Safety Improvement Program, plan, program, design, implement, and evaluate engineering type standalone safety improvement projects to reduce lane departure related fatalities and serious injuries specifically related to secondary crashes on Interstates and major commuter routes. Such projects will employ any of (but not limited to) the following countermeasures: install dynamic message signs and supporting components to be integrated into the adopted New Mexico statewide ITS Architecture.

- Not a nationally recommended strategy to reduce lane-departure crashes [1], [2]

### Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.


(2) Federal Highway Administration, Office of Safety website [12]

### Emphasis Area: Native Americans

#### Strategy NA-1: Provide Crash Data Analysis Tools, Training Opportunities, and Technical Assistance to Native Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Alignments and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Native American entities participating in TraCS</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Native American entities sharing data with NMDOT</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Native Americans killed and seriously injured in crashes</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Action Steps

1. Develop data sharing agreements between the State and Native American Tribes, Nations, and Pueblos and/or the Bureau of Indian Affairs as appropriate.
   - Aligns with recommended national best practice (4)
   - Yes
   - Outline roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for data sharing among Native American entities and the DOT

2. Outreach to Native American Tribes, Pueblos, and Nations interested in the TraCS program. (Native American participation in the TraCS program may require information sharing agreements with the State prior to implementation.)
   - Aligns with recommended national best practice (1), (2), (3), (4)
   - Yes
   - Define outreach activities and approaches to engage tribal leadership

3. Strengthen intergovernmental relationships and communication and disseminate and collaborate (consult) with NM’s Native American government entities on NMDOT’s proposed Tribal Collaboration policy, protocols, and processes. Establish general information database(s) with Native American and state contact information to enhance transportation and traffic-safety information dissemination.
   - Aligns with recommended national best practice (4), (5)
   - Yes
   - Separate Tribal Collaboration Policy from tribal and state contact data base

#### Notes:

1 Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
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### Emphasis Area: Native Americans

**Strategy NA-2: Provide Technical Assistance to Native American Tribes, Pueblos, and Nations on Roadway Improvement Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment(^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Provide Technical Assistance to Native American Tribes, Pueblos, and Nations on Roadway Improvement Strategies</td>
<td>Recommended (1), (2), (3)</td>
<td>Yes - number of initiatives No - outcomes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate road safety infrastructure and behavior-related technical assistance strategies</td>
<td>Establish Native American Traffic Safety Task Force including participation from Native American entities and state agencies to address traffic safety needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop comprehensive transportation safety plans for each reservation including data-driven safety emphasis areas and priority safety strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assess Native American attitudes, perceptions and behaviors with respect to traffic safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promote high-visibility enforcement and sobriety checkpoints on reservations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and outcome of technical assistance initiatives</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td>Yes – number of initiatives No – outcomes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Define “outcome” measures</td>
<td>Native American partner satisfaction survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and outcome of training courses</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td>Yes – number of initiatives No – outcomes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Define “outcome” measures</td>
<td>Number of Native American training attendees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action Steps**

1. Provide ongoing HSIP eligibility criteria, road assessments, and planning and design assistance to Tribes, Pueblos, and Nations. Aligns with recommended national best practices (1)

2. Collaborate with NMDOT’s Technical Traffic Safety Bureau to assist with road assessments on eligible roadways. Aligns with recommended national best practices (2)

3. Include Native American entities in all traffic safety relevant law enforcement training and monitor progress. Aligns with recommended best practice (3)**

4. Inventory Native American entities to identify traffic safety best practice models for data sharing, law enforcement, and educational curriculums. Aligns with recommended best practice (3)

**Notes:**

\(^1\) Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.

(1) Strategic Highway Safety Plan for Indian Lands, Federal Highway Administration, 2009 [9]


** Further research needed to confirm. Tallahassee, Florida DUI Enforcement Program in 2010 experienced 58% increase in DUI arrests due in part to enhanced officer training to identify impaired drivers.**
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# Emphasis Area: Occupant Protection

## Strategy OP-1: Support Ongoing Occupant Protection Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Strategy: Support Ongoing Occupant Protection Initiatives</th>
<th>Alignment1 and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                                   | Varying degree of effectiveness based on initiative       |                                               |                                            | No                     | Define high-level enforcement-related strategy to increase seatbelt use. | MAP-21 Guidance: Implementation of occupant protection programs for high risk populations (e.g., rural, nighttime, teen drivers)  
  - 5 stars (2), Proven (1) – High-visibility seatbelt enforcement, particularly nighttime campaigns  
  - 4 stars (2), Proven (1) – Target communications outreach for low-seatbelt-use audiences |
| Performance Measures              |                                                          |                                               |                                            |                        |                                                          |                                                |
| Number of seatbelt citations and convictions by daytime and nighttime | Aligns with emphasis area  
Aligns with strategy  
Aligns with federal requirements and recommended best practice (nighttime) | Yes                                                   | Yes                                          | No                     |                                                          | Existing federal HSP requirement: Number of seatbelt citations issued during grant-funded overtime enforcement activities as compared to on-duty enforcement |
| Number of outreach, media, and educational activities | Aligns with emphasis area  
Aligns with strategy  
Aligns with recommended national best practices | Yes                                                   |                                               | No                     | • Most effective if outreach/media supports enhanced enforcement campaigns  
  • Clarify if this is outreach, media and education to law enforcement only (versus the driving public)  
  • Define criteria for outreach, media and education activities | None                                                      |
| Number of unrestrained fatalities and serious injuries | Aligns with emphasis area  
Aligns with strategy  
Aligns with federal requirements | Yes                                                   | Yes                                          | No                     |                                                          | Federal HSP requirement: Percentage of front seat passenger vehicle occupants using seatbelts based on annual observation survey results |

### Action Steps

1. **Continue to establish project agreements with law enforcement agencies to conduct Operation Buckle Down, Click It Or Ticket, and other occupant protection enforcement activities, including seatbelt checkpoints.**  
   - **Highly Effective**  
   - Proven (1) for high visibility enforcement and checkpoints  
   - 5 stars (2): High visibility enforcement campaigns and checkpoints  
   - Yes, with refinements  
   - Clarify purpose. Outreach, media, education to law enforcement to conduct seatbelt enforcement or to the public about the enforcement?  
   - None                                                      |

2. **Provide outreach, media, and education to law enforcement agencies to increase the focus on seatbelt use.**  
   - **Highly Effective**  
   - Proven (1) for high visibility seatbelt enforcement  
   - 5 stars (2): Communications and outreach supporting enforcement campaigns  
   - 4 stars (2): Communications and outreach for low-seatbelt-use groups  
   - Yes, with refinements  
   - Clarify purpose. Outreach, media, education to law enforcement to conduct seatbelt enforcement or to the public about the enforcement?  
   - None                                                      |

3. **Conduct a nighttime seatbelt enforcement operation.**  
   - Aligns with recommended national best practice (3)  
   - Yes  
   - For grant-supported overtime enforcement, require higher percentage of seatbelt enforcement to be conducted at night  
   - Yes                                                      |

4. **Analyze unrestrained occupant fatalities by county.**  
   - Aligns  
   - Yes  
   - Examine seatbelt citation data for counties with high unbelted fatalities  
   - Yes
Notes:
1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
   - 5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
   - 4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
   - 3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
   - 2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
   - 1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence
### Emphasis Area: Occupant Protection

#### Strategy OP-2: Determine the Current Rate of Child Safety Seat and Teen Safety Belt Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment¹ and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Determine the Current Rate of Child Safety Seat and Teen Safety Belt Use</td>
<td>Recommended (3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Once baseline of restraint use determined, include in agency-specific plan.</td>
<td>Special high-visibility enforcement of age-appropriate restraint use for children – 5 stars (2) Communications and outreach supporting enforcement and or consequences of child restraint and teen seatbelt use – 5 stars (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measures

#### Teen safety belt use

- Aligns with emphasis area
- Aligns with strategy
- Aligns with recommended national best practice

- Yes

- Yes, with refinement

- Percent of observed seatbelt use of teen motor vehicle occupants
- How will age be determined?

- None

#### Child safety belt use

- Aligns with emphasis area
- Aligns with strategy
- Aligns with recommended national best practice

- Yes

- Yes, with refinement

- Percent of observed child restraint (not seatbelt) use

- None

#### Number of unrestrained teens or children injured or killed in motor vehicle crashes

- Aligns with emphasis area
- Aligns with strategy
- Aligns with federal requirements

- Yes

- Yes, with refinements

- Consider instead serious injury and fatality data. At a minimum, examine closely serious injury data, together with fatality data, for trends and patterns.

- None

### Action Steps

1. Train law enforcement personnel to properly fill out crash reports.

2. Conduct a statewide observation survey of teen safety belt use.

3. Repeat the statewide observation survey of teen safety seat use every year to obtain pre-survey data.

4. Continue to conduct the annual statewide seatbelt survey.

5. Collect occupant protection data from crash reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Train law enforcement personnel to properly fill out crash reports.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement Clarify action needed to support child/teen occupant protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct a statewide observation survey of teen safety belt use.</td>
<td>Aligns with recommended national best practice (3)</td>
<td>Yes None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Repeat the statewide observation survey of teen safety seat use every year to obtain pre-survey data.</td>
<td>Aligns with recommended national best practice (3)</td>
<td>Unclear Repeat annual teen seatbelt observation survey to establish behavioral trend line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Continue to conduct the annual statewide seatbelt survey.</td>
<td>Aligns with federal guidelines (4)</td>
<td>Yes None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collect occupant protection data from crash reports.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.


   - 5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
   - 4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
   - 3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
   - 2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
   - 1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence


### Emphasis Area: Occupant Protection

#### Strategy OP-3: Train Child Passenger Safety Technicians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Train Child Passenger Safety Technicians</td>
<td>Effectiveness Undetermined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tried (1) Inspection stations 2 stars (2) Inspection stations, distribution programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligns with federal guidelines and requirements (4), (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Action Steps

1. Expand certification opportunities for agencies and individuals throughout the State by offering additional 32-hour CPS trainings. Aligns with federal guidelines and requirements (4), (5) Yes None

2. Maintain course accreditation for nursing, EMS, and law enforcement CEUs. Aligns Yes None

3. Provide CEUs as an incentive for fire personnel and social workers. Aligns Yes None

4. Expand training opportunities to include car dealership personnel. Aligns Yes None

5. Expand Operation Kids child passenger safety training for law enforcement; offer child-passenger safety refresher training and certification renewal; and deliver 6-hour trainings to update and expand technician skills. Aligns with federal guidelines and requirements (4), (5) Yes None

6. Provide currently certified technicians with recertification assistance at Buckle Up Conferences. Aligns with federal guidelines and requirements (4), (5) Yes None

7. Continue to develop senior technicians through documented field experience with an instructor and ongoing technical training. Aligns with federal guidelines and requirements (4), (5) Yes None

#### Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.

2. Countermeasures That Work: A Highway Safety Countermeasure Guide for State Highway Safety Offices, Sixth Edition, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2011 [29] 5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results 4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations 3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources 2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results 1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence

# Emphasis Area: Occupant Protection

## Strategy OP-4: Expand the Availability of Child Safety Seats and Child Safety Seat Inspections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Strategy: Expand the Availability of Child Safety Seats and Child Safety Seat Inspections</th>
<th>Alignment and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>Effectiveness Undetermined</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggest higher-level strategy such as, “Provide comprehensive child passenger safety program services.” These include technician certification and advocacy training, safety seat distribution, fitting clinics, and public outreach/education about enforcement and consequences. (3)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of child safety seat clinics held each year</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Aligns with strategy</td>
<td>Aligns with federal requirements (4)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of child safety seats provided to low-income families</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Aligns with strategy</td>
<td>Aligns recommended national best practices (3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Action Steps

1. **Work to establish permanent funding, similar to Operation Buckle Down, for fire personnel to participate in child safety seat inspection events.**
   - Proven (1): High profile inspection events at multiple locations
   - 2 stars (2): Inspection stations
   - Aligns with nationally recommended best practice (3)
   - Include in Agency-Specific Plans: Yes
   - Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans: Conduct high-profile child restraint inspection events at multiple community locations

2. **Continue to offer child safety seat clinics throughout the State.**
   - Aligns with national recommended best practice (3)
   - Include in Agency-Specific Plans: Yes
   - Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans: None

3. **Maintain the New Mexico Child Safety Seat Distribution Program through healthcare agencies that offer child safety seats to low-income families at a reduced charge.**
   - Effectiveness Undetermined
   - 2 stars (2): Child restraint distribution programs
   - Aligns with nationally recommended best practice (3)
   - Include in Agency-Specific Plans: Yes
   - Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans: None

4. **Work with the Division of Motor Vehicles to establish a fund that gives motorists the option to make a donation that provides child safety seats to low-income families during vehicle registration.**
   - Aligns
   - Include in Agency-Specific Plans: Yes
   - Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans: None

5. **Target children affected by a change in the current legal standing (e.g., booster-seat age children).**
   - Aligns
   - Include in Agency-Specific Plans: Unclear
   - Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans: Define ‘target’ and suggested action

---

47
Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.

1. NCHRP Report 500 Series: Volume 11: A Guide for Increasing Seatbelt Use, National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board, 2004 [23]: “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.

   - 5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
   - 4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
   - 3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
   - 2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
   - 1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence


### Emphasis Area: Public Information and Education

#### Strategy: Providing public information and education support to all CTSP emphasis areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment(^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Providing public information and education (PI&amp;E) support to all CTSP emphasis areas</td>
<td>Emphasis on PI&amp;E on coupling with special enforcement and corridor campaigns for greater effectiveness (2)</td>
<td>No, not as separate emphasis area</td>
<td>PI&amp;E is not a nationally recognized highway safety emphasis area (1)</td>
<td>Include with associated strategy and supporting actions</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>See related PI&amp;E-related performance measures for emphasis areas</th>
<th>See emphasis areas</th>
<th>See emphasis areas</th>
<th>See emphasis areas</th>
<th>See emphasis areas</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Focus on (replaced “Action Steps”)

1. PI&E to support high-visibility DWI enforcement campaigns and non-enforcement messaging
   - See Alcohol-Related/Alcohol-Impaired Driving strategies for PI&E effectiveness
   - Yes
   - Include with associated strategy and supporting actions

2. PI&E to support high-visibility safety belt enforcement campaigns and non-enforcement messaging
   - See Occupant Protection strategies for PI&E effectiveness
   - Yes
   - Include with associated strategy and supporting actions

3. PI&E to support high-risk rural seatbelt use
   - See Occupant Protection strategies for PI&E effectiveness
   - Yes
   - Include with associated strategy and supporting actions

4. PI&E to support aggressive driving/speed and fatigued/distracted driving
   - See Aggressive Driving and Speeding and Fatigued and Distracted Driver strategies for PI&E effectiveness
   - Yes
   - Emphasis on coupling with special enforcement and corridor campaigns
   - Include with associated strategy and supporting actions

5. PI&E to support all other traffic safety issues
   - See Native Americans, Special Users, and Young Driver Crashes strategies for PI&E effectiveness
   - Yes, limit to priority emphasis areas
   - Based on problem identification from crash data, address top priority issues only
   - Include with associated strategy and supporting actions
   - Emphasis on coupling with special enforcement and corridor campaigns (2)

#### Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements. Alignment of action step with national proven and/or priority strategies.
4. 5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
5. 4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
6. 3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
7. 2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
8. 1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/ Performance Measures/ Action Step</th>
<th>Alignment and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. Following the procedures of the NM Highway Safety Improvement Program, plan, program, design, implement, and evaluate engineering type stand-alone safety improvement projects to reduce fatalities and serious injuries to special users who are pedestrians, equestrian riders, bicyclists, motorcyclists, and elder drivers by employing any of (but not limited to) the following countermeasures:</td>
<td>Alignment with nationally recommended strategies is noted for each countermeasure. The countermeasure noted with an asterisk is not a nationally recommended best practice for reducing special user crashes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Install signing and striping with enhanced visual conspicuity especially oriented for elder drivers with deteriorated eyesight</td>
<td>Install signing and striping with enhanced visual conspicuity especially oriented for elder drivers with deteriorated eyesight [Tried (1)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Install crosswalks with signal systems especially oriented for elder pedestrians who are slower speed walkers</td>
<td>Install crosswalks with signal systems especially oriented for elder pedestrians who are slower speed walkers [Tried (1)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Install signing and striping for designated bicycle routes and lanes to reduce bicyclist involved crashes</td>
<td>Install signing and striping for designated bicycle routes and lanes to reduce bicyclist involved crashes [Tried (1)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construct bicycle-pedestrian trails to reduce pedestrian and bicyclist involved crashes</td>
<td>Construct bicycle-pedestrian trails to reduce pedestrian and bicyclist involved crashes [Proven for pedestrians, Tried for bicyclists (1)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fencing to reduce equestrian hits</td>
<td>Fencing to reduce equestrian hits [Recommended (3)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhanced crosswalk pavement markings and signing to reduce pedestrian involved crashes</td>
<td>Enhanced crosswalk pavement markings and signing to reduce pedestrian involved crashes [Proven and Tried (1)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Step</th>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Following the procedures of the NM Highway Safety Improvement Program, plan, program, design, implement, and evaluate engineering type stand-alone safety improvement projects to reduce fatalities and serious injuries to special users who are pedestrians, equestrian riders, bicyclists, motorcyclists, and elder drivers by employing any of (but not limited to) the following countermeasures:</td>
<td>Add a similar action step relative to incorporating engineering-type countermeasures into the planning, design, and implementation of roadway and bridge resurfacing, rehabilitation, and reconstruction projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Pedestrian Travel Demand Study [Recommended (4)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Install signs, sidewalks, curb and gutter, median refuges, pedestrian detectors, and other devices to reduce pedestrian involved crashes [Proven/Tried/Experimental (1)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New generation pedestrian countdown signals at pedestrian crosswalks or intersections [Tried (1)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Install fencing to prevent unauthorized pedestrian travel and to separate pedestrians from vehicular traffic*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construct relatively low construction cost pedestrian crossing grade separations for relatively high pedestrian traffic volume benefit [Proven (1)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.


   (4) Federal Highway Administration, Office of Safety website [12]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy: Develop and Implement a Highly Visible Special Users Multimedia Campaign</th>
<th>Alignment(^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Proven (1): Provide pedestrian outreach, education and training</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Based on crash data and problem identification, focus strategy on priority special user group or groups (versus, combining all users into one strategy)</td>
<td>See SU-7 for older driver effective strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 star to 3 stars (2), Tried (1): Motorcycle, bicycle, and pedestrian conspicuity and safety equipment</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Multimedia community campaigns coupled with special, short-term (e.g., 1 day) enforcement campaigns whenever possible (see SLU-4)</td>
<td>4 stars (2) – Identify pedestrian “safety zone areas” to target limited resources to locations and audiences of significant crash areas (e.g., hospitals, school zones, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>Number of elderly motorist, bicyclist, pedestrian, motorcyclist and equestrian fatalities and serious injuries related to motor vehicle crashes</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Aligns with federal requirements (number of pedestrian, motorcycle fatalities)</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Separate fatality and serious injury numbers (and/or percentage of total) for each special user group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aligns with strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consider age breakdown of fatalities/serious injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fatality and serious injury data for only priority user group(s) based on problem identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of citizens reached by one or more components of the program</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Aligns with strategy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Identify components to track for outreach activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Challenge of assessing number of citizens reached by one or more of the information outreach programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Steps</td>
<td>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</td>
<td>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Compile regulations, policies, and best practices.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Include existing survey data of motorcycle and/or BPE safety practices and attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work with consultants to prepare materials appropriate to specific media, including MVD and other relevant venues.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Assess motorcycle and/or BPE safety practices and attitudes to address more defined safety outreach and enforcement needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify crash factors (e.g., impaired pedestrians) and high-incidence areas of serious crashes to potentially focus outreach efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Distribute, track, and evaluate the effectiveness of materials.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Clarify priority program components to track effectiveness criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency-specific implementation plans depend upon problem identification, priorities to address, effective/proven countermeasures to adopt, and available program evaluation results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

1 Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements. Alignment of action step with national proven and/or priority strategies.


5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence

** Further investigation needed to confirm
### Emphasis Area: Special Users

#### Strategy SU-3: Provide Safe, Multimodal Transportation Options for Rural Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment¹ and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Provide Safe, Multimodal Transportation Options for Rural Communities</td>
<td>Highly Effective: Proven for providing or enhancing sidewalks for pedestrians (1) Moderate to low effectiveness: Tried for bicycle facilities (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rural bicyclist, pedestrian, and equestrian fatalities, and serious injuries related to motor vehicle crashes</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Aligns with federal requirements to report traffic crash fatalities and serious injuries data for specific types of crashes (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Modify text to specify the performance should be measured specifically for the sections of roadway along which the new BPE facilities are provided.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of miles of new construction and retrofitted BPE facilities</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Does not align with federal reporting requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Action Steps

1. Convene stakeholders to identify issues and opportunities.
2. Develop prototypical programs and facilities.
3. Implement the programs in targeted locations.
4. Expand the program statewide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Convene stakeholders to identify issues and opportunities.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop prototypical programs and facilities.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Implement the programs in targeted locations.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Expand the program statewide.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.

2. "Proven" strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; "Tried" strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.


### Emphasis Area: Special Users

**Strategy SU-4: Modify Driver Behavior to Reduce BPE Conflicts and Crashes Through Coordinated, Statewide Law Enforcement Operations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/ Performance Measures/ Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment* and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategy:** Modify Driver Behavior to Reduce BPE Conflicts and Crashes Through Coordinated, Statewide Law Enforcement Operations | Varying Demonstration of Effectiveness:  
  - Tried (1): Enforcement of bicycle- and pedestrian-related laws  
  - 3 stars (2): Enforcement of pedestrian laws both pedestrians and motorists  
  - 1 star (2): Enforcement training and enforcement of bicyclists and motorists | Based on crash data and problem identification, focus strategy on priority special user group or groups (versus combining all users into one strategy) | Yes, with refinement |  |  
  - 5 stars (2) – Bicycle helmet laws for children  
  - 3 stars (2) – Bicycle helmet laws for adults  
  - 3 stars (2) – Enforcement of speed limits to reduce BPE crashes  
  - 3 stars (2), Tried (1) – Emphasis on well-publicized enforcement campaigns focusing on higher-risk, higher-frequency driver, bicyclists, pedestrian, equestrian behaviors  
  - Tried (1) – Law enforcement to identify specific motorcycle rider impairment behaviors  
  - 3 stars (2) – Motorcycle rider impairment detection and enforcement |
| Performance Measures |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of motorcyclists, bicyclist, pedestrian, and equestrian fatalities, and serious injuries related to motor vehicle crashes | Aligns with emphasis area  
Aligns with strategy  
Aligns with federal requirements (number of motorcycle and pedestrian fatalities) | Yes | Yes, with refinement |  |  
  - Fatality and serious injury data for only priority user group(s) based on problem identification  
  - Federal requirement: Number of motorcycle fatalities involving motorcycle driver or operator with a BAC of 0.08 and above  
  - Separate fatality and serious injury numbers (and/or percentage of total) for each special user group |
| Number of law enforcement agencies participating in the enforcement campaign | Aligns with emphasis area  
Aligns with strategy  
Aligns with national best practices | Yes | Yes | None |  |
| Number of citations and convictions resulting from the campaign | Aligns with emphasis area  
Aligns with strategy  
Aligns with national best practice | Yes | Yes | Include percentage of citations resulting in convictions |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Draft pocket summary of relevant laws for use by State Police, sheriffs’ departments, municipal police departments, MVD trainers, NMDO T staff, and the general public.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Provide biannual training for law enforcement operations. | Tried (1): Ensure sufficient officer training for effective enforcement  
Aligns with recommended national best practices | Yes | Clarify biannual training focus or for all special user areas? |
| 3. Implement and advertise the program through TSB/BPE district liaisons. | Aligns | Yes | None |
Notes:
1 Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements. Alignment of action step with national proven and/or priority strategies.
(1) NCHRP Report 500 Series
5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence
** Further investigation needed to confirm
### Emphasis Area: Special Users

#### Strategy SU-5: Provide Local Communities with BPE Technical Support and Serve as a Clearinghouse for BPE Information and Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment/Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategy:** Provide Local Communities with BPE Technical Support and Serve as a Clearinghouse for BPE Information and Best Practices | Proven (1) 2 stars (3) – Moderate evidence of effectiveness | Yes, with refinement | • Support comprehensive safety program development within local communities (data-driven problem identification, 4Es coalition development, enforcement, and public outreach)  
• Couple “share the roadway with bicyclists/pedestrians/equestrians” education/outreach with enforcement campaigns. (1) | Increase conspicuity (1), (2) |

#### Performance Measures

| Number of bicyclist, pedestrian, and equestrian fatalities and serious injuries related to motor vehicle crashes | Aligns with emphasis area  
Aligns with strategy  
Aligns with Federal requirements | Yes  
Yes | None | None |

| Number of communities participating in the programs | Aligns with emphasis area  
Aligns with strategy | Uncertain  
No | Difficult to measure. Need to define “communities,” “participation,” and “programs” for measurement | None |

#### Action Steps

1. Develop bicycle/equestrian programs to complement existing pedestrian program (WAG). Provide funding through competitive BPE safety seed grant funding.  
   Proven (1) – Pedestrian education, Outreach, and Training  
   Tried (1), (2) – Implement enforcement campaigns  
   2 stars (3) – Moderate evidence of effectiveness – similar to comprehensive, community-based Safe Routes to School safety strategy. | Yes, examine success and lessons learned from WAG pedestrian safety program | • Define WAG (Walkability Advocacy Group)  
   • Key to success - Implement comprehensive programs (such as WAG) including targeted well-designed educational/outreach for pedestrians and motorists in conjunction with engineering and enforcement programs. (1)  
   • Couple “share the roadway with bicyclists/pedestrians/equestrians” education/outreach with enforcement campaigns. (1) |

2. Review proposals and plans. | Aligns | Yes |

3. Approve and provide funding, including funding and/or standardized training for school crossing guards. | Aligns | Yes |

4. Provide one annual training for communities enrolled in the program. | Aligns | Yes |

5. Update, summarize, and digitize all safety tools, crash data, use data and compile, create, and maintain a web site. | Aligns | Yes |

**Notes:**
- Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices.
- Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
- (1) NCHRP Report 500 Series: Volume 10: A Guide for Reducing Collisions Involving Pedestrians, National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board, 2004 [56]: “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.
- (2) NCHRP Report 500 Series: Volume 18: A Guide for Reducing Collisions Involving Bicycles, National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board, 2008 [48]: “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.

- 5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
- 4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
- 3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
- 2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
- 1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence
## Emphasis Area: Special Users

### Strategy SU-6: Address the Mobility Needs of Older Road Users by Increasing Safety for Older Drivers and Providing Alternative Mobility Options, Including Pedestrian Facilities and Transit for Those Who Cannot or Choose Not to Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment¹ and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy</strong>: Address the Mobility Needs of Older Road Users by Increasing Safety for Older Drivers and Providing Alternative Mobility Options, Including Pedestrian Facilities and Transit for Those Who Cannot or Choose Not to Drive</td>
<td>Tried (1) – Establish coalition to address older driver needs</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A coordinated, comprehensive approach is key to providing safe mobility for older drivers: safe driver initiatives (screening/testing/licensing), vehicle adaptations, safer roads and infrastructure, and the provision of accessible and safe transport options. Coordination and community communications of government policy, local government initiatives and community programs is needed. (3), (4)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Measures</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>• Define age of “older” drivers as 65+ &lt;br&gt;• Include % of fatal crashes and serious injury crashes involving drivers age 65+</td>
<td>MAP-21 requirement – Fatality rate of older drivers for most recent 2-year period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of older road users who die or are seriously injured in motor vehicle crashes</td>
<td>Aligns with strategy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Difficult to measure. Need to define “engagement,” and “coalition activities” for measurement</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of agencies and individuals engaged with the coalition’s activities</td>
<td>Aligns with strategy</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Steps</td>
<td>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</td>
<td>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Partner with the advisory coalition and look at steps to include safe mobility for older road users within the CTSP.</td>
<td>Tried (1) – Establish coalition to address older driver needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Examine safe driver, vehicle, road, and transit interventions. Ensure coordination of state, local government initiatives and community resources/programs (see above).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review findings and recommendations from Survey of 2006.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>No, if completed.</td>
<td>What was the survey?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identify commonalities and projects that all stakeholders agree to work on.</td>
<td>Aligns with recommended best practice (4)</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>• Based on priority survey recommendations, determine and clearly track stakeholder commitments. &lt;br&gt;• Examine safe driver, vehicle, road, and transit interventions. Ensure coordination of state, local government initiatives and community resources/programs (see above).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prioritize and implement recommendations.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>No, if plans are in place, priorities identified</td>
<td>Move this step before step 3 of identifying stakeholder projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If the reauthorization of Section 1405 of SAFETEA-LU provides funding for pilot programs to assist states in implementing HWA recommendations to improve roadway safety for older road users, apply for funding to implement a pilot program.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Examine MAP-21 provisions for infrastructure and transit improvements for older drivers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.

(1) NCHRP Report 500 Series: Volume 9: A Guide for Reducing Collisions Involving Older Drivers, National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board, 2004 [47]. “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.


5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence

(3) The Elderly and Mobility: A Review of the Literature, Monash University Accident Research Centre, November 2006 [55]

### Emphasis Area: Special Users

#### Strategy SU-7: Provide Increased Information to Drivers about the Limitations and Risks Posed by the Aging Process as it Relates to Driving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy: Provide Increased Information to Drivers about the Limitations and Risks Posed by the Aging Process as it Relates to Driving</td>
<td>Moderate evidence of effectiveness Tried (1) 2 stars (2) – Education/Communications Recommended (3)</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Emphasis on high-risk older driver referral process to licensing agency</td>
<td>4 stars (2) – License screening and testing to evaluate driving abilities/skills 4 stars (2) – Driver Assessment Referral Process 3 stars (2) – License restrictions Above are NHTSA recommended best practices (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of older road users who die or are seriously injured in motor vehicle crashes</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Aligns with federal requirements</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>• Define age of “older” drivers as 65+ • Include % of fatal crashes and serious injury crashes involving drivers age 65+</td>
<td>MAP-21 requirement – Fatality rate of older drivers for most recent 2-year period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number and impact of programs developed and implemented</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td>Yes – number of programs No – measure of impact</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Establish criteria for what constitutes ‘impact.’</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Steps</strong></td>
<td>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</td>
<td>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide literature and educational programs regarding medical or functional conditions that may affect safe driving, e.g., CarFit Program possibly in partnership with “Child Car Seat” Program.</td>
<td>Tried (1) 2 stars (2) – Education/Communications Recommended (3)</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Instruct on the identification and referral process of at-risk older drivers to licensing agency to assess fitness for safe driving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase driver education programs that focus on elder drivers, e.g., Volunteer Driver Safety Program, AAA, etc. Address elder drivers on the MVD web site.</td>
<td>Tried (1) 2 stars (2) – Education/Communications Recommended (3)</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Combine driver education programs with on-road training to improve driver performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide presentations to community organizations regarding safety issues involving all drivers with an emphasis on older drivers.</td>
<td>Tried (1) 2 stars (2) – Education/Communications Recommended (3)</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Instruct on the identification and referral process of at-risk older drivers to licensing agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

- Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
- (1) NCHRP Report 500 Series: Volume 9: A Guide for Reducing Collisions Involving Older Drivers, National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board, 2004 [47]. “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.
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### Emphasis Area: Special Users

### Strategy SU-8: Address the Training Needs of Motorcycle Riders by Increasing Training Options for Motorcycle and Scooter Operators Using Qualified Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment(^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategy:** Address the Training Needs of Motorcycle Riders by Increasing Training Options for Motorcycle and Scooter Operators Using Qualified Facilities | Effectiveness of training undetermined 1 star (2) – Motorcycle rider training Aligns with recommended national best practices (3) | | Yes | None | + Review motorcycle crash data and contributing crash factors and compare with training curriculum and adjust as needed to ensure training addresses crash problems (2)  
+ Develop model motorcycle operator training standards and quality control guidelines for instructors (2)  
+ Target course availability toward experienced operators riding without a license (3)  
+ Implement ongoing training, monitoring, and mentoring of instructors (3) |

#### Performance Measures

1. **The number of motorcyclists who die or are seriously injured on the roadway**
   - Aligns with emphasis area
   - Aligns with strategy
   - Aligns with federal requirements and recommended best practice (seriously injured)
   - Yes
   - Yes
   - None
   - None

#### Action Steps

1. **Partner with MSF to assure sufficient training for all motorcycle riders.**
   - Aligns with recommended national best practices (3)
   - Tried (1) – Strategic motorcycle safety alliances to promote safety
   - Yes
   - None

2. **Review recommendations from participating partners.**
   - Aligns
   - Yes
   - In addition to motorcycle control skills, motorcycle training should equip riders to recognize hazardous riding conditions, assess rider risk and riding limitations, and ride within constraints

3. **Identify commonalities where all partners agree to work together.**
   - Aligns
   - Yes
   - Define roles and responsibilities of program partners

4. **Prioritize and implement recommendations.**
   - Aligns
   - Yes
   - Review training evaluation data for additional needs in training course offerings

#### Notes:

- \(^1\) Alignment performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
- (1) NCHRP Report 500 Series: Volume 22: A Guide for Addressing Collisions Involving Motorcycles, National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board, 2008 [46]; “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.
  - 5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
  - 4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
  - 3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
  - 2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
  - 1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidenced.
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### Emphasis Area: Traffic Records

#### Strategy TR-1: Expand Electronic Data Collection, Storage, and Transmission of Traffic Records Data Utilizing the Traffic and Criminal Software (TraCS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures/ Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment 1 and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Expand Electronic Data Collection, Storage, and Transmission of Traffic Records Data Utilizing the Traffic and Criminal Software (TraCS)</td>
<td>Recommended (1), (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes, if this objective was not accomplished as part of the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Delete strategy after TraCS is universally used within state</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Include in Future</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of all crashes submitted electronically</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area, strategy, and recommended national best practices</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Revise text to: Proportion of all crashes submitted electronically that are timely, accurate, and complete (3)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time from crash to data entry</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area, strategy, and recommended national best practices</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>• Define a specific time period for which data entry should be completed after the crash event&lt;br&gt;• Recommended national best practice (3)</td>
<td>• Incorporate all six model performance measures (timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility)&lt;br&gt;• Recommended national best practice (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.


### Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work cooperatively and collaboratively with other traffic record stakeholders to improve New Mexico’s traffic records system and implement the STRS Strategic Plan by: Establishing a TraCS Office for the implementation and support of TraCS&lt;br&gt;Continuing to support the TraCS application by providing resources&lt;br&gt;Providing technical and administrative support for the TraCS Statewide Rollout</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support projects to automate the exchange of traffic and DWI citation information between MVD, the courts, and law enforcement agencies throughout the state.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support projects to automate the exchange of traffic crash report information between law enforcement and NMDOT.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support projects to automate the exchange of traffic records information between law enforcement and their Record Management Systems, as well as local court applications.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Emphasis Area: Traffic Records

#### Strategy TR-2: Establish a Statewide Traffic Records System (STRS) and Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment¹ and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Establish a Statewide Traffic Records System (STRS) and Office</td>
<td>Recommended (1), (2)</td>
<td>No, this should be an Action Step or Objective in the STRS Strategic Plan</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of all crashes submitted electronically</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Does not align with strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time from crash to data entry</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Does not align with strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Steps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Hire STRS Program Manager.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Include in STRS Strategic Plan until the system and office are established.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Begin development of the STRS DC Project Management Plan (PMP).</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Include in STRS Strategic Plan until the system and office are established.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Begin development of the STRS Architecture Plan.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Include in STRS Strategic Plan until the system and office are established.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify additional resources needed for the implementation of the STRS.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Include in STRS Strategic Plan until the system and office are established.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Establish and implement a STRS Distribution Center based on the approved Architecture Plan.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Include in STRS Strategic Plan until the system and office are established.</td>
<td>Add an Action Step relative to establishing a data user/owner committee to provide recommendations for improvements to the system and office – Recommended (1). Add an Action Step relative to the continued promotion of system use to all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.


## Strategy TR-3: Develop and Maintain a Statewide Ignition Interlock Data Repository

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment(^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Develop and Maintain a Statewide Ignition Interlock Data Repository</td>
<td>Aligns with federal requirements (1) and national recommended best practice</td>
<td>Yes, if this objective was not accomplished as part of the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Delete strategy once repository is developed</td>
<td>Continue to examine opportunities to improve Ignition Interlock data quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measures

1. **Number of interlock records captured by the centralized Repository**
   - Aligns with emphasis area
   - Aligns with national recommended best practice
   - Yes
   - Via STRS\(^2\)
   - None

2. **Number of interlock installations in the Repository compared to mandatory court orders**
   - Aligns with emphasis area
   - Aligns with strategy
   - Aligns with federal recommendations and national recommended best practice
   - Yes, with refinements
   - Yes, with refinements
   - MAP-21 requirement to report percentage of DWI offenders convicted using ignition interlock
   - None

### Action Steps

1. **Develop and maintain a data interface to all approved ignition interlock manufacturers.**
   - Aligns
   - Yes
   - None

2. **Pilot test a web application process with one manufacturer submitting regular periodic data.**
   - Aligns
   - Yes
   - None

3. **Develop a web application to access information about high, initial BAC readings (on initial blow to start the car), rolling retests (results of blows while the car is in operation), and handset disconnect (sign of tampering). Encourage the courts, compliance officers, probation/parole offices, and county DWI coordinators to use the web application.**
   - Aligns
   - Yes
   - Incorporate web application pilot test results

4. **Expand the data analysis initiative to automate the fiscal management of the Indigent Fund and determination of offender indecency, and convert existing data systems to the DOT IT platform for licensing and certification management.**
   - Aligns
   - Yes
   - None

### Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.

2. State Traffic Records System (STRS) – to integrate the electronic collection and transmission of traffic records data among various data systems including crash, citation/adjudication, driver/vehicle history, injury surveillance and roadway.

(1) 23 U.S.C. §408: “State traffic safety information system improvements” [58] (Federal requirement of Section 408 grant funds to improve the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility of the state safety data.)
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### Emphasis Area: Traffic Records

**Strategy TR-4:** Develop the Standard Data Elements and Data Exchange Methodology to Support Electronic Data Exchange of Judgment and Sentencing Information within 10 Days of Court Assessment in Accordance with the Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pilot test a process demonstrating the submittal of regular periodic data (citation and DWI abstract information) utilizing STRS methodologies.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development of a data interface between the AOC and MVD for the timely exchange of judgment and sentencing information.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development of a data interface from the AOC’s case management system to the Citation Tracking System maintained by MVD.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of days for transferring judgment and sentencing data from AOC to MVD</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Identify target number of days (i.e., 10) for desired data transfer as the performance measure.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of citation and abstracts shared electronically between AOC and MVD</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>• Include “DWI” abstracts</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Steps</td>
<td>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</td>
<td>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pilot test a process demonstrating the submittal of regular periodic data (citation and DWI abstract information) utilizing STRS methodologies.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Incorporate pilot test results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development of a data interface between the AOC and MVD for the timely exchange of judgment and sentencing information.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Identify opportunities to improve AOC and MVD interface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development of a data interface from the AOC’s case management system to the Citation Tracking System maintained by MVD.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Identify opportunities to improve AOC and MVD interface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.

2. State Traffic Records System (STRS) – to integrate the electronic collection and transmission of traffic records data among various data systems including crash, citation/adjudication, driver/vehicle history, injury surveillance and roadway.

3. 23 U.S.C. §408: “State traffic safety information system improvements” [58] (Federal requirement of Section 408 grant funds to improve the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility of the state safety data.)
### Emphasis Area: Traffic Records

**Strategy TR-5: Develop Standard Data Elements and Data Exchange Methodologies for Traffic and DWI Citation Information Sharing between the Courts and MVD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/ Performance Measures/ Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment¹ and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Develop Standard Data Elements and Data Exchange Methodologies for Traffic and DWI Citation Information Sharing between the Courts and MVD</td>
<td>Recommended (1), (2)</td>
<td>Yes if this objective was not accomplished as part of the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Delete strategy once data elements and exchange methodologies are complete</td>
<td>Continue to define priority opportunities to improve traffic records data quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days for transferring citation data from the courts to the MVD</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Yes, via STRS²</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Identify target number of days for desired data transfer as the performance measure.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of courts engaged with and using the system</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Yes, via STRS²</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish a memorandum of understanding between Law Enforcement, AOC, and MVD for the exchange of traffic and DWI citation information and the development of a STRS Distribution Center.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop data interfaces from the Federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies to the STRS central repository.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop data interfaces from the STRS central repository to AOC’s case management system or a centralized server for distribution of citation information to the courts statewide.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop data interfaces from the STRS central repository to MVD’s citation tracking systems.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pilot test the data interfaces from the STRS central repository to AOC’s case management system or a centralized server and the MVD systems.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Incorporate pilot test results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
2. State Traffic Records System (STRS) – to integrate the electronic collection and transmission of traffic records data among various data systems including crash, citation/adjudication, driver/vehicle history, injury surveillance and roadway.

---

(3) 23 U.S.C. §408: “State traffic safety information system improvements” [58] (Federal requirement of Section 408 grant funds to improve the timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility of the state safety data.)
## Emphasis Area: Traffic Records

### Strategy TR-6: Integrate Traffic Records and Injury Surveillance Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Strategy: Integrate Traffic Records and Injury Surveillance Data</th>
<th>Alignment(^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Steps</td>
<td>Recommended (1), (2)</td>
<td>Yes, if this objective was not accomplished as part of the State Traffic Records Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Delete strategy once integration is complete</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measure

Number of medical records and systems integrated with the STRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</td>
<td>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish a memorandum of understanding among traffic records entities to establish data collection standards and integration/sharing methodologies.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work cooperatively and collaboratively with other traffic record stakeholders to improve New Mexico’s traffic records system and implement the STRS Strategic Plan by:</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing technical and administrative support for the data exchange initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continuing to support efforts to collect information electronically and evaluate data sharing possibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support projects to automate the exchange of traffic records information between DOH, DIHS, and the Distribution Center to increase the analytical capabilities to identify problem areas and develop program solutions</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop data interfaces for exchange between data integration systems.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pilot test the data interfaces for exchange between data integration systems.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

\(^1\) Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
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## Emphasis Area: Traffic Records

### Strategy TR-7: Update the NMDOT Crash Fact Book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Strategy: Update the NMDOT Crash Fact Book</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Steps</td>
<td>Not a nationally recommended strategy, but it is desirable to update the document (1)</td>
<td>No, this is an action step that belongs in an agency-specific plan</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Measure

- **Publication of a revised and updated Crash Book and Web Site**
  - Aligns with emphasis area
  - Relevant data is available in the NMDOT crash database.
  - Yes
  - None
  - None

### Action Steps

1. Create a draft revised “Annual Safety Fact Book” to be reviewed by DOT stakeholders and partners.
   - Aligns
   - Yes
   - None

2. Work cooperatively and collaboratively with DOT divisions and other interested partners to implement recommendations for updating and revising the “Annual Crash Fact Book.”
   - Aligns
   - Yes
   - None

3. Post the revised “Annual Crash Fact Book” and other relevant safety data on the DOT web site.
   - Aligns
   - Yes
   - None

**Notes:**

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
### Emphasis Area: Traffic Records

#### Strategy TR-8: Develop Crash System Improvement Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Develop Crash System Improvement Projects</td>
<td>Recommended (1), (2)</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Modify title to &quot;Develop Crash Record System Improvement Projects&quot;</td>
<td>Add timeframe and identify funding for implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time from crash to data entry into a centralized database</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Performance measure should be relative to the development and execution of projects focused on improving timeliness.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of crash reports submitted electronically</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Performance measure should be relative to the development and execution of projects focused on electronic submission of crash records.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of errors in reported data related to data entry</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>Performance measure should be relative to the development and execution of projects focused on improving quality of the crash record data.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Action Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Include in Agency-Specific Plans</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work cooperatively and collaboratively with other traffic record stakeholders to improve New Mexico’s crash reporting system by providing technical and administrative support for the TSB Crash Section.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support projects to automate the exchange of traffic crash report information between law enforcement and NMDOT to reduce manual data processing and, thereby, increase data accuracy and completeness.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support the development of a centralized crash database at DOT to exchange crash data with other systems within DOT and other agencies.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements. Include in future agency-specific plan until database is established.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.
# Strategy TR-9: Determine the Feasibility of Implementing Electronic Data Collection and Transmission of Citation, DWI, and Crash Data within Native American Tribes, Pueblos, and Nations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment (^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Native American entities participating in the electronic data capture program</strong></td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeliness, accuracy, and consistency of Native American data</strong></td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>Yes, with refinements</td>
<td>• Incorporate all six model performance measures (timeliness, accuracy, completeness, uniformity, integration, and accessibility) • Recommended national best practice (3)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Steps</strong></td>
<td>Include in Agency-Specific Plans Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Establish a memorandum of understanding between Tribal governments and data gathering agencies. <strong>Note:</strong> MOU currently is between TSB and Tesuque Pueblo Government for the implementation of TraCS and data exchange through the STRS DC.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop and test pilot data interfaces from the Federal or Tribal law enforcement agencies to the STRS central repository, MVD, Courts, and DOT.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work cooperatively and collaboratively with Native American traffic record stakeholders to improve New Mexico’s traffic records system and implement the STRS Strategic Plan by: • Providing technical and administrative support for the STRS • Continuing to support efforts to collect information electronically and evaluate data sharing possibilities with Native American entities</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support projects to automate the exchange of traffic, DWI, and crash report information between traffic records entities and Native American entities to reduce manual data processing and increase data accuracy and completeness.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Explore the feasibility of adding more Native American law enforcement agencies to the TraCS Statewide Rollout.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

\(^1\) Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.


### Emphasis Area: Traffic Records

**Strategy TR-10:** Develop and Maintain a Statewide Law Enforcement Reporting Database for the NM Comprehensive Impaired Driving Program (CDIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy/Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment(^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Develop and Maintain a Statewide Law Enforcement Reporting Database for the NM Comprehensive Impaired Driving Program (CDIP)</td>
<td>Recommended (1), (2)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of enhanced law enforcement activity records captured by the centralized Repository</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-County DWI participants compliance for submitting required information to the Repository</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Steps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop and maintain a data interface to a centralized database for the Six-County DWI participants to meet reporting requirements.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pilot test the data interface and move into production for monthly reporting.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop a new application version to allow access via a web application. Develop the web application to evaluate the feasibility of incorporating other law enforcement, program, and financial electronic reporting to the DOT TSB.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Expand and support the web-enabled reporting application that allows law enforcement to submit aggregated data on their enhanced law enforcement activities, such as checkpoints, saturation patrols, high-visibility media campaigns, and preventive initiatives.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended national best practices. Alignment of strategy and action step with national guidance for best practices.


### Strategy YD-1: Provide Education on the Dangers of Underage Drinking, Especially Early Onset Drinking to Communities, Middle or High School Students, and Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment(^1) and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategy:** Provide Education on the Dangers of Underage Drinking, Especially Early Onset Drinking to Communities, Middle or High School Students, and Parents | Effectiveness Undetermined 1 star (1): School education programs | Yes, based on program evaluation results | Strengthen parental engagement through parent requirement to attend event, parental guidance on monitoring, and guides for positive parent/child discussions. (2) | • 5 stars (1) – Couple special high-visibility zero-tolerance enforcement campaign with underage drinking event (include under-21 checkpoints)  
• 5 stars (1) – Enact or promote “use and lose” laws (confiscation/postpone of driver’s license)  
• 5 stars (1) – Comprehensive community programs (public/private participation, enforcement checkpoints, media, vendor compliance checks, roadside surveys, etc.) | |

### Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Aligns with emphasis area</th>
<th>Aligns with strategy</th>
<th>Aligns with recommended national best practices</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Consider pre- and post-education program survey data</th>
<th>Number of motor vehicle occupants age 20 or younger involved in alcohol-related crashes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey data on the onset and extent of underage drinking</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area</td>
<td>Aligns with strategy</td>
<td>Aligns with recommended national best practices</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pre- and post-course participant survey data to assess degree of attitudinal and awareness change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Aligns</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Considerations for Future Agency-Specific Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Using the RFP process, develop and implement a plan of best practices for an underage drinking prevention education program with training materials for parents and other stakeholders. | Aligns | Yes | Incorporate teen role-plays with parents and family members and resistance skills training (2)  
Incorporate social norming messages – most students do not use alcohol (2) |
| 2. Select a contractor, develop the program, and present it in middle and high schools. | Aligns | Yes, with refinements | Examine program evaluation data to determine program continuation or enhancements needed |

### Notes:

1. Alignment performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements and/or recommended measures. Alignment of strategy and action steps with national guidance.


- 5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
- 4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
- 3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
- 2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
- 1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence

(2) Strategies to Prevent Underage Drinking, National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, August 2002 [22]

** Further investigation needed to confirm
### Emphasis Area: Young Driver Crashes

**Strategy YD-2: Provide Media Literacy Education on the Effects of Alcohol Advertising to Middle and High School Youth and Adult Educators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures/Action Steps</th>
<th>Alignment and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy:</strong> Provide Media Literacy Education on the Effects of Alcohol Advertising to Middle and High School Youth and Adult Educators</td>
<td>Effectiveness undetermined 2 stars (1): Youth social norming campaigns • Alcohol exposure influences youth drinking**</td>
<td>Yes, based on program evaluation results</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Support youth alcohol prevention programs such as Students Against Destructive Decisions (SADD), effectiveness undetermined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey data on the onset and extent of underage drinking</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pre- and post-training behavioral survey data</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students taught and courses offered</td>
<td>Aligns with emphasis area Aligns with strategy</td>
<td>Yes, with refinement</td>
<td>Pre- and post-course survey to assess degree of attitudinal and awareness change</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Steps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop and implement a contract with the Media Literacy program.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop mini-grants with participating CDWI coordinators.</td>
<td>Aligns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide media literacy training at the local level to students under age of 18.</td>
<td>Effectiveness undetermined 2 stars (1): Youth social norming campaigns • Alcohol exposure influences youth drinking**</td>
<td>Yes, based on program evaluation results</td>
<td>Obtain training evaluation results; pre- and post-training attitudinal and/or behavioral surveys if available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements. Alignment of action step with national proven and/or priority strategies.
- 5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results
- 4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations
- 3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources
- 2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results
- 1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence
- ** Further research needed to confirm effects of media literacy training on teen alcohol use. In a 2006 published study entitled, “Effects of Alcohol Advertising Exposure on Drinking Among Youth” (L.B. Snyder, F.F. Milici, M. Slater, H. Sun, and Y. Strizhakova., Archives of Pediatric & Adolescent Medicine, January 2006 [49]), youth in markets with more alcohol advertisements showed increases in drinking levels into their late 20s.
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### Strategy: Provide Information on the Importance of Safety Belt Use to Youth in High Schools in the Eight New Mexico Counties with the Highest Rate of Nonuse in the Targeted Age Range of 14 to 20

#### Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Alignment and/or Assessment of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Availability of Relevant and Measurable Data</th>
<th>Include in Future CTSP</th>
<th>Refinements to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
<th>Potential Additions to Consider for Future CTSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of agencies participating</td>
<td>Proven Effective 4 stars (2), Proven (1) – Target communications outreach for low-seatbelt-use audiences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Number of agencies participating in high-visibility enforcement campaigns</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seatbelt survey results</td>
<td>Proven Effective 5 stars (2), Proven (1) – High visibility seatbelt enforcement coupled with communications outreach about the enforcement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Clarify if this is the annual seatbelt observation survey or the teen safety belt use survey.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of citations issued by age</td>
<td>Proven Effective 5 stars (2), Proven (1) – High visibility seatbelt enforcement coupled with communications outreach about the enforcement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ensure teen seatbelt outreach is coupled with seatbelt enforcement campaigns</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Action Steps

1. Coordinate with the NHTSA on campaign protocols.

2. Disseminate teen safety belt messages through a web site, flyers, and posters. Conduct safety belt enforcement blitzes coordinated with national "Click It or Ticket" campaign.

#### Notes:

1. Alignment of performance measure with emphasis area, strategy, and federal requirements. Alignment of action step with national proven and/or priority strategies.

(1) NCHRP Report 500 Series Volume 11: A Guide for Increasing Seatbelt Use, National Cooperative Highway Research Program/Transportation Research Board, 2004 [23]: “Proven” strategies are based on evaluations demonstrating effectiveness; “Tried” strategies have been widely implemented but limited evaluation data available.


5 stars: Demonstrated to be effective by several high-quality evaluations with consistent results

4 stars: Demonstrated to be effective in certain situations

3 stars: Likely to be effective based on balance of evidence from high-quality evaluations or other sources

2 stars: Effectiveness still undetermined; different methods of implementing this countermeasure produce different results

1 star: Limited or no high-quality evaluation evidence

** Further investigation needed to confirm
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Attachment B

SAMPLE TRACKING SYSTEM
SAMPLE TRACKING SYSTEM

The Comprehensive Transportation Safety Plan (CTSP) should be evaluated periodically to measure the progress toward implementing the strategies and assessing the safety performance of implemented safety initiatives. For implementation assessments, appropriate metrics include the status of implementation of each strategy – for example, the number of route miles with rumble strips, number of citations issued. Metrics for safety performance include change in the frequency and rate of severe crashes overall, by emphasis area, especially using performance measures that are required from MAP-21.

Evaluation results provide insights useful for improving the program structure and implementation processes followed, as well as guiding improvements in the future. A critical piece of the evaluation effort is a structure through which assessments and results can be disseminated and then reviewed by leadership and stakeholders. The spreadsheet files included on the CD provide a structure from which the NMDOT and other state agencies can build on or modify as necessary to suit their evaluation and tracking needs.

The “Sample Tracking System No Crash Data” spreadsheet contains two tabs. The “Sample Tracking System” tab provides a spreadsheet in which crash and implementation data can be entered to obtain estimates of the costs and benefits associated with an Emphasis Area for identified safety improvement strategies. The “Monitoring Data” tab provides spreadsheets useful to document information relative to implemented improvements including implementation information (such as date and cost), data (such as crashes and traffic volumes from before and after the safety improvement is implemented), quantitative calculations, qualitative opinions, and conclusions about the safety improvement’s effectiveness. Separate spreadsheets are provided for differing emphasis areas and strategies based on the metrics used considering a 4Es-based comprehensive program and performance measures adopted.

The “Sample Tracking System with Example Crash Data” spreadsheet contains one tab. The “Sample Tracking System” tab includes representative emphasis areas and strategies with crash and deployment data included to provide an example of the spreadsheet’s calculations to estimate costs and benefits associated, and safety performance associated with the example improvement strategies.
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