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INFORMATION AND BACKGROUND

Traffic deaths and injuries are rising even though accident rates, in terms of miles traveled, have subsided. Congress enacted the Highway Safety Act of 1966 and charged each state to establish and maintain a highway safety program. The purpose of this program is to decrease accident frequency and especially to reduce accidents which result in death and severe injuries.

The U.S. Secretary of Commerce was initially given the authority for implementing the Highway Safety Act of 1966. Shortly thereafter, Congress enacted legislation creating the Department of Transportation. Responsibility for the highway safety program was then shifted to the Secretary of Transportation. In order to administer the program, the National Highway Safety Agency was established; this agency is now called the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Each state's program must be approved by the Secretary of Transportation and must conform with uniform standards. Eighteen safety standards (1) currently in effect are related to:

1. motor vehicle inspection,
2. motor vehicle registration,
3. motorcycle safety,
4. driver education,
5. driver licensing,
6. traffic codes and laws,
7. traffic courts,
8. alcohol in relation to highway safety,
9. identification and surveillance of accident locations,
10. traffic records,
11. emergency medical services,
12. highway design, construction, and maintenance,
13. traffic control devices,
14. pedestrian safety,
15. police traffic services,
16. accident cleanup,
17. pupil transportation safety, and
18. accident investigation and reporting.

The 1966 Act defined the role of states in implementing the safety program. The Governor is responsible for its administration, and the state is to authorize political subdivisions to conduct their own highway safety programs. These programs must be approved by the Governor and comply with the standards. Federal aid funds have been linked to the construction.

Identification of factors contributing to accidents is imperative. Manufacturers of vehicles are regulated by safety standards which are continually updated to incorporate the latest proven safety features into vehicle design. States have taken steps to upgrade vehicle safety by enacting vehicle inspection laws. Improved vehicle safety may not significantly reduce frequency of accidents because of driver errors and roadway defects. However, the death rate and severity of injuries might be affected measurably. It may be debated whether the driver or the roadway is the principal cause of accidents. Even though a driver may cause an accident, some highway features may increase its severity. Selective police enforcement at high accident locations tends to encourage drivers to behave cautiously. Driver problems may be improved through education and periodic reexamination, but these may not exert as much influence as increased enforcement. If increased severity can be attributed to roadway features, then it is imperative to correct hazardous locations and improve highway design.

Success of a highway safety program depends upon the identification and analysis of problem locations. Analysis is accomplished by professional judgement, and accurate analysis must include an analysis of accident histories. Accident statistics and histories are of value only when the reporting is comprehensive and complete. When identification procedures are applied on a statewide basis, the capability should exist to analyze accident histories for large numbers of locations. The task can be accomplished most efficiently by utilizing a computerized accident records system.

The study reported herein issued from the highway safety program and addresses the need for uniform reporting and processing of accident records. Both the Divisions of Traffic and Planning have responsibilities in that area, and the Division of Research frequently analyzes accident records to discover causes and relationships. In the past, each division has handled records separately, with some duplication of efforts. If accident data were handled by a single agency, greater efficiency might result.

Extensive discussions were held with representatives from both the Divisions of Traffic and Planning concerning records maintenance techniques and accident data needs. There was also consultation with the Division of State Police, Department of Public Safety. Close contact was maintained with the Joint Committee for Uniform Accident Reporting (JCUAR). This ad hoc committee designed a uniform accident report form and advocates enabling legislation. Letters of inquiry were sent to other states to gain information concerning accident reporting.
**PRESENT REPORTING PROCEDURES**

Kentucky does not require uniform reporting from police jurisdictions investigating accidents. Uniform reporting refers to the procedure of reporting all traffic accidents to a central agency for processing on a statewide basis. Motorist involved in accidents wherein total property damage is $200 or more must submit written reports to the Department of Public Safety (2). Similarly, fatal accidents investigated by a police officer must be reported to the Department of Public Safety. Those reports and ones completed by the Kentucky State Police are processed centrally by the Department of Public Safety. Many urban, non-fatal accidents may be reported (by local police agencies) and processed only on the local level. Motorists’ reports may be biased when compared to police reports. Consequently, motorists’ reports are of little value to an engineer except to indicate that an accident occurred. Some have even suggested that motorists’ reports be eliminated and that police investigate all accidents regardless of damage (3). Lack of complete accident reporting handicaps the highway safety effort.

Local authorities may pinpoint trouble spots in their areas because local accident reports are readily available to them. The statewide highway improvement program, however, suffers because urban area reports are not readily available to the state planning agency. Therefore, it would be helpful if all accident reports were forwarded to a central processing agency.

The Department of Public Safety is responsible for central processing of accident reports submitted by motorists, State Police, and local police (fatal accidents only). The proceeding 10-year trend for accidents is shown in Figure 1. Projected accident estimates for 1975 and 1980 are 112,000 and 138,000 respectively. Figure 2 compares total accidents and police-investigated accidents for the same 10-year period. Total number of accidents was determined from the number of motorists’ reports filed each year; police-investigated accidents included State Police reported accidents and fatal reports only. Police-investigated accidents are those that are now centrally processed. If all police accident reports were centrally filed, the work load of central processing would nearly triple.

**CURRENT PROCESSING PROCEDURES**

**KENTUCKY**

Accident records are handled separately by each state agency. All are dependent on the Department of Public Safety for basic information. Agencies requiring accident data are:

A. Department of Transportation
   1. Bureau of Highways
      a. Division of Traffic
      b. Division of Planning
      c. Division of Research
   2. Bureau of Vehicle Regulation
B. Department of Public Safety, Division of State Police
C. Department of Health.

Each uses the data differently and some are dependent upon others for additional information.

Figure 3 traces the accident record processing from completion of the report through use of information by each agency. When an accident occurs, usually a policeman is called to investigate. If the investigating officer is a state policeman, his report is reviewed at the local post and then transmitted to the Department of Public Safety and reviewed in Central Records. Fatal accident reports from the other police agencies and reports from the motorists are also received. Name cards are prepared and the reports are forwarded to the Bureau of Highways, Division of Planning, where milepost numbers and highway system codes are added. When returned to Public Safety, the reports are coded, keypunched, and microfilmed. Information from punched cards of police and motorists’ reports are transferred to magnetic tapes. Summaries and reports are issued. Beginning in 1972, an annual report including accident summaries is published by Public Safety. A copy of the magnetic tape containing State Police and fatal accident reports is forwarded to the Department of Transportation.

In the Department of Transportation, the tape is used as a source for the creation of a 24-month, on-line file. Both the Bureau of Highways and Bureau of Vehicle Regulation are interested in this information. Presently, only the Bureau of Highways makes extensive use of the files. The Division of Traffic uses the on-line file to identify high accident locations in an attempt to determine hazardous locations. A monthly listing is obtained of high accident locations, defined as a 0.1-mile section of roadway where one fatality and(or) three accidents occurred in the preceding 12 months. Traffic Division central office and district engineers carefully screen all accident reports for these locations. If from this analysis it is believed that the site has some roadway deficiencies, then a field inspection is conducted. Field inspections are performed by a multidisciplinary team composed of traffic and maintenance engineers and police personnel. Afterwards, the team will formulate recommendations, which in many cases results in minor
highway improvement of the location. According to Agent (4), improvements of high accident locations can be credited with a 25-percent reduction in accidents; benefit-cost ratios are generally greater than 1.0.

The Division of Planning uses accident data to determine where and on what types of facilities accidents are occurring. The source of that information is the accident reports forwarded from the State Police. Table TA-1 is prepared for the Federal Highway Administration and a publication titled Kentucky Fatal Accident Facts is issued. Figure 4 is a copy of TA-1 for 1971. This report summarizes mileage, travel, and accidents according to highway system.

The Division of Research obtains a duplicate of the Department of Transportation accident tape. Accident information is used in conjunction with various research activities such as evaluation of high accident location improvement programs and establishing relationships between accidents and skid resistance of pavements (Standard 12). Accident records are considered indispensable.

The Department of Health requires information regarding location of traffic accidents to comply with Standard 11 for concentrating emergency medical services near dangerous locations. The Bureau of Vehicle Regulation require accident records for driver licensing purposes.

OTHER STATES
In some states, computerization of accident records is the responsibility of a single governmental agency. In others, various agencies are involved in accident report processing and computerization. Many states have completed traffic records systems, as defined by Standard 10, while others merely maintain accident files. Most agree that roadway inventory and traffic volumes are necessary inputs to accident records analysis. Illinois' accident records system is a good model. That system is outlined briefly in APPENDIX A.

Table 1 summarizes the status of other states with respect to uniform reporting. In 45 states, investigating officers are required to file reports of accidents with a central agency. Georgia does not require uniform reporting but does obtain reports on a voluntary basis. Maryland and Illinois receive uniform reports from all jurisdictions except their largest city. Kentucky and Mississippi do not have uniform reporting. It is apparent that 39 states utilize a uniform report form, while seven do not. Four states failed to respond.

SUGGESTED REPORTING PROCEDURES
In March 1973, the Joint Committee for Uniform Accident Reporting (JCUAR), composed of policemen and engineers, was formed. JCUAR's purpose is to secure passage of legislation requiring investigating officers to file uniform reports with a central agency. The committee's first task was to devise a uniform traffic collision report form for use by all law enforcement agencies. The recommended form is shown in Figure 5. The form is currently being used on an experimental basis by the Lexington Metropolitan Police Department.

Uniform reporting of all traffic accidents would:
1. provide a larger data base for identifying accident causes and would cover a wider variety of driving conditions,
2. provide accident data from all areas of the state and, therefore, would assist in identification of high accident locations,
3. assist in evaluation of new and existing traffic control devices,
4. provide local governmental jurisdictions with periodic computer printouts and summaries of accident data and thereby assist in their highway safety efforts,
5. achieve compliance with federal accident reporting requirements, and
6. provide an atmosphere for more accurate reporting with appropriate training of police officers (the Traffic Institute at Eastern Kentucky University is suited for this task).

Problems might include:
1. The work load of central processing will increase because the number of police reports would nearly triple.
2. Local authorities may oppose uniform reporting fearing that more time will be required for completing and duplicating reports and sending them to central processing.
3. It will also require training of investigators. The Traffic Institute plans to provide such training whether or not uniform accident reporting legislation is adopted.

The agency designated to collect and process accident information, referred to here as the Accident Records Unit (ARU), would be responsible for meeting all needs of state government for accident statistics. Governmental agencies requiring ARU services might include:
1. Department of Public Safety, Division of State Police -- summary reports.
2. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Highways, Division of Planning -- Table TA-1 (FHWA), fatal accidents facts book, etc.
3. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Highways, Division of Traffic -- assist in the highway improvement program, listings of
high accident locations, programs for setting
priorities for hazardous location
improvements. Other listings such as accidents
at railroad crossings, etc., might be useful.

4. Department of Transportation, Bureau of
Highways, Division of Research -- aid in
correlation of accidents with various highway
design elements or parameters, etc.

5. Department of Transportation, Bureau of
Vehicle Regulation, Division of Driver
Licensing -- financial responsibility data (if a
financial responsibility law is passed).

6. Department of Health -- accident
concentration listings to aid in assignment of
emergency medical services.

The ARU would also be responsible for providing
political subdivisions with information on concentration
of accidents, for example, listing of accidents per street,
at intersections, etc., within their jurisdictions.

With uniform accident reporting and creation of
ARU, accident reports may flow as shown in Figure 6.
Officers' reports would be reviewed locally and then
forwarded to the ARU for review. Motorists' reports
would arrive by mail. The ARU would check milepost
numbers or assign them if they are not on the report
and add highway system codes. Reports would then be
coded, keypunched, and microfilmed. Information
would then be loaded into an on-line accident records
file within a central computer facility from which
information may be "extracted for use by various
agencies.

Careful consideration should be given to the
method of referencing accident locations. In rural areas,
the milepost scheme would be adequate. For urban
areas, however, a referencing system must be selected
and implemented. The milepost system could be
extended into the urban areas by mileposting each
street. Another approach would be to index streets and
intersections in each urban area and record a measured
distance from the intersection to the accident location.
A third approach might involve establishment of an
involved link node system for the entire state. It is
recommended that the rural milepost scheme be
continued and that an urban indexing technique be
devised.

Besides accident reports, other inputs will be
required by the ARU. Detailed, computerized roadway
inventories and traffic volume files will be necessary and
will need continual updating. Hazardous location
identification methods, such as the rate quality control
procedure preferred by Jorgenson (5), require traffic
volume input. The roadway inventory could ease
reporting tasks of investigating officers. ARU could
determine physical features of roadway and the accident
report form could be simplified.

The ARU creation and maintenance should be
overseen by an Advisory Committee. This committee
should be composed of individuals who have direct
interests in the use of accident data. Membership may
consist of:

1. one representative from each of the Division
   of Planning, Division of Traffic, and Division
   of Research from the Department of
   Transportation, Bureau of Highways,
2. one representative of the Division of Driver
   Licensing from the Department of
   Transportation, Bureau of Vehicle Regulation,
3. one representative of the Kentucky State
   Police.
4. one representative of local governments to be
   appointed by the Governor,
5. one representative to be a law enforcement
   officer (local) appointed by the Commissioner
   of Public Safety, and
6. one representative of the Department of
   Health.

The committee should give strong consideration to the
needs of the ARU, such as manpower requirements.
Table 2 compares the manpower now used to estimated
requirements of the ARU. It was difficult to make
estimates of present personnel requirements because
many of the individuals charged with these
responsibilities perform other functions. It must also be
noted that the ARU will be handling many more reports
than are now processed. Figure 7 is a suggested
organization chart for the ARU, and APPENDIX B
describes each individual position.
RECOMMENDATIONS

From a survey of accident reporting in other states and consideration of advantages and disadvantages of uniform accident reporting, it is recommended that:
1. Kentucky adopt uniform accident reporting legislation to become effective January 1, 1975. A universal accident form should be utilized. The form should contain an accident number so that police and motorist reports could be matched. The police form should duplicate itself so that officers can detach a copy for the Accident Record Unit's use.
2. An Accident Records Unit, as described herein, be established.
3. An advisory committee be established to coordinate the creation and operation of the ARU.
4. The Department of Transportation provide the ARU with computerized traffic volumes and roadway inventories that will be compatible with the location scheme adopted for use with accident records.
5. Local governmental agencies receive data from ARU.
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Figure 1. Accident Trend in Kentucky.

\[ Y = 4827 X + 48519 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.93 \]
Figure 2. Total Accidents Compared to Investigated Accidents.
Figure 3. Current Flow of Accident Reports and Statistics.
### Table TA-1 - Statewide mileage, travel, and non-fatal and fatal injury accidents, 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway system and related items</th>
<th>Non-fatal injury accidents</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road miles and travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Per 10 mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>per vehicle-miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>per vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Interstate, rural, final (Toll)
- Miles: 534.72
- Percent: 0.25
- Travel: 7,759
- Fatal: 12.60
- Fatalities: 1,667
- Rate: 2.05
- Per 10 mi: 2.17
- Number: 777
- Fatal: 3.20
- Non-fatal: 1,338
- Total: 3.54

#### Interstate, urban, final (Toll)
- Miles: 55.25
- Percent: 0.24
- Travel: 1,025
- Fatal: 1.07
- Fatalities: 7
- Rate: 7.01
- Per 10 mi: 7.16
- Number: 622
- Fatal: 2.50
- Non-fatal: 393
- Total: 3.12

#### Subtotal final Interstate
- Miles: 590.47
- Percent: 2.87
- Travel: 8,784
- Fatal: 13.67
- Fatalities: 17
- Rate: 1.21
- Per 10 mi: 1.32
- Number: 1,405
- Fatal: 3.73
- Non-fatal: 1,024
- Total: 4.08

#### Non-Final Interstate
- Miles: 283.90
- Percent: 1.35
- Travel: 4,149
- Fatal: 0.98
- Fatalities: 5
- Rate: 1.10
- Per 10 mi: 1.18
- Number: 305
- Fatal: 0.75
- Non-fatal: 230
- Total: 0.83

#### Total Interstate
- Miles: 874.37
- Percent: 4.22
- Travel: 12,933
- Fatal: 14.65
- Fatalities: 26
- Rate: 2.15
- Per 10 mi: 2.32
- Number: 1,750
- Fatal: 4.04
- Non-fatal: 1,304
- Total: 4.45

#### Rural Non-Final
- Miles: 2,522.80
- Percent: 12.21
- Travel: 11,918
- Fatal: 13.37
- Fatalities: 26
- Rate: 2.21
- Per 10 mi: 2.42
- Number: 2,160
- Fatal: 0.68
- Non-fatal: 1,561
- Total: 1.04

#### Total Rural
- Miles: 3,397.17
- Percent: 16.43
- Travel: 24,851
- Fatal: 15.72
- Fatalities: 32
- Rate: 2.48
- Per 10 mi: 2.73
- Number: 3,317
- Fatal: 0.82
- Non-fatal: 2,496
- Total: 1.28

#### Non-State
- Miles: 1,786.34
- Percent: 8.59
- Travel: 12,332
- Fatal: 12.86
- Fatalities: 16
- Rate: 2.05
- Per 10 mi: 2.21
- Number: 1,181
- Fatal: 0.59
- Non-fatal: 1,122
- Total: 1.18

### Figure 4. Example of FHWA TA-1 Summary Report.
### COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
UNIFORM POLICE TRAFFIC COLLISION REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DATE OF COLLISION</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TIME (USE 2400 HRS)</th>
<th>REPORT DAY</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL</th>
<th>TRANSIT</th>
<th>PARK</th>
<th>MURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILES</th>
<th>OF</th>
<th>NO. STREE</th>
<th>INTERE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF STREET OR ROAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME &amp; NO. OF STREET OR INTERSECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF STREET OR ROAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL NO. OF VEHICLES</th>
<th>TOTAL NO. OF PEOPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT STRUCK</th>
<th>NAME OF OBJECT STRUCK</th>
<th>OWNER'S NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRIVERS NAME</th>
<th>LAST</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>MOBILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRIVER NO.</th>
<th>PRESENT STREET ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
<th>PHONE NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATOR NO.</th>
<th>PRESENT STREET ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
<th>PHONE NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>INJURY</th>
<th>(1) CLASS</th>
<th>(2) SEAT BELTS</th>
<th>(3) EJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SEVERITY OF INJURIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. INJURY</th>
<th>(4) SEAT BELTS</th>
<th>(5) EJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LOCATION OF OBJECT STRUCK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION OF OBJECT STRUCK</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NAME, ADDRESS & INJURIES OF PERSONS INVOLVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF INJURIES</th>
<th>REMOVED FROM SCENE BY</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INJURIES OF OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DOB</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF INJURIES</th>
<th>REMOVED FROM SCENE BY</th>
<th>TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) STAT</th>
<th>(2) SEAT POSITION</th>
<th>(3) INJURY CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 PASS</td>
<td>6 OTHER POSITION</td>
<td>1. NO INJURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PEDESTRIAN</td>
<td>9 POSITION UNKNOWN</td>
<td>2. DEAD AT SCENE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 BICYCLIST</td>
<td>5. DISABLING INJURY</td>
<td>3. DEAD ON ARRIVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DRV</td>
<td>7. OTHER INJURY</td>
<td>6. NON-DISABLING INJURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 WITNESS</td>
<td>8. INJURY</td>
<td>7. EVIDENT INJURY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) SEAT BELT</td>
<td>(5) EJECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODES</th>
<th>INJURY</th>
<th>(14) SEAT BELT</th>
<th>(15) EJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. JCUAR Police Collision Report.
**VEHICLE DAMAGE INSTRUCTIONS:**

1. In each box circle the number of each damaged area.
2. Shade area of most severe impact.
3. Draw arrow(s) to show principal direction of force.

**OFFICER'S OBSERVATIONS**

---

**POSITION BEFORE COLLISION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>MOVING STOPPED</th>
<th>INCREASING DECREASING</th>
<th>ON STREET OR HIGHWAY</th>
<th>TOWARD</th>
<th>NO. OF THROUGH LANES IN ONE DIRECTION</th>
<th>SPEED MAX.</th>
<th>CIRCULAR OF HARM</th>
<th>LEGALLY WAS HOISTED</th>
<th>PAVEMENT WAS USING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROAD CONDITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEATHER</th>
<th>ROAD CHARACTER (Not Specified)</th>
<th>LIGHT CONDITIONS</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTING CIRCUMSTANCES</th>
<th>VEHICLE CONDITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Under influence of alcohol/drugs</td>
<td>Defective headlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apparently asleep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visibility impaired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speeding reasonable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safely Speeded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faded to yield R/W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improper Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Failing to signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRAFFIC CONTROL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF ROAD</th>
<th>ROAD DEFECTS</th>
<th>WHAT DRIVERS WERE DOING IMMEDIATELY BEFORE ACCIDENT</th>
<th>SOBRIETY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chem. Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**QUESTIONS**

1. VEHICLE NO.
2. TRAILERS, MOTORCYCLES, ETC.
3. USE THIS SPACE FOR SKETCHING DAMAGE TO
4. VEHICLE NO.

---

Figure 5. (continued)
Figure 6. Proposed Flow of Accident Reports and Statistics (with Uniform Accident Reporting).
Figure 7. Accident Records Unit Organization Chart.
### TABLE 1

**SUMMARY OF REPORTING IN OTHER STATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>POLICE REPORTING LEGISLATION</th>
<th>UNIVERSAL FORM USED</th>
<th>FILING TIME</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uniform reporting on a voluntary basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Honolulu Form used throughout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>One jurisdiction does not use form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>Uniform reporting except for Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Uniform reporting except for Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Forthwith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>All reports not on same form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2

**ACCIDENT RECORDS PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>WITH ARU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Police</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Operator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Varifiers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keypunchers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coders</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOT Bureau of Highways</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

THE ILLINOIS METHOD

The state of Illinois requires uniform accident reporting from all law enforcement jurisdictions with the exception of Chicago. Report forms used have matching numbers; the police report corresponds to the motorist's report. Responsibility for receiving and processing reports has been vested in the Department of Transportation. Their accident records system was established over a period of 11 months. The system has an on-line file which contains data spanning 6 months and a permanent tape storage (off-line). Illinois is in the process of converting to a milepost reference system for both rural and urban highways. The time lapse involved from the time of an accident to the completion of the permanent record is 53-60 days.

When a law enforcement officer investigates an accident, he files a report and requests the driver to complete a report bearing matching accident numbers. Both types of reports are forwarded to the Department of Transportation. As police and motorist's reports are received by the responsible unit, a skeleton file is created containing form number, name, and accident number. The reports are then placed into a paper file where motorist's and police reports are matched. After this matching, statistical data are taken from the reports and added to the skeleton file to create the accident records file.

The final function of the unit is statistical analysis of the data. Summaries are prepared and detailed accident listings are sent to municipalities. The unit also provides output summaries and listings required by all levels of state government, including the Secretary of State (driver licensing responsibility), law enforcement officials, and the Department of Transportation.

APPENDIX B

ARU PERSONNEL

Manpower required by the ARU includes:

1. Director - He will coordinate all work carried out by the unit. He should be a competent computer programmer with a working knowledge of both engineering and police needs of accident statistics. He should be an equally competent statistician.

2. Two Assistant Directors -- Both should have a working knowledge of programming. One should be an engineer and be responsible for engineering needs within the unit. He should be in close contact with the three divisions of the Bureau of Highways that use accident records and be aware of any innovations in the engineering application of accident statistics. He should be considered the chief engineer of the Engineering Staff. The second Assistant Director should be a competent computer programmer and be in charge of technical aspects of the computerization functions of the unit. His job title could be Chief Programmer.

3. Enforcement Liaison Officer -- He should be a policeman who would coordinate all police functions of the unit and maintain close contact with the Kentucky State Police.

4. Engineering Staff -- The staff should consist of two assistant or associate engineers to aid the chief engineer in his coordination of the engineering functions of the unit. Also under their direction should be three engineering technicians who would be unitized for assigning milepoint numbers and highway system codes to accident records.

5. Computer Staff -- The staff should consist of two competent computer programmers responsible to the Chief Programmer.

6. Technical Staff -- The size of this staff should be more closely examined by the advisory committee to meet secretarial, coding, and keypunching needs.