

NHTSA MMUCC Committee – Law Enforcement Data Collection Subcommittee Meeting

February 7, 2023

1:30 – 3:00 PM ET

Microsoft Teams

I. Participants

A. Subcommittee members

1. Captain Brent Drummond — Missouri State Highway patrol
2. Staff Lieutenant Christopher Kinn — Ohio State Highway Patrol
3. Cindy Stewart — Colorado State Patrol
4. Lieutenant James Williams — Metro Nashville Police Department
5. Major Lisa Barnett — Florida Highway Patrol
6. Loren Hill — Minnesota Department of Transportation, Office of Traffic Safety
7. Sergeant Sean Smith — California Highway Patrol
8. Officer Thomas Mrozinski — Frisco Texas Police Department

B. Federal Liaisons

1. CDC
 - a. David Fosbroke
2. FHWA
 - a. Sarah Weissman Pascual
3. NHTSA
 - a. Barbara Rizzuti
 - b. Beau Burdett
 - c. Caitlin Webb
 - d. Donna Glassbrenner
 - e. Eric Chaney
 - f. Eric Li
 - g. Joanna Reed
 - h. Joshua DeFisher
 - i. Keith Williams
 - j. Michael Parsons
 - k. Rajesh Subramanian
 - l. Rodney Rudd
 - m. Sean Puckett
 - n. Tom Bragan
 - o. Tonja Lindsey

C. VHB

1. Bob Scopatz
2. Chelsea Palmateer
3. Courtney Ruiz

II. Committee tasks and clarifications

A. Chapters 4-9

1. This subcommittee will focus on Chapters 4-9 in the draft MMUCC Sixth Edition. Chapter 9: Narrative and Diagram, is brand new to MMUCC.

B. Other parts of the document

1. NHTSA welcomes your feedback on the entire draft MMUCC Sixth Edition.

2. If your feedback is relevant to this subcommittee, we will discuss it during the subcommittee meetings.
3. If your feedback is applicable to one of the other subcommittees, Joanna will provide your feedback to the appropriate subcommittee to consider during their review.
4. If you have feedback about other sections of the draft MMUCC Sixth edition document (e.g., Glossary) that fall outside the scope of the subcommittees, Joanna will provide your feedback to the NHTSA Traffic Records team and the Federal Liaisons for review.

III. Federal presentations

A. CDC/NIOSH – David Fosbroke

1. David facilitated a presentation on CDC's use and reliance on MMUCC Guidelines. David provided a high-level overview of examples on how the NIOSH Division of Safety Research, Center for Motor Vehicle Safety uses motor vehicle traffic crash data collected by law enforcement officers. David emphasized the importance of uniform data collection to assist with making clean connections between databases to help direct their analysis and injury prevention-related interventions.

IV. Review data elements

- A. The subcommittee will review and discuss feedback for each data element. For the draft MMUCC Sixth, there is a new landing page for each of the data element levels with corresponding hyperlinks to the data elements.

B. Chapter 4: Crash Data Elements

1. C1: Crash Date

a. Comments:

i. Discussion

- i. *Subfield 2: Month and Subfield 3: Day* have *Unknown* listed as an attribute, but *Subfield 1: Year* does not. This is intentional. In data analysis, a year is needed to understand the cutoff from one year to the next. Typically, it is not possible to have an unknown year. A committee member provided an example of a vehicle found in a river many months after the crash. The State was not sure what year to indicate the crash since it was at the crux of a new year. The year was unknown.

ii. C1 suggestion

- i. Add *Unknown* to *Subfield 1: Year*.

2. C2: Crash Time

a. No comments.

3. C3: Time of Roadway Clearance

a. Comments:

i. Discussion

- i. Committee members discussed it may be helpful to add the date of the roadway clearance. Committee members also mentioned challenges distinguishing between full and partial lane closure.

- ii. C3 suggestions
 - i. Add a second subfield for *date of roadway clearance*, similar to the subfields in C1 and C2.
 - ii. Provide a more robust definition for C3 to distinguish between full lane and partial lane closure.
- 4. C4: County or Equivalent
 - a. Comments:
 - i. Discussion
 - i. City was removed from the draft MMUCC Sixth. For NHTSA, City is obtained from the County and Latitude/Longitude. The draft MMUCC Sixth no longer provides a model crash report. With MMUCC as the minimum, States can still collect City. NHTSA is not telling States to remove City, but it's not useful for the databases NHTSA uses.
- 5. C5: Global position (Latitude, Longitude)
 - a. Comments:
 - i. Discussion
 - i. Interest expressed in the location of the crash and not the first harmful event. Another Committee member inquired why Latitude and Longitude are in degrees rather than decimals. Most programs analysts and GIS staff require Latitude and Longitude in decimals.
 - ii. C5 suggestions
 - i. Provide the latitude/longitude of where the unstabilized event occurred as opposed to the location of the FHE.
 - ii. Collect latitude and longitude in decimals instead of degrees, minutes, and seconds.
- 6. C6: First Harmful Event
 - a. Comments:
 - i. Discussion
 - i. Under Group 1: Non-Collision Harmful Events, there are no definitions for Pavement Surface Irregularity, Injured in Vehicle, or Gas Inhalation, but they are all considered harmful events.
 - ii. An example was provided of Injured in Vehicle — If a vehicle goes around a sharp turn and a person in the vehicle slaps their head hard against something and is injured, it would be considered an injury that occurred in the vehicle.
 - iii. Jumped from a Motor Vehicle does not constitute a Harmful Event or crash in our State, because it was intentional.
 - iv. The difference between a Road Vehicle on Rails and a Railroad Vehicle was discussed. A trolley was provided as an example of a Road Vehicle on Rails.
 - v. The difference between Strikes Object at Rest That Had Fallen from Motor Vehicle In-Transport and Striking/Struck by Object/Cargo/Person from Other Motor Vehicle In-Transport was discussed. Striking/Struck by Object/Cargo/Person from Other Motor Vehicle In-

Transport is typically called “set in motion” by States. For example, vehicle A drops a washing machine that immediately hits Vehicle B. So, two contact vehicles are involved in that interaction.

- vi. Committee members did not see a difference between a *Building* and a *Wall*.
- vii. For Subgroup 3: Traffic Barriers and Parts, the difference between *Guardrail End* and *Guardrail End Treatment* was discussed.
- viii. For Subgroup 5: Other Trafficway Components, Committee members discussed combining *Ditch* and *Embankment*.
- ii. C6 suggestions
 - i. Combine *Road Vehicle on Rails* and a *Railroad Vehicle*.
 - ii. Combine *Guardrail End* and *Guardrail End Treatment*.
 - iii. Combine *Ditch* and *Embankment*.

7. C7: Location of First Harmful Event Relative to the Trafficway

- a. Comments:
 - i. Discussion
 - i. Committee members discussed removing *Gore* and *Separator* due to few use cases.
 - ii. C7 suggestions
 - i. Remove *Gore* and *Separator*.

8. C8: Manner of Collision of the First Harmful Event

- a. Comments:
 - i. Discussion
 - i. Discussed C8 attributes and corresponding diagrams in MMUCC. Differences were highlighted amongst the Manner of Collision attributes.

9. C9: Atmospheric Conditions

- a. Comments:
 - i. Discussion
 - i. There is no definition for *Sleet or Hail* just yet. Clarification of how it differs from *Freezing Rain* would be helpful. A Committee member mentioned how their State uses *Rain* and then a selection for freezing temperatures.
 - ii. C9 suggestion
 - i. Provide a definition for *Sleet or Hail*, or combine *Sleet*, *Hail*, and *Freezing Rain*.

10. C10: Light Condition

- a. Comments:
 - i. Discussion
 - i. No definition provided for *Dusk* in MMUCC. NHTSA is hoping to provide definitions for those that are missing, but if members have suggestions for definitions, let Joanna know.
 - ii. *Sunrise* and *Sunset* were discussed as possible attributes, so people do not have to figure out what is *dawn* or *dusk*.
 - ii. C10 suggestion

- i. Use *Sunrise* and *Sunset* instead of *Dawn* and *Dusk*.

11. C11: Relation to Junction

a. Comments:

i. Discussion

- i. There was confusion on the difference between an interchange and intersection. The definitions are clear. However, Committee members indicated that law enforcement has issues filling this information out.
- ii. For Subfield 2: Specific Location, the differences between *Non-Junction* and *Through Roadway* was discussed. It was noted that *Through Roadway* would have an interchange. If the crash is in an interchange area, then you'd use *Through Roadway* and not *Not A Junction*.
 - 1. If you answer *yes* to *Subfield 1: Within Interchange Area*, you cannot select *Non-Junction* for *Subfield 2: Specific Location* because an interchange is a system of interconnecting roadways (junctions). *Through roadway* is only applicable to interchange areas.
- iii. Discussion about the sentence "*Breaks in a median designated for "authorized vehicles only" are not considered crossovers.*" Discussed adding an attribute to capture events that occur in these breaks in the median designated for authorized vehicles only.

ii. C11 suggestion

- i. Add an attribute to capture events that happen in the breaks in medians designated for authorized vehicles only, separate from the current *Crossover-related*.

V. Close meeting

A. Joanna Reed

1. We will begin with crash data element C11: Relation to Junction at the next meeting.
2. We will continue to review the data elements for chapters 4-9 at our remaining subcommittee meetings. If the subcommittee would like to revisit an element discussed at a previous meeting, we will do so at the following meeting. NHTSA is open to all suggestions for improvement.

B. Meeting ended at 2:58 pm.