

MMUCC Committee – Law Enforcement Data Collection Subcommittee meeting

February 14, 2023

1:30 – 3:00 Eastern

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. Lieutenant James Williams — Metro Nashville Police Department
4. Major Lisa Barnett — Florida Highway Patrol
5. Loren Hill — Minnesota Department of Transportation, Office of Traffic Safety
6. Sergeant Sean Smith — California Highway Patrol
7. Officer Thomas Mrozinski — Frisco Texas Police Department
8. Kelly Campbell – Idaho Office of Highway Safety

B. Federal Liaisons

1. CDC
 - a. David Fosbroke
2. FHWA
 - a. Sarah Weissman Pascual
3. FMCSA
 - a. Jessica Powell
4. NHTSA
 - a. Barbara Rizzuti
 - b. Beau Burdett
 - c. Caitlin Webb
 - d. Donna Glassbrenner
 - e. Eric Chaney
 - f. Eric Li
 - g. John Siegler
 - h. Joanna Reed
 - i. Joshua DeFisher
 - j. Keith Williams
 - k. Michael Parsons
 - l. Rajesh Subramanian
 - m. Rodney Rudd
 - n. Sean Puckett
 - o. Tom Bragan
 - p. Tonja Lindsey
 - q. Jonae Anderson
 - r. Lixin Zhao
 - s. Rebecca Dieken
 - t. Dereece Smither
 - u. Michael Frenchik

5. NTSB

- a. Brittany Rawlinson

C. VHB

1. Chelsea Palmateer

2. Courtney Ruiz

II. Review data elements

- A. Loren Hill compiled a document with his suggested changes for MMUCC data elements. His suggestions are included in the general suggestions for each element below.
- B. Continue reviewing data elements in the order presented in the draft MMUCC Sixth Edition
 - C11: Relation to Junction (continuation from last meeting)
 - i. Discussion: Law enforcement officers (LEOs) struggle with the difference between “interchange” and “intersection.”
 - ii. Discussion: LEOs may think that **Crossover-Related** incidents includes events that happen in the breaks in medians designated for authorized vehicles only.
 - iii. Suggestions:
 - Remove one of these two attributes: **Non-Junction** or **Through Roadway**
 - Provide clarification about grade separation for intersection and interchange
 - Add attribute to capture events that happen in the breaks in medians designated for authorized vehicles only, as these are not **Crossover-Related**.
 - Update the interchange diagram to include **Exit/Entrance Ramp or Related, Acceleration/Deceleration Lane, and Intersection or Related**.
 - C12: Type of intersection
 - i. Discussion: This is an important element for NHTSA’s data analysis. This element was shortened to better align with FARS and CRSS. This element is only applicable when the LEO selects **Intersection or Related** in the data element Relation to Junction. States can opt to collect additional intersection elements (e.g., four-leg skewed, four-leg perpendicular, etc.).
 - From Loren Hills notes: The subfields and attributes in MMUCC fifth edition were preferable. The draft of MMUCC Sixth Edition combines subfields 1 and 2 and eliminates subfield 3. Subfield 3 (Overall Traffic Control Device) is crucial—it cannot be derived from Traffic Control Device. For example, if V1 and v2 both have Stop Signs, you cannot tell if it is a Stop – All Way or Stop – Partial.
 - ii. Suggestions:
 - Add back in the MMUCC Fifth Edition subfield to collect Overall Traffic Control Device.
 - C13: School bus-related
 - i. Discussion: MMUCC Fifth Edition had two attributes: Yes, School Bus Directly Involved and Yes, School Bus Indirectly Involved. This has been updated to Yes and No.
 - ii. Suggestions: none
 - C14: Work zone
 - i. Discussion: NHTSA worked closely with FHWA’s work zone group to update this element. Lane Shift and Crossover were separated. Subfield 3 now allows for two selections.
 - ii. Suggestions: none

- C15: Secondary Crash
 - i. Discussion: FHWA’s Traffic Incident Management (TIM) team requested this element, and NHTSA worked with them to develop it. This element is only looking for crashes resulting from a prior crash—not crashes resulting from other traffic incidents. This may differ from TIM training materials, which says that a secondary crash can be a result of other traffic incidents.
 - ii. Suggestions:
 - NHTSA will clarify the intent of this element with FHWA’s TIM team.
- C16: Related Factors – Crash Level
 - i. Discussion: NHTSA added this element as part of the data uniformity effort between MMUCC, FARS, and CRSS. This element includes some factors from MMUCC Fifth Edition C14: Contributing Circumstances – Roadway Environment.
 - ii. Discussion: The definition of **Aggressive Driving** likely varies from State to State. It’s unclear what the distinction is between **Aggressive Driving by a Non-Contact Vehicle** and **Road Rage by a Non-Contact Vehicle**.
 - iii. Discussion: Some attributes are captured in the Driver and Vehicle levels and may not be necessary here on the overall Crash level.
 - iv. Suggestions:
 - Combine **Distracted Driver of a Non-Contact Vehicle, Aggressive Driving by a Non-Contact Vehicle, and Road Rage by a Non-Contact Vehicle** into **Non-Contact Vehicle Involved**.
 - Provide a clear definition of **Police Pursuit Involved** that clarifies if both direct and indirect involvement should be captured here.
 - Combine **Obstruction in Roadway** and **Obstructed Crosswalks**
 - Combine **Surface Under Water** and **Surface Washed Out (caved-in, road slippage)**, and change “Surface” to “Road.”
 - Group the attributes into categories similar to C6: First Harmful Event. Categories could include **Road-Related, Non-Contact Vehicle-Related, Vehicle, and Location**.
- V1: Motor Vehicle Number
 - i. Discussion: This number is usually assigned by the crash data system.
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V2: Vehicle Identification Number (VIN)
 - i. Discussion: none
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V3: Motor Vehicle Unit Type
 - i. Discussion: The location of a stopped or stalled unit determines its unit type. Any vehicle that is stopped or moving in the roadway is a **Motor Vehicle in Transport**, even if it is unoccupied. If the vehicle is not in the roadway and is not in motion, it is a **Parked Motor Vehicle**. If the vehicle is performing maintenance, construction, or utility work, it is a **Working Motor Vehicle**. One example of this is snowplows. When the plow is lowered and the vehicle is performing road maintenance, it is a **Working Motor Vehicle**. When the plow is raised and the snowplow is not working but (for example) on its way back to the depot, it is a **Motor Vehicle in Transport**. If a law enforcement vehicle is present in a work zone as part of traffic management efforts, it would be considered a **Working Motor Vehicle**.
 - ii. Suggestions: none

- V4: Vehicle Owner and Address
 - i. Discussion: This element was added at the request of an FMCSA contractor. 100% of States and Territories already collect this data.
 - ii. Suggestions: None
- V5: Motor Carrier or Responsible Entity Identification
 - i. Discussion: This element was also requested by an FMCSA contractor. FMCSA is charged with tracking more than just commercial vehicles (e.g., government). The element is consistent with how FMCSA currently collects the data from States.
 - ii. Suggestions:
 - More information should be provided to help States understand the intent of this element. Provide examples of types of vehicles that would be included in the element definition (e.g., school bus).
- V6: Type of Motor Carrier or Responsible Entity
 - i. Discussion: This element was also requested by an FMCSA contractor. The definitions are provided by FMCSA.
 - ii. Suggestions:
 - Same as for V5, provide a clear definition and examples of the non-commercial vehicles (e.g., school bus).
- V7: Motor Carrier or Responsible Entity Name and Address
 - i. Discussion: This element was also requested by an FMCSA contractor. The definitions are provided by FMCSA.
 - ii. Suggestions:
 - Same as V5 and V6, provide a clear definition and examples of the non-commercial vehicles (e.g., school bus).
- V8: Motor Vehicle Registration State
 - i. Discussion: none
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V9: Motor Vehicle License Plate
 - i. Discussion: The attribute **Temporary License Plate** was added because NHTSA has started collecting this information.
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V10: Motor Vehicle Make
 - i. No suggestions
- V11: Motor Vehicle Model Year
 - i. Discussion: none
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V12: Motor Vehicle Model
 - i. Discussion: none
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V13: Motor Vehicle Body Type
 - i. Discussion: Several States are struggling to define e-bikes. This is addressed in the Non-Motorist Data Elements chapter.
 - ii. Discussion: The previous data element **Vehicle Configuration** has merged with this element, Motor Vehicle Body Type Category.
 - iii. Discussion: An autocycle has two front wheels and one rear wheel, while a 3-Wheeled Motorcycle has one front wheel and two rear wheels.

- iv. Suggestions:
 - Update the attribute to **3-Wheeled Motorcycle (Trike)**.
- V14: Power Unit Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (GVWR)
 - i. Discussion: This element only applies to the power unit. It does not include GCWR. NHTSA would like this information for all vehicles. This element satisfies the needs of NHTSA and FMCSA.
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V15: Cargo Body Type (Power Unit Only)
 - i. Discussion: This is limited to the power unit only—there is a new data element to separately capture the trailing unit body types. This is important information for FMCSA and NHTSA.
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V16: Hazardous Materials
 - i. Discussion: Subfield 4 has been updated from a text entry box to a list of specific attributes.
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V17: Vehicle Trailing
 - i. Discussion: This was previously collected as part of the element Motor Vehicle Body Type Category, and is now a standalone element.
 - ii. Suggestions: None
- V18: Trailer VIN
 - i. Discussion: none
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V19: Trailer Body Type
 - i. Discussion: This was previously collected as part of the element Cargo Body Type, and is now a standalone element.
 - ii. Suggestions: None
- V20: Total Occupants in Motor Vehicle
 - i. Discussion: The validation rule says that the number of occupants must match the number of person records. If there is a school bus crash, LEOs won't record every passenger.
 - ii. Suggestions:
 - Change the validation rule to "TOTAL OCCUPANTS IN MOTOR VEHICLE **should** = the total number of Person Records for this vehicle."
- V21: Special Use
 - i. Discussion: Some attributes may not be needed.
 - ii. Suggestions:
 - Remove **Rental Truck (Over 10,000 lbs.)**
- V22: Bus Use
 - i. Discussion: none
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V23: Emergency Response
 - i. Discussion: It's important to know if both lights and sirens are on. In some states, both have to be on to be considered an emergency vehicle.
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V24: Motor Vehicle Posted/Statutory Speed Limit
 - i. Discussion: Language in the Note should be updated.

- ii. Suggestions:
 - In Note, change “Try not to confuse...” with “Do not confuse...”
- V25: Trafficway Flow
 - i. Discussion: The previous data element Trafficway Description can be a confusing element for LEOs, especially on divided trafficways. NHTSA split this element into two new elements to address this.
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V26: Median Barrier Presence
 - i. Discussion: This element is the second part of the old data element Trafficway Description.
 - ii. Suggestions: none
- V27: Number of Open Lanes in Vehicle’s Environment
 - i. Discussion: This information cannot be derived from a State’s LRS because it is specific to the vehicles and circumstances of the crash. This does not include lane closures due to construction or any other reason. If there is a median, LEOs should report only the number of open lanes on the side the vehicle was on. NHTSA adopted plain language best practices in MMUCC Sixth Edition and that is why the phrase “vehicle’s environment” was created.
 - ii. Suggestions:
 - Instead of “Vehicle’s Environment” use “Vehicle’s Road” or “Vehicle’s Direction of Travel.”
- V28: Roadway Alignment
 - i. Discussion: The direction of the curve doesn’t matter.
 - ii. Suggestions:
 - Combine **Curve Left** and **Curve Right** into just **Curve**.
- V29: Roadway Grade
 - i. Discussion: **Sag** and **Hillcrest** were in previous editions of MMUCC. These attributes can be difficult for LEOs to determine and may not be useful for analysis.
 - ii. Suggestions:
 - Remove **Hillcrest** and **Sag (bottom)**
- V30: Roadway Surface Condition
 - i. Discussion: This element was moved from the Crash level to the Vehicle level to make data analysis easier and to align with FARS and CRSS. However, this now requires LEOs to collect for each vehicle rather than the overall condition for the crash.
 - ii. Discussion: A Committee member noted that even Non-Trafficways and Driveway Accesses would have surface conditions, so they shouldn’t be separated out.
 - iii. Suggestions:
 - Remove **Non-Trafficway or Driveway Access**.
 - Move the data element back to the overall Crash level.
- V31: Traffic Control Device
 - i. Discussion: Officers should know what the sign is, so **Regulatory Sign, Type Unknown** isn’t necessary. Some attributes could be combined.
 - ii. Suggestions:
 - Remove **Regulatory Sign, Type Unknown**

- Change **Other Regulatory Sign (Explain in Narrative)** to just **Other Sign (Explain in Narrative)**
- V32: Device Functioning
 - i. Discussion: This applies to all devices, not only electronic devices. Signs can be damaged, leading to **Device Not Functioning or Device Functioning Improperly.**
 - ii. Suggestions: none

III. Close meeting: meeting ended at 2:58 PM Eastern