MMUCC Committee – IT Database Design and Administration Subcommittee Meeting
February 23, 2023
1:30 – 3:00 PM Eastern
Microsoft Teams

I. Participants
    A. Committee Chair: Joanna Reed - NHTSA
    B. Subcommittee members
        1. Allison Hawley — Minnesota Department of Public Safety
        2. Christopher Osbourn — Tennessee Department of Safety and Homeland Security
        3. David Kelly — Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Bureau of Operations
        4. Dennis Kleen — Iowa Department of Transportation, Driver Data Systems and Administration Bureau
        5. Sean Owings — Nebraska Department of Transportation, Highway Safety Office
        6. Thomas Gwinn — Ohio State Highway Patrol
        7. William Roseburgh — Florida Highway Patrol
    C. 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. Dereece Smither
            e. Donna Glassbrenner
            f. Eric Chaney
            g. John Siegler
            h. Jonae Anderson
            i. Joshua DeFisher
            j. Lixin Zhao
            k. Michael Frenchik
            l. Rebecca Dieken
            m. Sean Puckett
            n. Tom Bragan
            o. Tonja Lindsey
    D. VHB
        1. Chelsea Palmateer
        2. Courtney Ruiz

II. Committee tasks and clarifications
    A. Chapter 3: System Populated Data Elements
        1. Discussion: Some of these data elements were elsewhere in MMUCC Fifth Edition with different names. For the Sixth Edition, they are located in this new chapter.
    B. *Implementation Suggestions* and *Validation Rules* for each data element in Chapters 4-8

1. Discussion: *Implementation Suggestions* are new for MMUCC Sixth Edition and are located under each data element. The goal is to make electronic data collection for officers easier by auto-populating elements wherever possible. Implementation Suggestions are not required but helpful information that States could put into their electronic systems to help law enforcement when collecting the data.
       2. Discussion: Suggested Validation rules (consistency within an element) are under each element.
    C. Chapter 11: Designing User-Centered Crash Reporting Systems
       1. Discussion: Joanna sent this chapter out to the MMUCC Committee via email on February 22. The intent for this new chapter is to be useful to States looking to redesign their crash reporting system or start from scratch.
    D. Appendix C: Edit Rules
       1. Discussion: Suggested Edit rules (consistency between data elements) have been moved to an Appendix.
    E. Other parts of the document
       1. Discussion: Submit any feedback, questions, or comments to Joanna Reed. She will direct it to the proper subcommittee, Federal Liaisons, or discuss it internally at NHTSA.

III. Begin review and discussion of Chapter 3: System Populated Data Elements
    A. Collecting the optional elements will be helpful to States, especially if they participate in the EDT grant. It is also helpful to NHTSA to know how States collect data in their repositories.
    B. S1: State Unique Crash ID
       1. Discussion: States already collect this information. The element serves to standardize data collection.
       2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
    C. S2: Agency (Police Jurisdiction)
       1. Discussion: The attribute value definition may need to be modified. Some police agencies have established a different ORI number for the agency that is not an NCIC code. There are instances where the agency code is not an NCIC ORI, but an ORI that represents the police agency. Police agencies should have their own unique identifier, but it does not have to necessarily be an NCIC ORI.
          a. If States use their own State agency identifier and not an NCIC ORI, would States still be MMUCC-compliant?
          b. From an EDT standpoint, NHTSA will work with States to try to map this as best as we can back to the data.
          c. The NCIC codes have been inconsistent, so CRSS tends to look at the agency names, not the codes. Getting consistent reliable information from the States is more helpful than the NCIC codes.
       2. Suggestions:
          ▪ Change the name of the attribute value to **NCIC Originating Agency Identifier (ORI Code)** *and/or State-generated Unique Agency ID*
          ▪ Split into two fields — One field for **NCIC ORI Code** (if collected) and one field for **State-generated Unique Agency ID**
    D. S3: Police Reported / Citizen Reported
       1. Discussion: This can be automatically generated if a State doesn't have citizen reports.

2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
E. S4: State Reportable Crash (Y/N)
   1. Discussion: Minnesota has a trafficway and non-trafficway field and anything occurring outside the trafficway are automatically coded as non-reportable. Minnesota DNR uses the State crash report, so this is useful for keeping non-traffic crashes out of the traffic crash data set.
   2. Discussion: Officers may invertedly mark crashes in parking lots as nonreportable. Caution is needed as crashes occurring in parking lot ways are motor vehicle traffic crashes per ANSI D.16.
   3. Suggestions: Include a field that determines, based on the State's definition of a crash, if a crash is non-reportable and use business logic to code these as non-reportable.

IV. Implementation Suggestions and Validation Rules for each data element in Chapters 4-8
   A. General Comments
      1. Discussion: Every field is missing an attribute: "Not Stated" or "Not Reported." MMUCC is geared toward what the Officer collects. "Not Reported" exists in FARS and CRSS, but not MMUCC because an Officer wouldn't select "Not Reported." "Not Stated" or "Not Reported" would be coded during data cleaning, not by the Officer.
      2. Suggestions:
         a. Add a note to the introduction that "Unknown" and "Not Stated" are not the same thing.
         b. Add "Not Stated" attributes to distinguish from "Unknown" attributes.
   B. C1: Crash Date
      1. Discussion: ISO standards are used in Ohio.
      2. Suggestions:
         a. Use ISO standards.
         b. Update to "CRASH DATE can be used *in conjunction with other data elements from the crash report* to retrieve information from other Traffic Records data systems."
   C. C2: Crash Time
      1. Discussion: No discussion.
      2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
   D. C3: Time of Roadway Clearance
      1. Discussion: No discussion.
      2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
   E. C4: County or Equivalent
      1. Discussion: In Ohio, officers collect this internally, but agencies put the county code. They are many different vendors in Ohio, and they can all choose how to handle this.
      2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
   F. C5: Global Position (Latitude, Longitude)
      1. Discussion: Ohio has a validation rule in place, and if the latitude/longitude falls outside the county boundaries, the system will reject it.
      2. Discussion: Engineers want to know where the unstabilized situation began, not where the First Harmful Event occurred. This does not align with MMUCC.

3. Discussion: Pennsylvania has two locations— officers can put in a general location and data analysts can relocate the crash as appropriate. There is uncertainty if this data element is representing what the officers collect or the correction.
4. Suggestions:
   a. Update to "GLOBAL POSITION (LATITUDE, LONGITUDE) can be used _in conjunction with other data elements on the crash report_ to retrieve information from other Traffic Records data systems."

G. C6: First Harmful Event
   1. Discussion: No discussion.
   2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
H. C7: Location of First Harmful Event Relative to the Trafficway
   1. Discussion: No discussion.
   2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
I. C8: Manner of Collision of the First Harmful Event
   1. Discussion: No discussion.
   2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
J. C9: Atmospheric Conditions
   1. Discussion: In one State, if the Officers collect more than one attribute and the first one is **Clear**, then the second attribute more than likely will be **Clear** as well. If officers are asked for two attributes, they will typically repeat their first value.
   2. Suggestion:
      a. If the State allows 2 selections, gray out or remove the first selection in the drop down list for the second field.
      b. If the State allows 2 selections, only allow an attribute to be selected once.
K. C10: Light Condition
   1. Discussion: No discussion.
   2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
L. C11: Relation to Junction
   1. Discussion: NHTSA does not identify if a crash occurred at the beginning or end of a ramp.
   2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
M. C12: Type of Intersection
   1. Discussion: **Other Intersection Type** was added a few years ago to FARS and CRSS because they were encountering many intersections that did not fit any of the other intersection types. FARS and CRSS have an edit check that requires the analyst to explain why they are using the attribute.
   2. Discussion: If States do not have **Other Intersection Type** as an attribute selection, then they would not align with MMUCC.
   3. Suggestion:
      a. Provide images and descriptions/definitions of **Other Intersection Types** (e.g., J-turns, diverging diamond).
N. C13: School Bus-Related
   1. Discussion: No discussion.
   2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
O. C14: Work Zone
   1. Discussion: No discussion.

        2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
- P. C15: Secondary Crash
  1. Discussion: No discussion.
  2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
- Q. C16: Related Factors – Crash Level
  1. Discussion: This element is collected in addition to Related Factors at the Vehicle level and at the Driver level. Some crashes include situations with non-contact vehicles, so they are captured at the Crash Level.
  2. Suggestions:
     a. If one of the contact vehicles in the crash is an emergency vehicle, then auto-fill "Emergency Vehicle Related."
- R. V1: Motor Vehicle Number
  1. Discussion: In Pennsylvania, this is officer assigned. They have vehicle numbers and unit numbers. It may not be a sequential number.
  2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
- S. V2: Vehicle Identification Number (VIN)
  1. Discussion: No Discussion.
  2. Suggestions:
     a. Add "VIN can be used *in conjunction with other data elements on the crash report* to retrieve information from other Traffic Records data systems."
     b. **Suggest to the Traffic Records Data Integration Subcommittee:** Consider interfacing with the Vehicle data system to auto populate the VIN based on the license plate.
- V.   Close meeting – ended at 2:57 PM Eastern
  - A. Pick up with V2. VIN at next meeting.
  - B. Please review Chapter 11 to be prepared for discussion.