MMUCC Committee – Traffic Records Data Integration Subcommittee Meeting

March 2, 2023 1:30 – 2:30 PM Eastern Microsoft Teams

I. Participants

- A. Committee Chair: Joanna Reed NHTSA
- B. Subcommittee members
 - 1. Greg Gifford Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Data Collection
 - 2. Patricia Daniel Georgia Department of Public Health
 - 3. Sladjana Oulad Daoud California Office of Traffic Safety
 - 4. Russ Martin Governors Highway Safety Association
 - 5. Doug Mowbray Maryland Department of Transportation Motor Vehicle Administration's (MDOT MVA) Highway Safety Office
 - 6. Ty Carhart Florida Department of Health
- C. Federal Liaisons
 - 1. CDC
 - David Fosbroke
 - 2. FHWA
 - Sarah Weissman Pascual
 - 3. NHTSA
 - Barbara Rizzuti
 - Beau Burdett
 - Caitlin Webb
 - Donna Glassbrenner
 - Eric Li
 - Jeremiah Kinsman
 - John Siegler
 - Jonae Anderson
 - Joshua DeFisher
 - Lixin Zhao
 - Michael Frenchik
 - Michael Parsons
 - Rajesh Subramanian
 - Sean Puckett
 - Tom Bragan
 - Tonja Lindsey
- D. NTSB
 - 1. Brittany Rawlinson
- E. VHB
 - 1. Courtney Ruiz
 - 2. Kathleen Haney
- II. Continue review and discussion of Chapter 10
 - A. Edits to intro and State challenges
 - 1. Discussion:

- Russ Martin and Sladjana Oulad Daoud provided edits to the chapter's introduction to discuss with the Subcommittee. Russ also shared a document with a list of State challenges to traffic records data linkage.
 - a. Russ presented State challenges to traffic records data linkage related to cost, administration, discouragement, and external limitations. The Subcommittee provided additional challenges to data linkage such as: a lack of institutional knowledge, systems having their own challenges and histories, changes in leadership affecting agreements, different data QC, and different data governance among systems. There is a desire to share data but also concerns about data security.
 - b. The purpose and intention of the chapter was discussed amongst the Subcommittee in terms of potential data integration and if States have the capabilities (e.g., resources, connections to the interfaces).
- 2. Suggestions:
 - Differentiate this chapter from other chapters in the introduction by including a note that "this chapter contains best practice recommendations for data linkage, but such practices are not required elements of the MMUCC. The recommendations in this chapter are optional in terms of the MMUCC and will not be a part of MMUCC mapping or alignment calculations as described in Chapter 12."
 - Include additional benefits of data linkage and how these specific elements were selected.
 - Add details from the Advisory, particularly the differences between *interface* and *integration* and the goals of each, and whether the chapter title should use the word *integration*.
 - MMUCC could include a discussion of the challenges States face. Frame the discussion in MMUCC as "some States may have challenges such as . . . and here are some resources" and include positive notes of encouragement and benefits.
 - This chapter could instead be a supplemental document and not included in the MMUCC document.
 - CODES and the CDC's Linking Information for Nonfatal Crash Surveillance (LINCS) could be included along with other success stories.
 - The chapter should be reviewed for consistency in terminology (e.g., sometimes it says *crash system* and other times *crash file*).
- B. Review each traffic records system
 - 1. Discussion:
 - Additions to the Vehicle and Citation and Adjudication system elements were proposed (e.g., gender, ethnicity, citation date, and final disposition) that may be useful for highway safety analyses.
 - The Subcommittee discussed the usefulness of including height and weight from the Driver data system. Joanna clarified that height and weight data are used by vehicle manufacturers and crash investigation studies.
 - Subcommittee members will send additional elements to Joanna for consideration.
 - 2. Suggestions:
 - Several elements in the Citation and Adjudication section could also come from the Driver system.

- Add the NEISS (National Electronic Injury Surveillance System) to the Injury Surveillance system section.
- C. State Examples of Integration
 - 1. Discussion:
 - MMUCC may not be the right vehicle for State examples. It may be seen as inadvertently defining or advocating specific examples as best practices or standards.
 - Sharing best practices is helpful but how to do it right is important. Maybe only include examples of how States overcame the earlier-mentioned adversities.
 - 2. Suggestions:
 - Make the State examples more approachable for the reader pare down the information.
 - Include the State examples information as a supplement for "best practices" rather than including it in the MMUCC document
 - Include resources on obtaining funds for traffic records data integration (such as GO Teams, EDT grant, etc.).
- III. Close meeting ended at 2:26 PM.
 - A. Action items
 - 1. Subcommittee members: Type up edits, improvements, additions, and deletions for Chapter 10 and send them to Joanna by March 14. The Subcommittee will review this information at the next meeting.
 - 2. NHTSA: Joanna will compile all the edits and distribute the document for discussion at the next meeting.