MMUCC Committee – Law Enforcement Data Collection Subcommittee Meeting
February 28, 2023
1:30 – 3:00 PM Eastern
Microsoft Teams

I. Participants
   A. Committee Chair: Joanna Reed – NHTSA
   B. Subcommittee members
      1. Captain Brent Drummond — Missouri State Highway patrol
      2. Loren Hill — Minnesota Department of Transportation, Office of Traffic Safety
      3. Investigator Thomas Mrozinski — Frisco Texas Police Department
      4. Kelly Campbell – Idaho Transportation Department, Office of Highway Safety
      5. Cindy Stewart — Colorado State Patrol
   C. Federal Liaisons
      1. CDC
         ▪ David Fosbroke
      2. FHWA
         ▪ Sarah Weissman Pascual
      3. FMCSA
         ▪ Jessica Powell
      4. NHTSA
         ▪ Beau Burdett
         ▪ Caitlin Webb
         ▪ Donna Glassbrenner
         ▪ Eric Li
         ▪ John Siegler
         ▪ Joshua DeFisher
         ▪ Michael Parsons
         ▪ Rajesh Subramanian
         ▪ Tom Bragan
         ▪ Tonja Lindsey
         ▪ Lixin Zhao
         ▪ Rebecca Dieken
         ▪ Dereece Smither
         ▪ Michael Frenchik
         ▪ Jeremiah Kinsman
      5. NTSB
         ▪ Brittany Rawlinson
   D. VHB
      1. Chelsea Palmateer
      2. Courtney Ruiz
II. Review data elements
   A. P5: Person Type
      1. Discussion: It's unclear which attribute to use in situations where there isn't a driver (e.g., autonomous vehicles, remotely controlled vehicles).
      2. Suggestions:
         ▪ Provide clarification for vehicles without drivers (e.g., autonomous, platoon etc.)

B. P6: Special Function
  1. Discussion: This is collected at the person level to capture for each person involved, whether in a vehicle or as a non-motorist. This information is useful for Traffic Incident Management, Work Zone safety, towing, mail carriers, etc. These types of people may be considered vulnerable road users and can benefit from better data collection to support safety countermeasures.
  2. Discussion: "Struck By" crashes are hard to track and analyze and this element will help those efforts.
  3. Discussion: A person operating a snowplow would be included under roadway maintenance.
  4. Suggestions:
     ▪ Include snowplow operator as an example in the definition of Roadway Maintenance
C. P7: Injury Status
  1. Discussion: This element has not changed, because States were required to align with the Suspected Serious Injury (A) definition.
  2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
D. P8: Transported to First Medical Facility By
  1. Discussion: Previously, this data element contained subfields that have been split into new data elements.
  2. Discussion: Private vehicles would be included in the attribute **Other**.
  3. Discussion: It's possible for people to refuse treatment. NEMSIS contains elements for *Refused Transport* and *Refused Treatment*. Integrating crash data with NEMSIS would allow States to access this information for traffic safety analysis.
  4. Discussion: **Transported Source Unknown** means the person was transported but it's unknown how they were transported. **Unknown** means it's unknown if the person was transported.
  5. Suggestions:
     ▪ Add **Private Vehicle** as an attribute.
     ▪ **Suggestion for the Traffic Records Data Integration Subcommittee:** Include *Refused Transport* and *Refused Treatment* in Chapter 10 for the NEMSIS data integration section.
E. P9: EMS Response Agency
  1. Discussion: This is a new data element that was previously a subfield of Transported to First Medical Facility By.
  2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
F. P10: Medical Facility Receiving Patient
  1. Another new element that was previously a subfield of Transported to First Medical Facility By. It may be useful for FARS analysts when tracking down other information. States can choose to create a drop-down list of medical facilities in their State if they wish.
  2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
G. P11: Occupant's Motor Vehicle Unit Number
  1. Discussion: This element was unchanged.
  2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
H. P12: Seating Position

1. Discussion: Worked with FARS to update this element. Officers now only have to select one attribute instead of two.
2. Discussion: **Appended to a Motor Vehicle for Motion** is a new attribute to capture "skitching" (ski-hitching) where a person is connected to a vehicle in motion via hand grasp, rope, etc. People could be on skates, skateboards, bikes, skis, a sled, or other device. Once connected to the motor vehicle, they are an occupant of that vehicle. If they let go on purpose and not as a result of an unstabilized situation, they are a non-motorist. If they are connected when the unstabilized situation begins, they are an occupant for the duration of the unstabilized situation.
3. Suggestions: No suggestions.
I. P13: Restraint System Use
   1. Discussion: This element was split into two elements to accommodate vehicles that have seat belts but may also require helmets (e.g., snowmobiles, ATVs, ROVs, etc.). "Misused" should be rephrased as "used improperly."
   2. Suggestions:
      - Update subfield 2 attributes to **Restraint System Used Properly** and **Restraint System Not Used Properly**.
J. P14: Helmet Used
   1. Discussion: **Not Applicable** only applies to vehicles other than the ones listed in the element definition. Systems could autofill this field as **Not Applicable** based on the vehicle type.
   2. Suggestions:
      - Change attributes to **Helmet Used Properly** and **Helmet Not Used Properly**.
K. P15: Air Bag Deployed
   1. Discussion: Modified MMUCC, FARS, and CRSS so they all use the same attributes. It is collected per person to understand what happened for each occupant.
   2. Discussion: To simplify the element to one concept, the question of air bag *availability* was removed. If no air bag was *available* for the person, it is also true that no air bag deployed. This is why these are combined.
   3. Suggestions: No suggestions.
L. P16: Ejection
   1. Discussion: Changed some wording to align with FARS and CRSS, but nothing else changed.
   2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
M. P17: Law Enforcement Suspects Alcohol Involvement
   1. Discussion: Officers may be hesitant to say definitively whether alcohol was involved or not. This element is designed to capture the officer's judgement, not evidence of alcohol use (or no use). Change the wording to reflect that this element is intended to capture *suspicion* of alcohol involvement.
   2. Suggestions:
      - Change to **No, Alcohol Not Suspected** and **Yes, Alcohol Suspected**.
      - Change "involved" in the definition to "suspected".
      - Remove "only" in the definition.
N. P18: Alcohol Test
   1. Discussion: This element hasn't changed much but has been aligned with FARS and CRSS.

2. Discussion: The **.940** attribute is included to capture results at the extreme end of the spectrum. In practice, it will likely never be coded.
3. Discussion: **Alcohol and/or Drug Test Refused** is captured in D10: Related Factors – Driver Level.
4. Suggestions:
   - Add *(.000 - .939)* to the attribute **Actual Value**.

O. Returning to V16: Hazardous Materials Involvement
   1. Discussion: For subfield 3, the four-digit hazardous materials ID can be found in other places.
   2. Suggestions:
      - Update the attribute to read "**4-digit Hazardous Materials ID number or name taken from the middle of the placard, an orange panel, white diamond shape, or from the shipping papers**".

P. P19: Law Enforcement Suspects Drug Involvement
   1. Discussion: Discussion notes from P17 also apply here.
   2. Suggestions:
      - Change to **No, Drug Use Not Suspected** and **Yes, Drug Use Suspected**.
      - Change "involved" in the definition to "suspected".
      - Remove "only" in the definition.

Q. NM1: Vehicle Number of Motor Vehicle Striking Non-Motorist
   1. Discussion: No major changes to this element, just language changes to align with FARS and CRSS.
   2. Suggestions: No suggestions.

R. NM2: Non-Motorist Status Prior to Critical Event
   1. Discussion: Changed to reflect plain language best practices.
   2. Discussion: **Incident Responder Working in Trafficway** will help Traffic Incident Management performance measures.
   3. Discussion: This element is intended to capture the activity of the non-motorist—their location is captured in NM5 - NM7. This element is a combination element that is trying to answer too many questions. It may be helpful to remove the non-motorist's location part from these attributes, so that it is just one concept (the NM activity).
   4. Suggestions:
      - Update attribute to **Working, Playing, Standing, etc. in Roadway**.
      - Modify the attributes to include just the *activity*, not the *location*, because the location is captured in NM5 - NM7.

S. NM3: Non-Motorist Distraction
   1. Discussion: This new element was split off from Driver Distraction and simplified. Cell phone distraction is a major concern. It's not often clear what the non-motorist was doing with their cell phone (talking, listening, texting, watching, etc.).
   2. Suggestions: No suggestions.

T. NM4: Non-Motorist Contributing Circumstances
   1. Discussion: Minor changes to this element.
   2. Suggestions: No suggestions.

U. NM5: Non-Motorist at Intersection

1. Discussion: The previous element (Non-Motorist Location) asked several questions (intersections, crosswalks, specific location), so it was split into new elements.
    2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
V. NM6: Non-Motorist in Crosswalk
    1. Discussion: Some crosswalks are mid-block, so NM5 can be **No** and NM6 can be **Yes**.
    2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
W. NM7: Non-Motorist Specific Location
    1. Discussion: Simplified the previous data element (Non-Motorist Location). Crosswalk and Intersection were split into their own elements to better capture that data.
    2. Suggestions: No suggestions.
X. NM8: Non-Motorist Safety Equipment
    1. Discussion: FARS and CRSS Quality control reviews revealed that it wasn't clear if officers would have selected additional safety equipment if given the chance, which meant many "Not Reported" values in FARS and CRSS. The format of this element now uses the FARS/CRSS new subfields and are grouped into *Protective* and *Preventive*.
    2. Discussion: Helmets could be applicable to pedestrians because they may have been using a helmet earlier on a device (e.g., motorcycle, skateboard, bicycle) prior to being a pedestrian and still wearing the helmet at the time of the unstabilized situation.
    3. Suggestions: No suggestions.
Y. NM9: Non-Motorist Device Type
    1. Skipped for this meeting—it will be addressed at the next meeting.
Z. NM 10: Non-Motorist Traffic Control Device
    1. Discussion: This is a new element to capture control devices applicable to non-motorists.
    2. Suggestion:
        ▪ Clarify that this element doesn't include traffic signals designed for vehicles and add parenthetical: **Non-Motorist Crossing Signal** *(Walk/Don't Walk signals)*

III. Close meeting – ended at 2:49 PM Eastern