

MMUCC Committee – IT Data Admin Subcommittee Meeting

March 9, 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
 - David Fosbroke
2. FHWA
 - Carol Tan
3. NHTSA
 - Beau Burdett
 - Caitlin Webb
 - Dereece Smither
 - Donna Glassbrenner
 - Eric Chaney
 - John Siegler
 - Jonae Anderson
 - Joshua DeFisher
 - Lixin Zhao
 - Michael Frenchik
 - Michael Parsons
 - Rajesh Subramanian
 - Rebecca Dieken
 - Sean Puckett
 - Tonja Lindsey
4. NTSB
 - Brittany Rawlinson

D. VHB

1. Chelsea Palmateer
2. Courtney Ruiz

II. Review data elements

A. V2: Vehicle Identification Number (VIN)

1. Discussion: Minnesota interfaces with its vehicle system to auto-populate the VIN based on the license plate number. VIN could also be used to populate vehicle configuration attributes.
2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.

- B. V3: Motor Vehicle Unit Type
 - 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- C. V4: Vehicle Owner and Address
 - 1. Discussion: Like with VIN, Vehicle Owner and Address can be used with other data elements, like license plate number, to be auto populated into the crash report via an interface with the vehicle system. States cannot pull the data from out-of-state vehicles, but they can get it from scanning barcodes. Pennsylvania also has a “same as driver” function to avoid redundancy.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Auto populate the information for in-state vehicles using an interface with the State’s vehicle registration system
 - Use barcode scanners to auto populate information from out-of-state vehicles.
 - Use a “same as driver” function for auto population
- D. V5: Motor Carrier or Responsible Entity Identification
 - 1. Discussion: MC stands for the ICC Motor Carrier number, and MX is for the Mexico motor carrier authority. The MC/MX (ICC) number is only applicable to older carriers that still have this number from before it was retired. Pennsylvania retired using ICC numbers four years ago.
 - 2. Suggestions:
 - Clarify what Subfield 2: MC/MX (ICC) Number is asking for, and that it’s not always applicable.
- E. V6: Type of Motor Carrier or Responsible Entity
 - 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- F. V7: Motor Carrier or Responsible Entity Name and Address
 - 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- G. V8: Motor Vehicle Registration State
 - 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- H. V9: Motor Vehicle License Plate Number
 - 1. Discussion: The license plate number can be used in an interface with the vehicle registration system. Some States (e.g., Ohio) allow up to 30 days to transfer plates to a new vehicle. If the plate number is used to auto populate, it may have inaccurate information. Officers should always verify the information. Pennsylvania verifies the vehicle type using the VIN to make sure it matches.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Add “Motor Vehicle License Plate Number can be used **in conjunction with other data elements on the crash report** to retrieve information from other Traffic Records data systems.”
 - Officers should verify that information pulled from a vehicle registration interface is accurate.
- I. V10: Motor Vehicle Make
 - 1. Discussion: Make should be verified against the VIN and vehicle registration records.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions:

- Verify Motor Vehicle Make against the VIN and in-State vehicle registration.
- J. V11: Motor Vehicle Model Year
 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Verify Motor Vehicle Model Year against the VIN.
- K. V12: Motor Vehicle Model
 1. Discussion: Nebraska had a drop-down list for Make and Model but couldn't keep up with the Model list and switched to a free-form field. Ohio updates its Make and Model list every year based on NHTSA's Product Information Catalog Vehicle Listing (vPIC) Application Programming Interface (API). If the Model is not listed in the drop-down for officers to select, then Officers select Other/Unknown. Pennsylvania has been using VINtelligence since the 90s, and it works well.
 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Motor Vehicle Model should be verified against the VIN in States without freeform fields.
- L. V13: Motor Vehicle Body Type Category
 1. Discussion: Pennsylvania uses the Vehicle Type from MMUCC Fifth Edition. Officers do not always identify the vehicle's body type or style appropriately, especially with SUVs. As such, Pennsylvania allows officers to select only Make and Model.
 2. Discussion: With NHTSA's vPIC, States can retrieve the vehicle's body class, and this information comes directly from the manufacturer, but it's slightly different from Motor Vehicle Body Type Category.
 3. Discussion: **Recreational Off-Highway Vehicles (ROV)** needs a definition.
 4. Discussion: States are confused about where to include UTV (Utility Task Vehicles). A utility task vehicle (UTV) is a larger type of ATV designed to haul heavier loads and might allow additional passengers. ATVs are primarily used for recreation, whereas UTVs are often used for professional tasks such as farming or landscaping.
 5. Discussion: Minnesota recently added more recreational vehicle types, because they recently integrated the DNR crash system into MNCrash. Minnesota used DNR vehicle type definitions and a PDF guide of images for recreational vehicles in its crash system.
 6. Discussion: Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Tennessee have different definitions for **Autocycle**. The current definition in MMUCC may be different.
 7. Suggestions:
 - Provide a definition for attribute: **Recreational Off-Highway Vehicles (ROV)**
 - Clarify how to code a **Utility Task Vehicle (UTV)**.
 - Review the definition of **Autocycle**.
 - Provide officers with an instruction guide on identifying the Motor Vehicle Body Type Category.
- M. V14: Power Unit Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (GVWR)
 1. Discussion: Pennsylvania and Minnesota only collect this information from the VIN for commercial vehicles as a freeform field on the crash report. Tennessee collects this information for all vehicles.
 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - If **Medium** or **Heavy** are selected or pulled in by the VIN, flag the vehicle for further review to determine if it was a commercial unit.

- N. V15: Cargo Body Type (Power Unit Only)
 - 1. Discussion: There are currently three implementation suggestions to autofill this element in certain situations.
 - 2. Discussion: Cargo Body Type for the power unit and Trailer Body Type are now two separate elements to assist FMCSA. States expressed the collection rule of when to collect which unit's cargo body type (the power unit or the trailer) has been confusing for officers. Separating the two will make it much easier.
 - 3. Discussion: The VIN should not solely be used to populate this information due to aftermarket modification that can change the cargo body type. States could obtain information from the VIN on how it was manufactured, but this wouldn't capture any aftermarket modification. Some vehicles are built as "incomplete." Incomplete vehicles are around 1.5% of VINs that come in, so VIN could be helpful for other body types.
 - 4. Implementation Suggestions:
 - The VIN could be used to collect this information, but officers should always verify that the VIN matches the vehicle.
- O. V16: Hazardous Materials Involvement
 - 1. Discussion: Tennessee's crash system has a help button for this element that links to graphics for officers. Pennsylvania encourages vendors to add information from FMCSA's hazardous materials visor card.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Provide FMCSA's hazardous materials visor card as a link in the crash system to assist officers.
- P. V17: Vehicle Trailing
 - 1. Discussion: This element used to be a subfield of Motor Vehicle Body Type. Pennsylvania no longer asks how many trailers there are but calculates this number by how many trailers are entered. The State had pushback with "three trailers." Pennsylvania only allows 2 trailers.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- Q. V18: Trailer VIN(s)
 - 1. Discussion: Pennsylvania does not do VIN verification on trailers—it's a new data element to the State. They can look up trailer VINs using VINtelligence, but they are not verifying them at this time. Most trailers would be out-of-state and not accessible via interfacing with the State's vehicle system, and it would not make sense for this information to be looked up by license plate.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- R. V19: Trailer Body Type
 - 1. Discussion: Dollies are becoming more popular. They are considered trailers and have VINs. Six Wheel is one manufacturer.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Add **Dolly** as an attribute.
- S. V20: Total Occupants in Motor Vehicle
 - 1. Discussion: In FARS and CRSS, if you have a bus that's carrying 50 people (for example), you will enter person records for the driver and anyone injured, then enter the total number of occupants as 50 for this data element. This is only done with vehicles carrying a large number of passengers that are uninjured.
 - 2. Discussion: Pennsylvania collects this information in two ways. They ask officers to provide it, and if the number doesn't match the person records, they receive a

validation error. Tennessee only creates passenger records for those injured and captures the others in the “total occupants” count. All uninjured do not have a person record, just an attachment with a list of the names.

3. Discussion: Like FARS and CRSS, State systems can automatically create “dummy” records for each uninjured occupant reported in this element. The fields can be auto populated as **Unknown** for most data elements. This maintains the correct number of person records attached to the crash. The FARS and CRSS Manual guidance could potentially be used to create guidance for implementation suggestions in MMUCC.
4. Discussion: If a vehicle runs a stop sign and another vehicle crashes while avoiding them, the non-contact vehicle is a phantom unit which is collected in some states’ crash systems. In Pennsylvania, non-contact (phantom units) are collected as another vehicle in a crash and as a separate vehicle type so that the State has the unit number to put down as the prime factor. They are not involved in the crash other than they were a factor in the crash.
5. **Suggestions:**
 - Crash systems could automatically create “dummy” records for each uninjured person in vehicles with a large number of occupants (see the FARS/CRSS Coding and Validation Manual on "Created Records"). These “dummy” records could default to **Unknown** for many data elements for these uninjured occupants, which could save an officer time in completing the crash report.

III. Close meeting – ended at 2:55 PM Eastern

- A. Begin the next meeting with V20: Total Occupants in Motor Vehicle.