

MMUCC Committee – IT Data Admin Subcommittee Meeting

March 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. William Roseburgh — Florida Highway Patrol

C. Federal Liaisons

1. CDC
 - David Fosbroke
2. FHWA
 - Sarah Weissman Pascual
3. FMCSA
 - Jessica Powell
4. NHTSA
 - Beau Burdett
 - Caitlin Webb
 - John Siegler
 - Jonae Anderson
 - Keith Williams
 - Lixin Zhao
 - Michael Frenchik
 - Michael Parsons
 - Rebecca Dieken
 - Sean Puckett
 - Tom Bragan
 - Tonja Lindsey
5. NTSB
 - Brittany Rawlinson

D. VHB

1. Chelsea Palmateer
2. Courtney Ruiz

II. Review data elements

A. V20. Total Occupants in Motor Vehicle (cont.)

1. Discussion: No further discussion.
2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.

B. V21. Special Use

1. Discussion: The attributes in this list are mutually exclusive. States with more attributes than MMUCC may run into situations where multiple special uses are possible at the same time.

- 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- C. V22. Bus Use
 - 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- D. V23. Emergency Response
 - 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- E. V24. Motor Vehicle Posted/Statutory Speed Limit
 - 1. Discussion: Tennessee has some residential areas that have speed limits that are not divisible by 5 (some cities have a speed limit of 24 MPH). The validation rule that requires the speed to be divisible by 5 will not allow officers to enter local speed limits.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Review the validation rule.
- F. V25. Trafficway Flow
 - 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- G. V26. Median Barrier Presence
 - 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- H. V27. Number of Open Lanes in Vehicle's Environment
 - 1. Discussion: This element was previously called Total Lanes.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- I. V28. Roadway Alignment
 - 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- J. V29. Roadway Grade
 - 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- K. V30. Roadway Surface Condition
 - 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- L. V31. Traffic Control Device
 - 1. Discussion: There is one validation rule to auto populate V32 if there are no traffic controls.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- M. V32. Device Functioning
 - 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- N. V33. Vehicle Status Prior to Critical Event
 - 1. Discussion: This element was previously called Vehicle Maneuver. If the unit type is Parked Motor Vehicle, this could be auto populated to Parked. Backing Up (Other Than for Parking Position) is for backing movement other than movement to back into a parking space.
 - 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- O. V34. Initial Contact Point
 - 1. Discussion: Minnesota has **hit and run vehicle** as a unit type and are considering auto filling this element with the attribute **hit and run vehicle** for hit and run

units. In NHTSA's data systems, there is no distinction between **Unknown** and **Unknown (hit and run unit)**. Minnesota has clickable diagrams in its crash reporting form.

2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Use clickable clock point diagrams for officers to select the appropriate attribute.
- P. V35. Damaged Areas
1. Discussion: Minnesota and Tennessee have an option to select all damaged areas. Damaged Areas is a very useful element for crash data analysis.
 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Use clickable clock point diagrams for officers to select the appropriate attribute(s).
 - Provide an option to **Select All Areas** on the clickable clock point diagram.
- Q. V36. Extent of Damage
1. Discussion: No discussion.
 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- R. V37. Sequence of Events
1. Discussion: Pennsylvania does not collect non-harmful events. Tennessee allows for up to six events. "Select up to 4" is the minimum number of selections, but it may be misinterpreted as a maximum. Another subcommittee has suggested increasing this to six selections.
 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Review "Select up to 4" and consider changing wording to something like 'Select as many as there are events for the crash.'
- S. V38. Most Harmful Event for this Motor Vehicle
1. Discussion: Minnesota has a drop-down menu for the Most Harmful Event that only includes the events that were part of the Sequence of Events.
 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - If the officer selects an event from the Sequence of Events, the drop-down menu should only include the harmful attributes they selected in the Sequence of Events for the vehicle.
- T. V39. Hit and Run
1. Discussion: The validation rule is "should" not "must," so it can be overridden. Pennsylvania does not collect this information at the Vehicle level and has a Hit and Run unit type. Iowa added "left the scene" to their sequence of events. Tennessee has "hit and run yes or no" and "hit and run solved yes or no." They also collect "driver fled scene" and "vehicle fled scene." It's also possible for non-motorists to leave the scene.
 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- U. V40. Vehicle Towed
1. Discussion: If a vehicle is towed because the driver is impaired, you would select "Towed." This element is asking if the vehicle was towed, not why it was towed. It is uncommon for officers to not know if the vehicle was towed—**Unknown** attributes can create bad data. Tennessee and Minnesota require this field to be completed, and they do not have an option for **Unknown**. Iowa is looking to get rid of as many **Unknowns** and **Others** as they can because they become defaults for officers.
 2. Implementation Suggestions:

- Remove **Unknown** as an attribute.
- V. V41. Contributing Circumstances, Motor Vehicle
 1. Discussion: There can be more than one contributing circumstance, and several States allow for multiple selections. Minnesota and Pennsylvania allow for two selections and Tennessee allows for three. This element should allow for multiple selections or instruct officers to select the most contributing circumstance.
 2. Suggestion:
 - Change “Select 1” to allow for multiple selections or create a hierarchy for selections.
- W. V42. Vehicle Underride/Override
 1. Discussion: Definitions are needed for **Underride** and **Override**. Tennessee used to have this data element but found the quality was poor because officers did not understand how to code this. This element needs clear definitions. This applies to any vehicle, not just heavy trucks.
 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Provide clear definitions and examples of “Underride” and “Override.”
- X. V43. Fire Occurrence
 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- Y. V44. Related Factors – Vehicle Level
 1. Discussion:
 - Tennessee expressed that officers will not select the attribute **Suspect that Automated Driving System(s) engaged at the time of the crash or leading up to the crash** because of the word “suspect,” and believe it is not a reasonable attribute to expect a State to adopt. There are also concerns if officers will even know if ADS is engaged.
 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Remove the word “suspect” from the attribute **Suspect that Automated Driving System(s) engaged at the time of the crash or leading up to the crash** and provide clear definitions for both ADS attributes.
- Z. D1. Driver Presence
 1. Discussion: This element is asking if there was a driver present at the start of the unstabilized situation. A driver would be present in a hit and run unit because they fled the scene. There is an implementation suggestion for this element to auto fill the other Driver elements if No Driver Present/Not Applicable is selected.
 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- AA. D2. Driver Address
 1. Discussion: It may be more appropriate to use **Not Applicable** instead of **No Driver Present/Unknown if Driver Present**.
 2. It’s possible to use an interface with the driver database to auto fill this information. It’s also possible to use scanners. Pennsylvania uses scanners and receives good data for out-of-state vehicles.
 3. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Interface with the State’s driver database to auto fill this information for In-State vehicles based on the driver’s license number or driver name.

- Allow officers to use scanners to collect this information for In-State or Out-of-State vehicles.
- BB. D3. Driver License Jurisdiction
 1. Discussion: Pennsylvania collects this information as the Driver License State and their data dictionary includes all States and countries. They have a drop-down list available on the website with all of the options. If officers are using software, they can use the scanner to populate this field.
 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- CC. D4. Driver License Number
 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- DD. D5. Speeding-Related
 1. Discussion: Pennsylvania collects this information as a driver action, but they only allow four selections so it's possible they would miss this.
 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- EE. D6. Driver Distraction
 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- FF. D7. Attempted Avoidance Maneuver
 1. Discussion: If the attribute selected is "lay down motorcycle," then there should be a check against V13. This is included in the edit checks (pg. 310, ER.052).
 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- GG. D8. Driver's Vision Obscured By
 1. Discussion: No discussion.
 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- HH. D9. Violation Codes
 1. Discussion: Pennsylvania is not allowed to interface with its court system, but they do get a list of violation codes that they update quarterly. They have a drop-down list that is searchable for officers. They allow up to 4 and officers can indicate if the driver was charged or issued a warning.
 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Provide officers with a searchable drop-down list of the State's violation codes.
- II. D10. Related Factors – Driver Level
 1. Discussion: **Opening Closure into Moving Traffic or While the Vehicle is in Motion** includes if someone opened a door while the vehicle was in motion.
 2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Review the wording for the attribute **Opening Closure into Moving Traffic or While Vehicle is in Motion** and provide a definition.
- JJ. P1. Person Number
 1. Discussion: In Pennsylvania, some agencies provide a unique number for each person, and others have duplicates (e.g., V1 P1, V1 P2, V2 P1 V2 P2 vs. V1 P1, V1 P2, V2 P3, V2 P4).
 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.
- KK. P2. Name of Person Involved
 1. Discussion: Included format as an option and listed under suggestions as opposed to a minimum.
 2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.

LL. P3. Date of Birth

1. Discussion: Use the ISO standard format for storing year, month, and day. The dates should all be captured in the same format.
2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Collect this information in the same format (ISO) as suggested for Crash Date.

MM. P4. Sex/Gender

1. Discussion: Some states refer to it as sex, gender, or both. Many States also have an Other category, and ANSI D20 does as well. Sex and gender are combined in this element because separating them out can lead to mismatched records or be incorrectly coded as **Unknown**.
2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - For in-State drivers, pull this information from the driver license or an interface with the State driver system.
 - If auto filled by an interface or scan, make sure the field is editable to the officers.

NN. P5. Person Type

1. Discussion: No discussion.
2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.

OO. P6. Special Function

1. Discussion: Tennessee added a field to capture incident responders but have issues with officers selecting "yes" for *themselves* as an incident responder involved, resulting in challenges with data quality. Officers think this element is asking about the officer filling out the report, not to the people involved in the crash. This could be a training issue that States should be aware of.
2. Implementation Suggestions:
 - Review the definition for this element for clarification to who we are referring to.

PP. P7. Injury Status

1. Discussion: No discussion.
2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.

QQ. P8. Transported to First Medical Facility By

1. Discussion: No discussion.
2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.

RR. P9. EMS Response Agency

1. Discussion: Where officers obtain this information was discussed. Pennsylvania has a drop-down list of EMS agencies and its auto populated once selected. They also include **law enforcement** and update this list quarterly. This allows them to link to the injury outcomes. NEMSIS contains a list of data elements that the Traffic Records Data Integration Subcommittee is reviewing that could be used to link with NEMSIS.
2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.

SS. P10. Medical Facility

1. Discussion: An interface between crash and EMS systems may allow some elements to be auto filled based on the EMS run number. In Pennsylvania, the injury analysts have access to the crash data, but that data is not linked back to the crash system.
2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.

TT. P11. Occupant's Motor Vehicle Unit Number

1. Discussion: Pennsylvania has unit number, which could be a vehicle or non-motorist.
2. Implementation Suggestions: No suggestions.

III. Close meeting – ended at 3:00 PM Eastern

- A. Begin the next meeting with P12. Seating Position, and then the Subcommittee will review Chapter 8: Non-Motorist Data Elements and Chapter 11: Designing Data Collection with Human Factors.
- B. Next week is the mid-point check-in meeting. All three subcommittees will be in attendance to discuss the work completed.