

MMUCC Committee – Traffic Records Data Integration Subcommittee Meeting

April 6, 2023

1:30 – 3:00 Eastern

Microsoft Teams

I. Participants

A. Committee Chair - Joanna Reed, NHTSA

B. Subcommittee members

1. Doug Mowbray — Maryland Department of Transportation Motor Vehicle Administration's (MDOT MVA) Highway Safety Office
2. Greg Gifford — Illinois Department of Transportation, Bureau of Data Collection
3. Patricia Daniel — Georgia Department of Public Health
4. Richie Frederick — Florida Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles
5. Russ Martin — Governors Highway Safety Association
6. Sladjana Oulad Daoud — California Office of Traffic Safety
7. Ty Carhart — Florida Department of Health
8. Warren Stanley — Washington Department of Transportation

C. Federal Liaisons

1. CDC
 - David Fosbroke
2. FMCSA
 - Jenny Guarino
3. NHTSA
 - Beau Burdett
 - Donna Glassbrenner
 - Jeremiah Kinsman
 - John Metcalf
 - John Siegler
 - Joshua DeFisher
 - Lixin Zhao
 - Rebecca Dieken
 - Tom Bragan
 - Tonja Lindsey
4. NTSB
 - Brittany Rawlinson

D. VHB

1. Chelsea Palmateer
2. Courtney Ruiz

II. Continue review of compiled edits to Chapter 10

The elements included in Chapter 10 are a mixture of elements that would help officers in filling out the crash report (with real-time interface) and elements that will be useful for more robust crash data analysis after collection.

A. Vehicle Data System

- American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) D.20
 1. Discussion:
 - a. Illinois is having difficulty identifying motorized bicycles. Is a person on a motorized bicycle considered an occupant of a Motor Vehicle in Transport (MVIT) or a non-motorist?

- b. New to MMUCC 6, a person on a motorized bicycle is considered a non-motorist. NHTSA has had many meetings about this topic. This is a hot topic for the ANSI D.16 committee too, which will be considering changing motorized bicycles to exclude them from motor vehicles (how they are currently categorized). Motorized bicycles would be considered a bicycle with a motor. People on motorized bicycles would be non-motorists and no longer motor vehicle occupants. MMUCC, FARS/CRSS, and the D.16 will all hopefully use the same definitions and classifications moving forward.
- c. In Maryland, e-bikes are counted in non-motorist type. However, with bicyclists not having a specific license type or their “vehicle” not being registered, it's hard to categorize them with other road users/vehicle types.
- d. NTSB recently released a report that shows e-bikes are frequently grouped with motorcycles in crash data, due to the current ANSI D.16 classification. NTSB shared the following link to the report: <https://www.nts.gov/safety/safetystudies/Documents/SRR2201.pdf>

2. Suggestions:

- a. An example was added to this section to consider interfacing the crash report with the State’s vehicle registration system to capture the VIN, Make, Model, etc. based on a license plate lookup.

B. Driver Data System

- American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) D.20
 - 1. Discussion:
 - a. The suggestions from the subcommittee were added to the list of elements.
 - b. Does D.20 have a vehicle recall data element? Maryland is encouraging officers to check if there were vehicle recalls that may have contributed to the crash. Carfax is another source of data on crash history.
 - 2. Suggestions:
 - a. Add **A.38.28 Vehicle History Indicator** which has the attribute *Manufacturer's recall*
 - b. Add **A.38.49 Vehicle Recall Compliance** to see if any recalls on the vehicle were corrected.
- Add potential other sources of information (e.g., NHTSA’s recall info, Carfax)
- Problem Driver Pointer System (PDPS)
 - 1. Discussion: None
 - 2. Suggestions: None.
- Commercial Driver License Information System (CDLIS)
 - 1. Discussion:
 - a. Sladjana’s suggestions for PDPS should also be included in CDLIS.
 - 2. Suggestions:
 - a. Add DACDAT, DACSEV, DCVJUR, and CVDCV to CDLIS

C. Roadway Data System

- Model Inventory of Roadway Elements (MIRE)

1. Discussion:
 - a. Three elements were added to the list per submitted suggestions. MMUCC does not need to include every FDE from MIRE, but if there are other elements (FDE or not) that could be useful for crash data analysis, they can be added to the list.
 2. Suggestions: None.
- Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS)
 1. Discussion:
 - a. Four elements were added, per submitted suggestions

D. Citation/Adjudication Data Systems

- Example Citation and Adjudication Databases (typical State systems, no standards)
 1. Discussion:
 - a. We may want to capture the ACD Code that was originally charged and the ACD Code that was the outcome or conviction. This way we can see if there is a difference.
 - b. Some States do not have centralized tracking systems for citation data systems or a central repository.
 - c. Some driver data systems do not maintain citation data but only adjudication data.
 - d. Some States have combined citation and crash collection systems, such as TraCS or Report Beam. If a State does have one of these types of systems, then their citation data could potentially link with their crash data.
 2. Suggestions:
 - a. Review violation or arrest date vs crash date
 - b. **Adjudication:** Collect both the ACD code that was charged and the ACD code that was convicted.
 - c. **Citation:** Collect posted speed and actual speed.
- Example Traffic Court Records System (typical State system, no standard)
 1. Discussion: None.
 2. Suggestions: None.

E. Injury Surveillance Data Systems

- General Discussion:
 1. Systems/Standards for potential inclusion as examples
 - a. National Electronic Injury Surveillance System (NEISS)
<https://www.cpsc.gov/Research--Statistics/NEISS-Injury-Data>
 - b. Model Impaired Driving Records Information System (MIDRIS)
<https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.gov/files/811489.pdf>
 - c. Crash Outcome Data Evaluation System (CODES)
<https://www.nhtsa.gov/crash-data-systems/crash-outcome-data-evaluation-system-codes>
 - d. Linking Information for Nonfatal Crash Surveillance (LINCS)
[https://www.cdc.gov/transportationsafety/linkage/Linking-Information-Nonfatal-Crash-Surveillance.html#:~:text=Linking%20Information%20for%20Nonfatal%20Crash%20Surveillance%20\(LINCS\)%20is%20a%20guide,outline%20the%20data%2Dlinkage%20process](https://www.cdc.gov/transportationsafety/linkage/Linking-Information-Nonfatal-Crash-Surveillance.html#:~:text=Linking%20Information%20for%20Nonfatal%20Crash%20Surveillance%20(LINCS)%20is%20a%20guide,outline%20the%20data%2Dlinkage%20process)
- National Emergency Medical Information System (NEMESIS)

1. Discussion:
 - a. Several elements added per Subcommittee suggestions:
 - i. eDisposition.21 – Type of Destination
 - ii. eDispatch.01 – Dispatch Reason
 - iii. dAgency.02 – EMS Agency Number
 - iv. dAgency.03 – EMS Agency Name
 - v. eOutcome.09 – Emergency Department Procedures
 - vi. eOutcome.10 – Emergency Department Diagnosis
 - vii. eInjury.05 – Main Area of the Vehicle Impacted by the Collision
 - viii. eInjury.07 – Use of Occupant Safety Equipment
 - ix. eInjury.08 – Airbag Deployment
 - x. eInjury.26 – ACN Vehicle Seat Location
 - xi. eInjury.27 – Seat Occupied
 - xii. eInjury.28 – ACN Incident Seat Belt Use
 - xiii. eInjury.29 – ACN Incident Air Bag Deployed
 - xiv. eHistory.17 – Alcohol/Drug Use Indicators
 - b. Two examples added.
 - i. Consider using the NEMSIS UUID to link the crash report with the EMS patient care report(s) and other injury surveillance data systems (e.g., trauma registry, hospital records).
 - ii. Consider using eOutcome.10 Emergency Department Diagnosis and eOutcome.13 Hospital Diagnosis to compare to the INJURY STATUS on the crash report.
 2. Additional Suggestions: None.
- National Trauma Data Bank (NTDB)
 1. Discussion:
 - a. Three elements added
 - i. Date of Admission
 - ii. Time of Admission
 - iii. Location of Trauma Center
 - b. The “EMS Patient Care Report Universally Unique Identifier (UUID)” is the NEMSIS UUID. We could add a hyperlink up to the NEMSIS section.
 2. Suggestion:
 - a. Add a hyperlink to the NEMSIS section for the EMS Patient Care Report Universally Unique Identifier (UUID).
 - National Standard Certificate of Death
 1. Discussion:
 - a. One element added from submitted suggestions.
 - i. **44. If Transportation Injury, Specify**
 2. Suggestions:
 - a. Also add **32. Cause of Death**.
 - Alcohol and Drug Toxicology (typical State system, no standard)
 1. Discussion:
 - a. The NHTSA Traffic Records team reached out to the NHTSA Enforcement and Justice Services team (EJS) to ask about the DRE

database. They don't have an element to identify if the incident contributed to a crash, but they do have data on if a DRE was contacted and responded to the incident. It would be nice to know if the person was evaluated by a DRE—analysts can then follow-up with the DRE.

b. CA has a way to track if a DRE exam was conducted.

2. Suggestions:

a. Add a field to include on the crash report about if a DRE was notified/involved or if an exam was conducted.

b. Change Lab Number to **Laboratory** Number (spell out).

- Hospital Records (typical State system, no standard) was added to the Injury Surveillance list.

1. Discussion:

a. Four elements were added.

i. Hospital Name

ii. Hospital Location

iii. Admission Date

iv. Type of Admission

2. Suggestions: None.

F. Challenges and Opportunities

1. Discussion:

a. The Committee discussed if this suggestion (a Challenges and Opportunities section) should be included in MMUCC.

b. Should the suggested section be withdrawn, NHTSA will still support the effort to identify challenges and opportunities in another format.

2. Suggestions:

a. Possibly form peer-to-peer exchanges between MMUCC Committee members and State stakeholders.

b. The suggestion for a **Challenges and Opportunities** section is withdrawn.

G. Potential Funding Sources

1. Discussion: See the challenges and opportunities section discussion above, which also applies to the suggestion to add a Potential Funding Sources section.

2. The suggestion for a **Potential Funding Sources** section is also withdrawn.

H. Additional Comments:

1. NHTSA is compiling and tracking all suggestions. When the final version is published in 2024, the Committee members (and the public) will see the changes incorporated.

III. Close meeting — ended at 2:46 PM

A. Committee members have until the final meeting (May 24) to submit all suggestions to Joanna for improving the draft MMUCC Sixth Edition document.

B. Joanna will check-in with the subcommittee members to ask for agenda items. If there are suggestions submitted for Chapter 10 (from any subcommittee), Joanna will send out an agenda. If there are no agenda items, Joanna will cancel future meetings.