

MMUCC Committee – IT Database Design and Administration Subcommittee Meeting

April 27, 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. William Roseburgh — Florida Highway Patrol
 - 6. Sean Owings — Nebraska Department of Transportation, Highway Safety Office
 - 7. Thomas Gwinn — Ohio State Highway Patrol

C. Federal Liaisons

- 1. FHWA
 - Sarah Weissman Pascual
- 2. NHTSA
 - Tom Bragan
 - John Metcalf
 - Jonae Anderson
 - Michael Parsons
 - Donna Glassbrenner
 - Rebecca Dieken
 - Beau Burdett
 - John Siegler
 - Joshua DeFisher
 - Tonja Lindsey
 - Caitlin Webb
 - Rodney Rudd
 - Dereece Smither
 - Frank Subalusky
 - Eric Chaney
- 3. NTSB
 - Brittany Rawlinson

D. VHB

- 1. Chelsea Palmateer
- 2. Michael Bianco

II. The MMUCC Committee member from PA requested the following agenda items:

The Committee Chair gave the floor to the committee member from PA.

A. Non-Motorist device passengers

- 1. In PA out of roughly 1000 non-motorist “device” units (including bicycles and Amish buggies), there were roughly 100 passengers in 2022
- 2. In PA most of the non-motorist fields are not relevant to the passenger and are therefore redundant

3. If these redundant fields are not collected for non-motorist device passengers, would PA still be compliant?
 - E.g., Distraction, in crosswalk, in intersection, Specific Location, etc.
 4. **Discussion:** NHTSA considers non-motorists as people, not as vehicles/units. If there are multiple people on one device (e.g., a tandem bicycle, horse drawn buggy), MMUCC recommends collection as individual non-motorists, not as passengers of a non-motorist device.
 - In PA, non-motorist data is collected at the vehicle/unit level. The person steering the bicycle, buggy, or other device is listed as the operator of the non-motorist. Officers are only asked to collect the non-motorist data elements for the operator of the non-motorist device. Other non-motorists that were part of the unit are recorded in the person file the same way as occupants of a motor vehicle.
 - Some other States do things in a similar way. In OH, bicycles and buggies are common. The operator of the device is captured as a non-motorist driver of the device and may be evaluated for drug and alcohol use. MN has a non-motorist unit type at the vehicle level where they can collect the operator information. The passenger page collects a subset of information about the other non-motorist occupants of the unit. The unit information is connected to all of the occupants of the device (e.g., if a vehicle strikes a buggy, it strikes all occupants of the buggy) and is stored for each non-motorist in the person file.
 - Other States, like IA and TN, collect non-motorist data in a separate section of the crash report and they collect it for each non-motorist.
 - NHTSA is currently performing State-to-draft MMUCC Sixth Edition alignment mapping for all States.
 - PA can request a NHTSA GO Team to review the State's new documentation, if they wish.
 5. **Suggestions:** No suggestions.
- B. Non-Motorist Person Type
1. Isn't person type and device type redundant? Why collect "bicycle" and "other cycle" as both a person type and a device type? Why not then collect wheelchair, skateboard, etc. as a person type?
 2. Why not collect pedestrian walking, running, etc., and pedestrian in building as a device type (or more simply as a NON_MOTORIST_TYPE)?
 3. **Discussion: P5. Person Type** has options for both motorists and non-motorists. **NM9. Non-Motorist Device Type** collects more specific detail on the device type and allows for distinctions between motorized and non-motorized bicycles and scooters. The ANSI D.16 definition for *personal conveyance* excludes bicycles because they are pedal-powered devices. NM9 contains implementation suggestions to auto-populate this element, if appropriate.
 - TN shared that they have been collecting data on e-scooters for a couple years. There was a need for better data on e-scooter-involved crashes in metro areas, so they added a non-motorist type for "Pedestrian on Electric Scooter." They don't capture other conveyance devices, but officers record this information in the narrative.
 - IA has been waiting to introduce new non-motorist data elements until the publication of the MMUCC Sixth Edition. OH already collects non-motorist

data in a way that is similar to the MMUCC Sixth Edition. MN is currently reviewing their person type attributes to better align with the MMUCC Fifth Edition.

4. **Suggestions:** No suggestions.
- C. If the “Hit and Run” field encompasses both the vehicles leaving the scene and the driver leaving the vehicle and fleeing the scene, would the MMUCC Sixth Edition then not be able to differentiate between these two situations?
1. PA has had requests for this data in the past
 2. **Discussion: V39. Hit and Run** combines situations where the driver and the vehicle leave the scene together and where the driver flees on foot while leaving the vehicle behind. States can split this into two data elements (e.g., *Driver Left Scene without Vehicle* and *Driver and Vehicle Left Scene*) and could still align to MMUCC.
 - PA has a field called **Driver Presence** that includes the attributes “driver present,” “no driver present/drifted vehicle,” “driver fled scene,” and “hit and run.”
 - OH receives many requests for data on hit and run crashes and if they were solved. They do not collect the data as a **Yes or No**, but as **Solved or Not Solved**. If there is not a hit and run, the system auto-populates a null value. If there is a hit and run, the officer must specify if it has been solved or not solved. Analysts can tell if the driver fled the scene by using the other vehicle data—if there is no driver or vehicle data then both fled the scene, but if there is vehicle data, then the driver fled without the vehicle.
 - TN has hit and run **Yes or No** and **Solved or Not Solved** at the crash level. They have a hit and run option at the vehicle and driver levels to bypass data elements when the information is unknown (e.g., the system auto-populates *Unknown* values).
 3. **Suggestions:**
 - Edit the Alignment Rules: States can split V39. Hit and Run Yes attribute into two attributes (e.g., Yes, Driver Left Scene with Vehicle; Yes, Driver Left Scene without Vehicle) and still align with MMUCC.
- D. How do you fill out the Non-Motorist fields for a train or trolley?
1. **Discussion:** If there is a collision between a motor vehicle in-transport and a train, but there are no injuries sustained by passengers on the train, then officers would not collect any information on train passengers. If there are injuries, the injured people are considered non-motorists and would be coded under **P5. Person Type** as **Occupant of a Non-Motor Vehicle Transport Device**. Other trains and trolleys on rails are considered *Rail Vehicles*. Occupants of cable cars would be coded **Occupant of a Non-Motor Vehicle Transport Device** for **P5. Person Type**, and **Railroad Vehicle or Road Vehicle on Rails** for **NM9. Non-Motorist Device Type**. If the trolley had tires, it is considered a motor vehicle and any passengers are considered occupants of a motor vehicle.
 - PA does not collect data for people on trains and trolleys, even if they sustain injuries in collisions with motor vehicles in transport.
 2. **Suggestions:** No suggestions.
- E. How do you code a Personal Delivery Device?
1. E.g., kiwibot (a robotic delivery device)

2. **Discussion:** Robotic delivery devices are an emerging technology. They are currently active in several States and are mostly used to complete last-mile deliveries. They act like pedestrians in some ways—they navigate crosswalks and use sidewalks. Some have safety features such as collision prevention and air bags, and some models can reach speeds in excess of 30mph. Crashes involving robotic delivery devices will become more frequent. There is not a current definition for these devices in FARS, CRSS, or ANSI D.16. Robotic delivery devices have value, both the device itself and its cargo. One option for collecting data is to treat them like motor carriers. This would allow for data on the device owner and operator to be collected. Another option would be to look at how FAA handles drone data. Robotic delivery device could also be added to **V37**.

Sequence of Events.

- In PA, State law requires the collection of reports for crashes involving robotic delivery devices.
- For more information and examples:
<https://www.fastcompany.com/90291820/8-robots-racing-to-win-the-delivery-wars>

3. **Suggestions:**

- Add *Personal Delivery Device* as an attribute to **V37. Sequence of Events**.
- Consider also collecting some non-motorist elements for personal delivery devices (e.g., at intersection, in crosswalk, specific location, contributing circumstances).

III. Close meeting – ended at 2:57 PM Eastern