

MMUCC 3rd Edition Input & Draft

Tom Bragan

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
National Center for Statistics and Analysis



- Background
- State Data System Evaluations
- Traffic Records Assessments
- Data Standardization Workgroup
- MMUCC Input Form
- NHTSA Recommendations
- Expert Panel Initial Consensus
- MMUCC Website Forum

- **My MMUCC Experience**
- **Biggest change in the environment since the 2nd Edition was released:**
 - ◆ **SAFETEA-LU and its call for States to use model data elements**
 - ◆ **408 Data Improvement Grants requirement that States report they are MMUCC compliant or will use grants to become more compliant**

- **12 State evaluations**
- **Focused on Police Accident Report (PAR)**
- **Combination of manual and automated evaluation**

- **Provided State with comparison, identifying missing and surplus elements**
- **Listed percentage compliance of elements and element attributes**
- **Recommended changes to make State PAR more compliant**

Traffic Records Assessments

- **Accelerated to assist states apply for 408 data improvement grants**
- **Provide both PAR and database compliance scores**
- **Different methodology than used in SDS PAR Evaluations**

Data Standardization Workgroup

- **Formed by NHTSA's NCSA and includes representatives from FMCSA and FHWA**
- **Primary purpose is to standardize data elements as used in NHTSA's data systems**
- **Secondary purpose is to identify possible changes to MMUCC**

MMUCC Input Form

- **Sent out late last year to all States and territories**
- **Received completed forms from 29 states and the Virgin Islands**
- **18 questions about the MMUCC Guideline**

- **Has your State updated its crash report forms since January 2003.**
 - ◆ Yes = 18
 - ◆ No = 12

Key Findings

- **If yes, how important of a factor was the MMUCC Guideline in determining the contents of your updated crash forms?**
 - ◆ **11 of 18 said MMUCC was a leading factor**
 - ◆ **7 said MMUCC was either a minor factor or not a factor at all**

Key Findings

- **In general, which of the following statements reflects your opinion about the current size of the MMUCC Guideline?**
 - ◆ **Too large = 9**
 - ◆ **Too small (exclusive) = 0**
 - ◆ **Adequate = 16**
 - ◆ **No opinion = 5**

Question 11

- **Do you have any additional comments or suggested changes regarding MMUCC (either the Guideline or the Website)?**

Selection Comments for Question 11

- **“The more elements on the form, the more difficult it is to obtain crash reports from some police jurisdictions.”**
- **“MMUCC is extremely comprehensive, probably too long. [Our State’s] new crash form will be 8 pages long with multiple supplements required to get all the Commercial Vehicle Info, Bus info and non motorist info. It's a hard sell to law enforcement.”**

NHTSA Recommendations

- **Agreed to by NHTSA members of the MMUCC Expert Panel**
- **Derived from multiple sources of information:**
 - ◆ **PAR evaluations**
 - ◆ **TR Assessments**
 - ◆ **Data Standardization Workgroup**
 - ◆ **Input Form**

Recommendation Highlights

- **Remove 3 elements (C9, C10, V22) while adding only 1 (Bus Use)**
- **Reduce and clarify attributes where possible**
- **Striking a balance between the need to reduce the size of MMUCC while at the same time minimizing change**

Reclassifying MMUCC into Two Tiers?

- **Early draft of NHTSA recommended changes included tier classification of MMUCC elements:**
 - ◆ **MMIRE will use two tiers**
 - ◆ **Identified 26 elements as Tier 2 – secondary, or non-essential**
 - ◆ **Consensus was to drop tier scheme as too complex**

- **A 40-member mix from federal, state, local agencies & data users.**
- **Met April 11-13 in Arlington, VA**
- **Initial Consensus:**
 - ◆ **Remove 4 elements**
 - ◆ **Add 2 elements**
 - ◆ **Make name, definition, or attribute changes to 33 elements**

Elements Removed

- **C10 Date & Time of Crash Reported to Law Enforcement**
- **P22 Non-Motorist Action Prior to Crash**
- **V22 Underride/Override**
- **P24 Non-Motorist Action at Time of Crash – combined with P14 (Driver Action) to form Condition at Time of Crash**

- **Vehicle Removal**
 - ◆ To capture non-injury towaway crashes
 - ◆ 4 attributes
- **Bus Use**
 - ◆ To evaluate the outcome of crashes involving motor vehicles used as buses
 - ◆ 6 attributes

Other Major Changes

- **C16 Relation to Junction**
- **V30 Hazardous Materials (Cargo Only)**
- **P7 Occupant Protection System**
- **P23 Non-Motorist Actions at Time of Crash and P25 Non-Motorist Location at Time of Crash**

- **MMUCC workshop on July 26**
- **Website Forum input**
- **MMUCC Expert Panel meeting
November 13-15**
- **Publication spring/summer 2008**

- **www.mmucc.us**
- **Forum contains link to archived comments from old Website (dating back as far as 2002)**
- **Primary means of Expert Panel communication between meetings**

Summary

- **Higher profile for MMUCC due to 408**
- **Overriding State concern about MMUCC:**
 - ◆ **It's not a true “Minimum”**
- **3rd Edition Draft drawn from:**
 - ◆ **SDS Evaluations and Traffic Records Assessments**
 - ◆ **NHTSA Data Standardization Workgroup**
 - ◆ **MMUCC Input Form**
 - ◆ **MMUCC Expert Panel Consensus**

- **Questions?**
- **Contact me:**
 - ◆ **Website Forum:**
<http://www.mmucc.us/vbforums/index>
 - ◆ Tom.bragan@dot.gov
 - ◆ **(202) 314-5112**
 - ◆ **Fax (202) 314-0171**