**MCSAC Task 12-03: Evaluation of and Recommendations on the Compliance, Safety, Accountability (CSA) Program**

**Subcommittee Timeline, September 11, 2013**

1. **December 2013 CSA Subcommittee Meeting**
	1. Investigate further the Behavior Analysis & Safety Improvement Categories (BASICs) with weak correlation to safety (e.g., Driver Fitness BASIC, Drug and Alcohol BASIC).
	2. What are some strategies that can improve data sufficiency (e.g., State enforcement disparities)?
		1. How can the subcommittee help FMCSA identify passenger carriers for which there is no BASIC data?
		2. How could FMCSA normalize data across various data disparities and differences in miles driven?
		3. The Agency might benefit from reports by participating States on how many inspections they conduct, what kind of inspections, and what kind of violations they cite for, and what conditions they put out of service.
			1. Does this correlate tow here crashes take place?
			2. More enforcement should be encouraged in States where crashes take place.
	3. Potential Presentations:
2. Additional presentations on the violations/data behind the BASICs that are weakly correlated to safety, e.g., Driver Fitness, Drug and Alcohol.
	1. How can these BASICs be improved?
3. State enforcement disparities.
4. Briefing on FMCSA initiatives that deal with new entrant reviews.
5. Briefing/update from FMCSA on Safety Measurement System (SMS) scores.
6. How are other countries addressing challenges such as data insufficiency or disparities or scoring with weak correlation with safety?
7. Prior to next CSA subcommittee meeting, potential FMCSA webinar for CSA subcommittee (inviting the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance) that shows how to access comparative inspection data (to observe what different States are doing).
	1. It could be recorded for others to watch before meeting (if they cannot attend the live webinar).
8. **Longer Term**
	1. CSA should be more user-friendly to stakeholders (i.e., those that use CSA scores to make decisions).
		1. For example, the presentation should be something more simplistic and accessible.
		2. Public use of CSA data is a concern because of the insufficiencies with the data.
		3. While waiting for more data to fill in, perhaps the public should have an explanation of what you are looking at in the SMS.
			1. Right now there is a lot of confusion about carriers without data, e.g., blanks and zeros under BASICs.
			2. It might help to highlight a broader explanation of data issues, e.g., this is how many carriers are in the SMS, this is how many we do not have data for, and this is why.
			3. The SMS website should emphasize what conclusions users should draw (or not draw) from the lack of data.
			4. About 40 percent of active carriers (out of 525,000 active carriers) have enough data to be assessed (200,000 – account for 92 percent of crashes). Approximately 90,000 carriers have enough data to have BASIC scores.
	2. Weighting of violations within BASICs.
		1. MCSAC looked quickly at this issue for a previous task, but the results and impacts have not been looked at in detail.
	3. Crash Indicator BASIC
		1. This BASIC has unique concerns for passenger carriers and the types of and conditions surrounding their tow-away reported crashes.
	4. Attempts to normalize data across geographic locations.
		1. There are only 5-6 states that do State-level inspection programs of motorcoaches.
		2. If motorcoaches are inspected en route, it would be only a Level III inspection (driver only).
		3. This results in a lack of data and geographic disparities of data that does exist.
	5. Preventability of crashes (partially addressed in July 2013 MCASC Report to FMCSA).
	6. Hazmat BASIC – based on the results, does that need to be changed?