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C/O: Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE

Washington, DC 20590

December 15, 2016

The Honorable T.F. Scott Darling, III

Administrator

Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE

Washington, DC 20590

Dear Administrator Darling:

The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), Pub. L. No. 114-94 (Dec. 4, 2015), directed the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) to convene a working group to review the data elements of post-accident reports (PARs) for tow-away accidents involving commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) that are reported to DOT by States. Additionally, the FAST Act directed the working group to consider requiring additional data elements to PARs, including the physical characteristics of the CMV and any other vehicle involved in the accident, in particular, vehicle configuration, gross vehicle weight (if the weight can be readily determined), number of axles, and distance between axles (if the distance can be readily determined). The FAST Act also directed the working group to consider whether to require that PARs record the primary cause of the accident. The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) chartered this working group under the Federal Advisory Committee Act as the PAR Advisory Committee. In Task 16-1, FMCSA tasked the PAR Advisory Committee with providing its review and recommendations on PAR requirements and provide any relevant data or analysis relating to the recommendations to the Agency.

On March 30, 2016, FMCSA conducted an organizational meeting to plan the execution of the responsibilities in FAST Act sec. 5306, beginning with the convening of a PAR workgroup at a public meeting on April 26, 2016. In October 2016, FMCSA chartered the PAR Advisory Committee, which met in public meetings on December 6-7, 2016, to review State PARs, and consider PAR best practices and requiring additional data elements on PARs, including those specifically enumerated in the FAST Act. The attached report includes all of the PAR Advisory Committee’s recommendation and ideas relating to PAR best practices that it developed during those meetings.

On behalf of the PAR Advisory Committee, I respectfully submit this report to FMCSA for its consideration.

Sincerely,

//signed//

Robert Mills

Chairman, Post-Accident Reporting Advisory Committee

Enclosures

**Post-Accident Report Advisory Committee Task 16-1:**

**Best Practices and Recommendations to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration on Data Elements of Post-Accident Reports Collected by States and Reported to the U.S. Department of Transportation for Accidents Involving Commercial Motor Vehicles**

Introduction

Section 5306 of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), Pub. L. No. 114-94, requires the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) to convene a working group to review the data elements of post-accident reports (PARs) for tow-away accidents involving commercial motor vehicles (CMVs) that are reported to the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

With at least 51 percent of its members representing States or State law enforcement officials, the statute directed the working group to review existing State PARs to better understand what information is collected by State and local law enforcement in relation to motor vehicle crashes and CMVs. Specifically, sec. 5306 requires the working group to report its findings and any recommendations, including best practices for State PARs, and consideration of requiring additional PAR data elements, including the following (FAST Act sec. 5306(c)):

1. The physical cause of the accident, if the primary cause can be determined; and
2. The physical characteristics of the CMV and any other vehicle involved in the accident, including—
   * + 1. The vehicle configuration;
       2. The gross vehicle weight (GVW), if the weight can be readily determined;
       3. The number of axles; and
       4. The distance between axles, if the distance can be readily determined.

In PAR Advisory Committee Task 16-1, FMCSA directed the PAR Advisory Committee (hereinafter “the Committee”) to provide its review and recommendations on PAR requirements and to provide any relevant data or analysis relating to the following three areas:

1. Review current PAR data requirements to the States.
2. Review existing State PAR forms, including a consideration of inclusion of the data elements specifically mentioned in the FAST Act sec. 5306(c) (re-printed above).
3. Review other crash data standards, such as the Minimum Model Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC).

The report below presents the recommendations of the Committee based on the workgroup deliberations in the April 26, 2016, public meeting and the Committee’s deliberations in public meetings on December 6-7, 2016. Along with its recommendations, the Committee has included notes from discussions that resulted in the development of the consensus recommendations. The Committee believes these notes are useful because they include data and rationale that support the ultimate position taken, as well as explanations of relevant differences in opinions and tradeoffs.

1. **Review of State PAR Data Elements** (FAST Act sec. 5306(a)(1))
   1. On March 30, 2016, FMCSA conducted an organizational meeting to plan the execution of the responsibilities in FAST Act sec. 5306, beginning with the convening of a PAR workgroup at a public meeting on April 26, 2016.
   2. Before the April 26 PAR workgroup meeting, the workgroup had met over the phone and divided up responsibility among four smaller groups for reviewing each State’s PAR and documenting which data elements they contain. The results were compiled before the April 26 workgroup meeting and each group summarized its findings during the meeting.
   3. The Committee presents a summary of its State-by-State findings in Appendix A of this report.
   4. Findings:
      1. The groups generally reported that most basic data were similar across States.
      2. Most States collect information on PARs consistent with the MMUCC standards released by NHTSA. Improving on this consistency would be considered a best practice.
      3. Regarding Vehicle Configuration PAR data elements, members commented that:
         1. Vehicle configuration is FMCSA-required.
         2. Multiple members commented that many States’ PARs do not have adequate classifications for buses and suggested that the bus vehicle configuration category should be further broken down due the vast variety of passenger CMVs.
         3. The majority of States collect all of the same basic vehicle configuration data elements. However, some States did not have attributes for Tractor/Double and Tractor/Triple.
         4. Some members said that the collection of weight and length information where possible should be encouraged because of the potential implications for determining safety differentials.
      4. Some States require geographic coordinates associated with the crash to be recorded on the PAR (latitude and longitude), for example, California, Maryland, and Texas.
         1. This could be considered a best practice.
         2. MMUCC has a crash location data element with three options: latitude and longitude (GPS coordinates); linear referencing system; or link node and offset system (not recommended by MMUCC).
      5. Some members suggested that the importance of the description of events on a PAR often outweighs the importance of vehicle characteristics.
   5. Overarching PAR Data Recommendations:
      1. FMCSA should modify its data systems to be able to receive from States all MMUCC data that States are able to provide based on the most current MMUCC guideline.
         1. In terms of minimum required mandatory data elements, the Committee would leave that to FMCSA and NHTSA to decide.
         2. FMCSA should commit to using all data it receives to learn more about crashes to ensure that its collection is worth the effort and risk by State and local law enforcement.
      2. Congress should appropriate *additional* funding to FMCSA above and beyond existing levels to modify its systems and enable States to collect and report additional PAR data to keep up with evolving technology.
      3. In particular, PAR data elements relating to driver behavior should be expanded to coincide with all of the relevant MMUCC elements.
      4. FMCSA should work with NHTSA and other stakeholders to evaluate how FMCSA can align the FMCSA data systems with MMUCC data elements and potentially which data elements should be the minimum required mandatory data elements that must be submitted by States as a condition of receiving funding.
2. **Best Practices With Respect to Specific PAR Data Elements**
   1. **Vehicle Configuration** (FAST Act sec. 5306(c)(2)(A))
      1. Recommendation: While the PAR Advisory Committee recommends that FMCSA modify its systems to accept all MMUCC data that States provide (see Section I.E.1 above), for purposes of PAR vehicle configuration data specifically, the Committee recommends that FMCSA enable and request State partners to collect and upload data for reportable crashes that is consistent with the Motor Vehicle Body Type Category, Special Function of Motor Vehicle In Transport, and all Vehicle Configuration data elements of the most current edition of the MMUCC for all vehicles involved in a CMV crash. In addition, for purposes of CMVs, the following additional data elements should be collected on PARs and reported to FMCSA:
         1. Double decker motorcoach should be included as a vehicle body type category because this configuration impacts the weight distribution and center of gravity of the vehicle, which could impact the analysis of a crash.
            1. There is an expected increase in proliferation of this body type in the motorcoach vehicle market.
            2. This vehicle body type is not included in the current version of the MMUCC. However, this information may be obtained from vehicle identification number (VIN) records.
      2. Discussion Notes
         1. Regarding the existing Motor Carrier Management Information System (MCMIS) vehicle configuration data elements, the Committee agreed that they are generally adequate, but suggested that cargo body type should be expanded to account for different types of buses (transit, school bus, motorcoach [single-decker, double-decker], mini-bus, 15-passenger van) and an expanded view of passenger car (SUV, minivans, etc.). The proposed revisions for the 5th edition of the MMUCC include further breakouts in these categories and will include definitions and figures for new terms.[[1]](#footnote-1)
         2. Regarding vehicle configuration, most States collect already the majority of MMUCC data that should be uploaded into MCMIS. States do not collect or report the data uniformly.
         3. Regarding trailers, some members stated that it would be ideal to understand trailer configurations (e.g., distinguishing by trailer length, such as turnpike doubles from rocky mountain doubles) but it is difficult to get that information.
   2. **Number of Axles** (FAST Act sec. 5306(c)(2)(C))
      1. Recommendations:
         1. The Committee recommends that States should collect information on number of axles and be able to report this information to FMCSA with MMUCC data.
         2. This data element should specify the number of axles *per vehicle unit* so that axles per trailer would be recorded.
         3. The Committee passed along a recommendation to a MMUCC representative who was present at the meeting that the number of axles should be incorporated into the new Large Vehicle and Hazardous Materials Section of the draft MMUCC, 5th edition.
      2. Discussion Notes
         1. Many States do not require this information to be collected on a PAR because it is not a part of the MMUCC.
         2. Number of axles per vehicle unit can provide relevant and useful information. In particular, if the vehicle data on a PAR includes single/double/triple and other configuration information contained in MMUCC, using that combined with number of axles would provide potentially additional richness of data to allow analysis of trends regarding the precise vehicle configuration.
         3. Regarding whether this information could be useful to FMCSA, one Committee member suggested that the Agency could match the number of axles to exposure data by vehicle configuration. According to this workgroup member, this information combined with the bill of lading could be used to estimate the GVW at the time of the accident, which could help determine if the loaded CMV was overweight.
         4. This would require a modification of current State systems because number of axles is not a data element in the MMUCC.
         5. Some law enforcement Committee members felt that there are more important data elements they would like to see added to MCMIS before this one and expressed concerns that officers would not supply this information or would do so inaccurately.
   3. **Distance Between Axles** (FAST Act sec. 5306(c)(2)(D))
      1. Recommendation: The Committee recommends that FMCSA refrain from requiring distance between axles as a uniform data element on PARs due to reasons of practicality and feasibility.
      2. Discussion Notes
         1. The Committee does not believe that the problems associated with collecting this information would be outweighed by the benefits of having this data.
         2. The Committee believes that requiring this data would conflict with the goal of minimizing the amount of time that law enforcement officials have to stay on the road at the scene of a crash.
         3. Currently, there is limited training or equipment to collect this information.
         4. It could be difficult to assess this information on a CMV after a crash because the axles may have moved.
   4. **Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW)** (FAST Act sec. 5306(c)(2)(B))
      1. Recommendation: The Committee recommends that FMCSA refrain from requiring collection of GVW/Gross Combination Weight (GCW) (other than the already recorded load rating) for the following reasons noted below.
      2. Discussion Notes
         1. Finding the actual GVW takes a lot of effort and generally does not occur, unless the State conducts a full investigation on the crash.
         2. Often weight can be lost in a crash (fuel, tires, cargo, etc.).
         3. Most officers are not certified in weight enforcement and, therefore, do not carry the necessary equipment.
         4. To require officers that are trained in weight enforcement to collect weight data from all CMV crashes would take excessive time.
         5. FMCSA requires classification of the relevant CMV into one of three different gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) ranges (GVWR ≤ 10,000 pounds [lbs.]; GVWR 10,001-26,000 lbs.; GVWR > 26,000 lbs.).
            1. Regarding a suggestion to attempt to get more accurate GVWR information for a particular vehicle, requiring precise GVWR may result in less accurate results than asking for a range because the officer in the field may not have any idea.
         6. GVWR information could potentially be obtained from linkages with other data sources. For example, some States can get the manufacturer’s GVWR from the decoded VIN but most VINs are not decoded.
         7. Gross weight information might also be obtained using the bill of lading or weight slips (when available) in combination with other information.
   5. **Primary Cause of the Accident** (FAST Act sec. 5306(c)(1))
      1. Recommendations:
         1. The Committee recommends that FMCSA refrain from requiring that all jurisdictions record “primary cause” for each crash on a PAR, as there is neither a uniform definition of primary cause nor a common understanding of how it would be distinguished from preventability, primary contributing factor, fault, root cause, etc., on a consistent basis.
         2. However, the Committee recommends that all jurisdictions capture and report all MMUCC crash data elements. These data elements will contribute to a better understanding of what happened in a crash. Specifically, the crash data elements to be captured should include but not be limited to:
            1. First harmful event.
            2. Manner of crash/collision impact.
            3. Contributing circumstances – roadway environment.
            4. Motor vehicle maneuver/action.
            5. Vehicle damage.
            6. Sequence of events.
            7. Most harmful event for this motor vehicle.
            8. Contributing circumstances – motor vehicle.
            9. Driver actions at time of crash.
         3. The Committee recommends that the MMUCC crash data elements should be updated to include a collection of information about whether underride and override is involved in a crash (see, e.g., Kentucky PAR).
      2. Discussion Notes:
         1. Crashes are complex and may involve factors outside of the scope of a PAR.
         2. Primary causes of an accident may be able to be determined on a crash site but it is important to investigate the root causes of failures that result in crashes.
            1. The Safety Management Cycle can be considered a best practice for examining this issue.
         3. The MMUCC crash data elements are designed to identify contributing factors of a crash.
         4. Based on the Committee’s analysis of State PARs, some States had a data element relating to “fault” or “cause” but this varied State by State.
         5. Adding further detail about the crash to the FMCSA MCMIS database would allow FMCSA to better understand trends relating to crashes (e.g., striking versus struck, involvement of another vehicle).
            1. MMUCC crash data elements that record the sequence of events are useful in providing information about how the crash developed.
            2. The MMUCC has about 120 crash data elements to get a wide range of information relating to the what, when, where, and who of the crash.
         6. While some Committee members would like to see fault determined on every PAR, it is not realistic because reasonable individuals may come to different conclusions or not have enough time to investigate fully on the crash scene.
         7. The safety community has concerns with determination of fault for each crash based on information less than a full crash investigation, which many States perform only in fatal crashes.
            1. The crash data elements in MMUCC are not adequate to determine fault in all cases.
            2. Moreover, past crash involvement is the best current predictor of future crashes.
         8. Some State PARS require recording of primary cause/primary contributing factor and other contributing factors:
            1. Illinois reports primary cause and other contributing factors and the law enforcement Committee member from this State approximated that those data on the PAR are 90 percent accurate. Illinois has used the data to reduce crashes.
            2. California PARs include primary contributing factor. Officers are able to make a determination based off training.
            3. South Carolina uses primary cause from PAR data to identify high crash risk corridors.
            4. States use this data to help States understand what primary crash factors are in specific corridors and those States that have it find it useful.
         9. An officer working a crash has limited time on the crash scene to determine what happened. In most cases, they can determine contributing factors at the scene.
         10. Officers with less experience may find determining primary cause of an accident challenging. This may be due to differences in training and experience across different jurisdictions.
         11. In some “no fault” States where the primary cause of a crash is not made on a PAR, a court of law makes that determination, where relevant.
         12. Some members urged for inclusion of “primary cause” or “primary contributing event” on all PARs because it would provide FMCSA with more useful information.
         13. Some members urged that jurisdictions where officers are required to report on primary cause or primary contributing factor should report that information to FMCSA.
3. **Other PAR Best Practices** (FAST Act sec. 5306(a)(2))
   1. In general, PAR data collection should seek to reduce the time and risk to the investigating police officers and the general public while maximizing the collection of accurate data.
   2. Jurisdictions should structure the PAR so that it is not up to the reporting officer to determine whether the crash meets FMCSA definition of a recordable crash.
   3. States should use data linkages (i.e., obtaining information from other databases) as much as possible.
      1. Any information that can be obtained by linkage to other data sources (e.g., registration records, VIN records), for example by the officer running the license plate, should be used because it would reduce errors by getting it from administrative sources.
      2. Connections to State databases could likely be improved.
      3. Additional funding would likely be necessary for States to improve their data systems.
   4. Electronic versus Handwritten PAR
      1. The Committee recommends that jurisdictions should adopt electronic collection of PAR data, to the extent feasible, because it enhances accuracy, completeness, and consistency. While some States (e.g., Maryland) have required mandatory electronic filing of PARs, many local jurisdictions still allow PARs to be completed by hand.
      2. The Committee encourages the use of edit checks and validation rules in the development of electronic PAR systems.

**APPENDIX A – Post-Accident Report Advisory Committee: Review of State Post-Accident Reports**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Data Element | | |
|  | Vehicle Configuration | Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW) |  |

| **State** | Passenger Car (with HM placard) | Light Truck (with HM placard) | Bus (seats for 9-15 people, including driver) | Bus (seats for >15 people, including driver) | Single-Unit Truck (2-Axle, 6-Tire) | Single-Unit Truck (3 or more axles) | Truck/ Trailer | Truck Tractor (Bobtail) | Tractor/ Semitrailer | Tractor/ Double | Tractor/ Triple | Unknown Heavy Truck > 10,000 lbs. | Other Vehicle Configuration | GVW < 10,001 lbs. | GVW Between 10,001 – 26,000 lbs. | GVW > 26,000 lbs. | Manufacturers GVWR | Actual GVWR | Other GVW Info | Number of Axles | Distance Between Axles | Primary Cause of the Accident |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AL** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Noo | | | | | | No | No | Now |
| **AK** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | Non | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| **AZ** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | No | No | No | Yes |
| **AR** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | | | Non | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| **CA** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | Non | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| **CO** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yesi | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yesl | Yesl | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | Yes |
| **CT** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | Yes |
| **DE** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | No | | | Yes | No | Yes |
| **DC** | Yes | UNKe | UNKe | UNKe | UNKe | UNKe | UNKe | UNKe | UNKe | UNKe | UNKe | UNKe | UNKe | No | | | | | | No | No | Yes |
| **FL** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yesj | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Nox |
| **GA** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yesi | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Nop | | | | | | No | No | Yes |
| **HI** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | Yes | No | No | No | No | Noz |
| **ID** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | Noz |
| **IL** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Nog | Nog | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | | | | | | Yes | No | Noaa |
| **IN** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | No | | | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **IA** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yesm | Nop | | | | | | Yes | No | Nox |
| **KS** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | No | Yess | No | No | No | Yes |
| **KY** | Yes | Yes | Nof | Nof | Nog | Nog | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | | | | | | No | No | Noaa |
| **LA** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Nop | | | | | | Yes | No | Yes |
| **ME** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | Yes |
| **MD** | Yes | Yes | Nof | Nof | Yesi | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | | | | | | No | No | Noy |
| **MA** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | Yes |
| **MI** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | Yes |
| **MN** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Not | | | | | No | No | No | Yes |
| **MS** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | No |
| **MO** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yesm | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | Noz |
| **MT** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | | | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| **NE** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Noh | Noh | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | Nobb |
| **NV** | AVTa | Yesb | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yesm | Nor | | | | | No | No | No | Nox |
| **NH** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yesm | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | Noz |
| **NJ** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | Yes |
| **NM** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | | | No | | | Yes | No | No |
| **NY** | HMOc | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | No |
| **NC** | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | | | | |  | No | No | Yes |
| **ND** | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yesk | No | | | Yes | No | Yesu | Yes | No | No |
| **OH** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| **OK** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | No | | | No | Yes | No |
| **OR** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | Yes | No | No | No | No | Nox |
| **PA** | HMOc | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | | | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
| **RI** | HMOc | HMOc | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | No |
| **SC** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yesv | Yes | | | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| **SD** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Noq | | | | | | No | No | Nox |
| **TN** | Yesb | Yesb | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | No | | | No | No | Nox |
| **TX** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Nop | | | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| **UT** | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | | | No | No | No |
| **VT** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Nop | | | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| **VA** | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | | | Yes | No | No | No | No | Now |
| **WA** | No | No | Nof | Nof | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | | | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Now |
| **WV** | WHPd | WHPd | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | | | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| **WI** | AVTa | Yes | Nof | Nof | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Nop | | | | | | Yes | No | Noz |
| **WY** | Yes | Yes | Nof | Nof | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | | | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Now |

a AVP = Asks Vehicle Type

b Yes – If Hauling HM

c HMO = Hazmat Only

d WHP = With Hazmat Placard

e UNK = No code available in Vehicle Type box

f Bus only – No breakdown in number of passengers

g Just “Single-Unit”

h No – has weight

i 2-axle, no tire number

j 2 axle & GVWR > 10,000 lbs.

k Dry Bulk Cargo Tank, Liquid Bulk Cargo Tank, Gasoline Bulk Cargo Tank

l Other – Describe in narrative

m Cargo body type is requested

n Could be decoded

o Free text for “Weight Rating of Power Unit of Truck”

p Free text field for GVWR

q Free text field for GVWR and GCWR

r Power unit – GVWR

s “Actual Weight”

t Not on 2003 version but present before

u Field for GCWR

v Asks for trailer length and width

w Field for primary contributing circumstances/factor

x Field for first harmful event

y Field for harmful event

z Field for actions/events

aa Field for contributing factors/circumstances/causes

bb Field for most harmful event

1. See Traffic Records Team, NHTSA, “DOT Proposed Changes to MMUCC” (May 6, 2016), *available at* <http://www.ghsa.org/html/resources/tr/mmuccupdate.html> (last accessed Dec. 7, 2016). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)