DataQs State Implementation Plan

California

For Compliance with Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) Revised Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) Grant Requirements

Date: September 2026

Purpose

In April 2026, FMCSA announced updated requirements for State participation in the DataQs system as a condition of receiving MCSAP grant funding. To comply with those requirements, each State must submit a DataQs State Implementation Plan. The following pages contain the key elements of the plan approved by FMCSA for California.

DataQs State Implementation Plan

State: California

MCSAP Lead Agency: California Highway Patrol

Initial Review Process

Roles and Responsibilities

- Persons responsible for managing DataQs for the organization
  - ***Responsible Party:***
    Analyst I, Analyst II, Information Technology Associate, Officer, Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain
  - ***Supervisor(s):***
    <*intentionally left blank*>
  - ***Backups:***
    <*intentionally left blank*>
  - ***Interactions:***
    <*intentionally left blank*>
- Person(s) responsible for decision-making for the Initial Review process
  - ***Responsible Party:***
    Analyst I, Analyst II, Information Technology Associate, Officer*
    *California Highway Patrol utilizes a structured multi-tier process to ensure all DataQ challenges receive a fair and impartial review. The Inspecting Officer or professional staff member that conducted the inspection shall not be involved or responsible for decision-making in the initial review process.
  - ***Supervisor(s):***
    <*intentionally left blank*>
  - ***Backups:***
    <*intentionally left blank*>
  - ***Interactions:***
    <*intentionally left blank*>
- Person(s) consulted for additional information or evidence
  - ***Responsible Party:***
    Analyst II, Officer, Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, Commercial Enforcement Program Subject Matter Experts, Court Officials, Allied agencies, Department

of Motor Vehicles, CVSA, FMCSA division office, departmental commercial enforcement personnel.

- ***Supervisor(s):***
  <intentionally left blank>
- ***Backups:***
  <intentionally left blank>
- ***Interactions:***
  <intentionally left blank>

Process Description

- Receipt of RDR
  - ***Responsible Party:***
    Analyst I, Information Technology Associate
  - ***Process:***
    All RDRs are triaged and routed by the Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate
- Review of RDR
  - ***Responsible Party:***
    Analyst I, Analyst II, Information Technology Associate, Officer
  - ***Process:***
    Processes by type for review are as follows:

    Inspection – Report Request: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. Confirm requestor is a validated motor carrier or motor carrier service provider for involved company.
    Inspection – Incorrect Information: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate on a case-by-case basis.
    Inspection – Incorrect Violation: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review.
    Inspection – Duplicate Record: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate on a case-by-case basis.
    Inspection – Incorrect Driver: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review.

Inspection – Incorrect Carrier: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review.

Inspection – Citation with Associated Violation: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate on a case-by-case basis. Court minutes or court disposition containing applicable information is required for submission. Receipts required for amended adjudicated results requiring fines or fees paid to the court. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review.

Inspection – Missing Record: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate to confirm cause or source of missing record.

Crash – Incorrect Information: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II for review.

Crash – Incorrect Driver: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II for review.

Crash – Incorrect Carrier: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II for review.

Crash – Duplicate Record: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II for review.

Crash – Not Reportable: Request is reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. Reportability is determined by four criteria. These criteria are when the collision involves: a fatality, an injury requiring transportation at the scene, a disabled vehicle requiring a tow, or hazardous materials. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II for review.

Crash – Not Preventable: Request is reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

Crash – Missing Record: Reviewed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate to confirm cause or source of missing record.

- Outcome of RDR
    - ***Responsible Party:***
      Analyst I, Analyst II, Information Technology Associate, Officer
    - ***Process:***
      Outcome activity by type are as follows:
      Inspection – Report Request: Upon confirmation, send report. If requestor is not one of the classifications above, request is denied and provided with follow up information.
      Inspection – Incorrect Information: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.
      Inspection – Incorrect Violation: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.
      Inspection – Duplicate Record: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Inspection – Incorrect Driver: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Inspection – Incorrect Carrier: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Inspection – Citation with Associated Violation: If request and information is deemed to be valid, adjudicated results entered to SafeSpect by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Inspection – Missing Record: Condition is corrected if applicable. Record is confirmed restored by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

Crash – Incorrect Information: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Incorrect Driver: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Incorrect Carrier: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Duplicate Record: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Not Reportable: Information is corrected by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Analyst II/Officer for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Not Preventable: Type is an automatic denial if confirmed as a request for review of preventability. If confirmed, submitter is referred to Crash Preventability Determination Program by the Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. RDRs are reviewed by FMCSA and not the individual states, submitter will need to submit a request directly to FMCSA.

Crash – Missing Record: Condition is corrected if applicable. Record is confirmed restored by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

- Closure of RDR
    - ***Responsible Party:***

Analyst I, Analyst II, Information Technology Associate

- ***Process:***

  Closure activity by type are as follows:

  Inspection – Report Request: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

  Inspection – Incorrect Information: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

  Inspection – Incorrect Violation: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

  Inspection – Duplicate Record: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

  Inspection – Incorrect Driver: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

  Inspection – Incorrect Carrier: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

  Inspection – Citation with Associated Violation: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

  Inspection – Missing Record: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

  Crash – Incorrect Information: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

  Crash – Incorrect Driver: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

  Crash – Incorrect Carrier: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

  Crash – Duplicate Record: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information

Technology Associate.

Crash – Not Reportable: Report Request: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

Crash – Not Preventable: Report Request: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

- Timeliness:
  Open RDR within 7 days of submission of original request
  Respond to initial review within 21 days

Expected Outcomes for RDR Closures:

Possible outcomes for a closed RDR are as follows:

Closed—No Data Correction Made: Response sent through Data-Q portal outlining reason for denial. Drivers: Incorrect request type, incorrect data in request, insufficient/fraudulent documentation submitted to substantiate request, appropriate regulatory application by inspector, insufficient explanation for request from submitter, no basis for request.

Closed—Data Correction Made: Corrections made to record in either Iteris Inspect or SafeSpect. Approval response sent through Data-Q portal. Drivers: Sufficient documentation submitted to substantiate claim, inspector error, misapplication of regulation.

Closed—Citation Results Entered: Adjudicated results entered into SafeSpect. Violation is not removed. Approval response sent through Data-Q portal. Drivers: Sufficient documentation submitted to substantiate request.

Closed—Report Not Sent: Denial response sent through Data-Q portal with instructions for requestor to become validated. Drivers: Unvalidated requestor, incorrect report number.

Closed—Report Sent: Report uploaded and sent through Data-Q portal. Drivers: Requestor shown to have standing to receive report.

Closed—No Requestor Response: Request for additional information or documentation has been sent to requestor through Data-Q portal with no response from response from requestor. Drivers: System closure, no applicable decision drivers.

Communication:

All communications to be conducted through the Data-Q portal. Make contact with submitter within 7 days to update progress of RDR. Notations will be made through the Data-Q portal to include any phone calls or emails received concerning RDRs.

Next Steps:

Instructions for next step actions for RDRs (if applicable) will read as follows:
Your Request for Data Review (RDR) has been closed. If applicable, any changes to the inspection report and related Safety Measurement System (SMS)/Compliance, Safety, and Accountability (CSA) scores could take up to 60 days to be reflected on your carrier profile. Further information on this process can be found here:
https://csa.fmcsa.dot.gov/HelpCenter/GetFAQById/30897.
If you would like to submit a request for data review – reconsideration, you may:
1. Click on "My DataQs" from the main DataQs page. DO NOT OPEN A NEW REQUEST.
2. Scroll down to “Monitor an Existing Request”.
3. Search for your request and click “Search”.
4. Change the request status to “Pending Agency Review”.
5. Submit your response.

If you need assistance with this new entry, you can call (877) 688-2984, visit https://dataqs.fmcsa.dot.gov/HelpCenter/Topics, or email us at cadataq@chp.ca.gov.

Reconsideration Review Process

Roles and Responsibilities

- Person(s) responsible for decision-making for the Reconsideration Review process
  - ***Responsible Party:***
    Analyst II**, Information Technology Associate**, Officer**, Sergeant

    **The Officers and professional staff responsible for decision-making during the Reconsideration Review process shall not be involved in the inspection or initial DataQ review. This is to ensure an independent and impartial review.
  - ***Supervisor(s):***
    <intentionally left blank>
  - ***Backups:***
    <intentionally left blank>

- **_Interactions:_**
  <_intentionally left blank_>
- Person(s) consulted for additional information or evidence
  - **_Responsible Party:_**
    Analyst II, Officer, Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, Commercial Enforcement Program Subject Matter Experts, Court Officials, Allied agencies, Department of Motor Vehicles, CVSA, FMCSA division office, departmental commercial enforcement personnel.
  - **_Supervisor(s):_**
    <_intentionally left blank_>
  - **_Backups:_**
    <_intentionally left blank_>
  - **_Interactions:_**
    <_intentionally left blank_>
- Person(s) convening a panel or committee
  - **_Responsible Party:_**
    Panel will only be convened for final reviews.
  - **_Supervisor(s):_**
    <_intentionally left blank_>
  - **_Backups:_**
    <_intentionally left blank_>
  - **_Interactions:_**
    <_intentionally left blank_>
  - **_Panel members' titles and associations:_**
    <_intentionally left blank_>

Escalation Procedures:

RDRs are escalated to the Reconsideration level by the Analyst I and/or the Information Technology Associate when they are resubmitted for a second review by the requestor. If the requestor introduces entirely new, unrequested, and relevant information or evidence that was not evaluated during the Initial Review, the Reconsideration reviewer will not decide the appeal based on the new evidence. Instead, the RDR will be routed back to the Initial Review process to ensure a complete evaluation of the record.

Process Description

- Review of RDR
  - **_Responsible Party:_**
    Analyst I, Information Technology Associate

- *Process:*
  Triage RDRs by reviewing submitter's responses and route to appropriate subject matter expert or unit within the MCSAP lead agency.

- Outcome of RDR
  - ***Responsible Party:***
    Analyst II, Information Technology Associate, Officer, Sergeant
  - ***Process:***
    Outcome activity by type are as follows:
    Inspection – Report Request: Upon confirmation, Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate sends report. If requestor is not one of the classifications above, request is denied and provided with follow up information.
    Inspection – Incorrect Information: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst II, Information Technology Associate and/or Officer. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Officer/Sergeant for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.
    Inspection – Incorrect Violation: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst II, Information Technology Associate and/or Officer. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Officer/Sergeant for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.
    Inspection – Duplicate Record: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst II and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Sergeant for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.
    Inspection – Incorrect Driver: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst II and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Sergeant for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be

requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Inspection – Incorrect Carrier: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst II and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Officer/Sergeant for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Inspection – Citation with Associated Violation: If request and information is deemed to be valid, adjudicated results entered to SafeSpect by Analyst II. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Sergeant for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Inspection – Missing Record: Condition is corrected if applicable. Record is confirmed restored by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

Crash – Incorrect Information: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst II and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Sergeant for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Incorrect Driver: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst II and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Sergeant for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Incorrect Carrier: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst II and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Sergeant for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Duplicate Record: If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected by Analyst II and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Sergeant for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Not Reportable: Information is corrected by Analyst II and/or Information Technology Associate. If request needs further review it is forwarded to Sergeant for review. If request and information is later deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Not Preventable: Type is an automatic denial if confirmed as a request for review of preventability. If confirmed, submitter is referred to Crash Preventability Determination Program. RDRs are reviewed by FMCSA and not the individual states, submitter will need to submit a request directly to FMCSA.

Crash – Missing Record: Condition is corrected if applicable. Record is confirmed restored by Analyst II and/or Information Technology Associate.

- Closure of RDR
    - ***Responsible Party:***
      Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate
    - ***Process:***
      Reconsideration decision from reviewer is returned to the Analyst I or the Information Technology Associate to submit on behalf of the reviewer.
- Timeliness:
  Open RDR within 7 days of submission of request
  Respond to reconsideration review within 21 days

Expected Outcomes for RDR Closures:

Possible outcomes for a closed RDR are as follows:

Closed—No Data Correction Made: Response sent through Data-Q portal outlining reason for denial. Drivers: Incorrect request type, incorrect data in request, insufficient/fraudulent documentation submitted to substantiate request, appropriate regulatory application by inspector, insufficient explanation for request from submitter, no basis for request.

Closed—Data Correction Made: Corrections made to record in either Iteris Inspect or SafeSpect. Approval response sent through Data-Q portal. Drivers: Sufficient documentation submitted to substantiate claim, inspector error, misapplication of regulation.

Closed—Citation Results Entered: Adjudicated results entered into SafeSpect. Violation is not removed. Approval response sent through Data-Q portal. Drivers: Sufficient documentation submitted to substantiate request.

Closed—Report Not Sent: Denial response sent through Data-Q portal with instructions for requestor to become validated. Drivers: Unvalidated requestor, incorrect report number.

Closed—Report Sent: Report uploaded and sent through Data-Q portal. Drivers: Requestor shown to have standing to receive report.

Closed—No Requestor Response: Request for additional information or documentation has been sent to requestor through Data-Q portal with no response from requestor. Drivers: System closure, no applicable decision drivers.

Communication:

All communications to be conducted through the Data-Q portal. Make contact with submitter within 7 days to update progress of RDR. Notations will be made through the Data-Q portal to include any phone calls or emails received concerning RDRs.

Next Steps:

Instructions for next step actions for RDRs (if applicable) will read as follows:
Your Request for Data Review (RDR) has been closed. If applicable, any changes to the inspection report and related Safety Measurement System (SMS)/Compliance, Safety, and Accountability (CSA) scores could take up to 60 days to be reflected on your carrier profile. Further information on this process can be found here: https://csa.fmcsa.dot.gov/HelpCenter/GetFAQById/30897.
If you would like to submit a request for data review – final, you may:

1. Click on "My DataQs" from the main DataQs page. DO NOT OPEN A NEW REQUEST.
2. Scroll down to “Monitor an Existing Request”.
3. Search for your request and click “Search”.
4. Change the request status to “Pending Agency Review”.
5. Submit your response.

If you need assistance with this new entry, you can call (877) 688-2984, visit https://dataqs.fmcsa.dot.gov/HelpCenter/Topics, or email us at cadataq@chp.ca.gov.

Final Review Process

Roles and Responsibilities

- Person(s) responsible for decision-making for the Final Review process
    - ***Responsible Party:***
      Panel containing Lieutenant, Captain, subject matter expert*** chosen from departmental commercial enforcement personnel.

      ***The subject matter expert chosen for the final review process shall not be any of the Sergeants, Officers, or professional staff involved in the inspection, initial and/or reconsideration review process.
    - ***Supervisor(s):***
      <intentionally left blank>
    - ***Backups:***
      <intentionally left blank>
    - ***Interactions:***
      <intentionally left blank>
- Person(s) consulted for additional information or evidence
    - ***Responsible Party:***
      Analyst II, Officer, Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, Commercial Enforcement Program Subject Matter Experts, Court Officials, Allied agencies, Department of Motor Vehicles, CVSA, FMCSA division office, subject matter expert chosen from departmental commercial enforcement personnel.
    - ***Supervisor(s):***
      <intentionally left blank>
    - ***Backups:***
      <intentionally left blank>
    - ***Interactions:***
      <intentionally left blank>
- Person(s) convening a panel or committee
    - ***Responsible Party:***
      Review panel consisting of: Lieutenant, Captain, subject matter expert selected from departmental commercial enforcement personnel.

- ***Supervisor(s):***
  <intentionally left blank>
- ***Backups:***
  <intentionally left blank>
- ***Interactions:***
  <intentionally left blank>
- ***Panel members' titles and associations:***
  <intentionally left blank>

Escalation Procedures:

RDRs are escalated to the Final level by the Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate when they are resubmitted for a third and final review by the requestor. The Final Review decision-maker or panel may request additional information relevant and material to the appeal. If the requested information is provided, the RDR remains in a Final Review. If entirely new, unrequested, and relevant evidence is introduced by the requestor at this stage, the request must be routed back to the Initial Review process.

Process Description

- Review of RDR
  - ***Responsible Party:***
    Analyst I, Information Technology Associate
  - ***Process:***
    All RDRs are received, triaged, and routed by the Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate. Processes by type for review are as follows:

    Inspection – Report Request: Confirm requestor is a validated motor carrier or motor carrier service provider for involved company.
    Inspection – Incorrect Information: Reviewed by MCSAP Panel on a case-by-case basis.
    Inspection – Incorrect Violation: Reviewed by MCSAP Panel on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required.
    Inspection – Duplicate Record: Reviewed by Sergeant on a case-by-case basis.
    Inspection – Incorrect Driver: Reviewed by Sergeant on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required. If request needs further review it is forwarded to MCSAP Panel for review.

Inspection – Incorrect Carrier: Reviewed by MCSAP Panel on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required.

Inspection – Citation with Associated Violation: Reviewed by MCSAP Panel on a case-by-case basis. Court minutes or court disposition containing applicable information is required for submission.

Inspection – Missing Record: Reviewed by Sergeant to confirm cause or source of missing record.

Crash – Incorrect Information: Reviewed by MCSAP Panel on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required.

Crash – Incorrect Driver: Reviewed by Sergeant on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required. If request needs further review it is forwarded to MCSAP Panel for review.

Crash – Incorrect Carrier: Reviewed by MCSAP Panel on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required.

Crash – Duplicate Record: Reviewed by Sergeant on a case-by-case basis. Any pertinent documentation to substantiate submitter's claim is required. If request needs further review it is forwarded to MCSAP Panel for review.

Crash – Not Reportable: Request is reviewed by Sergeant. Reportability is determined by four criteria. These criteria are when the collision involves: a fatality, an injury requiring transportation at the scene, a disabled vehicle requiring a tow, or hazardous materials. If request needs further review it is forwarded to MCSAP Panel for review.

Crash – Not Preventable: Request is reviewed by Sergeant.

Crash – Missing Record: Reviewed by Sergeant to confirm cause or source of missing record.

- Outcome of RDR
  - ***Responsible Party:***
    Lieutenant, Captain, subject matter expert selected from departmental commercial enforcement personnel.
  - ***Process:***
    Outcome activity by type are as follows:
    Inspection – Report Request: Upon confirmation, send report. If requestor is not one of the classifications above, request is denied and provided with follow up information.
    Inspection – Incorrect Information: Request is forwarded to MCSAP Panel for final review. If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.
    Inspection – Incorrect Violation: Request is forwarded to MCSAP Panel for final review. If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.
    Inspection – Duplicate Record: Request is forwarded to Sergeant for final review.
    Inspection – Incorrect Driver: Request is forwarded to MCSAP Panel for final review. If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.
    Inspection – Incorrect Carrier: Request is forwarded to MCSAP Panel for final review. If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.
    Inspection – Citation with Associated Violation: Request is forwarded to MCSAP Panel for final review. If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.
    Inspection – Missing Record: Condition is corrected if applicable. Record is confirmed restored by Analyst I.
    Crash – Incorrect Information: Request is forwarded to Sergeant for final review. If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is

corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Incorrect Driver: Request is forwarded to Sergeant for final review. If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Incorrect Carrier: Request is forwarded to Sergeant for final review. If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Duplicate Record: Request is forwarded to Sergeant for final review. If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Not Reportable: Request is forwarded to Sergeant for final review. If request and information is deemed to be valid, information is corrected. If submitted information is insufficient, further information will be requested. If submitted information is deemed invalid, no change will be made.

Crash – Not Preventable: Type is an automatic denial if confirmed as a request for review of preventability. If confirmed, submitter is referred to Crash Preventability Determination Program. RDRs are reviewed by FMCSA and not the individual states, submitter will need to submit a request directly to FMCSA.

Crash – Missing Record: Condition is corrected if applicable. Record is confirmed restored by Analyst I.

- Closure of RDR
  - ***Responsible Party:***

    Analyst I, Analyst II, Information Technology Associate
  - ***Process:***

    Closure activity by type are as follows:

    Inspection – Report Request: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

    Inspection – Incorrect Information: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

    Inspection – Incorrect Violation: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

    Inspection – Duplicate Record: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information

Technology Associate.
Inspection – Incorrect Driver: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.
Inspection – Incorrect Carrier: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.
Inspection – Citation with Associated Violation: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.
Inspection – Missing Record: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.
Crash – Incorrect Information: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.
Crash – Incorrect Driver: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.
Crash – Incorrect Carrier: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.
Crash – Duplicate Record: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.
Crash – Not Reportable: Report Request: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.
Crash – Not Preventable: Report Request: RDR Closed by Analyst I and/or Information Technology Associate.

- Timeliness:
  Open RDR within 7 days of submission of request
  Respond to final review within 45 days

Expected Outcomes for RDR Closures:

Possible outcomes for a closed RDR are as follows:

Closed—No Data Correction Made: Response sent through Data-Q portal outlining reason for denial. Drivers: Incorrect request type, incorrect data in request, insufficient/fraudulent documentation submitted to substantiate request, appropriate regulatory application by inspector, insufficient explanation for request from submitter, no basis for request.

Closed—Data Correction Made: Corrections made to record in either Iteris Inspect or SafeSpect. Approval response sent through Data-Q portal. Drivers: Sufficient documentation submitted to substantiate claim, inspector error, misapplication of regulation.

Closed—Citation Results Entered: Adjudicated results entered into SafeSpect. Violation is not removed. Approval response sent through Data-Q portal. Drivers: Sufficient documentation submitted to substantiate request.

Closed—Report Not Sent: Denial response sent through Data-Q portal with instructions for requestor to become validated. Drivers: Unvalidated requestor, incorrect report number.

Closed—Report Sent: Report uploaded and sent through Data-Q portal. Drivers: Requestor shown to have standing to receive report.

Closed—No Requestor Response: Request for additional information or documentation has been sent to requestor through Data-Q portal with no response from response from requestor. Drivers: System closure, no applicable decision drivers.

Communication:

All communications to be conducted through the Data-Q portal. Make contact with submitter within 7 days to update progress of RDR. Notations will be made through the Data-Q portal to include any phone calls or emails received concerning RDRs.

Next Steps:

Information regarding closure of RDRs for final review will read as follows:
Your Request for Data Review (RDR) has been closed. If applicable, any changes to the inspection report and related Safety Measurement System (SMS)/Compliance, Safety, and Accountability (CSA) scores could take up to 60 days to be reflected on your carrier profile. Further information on this process can be found here:
https://csa.fmcsa.dot.gov/HelpCenter/GetFAQById/30897.
You are permitted an initial review, a reconsideration review, and a final review. This was the final review consideration for this report. No further reviews will be conducted for this inspection report. Disregard for the state's approved review process will result in closure of the Data-Q with no data corrections made.

If you any further questions regarding the Data-Q system, you can call (877) 688-2984, visit https://dataqs.fmcsa.dot.gov/HelpCenter/Topics, or email us at cadataq@chp.ca.gov.