

DataQs State Implementation Plan



Connecticut

**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 Connecticut.

DataQs State Implementation Plan

State: Connecticut

MCSAP Lead Agency: State of Connecticut Department of Motor Vehicles
Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Division (CVSD)

Initial Review Process

Roles and Responsibilities

- Persons responsible for managing DataQs for the organization
 - **Responsible Party:**
CVSD New Entrant Sergeant
 - **Supervisor(s):**
CVSD MCSAP Coordinator Lieutenant
 - **Backups:**
CVSD Hybrid Unit Sergeant and CVSD Truck Operations Lieutenant
 - **Interactions:**
The State of Connecticut has two agencies that conduct inspections under the MCSAP program. The Connecticut Department of Motor Vehicles Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Division (CVSD) is the lead MCSAP agency who certify additional units in the Connecticut State Police through their Traffic Services Unit, (TSU).
MCSAP civilian staff download DataQ's weekly and separate by agency, CVSD and State Police Traffic Enforcement Unit (TSU). Civilian MCSAP staff handle crash data, missing reports, and adjudicated citations for both agencies. The initial inspection DATAQ's are handled by the appropriate agency that conducted the initial inspection report. CT DMV overseas CSP TSU completion of DataQs to maintain timeliness and program compliance.
- Person(s) responsible for decision-making for the Initial Review process
 - **Responsible Party:**
The CVSD Sergeant in direct line of supervision of the officer who conducted the initial inspection report. The CVSD New Entrant Sergeant coordinates all RDRs beyond the civilian MCSAP level and coordinates those responses with the Sergeant of the issuing officer.
 - **Supervisor(s):**
CVSD MCSAP Coordinator Lieutenant

- **Backups:**
CVSD Truck Operations Lieutenant
- **Interactions:**
Unit Sergeants coordinate RDR responses with one another including providing support and information to TSU completing RDRs. Sergeants use all available state and federal data bases, body camera evidence and interviews with the inspection officer, witnesses, motor carriers and commercial motor vehicle driver if applicable. The Sergeant can use means they determine to be necessary to remain fair and impartial to review and investigate the DATAQ.
- Person(s) consulted for additional information or evidence
 - **Responsible Party:**
Agency policies and procedures, FMCSR's, CVSA inspection training, agency instructors, subject matter experts, extensive body worn and dash camera footage, inspect digital evidence saved from the initial inspection, preserved ELOGs, evidence provided by the carrier, DMV legal division, and any other resource deemed appropriate for information to assist the investigation that is readily available.
 - **Supervisor(s):**
CVSD MCSAP Coordinator Lieutenant
 - **Backups:**
Hybrid Unit Sergeant and CVSD Truck Operations Lieutenant
 - **Interactions:**
CVSD Unit Sergeants coordinate RDR responses with one another, CSP RDR sergeants, and applicable MCSAP civilian staff.

Process Description

- Receipt of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
New Entrant Sergeant including unit assigned civilian staff.
 - **Process:**
CVSD civilian staff first confirms the identity of all RDR requesters to the records to confirm RDR validity weekly upon receipt. CVSD civilian staff will then download the RDRs in the FMCSA portal and categorize them within an excel spreadsheet based on type of RDR weekly (to maintain timeline of seven days or less):
Adjudicated Citation
Crash Reports

Lost/missing report

Inspection Reports

Inspection Report RDRs are then broken down by supervisory units of the issuing officer into the following groups: CSP TSU, PVI, Dealer, East Truck, West Truck, and Hybrid. Within these unit groups the RDRs are then separated type: wrong carrier, incorrect violation, wrong driver, and incorrect information.

Copy of report request, citation adjunction and crash records are handed by MCSAP civilian personnel within seven days of submission. Inspection report RDRs are sent to the supervising sergeant of the original inspection report officer as listed above.

- Review of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
New Entrant Sergeant and assigned civilian staff in coordination with unit Sergeants of issuing officers as defined in RDR receipt process.
 - **Process:**
The DataQs are sorted by type of RDR: wrong driver, wrong carrier, incorrect violation, wrong information, copy of report, crash record, and adjudicated citation. Copy of report request, citation adjunction and crash records are handed by MCSAP civilian personnel. Inspection report RDRs are broken down by unit of issuing officer. These assigned unit Sergeants review each RDR and utilize all available tools to decide an outcome. Unit Sergeants review the inspection, review body worn camera footage available, examine all evidence provided in the RDR from the requester, review all evidence preserved by the issuing officer, review FMCSRs and CVSA materials to determine if a change should be made on the inspection report or if the RDR requester needs to provide more information/evidence. The Unit Sergeant will then make a decision based on their research, evidence, and training.
- Outcome of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
Assigned unit Sergeant in conjunction with New Entrant Unit Sergeant and/or assigned civilian staff
 - **Process:**
Assigned Unit Investigating Sergeant will make a clear decision on the RDR closure based on evidence (or lack thereof), Body Worn camera evidence, FMCSRs, and CVSA standards. The Assigned Unit Investigating Sergeant will make any changes needed to the record in SAFSPECT and communicate that

change in their response with action taken in the FMCSA DataQ portal. The RDR response will also include information on how to request the RDR be moved to the reconsideration phase if they are not satisfied with their closure.

- Closure of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
Assigned Unit Investigating Sergeant assigned to initial review in conjunction with the New Entrant Unit in charge of the RDR process.
 - **Process:**
Adjudicated citation, crash record, or report request closures shall identify any changes made to the record, document the reason for the closure, provide information related to regulation, if a report is included, or evidence reviewed. Inspection RDR closures will identify the action taken and provide a detailed explanation as to the reason for the outcome.
- Timeliness:
The following timetable is the best practice as outlined and described in the Department of Transportation Federal Register Volume 90. No 124 dated July 1, 2025.
CVSD staff will open an RDR within seven days (7) of submission. The status of the RDR would then change from “New” to “Open—In Review.”

CVSD must respond to the RDR, either to request additional information or communicate a decision, within twenty-one (21) days of submission.

If CVSD requests additional information from the requestor, CVSD staff will allow the full fourteen-day response period. These fourteen (14) days do not impact the timeline for CVSD’s review. The clock will stop while the requestor gathers additional information and will restart if the requestor responds to the CVSD.

If the requestor does not respond, the system will close the request with the status “Closed—No Requestor Response.” A request that is reopened after being closed for no response will be reviewed at the level it was closed and not escalated.

Each RDR closed with the status “Closed—No Data Correction Made” will adequately explain the facts and analysis supporting the decision.

Each response will contain the following information:

Link to our State’s approved DataQs Implementation Plan

Decision-maker (name and title)

List of evidence reviewed

Decision; Specific reason(s) for decision

Next steps/directions for more information (RDR Reconsideration process).

Expected Outcomes for RDR Closures:

Closed—No Data Correction Made: The request has been closed and the data will not be corrected. The DataQ was reviewed and the evidence substantiated the violation was correct including following the review process as defined in the DataQ Analyst Guide.

Closed—Data Correction Made: The request has been closed and the data will be corrected. The DataQ was reviewed and the evidence substantiated the violation was incorrect and the violation was removed, or the regulation corrected to the proper regulation following the FMCSA DataQ Analyst Guide.

Closed—Citation Results Entered: The request has been closed and the violation will be appended to reflect the outcome of the citation following the FMCSA DataQ Analyst Guide.

Closed—Report Not Sent: The request has been closed, but the requested inspection report was not sent. This could occur if the DataQ was incorrectly assigned to the wrong agency or if the request was not validated as outlined in the FMCSA DataQ Analyst Guide.

Each outcome will provide with the following information:

Link to our State's approved DataQ's State Implementation Plan

Decision-maker (name and title)

List of evidence reviewed

Decision including specific reason(s) for decision

Next steps for the submitter, including how to appeal the decision (RDR Reconsideration process)

Closed—Report Sent: The request has been closed and the agency sent the report. The agency may have faxed or uploaded the report to DataQ's or it may have sent the report directly via email or postal mail.

Closed—No Requestor Response: The request was closed because the requestor did not respond, no additional response is required for this response.

Communication:

Standard templates containing detailed information on DataQ process, if a review requires more time for investigation, review process and reconsideration process. Communication to submitter must be completed through the DataQ portal.

Next Steps:

Continued updates during view and final notification on the results of the review with the factors and evidence used for the determined outcome. Submitters will be advised of the reason for closure and provide the agency template for the RDR reconsideration process including the decision maker name, title, list of evidence reviewed and agency contact information.

Reconsideration Review Process

Roles and Responsibilities

- Person(s) responsible for decision-making for the Reconsideration Review process
 - **Responsible Party:**
CVSD MCSAP Coordinator Lieutenant
 - **Supervisor(s):**
CTDMVCVSD Captain and CTDMVCVSD Chief of Department
 - **Backups:**
CVSD Truck Team Operations Lieutenant
 - **Interactions:**
Lieutenants will use all available state and federal data bases, body camera evidence and interviews with the inspection officer, witnesses, motor carriers and commercial motor vehicle driver if applicable. The reviewer will use any means they determine to be necessary to remain fair and impartial to review and investigate the DATAQ.
- Person(s) consulted for additional information or evidence
 - **Responsible Party:**
CVSD Truck operations Lieutenant, Training Lieutenant, CMV Instructors, CVSD Captain, FMCSA, and TSU Lieutenant.
 - **Supervisor(s):**
CVSD Chief
 - **Backups:**
CVSD Captain
 - **Interactions:**
Lieutenants will use all available state and federal data bases, body camera evidence and interviews with the inspection officer, witnesses, motor carriers and commercial motor vehicle driver if applicable. The reviewer will

use any means they determine to be necessary to remain fair and impartial to review and investigate the DATAQ.

- Person(s) convening a panel or committee
 - **Responsible Party:**
CVSD MCSAP Coordinator Lieutenant
 - **Supervisor(s):**
CVSD Captain
 - **Backups:**
CVSD Chief
 - **Interactions:**
Lieutenants will use all available state and federal data bases, body camera evidence and interviews with the inspection officer, witnesses, motor carriers and commercial motor vehicle driver if applicable. The reviewer will use any means they determine to be necessary to remain fair and impartial to review and investigate the DATAQ.
 - **Panel members' titles and associations:**
CVSD MCSAP LT, Truck Operations LT, Training LT, and applicable agency instructors.

Escalation Procedures:

After all previous steps of the review were independently conducted and the submitted still requests a final review the state will escalate the DataQ to the reconsideration phase so long as the RDR is determined to be valid and not a fictitious or false representation in an attempt to improve safety scoring.

Process Description

- Review of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
CVSD MCSAP Coordinator Lieutenant
 - **Process:**
At the reconsideration phase the DataQ with all evidence used by the initial reviewer will be evaluated by one of the CTDMVCVSD Lieutenants who is not in the direct chain of command as the issuing officer.
- Outcome of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
CVSD MCSAP Coordinator Lieutenant
 - **Process:**

Review of initial DataQ and all previous review steps prior to reconsideration phase. Review all related documents and evidence used in each of the review steps and analyze what data sources were not utilized in the initial review process. Document and research any unused data source and cross reference initial RDR closure.

- Closure of RDR

- **Responsible Party:**

- CVSD MCSAP LT, Truck Operations LT, or Training LT.

- **Process:**

- Review of initial DataQ and all previous review steps prior to reconsideration phase. Review all related documents and evidence used in each of the review steps. Peer review and consultation if needed for independent review from CVSD command staff. Cross reference materials not considered in initial RDR review. Reference FMCSRs and CVSA inspection standards. Determine if closure should be altered from original closure and alter records if needed. Document closure reasoning and any actions taken if applicable.

- Timeliness:

The RDR Reconsideration process is applicable to requests that received a full review and a decision during the Initial Review phase, and the requestor is seeking an additional level of review. It would not include requests that are closed due to lack of information, or those reopened without a valid reason. CTDMVCVSD must open a RDR Reconsideration request within seven (7) days of the request. As in the Initial Review process, if the CTDMVCVSD requests additional information from the requestor during the RDR Reconsideration, the requestor has fourteen (14) days to provide the information. These fourteen (14) days do not impact the timeline for the CTDMVCVSD review. The clock will stop while the requestor gathers additional information and will restart if the requestor responds to the CTDMVCVSD. If the requestor does not respond, the system will close the request with the status “Closed—No Requestor Response.”

CTDMVCVSD must reach a decision and communicate it to the submitter within twenty-one (21) days. The RDR Reconsideration must be reviewed and decided by a person or panel with appropriate subject matter expertise within the MCSAP Lead Agency. The RDR Reconsideration must not be reviewed or decided by the issuing officer or inspector, nor a direct supervisor of the issuing officer or inspector. Legal review should be incorporated, where applicable.

Each RDR Reconsideration closed with the status “Closed—No Data Correction Made” will adequately explain the facts and analysis supporting the decision. Responses will contain the following information: Decision-maker (name and title); Description of evidence reviewed; Decision; Specific reason(s) for decision; and Next steps/directions for more information Final Review process.

RDR Reconsideration Requests the burden of proof remains with the requester. Requests to remove or modify information that negatively impacts the requester or others will not be successful without factual and/or legal justification of why the information is incorrect or incomplete by providing documentation supporting the request when necessary.

Unsubstantiated requests may be returned to the requester for more information or closed with no action taken. Requests that are closed for no response from the requester will not be deemed a substantive decision by the State and may be reopened once a sufficient response is received.

Requesters must address CVSD’s factual and/or legal basis for the decision and explain why the requestor believes the decision to be incorrect, with submission of additional documentation supporting the request when necessary.

Expected Outcomes for RDR Closures:

Closed—No Data Correction Made: The request has been closed and the data will not be corrected. The DataQ was reviewed and the evidence substantiated the violation was correct including following the review process as defined in the DataQ Analyst Guide.

Closed—Data Correction Made: The request has been closed and the data will be corrected. The DataQ was reviewed and the evidence substantiated the violation was incorrect and the violation was removed, or the regulation corrected to the proper regulation following the FMCSA DataQ Analyst Guide.

Closed—Citation Results Entered: The request has been closed and the violation will be appended to reflect the outcome of the citation following the FMCSA DataQ Analyst Guide.

Each outcome will provide with the following information:

Link to our State’s approved DataQ’s State Implementation Plan

Decision-maker (name and title)

List of evidence reviewed

Decision including specific reason(s) for decision

Next steps for the submitter, including how to appeal the decision (RDR Reconsideration process)

Closed—No Requestor Response: The request was closed because the requestor did not respond, no additional response is required for this response.

Communication:

Standard templates containing detailed information on DataQ process, if a review requires more time for investigation, review process and reconsideration process. Communication to submitter must be completed through the DataQ portal.

Next Steps:

DataQ submitters will receive notice of the decision, the process used, the evidence reviewed who made the decision, and the contact information for follow up with the state agency. The submitter will also be advised of the process to follow if the submitter requests a third and final review.

Final Review Process

Roles and Responsibilities

- Person(s) responsible for decision-making for the Final Review process
 - **Responsible Party:**
CVSD Command Staff to submit a RDR case from CT to the New England Regional Review Panel when the RDR has progressed through the initial and reconsideration phases.
 - **Supervisor(s):**
CVSD Chief
 - **Backups:**
CVSD LT Command Staff
 - **Interactions:**
<intentionally left blank>
- Person(s) consulted for additional information or evidence
 - **Responsible Party:**
MCSAP certified Supervisors or designated state representative with substantial knowledge of the DataQ process from participating New England States (VT, NH, MA, CT, RI, and ME) for peer review and CVSD Command staff.
 - **Supervisor(s):**

Peer Review panels will consist of MCSAP certified supervisors, their supervisor will be at least one rank higher or MCSAP coordinator but will be agency specific.

- **Backups:**
CVSD MCSAP Command Staff, peer review panel MCSAP Command staff agency dependent, and designated state panel member alternates to ensure representation.
- **Interactions:**
<intentionally left blank>
- Person(s) convening a panel or committee
 - **Responsible Party:**
New England Regional Peer Review Panel Composition:
Submitting States - The following states may submit Data Q cases for regional review:
Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island
Review-Only Participant - Maine participates in panel discussions and reviews but does not submit cases to the regional panel.

The regional review panel shall consist of one designated representative from each participating New England state. Each state's MCSAP Commander shall designate both a primary and secondary representative from their agency who possesses substantial knowledge of the DataQs process, FMCSA regulations, and applicable enforcement practices. A minimum of three (3) state representatives must be present and available for a panel to convene and commence processing Request for Data Reviews (RDRs). In the event a primary representative is unable to participate, the designated secondary representative shall serve in their capacity to satisfy this quorum requirement.

- **Supervisor(s):**
Peer Review panel supervisors will be MCSAP command staff and/or designee for that state agency.
- **Backups:**
Each state shall designate a back-up panel participant.
- **Interactions:**
<intentionally left blank>
- **Panel members' titles and associations:**
Each state's MCSAP Commander shall designate both a primary and secondary representative from their agency who possesses substantial

knowledge of the DataQs process, FMCSA regulations, and applicable enforcement practices.

Escalation Procedures:

After the DATAQ has gone through all previous steps, the state will escalate the DataQ to the Final Review process.

Process Description

- Review of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
CVSD MCSAP Command Staff
 - **Process:**
CVSD must reach a decision on the Final Review and communicate it to the submitter within thirty (30) days. The Final Review must be escalated for review by a responsible decision maker identified by CVSD MCSAP LT or designee who is outside the chain of command for the issuing officer or inspector. The RDR would then be presented to the New England Regional Peer Review Panel through the following process:

Submission Requirements - The submitting state must provide: Original Data Q RDR request, inspection or crash report, supporting documentation, state's preliminary assessment, and specific review questions for the panel. All submissions should be distributed electronically to designated panel representatives.

Panel Review Procedure - The submitting state distributes the review material to all panel members and allows for a ten business day review timeline.

State Review Responsibilities - Each participating state reviews the submitted materials and evaluates consistency with FMCSA regulations, guidance & CVSA OOS Criteria.

Panel Discussion - The regional review panel shall consist of one designated representative from each participating New England state. Each state's MCSAP Commander shall designate both a primary and secondary representative from their agency who possesses substantial knowledge of the DataQs process, FMCSA regulations, and applicable enforcement practices. A minimum of three (3) state representatives must be present and available for a panel to convene and commence processing Request for Data Reviews (RDRs). In the event a primary representative is unable to

participate, the designated secondary representative shall serve in their capacity to satisfy this quorum requirement.

Panel Discussions - The panel may conduct discussions and deliberations through conference calls, virtual meetings, or other mutually agreed-upon communication methods. The submitting state shall be afforded the opportunity to provide an initial presentation regarding actions taken prior to the final review, relevant historical background related to the Request for Data Review (RDR), the basis for requesting regional peer review, and any prior interpretations, findings, or considerations relevant to the case.

Recommendation and Final Determination - The panel will attempt to reach consensus regarding the recommended disposition of the Request for Data Review (RDR) to the submitting state and the supporting rationale for the recommended disposition, including applicable FMCSA guidance, policy interpretation, and enforcement considerations.

Final Authority - The originating state (CT) retains final authority for the official DataQs response and final disposition of the RDR. However, substantial consideration and deference should be given to the findings, recommendations, and consensus of the regional review panel in order to promote consistency and uniformity among the New England states.

CVSD's decision would be considered final by FMCSA after the Final Review is completed.

- Outcome of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**

The panel will attempt to reach consensus regarding the recommended disposition of the Request for Data Review (RDR) to the submitting state and the supporting rationale for the recommended disposition, including applicable FMCSA guidance, policy interpretation, and enforcement considerations. The originating state (CT) retains final authority for the official DataQs response and final disposition of the RDR. However, substantial consideration and deference should be given to the findings, recommendations, and consensus of the regional review panel in order to promote consistency and uniformity among the New England states.
 - **Process:**

Review of initial DataQ and all previous review steps prior to final reconsideration phase. Review all related documents and evidence used in each of the review steps including peer review panel recommendations for independent review.
- Closure of RDR

- **Responsible Party:**
CVSD MCSAP Command Staff utilizing Peer Panel Consensus Goal.
- **Process:**
 - Closed—No Data Correction Made: The request has been closed and the data will not be corrected. The DataQ was reviewed and the evidence substantiated the violation was correct.
 - Closed—Data Correction Made: The request has been closed and the data will be corrected. The DataQ was reviewed and the evidence substantiated the violation was incorrect and the violation was removed, or the regulation corrected to the proper regulation.
 - Closed—Citation Results Entered: The request has been closed and the violation will be appended to reflect the outcome of the citation.
 - Closed—Report Not Sent: The request has been closed, but the requested inspection report was not sent. This could occur if the DataQ was incorrectly assigned to the wrong agency
 - Closed—Report Sent: The request has been closed and the agency sent the report. The agency may have faxed or uploaded the report to DataQ's or it may have sent the report directly via email or postal mail.
 - Closed—No Requestor Response: The request was closed because the requestor did not respond
 - Closure shall include the following information:
Link to the State's approved DataQ's State Implementation Plan, decision-maker (name and title) including reference to Peer Review Panel consulted, list of evidence reviewed, decision, specific reason(s) for decision, and agency contact information. Requester will also be notified that this phrase is the final authority on the matter.
- **Timeliness:**
CVSD must reach a decision on the Final Review and communicate it to the submitter within thirty (30) days. The Final Review must be escalated for review by a responsible decisionmaker identified by CVSD (MCSAP Coordinator or designee) who is outside the chain of command for the issuing officer or inspector. The review may be delegated to a panel that provides a recommendation to the decision-maker.

Expected Outcomes for RDR Closures:

Closed—No Data Correction Made: The request has been closed and the data will not be corrected. The DataQ was reviewed and the evidence substantiated the violation was correct.

Closed—Data Correction Made: The request has been closed and the data will be corrected. The DataQ was reviewed and the evidence substantiated the violation was incorrect and the violation was removed, or the regulation corrected to the proper regulation.

Closed—Citation Results Entered: The request has been closed and the violation will be appended to reflect the outcome of the citation.

Closed—Report Sent: The request has been closed and the agency sent the report. The agency may have faxed or uploaded the report to DataQ's or it may have sent the report directly via email or postal mail.

Closed—No Requestor Response: The request was closed because the requestor did not respond

Communication:

Submitters will be notified via the DataQ portal.

Next Steps:

DataQ submitters will receive notice of the decision, the process used, the evidence reviewed who made the decision the contact information for follow up with the state agency. The submitter will be advised this is the final review.