

DataQs State Implementation Plan



New Hampshire

**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 New Hampshire.

DataQs State Implementation Plan

State: New Hampshire

MCSAP Lead Agency: New Hampshire State Police

Initial Review Process

Roles and Responsibilities

- Persons responsible for managing DataQs for the organization
 - **Responsible Party:**
MCSAP Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
 - **Supervisor(s):**
Lieutenant (Troop Commander)
 - **Backups:**
Administrative Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
 - **Interactions:**
<intentionally left blank>
- Person(s) responsible for decision-making for the Initial Review process
 - **Responsible Party:**
Troop-G NCO's (four Sergeants)
 - **Supervisor(s):**
MCSAP Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
 - **Backups:**
Each NCO can act as a backup for remaining members.
 - **Interactions:**
<intentionally left blank>
- Person(s) consulted for additional information or evidence
 - **Responsible Party:**
FMCSA Division Administrator for New Hampshire
 - **Supervisor(s):**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Interactions:**

If the assigned State Police NCO needs additional information on a specific subject matter, they may seek clarifying information from a qualified person to include but not limited to FMCSA NH's Division office.

Process Description

- Receipt of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
MCSAP Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
Troop-G NCO's (four Sergeants)
 - **Process:**
Current Troop-G members receive an e-mail notification when an RDR is received. They are responsible for monitoring and the initial receipt of Troopers assigned to them.
- Review of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
MCSAP Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
MCSAP program civilian staff
Troop-G NCO's (four Sergeants)
 - **Process:**
Administrative requests (such as request for a copy of missing inspection report) will be handled by the Staff Sergeant or civilian staff.

Requests for review of standard or post-crash inspection violations will be handled by the Troop-G NCO who is the immediate supervisor of the issuing inspector. NCO will review provided documents from motor carrier, speak with issuing inspector and have the ability to review cruiser and body worn camera systems.

If the issuing inspector is a current NCO the RDR will be delegated to another NCO for receipt, review and outcome.

- Outcome of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
MCSAP Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
Troop-G NCO's (four Sergeants)
 - **Process:**
Administrative outcomes (such as request for copy of missing inspection report) will be handled by the Staff Sergeant or civilian staff.
The outcome of standard or post-crash inspection violations will be handled

by the Troop-G NCO who is the immediate supervisor of the issuing inspector.

If the issuing inspector is a current NCO the RDR will be delegated to another NCO for receipt, review and outcome.

- Closure of RDR

- **Responsible Party:**

- MCSAP Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)

- Troop-G NCO's (four Sergeants)

- **Process:**

- Administrative closures (such as requests for copy of missing inspection reports) will be handled by the Staff Sergeant or civilian staff.

- Closure of standard or post-crash inspection violations will be handled by the Troop-G NCO who is the immediate supervisor of the issuing inspector.

- If the issuing inspector is a current NCO the RDR will be delegated to another NCO for receipt, review and outcome.

- Timeliness:

All review actions below must be opened within 7 calendar days, and responded to within 21 calendar days

Administrative requests (such as request for copy of missing inspection report) will be handled by the Staff Sergeant.

Requests for review of standard or post-crash inspection violations will be handled by the Troop-G NCO who is the immediate supervisor of the issuing inspector.

If the issuing inspector is a current NCO the RDR will be delegated to another NCO for receipt, review and outcome.

Expected Outcomes for RDR Closures:

Closed – no data correction made – insufficient documentation or proof was provided by the carrier, after review of documentation provided the violation was found to be valid.

Closed – data correction made – sufficient documentation or proof was provided by the carrier, after review of documentation provided the violation was found to be incorrectly applied.

Closed – citation results entered – the violation will be appended to reflect the outcome of the citation.

Closed – report not sent – report request was sent by unauthorized individual.

Closed – report sent – report request was set by authorized individual.

Closed – no requestor response – requestor did not respond to additional requests for documentation, proof, etc.

Communication:

All communication is done through the Data-Q Portal to ensure utilization of the existing templates provided for response, included are citations of applicable regulations, policy and guidance.

Next Steps:

After closure of an RDR a response is sent through the Data-Q portal explaining the outcome of the request as well as additional information such as contact information for reviewer and applicable regulations cited, and instructions of how to appeal the decision.

Reconsideration Review Process

Roles and Responsibilities

- Person(s) responsible for decision-making for the Reconsideration Review process
 - **Responsible Party:**
Lieutenant (Troop Commander)
Administrative Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
 - **Supervisor(s):**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Interactions:**
If the reconsideration panel needs additional information on a specific subject matter, they may seek clarifying information from a qualified person to include but not limited to FMCSA NH's Division office.
- Person(s) consulted for additional information or evidence
 - **Responsible Party:**
FMCSA Division Administrator of New Hampshire
The DA of NH is a subject matter expert outside of the direct chain of command of the inspectors within Troop-G.
 - **Supervisor(s):**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Interactions:**
<intentionally left blank>

- Person(s) convening a panel or committee
 - **Responsible Party:**
Lieutenant (Troop Commander)
Administrative Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
 - **Supervisor(s):**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Interactions:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Panel members' titles and associations:**
Troop Commander and administrative Assistant Trooper Commander. This assistant troop commander position although hold inspector certifications is responsible for administrative and DMV related assignments of the Troop. Is removed from the direct reporting chain of command of MCSAP related activities for inspectors.

Escalation Procedures:

When additional documentation or proof is submitted the request can remain under the initial review process.

If requestor disagrees with the outcome of the initial reviewer the request will be escalated for the reconsideration review process.

Process Description

- Review of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
Lieutenant (Troop Commander)
Administrative Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
 - **Process:**
A panel review is conducted by the Lieutenant and Staff Sergeant, both are not direct supervisors of the inspectors, also are separate and independent from the initial review NCOs. If additional information is needed on a specific subject matter, they may seek clarifying information from a qualified person to include but not limited to FMCSA NH's Division office.
- Outcome of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
Lieutenant (Troop Commander)
Administrative Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)

- **Process:**
A panel review is conducted by the Lieutenant and Staff Sergeant, both are not direct supervisors of the inspectors, also are separate and independent from the initial review NCOs. The outcome is agreed upon by all members of the panel.
- Closure of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
Lieutenant (Troop Commander)
Administrative Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
 - **Process:**
A panel review is conducted by the Lieutenant and Staff Sergeant, both are not direct supervisors of the inspectors, also are separate and independent from the initial review NCOs. The closure is agreed upon by all members of the panel.
- Timeliness:
Review and communication must be completed within 21 calendar days of the request.

Expected Outcomes for RDR Closures:

Closed – no data correction made – insufficient documentation or proof was provided by the carrier, after review of documentation provided the violation was found to be valid

Closed – data correction made – sufficient documentation or proof was provided by the carrier, after review of documentation provided the violation was found to be incorrectly applied

Closed – citation results entered – the violation will be appended to reflect the outcome of the citation

Closed – report not sent – report request was sent by unauthorized individual

Closed – report sent – report request was set by authorized individual

Closed – no requestor response – requestor did not respond to additional requests for documentation, proof, etc.

Communication:

All communication is done through the DataQ Portal to ensure utilization of the existing templates provided for response, included are citations of applicable regulations, policy and guidance.

Next Steps:

After closure of an RDR after reconsideration review a response is sent through the DataQ portal explaining the outcome of the request as well as additional information such as contact information for reviewer, applicable regulations cited, and instructions of how to appeal the decision.

Final Review Process

Roles and Responsibilities

- Person(s) responsible for decision-making for the Final Review process
 - **Responsible Party:**
MCSAP Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
New England Regional Peer Review Panel
 - **Supervisor(s):**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Interactions:**
<intentionally left blank>
- Person(s) consulted for additional information or evidence
 - **Responsible Party:**
New England Regional Peer Review Panel
Committee includes members of multiple MCSAP agencies, only one member will be from the requestor's agency.
 - **Supervisor(s):**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Interactions:**
<intentionally left blank>
- Person(s) convening a panel or committee
 - **Responsible Party:**
New England Regional Peer Review Panel
Individuals from Vermont, Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island
 - **Supervisor(s):**

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

Escalation Procedures:

When additional documentation or proof is submitted the request can remain under the secondary review process.

If requestor disagrees with the outcome of the reconsideration review the request will be escalated for the final consideration review process.

Process Description

- Review of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
MCSAP Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
New England Regional Peer Review Panel
 - **Process:**
The New England Regional Peer Review Panel conducts a review of the RDR, members are separate and independent from the initial review NCOs as well as the secondary review Lieutenant and Staff Sergeant.
- Outcome of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
MCSAP Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
New England Regional Peer Review Panel
 - **Process:**
The New England Regional Peer Review Panel conducts a review of the RDR, members are separate and independent from the initial review NCOs as well as the secondary review Lieutenant and Administrative Staff Sergeant. The outcome is agreed upon by all members of the panel.
- Closure of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
MCSAP Staff Sergeant (Assistant Troop Commander)
New England Regional Peer Review Panel
 - **Process:**

Closed – no data correction made – insufficient documentation or proof was provided by the carrier, after review of documentation provided the violation was found to be valid

Closed – data correction made – sufficient documentation or proof was provided by the carrier, after review of documentation provided the violation was found to be incorrectly applied

Closed – citation results entered – the violation will be appended to reflect the outcome of the citation

Closed – report not sent – report request was sent by unauthorized individual

Closed – report sent – report request was set by authorized individual

Closed – no requestor response – requestor did not respond to additional requests for documentation, proof, etc.

- **Timeliness:**

Review and communication must be completed within 21 calendar days of the request.

Expected Outcomes for RDR Closures:

Closed—No Data Correction Made: The request has been closed and the data will not be corrected.

Closed—Data Correction Made: The request has been closed and the data will be corrected.

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.

Closed—Report Sent: The request has been closed and the agency sent the report. The agency may have faxed or uploaded the report to DataQs 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:

All communication is done through the Data-Q Portal to ensure utilization of the existing templates provided for response, included are citations of applicable regulations, policy and guidance.

Next Steps:

After closure of an RDR a response is sent through the Data-Q portal explaining the outcome of the request as well as additional information such as contact information for reviewer and applicable regulations cited.