

DataQs State Implementation Plan



Vermont

**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 Vermont.

DataQs State Implementation Plan

State: Vermont

MCSAP Lead Agency: Vermont Department of Motor Vehicles (Highway Patrol)

Initial Review Process

Roles and Responsibilities

- Persons responsible for managing DataQs for the organization
 - **Responsible Party:**
Lieutenant, sector supervisor
Sergeant, shift supervisor
 - **Supervisor(s):**
Captain, Chief of Safety
 - **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Interactions:**
During the initial review process the person reviewing the request may interact with other stake holding offices or agencies, such as but not limited to:

FMCSA-Vermont Division
Vermont Judicial Bureau
Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance
- Person(s) responsible for decision-making for the Initial Review process
 - **Responsible Party:**
Lieutenant, Sector Supervisor
 - **Supervisor(s):**
Captain, Chief of Safety
 - **Backups:**
Sergeant, shift supervisor
Office staff, Safespect/data quality specialist.
 - **Interactions:**
During the initial review process the person reviewing the request may interact with other offices or agencies as a resource, such as but not limited to:

FMCSA-Vermont Division
Vermont Judicial Bureau
Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance

- Person(s) consulted for additional information or evidence
 - **Responsible Party:**
Inspecting Officer
Department certified trainer.
Vermont Judicial Bureau-clerk
FMCSA-Vermont Division
Medical provider that conducted Medical certification
 - **Supervisor(s):**
Captain, Chief of Safety
 - **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Interactions:**
Interactions with other agencies or offices by these parties are limited.
Outside agencies are used as an independent resource only and not contacted to be a responsible party by furthering investigations.

Process Description

- Receipt of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
Initial reviews are received through FMCSA portal. All initial reviews are the responsibility of a Lieutenant or Sergeant.

All initial reviews will be issued within 21 days of initial receipt.
 - **Process:**
Those responsible for the receipt of RDRs at a minimum:

Check the system for new RDRs that require initial review and ensure all RDRs are open and in review within 7 days of receipt.
- Review of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
Lieutenants, Sector Supervisors
Sergeants, shift supervisor
 - **Process:**

Review of dataQ (open pending agency review)

- request further information from requestors and Inspecting officers. (open pending requestor response or open pending officer comment”
 - employ investigative techniques. (Requesting supporting documentation, Query Central/CVIEW checks, requesting driver lists, DVIR, ELD, BOL (Open pending requester response) checking meta data on supporting documents, reviewing body camera/cruiser camera.
 - consult databases such as state CAD systems, federal databases, DMV repositories.
 - consult state medical lists regarding diabetes mellites and monocular vision.
 - remove violations based on citation outcomes as required (closed-citation results entered) by the dataQ analyst guidebook.
- An RDR maybe “Closed no requester response” if the requester fails to answer requests for information.

If the request is for a copy of an inspection report it may be addressed by any data quality personnel. (Closed report sent)

No Persons responsible for RDRs will review inspections which they are the Inspecting officer.

- Outcome of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
Lieutenants, Sector Supervisors
Sergeant, shift supervisor
 - **Process:**
A dataQ may be closed with “no data correction made” if it is determined that the violation documented was present at the time of inspection and documented correctly on the inspection report.
A dataQ may be closed “Data correction made” if the reviewer finds the dataQ to be valid and the data on the inspection report to be incorrect. In this case the data in question will be modified on the inspection report and reuploaded.
A dataQ may be closed as “Citation results entered” if the result of the citation is different from the original issuance. The violation will be changed to reflect the associated violation. If the citation has been amended and fits the same section of the CFRs i.e. a moving violation (392.2) is amended to a separate moving violation that falls within 392.2. No changes will be made.

Changes will be made to the citation section within Safespect.

A dataQ will be closed as “Report sent” if there is a request for a copy of an inspection report and it is provided to the requestor. Typically provided as an attachment in the dataQ.

A dataQ will be closed as “Report not sent” if a request for a report has been made but not sent.

A dataQ may be closed “No requester response” if the requestor fails to respond to a request within 14 calendar days.

- Closure of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
Lieutenants, Sector Supervisors
Sgts, shift supervisor
 - **Process:**
 - Upon closure of a dataQ reviewers will explain the decision. Reviewers are not expected to disclose investigative techniques; however, they will provide a basis for the decision.
 - Reviewers will provide the submitter with what steps are relative to the outcome of the RDR.
 - language examples:
 - “The RDR has been reviewed, and it has been determined that the violation was documented correctly. No modifications to the inspection report will be made.”
 - “The RDR has been reviewed, and it has been determined that a data correction is necessary. The violation has been modified to or removed from the inspection report. Please allow up to 30 days for the changes to reflect in MCMIS.”
 - “This RDR has been forwarded for agency review”
 - Reviewers will identify themselves by title and name and department as well as provide the submitter with the next step actions specific to outcome.
 - Review escalation.
- Timeliness:
Initial reviews must be completed within 21 days.

Expected Outcomes for RDR Closures:

A dataQ may be closed with “no data correction made” if it is determined that the violation documented was present at the time of inspection and documented correctly on the inspection report.

A dataQ may be closed “Data correction made” if the reviewer finds the dataQ to be valid and the data on the inspection report to be incorrect. In this case the data in question will be updated in the inspection report and reuploaded.

A dataQ may be closed as “Citation results entered” if the result of the citation is different from the original issuance. The violation will be changed to reflect the associated violation. If the citation has been amended and fits the same section of the CFRs i.e. a moving violation (392.2) is amended to a separate moving violation that falls within 392.2. No changes will be made. Changes will be made to the citation section within Safespect. A dataQ will be closed as “Report sent” if there is a request for a copy of an inspection report and it is provided to the requestor. Typically provided as an attachment in the dataQ.

A dataQ will be closed as “Report not sent” if a request for a report has been made but not sent.

A dataQ may be closed “No requester response” if the requestor fails to respond to a request within 14 calendar days.

Communication:

Reviewers will update the status of the RDR during the duration of the review. Reviewers will select the violation and update the status to the following options:

Open in review

Open pending officer comment

Open pending requester response

Reviewers will provide a brief explanation of the status dataQ so the requester knows if the RDR is requiring action on their part. Contact can be made through:

-DataQ database

-Telephone

-email

Contact with the requester will be documented using the dataQ system if communication is completed using telephone or email so that it is documented as part of the process i.e.

“Per the email communication with”

“Per the telephone conversation with”

Next Steps:

Upon closure of a dataQ reviewers will explain the decision. Reviewers are not expected to disclose investigative techniques; however, they will provide a basis for the decision.

Reviewers will provide the submitter with what the steps are relative to the outcome of the RDR.

language examples:

“The RDR has been reviewed, and it has been determined that the violation was documented correctly. No modifications to the inspection report will be made.”

“The RDR has been reviewed, and it has been determined that a data correction is necessary. The violation has been modified to or removed from the inspection report. Please allow up to 30 days for the changes to reflect in MCMIS.”

“This RDR has been forwarded for agency review”

Reviewers will identify themselves by title and name and department as well as provide the submitter with the next step actions specific to outcome. Review escalation.

Reconsideration Review Process

Roles and Responsibilities

- Person(s) responsible for decision-making for the Reconsideration Review process
 - **Responsible Party:**
HQ SGT
 - **Supervisor(s):**
Captain, Chief of Safety
 - **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Interactions:**
During the initial review process the person reviewing the request may interact with other stake holding offices or agencies, such as but not limited to:
Inspecting Officer
Vermont Judicial Bureau
FMCSA-Vermont Division
Medical provider that conducted Medical certification
Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance
- Person(s) consulted for additional information or evidence
 - **Responsible Party:**
VTDMV Captain, Chief of Safety
CVSA-Roadside Inspection specialist
DA Vermont- FMCSA

VJB-clerk
 - **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 in the event of a final review.
 - **Supervisor(s):**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Interactions:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Panel members' titles and associations:**
<intentionally left blank>

Escalation Procedures:

All requests for reconsideration will be identified by a Lieutenant or Sector Sergeant and forwarded to the HQ Sergeant for review by email.

HQ Sergeant will then go into Portals to review the DataQ.

-

Request for reconsideration will be issued within 21 days of filing.

Process Description

- Review of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
HQ Sergeant
 - **Process:**
Review of RR (open pending agency review)
 - request further information from requestors and Inspecting officers. (open pending requestor response or open pending officer comment"
 - employ investigative techniques. (Requesting supporting documentation, Query Central/CVIEW checks, requesting driver lists, DVIR, ELD, BOL (Open pending requester response) checking meta data on supporting documents, reviewing body camera/cruiser camera.
 - consult databases such as state CAD systems, federal databases, DMV

repositories.

-consult state medical lists regarding diabetes mellites and monocular vision.

- remove violations based on citation outcomes as required (closed-citation results entered) by the RR analyst guidebook.

An RDR maybe “Closed no requester response” if the requester fails to answer requests for information.

If the request is for a copy of an inspection report it may be addressed by any data quality personnel. (Closed report sent)

No Persons responsible for RDRs will review inspections which they are the Inspecting officer.

- Outcome of RDR

- **Responsible Party:**

- HQ Sergeant

- **Process:**

- Upon closure of an RR, reviewers will explain the decision. Reviewers are not expected to disclose investigative techniques; however, they will provide a basis for the decision.

- Reviewers will provide the submitter with what the steps are relative to the outcome of the RR.

- language examples:

- “The RR has been reviewed, and it has been determined that the violation was documented correctly. No modifications to the inspection report will be made.”

- “The RR has been reviewed, and it has been determined that a data correction is necessary. The violation has been modified to or removed from the inspection report. Please allow up to 30 days for the changes to reflect in MCMIS.”

- “This RR has been forwarded for agency review”

- Reviewers will identify themselves by title and name and department as well as provide the submitter with the next step actions specific to outcome.

- Review escalation.

- Closure of RDR

- **Responsible Party:**

- HQ Sergeant

- **Process:**

<intentionally left blank>

- Timeliness:

All reviews of RRs must be completed within 21 days.

Expected Outcomes for RDR Closures:

A reconsideration review (RR) may be closed with “no data correction made” if it is determined that the violation documented was present at the time of inspection and documented correctly on the inspection report.

A RR may be closed “Data correction made” if the reviewer finds the reconsideration review to be valid and the data on the inspection report to be incorrect.

A RR may be closed as “Citation results entered” if the result of the citation is different from the original issuance. The violation will be changed to reflect the associated violation. If the citation has been amended and fits the same section of the CFRs i.e. a moving violation (392.2) is amended to a separate moving violation that falls within 392.2. No changes will be made. Changes will be made to the citation section within Safespect.

A RR will be closed as “Report sent” if there is a request for a copy of an inspection report and it is provided to the requestor. Typically provided as an attachment in the reconsideration review.

A RR will be closed as “Report not sent” if a request for a report has been made but not sent.

A RR may be closed “No requester response” if the requestor fails to respond to a request within 14 calendar days.

Communication:

Upon closure of a RDR reviewers will explain the decision. Reviewers are not expected to disclose investigative techniques; however, they will provide a basis for the decision. Reviewers will provide the submitter with what the steps are relative to the outcome of the RDR.

language examples:

“The RDR has been reviewed, and it has been determined that the violation was documented correctly. No modifications to the inspection report will be made.”

“The RDR has been reviewed, and it has been determined that a data correction is necessary. The violation has been modified to or removed from the inspection report.

Please allow up to 30 days for the changes to reflect in MCMIS.”

“This RDR has been forwarded for agency review”

Reviewers will identify themselves by title and name and department as well as provide the submitter with the next step actions specific to outcome. Review escalation.

Next Steps:

Upon closure of a RR reviewers will explain the decision. Reviewers are not expected to disclose investigative techniques; however, they will provide a basis for the decision. Reviewers will provide the submitter with what the steps are relative to the outcome of the RR.

language examples:

“The RR has been reviewed, and it has been determined that the violation was documented correctly. No modifications to the inspection report will be made.”

“The RR has been reviewed, and it has been determined that a data correction is necessary. The violation has been modified to or removed from the inspection report. Please allow up to 30 days for the changes to reflect in MCMIS.”

“This RR has been forwarded for agency review”

Reviewers will identify themselves by title and name and department as well as provide the submitter with the next step actions specific to outcome. Review escalation.

Submitters will be notified that all requests for a final review must be filed within 30 days of closure of the RR.

Final Review Process

Roles and Responsibilities

- Person(s) responsible for decision-making for the Final Review process
 - **Responsible Party:**
Captain, Chief of Safety
 - **Supervisor(s):**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Interactions:**
Final review (FR) will be conducted by convening a committee of New England DataQ officials hailing from MCSAP lead agencies from New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

Vermont representatives may confer with the Vermont Attorney Generals office for guidance.
- Person(s) consulted for additional information or evidence

- **Responsible Party:**
The Vermont member of the panel will present the facts and evidence of the FR to the committee but will not be voting member. The Vermont representative will also be present as the subject matter expert on State laws. Vermont will retain the authority to ultimately choose the finding.
- **Supervisor(s):**
<intentionally left blank>
- **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
- **Interactions:**
<intentionally left blank>
- Person(s) convening a panel or committee
 - **Responsible Party:**
DataQ officials from respective participating jurisdictions.
 - **Supervisor(s):**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Backups:**
<intentionally left blank>
 - **Interactions:**
It is not expected that the panel will interact with outside agencies and offices.
 - **Panel members' titles and associations:**
<intentionally left blank>

Escalation Procedures:

A submitter may request a FR after closure of the RR. In this instance the Captain, Chief of Safety will organize the committee for review of the FR.

Process Description

- Review of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
Captain, Chief of Safety or designee
 - **Process:**
New England Regional Peer Review Panel
This process would apply to the six New England states:
Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.
Per regional agreement, Maine will participate as a panel member and

reviewer but will not submit Data Q cases to the regional group for review.

Step 3 – Regional Peer Review Process

Purpose

The purpose of Step 3 is to provide a consistent regional peer review process for CMV Roadside Inspections and Crash data for Data Q submissions among the New England states.

The review panel assures:

Consistent interpretation & uniform application of enforcement standards

Shared regional decision-making & documentation of recommendations and outcomes

1. Cases Eligible for Regional Review

A state may submit a Data Q-Request for Data Review (RDR) case from their state to the regional review panel when the RDR has progressed through the submitting states Step 1 & Step 2 workflow.

2. Participating States

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.

3. Submission Requirements

The submitting state must provide:

Original Data Q RDR request

Inspection or crash report

Supporting documentation

State's preliminary assessment

Specific review questions for the panel

All submissions should be distributed electronically to designated panel representatives.

4. Panel Review Procedure

A. Initial Distribution

The submitting state distributes the review material to all panel members.

B. Review Timeline

Standard review period: 10 business days

C. State Review Responsibilities

Each participating state:

Reviews the submitted materials

Evaluates consistency with FMCSA regulations, guidance & CVSA OOS

Criteria

D. Panel Discussion

Panel Composition

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

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 Step 3 review

Relevant historical background related to the Request for Data Review (RDR)

The basis for requesting regional peer review

Any prior interpretations, findings, or considerations relevant to the case

5. Recommendation and Final Determination

Consensus Goal

The panel will attempt to reach consensus regarding:

The recommended disposition of the Request for Data Review (RDR) to the submitting state

The supporting rationale for the recommended disposition, including applicable FMCSA guidance, policy interpretation, and enforcement considerations

Final Authority

The originating state 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.

6. Confidentiality and Data Handling

All participating states shall:

Handle Data Q materials with care and due respect to other party states

Limit distribution to authorized personnel

Avoid external dissemination without approval

8. Annual Review

The New England regional panel may conduct an annual review of this process to evaluate effectiveness, improve regional consistency, and incorporate updated FMCSA guidance or operational practices.

Participation in the regional review panel is voluntary. Any participating state may discontinue its participation in the process at its discretion upon providing notice to the other member states.

- Outcome of RDR

- **Responsible Party:**

- Captain Chief of Safety

- **Process:**

- A reconsideration review (RR) may be closed with “no data correction made” if it is determined that the violation documented was present at the time of inspection and documented correctly on the inspection report.

- A RR may be closed “Data correction made” if the reviewer finds the reconsideration review to be valid and the data on the inspection report to be incorrect.

- A RR may be closed as “Citation results entered” if the result of the citation is different from the original issuance. The violation will be changed to reflect the associated violation. If the citation has been amended and fits the same section of the CFRs i.e. a moving violation (392.2) is amended to a separate moving violation that falls within 392.2. No changes will be made. Changes will be made to the citation section within Safespect.

- A RR will be closed as “Report sent” if there is a request for a copy of an inspection report and it is provided to the requestor. Typically provided as an attachment in the reconsideration review.

A RR will be closed as “Report not sent” if a request for a report has been made but not sent.

A RR may be closed “No requester response” if the requestor fails to respond to a request within 14 calendar days.

- Closure of RDR
 - **Responsible Party:**
Captain, Chief of Safety or designee
 - **Process:**
The Captain will take the findings of the panel under advisement and may confer with the Vermont Attorney Generals office for advisement.
. The Captain will then communicate the results of the FR to the Submitter
The Captain will identify themselves by title and name and department explain the findings of the Committee and how it pertains to the data in question.
- Timeliness:
Final reviews must be completed within 45 days.

Expected Outcomes for RDR Closures:

Upon closure of a RR reviewers will explain the decision. Reviewers are not expected to disclose investigative techniques; however, they will provide a basis for the decision. Reviewers will provide the submitter with what the steps are relative to the outcome of the RR.

language examples:

“The RR has been reviewed, and it has been determined that the violation was documented correctly. No modifications to the inspection report will be made.”

“The RR has been reviewed, and it has been determined that a data correction is necessary. The violation has been modified to or removed from the inspection report.

Please allow up to 30 days for the changes to reflect in MCMIS.”

“This RR has been forwarded for agency review”

Communication:

Communication with the Submitter maybe through;

Telephone

Email

DataQ database

Next Steps:

For data submitted to FMCSA by a State, FMCSA considers the State’s determination of the validity of an RDR as the final decision on the RDR. FMCSA will not unilaterally change State records without State consent. However, in those instances when the RDR filer is

dissatisfied with the State's decision, States should confer with FMCSA about the RDR, answer any additional questions or concerns a filer may have, and provide additional educational information on the subject at hand, if available. This ongoing collaboration between the States and FMCSA field and headquarters is essential to ensuring the viability and effectiveness of the DataQs system