

**CR Number:** 4626

**External  
Reference:**

**Category:** Add capability for multiple DBA names in SAFER

**Component:** SAFER/MCMIS

**Synopsis:** Modify MCMIS and SAFER to accommodate multiple DBA name fields.

Summary:

Currently, SAFER and MCMIS contain one DBA field. Several states have expressed a need for multiple DBA names, while several states are against multiple DBA names. Currently, some states concatenate multiple DBA names in the single DBA name field in MCMIS and state systems handle the multiple names. If this change were approved and implemented, both MCMIS and SAFER would need to be changed.

**Status:** Disapproved

**Disposition:** [2006-06-23] Disapproved

**Description:** [Barbara Hague, MO - 10-27-2005] requested information on how to handle multiple "Doing Business As" (DBA) names that are concatenated in the DBA field in the SAFER T0031 transaction. In Missouri, divisions of one legal entity use the same DOT # but have different DBA names. How do states use the DBA data? What is the purpose of having a string of multiple names in one data field? If the state cannot clearly assign legal responsibility, how can it assign responsibility for Safety?

[Doug Deckert, WA - 02-23-2006] Multiple DBA names may assist enforcement in identifying the carrier. It was noted that often a truck will have a name and USDOT on its side and the name is neither the legal name nor the registered DBA name. Also, a driver may give a carrier name that again does not match either of the search names in SAFER.

Since the DBA name originates in MCMIS, via completion of the MCS-150 form, any change in the number of DBA fields must be made in MCMIS. In turn this will affect SAFER and the CVIEWS.

This issue was posted to the CVISN system architect's listserv in February. Some of the comments include:

[MD DJ Waddell - 03-02-2006] As an example, a CV enforcement officer would use a browser-based interface to CVIEW to find the listed DBA names for a carrier whose vehicle is presently sitting on the static scale. If the name on the door doesn't match any in the list, then pull 'em in to show paper.

[NY Stephen Trudell - 03-03-2006] New York would like a limit of 3 DBAs. NY inspection people feel that this number of DBA entries would capture the vast majority of carriers with multiple DBAs. If a carrier utilizes more than 3 DBAs, then a red flag should go up.

[WA Doug Deckert - 03-03-2006 ] There may be times when a carrier will use a DBA name in one state and a different DBA name in another state. Often when an officer looks up the USDOT # they will see a legal name and a DBA name that doesn't match the DBA given by the trucker or on the side of the truck. Providing multiple DBA names (hopefully with a match) would help both the officers and the carriers (really the truck drivers) make things go more smoothly while the officer is inspecting paperwork or the commercial vehicle. Agree with the idea of three DBAs

allowed and then raise a warning.

[MT Jodee Alm - 03-09-2006] Montana agrees that there should be a least 2 DBA's. But more than just the states' CVIEWs, SAFER, and MCMIS will be affected by this change. One has to remember what feeds into their CVIEWs. For Montana, we may also look at having to update our IRP, IFTA and Permitting Applications, plus any reports or forms that are printed with this information.

[TX Tammy Duncan - 03-10-2006] Texas DPS strongly feels there should be only a single DBA allowed per carrier. If a carrier wants to operate under additional names, they should apply for different operating authority and/or US DOT numbers.

Texas deals with approximately 300,000 commercial vehicle inspections and 16,000 commercial vehicle crashes annually, and verifies the carrier information on every inspection and crash report. DPS believes very strongly that adding additional DBAs will make the process for creating and maintaining carrier profiles exceptionally more difficult.

If you allow multiple DBAs, where do you draw the line... Two, three, twenty? It is felt that the current limit of one DBA is more than sufficient to consistently ensure proper identification of a motor carrier.

[FMCSA Sharon Owenson - 03-10-2006] Another aspect of changing the number of DBA names is the FMCSA regulations. 49 CFR 390.21(b)(1) states that the legal name or a single trade name of the motor carrier operating the self-propelled CMV, as listed on the motor carrier identification report (Form MCS-150) and submitted in accordance with Section 390.19. All FMCSA systems are set up to use only one DBA name. Using the legal name on the trucks and the trade name will allow you to use any trade name you want on the side of the truck as long as the officer can match the legal name and the USDOT number. In these instances where you have multiple DBA names, the DBA field would be left blank in MCMIS.

Example: JOHN DOE dba FARM & COUNTRY STORE USDOT XXXXXXXX

Also, in response to the Texas suggestion that a company apply for other USDOT numbers and authority, it is important to remember that there can be only one USDOT number per company. You must set up a separate corporation to have another USDOT number. Hopefully that is what Texas meant.

[2006-04-25] Presented at the 4/20/2006 ACCB meeting.

This CR will be posted to the CVISN System Architects listserv for a 30-day comment period and a vote.

Action: States are requested to respond by 2006-05-17 to these questions:

1. Does the state support modifications to MCMIS and SAFER to carry multiple DBA names?
2. If "yes", how many DBA names and how would the state use the multiple names?

[2006-05-26] Discussed at the 5/18/06 ACCB meeting.

The text string comes from the FMCSA MCS150 entry form. The current usage is uncontrolled. Even if more DBA Name fields are provided, there are no edit checks to keep from continuing to concatenate the DBA Names in one or more fields. Some states felt that the amount of effort needed to implement this CR would be put to better use on more important CRs. The comments received on this CR will be tallied by APL and posted to the listserv.

[2006-06-23] This CR was disapproved at the 6/22/06 ACCB meeting. After further discussion, the ACCB decided that the time and effort required to implement this CR would be better spent on more critical CRs. Participants agreed that this CR should be disapproved.

**Fix:**

**Comment:**

**Attachment  
names:**

**Responsibility:** Roberts Onna Beth

**Modified Time:** 6/27/2006 12:03:38 PM

**Modified By:** Magnusson Nancy C.

**Entered On:** 3/22/2006 3:15:49 PM

**Entered By:** Roberts Onna Beth

**Severity:** Medium

**Priority:** No

**Type:** Enhancement

**Closed On:**