

MINUTES OF THE  
TRAFFIC RECORDS COORDINATING COMMITTEE (TRCC) MEETING  
1120 North 22nd Avenue, Phoenix, AZ  
Human Resource Development Center, Grand Canyon #1 Room  
1:00 P.M., Tuesday, May 12, 2009

The regular scheduled meeting of the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee (TRCC) Meeting was held on Tuesday, May 12, 2009.

TRCC MEMBERS ATTENDING:

Alberto Gutier, GOHS  
George Delgado, ADOT-MVD\*  
Reed Henry, ADOT-HES\*  
Jeff King, DPS  
Doanh Bui, ADOT-ITG  
Rick Turner, ADOT-MVD  
Mark Hodges, ADOT-MPD  
Alan Vitcavage, FMCSA  
Esther Corbett, ITCA  
Pat McGrath, AOC  
Karen King, FHWA  
Bruce Byron, Glendale PD  
David Harden, ADHS-EMS

OTHERS ATTENDING

Teri Oliveira, ADOT-ITG  
Kiran Guntupalli, MAG  
Haleh Farhed, ADOT-ITG  
Karen Kontak, Phoenix PD for Lori Rhyons

TRCC COORDINATOR:

Larry Talley, ADOT-MVD

\* Co-Chairperson

**TASK LIST from 5/12/09 Meeting:**

1. TRCC revisit TraCS vs LEADRS
2. Rick Turner send Esther Corbett Risk Management's email address for requesting crash data.
3. George, Reed, Doanh and Larry get together and discuss the development of a Google or Microsoft map tool to display crash locations

1. Call to Order – George Delgado

Co-Chairperson, George Delgado called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM and introduced a guest and possible new member to the TRCC, GOHS Director Alberto Gutier. George thanked Director Gutier for attending and stated that the Director brings a wealth of experience and that the TRCC welcomes his input and insight.

2. Opening Remarks – Alberto Gutier, Director GOHS

Director Gutier briefed the committee on his history under previous Governors and spoke to the numbers of personnel he had on his previous staff and his efforts to realign his current staff. He further stated that all of GOHS' programs are driven by records. That in order to provide data, GOHS needs those numbers - working with data from a year and a half ago is ridiculous. He stated that the effort of the TRCC to pull the data together into one specific system is commendable.

Director Gutier stated that the only negative he had was that he understood some members feel that we should move to TraCS and basically dismantle LEADRS. Director Gutier stated that LEADRS is critical and provides the officer in the field the data they need and a way for them to enter it into the program - it makes a lot of sense. LEADRS provides active reports for specific information GOHS has to have. So please take another look at supporting LEADRS. Director Gutier stated that he remembered TraCS coming on line five years ago or so and a discussion followed regarding the Enterprise program by MVD and the escalating costs of that MVD program which ultimately ended up losing some \$40 million before the plug was pulled. We are data driven but we have to do the right thing. Director Gutier went on to say that he wants to help in any way he can and that he had a letter from NHTSA approving the next iteration of funds. He pointed out that in July the Traffic Records Forum was in Phoenix and that NHTSA will be there - it is a great opportunity to exchange information.

Going back to TraCS, Director Gutier stated that it is not as friendly to the officer in the street as LEADRS is. Using LEADRS the officer in the street writing the report is walked through the whole process. Director Gutier asked LT King to comment on LEADRS. LT King stated that LEADRS was assigned to one of DPS's DUI squads to look at. LT King stated that he had researched TraCS extensively and it is not the same program as it was five years ago. He went on to state that every officer in DPS is currently using TraCS and has been since October 2008. It is a cost effective program and DPS is anxiously waiting for the pilot of the crash form. LT King noted that LEADRS and TraCS are very much the same but LEADRS is being sold by a commercial company where TraCS is not. Director Gutier stated that he had heard from the other side and now he was hearing from this side.

George thanked Director Gutier for his insightful comments and stated that the TRCC would go ahead and have the discussion regarding TraCS vs LEADRS. George welcomed Director Gutier to become a permanent member of the Committee and stated that the Committee was more than happy to have him participate and that the Committee was only as good as its membership. Director Gutier advised the Committee that the

Governor's Traffic Safety Council (GTSAC) has been abolished basically and a new council had been established that consists of three people - Director DPS, Director ADOT and myself. The Executive Order was rewritten last week. Director Gutier thanked George and stated that he had another crisis going and that he had to excuse himself from the meeting.

3. Review of Agenda – George Delgado

George asked the Committee to back track to Item 1 and go around the room and introduce themselves. After introductions, George asked the Committee to take a few moments to review the agenda. No changes were recommended.

4. Approval of February 17, 2009 Meeting Minutes – George Delgado

George asked the Committee to review the minutes of the February 17, 2009 minutes. David Harden noted that he had provided Larry ADHS-EMS notes to be added to the minutes. David Harden made a motion to accept the minutes as written and Rick Turner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously to accept the minutes of the February 17, 2009 with LT Jeff King noting that in paragraph 5.e.1., DPS will participate in the TraCS pilot project.

5. Funding Status/Project Expenditures – Larry Talley

George stated that each member should have a funding spreadsheet in front of them and turned the meeting over to Larry. Larry stated that the TRCC has received \$1,044,140 thru ADOT and that it has expended \$603,314 of the S. 408 funds and \$100,230 of the \$129,350 FMCSA funds thru March 31, 2009. Because of the GTSAC reorganization, the \$30,000 HES Flex Funds have been withdrawn and the project to establish the requirements for the geospatial data analysis tool is no longer funded and no longer shown on the spreadsheet.

George asked Larry to make the announcement concerning the NHTSA email we received earlier today. Larry advised the Committee members that they had a memo in their packet from National NHTSA to Region 9, Subject: Determination of Arizona's Achievement of Measurable Progress that states Arizona has demonstrated measurable progress toward achieving the goals and objectives identified in the strategic plan. Therefore, we have achieved a major milestone toward qualifying for the next S. 408 grant. That award is contingent upon successful submittal of our grant application which is due June 15, 2009. George thanked Larry for his efforts in putting the submittal of performance measures together and explained that if NHTSA does not see any significant measurable progress being made, they recommend we do not receive successive year funding.

6. 06/07 Projects Update:

a) and b) ALISS and Traffic Records Data Entry Application – Rick Turner

Rick advised the Committee members that Traffic Records Section is now using the new ALISS database. They trained on the new ALISS April 7<sup>th</sup>, have been using it for just over a month and it is coming along really well. Data entry personnel are still learning the program and the changes. Speed is picking up as they learn it, but that they have run

into a few little glitches. ADOT-ITG has been real responsive to resolving the issues, so we are moving along. Pacific Data Center (PDC) has been doing backlog and is caught up. FARS is closed and will be closed for the month of May and Traffic Records personnel are going through ALISS to make sure it matches FARS. Rick stated that Crash Facts 2008 will be printed in June and that we are excited because it is the earliest Crash Facts has been published since my staff can remember. The Traffic Records Section is making progress. PDC's contract expires on June 9<sup>th</sup>, but we are trying to come up with funding to extend it. They were contracted to input 200,000 reports and to-date they have input 156,741 reports leaving them just over 43,000 reports to input. Since they completed the 2008 backlog, we have been utilizing them to input 2009 reports; however they are only doing Phoenix since some of their officers are still reporting utilizing the TraCS old crash form. So those reports are entered in the old system by PDC. PDC is in training to learn the new system and we intend to utilize them as long as we can or up to that 200,000 report limit.

c) and d) Location and Query Tool – *Rick Turner*

Rick explained that the first generation location tool is out and last week it was updated. Traffic Records has found that this update has made improvements in the tool. We are currently going back through old reports that Traffic Records has already entered utilizing the original tool and could not find the crash location. Most of those locations have now been found with the new tool, so we are pretty pleased with that.

Rick advised the Committee that we have a couple of agencies out there starting to look into the query tool. We have not had too many complaints or problems that we have run into and agencies are trying to learn how to go in and find data themselves. Rick explained that Haleh is over that part and she has been real responsive and has been addressing issues that come up with agencies and ourselves. It is moving along pretty good.

e) Data Cube Tool – *Rick Turner/Reed Henry*

George asked Reed if he had any comments on the Data Cube Tool and Reed responded in the negative. Rick stated he didn't have a lot on this and explained that a couple of people in-house use it a little bit and that he has had no complaints.

David Harden asked how the query tool is used and who has access to it or is authorization to use it. Rick explained that agencies need a Data Access/Exchange Agreement signed and in place with the State. Once in place, that agreement calls for you to identify a contact person for your agency or entity and then that contact person works with one of our analysis people to complete a CAR form which gets the person a password so they can get into the system. They can then go into the system on their own and use the standard queries to get their data. David Harden asked if it would be beneficial for his (ADHS) statisticians who want crash data to obtain access. Rick responded that right now most of the data is just data that is going out to those that input - DPS can get in and to look at DPS information, Chandler can get in to look at Chandler information, and that MAG and PAG can get in and look at their organizations' information. George advised David Harden that if he was interested he should complete

a Data Access Agreement. David Harden asked that if he sent Rick an email, could he send him the form and Rick responded in the affirmative.

Karen asked Rick that since you have stated that you could do standard queries, does the tool allow you to do custom queries also? Rick responded that you cannot do custom queries, but you can go into the standard queries, select different things in the dropdown boxes and customize the standard queries for the things you want; however, you cannot build a custom query.

Sarath commented that regarding the query tool, MAG does a lot of analysis of crash data - much more than ADOT does right now for MAG's future. That is because we need a good understanding of the crash occurrences in our region. So the standard query tool is not sufficient for us for what we want to do. We want access to the data so we can do a XML dump of the data so we can run custom queries. The issues or problems we are investigating are unique, so ADOT cannot build standard queries. They are in-depth analysis so they are well beyond any standard query tool. George responded that in the February 17, 2009 minutes there is a reference to our discussion on this topic – it references the data dump. That is one alternative that is available to agencies. Rick responded that one of the standard queries is a data dump. Doanh responded that the data dump is considered a standard query and that it allows agencies to pull all the data for as long as we have it. CSV, XML or Excel are the three available formats. Agencies can download all of the data so they can do whatever analysis they want. Standard queries are written by Traffic Records Section so I don't know how many are available today, but if more are needed, they can be put up very easily – it does not require a programmer.

Larry asked if Traffic Records is now advising agencies that the Traffic Records Section is no longer providing data and agencies have to utilize the query tool to obtain data. Rick responded that for the most part – yes. If an agency has turned in their agreement and they have just not gotten their stuff and they need data, we will help them. If someone has not put in the paperwork and they are just calling and asking for data, then we tell them they need to fill out the paperwork. Larry asked if Traffic Records Section was advertising that fact. What if an agency only needs data a couple of times a year? Can they call in and say I've never turned in my paperwork and be able to get the data or are we going to say that after say – August 1, 2009 you are out of luck if you have not turned in your agreement. Rick responded that they have had some agencies that say they are only going to use the data once a year and they are instructed that after this initial time they will need to go through ADOT Risk Management to get the data because TRS will not be providing it.

Ester asked Rick to explain the Risk Management request process. Rick responded that he was not real familiar with their internal workings. You will contact them, they will want the request in writing and then their people will then be able to pull the data that is required. George asked that Rick send Ester Risk Managements' email address for requesting the data. Ester stated that it seemed that this process should be listed as an option. She stated that she did not want Tribes being turned away by Risk Management because they did not understand the options. A discussion followed concerning the

GTSAC website and its continuation or discontinuation. George stated that the TRCC needs to consider developing its own website. Reed stated that the GTSAC website was coming down effective June 30, 2009, so we need to find a place for specific parts.

George commented that in summary and in reference to what Rick said concerning the ALISS database, query tool, and data cube, all of these items were developed and tested by Doanh's group. George stated that he remembered reading the PIJ that was submitted in January 2008 to GITA and thinking "wow" this is a major project. We had a major roll-out in February 2009, so a big thanks to Doanh, Teri, and Haleh for their dedicated efforts. These efforts brought ADOT from the stone age into a 21<sup>st</sup> century existence. As happens with all major projects like this one there have been a few bumps in the road, but everyone has been great in responding to requests for assistance.

George stated that he also wanted to respond to Rick's update on the Traffic Records data entry activity. The Traffic Records Section is going to publish the Crash Report for 2008 next month. That has not happened in the 20 years I have been around and a lot of people need to be recognized. First, Rick and his staff for their efforts and second I want to recognize all those funding sources and associated individuals that contributed the \$383,000 for outsourcing the backlog effort – a big thank you to the TRCC, FHWA, Reed Henry, and Jami Garrison. As a result of your funding, we are now current. Our biggest challenge now is to maintain that status. So we may come back to you with an open hand in the short term for more money. In the future, after the systems are on-line, sooner than later for electronic submittals, we will probably have major reductions in staff in Traffic Records.

Alan asked what was going to happen after the 43,000 records were entered by the contractor and if there was no extension to the contract. Are we going to be behind again? Rick stated that he would address that. We currently have received 32,980 - 2009 reports as of yesterday. So between January 1, 2009 and now we have received that many crash reports. We are learning a new system and changing procedures. Currently, we have put in about 5,000 reports, so we have about a 3 month backlog. If PDC can help us with the 43,000 reports, that will bring us up to current and we have until June 9<sup>th</sup> before the contract expires - unless we can extend. George stated that he is Rick's supervisor and that the Traffic Records Section is hanging on the ledge. There are several issues that need to be addressed in ADOT. Number one is the fact that Rick has a total of 20 FTE positions and right now only 13 positions are filled. Of the 20 positions, 14 are data entry positions. Of the 14 data entry positions only 6 are filled. That gives them a vacancy rating of 8 or 42% which is not a good thing. We have made a request to have these positions filled as mission critical, but our requests have been denied. As everyone is aware, there is a state hiring freeze attributed to the current FY 09/10 budget crisis and, possibly, a FY 11 budget crisis. The situation does not translate well for data entry efforts because we cannot fill positions. Our plan is that we are going to submit a new set of letters to the new management at ADOT to see if we can get a different result. The second major hurdle we face is the contract expiring for the third party selected for the backlog data entry. Pacific Data Corporation is their name. They have done a halfway decent job with data entry after their learning curve was worked out. We would

like for them to continue as long as the remaining 43,000 holds out. There is a deadline in the contract of June 9 as Rick pointed out. He has been in contact with Procurement to see if we can have that extended, but because of a change in Contracting Officers, we have been informed that they are not sure we can do that. Now that we are not sure it can be extended for another round of backlog work, we will probably have to rebid the process. That is not necessarily a good thing since it will take two months to complete. Even if that is overcome, we will still have the issue of funding. I am concerned that we do not end up in a year where we were two years ago - first we have to overcome the procurement situation and then pursue funding sources.

A discussion followed concerning possible internal options.

f) Electronic Incident Data Submittal (EIDS) – *Doanh Bui*

Doanh advised the Committee that at the last meeting he reported they had come out with a standard XML format which can be used by everyone who wants to submit crash data electronically. That is based on the new ALISS. We have finished the programming, but have not rolled it out because we intend to roll out as part of TraCS. It is going to be part of the TraCS standard. To date, we have not heard of any agencies ready to submit crash data electronically – except possibly for Scottsdale. Teri and her team have contacted the IT folks over there and have given them the data they need. It sounds like they are just getting started programming on extracting the data into the XML format. Before anyone can submit data electronically two things have to happen. First, is the Inter Agency Service Agreement for AzTraCS. The agreement basically spells out the roles and responsibilities of the agency, ADOT-ITG programming, and a third party to take care of the calls. A draft ISA has been developed and submitted to the Co-Chairs of the TRCC. Once the review process is done, we are hoping the agreement will be ready before the roll-out of AzTraCS. Second is the connectivity issue - which is a tough issue. We have been working with the IT personnel at DPS. It was recommended that since local agencies already have a secure connection to DPS, why not use it instead of each agency having a separate connection to ADOT. We have met with DPS twice and as you can imagine anything with security it is not a simple issue; however we are working it out. So we are hoping that if you already have a secure connection to DPS, that connectivity will be all you need.

Doanh stated that Project # 58, which was approved and funded by the TRCC for ITG hardware for a persistent connection won't be needed if the DPS connection works out. We won't need that infrastructure, but we are holding on to the \$20,000 in case we need hardware or software to affect this connectivity.

g) TraCS – *George Delgado*

George stated that as Doanh stated he has had the AzTraCS agreement in his possession for about a month, but unfortunately, I have been extremely busy. The good news is that we have a meeting scheduled for next Tuesday and will review the documents then and go from there. In terms of an update of the development of the AzTraCS, George advised the Committee that we have begun the development effort which we started on or about February 5<sup>th</sup>. Phoenix PD and DPS have been provided alpha copies for their feedback

pertaining to the interface. Doanh wants input on the general look and feel of the forms and the officers' ability to navigate within the system. ITG has been feedback from both entities - Phoenix on April 23 and DPS on April 1. Developmental work still continues with work on specific detail requirements and validation rules. The good news is that we are hoping to kick off the pilot program with both PPD and DPS in June sometime. A general discussion followed on the number of officers that would be participating in the pilot, when AzTraCS is anticipated to be deployed statewide, and the similarities of TraCS and LEADRS.

h) QA/Trend Analysis – *Reed Henry*

Reed reported that the QA/Trend Analysis project is well underway and will be done around the end of the summer. The consultant is developing baselines and goals for performance measures so we can see where we have been and where we are going. They have reviewed around 1,400 crash reports from 2006 and are using that data to determine timeliness, accuracy, consistency and completeness of the data. The contractor is currently completing Task 3 of 4 which determines the business needs and functions that will be provided to Doanh to determine what we should expect to receive from a law enforcement agency based on past experience. Then we will be moving to Task 4 which is final documentation.

i) Data User Community – *Reed Henry*

Reed reported that they finally have a consultant on board and that the first meeting is scheduled for this Thursday to go over the scope of work. The issue was finding a consultant that could address some of the legal work associated with access levels. The revised scope of work calls them to bring their recommendations to about a 95% level and then turn them over to the AG's office to determine if the policies developed and recommended will be applicable for the State.

Sarath asked if Reed could explain in more detail the scope of the project so he could better understand it (Project #18). Reed reviewed the scope of the project. Sarath asked how this project will impact the User Access Agreement that is currently required - will the Agreement be nullified by this project? George stated that he did not think so. Doanh stated that the Access Agreement is a generic agreement in that it does not state who can see the data. By default you can only see the data you submit. At the conclusion of this study, it may say that MAG can see data statewide. Then we would allow MAG to get access statewide without changing the Access Agreement. Further discussion followed.

j) EMS Data Repository – *David Harden*

David Harden briefed the Committee that the EMS Data Improvement Project is moving forward. On May 6, 2009, the Bureau of EMS and Trauma System website posted the documents that allow EMS Agencies interested in submitting EMS data, including traffic crash-related injury data, to the EMS Database and participate in the Bureau's Premier EMS Agency Program (the formal EMS Data Collection Program with a formal quality assurance component). The posted documents on the Bureau's website for EMS agencies to download and print include the EMS Data Dictionary, a GITA-compliant data

confidentiality agreement, a handbook on the Program, a guide to developing a quality assurance program, a program participation application, and other documents. The EMS Database has been established and is capable of receiving actual real EMS run reports (Patient Care Reports) data. The submitted data from sample EMS agencies are being validated using the NEMSIS Validator software. Validation will identify what types of data entry, data submission, and various other IT problems being encountered by the submitted data. As far as reporting capabilities, the Bureau anticipates being able to generate reports in about six months from now. However, the Bureau will not be able to run reliable and usable EMS reports or generate reliable data queries until May 2010, which is when 12 months of data will have been submitted, validated, and corrected of any errors identified from the NEMSIS Validator Software. David Harden explained the clarification of two of the codes used in the “EMS ID field in the new Crash Form Instruction Manual. The EMS ID field enables law enforcement officers to enter the alpha-numeric code of the EMS agency at the scene that treats/transport crash patients. There are two codes for the transporting EMS agencies – one for when they respond and transport and one for when they respond as a non-transporting First Responder. The EMS ID also has 205 additional EMS agency codes for First Responder Fire Districts. The Crash Form also has the Incident Number field, which is a 911 assigned number. A third field is the Destination ID field, which allows the officer to enter the alpha-numeric code of the hospital that the EMS agency transported the crash patient(s) to. The EMS ID and Destination ID codes are found in the Crash Form Instruction Manual appendices. The codes are the same as those used by the EMS Database and the Arizona State Trauma Registry, which will allow for future interoperability between the ADOT Crash Database and the State EMS Database and State Trauma Registry.

Sarath stated he understood what David Harden had just presented, but wanted to know if any of the data was coming back to the ALISS database. David Harden responded not yet because we just have established the database. To associate the two systems we will probably use the probabilistic approach, but again we are not at a point to address that yet. Sarath stated that in the old ALISS database the EMS response time was there and we could run reports, but we see that that data is not there now. A discussion followed. David Harden explained that the times are required in NEMSIS and you will be available to run those reports after the program is up and running. A discussion followed on how the databases could be linked and the sharing of data.

k) Geospatial Tool Requirements – *Larry Talley*

Larry reminded the Committee that at the last meeting, it had voted to approve the expenditure of the \$30,000 HES Flex funds on this project. Now that the funds have been withdrawn, funding is in question. Larry asked Doanh about a document he had seen where it stated ADOT-ITG was proposing to develop a Google or Microsoft map tool with crash locations displayed. If that is correct, then is this project still required? Doanh responded that the data warehouse wants to overlay the crashes on a map as the result of a query. That is the easy part. George suggested that Reed, Doanh, Larry and he get together and discuss this topic. Is this project considered critical? George stated that he is open to gathering the requirements if that is what the TRCC wants to do. A discussion followed. It was agreed that we need to figure out what ADOT-ITG wants to

do and what the users need as a tool. George reiterated that we need to meet and discuss the methodology and that he thinks costs will drive it at the end of the day.

7. TRCC FY 2010 Project Objectives – *George Delgado*

George asked Larry to lead the discussion. Larry pointed out that a spreadsheet was in the packet that listed the projects we submitted last year to NHTSA for our vision. The thought was that if any other state failed to have performance measures justifying funding and additional funds became available, we wanted to have a plan in place to accept additional funding. Last year we submitted \$1.5 million in projects and received \$500,000 – as anticipated. Larry explained that in our upcoming submission I have to show what we spent our money on this year and what we want to spend our money on next year. So we need to close out projects on that list that are no longer viable or indicate how much we want to spend on a project next year if it is to continue. I need the dollar amount each agency wants to spend on a project for next year. Larry explained that he has to consolidate all input, get it through the TRCC Executive Committee, present it to GOHS and obtain the GOHS' Director's signature on the certificate by June 12, 2009 in order to meet the deadline. George asked how much of an explanation or description of each project was needed. Larry explained that he only needed a short one. Doanh asked when the EC committee was. Larry stated on or about June 3<sup>rd</sup> depending on the members availability. A discussion followed concerning TraCS and LEADRS and funding. George recommended that the discussion be tabled and revisit TraCS at the EC meeting. Doanh requested a meeting off-line to discuss IT projects.

8. S. 408 2009 Submittal – *Larry Talley*

Larry stated that he had pretty much covered this item in Item 7. He will touch base with each project manager to make sure he has the latest status of each project and will include the results in the submittal. Esther had a question and a discussion followed concerning Project # 56, CODES Support for ASU and Position, and whether GOHS was continuing financial support to ASU for the project.

9. 2009 Traffic Records Forum – *Larry Talley*

Larry advised the Committee that the Traffic Records Forum is July 12 – 16, Sunday thru Thursday, at the Biltmore Hotel and Resort in Phoenix. Larry stated that he has made arrangements with the National Traffic Council that our members can register, not provide billing information and the TRCC can make payment through a consolidated invoice. He further stated that I sent out an email requesting you let me know if you were interested in attending. The responses I have received to date are from George, Reed, Rick, Esther, Alan, and me. Anyone else who wants to attend that has not responded please let me know after the meeting. David Harden stated that he is making a presentation and wanted to know if he needed to pay. Larry stated that it was his understanding that if you are an invited presenter, you do not have to pay for the day you make your presentation unless you intend to stay for the entire day and it includes a luncheon and then you have to pay for the entire day. Larry stated that he would send an email providing all participants with the specifics. Mark and Kiran – representing Sarath – also indicated that they would like to attend. George encouraged all members to

participate since this is an international forum and a very good opportunity to meet other state and federal representatives.

10. Call to the Public – *George Delgado*

Co-Chairperson George Delgado made a call to the audience providing an opportunity to members of the public to address the Traffic Records Coordinating Committee. No public comments or questions were received.

11. Adjournment – *George Delgado*

Co-Chairperson George Delgado adjourned the meeting at 2:50 PM.

Next Meeting: November 17, 2009, 1:00 – 3:00, – Location: TBD