

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the
Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting Summary Report**

May 6-7, 2008

Prepared for:

**US Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, S.E.
Washington, D.C., 20590**

Prepared by:

**Westat
Transportation and Safety
Research Group
Rockville, Maryland 20850**

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008**

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Agenda, including Participants	1
Meeting Summary.....	4
Summary of Proceedings.....	4
a. Welcome Mr. Michael Halladay	4
b. Meeting Format Overview Ms.Fran Bents	4
c. Overview of Status, Recommendations, and Current Issues Mr. Michael Halladay.....	5
d. ITS and Motorcycle Issues Ms. Linda Dodge, Mr. Kevin Dopart, Mr.Steve Sill	5
e. Member Roundtable - Open Discussion	8
f. Motorcycle Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Demo Update Mr. Tianjia Tang.....	13
g. Update on Motorcyclist Survey Mr. Ed Moreland, Mr. Darrell Killion, Mr.Gerry Salontai.....	14
h. Update on the Motorcycle NPA in the MUTCD Mr. Hari Kalla	16
i. Summary of Discussions and Consensus of Advisory Council Ms. Fran Bents.....	17
j. BikeSafe North Carolina Program - Sgt. Mark Brown	19
k. Awareness	23
FHWA Brochure Distribution – Dr. Oliver Oliver	23
AASHTO Motorcycle Initiatives – Ms.Priscilla Tobias	23
California Law on Motorcycle Detection – Mr. Dick Schaffer	24
Outreach and Open Discussion.....	25

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008**

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Table of Contents (continued)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Safety Research	25
Status Report on the FHWA Crash Causation Study (CCS) – Ms. Carol Tan.....	25
Open Discussion.....	26
m. Summary of Action Items, and Plans for Next Meeting	
Ms. Fran Bents.....	26
n. Closing Mr. Michael Halladay.....	29
Attachments	35
Attachment 1. ITS Presentation by Mr. Steve Sill, Ms. Linda Dodge, and Mr. Kevin Dopart.....	36
Attachment 2. Motorcycle Symbol and Signs NPA for the MUTCD	37
Attachment 3. BikeSafe NC Program Presentation by Sgt. Mark Brown	39

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008**

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

AGENDA

May 6, 2008

10:00 Welcome – Mr. Michael Halladay, Director, Office of Safety Integration, and Designated Federal Official

10:05 Meeting Format, Review of Ground Rules, and Agenda – Ms. Fran Bents

10:10 Overview of Status to Date, Recommendations, and Current Issues –Mr. Halladay

10:30 ITS and Motorcycle Issues – Ms. Linda Dodge, Mr. Kevin Dopart

11:00 Member Roundtable- open discussion

12:00 Lunch

1:30 Motorcycle VMT Demo Update – Mr. Tianjia Tang

2:00 Update on Motorcyclist Survey – Mr. Ed Moreland, Mr. Darrell Killion, Mr. Gerry Salontai

3:00 Break

3:15 Update on the Motorcycle NPA in the MUTCD – Mr. Hari Kalla

3:30 Summary of Discussions and Consensus of Advisory Council – Ms. Bents

3:45 Public Comment – Ms. Bents

4:00 Closing Comments and Adjourn for Day – Mr. Halladay

5:30 Optional Dinner for Continued Discussions

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008**

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Conference Call –in Number is 202.366.3920 pass code # 4639

May 7, 2008

9:00 Welcome – Dr. Morris Oliver, Office of Safety Integration

9:05 Status Review – Ms. Bents

9:10 Bike Safe Program - Sgt. Mark Brown

10:15 Awareness – Dr. Oliver

1. FHWA Brochure - distribution
2. AASHTO Motorcycle Initiatives – Ms. Priscilla Tobias
3. California Law on MC detection – Mr. Dick Schaffer
4. Outreach and Open Discussion

10:40 Break

10:50 Safety Research

1. Status Report on Crash Causation Study – Ms. Carol Tan
2. Open Discussion

11: 40 Public Comments

11: 50 Summary of Action Items, and Plans for Next Meeting – Ms. Bents

11:55 Closing Comments – Mr. Halladay

12:00 Adjourn

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008**

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Council Members Present: Mr. Tisdall
Mr. Ed Moreland
Mr. Jeff Hennie
Mr. Darrel Killion
Mr. Steven Zimmer
Mr. Gerald Salontai
Mr. Ken Kiphart
Ms. Kathy Van Kleeck

Council Members Absent: Mr. Donald Vaughn

Others Present: Mr. Michael Halladay, Director, Office of Safety Integration, FHWA
Dr. Morris Oliver, FHWA
Ms. Linda Dodge, RITA
Mr. Kevin Dopart, RITA
Mr. Tony Helton, FHWA
Ms. Ewa Flom, FHWA
Ms. Carol Tan, FHWA
Mr. William Cosby, NHTSA
Mr. Michael Jordan, NHTSA
Mr. Gordon Creed, BMW Riders Group of DC
Ms. Alicia Tank, Harley Davidson
Mr. Tianjia Tang, FHWA
Mr. Hari Kalla, FHWA
Mr. Steve Sill, RITA
Mr. Dick Schaffer, FHWA
Ms. Denise Hanchulak, AAMVA
Sgt. Mark Brown, North Carolina State Highway Patrol
Mr. Bryan Chadwick, North Carolina State Highway Patrol
Ms. Priscilla Tobias, Illinois Department of Transportation
(via teleconference)

Agenda:

- a. Welcome
- b. Meeting Format Overview
- c. Overview of Status, Recommendations, and Current Issues
- d. ITS and Motorcycle Issues
- e. Member Roundtable- Open Discussion
- f. Motorcycle Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Demo Update
- g. Update on Motorcyclist Survey
- h. Update on the Motorcycle NPA in the MUTCD
- i. Summary of Discussions and Consensus of Advisory Council
- j. BikeSafe North Carolina Program
- k. Awareness
- l. Safety Research

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Meeting Summary

A summary of the meeting and copies of selected presentations can be found on <http://safety.fhwa.USDOT.gov/MAC-FHWA/>.

Summary of Proceedings

a. **Welcome**

Mr. Michael Halladay

Mr. Halladay welcomed and thanked everyone for joining this fourth meeting of the MAC-FHWA. He explained Mr. Lindley's absence, and conveyed his best wishes. Mr. Halladay, reviewing Mr. Lindley's comments at the last meeting, referred to major activities going on and motorcycles are one of the top 4 elements within the USDOT safety plan.

Mr. Halladay introduced new attendees at the meeting, from FHWA and elsewhere, and began by welcoming Mr. Tisdall to the MAC-FHWA—another representative from industry.

Mr. Tisdall has been in the privately-owned traffic safety arena since the 1970s, as a family business. He has been involved with ATSSA since the 1970s. He has been active with motorcycles and the motorcycle community most of his life. Mr. Halladay added that Mr. Tisdall has been active in the MUTCD and has worked with Linda Brown, and is very much engaged with the traffic markings community. Mr. Tisdall added that he is more interested in signs. He has sat on the sign committee for ATSSA for 15 years.

Mr. Halladay continued introductions. Dr. Morris Oliver has been leading the hands-on activities supporting the group and his work is appreciated. Mr. Helton, also with FHWA WV division, joined the group for the first time. A rotational assignment had been arranged for him to help move some of the products, recommendations, and activities of the MAC-FHWA forward. USDOT staff was solicited for interested persons to participate in the MAC-FHWA activities and Mr. Helton responded. Mr. Helton added he has been riding for about 20 years and has been a Motorcycle Safety Foundation (MSF) instructor for the past year. He has worked with military riders, as well as with civilians. Mr. Halladay added that Mr. Helton has been working on what the status of the MAC-FHWA's recommendations are, and what the priorities might be in moving some of them more quickly forward. His help is welcomed. Also, there is Ms. Ewa Flom from FHWA, who focuses on ITS issues and the overall safety program. Mr. Dick Schaffer is from the Office of Safety Design. Others introduced themselves.

b. **Meeting Format Overview**

Ms. Fran Bents

Ms. Bents reviewed the ground rules, emphasizing that the full agenda is designed for open sharing of information and respect for the opportunity of all to be heard.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

c. Overview of Status, Recommendations, and Current Issues

Mr. Halladay

Mr. Halladay explained that the MAC-FHWA has no chairman, per se, and certain roles have been assumed—e.g., himself as the Designated Federal Official (DFO) and liaison for the FHWA; Ms. Bents as facilitator—in order to move the MAC-FHWA forward toward fulfilling the goals of the SAFETEA-LU charter. However, all were encouraged to contribute. The MAC-FHWA charter has a 2-year sunset, which is due to expire June 30th (2008). USDOT has recommended the continuation of the MAC-FHWA and no disruption in activities is anticipated.

Regarding the recommendations from the last meeting: *The MAC-FHWA should respond to the Notice of Proposed Amendment (NPA) to the MUTCD*—There has been some activity, i.e., Don Vaughn's submission to the docket, and other items slated to be discussed today. *The Council should notify and encourage interested parties to comment on the NPA*—that went out through the members of the MAC-FHWA. *USDOT should report to the MAC-FHWA on topics raised regarding the amount of funding and specific ITS projects related to motorcycle safety, and USDOT should include motorcycle issues in agreements with ITS developers, consistent with TEA21 and SAFETEA-LU provisions*—a presentation by ITS and the Joint Program Office will be given shortly. *Conspicuity of raised medians should be revisited*—there is no specific on-going activity at this time; however, a major rule-making activity on markings is scheduled. A major rule was recently published requiring certain retro-reflectivity / visibility standards for signs. The next undertaking from that team is believed to be a focus on pavement markings, and Mr. Halladay will make sure that they're aware of this issue as things move forward.

Regarding Action Items: the NPA will be addressed today and Mr. Hennie, Mr. Salontai, and Mr. Vaughn will be drafting a response. Dr. Oliver will address the brochure distribution. We are keeping track of where the tri-fold is being distributed. We encouraged AASHTO to share the brochure much more actively with appropriate committees. The VMT-measurement demonstration was held yesterday at Turner-Fairbank (Highway Research Center); the group will report later today.

Ms. Tobias, AASHTO, will join the meeting tomorrow via telephone. She is part of the safety sub-committee to the Standing Committee on Highway Traffic Safety. She, in turn, leads a group on vulnerable users, and will talk about some of the issues they could take on regarding motorcycle safety.

The ITS World Congress will occur this November in NYC, and there was a call for papers. We have proposed a paper to raise awareness in the ITS world, and hope it will be accepted. (June 2008 update: paper has been tentatively accepted for presentation at the World Congress.)

ITS and Motorcycle Issues

Ms. Dodge, Mr. Kevin Dopart, Mr. Steve Sill

At the previous meeting, Ms. Dodge and Mr. Dopart presented information on the Joint Program

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Office (JPO) and future ITS applications. They will speak more specifically about more motorcycle-related ITS projects. Motorcycles as a distinct vehicle type are not significantly involved in recent JPO ongoing projects. JPO projects that do address, in part, motorcycle safety issues will be discussed.

1. The Integrated Vehicle-Based Safety Systems (IVBSS) program. The intent of IVBSS is to develop and demonstrate an integrated collision warning system that will warn of forward collision, run-off-the-road, lane-change/merge, and curb speed run-off-the-road type accidents; representing about 60 percent of crashes. Although these options may be offered individually on some vehicles, no integrated system exists to provide correct, precise, and useful information to the driver. To date, the technology has been demonstrated to work in light vehicles and heavy trucks. Will now go on to see how well it works in the real world; data that couldn't be obtained from individual optionally equipped vehicles. Currently, the IVBSS suite of technologies is just physically too big to fit on motorcycles, but can envision future versions migrating to motorcycles as manufacturers and the marketplace respond. However, the collision warning systems in the program specifications require that the smallest legal vehicle be detected. In both the light-vehicles and trucks, this works. So in that sense, needs of motorcycles are covered.

2. The Vehicle Infrastructure Integration (VII) Program. VII is a large initiative within JPO looking to establish communication between the vehicle and the roadside to provide travel information and roadway warnings, among many other pieces of information. The VII system, currently in proof of concept testing, is currently being developed only for automobiles—primarily for ease of testing. However, the technologies are believed to be easily integrated into motorcycles, i.e., “little black boxes” would be miniaturized over time. The VII system treats a vehicle as a vehicle; it doesn't matter about size. The other part of this program is V2V (Vehicle to Vehicle) communications research effort, which would enable continuous communication between vehicles on the roadway.

Mr. Moreland asked how long before a study is completed on the behavioral implications; i.e., after a driver gets used to the system, he may no longer be looking over his shoulder to see potential hazards. Mr. Sill says this applies to the IVBSS and is one of the things expected to be learned in the field operational tests (FOIT)—*will the additional safety systems cause some risk-taking behaviors that you wouldn't ordinarily see?* Results are expected around the end of 2009. Mr. Moreland asked how the audio alert will work with routine situations. Mr. Sill said part of optimizing the system is balancing legitimate alerts with false alarms. The forward collision system looks at various factors, e.g., closure rate, etc., in deciding whether or not to issue a warning. In practice, a false-alarm rate of 7-8 per 100 miles has been found. Mr. Dopart added that, conversely, there can be some value to increasing the frequency of alert, so the driver is aware that the system is working.

Mr. Sill continued. Part of the human factors involved with research is determining the acceptable balance. The program is in partnership with private industry whose goal is to market the product; if the results are not acceptable, the product can't be sold. Mr. Tisdall asked how it will work regarding consideration of vehicle size. Mr. Sill responded that the system is programmed for the characteristics of the specific vehicle, as well as other factors, e.g., road conditions, weather, etc. Mr. Halladay asked Mr. Moreland if his earlier question, regarding people getting too used to the system, is a concern of people not seeing riders or of riders getting too used to the system, and not looking

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

over their shoulders—or both. Mr. Moreland said riders generally have a high degree of awareness. His concern is that automobile drivers may get used to warnings and no longer feel the necessity to actually look for the motorcycle rider. Mr. Sill agreed that may be a risk. The plan is to learn more in upcoming field operations testing (FOT). A previous generation of the system showed no signs of that behavior; but, what was seen was a drastic increase in turn-signal use. Changing lanes without a turn signal, even when no hazard was present, triggered the alert because the vehicle has crossed the lane marking.

The test area is SE MI, where the driving population is more civil. Mr. Zimmer asked if the system is designed to detect rear-end collisions, as well. Mr. Sill said no. It will tell you about forward collisions; it will not tell you someone is about to rear-end you.

Ms. Van Kleeck asked that when human behavior is tested, if it doesn't almost stand to reason that subjects would be on their best behavior. Mr. Sill responded that one would think so; however, past FOTs have found that they quickly revert back to their standard habits. Testers are given camera equipped cars for an extended period of time, and drivers are observed using numerous bad techniques.

3. The Cooperative Intersection Collision Avoidance System (CICAS) is closely related to the VII program. CICAS seeks to prevent intersection collisions. The system will warn drivers when they are likely to violate an intersection—e.g., running red lights, and provide information to drivers about the relative safety of turning into or through the 'gap' in traffic at the intersection. It would work with motorcycles, or any other vehicle.

Mr. Moreland asked whether it is a foregone conclusion that it will be an audio warning system. Mr. Sill said that was not at all the case. From the JPO perspective, interest is in making the programs work. With VII and V2V, testing is primarily on the technology aspect, with no optimization of the human interface. The expectation is that each manufacturer will decide how best to present the information to the driver. Mr. Zimmer asked whether intersection collision avoidance would require retooling all intersections. Mr. Sill said it would. This is one of the complexities of this proposed program; there will be a lot of work to be done. Mr. Halladay added that most intersections are computer-controlled so it becomes a non-trivial matter of tapping into them and collecting the appropriate information, etc. That team is also looking at installing the systems at higher crash and most technically feasible intersections. Currently it is in the proof of concept phase. Ms. Dodge said that there are some active tests and would share those with the group, if interested.

Mr. Dopart continues the presentation. The industry partnership component of VII started about 10 years ago with Ford and GM. They brought in other companies and the funding is shared. Members include Honda, Toyota, Mercedes, among others. Honda/Japan has done more testing on cars versus motorcycles, since around 2003.

Ms. Dodge said most of the current research is being done on automobiles; it doesn't mean that it can't be adapted to motorcycles. There are many programs out of the ITS JPO. Should the Council require information about other programs, other program managers can be reached. The <http://ITS.USDOT.GOV> web site shows the current projects.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Mr. Halladay added that NHTSA is heavily involved in many crash avoidance and other related studies. Another question was raised as to how much money has gone into motorcycle-related programs. Mr. Halladay said it was not really feasible to break out funding in this manner, because development work on communications, system processing needs, and other topics are expected to form the foundation which will support eventual applications on most vehicle types, including motorcycles.

Mr. Dopart said that in the NHTSA case (Combined Braking Study), it is a separate project and is a \$500K project for 12 months. Mr. Moreland asked whether the genesis of that study is that people don't use their front brakes when involved in a crash. Mr. Dopart believed that NHTSA had referred to earlier study that indicated in 83 percent of motorcycle crashes, the driver does not appropriately use the front brakes. Discussion among members ensued, with key points being that this work should be looking at training and other issues as well as the technology side.

A question was asked, by a non-MAC-FHWA member, regarding the timeline of these programs, and whether or when any rule making could be expected. Mr. Sill responded that, although the JPO sponsors testing, the rule-making activity is outside their purview. None of the projects mentioned have a specific component to support rule making, and Mr. Halladay added that the question is for NHTSA, and this is preliminary work that can inform that rule-making process. Mr. Sill further added the research *can* inform the process, but is not specifically targeted to do so.

d. Member Roundtable- Open Discussion

Prior to the discussion, Mr. Moreland asked Mr. Halladay if there was any way the MAC-FHWA could help in developing the paper (to be submitted to the ITS World Congress), and expressed his interest in knowing if the paper gets accepted. Mr. Halladay said we do want to raise the issue and put the needs out there within the ITS community, and he appreciated the offer.

Ms. Bents called attention to the *Road Plate Securing Assembly, Disclosure Abstract* in the information packet, given to her by Mr. Zimmer. Mr. Zimmer explained that this was forwarded to him by Chris Lane, unsolicited. He asked that it be presented to the MAC-FHWA, in light of the group's concern about the issues associated with steel plates. Mr. Zimmer described the device as a portable frame that a crew would anchor to the highway for the steel plate to fit in. The frame is inexpensive, lightweight, and reflective, and anchors directly to the asphalt. This is being used by the city of Medford, OR, in construction areas and they are pleased with it. It increases safety around the plate area; removes necessity for asphalt build-up, as well as de-construction when done. Mr. Zimmer continued that it seemed like a reasonable idea and he didn't know Mr. Lane's expectations. Mr. Tisdall noted that he may have seen similar applications in the NW using recycled materials. Someone asked Mr. Tisdall if steel plates are standard sizes; he answered no. Mr. Hennie asked about thickness (standards). Mr. Tisdall said they usually run about 1". Mr. Hennie thought the biggest concern was the slippery-when-wet issue, not plate stability.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Mr. Halladay noted that many ideas come to USDOT and FHWA from the public, and that the MAC-FHWA shouldn't be seen as endorsing a proprietary item. This may be better marketed to contractors, than to this group. Mr. Tisdall, as a contractor, remarked he would hesitate bolting anything to the road because it may pop out and cause damage. Mr. Zimmer, not knowing what is being used to anchor it, said it was explained to him that it was less damaging to the roadway than putting an asphalt ramp up—then having to tear it down and scrape it off—and did recall having seen instances where repeated pounding by heavy trucks caused plates to bounce and skid around. He will tell Mr. Lane it was discussed and recommend he focus more on manufacturers. Mr. Helton, agreeing with Mr. Hennie's earlier comment, stated, as a rider, he was more concerned with plates being slippery. Mr. Halladay said tyre-grip and other friction products have been discussed, and are also identified in the brochure.

Mr. Moreland asked Mr. Halladay if there was any data on number of reported instances where plates cause crashes, or if data exist on people avoiding plates/obstacles, and subsequently causing other accidents. Mr. Halladay didn't have those figures, noting that this degree of data specificity is difficult to find; it is mostly anecdotal. Mr. Tisdall said plates are mostly used in downtown areas, where the traffic rate is slow and speed is around 30 MPH. They are rarely used in high speed/heavy volume areas and speculated that if there were accidents related to them, they would be mostly minor, with the exception of if a motorcycle was involved. Mr. Zimmer liked the aspect that it would be more reflective and increase visibility. Mr. Halladay said it's not easy for inventors to find a path forward in the highway community. Each State typically has a hardware acceptance process which is a necessary step before specific items can be proposed by contractors, which may involve committee action, evaluation studies, and so forth. Mr. Zimmer made Mr. Lane's contact information available and invited anyone to contact Mr. Lane if interested further.

Ms. Bents solicited other topics. Mr. Halladay asked if there were any activities that members' respective organizations are doing that might relate to the MAC-FHWA.

Ms. Van Kleeck wished to mention the MSF began forming a Congressional Motorcycle Safety Caucus, about a year ago, which kicked off last week. Secretary Peters attended. There are about 8 Congress members, so far. She invited people to encourage Congress members to join. Coincidentally, there is a safety resolution currently pending in Congress, with about 20 co-sponsors, and she again asked that anyone with an interest encourage their representative to sign on to it. It is HouseRes-339 and is basically supporting the goal of motorcycle safety awareness. Mr. Hennie asked if there is a Senate component; there is none. She hoped the bill will pass this month.

Representatives Burgess (TX) and Gifford (AZ) are the leads on the Caucus, as well as the sponsors of the Resolution. The other members of the Caucus are Filner (CA), Duncan (TN), Conway and Edwards (TX), Walz (MN), and Butterfield (NC). Mr. Halladay asked if they envision a series of meetings, perhaps monthly. Ms. Van Kleeck said yes, and probably not even that often. It provides a forum to discuss motorcycle issues when the need arises.

Ms. Bents solicited other topics.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Mr. Moreland asked what can be done, as the MAC-FHWA, to encourage people to use ‘green’ vehicles, called motorcycles, to reduce the load and congestion on America’s highways. Motorcycles are getting over 40 MPG; they take less space; they’re easier to park. Mr. Hennie said one thing the MAC-FHWA can do is to contact municipalities, such as New York City, that are not allowing motorcycles to use the HOV lanes. As a council, maybe a letter can be sent. He asked Mr. Moreland to expound on this issue.

Mr. Moreland began by saying motorcycles are supposed to have access to HOV lanes. New York City began writing tickets for motorcyclists riding in the lanes. Despite losing in court, NYC still decided to file a petition to FHWA for exclusion from the Federal regulation that allows motorcycle access to HOV lanes. Mr. Moreland believes there was no data submitted by the city; they haven’t completed or commissioned a study. He said it doesn’t seem right that a city can just arbitrarily decide to exclude motorcycles from the HOV lanes. He thought that this should be a topic for the MAC-FHWA. Absent any supporting information from NYC that he was aware of, the obvious benefits that have been enjoyed for years by motorcyclists—the positive aspects of congestion relief, fuel economy, ease of parking—encourage people to use motorcycles. A situation should not be created to *discourage* ridership, especially in a city like NYC—which could certainly benefit from a dramatic increase in ridership, and a decrease in the use of other vehicles.

Mr. Halladay said FHWA’s Office of Operations oversees the HOV provision, and that a process exists for considering exemptions. In this case, he believed NYC would have to submit its request and all supporting data, and their request would be considered. Ms. Van Kleeck said safety is the only exclusion. Mr. Halladay said it may technically be outside the scope of the MAC-FHWA to get into issues like this. Mr. Hennie observed that this is an infrastructure issue; i.e., the roads are built with Federal dollars and the legislation says motorcycles are allowed to use the HOV lanes. Mr. Halladay noted that the infrastructure focus of the MAC-FHWA is mainly on safety issues—barriers and road maintenance activities, and similar issues. He said he didn’t wish to discourage, or outright forbid, the group’s involvement with this issue, but it is not an agenda item that would normally be included within the charter of the MAC-FHWA.

Mr. Hennie said, however, it sets a dangerous precedent, if NYC is able to sustain their position, for other ‘motorcycle-unfriendly’ jurisdictions. Mr. Moreland felt it was ironic that one of the core issues for passing the Federal legislation in the first place was the safety of riders in a congested traffic mix. Now NY is going to try to argue that motorcyclists are somehow endangering other drivers, or themselves, by being in an environment that originally was specifically allowed to protect them. Mr. Halladay noted that he had not been aware of this issue previously, said he will let FHWA Operations staff know. Mr. Moreland said no one really knows if this is coming; NY has released no information, other than what was asked for by the AMA.

Ms. Bents asked the group if it would be appropriate to have a recommendation from the MAC-FHWA of support for continued motorcycle-access to HOV lanes. Mr. Tisdall noted that when HOV lanes first opened, many did not allow motorcycles. After a time, they began to be allowed. Studies have shown, basically, that getting more people in the HOV lanes would reduce congestion. Mr. Moreland said he realized this may be controversial—that there are arguments to both sides—and asked if there was any value in the MAC-FHWA making any sort of recommendation

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

supporting the continued availability of HOV lanes for motorcycles. He didn't know if it fell within the purview of the MAC-FHWA, but thought it was a valuable opinion to express. Mr. Halladay said he personally had no objection with passing the information on. If conflicts existed versus the MAC-FHWA charter, that could be dealt with at the appropriate time.

Mr. Zimmer said should it come to an issue of what is within the MAC-FHWA's purview, there was an infrastructure side to this issue. He noted the more motorcycles there are on the highways, the less impact to the infrastructure—e.g., reduced usage of 4-wheel vehicles, taking up less space. Ms. Van Kleeck asked if the focus of the group is primarily infrastructure or safety. Mr. Halladay said he thought it is infrastructure as it relates to motorcycle safety. He said he was not in objection to the MAC-FHWA including this issue; however, it may be more applicable to the contacts of, and the organizations represented by, the members. Mr. Moreland said he thought the individual decisions made in VA and other municipalities—e.g., allowing hybrids, increasing/decreasing passenger limits, etc.—are not the same as the existing Federal law that allows motorcycles in the HOV lanes. Mr. Halladay agreed that there is a distinction and only cited the increased congestion of HOV lanes in VA earlier as possible arguments for exclusion.

Mr. Moreland said he would like to write a short recommendation endorsing continued access to HOV lanes by motorcycles, as originally inserted in TEA-21 and codified in the last highway bill—if no one objected. Mr. Hennie asked if it should be expanded to include Public/Private partnerships (PPPs), as well. Mr. Moreland said PPPs are something that is being developed; however, this is something that motorcycles already have right to. But, that may be something the group could do separately. Before it's too late, Mr. Hennie added. Mr. Hennie asked if there are any Federal laws governing PPPs. Ms. Bents asked what PPPs are.

Mr. Halladay explained that he is no expert in this area, but the basics are that Public/Private partnerships are arrangements wherein the private sector partners with public sector entities (usually State DOTs) to invest in the development and operation of roadways, sometimes with a long-term lease. They can typically include tolling, which provides income to the private sector in return for their capital and operating costs. 'Protecting the Public Interest' is a concept that's used on the public sector side—i.e., what means are used to ensure uniform operation and that appropriate public laws are enforced and that interconnections to the overall transportation network are maintained in a safe and efficient manner. USDOT does have a role when they tap into the InterState system. PPPs must adhere to the applicable Federal laws.

Mr. Halladay continued. Traffic operations laws and regulations are instituted and enforced at the State and/or local level, so access to HOV lanes for motorcycles had to be written into regulations at the State level. If the State doesn't follow through on that, then the remedy (e.g., penalties which may include loss of Federal funding for other highway purposes) is usually spelled out in law. There may be incentives, but that may not be enough to obtain compliance from all States. This may be the situation in NY. Mr. Moreland said it is not the State that is petitioning for the exclusion, it is the city.

Mr. Moreland, referring to Mr. Hennie's earlier point about PPPs, asked—as Governors look to PPPs for revenue sources, they may or may not be compelled to comply with the motorcycle/HOV

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

and other laws. Is there, or will there be a Federal remedy? Mr. Halladay acknowledged that these types of questions are serious concerns, and not all of them have been answered.

Mr. Moreland asked Mr. Halladay if he had any idea of Secretary Peters', as a rider, stand on the issue of motorcycles/HOV lanes. Mr. Halladay did not. Mr. Hennie said many of the emerging PPPs are internationally based. They may define motorcycles differently than does the U.S., e.g., European standards, etc. Mr. Moreland asked if any sovereign issues existed—if the private sector would be bound by existing regulations. Mr. Halladay believed that the terms would be typically defined in the agreements between the public and private sectors.

Mr. Tisdall asked if something is coming up from MUTCD about Toll Plaza safety standards. Mr. Halladay said there is a concern about Toll Plaza safety—issues such as too much signage, which can be very confusing; and awareness that the private sector wants to put advertising signs along the roadway. The questions are how much of that is acceptable; when does it become too much driver distraction, to the detriment of safety. Mr. Tisdall asked if there was work on the consistency of toll plazas from one State to the next. Mr. Moreland responded that the east coast EZ-Pass system exists, which has provided some uniformity.

Mr. Zimmer wished to commend the State of PA for their use of variable message signs. He saw two of them (on his way to DC from OH) which said “May is Motorcycle Awareness Month. Watch for Motorcycles.” One was fixed; one was mobile.

Ms. Bents solicited other topics.

Mr. Moreland asked if the group had arrived at a decision as to whether there was anything the MAC-FHWA can do to encourage motorcycle use, in order to reduce congestion, etc.—or if that even fell within the MAC-FHWA's purview. Mr. Halladay said the advisory council is set up to advise the Secretary of Transportation, through the FHWA, on infrastructure-related and other issues affecting motorcycles. In his mind, the Council is not a body that puts out encouragement to the general public or to people buying a vehicle in the next few months. He thought this stretches the purpose of the group. Mr. Moreland said the MAC-FHWA would not be recommending to the public, but would be making a recommendation to the Secretary. Mr. Halladay said that, if crafted in that manner, it would be appropriate. He said he didn't want to put boundaries on the group that did not need to be there, but the basic structure of the group was recommending to the Secretary. Mr. Moreland said it could be crafted in a manner that is consistent with the MAC-FHWA's mandate. He thought it was incumbent upon the MAC-FHWA to make these types of recommendations to her, and asked if others agreed.

Mr. Hennie said he was aware of a USDOT initiative to reduce congestion and wanted to know if motorcycles were a part of that. Mr. Halladay did not believe that motorcycles are specifically included as an element of the Congestion Initiative. He said that was more about encouraging partnerships in urban areas, operational concepts including congestion pricing, etc. To the extent that a motorcycle would use less road space, an argument could be made, he said. But, he didn't think there was a part of the program that says the USDOT should be specifically encouraging motorcycling.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Mr. Moreland said there is a basic paradigm shift that is widely encouraged. It is from considering motorcycles as recreation-only vehicles to a viable mode of transportation. So, if motorcycling is part of the transportation mix, then motorcycle use should be encouraged because of the obvious benefits it has.

Mr. Moreland continued. Motorcycles are used to commute—not just for weekend recreation—and there is a tangible benefit associated with their use. He said we would hope that FHWA and the Secretary would recognize those benefits—and promote them—because motorcycle usage is not just a benefit to motorcyclists; rather, motorcycle usage is a benefit to everyone. Mr. Halladay noted that the conversation would also include overall safety impacts, and Mr. Moreland said that NHTSA should be able to help answer that question. Mr. Moreland also said a perfect example would be London. The congestion pricing structure used there had cars using off days, based on the driver's birthday or the end number on their license plate, etc. They charged cars to come into the city; they did not charge motorcycles. Subsequently, fewer cars and more motorcycles were in the city. Fatalities and accidents for motorcycles went down—again, with more motorcycles on the road.

e. Motorcycle Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Demo Update

Tianjia Tang

Mr. Tang is with FHWA, Office of Policy Operations. The turnout at the motorcycle VMT Demo, held at Turner-Fairbank, was great. Ninety percent of the current technologies were represented. There were 28 riders registered; 25 riders participated—23 riders, after lunch. All data were recorded, and based on preliminary analysis, all contractors had similar results. Next, the number of motorcycles will be extracted and a report will be developed to summarize what was learned from the demo. The challenge begins now as implementation of what was learned begins. The goal is to track high-access and local road travel, and weekday/weekend, as well. Since the travel symposium in October 2007, a research travel roadmap was developed. This outlined the overall approach. Supplemental motorcycle travel guidelines were recently issued to State highway agencies. All is being done that can be by the Office; but, there is much more to be done, and there will be continued work on issue. Goal is not to just develop papers, but to make real improvements.

Mr. Oliver asked when the preliminary summary report would be released. Mr. Tang said he expected to obtain all of the results from the vendors by week's end, and hoped it would be produced by end of May. Another issue is cost. States can't be asked to expand counting stations without considering their costs. An attempt is being made to develop a rough estimate of what costs can be expected for implementation. Mr. Halladay asked if any feedback had been received from States on how equipped they'd be to report back with better data this year. Mr. Tang explained that the Office of Policy Operations has 3 divisions and his office is responsible for Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data—a component of which is VMT data. Prior to 2008, States have not been required to submit motorcycle travel data. Starting in 2008, all States are required to submit VMT data. In January 2007, States raised the issue of how collection can be done. This was the reason for issuing the supplemental guidelines. Already, four States have asked why the adjustment between weekend and weekday is necessary. Historically, there has not been the need for the distinction. The technology has been in place to count trucks; now the means exist to capture

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

motorcycle data, as well. In addition, it is important to distinguish between weekend, or recreational, travel versus weekday. Mr. Halladay added it will take time for all States to adjust. The upcoming report will be distributed to the States in order to give them an idea of the technologies' capabilities.

Mr. Schaffer, FHWA, added that he would be reporting on California, which is requiring traffic signals loop detectors to recognize motorcycles, and the new technology that is already able to recognize motorcycles. It is a matter of implementing this technology everywhere. Mr. Tang added that the MUTCD is working on signing to identify what portion of the detector is most sensitive. Mr. Zimmer asked if the MAC-FHWA would be able to see the report. Mr. Tang answered, yes.

Mr. Halladay said this is all directed toward getting better data on exposure. He thought the States would get better at this, as it gets more attention and resources devoted to the issue.

f. Update on Motorcyclist Survey

Mr. Moreland, Mr. Killion, Mr. Salontai

Mr. Moreland displayed the draft survey on its web site and explained it was divided into 3 sections: urban, rural, limited-access roadways. The questions are similar in each of the sections. The survey begins with an introduction stating the need for the survey, who it's intended to query, and who the answers will be sent to—the State highway safety entities and FHWA. He explained that the survey could be adjusted as much as desired. Participants will be limited to one completed survey response.

Opportunities for additional comments are limited within the survey because the desire is to get specific information. Yet, some comments are desired, in case participants make important points or there is something that hasn't been covered. The length and detail were the primary points considered in the creation of the survey. The likelihood of participant completion of the survey depends on its length, and how long it would take one to complete it. The intention was to provide enough detail that people thought it was meaningful; but, not so much detail as to be cumbersome.

Should the group agree, the intention is to circulate the notice of the survey in the motorcycle rider community. People will be encouraged to go to a remote Web site and complete the survey. It will not be hosted by any particular group or organization. Real-time results can be gathered and tabulated at any time. It can be decided at this meeting whether to cap the number of responses, or allow it to be open-ended. Another consideration is whether to run it now, for a finite period; then, run it again in the fall—in order to compare responses under seasonal road-conditions. He said the survey is not scientific, but it should provide a decent indication of what motorcycle riders believe to be significant issues. The survey covers signage, roadway markings, repairs—both in-progress and completed, tracks, traffic signals, train and metro tracks, roadway edging. Mr. Moreland solicited the group for comments and suggestions.

Mr. Tisdall asked if there was a way to track the region of respondent. Mr. Moreland said that could be done. Mr. Tisdall continued that roadway conditions are drastically different, depending on the region. Mr. Schaffer asked if Mr. Moreland and the other designers of the survey had decided how results information would be disseminated because his experience working in rural areas convinces him that this information would be good and useful to them. Mr. Moreland said he'd like the

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

information distributed as broadly as possible. No list of recipients has been created yet, but one certainly can be. Mr. Schaffer complemented the creators of the survey on how comprehensive it is—yet, concise so as to not be too lengthy. He said it would collect a lot of useful information.

Ms. Tan suggested changing the word “safe” to “adequate” on the questions referring to road conditions throughout the survey. Mr. Zimmer felt ‘adequate’ vs. ‘safe’ are 2 different things. He suggested perhaps ‘more hazardous’ should be used. Ms. Tan asked Mr. Moreland what the question being asked is. Mr. Moreland said are the markings themselves safe or hazardous. Mr. Helton said that this would be a valid issue in WV. After more discussion among other meeting participants, Ms. Tan said that broad questions and answers are not useful. She suggested that 2 questions be added to distinguish between assessing if the message road markings are sending is adequate, versus the safety of the actual physical acuity of the road markings. Mr. Moreland said he agrees and will split the question into 2 more specific questions where it appears throughout the survey.

Mr. Halladay raised the issue that technically this survey can’t be sponsored by the MAC-FHWA itself, due to restrictions on Federal entities doing surveys. Perhaps it can come from ‘the members of’ the MAC-FHWA, in the interests of gathering input for their consideration prior to being raised at a MAC-FHWA meeting itself.

Mr. Moreland asked if there were other issues that needed to be included. Ms. Bents asked if collecting the level of rider experience had been considered—stated as number of miles ridden. She asked if it could be important to determine respondents’ expertise. Mr. Moreland asked the group if they felt this was important to capture. Mr. Tisdall thought years of experience—perhaps, in categories of 5-10, 10-15, etc.—could be asked. Mr. Helton said that just because one owned a motorcycle for a length of time, rarely equates to the number of miles ridden. He felt that number of miles traveled still doesn’t capture the level of experience of the rider, and suggested the group may want to ask if the rider is endorsed. Mr. Moreland said the type of information the group is after must first be considered. The group is not interested in whether the rider was trained, whether the rider is licensed, etc. The survey is to determine the riders’ opinions of the roadway. Mr. Helton asked if the level of experience would be considered at all. Mr. Killion said it is just as important what the novice rider thinks of the roadway, as it is the veteran.

Ms. Van Kleeck again said it must be considered what the MAC-FHWA is going to do with the information. She felt knowing the experience level of the rider would probably have no effect on the use and analysis of the survey results. Mr. Moreland agreed. Mr. Halladay said maybe the question should not be asked at all. He was thinking the more experienced riders’ answers might be more valuable. Mr. Killion was inclined to believe, based on his experience conducting surveys on the South Dakota (SD) ABATE web site, that the riders with limited experience probably would not do the survey, generally. Ms. Van Kleeck asked Mr. Killion if the question of experience is generally asked in the surveys he posts on the web site he maintains. Mr. Killion said the question is asked, but only at the behest of the SD Department of Highway Safety. He didn’t know whether the question would have been included had the Department of Highway Safety not requested it.

Mr. Tisdall felt the experience of the rider was not as important as the region in which the rider’s responses applied. He continued to say, should the results of the survey identify problem trends,

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

they would more likely be regional in nature, or even distinguished by State, than anything else. Mr. Zimmer agreed and said further that using States to delimit responses would be better than regions. He noted there could be significant differences between States, within a particular region, using MN and SD as an example. Mr. Killion suggested adding a drop down object to allow the respondent to select a State. Mr. Moreland said that could be done.

It was suggested that a question about toll plaza detectors be added, e.g., EZ-Pass. All agreed it was a good idea to include such a question. It was also observed that the last question in each of the sections, "Are you satisfied with current road conditions?", is ambiguous. Mr. Moreland agreed and said he will add the word 'overall,' or otherwise modify the question to be less ambiguous.

A discussion began on means to disseminate word of the survey. Denise Hanchulak said she would ask the State DMVs to put the survey on their web sites. Mr. Moreland said he didn't envision difficulty with obtaining respondents. Ms. Van Kleeck told the group of a very narrowly focused survey MSF just conducted, where they expected around 200 responses and got 3,000 responses in 2 weeks.

Mr. Moreland said he would make the suggested revisions overnight, and hopefully get the group's approval the next day.

g. Update on the Motorcycle NPA in the MUTCD

Mr. Kalla

Mr. Kalla displayed the proposed universal motorcycle symbol, which is part of the Notice of Proposed Amendment (NPA) to the MUTCD. The symbol is based on the research conducted at the Turner-Fairbank Research Center. A number of alternative symbols were evaluated; this one tested the best. Two signs are proposed to accompany the symbol, based on roadway situations. The NPA was published in January and the comment period ends in July. All of the comments will be analyzed then, and the final rule will be published after that time. To date, thousands of comments have been received; one industry group has promised to submit 50,000 comments. It will take some time to get through all of the comments and prepare the final ruling. The goal is to have the process completed by early 2009.

Mr. Oliver asked how long until the ruling is effective, after being entered into the Federal Register. Mr. Kalla said the rule would become effective 1 month after the Federal Register notice is published. Then, States have 2 years to bring themselves into compliance. Compliance means the States must update their MUTCDs and supplements. Currently, the motorcycle sign cannot be used because it is not in compliance. If it is approved, then the symbol can be used. Mr. Halladay added that it is still at the States' option. Mr. Kalla said that was correct. Currently, the States do not have this option. Once the symbol is approved, then the States can use it if they think it's appropriate.

Mr. Halladay asked Mr. Kalla to comment on likelihood of rejection and Mr. Kalla said it happens all the time, and strongly encouraged the group to comment on the symbol; especially, if there is no objection or they like the symbol. He said that frequently during the comment period, people who approve don't bother to comment, and most of the comments received are negative. That is why it

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

is important to comment, either way. Mr. Halladay thought that a typical objection might be there are too many signs/symbols already. Mr. Kalla agreed and said the symbols are taken very seriously, which is why unapproved symbols are not allowed. This symbol is a product of extensive research and is proposed because it has been found to be the best solution.

Mr. Hennie asked Mr. Kalla to speculate on the worse case scenario, and what conditions would get this rejected. Mr. Kalla said the quality of the comments, not the quantity, is what is given the most consideration. Research supports the use of this symbol; the successful argument against its use would have to be compelling. Mr. Hennie asked if the fact that no symbol currently exists, at all, would not be enough to gain approval. Mr. Kalla responded that the approval would include a decision on *what* symbol to use—not just to use a symbol. For example, there could be additional research out there supporting an alternative.

Mr. Tisdall added that many States balk at the prospect of the additional spending required for purchase and installation of new signs. Mr. Hennie asked if that would be a valid argument, in this case. Mr. Kalla explained that in the case of this specific symbol and signs, it is just an option. Mr. Halladay added that, although placement of the sign is optional, if placed in some places, and not others, it might raise legal issues.

Mr. Tisdall further explained the MUTCD uses the words “*should*,” “*shall*,” and “*may*” in its language, which distinguishes between mandate, recommendations, etc. Mr. Hennie asked if it would be beneficial to make certain kinds of motorcycle signs mandatory. Mr. Kalla said care is used in deciding what signs shall be made mandatory.

Mr. Kalla said all of the comments could be seen on the docket on the web.

Mr. Zimmer felt one of the benefits will be that once there is approved motorcycle signage, States can be approached and encouraged to implement them. Mr. Kalla said indeed that is the hope—that on approval, individual groups will take it and run with it.

h. Summary of Discussions and Consensus of Advisory Council Fran Bents

Ms. Bents reminded the group that at the last meeting, the NPA was discussed and it was enthusiastically endorsed. She referred the group to the letters of support already written by Don Vaughn, representing the Alabama Department of Transportation, and Kathy Van Kleeck, representing the MSF. Mr. Hennie, Mr. Vaughn, and Mr. Salontai drafted an endorsement from the MAC-FHWA that the group considered.

Mr. Hennie explained the letter is a straight-forward endorsement for the adaptation of the motorcycle symbol and signs seen earlier. The letter suggested additional signs for other roadway conditions and situations. He asked Mr. Halladay if the letter should come from *members of MAC-FHWA* or the MAC-FHWA, itself. It was decided that it would be appropriate for the Council, as a body, to originate such a letter. A letterhead could be easily created. Mr. Moreland asked what was

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

done with previous Advisory Councils in this situation, but Mr. Halladay didn't know of previous situations like this.

Mr. Oliver asked Mr. Kalla if he hadn't said earlier that the origin of the comments was not considered. Mr. Kalla said the origin of the comment does, in fact, matter. He said it makes no difference whether it is on letterhead, etc., but the person or entity making the comment is considered. Mr. Hennie wished to have it clarified whether or not the letter can come from the Council, or the individual members. Mr. Halladay said Mr. Moreland's point was valid. The letter *should* come from the Council. Mr. Moreland thought the community looked upon it in that way—i.e., the MAC-FHWA would communicate and act as a body, rather than individuals with common interests, in issues involving motorcycles.

Mr. Zimmer added that it would be advantageous, as the group moves forward, to have some kind of logo or other unique identifier. Mr. Killion said people browsing the comments do look at the PDFs.

Mr. Tisdall suggested that it should be requested this NPA be a *shall* condition. Mr. Hennie said the States must be given flexibility, as well. Mr. Moreland agreed with Mr. Tisdall, saying that requesting the use of the word "shall" may or may not be approved by the MUTCD, but does not change the nature of the endorsement. Mr. Kalla said a request such as this should State supporting arguments saying why. Mr. Tisdall said his concern was if the NPA goes in as a *may* condition, it might never be used. Mr. Zimmer said using the word 'shall' makes it an unfunded mandate. Mr. Halladay agreed with this opinion, and Mr. Moreland said the most important issue at this time is that States have something approved and on-hand to use, should they choose to.

Ms. Bents confirmed that the language was agreed upon by the group. Mr. Hennie agreed to make the requested changes that evening, and bring the letter back to the group the next day.

Ms. Bents anticipated 3 potential recommendations and began drafting them, earlier.

- The first had to do with the issue of motorcycle access to HOV Lanes. The wording in question is "*affirms its support and recommends to the Secretary...*" Mr. Moreland agreed to followup with this and present it the next day. He sought to confirm that the intention of the MAC-FHWA is affirming its support and recommending that the Secretary affirm her support, as well. It was agreed.
- The second was in recognition of the growing implementation of Public/Private Partnerships (PPPs), the MAC-FHWA recommends PPPs conform to applicable Federal, State, and local laws. Mr. Moreland did not want the recommendation to appear as if the MAC-FHWA was in support of PPPs, in and of themselves. He felt the language should convey the MAC-FHWA's position, in the event that PPPs are implemented. Ms. Van Kleeck suggested adding the phrase "*Where these partnerships go forward...*" Mr. Hennie suggested adding the phrase "*Guaranteed full access...*"

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

- The third recommendation encourages the Secretary to promote the use of motorcycles. Mr. Zimmer said the original intention was to encourage viewing motorcycles as a means of transportation, as opposed to primarily recreational. Ms. Bents said it sounded more like a marketing issue, worded in this manner, and it is not the Secretary of Transportation's job to market the use of motorcycles; rather it is to meet certain national goals. Mr. Moreland said the Council's job is to market motorcycles. Ms. Bents questioned whether that was part of the MAC-FHWA's charter. The charter is more to advise the Secretary on infrastructure and safety issues. Mr. Zimmer disagreed. He said that part of the Secretary's mandate *is* to promote economical modes and wise uses of transportation, which would include the wider use of motorcycles. While it may not be part of the Secretary's job description, it is part of the public perception of her duties. It was suggested that the phrase "*include the broader use of motorcycles in the promotion...*" It was agreed.

Ms. Bents moved the group to identifying the Action Items. (1) Mr. Hennie will produce the final version of letter, collect the signatures, and forward the letter to the MUTCD; (2) Mr. Moreland will launch the motorcycle survey and report on the results. Mr. Moreland reminded the group that the survey duration and/or frequency still remained to be decided on; (3) Seek to obtain a presentation on the PPP process. Mr. Halladay will explore avenues of getting someone to present. Mr. Moreland suggested Greg Cohen of the American Highway Users Alliance, who is immersed in this issue, as one who would be a good source. Mr. Halladay agreed to followup on arranging the PPP presentation.

i. **BikeSafe North Carolina Program - Sgt. Mark Brown**

After introductions of persons in attendance, who were not at the previous day's meeting, Mr. Oliver said that yesterday's meeting was good. He welcomed the members of the North Carolina State Highway Patrol (NCSHP), who were scheduled to present information on the BikeSafe NC program at the last meeting, but had to postpone. He acknowledged that the focus of the program is somewhat outside the primarily infrastructure-focused scope of the MAC-FHWA.

Ms. Bents announced there were video anomalies that were being addressed, but welcomed Sgt. Mark Brown to begin his presentation on the BikeSafe NC program.

Priscilla Tobias (Illinois USDOT) joined the meeting via telephone.

Sgt. Brown is with the NCSHP. North Carolina (NC) has experienced record increases in motorcycle crashes and related fatalities in the last five years. He recently went to London to take the BikeSafe safety course. BikeSafe is a motorcycle crash reduction program. He maintained communication with law enforcement personnel there, and learned that London enjoyed a 25% reduction in motorcyclist fatalities the first year they implemented this program. After taking the course, Sgt. Brown was first certified as an assessor, then as a *Train-the-Trainer*.

NC began a one-year pilot BikeSafe program, patterned after the *BikeSafe London* program in the UK. The program is taught by 41 departments in the UK. The UK spends more money on traffic safety than does any other country. There are more motorcyclists there, than in the U.S., but have

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

just a third of the fatalities. The 12 members of the NC motorcycle patrol unit were used as trainees for the initial program in the U.S.

The top four things killing motorcyclists are within their control. The number one killer is improper curve negotiation. This is sometimes characterized as speed, when often it is actually negotiating the curve improperly, to include going too fast. The second is alcohol. The third is improper braking. The fourth is poor equipment, e.g., helmets, etc. The fifth is a left-turn yield violation by the oncoming driver. So, four out of five can be controlled by the motorcyclist. BikeSafe was created to proactively address this fact. The presentation contains the results of implementing this program.

BikeSafe NC is a one-day program. Ideally, the class has a two to one, rider to trooper, ratio. The class begins with a short real-world ride for observation and assessment. The riders are then given the results of the assessment—strengths and weaknesses, etc. Then riders are taught the *system of motorcycle control*, taught in the UK, which includes eye drills, hazard perception, and assertiveness. Next a longer ride is taken, which includes the five statistically worst roads in Wake County, in order to have riders use the system they were just taught in myriad situations and conditions. The day concludes with review and more assessment.

To date, this is just a pilot program in Wake County. To attract students, notices were posted, brochures were distributed, and notice of the program was placed on their web site. There was an overwhelming response.

Ms. Bents requested a brief pause to correct the video problems. Mr. Halladay invited comments or questions during the pause. Mr. Schaffer suggested making the BikeSafe program part of the licensing process and remanding traffic law violators to take the program—like the DUI process requires violators to participate in alcohol programs—as two additional methods of proactively addressing fatality problem. Sgt. Brown agreed and added riders taking the BikeSafe assessment are required to be endorsed, not just licensed. He agreed traffic safety schools are focused on cars and a motorcycle-remedy would be valuable. Mr. Moreland asked if there was a behavioral difference in how riders ride when flanked by troopers. Sgt. Brown said that has not been much of a problem.

Sgt. Brown continued. The riders want to learn and seeing the proper way to ride makes the motorcyclist begin to see the benefits. Dr. Oliver asked if any incidents had been experienced. Sgt. Brown said there have been no crashes, yet. London has experienced accidents while conducting the assessment and NC expects to—things happen. Mr. Zimmer asked if there is a charge to the motorcyclist. Sgt. Brown said during the pilot program, there was no charge. London charges \$56. The pilot included a followup to ask students how much they would pay, and the answer was between \$50 and \$100. Ms. Van Kleeck asked if the followup was with people who had not taken the course. Sgt. Brown said the followup was with the participants. The students do a critique of the course at the end of the class, and then there is a six-month followup to assess the effect of their participation.

The video problems were resolved and the presentation continued.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Some things are unavoidable. BikeSafe cannot prevent all accidents. The most common Statement from a car driver involved in a motorcycle accident is “I didn’t see him.” Riders must do their part to be seen.

After the pilot, Wake County had steady decreases on fatalities over six months. A question is if the decrease can all be attributed to BikeSafe. Sgt. Brown feels it was a team effort—Highway Patrol, Sheriffs, City Police Departments, other programs, as well.

The BikeSafe London program has shown a steady decrease in fatalities since it was started in 2001. They have trained over 10,000 motorcyclists. NC has had record fatalities. In NC, 400,000 people are endorsed, while only 200,000 have motorcycles. Motorcycle ownership may increase as the cost of driving increases.

The correct method to take a curve is *outside, inside, outside*, as taught by MSF. BikeSafe teaches this and also teaches riders to use a *hazard perception line*, when looking ahead, rather than tunneling just on the object immediately in front of them. Mr. Halladay asked the number of riders that participated in the 2007 pilot. Sgt. Brown said 120 riders have been assessed, to date, and 10 additional NC department troopers have been trained, as well.

GEICO and other insurance companies offer a discount to policyholders who have taken this assessment. The Governor’s Highway Safety Program (GHSP) would like to allocate \$100K for the 2008 program. Part of these funds will be used to set up mobile classrooms at rallies and other events. Assessors have been trained across the State, including the military with over five bases in NC. The NC Highway Patrol feels that teamwork is very important. Currently, only Sgt. Brown is certified to teach BikeSafe—train-the-trainer. Implementation of train-the-trainer projects is needed. Ms. Tobias asked the length of the training program for instructors. Sgt. Brown said the program totals 32 hours. The first 3 days teaches them how to be assessors; the last day is hands-on. Lt. Scott Abbott, the motor unit commander for Illinois (IL), asked (via telephone) how 42 officers would be trained. Sgt. Brown said he would have the lieutenant send two of his officers to NC assessor train-the-trainer training; then they would go back and train the others. The lieutenant asked if the training schedule is posted on the web. Sgt. Brown said it is not, yet. He hopes to host two-three more in 2008. At this time, NC wants candidates to come to NC to participate in the program. Ms. Van Kleeck asked Sgt. Brown if he knew where the funds he receives from GHSP originate. Sgt. Brown did not know.

Mr. Halladay asked, referring to the five worse roads in Wake County included in the pilot program, if other State agencies were brought in to assess the State of roadways. Sgt. Brown said the NC Department of Transportation does assess the condition of roadways, and reports from the Highway Patrol contribute to that. Mr. Halladay then asked if program participants were talked to about impact of infrastructure. Sgt. Brown said the focus of BikeSafe is primarily to address things the rider can change.

BikeSafe has the same goal as the MAC-FHWA—motorcycle crash reduction. Both are addressing the problem; just using two different approaches.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Mr. Tisdall asked if anyone had re-taken the course, and if any cycle of taking/re-taking the BikeSafe program is anticipated. Sgt. Brown said the short-term goal is to have as many people as possible take the course, at least once. He said London uses a stand-by system for persons who wish to re-take the course; but, priority is given to the new participant. Dr. Oliver asked what the cost would be to keep the program going. Sgt. Brown could only say as much as possible, because it is just too early to tell. The initial Startup kits—consisting of posters, brochures, other promotion items—would be \$500-\$600 per agency. Ms. Tobias requested a copy of Sgt. Brown's presentation.

Mr. Zimmer asked how the BikeSafe NC program envisions collaborating with the MAC-FHWA. Sgt. Brown said by working together—BikeSafe/troopers out on the roads that are the MAC-FHWA's focus—there must be ways to work together. Mr. Salontai said he applauded the program. However, the scope of the MAC-FHWA is more related to infrastructure. He asked Mr. Halladay if this initiative is more suited to one of USDOT's safety-related offices. Mr. Halladay said BikeSafe is more in line with NHTSA's motorcycle program and that's why they are represented here, i.e., Mr. Jordan. Most aspects of the BikeSafe program are outside of the MAC-FHWA's scope. What the MAC-FHWA could say is limited, but individual members, and the groups they represent, can do whatever they feel is appropriate. Mr. Salontai said one thing that would bring the program more in line with the MAC-FHWA would be to possibly integrate some sort of report-back on the infrastructure component into the curriculum, that the MAC-FHWA could then recommend action be taken on. Ms. Tobias commented that the State DOTs, with SAFETEA-LU, are supposed to be the lead for the Strategic Highway Safety Plan and thought BikeSafe may fit with this approach. Mr. Halladay responded he thought she was correct. It does have a role with the Strategic Highway Safety Plan and other elements of safety, but for the MAC-FHWA, it is not quite compatible.

Mr. Zimmer suggested making a letter of commendation to Sgt. Brown and the BikeSafe NC program from the MAC-FHWA. Mr. Halladay thought that was a viable idea. Mr. Tisdall asked what other safety classes are being taught out there. Sgt. Brown responded that BikeSafe is not a safety program, it is an assessment.

Mr. Helton asked if, during the session, there was a constant communication between riders and the assessors. Sgt. Brown said there is no verbal communication. Non-verbal communication between the motorcyclists and the troopers is used constantly. In addition, it also serves to prompt riders to keep an eye on the troopers and other elements of their environment, rather than just being focused on what is immediately ahead of them. Mr. Helton asked at what point in the day the feedback is provided. Sgt. Brown said there are designated areas to stop and review observations. There is a detailed debriefing at the end of the day. Ms. Van Kleeck asked if the program has any relationship with the NC Statewide program. Sgt. Brown said the MSF is fully endorsed by BikeSafe NC, as well as other programs, and riders are encouraged to take the MSF course. He said there is cooperation with the Statewide program.

Mr. Halladay asked if there was any response from the group on the suggested letter of commendation. (Members nodded affirmatively.) It will be further discussed later in the meeting.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

j. Awareness

FHWA Brochure Distribution – Dr. Oliver

Dr. Oliver gave the Council an update on the brochure. He said it had its second printing and 8,000 copies have been printed, to date. Of those, 3,000 are currently in the warehouse. He invited the members to distribute them at will to their respective constituents. Most of the requests have come from within USDOT; the majority from NHTSA. Also, the FHWA field offices and VOLPE have requested copies, as well as the Connecticut and Oregon State DOTs and private citizens. It was discussed with USDOT's public affairs office whether a press release would be appropriate. They said it was probably not a good idea because the brochure is probably not as newsworthy as some of the other items. He said other alternatives, such as an announcement in *Public Roads*, or other USDOT magazines, are being investigated to help promote the brochure. Mr. Halladay said FHWA has been very pleased and it is part of the regular distribution—noting FHWA participates in around six major conferences and meetings each year. Mr. Salontai asked if the primary reliance is on a *pull* of the brochure, rather than a *push*, remarking that only two State DOTs have requested copies. He asked if a mechanism exists to push it out. Mr. Halladay said AASHTO and other organizations with upcoming meetings were notified that the brochure is available and were asked to distribute it. He said, although the number of copies on hand was getting pretty low, the camera-ready art is available and the brochure can be retrieved from the web site in several forms for redistribution.

AASHTO Motorcycle Initiatives – Ms. Tobias

Mr. Halladay introduced Ms. Tobias, the IL State USDOT Safety Program Manager, who serves on the AASHTO Standing Committee on Highway Traffic Safety. She is the leader of a sub-committee working group on vulnerable users. She was invited because of her professional ties to the work of the MAC-FHWA.

Ms. Tobias continued. The AASHTO Sub-committee on Safety Management has several sub-groups and the one she is in charge of is the At-Risk or Vulnerable Users. This was separated into pedestrians and motorcyclists—having two distinct problems. Moving through the process, it was found that a web clearinghouse exists for pedestrians; however, no such counterpart exists for motorcycles. Early in the process, it was realized that information on a lot of activity is out there, but people don't know where to get it. Also they realized that better understanding of the problems was needed, which included crash characteristics. That moves into the roadway design. At the last meeting, it was decided to move the focus more toward motorcycles. One sub-group within this AASHTO sub-committee is working on a Safety Web Portal—e.g., using 'safety' as a keyword in web search would bring a browser to this. This portal would contain safety-related information on motorcyclists and pedestrians without requiring browsers to go to many web sites to retrieve information. Currently, that project is under development. The sub-group will put together a resolution to support the development of a motorcycle clearinghouse, as well as a request for proposal (RFP). Currently, there is a work zone safety clearinghouse and the sub-group thought it would be a good idea to build upon the MAC-FHWA to establish a motorcycle clearinghouse, perhaps needing \$1 million to fund the establishment and maintenance. In the interim, the sub-

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

group would work to come up with the funding mechanism. This would be a really good way to pool information and have it in one source.

Ms. Tobias continued. Having decided that collecting data on the infrastructure-related aspects of crashes was needed, it was suggested to develop research into motorcycle crashes, at a cost of around \$50,000. A pilot could be done to identify trends, not just alcohol, age, etc., but other related conditions, including infrastructure. FHWA has its Motorcycle Crash Causation Study that AASHTO could tie into, in order to get a project going. It is hoped to start by the end of 2008. Illinois and New Mexico would participate; Florida and South Carolina have been asked. A cross-section of States should be examined.

Ms. Tobias continued. Finally, the sub-group will rewrite the task group charter to reflect the multi-discipline approach to achieve improved motorcycle safety and a reduction in motorcyclist fatalities across the U.S. It would also reflect the goals of the MAC-FHWA and the PR-107 AASHTO Policy Resolution. They also will develop a scope of work to develop a motorcycle clearinghouse. The task group will be meeting in September, at which point the next steps will be determined. She asked Mr. Halladay if anything was omitted.

Mr. Halladay referred to the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Series 500 Reports on implementing the AASHTO Strategic Safety Plan. The motorcycle report is in final editing and is expected to be released in June or July. Also, the AASHTO committee that decides on projects approved a major study on the impact of barriers on motorcycle fatalities. This study should begin in August 2008. Followup conversations with NHTSA to see if they might participate in the clearinghouse project will be held also. Ms. Tobias said she would like to invite Sue Ryan, NHTSA, to attend the next meeting in September. Her expertise could add to the meeting. Mr. Zimmer said the TRB already exists and his understanding was that they already have a list of research needs detailed before the Motorcycle and Moped Committee, and they are putting together a clearinghouse of ongoing or potential research projects. Mr. Halladay said that they do—it is the Transportation Research Information Service (TRIS), which is a database of ongoing research. He attended that committee meeting, in January, at TRB where research policy statements were refreshed. He will forward that information to Ms. Tobias. Mr. Halladay thanked Ms. Tobias and said he will make sure all related activity stays linked together.

California Law on Motorcycle Detection – Dick Schaffer

Mr. Schaffer presented information on the new California law on motorcycle detection. Traffic signals have evolved over time. They are either timed or actuated—using sensors in the roadway. The actuated signals were designed for two-axle vehicles. There are some sensors that have been designed for vertical vehicles—e.g., motorcycles and bicycles. The two-axle design for loop-detection does not recognize vertical vehicles and has the cyclist waiting indefinitely for the traffic light to change.

Mr. Schaffer distributed a handout and continued. The handout described a magnet that attaches to a vehicle that would activate sensors within a six foot radius. This solution is viable for all existing

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

loop-detectors. California has acknowledged that motorcycles and bicycles are vehicles and thus have a right to the roadway and to be detected at traffic signals. California passed a law that detectors will be designed to detect all types of vehicles on the roadway, in order to set the standard. Once the standard has been set, municipalities Statewide will have 10 years to comply. A provision of the law says if localities can prove there is an additional cost, then the State will pay. This will be in effect until such time as the whole system moves to video-based detection or other technology is developed. This will take some time.

Mr. Schaffer continued. Many riders know—as a fact of life or unwritten law—that you wait for a reasonable period of time for the traffic light to change, and then, if it doesn't, proceed when it is safe. Arguments can be made about the cost of retrofitting all loop-detectors around the U.S., and alternatively the magnet option does work. It is becoming more prominent around the country. Possibly, both solutions could be used. Mr. Halladay added that other things seen on Monday were improved sensors and other technology to improve traffic signal control for motorcyclists, as well as bicyclists, pedestrians, etc.

Outreach and Open Discussion

Dr. Oliver invited members of the Council to share information on any issues for outreach and awareness that are going on. Mr. Zimmer asked Dr. Oliver to clarify. Dr. Oliver replied anything that may be of interest to the group, regarding outreach and awareness. Mr. Halladay said, as others had mentioned, the value of the individual members of the MAC-FHWA, and the groups they represent. This was the idea behind putting this item on the agenda.

Mr. Zimmer, as he mentioned the previous day, wished to commend the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for their use of motorcycle-related signs—i.e., “May is Motorcycle Awareness Month.” This is outreach, using the infrastructure.

Ms. Bents mentioned previous discussions about States having web sites to report roadway hazards and whether anyone was aware of additional States adopting that approach. Also, it was discussed how members of the MAC-FHWA, as individuals representing various groups, have the opportunity to filter the findings, recommendations, etc., back to their own organizations.

k. Safety Research

Status Report on the FHWA Crash Causation Study (CCS) – Carol Tan

Ms. Tan said the Pilot Study is rapidly moving ahead and from it, a draft coding manual soon will be produced. Currently, the training manual is being worked on with an anticipation of completion in July.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

There are still contractual issues, with the main study, that need to be resolved with Oklahoma State University and accounting for the matching funds still is needed. FHWA Contracts Office has written to them regarding outstanding deliverables: e.g., web site, work plan, an Institutional Review Board report. However, the plan continues, which is to move on to the actual study, once enough data are received from the pilot, and while the team is still in place. The Pilot Study will be in the Los Angeles, California area.

Ms. Tan continued. A project working group meeting will be scheduled in the next two months for the CCS. It needs to move forward. The funds, although FY06, are allocated for the actual study and can and will be used. The money must be obligated this fiscal year. Mr. Hennie asked if there is an anticipated kick-off date for the pilot study. Ms. Tan said data collection will begin in mid-September; training will begin mid-July. Ms. Bents added that the Pilot Study data collection phase will be three months. One of the main goals of the pilot is ascertaining how long it takes to gather each component of the crash investigation. She said the contract actually expired in April 2008; however, it was extended until October 2009.

Mr. Hennie asked when results from the Crash Causation Study could be expected. Ms. Tan responded that there will be a two to three year data-collection period, while the total project is a four-year effort. However, there will be preliminary results that can be analyzed and discussed in the interim.

Supplemental data exist that could be used. The National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) effort uses the method of examination of crash reports to produce results. This is an accepted method to conduct studies. The results of this methodology may provide an overview, and possibly determine the feasibility of conducting a larger study.

Open Discussion

Ms. Bents announced the conclusion of the formal presentations.

Sgt. Brown distributed additional information and items on the BikeSafe NC program.

1. Summary of Action Items, and Plans for Next Meeting

Fran Bents

Ms. Bents moved the meeting to the clean-up items and asked Mr. Moreland to give an update on the suggested changes to the survey.

Based on the previous day's comments and suggestions, Mr. Moreland modified and/or added questions for the safety of roadway markings to distinguish between "traction," or surface quality, and "sufficient," assessing if they convey the intended message. Wording of the last question was changed to "overall road conditions." He said the remaining outstanding issue is allowing the respondent to choose a State, via a drop-down menu object, and it was only a minor technical issue to implement that feature.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Mr. Moreland continued. More responses are likely to be received than are needed. He asked if the Council felt the survey should be limited by the duration of its availability or by the number of responses. Ms. Van Kleeck suggested a duration of 30 days. Mr. Moreland said that would be good, and if there were not enough responses after that length of time, the survey can be extended. Mr. Zimmer agreed, as well.

Mr. Moreland said the survey will be set up so respondents can only respond once. This could potentially be a problem if there is more than one rider in the home. Mr. Hennie said it is best to deal with that, as it comes up. Mr. Moreland asked if there was anything discussed earlier that he did not address.

Mr. Hennie asked whether the issue of asking the respondent's time as a motorcyclist or miles driven been resolved. Mr. Killion said it was decided that the level of experience of the respondent was not relevant.

Mr. Moreland asked Mr. Helton if it was a road surface issue with Mr. Helton's motorcycle accident of earlier that morning. Mr. Helton said it was not.

Mr. Tisdall asked would the survey be released right away. Mr. Moreland said he hoped to put it up right away. Mr. Hennie asked if some lead-time could be given, in order to spread notice of the impending survey. Mr. Moreland thought this possibly could produce a problem, with having time to prepare an artificial response in order to influence the outcome of the survey. He suggested releasing it immediately, and again in the fall, and added that all of the members of the MAC-FHWA can have access to the data. However, if it was agreeable to the Council, it would be OK.

Mr. Salontai suggested that the definitions of "rural," "limited access," "urban," etc., may need to be provided, i.e., add the definitions in the opening description to all of the subsequent sections. It was discussed and clarified that a limited access highway is only accessible by a ramp. Mr. Moreland said he will make the final changes, and once the changes are made, Ms. Bents will circulate the survey to the MAC-FHWA members one more time for final review. Then the survey will be launched.

Ms. Bents moved the group on to the letter of endorsement from the MAC-FHWA to the MUTCD. Mr. Hennie had finalized the letter, based on the previous day's comments and suggestions, and distributed it for review and signatures. The letter was signed by all members present and Ms. Bents agreed to forward it to Mr. Vaughn for his signature.

Ms. Bents moved the group on to the letter of commendation from the MAC-FHWA to BikeSafe NC and asked the group who will write it. Mr. Hennie said he would.

Ms. Bents moved the group on to finalization of the Recommendations and Action Items.

Recommendations:

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

- 1) The Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration affirms its support and recommends to the Secretary the continued use of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes by motorcyclists as prescribed in TEA 21.
- 2) The MAC-FHWA recognizes the current interest in Public Private Partnerships (PPPs) for highway operations. Where these partnerships go forward, the Council expresses its endorsement of guaranteed full access for motorcycles to all PPP roadways in conformance with applicable federal and State laws.
- 3) The MAC-FHWA encourages the Secretary of Transportation to include the broader use of motorcycles as a means of reaching Departmental goals to reduce congestion and fuel consumption.
- 4) Suggest that the Bike Safe program recommend to participants that road condition feedback be provided to State highway agencies.

Action Items:

- 1) Circulate the letter from the MAC-FHWA regarding the motorcycle NPA to the MUTCD for signature and submit it to the docket by July 31, 2008.
Mr. Hennie and Ms. Bents.
- 2) Launch the survey of motorcyclists' views of roadway infrastructure condition and performance and provide a status report at the 5th MAC-FHWA meeting.
Mr. Moreland, Mr. Killion, Mr. Salontai.
- 3) Provide a presentation on Private Public Partnership (PPP) plans and perceptions at the next meeting.
FHWA.
- 4) Send a letter of commendation to the North Carolina State Highway Patrol for their initiative and leadership in being the first State to adopt the Bike Safe program in the U.S.
Mr. Hennie and Ms. Bents.

Mr. Hennie asked, regarding Recommendation #1, if a letter will be sent to the USDOT Secretary. He felt the recommendation should go on record and be in writing. Ms. Bents said that the recommendations and action items are formalized in writing, as well as the highlights of the MAC-FHWA's discussion, and forwarded to Mr. Halladay. Mr. Halladay said no official letter or departmental memo goes up after each meeting, but that a package has gone forward recommending the extension of the MAC-FHWA's term that does include all of the recommendations, to date, from the Council. For the results of this meeting, a written addendum can be forwarded to the Secretary through the FHWA Administrator.

Mr. Zimmer wished to announce that the TRB just put out a call for papers for their next year's meeting.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Mr. Halladay wished to announce that Dr. Oliver led a group that gave a full-session presentation, “Hogs and Highways,” at the American Traffic Safety Services Association (ATSSA) Annual Meeting, in February in New Orleans, LA.

Ms. Bents stated the extension of the MAC-FHWA charter is for 2 additional years. Mr. Hennie asked if it was a certainty. Mr. Halladay said a process exists in order to finalize the extension, which began in January. The paperwork has been submitted to GSA, and it has returned, with comments. Once approved by GSA, it, next, must go to the OMB. The comments are procedural, in nature, and not substantive. Mr. Hennie asked if the process will require rule-making, re-nomination, etc. Mr. Halladay said he did not think so. The assumption is the current members would continue serving on the MAC-FHWA, if they chose to do so, and legislative requirements are maintained. Dr. Oliver added that the yellow sheet in the provided packet—i.e., the list of Council Members and their contact information—is what was included in the extension package sent for approval.

Ms. Bents asked the group to decide on when the next meeting will be. She recalled that after the first meeting, the format changed from a 1-day meeting to 1½ days and asked if the group wanted to continue that length; or go to 1 day; or decide based on the agenda. Mr. Hennie said let the agenda determine the scheduled meeting duration. Mr. Halladay said at the next meeting there will be the survey results and AASHTO, and other activities, so it may be best to decide based on the agenda.

Ms. Bents asked the group when the next meeting should be scheduled, adding that the last meeting was December 6-7 (2007). Mr. Halladay said the time between previous meetings has been around 6 months. Mr. Zimmer said the group has originally talked about scheduling the meetings at the beginning and at the end of the riding season, in the fall, and suggested November.

m. Closing

Mr. Halladay

Mr. Halladay remembered that at the last meeting the group took stock of the progress made, and it was positive. He saw the same this week. The MAC-FHWA meetings give him an opportunity to learn a lot and it is appreciated and he hoped the same was true for everybody. He asked if there were any other thoughts from individuals.

Mr. Moreland asked how the MAC-FHWA’s work is being perceived within FHWA. Mr. Halladay said that FHWA does take MAC-FHWA discussions and perspectives very seriously, and that we bring the information to the AASHTO community. He thought it is very positive. He thought that the identification of the issues, where needs exist which result in suggestions for improvements, etc., are well-taken. Dr. Oliver added that information on the MAC-FHWA web site elicits responses from a lot of people. NHTSA is also using the MAC-FHWA’s information, as well. He said he wouldn’t have foreseen such progress being made at the beginning.

Mr. Halladay said there is a good interchange—a very positive impression.

The meeting was adjourned.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration

Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

A review of the status of previous recommendations and action items is summarized below.

Meeting 1 – October 24, 2006

Recommendations

- 1) Prepare a brochure that can be distributed to government agencies urging them to consider motorcyclists' concerns during road design, construction, and maintenance activities.
Status: Presented at the May meeting; distributed in December, 2007.
- 2) Encourage State departments of transportation to create websites that allow motorcyclists to report roadway hazards. A model for this is the Roadhazard.org site created by ABATE in the Midwest. The websites would be monitored by State and local highway officials who could schedule repairs, improve signage, etc.
Status: Texas has begun implementation. South Dakota is providing a quick response to items identified on the Abate site. Other States and localities are creating reporting mechanisms.
- 3) Examine the skid resistance of intersection markings. The use of thermoplastics, especially for broad, horizontal intersection lines, creates slippery surfaces for motorcyclists who are stopped on top of them.
Status: Mark Bloschock presented information on skid resistant materials, May, 2007.
- 4) Continue FHWA initiatives to improve retro-reflectivity of signs and roadway markings. Also consider the use of wider lane markings in order to increase their visibility.
Status: Council proposed a formal recommendation on line visibility. The FHWA has a new rulemaking proposal coming that includes minimum levels of retroreflectivity.
- 5) Reduce hazards associated with milled surfaces, parallel paving lane joints, drop offs at shoulders and bridge surfaces, parallel grids on bridges, steel plates, potholes and other uneven roadway surfaces.
Status: The proposed brochure addresses this issue.
- 6) Conduct a review of barrier designs used internationally, and identify those that are most forgiving when impacted by motorcyclists.
Status: Presentation made by Nick Artimovich, May, 2007.
- 7) Consider signage targeted to motorcyclists to warn of especially hazardous conditions for them. These could include subjects such as uneven pavement surfaces and crosswinds.
Status: Don Vaughn drafted and submitted a resolution approved by the Council to AASHTO and SASHTO where they were approved, summer, 2007.
- 8) Examine the use of various sealants on road surfaces. Tar snakes (excess tar left on the surface) and other materials present slippery surfaces for motorcyclists.
Status: Mark Bloschock provided a presentation on two commercially available products, May, 2007.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

- 9) Extend future meetings to at least 1 ½ days.

Status: Adopted.

- 10) The Council was also interested in exploring ways in which they could better interact with groups such as AASHTO to ensure that motorcyclists' perspectives are considered during the development of recommendations and standard practices.

Status: A formal recommendations was submitted to AASHTO highlighting the need for formal guidelines on enhancing motorcyclist safety.

Action Items

Council members assumed responsibility for support activities as described below:

- 1) Mr. Hennie volunteered to provide examples of highway signs targeted for motorcyclists.

Status: Kathy Van Kleeck provided an exemplar photo from Maryland.

- 2) Mark Bloschock will consult with highway designers and engineers to review whether new entrance ramps are getting shorter than in older designs.

Status: (Nov 2007 update): Recent changes to geometric design standards relate mainly to sight distance, which have little to no impact on designs of ramp length.

- 3) Mark Bloschock will bring a sample of a Tyregrip product that is used on surfaces such as steel plates to provide some traction for tires.

Status: Mr. Bloschock provided a detailed PowerPoint presentation on two products.

- 4) The next Council meeting is tentatively planned for the spring of 2007.

Status: Held on May 9 and 10, 2007.

Meeting 2– May 9 -10, 2007

Recommendations

- 1) There should be a Web based survey to identify rider safety issues; enthusiasts groups could assist in this effort to increase participation.

Status: Ed Moreland reported that planning is underway, and results should be available for the May 2008 meeting.

- 2) Pavement surfaces and markings should include skid resistance at junctions, school zones, and crosswalks.

Status: This is covered by the new brochure.

- 3) The Council supports improved pavement markings w/regard to line width, retroreflectivity, and skid resistance, and urges that research in these areas be conducted.

Status: There is no current research, but future rulemaking on lane marking is expected to cover this topic.

- 4) Motorcycles should be included with recommendations for pedestrian and bicycle safety as vulnerable roadway user groups.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Status: Under consideration, and being advanced with AASHTO and others as various guidance materials and other documents are advanced.

- 5) All safety research should consider motorcyclists.
Status: Brochure, AASHTO Resolution, SASHTO Resolution and new recommendations to ITS cover this topic.
- 6) The conspicuity of raised medians should be increased with reflective paint.
Status: Change the wording to remove "with reflective paint." This is related to issue #3 above, and may be considered as part of future updates of the MUTCD.

Action Items

- 1) Bob McClune will draft a resolution from the Council to AASHTO on Pavement Markings.
Status: Superseded by AASHTO recommendation.
- 2) FHWA will develop a presentation on what is being done about ITS development with regard to motorcycle safety. They and the Council will also explore opportunities to present motorcycle safety issues at ITS conferences.
Status: Presentation, December, 2007.
- 3) Don Vaughn will submit a revised letter of endorsement from the MAC-FHWA-FHWA to have motorcycle- focused placards included in the MUTCD.
Status: Included in resolution, approved in summer, 2007.
- 4) Ed Moreland will edit Don's original letter recommending that motorcycle-related global issues and standard signs become a permanent part of the MUTCD.
Status: Complete.
- 5) Don Vaughn will draft a resolution from MAC-FHWA-FHWA to the chair of AASHTO standing committee on highways recommending that a formal motorcycle guidelines document be created. The package will include the FHWA motorcycle safety pamphlet.
Status: Submitted and adopted by AASHTO and SAASHTO, summer, 2007.
- 6) Jeff Hennie , Darrel Killion, Steve Zimmer, and Ed Moreland will explore developing a web based survey.
Status: Underway.
- 7) FHWA will invite an MUTCD expert to attend the next meeting.
Status: Presentation, December, 2007.
- 8) Kathy Van Kleeck will send a photograph of a motorcycle caution sign.
Status: Complete – a Maryland sign was provided.

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008**

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

- 9) FHWA will email a final draft of the motorcycle awareness pamphlet to the Council for review and comment.
Status: Brochure complete.

Meeting 3 – December 5-6, 2007

Recommendations

- 1) The Council should respond with written comments to the Notice of Proposed Amendment (NPA) to the MUTCD, regarding motorcycle-related signage.
Status: Complete, May 2008.
- 2) The Council should notify and encourage interested parties to comment on the NPA.
Status: Complete, May, 2008.
- 3) USDOT should report to the MAC-FHWA-FHWA on topics raised regarding the amount of funding and specific ITS projects related to motorcycle safety.
Status: Presentation, May, 2008.
- 4) USDOT should include motorcycle issues in agreements with ITS developers, consistent with TEA21 and SAFETEA-LU provisions.
Status: Ongoing.
- 5) Conspicuity of raised medians should be revisited.
Status: Research program pending.

Action Items

- 1) Kathy Van Kleeck will monitor the Federal Register and notify Fran when the NPA is published.
Status: Complete.
- 2) Jeff, Don and Gerry will review the NPA and make recommendations to the MAC-FHWA-FHWA.
Status: Complete.
- 3) Jeff, Don and Gerry will draft a response on behalf of the MAC-FHWA-FHWA.
Status: Complete.
- 4) Each MAC-FHWA-FHWA member will notify his/her constituency about the NPA and suggest a response.
Status: Complete.
- 5) FHWA will keep track of brochure distribution.
Status: Presentation in May, 2008.

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008**

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

- 6) Ed, Darrell and Gerry will attempt to bring survey results to the next meeting.
Status: Update provided, May, 2008. Survey planned for summer, 2008.
- 7) Another ITS discussion is requested for May, 2008.
Status: Presentation, May 2008.
- 8) If possible, the next meeting should be held in conjunction with a demonstration of VMT-measurement technology.
Status: Complete.
- 9) Dr. Oliver will prepare an appropriate announcement on the availability of the brochure.
Status: Public Relations office consulted. Effort is ongoing.

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008**

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Attachments

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008**

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Attachment 1. ITS Presentation by Steve Sill, Linda Dodge, and Kevin Dopart

Please see Website for PowerPoint presentation

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008**

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

**Attachment 2. MAC-FHWA-FHWA Letter of Support for Motorcycle Symbol and Signs NPA for the
MUTCD**

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008**

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

**The Motorcyclist Advisory Council to
the Federal Highway Administration**

May 7, 2008

US Department of Transportation
Dockets Management Facility
1200 New Jersey Ave. SE
Washington, DC 20590

SUBJECT: FHW A DOCKET No. FHW A-2007-28977
Notice of Proposed Amendments MUTCD

The Motorcyclist Advisory Council (MAC) to the Federal Highway Administration supports the proposed changes to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) to include motorcyclist specific surface condition warnings (W8-15 & W8-16) and the inclusion of a motorcycle plaque (W8-15P). The implementation of these new signs and plaque will be a benefit to the American motorcycling public.

The MAC FHW A was created under the SAFETEA-LU highway funding legislation (PL109-59, sec. 1914) and advises the Secretary of the Department of Transportation on all infrastructure issues that specifically impact motorcyclists. The council is the only motorcyclist advisory group existing at the federal level today.

We applaud the attention the MUTCD update team is giving to motorcyclists and we believe the MAC can add a unique critique of the additional applications of the plaque and recommend additional signs that would be helpful to motorcyclists.

For example, some additional signs that could benefit motorcyclists by displaying the motorcycle plaque include, but are not limited to High Winds, Railroad Crossings as well as other surface condition warnings such as gravel or brick surfaces. We encourage the MUTCD to allow states to have flexibility when applying the motorcycle plaque as the State DOT or related agency deems necessary.

Thank you for your attention to this very important issue. Please contact the undersigned should you wish for further input and assistance from the MAC.

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Fourth Meeting: May 6-7, 2008**

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
Conference Room C

Attachment 3. BikeSafe NC Program Presentation by Sgt. Mark Brown

Please see Website for the PowerPoint presentation on BikeSafe