



Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting Summary Report

November 5, 2009

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**

Westat[®]

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009**

Table of Contents

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|--------------------|
| Agenda | 1 |
| Meeting Summary..... | 3 |
| Summary of Proceedings..... | 3 |
| a. Welcome and Overview of Status to Date, Recommendations, and Current Issues..... Mr. Griffith | 3 |
| b. Agenda and Review of Recommendations and Action Items..... Ms. Bents | 5 |
| c. Status Report on the Motorcycle Crash Causation Pilot Study..... Dr. Vegega | 5 |
| d. Roadway/Roadside Motorcycle Crash Statistics | 8 |
| Ms. Samaha | |
| e. Status Report on the Motorcycle Crash Causation Study..... Dr. Tan | 10 |
| f. Update on National and International Scans..... Mr. Williams | 11 |
| g. Review of Massachusetts Motorcycle Crashes 2006..... Ms. Rothenberg | 11 |
| h. Update on the Motorcyclists Survey | 14 |
| Mr. Moreland | |
| i. Planned Motorcycle Questions in the Traveler Opinion and Perception Survey..... Ms. Bents | 15 |
| j. Awareness Topics | 15 |
| All | |
| k. Public Comments..... | 16 |

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009**

Contents (continued)

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|---|--------------------|
| l. Summary of Action Items and Plans for Next Meeting..... Ms. Bents | 166 |
| m. Closing Comments..... Mr. Griffith | 17 |

AGENDA

November 5, 2009

- 9:00 Welcome and Overview of Status to Date, Recommendations, and Current Issues – Mike Griffith, Director, Office of Safety Integration, and Designated Federal Official
- 9:20 Welcome From the New MAC-FHWA Task Manager – Keith Williams (FHWA)
- 9:30 Agenda and Review of Recommendations and Action Items – Fran Bents (Westat)
- 9:40 Status Report on the Motorcycle Crash Causation Pilot Study – Maria Vegega (NHTSA)
- 10:00 Roadway/Roadside Motorcycle Crash Statistics – Randa Radwan Samaha, The George Washington, University
- 10:45 Break
- 11:00 Status Report on the Motorcycle Crash Causation Study – Carol Tan (FHWA)
- 11:15 Update on National and International Scans – Keith Williams
- 11:30 Review of Massachusetts Motorcycle Crashes 2006 – Heather Rothenberg, (NHTSA)
- 12:00 Lunch
- 1:15 Update on the Motorcyclists Survey – Ed Moreland (AMA)
- 1:40 Planned Motorcycle Questions in the Next Traveler Opinion and Perception Survey – Fran Bents (Westat)
- 1:50 Summary of Action Items and Plans for Next Meeting – Fran Bents (Westat)
- 2:00 Closing Comments – Mike Griffith
- 2:30 Adjourn

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

Council Members Present: Mr. Jeff Hennie
Mr. Darrel Killion
Mr. Ken Kiphart
Mr. Ed Moreland
Mr. Dean Tisdall
Ms. Kathy Van Kleeck
Mr. James "Doc" Reichenbach II

Council Members Absent: Mr. Gerald Salontai
Mr. Donald Vaughn

Others Present: Mr. Mike Griffith, Director, Office of Safety Integration, and
Designated Federal Official
Mr. Keith Williams, MAC Task Leader, FHWA
Mr. Michael Jordan, NHTSA
Mr. David Nicol, FHWA
Ms. Heather Rothenberg, NHTSA
Ms. Randa R. Samaha, The George Washington University
Mr. Dick Schaffer, FHWA
Mr. Scott Shenk, PennDOT
Dr. Carol Tan, FHWA
Dr. Maria Vegega, NHTSA
Ms. Diane Wigle, NHTSA

Agenda:

- a. Welcome and Overview of Status to Date, Recommendations, and Current Issues
- b. Agenda and Review of Recommendations and Action Items
- c. Status Report on the Motorcycle Crash Causation Pilot Study
- d. Roadway/Roadside Motorcycle Crash Statistics
- e. Status Report on the Motorcycle Crash Causation Study
- f. Update on National and International Scans
- g. Review of Massachusetts' Motorcycle Crashes 2006
- h. Update on the Motorcyclists Survey
- i. Planned Motorcycle Questions in the Next Traveler Opinion and Perception Survey
- j. Awareness Topics
- k. Public Comments
- l. Summary of Action Items and Plans for Next Meeting
- m. Closing Comments

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

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 and Overview of Status to Date, Recommendations, and Current Issues**

Mr. Griffith

Michael Griffith, Director of the Office of Safety Integration and the Designated Federal Official for the Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration (MAC-FHWA), began the meeting by calling for introductions. Mr. Griffith then introduced Keith Williams, who became the new MAC task leader after a reorganization in the Office of Safety. He took over this position when Dr. Oliver moved to the evaluation team. Mr. Williams is relatively new to FHWA but worked for NHTSA for several years. As a former Maryland State Police officer, Mr. Williams worked in narcotics, homicide, criminal intelligence, and traffic operations and special operations. He also completed courses in police motorcycle operations and training.

Mr. Griffith told the group that from 2007 to 2008, there was a 9 percent decline in all crash fatalities. Because there was not a concurrent 9 percent decline in vehicle miles traveled (VMT), however, the decline was probably largely due to the economy. Moreover, for the first 8 months of 2009, there was an additional 9 percent decline in overall crash fatalities. Mr. Griffith was unable to break out if there was a decline in motorcycle fatalities for those same 8 months. He added that motorcycle fatalities have been increasing for at least 12 years.

The Department of Transportation has established a new Safety Council headed by a Deputy Secretary. This new Council brings together all the top administrators across the agencies to identify what DOT wants to accomplish in safety during this administration, to identify key safety initiatives, and to determine the Secretary's safety agenda. Recently the Secretary held a summit on distracted driving, and that summit got a lot of media attention. The safety agenda will be more comprehensive; thus, the Safety Council will focus on various issues, not just distracted driving.

FHWA, the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and their partners are starting an effort called "Toward 0 Deaths, A National Strategy for Highway Safety." The kickoff meeting was held in Georgia in September. This initiative is trying to map out the direction for the future in motorcycle safety efforts and determine key strategies over the next decade to reduce highway fatalities and injuries. Currently the group is developing white papers for key initiatives and strategies for safer drivers, vehicles, and infrastructure. In the future, the initiative will involve motorcycle groups.

Mr. Hennie asked if he understood correctly, that the goal was 0 deaths. Mr. Griffith replied that that was the long-term vision. It is already a goal in other countries such as Sweden. He added that AASHTO has a goal of cutting deaths by half in 20 years. DOT has a 1.0 goal—one fatality per 100

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

million VMT. DOT is reevaluating that goal because it is a fatality rate goal, and DOT believes that the public understands numbers more than rates.

Mr. Griffith also noted that the DOT is in its second continuing resolution, which goes through December 18; however, new legislation is highly improbable by the end of December when the resolution ends. Continuing resolutions mean that the department is just getting allotments of its budget, making it difficult to manage its program. Mr. Griffith stated that the MAC will continue so long as the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) continues, but what will happen under the new legislation is unknown.

Mr. Griffith introduced some new projects dealing with motorcycle safety. Two years ago, there was an action plan to reduce motorcycle fatalities that resulted in a number of strategies. The *NCHRP 500* (National Cooperative Highway Research Program) report is a compilation of those strategies and is a guide for addressing collisions with motorcyclists. Many of these strategies, however, have not been verified, so FHWA is putting together a research plan to determine their efficacy. Mr. Moreland asked if motorcycle riders were involved in developing the strategies; Ms. Van Kleeck responded that they were.

Mr. Griffith said FHWA is also looking at marketing for infrastructure-based countermeasures to address motorcycle safety. He said that there are a number of issues surrounding reporting of motorcycle registration data. David Winters' office (Policy) is looking at releasing a Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) to update guidance regarding motorcycle registration information received from the states to improve reporting of motorcycle registration data. Mr. Williams added that within about 60 days, the notice will be in the *Federal Register* for public comment.

Mr. Nicole asked about the content of the NPRM. Mr. Williams responded that it was to gather more data from the states. Mr. Williams also said that it was to help develop a mechanism for states to consistently differentiate among motorcycles, mopeds, and scooters to improve accident reporting data. The guidance will tell states how to discriminate which is which, and this, in turn, will affect the crash data.

Mr. Reichenbach reported that Florida started this effort 3 years ago and now has standard definitions. He added that the NPRM also needs to look at the classification of Spyders because some states classify them as motorcycles and some do not. Mr. Tisdall asked if the definitions would include ATVs, but Mr. Williams said those were four-wheel vehicles and therefore not included. In some states, ATVs do not even carry license plates.

Mr. Williams told the group that he appreciated the opportunity to work with the group. He also said that decisions about its continuation will have to be made because the extension under which it is operating will expire in December. The brochure previously developed at the recommendation of the MAC-FHWA includes a number of good recommendations, and FHWA is looking at a way to promote those recommendations. He added that he is available to the group at any time.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

b. Agenda and Review of Recommendations and Action Items

Ms. Bents

Ms. Bents reviewed the agenda and format of the meetings and noted a reorganization of the discussion topics. She reminded the group that a full agenda was not meant to squelch discussion. She then referred attendees to the printed recommendations and action items in their packets (see list at the end of this summary). One of the action items was for Michael Jordan to provide examples of state road hazard websites to Mark Bloschock, and Mr. Jordan reported that he had done so.

Mr. Williams said that he had been on state DOT websites to see if riders and drivers could report an infrastructure problem and if the DOT could provide feedback. None of the sites he visited could provide feedback on reported hazards; some had a contact button on the website; some had a forced choice menu regarding hazards; but all had a phone number to report debris in the roadway. And many dealt only with state-maintained roads. He offered to share the matrix he developed with council members.

c. Status Report on the Motorcycle Crash Causation Pilot Study

Dr. Vegega

The pilot study was conducted by Westat and its subcontractor Dynamic Science, Inc., primarily for methodological reasons. The people from NHTSA who were involved were Paul Tremont and Jenny Percer. The study examined the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) methodology for use in the United States and tried to determine how long it would take to get a case study and two controls. The main study is to be conducted by FHWA. Once the study started, NHTSA realized that it would have to revise its initial goals. The new study goals included:

- Revising the OECD data collection forms;
- Creating a coding manual for consistency. This manual ended up being 1,100 pages long and represented 1,700 data elements to be collected on each form in the pilot survey;
- Creating training materials so that the study could be replicated in the future;
- Creating a database. The data in the database were not analyzed; rather, it was created to be in place for the larger study; and
- Estimating cost per case.

For the pilot study, NHTSA negotiated agreements with police departments, and results from the study revealed good police cooperation. Notification of an accident was not always timely, but that was sometimes because the police were given the wrong crash location. Notification improved over time (the study was conducted primarily in Orange County, CA). When the response was timely, the average time to the crash was 16-17 minutes. The protocol itself worked well; information was collected in a timely manner. Hospital data were obtained within 18 days and complied with Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) regulations, which meant that crash victims had to give consent for their medical records to be released. The study had no problem collecting data on fatalities, however, because autopsy data in California are public record.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

The pilot took 3 months and initiated 53 crash investigations. Twenty-three of these were completed; of the completed cases, three were fatalities, five hospitalized riders, and seven treated and released. Most crashes occurred during the daylight; they involved people ages 18-60; and they included interstates, arterials, local roads, ramps, and a dedicated path.

There were challenges associated with the pilot study. The biggest one was collecting control data. The study wanted to get two controls for each crash to see if there was a difference between individuals involved in the crash and those who were not, but it was difficult to get riders to stop. The study offered free gas cards as an incentive and set up at gas stations to try to garner interviews. Finally, investigators had to resort to videotaping motorcycles as they went by, but that only provided the type of motorcycle being driven. In addition, there were only three investigators, so if the investigator was collecting control data and was notified that a crash occurred, that person had to leave, so control data were not collected at the preferred time.

The cost per case for the pilot study was about \$7,500 and included completed and dropped cases, collecting control data, and quality review. If the dropped cases are eliminated from the full study, the costs will probably decrease, and in a larger study, the cost per case is expected to decrease. Unfortunately, this cost does not include equipment, negotiating Memoranda of Agreement with police departments, or database and instrument development (although these will now be in place for the full study), training, administration, and analysis.

Recommendations from the study include:

- Making minor edits to the forms, coding manual, and training materials;
- Assigning one person for all control data collection, so he/she will not be pulled away to investigate crashes;
- Having the database on a secure network rather than on a computer so data can be entered simultaneously by several investigators;
- Including an investigator narrative description of crash causation; and
- Revising the training time allotments and including formal training in anatomy and injury coding.

Ms. Van Kleeck asked how the investigators tried to get riders to stop. Dr. Vegega responded that they posted a sign that said "Motorcycle Survey Ahead." In a different study in another state, the police helped direct riders into a parking lot for the survey; however, in California, the police were reluctant to stop a motorcyclist without probable cause. Therefore it was incumbent on the researchers to try to get traffic to stop. This issue needs to be revisited before the full study is conducted. Mr. Reichenbach contributed that riders might not stop because in Florida, for example, police use this kind of signage in sting operations to stop riders with outstanding warrants. The riders do not trust these signs. He recommended that the study organization talk with motorcycle organizations and national organizations so that they can help put the word out that the study is legitimate. He added that NHTSA has little credibility with Florida ABATE and suggested that NHTSA work with California ABATE, for example, or HOG or the Harley-Davidson and Yamaha communities to publicize the study and state that the information will not be used for other purposes. Dr. Vegega replied that NHTSA would appreciate that kind of help, although FHWA will be conducting the main study. Mr. Reichenbach said a motorcycle sting operation just occurred in

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

North Carolina where many riders were ticketed. He opined that now more riders would question being stopped without cause, which in turn might hurt the ability of the study to attract riders.

Mr. Moreland clarified that the study involved researchers going to a crash scene, then going to a nearby point to find riders on that road so researchers could tell why some riders crash and some do not. Because of the variability of the crash points and control points, it might not be feasible to provide statewide notification of motorcyclists saying that a survey was going to be taken at a particular gas station or locale. Dr. Vegega agreed that the crash sites varied and added that the investigators did not stop riders on interstates.

Mr. Tisdall agreed with Mr. Reichenbach that the best way to publicize the survey aspect of the study is to work with motorcycle organizations. They can let their constituents know that it is important for them to stop to provide information if they see the survey available. Dr. Vegega said that all of these issues were important to be addressed now so that FHWA would not have to deal with them for the main study.

Mr. Williams added that the control riders have to be in time proximity to the crash. It is best to collect those data as close as possible to the time of the crash. Dr. Vegega said the control data were usually collected within a week of the crash. Mr. Williams wondered if sending out advance notice would bias the sample in any way. Dr. Vegega replied that if word gets out that a survey is being conducted at different locations, there would not be bias because no one could predict where a crash occurs. Mr. Williams also suggested developing a logo for the study that organizations could use in their publications and become familiar with so that if their members saw the logo on the survey sign, they would recognize it as something their organization endorses. Mr. Moreland responded that if his organization's logo was on the sign, and riders were detained by police, word would get out very quickly to other riders. Mr. Tisdall reminded the group that the study could not just put a sign out with logos on it; there are height and size requirements for road signage. Mr. Williams stated that he was thinking of a study logo, rather than an organizational one. Dr. Vegega did not have the number of actual controls collected—Ms. Bents said there were probably 11 or 12.

In response to a question regarding the types of questions being asked, Dr. Vegega said there are about 80 questions regarding experience riding, experience with that particular bike, familiarity with the area, health, training, and information about the motorcycle itself. A blind breath analyzer test is available as well. Mr. Moreland asked how long the survey took. Ms. Bents answered that it took 40 minutes. Mr. Griffith thought 40 minutes was long, and the group concurred. In response to a question regarding linkability of survey variables to a countermeasure, Ms. Bents replied that some variables were, such as training and familiarity, have you had gaps in riding, how long were you riding today. Ms. Van Kleeck asked if the investigators could identify the person and then ask him/her to come back. That is a possibility, and the investigators could examine the bike during the stop and call the person later for the survey. Mr. Tisdall said if he knew he would be helping out, he would stop and agree to be contacted later, but even so, he believes the response rate will be low.

Mr. Reichenbach asked if the investigators took pictures of the riders as well as the motorcycles. Ms. Bents replied that if the rider stopped, the investigators did not take photos. If they didn't stop, the riders were videotaped as they went by.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

d. Roadway/Roadside Motorcycle Crash Statistics

Ms. Samaha

At the annual meeting this year, two TRB committees, the Motorcyclist and Mopeds ANF 30 and Roadside Safety Design Committee, decided to co-sponsor a joint panel on motorcycles and roadway/roadside safety issues to be held in the Marriott on January 12 in the afternoon. Ms. Samaha invited MAC participants to attend. Basically, Ms. Samaha and Jim Ouellet, as members of ANF 30, volunteered to serve as liaisons for the panel. Her presentation today presented crash statistics and a framework for the panel topics to give MAC an idea of the schedule and solicit some speakers from the Council.

There has been a steady increase in motorcycle sales, a lesser increase in registrations, and an increase in fatalities since the 1990s. These fatalities have increased for all types of crashes. Ms. Samaha noted that crashes that leave the road have a greater chance of death for motorcyclists. In contrast, the trend in fatalities for other vehicles is downward.

Part of this study was to see how United States' crash data compare to those of the rest of the world. OECD studied crashes in several countries and found 3.4 deaths/per 10,000 registered motorcycles. The United States rate is more than double that, followed by Australia.

Ms. Samaha then presented data from a FARS study conducted in 2007. The study looked at first and most harmful event in the fatal crash when the collision did not involve another moving vehicle. Motorcycle crashes accounted for 47 percent of the accidents. Most fatal crashes involved roadside hazards, representing 50 percent of riders killed. These hazards included trees, curbs, embankments, drop-offs, and guardrails.

Crashes on roads account for 20 percent of fatalities; however, crashes on the roadside account for 40 percent. Thus, if a rider can keep the bike on the roadway, he/she will have less risk for severe injury, but a higher risk for minor injury.

In 2007, there were 2,300 riders killed; 25 percent listed curb or embankment as the most harmful event; the second most harmful event coded by investigators at fatal crashes was collision with a tree or pole. For another 25 percent, the bikes overturned. Ms. Samaha noted that although guardrails have gotten increasing exposure as dangerous for motorcyclists, they accounted for only 8 percent of fatalities; however, the number of cyclists hitting guardrails is increasing. In any event, the focus of infrastructure research needs to be on all roadway/roadside hazards, not just guardrails. However, in another study, it was found that riders who hit guardrails suffered more fatalities than drivers of passenger vehicles. This is probably because guardrails were designed for cars and trucks.

If an investigator coded the roadway surface as the first harmful event, few riders died from the crash. Again, the data indicate if we can keep motorcyclists on the roads, there might be fewer fatalities.

If the first harmful was overturning, it was also the most harmful event. If the first harmful event was embankment, which could result in falling off or hitting an obstacle, the most harmful event was hitting a guardrail.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

Two additional issues in crash fatalities are alcohol and helmet use. Ms. Samaha presented findings from a 2005 study that used Japan as a baseline 1. In Europe, alcohol involvement is about 3.5 times greater than in Japan. In the United States, it is 6.6 times greater. The question is whether riders are getting drunk and leaving the road—is it a behavioral issue? She looked at riders who had been drinking and riders who had not been drinking who were killed to determine if they hit the same obstacles. She found that if the rider had been drinking, he/she was more likely to be killed on a curve. However, riders who had not been drinking were also killed on straight roads and curves. In contrast, riders who had been drinking were more likely to leave the road and hit a tree.

Ms. Samaha referenced the *NCHRP 500* report, which includes guides to address motorcycle collisions. The guides emphasize:

- Reducing the number of motor crashes by incorporating motorcycle friendly roadway design,
- Traffic control,
- Construction,
- Maintenance,
- Policies and practices.

Strategies in the guide included:

- Provide fully paved shoulders to accommodate motorcycle roadside recovery and breakdown,
- Select more friendly roadside barriers, as is done in Europe,
- Review surface material,
- Maintain roadways,
- Clear work zones of debris,
- Post signage for advance warning of dangers for motorcycles.

The joint committee panel will look at worldwide research to determine strategies that could be adopted in the United States. Panelists are to be representative of the international community and stakeholders. In addition, it is important to get representatives from the engineering community and the motorcycle community together on the same page.

The panel topics include:

- Summary of crash statistics in Europe
- Stability and handling
- Crash barriers
- Self-protection (helmets, armor)
- Road design (features that contribute to crashes and exacerbate rider injuries)
- ITS (intelligent transportation systems)
- Education

Session topics and presenters are posted on the TRB website.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

Mr. Moreland offered to discuss participation on the panel later with Ms. Samaha. She indicated that she needed speakers for the statistics and ITS presentations. Mr. Reichenbach asked if there would be a website for the meeting. There will be.

e. Status Report on the Motorcycle Crash Causation Study

Dr. Tan

Dr. Tan noted that the pilot study is complete, and FHWA is ready to transition to the full study. She reminded the group that there were some financial issues associated with the full study. It was earmarked for the University Transportation Center of Oklahoma State University, which was required to provide matching funds. OSU requested a waiver of that match requirement, however, and received it, so the FY 2006-07 money has been allocated. OSU and FHWA have a signed cooperative agreement to conduct the study, but because the budget was lower than expected, the study has been scaled down to \$3 million. About \$2 million will come from SAFETEA-LU; NHTSA is contributing \$500,000; AMA members have donated funds, and there are pledged funds from the transportation pooled funds study from five to six states that have not been obligated yet. With this amount, FHWA can study about 300 crashes and conduct data analysis.

The study started officially on October 1, and OSU is developing a work plan. The full study may not be conducted in the same place as the pilot study. FHWA is looking at locations that have year-long riding and a cooperative police force, as well as, perhaps, a low cost of living for the data collectors. Before data collection begins, OSU needs to address issues from the pilot and include solutions in the work plan. OSU and FHWA will have a conference planning call before December to discuss project implementation. Dr. Tan added that if the study can get more funding, it can increase the sample size. The study may not be able to answer as many questions with 300 cases, but it can answer some. The study will look at data and analyze what they show; it is not trying to prove or disprove a hypothesis.

Mr. Hennie noted that the pilot completed 40 percent of crash case studies. He asked if it was anticipated that the full study would complete a similar 40 percent. Dr. Tan replied that she did not think that assumption could be made because the full study may be in a different location, with different hospitals, and different police involvement. Ms. Bents added that there is also a timing issue. During the pilot study, cases were being initiated throughout the 3-month period; however, at the end of 3 months, incomplete cases remained incomplete. This would not be the case in the full study because it will take place over several years. For the full study, FHWA will discount minor or no-injury crashes as was done in the Pilot Study (these accounted for about half of the dropped cases).

Mr. Reichenbach asked if the study would be nationwide, to which Dr. Tan responded that FHWA could not accommodate that scope because of funding. She said that Southern California has not been set as the location, so far. Mr. Reichenbach then said that some areas need to take into account the economy of the region and the costs of hospitalization; however, Ms. Bents noted that hospitalization cost is not part of the study.

Mr. Griffith told the group that one lesson learned from the pilot study was that outreach and marketing are needed to get the number of control cases necessary for meaningful data.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

f. Update on National and International Scans

Mr. Williams

Mr. Williams introduced David Nicol, director of the Office of Safety Design, who is co-chair on the international scan. Ms. Bents asked him to briefly describe to the group what a scan is. He reported that a scan is a group of people representing FHWA, state departments of transportation, user groups, and industry to look at other nation's work in a transportation area. This scan is related to motorcycle safety, in particular, infrastructure. FHWA will be looking at behavioral issues, licensing, legislation, and what other countries are doing with infrastructure to increase safety for motorcycles. The scan is currently in the planning stage and will probably take place in September 2010. There are two co-chairs, one from FHWA and one from AASHTO. Originally, the AASHTO representative was to have been Don Vaughn, but he is no longer doing it. Once a new co-chair is found, FHWA may come to the MAC for representatives for the scan. He referred people to Diane Wigle for information on exactly how a scan works, since she recently completed one. The scan will study barriers, pavements, policies, and ITS in other countries in an effort to find strategies or actions we can implement to improve rider safety in the United States.

Mr. Kiphart asked what countries were involved. Mr. Nicol responded that the location had not yet been determined. FHWA has to do a desk scan on what countries are doing; then the agency tries to clump countries as closely as possible in an effort to keep costs down; however, the agency will probably concentrate in Europe. Mr. Reichenbach asked if data on roadways included how they were set up. He reported to the group that during travel in Guatemala, he saw a walkway built for motorcycles that took them out of traffic, up and over it so they would avoid crossing the other vehicle traffic. Mr. Nicol noted that FHWA may add the country to its list.

Mr. Williams discussed the domestic scan. FHWA submitted a proposal to NCHRP for both the domestic and international scans, and both were accepted. Because FHWA did not fund the domestic scan, there is not a co-chair for it. It will also occur in 2010. Domestic scans are new for NCHRP. The domestic scan is also infrastructure focused and will concentrate on hardware throughout the states.

Ms. Samaha asked if there will be an update on the international scan by January. Mr. Nicol could not commit to that. She reported that Europe has done a lot with infrastructure and volunteered to share the presentations from a conference held in 2007 on the topic with Mr. Nicol.

g. Review of Massachusetts Motorcycle Crashes 2006

Ms. Rothenberg

The Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles contacted the University of Massachusetts Transportation Center to help with its motorcycle programming. The Registry wanted information about motorcycle crashes that was based on data rather than on anecdote. The data review included two phases: review of data in the Massachusetts crash data system and review of crash reports from narratives.

Except for a dip in 2003, the percentage of crash fatalities involving motorcycles in Massachusetts has been above that for the rest of the states, although the rates are converging. The data were collected from the UMass Safety Data Warehouse, which contains 14 interrelated datasets. The data

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

in the warehouse came from crash reports filled out at the accident scene by the police. At the rider level, the investigators looked at age and sex, driver contributing code, and vehicle action prior to crash. At the crash level, they looked at first harmful event and when it occurred, vehicles involved in the crash, whether an object was struck, day of the week, and road surface conditions.

In response to a question from Mr. Reichenbach about who wrote the crash reports, Ms. Rothenberg said that the reports were from both state and local police obtained from the Registry of Motor Vehicles. She added, however, that the data may be incomplete because Boston is lax about reporting its crash data.

The Phase 1 data were quantitative. The data were grouped by variables to get more meaningful data, such as age and time of day. Injury severity was considered at the person and crash level. Personal injuries were reported as killed, not injured, serious, moderate, and possible injury. Crash level was by categories by the most severe injury sustained by any person involved in the crash. These data were grouped into four categories: fatal injury, nonfatal injury, property damage only, and other/unknown. For motorcycles, the person level was all riders; however, 99 percent of those were operators. Ms. Rothenberg noted that as crash severity decreased, the amount of missing information increased.

Results from data analysis showed that more serious crashes involve younger riders (ages 21-34). Older riders sustained nonfatal or no-injury accidents. In addition, as the crash injury severity decreased, the number of female riders increased. Two primary contributing factors for fatal crashes were noted in the narrative reports: operating in an erratic manner and speeding. These two factors accounted for one-half of the fatalities. Mr. Hennie pointed out that the percentage of fatalities attributed to “no improper driving” was almost the same as that for exceeding the speed limit. Ms. Rothenberg stated that police are often hesitant to assign blame for the accident unless they are doing crash reconstruction. Ms. Samaha added that, in contrast, often police will see a rider in an accident and automatically assume he/she was speeding; therefore, crash speed data are somewhat unreliable.

For passenger vehicles, the major contributing cause for a crash was failure to yield right of way, although it was unclear whether the motorist did not see the cyclist or hit him/her for some other reason. Mr. Moreland asked the difference between cell phone use and other distractions, since both were reported. Ms. Rothenberg replied that the cell phone use data were not good. The difference between cell phone use and other distractions is reporting requirements at the state level.

The most common occurrence contributing to all injuries was traveling straight ahead. In contrast, more fatal injuries occurred when the rider was passing or changing lanes. The study did collect whether cyclists were cited for the accident; however, these data are not deemed reliable.

At the crash level, the first harmful event was usually collision with a motor vehicle in traffic, followed by collision with fixed objects alongside the road. Single vehicle crashes were likely to be associated with higher severity injuries—40 percent of fatal crashes versus 20 percent of nonfatal crashes. Most motorcycle fatalities did not occur at intersections; the ones that did were at 4-way and T intersections. Most fatal crashes occurred between midnight and 3 am. In addition, more fatal crashes occurred on weekends, but the study did not correlate the day-of-week and time-of-day data. Overwhelmingly, the accidents occurred when the road surface was dry.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

Phase 2 of the study focused on the narratives of the police reports and was based on a sample of reports. This part of the study recorded whether the motorcyclist was responsible for the crash, whether he/she was wearing a helmet, was he/she traveling with other cyclists, and contributing factors to the crash. Alcohol analysis was difficult because police do not collect this information on their reporting form, although the narratives did provide some information. Police categorized crashes most often as the motorcycle being hit from behind by a passenger vehicle and the inability of the motorcyclist to stop. The rider was cited as responsible for the crash almost equally as was the passenger vehicle driver. The motorcycle rider was wearing protective headwear in three-fourths of the crashes; however, sometimes the police coded the helmet as a bike helmet, so these data are suspect.

One of the issues to arise from this study is how to make motorcyclists more visible. Other issues include:

- Providing safety education to young motorcyclists,
- Reducing high-risk motorcyclist behavior for all age groups,
- Examining opportunities for engineering improvements,
- Educating passenger vehicle operators.

Mr. Tisdall inquired if any of the data included information about work zones. Ms. Rothenberg noted that this information is on the form, but police rarely check it. Mr. Reichenbach stated that he was amazed that the data showed more fatalities for younger riders because that is contrary to national data. Mr. Hennie asked if any information was collected on type of motorcycle; none was collected. Mr. Kiphart asked if Massachusetts has a helmet law, which it does.

Mr. Williams remarked that police do not do a good job of completing crash reports for nonfatal crashes, and this project shows how poorly this is done. There are efforts to correct the problem through FHWA, NHTSA, etc. The problem could be due to the forced choice report forms police have to use. There is an effort at NHTSA to revise the MUCC (Model Uniform Crash Criteria) to include training for law enforcement executives to impress on them the importance of this reporting. There is also clearly a lack of description of roadways during reporting. Ms. Rothenberg stated that police have the responsibility of getting crash information; we cannot ask them to make medical and engineering judgments as well. This is an area for training and data linkage. We need to find a way to supplement the crash report form. Ms. Samaha said that police could take photos of the crash scenes, to which Mr. Williams added that most police officers have cameras; the next iteration of that will be their use for vehicle accidents. Technology in digital imaging is improving and will help with some investigations.

Mr. Reichenbach noted that his 32 ABATE chapters are required to have a camera to record roadway conditions that they can give to police. In response to a query regarding uniform reporting, Mr. Williams stated that the MUCC is being revised and will be released in 2010. Ms. Wigle? stated that MUCC is a model only; states are not required to use it. In addition, there can be a standard form, but that does not mean there are standard skills in filling it out. Mr. Moreland asked if FHWA was going to issue a nationalized form, to which Mr. Williams answered negatively. Mr. Reichenbach added that coding is a huge problem in the south because each sheriff has his own domain. Mr.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

Tisdall noted that it has a trickledown effect: the Federal government does not tell the states what to do; the states do not tell counties and cities what to do; and it comes down to who has independence. There are minimal set guidelines, but none of them has to be used.

After the lunch break, Ms. Bents shared with the group the recommendations and action items from the morning session. The recommendation was: The MAC endorses the efforts of the DOT to improve and standardized state and local police accident reports. Mr. Moreland felt it should say encourage or support efforts to standardize, and Ms. Boyd changed the text accordingly. A suggested action item was that Mr. Moreland would represent the MAC at the TRB Roadway/Roadside Motorcycle Crash Statistics panel meeting. Mr. Moreland responded that he would talk with Ms. Samaha about it. Returning to the police action reports, Mr. Kiphart said that police reports come out of 408 funds, so it may be better for the Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA) to embrace standardization. He suggested that the MAC send a letter to GHSA to support standardization of police report forms. Mr. Kiphart and Mr. Hennie will draft the letter. Don Vaughn at AASHTO will also be sent the letter.

h. Update on the Motorcyclists Survey

Mr. Moreland

Mr. Moreland began by reviewing some of the information from the last survey. Last year, 10,000 people began the survey; 7,000 completed it. This year, fewer riders took the survey—about 3,500—and 2,500 completed every question. The survey was launched on June 1, 2009, and closed September 2, 2009. The response rate was over 50 percent per question and reflected responses from every state. The survey again asked about urban, rural, and limited access roads. The results were almost identical to last year's responses; all the data were within 2-3 percent of last year's answers. Mr. Moreland used the same two states as last year, Washington and Pennsylvania, for a side-by-side comparison. Washington riders reported more positive responses than did Pennsylvania riders. As last year, the major issues for riders were striping, intersections, and frailty of the roadway. Motorcyclists were also concerned about road repairs and warning signs. Mr. Moreland believes it will be interesting to continue the survey to look at trends. He would like to look at the data both before and after the transportation bill is passed. Because of the timing of the MAC meetings, he was not able to schedule the survey for a different time of year.

Mr. Tisdall reported that he had a difficult time logging in to the survey. Mr. Reichenbach never saw it. Mr. Hennie would like to see the survey repeated next year. Mr. Reichenbach agreed, but would like to see a survey that involves a different season—maybe earlier in the spring so that there would be data about road conditions at the beginning of the riding season. Mr. Moreland wondered if changing the survey season would alter responses and make comparisons invalid. Mr. Killian noted that seasons make a big difference in South Dakota. Mr. Reichenbach pointed out that if the survey is fielded during the same time each year, it is not going to be representative of the nation. Mr. Killian said that he thought the purpose of the survey was to evaluate signage and asked if the scope was broader than that. Mr. Tisdall suggested fielding the survey from May until the end of October. Before April or after October probably would not get better results because riders in northern states would not be participating. Ms. Van Kleeck stated that it was important to get as many responses as possible. Mr. Reichenbach asked how many people answered from each state, and Mr. Moreland said that the responses usually reflected the ridership of the state. States with a lot of riders had more responses than did states with fewer riders. Mr. Reichenbach suggested fielding the survey

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

from August through October. In response to Mr. Moreland's concern that changing the dates would change the comparison, Dr. Tan noted that if the time periods of the surveys overlapped, the overlap period could be compared. On the other hand, if the survey is to determine the usability of the road, it should be fielded at the same time each year. She also noted that 2 years of data does not constitute a trend.

Ms. Van Kleeck stated that it is important to get the survey results to states, but more data are needed first. Mr. Moreland wondered if extending the survey time would automatically mean getting a larger response. Ms. Van Kleeck believed that it would because a longer survey period gives FHWA more time to get the word out about the survey. Mr. Reichenbach opined that the survey would get more people to answer if it ran later—through October. Mr. Moreland said he could extend the survey by 30 days and overlap 2 months. Thus, the survey would run April through July. He asked how much lead time organizations would need to get the word out about the survey. Mr. Reichenbach replied that as soon as he got the survey, he would distribute it to his groups.

In a different discussion, Mr. Kiphart brought to the MAC's attention a letter he received regarding motorcycle safety in Las Vegas. The issue was decorative rocks in medians and alongside the roadway that posed a hazard to motorcycles and passenger cars alike. He believed this was a landscaping issue. Mr. Tisdall reminded the group that there is a roadside design manual that defines how far from a roadway things need to be. As the speed limit increases, the clear zone around the roadway also has to increase.

i. Planned Motorcycle Questions in the Traveler Opinion and Perception Survey

Ms. Bents

Ms. Bents distributed the suggested questions for the TOPS; however, she noted there is no money at the present time to fund it. Mr. Williams added that funding may be authorized but not obligated or obligated and not allocated to this task yet. In response to which of the proposed questions would be used, Mr. Williams stated that he did not know which questions, but, at least when the survey is awarded, they have the questions to go in it. Mr. Moreland and Mr. Hennie wondered if FHWA is developing questions for a survey that might not be done. Mr. Williams said the survey will be funded. Normally, surveys are done through a contractor, and there is back and forth on the instrument items at that time.

j. Awareness Topics

All

Mr. Moreland then asked about the process for extension of the MAC's charter. Mr. Griffith responded that there will be at least one more meeting of the MAC. Beyond that, the future of the group depends on the legislation. He was unaware of how the MAC-FHWA authorization became part of SAFETEA-LU. Mr. Hennie stated that he had heard a House committee staff member say that FHWA said MAC had completed its work and was no longer needed. He asked Mr. Williams to write to the House committee about keeping the MAC since it is the only public venue that has input to FHWA. Mr. Griffith told him that FHWA cannot lobby Congress. Mr. Hennie responded that the MAC is the only motorcycle-specific council FHWA meets with. He noted that Mary Peters

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

re-authorized the Council charter for 2 years beyond its start. The Secretary could do the same again without legislation, but the MAC needs someone to step up and put that forward.

Mr. Griffith addressed Mr. Hennie's concerns about the rumor that MAC completed its work. He said FHWA does not hold that opinion, but he needs to work with congressional affairs people to see how to extend the Council. A lot depends on the Crash Causation Study and the International Scan, which will drive a lot of what FHWA does in the future. Mr. Hennie reported that he meets with NHTSA every quarter, and the Crash Study results are 5 years away. He said the MAC does not have to be legislated. The Administration could re-authorize the charter without a requirement from Congress. He asked Mr. Griffith to advocate for the MAC. Mr. Griffith responded that he would look into how to do so because it is under legislation. Mr. Hennie reiterated that the MAC is not under legislation anymore because the former Secretary made it happen. Mr. Moreland agreed with Mr. Hennie that the work of the MAC needs to continue, and the MAC needs to know the most effective means of making that happen. Continuing the group would be a good faith gesture from the Secretary, and he agreed that the continuance could be done through the Secretary's office. Mr. Griffith stated that he would look into the internal mechanisms to accomplish this. Since the MAC was instituted under the previous Secretary, he suggested that the Council could send a letter to the new Secretary to support continuation and noting the safety problem due to exponential growth in ridership. Mr. Reichenbach added that the MAC is a committee motorcyclists sit on and thus is a good way to get information from them to the government. The MAC's members are in contact with motorcycle riders nationwide and provide a valuable resource to FHWA's decisionmaking. Mr. Moreland stated that as important as it is to continue the Council because of what it brings to the table, it is also important for riders to learn from presentations from FHWA. Mr. Hennie and Mr. Moreland volunteered to take the lead in writing a letter to the Secretary. They will draft the letter and send it to Ms. Bents for distribution to the group. Mr. Hennie believes the Secretary will re-authorize the Council if it is presented to him.

Mr. Reichenbach complimented the day's presenters and the information they provided. Mr. Tisdall added that the data regarding motorcyclists also have crossover importance for motorists, particularly in infrastructure design.

In the meeting last November, Mr. Reichenbach had requested a disclaimer footnote to be added to the reporting of VMT data. He noted that the disclaimer was on the 2007 NHTSA report but not on the 2008 report. Mr. Williams responded that the VMT data are getting better. Mr. Jordan said that he would follow up to see why the disclaimer was missing.

k. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

1. Summary of Action Items and Plans for Next Meeting

Ms. Bents

Ms. Bents suggested May 13, 2010, as the date for the next meeting. The group tentatively accepted that date. Possible topics for the May meeting include VMT and a report from Mr. Hennie on barrier updates in Europe.

**Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration
Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009**

m. Closing Comments

Mr. Griffith

Mr. Griffith noted that an international scan usually takes about 17 days, and that FHWA is very excited about it. He added that it was important to find a way to continue the MAC in the future. Mr. Williams stated that he looked forward to working with the group. Mr. Griffith reported that the *NCHRP 500* guide for motorcycles was available, and he could give a copy of the plan to the group. FHWA will develop a statement of work for a contractor for the NCHRP plan.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

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 web sites that allow motorcyclists to report roadway hazards. A model for this is the Roadhazard.org site created by ABATE in the Midwest. The web sites 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.
- 9) Extend future meetings to at least 1 ½ days.
Status: Adopted.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

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

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

- 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 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 to the chair of AASHTO standing committee on highways recommending that a formal motorcycle guidelines documents be created. The package will include the FHWA motorcycle safety pamphlet.
Status: Submitted and adopted by AASHTO and SAASHTO, summer, 2007.
- 6) Mr. 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.
- 9) FHWA will email a final draft of the motorcycle awareness pamphlet to the Council for review and comment.
Status: Brochure complete.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

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) USUSDOT should report to the MAC-FHWA on topics raised regarding the amount of funding and specific ITS projects related to motorcycle safety.
Status: Presentation, May, 2008.
- 4) USUSDOT 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) Mr. Hennie, Don and Gerry will review the NPA and make recommendations to the MAC-FHWA.
Status: Complete.
- 3) Mr. Hennie, Don and Gerry will draft a response on behalf of the MAC-FHWA.
Status: Complete.
- 4) Each MAC-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.
- 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.

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

- 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.

Meeting 4 – May 6-7, 2008

Recommendations:

- 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.

Status: Complete

- 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.

Status: Complete

- 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.

Status: Acknowledged

- 4) Suggest that the Bike Safe program recommend to participants that road condition feedback be provided to State highway agencies.

Status: BikeSafe has adopted this policy and includes reported information on road conditions on its web site.

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.

Status: Complete

- 2) Launch the survey of motorcyclists' views of roadway infrastructure condition and performance and provide a status report at the 5th MAC-FHWA meeting.

Status: Complete

- 3) Provide a presentation on Private Public Partnership (PPP) plans and perceptions at the next meeting.

Status: Presentation provided at November 13, 2008 meeting

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

- 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.
Status: Complete

Meeting Five - November 13, 2008

Recommendations:

- 1) States should develop a way for motorcyclists to notify respective DOT agencies of hazardous road conditions.
Status: Covered at May 7 meeting – TXDOT website
- 2) States should educate DOT and law enforcement personnel on the importance of immediately addressing road debris hazards.
Status: Included in Roadway Safety for Motorcycles brochure.
- 3) FHWA and road marking providers should conduct research on increasing friction of pavement markings.
Status: FHWA's staff at the Turner-Fairbank Highway Research center have made contact with Slipnot and another manufacturer who will be working together to address this issue.

Action Items:

- 1) FHWA will request MAC-FHWA to develop motorcyclist specific questions for the next Traveler Opinion and Perception Survey (TOPS). *FHWA*
Status: Followup at the May 7, 2009 meeting.
- 2) Repeat the Motorcyclist Survey in May for comparison data. *Ed*
Status: The Survey will be repeated during June and July, 2009.
- 3) Prepare a report on national level results of Motorcyclists Survey. *Ed*
Status: Complete.
- 4) Distribute the MC Survey results to State and local highway agencies and professional organizations. *FHWA*
Status: Materials were provided to the FHWA.
- 5) Make survey format available to State level users. *Ed, Jeff, & Doc*
Status: Materials were provided to the FHWA.
- 6) NHTSA should add footnotes to motorcycle crash presentation of November 13, 2008 indicating limitations of VMT data.
Status: Language adopted as follows:
"Please note that FHWA did not require States to separate out motorcycle travel information until 2007, which affected data quality. Improved data quality is being seen as FHWA works with States and others to strengthen the quality and completeness of motorcycle travel data. Caution should be exercised in use of the fatality rate data."

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

Meeting Six – May 7, 2009

Recommendations:

- 1) The Council reiterates its encouragement to State departments of transportation to create Web sites that allow motorcyclists to report roadway hazards (see recommendation #2, October, 2006). A model for this is the Roadhazard.org site created by ABATE in the Midwest. The Web sites would be monitored by State and local highway officials, who could schedule repairs, improve signage, etc. *Michael Jordan will provide additional examples of such Web sites to Mark Bloschock to present to the Texas Department of Transportation. Morris Oliver will collaborate with Mark Bloschock on the best way to engage TX DOT on a web reporting system.*

Action Items:

- 1) The American Motorcyclists Association will conduct the Motorcyclists Survey again during the period 6/1/09– 7/31/09.
Status: Complete
- 2) Ed Moreland will provide the link to the MC Survey to Fran to distribute to MAC -FHWA.
Status: Complete
- 3) One page description of Traveler's Opinion and Perception Survey (TOPS) and copies of previous questions will be provided to Fran to distribute to MAC -FHWA.
Status: Complete
- 4) Fran will solicit and assemble TOPS question from members and provide results to FHWA by 7/31/09.
Status: Complete
- 5) A one page description of the National Household Travel Survey (NHTS), which has just been completed, will be provided to the members as a reference document.
Status: Complete
- 6) Interested parties will seek statistical opinion on whether a 4-point opinion survey would be an improvement over a 5 point survey and whether the 2 would be comparable. Response required by 5/21/09.
Status: Complete. Five point scale was retained .
- 7) At the next meeting of the AASHTO Highway and Traffic Safety Subcommittee, the Chair will promote the utilization of State DOT websites for the reporting of potential roadway-related safety hazards by motorcyclists.
Status:

Motorcyclist Advisory Council to the Federal Highway Administration Seventh Meeting: November 5, 2009

Meeting 7 - November 5, 2009

Recommendations:

The MAC-FHWA supports the efforts of the Department of Transportation to promote the Model Uniform Crash Criteria (MUCC) to improve and standardize police reporting of traffic crashes. It further supports training to improve the quality and consistency of reported data.

Action Items:

1. The MAC-FHWA will send a letter to the Governor's Highway Safety Association and to AASHTO in support of the efforts of the Department of Transportation to improve and standardize state and local police accident reports.
Ken and Jeff will draft letters for review.
2. Ed Moreland may represent the MAC-FHWA as a panel member during the TRB Motorcycles and Roadway/Roadside joint committee meeting. *TBD*
3. Ed and Jeff will draft a letter to the Secretary of Transportation requesting that the MAC-FHWA charter be extended.
Ed and Jeff
4. AMA will host the next Motorcyclist Survey from April 1 through July 31 2010.
Ed