

**Comments on the Michigan Pedestrian and Bicycle  
Safety Program Assessment (MPBSPA) report  
By Mike Unsworth  
May 11, 2018**

On May 8, 2018, Lenny Provencher, Mike Unsworth, and John Lindenmayer (by phone) attended the bimonthly meeting of the Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Action Team which discussed the MPBSPA report (see the “Meetings” link at [biketcba.org/advocacy](http://biketcba.org/advocacy)). Below are the main recommendations that were discussed and my comments.

**I. Background:**

- A. The Governor's Traffic Safety Advisory Commission has been in existence since 1941. Its purpose is “to provide leadership in the identification of state and local traffic safety issues and promote recommended strategies to address them.”
- B. It has 11 Action Teams composed of governmental and non-governmental participants. One of which is for Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety (PBSAT). The Action Teams can not craft or introduce legislation. It can study possible options. Non-governmental actors (such as the League of Michigan Bicyclists) can push for legislation.
- C. TCBA Advocacy has been attending the bimonthly meetings since November 2016.

**II. The State of Michigan requested that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration conduct an assessment (based on the Uniform Guidelines for State Highway Safety Programs Number 14 (<https://icsw.nhtsa.gov/nhtsa/whatsup/tea21/tea21programs/pages/PedBikeSafety.htm>) by participants who have demonstrated competence in pedestrian and bicycle safety.**

- A. The assessment was conducted from February 26 to March 2, 2018. TCBA and LMB gave presentations.
- B. The main audience for the assessment is PBSAT
- C. The assessment can be forward to other agencies and the legislature but dozens of such reports are submitted to such bodies each year.

**III. The areas studied were:**

- Program Management
- Multidisciplinary Involvement
- Legislation, Regulation, and Policy
- Law Enforcement

- Highway and Traffic Engineering
  - Communication Program
  - Outreach Program
  - Driver Education and Licensing
  - Evaluation Program
  - Emergency Medical Services
- IV. The report is a good snapshot of Michigan’s Ped/Bike situation
- V. Key recommendations (which may or not be incorporated into PBSAT’s action plan for 2018-2019):
- A. *Program Management:*
1. “Increase the rate at which 405(h) funds [of the FAST Act which provides grant funding to address selected, national priorities for reducing highway deaths and injuries] are being expended through the provision of proven countermeasures and the identification of funding sources that grantees use to meet the 20 percent match requirement.”
  2. “Revise the UD-10 *Traffic Crash Report* to reflect the current (5<sup>th</sup> edition) *Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria* [<https://www.nhtsa.gov/mmucc>] data elements related to non-motorists.” COMMENT: Michigan just updated the UD-10 in 2016. According to the Michigan State Police people on the committee, the update process was laborious effort. Narratives in each report are currently hard to search. Deaths generate a *Fatality Analysis Report* ([https://www.michigan.gov/documents/msp/Lorie\\_Sierra\\_Amanda\\_Heinze\\_451333\\_7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/msp/Lorie_Sierra_Amanda_Heinze_451333_7.pdf)) which has more info. This recommendation was repeated in the “Evaluation Program” section
- B. *Multidisciplinary Involvement*— “Work with the Governor’s Traffic Safety Advisory Commission’s Communications Committee to identify a strategy for promoting pedestrian and bicyclist safety statewide.” COMMENT; This recommendation was repeated and expanded on the “Communication Program” and “Outreach Program?” sections. Most likely it will be based on Grand Rapids’ “Driving Change” program (<http://grdrivingchange.org/>).
- C. *Legislation, Regulation, and Policy:*
1. “Incorporate the full pedestrian and bicyclist safety guidance of the Uniform Vehicle Code into the Michigan Vehicle Code and preempt conflicting local pedestrian and bicyclist safety ordinances to the Michigan Vehicle Code.” COMMENT: This Recommendation was

also listed in “Law Enforcement” The lack of uniformity creates much confusion and results in “enforcement abstinence.” (p. 19)

2. “Adopt legislation requiring the use of approved bicycle helmets by bicyclists 16 years of age or younger.”
3. “Adopt legislation requiring a driver to yield to pedestrians legally crossing the roadway at other than signalized intersections.”
4. “Adopt legislation prohibiting the riding of a bicycle while under the influence of drugs or alcohol.”

*D. Law Enforcement:*

1. Repeated the Uniform Vehicle Code recommendation that appeared in the “Legislation, Regulation, and Policy” section
2. “Reinstitute the Law Enforcement Liaison program [a cadre of sworn and retired law enforcement officials who serve as a “vital link and conduit between a State Highway Safety Office (SHSO) and that state’s law enforcement community”]; <http://www.nlelp.org/about-lel/> to promote traffic safety initiatives with emphasis on pedestrian and bicyclist safety.” COMMENT: No one at the meeting knew about this program. For more information, see <http://www.nlelp.org>.

*E. Highway and Traffic Engineering*

1. “Conduct pedestrian and bicyclist Road Safety Audits.” COMMENT: Required on most federally- and state-funded projects. Ped/Bike concerns are supposed to be incorporated.
2. “Train local governments on the use of National Association of City Transportation Officials guidelines for the design of bicycle infrastructure facilities [<https://nacto.org/publication/urban-bikeway-design-guide/>].” COMMENT: In Michigan, this is the “Training Wheels” program ([https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdot/TrainingWheelsAnnounce\\_529107\\_7.pdf](https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdot/TrainingWheelsAnnounce_529107_7.pdf))

- F. Communication Program*— “Task the Office of Highway Safety Planning with developing and implementing a statewide, branded pedestrian and bicyclist safety campaign that allows for customization to accommodate local needs.” COMMENT: Repeats recommendations in “Multidisciplinary Involvement” and “Outreach Program” sections.

*G. Outreach Program*—COMMENT: Repeats the recommendation in “Multidisciplinary Involvement” and “Communication Program” sections

*H. Evaluation Program*

1. Revise the UD-10 COMMENT: Repeats recommendation in “Program Management” section
2. “Integrate available traffic records data to support problem identification, strategic planning, resource deployment, public education and injury prevention efforts related to pedestrian and bicyclist injuries.”  
COMMENT: Michigan has a good program with the Michigan Traffic Crash Facts data program (<https://www.michigantrafficcrashfacts.org/>). However, MTCF only covers automobile crashes based on the UD-10 forms. There are other data sources which should all be integrated (“cross linked):
  - Trauma (ambulance runs)
  - 911 calls
  - Hospitalization statistics—There is a declining participation from 90% to 60%. Moreover, there is inconsistent coding by participants.