LOG OF MEETING
DIRECTORATE FOR ENGINEERING SCIENCES

SUBJECT: Bicycle Reflector Meeting

DATE OF MEETING: July 16, 1997

PLACE: CPSC headquarters, 4330 East West Towers, Bethesda, MD

LOG ENTRY SOURCE: Mark Kumagai, ESME

DATE OF ENTRY: July 23, 1997

COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

Debbie Tinsworth	Directorate for Epidemiology and Health Sciences
Joyce Coonley	Directorate for Epidemiology and Health Sciences
Robert Franklin	Directorate for Economic Analysis
Andrew Stadnik	Directorate for Engineering Sciences
Sandra Inkster	Directorate for Epidemiology and Health Sciences
Tom Schroeder	Directorate for Economic Analysis
Mark Kumagai	Directorate for Engineering Sciences
Greg Rodgers	Directorate for Economic Analysis
Celestine Trainor	Directorate for Engineering Sciences

One participant felt we needed to perform more research to address side detection. One participant recommended a voluntary standard for lights which would standardize the light signature and increase recognition. He also recommended a side lighting requirement to increase side detection and recognition. One participant suggested collecting better incident data similar to the Cross/Ficher study with actual interviews with the motorist.

cc:
Colin Church, EXHR
OS (2)
ES
File

w/o enclosure (1):

Debbie Tinsworth, EHHA
Sandra Inkster, EHHS
Joyce Coonley, EHDS
Greg Rodgers, ECPA
Robert Franklin, ECSS
Tom Schroeder, EHDS
Mark Kumagai, ESME
Celestine Trainor, ESHF

Summary of Meeting

CPSC staff meet with manufacturers of bicycles, bicycle reflectors, experts in the field of nighttime visibility and other US Government Agencies to discuss the CPSC Bicycle Reflector Projects results and findings, bicycle lighting, and nighttime riding safety. Enclosure (1) is a copy of the presentation slides staff used to present the results and conclusions of the bicycle reflector study. Based on the results of the study the CPSC staff does not recommend amending the bicycle reflector requirements in 16 C.F.R. §1512. Staff does recommend additional research to develop minimum requirements for bicycle lighting that can be used in a voluntary standard.

The participants discussed the low detection and recognition distances in the crossing path test. One participant asked the CPSC staff to clarify the Summary and Conclusion vu-graph slide's last point " Reflectors or lights tested were not effective for side detection or recognition." Staff said that the study showed that side treatments tested did not show significant improvements over the CPSC spoke reflectors, and the vu-graph should read "Reflectors or lights tested did not significantly increase side detection or recognition."

Participants also discussed the problem of alcohol use by the motorist and bicyclist, the difficulties of obtaining crash data to understand why the motorist crashed into the bicyclist, and the driver's perception model. Staff explained the driver's perception model and discussed the importance of recognition. A participant added that researchers have shown that if a motorist correctly recognizes a bicycle, they would track the bicycle rather than classify it as a non-threat such as a mailbox reflector.

Thomas Prehn, representing Cat Eye, presented a general overview of bicycle lighting technology. He discussed differences between the German, British, Danish and Japanese headlight and rear light standards. He recommended that a US voluntary standards committee adopt the British standard without the upward lighting requirement. Enclosure (2) is a list of recommendations for the CPSC to consider.

Chet Bacon of 3M presented bicycle injury data and photometric data comparing a prototype treatment to the current CPSC standard. He showed the 360 degree photometric performance of the 3M treated bicycle compared to a bicycle with CPSC reflectors. He advocated the use of fluorescent bicycle treatments for daytime and dusk conditions. He reported that 3M will consider petitioning the CPSC to consider fluorescent treatments to increase bicycle safety during daytime and dusk conditions.

Joe Ciolleti of Bike Safe demonstrated a prototype rear light that operated from a magnetic pick-up attached to the bicycle wheel. He explained that the bicyclist would not need to remember to turn on the light since it would only operate if the wheels were in motion.

After the presentations the meeting was opened for general discussion. CPSC staff asked the participants for their opinion on additional research and a voluntary standard for lighting.

NON-COMMISSION ATTENDEES:

Thomas Prehn	Cat Eye
Koichi Tsuyama	Cat Eye
Joe Kagayama	Cat Eye
Joe Hunt	Marwi USA
Brook Landry	Bicycle Products Supplier Association
Chet Bacon	3M
Rollie Bible	3M
Bob Jensen	3M
Dick Van Deventer	Stae-Lite Mfg
Mike Kershow	Bicycle Manufacturer Association
Mike Rood	Sate-Lite Mfg
Lee Isselhardt	GT Bicycles
Barbra McMillen	Federal Highway Administration
Sam Cristy	Product Safety Letter
Alex Cohen	Consumer
Reed Pike	Specialized
Robert Burns	Trek Bicycle Corporation
Dan Turner	Center for Applied Research
O. Cioletti	Bike Safe
Joe Cioletti	Bike Safe
John Fegan	US Department of Transportation Office of the Secretary
Gerry Breting	ARA/Inc
John Bogler	Shimano
Richard Blomberg	Dunlap and Associates, Inc
John Schubert	Limeport Marketing Group
John Forester	Cycling Transportation Engineer
Genny O'Donnell	National Safe Kids Campaign
Maria Vegaga	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Lori Greaser	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration