

**A Report from the Interagency Truck Committee**

**TRUCK SAFETY IN MICHIGAN:**

**BACKGROUND AND PROPOSED ACTIONS**

**Prepared By:**

**Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Michigan Department of Transportation**

**May 1, 1987**

**(517) 373-3335**

## I. Summary

Truck accidents in Michigan increased by 65 percent during the 1982-85 period. The Interagency Truck Committee has been asked to review this issue and develop an action plan. The following recommendations are proposed.

1. Implement the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986.
2. Increase fines for truck safety violations.
3. Stricter local court enforcement.
4. Develop a pilot program to identify truck owners and dimensions.
5. Increase the tanker inspection fee.
6. Develop an improved truck accident data base.
7. Include truck information in driver education programs.
8. Update the Motor Vehicle Code.
9. Provide additional MPSC enforcement authority.
10. Recommend 12 month mandatory truck inspection program.
11. Implement corrective actions at high truck accident locations.
12. Evaluate mandatory use of tachographs.
13. Cover all loads where spillage could occur.
14. Expand 22" bumper height requirement to other trucks.
15. Restrict trucks to the two right lanes on freeways of three or more lanes.
16. Review the need for additional Motor Carrier Division enforcement personnel.
17. Require registration of all for-hire trucks and private fleets.
18. Develop truck safety funding sources.
19. Retain 55 mph maximum speed limit for trucks.

## II. The Truck Safety Problem

Truck accidents are increasing dramatically in Michigan. The following table shows a 65 percent increase in truck related accidents during the

three year period between 1982 and 1985. Truck travel during this period increased by only 15 percent.

	Accidents		Accident Change	Travel Change
	1982	1985		
Trucks	12,900	21,300	+65%	+15%
Cars	282,000	365,800	+30%	+11%

In general, increases in Michigan truck accidents are following regional and national trends. In fact, a report by the University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute (UMTRI) shows that heavy truck accident increases are somewhat less for Michigan than for Ohio, Indiana or the nation.

The causes of the increases are not completely understood although the competitive pressures of deregulation are commonly assumed to be a major factor. This may cause truckers to drive faster and run longer hours. Less vehicle maintenance may also be occurring because of insufficient revenues. This is supported by the fact that an increasing percentage of trucks are removed from service after police inspection.

In general, the principal causes of truck accidents are:

- Drivers who are inexperienced, or have poor driving records.
- Drivers operating too many hours or driving too fast.
- Trucking companies or shippers who encourage violation of laws.
- Inadequate truck maintenance.
- Increasing auto and truck traffic.
- Truck configurations and loading.

Accidents are increasing at an unacceptable rate. There is no single cause or easy solution. It will require a comprehensive package of actions to begin to address the problem.

### III. Recent Truck Safety Actions

A number of state level actions have already occurred to address the truck safety problem. These include:

- State support for the federal Motor Carrier Safety Act of 1986.
- Increases in the number of Motor Carrier Division enforcement officers from 115 at the start of FY87 to 168 by this fall.
- Increases in truck inspections from 18,000 in 1984 to 51,000 in 1987.
- Construction by MDOT of a new scale facility on I-75 at Erie. This new state-of-the-art facility opened in October 1986 and will be followed by similar facilities at Grass Lake and New Buffalo.
- State Transportation Commission approval of a comprehensive truck report prepared by MDOT.
- Formation of a truck safety subcommittee of the House Transportation Committee to review the truck safety problem and propose legislation.
- Reports by AAA Michigan and WDIV-TV calling attention to truck safety issues.
- Formation of an ad hoc committee on truck accident data collection by the Michigan Traffic Accident Records Committee.

### IV. Proposed Truck Safety Actions

The trucking industry is huge and diverse. As a result, the truck safety issue is very diffuse and any single action is going to affect only a small part of the overall problem. This situation exists because truck accidents result from a complex interaction of forces affecting:

- Truck drivers
- Truck companies
- Truck design and maintenance
- Shippers
- Highway facility design and maintenance
- Other vehicle drivers

Any action plan must address all of these issues if meaningful results are to occur. In addition, an ongoing effort must be made to address new problems as they arise. The following actions are recommended:

1. Recommended Action: Implement Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986.

Description: This national legislation was passed by the U.S. Congress in October 1986. It provides for:

- A single commercial vehicle operators license after July 1, 1987.
- Increased driver training and testing.
- Stiffer fines and penalties for drug and alcohol use.
- Requires trucks to have front wheel brakes.

Justification: Required by PL-99-579. Loss of federal highway funding if not in compliance.

Lead Agency: Michigan Department of State.

Legislative Requirements: Numerous changes in Michigan laws will be required.

Time Frame: New state legislation will begin to be introduced in the Michigan Legislature in May 1987, Final passage of all bills must await final federal rules scheduled to be issued by July 15, 1988.

Budgetary Implications: Unknown.

2. Recommended Action: Increase fines for serious truck safety violations.

Description: The existing fine structure is not an effective deterrent to illegal operations. In the State-of-the-State message, the Governor supported significant increases in fines for violators of safety regulations. The concept of shipper responsibility for overweight violations should be considered. A clean definition of what constitutes a serious violation must also be developed and fines should be structured to penalize carriers and not generate revenues.

Justification: A fine structure should be developed which serves as an effective deterrent and covers increased enforcement costs.

Lead Agency: Departments of Transportation and State.

Legislative Requirements: Legislation will be needed.

Time Frame: Introduce legislation for implementation by 1988.

Budgetary Implications: Approximately \$3 million in tickets are annually written. Current estimates are unavailable as to total dollar value of fines assessed by local magistrates. Increased revenue from a higher fine structure should go toward truck enforcement. Currently most truck fine revenues goes to county library systems.

3. Recommended Action: Stricter local court system enforcement.

Description: In some instances, local courts need to be encouraged to levy higher fines up to the maximums allowed under law for serious truck safety violations. The seriousness of the truck accident problem should be communicated to local courts. Progressive penalties should be considered for repeat violators. Information should be provided to district attorneys and court administrators to appraise them of motor carrier problems and issues.

Justification: Some courts are not aware of truck safety issues and often levy fines or penalties which are not a deterrent to further violation of motor carrier laws and regulations.

Lead Agency: Secretary of State.

Legislative Requirements: None.

Time Frame: Immediate implementation.

Budgetary Implications: No cost to implement. Could result in increased revenues to local jurisdictions.

4. Recommended Action: Pilot program for truck identification.

Description: Provide for uniformity of identification of truck dimensions and ownership to aid in accident investigation and data needs. Also, a toll free number of the trucking company on the rear of the vehicle for the public to call to voice concerns or praise.

Justification: Truck companies that operate in an illegal or dangerous way or spill loads and cause accidents cannot be easily identified.

Lead Agencies: Department of Transportation and Department of State Police.

- Legislative Requirements: Could start as a demonstration project with legislation developed after the project.
- Time Frame: Pilot program in six months.
- Budgetary Implications: Unknown at this time.
5. Recommended Action: Increase tanker inspection fee to an appropriate level.
- Description: The current tanker inspection program only allows inspection of new or repaired tankers. No funds are available for annual inspection of other tankers licensed in Michigan. The fee should be increased to its original \$70/tanker level (\$35 at present) or to a level which would support an adequate inspection program.
- Justification: Additional revenue is required to support an adequate tanker inspection program.
- Lead Agency: Michigan Department of State Police.
- Legislative Requirements: Bill submitted last session - one will be introduced this session.
- Time Frame: Legislation to be introduced this session.
- Budgetary Implications: Estimated revenues would increase from \$112,000 (\$35 fee) to \$225,000 (\$70 fee) allowing two more officers above the two officers/secretary currently employed under this program.
6. Recommended Action: Develop improved truck accident data base.
- Description: Determine means of obtaining improved truck accident data for analytical and other purposes. This will include consideration of a supplemental truck accident form, sampling techniques, telephone interviews or other means. The objective will be to provide reliable statistical data on exposure levels and accident levels for different truck sizes, configurations and types.
- Justification: Adequate data on truck accidents is not available to do many types of analysis or to identify causes of accidents. This is needed to develop more effective responses to truck safety issues.

Lead Agencies: Michigan Department of State Police and Department of Transportation working through the Traffic Accident Records Committee.

Legislative Requirement: None.

Time Frame: Currently being reviewed by Accident Records Committee.

Budgetary Implications: Unknown.

7. Recommended Action: Include truck information in drivers education and other safety programs.

Description: This involves a program to include information on trucks in driver training and other vehicle safety courses. This information would make drivers more aware of stopping distances of trucks as well as other special characteristics unique to truck operations. The advertising council, MTA, AAA and other organizations will be approached to do videos and other public service programs on truck safety.

Justification: The general motoring public does not understand operating characteristics of trucks (e.g. stopping distance). A better understanding could decrease truck-car accidents.

Lead Agencies: Departments of Education, State Police, and State.

Legislative Requirements: None.

Budgetary Implications: Minor.

8. Recommended Action: Update the Motor Vehicle Code.

Description: The Motor Vehicle Code and Motor Carrier Safety Rules need to be reviewed and modified to make them consistent with one another.

Justification: Inconsistent regulations cause confusion and are difficult to enforce.

Lead Agency: Department of State Police.

Legislative Requirements: Legislation submitted.

Time Frame: Legislation submitted.

Budgetary Implications: None.



9. Recommended Action: Allow Public Service Commission more authority to enforce safety laws.

Description: The MPSC needs legal authority to sanction motor carriers having a poor safety record. This would apply to all carriers holding an MPSC certificate or permit. Fines and revocation of MPSC certificates could occur if improvement in the carriers' safety record does not occur.

Justification: MPSC currently has very little authority to deal with carriers which have MPSC certificates and poor safety records.

Lead Agencies: Michigan Department of Commerce, Public Service Commission.

Legislative Requirements: Requires amendment to the Motor Carrier Act.

Time Frame: MPSC is currently developing proposal.

Budgetary Implications: Estimates of enforcement costs and amount of revenues generated by fines is unknown at this time.

10. Recommended Action: Recommend mandatory 12 month vehicle inspection program.

Description: Several states have implemented an annual inspection program to help assure that trucks are safe and properly maintained. Issues associated with inspection procedures (who would do them, cost, etc.) and effectiveness shall be analyzed. The relationship of state programs to a possible federal level requirement shall also be considered.

Justification: Michigan currently has no truck inspection program other than spot inspections conducted by the Motor Carrier Division. Only 51,000 trucks out of 400,000 will be inspected in 1987. The number of trucks taken out of service after inspection continues to increase and is now at the 30% level.

Lead Agencies: Michigan Department of State Police.

Legislative Requirements: State legislation will be needed to implement the program if it is decided to proceed.

- Time Frame: Study complete in 6 months.
- Budgetary Implications: Unknown. Depends on approach.
11. Recommended Action: Review and implementation of corrective actions at high truck accident locations.
- Description: Development of a program to identify high truck accident locations and implementation of corrective action to reduce the potential for truck accidents.
- Justification: Truck accidents which occur at specific locations may be caused by other than driver error and some corrective action could reduce the chance of accidents (e.g. skidding on wet pavement - provide a more skid resistant surface; provide special signs on freeway ramps where there is high incidence of truck rollover).
- Lead Agency: Department of Transportation.
- Legislative Requirement: None.
- Time Frame: A pilot project is currently underway by MDOT to determine the scope and requirements of the project.
- Budgetary Implications: Could result in a program budget change or a reordering of project priorities.
12. Recommended Action: Evaluate mandatory use of tachographs.
- Description: Tachographs are instruments which provide a reading of speed, idling, stops and starts, and other information which would assist in enforcement of hours of service rules. An evaluation of the costs and benefits associated with a mandatory tachograph requirement will be undertaken.
- Justification: Fatigue appears to be a major cause of truck accidents. The current law limiting drivers to 10 hours of driving and eight hours rest (up to 70 hours of driving per week) is felt to be violated widely throughout the industry by falsification of log books. Tachographs would assist in the enforcement of hours of service laws.
- Lead Agencies: Departments of Transportation and State Police.

Legislation Required: Yes, if decision to implement.  
Time Frame: Study done in six months.  
Budgetary Implications: Inhouse or consultant study with minor costs. Cost of program would be minimal to state government. The cost burden would reside with truck owners. The cost of tachographs is in the \$2,000-3,000 range.

13. Recommended Action: Cover all loose loads.

Description: The current law requires that the load be 6" below the sideboards and not spill on the highway. It can be peaked in the center but must not blow off or otherwise spill. Legislation to insure covering of all loads should be developed.

Justification: Spillage of materials from open top trucks is one of the most common complaints from the motoring public. AAA Michigan reports almost 35,000 broken or cracked windshields at a cost of over \$4.5 million to replace. All Michigan insurance companies paid out almost \$18 million to replace windshield damage.

Lead Agencies: Michigan Department of State Police.

Legislation Required: Yes.

Time Frame: Introduce legislation this session.

Budget Implications: None to government. Cost to truck companies in terms of covering and labor costs will be significant.

14. Recommended Action: Maximum 22" rear bumper for trucks.

Description: Federal law currently allows a rear bumper to be 30" from the ground. Michigan requires all 53' trailers registered in Michigan to have rear bumper height of 22" from the ground. This should be expanded to require all large trucks registered in Michigan to have reinforced rear bumpers at a maximum of 22". The federal law should also be revised to the 22" maximum height.

Justification: Current federal standards result in small passenger cars under-riding the truck. This could result in severe injury or death. A 22" reinforced rear bumper would stop most small compact cars from passing under the guard.

Lead Agency: Department of Transportation.

Legislation Required: Yes.

Time Frame: Legislation introduced this session.

Budget Implications: None to state government. Reinforced bumper could cost several hundred dollars.

15. Recommended Action: Restrict trucks to the two right lanes on freeways of three or more lanes in each direction.

Description: Implement a policy of restricting trucks to the two right lanes of freeways having three or more lanes in each direction. Trucks would only be allowed in the left lane for left exits or emergency passing situations. This policy could apply to approximately 429 miles of freeway in Michigan.

Justification: Trucks often use all lanes of freeways for driving or passing. This prevents motorists from passing, provokes them to tailgate and causes potential danger to all drivers. On freeways of three or more lanes, trucks should be limited to the two right lanes so traffic can flow smoothly and reduce the potential for congestion and dangerous tailgating.

Lead Agency: Michigan Department of Transportation.

Legislative Requirements: The Department of Transportation is investigating whether an administrative rule may limit trucks to two right lanes on freeways with three or more lanes in each direction. If this is not possible, legislation may be required.

Time Frame: Near term implementation.

Budgetary Implications: Cost of signs and enforcement.

16. Recommended Action: Review the need for additional enforcement personnel in the Motor Carrier Division, Department of State Police.

Description: During 1986-87, the number of uniformed officers is projected to increase from 111 to 168. The Department of State Police suggests the need for an additional 50 officers so all State Police posts would have a motor carrier officer. Additional officers would also allow for more scale house hours of operation. This request should be reviewed to determine impacts and funding sources.

Justification: Budget and personnel limitations require a review of the costs and benefits associated with this increase.

Lead Agency: Michigan Department of State Police and funding agencies.

Legislative Requirements: Appropriation process.

Time Frame: Conduct review by June 1 or in time for appropriation hearings.

Budgetary Implications: Would require \$2,285,000 to support 50 additional officers.

17. Recommended Action: Require registration of all for-hire trucking companies and all Michigan based private fleets.

Description: Develop a program, and enact legislation, for registration of all for-hire trucking companies and all Michigan based private fleets operating in Michigan. Federal law allows a state to charge a maximum of \$10/truck for registration of for hire trucking companies. Most states levy this fee to support enforcement and other activities.

Justification: Approximately 1/3 of all trucking companies currently are regulated by MPSC and subject to sanctions for unsafe operations. The remaining 2/3 are private fleets, exempt carriers or interstate carriers. These carriers do not provide a reasonable contribution for truck safety enforcement activities and are not subject to MPSC sanction. Michigan intrastate trucks must

pay \$100 to register their vehicles. Registration may be revoked if companies have a poor safety record. These fees support MPSC and State Police enforcement activities. Interstate companies, exempt carriers and Michigan based private fleets should be subject to a \$10 registration fee to support truck safety enforcement by MPSC and State Police. In addition, registration would allow them to monitor a carrier's safety record and petition the ICC for revocation of interstate operating authority if they have a poor safety record.

**Responsibility:** Michigan Public Service Commission.

**Legislative Requirements:** Registration of all trucking companies operating heavy trucks, fee for registration and safety requirements for obtaining and retaining registration.

**Time Frame:** PSC currently is reviewing legislation in other states.

**Budgetary Implications:** Approximately 100,000 trucks would be liable for this \$10 registration fee resulting in revenue of \$1.0 million.

18. **Recommended Action:** Develop funding sources for truck safety.

**Description:** Locate sources of funding to support increased truck safety efforts. Potential sources include:

Tanker truck inspection fee	\$ 150,000
Increased fines	\$1,500,000
MPSC registration fee	\$1,000,000

**Justification:** Additional funding is required to support new or enhanced state level truck safety activities.

**Responsibility:** Departments of State Police, Transportation and Commerce.

**Legislative Requirements:** Legislation needed.

**Time Frame:** Detailed proposals to be developed for legislation to be introduced this session.

**Budgetary Implications:** Potential revenue of \$2.5-3.0 million for truck safety activities.

19. Recommended Action: Retain 55 mph maximum speed limit for trucks.

Description: Current Michigan law limits the maximum speed of all vehicles to 55 mph. Recent changes in federal law allows a maximum speed of 65 mph on rural interstate freeways outside of urbanized areas for cars and trucks. The maximum truck speed should remain at 55 mph even though federal law now allows an increase on the selected sections of rural interstate freeways.

Justification: Truck related accidents are increasing in Michigan; a 65% increase occurred during the three year period between 1982 and 1985.

Local Agencies: Departments of Transportation, State Police and State.

Legislation Required: No

Budgetary Implication: None



## COMMISSIONERS

William E. Long  
Edwyna G. Anderson  
Matthew E. McLogan

JAMES J. BLANCHARD, Governor

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

DOUG ROSS, Director

## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

6545 Mercantile Way  
P.O. Box 30221  
Lansing, Michigan 48909

May 5, 1987

Morris		<b>RECEIVED</b>  MAY 03 1987  Office of Governmental Affairs	Stu. Asst
Davis			
Mellios			Spraul
			File

Mr. Robert K. Morris  
Legislative Director  
Michigan Department of Transportation  
Lansing, MI 48909

Dear Bob:

On April 23 the Motor Carrier Advisory Board convened a special meeting to consider the Truck Safety Report prepared by the Interagency Truck Committee. The Advisory Board has authorized me to transmit this letter setting forth the comments on, and position of, the Advisory Board on the recommendations contained in the Truck Safety Report. The Board understands that you will soon transmit the report to the Special Truck Safety Subcommittee of the House Transportation Committee and we request that this letter accompany the report to that Subcommittee.

The opportunity to review and comment on the report is greatly appreciated and members of the Advisory Board are available to participate as the issue of truck safety is examined in the legislature or elsewhere.

The Motor Carrier Advisory Board, like the vast majority of businesses and individuals that are involved in the Michigan trucking industry, supports improved highway safety and commends the state legislature and state agencies in their activities to curtail accidents, injuries and deaths. The trucking industry has in the past supported improved enforcement and other safety measures even when it involved higher fees or taxes. The Board supports additional steps at this time to improve highway safety, but asks that any actions be carefully considered to assure that they are cost-effective and do not place Michigan truckers in an uncompetitive situation.

The Motor Carrier Advisory Board's comments on eighteen of the recommendations are attached. The nineteenth recommendation regarding retention of the 55 mph speed limit for trucks was added after the April 23 meeting and has not been reviewed by the Advisory Board.

Sincerely,

*Thomas R. Lonergan*

Thomas R. Lonergan, Chairman  
Motor Carrier Advisory Board  
Michigan Public Service Commission

TRL/mar  
attachments



1. Implement Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986

The Advisory Board supports the expeditious implementation of the provisions of this statute.

2. Increase Penalties for Truck Violations

The Advisory Board supports an increase in penalties for serious safety violations. The Board is concerned that this measure not be viewed only as a source of revenue, but truly be designed to provide an effective deterrent. The legislation should carefully define "serious safety violations" and designate effective penalties which could include increased fines. Also, the Board feels strongly that the fines should not be earmarked directly to law enforcement agencies but should be allocated to state highway safety programs through legislative appropriations.

3. Stricter Local Court System Enforcement

The Advisory Board supports this recommendation but points out that there are other penalties in addition to fines that can and should be applied in some situations.

4. Pilot Program for Truck Identification

The Advisory Board opposes any mandatory program of truck markings or toll-free numbers. There are already sufficient requirements for truck marking and documentation. Additional requirements would not be effective since they would not apply to out-of-state trucks and would be costly, particularly for small companies. Also, since no other businesses are required to maintain toll-free telephones, the trucking business should not be the exception. Individual companies are, of course, free to participate in pilot projects if they so choose.

5. Increase Tanker Inspection Fee to an Appropriate Level

The Advisory Board supports restoration of the tanker inspection fee to the original \$70 level if the inspections are increased commensurately.

6. Develop Improved Truck Accident Data Base

The Advisory Board supports this recommendation and would welcome more definitive data about the contributing factors to truck accidents.

7. Include Truck Information in Driver Education and Other Safety Programs

The Advisory Board supports this recommendation and expresses concern over the general effectiveness of current driver education and licensing programs, particularly the absence of a requirement for a road test for new drivers.

8. Update the Motor Vehicle Code

This recommendation is fully supported.

9. Allow Public Service Commission More Authority to Enforce Safety Laws

The Advisory Board supports the concept of the MPSC having effective sanctions to deal with unsafe carriers, subject to due process protections. However, the Board will not take a position on this recommendation until it has a chance to review the specific proposals being developed.

10. Recommend Mandatory Twelve-month Vehicle Inspection Program

The Advisory Board does not support a mandatory state administered annual vehicle inspection. Experience in other states indicate that it is costly and ineffective in curtailing the operation of poor equipment. The Board supports a significant increase in the State Police selective inspection and audit programs as a more effective and less costly alternative and one which does not unfairly burden Michigan-based companies.

11. Review and Implementation of Corrective Actions at High Truck Accident Locations

The Advisory Board supports this recommendation and in particular urges the use of distinctive signing at unusual traffic intersections.

12. Evaluate Mandatory Use of Tachographs

The Advisory Board opposes a mandatory requirement for tachographs. Some carriers are using this equipment on a voluntary basis, but experience indicates that they will not necessarily be effective if mandated and the cost would place Michigan carriers at a serious competitive disadvantage.

13. Cover all Loose Loads

The Advisory Board supports this recommendation but believes it should apply to vehicles of any size and ownership, not just commercial vehicles.

14. Maximum 22" Rear Bumper for Trucks

The Advisory Board would support efforts to make this a national standard for trailer and truck manufacture. A Michigan law would place Michigan equipment at a significant competitive disadvantage and is not supportable.

15. Restrict Trucks to the Two Right Lanes on Freeways of Three or More Lanes in Each Direction

This recommendation is supported.

16. Review the Need for Additional Enforcement Personnel in the Motor Carrier Division, State Police

The Advisory Board generally supports this recommendation as long as there is equity in the system of funding and the personnel are used exclusively for increased safety enforcement.

17. Require Registration of all For-Hire Trucking Companies and all Michigan Based Private Fleets

The Advisory Board supports the concept as an equitable one, allowing improved safety enforcement and some contribution towards the costs of safety enforcement. Since there are several elements to this recommendation that are preliminary, the Board withholds any specific endorsements at this time.

18. Develop Funding Sources for Truck Safety

The Advisory Board realizes that some of the previous recommendations will require additional funds. The Board supports the tanker truck inspection fee increase and consideration of those concepts included in item #17. The Board objects to fines being earmarked for enforcement activities, but they should be allocated generally to highway safety. The Board also recommends that the allocation of current revenues available to the state be examined to see if they are being expended in conformance with legislative intent and in a cost-effective manner.

STATE OF MICHIGAN



JAMES J. BLANCHARD, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TRANSPORTATION BUILDING, 425 WEST OTTAWA PHONE 517-373-2090

POST OFFICE BOX 30050, LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909

JAMES P. FITZ, DIRECTOR

June 26, 1987

TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

JAM C. MARSHALL

RODGER D. YOUNG

HANNES MEYERS, JR.

CARL V. PELLONPAA

SHIRLEY E. ZELLER

WILLIAM J. BECKHAM, JR.

Honorable Curtis Hertel  
Michigan State Representative  
The Capitol  
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Dear Representative Hertel:

As you know, Rodger Young or myself have been scheduled several times to appear before the Truck Safety Subcommittee to present information on truck safety issues. The busy legislative agenda has caused this meeting to be postponed.

Our testimony was to be, in part, a presentation of the attached report from the Interagency Truck Committee (ITC) on truck safety in Michigan. The ITC consists of representatives from the Departments of Transportation, State Police, Commerce, Treasury, and State. The report contains 19 recommendations which the ITC feels would assist in improving motor carrier safety. We have made a special effort to review these recommendations with the Motor Carrier Advisory Board of the Michigan Public Service Commission. This board consists of trucking companies, shippers, labor, and others concerned with motor carrier issues. Two meetings were held to discuss the report and a detailed review was undertaken. A copy of the board's comments is also attached. I feel it is significant that there was general consensus on all but a few of the recommendations.

The Michigan Department of Transportation and the Interagency Truck Committee is ready, as always, to assist you and the Truck Safety Subcommittee. You will note that many of the recommendations require legislative action before implementation. Others can be, and are being, implemented directly by individual state departments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Robert K. Morris".

Robert K. Morris  
Legislative Director  
Office of Governmental Affairs

Attachment