

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
Subcommittee on Revision

February 6, 1974

Minutes

Members Present: Sen. Elizabeth W. Browne, Chairman
Rep. Stan Bunn
Sen. Wallace P. Carson, Jr.
Rep. Robert P. Marx

Staff Present: Mrs. Marion Embick, Research Counsel

Others Present: Miss Vinita Howard, Motor Vehicles Division
Mr. Lawrence E. George, Engineer, Highway Division
Capt. John Williams, State Department of Police
Mr. Jim Dutoit, Automobile Club of Oregon (AAA)

Agenda: Driving on Right Side of Roadway; Overtaking and
Passing; Use of Roadway; Preliminary Draft No. 1;
January 1974. Section 4 and sections 8 through 14

Right of Way; Preliminary Draft No. 1; February
1974. Sections 1, 2 and 3

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by Chairman Elizabeth W. Browne in Room 14, State Capitol.

Driving on Right Side of Roadway; Overtaking and Passing; Use of
Roadway; Preliminary Draft No. 1; January 1974

Section 4. Duty of driver of 6,000 pound vehicle, vehicle with
trailer or camper to drive on right. Mrs. Embick outlined the
provisions of section 4 and said her notes did not indicate that the
subcommittee had approved it at the last meeting.

Captain John Williams said he had recently discussed the new law
relating to heavy vehicles (Chapter 510, Oregon Laws 1973) with some
of the state troopers at an in-service training school. They indicated
that enforcement up to this point had been minimal but there appeared
to be no particular problems with the law.

Rep. Marx commented that this Article contained two provisions
that appeared to cover the same subject -- this section plus section 2
dealing with the duty of the slow driver to drive on the right. Mrs.
Embick advised that the legislation from the 1973 session was directed

specifically at heavy vehicles which impeded traffic because of their size and the difficulty in passing them whereas section 2 was directed at the slow driver of any type of vehicle.

Capt. Williams said he had raised the question earlier that there were two other sections addressed to the problem of keeping vehicles to the right. One required a driver to give way to the right when overtaken on a freeway and the other required campers, trailers, etc. on a two lane highway to pull off the road at a safe location to allow traffic to pass. Perhaps, he said, there was sufficient authority in this area without section 2.

Sen. Carson asked Capt. Williams what he would like to see in the statutes from an enforcement standpoint to control slow moving vehicles. Capt. Williams' reply was that the 6,000 pound statute passed by the last session had not been in effect long enough to determine its effectiveness but from all indications he believed it was going to work all right on both two and three lane highways. Drivers had been moving to the right and had been making an effort to pull off the road at safe turnouts to let other drivers pass. With the added requirement for heavy vehicles, he believed law enforcement had all the tools they needed in this area. He added that the weight limit in section 4 should probably be raised to 8,000 pounds to coincide with the PUC definition of a truck adopted by the last session of the legislature.

Senator Carson said he believed there would be a bill at the special session which would change the definition of truck in the motor vehicle statutes to 8,000 pounds to coincide with the PUC code and if that were enacted, section 4 should also be amended in that regard. There being no objection, Chairman Browne directed that section 4 be amended to reflect the 8,000 pound definition and asked Mrs. Embick to flag the amendment to keep track of the bill to which Senator Carson referred. If it did not pass, the committee could reconsider this action.

Rep. Marx moved approval of section 4 as amended. Motion carried with all members present and voting.

At a later point in the meeting Sen. Carson advised that a representative of one of the bus companies had reported to him that at least one of his busses had received a citation for driving in the left lane of a highway with three lanes for traffic going in one direction. In that instance the bus came upon two vehicles driving in the first and second lanes doing well under the 55 mph limit. The bus driver had the choice of staying behind or passing in the third lane. No one was using the third lane so he pulled over into it, passed and received a citation. Sen. Carson had been asked if an exception could be made to allow busses to use the third lane in such circumstances.

Capt. Williams noted that I-5 was the only highway in the state at the present time which carried three lanes in one direction and even there it was for a relatively short distance. He said there was a question as to whether busses should be passing vehicles under those circumstances, especially when traffic was moving at 55 mph. At the present time busses could legally exceed the 55 mph limit but if the maximum was set at 55 by the special session, that problem would be solved because busses could not then exceed that rate.

Sen. Carson said the gentleman's point was that when the vehicles blocking the two right lanes were going 45 mph, the bus driver was not permitted to use the third lane for passing. He suggested that the answer might be for the officer to cite the driver in the second lane for impeding traffic.

Capt. Williams said the size of the busses, the spray they threw in wet weather and the complaints of motorists when busses passed them lead him to believe the approach suggested by Sen. Carson was better than to change section 4 to permit busses to use the third lane. Until there were more six lane highways, he said it was no great problem, and he could direct his officers to try to keep the second lane free of slow moving vehicles. The committee concurred with this approach.

Section 8. Further limitations on driving on left of center of roadway. Mrs. Embick recalled that the earlier discussion on this section centered on the advisability of including the exact distance of 100 feet in paragraphs (b) and (c) of subsection (1). It was pointed out that exact distances were difficult to work with and the legislature had been attempting to get away from stating precise distances by statute. She also noted that Oregon was the only state that used the phrase "unless such movement can be made in safety" when speaking to this point and proposed to substitute "unless otherwise directed by a uniform traffic control device" for that phrase.

Miss Vinita Howard indicated that 42% of all accidents occurred at intersections. She expressed approval of eliminating the phrase, "unless such movement can be made in safety." She noted that the comparable UVC section placed a period after "grade crossing."

Chairman Browne asked if an intersection would include a place where a private driveway intersected with a roadway and was told by Miss Howard that an intersection was where two roadways or highways crossed, but the term should be defined in the definitions section. Mrs. Embick noted that the UVC definition of "intersection" was cited on pages 17 and 18 of the draft.

Capt. Williams concurred that the phrase, "unless such movement can be made in safety," would be difficult from an enforcement standpoint. Many courts, he said, would not even consider a violation citation, no matter how close a person came to causing an accident, unless there was actually a collision.

Sen. Carson moved to delete "unless such movement can be made in safety" from subsection (1) (b) of section 8. Motion carried.

The committee then turned to a discussion of the necessity of including "100 feet" in subsection (1) (b) and (c). Capt. Williams indicated that the trend was to eliminate specific distances and to put the burden on the individual to make sure that he did not create a hazard. While "100 feet" established a guideline, it created problems in the prosecution of cases, but the same would be true if the phrase were removed. He added that 100 feet might not be enough distance if a person were traveling, for example, at 60 miles per hour.

Mr. Lawrence George said he would be in favor of deleting "100 feet" and substituting the language of subsection (1) (a): "within such a distance as to create a hazard."

Miss Howard suggested subsection (1) (b) be amended to read:

"When approaching within such a distance or crossing an intersection or railroad grade crossing, if a hazard is created for other traffic approaching or within the intersection."

Rep. Marx commented that there was some benefit in using the same criteria as that in subsection (1) (a), i.e., "within such a distance as to create a hazard." Mr. George believed it was easier for a person to tell when he was creating a hazard than to know when a movement could be made in safety.

Chairman Browne asked Mr. George what criteria was used in painting no passing lines on highways and was told that they were placed primarily on the basis of sight distance founded on certain established standards. Chairman Browne asked if citations were issued on the basis of the no passing lines and Capt. Williams replied that the lines were used only as a guide. Some of the lines, he said, were longer than they should be.

Rep. Marx moved to amend paragraphs (b) and (c) of subsection (1) to read:

"(b) When approaching or traversing an intersection or railroad grade crossing within such a distance as to create a hazard if another vehicle approaches from the opposite direction; or

"(c) When the view is obstructed upon approaching any bridge, viaduct or tunnel."

Chairman Browne suggested that Mrs. Embick be given some latitude in drafting the precise language and Rep. Marx concurred.

Mrs. Embick asked if the committee wanted an absolute prohibition against being in the left lane when traversing or approaching an intersection. Under current law, she said, passing in the left lane at intersections was permitted when safe. The committee decided to differentiate between traversing and approaching an intersection by substituting the hazard language suggested by Rep. Marx for approaching within 100 feet so that a person could approach an intersection in the left lane if it were safe to do so. It would, however, be unlawful to traverse an intersection in the left lane, whether or not it was safe.

Vote was then taken on the motion to amend paragraphs (b) and (c) of subsection (1) of section 8 in accordance with the above discussion. Motion carried unanimously with all members present.

Senator Carson moved to approve section 8 as amended. Motion carried without opposition.

Section 9. No passing zone. Mrs. Embick explained that subsection (1) of section 9 would specifically designate authority to establish a no passing zone. Oregon law, she said, handled this subject in a manner different from that suggested by the UVC. While the authority of the State Highway Commission to erect no passing zone signs had never been questioned, there was no specific provision conferring that authorization and section 9 would do so. She noted that the section referred to the "Department of Transportation" and at the last meeting the committee had decided that the "Director of Transportation" would be the appropriate authority. Also, "proscribe" appeared in line 5 and the Motor Vehicles Division would prefer "prohibit." Mrs. Embick also pointed out that subsections (b) and (c) of UVC s 11-307 had been inadvertently omitted from the draft on page 35. Those two subsections were similar to paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection (3) of section 9.

Chairman Browne commented that sometimes when driving in the mountains, a driver encountered a truck going uphill at two or three miles per hour and if he was required to follow the truck at that speed for any length of time, it became highly frustrating. Sen. Carson recalled that Capt. Williams had stated earlier that the no passing lines were sometimes too long. He said he would be inclined to favor section 9 although he was aware of the weakness pointed out by the Chairman.

Miss Howard said the State Police and the Motor Vehicles Division had discussed the peculiarities of having a yellow line meaning it was unsafe to pass but not illegal to pass. Most of the states had no passing zone laws and she believed Oregon should too.

Mr. George said the Highway Division used two types of devices to prevent passing. One was the standard no passing yellow stripe used

in conjunction with a broken white median line and the other was a solid yellow double barrier line down the median of a four lane highway. Near Springfield, he said, there was a considerable length of double barrier lines and when they were installed, there were many calls from property owners wanting to know if it was illegal to turn across that double barrier line into their private accesses. He asked if the passage of section 9 would prohibit a person from crossing such a double line to get onto his property. Mrs. Embick said it would not because of the exception in subsection (3) (b).

Sen. Carson and Capt. Williams raised the question of whether the statute should make that prohibition in view of certain areas where private access posed a serious hazard. Sen. Carson asked if some mechanism could be written into the law to take into account those areas that were particularly hazardous and to say that a particular type of line could not be crossed under any circumstances. Rep. Bunn asked how many persons would be affected by the passage of such a law and was told by Mr. George that there would be several thousand.

The committee discussed various methods of overcoming the problem of access to or from private property, one of which was to use the standard no passing zone marking (broken center line in conjunction with the solid yellow line in the no passing lane) in areas where it was unsafe to pass or to turn and the double yellow barrier line in areas where turning left was absolutely prohibited. Mr. George was of the opinion that most of the locations which posed a serious hazard were more or less isolated and it might be better to post "no left turn" signs at those spots than to go to a coding system which might be confusing to the public.

Rep. Bunn commented that in many areas where a left turn might be prohibited, it could be equally dangerous to turn right. He was of the opinion that there had to be some way to make both turns safely, but a prohibition against turning was not the answer.

Miss Howard then suggested that in sections 9, 10, 11 and 14 the committee should depart from the UVC and place the provisions designating authority to the Director of Transportation or local authority with the general authority provisions in the earlier part of the code. She contended this part of the code should be devoted strictly to Rules of the Road. The statutes designating authority were probably adequate at the present time, she said, but if the committee decided it was advisable to designate additional authority, it should be included in the area of ORS 483.038 rather than added to the Rules of the Road. In other words, her recommendation was that subsection (1) of section 9 be deleted to avoid cluttering up the Rules of the Road with miscellaneous authority provisions.

Sen. Carson, who was presiding in the temporary absence of the Chairman, expressed approval of Miss Howard's suggestion.

Rep. Marx moved to adopt section 9 with the understanding that the deletion of subsection (1) would be discussed when Chairman Browne returned to the meeting. Motion carried. Voting for the motion: Bunn, Marx, Carson.

[Note: Subsection (1) was subsequently deleted. See pages 8 and 9 of these minutes.]

Section 10. No passing zone. Following Mrs. Embick's explanation of section 10, Miss Howard suggested that paragraph (b) of subsection (1) be amended to read:

"A person who drives upon a roadway designated for one-way traffic in the direction other than that indicated "

There being no objection, the proposed amendment was adopted unanimously with all four members present.

Capt. Williams pointed out that the amendment just adopted changed the meaning of the original wording in that there might be directions other than a one-way street designation, such as directions setting out proper lane usage, and the amended language did not take into account signs bearing directions other than those pertaining to a one-way street. Following a brief discussion of this point, the committee recessed for a short time. Upon reconvening, Mrs. Embick indicated that during the recess she had discussed the question raised by Capt. Williams with Miss Howard and they agreed that the UVC used the word "direction" in the manner adopted in the amendment, i.e., to refer to the direction indicated by a one-way sign. Capt. Williams agreed that was the proper language.

Rep. Bunn moved the adoption of section 10 as amended. Motion carried unanimously with all members present.

[Note: Subsection (1) was subsequently deleted. See page 8 of these minutes.]

Section 11. Driving on roadways laned for traffic. Following an explanation of section 11 by Mrs. Embick, Capt. Williams called attention to subparagraph (C) of subsection (1) (b) which stated, "When the driver is preparing to make a left turn." This raised a question of how long he was to be permitted to "prepare" for the turn. His opinion was that the statute should be confined to the making of the turn and not extended to the preparation for turning.

Rep. Marx moved to amend the subparagraph to read:

"(C) When the driver is making a left turn."

Mr. George agreed with Capt. Williams' comments but observed that many times a specific lane was assigned for left turns and the driver could get into that lane and drive for quite a distance preparatory to making the left turn. Chairman Browne commented that such a lane would be subject to a traffic control device.

Rep. Marx pointed out that in some places there was one center lane for left turns used by traffic coming from both directions, but in that case also the lanes would be subject to a traffic control device.

Rep. Bunn said he would interpret the proposed amendment to (1) (b) (C) to mean that when a driver was preparing to make a turn, he could not move into a center lane designated for turning from both directions. His position was that the language of the section as drafted was better than the proposed amendment.

Mrs. Embick commented that if a driver were going to turn left, he would need to be able to turn left from the center lane unless it had been otherwise allocated by a traffic control device.

Chairman Browne asked what the intention of the committee was with respect to one center lane designated for left turns for traffic coming from either direction. Rep. Marx replied that the intent was that the lane be used for that purpose when so designated.

Vote was then taken on Rep. Marx' motion to amend section 11 (1) (b) (C) to read: "When the driver is making a left turn." Motion carried in accordance with the subcommittee rule adopted at the meeting of January 8, 1974, whereby three members constituted a quorum and a majority vote of the quorum (2) would approve or reject a motion. Voting for the motion: Marx, Chairman Browne. Voting no: Bunn.

Mrs. Embick questioned the necessity of including subsections (3) and (4) of section 11. The committee concurred that they should be deleted because they were redundant with section 1 of the Article on Traffic Signs, Signals and Markings which stated that official traffic control devices should be obeyed.

Rep. Bunn moved the deletion of subsections (3) and (4). Motion carried unanimously. Voting: Bunn, Marx, Chairman Browne.

Rep. Bunn then moved that section 11 be approved as amended. Motion carried unanimously with the same three members voting.

Sections 9, 10 and 14. Chairman Browne pointed out that Miss Howard had earlier suggested grouping the authority for sections 9, 10 and 14. [See page 6 of these minutes.] Mrs. Embick expressed agreement and commented that sufficient authority probably already existed in ORS 183.040 and 183.044, both of which would be retained in the Article on general provisions.

After a discussion, Rep. Bunn moved to strike the subsections conferring authorization from sections 9, 10 and 14. Motion carried unanimously. Voting: Bunn, Marx, Chairman Browne.

Section 12. Following too closely. Miss Howard suggested that the first sentence of subsection (2) of section 12 be amended to read:

"When traveling on a roadway outside of a business or residence district, a driver of a truck, motor bus or motor vehicle which is drawing another vehicle shall, when following another such vehicle, leave sufficient space so that an overtaking vehicle may enter and occupy the space without danger."

She was of the opinion that the phrase, "when conditions permit," required a difficult decision on the part of law enforcement officers and questioned the need for it, her position being that there was no excuse for "tailgating." Chairman Browne asked if the phrase was in the UVC and received an affirmative reply from Mrs. Embick.

Rep. Bunn inquired if section 12 would apply to freeways as well as two lane roads and was told by Mrs. Embick that the UVC made no distinction in that regard.

Rep. Bunn preferred to retain "when conditions permit" to avoid any implication that a truck driver on a four lane highway was doing something illegal when he pulled close behind another truck before passing. Capt. Williams expressed agreement with Rep. Bunn. He also pointed out that the phrase in section 12 (2), "outside of a business or residence district," included a freeway when it traversed the city limits, examples being portions of the freeway going through Eugene and Salem. In other words, section 12 would not apply to those parts of a freeway within a city's limits. This same language appeared in current law, he said, and was necessary to permit trucks and busses to follow closely in congested city traffic. Therefore, when the freeway was within the city limits, the State Police were permitting this type of violation to occur but applied a different rule on the same stretch of highway when it was outside the city limits. He said he did not have an answer to that situation but it did create an enforcement problem.

Mrs. Embick suggested excluding a highway going through a city by adding "or a freeway within a city's limits" after "a business or residence district" in subsection (2).

The Chair moved adoption of the following amendments to section 12:

(1) Modify the language in line 1 of subsection (2) in accordance with Miss Howard's suggestion as set forth above by inserting "drawing another vehicle" after "truck, motor bus or motor vehicle".

(2) In line 2 of subsection (2) insert "or a freeway within a city's limits" or words to that effect.

(3) Delete ", when conditions permit," in line 4 of subsection (2).

Both Rep. Bunn and Rep. Marx indicated opposition to the third part of the amendment and Chairman Browne withdrew that portion of her motion.

Capt. Williams advised that ORS 483.312 set the standard for following too closely at 300 feet while section 12 substituted a "sufficient space" criteria. There were mixed opinions on this matter, he said. Highway division permits wrote in a standard of 500 feet, and he had heard several different opinions among state policemen as to whether 300 feet was necessary as a law enforcement tool. Chairman Browne commented that the most recent policy appeared to be to eliminate specific footages wherever possible.

Miss Howard contended that the phrase, "when conditions permit," should be deleted from subsection (2). She said that section 12 was not talking about passenger cars but about trucks, motor busses or a vehicle drawing another vehicle. When a driver encountered a situation where two such vehicles were following closely and he wanted to pass, it would take a great deal of space to be able to pass both vehicles. If there were room between them to permit him to pass one at a time, it would create less of a problem on the highway.

Capt. Williams' opinion was that from an enforcement standpoint retention of the phrase would not cause a problem and he could see times when conditions would not permit a driver to leave sufficient space. The officers could make that judgment on the highway.

Mrs. Embick suggested adding to subsection (3) language parallel to subsection (2) to exclude freeways going through cities from the rule that a car going in a caravan should leave sufficient space between vehicles.

Chairman Browne then added the following revision to her motion to adopt the two amendments set forth above:

In subsection (3) insert "or a freeway within a city's limits" after "outside of a business or residence district".

The three-part motion carried unanimously. Voting: Bunn, Marx, Chairman Browne.

The Chair moved adoption of section 12 as amended. Motion carried without opposition with the same three members voting.

At this point the subcommittee recessed for lunch and reconvened at 1:00 p.m. with the following members present: Chairman Browne, Rep. Bunn and Rep. Marx.

Section 13. Driving on divided highways. Mrs. Embick described the provisions of section 13 and indicated she had some question about the wording taken from UVC s 11-311 in paragraph (a) of subsection (2) which appeared to allow a driver to drive through an opening in a physical barrier or dividing section whether or not it was authorized.

Miss Howard said she believed both Capt. Williams and Mr. George, although they were not present at this time, would agree with her that they would be more comfortable if paragraph (a) of subsection (2) were amended to read: "At an authorized crossover or intersection; or".

Miss Howard said some states permitted drivers to cross over an unpaved portion of a highway, but she believed this was inadvisable from a traffic safety standpoint.

Chairman Browne asked Mrs. Embick if she believed "authorized" was better than "established" in the proposed amendment and was told that "authorized" would not raise a question as to the agency that would give the authorization because it would have to be authorized either by the Department of Transportation or by local authorities. She added that there was a footnote to this section in the UVC which said that the National Committee interpreted this section as allowing a driver to cross a painted median which explained the final sentence in the commentary on page 30 of the draft.

Rep. Marx moved to amend paragraph (a) of subsection (2) of section 13 in accordance with Miss Howard's suggestion:

"At an authorized crossover or intersection; or"

Motion carried unanimously. Voting: Bunn, Marx, Chairman Browne.

Rep. Bunn moved adoption of section 13 as amended. Chairman Browne indicated the section was being adopted without amendment to the commentary so far as the painted median strip was concerned unless a question was later raised that appeared to make a modification of the commentary statement advisable. Motion carried without opposition with the same three members voting.

Section 14. Restrictions on use of controlled access roadway. Mrs. Embick indicated that ORS 183.040 provided the general authority to the State Highway Division to make this type of regulation and subsection (1) could probably therefore be eliminated on the basis of the committee's earlier decision as set out on pages 8 and 9 of these minutes. She said she also believed there was adequate rule making power in the code to cover obedience of signs and traffic control devices and therefore questioned whether any part of section 14 was necessary.

Rep. Bunn said that as he read the commentary, it seemed to indicate that existing law allowed control on freeways but it did not discuss this type of control on highways that were not freeways. Mrs. Embick advised that section 14 made no change in existing law and all highways would be encompassed by the general authority in ORS 483.040 and 483.044.

Miss Howard expressed agreement with Mrs. Embick that section 14 was unnecessary.

Mrs. Embick noted that the UVC definition of "controlled-access highway" set out on page 32 of the draft should probably be added to the general definitions Article, and the committee concurred.

The committee unanimously agreed to delete section 14.

Right of Way; Preliminary Draft No. 1; February 1974

Section 1. Vehicle approaching or entering intersection. Subsection (2) of ORS 483.202, Mrs. Embick said, stated the rule that a driver approaching an uncontrolled highway intersection must look out for and give right of way to a vehicle simultaneously approaching on the right, whether or not the other vehicle first entered the intersection. Section 1 of the draft, therefore, contained a major change from existing law because subsection (1) would apply to both approaching and entering the intersection whereas the present code applied only to approaching. She also advised that the draft omitted the provision in present Oregon law that a driver forfeited his right of way when he entered an intersection at an excessive, unlawful speed.

Miss Howard commented that failure to yield right of way was one of the leading causes of accidents and was one of the areas where it was important for Oregon to be uniform with other states. Perhaps some part of the right of way violations and accidents, she said, were attributable to the fact that Oregon's right of way law was different from that in existence in most of the other states.

Mr. George pointed out that ORS 483.202 (1) spoke to right of way at entrance ramps on freeways whereas section 1 was not specifically directed to that point. The current statute required the entering vehicle to yield right of way at freeway entrance ramps. Mrs. Embick agreed that point was not covered by section 1, but might be included in section 3 relating to stop signs and yield signs, providing the freeway ramps were posted. Mr. George advised that yield signs had not been placed on the freeway entrance ramps, partly because of the difficulty in locating the signs and partly because of the problem of deciding the confines of the intersection in the acceleration lanes as they merged with the freeway proper. It was for that reason that the legislature enacted subsection (1) of ORS 483.202.

Mrs. Embick suggested it might be appropriate, in view of Mr. George's remarks, to add subsection (1) of ORS 483.202 as another section to the Right of Way Article.

The Chair moved to add subsection (1) of ORS 483.202 to this Article at an appropriate spot. Motion carried unanimously. Voting: Bunn, Marx, Chairman Browne.

Rep. Marx moved the adoption of section 1. Motion carried without opposition with the same three members voting.

Section 2. Driver turning left. Mrs. Embick advised that subsection (5) of ORS 483.202 contained the "shifting right of way" rule as explained in the commentary on page 4 of the draft. The UVC recommended against that rule because studies had shown that the driver was really not able to exercise proper judgment in all cases as to when the right of way shifted. For that reason it was not included in the draft section which stated that the driver intending to turn left would yield right of way to a vehicle approaching from the opposite direction.

Miss Howard suggested deletion of the phrase, "upon that highway," in line 4 of subsection (1). It was not, she said, included in the present law nor did it appear in the UVC. Mrs. Embick agreed the phrase could be deleted. The Chair moved to make the deletion. There being no objection, it was so ordered.

Rep. Bunn moved adoption of section 2 as amended. Motion carried unanimously. Voting: Bunn, Marx, Chairman Browne.

Section 3. Stop signs and yield signs. Mrs. Embick summarized the provisions of section 3 and commented that it described the point at which a driver should stop when approaching a stop or yield sign, a description not set out in current Oregon law. This supplement to the state code, she said, was taken from section 12, subsection (4), of the Suggested Uniform Traffic Ordinance prepared in cooperation with the League of Oregon Cities.

Chairman Browne asked if subsection (1) (a) should contain a provision requiring vehicles to yield right of way to pedestrians in a crosswalk and was told by Miss Howard that this requirement would appear in the statutes relating to pedestrians.

Miss Howard commented that many drivers believed they had complied with the requirements of a stop sign when they stopped several cars back from the intersection even though they could not at that point

see whether or not the intersection was clear. She emphasized the importance of adopting this provision to spell out the point at which cars should stop.

At this time Rep. Bunn left to attend another meeting. Inasmuch as a quorum was no longer present, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mildred E. Carpenter, Clerk
Committee on Judiciary