

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY  
Subcommittee on Revision

May 22, 1974

Minutes

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

Staff Present: Mrs. Marion B. Embick, Research Assistant  
Mr. Donald L. Paillette, Project Director

Also Present: Mr. James Dutoit, Automobile Club of Oregon  
Ms. Vinita Howard, Motor Vehicles Division  
Mr. Ralph Sipprell, Department of Transportation

Agenda: Stopping, Standing and Parking, Reference Paper  
Operation of Bicycles and Play Vehicles,  
Reference Paper  
Miscellaneous Rules, Reference Paper

Senator Elizabeth W. Browne, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. in Room 14, State Capitol.

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of April 22, 1974

There being no objections, the minutes of the meeting of April 22, 1974 were approved as submitted.

STOPPING, STANDING AND PARKING, REFERENCE PAPER

Mrs. Embick reported that at the meeting of April 22, UVC ss 11-1001 and 11-1003 had been adopted with minor changes. Subsection (b), s 11-1001, refers to ss 11-1003 and 11-1004. Oregon has no counterpart to s 11-1004.

UVC s 11-1004. Additional parking regulations.

The section provides that a vehicle stopped or parked on a two-way roadway must be parallel to the right-hand curb and within 12 inches of such curb. Subsection (b) states that if it is a one-way roadway, the vehicle stopped or parked must be either on the right side within the 12 inch limit or on the left side within 12 inches of the curb, unless otherwise provided by local authorities. Subsections (c) and (d) deal with those authorities which may allow or prohibit angle

parking. Mrs. Embick noted that these two subsections would properly belong in the Article on Powers of State and Local Authorities.

Returning to subsection (b), UVC s 11-1001, Mrs. Embick stated that if the vehicle is disabled to the point where it is impossible to avoid stopping and temporarily leaving the vehicle, the driver is allowed to stop or stand in violation of the 12 inch rule as stated in s 11-1004. Oregon has no provision with respect to parking 12 inches from the curb or the right-hand edge of the curb. In answer to the Chairman's question as to whether confusion could be created by the 12 inch rule, Mrs. Embick stated it is required that the driver must be 12 inches to the curb or as "close as practicable to the right edge of the right-hand shoulder" and agreed that it could result in confusion.

Mrs. Embick recommended the adoption of UVC s 11-1004 (a) and (b).

Senator Carson expressed favor of existing law which makes it more definite that municipal authorities have exclusive control. The proposed UVC section does not direct itself to this matter as precisely although if only (a) and (b) were to be adopted, this issue could be considered later, he said.

Senator Carson moved the adoption of UVC s 11-1004,  
(a) and (b).

Motion carried unanimously. See page 4 of these minutes for further discussion of subsections (c) and (d), UVC s 11-1004.

UVC s 11-1002. Officers authorized to remove vehicles.

Subsection (a) authorizes the officer to remove the vehicle which is in violation of the parking provisions of s 11-1001. Subsection (b) is similar in that it authorizes the officer to remove an unattended vehicle illegally left standing. Mrs. Embick indicated subsection (a) is comparable to ORS 483.362 (2), which covers the officer's right in respect to the illegally parked vehicle.

Subsection (c) concerns itself with a situation whereby the officer is authorized to remove a stolen vehicle, a vehicle where the person in charge is unable to provide for its custody, and removing a vehicle when the person has been arrested. Mrs. Embick explained that included in the reference paper were statutes relating to the taking of abandoned or disabled vehicles into custody and that the only provision with respect to impounding the vehicle was in Chapter 484 which deals with the person driving under the influence. She recommended omitting portions of the UVC which authorize the officer to remove stolen or abandoned vehicles to a place of safety.

Senator Carson agreed with this recommendation and stated that subsection (b), which gives authorization to any police officer

to remove or cause to be removed an unattended vehicle to a place of safety could make a good case for the arrested individual because if the car were hit or stolen when so doing, the police would be liable. He was of the opinion subsections (b) and (c) should be deleted. Mrs. Embick explained that under ORS 483.382 the car can be taken into custody if abandoned or disabled. If subsection (a) were to be adopted, ORS 483.362 (2) would still be retained.

Senator Carson expressed the view that if subsection (a) were to be adopted, there should be further evaluation given to the existing statutes as to whether additional changes were needed.

The Chair moved UVC s 11-1002 (a) be amended to insert on line 3 following "move" the words "or cause to be moved".

There being no objections, the amendment was adopted.

Senator Carson moved the adoption of UVC s 11-1002 (a), as amended.

Motion carried unanimously.

ORS 483.350. Authority of municipalities to control parking on state highways.

ORS 483.346. Authority of highway commission to control parking on state highways.

ORS 483.348. Entry of commission's parking regulations in official records; erecting appropriate signs; regulations as having force of law.

With respect to ORS 483.350, Mrs. Embick explained the cities have exclusive authority to regulate parking upon the right of way of any state highway within the corporate limits of an incorporated city and on any city street designated as the route of a state highway. The final phrase of the section appeared to say, she observed, that the parking shall not be authorized without written consent by the Highway Commission if a study made by them showed the street to be too narrow for diagonal parking. The section relates to ORS 483.346 and Mrs. Embick favored the deletion of the last five lines of that section inasmuch as it is obsolete language. She mentioned that it had been proposed by the Highway Commission to insert another subsection which would provide a pattern for the regulation of parking on state highways within incorporated limits of cities comparable to the pattern of control over regulation of speeds between the State Transportation Commission and the State Speed Control Board. The suggested amendment to ORS 483.346 is as follows:

"(2) The commission shall also have authority to control parking over all state highways within the corporate limits of a city except where such highway is routed over a city street pursuant to ORS 483.350."

Mr. Sipprell stated the proposed amendment would distinguish it from a state highway over which the Highway Commission had access control before it was taken into the city.

Mrs. Embick favored retaining existing law over UVC s 11-1004 (c) and (d) because existing law has cast the authorization provisions in more definite terms and there would be no reason to adopt the general provisions of those subsections.

Senator Carson referred to rock festivals which occur in the county. The counties have ordinance powers, he said, and assumed they could provide parking requirements on their own county roads. He wondered if the committee should take cognizance of the new emerging authority of the counties as he believed this is where the parking problems will occur and there should be the same kind of exchange between the county officials and the state.

The Chairman thought it feasible to include "or other local authority" which would then include the county. Mrs. Embick reported there is no provision for the counties to regulate parking in any manner, although they do have this authority on their own county roads.

Senator Carson moved to amend ORS 483.350 to allow the counties the same authority as municipal authorities with respect to parking.

There being no objections, the motion was adopted.

Mrs. Embick alluded to her earlier statement regarding the angle parking on a highway which is too narrow. She stressed that the consent should not be given after the study shows the highway to be too narrow. Mr. Sipprell agreed and suggested the inclusion of subsection (c), UVC s 11-1004. He also proposed incorporating the city street which has been selected as the route of a state highway, inasmuch as subsection (c) only relates to the federal-aid or state highway.

Representative Bunn moved ORS 483.350 be amended to insert a period after "ORS 373.010" and delete the balance of the sentence and substitute UVC s 11-1004 (c), with the additional language of a city street selected and designated as the route of a state highway. The term "State Highway Commission" will be changed to "State Highway Division".

Motion carried unanimously.

ORS 483.346

The Chairman questioned the need to insert "counties" into ORS 483.346. Mr. Sipprell advised there is no dual designation as a

county road and a state highway. The county is authorized under the previous section to control parking on county roads and ORS 483.346 gives the Highway Commission authority over state highways, both within and without cities and over the highways within a city to which the State Highway Commission had the right of access before that area was included within the city limits.

Representative Marx was of the opinion that as the cities extend, the state then is given more authority and believed this to be a peculiar provision. Senator Carson suggested asking representatives of the Association of Oregon Counties and League of Oregon Cities for any recommendations which they may have. He was inclined to give them more power than they presently have, although it could be the case where they do not wish to be given this further authority. Mrs. Embick was directed to contact these associations for further input. It was the Chairman's intention to place the drafted proposal before the full committee at its next meeting.

ORS 483.348

Mrs. Embick indicated the statute is a companion provision to ORS 483.346, and Ms. Howard suggested that in lines 4 and 5 the change be made to "State Highway Division" as well as a change to "State Transportation Commission" on the last line of subsection (1).

The section, Mrs. Embick reported, is perhaps unnecessary as the authority to place signs and regulate traffic will be dealt with in the Article on Powers of State and Local Authorities. The Chairman asked Mr. Sipprell to examine the section and report any objections which the Highway Division might have to its deletion.

Representative Marx again referred to the provision in ORS 483.346 where the Commission has authority over the right of way of any section of any state highway within the corporate limits of cities if the access was controlled by it before the section was included within the limits of the city. He asked if, when the city has grown, the Commission would still have that authority and Mr. Sipprell responded that this authority would be retained if they acquired the right of way on a restricted, controlled or prohibited access basis. Representative Bunn inquired if this was needed once the highway was taken into the city and Mr. Sipprell answered that the state owns the property in fee and has purchased the access and he believed it reasonable to continue the Commission's authority to control.

Senator Carson asked if a distinction could be drawn as to why the State Highway Commission should have exclusive authority over such as Portland Road, for example. The statute already gives authority to the city to control parking, unless the highway is too narrow, and that even though the state would still control the access and own the property he would question why this parking authority should not be given to the city. He suggested the exception could be removed and restated that if it is within the city, it would have control regardless of when the additional extension was acquired.

The Chairman asked Mr. Sipprell to confer with the Department's legal counsel as to the rationale of the provision.

ORS 483.347. Parking vehicle on state highway for vending purposes prohibited.

Mrs. Embick explained the section had been discussed previously in connection with the hitchhiking provisions. There is no counterpart in the UVC. The prohibition in the Article on Pedestrians' Rights and Duties against unlawful solicitation of employment, business or contributions from vehicle occupants would permit the same thing. In one respect the person is prohibited from parking to sell and in the other, he is prohibited from standing and attempting to sell. Mr. Sipprell stated the Highway Department would favor the retention of the section.

ORS 483.352; ORS 483.356; ORS 483.354

Mrs. Embick stated ORS 483.352 had been amended in 1973 to further define the disabled person. Subsection (b), ORS 483.354, was added to allow the person to park next to an alley or curb without incurring an overtime parking penalty. Senator Carson noted that the state overrides all cities with respect to the parking of the disabled person, but would not recommend any changes be made to the statutes inasmuch as apparently the cities have not objected.

Senator Carson interpreted ORS 483.354 to mean that the person could parallel park in a limited time parking area and not be charged for overtime parking. It was Mr. Dutoit's contention that the person could not park in a 30 minute zone but that if it were 60 minutes or longer, he could park all day and not be penalized. Ms. Howard observed that the Motor Vehicles Division has issued only 300 to 400 plates to the disabled person.

No changes were proposed to the existing statutes.

#### OPERATION OF BICYCLES AND PLAY VEHICLES

UVC s 1-105. Bicycle.

ORS 483.002 (5). Bicycle defined.

Under existing law the bicycle is allowed to have two or three wheels and the UVC definition permits only two wheels. The question arose as to whether or not an air compressed unit would be excluded from the definition and it was determined that it must be propelled by human power.

Mrs. Embick reported the proposed Michigan code defines "bicycle" as follows:

"Every device propelled by human power upon which any person may ride, having two tandem wheels either of which is over 20 inches in diameter. It includes pedal bicycles with helper motors rated less than one brake horsepower transmitted by friction and not by gear or chain, which produce only ordinary pedaling speeds up to the maximum of 20 miles an hour."

Ms. Howard thought the above definition could be taking into consideration the "Moped" unit and urged that the Moped not be defined in the category of a bicycle. If so defined, she said, the issue would arise with respect to riding a motorized unit on a bicycle path. Senator Carson noted that it was not being attempted to define the Moped as a bicycle, but that the compressed air vehicle does not fit the normal Moped as it does not have a combustion or electrical engine. When speaking of a device propelled by human power, the present definition of "bicycle" was not precise inasmuch as if a bicycle were going down a hill, for example, it was not going under human power, he said.

Mrs. Embick commented that the Article on motorcycles has not yet been drawn and that perhaps the Mopeds should be placed in the category of motorcycles. Senator Carson suggested having three categories and make a distinction between bicycles, Mopeds and motorcycles. The question would then arise as to whether the turn signals, helmets, bicycle paths, etc. would be made applicable to Mopeds.

Mrs. Embick was directed to contact the various bicycle groups for further input on the subject.

Mrs. Embick explained that the Oregon definition of "bicycle" was superior to that of the UVC and suggested its retention.

UVC s 11-1201. Effect of regulations.

ORS 483.830 Parent or guardian prohibited from permitting child or ward to violate bicycle laws.

ORS 483.835. Applicability of chapter to bicycle operation.

Subsection (a) of UVC s 11-1201, has no counterpart in existing law. Subsection (b) is identical to that of ORS 483.830. Subsection (c) is identical to ORS 483.835. Mrs. Embick reported that there are no penalties for violation of the bicycle laws. With respect to the parent prohibited from permitting the child to violate the bicycle laws, Ms. Howard stated that this is a necessary statute inasmuch as there are situations occurring whereby parents allow the child to ride his bicycle on a dark street without lights or reflectors and she was of the opinion the parent should be held responsible. In the original drafting of the section, it was the intent that the parent or guardian responsibility would relate to only the equipment provisions of the law although this was not added to the statute. Representative Bunn asked if the child took the light off the bicycle

after leaving the home, would the parent be held responsible and Mrs. Embick responded that he would not be in this situation as he did not authorize or knowingly permit the act. Representative Marx posed the situation where the parent allowed the child to ride a bicycle at night which had no light and was involved in an accident. He asked what the effect would be on the civil liability. Mrs. Embick advised that ORS 30.770 provides that the parent shall be liable for damages not exceeding \$300, resulting to person or real or personal property caused by any tort intentionally committed by such child.

The Chair moved to amend ORS 483.830 to limit the responsibility of the parent to equipment on the bicycle as required by law.

There being no objections, it was so ordered.

Representative Bunn moved the adoption of ORS 483.830 as amended.

Motion carried unanimously.

UVC s 11-1202. Traffic laws apply to persons riding bicycles. ORS 483.034. Application of chapter to bicyclists and to persons riding, driving or leading animal.

Mrs. Embick noted that the bicyclist and the person riding an animal are dealt with together in existing law. The bicyclist is subject to the provisions applicable to the driver of a vehicle although he is not granted any of the rights of the driver. UVC grants the bicyclist these rights. Mrs. Embick called attention to a letter from Judge Unis which contained briefs with respect to failure to yield by a vehicle to an oncoming bicycle. The letter stated that serious consideration should be given by the committee to the area of granting the rights to the bicyclist. Mrs. Embick was of the opinion the UVC proposal was superior to that of existing law. Representative Bunn commented that the bicyclist should be granted some of the rights of the road but that it was imperative that he use defensive driving when riding a bicycle.

The subcommittee recessed for lunch at 12 noon, reconvening at 1:15 p.m. with all members present.

Representative Marx moved the adoption of UVC s 11-1202.

Representative Bunn reiterated his concerns over what rights are actually being granted to the bicyclists and wondered if when stating "except those that do not apply" there would be much gray area involved where it would be difficult to know if the rules should or shouldn't apply.

Senator Carson supported Representative Bunn's concerns and asked that the section be flagged and discussed after the reference



paper had been fully considered. He suggested that it might be feasible to draft an entire new bicycle code.

Representative Marx withdrew his motion to adopt UVC s 11-1202.

Senator Carson alluded to Judge Unis' letter and questioned the desirability of bicyclists being given all the rights and duties of the driver and not be required to have headlights turned on as required for motorcycles. He thought perhaps it wiser to have the bicyclist yield to the driver. Mrs. Embick indicated that presently there is no duty to yield to the bicyclist and there is no statutory violation on the part of the driver for failure to yield.

Representative Bunn was fearful of the situation where a driver comes up behind a bicycle and sounds his horn which could, in turn, be dangerous to the rider. He was of the opinion this should be prohibited and urged that the members examine every detailed part of the law and make more definite what applies to the bicycle.

Mr. Paillette proposed attempting to single out certain areas which are especially hazardous and deal with them in specific statutes. A bicyclist passing on the right of a car which is attempting to make a right-hand turn creates an extremely hazardous situation, he said. Representative Bunn suggested inviting the bicycle groups to submit recommendations and present ideas and Ms. Howard agreed, stating that it was already determined by these groups that there is a need for further guidance.

UVC s 11-1203. Riding on bicycles.

ORS 483.840. Bicyclists required to use permanent seat; prohibition against transporting more persons than bicycle is designed and equipped for.

The sections are identical.

UVC s 11-1204. Clinging to vehicles

ORS 483.845. Attaching by rider of bicycle or other coaster device to vehicle on roadway prohibited.

Mrs. Embick reported the UVC includes the streetcar which has been omitted from existing law. The sections are identical in all other respects.

UVC s 11-1205. Riding on roadways and bicycle paths.

ORS 483.850. Bicyclists required to use right side of roadway; riding abreast or single file; use of bicycle lanes.

Subsection (1) of existing law contains an exception for a one-way highway and does not actually state where the bicyclist needs to be and could be construed that he may be almost anyplace on the road. Ms. Howard indicated the intent was that the bicyclist ride

on the right-hand side of the roadway or, if it is a one-way street, he may ride on the extreme left-hand side as well. In other respects, UVC s 11-1205 (a) and subsection (1) are identical.

Subsection (b), UVC s 11-1205, states the riders may not ride more than two abreast, whereas subsections (2) and (3) of existing law state that they shall not ride more than two abreast, although on roadways where the speed exceeds 25 miles per hour they must ride single file.

Mr. Sipprell called attention to subsection (b), UVC s 11-1205, and the words "shall not ride more than two abreast except on paths or parts of roadways set aside for the exclusive use of bicycles." He indicated that a "bicycle lane" as defined in existing law would be a part of the roadway and that it was questionable that the persons should be permitted to ride two abreast on the roadway. He proposed ending the sentence on the second line, following "paths." The Bicycle Advisory Committee, he reported, has indicated its favor of returning to the bicycle lanes adjacent to or part of the roadway rather than constructing separate bicycle paths. Ms. Howard thought the matter could be resolved in ORS 483.850 (4) by deleting "not use the roadway" and inserting "shall ride single file."

Mr. Sipprell commented that the maximum width of the lanes has been set at eight feet, either on the lane or path, although he indicated this has not been done in most cases. Senator Carson believed that it could be stated that bicyclists must ride in single file in the bicycle lane but that no prohibition be given as to the number of bicyclists that could ride on the path.

Regarding subsection (b) which states that the bicyclists have exclusive use of the paths or parts of roadways, the Chairman inquired as to whether this would restrict their use by pedestrians. Mrs. Embick indicated this would be the intent. Mr. Sipprell reported that the original bicycle law, codified in Chapter 366, refers to a "bicycle trail" and "foot path" and should allow the pedestrians the use.

Representative Bunn asked if most bicycle lanes adjacent to the highway were at least three feet wide and Mr. Sipprell responded that most would be in the category of three to four feet. Representative Bunn commented that under these circumstances he would favor allowing them to ride two abreast.

Mr. Dutoit remarked that routes have been designated as bicycle lanes and have not been painted. He wondered what the duty of the rider would be in this instance and if they could ride two abreast.

Mr. Sipprell expressed concern over the lanes where traffic would be approaching the bicycle and moving in the same direction. The bicyclist would not necessarily know the car was approaching from

the rear and he could veer out onto the roadway over the painted line. Representative Bunn stated that if there was this safety problem involved as pointed out by Mr. Dutoit and Mr. Sipprell, it might be best to prohibit riding two abreast. Senator Carson concurred with this statement and said that except for passing, they should be required to proceed single file with some provision made for overtaking and passing.

It was the consensus of the members that bicycle paths are to be separate from the roadway and the bicyclists shall ride single file if it is part of the roadway. The section is to be drafted with the deleting of the reference to the 25 mile per hour speed limit. Ms. Howard asked if the reference in subsection (1) with respect to using the left side on a one-way street would be incorporated into the draft.

In response to Mr. Paillette's question, Mr. Sipprell stated that the Highway Division's bicycle route and location engineers meet with the Bicycle Advisory Committee, and to whether any recommendations had been made by them which would have any effect in the statutes with respect to the vehicle code, he said the only direction which had been given was to construct more lanes than paths.

Representative Marx asked what the rules of the road would be with respect to entering an intersection from the path. Mr. Sipprell believed that in this instance the vehicular traffic is warned by a bike crossing sign. Ms. Howard indicated that on some paths there are yield right of way signs where they are intersecting streets or highways. Mr. Sipprell recalled that under ORS Chapter 366 the Commission has been given authority to adopt regulations with respect to signing.

Ms. Howard reported that the State Department of Education has received federal funds to produce a "Bicycle Rules of the Road" booklet which will include material dealing specifically with rules and regulations on the bicycle paths. This, she said, would be widely distributed throughout the school system.

Mrs. Embick mentioned there was an absence of any statutory provisions on right of way but referred to some suggested right of way provisions on page 15 of the reference paper. Sections 5-24 and 5-25 of the Santa Maria Bicycle Ordinance are directed toward the duty of the bicyclist, and in response to Representative Bunn's earlier concern as to what rights they have, Mrs. Embick stated that something of this nature would spell out the duty not to leave the bicycle lane until it is safe.

UVC s 11-1207. Lamps and other equipment on bicycles.  
ORS 483.404. Head lights required; lighting and braking equipment on bicycles.  
ORS 483.446 (5). Horns and other sound equipment.

Mrs. Embick reported that the UVC requires a lamp on the front of the bicycle whereas subsection (3), ORS 483.404, requires the bicycle or its rider be equipped with the lamp. The light could be strapped onto the bicyclist's arm or under his head. The distance requirements are the same. Subsection (b), UVC s 11-1207, requires the bicycle to be equipped with a bell which is capable of giving an audible signal for a distance of at least 100 feet and existing law only prohibits a bicyclist from using a siren or whistle. Representative Bunn questioned the rationale for requiring the bell and the Chairman indicated it could be used to alert pedestrians. Ms Howard reported the bell provision had been placed in the original bill but was deleted for the reason that no purpose was served and it could lead to noise pollution. The deletion was agreed to by the Motor Vehicles Division. Mr. Dutoit recalled a meeting with a Senior Citizens' group at which time it was urged that a bell be required of the bicyclists inasmuch as the elderly use the paths and they wished to be forewarned of the approaching bicycle.

Senator Carson offered that it would only be an assumption that the pedestrian would get out of the way upon hearing a bell, and a better way to avoid a collision would be to make use of the brakes.

It was the consensus of the members that subsections (3) and (4) of ORS 483.404 be retained. Subsections (1) and (2) would then be inserted in the Article on motorcycles.

Mrs. Embick commented that several states have adopted a provision requiring the pedals and spokes of the bicycles to have reflectors. Ms. Howard reported that at the federal level there are standards being developed requiring the manufacturers of bicycles to reflectorize the wheels. In response to the Chairman's question, she reported that in 1973 there were 716 bicycle-car accidents with 12 fatalities, and a total of 742 injuries. Twenty-nine percent of the total accidents, judged from an error standpoint, was caused by bicyclists not having the right of way. The second leading error was driving on the wrong side of the road and the third was for making a left turn in front of oncoming traffic. Mr. Paillette asked if any distinction was made between daytime and nighttime accidents and was told that 598 accidents occurred during daylight hours, 64, dark with street lights, 19, dark with no street lights and 35 other. She noted that the hours from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. are when the most accidents occur. Ms. Howard left with the committee a statistical summary containing further data and which is attached to these minutes as Appendix A.

Senator Carson stated that the bicycles now are required to have lights and reflectors and wondered if the committee desired to continue in the area of other equipment requirements. It was the Chairman's contention this should be done. Representative Bunn commented that if this were to be the case, consideration should be given to requiring a bicycle flag or, as an alternative, an iridescent jacket. Senator Carson offered that the bicycle could be required to have a headlight in use at all times.

The Chairman asked the consensus of the members as to whether or not the draft should contain the minimal equipment requirements. Senator Carson remarked that the area should be further explored and before any adoption of the draft he would desire to hear the views of police officers, bicycle groups and highway personnel. Mr. Paillette recommended setting a separate hearing on this subject and make inquiries with respect to minimum standards which different groups and the National Safety Council might have.

Mrs. Embick inquired as to the intent of the committee with relationship to the audible signal and was informed that ORS 483.446 (5) should be retained with no requirement as to a bell. The Chairman stated that the rights and privileges granted to the bicyclists would be dependent upon what equipment they are required to have.

ORS 483.860. Use of bicycle lane by vehicles restricted; vehicle operators required to yield to bicyclists in bicycle lane.

It was Mrs. Embick's belief that the section was no longer valid inasmuch as a bicycle lane, by definition, is off the roadway on the shoulder. The passing on the right rule has been changed so that the driver no longer can go off the roadway onto the shoulder and pass on the right, therefore there would not be a driver going onto a bicycle lane and passing on the right. It would appear to her that the bicycle lane would be a part of the shoulder. It was Senator Carson's interpretation that the shoulder would be outside the fog line if it were painted, or the edge of the pavement.

Mrs. Embick commented that the bicyclist would be riding on the bicycle lane if that part of the shoulder had been designated as such by signs. If not so designated, he would be on the roadway as close to the right as possible unless it was one-way and in that case he could be on the far right or far left. If the signs were erected for a bicycle lane, there would be no problem. The Chairman was of the opinion the problem arises with the definitions of "roadway" and "shoulder" and until this is defined, it would be difficult to know where to place the rider.

Ms. Howard commented that the problem exists where the driver must cross the bicycle lane to enter one's driveway and proposed that an exception be stated that the vehicle shall not drive upon the lane except when "entering or leaving the roadway." Mr. Sipprell concurred with this proposal and stated that at times the Highway Division has had problems with mail carriers crossing the lane to make deliveries to rural mail boxes. He mentioned that section 5-26 of the Santa Maria Bicycle Ordinance speaks to this problem and favored the proposal as a substitution. Section 5-26 is as follows:

"No person shall drive a vehicle upon or across a bicycle lane except to enter or exit a driveway, and except to park such vehicle or leave a parking space. No person shall drive or cross a bicycle lane, as permitted by this section, except after giving the right-of-way to all bicycles within the lane."

The Chairman expressed the view that the above proposal would imply there was no intersection and Mrs. Embick stated this would be true if the bicycle lane ceases to exist at the intersection.

Mrs. Embick explained that section 5-24 of the Santa Maria Ordinance would answer the problem in part whereby at a controlled intersection the bicyclist yields the right of way to all vehicles within or approaching the intersection, but all vehicles which must stop before entering an intersection or those making a left-hand turn must yield to the bicycle. With respect to the uncontrolled intersections, she believed that the right of way rules relating to vehicles would apply.

Ms. Howard was uncertain as to the feasibility of section 5-24 because of the educational standpoint in having different types of right of way laws applying to bicycles. She stated that in other states, the prevailing pattern is that the driver yields to the bicycle on its right as is done to a vehicle on the right. The section would result in educating the people to a new set of right of way rules for a bicycle as opposed to any other kind of unit. Ms. Howard alluded to the proposed Bicycle Rules of the Road booklet and stated that it contains diagrams and illustrations of not necessarily the bicyclist's legal rights, but showing from a safe operation of a bicycle what the rider should do at heavily traveled intersections. It recommends that the rider dismount from the bicycle, walk the bicycle across the intersection, becoming a pedestrian at that point. She commented that it may be impossible to write this into law although Mr. Paillette remarked it might be worth considering. If this is a safe method, and bicycle groups concur with it, he believed thought should be given to placing some of these recommendations into law.

Senator Carson observed that if the bicyclist wishes to be treated as a driver of a car, then he must wait behind the cars and then proceed. In this manner he will have equal right of way responsibilities in traffic. If he desires to turn left, he could also come up to the right, dismount and wait for the Walk signal and push the bike across the intersection and in this manner he could regain the right of way by acting as a pedestrian. If there are two marked lanes for vehicular traffic and a bicycle would be called "vehicular traffic" he would not be allowed to pass on the right. What is being attempted, he said, is to avoid allowing the bicyclist to float back and forth between the rights and responsibilities and agreed with Mr. Paillette's proposal that perhaps further legislation in the area should be considered.

The Chairman asked if the statistical data provided by Ms. Howard contained any specific ages involved in accidents and was informed that it considered those 15 years and younger.

It was Senator Carson's suggestion that the bicyclist dismount and retain the right of the pedestrian or, in the alternative, they shall have no rights. At an intersection, the bicyclist yields to all vehicles or dismounts.

Ms. Howard noted that until the last session, the term "bicycle" had not been defined and Mrs. Embick stated it comes within the definition of a vehicle.

Mr. Dutoit expressed concern over the cities and counties indiscriminately placing bicycle lane and path signs with no guidelines to follow. He suggested the committee consider setting standards for marked bicycle lanes and paths and require the cities and counties to meet safety requirements. The Chairman agreed to the suggestion although she observed this would be outside the scope of what could be done by the committee and suggested this area be considered by the Highway or Transportation Committees. Mr. Sipprell remarked that the Division has published a book which promulgates standards for both lanes and paths although he was unaware as to compliance by cities and counties.

Mrs. Embick asked direction as to the disposition of ORS 483.860 wherein it is stated that no driver shall drive on the bicycle lane except when passing another vehicle on the right and shall give right of way to bicycles on the lane. Because of the rule relating to passing on the right, she asked if the statute should be repealed. The Chairman indicated the draft should be considered as a whole and it was Senator Carson's contention that it should be repealed inasmuch as they should be prohibited from driving on the bicycle lane to pass. Ms. Howard suggested that section 5-26 of the Santa Maria ordinance be substituted for ORS 483.860. This would relate only to entering a bicycle lane when entering or exiting a driveway or parking. In answer to the Chairman's query to entering a bicycle lane when turning a corner, it was stated this would be in another section as the bicycle lane would not continue unless it is a through street. Representative Marx observed that the lane could be defined as not to include the intersection being crossed, except for the through highway. Senator Carson stated the rule could apply as to what must be done when proceeding from a stop sign, i.e., the requirement to yield to automobiles, motorcycles and bicycles before proceeding.

With respect to the proposed meeting with the bicycle groups, the Chairman suggested drafting the Article before hearing input from them. Mrs. Embick thought it appropriate to discuss the matters with the groups before the initial drafting as it may be desirable to incorporate some of the provisions from the Santa Maria code. With respect to equipment, Mr. Paillette believed it feasible to hear from these groups before attempting to draft any statutes.

Mrs. Embick was instructed to draft the Article incorporating the suggestions which were under discussion at today's meeting.

MISCELLANEOUS RULES; Reference Paper

UVC s 11-1101. Unattended motor vehicle.

ORS 483.366. Precautions when vehicle allowed to stand on highway or grade.

Mrs. Embick reported the UVC differs from the Oregon rule in that existing law does not require that the key be removed from the ignition.

Ms. Howard explained that at the time the bill was proposed, the problem arose whereby removing the key from the ignition would result in prohibiting the driver to warm up his vehicle in his own driveway. She wondered if this problem could be alleviated by stating that the person may not permit the vehicle to stand unattended on the highway, thereby allowing him to leave his keys in the vehicle in the situation she had spoken to.

It was Senator Carson's understanding that the parking lots were to be included in certain offenses and Mr. Paillette stated that in this instance it could include those lots.

Senator Carson moved to amend UVC s 11-1101 to insert "on a highway" following "unattended" in line 2 and with the proviso that it shall include the public parking lots.

There being no objections the amendment was adopted.

Senator Carson moved the adoption of UVC s 11-1101 as amended.

Mr. Sipprell posed the situation whereby a driver leaves his car on a public parking lot and on some occasions he is directed to leave his key in the ignition so that the attendant may move it, if necessary. He asked if this would contemplate that the car is being left attended in this instance. Mr. Paillette stated he would believe this would mean it is attended and that a sign or disclaimer placed in the lot would not have any legal effect on the responsibility of the bailee if the car is stolen when he, in fact, directs the owner to leave the key.

Vote was taken on Senator Carson's motion to adopt UVC s 11-1101 as amended.

Motion carried unanimously.

UVC s 11-1102. Limitations on backing.

Mrs. Embick explained the driver is prohibited from backing the car unless it is safe, and may not back it upon any shoulder. Mr. Paillette stated that the section would be redrafted as to form and style.



Mr. Sipprell called attention to the problem which arises when emergency vehicles, maintenance vehicles and wreckers attempt to get onto the freeway and in some instances must back the vehicle. Mrs. Embick indicated that the Article on General Provisions defines emergency vehicle although it would not necessarily include a wrecker and this should be considered. Emergency vehicle is also defined as one authorized in writing by the Administrator of the Motor Vehicles Division and which could include a wrecker, she said. Ms. Howard thought it unwise to define "wrecker" as such as it could then use the other prerogatives of the emergency vehicle, for example, going through traffic lights.

In response to Representative Marx's query of the definition of "controlled-access highway" in subsection (b), Mr. Sipprell explained that generally it is presumed to refer to freeways but the use of the term does not necessarily exclude those other major highways where they have purchased rights of access or restricted access and could be partially controlled, for instance. It was this subsection which concerned the Commission as earlier stated and they would desire to have exceptions placed in the section. Mr. Paillette said there would be a definition of "controlled-access highway" which would have a broader definition than "freeway" inasmuch as it is defined to mean a highway to which all rights of access have been acquired by the public authority having jurisdiction of the highway.

The Chair moved the adoption of UVC s 11-1102.

Motion carried unanimously.

UVC s 11-1103. Driving upon sidewalk.

The UVC prohibits a vehicle from being driven upon a sidewalk and its definition of "vehicle" does not include a device driven by human power, consequently excluding the bicycle. Senator Carson noted that sidewalk sweepers are equipped with motors and viewed the UVC provision as prohibiting these sweepers to operate.

Ms. Howard called attention to ORS 483.865 which relates to the prohibition of vehicles on bicycle lanes, and ORS 483.870 relating to bicycles on sidewalks. Mrs. Embick reported these statutes had been overlooked in drafting and would be picked up. Ms. Howard reported the audible warning provision in ORS 483.870 was intentionally left in the statute in order that the bicyclist might warn the pedestrian, although this warning would not necessarily have to be by a bell.

In response to Representative Marx's question as to the rationale of the UVC proposal, Ms. Howard stated that under city ordinance 83 persons had been convicted in Oregon for driving on the sidewalk in 1973.

Senator Carson agreed with Representative Marx's contention that there should be some protection against automobiles riding on the sidewalks but said if UVC s 11-1103 is adopted, there must be exceptions placed into the section relating to the sweepers, delivery trucks and construction trucks which do use the sidewalks on occasions. He believed the cities and state would be in violation of this more than anyone else.

UVC s 11-1004. Obstruction to driver's view or driving mechanism.  
UVC s 11-1106. Riding in house trailers.  
ORS 483.538. Passengers in front seat; interfering with driver; in house trailer.

Existing law covers both sections of the UVC. Under UVC s 11-1106 the passenger is prohibited from riding in the trailer whereas existing law places the prohibition on the driver from allowing persons to ride in the travel trailer.

Ms. Howard reported the number of passengers prohibited from riding in the front seat of the vehicle was deleted from the statute in 1963 inasmuch as there are pickups which can comfortably seat four persons and that existing law was superior in this area.

The Chairman expressed concern over the people riding in campers and the hazardous situation it creates, especially riding in the bunk bed above the cab. She believed that if riding in that area could be prohibited some of the problem could be resolved. Mr. Sipprell observed that existing law separates the definitions of mobile homes and travel trailers and the house trailer definition in the UVC is actually out of date. Senator Carson mentioned that if a separate bill or otherwise were to be considered, there should be considerable input from the general public indicating the necessity for this change.

With respect to whether the duty should be placed on the driver or the passengers, Mr. Paillette expressed the view that it would be the matter of who has control over the vehicle and that the burden should be placed on the driver.

Subsection (2) relates to vehicles or streetcars and it was the consensus of the members to delete "streetcar."

Senator Carson moved to amend subsection (2), ORS 483.538 to delete "or streetcar" in lines 2 and 3 and in line 6.

There being no objections the motion was adopted.

UVC s 11-1105. Opening and closing vehicle doors.

Mrs. Embick explained there is no comparable provision in existing law. Senator Carson commented that Salem utilizes this rule in a city ordinance and favored the provision. Mr. Paillette thought there should be consideration given to section 14 of the suggested Uniform Traffic Ordinance for Oregon. Mrs. Embick wondered if a provision with

respect to loading or unloading property should be incorporated into the section and it was determined that the unloading of property should be accomplished on the opposite side of the car.

Representative Marx moved the adoption of UVC s 11-1105.

Motion carried unanimously.

UVC s 11-1107. Driving on mountain highways.

ORS 483.338. Driving through defiles, canyons, or mountain highways.

Mrs. Embick suggested that the requirement to give the audible warning with a horn be omitted when there is adequate space for an oncoming vehicle to pass.

Discussion was held relating to the definition of "defile" and Mr. Paillette questioned the advisability of retaining the term. Inasmuch as "defile" was considered to be a narrow passage or gorge, he suggested the term "gorge" be substituted for "defile."

Senator Carson moved to delete "defile" from UVC s 11-1107 with appropriate editorial changes.

There being no objections it was so ordered.

The Chair moved the adoption of UVC s 11-1107 as amended.

Motion carried unanimously.

UVC s 11-1108. Coasting prohibited.

ORS 483.336. Coasting upon down grade.

Senator Carson questioned the rationale for permitting a driver of a vehicle to coast with the clutch disengaged whereas the driver of a truck is prohibited from doing so. Mr. Paillette proposed prohibiting both drivers from either coasting with the gears in neutral or with the clutch disengaged.

The Chair moved to amend subsection (a), UVC s 11-1108, to insert the phrase "or with the clutch disengaged" at the end of the sentence.

There being no objections the motion was adopted.

Senator Carson moved the adoption of subsection (a), UVC s 11-1108 as amended.

Motion carried unanimously.

UVC s 11-1109. Following fire apparatus prohibited.

ORS 483.330. Following fire apparatus or parking in vicinity of fire.

Existing law contains two standards, Mrs. Embick reported, one that the vehicle shall not drive into or park within two blocks of where fire apparatus has stopped and secondly, the vehicle shall not drive into or park within three blocks of a point where the fire is in progress. UVC states the vehicle must stop within 500 feet of the apparatus stopped in answer to the alarm. Both provisions prohibit following the apparatus closer than 500 feet. She expressed favor of retaining existing law although, with respect to distances, a problem may arise with the length of the block, she said.

Senator Carson expressed favor of the 500 feet provision as stated in the UVC, as the two or three block area was not as definite. With respect to the term "official business" he suggested it be changed to relate to "fire, police or emergency" business. Ms. Howard offered that "official business" could be construed to mean the volunteer fire personnel who could be following too closely. Under existing law, the Chairman observed that the person could be held in violation if he had already been parked in the prohibited area although the UVC would seem to relate to the person who was following the fire apparatus. Mr. Paillette thought it was attempting to imply that the driver would be driving into or parking at the time of the fire and that perhaps the language should read "driving into and parking."

Senator Carson moved the adoption of UVC s 11-1109 with the proviso that "official business" be defined as "fire, police and emergency" business.

Representative Marx questioned the 500 feet provision and stated that drivers were more capable of ascertaining when they were two or three blocks from the fire as opposed to being at a distance of 500 feet and favored the retention of ORS 483.330 with the above definition of "official business."

Senator Carson withdrew his motion to adopt UVC s 11-1109.

UVC s 11-1110. Crossing fire hose.  
ORS 483.332. Driving vehicle or streetcar over fire hose.

The Chair moved to amend ORS 483.332 to delete "streetcar or" in line 2 and redraft the statute to direct it to the person rather than the vehicle.

Motion carried unanimously.

UVC s 11-1111. Putting glass, etc. on highway prohibited.  
ORS 164.785. Placing offensive substances in waters, on highways or other property prohibited.  
ORS 164.805. Offensive littering.

ORS 164.805 is more in point with the UVC provision and sets out the crime of offensive littering as does ORS 164.785.

Senator Carson noted that under ORS 164.805 the person must intentionally cause the littering whereas under UVC, if the person permits it to be dropped, he shall immediately cause it to be removed. He wondered if the person would be in violation if he did not pick up the material and thought there could be a difference in that one provision concerns itself with a negligent dropping of the debris as opposed to an intentional dropping. He asked if perhaps UVC (b) and (c) could be included and Mr. Paillette stated there would be no problem if it is intended to go to a strict liability concept, if it is to be a noncriminal offense.

Senator Carson was concerned over the situation where boards and blown tires have fallen onto the highways from trucks and because it was not intentionally caused, the person would not be in violation of ORS 164.805. Mr. Sipprell offered that the person could be arrested under ORS 483.510 which prohibits using a vehicle unless it is so constructed to prevent the load from dropping, leaking or sifting, although he said that the blown tire situation would not come under that statute.

Mr. Paillette stated that there would be nothing inconsistent to adopting subsection (b), even with the strict liability definition. He assumed that Senator Carson was referring that the penalty would be a fine to which he received an affirmative answer.

With respect to subsection (b), the Chairman remarked that this provision would place the bus driver in violation and Mr. Paillette stated a provision could be written similar to that in the Criminal Code which could exclude certain persons.

Representative Bunn expressed the view that between existing law and ORS 164.805 all violations would be covered and that subsection (c) could be added which requires the removing of the injurious substances from the road.

Referring to Senator Carson's concern over the tires strewn along the highway, Mr. Dutoit commented that most wreckers carry brooms and sweep up the debris if at all possible, doing so as a courtesy to the police officer. He objected to legislation requiring the wrecking crew to clean up when they do so already. Representative Marx was of the opinion this is already done - the material would be available to the wrecker and he is charging for his service. Ms. Howard observed that there are some accidents where the vehicle is removed by the driver and subsection (c) would require him to clean the debris.

Representative Marx moved the adoption of subsection (c),  
UVC s 11-1111.

Motion carried unanimously.

UVC s 11-1112. Stop when traffic obstructed.

Senator Carson moved the adoption of UVC s 11-1112.

Motion carried unanimously.

UVC s 11-1113. Snowmobile operation limited.

ORS 483.710, 483.725, 483.730, 483.735, 483.740 and 483.755. Relating to snowmobiles.

Mrs. Embick reported the UVC provisions are far more limited than those in existing law and recommended the retention of Oregon law. Ms. Howard reported that Oregon's snowmobile laws are patterned more after what is recommended nationally for the off-highway snowmobiles than is the UVC. Mr. Sipprell added that the Minor Court Rules Committee has adopted what is identified by the State Police as five different registration violations and 12 operation violations of snowmobiles under the Oregon statute and has agreed to recommend adoption of a bail schedule for those violations.

ORS 483.326. Stopping for streetcars and busses.

ORS 483.328. Driving or crossing in front of streetcars.

ORS 483.532. Public bodies authorized to restrict use of highways.

Mrs. Embick recommended the repeal of the above statutes which, she stated, were obsolete. Responding to Representative Marx's inquiry relating to subsection (2), ORS 483.326, she advised that the vehicle is not required to stop behind the bus if the bus has stopped at the curb. She suggested contacting the Portland, Eugene and Salem Traffic Divisions to determine whether the busses always stop at the curb and if this is true, then the provision would be redundant.

Mr. Sipprell favored the retention of ORS 483.532 as he believed it was needed by both state and counties.

Representative Marx wondered if safety zones were still in existence and Mrs. Embick was directed to contact the Traffic Divisions to secure data as to whether passengers still disembark in those zones and whether there is a requirement for the vehicles to stop. Mr. Sipprell observed that neither he nor Mr. George could recall any place in Oregon where there are safety zones in the middle of the street.

Representative Bunn moved to repeal ORS 483.326.

Motion carried unanimously.

Representative Marx moved to repeal ORS 483.328.

Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Norma Schnider, Clerk  
Subcommittee on Revision

## Summary of Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents

STATEWIDE

BICYCLE ACCIDENTS 1973

(State, City or Area)

(Month or other period)

A. TYPE OF ACCIDENT	Number of Accidents			Number of Persons			Number of Persons			Note: The three categories of injuries follow the Manual on Classification of Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents.
	Total	Fatal	Non-Fatal	Property Damage	Total Killed	Total	A	B	C	
1. Pedestrian	716	12	683	21	12	742	242	327	173	A. Bleeding wound, distorted member, or any condition that required victim to be carried from the scene.  B. Other visible injuries such as bruises, abrasions, swelling, limping, or other painful movement.  C. Complaint of pain, without visible signs of injury; or momentary unconsciousness.
2. Bicyclist										
3. Animal										
4. Motor Vehicle in Traffic										
5. Parked Motor Vehicle										
6. Railroad Train										
7. Fixed Object										
8. Other Object										
9. Ran off Road										
10. Overturned on Roadway										
11. Other Non-Collision										
Totals	716	12	683	21	12	742	242	327	173	

Legally reportable accidents are those involving death, bodily injury, or property damage in excess of \$200 on trafficways.

This summary includes reports and information available on:

February 15, 1974

REPORT PUBLISHED BY  
OREGON MOTOR VEHICLES  
DIVISION

B1. COMPARATIVE TOTALS	Same Month Last Year			This Year to Date			Same Period Last Year			Change Cumulative Death Rec'd
	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	
1. Pedestrian				716	12	742				%
2. Bicyclist										%
3. Animal										%
4. Motor Vehicle in Traffic										%
5. Parked Motor Vehicle										%
6. Railroad Train										%
7. Fixed Object										%
8. Other Object										%
9. Ran off Road										%
10. Overturned on Roadway										%
11. Other Non-Collision										%
Totals				716	12	742				%

B2. MILEAGE RATES	This Year to Date			Last Year to Date	Per Cent Change
	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries		
1. Motor Vehicle Traffic Deaths					%
2. Estimated Motor Vehicle Miles Traveled (Millions)					%
3. Death Rate per 100,000,000 Vehicle-Miles					%
4. Fatal Accident Rate per 100,000,000 Vehicle-Miles					%
5. Accident Rate per Million Vehicle-Miles					%

C-1. LOCATION-POPULATION GROUP AND ROUTE	Number of Accidents				Number of Persons	
	Total	Fatal	Non-Fatal	Property Damage	Killed	Injured
1. Below 1,000 pop.	11	1	9	1	1	9
2. 1,001 to 2,500 pop.	15		14	1		15
3. 2,501 to 5,000 pop.	30	1	27	2	1	34
4. 5,001 to 10,000 pop.	44	1	42	1	1	46
5. 10,001 to 25,000 pop.	98	2	93	3	2	102
6. 25,001 to 50,000 pop.	58		54	4		59
7. 50,001 to 100,000 pop.	191	1	186	4	1	198
8. City of Portland only	158	1	155	2	1	161
Total Urban Accidents	685	7	580	18	7	624
1. Primary state highways	114	4	103	7	4	113
2. Secondary state highways	68		68			81
3. County and local roads	68	4	63	1	4	69
4. City streets	466	4	449	13	4	479
Total accidents (incl. below)	716	12	683	21	12	742
5. State freeways	1		1			1
6. Other state highways	181	4	170	7	4	193

C-2. KIND OF LOCATION	This Year to Date			Last Year to Date	Per Cent Change
	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries		
1. Built-up					
2. Not built-up					
3. Not stated					
Totals					

C-3. LOCATION BY COUNTY							
County	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	County	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries
Baker	2		2	Lincoln	10	1	10
Benton	24		23	Linn	25	2	27
Clackamas	42		51	Malheur	4		4
Clatsop	7		6	Marion	46	2	47
Columbia	8		9	Morrow			
Coos	9		8	Multnomah	214	1	218
Crook	5		4	(Portland)	158	1	161
Curry	1		1	(Other)	54		57
Deschutes	7		8	Polk	11	1	12
Douglas	20		20	Sherman			
Gilliam	1		1	Tillamook	3	1	2
Grant	2		2	Umatilla	16		17
Harney	2		2	Union	7		9
Hood River	3		2	Wallowa	3		3
Jackson	44	1	42	Wasco	2		2
Jefferson	1		1	Washington	45		52
Josephine	10	1	11	Wheeler			
Klamath	16	1	16	Yamhill	12		11
Lake	1		1				
Lane	113	1	118	Total	716	12	742

Note: The State of Oregon has no turnpike commissions or separate freeway authorities.

Note: The State of Oregon has no turnpike commissions or separate freeway authorities.

D. TIME	Total		Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday		Sunday		Not Stated	
	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal
Hour beginning																		
0. Midnight															2			
1. 1:00	4		1				1											
2. 2:00	1																	
3. 3:00																		
4. 4:00																		
5. 5:00																		
6. 6:00	8				2				3		1		2					
7. 7:00	23		1		10		5		3		2		1		1			
8. 8:00	23		3		7		1		4		6							
9. 9:00	18		4		3		2		2		2		5					
10. 10:00	21		5		2		4		3		5		1		1			
11. 11:00	25	1	2		4	1	6		4		3		3		3			
12. 12:00	45	1	8		10	1	4		6		3		11		3			
13. 1:00	38	1	5		11	1	4		8		4		3		3			
14. 2:00	96		5		2		12		10		8		8		11			
15. 3:00	96		18		12		16		17		16		12		5			
16. 4:00	96	1	10		18		17		12		19		12		8	1		
17. 5:00	94	2	15		21		11	1	21		13	1	7		6			
18. 6:00	60	4	10	2	9	1	16	1	9		9		3		4			
19. 7:00	37		7		8		6		5		3		4		4			
20. 8:00	33	2	2		8		5	1	4		5		5		4	1		
21. 9:00	19		3		3		4		2		2		3		2			
22. 10:00	10		2		1		1		2		1		2		1			
23. 11:00	5		1		1								3					
24. Not Stated	4		2						1						1			
Totals	716	12	104	7	132	4	116	3	116		104	1	85		59	2		

# Summary of Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents

Page 24, Appendix A  
Minutes, 5/22/74

In RURAL

BICYCLE ACCIDENTS 1973

(State, City or Area)

(Month or other period)

A. TYPE OF ACCIDENT	Number of Accidents				Number of Persons Injured			
	Total	Fatal	Non-Fatal	Property Damage	Total Killed	Total	A	B
1. Pedestrian	111	5	103	3	5	118	45	49
2. Bicyclist								
3. Animal								
4. Motor Vehicle in Traffic								
5. Parked Motor Vehicle								
6. Railroad Train								
7. Fixed Object								
8. Other Object								
9. Ran off Road								
10. Overturned on Roadway								
11. Other Non-Collision								
Totals	111	5	103	3	5	118	45	49

Note: The three categories of injuries follow the Manual on Classification of Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents.

A. Bleeding wound, distorted member, or any condition that required victim to be carried from the scene.

B. Other visible injuries such as bruises, abrasions, swelling, limping, or other painful movement.

C. Complaint of pain, without visible signs of injury; or momentary unconsciousness.

Legally reportable accidents are those involving death, bodily injury, or property damage in excess of \$200 on trafficways.

This summary includes reports and information available on:

February 15, 1974

REPORT PUBLISHED BY  
OREGON MOTOR VEHICLES  
DIVISION

B1. COMPARATIVE TOTALS	Same Month Last Year			This Year to Date			Same Period Last Year			Change Cumulative Death Rate
	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	
1. Pedestrian				111	5	118				%
2. Bicyclist										%
3. Animal										%
4. Motor Vehicle in Traffic										%
5. Parked Motor Vehicle										%
6. Railroad Train										%
7. Fixed Object										%
8. Other Object										%
9. Ran off Road										%
10. Overturned on Roadway										%
11. Other Non-Collision										%
Totals				111	5	118				%

B2. MILEAGE RATES	This Year to Date	Last Year to Date	Per Cent Change
1. Motor Vehicle Traffic Deaths	5		%
2. Estimated Motor Vehicle Miles Traveled (Millions)			%
3. Death Rate per 100,000,000 Vehicle-Miles			%
4. Fatal Accident Rate per 100,000,000 Vehicle-Miles			%
5. Accident Rate per Million Vehicle-Miles			%

C-1. LOCATION-POPULATION GROUP AND ROUTE	Number of Accidents				Number of Persons Injured	
	Total	Fatal	Non-Fatal	Property Damage	Killed	Injured
1. Below 1,000 pop.						
2. 1,001 to 2,500 pop.						
3. 2,501 to 5,000 pop.						
4. 5,001 to 10,000 pop.						
5. 10,001 to 25,000 pop.						
6. 25,001 to 50,000 pop.						
7. 50,001 to 100,000 pop.						
8. City of Portland only						
Total Urban Accidents						
1. Primary state highways	19	1	16	2	1	19
2. Secondary state highways	24		24			30
3. County and local roads	68	4	63	1	4	69
4. City streets						
Total accidents (incl. below)	111	5	103	3	5	118
5. State freeways	43	1	40	2	1	49
6. Other state highways						

C-2. KIND OF LOCATION						
1. Built-up						
2. Not built-up						
3. Not stated						
Totals						

C-3. LOCATION BY COUNTY		Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	County	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries
Baker	1			1	Lincoln	2	1	1
Benton	4			4	Linn	6	1	9
Clackamas	8			11	Malheur	1		1
Clatsop	2			2	Marion	4	1	8
Columbia	3			3	Morrow			
Coos	1			1	Multnomah	3		3
Crook	3			2	(Portland)			
Curry					(Other)			
Deschutes	1			1	Polk	3		5
Douglas	8			8	Sherman			
Gilliam					Tillamook	2	1	1
Grant	1			1	Umatilla			
Harney					Union	2		4
Hood River	2			2	Wallowa	1		1
Jackson	5			4	Wasco	1		1
Jefferson					Washington	12		13
Josephine	6			8	Wheeler			
Klamath	5	1		4	Yamhill	2		3
Lake	1			1				
Lane	4			9	Total	111	5	118

Note: The State of Oregon has no turnpike commissions or separate freeway authorities.

D. TIME	Total		Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday		Sunday		Not Stated	
	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal
Hour beginning																		
0. Midnight																		
1. 1:00																		
2. 2:00																		
3. 3:00																		
4. 4:00																		
5. 5:00																		
6. 6:00	1				1						1							
7. 7:00	1										1							
8. 8:00	2				1						1							
9. 9:00	3										2							
10. 10:00	3		2						1									
11. 11:00	6		2								2							
12. 12:00	11	1	3		3	1	2						1		2			
13. 1:00	11				4				2		1		1		1			
14. 2:00	9						2		1		2				4			
15. 3:00	14								1		3		2		2			
16. 4:00	14		2		5		1		1		2		1		2			
17. 5:00	18	2	3		4		1	1	3		3	1	2		2			
18. 6:00	8	1	1		2	1	2				1		1		1			
19. 7:00	3				1													
20. 8:00	3	1	1		1		1	1										
21. 9:00																		
22. 10:00																		
23. 11:00																		
24. Not Stated	1														1			
Totals	111	5	14		24	2	10	2	12		19	1	11		17			



# Summary of Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents

Page 25, Appendix A  
Minutes, 5/22/74

In PORTLAND BICYCLE ACCIDENTS 1973  
(State, City or Area) For (Month or other period)

A. TYPE OF ACCIDENT	Number of Accidents				Number of Persons Injured			
	Total	Fatal	Non-Fatal	Property Damage	Total Killed	A	B	C
1. Pedestrian								
2. Bicyclist	158	1	155	2	1	161	62	63
3. Animal								36
4. Motor Vehicle in Traffic								
5. Parked Motor Vehicle								
6. Railroad Train								
7. Fixed Object								
8. Other Object								
9. Ran off Road								
10. Overturned on Roadway								
11. Other Non-Collision								
Totals	158	1	155	2	1	161	62	63

Note: The three categories of injuries follow the Manual on Classification of Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents.

A. Bleeding wound, distorted member, or any condition that required victim to be carried from the scene.

B. Other visible injuries such as bruises, abrasions, swelling, limping, or other painful movement.

C. Complaint of pain, without visible signs of injury; or momentary unconsciousness.

Legally reportable accidents are those involving death, bodily injury, or property damage in excess of \$200 on trafficways.

This summary includes reports and information available on:

February 15, 1974

REPORT PUBLISHED BY  
OREGON MOTOR VEHICLES  
DIVISION

B1. COMPARATIVE TOTALS	Same Month Last Year			This Year to Date			Same Period Last Year			Change Cumulative Death Rec'd
	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	%
1. Pedestrian										%
2. Bicyclist				158	1	161				%
3. Animal										%
4. Motor Vehicle in Traffic										%
5. Parked Motor Vehicle										%
6. Railroad Train										%
7. Fixed Object										%
8. Other Object										%
9. Ran off Road										%
10. Overturned on Roadway										%
11. Other Non-Collision										%
Totals				158	1	161				%

B2. MILEAGE RATES	This Year to Date	Last Year to Date	Per Cent Change
1. Motor Vehicle Traffic Deaths	1		%
2. Estimated Motor Vehicle Miles Traveled (Millions)			%
3. Death Rate per 100,000,000 Vehicle-Miles			%
4. Fatal Accident Rate per 100,000,000 Vehicle-Miles			%
5. Accident Rate per Million Vehicle-Miles			%

C-1. LOCATION-POPULATION GROUP AND ROUTE	Number of Accidents				Number of Persons Injured	
	Total	Fatal	Non-Fatal	Property Damage	Killed	Injured
1. Below 1,000 pop.						
2. 1,001 to 2,500 pop.						
3. 2,501 to 5,000 pop.						
4. 5,001 to 10,000 pop.						
5. 10,001 to 25,000 pop.						
6. 25,001 to 50,000 pop.						
7. 50,001 to 100,000 pop.						
8. City of Portland only	158	1	155	2	1	161
Total Urban Accidents	158	1	155	2	1	161
1. Primary state highways	23		22	1		23
2. Secondary state highways	5		5			5
3. County and local roads	130	1	128	1	1	132
4. City streets	158	1	155	2	1	161
Total accidents (incl. below)						
5. State freeways	28		27	1		29
6. Other state highways						

C-2. KIND OF LOCATION						
1. Built-up						
2. Not built-up						
3. Not stated						
Totals						

C-3. LOCATION BY COUNTY		Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	County	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries
Baker	Lincoln							
Benton	Linn							
Clackamas	Malheur							
Clatsop	Marion							
Columbia	Morrow							
Coos	Multnomah	158	1	161				
Crook	(Portland)	158	1	161				
Curry	(Other)							
Deschutes	Polk							
Douglas	Sherman							
Gilliam	Tillamook							
Grant	Umatilla							
Harney	Union							
Hood River	Walla							
Jackson	Wasco							
Jefferson	Washington							
Josephine	Wheeler							
Klamath	Yamhill							
Lake								
Lane								
	Total	158	1	161				

Note: The State of Oregon has no turnpike commissions or separate freeway authorities.

D. TIME	Hour beginning	Total		Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday		Sunday		Not Stated	
		All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal
Before Noon	0. Midnight																		
	1. 1:00																		
	2. 2:00																		
	3. 3:00																		
	4. 4:00																		
	5. 5:00																		
	6. 6:00	3				1				1									
	7. 7:00	6				3		1											
	8. 8:00	4				2		1				2							
	9. 9:00	5		1		2		1				1				1			
	10. 10:00	4				1		2				3				1			
	11. 11:00	3				1		1								1			
After Noon	12. 12:00	5		1		2		2		2		1				2			
	13. 1:00	9				2		2		2		1				1			
	14. 2:00	11		1		1		4		1		1		2		1			
	15. 3:00	25		1		2		6		6		3		5		2			
	16. 4:00	23	1	2		4		4		2		6		2		3	1		
	17. 5:00	14		2		5		2		1		3		1		2			
	18. 6:00	17		2		3		5		2		3		2					
	19. 7:00	5		1		1										1			
	20. 8:00	7		1		2				2									
	21. 9:00	5				2		1		1				1					
	22. 10:00	3						1		1		1				2			
	23. 11:00	3		1															
	24. Not Stated																		
Totals		158	1	15		34		30		20		26		14		14	1		

# Summary of Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents

Page 26, Appendix A  
Minutes, 5/22/74

In **URBAN** **BICYCLE ACCIDENTS 1973**  
(State, City or Area) (Month or other period)

A. TYPE OF ACCIDENT	Number of Accidents				Number of Persons Injured			
	Total	Fatal	Non-Fatal	Property Damage	Total	A	B	C
1. Pedestrian	447	6	425	16	463	135	215	113
2. Bicyclist								
3. Animal								
4. Motor Vehicle in Traffic								
5. Parked Motor Vehicle								
6. Railroad Train								
7. Fixed Object								
8. Other Object								
9. Ran off Road								
10. Overturned on Roadway								
11. Other Non-Collision								
Totals	447	6	425	16	463	135	215	113

Note: The three categories of injuries follow the Manual on Classification of Motor Vehicle Traffic Accidents.

A. Bleeding wound, distorted member, or any condition that required victim to be carried from the scene.

B. Other visible injuries such as bruises, abrasions, swelling, limping, or other painful movement.

C. Complaint of pain, without visible signs of injury; or momentary unconsciousness.

Legally reportable accidents are those involving death, bodily injury, or property damage in excess of \$200 on trafficways.

This summary includes reports and information available on:

February 15, 1974

REPORT PUBLISHED BY  
OREGON MOTOR VEHICLES  
DIVISION

B1. COMPARATIVE TOTALS	Same Month Last Year			This Year to Date			Same Period Last Year			Change Cumulative Death Rate	B2. MILEAGE RATES	This Year to Date	Last Year to Date	Per Cent Change
	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries					
1. Pedestrian				447	6	463				%	1. Motor Vehicle Traffic Deaths			%
2. Bicyclist										%	2. Estimated Motor Vehicle Miles Traveled (Millions)			%
3. Animal										%	3. Death Rate per 100,000,000 Vehicle-Miles			%
4. Motor Vehicle in Traffic										%	4. Fatal Accident Rate per 100,000,000 Vehicle-Miles			%
5. Parked Motor Vehicle										%	5. Accident Rate per Million Vehicle-Miles			%
6. Railroad Train										%				
7. Fixed Object										%				
8. Other Object										%				
9. Ran off Road										%				
10. Overturned on Roadway										%				
11. Other Non-Collision										%				
Totals				447	6	463				%				

C-1. LOCATION-POPULATION GROUP AND ROUTE	Number of Accidents				Number of Persons	
	Total	Fatal	Non-Fatal	Property Damage	Killed	Injured
1. Below 1,000 pop.	11	1	14	1	1	15
2. 1,001 to 2,500 pop.	15		27	2	1	34
3. 2,501 to 5,000 pop.	30	1	42	1	1	46
4. 5,001 to 10,000 pop.	44	2	93	1	2	102
5. 10,001 to 25,000 pop.	98		54	4		59
6. 25,001 to 50,000 pop.	54		186	4	1	196
7. 50,001 to 100,000 pop.	191					
8. City of Portland only	447	6	425	16	6	463
Total Urban Accidents	72	3	65	4	3	71
1. Primary state highways	19		39			45
2. Secondary state highways						
3. County and local roads	336	3	321	12	3	347
4. City streets	447	6	425	16	6	463
Total accidents (incl. below)						
5. State freeways	1		1			1
6. Other state highways	116	3	103	4	3	115

C-2. KIND OF LOCATION					
1. Built-up					
2. Not built-up					
3. Not stated					
Totals					

C-3. LOCATION BY COUNTY								
County	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	County	Accidents	Deaths	Injuries	
Baker	1		1	Lincoln	1		9	
Benton	2		19	Linn	17	1	18	
Clackamas	34		40	Malheur	1		3	
Clatsop	5		4	Marion	37	1	36	
Columbia	5		6	Morrow				
Coos	2		7	Multnomah	33		54	
Crook	2		2	(Portland)				
Curry	1		1	(Other)	53		54	
Deschutes	6		7	Polk	8	1	7	
Douglas	12		12	Sherman				
Gilliam	1		1	Tillamook	1		1	
Grant	1		1	Umatilla	11		11	
Harney	2		2	Union	5		5	
Hood River	1			Wallowa	2		2	
Jackson	39	1	36	Wasco	1		1	
Jefferson	1		1	Washington	13		19	
Josephine	4	1	3	Wheeler				
Klamath	11		12	Yamhill	16		8	
Lake								
Lane	114	1	139	Total	447	6	463	

Note: The State of Oregon has no turnpike commissions or separate freeway authorities.

D.	TIME	Total		Monday		Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday		Sunday		Not Stated	
		All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal	All	Fatal
Before Noon	Hour beginning																		
	0. Midnight			1				1								2			
	1. 1:00	4																	
	2. 2:00	1						1											
	3. 3:00																		
	4. 4:00																		
	5. 5:00																		
	6. 6:00	4								2		1		1					
	7. 7:00	18		1		7		4		1		1		1		1			
	8. 8:00	17		3		4		1		4		5							
	9. 9:00	16		3		1		1		2				3					
	10. 10:00	17		3		1		2		2		2							
After noon	11. 11:00	16	1			3	1	5		4		1		2		1			
	12. 12:00	29		4		5		7		6		2		9		1			
	13. 1:00	18	1	5		3	1	2		4		3		1					
	14. 2:00	36		6		1		6		8		5		6		6			
	15. 3:00	57		11		10		12		10		10		5		1			
	16. 4:00	59		6		9		12		9		11		4		2			
	17. 5:00	58		10		12		8		15		7		4		2			
	18. 6:00	35	1	7	2	4		9	1	7		5				3			
	19. 7:00	29		6		6		6		3		2		4		2			
	20. 8:00	23	1			5		4		3		3		5		3	1		
	21. 9:00	11		1		1		2		1		1		2		2			
	22. 10:00	7		2		1				1				2		1			
23. 11:00	2				1								1						
24. Not Stated	3		2							1									
Totals		447	6	71	2	74	2	76	1	84		59		55		24	1		

DRIVER ERROR SUMMARY

ACCIDENTS INVOLVING BICYCLES IN STATE OF OREGON FOR 1973

BICYCLE DRIVERS

REPORT PUBLISHED BY  
MOTOR VEHICLES DIVISION

MOTOR VEHICLE TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

TYPE OF ERROR	NUMBER OF ERROR	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL	PERCENTAGE OF DRIVERS RESPONSIBLE BY AGE GROUP													N.S.
			15	16	17	18-19	20-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65-74	75			
TURNING MANEUVERS																
WIDE TURN.....	10	2	60	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	20	
CUT CORNER ON TURN.....	5	1	80	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
FAILED TO OBEY MANDATORY TURN SIGNAL OR SIGN.....	2	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
LEFT TURN IN FRONT OF ONCOMING TRAFFIC.....	15	3	73	0	0	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
LEFT TURN WHERE PROHIBITED.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TURNED FROM WRONG LANE.....	27	5	85	0	0	0	4	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	
TURNED INTO WRONG LANE.....	2	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
U-TURN ILLEGALLY.....	10	2	50	10	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	
IMPROPER MANEUVERS																
IMPROPERLY STOPPED IN TRAFFIC LANE.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
IMPROPER SIGNAL OR FAILURE TO SIGNAL.....	25	5	80	0	0	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PARKING IMPROPERLY-NOT PARKING.....	1	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
IMPROPERLY OR DOUBLE PARKED.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
IMPROPER START FROM PARKED POSITION.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
IMPROPER START FROM STOPPED POSITION.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
IMPROPER CHANGE OF TRAFFIC LANES.....	40	8	73	8	3	5	3	3	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	
OTHER IMPROPER PARKING MANEUVERS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DISOBEYING SIGNS AND SIGNALS																
DISOBEYED STOP SIGN.....	4	1	17	0	17	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DISOBEYED STOP SIGN ON FLASHING RED.....	14	3	29	7	7	0	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DISOBEYED STOP SIGN ON FLASHING RED.....	49	9	78	2	4	2	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DISOBEYED WARNING SIGN, FLARE OR FLASHING AMBER.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DISOBEYED POLICE OFFICER OR FLAGMAN.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DISOBEYED SIREN OR WARNING OF EMERGENCY VEHICLE.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DISOBEYED STOP SIGN, OR SIGN, OR MR FLAGMAN.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
FAILED TO AVOID STOPPED OR PARKED VEHICLE AHEAD.....	0	2	13	13	0	0	38	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	
RIGHT-OF-WAY ERROR																
FAILED TO YIELD RIGHT-OF-WAY TO AVOID ACCIDENT.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DID NOT HAVE RIGHT-OF-WAY.....	154	29	81	0	3	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	
FAILED TO YIELD RIGHT-OF-WAY TO PEDESTRIAN.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PASSING MANEUVERS																
PASSING ON CURVE.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PASSING ON WRONG SIDE.....	10	4	20	5	11	21	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	
PASSING ON WRONG SIDE UNDER UNSAFE CONDITIONS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PASSING UNDER UNSAFE CONDITIONS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PASSING AT INTERSECTION.....	2	0	50	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PASSING ON CREST OF HILL.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PASSING IN NO PASSING ZONE.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PASSING IN FRONT OF ONCOMING TRAFFIC.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CUTTING IN.....	3	1	33	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	33	0	0	0	
MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS																
IMPROPER OR NO LIGHTS-MOVING VEHICLE.....	27	5	30	15	11	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	
FAILED TO DIM LIGHTS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DRIVING UNSAFE VEHICLE-NO OTHER ERROR.....	3	1	0	33	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	
DRIVING ON WRONG SIDE OF ROAD.....	69	13	78	1	0	4	4	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	
DRIVING THROUGH SAFETY ZONE OR OVER ISLAND.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
FAILED TO STOP FOR SCHOOL BUS.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
FAILED TO STOP FOR SLOW MOVING VEHICLE.....	4	1	25	0	0	0	25	0	0	25	0	0	25	0	0	
FOLLOWING TOO CLOSELY.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
STRADDLING OR DRIVING IN WRONG LANE.....	22	4	68	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	
WROTE WAY ON ONE-WAY STREET.....	7	1	57	0	0	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	
EXCESSIVE SPEED.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
BASIC RULE ERROR																
DRIVING TOO FAST FOR COND.-NOT EXCESSIVE SPEED.....	6	1	50	0	0	17	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OTHER BASIC RULE ERROR.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL ERROR	530	100														

NUMBER OF DRIVERS		NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS	PERCENT OF ALL ACCIDENTS	OTHER CONTRIBUTING CIRCUMSTANCES		NUMBER OF ACCIDENTS	PERCENT OF ALL ACCIDENTS
				VEHICLES			
DRIVERS				INADEQUATE OR NO BRAKES.....	7	2	
HAD BEEN DRINKING.....	1	0	0	DEFECTIVE STEERING MECHANISM.....	0	0	
ASLEEP.....	1	0	0	TIRE FAILURE.....	0	0	
BLINDED BY SUN OR HEADLIGHTS.....	1	0	0	TRAILER CONNECTION BROKE.....	0	0	
PHYSICAL ILLNESS.....	1	0	0	OTHER MECHANICAL DEFECT.....	1	0	
ATTENTION DISTRACTED.....	25	7		MISCELLANEOUS			
PASSENGER INTERFERENCE.....	1	0	0	PET INVOLVED.....	0	0	
INADVERTENT FAULTY OPERATION OF VEHICLE.....	0	0	0	LIVESTOCK INVOLVED.....	0	0	
PEDESTRIANS & BICYCLISTS				WILD ANIMAL INVOLVED.....	0	0	
WITH ERROR.....	749	220		FALLING OR MOVING OBJECT.....	0	0	
WITH NO ERROR.....	0	0		POOR VISIBILITY.....	9	3	
<b>TOTAL DRIVERS</b>	<b>749</b>	<b>100</b>					

<b>DRIVERS</b>		<b>VEHICLES</b>	
HAS BEEN DRINKING.....	5	INADEQUATE OR NO BRAKES.....	1
ALCOHOL BY SIGN OR HEADLIGHTS.....	0	DEFECTIVE STEERING MECHANISM.....	0
PHYSICAL ILLNESS.....	0	TIRE FAILURE.....	0
ATTENTION DISTRACTED.....	6	TRAILER CONNECTION BROKE.....	0
PASSENGER INTERFERENCE.....	0	OTHER MECHANICAL DEFECT.....	0
INADVERTENT FAULTY OPERATION OF VEHICLE.....	0	<b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>	
		PET INVOLVED.....	0
		LIVESTOCK INVOLVED.....	0
<b>PEDESTRIANS &amp; BICYCLISTS</b>		WILD ANIMAL INVOLVED.....	0
WITH ERROR.....	0	FALLING OR MOVING OBJECT.....	0
WITH NO ERROR.....	1	POOR VISIBILITY.....	0