

Stacks
52
Colo. 6
no. 91

Report to the Colorado General Assembly:

DRIVER LICENSING IN COLORADO



COLORADO LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

RESEARCH PUBLICATION NO. 91

DECEMBER 1964

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
OF THE
COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Representatives

C. P. (Doc) Lamb, Chairman
Joseph V. Calabrese
John L. Kane
William O. Lennox
John W. Nichols
Clarence H. Quinlan
John D. Vanderhoof, Speaker

Senators

Fay DeBerard, Vice Chairman
William E. Bledsoe
Edward J. Byrne
Frank L. Gill
Floyd Oliver
Robert L. Knous, Lt. Governor

* * * * *

The Legislative Council, which is composed of five Senators, six Representatives, and the presiding officers of the two houses, serves as a continuing research agency for the legislature through the maintenance of a trained staff. Between sessions, research activities are concentrated on the study of relatively broad problems formally proposed by legislators, and the publication and distribution of factual reports to aid in their solution.

During the sessions, the emphasis is on supplying legislators, on individual request, with personal memoranda, providing them with information needed to handle their own legislative problems. Reports and memoranda both give pertinent data in the form of facts, figures, arguments, and alternatives.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER COLLEGE OF LAW LIBRARY

DRIVER LICENSING

**Legislative Council
Report To The
Colorado General Assembly**

**Research Publication No. 91
December, 1964**

OFFICERS

Rep. C. P. (Doc) Lamb
Chairman
Sen. Fay DeBerard
Vice Chairman

STAFF

Lyle C. Kyle
Director
Harry O. Lawson
Senior Analyst
Phillip E. Jones
Senior Analyst
David F. Morrissey
Research Assistant
Myran H. Schlechte
Research Assistant
Janet Wilson
Research Assistant

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 341, STATE CAPITOL
DENVER 2, COLORADO
222-9911—EXTENSION 2285

December 6, 1964

MEMBERS

Lt. Gov. Robert L. Knous
Sen. William E. Bledsoe
Sen. Edward J. Byrne
Sen. Frank L. Gill
Sen. Floyd Oliver

Speaker John D. Vanderhoof
Rep. Joseph V. Calebrese
Rep. John L. Kane
Rep. William O. Lennox
Rep. John W. Nichols
Rep. Clarence H. Quinlan

To Members of the Forty-fifth Colorado General Assembly:

As directed by H.J.R. No. 1030, 1964 session, the Legislative Council submits the accompanying report on Driver Licensing for your consideration.

The committee appointed by the Council to conduct this study made its report to the Council on November 23, 1964. At that time, the Council adopted the report for transmission to the members of the Forty-fifth General Assembly.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Representative C. P. (Doc) Lamb
Chairman

OFFICERS
Rep. C. P. (Doc) Lamb
Chairman
Sen. Fay DeBerard
Vice Chairman

STAFF
Lyle C. Kyle
Director
Harry O. Lawson
Senior Analyst
Phillip E. Jones
Senior Analyst
David F. Morrissey
Research Assistant
Myran H. Schlichte
Research Assistant
Janet Wilson
Research Assistant

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 341, STATE CAPITOL
DENVER 2, COLORADO
222-9911—EXTENSION 2285

November 23, 1964

MEMBERS

Lt. Gov. Robert L. Knous
Sen. William E. Bledsoe
Sen. Edward J. Byrne
Sen. Frank L. Gill
Sen. Floyd Oliver

Speaker John D. Vanderhoof
Rep. Joseph V. Calabrese
Rep. John L. Kane
Rep. William O. Lennox
Rep. John W. Nichols
Rep. Clarence H. Quinlan

Representative C. P. Lamb, Chairman
Colorado Legislative Council
341 State Capitol
Denver, Colorado

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Your Committee on Driver Licensing appointed pursuant to H.J.R. No. 1030, 1964 session, submits herewith its report and recommendations. The committee believes that the irresponsible attitude of many motorists is the principal factor contributing to motor vehicle accidents. Therefore, the committee's recommendations are designed to motivate drivers, especially young drivers, to develop safe driving practices, as well as to encourage motorists to recognize their responsibilities to the public.

Respectfully submitted

/s/ Representative Norman W. Ohlson
Chairman, Committee on
Driver Licensing

NWO/mp

Foreword

To conduct the study on Driver Licensing, the Legislative Council appointed the following committee: Representative Norman W. Ohlson, chairman; Senator A. Woody Hewett, vice chairman; Senators William Chenoweth, Charles Porter, and Andrew Kelley, and Representatives Ruth Stockton, Don Friedman, John Moran, Walter Stalker, Mark Hogan, and Betty Kirk West. Representative C. P. Lamb, Council chairman, served in an ex officio capacity.

The Committee on Driver Licensing held a series of six meetings in the course of its study. Following an organizational meeting, the committee conducted a public hearing on May 29, 1964, to review problems associated with financially irresponsible motorists, to consider psychological factors contributing to motor vehicle accidents, and to review data on motor vehicle accidents in Colorado. At a subsequent hearing on July 20, 1964, testimony was presented to the committee on the need for an "implied consent law" to assist in the prosecution of drunk drivers; State Department of Education, Colorado School Board Association, and driver education officials outlined problems relating to compulsory driver education; and officials of the motor scooter industry also met with the committee. Subsequent meetings were devoted to examinations of specific issues related to the aforementioned items and to committee findings and recommendations.

In the development of statistical data and compilation of information relating to driving practices and driver education, the committee would like to express its appreciation to Mr. William Cassell, Chief of the Motor Vehicle Division, Dr. Donald Luketich, State Department of Education, the data processing services of the Department of Revenue and Department of Highways, and to Mr. Merf Evans of the Highway Safety Council.

The committee also is grateful for the assistance rendered by the Colorado School Board Association, driver education officials, representatives of the motor scooter industry, Dr. John Conger, Colorado University Medical School, representatives of the insurance industry, and others participating at committee hearings.

Assisting the committee in the study were Mr. Jim Wilson of the Legislative Reference Office and Dave Morrissey of the Council staff.

December, 1964

Lyle C. Kyle
Director

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL	i
FOREWORD	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	xi
Driving a Motor Vehicle -- Right or Privilege	xi
Licensing Standards and the Accident Problem	xiv
Minimum Age For Operation of a Motor Vehicle	xv
Three Classes of Licenses	xvi
Provisional Chauffeurs' and Chauffeurs' Licenses	xvii
Strengthen Financial Responsibility of Teenagers	xvii
Instruction Permits	xvii
"Implied Consent"	xviii
Tighten Financial Responsibility Laws For All Drivers	xviii
Driver Education	xxii
MOTOR VEHICLE VIOLATIONS AND ACCIDENTS IN COLORADO	1
Motor Vehicle Violations Reported by the State Patrol	1
Motor Vehicle Accidents and Violations of Male Drivers	3
Motor Vehicle Accidents and Violations -- Female Drivers	3
Time of Accidents	3
Time of Violations	6
Contributing Factors -- Accidents	9
Types of Violations -- State Patrol	9
Summary of Colorado Accident and Violation Data	12
PRACTICES IN LICENSING YOUNG DRIVERS	13
Minimum Ages	13
Types of Restrictions	13
PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS INVOLVED IN TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS	17
"IMPLIED CONSENT"	19
Need For Implied Consent Legislation	19
Chemical Tests	21
Implied Consent Legislation	22
Constitutional Issues -- Court Decisions	23
Operation of a Motor Vehicle -- "Right" or "Privilege"	28
Implied Consent in Colorado	29

	<u>Page</u>
FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY	34
Financial Responsibility in Other States	34
Pros and Cons of Financial Responsibility Laws	35
MOTOR SCOOTER LICENSES	37
Motor Scooter and Bicycle Accidents in Colorado	37
HIGH SCHOOL DRIVER EDUCATION	40
Cost of Driver Education Programs in Colorado	40
State-aid -- Cost Estimates For Colorado	44
Financing State Assistance for Driver Education	45
Applicability of Various State Revenue Sources to Financing Driver Education in Colorado	45
Effectiveness of Driver Education	48

List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
I RELATIONSHIP OF THE NUMBER OF DRIVERS INVOLVED IN MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS AND VIOLATIONS TO TOTAL COLORADO POPULATION OVER AGE 16	2
II RELATIONSHIP OF THE NUMBER OF MALE DRIVERS INVOLVED IN MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS AND VIOLATIONS TO TOTAL COLORADO POPULATION OVER AGE 16	4
III RELATIONSHIP OF THE NUMBER OF FEMALE DRIVERS INVOLVED IN MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS AND VIOLATIONS TO TOTAL COLORADO POPULATION OVER AGE 16	5
IV TIME OF DAY OF MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS IN COLORADO IN 1963, BY AGE GROUPS	7
V TIME OF DAY OF MOTOR VEHICLE VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY THE COLORADO STATE PATROL IN 1963, BY AGE GROUPS	8
VI CONTRIBUTING FACTORS IN MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS INVOLVING INJURY AND DEATH IN COLORADO DURING 1963	10
VII TYPE OF VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY THE COLORADO STATE PATROL IN 1963	11
VIII SURVEY OF STATE MINIMUM AGE REQUIREMENTS TO OPERATE A MOTOR VEHICLE	14
IX MOTOR SCOOTER ACCIDENTS INVOLVING 14 AND 15 YEAR OLD OPERATORS	38
X MOTOR SCOOTER ACCIDENTS INVOLVING 16-YEAR-OLD AND OLDER OPERATORS	39
XI DRIVER EDUCATION -- SECONDARY SCHOOLS	42
XII ESTIMATED COST OF STATE-AID FOR DRIVER EDUCATION IN COLORADO	44
XIII SOURCE OF STATE FUNDS FOR SUPPORT OF DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS	46
XIV ILLINOIS STUDY OF TEENAGE ACCIDENT RECORDS, HIGH SCHOOL DRIVER EDUCATION COMPARED TO NON-DRIVER EDUCATION	49

Committee Findings and Recommendations

Driving a Motor Vehicle -- Right or Privilege

In attempting to deal with the problems of licensing persons to drive motor vehicles this committee has encountered a misconception in the minds of many Coloradoans that appears to be an obstacle to more stringent regulation of driver licensing. That misconception revolves around a Colorado Supreme Court decision and the question of whether a driver's license is a "privilege" or a "right."

It is the feeling of this committee that this obstacle is more apparent than real and that it stems from semantics and not from philosophical disagreement.

The committee in its deliberations has encountered no one nor discovered any court decisions which maintain that a driver's license is a right in the sense that freedom of religion, speech, press, or to assemble is constitutionally guaranteed. Neither have we encountered anyone nor found any court case which maintains that a driver's license is a privilege that can be arbitrarily given, suspended, or revoked.

It is in this context that the committee wishes to suggest that the following quotation from a Kansas Supreme Court case best describes the philosophy which we consider pertinent to the problems of driver licensing:

It is an elementary rule of law that the right to operate a motor vehicle upon a public street or highway is not a natural or unrestrained right, but a "privilege" which is subject to reasonable regulation under the police power of the state in the interest of public safety and welfare....¹

The committee believes that such an outlook on a driver's license is absolutely essential if the needless slaughter and maiming of American citizens on the streets and roads of this state and nation are to be curbed.

Some people in Colorado contend that the Supreme Court in this state disagrees with this philosophy based on the decision in the Nothaus case. The text of that decision is as follows:

Article II, Section 3 of the constitution provides that: "All persons have certain natural, essential and inalienable rights, among which may be reckoned the right *** of acquiring, possessing and protecting property; ***" A motor vehicle is property and a person cannot be deprived of property without due process of law. The term property, within the

1. Lee v. State of Kansas (1961), 358 P. 2d 765.

meaning of the due process clause, includes the right to make full use of the property which one has the inalienable right to acquire.

Every citizen has an inalienable right to make use of the public highways of the state; every citizen has full freedom to travel from place to place in the enjoyment of life and liberty. The limitations which may be placed upon this inherent right of the citizen must be based upon a proper exercise of the police power of the state in the protection of the public health, safety and welfare. Any unreasonable restraint upon the freedom of the individual to make use of the public highways cannot be sustained. Regulations imposed upon the right of the citizen to make use of the public highways must have a fair relationship to the protection of the public safety in order to be valid.

The regulation and control of traffic upon the public highways is a matter which has a definite relationship to the public safety, and no one questions the authority of the General Assembly to establish reasonable standards of fitness and competence to drive a motor vehicle which a citizen must possess before he drives a car upon the public highway. When a citizen meets the standards thus defined in a proper exercise of the police power, he has a right to continue in the full enjoyment of that right until by due process of law it has been established that by reason of abuse of the right or other just cause it is reasonably necessary in the interest of the public safety to deprive him of the right to drive a motor vehicle on the highways. Such action cannot be taken without notice to the party affected and without an opportunity for him to be heard on the question of whether sufficient grounds exist to warrant a revocation of his right to drive a motor vehicle upon the highways of the state. The question of whether a constitutionally guaranteed property right can be denied for some justifiable reason, is essentially a judicial question, and under the doctrine of separation of powers of government it must remain a judicial question. In the instant case Nothaus was denied due process of law. The purported revocation of his license to drive was of no force or effect and was brought about under provisions of a statute which cannot be sustained.

The requirement of C.R.S. '53, 13-7-7, that the director of revenue, "*** shall suspend the license of each operator and all registrations of each owner of a motor vehicle in any manner involved in such accident ***" unless such persons deposit a sum "sufficient in the judgment of the director ***" to pay any damage which may be awarded, or otherwise show ability to indemnify the other party to the accident

against financial loss, has nothing whatever to do with the protection of the public safety, health, morals or welfare. It is a device designated and intended to bring about the posting of security for the payment of a private obligation without the slightest indication that any legal obligation exists on the part of any person. The public gets no protection whatever from the deposit of such security. This is not the situation which we find in some states where the statutes require public liability insurance as a condition to be met before a driver's license will issue. Such statute protects the public. The statute before us is entirely different. In the matters to which we have particularly directed attention, C.R.S. '53, 13-7-7, is unconstitutional. On a matter so obviously basic and fundamental no additional citation of authority is required. We reach this conclusion notwithstanding the fact that other jurisdictions have seemingly overlooked basic constitutional guarantees which must be ignored in reaching an opposite conclusion.²

The facts of the Nothaus case are these:

On January 10, 1959, on a public highway in Teller County, a horse was struck by a motor vehicle driven by defendant. The director of revenue, upon receiving a report of the accident from one Dobbie, and acting under the purported authority of C.R.S. '53, 13-7-7, suspended the operator's license which had theretofore been issued to defendant. The suspension followed the failure of defendant to "deposit security in a sum which shall be sufficient in the judgment of the director to satisfy any judgments for damages resulting from such accident as may be recovered ***" against the defendant as required by the statute above cited. Defendant admitted receiving notice of the "cancellation" of his operator's license, and also admitted that notwithstanding the receipt of said notice he thereafter drove a motor vehicle at the time and place named in the summons and complaint filed against him. The sole defense relied upon by him was, and is, that those sections of the Safety Responsibility Law, and those statutory provisions purporting to authorize a revocation of defendant's operator's license without a hearing or trial, are unconstitutional.³

The Court affirmed the decision of the trial court.

2. People v. Nothaus (1961), 147 Colorado Reports 214-216.

3. People v. Nothaus (1961), 147 Colorado Reports 211-212.

The committee wishes to call particular attention to two sentences in the Supreme Court decision. The first is "... The regulation and control of traffic upon the public highways is a matter which has a definite relationship to the public safety, and no one questions the authority of the General Assembly to establish reasonable standards of fitness and competence to drive a motor vehicle which a citizen must possess before he drives a car upon the public highway..."

This sentence seems to the committee to clearly indicate that the court will uphold "reasonable standards of fitness and competence to drive" and we further believe the recommendations contained herein meet the reasonable test.

The second sentence in the court opinion which the committee wants to call particular attention to is "... When a citizen meets the standards thus defined in a proper exercise of the police power, he has a right to continue in the full enjoyment of that right until by due process of law it has been established that by reason of abuse of the right or other just cause it is reasonably necessary in the interest of the public safety to deprive him of the right to drive a motor vehicle on the highways..." In the committee's opinion this is the particular part of the opinion which raises the semantics problem. Whether a driver's license is a "right" or a "privilege" in this instance, in the opinion of the committee, is moot because the principle enunciated by the court is that a driver's license can be revoked on justifiable cause if due process of law is observed -- a point with which the committee is in full agreement.

Licensing Standards and the Accident Problems

In the past, the key qualifications for obtaining a vehicle operator's license included meeting minimum age requirements, successful completion of a test of driving skills, a knowledge of rules of the road, a keen eye, and lack of any physical impairment that would prohibit safe driving. Although these standard motor vehicle operator's requirements are designed to eliminate unfit drivers from the nation's highways, the tests, of course, are not a complete solution for the determination and weeding-out of accident-prone drivers. Perhaps, the failure of the aforementioned tests may be demonstrated by the following analogy.

Young drivers, under age 21, appear to comprise an age group most likely to possess the best physical qualifications, i.e., their eyesight may be sharper, and, certainly, their reaction time also may be quicker than older drivers. In addition, teenagers, all who recently have been tested on rules of the road, probably have the advantage of being informed of recent changes in traffic laws. Despite these assets, the accident record of male teenagers, 18 and 19 years of age, as reflected by Colorado accident statistics, is twice as severe as that for all age groups over 25. Similarly, the accident record of 16 and 17-year-old male operators ranks second highest of all age groups.

Motor vehicle accidents appear to evolve out of a complex set of circumstances involving road conditions, traffic congestion,

mechanical condition of vehicles, and, most importantly, the mental and physical conditions of the drivers. Perhaps, the avoidance of accidents, to a large degree, may involve three human factors: 1) the driver's knowledge of risk potential; 2) alertness of the operator to the driving situation; and 3) desire on the part of drivers to act maturely and rationally in every driving situation. Of course, a breakdown of these processes may result from the effect of alcohol or drugs, or simply because the individual may be emotionally disturbed, either temporarily or chronically, by anxiety, anger, depression, or even over-exhilarated by joy or excitement.

With this in mind, the committee is recommending legislation designed to encourage the development of attitudes which foster safe driving practices and remove drivers from Colorado highways who flagrantly abuse their driving privileges.

Minimum Age for Operation of a Motor Vehicle

One of the first suggestions made to the committee for curtailing the relatively high accident rate of teenagers was to raise the minimum age for operation of a motor vehicle from 16 to 18. At first glance, the proposal appears to have considerable merit, for it not only eliminates an accident-prone age group, but it also removes a significant number of drivers from Colorado's highways.

The proposal was rejected by the committee for the following reasons.

Generally, 18-year-olds already may be faced with a period of transition -- secondary education, for the most part, has been completed; parental and school authority has been minimized; malt beverages are available; and the pressures of business and collegiate careers are developing. Because of this period of transition, and especially with the limitation of parental and school control, the committee questions whether age 18 is the desirable time for formulating and developing safe driving practices.

Perhaps the most significant argument for not raising the minimum age to 18 is that it would destroy driver education in the public schools and, in turn, pre-empt the opportunity for formulating safe driving attitudes at an age when youth may be most receptive to driver education programs. Also, the accident involvement of teenagers 16 and 17 is not as great as for drivers 18 through 20, especially when consideration is given to driving errors more or less expected of inexperienced drivers. Raising the minimum age to 18, of course, probably would result in a higher accident rate for the 18 through 20 age group because of the addition of driving errors currently eliminated at ages 16 and 17.

Another serious disadvantage to raising the minimum age to 18 is that it does not take into consideration the needs of rural areas. The efficient operation of many family farms would be hampered by a restriction of the operating privileges of youngsters 16 and 17. Furthermore, the mobility of our society would be curtailed, to some degree, by limiting driving privileges to operators 18 and over. With these considerations in mind, the committee believes that youngsters

should not be turned loose at age 18 to learn to operate a motor vehicle at a time of reduced supervision, both at home and in the schools.

Although the committee rejected the concept of raising the minimum age limit, the committee recognizes that steps need to be taken to reduce the accident involvement of teenagers. In particular, the committee believes that the present point system, in regard to teen-age operators, tends to work against the development of proper driving attitudes, i.e., a youngster with a newly acquired driving license tends to think that he has nothing to worry about until he has acquired a few violations on his driving record. In the following recommendations of the committee, an attempt is made to eliminate this negative philosophy by placing the young driver on probation at the time that he receives his license. The committee's recommendations also are based on a report by the Motor Vehicle Division that drivers with poor violation records, and who are on the borderline of having their operators' privileges suspended under the point system, appear to improve their driving performances because of the threat of suspension.

Three Classes of Licenses

The committee recommends a three-step approach to the issuance of motor vehicle operators' licenses: 1) a minor's license issued to 16 and 17-year-olds; 2) a provisional license (ages 18 through 20); and 3) a regular operator's license at age 21 and over.

Minor's License. The proposed minor's license is to include operators age 16 and 17. Each minor's license is to be embossed or printed with the numbers, not less than one-half inch in height, "16-17." In this way, the license can readily be identified and can not be subject to alteration for purposes of falsifying ages. Basically, it is the committee's intent that a proposed minor's license be designed to meet the needs of new drivers and suggests that these drivers receive closer scrutiny and regulation. Therefore, the committee proposes that a minor's license may be suspended if the licensee receives more than four points in violations in any 12-month period. This tightening of the privilege of a youngster to drive should tend to develop greater respect and observance of traffic laws and, in turn, a reduction of accident involvement. The committee also believes that a motor vehicle violation committed by an unlicensed minor within three years prior to the time an operator's license is issued should be subject to the point system applicable to the type of license issued. To assist in the administration of this program, the committee recommends that teenagers (16 through 20) be required to sign a statement at the time of licensing indicating whether they have committed a motor vehicle violation during the preceding three years. A false statement, of course, would be grounds for suspension of a license.

Provisional License. The proposed provisional license recommended by the committee is to be issued to young people in the most accident-prone years -- 18 to 20. The proposed provisional license, in a sense, is a transitional license; the youngster still has not reached full emotional, mental, and physical maturity. At this age, a person has acquired privileges of greater freedom, including eligibility to use malt beverages. On the other hand, these new freedoms may be contributors to an accident rate, as a group, double and triple that

of older drivers. The committee believes that extensive tightening of the motor vehicle operator's point system for this age group is necessary to pinpoint the problem driver quickly. Therefore, the committee recommends that drivers 18 to 20 years of age must be subject to license suspension if more than eight points are accumulated in any 12-month period. A reduction in the point system should, in regard to the proposed minor and provisional licensee, tend to penalize the chronic offenders to a sufficient degree that the safe driver in these age groups may benefit through an insurance rate reduction.

Provisional Chauffeurs' and Chauffeurs' Licenses

The committee believes that the point system for chauffeurs' licenses should continue to correspond to those of regular operators. The records of the Motor Vehicle Division suggest that the vast majority of professional chauffeurs are not acquiring more points than those regularly licensed operators despite greater exposure. People who drive for a living probably exercise greater caution and restraint than the average driver simply because of their professional status. The committee also recommends that persons may not qualify for a chauffeur's position until age 18. This proposed one-year increase in present minimum age limits would bring the chauffeurs' licenses into conformity with the recommendations of the committee regarding operators' licenses. However, the committee recognizes that denial of provisional chauffeurs' privileges to 17-year-olds may work as a hardship in some instances. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Department of Revenue extend provisional chauffeurs' privileges to minor operators (17 years of age) demonstrating the necessity for obtaining chauffeurs' privileges.

Strengthen Financial Responsibility of Teenagers

Section 13-3-7(2) provides: "Any negligence or willful misconduct of a minor under the age of seventeen years when driving a motor vehicle upon a highway shall be imputed to the person who has signed the application of such minor for a permit or license, which person shall be jointly and severally liable with such minor for any damages caused by such negligence or willful misconduct except as otherwise provided...." The committee believes that lack of parental responsibility for teenagers 18 through 20 may be a contributing factor in the relatively high accident rate of this age group. Therefore, the committee recommends that parental responsibility be required for all drivers under age 21. In addition, the committee believes that by raising the age for parental liability to age 21 that a number of minors presently uninsured may be encouraged to obtain liability insurance and, to some degree, the public may be further protected, at least in an economic sense, from irresponsible young drivers.

Instruction Permits

As a part of the committee's recommendations for fostering the proper training and development of young drivers, the committee proposes that as a prerequisite for obtaining the proposed minor operator's license, a teenager must obtain a learner's permit. The

mandatory requirement for a learner's permit, coupled with a minimum period for possessing a permit, may encourage the utilization of proper training procedures, as well as developing a sense of respect for the operation of a motor vehicle.

Requiring a mandatory permit also may encourage students to participate in driver education courses, because the learner's permit may be obtained at age 15 and one-half for youngsters enrolled in approved driver education programs, while other teen-age applicants must wait until age 15 and nine months before applying for a permit.

"Implied Consent"

"Implied consent" simply means that any individual operating a motor vehicle upon the highways automatically consents to a chemical test to determine the alcohol content of his or her blood, whenever he is arrested for allegedly driving while under the influence of alcohol. A person may refuse to submit to a chemical test; however, the individual may have his driver's license suspended following a hearing as to the reasonableness for refusing to submit to the test. In other words, implied consent provides the law enforcement officers with an additional tool in the arrest and prosecution of drinking drivers. Testimony to the committee indicated that, to a large extent, persons arrested for allegedly driving while under the influence are not submitting to chemical tests, with the result that a large number are escaping conviction of drunk driving charges.

Studies of drivers involved in fatal motor vehicle accidents indicate that a minimum of 50 per cent of these drivers had been drinking. The committee believes that the high incidence of drinking drivers in relation to accidents, coupled with the difficulties of prosecuting drinking drivers, is a mandate for the adoption of an implied consent law in Colorado. Furthermore, states adopting implied consent legislation have succeeded in suspending a number of operators' licenses under their respective implied consent laws, while, at the same time, the various state supreme courts have upheld the validity of implied consent legislation.

Tighten Financial Responsibility Laws For All Drivers

Approximately 85 per cent of Colorado motorists have purchased motor vehicle liability insurance; the remaining 15 per cent, coupled with the uninsured motorists from other states, pose a serious economic threat to motorists involved in accidents with financially irresponsible drivers. Therefore, as a matter of public policy, the committee recommends that every effort should be made to encourage motorists to obtain insurance for the protection of the public.

Although 100 per cent coverage for all motorists should be the ultimate goal, the committee does not believe that mandatory motor vehicle liability insurance is the answer to the problem. States adopting mandatory insurance appear to have two significant problems: 1) an expensive program to enforce; and 2) a substantially higher insurance rate for the average motorist. In these states, the responsible motorist actually is paying a substantial part of the cost

of insuring the small percentage of irresponsible motorists. Also, a mandatory program probably can not guarantee that 100 per cent of the motorists actually will obtain or keep liability policies.

The committee is of the opinion that the most economical method for financially responsible motorists to protect themselves from irresponsible motorists is through the purchase of uninsured motorist coverage. This insurance may be obtained for approximately \$2.00 per year.

The committee recommends the adoption of a proposal to amend Colorado's Safety Responsibility Law to require every liability policy to contain a provision for protection against the uninsured motorist, with the added provision that the policy holder may reject the protection.

The committee also recommends the following ten-step approach to strengthening Colorado's Safety Responsibility Law:

I. Colorado's Safety Responsibility Law (13-7-1 to 13-7-39, CRS 1953, as amended) provides, in part, that when motorists are involved in an accident in which bodily injury or property damage in excess of \$50 occurs, the director of the Department of Revenue must notify the motorists involved in the accident that their licenses are subject to suspension if they fail to demonstrate financial responsibility through proof of liability insurance, evidence of a liability bond, or by a deposit of security to the department in an amount specified by the director sufficient to satisfy judgments for damages or injury resulting from the accident. The act also provides that a motorist may request a hearing, which, in effect, usually postpones the director's order for suspension. The committee believes that in the event a hearing postpones the effective date of the suspension, steps must be taken to insure the public that the individual is prohibited from driving a vehicle during the period of postponement, unless he demonstrates financial responsibility. Therefore, the committee recommends that present law be amended to provide that as a condition for postponement, the motorist must submit evidence of financial responsibility through an automobile liability policy, bond, or deposit of security.

II. The committee recommends that the property damage requirement of \$50, required by accident reports (see Item I, above), be raised to \$100. At present, the department must process a great number of minor accident reports for the purpose of checking motorists to see that they comply with Colorado's Safety Responsibility Law. To a large extent, the processing of minor accident reports results in a comparatively small number of license suspensions in relation to the administrative expense involved. The committee believes that raising the property damage limit for reporting accidents to \$100 would reduce the administrative workload of the department. In addition, the committee proposes that the law be amended to allow the department to rely on the accuracy of information as to insurance coverage contained in the reports filed by motorists, at least, until the Director of Revenue believes the information is erroneous. In this way, the department may concentrate on reviewing accidents involving problem drivers and not be bogged down with an administrative check on the vast majority of properly insured motorists.

III. Briefly, the Safety Responsibility Law requires that in the event an uninsured motorist is involved in an accident he must post security or file a bond with the Director of Revenue sufficient to satisfy judgment for damages. If it is logical to require an individual to post security for past accidents, it may be just as important to require a statement of insurance for the protection of the public against the possibility of future accidents. On this basis, the committee recommends legislation to provide that if an uninsured motorist is required to post security for involvement in an accident, he also must furnish evidence of financial responsibility for future accidents.

IV. At present, if a federal employee is involved in an accident during the course of his employment, and is at fault, the injured person or owner of the damaged property must seek recourse for damages under the auspices of the Federal Tort's Claims Act. Even though the judgment for damages may be satisfied under the federal act, the federal employee could be subject to license suspension under Colorado's Safety Responsibility Law, because no provision is made in the Colorado law for federal employees financially protected by the federal government. In other words, the Colorado law requires an individual to post security or submit a statement of insurance following an accident, but, in this situation, the government and not the individual is responsible. Therefore, the committee recommends that legislation be enacted to clarify Colorado's Safety Responsibility Law to insure that an individual's license is not suspended over a technicality and that recognition is given in the Colorado law for cases involving the Federal Tort Claims Act.

V. If an operator's license is suspended for failure to report an accident or satisfy the safety responsibility requirements with respect to a deposit of security, the operator's license may not be renewed for a period of one year, unless the individual is released from liability or adjudicated not liable, and that no action for damages have been filed in connection with the accident. The committee believes that the law would be strengthened if, as a condition for renewal of a license, the individual under suspension is required to demonstrate financial responsibility for a subsequent three-year period. The committee's recommendation simply is designed to crack down on financially irresponsible motorists involved in accidents by requiring them to demonstrate proof of financial responsibility, for a three-year period, as a condition for reinstatement of their licenses.

VI. The Department of Revenue reports that the provisions of Colorado's Safety Responsibility Law (13-7-3, CRS 1953) pertaining to suspension of registration certificates and plates of motorists whose licenses have been suspended for a serious violation, either in Colorado or out-of-state, are unenforcible. Consequently, the committee recommends that reference to registration certificates and registration plates be deleted from the law. Also, the committee proposes that, as a condition for the issuance of a new license to an operator whose license has been suspended for a serious violation or a renewal of a cancelled or probationary license, the applicant must provide proof of financial responsibility for the following three-year period. In this event, a person whose license is suspended under the point system would, as a condition for reinstatement, be required to furnish the Department of Revenue a statement evidencing that he is insured or has

deposited security in lieu of insurance. In addition, a person whose license has been cancelled because of inability to operate a vehicle due to mental or physical incompetence also would be required to demonstrate financial responsibility. The committee also believes that the cost of processing license suspensions and reinstatements should be paid for by the problem driver. Therefore, the committee recommends that a \$10 reinstatement fee be charged to operators having their licenses revoked or suspended.

VII. Under the requirements of Colorado's Safety Responsibility Law an operator involved in a motor vehicle collision, and who is at fault, must meet the following minimum financial responsibility requirements or be subject to suspension of his operating privileges:

1) a minimum liability of \$5,000 for any one person injured or killed;

2) a minimum liability of \$10,000 for two or more persons injured or killed; and

3) a minimum liability of \$1,000 in property damage.

These standards were adopted by the General Assembly in 1935, and, in view of the changing value of the dollar, the committee recommends that the aforementioned liability limits be raised to \$10,000, \$20,000, and \$5,000, respectively. Raising the dollar limits will tend to bring Colorado in line with the financial responsibility requirements in other states.

VIII. On occasion, motorists insured with one company may wish to drop their coverage and insure with another company. In such an event, it would be possible for an individual to be covered by two policies within the same time-period. For instance, Section 13-7-19, CRS 1953, provides that an individual may establish proof of financial responsibility by submitting to the Department of Revenue a certificate of insurance, and this certificate of insurance shall not be cancelled by the company unless ten days written notice is given by the company to the Director of Revenue. During the ten-day period, it could be possible for an individual notified that his insurance has been cancelled to purchase additional insurance and be covered by two policies. The committee believes that a policy subsequently procured and certified to the department should operate as a cancellation of any policy previously certified with respect to any motor vehicle designated in both certificates.

IX. In the administration of the Safety Responsibility Law, the committee believes that information collected concerning the financial responsibility of motorists utilizing the state's highways should be used exclusively for encouraging motorists to provide for the financial protection of accident victims; that is, the committee does not believe that accident report actions taken by the Department of Revenue should be referred to in any way nor be made evidence of the negligence of any party in an action to recover civil damages or in any criminal proceeding arising out of a motor vehicle accident. Information gathered in the administration of the act is neither relevant nor proper for use in civil or criminal actions, and the committee is recommending legislation to this effect.

X. Motor vehicle travel across state boundaries is continuing at an accelerated rate, necessitating improved cooperation among states to minimize the impact of uninsured motorists involved in out-of-state accidents. Lessening of the impact of uninsured motorists involved in interstate travel may be accomplished by the adoption of reciprocity provisions requiring the Director of Revenue to suspend the license of a Colorado resident involved in an accident in another state under circumstances which would require the director to suspend a non-resident's operating privilege had the accident occurred in Colorado. The committee makes this recommendation based on the statutes of over 30 state financial responsibility laws.

As a final recommendation in this area, the committee believes that the title of Colorado's Safety Responsibility Law is a misnomer -- the law, as such, has nothing to do with safety, but, rather, is designed to encourage financial responsibility of all motorists -- and the act should be re-named Colorado's Financial Responsibility Law.

Driver Education

The committee has spent endless hours hearing testimony and deliberating on the necessity, desirability, value and cost of driver education. There appears to be considerable agreement among safety people and the insurance industry that driver education and training will improve the quality of our young people as drivers on our highways and thereby reduce the number of accidents. The committee also wishes to endorse the driver education programs presently conducted not only in the public schools but in programs administered by parochial schools, the American Automobile Association, and other private organizations.

In viewing driver education in Colorado, the committee is concerned with the relatively large number of youngsters who are not exposed to any formal course of driver training and, particularly, with the aspects of driver education most likely to foster improved driver attitudes. The committee believes that emphasis of the classroom aspects of driver training should be the initial step in any proposals for a state-wide driver education program because of the problems of scheduling driver education classes within crowded curriculums, financing such programs, and developing qualified teachers. The committee recommends continued improvement and expansion of present driver education programs and, in addition, that the representatives of the State Board of Education, Colorado Association of School Boards, the parochial schools, administrators and educators of the public schools, and private organizations active in driver training, should cooperate in developing standards for a proposed minimum classroom program of driver training as a condition to licensing drivers under age 18. The committee also suggests that the recommendations made in regard to the aforementioned proposal for a minimum program of classroom education be presented to the Forty-fifth General Assembly for consideration during the 1965 session.

Prohibit the Operation of Motor Scooters by Teenagers 14 and 15 Years Old

The committee believes that the high percentage of injuries, in excess of 70 per cent, to operators of motor scooters involved in motor vehicle accidents is a mandate for removal of youngsters under 16 from driving motor scooters on Colorado's highways. The committee is of the opinion that motor scooters are not a necessary means of transportation and that youngsters on scooters are turning the streets into playgrounds, constituting a menace not only to themselves but to the motorist who may be involved in an accident attempting to avoid a scooter.

In addition, the dramatic change in the motor scooter industry brought about by the introduction of lightweight motor-driven cycles in the past few years has made it increasingly difficult to segregate the low-horsepowered, limited-speed vehicles, originally intended for use by 14 and 15-year-olds, under the so-called "motor scooter law."

Generally, the committee concludes that the high exposure rate of motorized two-wheel vehicles requires a level of maturity equal to that required of individuals for operation of a motor vehicle. And, since the impetus across the nation has been for raising the minimum age for operation of all vehicles from 16 to 18, it is illogical to continue to allow children 14 and 15 years of age to operate motor scooters on Colorado's congested municipal streets or high-speed rural highways. In conclusion, the committee recommends prohibiting youngsters 14 and 15 from operating motor scooters on Colorado's public roads.

Motor Vehicle Violations and Accidents In Colorado

Statistics released by the Motor Vehicle Division reveal that approximately 85,138 motorists over the age of 16 were involved in motor vehicle accidents in Colorado during 1963 (see Table I). Of this group, 18,760 motorists were between the ages of 25-34; 15,661 were between the ages of 35-44; 13,854 were between 20 and 24 years of age; and 10,940 were from 45 to 54 years of age.

At first glance, the 25-34 age group appears to be the most accident-prone based strictly on the number of accidents. However, if the per cent of persons in each age group is compared to the per cent of drivers involved in accidents for each age category, another conclusion can be reached. For instance, although the 25-34 age group is reported to have been involved in 22.035 per cent of Colorado's motor vehicle accidents in 1963, the 1960 census indicates that 20.019 per cent of the population also is in this age group. On the other hand, the 18 to 19 age group is charged with 8.307 per cent of all accidents, and, at the same time, only represents 4.373 per cent of the population. In other words, the 18 to 19 age group had approximately twice the number of accidents per person as the 25 to 34 age group.

Motor Vehicle Violations Reported By the State Patrol

Table I also summarizes motor vehicle information pertaining to moving violations reported by the Colorado State Patrol in 1963. There were more than 49,451 moving violations in 1963, according to the State Patrol.

A brief glance at Table I appears to substantiate the theory that a correlation exists between violations and accidents. For example, the age group with the most violations, again, is the 25-34 year category -- 11,337 violations, or 20.019 per cent of the total. It may be noted that this same group also was involved in 22.035 per cent of the accidents.

If a comparison of population of age groups is made with motor vehicle violations of drivers in similar age groups, the 18 to 19-year-olds appear to be the most serious offenders -- 4.373 per cent of the population compared to 10.208 per cent of the violations. (Note that the per cent of accidents -- 8.307 per cent -- of this age group corresponds to the per cent of violations.)

Column 8, Table I, also lists an index of population to violations. The index of violations for 18 to 19-year-old drivers is 2.33, while the violation index for ages 45 to 54 is .70. In comparing the violation index to the accident index, both show an increase from age 16 to ages 18 and 19 and then a decrease for the remaining years.

101.
2.33
the
age
101.
2.33
1963
the
101.

Table I

RELATIONSHIP OF THE NUMBER OF DRIVERS INVOLVED IN MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS AND VIOLATIONS
TO TOTAL COLORADO POPULATION OVER AGE 16^a

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Age of Drivers	Population (1960 Census)	No. of Viol. State Patrol ^b	No. of Drivers All Acc.	Per Cent of Pop. Over Age 16	Per Cent of Viol. by Age	Per Cent of Acc. by Age	Index of Violations To Age (Col. 6 ÷ Col. 5)	Index of Accidents To Age (Col. 7 ÷ Col. 5) ^c
Under 16	---	250	584	---	.506%	.686%	---	---
16	26,873	1,883	3,666	2.320%	3.808	4.306	1.64	1.87
17	26,458	2,167	3,510	2.285	4.382	4.123	1.92	1.80
18-19	50,645	5,048	7,072	4.373	10.208	8.307	2.33	1.90
20-24	112,197	10,073	13,854	9.688	20.370	16.272	2.10	1.68
25-34	231,853	11,337	18,760	20.019	22.926	22.035	1.15	1.10
35-44	232,015	8,843	15,661	20.033	17.882	18.395	.89	.92
45-54	184,941	5,531	10,940	15.969	11.185	12.850	.70	.80
55-64	134,997	2,766	6,642	11.656	5.593	7.801	.48	.67
65-74	100,731	1,218	3,359	8.698	2.463	3.945	.28	.45
75 Over	57,429	335	1,090	4.959	.677	1.280	.13	.26
TOTAL	1,158,139	49,451	85,138	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%		

a. Source: Population - 1960 Census; violations - State Patrol; and accidents - Department of Revenue.

b. The violations reported by the State Patrol are moving violations. Miscellaneous pedestrian violations, over weight vehicle violations, defective vehicle violations, etc., are not included.

c. The column represents an index of per cent of population to the per cent of accidents for each age group. For example, the 18 to 19 age group index is 1.90 (the highest), while the index for the 35 to 44 age group is .92, or less than one-half the index for the 18 to 19 age group.

Motor Vehicle Accidents and Violations of Male Drivers

Table II reveals the relative accident and violation rates of male drivers in Colorado for calendar year 1963. The table is based on the same assumptions as Table I.

Accidents. Approximately 64,510 male drivers were involved in accidents in Colorado, according to the Motor Vehicle Division reports. Again, male drivers from age 18 to 19 appear to have had more than their share of motor vehicle accidents. For instance, 18 to 19-year-olds accounted for 6.492 per cent of all accidents, while the age group represents only 2.233 per cent of the population over age 16. For comparison of accident rates for all age groups, Column 9 lists an index of population to accidents, similar to Table I, i.e., age 16 (index 2.76); age 17 (index 2.73); ages 18 and 19 (index 2.91); and ages 20 to 24 (index 2.64). After age 24, the index drops rapidly to .51 for male drivers over 75. Undoubtedly, the index rate for older drivers may be misleading.

Violations. Male drivers accounted for 42,801 of the moving violations reported by the State Patrol, or approximately 86 per cent of the moving violations. The worst offenders appear to be in the 18 to 19-year-old age group, at least, as indicated by the violation index (4.04) reported in Column 8, Table II. The rate of violations for the 20 to 24-year-old male drivers is the next highest with an index of 3.78, followed by the index for 17-year-old drivers (3.27), and 16-year-old drivers (2.81).

Motor Vehicle Accidents and Violations -- Female Drivers

Colorado's women drivers have achieved a better accident and violation record than their male counterparts (See Table III). Both the violation and accident indexes (Columns 8 and 9, Table III) are significantly lower than for male drivers for all age groups. However, consideration should be given to the amount of driving done by female drivers and the number of female drivers in relation to the number of male drivers.

The accident index for female drivers may be of unusual interest, because the highest index is for age 16 (.93); thereafter, the index drops -- age 17 (.85); 18-19 (.84); 20-24 (.74); 25-34 (.50); etc. On the other hand, the vehicle violation index for female operators follows a pattern closer to that of male drivers, i.e., the rate increases from age 16 (.44) to age 18 and 19 (.56), and then drops rapidly -- ages 20-24 (.46), ages 25-34 (.31), ages 35-44 (.29), ages 45-54 (.22), etc.

Time of Accidents

One of the questions of concern to the committee is whether teen-age drivers are having more than their proportionate share of accidents at night and whether there is a need for a restriction on night driving by 16 and 17-year-olds.

Table II

RELATIONSHIP OF THE NUMBER OF MALE DRIVERS INVOLVED IN MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS
AND VIOLATIONS TO TOTAL COLORADO POPULATION OVER AGE 16^a

(1) Age of Drivers	(2) Male Population (1960 Census)	(3) No. of Viol. State Patrol ^b	(4) No. Male Drivers All Acc.	(5) Per Cent of Pop. Over Age 16	(6) Per Cent of Total Viol. by Age	(7) Per Cent of Total Acc.	(8) Index of Violations To Age	(9) Index of Accidents To Age
Under 16	---	211	525	---	.427%	.617%	---	---
16	13,638	1,634	2,759	1.77%	3.304	3.243	2.81	2.76
17	13,443	1,876	2,694	1.161	3.794	3.166	3.27	2.73
18-19	25,860	4,456	5,524	2.233	9.011	6.492	4.04	2.91
20-24	55,508	8,948	10,768	4.793	18.095	12.655	3.78	2.64
25-34	114,244	9,780	14,428	9.864	19.777	16.957	2.00	1.72
35-44	114,890	7,413	11,319	9.920	14.991	13.303	1.51	1.34
45-54	92,374	4,679	7,988	7.976	9.462	9.388	1.19	1.17
55-64	65,657	2,403	4,929	5.669	4.859	5.793	.86	1.02
65-74	47,274	1,093	2,647	4.082	2.210	3.111	.54	.76
75 Over	<u>24,941</u>	<u>308</u>	<u>929</u>	<u>2.154</u>	<u>.622</u>	<u>1.092</u>	<u>.29</u>	<u>.51</u>
TOTAL	<u>567,829</u>	<u>42,801</u>	<u>64,510</u>	<u>49.029%</u>	<u>86.552%</u>	<u>75.816%</u>	<u>1.77</u>	<u>1.55</u>

a. Source: Population - 1960 Census; violations - State Patrol; and accidents - Department of Revenue.

b. The violations reported by the State Patrol are moving violations. Miscellaneous pedestrian violations, over weight vehicle violations, defective vehicle violations, etc., are not included.

Table III

RELATIONSHIP OF THE NUMBER OF FEMALE DRIVERS INVOLVED IN MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS
AND VIOLATIONS TO TOTAL COLORADO POPULATION OVER AGE 16^a

(1) Age of Drivers	(2) Female Population (1960 Census)	(3) No. of Viol. State Patrol ^b	(4) No. Female Drivers All Acc.	(5) Per Cent of Pop. Over Age 16	(6) Per Cent of Total Viol. by Age	(7) Per Cent of Total Acc.	(8) Index of Violations To Age	(9) Index of Accidents To Age
Under 16	---	39	58	---	.07%	.068%	---	---
16	13,235	249	906	1.143%	.504	1.065	.44	.93
17	13,015	291	816	1.124	.588	.959	.52	.85
18-19	24,785	592	1,526	2.140	1.197	1.793	.56	.84
20-24	56,689	1,125	3,084	4.895	2.275	3.624	.46	.74
25-34	117,609	1,557	4,324	10.155	3.149	5.082	.31	.50
35-44	117,125	1,430	4,334	10.113	2,891	5,094	.29	.50
45-54	92,567	852	2,949	7.993	1.723	3.466	.22	.43
55-64	69,340	363	1,708	5.987	.734	2.007	.12	.34
65-74	53,457	125	712	4.616	.253	.837	.05	.18
75 Over	32,488	27	161	2.805	.055	.189	.02	.07
TOTAL	590,310	6,650	20,578	50.971%	13.448%	24.184%	.26	.47

- a. Source: Population - 1960 Census; violations - Colorado State Patrol; and accidents - Colorado Department of Revenue.
b. The violations reported by the Colorado State Patrol are moving violations. Miscellaneous pedestrian violations, over weight vehicle violations, defective vehicle violations, etc., are not included.

An analysis of the time of Colorado motor vehicle accidents, by age groups, is contained in Table IV. Five basic time periods are listed in Table IV along with the numbers and percentages of accidents.

The morning time period (5:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.) is characterized by a smaller per cent of accidents involving 16-year-olds (11.321 per cent) and 17-year-olds (14.347 per cent), compared to over 20 per cent for all ages over 25. Perhaps school attendance accounts for the lower rate for teen-age drivers during the morning period.

According to Table IV, the afternoon period (12:00 noon to 4:00 p.m.) marks a sharp increase in accidents for teen-age drivers. 16 and 17 years old, accounting for over 30 per cent of their accidents; however, the rate does not appear to be out of line with other age groups -- ages 18-19 (26.771 per cent), ages 20-24 (25.650 per cent), ages 25-34 (28.395 per cent), ages 35-44 (31.136 per cent), and ages 45-54 (32.298 per cent). The afternoon period also accounts for a high per cent of accidents of older drivers -- ages 65-74 (42.067 per cent) and ages 75 and over (46.512 per cent).

The evening period (5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.) appears to be a universally high accident period for all age groups. The percentage of accidents for each age group ranges from 26.667 per cent for drivers 75 and older to 31.570 per cent for drivers 55 to 64 years of age.

The time period of 9:00 p.m. to midnight, as listed in Table IV, shows a significantly higher per cent of accidents by the younger age groups. For example, 16-year-old drivers were involved in 21.062 per cent of their total accidents during this period, 17-year-olds (20.190 per cent), 18 to 19-year-olds (18.574 per cent), and after that a steady decrease in the per cent of accidents for older age groups is apparent.

Accidents after midnight account for a significant percentage of accidents for the 20 to 24 year age group -- 12.541 per cent. Other age groups having a significant rate of accidents during this time of the day include: 18-19 years of age -- 11.277 per cent; 25-34 years of age -- 8.665 per cent; 17 years of age -- 6.508 per cent; 35-44 years of age 6.142 per cent; and 16 years of age -- 5.002 per cent.

Time of Violations

The time periods for moving violations reported by the State Patrol for 1963 follow a pattern similar to accidents. For instance, the percentage of violations reported during the morning hours (5:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.) by the State Patrol (See Table V) is significantly less for teen-age drivers -- age 16 (12.028 per cent) and age 17 (14.344 per cent), while the rate for age groups 20 to 44 is close to 20 per cent.

The afternoon period, according to Table V, also presents a sharp increase in the teen-age violation rate. In addition, the violation rate for the evening hours is similar to the accident rates with a large percentage of violations reported for all age groups. The percentage of violations reported for the evening period ranges from 20.854 per cent for ages 65 to 74 to 26.098 per cent for the 35 to 44 age group.

Table IV

TIME OF DAY OF MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS IN COLORADO IN 1963 BY AGE GROUPS^a

Age	All Accidents					Accident Total
	Day		Evening	Night		
	5:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.	12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.	5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.	9:00 p.m. to 12:00 a.m.	1:00 a.m. to 4:00 a.m.	
16 No. of Acc. Per Cent of Acc.	258 11.321%	729 31.988%	698 30.627%	480 21.062%	114 5.002%	2,279 100.00%
17 No. of Acc. Per Cent of Acc.	302 14.347%	635 30.166%	606 28.789%	425 20.190%	137 6.508%	2,105 100.00%
18-19 No. of Acc. Per Cent of Acc.	642 15.209%	1,130 26.771%	1,189 28.169%	784 18.574%	476 11.277%	4,221 100.00%
20-24 No. of Acc. Per Cent of Acc.	1,357 17.121%	2,033 25.650%	2,234 28.186%	1,308 16.502%	994 12.541%	7,926 100.00%
25-34 No. of Acc. Per Cent of Acc.	2,088 20.284%	2,923 28.395%	2,986 29.007%	1,405 13.649%	892 8.665%	10,294 100.00%
35-44 No. of Acc. Per Cent of Acc.	1,722 20.379%	2,631 31.136%	2,479 29.337%	1,099 13.006%	519 6.142%	8,450 100.00%
45-54 No. of Acc. Per Cent of Acc.	1,275 21.754%	1,893 32.298%	1,842 31.428%	616 10.510%	235 4.010%	5,861 100.00%
55-64 No. of Acc. Per Cent of Acc.	790 21.763%	1,287 35.455%	1,146 31.570%	338 9.311%	69 1.901%	3,630 100.00%
65-74 No. of Acc. Per Cent of Acc.	429 22.390%	806 42.067%	536 27.975%	127 6.628%	18 .940%	1,916 100.00%
75 Over No. of Acc. Per Cent of Acc.	140 21.705%	300 46.512%	172 26.667%	30 4.651%	3 .465%	645 100.00%

a. Source: Accident records of the Colorado Department of Revenue.

Table V

TIME OF DAY OF MOTOR VEHICLE VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY THE COLORADO STATE PATROL IN 1963 BY AGE GROUPS^a

Age	Moving Violations					Violations Total
	Day		Evening	Night		
	5:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.	12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.	5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.	9:00 p.m. to 12:00 a.m.	1:00 a.m. to 4:00 a.m.	
16 No. of Violations	226	546	479	561	67	1,879
Per Cent of Violations	12.028%	29.058%	25.492%	29.856%	3.566%	100.00%
17 No. of Violations	316	580	552	661	94	2,203
Per Cent of Violations	14.344%	26.328%	25.057%	30.004%	4.267%	100.00%
18-19 No. of Violations	775	1,262	1,276	1,421	303	5,037
Per Cent of Violations	15.386%	25.055%	25.333%	28.211%	6.015%	100.00%
20-24 No. of Violations	1,818	2,463	2,450	2,521	811	10,063
Per Cent of Violations	18.066%	24.476%	24.347%	25.052%	8.059%	100.00%
25-34 No. of Violations	2,495	3,117	2,844	2,140	730	11,326
Per Cent of Violations	22.029%	27.521%	25.110%	18.895%	6.445%	100.00%
35-44 No. of Violations	2,012	2,660	2,306	1,419	439	8,836
Per Cent of Violations	22.771%	30.104%	26.098%	16.059%	4.968%	100.00%
45-54 No. of Violations	1,303	1,844	1,499	716	167	5,529
Per Cent of Violations	23.567%	33.351%	27.112%	12.950%	3.020%	100.00%
55-64 No. of Violations	728	1,029	714	235	57	2,763
Per Cent of Violations	26.348%	37.242%	25.842%	8.505%	2.063%	100.00%
65-74 No. of Violations	341	530	254	80	13	1,218
Per Cent of Violations	27.997%	43.514%	20.854%	6.568%	1.067%	100.00%
75 Over No. of Violations	98	154	72	9	2	335
Per Cent of Violations	29.254%	45.970%	21.492%	2.687%	.597%	100.00%

a. Source: Accident records of the Colorado State Patrol.

The time period from 9:00 p.m. to midnight appears to be a comparatively high violation period for teen-age drivers. In fact, the per cent of violations reported in Table V, for each age group, decreases after age 20. For instance, the percentage of violations for 16-year-olds for the period 9:00 p.m. to midnight is 29.856 per cent; 17 years (30.004 per cent); 18 to 19 (28.211 per cent); 20-24 years (25.052 per cent); 25-34 years (18.895 per cent); etc.

After midnight, the violation rate drops significantly; however, the per cent of violations by the 20 to 24-year age group is the highest -- 8.059 per cent. As may be noted, the per cent of accidents for the 20-24 age group also is the highest for this time period -- 12.541 per cent.

Contributing Factors -- Accidents

Although the police reports regarding contributing factors of motor vehicle accidents are subjective, for the most part, and may not be entirely reliable, the reports reflect the bad driving habits for various age groups. For instance, of the 12 contributing factors listed in Table VI, three items appear to stand out:

1) For drivers under 24 years, speed is listed most often as a contributing factor to accidents -- 16 years of age (25.134 per cent of all accidents); 17 years of age (26.923 per cent); ages 18 to 19 (25.995 per cent); and 20 to 24 years (22.973 per cent). It also may be noted that after age 17, speed gradually decreases as a factor contributing to accidents.

2) The most significant contributing factor in traffic accidents for drivers ages 25 to 54 is drinking, accounting for 20.626 per cent of accidents in the 25-34 age group; 20.993 per cent of accidents in the 35 to 44 age group; and 19.330 per cent of accidents in the 45 to 54 age segment.

3) Older drivers, ages 55 and up, account for a large percentage of accidents involving failure to yield the right-of-way. The percentage of accidents for failure to yield the right-of-way for older age groups follows: ages 55 to 64 (27.043 per cent); ages 65-74 (33.752 per cent); and ages 75 and up (42.000 per cent).

Types of Violations -- State Patrol

Table VII lists the major types of moving violations reported by the Colorado State Patrol in 1963. In examining Table VII, there appear to be four major areas of violations: 1) speeding; 2) careless or reckless driving; 3) disregard of traffic control devices; and 4) improper passing. These four types of violations account for 73.844 per cent of violations reported. The remaining seven categories -- following too close; improper turn; failed to yield right-of-way; attempt to elude police; driving left of center; drinking; and driving while license suspended -- were responsible for 26.156 per cent of violations reported for 1963.

Table VI

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS IN MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS INVOLVING INJURY AND DEATH IN COLORADO DURING 1963^a

Age	(1) Speed	(2) Failed Yield R/W	(3) Left Center	(4) Imp. Over Taking	(5) Pass Stop Sign	(6) Disregard Traffic Control	(7) Followed Too Close	(8) Imp. Turn	(9) Other	(10) Brakes Inadequate	(11) In. Lights	(12) Drinking	(13) Totals
16 Number of Acc. % of Acc. Each Age	187 25.134%	139 18.683%	53 7.124%	1 .134%	22 2.957%	24 3.226%	60 8.065%	11 1.478%	200 26.882%	23 3.091%	2 .269%	22 2.957%	744 100.00%
17 Number of Acc. % of Acc. Each Age	189 26.923	122 17.379%	45 6.410%	-0- -0-	11 1.567%	12 1.709%	57 8.120%	13 1.852%	200 28.490%	15 2.137%	3 .427%	35 4.986%	702 100.00%
18-19 Number of Acc. % of Acc. Each Age	405 25.995%	179 11.489%	109 6.996%	3 .193%	40 2.567%	51 3.273%	129 8.280%	23 1.476%	380 24.390%	40 2.567%	6 .385	193 12.388	1,558 100.00%
20-24 Number of Acc. % of Acc. Each Age	745 22.973%	339 10.453%	219 6.753%	2 .062%	66 2.035%	118 3.639%	242 7.462%	51 1.573%	802 24.730%	67 2.066%	14 .432	578 17.823%	3,243 100.00%
25-34 Number of Acc. % of Acc. Each Age	559 16.194%	491 14.224%	215 6.228	6 .174%	74 2.144%	100 2.897%	309 8.951%	52 1.506%	845 24.479%	68 1.970%	21 .608%	712 20.626%	3,452 100.00%
35-44 Number of Acc. % of Acc. Each Age	436 15.566%	413 14.745%	161 5.748%	4 .143%	55 1.964%	86 3.070%	275 9.818%	55 1.964%	661 23.599%	52 1.856%	15 .536%	588 20.993%	2,801 100.00%
45-54 Number of Acc. % of Acc. Each Age	230 12.630%	351 19.275%	112 6.150%	2 .110%	57 3.130%	76 4.174%	147 8.072%	37 2.032%	422 23.174%	32 1.757%	3 .165%	352 19.330%	1,821 100.00%
55-64 Number of Acc. % of Acc. Each Age	109 10.603%	278 27.043%	52 5.058%	-0- -0-	44 4.280%	60 5.837%	103 10.019%	23 2.237%	206 20.039%	20 1.946%	8 .778%	125 12.160%	1,028 100.00%
65-74 Number of Acc. % of Acc. Each Age	48 8.618%	188 33.752%	26 4.668%	1 .180%	25 4.488%	36 6.463%	42 7.540%	22 3.950%	132 23.698%	9 1.616%	-0- -0-	28 5.027%	557 100.00%
75 Over Number of Acc. % of Acc. Each Age	18 9.000%	84 42.000%	6 3.000%	2 1.000%	13 6.500%	16 8.000%	10 5.000%	8 4.000%	34 17.000%	2 1.000%	-0- -0-	7 3.500%	200 100.00%
TOTAL	2,926 18.167%	2,584 16.044%	998 6.196%	21 .130%	407 2.527%	579 3.595%	1,374 8.531%	295 1.832%	3,882 24.103%	328 2.037%	72 .447%	2,640 16.391%	16,106 100.00%

a. Source: accident reports of the Colorado Department of Revenue.

Table VII

TYPE OF VIOLATIONS REPORTED BY THE COLORADO STATE PATROL IN 1963^a

Age	Speeding	Follow Too Close	Improper Turn	Failed To Yield R/W	Attempt To Elude Police	Disregard Traffic Control	Left Of Center	Improper Passing	Careless or Reckless Driving	Drinking	Driving While License Suspended	Totals
16 Number of Viol.	467	51	65	105	2	278	128	133	619	6	29	1,883
% Viol. Each Age	24.801%	2.708%	3.452%	5.576%	.106%	14.764%	6.798%	7.063%	32.873%	.319%	1.540%	100.00%
17 Number of Viol.	646	95	78	86	-0-	336	125	134	581	16	70	2,167
% Viol. Each Age	29.811%	4.384%	3.600%	3.969%	-0-	15.505%	5.768%	6.184%	26.811%	.738%	3.230%	100.00%
18-19 Number of Viol.	1,703	172	137	179	4	714	322	443	1,147	61	166	5,048
% Viol. Each Age	33.736%	3.407%	2.714%	3.546%	.079%	14.144%	6.379%	8.776%	22.722%	1.208%	3.289%	100.00%
20-24 Number of Viol.	3,530	365	263	258	6	1,480	705	1,059	1,876	239	292	10,073
% Viol. Each Age	35.044%	3.624%	2.611%	2.561%	.059%	14.693%	6.999%	10.513%	18.624%	2.373%	2.899%	100.00%
25-34 Number of Viol.	3,584	420	368	349	3	1,994	799	1,274	1,811	461	274	11,337
% Viol. Each Age	31.613%	3.705%	3.246%	3.078%	.027%	17.588%	7.048%	11.238%	15.974%	4.066%	2.417%	100.00%
35-44 Number of Viol.	2,386	364	359	314	2	1,461	662	1,002	1,361	627	305	8,843
% Viol. Each Age	26.982%	4.116%	4.060%	3.551%	.023%	16.521%	7.486%	11.331%	15.391%	7.090%	3.449%	100.00%
45-54 Number of Viol.	1,223	213	257	258	-0-	942	516	698	787	475	162	5,531
% Viol. Each Age	22.112%	3.851%	4.646%	4.665%	-0-	17.031%	9.329%	12.620%	14.229%	8.588%	2.929%	100.00%
55-64 Number of Viol.	444	100	196	218	1	489	257	444	365	197	55	2,766
% Viol. Each Age	16.052%	3.615%	7.086%	7.882%	.036%	17.679%	9.291%	16.052%	13.196%	7.122%	1.989%	100.00%
65-74 Number of Viol.	117	39	98	136	-0-	259	142	196	171	48	12	1,218
% Viol. Each Age	9.606%	3.202%	8.046%	11.166%	-0-	21.264%	11.659%	16.092%	14.039%	3.941%	.985%	100.00%
75 Over Number of Viol.	16	12	43	52	-0-	54	39	49	59	5	6	335
% Viol. Each Age	4.776%	3.582%	12.836%	15.522%	-0-	16.119%	11.642%	14.627%	17.612%	1.493%	1.791%	100.00%
TOTAL	14,116	1,831	1,864	1,955	18	8,007	3,695	5,432	8,777	2,135	1,371	49,201
	28.691%	3.722%	3.789%	3.973%	.036%	16.274%	7.510%	11.040%	17.839%	4.339%	2.787%	100.00%

a. Source: records of Colorado State Patrol.