

Thank you Chairman Green, Vice-Chair Greenspan, ranking-member Sheehy and members of the Transportation and Public Safety Committee for allowing me to testify to you today on House Bill 9.

As some of you may be aware, House Bill 154, the bicycle safety bill, passed during lame duck of this past general assembly. I communicated with the bill sponsor, Representative Henne, frequently during the past general assembly because I had a few issues with the bill. I even voted against the bill the first time it was voted out of the House because of those concerns. After the Senate passed it and it came back to the House during the craziness of lame duck, I talked with Rep. Henne again about the changes the Senate made to the bill and voted for concurrence based on my conversations with him.

Because of the craziness of lame duck, I was unaware of a small but significant provision in the language of the bill, which was brought to my attention the next day by constituents in my district and the local media outlets. I was a little surprised to hear my local radio station announced that "we" had passed a law that allows "motorists to run red lights if no one else is around".

I am including with my testimony another media report that I believe makes similar claims.

I guess the problem I have with the legislation is that the language states, "or the signals are otherwise malfunctioning, including the failure of a vehicle detector to detect the vehicle," in the list of requirements for what the driver of a vehicle, streetcar, or trackless trolley should do when approaching an intersection where traffic is controlled by traffic control signals.

This allows the driver of a motorized vehicle, not just a bicycle, to determine if the red light is malfunctioning or not without any visible indicators as mentioned in lines 11,12 and 13 of the bill. I understand that this language is necessary for bicyclists because their weight and the material of the bicycle are not enough to affect the signals in place for the light. However, I do not believe it is safe for a driver of a motorized vehicle, with plenty weight and metal to set off the detection, to determine if the red light is functioning properly when there are no visible cues other than the light is not turning fast enough.

My concern is the precedent we are setting... and I believe the media reports bear me out. Motorists are going to begin to believe that they can pull up to any stop light and as soon as they believe they've waited *long enough*... proceed through the red light. I believe you will agree with me that we live in a *very hurried society*. I can't think of any stop light that changes fast enough for me. In my opinion, I believe there are very few lights that function properly when I am in a hurry. The bottom line is, just like the media reports we have heard, I believe we have created language that will be used as a loophole to use stoplights as stop-signs for automobiles.

My bill would limit the language for non-visible indicators, added at the end of the 131<sup>st</sup> General Assembly, to be used by bicycles only.

Thank you again for hearing my testimony. I am happy to answer any questions from the committee at this time.