

AUGUST 1973 VOLUME 2 NUMBER 1

Traffic Laws Commentary

U.S. Department of Transportation
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Washington, D.C. 20590

RULES of the ROAD RATED



The Commentary series covers,
on a selective basis, the development
and status of state motor vehicle and
traffic laws, particularly as they relate
to provisions in the Uniform Vehicle Code.

17252

Rules of the Road Rated

III

by

Edward F. Kearney

National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances

Prepared for the U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, under Contract No. DOT-HS-107-3-696. The opinions, findings and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

This publication continues the Traffic Laws Commentary series published prior to 1972 by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, Suite 430, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Queries concerning these earlier documents should be directed to the Committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.	1
EXPLANATION OF TABLES	1
CAVEAT VIATOR	2
RANKING OF THE STATES	3
COMMENTS ABOUT THE RANKING.	5
SUMMARY OF 1972 CHANGES IN STATE LAWS	6
DOT REPORT CARD	7
OBSERVATIONS.	8
FOOTNOTES	9
APPENDIX A -- SUMMARY TABLE	
APPENDIX B -- TABLES FOR EACH ARTICLE IN THE CODE	

INTRODUCTION

This Commentary shows how state traffic laws compare with the "Rules of the Road" Chapter of the Uniform Vehicle Code.

The National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances publishes a book showing the status of state traffic laws in comparison with each section, subsection or principle in the "Rules of the Road" Chapter of the Uniform Vehicle Code. Entitled Traffic Laws Annotated (1972), this book contains detailed information about the traffic laws of all states on each rule of the road in the Code in the form of over 150 "Statutory Annotations."^{1/} Perusal of all these Annotations would also provide a general picture of the status of traffic laws in any one state in comparison with the Code and the laws in other jurisdictions. This Commentary attempts to provide a more precise picture of the status of state traffic laws as of January 1, 1973, that will facilitate rapid identification of particular areas of a state's laws that may not be in substantial conformity with the Code, indicate areas of the statutory law where uniformity may be markedly poor on a nationwide basis, and identify states whose traffic laws may need substantial attention on a priority basis as part of contemporary efforts to improve highway safety. This Commentary updates two previous ones published under the same title in 1970 and in 1972.^{2/}

The importance of uniform rules of the highest quality to highway safety efforts is not here restated,^{3/} but it is the conviction of the author of this Commentary that substantial improvement in such uniformity, and the termination of laws that are archaic or that cannot be reasonably expected to improve the safe and efficient use of our highways, are imperative and must occur during upcoming legislative sessions.^{4/}

EXPLANATION OF TABLES

Each "Statutory Annotation" in Traffic Laws Annotated (TLA) was reviewed and state laws were rated in comparison with the Uniform Vehicle Code using the following numbers:

- 5 Law is in verbatim conformity with the Uniform Vehicle Code.
- 4 Law is virtually identical to the Code.
- 3 Law is clearly in substantial conformity with the Code.

- 2 Law is probably in substantial conformity with the Code.
- 1 Law could be in substantial conformity with the Code but such conformity is questionable.
- 0 State has no comparable law.
- 1 Substantial conformity of law is not probable, but is possible.
- 2 Law is probably not in substantial conformity with the Code.
- 3 Law is substantially different from the Code.

Naturally, differences between laws and Code provisions that are unrelated to the rule expressed were not included in the application of the numerical ratings.

These numerical assessments have been arranged in tabular form in Appendix B. There are 13 tables -- one for each article in the "Rules of the Road" Chapter of the Code.^{5/} The names of 50 states and the District of Columbia are listed in the margin and each column is headed by the particular section, subsection or principle in the Code that formed the basis for the TLA's "Statutory Annotation." Occasionally, a figure shown in parentheses, such as (1) or (I), is also included to indicate which portion of a "Statutory Annotation" in Traffic Laws Annotated (1972) formed the basis for the figures in the column. In such instances, TLA should be consulted for further information.^{1/}

The total points for each state in these 13 tables form the basis for the tabular summary in Appendix A.

CAVEAT VIATOR^{6/}

From a mere statement of the above rating system, and its application, the reader should recognize that it is not perfect and that it could be misleading. Clearly, the law cannot be reduced to numbers, so that the totals for each state advanced in this Commentary do not actually paint the precise portrait that might be suggested by the numerical totals.

Also, the ratings used in this Commentary fail to make distinctions based on any relative importance among rules of the road. That is, a law duplicating the Code's rule against riding in house trailers and a law duplicating the Code provision on the duty of a driver making a left turn to yield to oncoming vehicles each receive equal treatment -- plus 5 points. Thus,

if a state duplicates one rule but not the other, its total score would be 5. Though all rules of the road are deemed necessary for highway safety by the National Committee, some contend that certain rules contribute more than others. Certainly, some rules do cover situations encountered more frequently by many people and, for that reason alone, may make a more significant contribution to highway safety -- particularly when they are reasonably uniform.

These ratings may also be unfair to some states because they do not reflect changes approved by state legislatures during 1973. The ratings include changes in the Code approved on November 10-11, 1971, and thus are unfair to some states because they have not had an opportunity to adopt those changes before January 1, 1973, the date before which a law would have to be changed to be reflected in this Commentary. And, as noted in Traffic Laws Annotated, a complete assessment of a state's traffic laws requires consideration of the context of each law and its interpretation by the courts.^{7/} In addition, a low total score should not be allowed to obscure areas where there may be a high degree of uniformity; and a high total score should not be construed as an indication of the absence of one or more significant differences.

Finally, as previously noted, these ratings have been formulated and applied by one person and they represent his opinions.^{4/}

RANKING OF THE STATES

The list which appears below ranks the states according to the total points for each state shown in the Summary Table, infra, in Appendix A.^{8/} Numbers in parentheses are taken from the 1970 and 1972 Commentaries rating state traffic laws.^{2/} Columns have been added showing each state's score and the number of substantial variances from the Code -- these variances are shown in the 13 tables in Appendix B by minus numbers.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Total Points</u>	<u>Number of Substantial Variances</u>
1972(1971)(1969)		1972(1971)(1969)	1972(1971)(1969)
1(1)(7)	Kansas	789(781)(650)	1(1)(3)
2(3)(39)	Maryland	768(759)(306)	2(2)(9)
3(2)(--)	Hawaii ^{9/}	763(763)(---)	2(2)(-)
4(4)(1)	Washington	754(737)(770)	2(2)(2)
5(5)(13)	Florida	734(734)(624)	3(3)(3)

Rank 1972(1971)(1969)	<u>State</u>	<u>Total Points</u> 1972(1971)(1969)	Number of Substantial Variances		Rank 1972(1971)(1969)	<u>State</u>	<u>Total Points</u> 1972(1971)(1969)	Number of Substantial Variances	
			1972(1971)(1969)	1972(1971)(1969)				1972(1971)(1969)	1972(1971)(1969)
6(6)(29)	Texas	726(726)(453)	3(3)(7)		45(44)(49)	Nebraska	277(278)(166)	7(6)(10)	
7(7)(2)	Delaware	712(709)(739)	2(2)(2)		46(45)(42)	Virginia	270(252)(244)	7(11)(13)	
8(8)(5)	New York	684(679)(673)	2(2)(3)		47(46)(44)	Kentucky	249(247)(241)	7(7)(10)	
9(51)(50)	Vermont	683(140)(137)	3(5)(6)		48(47)(43)	Oregon	238(238)(243)	12(12)(11)	
10(9)(12)	Colorado	667(669)(631)	7(7)(6)		49(48)(45)	North Carolina	230(230)(230)	6(6)(4)	
11(10)(6)	New Mexico	663(663)(666)	3(3)(1)		50(49)(46)	Pennsylvania	228(226)(225)	8(8)(9)	
12(11)(14)	Alaska	646(646)(623)	2(2)(5)		51(50)(47)	Massachusetts	208(204)(203)	13(13)(13)	
13(12)(3)	Montana	645(645)(680)	3(3)(3)						
14(13)(11)	Arizona	642(638)(633)	3(3)(4)						
15(14)(8)	Idaho	621(625)(647)	5(5)(7)						
16(15)(20)	Illinois	621(621)(582)	4(4)(6)						
17(16)(9)	New Hampshire	618(618)(647)	5(5)(6)						
18(17)(21)	Utah	617(617)(582)	6(6)(6)						
19(18)(4)	Wyoming	617(617)(679)	6(6)(2)						
20(20)(10)	Oklahoma	599(590)(641)	5(5)(5)						
21(19)(17)	South Carolina	598(598)(596)	5(5)(4)						
22(22)(19)	Rhode Island	578(578)(584)	5(5)(5)						
23(21)(15)	West Virginia	577(582)(619)	5(4)(4)						
24(23)(16)	Tennessee	576(576)(613)	5(5)(5)						
25(24)(23)	Minnesota	560(560)(560)	4(4)(4)						
26(25)(18)	North Dakota	549(549)(585)	3(3)(3)						
27(27)(26)	Louisiana	547(529)(510)	4(5)(3)						
28(26)(22)	Nevada	546(546)(565)	5(5)(5)						
29(28)(24)	Indiana	528(528)(544)	7(7)(6)						
30(29)(25)	Georgia	512(517)(520)	2(2)(2)						
31(30)(38)	South Dakota	494(494)(315)	6(6)(7)						
32(31)(27)	District of Columbia	474(470)(492)	3(3)(2)						
33(32)(28)	Arkansas	444(444)(477)	8(8)(8)						
34(33)(31)	California	439(439)(414)	4(4)(4)						
35(34)(30)	Wisconsin	428(426)(420)	5(5)(6)						
36(36)(34)	Maine	413(410)(409)	5(5)(6)						
37(35)(33)	Michigan	411(411)(411)	9(9)(10)						
38(37)(35)	Ohio	389(389)(378)	4(4)(6)						
39(38)(32)	Alabama	387(387)(411)	5(5)(6)						
40(39)(41)	Connecticut	345(345)(296)	8(8)(11)						
41(40)(40)	Iowa	345(345)(299)	10(10)(11)						
42(41)(37)	New Jersey	326(321)(326)	11(12)(12)						
43(42)(36)	Mississippi	319(319)(353)	7(7)(9)						
44(43)(48)	Missouri	283(279)(174)	10(10)(8)						

COMMENTS ABOUT THE RANKING

There are 213 columns in the 13 tables in Appendix B. If a state had laws in verbatim conformity (5 points) with each point of comparison in the Code, it would have a total score of 1065. Because the highest score is 789(Kansas), it is clear that no state traffic code duplicates every rule of the road in the Code as revised in 1971.

There are two principal reasons why a state's total score might be greater or less than it was in a prior rating -- changes in state laws and changes in the Uniform Vehicle Code.

Changes in state laws. A state may have amended one or more laws during the four years 1969-1972 and thereby altered its total score. For instance, the eight states registering gains in excess of 100 points (Florida, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Nebraska, South Dakota, Texas and Vermont) amended a significant number of laws to be in substantial agreement with the Code. However, some jurisdictions adopted amendments that do not conform with the Code and their total score decreased. Naturally, some states adopted nonconforming amendments and provisions from the Code.

Changes in the Code. Another important reason accounting for a different total score between the first two ratings involves changes in the Uniform Vehicle Code that were approved by the National Committee in November of 1971. In some instances, changes in the Code resulted in a decrease, particularly in states that had not offset the decrease by adopting conforming amendments.

The 1970 ratings indicated that there were 303 instances where a traffic law differed in some substantial way from a provision in the Code. This number was reduced to 275 as of January 1, 1972 and to 269 as of January 1, 1973. All states continue to have at least one. The 11 jurisdictions where the number of substantial variances increased during the last four years are: Colorado, Indiana, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, West Virginia, Wyoming and the District of Columbia.

Though all such substantial differences warrant consideration and reevaluation, it is possible that a few may be justified as being reasonably calculated to improve safe and efficient movement of traffic. However, this principle will not excuse the continuation of archaic, obsolete, nonuniform rules that cannot reasonably be found to provide such benefits, and the burden of justifying any difference rests with those advocating it.

Needless to say, this emphasis on substantial differences should not obscure the vastly larger number of instances where there is similarity. In the 213 columns in Appendix B, there are 10,863 points of comparison and these produced 269 variances (in the 1970 rating there were 303 variances in 10,250 comparisons).

SUMMARY OF 1972 CHANGES IN STATE LAWS

Vermont adopted a new traffic code in 1972 and moved from 51st in the 1972 ranking to 9th in this ranking. Its point total went from 140 to 683, an increase of 583 points! It also reduced its total number of substantial differences with the Code from five to three.

Virginia eliminated four substantial differences with the Code. Louisiana and New Jersey each eliminated one.

Unfortunately, Nebraska and West Virginia each added one substantial difference by adopting a rule that differs from a UVC rule.

As a result of 1972 legislation, the total scores changed in 23 jurisdictions. Because the total went up in 18¹⁰/ and down in only five,¹¹/ there was some movement toward greater uniformity based on the Uniform Vehicle Code during 1972.

DOT REPORT CARD

The ratings in this document apparently do not agree with findings in a 1972 Report Card issued by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.¹²/ The Report Card was to have been an annual evaluation of state highway safety programs. Under the portion dealing with "Codes and Laws," a perfect score of 100 was given to 40 states while, in this Commentary, no state is given a perfect score.

The two ratings are different because they assess different things. This Commentary rates conformity with the "Rules of the Road" portion of the Uniform Vehicle Code while the DOT Report Card assesses compliance with the Highway Safety Program Standard on "Codes and Laws" which contemplates that each state will have an approved plan to achieve intrastate and interstate uniformity.¹³/

However, there is one aspect of the Report Card that should be noted. The 11 jurisdictions that did not receive a perfect score of 100, and their scores in this Commentary are as follows:

	DOT Report Card	This Commentary
Perfect score	100	1065
Alabama	0	387
Alaska	80	646
California	0	439
Kentucky	80	249
Massachusetts	0	208
Missouri	80	283
North Carolina	20	230
Ohio	20	389
Pennsylvania	80	228
Vermont	0	683
District of Columbia	80	475

It should be a matter of some concern that any state with a score under 426¹⁴/ does not have an approved program for achieving uniformity and may not be studying its traffic laws. Of course, as previously noted, Vermont in 1972 modernized its traffic laws based on recent editions of the Uniform Vehicle Code and it apparently did not have a "Codes and Laws" plan approved by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

OBSERVATIONS

One of the principal reasons for publication of the 1970 and 1972 ratings was to stimulate consideration and elimination of major differences between state laws and the Code. Though many states made significant advances toward uniformity during 1969-1972, 269 substantial differences still remain. Particularly in view of the fact that 139 of these differences involve traffic control devices (Table II in Appendix B) and right of way (Table IV in Appendix B), this number is too high. All substantial differences should be eliminated on a priority basis by each state as soon as possible unless the difference can be clearly justified as improving safe and efficient movement of traffic.

Another disappointment is the failure of 16 states with total scores of less than 426 to make more significant progress toward uniformity.^{14/} Not only are the total scores in these 16 states low, but these states account for almost half of all substantial differences. Three encouraging developments in this regard were significant changes in the laws of Maryland, South Dakota and Vermont resulting in their moving up from the last 16 states in the rankings.

Most states with low scores are located in the eastern half of the United States and several are in areas where millions of tourists will visit during the next few years in celebration of the American Revolution Bicentennial. For instance, Massachusetts is rated as having more substantial variances (13) than any other single state and, as noted in the 1970 Commentary,^{2/} is the only state whose traffic laws have never been closely patterned after any edition of the Code published between 1926 and 1972. Some Massachusetts traffic laws should be regarded as an affront to reason and as a national disgrace concerning all highway users and officials.

Legislators in states with scores of less than 426 should be informed that their laws appear to be nonuniform, obsolete and in need of modernization based upon the most recent edition of the Uniform Vehicle Code. Legislators in these states probably do not know about the condition of their traffic laws and cannot be expected to take action without knowledge of the problem.

FOOTNOTES

1/ Traffic Laws Annotated (1972, 851 pages) annotates Chapters 1, 10, 11 and 15 of the Uniform Vehicle Code relating to definitions, accidents, rules of the road, scope of traffic ordinances and uniformity among traffic-control devices. This book replaces Uniform Vehicle Code: Rules of the Road with Statutory Annotations (1967, and 1970 Annual Supplement). Traffic Laws Annotated includes state laws adopted or amended prior to January 1, 1972, and reflects all changes made in the Uniform Vehicle Code in 1971.

The "1973 Annual Supplement" updates TLA through January 1, 1973 by showing how 1972 amendments in state traffic laws changed the annotations in the main volume.

Copies of the TLA volume (\$15.00) and its supplement (\$2.50) can be obtained from the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, Suite 430, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

2/ "Rules of the Road Rated," Traffic Laws Commentary No. 70-6 (July 1, 1970, 15 pages). Copies can be obtained for \$3.00 from the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, Suite 430, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. This rating was based upon state traffic laws adopted prior to January 1, 1969.

"Rules of the Road Rated," Traffic Laws Commentary, volume 1, number 2 (August, 1972, 10 pages). Copies can be obtained from the United States Government Printing Office for \$.40 (Stock No. 5003-00079). This rating was based upon state traffic laws adopted prior to January 1, 1972.

This document is based on laws adopted prior to January 1, 1973.

3/ See "The Importance of Uniform Traffic Laws" in the Appendix to Traffic Laws Annotated (1972).

4/ The author and person exclusively responsible for the preparation of all portions of this Commentary is Edward F. Kearney, Executive Director of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances since May 25, 1967, and its Director of Research for four years prior to that time.

5/ A table for the annotations covering Chapter 11 Article XIV on Streetcars in the Uniform Vehicle Code is not included.

6/ This Latin phrase means, "let the wayfarer beware," and has been used as a concise expression of the duty of a highway traveler to use due care to detect and avoid defects in the way.

7/ See "Explanatory Notes on Organization and Use of the TLA" in Traffic Laws Annotated (1972).

8/ States with the same total score are listed alphabetically.

9/ Hawaii was not included in the 1970 rating cited in footnote 2, supra, because it did not have many state traffic laws and was not included in Uniform Vehicle Code: Rules of the Road with Statutory Annotations (1967). Since publication of the 1970 rating, however, Hawaii adopted a statewide traffic law and is included both in Traffic Laws Annotated (1972) and in this rating.

10/ The 18 jurisdictions whose total scores increased in this rating are: Arizona, Delaware, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin and the District of Columbia.

11/ The five states whose total scores decreased in this rating are: Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Nebraska and West Virginia.

12/ A copy of the DOT "Report Card" appears in 7 Status Report No. 8 (April 24, 1972) published by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.

13/ The "Codes and Laws" Standard issued under the Highway Safety Act of 1966 provides as follows:

Each State shall develop and implement a program to achieve uniformity of traffic codes and laws throughout the State. The program shall provide at least that:

I. There is a plan to achieve uniform rules of the road in all of its jurisdictions.

II. There is a plan to make the State's unified rules of the road consistent with similar unified plans of other States. Toward this end, each State shall undertake and maintain continuing comparisons of all State and local laws, statutes and ordinances with the comparable provisions of the Rules of the Road section of the Uniform Vehicle Code. 33 Federal Register 16562 (Nov. 14, 1968).

14/ The significance of a score of 426 is this: If a state had a law that probably is in substantial conformity with the Code (2 points) in each of the 213 columns in the tables in Appendix B, it would have a total score of 426. In other words, if a state conforms substantially with each rule of the road in the 1971 Code, it would have a total score of at least 426.

APPENDIX A -- SUMMARY TABLE

This Table contains the total scores shown in the 13 Tables
in Appendix B.

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	Total
UVC	50	115	180	65	125	65	70	75	45	45	90	70	70	1065
Ala.	13	35	66	20	62	39	12	18	8	7	39	61	7	387
Alaska	35	93	153	29	59	44	50	25	11	22	42	48	35	646
Ariz.	41	84	121	30	62	39	45	49	23	26	42	60	20	642
Ark.	29	37	95	22	40	40	36	42	20	18	48	4	13	444
Cal.	33	48	100	16	49	26	34	23	19	19	34	30	8	439
Colo.	27	92	143	17	70	45	39	25	25	18	63	46	57	667
Conn.	20	52	68	22	13	36	17	7	15	12	32	29	22	345
Del.	44	97	135	34	77	48	51	42	21	22	60	59	22	712
Fla.	38	103	155	31	76	52	35	32	12	22	62	51	65	734
Ga.	35	62	129	21	54	37	33	33	16	20	34	0	38	512
Hawaii	38	105	177	50	84	51	50	13	18	4	52	64	57	763
Idaho	42	57	123	39	69	43	34	42	22	18	48	69	15	621
Ill.	41	67	140	40	70	39	38	38	24	25	59	19	21	621
Ind.	45	39	104	14	64	34	25	39	10	16	44	48	46	528
Iowa	27	27	53	27	32	28	15	30	12	12	34	5	43	345
Kan.	45	110	140	42	81	49	54	39	24	28	61	49	67	789
Ky.	19	8	37	7	38	25	15	24	14	11	27	5	19	249
La.	35	40	106	42	63	38	31	23	10	17	33	47	62	547
Me.	7	79	81	11	51	37	22	25	14	10	33	25	18	413
Md.	47	108	145	32	79	48	37	31	24	22	63	64	68	768
Mass.	11	20	33	-7	29	9	25	7	12	10	26	19	14	208
Mich.	28	39	91	22	8	14	23	30	14	13	41	66	22	411
Minn.	24	99	99	30	53	29	26	30	16	13	46	49	46	560
Miss.	32	22	83	9	41	30	18	15	12	11	41	5	0	319
Mo.	15	100	58	26	2	24	17	17	12	2	6	-1	5	283
Mont.	38	62	127	27	67	44	51	49	19	18	58	52	33	645
Neb.	9	5	53	33	77	22	8	20	19	8	15	2	6	277
Nev.	30	74	81	20	54	30	38	24	14	18	54	69	40	546
N.H.	26	104	136	33	70	49	41	41	10	20	53	1	34	618
N.J.	17	30	56	-3	47	24	31	13	13	11	16	46	25	326
N.M.	46	70	129	34	70	39	48	47	20	18	60	67	15	663
N.Y.	30	90	134	36	77	46	32	20	15	21	60	63	60	684
N.C.	22	6	56	12	48	9	20	21	11	8	10	4	3	230
N.D.	29	64	118	37	61	43	50	27	10	16	46	39	9	549
Ohio	11	52	84	24	41	36	19	20	15	15	24	29	19	389
Okla.	42	54	122	36	69	44	33	43	14	18	44	64	16	599
Ore.	6	35	43	9	26	22	20	16	15	8	25	7	6	238
Pa.	13	18	39	19	15	13	20	21	9	12	21	2	26	228
R.I.	44	44	104	37	64	44	43	33	12	17	42	69	25	578
S.C.	45	51	114	15	64	40	21	62	16	18	28	62	62	598
S.D.	20	68	92	36	10	29	43	42	18	27	50	4	55	494
Tenn.	39	56	119	23	66	37	45	34	13	17	42	68	17	576
Tex.	42	96	137	45	75	50	39	45	24	27	70	64	12	726
Utah	40	60	117	24	75	40	42	27	25	18	42	56	51	617
Vt.	20	96	144	46	62	35	43	20	23	26	64	59	45	683
Va.	14	22	58	11	20	24	22	25	12	12	31	9	10	270
Wash.	47	101	159	46	71	48	50	34	22	22	60	64	30	754
W.Va.	40	51	114	20	58	39	48	37	21	18	42	69	20	577
Wis.	33	35	78	25	25	32	31	25	9	19	28	55	33	428
Wyo.	46	69	112	36	60	43	46	53	15	18	45	69	5	617
D.C.	30	63	99	23	51	47	16	17	9	10	51	41	17	474

APPENDIX B -- TABLES FOR EACH ARTICLE IN THE CODE

Table I -- Obedience to and Effect of Traffic Laws

Table II -- Traffic Signs, Signals and Markings

	\$ 11-201(a)	\$ 11-201(b)	\$ 11-201(c)	\$ 11-201(d)	\$ 11-202	\$ 11-202(a) 1	\$ 11-202(a) 2	\$ 11-202(a) 3	\$ 11-202(b) 1	\$ 11-202(c) 2	\$ 11-202(c) 3	\$ 11-202(d)	Total
UVC	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	115
Ala.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	-2	2	0	-2	5
Alaska	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	2	-3	5
Ariz.	5	4	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	-3	5	-2	5
Ark.	3	0	0	0	2	5	1	1	-2	2	-1	-2	5
Cal.	2	0	5	5	2	5	2	1	5	5	2	-3	5
Colo.	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	2	-3	5
Conn.	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	-2	5	0	5	0	5
Del.	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	103
Fla.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	62
Ga.	3	0	0	0	2	5	1	2	1	5	5	5	105
Hawaii	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	57
Idaho	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	-2	2	0	-2	5
Ill.	3	5	0	0	5	1	1	1	5	5	-2	2	4
Ind.	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	-2	-2	5	5	2
Iowa	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	-2	-2	5	0	27
Kan.	5	5	5	5	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	110
Ky.	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
La.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	-2	2	0	0	40
Me.	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	79
Md.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	108
Mass.	2	0	0	0	5	2	-1	1	-2	3	1	0	20
Mich.	3	0	0	0	5	5	1	-2	-2	2	0	-2	39
Minn.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	99
Miss.	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	-2	-2	0	0	0	22
Mo.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	100
Mont.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	-2	2	1	0	62
Neb.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Nev.	3	5	2	4	5	5	2	3	3	1	-3	4	74
N.H.	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	104
N.J.	3	0	0	0	5	-1	1	2	-2	2	1	-1	30
N.M.	5	4	0	0	5	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	70
N.Y.	3	4	5	5	5	4	3	5	3	5	5	5	90
N.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
N.D.	5	4	5	5	2	5	1	1	-2	5	5	5	64
Ohio	3	3	0	0	5	1	2	2	2	5	1	-1	52
Okla.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	-2	2	5	2	54
Ore.	3	0	0	0	2	5	1	2	-2	5	0	0	35
Pa.	2	0	0	0	5	2	1	0	-2	0	0	2	18
R.I.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	-2	2	0	-2	44
S.C.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	-2	2	0	-2	51
S.D.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	2	-2	5	5	68
Tenn.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	-2	2	1	-1	56
Tex.	5	5	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	96
Utah	5	5	5	2	1	1	1	-2	1	-3	2	5	60
Vt.	3	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	96
Va.	1	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	-1	5	0	0	22
Wash.	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	101
W.Va.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	-2	2	0	0	51
Wis.	2	0	0	0	5	2	1	1	-2	2	0	0	35
Wyo.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	-2	2	0	0	69
D.C.	3	4	0	0	2	5	3	2	5	-2	2	0	63

Table III - Driving on Right Side of Roadway - Overtaking & Passing - Use of Roadway

	\$ 11-301(a)	\$ 11-301(b)	\$ 11-301(c)	\$ 11-301(d)	\$ 11-302	\$ 11-303(a)	\$ 11-303(b)	\$ 11-304(a)	\$ 11-304(b)	\$ 11-305	\$ 11-306(a)	\$ 11-306(b)
UVC	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Ala.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	2	2	1	1	1
Alaska	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Ariz.	5	4	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Ark.	3	0	0	0	2	5	1	1	1	1	1	1
Cal.	2	0	5	5	2	5	1	1	1	1	1	1
Colo.	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Conn.	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5
Del.	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Fla.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Ga.	3	0	0	0	2	5	1	2	1	1	1	1
Hawaii	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Idaho	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ill.	3	5	0	0	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ind.	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Iowa	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Kan.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Ky.	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
La.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	1	1	1	1
Me.	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Md.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mass.	2	0	0	0	5	-1	1	-2	2	0	0	0
Mich.	3	0	0	0	5	1	-2	2	0	0	0	0
Minn.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Miss.	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	-2	2	0	0	0
Mo.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mont.	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	1	1	1	1	1
Neb.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nev.	3	5	2	4	5	5	2	3	1			

Table III - Continued

Table IV -- Right of Way

Table V -- Pedestrians' Rights and Duties

Table V -- Continued

UVC	5	5	§ 11-506(a)
Ala.	3	1	§ 11-506(b)
Alaska	3	1	§ 11-506(c)
Ariz.	3	1	§ 11-506(d)
Ark.	0	0	
Cal.	0	0	
Colo.	0	0	
Conn.	0	0	
Del.	3	1	
Fla.	3	2	
Ga.	3	1	
Hawaii	3	1	
Idaho	3	1	
Ill.	3	1	
Ind.	3	1	
Iowa	0	0	
Kan.	3	1	
Ky.	0	0	
La.	3	1	
Me.	3	1	
Md.	3	2	
Mass.	3	3	
Mich.	3	0	
Minn.	3	0	
Miss.	0	0	
Mo..	0	0	
Mont.	3	1	
Neb.	0	0	
Nev.	3	0	
N.H.	3	1	
N.J.	3	1	
N.M.	3	1	
N.Y.	3	1	
N.C.	0	0	
N.D.	3	1	
Ohio	3	0	
Okla.	3	1	
Ore.	0	0	
Pa.	0	0	
R.I.	3	1	
S.C.	3	1	
S.D.	0	1	
Tenn.	3	1	
Tex.	3	1	
Utah	3	1	
Vt.	3	1	
Va.	2	3	
Wash.	3	1	
W.Va.	3	1	
Wis.	0	0	
Wyo.	3	1	
D.C.	3	1	

Table VI -- Turning and Starting and Signals on Stopping and Turning

	§ 11-601(a)	§ 11-601(b)	§ 11-601(c)	§ 11-602(a)	§ 11-602(b)	§ 11-603	§ 11-604(a)	§ 11-604(b)	§ 11-604(c)	§ 11-604(d)	Total
UVC	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	5	65
Ala.	4	4	4	4	2	2	5	3	3	3	39
Alaska	4	4	4	4	2	3	5	0	0	0	44
Ariz.	4	4	4	4	1	0	5	5	5	5	39
Ark.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Cal.	4	4	4	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	36
Colo.	4	4	4	4	2	2	5	4	4	4	40
Conn.	2	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	36
Del.	4	4	4	2	3	3	5	5	5	5	45
Fla.	4	4	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	52
Ga.	4	4	2	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	37
Hawaii	4	4	3	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	51
Idaho	4	4	2	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	43
Ill.	4	4	3	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	39
Ind.	4	4	1	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	34
Iowa	4	4	1	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	28
Kan.	4	4	3	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	49
Ky.	-1	1	1	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	25
La.	4	4	2	2	3	0	5	5	5	5	38
Me.	4	4	2	2	3	3	5	5	5	5	48
Md.	5	5	1	1	3	0	5	5	5	5	9
Mass.	1	1	1	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	14
Mich.	4	4	1	2	3	0	5	5	5	5	29
Minn.	4	4	2	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	30
Miss.	4	4	1	1	3	0	5	5	5	5	24
Mo.	4	4	1	1	3	0	5	5	5	5	44
Mont.	4	4	2	2	3	0	5	5	5	5	22
Neb.	4	4	3	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	30
Nev.	4	4	2	2	3	0	5	5	5	5	49
N.H.	4	4	2	2	3	0	5	5	5	5	24
N.J.	4	4	2	2	3	0	5	5	5	5	39
N.M.	4	4	2	2	3	0	5	5	5	5	46
N.Y.	4	4	2	2	3	0	5	5	5	5	43
N.D.	1	1	3	1	0	0	5	5	5	5	36
N.D.	4	4	2	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	44
Ohio	4	4	2	2	3	0	5	5	5	5	22
Okla.	4	4	1	1	3	0	5	5	5	5	13
Ore.	1	1	1	1	0	0	5	5	5	5	44
Pa.	1	1	1	1	0	0	5	5	5	5	40
R.I.	4	4	2	2	3	0	5	5	5	5	29
S.C.	4	4	2	2	3	0	5	5	5	5	37
S.D.	1	3	1	1	0	0	5	5	5	5	50
Tenn.	4	4	2	2	3	0	5	5	5	5	40
Tex.	4	4	3	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	35
Utah	4	4	2	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	24
Vt.	4	4	2	0	0	2	5	5	5	5	24
Va.	4	4	2	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	48
Wash.	4	4	3	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	39
W.Va.	4	4	2	3	3	0	5	5	5	5	32
Wis.	5	4	3	3	0	1	5	5	5	5	43
Wyo.	4	2	3	3	0	1	5	5	5	5	47
D.C.	4	1	3	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	

Table VII -- Special Stops Required

	§ 11-701(a)	§ 11-701(b)	§ 11-702	§ 11-703(a)	§ 11-703(b)	§ 11-703(c)	§ 11-704	§ 11-705	§ 11-706(a)(1)	§ 11-706(a)(2)	§ 11-706(a)(3)	§ 11-706(a)(4)	§ 11-706(b)	§ 11-706(c)	§ 11-706(d)	Total
UVC	5	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Ala.	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	50
Alaska	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	45
Ariz.	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	36
Ark.	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	34
Cal.	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	39
Colo.	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	51
Conn.	2	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	35
Del.	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	33
Fla.	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	50
Ga.	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	34
Hawaii	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	34
Idaho	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	38
Ill.	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	15
Ind.	4	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	54
Iowa	4	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	15
Kan.	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	15
Ky.	-1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
La.	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	15
Me.	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	15
Md.	5	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	25
Mass.	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	25
Mich.	4	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	18
Minn.	4	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	17
Miss.	4	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	17
Mo.	4	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	17
Mont.	4	2	3	3	3	3										

Table VIII -- Speed Restrictions

	\$ 11-801	\$ 11-801.1	\$ 11-801.11	\$ 11-801.111	\$ 11-802	\$ 11-803	\$ 11-804(a)	\$ 11-804(b)	\$ 11-805	\$ 11-806(a)	\$ 11-806(b)	\$ 11-806(c)-(e)	\$ 11-807(a)	\$ 11-807(b)	\$ 11-808	Total
UVC	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	75
Ala.	2	-1	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	1	18
Alaska	3	3	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	25
Ariz.	3	-2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	3	49
Ark.	3	-1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Cal.	2	-1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	23
Colo.	3	-2	1	1	0	0	0	-1	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	25
Conn.	2	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	7
Del.	3	5	2	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	42
Fla.	3	5	2	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	32
Ga.	3	5	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Hawaii	3	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	13
Idaho	3	-1	2	5	5	0	0	3	3	2	2	2	2	0	0	42
Ill.	3	5	5	5	0	0	1	3	3	5	5	5	5	0	0	38
Ind.	3	5	5	5	0	0	5	3	2	5	5	5	5	0	0	39
Iowa	2	5	1	1	5	5	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Kan.	3	5	1	1	5	5	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Ky.	1	5	2	1	5	5	5	1	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	24
La.	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	23
Me.	1	5	2	2	0	0	-1	1	1	1	5	3	2	0	0	25
Md.	3	5	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	2	2	0	0	31
Mass.	2	-2	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Mich.	1	-1	2	2	5	5	5	1	1	2	3	2	2	0	0	30
Minn.	3	-1	5	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	2	2	0	0	30
Miss.	1	5	0	0	5	5	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Mo.	1	5	0	0	5	5	5	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	17
Mont.	2	5	5	5	0	0	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	49
Neb.	3	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	2	0	0	20
Nev.	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	5	5	0	0	24
N.H.	2	-1	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	5	5	5	0	0	41
N.J.	1	-2	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	13
N.M.	1	5	2	2	5	5	5	3	1	5	2	2	2	0	0	47
N.Y.	2	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	5	2	2	2	0	0	20
N.C.	2	5	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	21
N.D.	1	5	2	2	5	5	5	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	27
Ohio	1	-2	1	1	5	5	5	2	1	3	2	2	2	0	0	20
Okla.	2	5	0	0	5	5	5	3	3	5	2	2	2	0	0	43
Ore.	1	-1	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	16
Pa.	1	5	2	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	21
R.I.	3	-2	2	2	5	5	5	3	2	5	5	5	5	0	0	33
S.C.	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	62
S.D.	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	1	5	2	2	2	0	0	42
Tenn.	0	5	0	0	5	5	5	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	34
Tex.	3	-2	5	5	0	0	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	0	0	45
Utah	3	-2	2	2	5	5	5	2	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	27
Vt.	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Va.	1	5	2	2	0	0	1	1	5	3	3	3	3	0	0	25
Wash.	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	34
W.Va.	3	5	2	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	37
Wis.	3	5	1	1	5	5	5	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	25
Wyo.	1	5	5	5	5	0	0	5	4	5	5	5	4	0	0	53
D.C.	3	5	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	17

Table IX -- Serious Traffic Offenses

Table X -- Stopping, Standing and Parking

Table XI -- Miscellaneous Rules

Table XII -- Operation of Bicycles and Play Vehicles

Table XIII -- Special Rules for Motorcycles

NOTES

END