

**BALLOT MEASURE 37 (CHAPTER 1, OREGON LAWS 2005)
CLAIM FOR COMPENSATION**

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF LAND CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Final Staff Report and Recommendation

July 25, 2005

STATE CLAIM NUMBER: M119633

NAME OF CLAIMANTS: David and Pamela Franzen

MAILING ADDRESS: 28405 Salmon River Highway
PO Box 86
Grande Ronde, Oregon 97347

IDENTIFICATION OF PROPERTY: Township 6S, Range 8W, Section 12DC
Tax Lots 1400, 1700 and 1800
Polk County

DATE RECEIVED BY DAS: February 7, 2005

180-DAY DEADLINE: August 6, 2005

I. CLAIM

David and Pamela Franzen, the claimants, seek compensation in the amount of \$460,000 for the reduction in fair market value as a result of certain land use regulations that are alleged to restrict the use of certain private real property. The claimants desire compensation or the right to build a diner, retail, storage, and other uses allowed by the commercial zone that applied to the property at the time of purchase. The property subject to this claim contains 1.3-acres located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Oregon State Highway 18 and Grande Ronde Road in western Polk County. (See claim.)

II. SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth below, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (the department) has determined that the claim is not valid because the regulation and laws that are the subject of this claim restrict and prohibit the use of the property for the protection of public health and safety, and such regulations are exempt from claims under Section 3(B) of Measure 37.

III. COMMENTS ON THE CLAIM

Comments Received

On March 15, 2005, pursuant to OAR 125-145-0080, the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS) provided written notice to the owners of surrounding properties. According to DAS, only one of the claimants, David Franzen, commented, requesting that he be included on the mailing list.

IV. TIMELINESS OF CLAIM

Requirement

Ballot Measure 37, Section 5, requires that a written demand for compensation be made:

1. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted prior to the effective date of the measure (December 2, 2004), within two years of that effective date or the date the public entity applies the land use regulation as an approval criteria to an application submitted by the owner, whichever is later; or
2. For claims arising from land use regulations enacted after the effective date of the measure (December 2, 2004), within two years of the enactment of the land use regulation, or the date the owner of the property submits a land use application in which the land use regulation is an approval criteria, whichever is later.

Findings of Fact

The claim was submitted to DAS on January 27, 2005 for processing under OAR 125, division 145. The claim alleges that a “trip cap” Limited Use Overlay Zone, adopted by Polk County on May 2, 2001 (Ordinance #01-2), restricts the use of the property as the basis for this claim. Only laws that were enacted prior to December 2, 2004, the effective date of Measure 37, are the basis for this claim. (See citations of statutory and administrative rule history of the Oregon Revised Statutes and Oregon Administrative Rules.)

Conclusions

The claim has been submitted within two years of December 2, 2004, the effective date of Measure 37, based on land use regulations enacted prior to December 2, 2004, and is therefore timely filed.

V. ANALYSIS OF CLAIM

1. Ownership

Ballot Measure 37 provides for payment of compensation or relief from specific laws for “owners” as that term is defined in the Measure. Ballot Measure 37, Section 11(C) defines “owner” as “the present owner of the property, or any interest therein.”

Findings of Fact

According to the claim, David and Pamela Franzen, the claimants, acquired the subject property on February 10, 1998. (See copy of deed in department claim file; Polk County Deed Records Book 348 Page 1893.)

The department obtained a copy of a title report from the Polk County Planning Division’s claim file showing chain of title and certifying that the 1998 transfer to the claimants was the last transfer of title made on the subject property.

Conclusions

The claimants, David & Pamela Franzen, are the “owners” of the subject 1.3-acre property as that term is defined by Section 11(C) of Measure 37.

2. The Laws that are the Basis for the Claim

In order to establish a valid claim, Section 1 of Ballot Measure 37 requires, in part, that a law must restrict the claimant’s use of private real property in a manner that reduces the fair market value of the property relative to how the property could have been used at the time the claimant or a family member acquired the property.

Findings of Fact

The claim alleges that a “trip cap” Limited Use Overlay Zone, adopted by Polk County on May 2, 2001 (Ordinance #01-2), restricts the use of the property as the basis for this claim. The claimants desire compensation or the right to build a diner, retail, storage, and other uses allowed by the commercial zone that applied to the property at the time of purchase.

The claim is based on the following specific provision (“trip cap”) that was applied to the all residential, commercial and industrial zoned properties having direct access on to Highway 18, including the claimants’ property (Section 9, Ordinance #01-02):

“That Polk County adopts a Limited Use Overlay Area (/LUB), as shown on Exhibit “I”, to limit the development of uses that create traffic levels above the following:

a) In residential zones, ten (10) average daily trips as per the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation, 6th Edition, 1997; and

b) In commercial and industrial zones, ten (10) trips per acre per day with a maximum of 100 trips per day.

The Limited Use Overlay Area (/LUB) shall remain in effect until such time as Polk County adopts the H.B. Van Duzer Forest Corridor to Steel Bridge Corridor Refinement Plan and the transportation facilities analysis (OAR 660-012-0030(7) is completed, or transportation improvements are provided to Oregon Highway 18 that provide for additional use.”

The subject property is 1.3-acres in size and zoned to allow commercial uses. Under the trip cap described above, the claimants’ use of the subject property is limited to a commercial use or uses that do not exceed 10 or 11 vehicle trips per day. That restriction limits the type of commercial uses allowed on the subject property until such time as the county adopts a refinement plan completes the facilities analysis or the necessary improvements are provided to serve the additional use.

The claimants purchased the property in 1998 when it was zoned for commercial uses without the trip cap overlay. However, in 1998, all lands zoned for commercial and industrial uses located outside an urban growth boundary were under the state’s mandate for local governments to update comprehensive plans and land use regulations under periodic review. In this case, this required Polk County to address a 1986 Supreme Court decision interpreting Statewide Planning Goal 14.¹ To comply with part of the periodic review obligations, Polk County applied the provisions of the unincorporated community rule (OAR 660, division 22) to lands in and around the Grand Ronde area, including the claimants’ property located at the intersection of Highway 18 and the Grand Ronde Road (See OAR 660-022-0070, Applicability). This requirement was enacted in 1994.

As part of applying OAR 660, division 22, to lands in the Grand Ronde area, including the claimants’ property, the County was required to adhere to the following provision under OAR 660-022-0030:

(7) County plans and land use regulations shall allow only those uses which are consistent with the identified function, capacity and level of transportation facilities serving the community pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060(1)(a) through (c).

OAR 660-012-0060(1) provides that amendments to functional plans, acknowledged comprehensive plans, and land use regulations which “significantly affect” a transportation facility shall assure that allowed land uses are consistent with the identified function, capacity, and performance standards (e.g., level of service, volume to capacity ration, etc.) of the facility.² The rule also provides that this is to be accomplished by either:

¹ *1000 Friends of Oregon v. LCDC (Curry County)*, 301 Or 447 (1986).

² The Commission adopted amendments to this rule that became effective on April 11, 2005. The rule was first adopted, however, in 1994.

- (a) Limiting allowed land uses to be consistent with the planned function, capacity, and performance standards of the transportation facility;
- (b) Amending the Transportation System Plan (TSP) to provide transportation facilities adequate to support the proposed land uses consistent with the transportation facility;
- (c) Altering land use designations, densities, or design requirements to reduce demand for automobile travel and meet travel needs through other modes; and
- (d) Amending the TSP to modify the planned function, capacity and performance standards, as needed, to accept greater motor vehicle congestion to promote mixed use, pedestrian friendly development where multimodal travel choices are provided.

The rule provides that a plan or land use regulation amendment “significantly affects” a transportation facility if it (OAR 660-0120060(2):

- (a) Changes the functional classification of an existing or planned transportation facility;
- (b) Changes standards implementing a functional classification system;
- (c) Allows types or levels of land uses which would result in levels of travel or access which are inconsistent with the functional classification of a transportation facility; or
- (d) Would reduce the performance standards of the facility below the minimum acceptable level identified.

Based upon the requirement of OAR 660-022-0030(7) and OAR 660-012-0060(1)(a) and (b), and the determination made pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060(2)(c) that uses authorized in the commercial zone applied to the claimants’ property result in levels of travel and access that are inconsistent with the functional classification of Highway 18, Polk County adopted a trip cap limiting commercial uses exceeding more than 10 vehicle trips per day under Section 8 of Ordinance #01-2. The trip cap may be removed pursuant to OAR 660-012-0060(1)(b) by amending the TSP to provide transportation facilities adequate to support the uses allowed in the commercial zone under OAR 660-012-0060(1)(b). A list of the transportation facilities that are adequate to support the uses allowed in the commercial zone are included in a proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan that the County is currently considering, which is to include the corridor refinement plan for this area as part of the County’s Transportation System Plan.

Conclusions

The claim is based on a land use regulation adopted by Polk County after the claimants purchased the property in 1998. The local regulation that is the subject of this claim is based on state land laws that to apply to the planning and zoning of unincorporated communities, specifically OAR 660-022-0030(7), and to land use regulations that require that uses that significantly affect a transportation facility meet certain requirements, specifically

OAR 660-012-0060(1) and (2). In addition to these requirements, OAR 660-012-0065 and 660-012-0070 govern transportation improvement on rural lands, and may apply to the subject property to limit access to the property under certain circumstances. These rules, as well as the rules that led the county to adopt its trip cap ordinance, were enacted before the claimants acquired the subject property.

The current state land use regulations described above restrict the claimants' ability to use the property.

3. Effect of Regulations on Fair Market Value

In order to establish a valid claim, Section 1 of Ballot Measure 37 requires that any laws described in Section V. (2) of this report must have "the effect of reducing the fair market value of the property, or any interest therein."

Findings of Fact

The claim states that the offending ordinance has caused the fair market value of the property to decrease by \$460,000. No information or evidence was provided to substantiate the specific dollar amount the claimants demand for compensation.

Conclusions

As explained in section V. (1) of this report, the current owners are David and Pamela Franzen, who acquired the property on February 10, 1998. Based on the department's record, current land use regulations enforced by the Commission or department restrict the use of the property. Thus, under Ballot Measure 37, David and Pamela Franzen are due compensation if these land use regulations also reduces the property's fair market value.

No evidence was provided to demonstrate a reduction in the fair market value of the property due to laws that the Commission or the department have enacted or that they enforce. Without an appraisal of the effect of the land use regulations on the value of the property, it is not possible to substantiate the specific dollar amount the claimants demand for compensation. Nevertheless, based on the submitted information, the department determines that it is more likely than not that there has been some reduction in the fair market value of the property as a result of a land use regulation enforced by the Commission or the department.

4. Exemptions under Section 3 of Measure 37

Ballot Measure 37 does not apply to certain land use regulations. In addition, under Section 3 of the Measure, certain types of laws are exempt from the Measure.

Findings of Fact

Section (3) (B) provides that the provisions of Measure 37 do not apply to land use regulations, "Restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety, such as fire

and building codes, health and sanitation regulations, solid or hazardous waste regulations, and pollution control regulations;”

The state administrative rules, upon which Polk County’s trip cap provision is based, are necessary for the protection of public health and safety. For the reasons discussed below, Section 3(b) of Measure 37 precludes application of the Measure to the restriction that this provision has on commercial uses that would generate additional traffic entering or exiting the claimants’ property form Highway 18.³

According to the claim, the subject property currently has one driveway access to Highway 18 and two driveways to Grand Ronde Road. The trip cap provision was adopted in part, in response to crashes that occur along this stretch of Highway 18. For a summary of the crash history along this stretch of Highway 18 (see endnote¹). Oregon Highway 18 is perceived to have a great number of crashes and fatalities and it has been the subject of several newspaper articles.

The Oregon Department of Transportation established a Safety Corridor along Highway 18 in 1996 as a means of responding to the crash problem. Other actions taken include increased law enforcement, larger signs, warnings and incident patrols.

On May 19, 2005, the department requested that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) provide information on accidents at or new the intersection of Highway 18 (ORE-18) and Grand Ronde Road where the claimants’ property is located. At the request of the department for additional information on the ‘Statewide Priority Index System’ (SPIS) ranking at or near this intersection, the following was provided in an e-mail, dated June 1, 2005, from John deTar, ODOT Region 2 Senior Planner:

“ODOT classifies crash sites based upon the frequency of crashes, the crash severity, and the volume of traffic on the highway. This becomes the annual SPIS-rank. These are the worst 10% of the crash sites on the state highway system. In 1998, there were no SPIS-rated sites within the Van Duzer Corridor to Steel Bridge Road section (Milepost (MP) 18.79 to MP 28.21). In 1999, the area near AR Ford Road, west of the ORE-18/Grand Ronde Road Intersection, is rated as a SPIS site. In 2000, locations at AR Ford Road and at Fort Hill Road are SPIS-rated. In 2001 and 2002, the Fort Hill Road location remains SPIS-rated. In 2003, Grand Ronde Road is SPIS-rated.

ODOT also classifies sections of highway based upon the number of fatal and severe crashes that have occurred in 5-mile sections during a 3-year period. This ‘Safety Investment Program’ (SIP) ranks highway sections using a 1-5 ranking: a highway section ranked "5" is most crash-prone. Comparing the SIP program to the SPIS

³ The source of the information contained in the report on crash history is from the document cited above in the trip cap regulation that is the subject of this claim (Section 9 of Ordinance #01-02) and prepared by the Oregon Department of Transportation and the Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments titled *ORE-18 Corridor Refinement Plan, H.B. Van Duzer Forest Corridor to Steel Bridge Road*, June 2001; Amended and Edited May 2004.

program, the SIP program evaluates sections of state highway whereas the SPIS program rates sites, or points. The 1998-2000 Safety Investment Program (SIP) map shows MP 20-25 on ORE-18 (AR Ford Road to a point about 1 mile east of the ODOT Weigh Station near Fort Hill Road to be rated as a SIP Category 3. This section becomes a SIP Category 4 for the 1999-2001 period. It is a SIP Category 3 for the 2000-2002 period and the 2001-2003 period.

Finally, there is the actual crash history. I acquired the January 1, 1998 to June 30, 2004 data for ORE-18, between MP 20 and MP 25 to allow some cross-comparison to the SIP rankings. During this 6 1/2 year period, there have been 159 crashes, 5 fatal crashes with 6 fatalities, 84 non-fatal crashes involving 174 injured persons, and 70 property-damage only crashes. I have attached summary data for your review.” (See Endnote ⁱⁱ to review summary data.)

While the claimants have two driveways on Grande Ronde Road as well an access to Highway 18, commercial development and associated traffic would worsen traffic safety problems on Highway 18. The presence of the commercial development will add additional turning movements on and off of Highway 18, at some combination of the claimants’ three driveways. Use of driveways along Grande Ronde Road does not eliminate safety concerns because access to the commercial development will still involve turning movements on and off of Highway 18 for most customers. Turning movements at intersections are key conflict points. In addition, driveway access to the claimants’ property is very close to the intersection, creating additional safety concerns where vehicles enter and exit close to the intersection.

Section 3(E) of Measure 37 also exempts land use regulations that were enacted before the date the current owner (or a family member) acquired the property. In this case, the state regulations at issue were all enacted before the claimants acquired the property. As a result, the rules also are exempt under section 3(E) of the measure.

Conclusions

The state regulations, specifically OAR 660-022-0030 and OAR 660-012-0060(1) and (2), upon which Polk County based its adoption of the trip cap provision, are necessary, in part, for the protection of public health and safety. Section 3(B) of Measure 37 specifically exempts application of the Measure to restrictions of property for public health and safety such as the trip cap provision which limits commercial uses that would generate additional traffic accessing on and off of Highway 18. The state rules also were enacted before the owners acquired the property and, as a result, are exempt under Section 3(E) of the measure.

VI. FORM OF RELIEF

Section 1 of Measure 37 provides for payment of compensation to an owner of the claimants’ property if the Commission or the department has enforced a law that restricts the use of the property in a manner that reduces its fair market value. In lieu of compensation, the department may choose to not apply a law to allow the present owner to carry out a use of the property permitted at the time the present owner acquired the property. The Commission, by rule, has

directed that if the department determines a claim is valid, the Director must provide only non-monetary relief unless and until funds are appropriated by the legislature to pay claims.

Findings of Fact

Based on the findings and conclusions set forth in this report, laws enforced by the Commission, specifically OAR 660-022-0030(7) and OAR 660-012-0060(1) and (2), restrict the use of the property. The claimants cannot locate commercial uses that result in traffic that exceeds 10 vehicle trips per day. The laws enforced by the Commission or the department may reduce the fair market value of the property to some desired extent. The claim asserts this amount to be \$460,000. However, because the claim does not provide a specific explanation for how the specified restriction reduces the fair market value of the property, a specific amount of compensation cannot be determined. Nevertheless, based on the record for this claim, the department acknowledges that the law on which the claim is based more likely than not have reduced the fair market value of the property to some desired extent.

Section (3)(B) of Measure 37 provides that the compensation or waiver provisions of the measure do not apply to land use regulations, “Restricting or prohibiting activities for the protection of public health and safety, such as fire and building codes, health and sanitation regulations, solid or hazardous waste regulations, and pollution control regulations;”

OAR 660-022-0030 and OAR 660-012-0060(1) and (2), restrict activities to protect public health and safety. As a result, they are exempt under section 3(B) of the measure. In addition, these rules were enacted before the claimants acquired the subject property, and as a result they also are exempt under section 3(E) of the measure.

Conclusions

The department has determined that the claim is not valid because the laws that are the subject of this claim restrict and prohibit the use of the property for the protection of public health and safety, and such regulations are exempt from claims under Section 3(B) of Measure 37. In addition, the department has determined that the claim is not valid because the laws that are the subject of the claim were enacted before the claimants acquired the property, and such regulations are exempt under Section 3(E) of Measure 37. Therefore, the department recommends that the claim be denied.

VII. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT STAFF REPORT

The department issued its draft staff report on this claim on July 6, 2005. OAR 125-145-0100(3), provided an opportunity for the claimant or the claimant’s authorized agent and any third parties who submitted comments under OAR 125-145-0080 to submit written comments, evidence and information in response to the draft staff report and recommendation. Comments received have been taken into account by the department in the issuance of this final report.

Endnote:

ⁱ There were 166 reported crashes from 1991 through 1997 in the corridor refinement study area, where the claimant's property is located within. Six of these crashes resulted in 8 deaths and 12 other individuals being injured. There were an additional 199 people injured in 97 other crashes. Only property damage was reported in the other crashes.

From 1991 through 1993, the crash rate in the corridor refinement study area was 0.70 crashes per million vehicle miles (a/mvm). (Crash rates, a common measure of traffic safety, are typically compared in number of crashes per million miles of highway traveled. These rates are therefore dependent of the number, or volume, of vehicles traveling a given stretch of highway. If the volumes are high, a high number of crashes can result in a relative low rate. Another highway or segment thereof could have fewer crashes, but combined with low volumes, have a higher rate.) In subsequent years, traffic volumes increased faster than crashes and the rate dropped to 0.62 a/mvm for a period from 1994 through 1996. The rate further dropped to 0.61 a/mvm traveled in 1997. The yearly state average for crash rates for primary rural, non-suburban areas for this period ranged from 0.70 to 0.79 a/mvm. The following figure depicts the total number of crashes per year:

Total Crashes by Year (ORE-18)

YEAR	NUMBER OF CRASHES
1991	33
1992	17
1993	16
1994	23
1995	24
1996	24
1997	29

The highest number of crashes occurred at the Fort Hill Road intersection with Highway 18 with 18 crashes. The second highest number of crashes was at or near the Grand Ronde Road intersection with 15 crashes. Each of these locations had one fatal crash.

For the years 1991 through 1993, the, the fatality rate on Highway 18 was 1.6. (The measurement for fatality rate is similar to crash rate, except the measurement is per *hundred* million miles of vehicle travel.) However, from 1994 through 1996 the rate increased to 4.35, and the fatality rates for 1997 was slightly lower than 4.28. During this period, the yearly state average fatality rate for primary rural, non-suburban areas ranged from 2.92 to 3.52. The following figure depicts the total number of fatal crashes and fatalities per year:

Fatal Crashes by Year (ORE-18)

Year	NO. OF FATAL CRASHES	NO. OF FATALITIES
1991	1	1
1992	0	0
1993	0	0
1994	0	0
1995	2	3
1996	1	2
1997	2	2

The Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) is a method used in Oregon to identify locations where funds can best be used to improve safety. The SPIS is composed of three parameters, each having different weights, totaling 100%. The parameters are crash frequency 28%, crash rate 39%, and crash severity 33%. Any location that has three crashes or a fatality in a three-year period is rated as a SPIS site. For the 1991-1993 period, there were fifteen SPIS

sites in the study area and from 1994-1996 there was twenty-five. The state further breaks down the SPIS sites by setting an index number representing the top 10% of the SPIS sites statewide. During the 1991-1993 period, three local sites were in the top 10%, all of them in the immediate area of Grande Ronde.

Highway 039 Milepoint 20.00 to 25.00, 01/01/1998 to 06/30/2004 Both
Add and Non-Add mileage

YEAR	COLLISION TYPE	FATAL CRASHES	NON-FATAL CRASHES	PROP DAMAGE ONLY	CRASHES TOTAL	PEOPLE KILLED	PEOPLE INJURED	TRUCKS	DRY SURF	WET SURF	DAY	DARK	INTERSECTION	INTERSECTION RELATED	OFFROAD
1998	FIXED / OTHER OBJECT	0	2	2	4	0	3	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	4
1998	HEAD-ON	2	0	0	2	2	4	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0
1998	PEDESTRIAN	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
1998	REAR-END	0	5	0	5	0	10	0	5	0	5	0	0	0	0
1998	SIDESWIPE - MEETING	1	1	0	2	2	4	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0
1998	TURNING MOVEMENTS	0	6	4	10	0	11	0	6	4	7	3	4	0	0
1998	YEAR 1998 TOTAL	4	14	6	24	5	33	0	16	8	17	7	4	0	4
1999	FIXED / OTHER OBJECT	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	1	0	3
1999	HEAD-ON	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
1999	MISCELLANEOUS	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
1999	NON-COLLISION	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
1999	REAR-END	0	8	4	12	0	21	1	10	2	12	0	1	0	1
1999	SIDESWIPE - MEETING	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
1999	TURNING MOVEMENTS	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	0
1999	YEAR 1999 TOTAL	1	10	11	22	1	25	1	14	7	17	5	3	0	4
2000	ANGLE	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
2000	FIXED / OTHER OBJECT	0	3	2	5	0	3	1	3	2	1	4	0	0	5
2000	HEAD-ON	0	2	0	2	0	7	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0
2000	MISCELLANEOUS	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	3	0	1	2	0	0	0
2000	PEDESTRIAN	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
2000	REAR-END	0	6	3	9	0	10	1	8	1	9	0	1	0	0
2000	SIDESWIPE - MEETING	0	2	0	2	0	6	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0
2000	TURNING MOVEMENTS	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0
2000	YEAR 2000 TOTAL	0	16	9	25	0	29	2	18	7	17	8	4	0	5
2001	ANGLE	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
2001	FIXED / OTHER OBJECT	0	3	3	6	0	7	0	4	2	4	2	0	0	6
2001	HEAD-ON	0	2	0	2	0	5	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0
2001	MISCELLANEOUS	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
2001	NON-COLLISION	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
2001	PARKING MOVEMENTS	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
2001	REAR-END	0	8	2	10	0	22	0	8	2	9	1	1	0	0
2001	TURNING MOVEMENTS	0	1	3	4	0	1	0	3	1	2	2	0	0	0
2001	YEAR 2001 TOTAL	0	16	10	26	0	38	0	20	6	18	8	1	0	6
2002	FIXED / OTHER OBJECT	0	2	3	5	0	3	0	4	1	3	2	2	0	5
2002	REAR-END	0	3	8	11	0	4	0	8	3	8	3	2	0	0
2002	SIDESWIPE - OVERTAKING	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
2002	TURNING MOVEMENTS	0	2	1	3	0	5	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	0
2002	YEAR 2002 TOTAL	0	7	13	20	0	12	1	14	6	13	7	6	0	5
2003	ANGLE	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
2003	FIXED / OTHER OBJECT	0	7	4	11	0	12	0	7	4	6	5	1	0	11
2003	MISCELLANEOUS	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
2003	PARKING MOVEMENTS	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
2003	REAR-END	0	4	8	12	0	6	0	9	3	11	1	1	1	1
2003	TURNING MOVEMENTS	0	5	3	8	0	11	0	5	3	6	2	6	0	0
2003	YEAR 2003 TOTAL	0	17	17	34	0	30	0	24	10	25	9	9	1	12
2004	FIXED / OTHER OBJECT	0	2	2	4	0	4	1	0	4	2	2	0	0	4
2004	NON-COLLISION	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
2004	REAR-END	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
2004	TURNING MOVEMENTS	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
2004	YEAR 2004 TOTAL	0	4	4	8	0	7	1	3	5	5	3	0	0	4
ii	ALL FINAL TOTAL	5	84	70	159	6	174	5	109	49	112	47	27	1	40