

2019 HOUSE TRANSPORTATION

HB 1065

2019 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Transportation Committee
Fort Totten Room, State Capitol

HB 1065
1/4/2019
30426

- Subcommittee
 Conference Committee

Committee Clerk: Jeanette Cook

Explanation or reason for introduction of bill/resolution:

A bill relating to the immediate notice of a vehicle accident.

Minutes:

Chairman Ruby opened the hearing on HB 1065.

Representative Roers Jones introduced HB 1065. She stated that the request for this bill comes from law enforcement. They would like to change the minimum threshold for reporting a motor vehicle accident to the police from \$1000 to \$3000 of damage. The reason is that almost any accident will cause damage much more than \$1000. It would eliminate officers having to write reports on every small accident.

Representative Westlind: Is \$3000 enough?

Representative Roers Jones: I think it is enough. It was the request by law enforcement.

Representative Westlind: \$3000 is not a lot of damage. Would it be fair to say that we could raise it to \$5000 without objection?

Representative Roers Jones: I don't think law enforcement would mind that. They were just trying to take a conservative approach.

Representative Grueneich: Are the body shops/insurance companies okay with this? Would there have to be a report at the body shop if the police didn't do one? Currently when you take a car to a body shop is a police report required?

Representative Roers Jones: I'm not aware of that.

Chairman Ruby: I think the concern of going with a percentage is that people will have a hard time estimating the damage done in terms of the percentage of the value of their vehicle.

Representative Roers Jones: Law enforcement would like to see some improvement. It is difficult to know how much damage has been done to a vehicle until it has been taken to a

body shop. People probably call the police automatically. If we raise the threshold, it will probably reduce some of the calls to have a police report written.

Donnell Preskey, North Dakota Association of Counties/North Dakota Sheriffs & Deputies Association, spoke in support of HB 1065.

Donnell Preskey: The NDSA's discussion also centered around the question, "Is \$3000 the right number?" They did even suggest \$5000. From the Sheriffs' perspective they would be open to changing the amount.

Chairman Ruby: How will the public be educated to the new level of damage? Will dispatch ask if the damage is over \$3000?

Donnell Preskey: I don't know the answer to that.

There was no further support for HB 1065.

There was no opposition to HB 1065.

The hearing on HB 1065 was closed.

Representative Westlind moved to amend the amount from \$3000 to \$5000.

Representative Grueneich seconded the amendment.

Chairman Ruby: It has been a while since this amount has been changed. Do you think the body will approve \$5000? I think \$3000 will not be a problem, but \$5000 might be too high. No one testified from the insurance companies, so we don't know if they have a problem with this or not.

Representative Westlind: I could reduce the amendment to \$4000 if it would be more acceptable.

Representative Grueneich: I could support that. I do think that it doesn't take much of an accident to result in \$3000 or \$4000 worth of damage.

Chairman Ruby: I think overall, that \$4000 would be a better choice.

Representative Westlind moved to change the amendment to \$4000 instead of \$3000.

Representative Grueneich seconded the amendment.

A voice vote was taken on the amendment. All aye. Motion passed.

Representative Westlind moved a **DO PASS** as amended on HB 1065.

Representative O'Brien seconded the motion.

**A roll call vote was taken: Aye 8 Nay 0 Absent 6
HB 1065 passed as amended.**

House Transportation Committee

HB 1065

1-4-19

Page 3

Representative Paulson will carry HB 1065.

DA 1/9/19

19.0510.01001
Title.02000

Adopted by the House Transportation
Committee

January 4, 2019

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1065

Page 1, line 7, replace "three" with "four"

Renumber accordingly

Date: 1-4-19
 Roll Call Vote #: 1

2019 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE
 ROLL CALL VOTES
 BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1065

House Transportation Committee

Subcommittee

Amendment LC# or Description: (Change \$3000 to \$4000) 19.0510.01001

- Recommendation: Adopt Amendment
 Do Pass Do Not Pass Without Committee Recommendation
 As Amended Rerefer to Appropriations
 Place on Consent Calendar
 Other Actions: Reconsider _____

Motion Made By Westlind Seconded By Grueneich

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
CHAIRMAN RUBY			REP LAURIEBETH HAGER	A	
VICE CHAIR BECKER	A		REP KARLA ROSE HANSON		
REP JIM GRUENEICH			REP MARVIN NELSON	A	
REP TERRY JONES	A				
REP TOM KADING					
REP EMILY O'BRIEN					
REP MARK OWENS	A				
REP BOB PAULSON					
REP GARY PAUR					
REP ROBIN WEISZ	A				
REP GREG WESTLIND					

Total (Yes) _____
 Absent Voice Vote No aye
 Floor Assignment _____

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:
Change \$3000 to \$4000

Date: 1-4-19
Roll Call Vote #: 2

2019 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE
ROLL CALL VOTES
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1065

House Transportation Committee

Subcommittee

Amendment LC# or Description: 19. 0510. 01061

Recommendation: Adopt Amendment
 Do Pass Do Not Pass Without Committee Recommendation
 As Amended Rerefer to Appropriations
 Place on Consent Calendar
Other Actions: Reconsider _____

Motion Made By Westlind Seconded By O'Brien

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
CHAIRMAN RUBY	X		REP LAURIEBETH HAGER	A	
VICE CHAIR BECKER	A		REP KARLA ROSE HANSON	X	
REP JIM GRUENEICH	X		REP MARVIN NELSON	A	
REP TERRY JONES	A				
REP TOM KADING	X				
REP EMILY O'BRIEN	X				
REP MARK OWENS	A				
REP BOB PAULSON	X				
REP GARY PAUR	X				
REP ROBIN WEISZ	A				
REP GREG WESTLIND	X				

Total (Yes) 8 No 0

Absent 6

Floor Assignment Paulson

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

HB 1065: Transportation Committee (Rep. D. Ruby, Chairman) recommends **AMENDMENTS AS FOLLOWS** and when so amended, recommends **DO PASS** (8 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 6 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). HB 1065 was placed on the Sixth order on the calendar.

Page 1, line 7, replace "three" with "four"

Renumber accordingly

2019 SENATE TRANSPORTATION

HB 1065

2019 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Transportation Committee
Lewis and Clark Room, State Capitol

HB 1065
3/1/2019
33042

- Subcommittee
 Conference Committee

Committee Clerk: Liz Stenehjem

Explanation or reason for introduction of bill/resolution:

A bill relating to the immediate notice of a vehicle accident.

Minutes:

No Attachments

Representative Shannon Roers Jones, District 46: HB 1065 was brought to me by some friends that I have in law enforcement who asked me to increase the reporting threshold for reporting a motor vehicle accident. Their request was that it be increased from \$1000 to \$3000. The House Transportation Committee amended this bill to increase the \$3000 level to \$4000. Basically what it's suggesting is that a motor vehicle driver that has an accident is not required to make a report of that accident unless the damage to those vehicles is at least \$4000. So what this does is, it doesn't prevent motor vehicle drivers from calling law enforcement and asking them to come to an accident, evaluate people, anything of that nature. Law enforcement wants to express that they are happy to respond to those reports and check in on people and make sure traffic is moving and everyone is safe and sound. What it prevents is law enforcement having to spend roughly 2-hours per accident writing reports. So during winters like we've had recently where we're getting a lot of snow, they can spend a good portion of their day responding to motor vehicles accidents and then they have to spend roughly 2-hours per incident writing a report afterwards. So this would just allow them to kind of facilitate the exchange of insurance information, but not have to create a police report for each one of those incidents.

Chairman Rust: So what you're saying is if there's an accident and right after it happens I pick up the phone and I call law enforcement and they come. The law enforcement officer looks at it and says, I don't think it's \$4000. What happens then?

Representative Roers Jones: Obviously the amount of damage is subjective, I know some times it's hard to estimate how much damage has been done. I would say that many of our law enforcement officers have seen a number of accidents. With vehicles the way we have now, any little fender bender is going to amount in about \$1000 worth of damage. So it's not meant to turn our law enforcement officers into appraisers of vehicle damage, but what it's intended to do is raise that threshold so that not every single accident that occurs ends up turning into a report. Right now what we're hearing is that there is almost no vehicle accident that is going to occur that would not result in a report. So it's creating a

burden for law enforcement, as far as a draw on their time and their ability to be useful in other places. So there will be some subjectivity as far as if it's close or if it's a more substantial accident they may choose to err on the side of caution and right the report, especially if the feel insurance companies are going to require something. It just says they are not required to issue a report. It will give them discretion under \$4000 and allow them to suggest the parties exchange insurance information and go get estimates and take care of it that way.

Senator Clemens: Let's say you just had a small fender bender that was less than \$4000, if I call the police would law enforcement still write the report if I called them?

Representative Roers Jones: I guess that would be up to the individual law enforcement officer. Now, law enforcement wanted to make sure that it was conveyed that they are always happy to respond and kind of evaluation a situation and make sure everyone is safe and that no other laws were broken. However, by just raising that reporting threshold it allows motor vehicle drivers the discretion to not have to call law enforcement if their comfortable that the damage is lower.

Senator Bakke: Here you have "a driver who violates this section must be assessed a fine of \$50." So, if I have an accident and I look at it and say, oh I think that's less than \$4000. Then the other driver looks at it and agrees with me, so we don't have a report filed. Then it turns out to be more than that, are we both going to be fined \$50?

Representative Roers Jones: I don't know how often that violation fine is enforced, if it's a mistake of fact as far as the value is. But what I would suggest is increasing that threshold gives the driver more leeway than it does currently.

Chairman Rust: I'm guessing probably if somebody totaled a brand new vehicle and said "ah, I don't think it's \$4000," you might get hit with that \$50 fine.

Senator Dwyer: A lot of vehicle insurance the deductible is \$250 or \$500, and then if you have an accident that's more than that the police report often times is what the insurance companies go by to decide who's going to pay. I think. So if it was an accident for \$3000, the insurance companies would just have to get a report from the two drivers I'm assuming and decide whether it's covered or not.

Representative Roers Jones: I would assume that would be the case, if the law is that they're not required to file a report and police officer is not required to write a report. I would assume that the insurance companies would have to accommodate that circumstance somehow.

Chairman Rust: Closed hearing on HB 1065.

2019 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Transportation Committee
Lewis and Clark Room, State Capitol

HB 1065
3/7/2019
33400

- Subcommittee
 Conference Committee

Committee Clerk: Liz Stenehjem

Explanation or reason for introduction of bill/resolution:

A bill relating to the immediate notice of a vehicle accident.

No Attachments

Chairman Rust: All HB 1065 does is it moves the amount at which you have to notify police. It moves the threshold from \$1000 to \$4000.

Senator Dwyer: So if the insurance industry or if any police department would have come and said, "we're over worked and we need this moved so we don't have to respond." It seems like it would make more sense. I would be a little worried about moving it up to \$4000 because a lot of times the insurance companies rely on the police report as to what they're going to do. If there's no police report, \$4000 is quite a bit. If there's no police report then it's just he said she said, and I'm not sure, I'd be worried about it.

Chairman Rust: It doesn't prevent calls to law enforcement on an accident. The information we got is that it takes roughly 2-hours of law enforcement time in order to process an accident report. I do kind of agree with you. Normally speaking, if I'm involved in an accident I'm probably going to call law enforcement because I don't have a very good handle on what is how much. I would call and this does not prevent you from calling. After that, what normally happens is you have the insurance agents that deal with it. Shortly thereafter you will get a call from an adjuster who will ask you to go through and give a statement as to the cause of the accident. Many times I think what happens is they fight it out and decide that you're 20% at fault and he's 80% or what have you.

Senator Patten: I think on these small dollar amounts they just write the checks. It isn't cost efficient for them to go in and do a lot of investigation and tie up staff time going back and forth with other insurance companies.

Senator Bakke: So how do the insurance companies decide who's going to pay if there's no police report?

Senator Patten: If you have a dispute over that, then obviously you would want to call law enforcement.

Senator Fors: If the driver is not the owner of the vehicle whose insurance is affected?

Chairman Rust: It would be the insurance of the vehicle, not the driver. That is current law, it's not being changed, the only thing we're talking about is changing the reporting threshold.

Senator Clemens: I guess my thinking is, if somebody runs into my car and let's say it's \$3000, I would want a police report written up on it. To me \$3000 could have a bearing on my insurance company paying it or not. If we raise it to \$4000 and somebody hits me, they can just take off and there I sit with a smashed up car and have to pay a \$3000 bill. I have insurance, but...so I don't know. I have a little reservation on it.

Senator Patten: Just a follow up on the comment on the subrogation. Usually I think the insurance company will probably pay your claim and if they feel there's value in pursuing the opposing then they'll do that on the backside.

Chairman Rust: My understanding of the way it normally works is, you have an accident, you take your car in, then your insurance company is the one who's going to pay it. After that your insurance will go after the other person. What happens as I recall is, you will end up paying the deductible to begin with and then after the insurance company takes the other person to task you'll get your deductible back.

Senator Clemens: How are they going to go after somebody if they don't know who they are?

Chairman Rust: First off you need to exchange that information and if they take off it's a hit and run.

Senator Dwyer: If the purpose of the bill is so that police departments don't have to deal with these smaller accidents then why didn't a police department come testify? Nobody did. So maybe it's not really a problem.

Senator Patten: I think we did hear this morning after one of the hearings the one guy said "well we missed it." They didn't always catch all of the bills that affected them and they may have missed it. I'm guessing that if you wanted to ask the police department if they wanted to have that two-hours back out of each day they would say yes.

Senator Fors: It's pretty simple if everybody sticks around and everybody gives the correct information and you trade it back and forth, it's pretty simple. But if there's a party that's reluctant to do so or a hit and run, in theory I guess you don't really even have to establish guilt of any kind if the two insurance companies just take care of it together. Nobody's guilty then, it's a neutral accident.

Chairman Rust: This part of the law deals with, if you don't report an accident you can be fined up to \$50 and the threshold is \$1000. What we would be doing here is raising that threshold to \$4000 for it being a mandatory report to the police so you don't get a \$50 fine. The rest of the law stays the same as it is right now.

Senate Transportation Committee

HB 1065

3/7/19

Page 3

Senator Dwyer: I'll talk to the Bismarck Police Department and see if they have a comment on this.

Chairman Rust: I will reach out to the North Dakota Highway Patrol to get their take on this as well.

2019 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Transportation Committee
Lewis and Clark Room, State Capitol

HB 1065
3/14/2019
33756 & 33757

- Subcommittee
 Conference Committee

Committee Clerk: Liz Stenehjem

Explanation or reason for introduction of bill/resolution:

A bill relating to the immediate notice of a vehicle accident.

Minutes:

1 Attachment

(Job# 33756 13:46) Chairman Rust: Let's talk about HB 1065. Brief discussion of bill and previous testimony and attachments. Provided **Attachment #1** for committee members as information and testimony from various people that was also emailed. Went through **Attachment #1** with committee members. Bill deals with changing reporting limits from \$1000 to \$4000. It does not prevent reporting under \$4000. Still requires drivers to stop at all vehicle accidents.

(Job# 33757)

Senator Clemens: I move a **Do Pass**.

Senator Patten: I **Second** the Motion.

Roll Call Vote Taken:

6-0-0 Do Pass

Carrier: Senator Clemens

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

HB 1065, as engrossed: Transportation Committee (Sen. Rust, Chairman) recommends **DO PASS** (6 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). Engrossed HB 1065 was placed on the Fourteenth order on the calendar.

2019 TESTIMONY

HB 1065

HB 1065 #1
3/14/19 pg1

House Bill 1065

Chairman Rust and members of the Senate Transportation Committee. My name is Rob Hovland . I currently serve as the President of Center Mutual Insurance Company, which is a North Dakota Insurance Company based out of Rugby. Currently, we are the 9th largest auto insurer (by premium volume) in North Dakota.

HB 1065 raises the threshold of reporting accidents from \$1,000 to \$4,000, which makes sense. Since the \$1,000 threshold was established, inflation alone would justify increasing it, and the increased costs of repairs (above and beyond inflation) make a \$4,000 threshold reasonable. Today, it is very rare that a vehicle has \$1,000 or less damage when it is involved in a collision. I would be surprised if any insurance company would be opposed to a \$4,000 threshold.

I would, however, caution against increasing this threshold above \$5,000, because we have a state law that changes comparative fault allocation for claims over \$5,000. If the threshold is raised higher than \$5,000, this would cause some problems, and in my opinion, other laws would need be tweaked in conjunction with that type of change.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding my comments, or I can be of further assistance to the Committee.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rob Hovland

-----Original Message-----

From: Dwyer, Mike A. [mailto:madwyer@nd.gov]

Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2019 2:39 PM

To: Dave Draovitch

Subject: HB 1065

Police Chief Draovitch, This is Senator Mike Dwyer. We have a bill that increases the property damage limit for reporting accidents to the local police department. It is House Bill 1065, and amends subsection 1 of Section 39-08-09, NDCC. It increases the current limit from \$1,000 to \$4,000. Could you look at it and give me your perspective, or your departments perspective. You can email back or call me at [701-400-6075](tel:701-400-6075). Thanks Senator Mike Dwyer

From: Timothy Bleth tbleth@bismarcknd.gov

Subject: RE: HB 1065

Date: Mar 7, 2019 at 3:44:07 PM

To: Dave Draovitch ddraovitch@bismarcknd.gov, Jeff Solemsaas jsolemsaas@bismarcknd.gov

Chief,

I have mixed feelings on raising the limits to report an crash to \$4000. It may help reduce the number of crashes we take, however it could end up causing more problems and follow ups.

The people involved would more than likely end up getting into arguments while on scene. We sometimes deal with the one party coming into report a crash a day or several days later because they found it to be over a \$1000 and I think we would end up with more cases of that happening which causes more work. Honestly, it would be easier to just keep it the way it is or just change to where any private property/parking lot two vehicle crashes do not need to be reported. I think at this point, I would probably have more questions about it and would be interested in sitting in on the hearing and possibly commenting if needed with permission. I cannot find it on the schedule. Do you know when the hearing is?

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave Draovitch

Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2019 2:42 PM

To: Jeff Solemsaas; Timothy Bleth

Subject: FW: HB 1065

Thoughts?

From: Iverson, Maj. Thomas O. tiverson@nd.gov

Subject: HB 1065 and HB 1154

Date: Mar 7, 2019 at 5:25:51 PM

To: Rust, David S. drust@nd.gov

HB 1065 #1
Pg 4
3/14/19

Senator Rust,

Good afternoon. Thank you for stopping in and visiting with us about the potential concerns with HB 1065 and HB 1154.

HB 1065 raises the reporting requirement of a crash from \$1,000 to \$4,000. According to NDCC 39-08-05, the driver involved in a crash must stop at the scene and remain at the scene until they have fulfilled the requirements of 39-08-06. The driver must stop at the scene regardless of the dollar amount of damage. Failing to do so is a class B misdemeanor. In order to fulfill the requirements of 39-08-06, the driver involved in a crash with another vehicle must exchange information to include the drivers name, address, insurance company, vehicle registration information, and render aid if possible.

* HB 1065 has no impact on those laws. If someone is involved in a crash resulting in minimal vehicle damage, they would still need to pull over and fulfill the obligations of 39-08-05 and 39-08-06. However, they would not need to report the crash to law enforcement, if the vehicle damage appeared to be less than \$4,000. Our troopers are often times called to crash scenes that end up with minimal vehicle damage. If the two parties have already exchanged information and it is apparent that the damage is less than \$1,000, an official crash report would not be needed.

Responding to crashes and completing the corresponding paperwork is a time consuming task, but it is something that our agency takes very seriously. That being said, I do not see any issues with increasing the threshold to \$4,000.

HB 1154 would essentially remove a bicycle or ridden animal from being considered a vehicle for purposes of criminal violations within NDCC 39-08 through 39-13. Below are two examples that have been provided from one of our troopers regarding this bill.

- "When considering to not allow bicycles and ridden animals to be subjected to the impaired driving laws, we must consider the enforcement aspect. As a traffic trooper in Fargo, I have personally heard the State Radio broadcasts of a traffic hazard that resulted from an intoxicated person riding a bicycle down Interstate 94 on a busy summer afternoon. Luckily, one of my coworkers was able to locate this person and arrest the rider for DUI, who blew a .26 on a preliminary breath test. Although this intoxicated rider was arrested for committing a violation of state law, it did not come without a price. As a result of this persons behavior, a crash resulted from other motorists slowing and stopping for the impaired person. Although this event resulted in an arrest and a minor crash, not all impaired bicyclists are so lucky."
- "Last June, I responded to a report of an injury crash that occurred near a rural subdivision north of West Fargo in Reile's Acres. In this incident, a female was riding

her bicycle on the shoulder of a county road at a peak travel time. She attempted to cross the roadway without looking behind her and was struck by an SUV. I arrived on scene within a few minutes, in time just to see the failed attempts by the paramedics to save her life. I then processed the scene just like many of our other numerous fatal crashes every year, and had to identify this female who possessed no identification and no way to run the owner of a bicycle. Meanwhile, I had to comfort the driver of the SUV who knew he just struck and killed a person on a bicycle. After finding out that the female lived only a few houses up from the intersection of the crash, I had to deliver the death notification to her husband and then her adult sons. I would later learn that her blood alcohol concentration was a .10, which would explain her lack of coordination and judgment which resulted in this crash.”

The trooper also mentioned that it would not take long for the public to know that this is a legal option when they have had too much to drink. I feel that this is a valid point, but I do understand the opposing argument that a person driving intoxicated on a bicycle poses less of a danger to the public than someone driving intoxicated in a motor vehicle. Ultimately, both options are unsafe and pose a danger to the driver, as well as the public.

In addition to DUI, there are other criminal violations that law enforcement would not be able to enforce if this would pass. For example, someone riding a bicycle would be able to crash into another vehicle and leave the scene of the crash. Law enforcement would not be able to enforce this law, even if the crash resulted in several thousand dollars of damage.

Another concern with this bill is fleeing a law enforcement officer. Technically, someone would be able to utilize a bicycle to flee a law enforcement officer, and the officer would not be able to charge them with fleeing a police officer under NDCC 39-10-71, as the bicycle would not be considered a vehicle. However, the person could still be charged with Refusing to Halt on a bicycle under NDCC 12.1-08-11. Refusing to Halt is a class B misdemeanor, versus a class A misdemeanor for Fleeing a Police Officer.

As an agency, we are not necessarily opposed to this bill, but rather wanted to point out a few concerns.

Major Thomas O. Iverson
Chief of Operations
North Dakota Highway Patrol
[701-328-5141](tel:701-328-5141)

HB 1065 #1
Pg 6
3/14/19

From: Jeff Solemsaas jsolemsaas@bismarcknd.gov
Subject: RE: HB 1065
Date: Mar 7, 2019 at 3:43:30 PM
To: Dave Draovitch ddraovitch@bismarcknd.gov,
Timothy Bleth tbleth@bismarcknd.gov

Chief Draovitch,

My first thought is that the dollar value for reportable collisions should have been changed years ago but I also have some concerns with this. Occasionally we have an issue when an officer feels that the damage level doesn't meet the current \$1000 threshold and they don't complete the report. The drivers then have to return later and another officer is tasked with doing a report that should have been completed in the first place. Years ago, we had a directive that if an officer was sent to a collision a report would be completed. Bottom line is that some officers are a little lazy and don't want to write the collision report. This creates extra work for another officer and a lot of frustration from the drivers that both believe that a report should have been completed in the first place. It takes very little damage to achieve \$1000 worth of damages.

Insurance companies want a report for their purposes we should be completing the report both for the drivers and the insurance companies. The officer can complete a "non-reportable" report with the same information that goes into a "full report collision. The only difference would be that the non-reportable collision is not transmitted to the state DOT and they collect no data from

HB 1065 #1
3/14/19 pg 7

that collision. I still like the information that is collected in the report and if the information did not go to the state, at this time, we would have no ability to access it. With the RMS system I would like to believe that we would be able to recover the information from the non-reportable report. There is really no benefit to completing a non-reportable report as both forms require the same information.

I think that we wouldn't really change our way of doing things in that the officer dispatched to a collision would have the expectation of completing a report, no matter the amount of damage. If it were determined later that the damages were above the new \$4000 level it would be a simple process to edit the report as a reportable collision and transmit the data to DOT. If this doesn't make any sense please let me know.

Lt. Jeff Solemsaas
Traffic Commander
City of Bismarck Police Department
700 S. 9 St.
Bismarck, ND 58504
Office: 701-355-1914
Fax: 701-355-1927