HOUSE RESEARCH ORGANIZATION &	oill analysis	5/9/2013	HB 307 Farias (CSHB 307 by Martinez)
SUBJECT:	Revising required safety equipment for nighttime cyclists		
COMMITTEE:	Transportation — committee substitute recommended		
VOTE:	7 ayes — Phillips, Martinez, Burkett, Fletcher, Guerra, Lavender, Riddle		
	2 nays — Harper-Brown, Pickett		
	2 absent — Y. Davis, McClendon		
WITNESSES:	For — Mark Stine, BikeTexas; ( <i>Registered, but did not testify:</i> Laura Blanke, Texas Pediatric Society; Marc Rodriguez, City of San Antonio) Against — None		
BACKGROUND:	Transportation Code, sec. 551.104(b) prohibits a person from operating a bicycle at night unless the bicycle has a lamp on the front that emits a white light visible from at least 500 feet in the front and has on the rear either a red reflector visible from 50 to 300 feet or a red light visible from 500 feet in the rear.		
		sdemeanor punishable by nsportation Code, sec. 54	y a fine between \$1 and \$200 42.401.
DIGEST:	CSHB 307 would revise the required equipment that bikes must have at night. The light currently required to be on the front of the bicycle could be on the person instead and the light could be flashing or steady.		the front of the bicycle could
	that all bikes had to be on either the bik	have a red light visible t	nate the option of a reflector so from the rear. The light could or on the person. The bill r steady.
	The bill would appl of the bill, Septemb	•	ed on or after the effective date
SUPPORTERS SAY:		· ·	oth cyclists and drivers by rs would be less likely to

## HB 307 House Research Organization page 2

experience the trauma of causing injury to a cyclist. Cyclists, who include a lot of children, would have a lower risk of death or injury due to a collision.

The bill would require cyclists to have a light on the rear of their bicycle or on their person instead of a reflector because lights are the most effective way to see cyclists at night. A reflector only functions when light shines directly on it. Rain and other weather conditions can seriously diminish its effectiveness at night.

The bill is necessary. Fifty cyclists are killed each year in Texas. Current bike safety education programs have not adequately reduced cyclist deaths. Law enforcement already identify a lack of proper lighting as a safety issue leading to collisions. The bill would allow law enforcement to take a proactive approach to prevent collisions before they occurred.

The bill would not unfairly affect low-income bicyclists. A set of bike lights can cost as little as \$2 and the increased protection significantly outweighs the potential cost of a collision. The bill would allow lights to be on a cyclist's bicycle, helmet, cap, or on any visible part of the body, which is less expensive than requiring mounted lights.

The physical benefits of cycling are clear and the state should encourage cycling safety. The bill would improve safety for cyclists while they commuted or exercised.

OPPONENTS SAY: CSHB 307 is unnecessary and would not improve safety. Current law already requires cyclists to have a light on the front of their bikes and a reflector on the back so that they can see the road and so that vehicles can see them at night. Current law also already allows cyclists to use another light at night if they need or want to. The bill would interfere with an individual's right to take personal responsibility for deciding when an extra light would or would not be necessary.

Education programs in schools and communities already exist to educate cyclists and drivers about road safety. The bill would not make drivers or cyclists any more aware than they already are about road safety and would not necessarily reduce accidents. Moreover, bicycle light offenses are often already not enforced. The bill also could unfairly affect individuals who used a bicycle instead of a car for everyday transportation and could not afford to buy a new light.