

## Courts Weigh Restraint Requirements

Questions surrounding whether and when car manufacturers will be required by the government to install automatic restraint systems in new cars are now before two courts.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which has reinstated the standard requiring either air bags or automatic seat belts for new cars, is now considering whether it should extend the deadline for compliance with federal motor vehicle safety standard (FMVSS) 208 beyond Sept. 1, 1983.

Separately, the Supreme Court is considering petitions for review of the appeals court ruling which were filed by the auto industry, the federal government, and several advocacy groups. (See accompanying story.)

### NHTSA Sees Two-Year Delay

Relying on estimates from the auto makers it regulates, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) has told the Appeals Court that all new cars cannot be equipped with automatic restraints until Sept. 1, 1985, "at the earliest."

Recommendation for further delay in implementation of the restraint rule came in response to the court's order that the agency notify it as to whether auto manufacturers could meet a compliance date of Sept. 1, 1983. (See *Status Report*, Vol. 17, No. 11, Aug. 12, 1982.)

Insurance plaintiffs in the case, who had filed the suit resulting in the court order, reacted sharply to NHTSA's proposed lead-time delay.

"A person unfamiliar with the 12-year history of motor vehicle safety standard 208 would surmise from NHTSA's memorandum [seeking a delay of the rule] that ... the passive restraint requirement sprang, like Athena, fullblown from the head of Zeus," the State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co. said in comments on the proposed delay.

"When NHTSA postponed the rule in April 1981, the manufacturers were preparing to comply by September 1981 — a deadline less than five months away. Yet NHTSA would now have this court believe that it would take auto makers three years, or even longer, to comply with the reinstated standard," State Farm continued.

The insurer asked the court not to postpone the effective date of the rule beyond Sept. 1983. It suggested that the court withhold its decision on NHTSA's request for a delay, pending the Supreme Court's han-

*(Cont'd on next page)*

## Insurers and Health Groups Seek to Block Supreme Court Review

The Supreme Court should not review a lower court ruling reinstating the automatic restraint provisions of federal motor vehicle safety standard (FMVSS) 208, insurance industry representatives and health groups have said in briefs responding to government and other petitioners.

The auto industry, conservative advocacy groups, and the Department of Transportation had earlier asked the Supreme Court to grant a review of the ruling by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, which ordered manufacturers to begin complying with the standard starting with 1984 models. (See *Status Report*, Vol. 17, No. 13, Sept. 15, 1982.)

A year ago, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) dropped the rule which had been announced in 1977 and was scheduled to take effect in stages, beginning with 1982 large cars. NHTSA's decision followed a White House announce-

*(Cont'd on page 6)*

## **Courts Weigh Restraint**

### **Requirements (Cont'd from Page 1)**

ding of petitions for review of the case. State Farm said the “auto makers’ assertion that installation of passive restraints by September 1983 might require them to divert resources from endeavors that they prefer to vehicular safety” was “heavily outweighed” by the “human and economic loss that would result from further delay.”

The National Association of Independent Insurers (NAII), in comments opposing NHTSA’s proposal, said it “believes that the record NHTSA now has before it on the lead-time question, primarily affidavits and correspondence from manufacturers, clearly establishes only two facts. First, the goals of the safety act will not be met by the voluntary actions of the manufacturers; and second, absent a tightly-disciplined compliance schedule, even mandatory passive restraint requirements will be weakened by further delays.”

The sought-for delay was made “even more incredible,” said NAII, by the fact that the statements “are coming from ... an industry that can design and produce an entirely new car model in one and a half to two years, if necessary, to meet competition; an industry that initially designed and produced the air bag from scratch in under three years.”

### **NAII Opposes Delay**

NAII asked the court to deny NHTSA’s request for delay and to order the agency to come up with a more timely schedule. “Significantly, when the statements of the manufacturers are read, as opposed to NHTSA’s conclusory analysis of these statements,” said NAII, “it appears as though even they cannot deny that they would be able to effect substantial compliance by Sept. 1, 1984.”

Affidavits from 19 auto makers offered a wide range of estimates on how long it would take to comply with the court-ordered restoration of the automatic protection requirement. None said they could meet the Sept. 1, 1983, compliance date that now stands, although Volkswagen of America and Toyota indicated they could comply on models where they now offer automatic belts.

Detroit’s “Big Three” — Chrysler, Ford, and General Motors — indicated partial compliance could be possible by Sept. 1, 1984 if the requirements of FMVSS 208 are not changed and detachable automatic belts are still considered acceptable.

As part of the prolonged lead time for requiring the often-delayed automatic restraints, NHTSA told the court it would be necessary for the agency to conduct new rulemaking, but before such rulemaking

could begin, it would be necessary for the Supreme Court to decide whether it will accept the restraint case for review.

NHTSA said auto makers had given “numerous credible reasons” why automatic restraints cannot be required for 1984 models. Among them were:

- The Sept. 1, 1983 compliance date would be particularly inappropriate for small cars with a wheel-base of less than 100 inches — which constitute 41 percent of current production — since manufacturers had abandoned their passive restraint programs following rescission of the standard in 1981, and diverted resources elsewhere. Design problems remain for new models.

- An early, simultaneous, compliance date would make it difficult to obtain parts from suppliers.

- An early date could also hike costs considerably for manufacturers. GM said it would cost \$375 million, Ford estimated compliance costs at \$280 million, and Chrysler put the cost at \$100 million.

Few manufacturers mentioned air bags as a means of compliance. BMW said it plans to install air bags in three models and automatic belts in its most popular model. BMW said it would be able to install air bags in one model line beginning Sept. 1, 1984.

Saab suggested incentives for air bag installation, urging NHTSA to stagger compliance dates so that manufacturers who intend to install air bags be given additional lead time, while those intending to install belts could meet an earlier deadline.

Volvo said although it had earlier planned to install air bags in its top-of-the-line models, it now would probably utilize designs for motorized belts, and could comply with the standard by Sept. 1, 1984.

## **Allstate Study Confirms 5 MPH Bumper Benefits**

Additional confirmation of the economic benefits of the federal 5 mph bumper standard — a requirement recently weakened to 2.5 mph by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) — has been supplied to the regulatory agency by Allstate Insurance Co.

NHTSA presently is considering a petition by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety calling for reinstatement of the 5 mph standard. (See *Status Report*, Vol. 17, No. 9, July 1, 1982.) That petition, along with supporting material filed by the Institute and others raises fundamental doubts about NHTSA’s claims that

a 2.5 mph standard would be more advantageous to consumers and insurers than the 5 mph version.

In a letter and evaluation report to NHTSA, Allstate recalled that in 1974 it carried out “an evaluation of the new bumper systems by utilizing claim estimates from model years 1971 and ’72 (i.e., before improved bumpers) and for model years 1973 and ’74 (i.e., after improved bumpers).” The agency’s first 5 mph bumper standard, which protected safety-related but not other parts in low-speed impacts, began to take effect in 1973. That earlier study, Allstate noted, “demonstrated substantial reductions in costs in front and rear end impacts leading to a conclusion that better bumpers were performing well.”

Allstate said it now has analyzed its data to “determine the benefits of the first true no-damage bumper system which was initially required on 1980 model year” cars by the federal standard.

“Based on this analysis, we conclude that 1980 model bumper systems produced a relative cost reduction of 43.7 percent in frontal impacts, and 59.6 percent in rear impacts relating to 1971, ’72 models. Reductions of 30 percent in frontal impacts and 53 percent in rear impacts were produced by 1980 bumpers compared to 1973, ’74 models.

“Accordingly, NHTSA’s recent reductions in the protection effectiveness requirements for bumpers may be even more costly to consumers than we originally anticipated. Even considering other facts which might have some impact on these results, the inevitable conclusion is that the 1980 bumper systems produced substantial cost reductions.”

## **Congress Approves Anti-Drunk Driving Incentives for States**

Before adjourning for the November elections, Congress adopted a \$125 million incentive grant program to encourage state adoption of comprehensive anti-drunk driving statutes. The legislation also authorizes modernization of the National Driver Register in order to speed screening of motor vehicle license applicants.

The legislation (H.R. 6170) resembles a bill adopted in the Senate on May 11 (S. 2158) sponsored by Sen. John Danforth (R.-Mo.), in that it preserves four major criteria that states must meet in order to qualify for the grant awards starting Feb. 1, 1983. (See *Status Report*, Vol. 17, No. 7, May 24, 1982.) Under these, state laws must provide:

- Prompt license suspension or revocation for any person who has committed an alcohol-related traffic offense and fails or refuses to take a chemical sobriety test. For first-time offenders, there would be a 90-day license suspension or revocation and no less than a year’s suspension for second-offenders.

- A mandatory 48-hour prison sentence, or as an alternative a minimum of 10 days of community service, for any person convicted of driving while intoxicated more than once in a five-year period.

- That any driver with a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) of 0.10 percent or greater shall be deemed to be driving while intoxicated.

- Increased enforcement and public information efforts on the part of the states.

### **Few Meet All Criteria**

According to Philip Haseltine, chairman of the National Association of Governor’s Highway Safety Representatives, few states currently meet all the criteria for the incentive grant awards — a fact readily acknowledged by Capitol Hill staffers who worked for the bill’s passage.

The motive behind the legislation is to induce state adoption of at least these minimum criteria, said one spokesman. States will become eligible for additional incentive grants if they meet the minimum criteria set in the legislation and both conform with additional criteria to be set by the Secretary of Transportation.

The legislation also authorizes the upgrading of the National Driver Register, a file of drivers whose licenses have been suspended or revoked — many of them for drunk driving violations. Currently, states may query the register to screen new license applicants, but the register has been underutilized because it can take up to 14 days for its mailed responses to arrive at state licensing facilities. (See *Status Report*, Vol. 16, No. 20, Dec. 21, 1982.)

### **New Rulemaking Needed**

Under the new law, the register will continue for the time being to function as is while the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) conducts rulemaking to establish a new register which would provide computerized access to states. The new register will serve as a “pointer” system whereby the inquiring state will be alerted if an applicant appears to have a faulty record in another state (or states). At the same time, the states where the violator’s records are stored will automatically transfer the information to the state where the individual is seeking a new license.

*(Cont’d on next page)*

## **Congress Approves Anti-Drunk Driving Incentives for States**

**(Cont'd from Page 3)**

This rulemaking activity should be accomplished within 18 months, according to the mandate set by Congress.

At the same time, NHTSA will set up a pilot test program with selected states, and begin running it within 18 months in order to demonstrate the most effective computer system. Eventually, when the new system is perfected, the entire operation will be transferred over.

The legislation also provides access to the upgraded register not only for the chief licensing officials of the states, but, for purposes of crash investigation, to the National Transportation Safety Board and the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety as well.

It also would allow prospective employers of commercial drivers to screen applicants' driving records through the state motor vehicle licensing agency. Individuals who are employed as commercial drivers or seek such employment also may request their files through the state agency.

The legislation also would set up a 15-member advisory committee, which would review the driver register's operations.

## **Institute Film Receives Award**

The Council on International Nontheatrical Events (CINE) has selected *Faces in Crashes*, an Insurance Institute for Highway Safety film, for a "Golden Eagle" certificate, its top award. It is the fifth such award accorded Institute films.

The production will now become an official United States entry in foreign film festivals.

The overwhelming majority of severe facial injuries sustained each year occur in motor vehicle crashes. *Faces in Crashes* documents the problem and demonstrates practical improvements in vehicles that would prevent many of these needless injuries.

The film may be obtained for free loan on a first-come-first-served basis from Modern Talking Picture Service, Inc., 5000 Park Street North, St. Petersburg, Fla. 33709 (813/541-7571), or for sale from the Communications Dept., Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Watergate 600, Washington, D.C. 20037. Purchase price: 16 mm. film - \$90, 3/4" videotape cassette - \$40.

## **Temporary Highway Funding Measures Adopted**

Congress agreed to extend authorizations for federal aid highway construction out of the Highway Trust Fund at 1982 levels for the next three months and continued appropriations at current operating levels for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) under continuing resolution H.J. Res. 599, before it adjourned October 1.

## **NHTSA Authorizations Bill Clears Congress**

The Senate adopted without amendment a three-year House bill extending authorizations for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). The measure now awaits the President's signature.

The legislation (H.R. 6273) would authorize appropriations at current administration policy levels through the 1985 fiscal year. (See *Status Report*, Vol. 17, No. 11, Aug. 11, 1982.)

The bill's Senate sponsor, Sen. John Danforth (R.-Mo.), chairman of the Commerce subcommittee on transportation, told colleagues his support for the measure was given reluctantly because of his reservations about NHTSA's current policy direction.

### **Danforth Lists Problem Areas**

Danforth listed NHTSA actions which he said have resulted in the dismantling of consumer and safety-related rules, including its decision to adopt a less effective bumper standard and its cancellation of rulemaking strengthening occupant protection in side and frontal impacts, and to help combat auto theft and odometer fraud.

Danforth said he was particularly concerned because two of the agency's actions — the decision to drop the automatic restraint requirements of FMVSS 208 and to roll back the 5 mph bumper rule — have been challenged in court. "This puts NHTSA, the agency created by Congress to promote safety, in the inconsistent position of arguing against auto safety," said Danforth.

"In addition, NHTSA is wasting valuable time and our tax dollars fighting these court battles," Danforth said.

## Delta 88 Has Best Collision Experience

General Motors' intermediate-sized Oldsmobile Delta 88 had the best collision coverage loss experience among high-volume 1982 models, the Highway Loss Data Institute (HLDI) has reported.

During the first 10 months of the model year, HLDI found the Delta 88 had a record ranking 47 percent below the average for all 1982 models, while the Mazda RX-7, a small subcompact, had the worst experience of high-volume cars, with a record slightly more than double the average.

The best and worst cars listed below are those with the lowest and highest average loss payments per insured vehicle year. The value 100 represents the average loss payment per insured vehicle year. A rank-

ing of 53, as in the case of the Oldsmobile Delta 88 means the model's performance was 47 percent better than average.

Of the low-volume cars sold, the Mercury Marquis had a relative average loss payment of 47, or 53 percent better than the average for all 1982 models, while the Chevrolet Corvette, a sports subcompact, had the worst rating of all autos — 299 — or nearly 200 percent worse than the average.

Of the 12 cars with the best experience, seven were either compact or intermediate models. However, the group also included one subcompact and one small subcompact model. Five of the 12 were 4-door models and five others were station wagons. Eleven out of the 12 were domestic products and nine were built by GM.

### RELATIVE AVERAGE LOSS PAYMENTS PER INSURED VEHICLE YEAR FOR THE 1982 MODEL YEAR CARS WITH THE BEST AND WORST COLLISION COVERAGE LOSS EXPERIENCE

	BEST CARS				WORST CARS			
<b>HIGH VOLUME</b> (At least 1% of total exposure)	Oldsmobile Delta 88	4 Dr.	I	53	Mazda RX-7	Sp.	SS	201
	Ford Escort	S.W.	SS	64	Chevrolet Camaro	Sp.	S	170
	Chevrolet Cavalier	S.W.	SC	67	Toyota Celica	2 Dr.	S	139
	Honda Accord	4 Dr.	S	69	Datsun 210	2 Dr.	SS	137
	Oldsmobile Cutlass	4 Dr.	C	76	Ford Mustang	2 Dr.	S	133
					Ford EXP	Sp.	SS	133
<b>LOW VOLUME</b> (Less than 1% of total exposure)	Mercury Marquis	4 Dr.	I	47	Chevrolet Corvette	Sp.	S	299
	Buick LeSabre	2 Dr.	I	48	BMW 320i	Sp.	S	241
	Chevrolet Caprice	S.W.	I	49	Datsun 280ZX	Sp.	SS	239
	Buick Regal	S.W.	C	49	Datsun 280ZX 2+2	Sp.	S	197
	Pontiac Bonneville	S.W.	C	54	Datsun 200SX	2 Dr.	SS	183
	Chevrolet Celebrity	4 Dr.	SC	54				
	Buick Skyhawk	2 Dr.	SC	54				

Notes:

- Results are standardized to the following distribution:

DEDUCTIBLE	YOUTHFUL OPERATOR	NO YOUTHFUL OPERATOR
< \$150	10%	60%
≥ \$150	5%	25%

\*SS — Small Subcompact  
 S — Subcompact  
 SC — Small Compact  
 C — Compact  
 I — Intermediate  
 FS — Full-Size

- Results are relative to the overall results for 1982 models.

## DOT to Let States Judge Breath-Testing Devices

Responsibility for setting criteria for alcohol breath-testing instruments and radar equipment purchased with federal funds will be left to the states, the government announced in a *Federal Register* notice.

The decision to drop federal requirements for the equipment purchases, along with reductions in “paperwork requirements” for obtaining federal highway safety grant (Section 402) funds, reflects the administration’s commitment to allowing states more flexibility when spending federal funds, a Department of Transportation official said.

The notice was published by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), which jointly administer the state and community highway safety grant program.

Since 1974, NHTSA has periodically issued lists of qualified instruments which measure breath alcohol under a standard set by the National Bureau of Standards.

NHTSA will continue to test such equipment and issue the results, said George Reagle, NHTSA’s acting associate administrator for traffic safety programs.

There has been a controversy in several state courts concerning potential interference by police radios which could affect the performance of a popular breath-testing instrument sold by Smith and Wesson. A federal official said the instrument is currently being tested by the National Bureau of Standards under NHTSA contract in order to assess this problem, but he denied any connection between the agency’s decision to drop the federal requirements and the legal controversy.

The agency also said it would leave criteria for purchase of radar devices up to the states. Last November, NHTSA decided to drop a completed performance standard for radar units but said it would issue test results along with model specifications for state consideration. In addition, the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) — which had instigated the rulemaking effort in 1977 — has adopted NHTSA’s proposed specifications as its own. Following product testing, IACP will issue a list of recommended products for state use, an organization spokesman said.

Ambulances purchased with federal funds will still have to meet certain criteria, as will child restraints, which must meet the provisions of federal motor vehicle safety standard (FMVSS) 213.

The notice also said that “substantial changes in the content and format” of highway safety plans required of states have been inaugurated by NHTSA and FHWA, along with simpler reimbursement criteria. Projects falling into six program areas deemed to be “national priorities” because they’ve been identified as most effective “will be subject to a minimum of federal scrutiny,” the notice said. They are: alcohol countermeasures, police traffic services, occupant protection, traffic records, emergency medical services, and safety construction and operational improvements.

In essence, said one NHTSA official, program grant applications will be scrutinized only to ascertain that they describe identified highway safety problems and select appropriate countermeasures. (See *Status Report*, Vol. 17, No. 6, April 27, 1982.)

States have the option of utilizing the relaxed procedures beginning with the 1983 fiscal year grant applications and they will become mandatory starting with the 1984 budget cycle, the notice said. Comments on the revisions may be sent to the associate administrator for traffic safety programs, NHTSA, with a copy to FHWA. Comments should be addressed to George Reagle, Traffic Safety Programs, NHTSA, 400 7th St., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590. Copies should be sent to Howard Hassa, Office of Highway Safety, FHWA, 400 7th St., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590.

## Insurers and Health Groups Seek To Block Supreme Court Review

(Cont’d from Page 1)

ment in early 1981 that the standard would be among many targeted for quick deregulatory action. (See *Status Report*, Vol. 16, No. 6, April 27, 1981.)

NHTSA said it was dropping the rule because auto makers had indicated they intended to install restraint systems that were no better than manual belts and thus, no increase in restraint use could be expected.

The facts are to the contrary, State Farm told the Supreme Court. “NHTSA’s own studies of technology [automatic seat belts] *already in use* clearly demonstrate the agency’s rescission will lead to thousands of otherwise preventable traffic fatalities and tens of thousands of additional injuries each year.”

“In short,” State Farm said, “by its decision in this case, NHTSA abandoned a 12-year-old commitment to auto safety because the industry it was instructed by Congress to regulate threatened to comply with such regulation by installing devices which constitute the ‘worst available technology.’” Moreover, State Farm added, “the agency then rejected the obvi-

ous alternatives to abandonment on the basis of arguments lacking any support in the record. 'Arbitrary' and 'capricious' are, if anything, gentle words to apply to that kind of decisionmaking."

A brief filed by the National Association of Independent Insurers (NAII) and the Automobile Owners Action Council, said the petitions for writs of certiorari should be denied because no new theories about court review of agency actions were inherent in this particular case. If the Supreme Court agreed to take on the case, said NAII, it would be undertaking the same task the court of appeals had already accomplished — that of an exhaustive review of the record in order to determine whether the agency's action was arbitrary and capricious and not in accordance with the law.

NHTSA certainly had the right to change the rule and even rescind it, but as noted by the appeals court in its ruling, it couldn't proceed as if it were working with a "clean slate," said NAII. There had to be a rational basis for such a radical change in direction.

Before abandoning the passive restraint rule, said NAII, NHTSA had an obligation to "consider alternatives less drastic in terms of their safety consequences."

### **Continuing Congressional Interest**

NAII said "public interest considerations suggest against further review" by the Court. "There is a continuing and active Congressional interest in passive restraints — and the Congress is the ultimate forum where the decision to follow or abandon the goals of the safety act should be made."

Filing as *amici curiae* opposed to Supreme Court review of the case, the American College of Preventive Medicine and the American Public Health Association cited data showing that "motor vehicle accidents are the fifth leading cause of death in this country, and are the leading cause of death for persons in the age bracket of 1-24 years. In 1978, 51,500 persons died in motor vehicle accidents, of which approximately 28,000 were front seat occupants," said the groups. "An additional two million persons suffered disabling injuries in 1978 as a result of motor vehicle accidents.

"This translates to the following morbid statistics: every 10 minutes someone dies in a traffic accident; injuries, many of which are the major cause of paraplegia, epilepsy, and cerebral palsy, are sustained at the rate of one every 8 seconds; the number of persons killed each day, 140, is the equivalent of a major airline crash," the brief said.

"As the statistics demonstrate ... there is consensus that FMVSS 208 has substantial public health consequences and has very real meaning for the lives of those affected," the brief said. "Further delay in implementation of this rule, which has to date withstood considerable challenge, will therefore bring about consequences which will clearly be irreversible."

## **Court Review Sought On FHWA Decision to Drop RRR Design Rules**

The Center for Auto Safety has filed suit in the U.S. District Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia asking for review of a Department of Transportation decision to abandon rulemaking on design standards for resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation (RRR) projects receiving federal aid.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) dropped the 5-year-old proceeding last June, saying the states should adopt their own standards for RRR work conducted off the interstate system. (See *Status Report*, Vol. 17, No. 10, July 22, 1982.)

The center, along with three private individuals, said the FHWA decision fails to comply with its legal mandate to insure that roads be constructed in a manner that is "conducive to safety, durability, and economy of maintenance."

The FHWA decision will permit states to follow unsafe practices, the center said in its court filing. It noted that the states are likely to spend a large portion of available funds on simple resurfacing projects, without bothering to upgrade older sections which were designed to meet lower traffic volumes driving at lower speeds than is now the norm.

"Resurfacing encourages motorists to drive at higher speeds," the center contended, "thereby magnifying the effect of any design flaws and increasing highway accidents and fatalities."

Durability and the ability to maintain work done under RRR funding also will be shortchanged, the center said, since laying down new surfaces over roads in need of more substantial repairs will not last nearly as long as new surfaces laid over properly prepared roadbeds.

## On The Inside

- **TWO FEDERAL COURTS** are considering questions pertaining to whether and when auto makers will be required to furnish automatic restraints ...Page 1
- **INSURANCE INDUSTRY** representatives have asked the Supreme Court to deny an appeal to review the automatic restraints decision. ...Page 1
- **BUMPER STANDARD** benefits have been reconfirmed by Allstate Insurance Co. and reported to NHTSA in a plea against the weakened rule. ...Page 2
- **CONGRESS APPROVES** incentives for states to strengthen anti-drunk driving statutes, and votes improved National Driver Register. ...Page 3
- **'FACES IN CRASHES,'** a film produced by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, has been honored by a film council. ...Page 4
- **NHTSA AUTHORIZATIONS** through the 1985 fiscal year have been approved by Congress, and the bill awaits the President's signature. ...Page 4
- **THE OLDSMOBILE DELTA 88** had the best collision coverage loss experience for 1982 models, HLDI reports. ...Page 5
- **DOT SURRENDERS** to the states responsibility for setting criteria for breath testers and radar equipment. ...Page 6
- **COURT REVIEW** of the FHWA decision to abandon rulemaking on the highway RRR design standards is asked by Center for Auto Safety. ...Page 7

If you are not now receiving *Status Report* on a regular basis, but would like to, simply drop a note to the Communications Department at the address below and we will add your name to the mailing list.

(Contents may be republished whole, or in part, with attribution.)

insurance  
institute  
for  
highway  
safety

the highway loss reduction

# Status Report

Watergate 600 • Washington, D.C. 20037 • 202/333-0770

Editor: Paul C. Hood

Writers in this issue: Ben Kelley, Rea Tyler

Production: Ron Bevilacqua, Luci Malone