

Assembly

MINUTES OF TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE HEARING - 56TH NEVADA
ASSEMBLY SESSION - FEBRUARY 9, 1971

Present: Lowman, F. Young, Kean, Howard, Ashworth, Prince
and Valentine

Chairman Lowman convened the hearing of the Transportation Committee with representatives of various companies and organizations present to testify on bills A.B. 23, 81, 120, 177, 193, S.B. 51, 63 and 64 at 10:20 a.m. in Room 240.

On A.B. 23 -- permits appointment of highway patrolmen within budgetary limitations; and A.B. 177 -- limits employment of supplementary Nevada highway patrolmen by availability of moneys in special statutory fund.

James Lambert, Superintendent, Law Enforcement Division, said that they presently have 91 men employed on the highway patrol and would like to hire 15 more men this year.

Howard Hill, Director, Department of Motor Vehicles, said they would like to hire most of the men, 15 of them, the first year and then 5 or 6 the following year.

Ashworth asked how many men they could handle in the Academy.

Lambert informed him they could handle 20 to 25 people. He said that they were trying to establish a highway patrol ratio to regulate the highway patrol personnel numbers instead of always needing approval every session to do so. The men are never allowed overtime. The \$1.00 assessment would be used for a gradual growth program including patrolmen's salaries and total costs. It is only spent on highway patrolmen. There are three concepts on which the number of patrolmen are based: patrolmen per registration of automobiles, patrolmen per highway miles and the third a combination of the two. He proposed a 1 to 1500 ratio. With the moneys available, in 6 to 10 years, it would bring the Nevada Highway Patrol to 252 men. Statutory miles of highway about 6,000 could be used for the ratio or number of autos on the highway, increased in this state by tourism.

Kean asked about the total cost of a patrolman including the depreciation of his vehicle.

Lambert advised it costs \$15,000 per year per patrolman and the vehicles are included in this figure. Divisional support costs will cover the augmentation of patrolmen but it will not sustain them in a cost budget figure. Lambert: We object to the terminology in the bill as it put a numerical restriction on the total strength of the organization without regard to need or effect. At the outset we need to establish a ratio that will control the total strength of the Highway Patrol on a reasonable basis. The passage of the \$1.00 per registration assessment for the augmentation was a step

in the right direction; to change this now would abort any reasonable progress to attain the number of patrolmen needed to do the job. We have one of the worst ratios of death, to injury, to property damage accidents in the country, and fatality rates are setting new records each year - to say nothing of the injury and property damage costs. Our present strength is far below the acceptable national standard. The average nationwide ratio is one patrolman for 2300 registrations. Here in Nevada, we now have one patrolman for every 5000 registrations. With this undermanned force, it is virtually impossible to furnish the service and protection required. The absolute best we can do with this size force is mop up the gory mess of the accident - we do not have the manpower to do the preventive patrol work that will help to lessen the fatalities and control and lessen the carnage on our highways.

Lowman suggested changing the law from "5 to 15".

Robert Guinn, Nevada Motor Transportation Association, said that the highway fund would not sustain additional highway patrolmen without additional taxes. To do this, the registration costs or appropriate other highway funds must be increased to pick up the slack.

Valentine felt that A.B. 23 was the best bill for this purpose.

Guinn advised that \$300,000 a year would be used in the overall effort to expand the patrol.

Ashworth asked why it was reverted back to the highway fund.

Guinn said that the five-man limitation was written in by the Senate Finance Committee in order to get the bill out. It was never intended to be reverted.

Ashworth said that he felt the problem was the limitation of 5 men instead of 15 men.

A general discussion then took place.

On A.B. 81 -- excludes old motor vehicles from standard requirements of licensing and registration.

Prince advised that he met with the Motor Vehicle Department people and they have made some amendments to the bill as follows: Section 2, page 1, by deleting lines 6 and 7 and inserting "exhibitions, tours, parades and similar uses"; Section 3, page 1, by deleting lines 10 and 11 and inserting "passenger car, regardless of weight or number-of-passenger capacity"; Section 4, page 1, by deleting lines 13 and 14 and inserting "under this chapter shall execute an affidavit, declaring that the vehicle for which registration is requested is owned and"; Section 4, page 1, by deleting lines 16 through 18; and Section 6, page 1, by deleting lines 24 through

26 and inserting "number, which shall be displayed pursuant to this chapter".

Mrs. Larry (Marthlena)Callaghan, 1014 S. Division Street, Carson City, Nevada, representing the V-8 Ford Club and the Model-A Ford Club, said they would like to have the cars licensed legally but not as a car driven every day. They would like the bill as originally written.

Prince advised that this law was a copy of the Idaho law.

Richard Herz, Chief, Registration Division, said that people would be able to use their special license plate, "NEVADA OLD TIMER", for special events.

Young advised that for parades no license was necessary.

Herz said they need to apply for a permit though.

A general discussion took place.

On A.B. 120 -- authorizes Department of Motor Vehicles to regulate noise emissions from motor vehicles using public highways.

Valentine stated that he would like to hold off on this bill if there were no objections.

Lambert felt it would be better to make an amendment to N.R.S. 481.611 although he did not object to the bill.

On A.B. 193 -- provides method for canceling demerit points of driver.

Bill Fitzpatrick, Safety Traffic Division, testified for the bill.

A general discussion took place regarding demerit points. When demerit points are 12 months old, they are automatically deleted. A person would be notified by the Department when he has received 6 demerit points that he may attend driving school to erase 3 demerit points. The oldest demerits would be taken off after attending driving school.

Hill said that they would erase 3 points and not the citation. He explained the school and demerits. They are trying to keep the driver from getting 12 points and losing his license.

Valentine stated that the bill should read "shall cancel these 3 newest demerit points".

The hearing was adjourned at 11:55 a.m. and the committee continued in discussion.

Guinn felt that S.B. 51 should be rewritten and then checked out

with the highway people.

Ashworth moved that S.B. 51 be indefinitely postponed, Young seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed. A new bill was asked of Counsel.

Ashworth moved to amend A.B. 23 from "5 to 15" man limit, Kean seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed as amended.

Young moved to postpone A.B. 177, Kean seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed to postpone.

A.B. 193, Valentine moved that on line 16 the words "not more than" be deleted, Young seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

Valentine moved that on line 16 the word "such" be replaced by the words "most recent", Young seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

cr