

SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

MINUTES OF MEETING

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1971

HELEN HERR, CHAIRMAN

SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

MINUTES OF MEETING

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1971

HELEN HERR, CHAIRMAN

The Senate Committee on Transportation was called to order at 1 P.M. by Senator Herr, Chairman.

PRESENT: Senator Herr
 Senator Monroe
 Senator Drakulich
 Senator Manning
 Senator Dodge
 Senator Harris
 Senator Pozzi

WITNESSES: Mr. Howard Hill, Director of Motor Vehicles
 Mr. A. Wayne Tatrault, Assistant Highway
 coordinator
 Mr. James L. Lambert, Chief of the Law
 Enforcement Division
 Mr. Winkelman, Mr. Ramsey and
 Mr. Little

 Mr. Bob Guinn, Executive Director
 Motor Transport Association

The Chairman announced that the meeting scheduled for March 8, 1971, at 1.P.M. on S. B. 87 and SB 128 would be held in Room 243, instead of room 345.

The Chairman stated that this committee would first consider S.B. 86, a bill which permits random inspection of vehicles. Senator Herr announced that the committee had requested the presence of two members of the California Highway Patrol to be present, and read a letter of explanation as to why they could not be here. Senator Herr also stated that she had requested Mr. Bob Guinn to attend this meeting, as well as Mr. James L. Lambert, Chief of Law Enforcement.

Mr. Lambert was called and testified as follows:

He said that they were in favor of random inspection; that at an earlier meeting he passed out a program to each member of the committee explaining the program.

A number of the committee member said they had never received the program, and Mr. Lambert then passed out a copy of the program to each member present. He stated that they had patterned the program very close after the California program, and stated the reasons; he said that the program had worked very well in California. He pointed out that if people did not know just when they might be inspected they would keep their cars in good condition. A person has to have his car in good condition as a safety measure also. He said they put together their studies here in an attempt to have a good program. Mr. Lambert submitted a written analysis of the program from the department, which is attached hereto, and made a part of these minutes. Mr. Lambert referred to the page on the budget relating to the cost of operating the program. He said that it did not stipulate particular things, but they were attempting an explanation of the program.

The Chairman said: "At this time then we cannot satisfy the National Safety Bureau, can we?"

Mr. Lambert said that the only thing they could to was to have the random inspection at this time; that they had no statistics, that it was a trial system, that there were no district facilities; he spoke of mechanical failures, and other things.

The Chairman spoke of the National Bureau of Safety and their requirements, and inquired what they were.

Mr. Lambert stated that they did not have specific data to go on, the Federal Government had a policy that is quite flexible, it would give data and information needed to evaluate, which we could use to update or change our direction to achieve our desired objective, either by federal regulations or economical evaluation, in other words seek improved methods.

Senator Monroe remarked that he understood the department set up a check line in a community, and asked what happens if a man is on his way to church, or to a business appointment.

Mr. Lambert said that all goes back to general common sense; that there was no set rule. In California where emergencies arise they will pass the motorist on.

Senator Monroe inquired how would they do this?

Mr. Lambert said they would set up a traffic control.

Senator Monroe asked how long it would take to go through, to which Mr. Lambert replied: "A relatively short time." He said there were only limited tests you could make in this type of operation, the state might be liable; that there was always a liability factor. We are checking the obvious, and with the proper equipment you can get a little better test.

Senator Monroe asked how long would the motorist be in line, to which Mr. Lambert replied: "We could not

tie up a great number of cars at a time. If you see a 1969 car that is one thing, but if you see an old junkie coming down the street, you are going to look that one over. We would stop that car, and have a short waiting line. I feel this is a very effective program.

The Chairman inquired as to what the highway patrolman would do? The answer was that safety patrolment would be assigned Highway vehicles. Mr. Lambert then discussed how they would assign teams of four' that in the case of rural areas there would be a split of and only two men would be assigned to the smaller c heck station. He said the patrolman would direct traffic, and trained mechanics would do the inspection. They would have these different functions, he stated that our traffic offic ers are not trained to do mechanical inspection.

Senator Drakulich said: "Y ou say this random inspection will not meet the requirements of the Federal Bureau of Highway Safety Act, to which Mr. Lambert said that it did not at the present time; that this was a trial; that they had no statistics to work on; that this is one of the things which we must have. We are not sure at this point, but that the Federal Government is considering accepting the California program. If they do we will be able to have a good program, and at the end of the year we could submit our findings for a periodical check. It will be necessary to show that you have had this inspection

before you can be licensed.

The Chairman stated that she would like to hear from Mr. Bob Guinnon random inspection; that she felt they should hear about different methods; that she could not see taking any action that cannot meet the Federal standards.

Senator Monroe stated that he had been involved in this, and remarked about states that have random inspection; that safety is developed through such a program, he mentioned several states, and discussed the situation in Texas, where so many gas stations are robbed.

Mr. Lambert then submitted an amendment to Sec. 2, subsection 2, line 9, which should include "Items to be inspected." He also stated that apropos of your cost estimate of this program this would have to go to Finance Committee.

Senator Monroe inquired if this was total funding? He asked if you could legally take this out of Highway Funds?

Mr. Lambert said he did not know.

Mr. Robert Guinn Executive Director of Motor Transport Association was called as a witness.

Mr. Guinn speaking on the bill said: "That in compliance with the Federal Highway Safety Act one of the requirements was a compulsory periodic inspection; that the State of California had instituted a random inspection program, that they were being very hard-nosed about it.

The position in California was that ten percent would come out of the highway funds. The Nevada legislative committee had considered all the pros and cons of the system. Mr. Guinn said that three states operated their own systems; that in many states certain qualifications are set forth by the highway departments, one was that you take your car to a station and get it inspected. That the fees were all the way from \$1.50 up to \$4.00 in Hawaii; that the law stipulated that certain inspections must be made; such as brakes, lights, horns, etc. If you took your car over to a regular station and had lights inspected it would cost \$5.00, and the motorist in the long run pays six or seven dollars for inspection. At most appointed inspection stations they say you can take the car where you want to. Most people do not want to take the car to a station and then come back to the check station. Mr. Guinn remarked about the attempted RCA proposal made several years ago, where this would have been done on a contract basis, which would have entailed the acquisition of land and building stations. They asked for a fixed period of time on the contracts, and estimated the cost at about \$5.00. The Legislative Counsel said they could not enter into this, so the plan was abandoned.

We understand that the department is recommending the 1969 inspection plan. He said that if the Legislature did not act, then the State should submit a plan; that was when the random inspection bill was put in. There is a question of how the Federal Bureau is going to be on the inspection; that there were states which have worse records in complying with the sixteen points of the Federal Act, as they do not have adequate driver training and education. Every state is trying to comply but if you don't you have a possible loss. Mr. Guinn said that he had serious doubts that we will be penalized in the next few years. He said that he had formed this opinion. If you decide you want to have this inspection, in view of the magnitude of the cost of periodic inspection you would be better off making this modest investment. We have 400,000 or more vehicles, when you talk about trailers there are close to a half million, and we are talking about a million dollars, now you are talking about a substantial investment of taxpayers' funds.

Mr. Guinn then discussed another problem regarding a proposed quality standard relating to environmental requirements, if that happens then this state would have to adopt that. These have been promulgated in the states, and he outlined the way in which it would work in order to comply. Mr. Guinn discussed HEW ideas on pollution, and on that particular point he stated that it was his judgment we cannot work on the random inspection plan.

He said he did not think anyone knows right now whether we will have this until we see this letter from HEW to the Government.

Mr. Guinn said that random had other merits, like checking vehicles licenses et cetera.

The Chairman stated: "Going back to this budget on salaries, there is a bill in the Assembly, would it be comparable to this?"

Mr. Guinn stated that it would not. He said that he thought if we were going to do this we should ask the highway department for the funds.

Senator Dodge interposed a question, as to whether a man is accused of wrong doing when he is cited.

Mr. Guinn said that he thought this committee should recommend that in case a vehicle is so unsafe, that the owner be given an opportunity to correct the defects in his care, and specify that it be done within a certain time.

Senator Dodge asked how this could be done, and Mr. Guinn said the man would go to a garage, get the car repaired and mail back evidence of such repairs.

Senator Dodge remarked that he liked that better than what was in the bill.

Senator Monroe remarked that the garage that did this work, would they do this at a reasonable fee?

Mr. Guinn stated that the garages would get this work.

Senator Monroe inquired if there had been much opposition to random inspection.

Mr. Guinn said that he felt the public had accepted the plan, with the concept of using good common sense and judgment; that the inspection acceptance had been good and in California a lot of people want to go through voluntarily.

The Chairman said that she believed the committee had heard enough to enable them to decide in which area they wanted to work.

The Chairman thanked the witnesses, and excused them.

There being no further business to come before the meeting, it was adjourned until Monday, March 1, 1971, at the hour of 1 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

E. Story

APPROVED:

HELEN HERR, CHAIRMAN

Amendment

SB 86

Lambert submitted.

We recommend that Section 2, subsection 1, line 6 be amended to read [Nevada Highway Patrol] Law Enforcement Division.

Subsection 2, line 9 add, The Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles shall make and the department shall enforce rules and regulations with respect to the items to be inspected and to the issuance of an identifying device and the manner of display of such devices on vehicles or combination of vehicles as evidence that such vehicles have been inspected and have been found to be in a safe mechanical condition and equipped as required by this title.

2-24-71

SENATE BILL NO. 86—COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 1, 1971

Referred to Committee on Transportation

SUMMARY—Permits random inspection of vehicles. Fiscal Note:
No. (BDR 43-952)



EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [] is material to be omitted.

AN ACT relating to the inspection of vehicles; permitting the Nevada highway patrol to inspect vehicles under certain conditions; establishing a procedure for court appearances and the issuance of verified complaints; providing penalties; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

- 1 SECTION 1. Chapter 484 of NRS is hereby amended by adding
- 2 thereto the provisions set forth as sections 2 to 4, inclusive, of this act.
- 3 SEC. 2. 1. *Every driver of a vehicle or combination of vehicles shall*
- 4 *stop and submit the vehicle to an inspection of the mechanical condition*
- 5 *and equipment of the vehicle at any location where patrolmen of the*
- 6 *Nevada highway patrol are conducting tests and inspections of motor*
- 7 *vehicles and when signs are displayed requiring such stop.*
- 8 2. *The director of the department of motor vehicles shall make and*
- 9 *the department shall enforce regulations with respect to the issuance of*
- 10 *an identifying device and the manner of display of such devices on*
- 11 *vehicles or combination of vehicles as evidence that such vehicles have*
- 12 *been inspected and have been found to be in safe mechanical condition*
- 13 *and equipped as required by this Title.*
- 14 3. *If, upon such inspection of a vehicle, such vehicle is found to be*
- 15 *in an unsafe mechanical condition or not equipped as required by this*
- 16 *Title the patrolman making the inspection may give such driver a notice*
- 17 *to appear and further require the driver or the owner of the vehicle to*
- 18 *produce in court satisfactory evidence that such vehicle or its equipment*
- 19 *has been made to conform with the requirements of this chapter.*
- 20 4. *Every patrolman giving such notice as provided in this section*
- 21 *shall mail a copy or otherwise give notice thereof to the owner and any*
- 22 *legal owner of such vehicle if other than the driver.*
- 23 SEC. 3. 1. *Whenever a written notice to appear has been mailed to*
- 24 *a person, as provided in subsection 2 of this act and NRS 484.695, an*
- 25 *exact and legible duplicate copy of such notice when filed with a justice of*

1 the peace shall constitute a complaint to which the person may plead
2 "guilty," and shall be in lieu of a verified complaint.

3 2. If the person fails to appear at the time set forth in the notice to
4 appear, does not deposit lawful bail or pleads other than "guilty," a veri-
5 fied complaint shall be filed, unless waived by such person, and there-
6 after-proceedings shall be had as provided by law.

7 3. A warrant of arrest shall not issue against an owner of a vehicle or
8 any other person following the filing of a verified complaint if such owner
9 or person was not driving the vehicle involved unless he is:

- 10 (a) Served notice of the violation he allegedly committed; and
- 11 (b) Informed that unless he appears in the appropriate justice's court
12 within 10 days after such service and answers the charge a verified com-
13 plaint will be filed and a warrant for his arrest will issue.

14 SEC. 4. It is unlawful for an owner of a vehicle or any other person
15 having the custody or control of a vehicle to request, cause or permit
16 the driving of such vehicle upon a highway if it is:

- 17 1. In an unsafe mechanical condition; or
- 18 2. Not equipped in the manner prescribed by this Title.

19 SEC. 5. NRS 484.695 is hereby amended to read as follows:

20 484.695 1. Police officers of incorporated cities and towns, sheriffs
21 and their deputies, and other peace officers of the State of Nevada in pur-
22 suance of assigned duty, having reasonable cause to believe that any vehi-
23 cle or combination of vehicles is not equipped as required by this
24 [chapter] Title or is in such unsafe condition as to endanger the driver
25 or other occupant or any person upon a public highway, may require
26 the driver thereof to stop and submit such vehicle or combination of
27 vehicles to an inspection of the mechanical condition or equipment
28 thereof and such test with reference thereto as may be appropriate.

29 2. If such vehicle or combination of vehicles is found to be in an
30 unsafe mechanical condition or is not equipped as required by this [chap-
31 ter,] Title, the officer making the inspection may give such driver a notice
32 [of arrest] to appear and further require the driver or the owner of the
33 vehicle to produce in court satisfactory evidence that such vehicle or its
34 equipment has been made to conform with the requirements of this chap-
35 ter.

36 3. Every officer giving such [directions or a] notice [of arrest] as
37 provided in this section shall mail a copy or otherwise give notice thereof
38 to the owner and any legal owner of such vehicle if other than the driver.

39 SEC. 6. NRS 484.697 is hereby amended to read as follows:

40 484.697 No person shall operate any vehicle or combination of
41 vehicles after notice of such unsafe condition or that the vehicle is not
42 equipped as required by this [chapter,] Title, given pursuant to the
43 provisions of section 2 of this act or NRS 484.695, except as may be nec-
44 essary to return such vehicle or combination of vehicles to the residence
45 or place of business of the owner or driver or to a garage, until the vehi-
46 cle and its equipment has been made to conform with the requirements of
47 this chapter.

48 SEC. 7. NRS 484.701 is hereby amended to read as follows:

49 484.701 Whenever the driver of a vehicle is directed by a police
50 officer, sheriff or his deputy, or other peace officer of the State of Nevada

1 in pursuance of assigned duty, to stop and submit the mechanical condi-
2 tion of the vehicle or its equipment to an inspection or test under condi-
3 tions stated in section 2 of this act or NRS 484.695, such driver shall stop
4 and submit to such inspection or test. A failure or refusal so to do is a
5 misdemeanor.

6 SEC. 8. This act shall become effective on July 1, 1972.

30

SENATE BILL NO. 87—COMMITTEE
ON TRANSPORTATION

FEBRUARY 1, 1971

Referred to Committee on Transportation

SUMMARY—Prescribes proper equipment for and operation of motorcycles and power cycles. Fiscal Note: No. (BDR 43-39)



EXPLANATION—Matter in *italics* is new; matter in brackets [] is material to be omitted.

AN ACT to amend chapter 486 of NRS, relating to power cycles, by extending such chapter to include motorcycles; establishing operator license requirements, equipment standards and operation limitations and privileges; providing penalties; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

The People of the State of Nevada, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. Chapter 486 of NRS is hereby amended by adding
2 thereto the provisions set forth as sections 2 to 32, inclusive, of this act.

3 SEC. 2. *As used in sections 3 to 32, inclusive, of this act, the words*
4 *and terms defined in sections 3 to 7, inclusive, of this act shall, unless the*
5 *context otherwise requires, have the meanings ascribed to them in sec-*
6 *tions 3 to 7, inclusive, of this act.*

7 SEC. 3. *“Department” means the department of motor vehicles.*

8 SEC. 4. *“Highway” means the entire width between the boundary*
9 *lines of every way maintained by a public authority when any part*
10 *thereof is open to the use of the public for purposes of vehicular traffic.*

11 SEC. 5. *“Motorcycle” means every motor vehicle equipped with a*
12 *seat or a saddle for the use of the driver and designed to travel on not*
13 *more than three wheels in contact with the ground, but excluding a tractor*
14 *or power cycle.*

15 SEC. 6. *“Muffler” means a device consisting of a series of chambers*
16 *or baffle plates, or other mechanical design, for the purpose of receiving*
17 *exhaust gas from an internal combustion engine, and is effective in reduc-*
18 *ing noise.*

19 SEC. 7. *“Power cycle” means every motor vehicle equipped with a*
20 *seat or saddle for the use of the driver, designed to travel on not more*
21 *than three wheels in contact with the ground, and propelled by a motor of*
22 *155 cc. displacement or less.*

23 SEC. 8. *Except as provided in section 9 of this act, a person shall not*

AMEND AS FOLLOWS:

Amend Section 13, Page 2 by deleting Lines 33 through 36 and inserting:

" Section 13. No person shall authorize or knowingly permit a motorcycle or power-cycle owned by him or under his control to be driven upon any highway by any person who is not authorized by this chapter to drive a motorcycle and powercycle."

Amend Section 14, Subsection 3, Page 2, Line 46 by deleting "seat" and inserting "motor-cycle or powercycle."

Amend Section 16, Page 3 by adding:

"A person driving a motorcycle or powercycle shall ride only upon the permanent and regular seat attached thereto."

Amend Section 20, Subsection 2, Page 3, Line 21 by inserting after "headgear" and before "on" the words "securely fastened".

Amend Section 21, Page 3, Line 31 by inserting after "powercycles" and before "unless" the words "or transparent windscreens for motorcycles or powercycles."

Amend Section 24, Page 3 and 4 by deleting Section 24, Subsection 1 and 2 and inserting:

"Section 24. Every motorcycle or powercycle shall be equipped with brakes adequate to control the stopping and holding as prescribed in NRS 484.593 and 484.595."

Amend Section 30, Page 4, Line 27, by deleting "both of".

Amend Section 33, Subsection 4, Page 5, Line 2 by deleting "the operators and chauffeur's licensing law" and inserting after "provisions of" "NRS 483".

Amend the bill as a whole by inserting:

"Every motorcycle or powercycle upon a highway of this state at any time from one-half hour after sunset to one-half hour before sunrise and at any other time when, because

of insufficient light or unfavorable atmospheric conditions, persons and vehicles on the highway are not clearly discernible at a distance of 1,000 feet ahead shall display lighted lamps and illuminated devices as respectively required in this chapter.

Every motorcycle or powercycle upon a highway shall be equipped with stop lights and turn signals to be lighted in the manner prescribed for the use of such devices.

Every motorcycle or powercycle shall be equipped with at least one tail lamp mounted on the rear, which, when lighted as required by this chapter, shall emit a red light plainly visible from a distance of 500 feet to the rear.

Such lamp shall be wired to be lighted whenever the headlamp is lighted.

Every motorcycle or powercycle manufactured after January 1, 1972, shall be equipped with electric turn signal lamps.

Such lamps shall be located on the front and rear and shall indicate an intention to turn by flashing lights in the direction toward which the turn is to be made.

The lamps showing to the front shall be mounted on the same level and as widely spaced laterally as practicable and, when signaling, shall emit white or amber light, or any shade of light between white and amber.

The lamps showing to the rear shall be mounted on the same level and as widely spaced laterally as practicable, and, when signaling, shall emit red or amber light, or any shade of light between red and amber."

"This act shall become effective on January 1, 1972."

Random and Select Vehicle Inspection

The State of Nevada is now at a stage where a motor vehicle inspection program is not only desired, but by federal regulation will soon be mandatory.

The vehicle registration in Nevada from 1958 to 1968 doubled. In 1969 there were 384,885 motor vehicles registered in the state. This growth rate can be expected to continue. Although this figure is not high when compared to most states, it is an advantage in starting a motor vehicle inspection program while the number of vehicles in our state is comparably low.

We avoid the "crash program" which has put some states under fire, not only from the Federal Government, but from the citizens of those states as well. Examples: Oklahoma, Nebraska, Arkansas and Indiana.

We can learn from their mistakes.

The State of Nevada should go into a motor vehicle inspection program with well trained personnel, using good sound rules and regulations, which will be adequate for the safety we seek, and yet not be prohibitive economically for the people of our state.

The difficulty in the justification of any motor vehicle inspection is that the results of time and cost cannot be seen. A vehicle, in most cases, looks just the same after a safety inspection as it did before the inspection. There is not any physical or monetary values that can be measured. There is no way to tell if an inspection has prevented an accident.

Professor J. S. Baker of Northwestern University Traffic Institute states in part, "We do not have now, nor that we shall have in the next few years sufficiently good data from accidents to estimate the cost of accidents due to mechanical failure. I believe that it is under 10 percent." His educated guess is probably as good as anyone's at this time.

However, if we can prevent even 10 percent fewer accidents in our state, then our program is of great value to the motoring public.

57

There are four types of vehicle safety inspections.

1. Private stations appointed by the State.
2. State owned and operated stations.
3. Random (select) vehicle inspection.
4. Combinations of above.

There are numerous benefits and drawbacks to any of these programs.

The department has concluded that for an initial program the random vehicle inspection is the most desirable.

Although the Federal Government has had a policy where a random inspection program is considered as a "Trial or substitute" program, there is now evidence that, because of pressure from California, the Federal Government is now looking at this type program more open-minded for further evaluation.

Why a random vehicle inspection program?

It is the most flexible. It would give us data and information needed for evaluation, which we would use to update or change our direction to achieve our desired objective, either by federal regulations or economical evaluation. In other words, with an open mind, seek improved methods.

It gives us the complete spectrum of motor vehicles, school buses, motorcycles, commercial vehicles, and passenger vehicles.

It gives us the choice of vehicles to be inspected, and the time and place of inspection.

This would help the public realize that vehicle safety is an all year requirement, and not just once a year -- on a given date -- and then forgetting it until the next year.

It gives the opportunity to check for other violations, such as expired or suspended licenses, vehicle registration violations, drunk drivers, plus the mechanical safety inspections.

Opponents will argue that the above is not the purpose of a vehicle inspection.

We consider the objective is to make our highways safer, and so if we find a drunk driver, and get this person off the highway, then we have made that highway safer. It gives us the opportunity to promote vehicle inspections by getting the local police, and other law enforcement agencies involved in our inspections in their local areas.

Purpose:

The motor vehicle inspection program is designed to make the highways and roads of Nevada safer for the traveling public.

Its function is:

- To get the mechanically unsafe vehicles off the highways, and have mechanical defects corrected.
- To inspect motor vehicles, private and commercial, in a systematic manner, and to enforce the rules and regulations set forth by the Federal Government and the State of Nevada.
- To inspect all school buses, municipal and contracted, for compliance of the safety rules and regulations, to help insure the safety of the children of our state.
- To maintain a complete records system, and compile data which will help the state and Federal Government to promote safety programs and needed regulations.
- To assist any agency within the state, or federal agencies, in the field of motor vehicle safety.
- To cooperate with the Federal Government and other states to establish vehicle safety standards and reciprocal inspection agreements.
- To inspect and enforce the rules and regulations in regard to the transportation of hazardous materials upon our highways.

Procedure:

There would be two teams of four men: (8 men)

Each team consisting of two patrolman and two specialist.

One team would be assigned to the Las Vegas District and would have the southern half of the state.

Approximately 180,000 vehicles

One team would be assigned to the Reno District and would be responsible for the northern half of the state.

Approximately 170,000 vehicles

A team would go anywhere in its assigned district. The safety specialist would be assigned a panel truck. The safety patrolman would be assigned Highway Patrol vehicles.

Normal procedure would to have the four-man team set up a roadside check lane, realizing all safety factors in regard to traffic flow. The ideal location is within the outer limits of a town. This way you already have traffic in a controlled speed zone. Whenever possible there should be a local law enforcement agent in assistance. If this cannot be done, you still have enough men with the four-man team:

1. Control traffic
2. Inspect vehicles
3. Take enforcement action or help motorist with any questions or problems relating to motor vehicle safety.

A part of the flexibility of this program is that times it may be desirable to break your four-man teams into two two-man teams. This would be ideal in small rural areas, checking school buses, and for training periods that other agencies may request.

When a vehicle is directed into the inspection lane the safety patrolman would check drivers licenses, vehicle registrations and assist the safety specialist in duties that can best be done in a team effort, such as light checks.

The safety specialist would check the mechanical condition of the vehicle in a systematic manner as per established procedures, to see that the vehicle meets the safety standards prescribed by the Federal and State Rules and Regulations.

Safety in the work, at all times, will be the paramount concern of each member of the team.

If the vehicle passes the vehicle safety inspection it will be issued a safety certificate, containing all necessary information, which will be placed by a member of the team, in the lower left side of the windshield.

When a mechanical violation(s) is found, enforcement action will be taken by:

- A. A mechanical warning citation.
- B. A Justice Court citation.

A mechanical warning citation, when issued, would give the driver (owner) 10 days to correct the defect, unless the defect is so serious a nature as to require immediate attention.

After the defect is corrected, the citation can be signed off by any peace officer. The person will then send in the citation to the district office.

-6-

This gives us the needed follow-up information.

Note:

There will be times when a defect cannot be corrected within 10 days, and consideration will have to be taken. Example: A muffler or taillight lens defect found in a small outlying area where it may take more time to obtain the necessary part.

A Justice Court citation will be issued in cases of deliberate violations, or where a mechanical warning citation was issued previously and no action was taken to correct the defect.

This program is initiated to get the unsafe mechanical condition of a vehicle corrected, and not a program to collect money through citations per se.

At the completion of the inspection the driver will be given, along with the safety certificate, or citation, a Public Relation Leaflet, thanking them for their time, and calling their attention to the facts in regards to vehicle safety, and its importance.

The inspection

Passenger vehicles:

Driver's license

Vehicle Registration - License plates

Horn

Glazing

Windshield wipers

Mirrors

Exhaust System

Lites:

Head lites and high beam indicator

Tail lites

Stop lites

Turn lites

License plate lite

Hand brake

Foot brake and brake fluid lines

Window obstructions

Seat belts - as required

Smog control (when legislated)

Latches, door and hood

Steering

Tires

School Buses:

This inspection would be planned so as not to interfere with the function of the buses.

The inspection would be conducted at the home terminal or place of domicile with the cooperation of the school bus maintenance personnel.

The inspection would include all of those mentioned above plus the equipment required by federal regulations and Department of Education requirements. This would include, but not limited to:

First aid kits

Drive shaft guards

Flags and flares

Flasher lites

Color and markings

Fire extinguishers

Emergency doors:

 Passage

 Bar stroke

 "open door" Buzzer

Hand holds

Seating

Annual inspection would be conducted. An inspection of shorter duration would be conducted at the request of the Department of Education or if compiled data show a need.

It is necessary for the supervisor of the inspection program to work very closely with the Department of Education when there is a desire by either department to have any rules or regulations initiated regarding safety and safety equipment on school buses.

Commercial Vehicle Inspection:

Note: Having a random vehicle inspection there is no need for company fleet inspectors. They would only be required if the state initiates a mandatory periodic inspection where all vehicles would have to be inspected.

The Department of Transportation, Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety, in fiscal year 1969 checked 49,502 property-carrying motor vehicles. Of these 11,507 (23.2%) were mechanically unsafe for continued operation and were put out-of-service on the spot.

Less serious violations were:

Brake System	22,384	Defects	29.8%
Lite & lighting	13,460	Defects	17.9%
Signal lites	9,717	Defects	13.0%
Hazardous material violations	743		
Driver violations	10,919		

(include failing to keep log book, no doctor's certificate, and not meeting minimum qualifications)

These are random vehicle inspections.

By these figures it is apparent that there is a need to have an inspection program relevant to commercial.

These inspections would be conducted on the highways, unless requested by the owner to inspect his vehicles at his terminal.

The inspection procedure would be aimed at the commercial vehicles. Inspection of commercial vehicles would also be held with Department of Transportation and Public Service Commission in joint effort and close working cooperation in stressing of safety as they apply to this type of vehicle. There would be air brake systems checks, driver compliance, etc.

Report System:

Vehicle Inspection Check List:

One made out on each vehicle checked.

Will show time, place, year and make of vehicle defects found, type of enforcement action.

Daily Report:

One made out each day by the team.

Will show total vehicles inspected, total violations, travel time, miles traveled, etc.

Weekly Report:

Totals of daily activity reports.

Forwarded to main office for statistical compiling and evaluations.

Monthly Report:

Breakdown of personnel time.

(Travel, inspection, teaching, reports, etc.)

Will show the time/vehicle inspection ratio.

To Write:

Inspection Procedure Manual

Public Relations Leaflets

Standards Booklet For Public

Reports And Forms.

BUDGET

	<u>1971-72</u>	<u>1972-73</u>
Salaries	\$90,899.00	\$95,122.00
Out-of-State Travel	2,000.00	2,000.00
In-State Travel	14,215.00	18,880.00
Operating		
Office Supplies	500.00	500.00
Subscriptions & Reference Manuals	150.00	150.00
Laboratory & Technical Supplies	3,150.00	3,150.00
Radio Maintenance Supplies	1,000.00	1,000.00
Printing Operational	6,000.00	5,000.00
Bonds & Insurance	1,800.00	1,800.00
Contract Services		
Office Equipment Repairs	300.00	300.00
Other Equipment Repair	200.00	600.00
Vehicle Operation	9,000.00	9,000.00
Uniform Allowance	1,440.00	1,440.00
Dues & Registrations	50.00	50.00
Instructional Supplies	200.00	200.00
Special Services	6,000.00	1,000.00
Automobiles	15,000.00	
Trucks	12,000.00	
Office Furniture	1,500.00	250.00
Office Equipment	1,500.00	250.00
Others	<u>16,200.00</u>	<u>1,800.00</u>
	\$183,104.00	\$142,492.00

