

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING - MINUTES  
APRIL 7, 1977  
3:15 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Hayes  
Mr. Glover  
Mr. May  
Mrs. Westall

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Demers  
Mr. Harmon  
Mr. Jacobsen

GUESTS PRESENT: Daryl E. Capurro, Nevada Motor Transport Assossian  
Rowland Oakes, Associated General Contractors  
Brent Howerton, Highway Department  
John Maddle, Associated General Contractors  
Lorree Patto, Intern, Senator Sheerin  
Sue Morrow, Appeal Reporter  
John Ciardella, Department of Motor Vehicles  
James Lambert, Nevada Highway Patrol  
John Borda, Office of Traffic Safety  
Bart Jacka, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department  
Joseph Dini, Assemblyman

AB 424

Bart Jacka, Metropolitan Police of Las Vegas, opposing AB 424, said any action on the part of the legislature to limit effective tools for law enforcement to enforce speed regulations would be a traversity to the control of death on the highways. His concern was that if use of radar was eliminated in the 55 m.p.h. zones, the next step would be to reduce the utilization in the 45 m.p.h., 25 m.p.h., etc's, in the metropolitan areas. Sheriff Galley of Washoe County agrees with concept. These devises are preferable to other means of traffic control methods such as high speed chases that endanger the lives of those directly involved as well as everyone on the highway. Fatalities are up in Clark County and by enacting this measure we invite an increase in fatalities.

Joseph Dini, Assemblyman, sponsor of the measure, said in his district one of the most critized practices was the electronic traffic speed control devises. The attitude of the people in the rural areas is that this is an entrapment act. California does not use radar and have a good program. Elimination of these devise would give the people an even chance and the people of the State are about to rebel over the over-emphasis of the 55 m.p.h. speed limit. He said he had no objections eliminating the sheriffs in the metropolitan areas from provisions of the proposed legislation.

John Borda, Director Office of Traffic Safety opposed AB 424. He said that since radar equipment was purchased in June, 1976, the State had the best fatality picture in the last six months of last year it has had in the past 8 years. Speeds in the State are now increasing, the death rate has risen; Clark County's rate has almost tripled compared to number of fatalities at this same time last year. Speeds have risen because the 55 m.p.h. speed limit has become a mockery by public officials.

Col. James Lambert, Chief of Nevada Highway Patrol, said he was of the opinion that enactment of AB 424 would in effect nullify speed enforcement on the highway. California does a great job of enforcement without the use of radar but they feel they are not effectively enforcing the law. They have 5500 patrolmen. AB 424 does not address the real problem, which is the 55 m.p.h. law. Rather than do away with the effective tools of enforcement, we should eliminate the 55 m.p.h. speed limit if we don't believe in it. The people are aware of the attitude of the legislature, which makes the job of the Patrol very difficult. Speed traps are a sore issue but the Highway Patrolmen are parked in the highway right of way for these exercises. The percentage of fatalities has been reduced with the use of radar devices; they have eliminated the long highway chase which doubles the hazards. The speeds of those now being cited are going up. Court cases are stronger with the information supplied by the radar devices.

AB 510

Rowland Oakes, Associated General Contractors, opposed AB 510 because mud flaps are not very effective and are very expensive. They have to be replaced on dump trucks everytime a load is dumped and this cost is passed on to the consumer. Most Contractors' trucks do not have mud flaps because of the type or work they engage in.

Daryl E. Capurro, Nevada Motor Transport Association also opposed AB 510, saying mud flaps were ineffective on the highway because the water and mud was in a large part directed to the side and rocks were thrown forward of the dual wheels. The bill does not indicate where the flaps would be located; if the proposed measure is adopted this should be left to regulation; studies should be made to prove the most effective location. The problem is that with many states the regulations vary and this leads to confusion.

SB 88

Senator Blakemore stated this bill was a Committee introduction at the request of Department of Motor Vehicles and suspensions should run consecutive and the other change was corrective language.

SB 292

Senator Blakemore spoke in favor of SB 292 also, saying this too was an agency bill that required notification to people that have signs along a highway that the signs have to be removed because they are in violation of the highway beautification act.

SB 88

Howard Hill, Department of Motor Vehicles, speaking in favor of the measure said they were trying to clean up the language of the provisions. Currently they are doing what they want to do if SB 88 is passed; it concerns, and there is a revocation for a driver's license and also a suspension under the implied consent law; the intent of statutes indicate that these suspension revocations should run consecutively.

SB 309

John Ciardella, Department of Motor Vehicles, said code letters for license plates in Washoe and Clark Counties would be exhausted by October or November. This bill would allow an additional 529,000 plates each in the two counties.

Assembly

SB 292

Brent Howerton, Highway Department, said SB 292 was to eliminate cumbersome provisions of existing law. Currently when a sign comes in violation of state law it has to be removed and the notification has to be directed. The law requires they serve personal notice on the violator. In order to achieve personal notice, that notice has to be served by one of the deputies in the state. In the case of sign owner living out of state notice must be sent to the sheriff or officer that has jurisdiction. Having the notice served within the state does not cost but works a hardship on the smaller counties. It costs for delivery of out of state notices from \$10 to 35¢. There are administrative costs and this system of delivery by uniformed officer provides some embarrassment to the party receiving the notice. Notification by certified mail will relieve this situation.

In response to questions from Mr. May, Mr. Howerton said most of the signs were owned by outdoor advertising companies. The need for removal of signs arose when highways were reclassified. This legislation had been reviewed by the Nevada Outdoor Advertising Association and they were not opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted:

M. ROBERTSON, Secretary

GUEST LIST

NAME

REPRESENTING

IF YOU  
WISH TO SPEAK

(Please print)

Pro Con

<u>NAME</u> (Please print)	<u>REPRESENTING</u>	IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK	
		Pro	Con
✓ DARYL E. CAPURRO	NEVADA MOTOR TRANSPORT ASSN		X ABS
✓ ROWLAND OAKES	ASSOC GEN CONTR		X 510
x ✓ Brent Howerton	Highway Dept.		x SB 292
✓ JOHN MADOLE	ASSOC. GEN. CONTR.		✓ 510
J. OPPEE PATTO	Inter Sen Sheerin		
S. Morrow	Appeal		
✓ J. Ciardella	DNU	SB 109	
✓ James Lambert	NEVADA HIGHWAY BLDG	510	
✓ A. Borden			424
✓ Bart Jaskai			
✓ Joe Dini			
✓ Col. Lambert			424