

MINUTES OF THE
MEETING OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON TRANSPORTATION

SIXTY-FIRST SESSION
NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE
April 30, 1981

The Senate Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chairman Richard E. Blakemore, at 2:03 p.m., Thursday, April 30, 1981, in Room 323 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Meeting Agenda. Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Richard E. Blakemore, Chairman
Senator William Hernstadt, Vice Chairman
Senator Joe Neal
Senator Lawrence E. Jacobsen
Senator Wilbur Faiss
Senator Clifford E. McCorkle
Senator James H. Bilbray

STAFF MEMBER PRESENT:

Kelly R. Torvik, Committee Secretary

SENATE BILL NO. 588

Colonel Pete Zadra, Chief, Nevada Highway Patrol submitted information to the committee regarding the bill. (See Exhibit C.)

Senator Neal stated that he would support the bill if there was an amendment attached to the bill stating that the funds could not be used for the purchase of speed guns. Colonel Zadra stated that purchases are controlled by the budget. He did not believe that there were any speed guns proposed in the current year's special fund budget.

Senator Hernstadt asked how the special fund was utilized. Colonel Zadra explained that the fund was created several years ago as a means of providing for supplemental troopers. The fund covers everything for 90 of the troopers in the patrol.

Senator Hernstadt noted that there would be enough money to amend the bill to provide that lights be required on the top of 90 patrol cars.

Senate Committee on Transportation
April 30, 1981

Senator Blakemore asked where the effective date appeared in the bill. Colonel Zadra stated that the bill was written for a period of two years. However, the patrol only needs it for 18 months, which would be effective January 1, 1982. Chairman Blakemore questioned if it would be necessary to have an effective date within the bill.

Mr. Daryl Capurro, representing the Nevada Motor Transport Association, noted that, if approved, the bill would conflict with Senate Bill No. 262 and Senate Bill No. 477.

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 422

Mr. Mike Cool, representing the City of Las Vegas, presented the committee with information regarding the bill. (See Exhibit D). He noted that under current statutes, if the city does not generate the notice to appear within 20 days after the citation is issued, the violator is not required to pay the citation.

Chairman Blakemore noted that Reno operates under the same statute and does not have a problem generating notices. Mr. Cool stated that Reno does not issue as many parking citations as Las Vegas and Reno may have a different data processing system. He stated that Las Vegas is unable to generate the notices because of problems in its data processing system and the magnitude of citations issued.

Senator Neal asked how many notices were generated per month. Mr. Cool stated that the computer only compiles a monthly list. Therefore, no notices had been recently issued. He said that there had been problems with the constituency because they had rushed the notices through and warrants had been mailed to constituents who had paid their citations. Instead of mailing out warrants on paid citations they began to take their time in order to be accurate.

Senator Neal asked if they could reprogram the computer to print a list of unpaid citations more often than once per month. Mr. Cool said that the computer people could not meet the ten day deadline after a violator had not come in within ten days after the issuance and paid the citation.

Senator Hernstadt noted that if the public knew that the payment of parking citations could not be enforced, now one would pay the citations voluntarily. Mr. Cool stated that a newspaper article had brought up that point and the county experienced a definite drop in revenues.

Senate Committee on Transportation
April 30, 1981

Senator Neal noted that only 20 percent of the citations are going unpaid. However, the city is asking for a 66 percent increase in time to issue the notices. Mr. Cool felt that the point was that there were citations which had been issued which go unpaid and payment cannot be enforced.

Senator Neal noted that the revenues collected for parking fines would not be subject to the revenue caps in the tax package. There could be an increase in citations issued in order to compensate for financing that had been capped. Mr. Cool stated that to increase the number of citations issued there would have to be an increase in the work force which issued the citations and the city was not in a financial position to do that. Senator Hernstadt felt that the work force issuing citations was very efficient. Mr. Cool noted that the number of parking meters is actually being reduced in the future.

Chairman Blakemore asked if Las Vegas used the envelope system similiar to the one used in Reno. Mr. Cool stated that Las Vegas does use an envelope system. Chairman Blakemore noted that the system works well in Reno.

Senator Neal felt that the parking fines were looked upon as a revenue measure. Mr. Cool stated that there are a lot of parking citations issued which generate a great deal of money.

Senator Jacobsen asked if the unpaid accounts were ever written off. Mr. Cool stated that the auditors have written accounts off the books which have not been voluntarily paid. There is a record kept of the unpaid accounts. However, names are not kept in those records.

Senator Bilbray noted that the courts only remind the traffic violators that they have unpaid parking citations, rather than escorting parking violators, who are appearing in court on a traffic violation, to the desk and having them pay their citation. He asked if the city had tried to work with the courts to have traffic violators pay their parking citations. Mr. Cool stated that the judges have determined individually whether they will request a traffic violator to pay his parking citations.

Mr. Cool stated that the violators do not consider the fine to be expensive. The violators do not like to go to the office and pay the fine. Senator Hernstadt noted that if a violator had six \$15 parking citations it could become very expensive. That would be serious revenue for the city.

Senate Committee on Transportation
April 30, 1981

Senator Faiss asked if passage of the bill would actually help the city with its delinquent fine collection. Mr. Cool stated that it would allow the city to legally force payment of citations because it would be able to take the time to be accurate and issue the notices to appear in sufficient time.

Mr. Bill Curran, representing the Clark County District Attorney's Office, stated his support for Assembly Bill No. 422. He noted that the bill would apply to all parking offenses. He stated that the county's largest problem is with parking violations at the airport. He said that there were repeat offenders who continually took advantage of the fact that the parking fines were not being enforced.

Senator Neal asked how a violator is forced to pay a parking citation. Mr. Curran supposed that a violator could be held in contempt of court if he refused to acknowledge a warrant issued because of his failure to pay a parking citation.

Senator Bilbray noted that when a driver is stopped for a traffic violation and the officer discovers that there is a warrant for a parking violation that the officer would arrest the driver and put him in jail if he did not pay the citation. Mr. Curran noted that a bench warrant would have to be issued for a driver to be arrested. The bill would give the city enough time to issue the bench warrants.

Senator Hernstadt stated that a notice to appear has only been required for the past two or four years. He said that the problem that the city had could be solved by the city mailing everyone who received a parking violation a notice to appear with a notation to disregard the notice if the citation had been paid. Senator Bilbray noted that would be expensive to the city.

Chairman Blakemore asked why the bill originally asked for 90 days rather than 60 days to issue the notice to appear. Mr. Cool stated that 90 days would allow the city to make two computer runs, one per month. He said that the city could work with 60 days which would only allow it one computer run to send out the notices.

Mr. Virgil Anderson, representing AAA, stated that the bill would be a benefit to the public because of the extensive tourist trade in the state. He noted that several travel clubs, including AAA, have a traffic citation appearance service for the members. Because of the length of travel and

Senate Committee on Transportation
April 30, 1981

the time that is involved the 60 days would provide for an appearance to clear the tourist's record. He stated that most of the tourists do want the citation cleared from the records.

Chairman Blakemore asked how parking citations can be enforced on rental automobiles since the citations are issued to the automobile and not the driver. Senator Hernstadt noted that the rental parking violations are not enforceable anywhere in the country.

Senator Hernstadt pointed out that legislation in the past had proposed that the lessor be responsible to pay the citation and the lessor can pursue the driver for the cost of the citation. The lessors had stated that they would have to raise the price of automobile rentals if they were held responsible. Mr. Anderson felt that was a valid argument.

SENATE BILL NO. 589

Senator Bilbray spoke in support of the bill, which would establish a mass transit commission in the counties that so desired. The regional transit commission would be the governing body in those counties. They would be funded by a return to the county of 25 percent of their revenue deposited into the General Fund which was derived from the entertainment tax. The bill would benefit Washoe County and Clark County. He stated that Clark County was in dire need for an adequate mass transit system. He noted that because of the recent increase in the sales tax it would not be advisable to fund a mass transit commission through an additional sales tax. The county would only be receiving 25 percent of the monies deposited by that same county. He said that the members of the Regional Transportation Commission in Las Vegas and the county representatives supported the bill 100 percent.

Senator Hernstadt stated that Douglas County may need to have those funds available for mass transit in the Lake Tahoe area.

Senator Faiss asked how much money the bill would generate. Senator Hernstadt noted that the bill had a fiscal note. Senator Bilbray said that it would generate \$4 million for Clark County since Clark County pays 74 percent of the total entertainment tax.

Senator McCorkle asked which was higher priority, mass transit or education. Senator Bilbray felt that both were top priorities. He stated that he would be willing to ask the Senate Committee

Senate Committee on Transportation
April 30, 1981

on Finance to prepare a study and give the county only \$1 million to start a mass transit program if other monies were needed for education. A full scale system could be postponed until the next biennium, as long as the county was guaranteed that it would have the monies the next biennium. Senator McCorkle felt that if the program were funded the monies would come out of education funds.

Senator Hernstadt stated that there is a possibility that federal funding for matching funds will be eliminated in the next two or three years. Therefore, if the county was planning on using the funds to purchase buses those purchases should be made immediately because if it waits there may not be any funds to match from the federal level. Senator Bilbray stated that would have to be determined by the Senate Committee on Finance. There would be no money available this biennium.

Senator Hernstadt stated that, as cointroducer of the bill, there is definitely a need for mass transportation in the state.

Senator Bilbray felt that the people of Clark County would be willing to wait two years if they knew that the program would begin in two years.

Senator Neal stated that he understood the Senate Committee on Finance was considering a proposal to appropriate \$800,000 to purchase buses for lease to private enterprise at \$1 per year. Senator McCorkle stated that it was being considered by the Senate Committee on Finance.

Senator Jacobsen asked if there was any movement by the county to put together a mass transit plan. Senator Bilbray stated that the Regional Transportation Commission had been working on a plan for quite a while. It needs approximately \$1 million to start the program. That includes the proposed \$800,000 before the Senate Committee on Finance to purchase buses. He stated that he was going to ask the Senate Committee on Finance for \$1 million to get started and a guarantee that in 1983 the county would receive 25 percent of its entertainment tax to support the system.

Senator Jacobsen questioned if a monorail system would be more appropriate than a bus system. Senator Bilbray stated that a monorail system, as had been proposed in the past, would run from the airport to downtown and a bus system could be the only type of program feeding into a monorail system. He noted that years ago it was estimated to cost \$100 million to build a monorail system. He stated that because the status of the art had increased it would probably not cost much more than \$100 million

Senate Committee on Transportation
April 30, 1981

to build a monorail system today. He felt that in the long run the city would need a monorail system. However, a monorail system would probably not be part of the mass transit plan proposed in the bill. Outside funding would be necessary for a monorail system, such as private enterprise. He could not see the state spending \$100 million for a monorail system in Las Vegas.

Senator Jacobsen noted that he and Senator Gibson had been informed by President Reagan that there would be no federal funds for mass transit in the line of construction.

Mr. Darrell Dreyer, representing Las Vegas Transit, stated that his company had no problem with the bill. He felt that it may not be wise to have a population limitation in the bill. Senator Bilbray did not feel that there had to be a population limitation.

Senator Hernstadt asked if the Las Vegas Transit knew anything about a cut in federal monies for mass transportation. Mr. Dreyer stated that his company had heard nothing definitive about a cut in mass transportation monies.

Mr. Bill Madigan, representing Carson City, voiced his support of the bill. Carson City would like to develop a bus transportation service in the future for Carson City and the surrounding areas in conjunction with surrounding counties. He noted that the Department of Transportation did a study in 1979 which was a very good plan encompassing Carson City and its surrounding area. However, the funds were not available then and funds are not available today.

Ms. Peggy Twedt, representing the League of Women Voters, spoke in support of the bill. She stated that a mass transit system would be valuable and a service that both Washoe County and Clark County need. She felt that transportation should be looked upon as a service that does cost money to provide.

SENATE BILL NO. 379 (See Exhibit E)

Chairman Blakemore noted that he had a proposed amendment from Mr. Mervin J. Flanders. (See Exhibit F.) Senator McCorkle questioned if the language should be "and when yielding a right-of-way come to a full stop." He felt that such language as Mr. Flanders suggested would require that the driver come to a full stop even when the driver is not yielding.

Senator Neal stated that the term yield, in its definition, requires that a driver give way to the particular person or vehicle that it is approaching.

Senate Committee on Transportation
April 30, 1981

Mr. Anderson suggested that the wording "when necessary" be inserted after the words "come to a full stop" in the proposed amendment.

Chairman Blakemore stated that he would get a legal definition when he requested the amendment to be printed. He understood Senator McCorkle's concern and would see that it was provided for in the amendment.

Senator Hernstadt moved that the bill receive an amend and do pass recommendation with Mr. Flander's amendment.

Senator Faiss seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

SENATE BILL NO. 397 (See Exhibit G)

Chairman Blakemore stated that the committee needed an amendment to establish who would perform the inspection because the Department of Motor Vehicles was not capable of performing the inspection. Mr. Jim Avance suggested that the bill be amended by deleting "annual" on line three of the bill because the Taxicab Authority inspects more often than once per year. The amendment should also delete "by" on line four and all of line five. By deleting that language the Taxicab Authority could perform the inspection.

Senator Bilbray moved that the previous action on the bill be rescinded.

Senator Hernstadt seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Senator Neal moved that the bill receive an amend and do pass recommendation with Mr. Avance's amendment.

Senator Bilbray seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Senate Committee on Transportation
April 30, 1981

SENATE BILL NO. 589 (See Exhibit H)

Senator Bilbray moved that the bill receive an amend and do pass recommendation with a rereferral to the Senate Committee on Finance. The amendment would delete the population limitation within the bill.

Senator Jacobsen seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 422 (See Exhibit I)

Senator Hernstadt moved that the bill receive a do pass recommendation.

Senator Bilbray seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:


Kelly Rae Torvik

APPROVED:


Senator Richard E. Blakemore

Dated: 5/4, 1981

SENATE AGENDA

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

EXHIBIT A

Committee on Transportation , Room 323 .

Day Thursday , Date April 30, 1981 , Time 2:00

S. B. No. 588--Increases additional fee for registration of motor vehicle which is accounted for in highway patrol special fund.

S. B. No. 589--Provides authority for establishment of mass transit commission in certain counties.

A. B. No. 422--Extends time for issuance of notice to appear on citation for unlawful parking.



EXHIBIT C

DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES

555 WRIGHT WAY

CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89711

April 30, 1981

TO: Senate Transportation Committee

FROM: Colonel Peter J. Zadra
Chief, Nevada Highway Patrol

SUBJECT: INCREASE IN HIGHWAY PATROL SPECIAL FEE

The Department of Motor Vehicles with approval of the State Budget Director, proposed to increase the Highway Patrol Special Fee from \$3.00 to \$4.00. We submit the following comments and estimated funding and expenditure projections for your information.

The Department has researched previous executive budget recommendations, copies of which are attached, and determined that over a period of four previous fiscal years, FY 76, 77, 78, 79; an amount of \$693,146 dollars was transferred from the Highway Patrol Special Budget Account (4707) to the Highway Patrol Budget Account (4713) as partial support for the appropriated budget. Had these funds been carried forward in the Highway Patrol Special Budget Account each year, the fund would have been solvent for the 82/83 biennium.

The recommended budget for Highway Patrol Special (4707) currently being considered by the legislature reflects the Department's request to increase the present \$3.00 fee to \$4.00 effective July 1, 1981.

Estimated Funding and Expenditure Projection:

CURRENT STATUS \$3.00 FEE

	FY 80/81	FY 81/82	FY 82/83
Estimated Balance Forward	1,431,934	1,193,823	248,684
Estimated Receipts	<u>2,400,000</u>	<u>2,485,000</u>	<u>2,735,000</u>
Total	3,831,934	3,678,823	2,983,684
Estimated Expense	2,638,111	3,430,139	3,654,985
Estimated Balance Forward	1,193,823	248,684	(671,301) deficit

Following is an alternative to the Department's present request. Under this alternative the estimated reserve for balance forward will not be substantial enough to support any possible salary and operating cost increases beyond the 82/83 biennium if the present complement of troopers is allowed to remain at 90 positions.

INCREASE PRESENT \$3.00 FEE TO \$4.00 FOR 18 MONTHS - EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1982

	FY 81/82	FY 82/83
Estimated Balance Forward	1,193,823	662,850
Estimated Receipts	<u>2,899,166</u>	<u>3,646,666</u>
Total	4,082,989	4,309,516
Estimated Expense	3,420,139	3,654,985
Estimated Balance Forward	662,850	654,531

LA4 ENFORCEMENT HIGHWAY PATROL
(201-4713)

	1975-76		1977-78			1978-79		
	ACTUAL	WORK PROGRAM	AGENCY REQUEST	GOVERNOR RECOMMENDS	LEG. AP.	AGENCY REQUEST	GOVERNOR RECOMMENDS	LEG. AP.
HIGHWAY APPROPRIATION	\$ 2,776,544	\$ 2,769,818	\$ 4,149,570	\$ 3,062,378		\$ 4,046,851	\$ 3,322,153	
REVERSIONS	\$ 171,657-	\$ 678						
UNAL FND FROM OLD YEAR		\$ 678						
UNAL FND TO NEW YR	\$ 678							
TRANS FR H P SPECIAL	\$ 86,509	\$ 122,740		\$ 379,299			\$ 104,598	
Hwy SFTY FD FOS 30:600	\$ 75,019	\$ 122,769						
15% SALARY ADJUSTMENT	\$ 262,500							
LONGEVITY SAL ADJUST	\$ 1,650							
SALARY ADJUSTMENT NEED		\$ 355,588	\$ 50,000	\$ 45,500		\$ 50,000	\$ 45,500	
Hwy PATROL COMM REV								
TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE	\$ 3,029,849	\$ 3,371,593	\$ 4,199,570	\$ 3,487,177		\$ 4,096,851	\$ 3,472,251	

EXISTING POSITIONS

CARSON HEADQUARTERS	1.00	23,746	1.00	23,746	1.00	25,128	1.00	23,655	1.00	25,032
CHIEF NMP	1.00	22,861	1.00	22,861	1.00	22,861	1.00	22,774	1.00	22,774
ASST CHIEF NMP	2.00	41,616	2.00	41,616	2.00	41,616	2.00	41,458	2.00	41,458
Hwy PATROL MAJOR	1.00	19,859	1.00	19,859	1.00	19,859	1.00	19,783	1.00	19,783
Hwy PATROL CAPT/7A	1.00	17,274	1.00	17,274	1.00	17,274	1.00	17,208	1.00	17,208
Hwy PATROL SERGEANT	3.00	47,232	3.00	47,232	3.00	47,232	3.00	47,052	3.00	47,052
HIGHWAY PATROL TROOPER	1.00	18,959	1.00	18,959	1.00	18,959	1.00	18,896	1.00	18,896
RADIO COMMUNICATE SUPV	6.00	65,223	6.00	65,223	6.00	65,223	6.00	66,819	6.00	66,819
OPER COMMUNICATION CTR	1.00	10,961	1.00	10,961	1.00	10,961	1.00	10,919	1.00	10,919
SR KEY PUNCH OPERATOR	1.00	7,996	1.00	7,996	1.00	7,996	1.00	8,319	1.00	8,319
KEY PUNCH OPERATOR	1.00	11,623	1.00	11,623	1.00	11,623	1.00	11,941	1.00	11,941
ADMINISTRATIVE SEC I	1.00	10,961	1.00	10,961	1.00	10,961	1.00	10,919	1.00	10,919
PRINCIPAL CLERK TYPIST	2.00	19,192	2.00	19,192	2.00	19,192	2.00	19,118	2.00	19,118
SENIOR CLERK TYPIST	1.00	10,961	1.00	10,961	1.00	10,961	1.00	10,919	1.00	10,919
SENIOR ACCOUNT CLERK	1.00	8,801	1.00	9,189	1.00	9,189	1.00	9,559	1.00	9,559
SENIOR CLERK STENO										
LAS VEGAS OFFICE	1.00	19,859	1.00	19,859	1.00	19,859	1.00	19,783	1.00	19,783
Hwy PATROL CAPT/8	1.00	18,077	1.00	18,077	1.00	18,077	1.00	18,028	1.00	18,028
Hwy PATROL LIEUTENANT	7.00	120,918	7.00	120,918	7.00	120,918	7.00	120,456	7.00	120,456
Hwy PATROL SERGEANT	2.00	32,980	2.00	32,980	2.00	32,980	2.00	32,854	2.00	32,854
Hwy PATROL CORPORAL	15.00	232,554	15.00	232,554	15.00	232,554	15.00	232,512	15.00	232,512
HIGHWAY PATROL TROOPER	1.00	11,405	1.00	11,405	1.00	11,405	1.00	11,831	1.00	11,831
Hwy PATROL SP OFF	1.00	15,744	1.00	15,744	1.00	15,744	1.00	15,684	1.00	15,684
RADIO TECHNICIAN	8.00	88,204	8.00	88,204	8.00	88,204	8.00	90,763	8.00	90,763
OPER COMMUNICATION CTR	1.00	10,961	1.00	10,961	1.00	10,961	1.00	10,919	1.00	10,919
PRINCIPAL CLERK TYPIST	3.00	27,777	3.00	27,777	3.00	27,777	3.00	28,474	3.00	28,474
SENIOR CLERK TYPIST	1.00	10,031	1.00	10,031	1.00	10,031	1.00	9,993	1.00	9,993
SENIOR CLERK STENO										
RENO OFFICE	1.00	18,959	1.00	18,959	1.00	18,959	1.00	18,886	1.00	18,886
Hwy PATROL CAPT/8	1.00	18,959	1.00	18,959	1.00	18,959	1.00	18,886	1.00	18,886
Hwy PATROL LIEUTENANT	7.00	120,918	7.00	120,918	7.00	120,918	7.00	120,456	7.00	120,456
Hwy PATROL SERGEANT	3.00	48,769	3.00	48,769	3.00	48,769	3.00	48,583	3.00	48,583
Hwy PATROL CORPORAL	20.00	315,626	20.00	315,626	20.00	315,626	20.00	314,423	20.00	314,423
HIGHWAY PATROL TROOPER	1.00	11,605	1.00	11,605	1.00	11,605	1.00	12,089	1.00	12,089
Hwy PATROL SP OFF										

HIGHWAY PATROL SPECIAL FUND - Continued
276-4707

	1975-76 ACTUAL	1976-77 WORK PROGRAM	1977-78			1978-79		
			AGENCY REQUEST	GOVERNOR RECOMMENDS	LEG. AP.	AGENCY REQUEST	GOVERNOR RECOMMENDS	LEG. AP.
SPEC PROJECT/REPORT	\$ 2,590	\$ 5,744	\$ 9,280	\$ 7,961		\$ 9,744	\$ 8,917	
EMPLOYEE TRANSFERS	\$ 1,302	\$ 3,480	\$ 3,900	\$ 3,900		\$ 4,130	\$ 4,130	
TOTAL OPERATING EXP	\$ 245,307	\$ 319,921	\$ 352,640	\$ 295,664		\$ 379,624	\$ 312,541	
AUTOMOBILES	\$ 96,134	\$ 170,000	\$ 120,000			\$ 120,000		
OFF FURNITURE & EQUIP	\$ 643							
OTHER FURNITUR & EQUIP	\$ 2,896	\$ 3,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 4,640		\$ 5,000	\$ 4,640	
TOT. CAPITAL OUTLAY EQ.	\$ 99,678	\$ 173,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 4,640		\$ 125,000	\$ 4,640	
RESERVE		\$ 468,568		\$ 100,000			\$ 100,000	
HWY PATROL VEHICLES				\$ 120,000			\$ 120,000	
TRANS TO HIGHWAY PATROL	\$ 86,509	\$ 122,740		\$ 379,249			\$ 104,598	
TOTAL AGENCY EXPENDITURES	\$ 1,496,716	\$ 2,380,429	\$ 1,889,986	\$ 2,274,548		\$ 1,993,038	\$ 2,093,038	

AGENCY BALANCE

Program Statement

The Nevada Highway Patrol Special Fund is supported as set forth in Nevada Revised Statutes 482.480. The authorized personnel total 70 patrolmen. The goals and responsibilities are identical and supportive to those expressed in the regular Highway Patrol budget narrative.

Sub-Account Explanations

In-State Travel - The amount recommended will provide for per diem and travel for special inservice training sessions and routine in-state travel, including patrol and court appearances.

Operating - Except those expenditure areas that can be directly related to patrolmen funded within this account, the amounts recommended in the operating categories represent 46.4% of the regular Highway Patrol operating category. That percentage is derived from the number of patrolmen in this account (70) as they relate to the total number of authorized, commissioned personnel (151) as specified in NRS 481.145.

Vehicle Operation - The amount recommended is based on actual amounts spent in 1975-76 plus moderate inflationary increases.

Clothing and Uniform Allowance - The amount recommended provides for moderate inflationary increases in commissioned personnel's uniform costs.

Equipment

Automobiles - The amount recommended provides for 20 replacement patrol cars in each fiscal year.

Other Equipment - The amount recommended provides for replacement of articles that are lost, stolen, or wornout.

Transfer to Highway Patrol - The amount recommended to be transferred from the Highway Patrol Special Account allows for administrative overhead costs and equipment purchases (except automobiles) used by the entire Patrol but generally charged to the appropriated account.

Date of Hearing _____

Who Testified _____

Date Budget Closed _____

HIGHWAY PATROL - Continued

new dispatch consoles, radio scanners, emergency backup generator for Carson City, radar test equipment, dual trace oscilloscopes, and a telephone channel switch.

Communications Board Assessment - The amount recommended provides payment to the Communications Board for fifty-eight microwave channel ends utilized by the Highway Patrol.

Highway Patrol Vehicles - The amounts recommended provide for thirty replacement Highway Patrol vehicles and new vehicles for the Tactical Officers in fiscal year 1979-80. In fiscal year 1980-81, the recommendation provides for thirty replacement vehicles and an additional snow cat for use in getting to remote mountaintop communication sites with the required repair equipment.

General Fund SCOPE Assessment - The recommendation provides for the estimated amount required by user State agencies, not including Highway Patrol, for their percentage use of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department's SCOPE System (Criminal Justice Data Information System).

Highway Patrol SCOPE Assessment - The recommendation provides for the

estimated amount required by the Highway Patrol for its percentage use of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department's SCOPE System.

Vehicle Replacement - Self-Insured - In fiscal year 1978-79, due to rising insurance costs, the Highway Patrol undertook a program of self-insurance for Highway Patrol vehicles and dropped collision insurance being carried on the cars. It is recommended the program be continued.

Switcher Operation - The recommended amount provides for those anticipated costs of operating the high speed communication switcher (additional tapes, data processing costs, contract payments, line charges, etc.). This had previously been paid partly by the State and partly by users. It is recommended the General Fund pay all operating costs with each user paying for its share of the use of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department's SCOPE System (the data base for criminal justice activities).

Date of Hearing _____

Who Testified _____

Date Budget Closed _____

	1977-78 ACTUAL	1978-79 WORK PROGRAM	1979-80 AGENCY REQUEST	1979-80 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDS	LEG. AP.	1980-81 AGENCY REQUEST	1980-81 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDS	LEG. AP.
REGULAR APPROPRIATION	\$ 3,062,378	\$ 3,322,153	\$ 5,294,650	\$ 293,300	-----	\$ 6,033,582	\$ 314,707	---
HIGHWAY APPROPRIATION	\$ 78,418			\$ 4,111,087	-----		\$ 4,094,563	---
REVERSIONS	\$ 379,299	\$ 1,017,398			-----			---
TRANS FR M.P. SPECIAL	\$ 24,600	\$ 45,500			-----			---
RADIO SYSTEM USES				\$ 26,458	-----		\$ 27,963	---
TR FR GAMING CONTRL		\$ 158,442			-----			---
SALARY ADJUSTMENT					-----			---
TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE	\$ 3,387,859	\$ 3,631,193	\$ 5,294,650	\$ 4,430,845		\$ 6,033,582	\$ 4,431,233	

EXISTING POSITIONS

POSITION	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1979-80	1980-81	1980-81
CARSON HEADQUARTERS						
CHIEF NHP	1.00	26,080	1.00	26,180	1.00	27,968
ASST CHIEF NHP	1.00	13,023	1.00	13,674	1.00	14,959
NHP PATROL MAJOR	2.00	46,142	2.00	46,320	2.00	46,320
NHP PATROL CAPT/B	1.00	22,019	1.00	22,104	1.00	22,104
NHP PATROL SERGEANT	1.00	19,153	1.00	19,226	1.00	19,226
HIGHWAY PATROL THROOPER	3.00	52,368	3.00	52,572	3.00	52,572
NHP PATROL COMM SUPV	1.00	21,102	1.00	21,102	1.00	21,102
RADIO TECHNICIAN	1.00	17,524	1.00	17,524	1.00	17,524
SUPV UPR COMM CTR NHP	1.00	14,603	1.00	14,603	1.00	14,603
OPERATOR COMM CENTER	5.00	58,537	5.00	58,573	5.00	60,537
SM KEY PUNCH OPERATOR	1.00	12,200	1.00	12,200	1.00	12,200
KEY PUNCH OPERATOR	1.00	11,165	1.00	11,165	1.00	11,165
STATISTICAL CLERK I	1.00	9,988	1.00	9,988	1.00	9,988
ADMINISTRATIVE SEC I	1.00	9,988	1.00	9,988	1.00	9,988

HIGHWAY PATROL SPECIAL FUND - Continued
276-4707

	1977-78 ACTUAL	1978-79 WORK PROGRAM	1979-80			1980-81		
			AGENCY REQUEST	GOVERNOR RECOMMENDS	LEG. AP.	AGENCY REQUEST	GOVERNOR RECOMMENDS	LEG. AP.
TOTAL OUT-OF-STATE TRAVEL	\$ 386	\$ 1,500	\$ 2,000	\$ 1,500		\$ 2,400	\$ 1,500	
TOTAL IN-STATE TRAVEL	\$ 7,563	\$ 11,360	\$ 33,810	\$ 32,339		\$ 38,190	\$ 34,452	
OFF SUPPLIES & EXPENSE	\$ 2,481	\$ 3,070	\$ 5,820	\$ 3,165		\$ 7,130	\$ 3,842	
OPERATING SUPPLIES	\$ 13,095	\$ 12,179	\$ 17,360	\$ 17,250		\$ 22,460	\$ 20,069	
COMMUNICATIONS EXPENSE	\$ 24,219	\$ 1,500	\$ 32,430	\$ 25,585		\$ 41,420	\$ 21,751	
PRINT DUPLICATING COPY	\$ 4,323	\$ 1,970	\$ 5,785	\$ 5,785		\$ 7,410	\$ 7,410	
INSURANCE EXPENSE	\$ 41,734	\$ 11,770	\$ 57,272	\$ 26,040		\$ 63,818	\$ 30,245	
OTHER CONTRACT SERVICE			\$ 2,700			\$ 3,990		
EQUIPMENT REPAIR	\$ 1,773	\$ 3,182	\$ 2,353	\$ 2,353		\$ 2,970	\$ 2,970	
VEHICLE OPERATION	\$ 191,383	\$ 196,557	\$ 255,670	\$ 354,800		\$ 300,745	\$ 431,010	
CLCIN. & UNIFORM ALLOW	\$ 22,322	\$ 22,320	\$ 31,250	\$ 30,880		\$ 36,530	\$ 37,530	
MED. & DENT. EXPENSE	\$ 363	\$ 4,500	\$ 16,950	\$ 15,588		\$ 12,595	\$ 17,499	
STIPENDS AND TRAVEL			\$ 200			\$ 290		
DUES AND REGISTRATIONS	\$ 200							
INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES	\$ 2,463	\$ 571	\$ 2,895	\$ 1,289		\$ 3,390	\$ 1,368	
SPEC PROJECT/REPORT	\$ 6,119	\$ 8,917						
EMPLOYEE TRANSFERS	\$ 4,599	\$ 4,100	\$ 5,100	\$ 5,100		\$ 6,400	\$ 6,400	
MISCELLANEOUS	\$ 14							
TOTAL OPERATING EXP	\$ 321,290	\$ 279,886	\$ 430,237	\$ 488,127		\$ 511,345	\$ 580,114	
OFF FURNITURE & EQUIP			\$ 4,922			\$ 5,311		
OTHER FURNITURE & EQUIP	\$ 4,513	\$ 4,640	\$ 97,331	\$ 40,672		\$ 59,901	\$ 25,050	
TOT. CAPITAL OUTLAY EQ.	\$ 4,513	\$ 4,640	\$ 102,223	\$ 40,672		\$ 65,212	\$ 25,050	
RESERVE		\$ 578,114	\$ 36,894	\$ 496,359		\$ 45,819	\$ 246,988	
HWY PATROL VEHICLES	\$ 118,224	\$ 120,000	\$ 195,000	\$ 201,500		\$ 234,600	\$ 201,500	
TRANS TO HIGHWAY PATROL	\$ 379,299	\$ 104,598						
VEH REPLACHT-SELF INS		\$ 10,000		\$ 13,000			\$ 13,000	
CONSOLIDATED COMM CGST		\$ 24,455						
TOTAL AGENCY EXPENDITURES	\$ 2,088,032	\$ 2,571,152	\$ 2,375,000	\$ 2,953,114		\$ 2,600,000	\$ 3,096,359	

AGENCY BALANCE

EXHIBIT D

The City of Las Vegas has been experiencing a problem with our processing of unpaid parking citations. AB 422 is proposed to assist the City by extending the time for the issuance of a notice to appear on a parking citation.

Currently, the City issues approximately 400 parking tickets a day; the person ticketed has ten days in which to pay the \$2.00, \$4.00 or \$10.00 fine determined by the nature of the parking violation. If the ticket is not paid within the ten days, the fines are increased to a maximum of \$15.00.

Currently, NRS 484.810 allows the City to issue a bench warrant for a parking violation only after:

1. A notice to appear concerning the violation is mailed to the person receiving the citation by 1st class mail with 20 days after original issue.
2. the person does not appeal within 20 days after the date of the notice.

The problem is that after the original ten days the City allows for payment of the citation, there are only 10 remaining days for the City to generate a "notice to appear" on those citations still unpaid. City records for fiscal year 1979-1980 showed that approximately 80% of the tickets are paid within the original ten days. This leaves an average of 80 tickets unpaid for each daily issue of 400 parking citations. This would require the City's Data Processing Department to generate daily listing of unpaid tickets to meet the requirements of the current statute.

By amending the law to allow 60 days for the processing and mailing of a notice to appear, the City would exercise a more cost-effective approach to parking citations bench warrants; in lieu of daily notices, a monthly listing could be compiled, checked for accuracy, paid versus unpaid citations, and mailed to the person ticketed.

We would appreciate your support on this matter and I would be happy to try and answer any questions you may have.

S. B. 379

 SENATE BILL NO. 379—SENATORS FORD, BLAKEMORE,
WAGNER, DON ASHWORTH, McCORKLE AND BILBRAY

MARCH 9, 1981

 Referred to Committee on Transportation

 SUMMARY—Strengthens provisions for protection of blind persons
in traffic. (BDR 43-1118)

 FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: No.
Effect on the State or on Industrial Insurance: No.

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

 AN ACT relating to blind persons; strengthening provisions for the protection of
such persons in traffic; providing a penalty; and providing other matters prop-
erly 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 a new section which shall read as follows:
3 1. *Any driver of a vehicle who approaches or encounters a blind per-*
4 *son on foot using a guide dog or carrying a cane or walking stick white*
5 *in color, or white tipped with red, shall come to a full stop and take such*
6 *precautions before proceeding as may be necessary to avoid accident or*
7 *injury to the blind person.*
8 2. *Any person who violates subsection 1 shall be punished by impris-*
9 *onment in the county jail for not more than 6 months or by a fine of not*
10 *less than \$100 nor more than \$500, or both fine and imprisonment.*
11 SEC. 2. NRS 484.325 is hereby amended to read as follows:
12 484.325 [1.] Except as provided in NRS 484.327 [, when] and
13 section 1 of this act:
14 1. When official traffic-control devices are not in place or not in oper-
15 ation the driver of a vehicle shall yield the right of way, slowing down or
16 stopping if need be so to yield, to a pedestrian crossing the highway within
17 a crosswalk when the pedestrian is upon the half of the highway upon
18 which the vehicle is traveling, or when the pedestrian is approaching so
19 closely from the opposite half of the highway as to be in danger.
20 2. [No] A pedestrian shall not suddenly leave a curb or other place
21 of safety and walk or run into the path of a vehicle which is so close that
22 it is impossible for the driver to yield.
23 3. Whenever a vehicle is stopped at a marked crosswalk or at an

1 unmarked crosswalk at an intersection, the driver of any other vehicle
2 approaching from the rear shall not overtake and pass such stopped vehi-
3 cle until [such] the driver has determined that the vehicle being over-
4 taken was not stopped for the purpose of permitting a pedestrian to cross
5 the highway.

6 4. Whenever signals exhibiting the words "Walk" or "Don't Walk"
7 are in place, such signals [shall] must indicate as follows:

8 (a) While the "Walk" indication is illuminated, pedestrians facing the
9 signal may proceed across the highway in the direction of the signal and
10 [shall] must be given the right of way by the drivers of all vehicles.

11 (b) While the "Don't Walk" indication is illuminated, either steady or
12 flashing, a pedestrian shall not start to cross the highway in the direction
13 of the signal, but any pedestrian who has partially completed his crossing
14 during the "Walk" indication shall proceed to a sidewalk, or to a safety
15 zone if one is provided.

16 (c) Whenever the word "Wait" still appears in a signal, [such] the
17 indication has the same meaning as assigned in this section to the "Don't
18 Walk" indication.

19 (d) Whenever a signal system provides a signal phase for the stopping
20 of all vehicular traffic and the exclusive movement of pedestrians, and
21 "Walk" and "Don't Walk" indications control [such] pedestrian move-
22 ment, pedestrians may cross in any direction between corners of the
23 intersection offering the shortest route within the boundaries of the inter-
24 section when the "Walk" indication is exhibited, and when signals and
25 other official traffic-control devices direct pedestrian movement in [such]
26 the manner [as] provided in this section and in NRS 484.283.

27 Sec. 3. NRS 484.327 is hereby amended to read as follows:
28 484.327. *Except as provided in section 1 of this act:*

29 1. Every pedestrian crossing a highway at any point other than
30 within a marked crosswalk or within an unmarked crosswalk at an inter-
31 section shall yield the right of way to all vehicles upon the highway.

32 2. Any pedestrian crossing a highway at a point where a pedestrian
33 tunnel or overhead pedestrian crossing has been provided shall yield the
34 right of way to all vehicles upon the highway.

35 3. Between adjacent intersections at which official traffic-control
36 devices are in operation pedestrians shall not cross at any place except in
37 a marked crosswalk.

38 4. A pedestrian shall not cross an intersection diagonally unless
39 authorized by official traffic-control devices.

40 5. When authorized to cross diagonally, pedestrians shall cross only
41 in accordance with the official traffic-control devices pertaining to such
42 crossing movements.

43 Sec. 4. NRS 426.510 is hereby amended to read as follows:

44 426.510 1. No person, except [those] a person wholly or partially
45 blind, [shall] may use a guide dog or carry or use on any street, high-
46 way, or in any other public place a cane or walking stick which is white
47 in color, or white tipped with red.

48 2. Any pedestrian who is not wholly or partially blind [, or any
49 driver of a vehicle,] who approaches or comes in contact with a person
50 wholly or partially blind using a guide dog or carrying a cane or walking

1 stick white in color, or white tipped with red, shall immediately come to
2 a full stop and take such precautions before proceeding as may be neces-
3 sary to avoid accident or injury to the person wholly or partially blind.

4 3. Any person other than a person wholly or partially blind:

5 (a) Who [shall use] *uses* a guide dog or [carry] *carries* a cane or
6 walking stick such as is described in this section, contrary to the provi-
7 sions of this section; [or]

8 (b) Who [shall fail] *fails* to heed the approach of a person using a
9 guide dog or carrying such a cane as is described by this section; [or]

10 (c) Who [shall fail] *fails* to come to a stop upon approaching or
11 coming in contact with a person so using a guide dog or so carrying such
12 a cane or walking stick; or

13 (d) Who [shall fail] *fails* to take precaution against accident or
14 injury to such a person after coming to a stop,
15 as provided for in this section, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

16 4. This section does not apply to any sighted person who uses a guide
17 dog or white cane for the purpose of training [such] *the* dog or of
18 instructing a blind person.

⊙

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

RALPH R. DISIBIO, Ed.D., DIRECTOR

ROBERT LIST, GOVERNOR

EL FROST, ADMINISTRATOR



REHABILITATION DIVISION
BUREAU OF SERVICES TO THE BLIND
KINKEAD BUILDING, SIXTH FLOOR
505 EAST KING STREET
STATE CAPITOL COMPLEX
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710

EXHIBIT F

March 31, 1981

Senator Richard Blakemore, Chairman
Senate Transportation Committee
Legislative Building
Carson City, NV 89710

Dear Senator:

As requested at the hearing on S.B. 379 on March 24, 1981, I am submitting the following substitute language for Section 1 of the bill:

Section 1. Chapter 484 of NRS is hereby amended by adding thereto a new section which shall read as follows:

1. A blind person using a guide dog or carrying a cane or walking stick, white in color or white tipped with red, has the right-of-way when entering upon or when on a street, highway, or roadway of this state. Any driver of a vehicle who approaches or encounters a blind person using a guide dog or carrying a cane or walking stick white in color or white tipped with red, who is entering upon or is on a street, highway, or roadway shall yield the right-of-way to the blind person, come to a full stop, and take such precautions before proceeding as may be necessary to avoid accident or injury to the blind person.

If I can be of further assistance to the committee, please contact me at 885-4444.

Sincerely,


Mervin J. Flander, Chief
Bureau of Services to the Blind

cc: Senator Jean Ford

MJF:emv

S. B. 397

SENATE BILL NO. 397—COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

MARCH 11, 1981

Referred to Committee on Transportation

SUMMARY—Limits use of taxicabs by standards of safety instead of by age. (BDR 58-1045)

FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: No. Effect on the State or on Industrial Insurance: No.

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

AN ACT relating to taxicabs; limiting their use by standards of safety instead of by age; 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. NRS 706.8834 is hereby amended to read as follows:
- 2 706.8834 1. A certificate holder shall not permit a vehicle to be
- 3 used as a taxicab if **[its age exceeds 4 years.]** *at its annual safety inspection the vehicle is declared to be in an unsafe mechanical condition by*
- 4 *a qualified safety inspector of the department of motor vehicles.*
- 5 2. Any replacement or supplement vehicle which a certificate holder
- 6 acquires for use as a taxicab **[shall:]** *must:*
- 7 (a) Be new; or
- 8 (b) Register not more than 10,000 miles on the odometer.
- 9

S. B. 589

**SENATE BILL NO. 589—SENATORS BILBRAY; FAISS, DON
ASHWORTH, CLOSE, HERNSTADT, FORD, ECHOLS AND
NEAL**

APRIL 22, 1981

Referred to Committee on Transportation

SUMMARY—Provides authority for establishment of mass transit commission in certain counties. (BDR 58-1002)

FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: No.
Effect on the State or on Industrial Insurance: Yes.

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

AN ACT relating to transportation; authorizing the establishment of a mass transit commission and vesting in the commission the authority to operate regional systems of bus transportation; appropriating part of the casino entertainment tax for this purpose; 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 710 of NRS is hereby amended by adding
2 thereto a new section which shall read as follows:

3 1. *In any county having a population of 25,000 or more, the board*
4 *of county commissioners may by ordinance create a mass transit com-*
5 *mission if a regional transportation commission has not been created in*
6 *that county. In counties which have established a regional transportation*
7 *commission pursuant to NRS 373.030, the board of county commissioners*
8 *shall designate that commission as the mass transit agency for that county.*

9 2. *A mass transit commission must be composed of five members to*
10 *be appointed by the board. The initial members must be selected within*
11 *30 days after passage of the ordinance creating the commission and shall*
12 *serve until the next-ensuing December 31 of an even-numbered year.*
13 *Their successors shall serve for terms of 2 years. Vacancies must be filled*
14 *for any unexpired term.*

15 3. *The ordinance creating a mass transit commission must provide*
16 *for its organization and meetings.*

17 SEC. 2. NRS 706.401 is hereby amended to read as follows:
18 706.401 An incorporated city, county [or], regional transportation
19 commission or mass transit commission is not required to obtain a
20 certificate of public convenience and necessity to operate a system of

1 bus transportation consisting of regular routes and fixed schedules to
2 serve the public.

3 SEC. 3. NRS 710.395 is hereby amended to read as follows:

4 710.395 A regional transportation commission ~~or a mass transit com-~~
5 mission may establish [or] and operate a system of bus transportation
6 consisting of regular routes and fixed schedules to serve the public.

7 SEC. 4. NRS 463.404 is hereby amended to read as follows:

8 463.404 1. The tax imposed by NRS 463.401 [shall] must be paid
9 in the form of remittances payable to the Nevada gaming commission.
10 The commission shall transmit the payment to the state treasurer to be
11 deposited to the credit of the general fund.

12 2. *The state treasurer shall pay from the state general fund to each*
13 *board of county commissioners, which has provided that a transit system*
14 *in their county be so funded, 25 percent of the revenue deposited in the*
15 *state general fund which was derived from the tax imposed by NRS*
16 *463.401 in their respective counties to be used for the planning, construc-*
17 *tion, administration, operation and maintenance of a system of bus*
18 *transportation to serve the public. Each board of county commissioners*
19 *shall establish a separate account into which the money received pursuant*
20 *to this subsection must be deposited.*

21 3. Refunds of tax erroneously collected may be made, upon the
22 approval of the commission, as other claims against the state are paid.

(REPRINTED WITH ADOPTED AMENDMENTS)

FIRST REPRINT

A. B. 422

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 422—COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

APRIL 2, 1981

Referred to Committee on Judiciary

SUMMARY—Extends time for issuance of notice to appear on citation for unlawful parking. (BDR 43-1201)

FISCAL NOTE: Effect on Local Government: No. Effect on the State or on Industrial Insurance: No.

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

AN ACT relating to unlawful parking; extending the time for the issuance of a notice to appear on a citation; 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. NRS 484.810 is hereby amended to read as follows:
- 2 484.810 When a traffic citation for a parking violation has been
- 3 issued identifying by license number a vehicle registered to a person who
- 4 has not [personally] signed the citation, a bench warrant [shall] may
- 5 not be issued for that person for failure to appear before the court unless:
- 6 1. A notice to appear concerning the violation is first sent to [such]
- 7 the person by first class mail within [20] 60 days after the citation is
- 8 issued; and
- 9 2. The person does not appear within 20 days after the date of the
- 10 notice or the notice to appear is returned with a report that it cannot be
- 11 delivered.