

MINUTES OF MEETING - TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - 55TH NEVADA
ASSEMBLY SESSION - FEBRUARY 28, 1969

Present: B. Hafen, Wood, Kean and Ashworth

Absent: Howard, Glaser and Tyson

Also Present: James Bailey, Department of Motor Vehicles
Robert Guinn and Daryl Capurro, Nevada Motor
Transport Association and the Nevada Franchise
Auto Dealers Association

Chairman Hafen convened the meeting at 10:00 a.m. and discussion was held on S.B. 136, adding qualification requirements for operators of driver training schools. Wood stated that without S.B. 136, the highway safety act of 1966 could cause some problems. The act provided that students and adults could receive drivers training from either private sources or from the schools. He said people would go into this business without proper controls and they would have schools popping up all over the state.

Mr. Bailey said that through S.B. 136, these people would be required to renew their certificates which they would receive from the department every few years and pay a fee for the renewal. Also tests are required prior to the issuance of certificates.

Hafen presented A.B. 264, requiring affidavit of power cycle manufacturer that motor is within legal limits for discussion. Mr. Bailey said that in the past it had been very difficult to enforce the rules on power cycles. The language of the law is very ambiguous. It was believed at one time that if the cycles were held down to 6-1/2 hp in all situations they would be able to control it. but this did not prove to be workable. It was too easy for the kid to buy the cycle, drive home and tear down the engine. With certain equipment, altering the air pressure in the tires, etc. it was too easy to soup up the engine.

Bailey continued that they had worked with the Engineering Department of the University in the testing of cycles and they had determined that it would be best to knock out the 6-1/2 hp requirement and limit the power cycles to 50cc displacement and require the manufacturer to certify that nothing has been added to the machine other than what is called for in the specifications. This 50 cc displacement can produce not more than 6-1/2 brake hp measured at the rear wheel at sea level.

He believed, however, it was necessary to delete the following words on line 16, page 1 of A.B. 264: "not to exceed 35 miles per hour." He noted that this bill provided that certification of these limits would be required for all cycles sold to 14 and 15 year old persons.

In these respects, the manufacturers such as Honda, Yamaha, etc. would have to come down to meet these requirements.

February 28, 1969

Ashworth asked if by doing this we would be prohibiting the manufacturers from building these larger machines and Mr. Bailey said it would prohibit the dealers from selling the machines to persons 14 and 15 years of age without certification.

A.B. 262, prescribing proper equipment for and operation of motorcycles and power cycles, was presented and Mr. Bailey stated that this bill had come out of the legislative subcommittee and that it goes along with the federal highway standards.

Wood said he had received a letter from a gentleman who was opposed to certain portions of A.B. 262 and read same to the committee. The letter stated that he was in support of the mufflers and the licenses but objected to the following:

Section 22, Front fender requirements; He said he had been driving his Harley-Davidson for many years without the fender and he did not believe it was a hazard.

Section 23, Helmets required; He stated that the helmet cuts down on hearing and vision and causes some accidents which would not have occurred without the helmet. He further stated that if the state would change the requirement to a 3/4 police type helmet, it would be much safer and acceptable.

Section 27, Front brakes

Section 28, Mirrors; He felt there was too much vibration on the handlebars for the mirrors to be effective anyway.

The committee agreed that some of his points were sound and Mr. Bailey noted that these were all federal requirements and if the state wants to satisfy the federal act, they would have to enforce these things. Mr. Guinn stated that most of these are covered by local ordinances such as the ones in Sparks, Reno, Ely, etc. and are actually locally controlled.

Mr. Guinn said if A.B. 262 were killed in committee, it would be necessary to back and pick up certain language in A.B. 269 and A.B. 271 because they had been established in this separate section. Without either passing 262 or picking up these provisions in 269 and 271, there would be no control over cycles.

Ashworth said in view of what Mr. Guinn had stated, it would be best to work on A.B. 262 and put it into shape.

Mr. Guinn then noted that there was an error due to conflict between A.B. 262 and A.B. 264 regarding the definitions of a power cycle. Mr. Bailey said the problem was that the definition in A.B. 264 is the original language and A.B. 262 contains the new definition.

February 28, 1969

Mr. Hafen suggested that A.B. 262 be set aside until such time as A.B. 271 was discussed by the committee.

Kean then moved that A.B. 264 be amended by adding a period after the word "speed" on line 16, page 1, and the following be deleted: "not to exceed 35 miles per hour."; further that the definition of a power cycle as shown on page 1, Section 1 be deleted and substituted with that definition for power cycle shown in Section 7 of A.B. 262; and that A.B. 264 be given a DO PASS as amended hereby. Motion seconded by Wood and unanimously carried.

A.B. 266 was presented by Chairman Hafen and discussion was held. Wood moved that A.B. 266 be indefinitely postponed; motion was seconded by Ashworth and unanimously carried.

Mr. Bailey noted that with regard to S.B. 25 scheduled for discussion on Monday, it would be impossible for his department to handle the requirements without additional funds. Mr. Hafen noted that A.B. 540 referring to drivers license numbers had just been introduced and that the committee would consider that one also on Monday. Those bills scheduled for Monday are as follows: A.B. 270, A.B. 350, A.B. 540 and S.B. 25. Mr. Bailey stated he would have an expert witness at the meeting on Monday.

Mr. Ashworth requested that the members of the committee receive a separate binder of the transportation bills now before them for discussion.

Kean suggested that sandwiches and coffee be brought in on Monday so that the committee could work through the lunch hour. All members concurred and Hafen stated that if there was time they would work on A.B. 269 and A.B. 271 also.

Mr. Guinn noted that there were several amendments being drafted now on A.B. 269 because there were many areas which needed to be covered, such as lights, brakes, etc.

Meeting adjourned.