

Assembly

MINUTES OF MEETING - TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - 55TH NEVADA
ASSEMBLY SESSION - MARCH 3, 1969

15

Present: B. Hafen, Kean, Ashworth, Wood, Tyson, Glaser
and Howard

Absent: None

Also Present: James Bailey, Department of Motor Vehicles
Thomas Cook, Deputy Attorney General's Office
assigned to the Motor Vehicle Department
Robert Guinn and Daryl Capurro, Nevada Motor
Transport Association and the Nevada Franchise
Auto Dealers Association
Virgil Anderson, AAA
Representative of the Press

Vice Chairman Kean convened the meeting at 11:05 a.m. and noted that they would discuss A.B. 265 pending the arrival of Chairman Hafen.

Discussion was held on the purpose of the bill since a person could go ahead and take the prescriptive drugs and get into an accident and then say he had left his prescription at home. Kean noted that the purpose was to inform him that they would be dangerous to him while driving. Ashworth asked if this referred to the physician or to the pharmacist; Tyson said she believed it meant the pharmacist.

Chairman Hafen arrived and discussion turned to A.B. 270, providing for single license for drivers.

Mr. Bailey stated that the two most important portions of A.B. 270 were the change of classifications of drivers licenses and changing the expiration of licenses from 5 years to 4 years. He then proceeded through the sections and read the changes being recommended. He noted that most of the changes were for the purpose of eliminating reference to a chauffeur's license since classification of licenses would delete the use thereof. He read paragraph 3 of Section 15 and noted therein "...of this act for the type or class of vehicle being driven..." clarified the classification involved.

Ashworth asked if this meant that a person driving a heavy equipment vehicle would have to have a separate classification to drive a pick up truck. Wood stated he believed that it is not required to hold all three licenses, that one class would include other classes.

Bailey confirmed that if a person had a Class 3 license, it would automatically give him the next two classifications, and a Class 2 license would give him a Class 1 license.

Assembly

Page -2- Transportation Committee

March 3, 1969

Glaser asked about the people who drive coast to coast whether they would be required to have the classified license and Bailey said if they were a resident of Nevada, they would. Under Nevada law, you can only have one state license. If you request a Nevada license, you have to relinquish your other licenses. He said this referred to all states belonging to the compact.

Mr. Hafen asked how many states belonged to the compact and Mr. Bailey said he believed all of the western states did. He noted that California and Nevada were about the first states to do this. He then noted paragraph 4 of Section 15 wherein it states, "A person shall not receive a driver's license until he surrenders to the department all valid licenses in his possession issued to him by this or any other jurisdiction. Surrendered licenses issued by another jurisdiction shall be returned by the department to such jurisdiction. A person shall not have more than one valid driver's license."

Glaser then asked if this would include farm trucks. Bailey answered that they would most likely come under the heading of a Class 2 license. Diesels and other large trucks and buses require a Class 3 license because they require more experience and knowledge.

Glaser wondered if it would be necessary to go back and take a new examination on this or if it would be accepted. Bailey said that it was planned to have an employer give a certificate as to the qualifications of their drivers so that they would not need to take the examination, however this would not cover the farmers, since they are usually self-employed.

Guinn said it would be necessary to put some new language in the bill saying that any existing licenses will be valid until the expiration date because most people now hold the 5 year license and would not be aware of the new law. This way these provisions would become effective on the renewal of old licenses or upon issuance of all new licenses.

Kean moved that an amendment be drafted for the phasing out of existing licenses to ensure their validity until expiration date; seconded by Glaser and unanimously carried.

Guinn asked if they were talking about all licenses and Kean said he believed it would have to be done that way, to include all licenses.

Guinn noted that they should remember that there would be no more chauffeur's licenses to be renewed. He said there would also be a problem involved if you say an individual with a drivers license can drive a pick-up truck.

Hafen asked where the classes were spelled out in the bill. He said that would mean that he and Mr. Glaser would have to take new examinations when they renew their licenses. Now it is only

required that they have the eye test and pay their license fee.

Mr. Ashworth asked who worked up the bill and Bailey said it was not a department bill; it had come from the legislative sub-committee. Ashworth asked if the department had any recommended changes to the bill and Bailey said we would have to have changes on the different vehicle classifications. They need something to cover the areas until the license expired.

Ashworth then stated that it might be a tough bill to comply with. He wondered if it would be better just to take up those matters necessary to stay within the compact. Bailey said these things would be necessary to stay within the compact requirements.

Wood noted that these changes have all been studied over a period of several years and he felt Grant Davis should speak on these matters. Mr. Davis has a stack of papers as a result of these studies and that they are conforming legislation. He said if we had the code to go by they would be able to see the tie in on these matters. He then asked where the classifications could be found.

Mr. Guinn said the classifications were not listed in any bill. He said the bill had been patterned after California law which gives the department the right to set the classifications. Wood asked if the criteria for these classifications should not be shown somewhere.

Guinn said in his opinion it was not necessary. Class 3 license would cover any bus or farm labor truck having three or more axles or a vehicle weighing or towing 10,000 lbs. in weight; Class 2 license would cover 3 axle pick-up trucks and buses carrying no more than 15 passengers; and Class 1 license would cover 3 axle automobile or two axle truck. He said in view of the close inter-relationship with the California code, he did not think there was anything to worry about.

Hafen asked if this was not necessary to conform with the Federal Standards and the compact and Bailey said essentially, yes.

Hafen stated that what the committee needed to determine was if they were going to conform what would need to be changed. He asked if there were any reasons why they should not conform. Wood said he felt it would be the smartest idea to have Grant Davis come in and speak to the committee.

Mr. Hafen noted that Mr. Davis had been there at 10:00 this morning and asked if there was going to be a meeting. However, in view of the long morning session, it looked like it would only be about 5 more minutes before they would have to adjourn.

Ashworth suggested that they get into the bill and if they run into legal ramifications, they can make note of them and ask Mr. Davis to take care of them later. The important thing was to find out what the problems were.

Kean moved that the committee express themselves in favor of changing the period of validity for all driver's licenses from five years to four years; motion seconded by Glaser and unanimously carried.

Ken then moved that the committee express concurrently therewith that the three types of driver's license classifications be established rather than the two now being used; seconded by Tyson. No vote taken.

Ashworth stated that the classifications were not spelled out in any bill, so what could they refer to. Wood suggested that they concur with giving the Department of Motor Vehicles the right to establish different types of driver's license classifications rather than the two types now being used on the assumption that they will change these to Class 1, 2 and 3.

Hafen said in his opinion, they had not thoroughly discussed the classes and Mr. Guinn stated that the differences were easy to distinguish between.

Glaser said he would prefer to see the classifications set out in legislation and Bailey said this would all be in the code. He noted that the chapters he had been referring to had all been taken from the code.

Glaser said he wanted to see them listed in the minutes so we can know what the requirements are on this.

Mr. Anderson, AAA, introduced himself and said he hoped they would work on the definition of certain types of trailers that may be pulled behind automobiles also and Bailey noted that this is covered in another bill.

Guinn said in his opinion he did not feel the types of classifications should be in the bill. He said they did not know enough about what they would run into after it goes into affect. They don't want to get tied down in the bill; they would rather have some latitude so that they can go back and pick up those areas which need to be corrected.

Glaser stated again that he would like to see the breakdown in the minutes though. He said he did not want some farmer coming back to him later and asking him what they had based their decision on with regards to these classifications.

Bailey noted that this is spelled out in Section 12804 of the California Code but that a copy of the code would be furnished to them for their minutes.

Guinn then asked if the committee would like a report of the Las Vegas meetings held Thursday and Friday regarding the PX Plates. He noted that Tyson had left the meeting today and wondered if they wanted to wait until another day. Hafen asked him to go

ahead with his report and Guinn stated that the meeting was held to get the opinions of dropping the fee on vehicles over 5,000 pounds and raising the fees on the 4,000 to 5,000 pound vehicles to compensate. The people attending the meeting were in favor of this, but as he had pointed out previously, they would be in favor of this because they were almost all plating vehicles over 5,000 pounds. He said the only resistance shown at the meeting came from a Mr. Sutzke who noted that the camper and pick-up and trailer people were against this bill because they feel the pick-ups are already overtaxed in comparison to passenger cars.

Mr. Guinn was asked how many were at the meeting and he noted that there were only about 25 in Las Vegas and that his own department had shown poor attendance. Ashworth stated that the thing needed to be looked at and they could accomplish this better if there were a bill drafted on it.

Mr. Ashworth then moved that said bill be drafted and referred back to the Committee on Transportation for their consideration. Guinn said he believed the private carriers would be very happy about this bill but the pick-up people would have to pay for it.

Chairman Hafen noted that Kean's motion regarding classifications had been seconded but not voted upon.

Kean then amended his motion by stating as follows: I move that the committee express concurrently therewith that the three types of driver's license classifications be established in accordance with the California Code; that the Department of Motor Vehicles be authorized to establish these classifications; and that a copy of said classifications be attached to these minutes and made a part hereof; Motion seconded by Glaser and unanimously carried.

Chairman Hafen then stated that Ashworth had moved that the bill regarding PX Plates be drafted and referred back to the Committee on Transportation for consideration; motion seconded by Kean and unanimously carried.

Mr. Guinn stated he would need further guidance on the PX Plate bill due to the amount that would be lost to the PSC by dropping fees on the vehicles over 5,000 pounds. Ashworth said when drafting the bill they allow for the necessary amount and raise the other fees accordingly.

Mr. Guinn then said he would need the assistance of Mr. Daykin on the validity of the increase and Mr. Kean noted that he had already discussed this matter with Mr. Daykin who had expressed an opinion that there would be no problem.

Mr. Kean then moved that Mr. Guinn and Mr. Bailey be authorized to make a study with regard to an amendment in relationship to the expiration dates and new classifications of all driver's licenses; motion seconded by Glaser and unanimously carried.

Guinn stated that due to the length of time being spent with committee on these bills, he was finding it difficult to get his bill drafted and into committee before the end of the 40 days. He asked if the committee could assist him on this and Ashworth moved that the committee introduce Mr. Guinn's bill when it has been drafted and presented as a committee measure; motion seconded by Kean and unanimously carried.

Meeting adjourned.