

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**

**Seventy-sixth Session  
March 10, 2011**

The Senate Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chair Shirley A. Breeden at 3:40 p.m. on Thursday, March 10, 2011, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Shirley A. Breeden, Chair  
Senator Michael A. Schneider, Vice Chair  
Senator John J. Lee  
Senator Mark A. Manendo  
Senator Dean A. Rhoads  
Senator Mike McGinness  
Senator Elizabeth Halseth

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Don Gustavson, Washoe County Senatorial District No. 2  
Assemblyman John C. Ellison, Assembly District No. 33

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Kelly Gregory, Policy Analyst  
Bruce Daines, Counsel  
Laura Adler, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Patti Chipman, Nye County  
Lorinda A. Wichman, Vice Chair, Board of Commissioners, Nye County  
Don Alt, Nevada Live Stock Association  
Sue Silver, Board of Directors, Coalition for Public Access  
Doug Busselman, Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation

Senate Committee on Transportation  
March 10, 2011  
Page 2

Wes Henderson, Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties  
Mike L. Baughman, Ph.D., CECD, Executive Director, Lincoln County Regional  
Development Authority  
Tracy Larkin-Thomason, P.E., P.T.O.E., C.P.M., Assistant Director of Planning,  
Nevada Department of Transportation  
Demar Dahl, Chair, Board of Commissioners, Elko County  
Janine Hansen, President, Nevada Eagle Forum  
Kyle Davis, Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League  
John Bland, President, A.B.A.T.E. of Northern Nevada  
John Hobbs, A.B.A.T.E. of Northern Nevada  
Ken Wellington  
Mike Davis, President, A.B.A.T.E. of Southern Nevada  
Larry Marina, D & M Cycle School  
Victor Moss, Motorcycle School Instructor  
Lynn Chapman, Vice President, Nevada Families  
Doug Knight, A.B.A.T.E. of Northern Nevada  
Mike Marcum, President, Longrider Cowboys  
Samuel J. Marber  
Karen Jurasinski, Vice President, A.B.A.T.E. of Southern Nevada  
Jim Canfield  
Lillian Gonzalez  
James Kimsey, President, Southern Nevada Confederation of Clubs  
Frank Adams, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association  
Rusty McAllister, President, Professional Firefighters of Nevada  
Adam Stubbs, Government Liaison, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department  
Marty Wright, Sergeant, Traffic Unit, Reno Police Department  
Chris Waddle, Detective, Traffic Division, Reno Police Department  
Ken Kiphart, Program Administrator, Program for Educational Motorcycle Riders,  
Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety  
John R. Johansen, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety  
Dale Andrus

CHAIR BREEDEN:

We will open the hearing on S.B. 49.

**SENATE BILL 49**: Revises provisions governing the authority of a board of county highway commissioners regarding the establishment of certain rights-of-way. (BDR 35-341)

Senate Committee on Transportation  
March 10, 2011  
Page 3

PATTI CHIPMAN (Nye County):

Commissioner Lorinda Wichman will provide the presentation on Lyon County roads.

LORINDA A. WICHMAN (Vice Chair, Board of Commissioners, Nye County):

My history with S.B. 49 has been long and arduous. As we went through the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) to get the minor roads into the Nye County inventory system, it became apparent everything we did we would have to do twice. We reduce everything to writing in order to track the process for the future. We have to appear before our board of road commissioners with a resolution to establish the width of a road, which is already defined in the NRS. We conduct a public hearing, then we put it in writing to comply with the second NRS to establish length, distance and whether it is a minor county road. With small changes to the language we would be able to incorporate six actions into four, thus reducing staff time without changing the existing meaning in the NRS. The handout ([Exhibit C](#)) details areas in NRS 403.190 requiring the layout and designation of county roads, but does not allow for the commissioners to do it; it has to be done before the road commission. Any main, general or minor county road that is laid out is covered in NRS 405.191. We suggest placing the new language under section 2, following Title 43 U.S.C. section 932 with, "In a county in which a board of county highway commissioners has exclusive control of all matters relating to the construction, repairing and maintaining of public highways, roads and bridges within the county pursuant to NRS 403.090, the board of county highway commissioners may locate and determine the width of those rights-of-way and open those rights-of-way for public use ... ." Now, we would have everything in one commission, instead of having to hear it in two separate commissions. We meet at the same time, the same day, because it is the same group of people, but we have to go through it twice.

SENATOR LEE:

What you are saying is that you have dual responsibilities in that you are county commissioners and also sit on the highway board. The resolution comes to the highway board, then to the county commission. Do all county commissioners sit on the highway board?

MS. WICHMAN:

We do, but that may not be true for all counties.

SENATOR LEE:

Did I understand that if it is heard on the county board, you should not have to report it again to yourselves as the highway board?

MS. WICHMAN:

Exactly.

CHAIR BREEDEN:

Will this bill affect other counties or just Nye County?

MS. WICHMAN:

It would affect all counties by allowing them not to duplicate effort every time they tried to put a minor county road on their inventory. When we research and bring a minor county road to the commission for approval and acceptance on our inventory, some packets are nearly an inch thick. They contain all the historical data that supports our claim to that road as a minor county road in our jurisdiction. That same thick packet of backup data must be presented each step of the way again and again. I have talked with Mineral County, Elko County, Eureka County, Lander County, Lyon County and Esmeralda County. I have only been to those counties that surround Nye County and have the same issues to find a way to refine the process.

SENATOR MANENDO:

Would this bill enable you or anyone else to designate new roads?

MS. WICHMAN:

Not new roads. All our county roads deal with U. S. Department of the Interior Revised Statute 2477 (R.S. 2477). When Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6 of the 75th Session was brought forward, it encouraged counties to establish and inventory their minor county roads for that reason to establish our jurisdiction and protect our R.S. 2477 rights-of-way (ROW) for the public. In an attempt to comply, we found we had to go through these steps in order to complete the process. We are looking for a State validation process because all the case law dealing with these jurisdiction issues refer to a State validation process. Some of the language in S.B. 49 caused concern with the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). The procedures we are using in Nye County were worked out with NDOT's help over the past year, arriving at language that will constitute acceptance by the State for certification of minor

county roads. The NDOT has brought forth an amendment to the bill that is acceptable.

SENATOR MANENDO:

I want to make sure it is on the record that this is not going to be designated for new roads.

MS. WICHMAN:

To begin with, we had to review the roads prior to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) assuming authority under Section 201, Inventory and Identification Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. If we could not do that and the road is a United States Forest Service (USFS), Department of Agriculture road, in some places we had to prove the historical route of that road prior to 1906 when they did the forest service reserve date. If that road was not there in 1906, or prior to 1906, then we did not go any further with the process. Our minor county roads are old existing rights.

SENATOR LEE:

There are 3,000 minor county roads that are not maintained. The only way they do get maintained is if somebody drives a truck over the road, knocking down the sagebrush. There is a lot of work the Nye County people have done on this program, and I wish them well.

DON ALT (Nevada Live Stock Association):

I support S.B. 49. I would like to see a savings clause in the bill that would preserve the grazing and ranging of livestock. As detailed in my handout ([Exhibit D](#)), the Act of 1866 granted ROW for stock trails over public lands. I also list several court cases in different states regarding ROW. It would be advisable to add to S.B. 49 that none of the preexistent rights will be forfeited or diminished in any way for ranging and grazing of livestock.

SUE SILVER (Board of Directors, Coalition for Public Access):

I am a researcher and lay historian. I have spent many months providing Mineral County with historical background on existing roads, ways and trails that developed and evolved since 1860. I have provided details on county roads in my written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)) in support of S.B. 49.

Senate Committee on Transportation  
March 10, 2011  
Page 6

DOUG BUSSELMAN (Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation):  
The Nevada Farm Bureau Federation is in support of S.B. 49. We are proud of Nye County for their effort in keeping their roads open for their citizens, and this bill will help in that effort.

WES HENDERSON (Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties):  
We are in support of S.B. 49. As stated in my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)), access through public lands is crucial to the well-being of the economies of Nevada's counties.

SENATOR MANENDO:  
Does this bill allow, in any way, the moving of ROW?

MR. HENDERSON:  
No, it does not. It is the historical ROW that predates the 1976 Federal Land Policy and Management Act or predates the creation of the national forest.

MIKE L. BAUGHMAN, PH.D., CECD (Executive Director, Lincoln County Regional Development Authority):

We support S.B. 49. The federal government administers 98.6 percent of Lincoln County, primarily by the BLM. Because Lincoln County is immediately north of Clark County, we are their playground, which is important to Lincoln County's economy as well as our own residents to have access to public lands. There are thousands of miles of minor roads on BLM land that must be maintained for public access. These roads serve a variety of purposes including recreation, mining and now, because of the interest in renewable energy, particularly solar. The BLM is analyzing 75,000 acres to be designated as solar energy zones. This bill will help facilitate the perfection of claims for R.S. 2477 roads before the federal government. The partnership between the counties and NDOT is important in making the clarification of minor roads happen.

Tracy Larkin-Thomason, P.E., P.T.O.E., C.P.M., Assistant Director of Planning,  
Nevada Department of Transportation

The NDOT supports S.B. 49. We are proposing a friendly amendment you will find in your packet ([Exhibit G](#)). As NRS 403.190 was originally written, it had unintended consequences to the State causing a large fiscal impact. This amendment was discussed with Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) and Nye County. If accepted, NDOT would withdraw the fiscal impact statement.

DEMAR DAHL (Chair, Board of Commissioners, Elko County):

Elko County supports the proposed amendment to S.B. 49. Roads are important to Elko County as they are in all the rural counties for mining, ranching and recreation. We used a different process in Elko County to inventory our roads. In the 1990s, one of our citizens, Cliff Gardner, put a set of maps together, now called the Gardner Maps. Those maps designate all the R.S. 2477 roads that could be determined at that time. Those maps include about 70 percent of the three forests in Elko County. One of those roads is the Jarbidge Road that was opened in 2000 with the help of about 2,000 volunteers. There was a court settlement to keep the Jarbidge Road open. That settlement has been appealed by a group called the "Grand Old Broads for Wilderness," and is still pending. Elko County is now in a contest with the USFS on the general management plan they introduced January 2009. We have not been able to get a good figure from the USFS as to the number of roads and miles of roads they propose to close. We whittled down the number of originally proposed roads considerably. The county has held three hearings in Elko with a lot of testimony, science and monitoring supporting our position that very few of those roads should be closed, and any that are closed, should be closed because the USFS has good monitoring and good science to do that. For the most part, we have depended on our Gardner Maps, but over the years we will perfect each one of those roads. We support S.B. 49 because it will make the process simpler.

JANINE HANSEN (President, Nevada Eagle Forum):

I also represent the Nevada Committee for Full Statehood which is involved in the issues of property rights in Nevada, including the preservation of R.S. 2477, individual access in Nevada and protesting some of the abuses by the federal government. We support S.B. 49 and hope it helps the counties with an easier way to perfect rural roads. It is important we assert our rights in light of the overwhelming evidence of the federal government's efforts to take away those rights. Several years ago, I was deer hunting with my husband in Washoe County near the Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge. Many of those roads had barriers placed across them by the USFS and BLM, prohibiting people from entering those areas. My husband had hunted in that area for many years, and now most of the access is blocked because the federal government has usurped those R.S. 2477 roads. It is critical this process goes forward. For further information, I have submitted a fact sheet on R.S. 2477 ([Exhibit H](#)).

KYLE DAVIS (Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League):

As the bill is written, I am concerned about the impact on the State and the liability by certifying these roads. As previously mentioned, the elaborate process for R.S. 2477 roads often involves the courts. If the State is going to be in charge of certifying roads, the State would need to do due diligence to make sure the map presented is accurate. My other issue is that the State certifying this map does not do much to provide proof the road was in use before passage of the act. In talking with NDOT, it is their opinion that changing to acknowledgment would reduce the liability to the State. I want to be sure that we fully explore all aspects of this action. I remain neutral at this time on S.B. 49.

CHAIR BREEDEN:

We will close S.B. 49 and open the hearing on S.B. 177.

[SENATE BILL 177](#): Revises provisions governing the wearing of protective headgear when operating motorcycles. (BDR 43-571)

SENATOR DON GUSTAVSON (Washoe County Senatorial District No. 2):

As far as I know, I have the only bill that will create new jobs and generate millions of dollars of revenue for Nevada without raising any taxes or spending any stimulus money. I have outlined how this can be done in my handout ([Exhibit I](#)). Today, a total of 30 states have said no to mandated helmet use and yes to the right to choose ([Exhibit J](#)). The best safety device is a good motorcycle rider safety program. Nevada has one of the finest. Arizona is recent proof that safety programs work better than forced helmet wearing as you see in the Arizona Motorcycle Fatalities by Year ([Exhibit K](#)). There are more brain injuries due to accidents related to bicyclists, pedestrians and occupants of motor vehicles, yet we do not mandate the wearing of a helmet for the rest of civilization, as shown in the Traumatic Brain Injuries chart ([Exhibit L](#)). I have submitted a conceptual amendment for S.B. 177 ([Exhibit M](#)).

CHAIR BREEDEN:

You said you want to change the effective date of the bill to July 1, 2011. Are you expecting a rally to accommodate that request?



Senate Committee on Transportation  
March 10, 2011  
Page 9

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

There are several events coming, mostly during summer and fall. Actually, I would like to change the effective date to as soon as the bill is signed by the Governor. I think there is an earlier event, but I am not sure of when.

CHAIR BREEDEN:

The Laughlin motorcycle event is coming in April.

SENATOR LEE:

Is it correct that the year you receive your motorcycle operator's license, you wear your helmet for a year, then you qualify to take off the helmet?

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

Yes.

SENATOR LEE:

If the motorcycle driver is licensed for less than a year, then the passenger should also have a helmet, but if that person has been licensed over a year, then the passenger does not have to wear a helmet, correct?

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

Yes, a driver licensed less than a year must wear a helmet and a passenger under the age of 21 must wear a helmet. After one year, the responsibility falls on the driver.

JOHN BLAND (President, A.B.A.T.E. of Northern Nevada):

I am the state representative of the Motorcycle Riders Foundation, and the founder of the Elko Motorcycle Jamboree. You will see a map of the United States in my handout ([Exhibit N](#)) showing the states that allow adult voluntary helmet use; Nevada is not one of them. Page 3 lists the history of the national helmet laws. Table 111 on page 5 shows the fatality average of 13.2 percent for all states together. On page 4, Nevada's motorcycle fatalities with a mandatory helmet law is at 17.3 percent. That is higher than the national average. Florida's fatality rate of 16.1 percent, with a helmet choice, is lower than Nevada's. There appears to be no appreciable difference between helmet-required states and non-helmet states; both averaged 13 percent fatality rates.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) is often the source for helmet information. They have an agenda to mandate safety and helmets, and their numbers are not always fairly represented on their Website. The NHTSA Website presents statistics regarding the safety of motorcycle helmets, yet does not mention that helmets are only designed, tested and approved for 13 miles-per-hour impact. It is stunning that information is not more widely known. That information should be on the inside of every helmet just like the warnings on wine and cigarettes to inform the public on what that safety device will and will not do. It is interesting to note NHTSA's disclaimer on their Website, which you can read on page 6, [Exhibit N](#). The most effective means of reducing motorcycle injuries is accident prevention rather than accident survivability. It should be obvious the most effective means of reducing motorcycle deaths and injuries is to prevent motorcycle accidents. Pennsylvania has constantly promoted rider education, driver education, enhanced public awareness of motorcycles and safe design of roads and traffic control devices.

SENATOR HALSETH:

Could you explain how repealing the helmet law means more money for Nevada?

MR. BLAND:

The Elko Motorcycle Jamboree brought in an estimated \$1 million the first year. The event has increased \$1 million every year, and is now in its 11th year. Nevada's central valley is an ideal location as it is a one-day ride from Las Vegas, from Los Angeles and the Bay Area where many jamboree participants come from. I am not sure of the number, but it is around 500,000 registered motorcycles in California and they are landlocked. They cannot go west or south, so it is ideal to ride east to Nevada, which has some of the most beautiful riding areas in the country.

SENATOR HALSETH:

Are there other ways to raise revenue beside the jamboree?

MR. BLAND:

Advertising across the country about motorcycle riding opportunities in Nevada is one. Rural riding is most popular. We also have two renowned cities for vacationing. The combination is unique and results are apparent within the first couple of years.

SENATOR HALSETH:

It is a great point about Nevada being a great vacation destination. My brother rides his motorcycle to Nevada. He belongs to a motorcycle group who say they would all like to come to Nevada, except for our helmet law.

JOHN HOBBS (A.B.A.T.E. of Northern Nevada):

I will quote a few observations made by others in support of natural law ([Exhibit O](#)). Helmets save lives. Helmets can also extinguish lives. I have submitted a letter from my father, George Hobbs, ([Exhibit P](#)) on the dangers of heat stroke from wearing a helmet. I have also provided an e-mail response from Hari Shanker Sharma, Ph.D., ([Exhibit Q](#)) regarding his article on heat dissipation.

KEN WELLINGTON:

I am speaking on behalf of myself in favor of S.B. 177. I tell you my background in my handout ([Exhibit R](#)) because I have nothing to gain or lose behind my testimony. In the big packet ([Exhibit S](#)) are letters from multiple law enforcement agencies throughout Nevada indicating they have no documentation on motorcycle helmet recalls, laboratory testing facilities or training for officers on NHTSA certificates concerning noncompliant motorcycle headgear protection. Also included are court cases regarding wearing helmets.

During my career, I was taught that when two people have different stories, I had to determine who had the most credible statement, and who had the most to lose or gain. I ask you to consider the motivation behind each testifier and what each person or organization has to gain or lose.

MIKE DAVIS (President, A.B.A.T.E. of Southern Nevada):

The motorcycle riders in the south are in favor of S.B. 177. In my prepared testimony ([Exhibit T](#)) I also cover the validity of statistics, the economic impact, the possibility of a motorcycle event in Tonopah and NHTSA's documents. This bill is an excellent start in giving riders in Nevada the ability to decide for themselves with regard to helmet use. I have read the history of NRS 486.231, and I am of the opinion it was passed because of prejudice against motorcyclists. In 1971 there was little or no accurate statistical data proving one way or the other that helmets reduced fatalities.

LARRY MARINA (D&M Cycle School, Inc.):

I have been riding motorcycles in Nevada for 35 years. I worked with major movie studios as a stunt rider and have a lot of experience. Personally, when

I put a helmet on I feel as impaired as if I was drinking or texting while driving. The helmet impairs my peripheral vision and my ability to hear traffic around me. I have researched articles and studies which conclude that motorcycle helmets cause harm. A complaint on file with the United States Department of Transportation (DOT) No. 10193212 says the D-ring on the helmet strap allegedly causes stroke and brain damage, referencing Dr. Sharma's article on heat stress and motorcycle helmets. There are numerous studies about the hyperthermic brain damage, and we live in one of the hottest climates in the country.

It was recommended that helmets of a certain amount of volume, such as DOT helmets, be avoided due to fractures at the base of the skull influenced by the mass of certain types of highway helmets. This information came from a study "The Effect of Motorcycle Helmet Use on the Probability of Fatality and the Severity of Head and Neck Injuries" by Jonathan P. Goldstein, Ph.D., Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine. A National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) case, open for several years, was deferred eventually to the Hertz study because that was coming out shortly, and closed their case. The Hertz study ultimately concluded there was a 75 percent increase in serious neck injuries caused by wearing helmets.

There are over 500,000 helmets in the recall database at NHTSA. Some of these helmets could cause serious injury or death. These are the only helmets actually deemed not compliant by make and model, yet per e-mails from the DOT, they have no ability to do effective recalls. The NHTSA says to use failed helmets unless notified by the manufacturer to stop. Note that since *California Highway Patrol v. Richard Quigley, Steve Bianco, Don Blanscet, Steve Barron, Patrick Holmes*, Case No. CIV 155682, and Judge Barton's finding, there is no such term as DOT approved, in fact or in law. The motorcycling community has publicized this extensively. There is now a new trend for the DOT secretary and NTSB Chair Mark Rosenberg to use the term DOT-certified rather than DOT-approved helmets. Likewise, there is no such term as DOT-certified. Because the DOT does not approve helmets or have a list of approved helmets, it does not certify or maintain—certify is a misleading term that has no meaning, just as when using DOT-approved. The only certification is done by the manufacturer. The DOT has no statutory authority over consumers or motorcycle operators. The Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 218 is a standard to be followed by manufacturers and the supply chain of exporters,

importers, resellers and distributors. The only laws pertinent to consumers and motorcycle operators are found in state codes or statutes.

VICTOR MOSS (Motorcycle School Instructor):

I am a certified Motorcycle Safety Foundation instructor licensed to provide training in Nevada. I am a lifelong motorcycle rider with over one-half million miles of riding and have never been in a crash because of training, education, practice and skill. I have also provided information on training capacity analysis in my written testimony ([Exhibit U](#)). I support S.B. 177.

LYNN CHAPMAN (Vice President, Nevada Families):

We are in favor of S.B. 177. When I was younger, my brother had a motorcycle, and I always rode on the back with him. He got a motorcycle because it was cheaper to buy and run. With gasoline prices rising rapidly, I bet there will be a lot more people riding motorcycles. The government is responsible to lay out and build the highways, but it should not be in charge of what I wear.

DOUG KNIGHT (A.B.A.T.E. of Northern Nevada):

I support S.B. 177. When I was in Wyoming, I had a motorcycle accident. A world-renowned neurosurgeon at the University of Utah reattached my skull to my spine. My spinal cord was injured at cervical levels 3 and 4. The doctor said if I had had a helmet on, it would have severed my spinal cord from my brain and killed me instantly. Wyoming is a freedom-of-choice state, and Nevada should be too. You have heard all the statistics. If you are wearing a full-face helmet and want to turn your head, you have to move the helmet too.

MIKE MARCUM (President, Longrider Cowboys):

I agree with a number of testifiers who spoke before me in support of S.B. 177. I ask that you carefully look at the numbers in the charts, as the books are cooked a lot. This is an issue of freedom of choice for adults. The bill strikes a happy compromise between the responsibilities of the State and the responsibilities of the individual.

MS. HANSEN:

Before he left, Elko County Commissioner Demar Dahl asked me to say he was in support of S.B. 177 as am I. I believe in individual liberty and responsibility. I became a member of A.B.A.T.E. this last year because I was so impressed with their commitment to liberty and the constitution. Often, I found that people

who are seeking liberty and to be responsible for themselves, become engaged after that in the full broad range of issues regarding liberty in our nation. People act more responsibly when they take care of themselves and the government is not taking care of them.

Samuel J. Marber

I am 71 years old and have been riding a motorcycle for 45 years. I have logged 283,000 motorcycle miles. I was also a stunt rider in the movies. The motorcycle helmet law, as it stands, is blatantly unconstitutional. The United States Supreme Court held in *Yick Wo v. Hopkins, Sheriff*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886) that a law, however constitutional it may appear on its face, is unconstitutional if it was passed for unconstitutional reasons. The motorcycle helmet law was passed in Nevada before we had a seat belt law. It was passed at a time when there were a lot of biker movies, and the bikers were made out to be super bad guys. Legislators were afraid the Hell's Angels would come into Nevada if there were no helmet law. We got a helmet law and the Hell's Angels came anyway. When the federal government mandated a helmet law, Utah wisely exempted the wearing of helmets on streets with speed limits of 35 miles per hour or less. A bicycle or a moped can go that fast, yet drivers of all bicycles and most mopeds are not mandated to wear helmets. Why is there no helmet law for bicyclists or people who are going slower than 36 miles per hour? Nevada has not shown real consideration for the safety of motorcyclists. If they did, then I would not have gone down on the Salt Lake Highway at night, because half the highway was repaved and the other half of the southbound lanes were not repaved, leaving a curb between the two lanes. I hit that curb, went into a violent wheel wobble, went down and fortunately did not get hurt. I did have to leave my motorcycle near the highway, and it was stolen. Recently, in Las Vegas, they were repaving Charleston Boulevard. I was traveling through the Charleston underpass, came out on South Main Street, and right after that there were furrows about 4 inches deep near the berm. These furrows were parallel to the line of travel, making it difficult for me to keep my motorcycle up. Along Boulder Highway big, angular rocks were placed in the median. Should a motorcycle be forced off the road, the rider would be dashed against these big angular rocks. This nation was based on liberty, not safety. If you put liberty first, you can choose safety, but if you put safety first, you will lose liberty.

KAREN JURASINSKI (Vice President, A.B.A.T.E. of Southern Nevada):

I have been riding a motorcycle since I was 11 years old, and I am 54 years old now. I own a 1999 Harley-Davidson on which I have put over 160,000 miles. In 1980, the median age in the riding community was 24. In 2007, the riding age rose to 48. The median riding age for women in 2008 was 42. I read an article, "Rebels with a Disposable Income." We all know it is disposable income that runs Nevada. In 2006, in 58 percent of all motorcycle fatalities, the riders were wearing helmets. I could not find a percentage for men, but found one for women riders who are 10 percent of the riding community these days; 28 percent of women who ride have a college or postgraduate degree. The point is, today's average motorcycle rider is an older well-educated person with money and means. Since we are an older, well-educated group, we should be able to make our own decisions as to whether or not to wear a helmet, and that is what S.B. 177 would allow. When there is a motorcycle accident that involves a car, most of the time the driver of the car is at fault. What we need to do is make the car driver more aware of the motorcycle riders on the road.

In the past, we have made several suggestions to the Advisory Board on Motorcycle Safety in Nevada, and they have done nothing. One suggestion was to use the Rapid Transit Commission message boards on the freeways. If they can post a message about not cutting off big-rigs, then they can post a watch out for motorcycles sign. I was told by someone from the Nevada Highway Patrol (NHP) that they do not want to overuse those signs, so when something important is posted, people will pay attention. Is my life not important? Another idea is to educate the public by including at least a half-hour on motorcycles and motorcycle safety in all traffic schools. We know just about everyone in Nevada is going to wind up going to traffic school. Include more about motorcycles and motorcycle safety in the driver handbook. This will cost some money, but is worth working towards. Stop punishing us for the fault of others when it comes to motorcycle fatalities. Let us educate the public.

JIM CANFIELD:

In my written testimony ([Exhibit V](#)), I point out the City of Henderson has no list of approved helmets or a record of any that might have been recalled, yet the judge says he will decide and the police will not even look at my helmet. I ask that Nevada join those 30 states that allow adults to make their own choice by approving S.B. 177.

ASSEMBLYMAN JOHN C. ELLISON (Assembly District No. 33):

As a cosponsor, I am here in support of S.B. 177. I have had a motorcycle license since I was 14 years old. I traveled from Elko to Winnemucca without a helmet. The worst wreck I was in was the day they passed the helmet law. I pulled into the yard, smacked a tree and knocked myself out. A helmet impairs vision, muffles hearing and distracts in other ways.

LILLIAN GONZALEZ:

I am a reporter for a motorcycle magazine. One of the first stories to get a lot of attention was the dismissal of 56 helmet cases in Henderson. Evidently, the helmet law has been used to harass motorcyclists. There was a party at Henderson Harley-Davidson where about 100 motorcyclists were detained by law enforcement under the pretext that their helmets were no good. Once the motorcyclists were detained, they were told to go back where they came from or get a ticket. Of the riders who took tickets, 56 decided to challenge the tickets in court. There is an expert in Nevada named David Stillwell who used a foreclosure attorney to educate him on the helmet law. Mr. Stillwell, with the attorney's expertise, successfully got all 56 cases dismissed. The loss of revenue to Henderson was about \$88,000. That was not just the helmet tickets, but all the associated tickets.

I also covered a story about a "bike fest" that happens the last week in September. According to the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, the event organizers were expecting a great many motorcyclists but had a deficit of around 40 percent. It was obvious a lot of motorcyclists were not coming because of the perception that law enforcement was violating their rights. During the week of the Las Vegas Bike Fest, one of the biggest motorcycle events in the Las Vegas area, Arizona decided to have an event inasmuch as to say do not bother going to Las Vegas, come here where there is a helmet choice and not be violated by law enforcement. Initially, when I heard these stories, I did not believe them. I put on my little helmet, thinking since all those cases were dismissed, mine would be if I were stopped. I have been detained five times, and ticketed twice for wearing my skinny helmet. The first time I was stopped I did not get a ticket, but I did get a Nevada Highway Patrol officer pointing her finger two inches from my face telling me, "You will not speak until I am finished speaking." I was treated like a villain and my husband was treated like a dog by telling him, "You sit!" All of this happened apparently because law enforcement is being told motorcyclists are dangerous and are to be treated as though armed and going to hurt them. As a matter of freedom and perception



for tourism, I believe we should have helmet choice. It will take away a tool by which law enforcement has been unfairly targeting and profiling motorcyclists to the detriment of Nevada's economy.

JAMES KIMSEY (President, Southern Nevada Confederation of Clubs):

I am surprised there is no testimony from members of the insurance industry and the personal injury industry. Two years ago I was here to testify before this Committee in support of a similar bill. I am also president of the Coalition of Independent Riders and a member of the U.S. Defenders. It is these three groups on whose behalf I am speaking. I have provided the Committee with our current motorcycle law, as well as statistics from other states with helmet-choice laws, and suggested revisions to NRS 486 ([Exhibit W](#)). I do legal compliance for law firms and the gaming industry. I have been a motorcycle rider for 38 years and a lifetime member of A.B.A.T.E. I have ridden in all 50 states, in different countries, and on the Pan-American Highway. I support all the statements made today. I also received a helmet ticket which was dismissed as unenforceable. My wife and I are dual residents of Nevada and Florida where I am active in the helmet and bikers' rights issues. My wife is a licensed attorney in Florida, and as of last year, the ridership in Florida continues to increase, and fatalities continue to go down. Florida's percentage of fatalities is less than Nevada's with its helmet law. We are losing significant revenue and significant ridership as a result of our helmet law.

Because of my work in the legal field, I work with several personal injury firms. There are few firms in the industry representing motorcycle riders, because there are few accidents and fatalities in percentage to the normal population. I am a veteran with the Nevada National Guard, and find it interesting that I could choose to be shot for my country, but I could not choose if I would wear a helmet.

Senator Gustavson said it best. We should make this bill a top priority. Make it effective upon passage and signature. We have many motorcycle events in Nevada that would benefit. Right now, ridership is still dropping. We could jump-start Laughlin in April and May, as well as the Las Vegas Bike Fest. We have a significant September 11, 2001, commemoration special event coming up, plus Street Vibrations. These are all significant events where ridership could be increased in celebration of this new helmet law. Nevada is a bastion of freedom. It was "Battle Born" to begin with, and we want to return that to the people. I believe that by passage of S.B. 177 we will.

SENATOR HALSETH:

One economic chart, [Exhibit N](#), compares the California mandatory helmet law passed in 1992 to Florida's right-to-choose law passed in 2000. There is a decline in motorcycle registration in California, and a steep increase in motorcycle registration in Florida. Do you think it would be beneficial for Nevada and more motorcycle registration, if riders had the right to choose?

MR. KIMSEY:

Absolutely. In fact, the Southern Nevada Confederation of Clubs has 44 member clubs with approximately 500 members, with extended family. Ridership is about 3,000. In Florida with the helmet choice law, the confederation of clubs and A.B.A.T.E. are significantly larger. The ridership has increased exponentially. Florida has a plethora of year-round motorcycle events up and down the state. Although Florida's weather is good, it does not compare with Nevada's. Prohibition laws in California are losing motorcycle riders by the thousands. Industries are moving to friendlier states. California has adversely impacted its own economy by the passage and continued passage of laws. In this case, between California and Florida, there really is no comparison. Freedom of choice means people will come to you to enjoy what is offered, spend money and create jobs. If there is no choice, people will stay away because they will not go where their hand will be slapped. Nevada is an adult-entertainment playground, and we should invite and welcome Californians.

SENATOR HALSETH:

Another chart, [Exhibit N](#), shows a steep increase in motorcycle sales once the law was passed in Florida. Motorcycle sales will increase sales tax revenue, which will help with our budget shortfall.

MR. KIMSEY:

Motorcycle shops are opening almost daily in Florida. Nevada has the potential for that opportunity. We have a great ridership and many people with skills. We have a 14 percent unemployment rate. I would like to see a motorcycle shop school move to Nevada because of passage of S.B. 177. It will make it possible to start training people and get them back to work to service this new and expanding industry.

FRANK ADAMS (Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):  
We are the ones who deal with the carnage on the roads every day. We feel it is a matter of safety. It is not a matter of freedom. It is not a matter of liberty. We are in opposition to S.B. 177 and support continued use of the helmet law.

SENATOR HALSETH:  
I refer to University Medical Center (UMC) trauma data for 2005 to 2008 showing total trauma cases for motorcycles of 1,193 with helmets and only 141 without helmets. Can you explain the difference?

MR. ADAMS:  
I am not familiar with the statistics in southern Nevada. Perhaps Officer Stubbs with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro) can help answer your question.

SENATOR HALSETH:  
I also have UMC Trauma Data on percentages of helmets used in other states. For Nevada it is 1,074 helmet accidents and 100 non-helmet accidents. That means 91 percent of trauma cases in Nevada were because of helmets. In California it is 95 percent of helmeted trauma cases. The UMC data shows trauma is greatly increased because of wearing helmets.

RUSTY MCALLISTER (President, Professional Firefighters of Nevada):  
As a public safety official, I would be remiss were I not to oppose this bill. We are the ones who get to pick them up after they are down. There is no doubt in my mind that helmets save lives, just like seat belts save lives. Statistics and numbers can be whatever you want them to be. One presenter's statistics showed only 6 percent of head injuries were a result of people on motorcycles. But if you extrapolate that, the population of America is 310 million people, and there are about 7 million motorcycles. That is 2.3 percent of the population that suffered 6 percent of the head injuries.

One testifier said to show a law that saved a life. I can. The fact there is a helmet law on the books is why I am here today, able to testify and carry on a coherent chain of thoughts. I was involved in a motorcycle accident, and my head was not detached from my spine, but I broke a lot of bones, and there was bleeding in my head. I still have that helmet as a memory, because it kept me alive. There is no doubt that without that helmet, I would not be sitting here today.

SENATOR HALSETH:

I appreciate your testimony that helmets save lives. But I have to refer back to Mr. Knight's testimony where his surgeon said had he been wearing a helmet, it would have killed him. We can go back and forth, but the point of this legislation is that it gives people a choice.

ADAM STUBBS (Government Liaison, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):  
For the record, I oppose S.B. 177. Contrary to popular belief, law enforcement is not in the business of only issuing citations, making arrests and enforcing laws. We are also in the business of saving lives by being proactive. That is the general premise of traffic enforcement. We know that seatbelts save lives. I say that from the perspective as a police officer on the streets going on those accident calls and seeing firsthand how helmets have saved lives. We would like the law to remain unchanged to ensure that lives can continue to be saved.

CHAIR BREEDEN:

It was mentioned in earlier testimony that if you receive a ticket for a helmet violation, it is unenforceable. Is that correct?

MR. STUBBS:

To my knowledge, that is not correct. If we issue a citation, we can confirm that either this driver was not wearing a helmet or that the helmet did not meet DOT standards with the proper stamp or sticker. If the rider is not wearing a helmet or has a false helmet, we do issue a citation, which is handled in justice or city court with Metro.

CHAIR BREEDEN:

Do you know what a ticket would be for not wearing a standard helmet?

MR. STUBBS:

I am not sure, but the courts would have the answer. Approximately five years ago they advised us to stop putting codes and putting fine amounts on citations, so the court now makes that determination when the person appears to answer the citation.

MARTY WRIGHT (Sergeant, Traffic Unit, Reno Police Department):

I have a cool job in that I ride a Harley-Davidson and get paid for it. I also see the negative effects of accidents with motorcyclists wearing and not wearing helmets. Common sense dictates, and my 21 years on the streets has shown

me, that wearing a helmet makes you safer when riding a motorcycle. I am a motorcycle rider who has ridden many thousands of miles, and I hope to be riding for the rest of my life. Coming back from a 3,500-mile trip to the Canadian Rockies 4 years ago, I had a severe accident just 10 miles from home. If not for the helmet law, I would not be here either. When I have ridden in places with the choice of wearing a helmet, I sometimes took off my helmet. I truly think if people saw what I have seen and lived through what I have lived through, this would be a no-brainer.

I understand the issue of bringing in more revenue because of the economy. I will soon be the proprietor of Party Marty Travels, and I will put on a motorcycle event that will fill seats with helmet wearers. It is putting on a good venue that brings people in, not the helmet laws. I have friends in a wide variety of occupations throughout North America. Some wore the "helmet laws suck" stickers, but when they saw my helmet from the accident, that changed some minds. I hope to change the minds of people here today, because I love motorcyclists; it is a great way of living. We can have different viewpoints and I know which one is right and which one I will do. When it comes to the freedom of choice, sometimes we all need controls to protect us from ourselves.

SENATOR HALSETH:

I agree that it can go both ways on whether to wear a helmet or not. I have charts showing numbers of fatalities with helmets are greater than fatalities without.

SERGEANT WRIGHT:

It is proportional in that more people wear helmets.

SENATOR HALSETH:

Common sense also states if we get in vehicles, we have higher rates of death as well. It goes both ways.

CHRIS WADDLE (Detective, Traffic Division, Reno Police Department):

I and my partner are the full-time members of the Reno Police Department's major accident investigation team. We are trained accident reconstructionists and have investigated more than 1,000 accidents. During my research, I located several studies done by different agencies. The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety states that without a law requiring wearing helmets, only about

50 percent of riders would wear them, whereas the number nears 100 percent with the law requiring helmets. In my handout ([Exhibit X](#)), I give three examples showing accidents can have several different causes; the rider's ability and control of the motorcycle, a mechanical malfunction and the actions of another vehicle operator. Most accidents are caused by poor judgment or poor driving on the part of one of the drivers. I oppose S.B. 177 because it will lead to more serious injuries and fatalities sustained by motorcycle riders involved in traffic accidents.

KEN KIPHART (Program Administrator, Nevada Rider Motorcycle Safety Program, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety):

I wrote my comments ([Exhibit Y](#)) before coming here based on how the original bill was drafted. Last year, the motorcycle rider safety classes operated at capacity and had to turn away potential students. It is possible that creative scheduling might help the increased demand for classes, and possibly private providers could pick up some of the slack. There are 61,000 endorsed riders, leaving about 60,000 potential students. We have no way of confirming how many riders have taken a course. Most of the demand is for the Basic Rider Course. The average age of motorcycle rider students is 30 to 35 years.

JOHN R. JOHANSEN (Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety):

In my handout ([Exhibit Z](#)) is the Florida Experience in which the numbers are like those others presented. For the three years after Florida changed its helmet law, registration went up, but so did head injuries, fatalities and cost of injuries. Florida's total fatality from 1994 to 2009—the law was changed in 2000—were relatively flat with a few significant drops and increases, [Exhibit Z](#). However, motorcycle fatalities went up for over a decade until it leveled from 2006 to 2008. In 2009, the numbers dropped for Florida, which was similar to national figures. The next chart came from Florida's Transportation Safety Handbook. The numbers are slightly different because Florida does not count motorcycle passengers with drivers. Over time, Florida's numbers show steady increases in fatalities, injuries and crashes until 2009. All other states that have repealed their helmet laws have had an increase in total fatalities. Arkansas did have a decrease in the number of fatalities per 10,000 registered motorcyclists.

There is 96 percent to 99 percent helmet usage in states with helmet laws. However, without a helmet law, usage is around 50 percent. There were 783 trauma cases at UMC involving motorcycles including 695 with helmets and 88 without helmets. Most riders who had a crash, 96 percent to

97 percent, and went to the trauma center were wearing helmets. The key is the difference in average cost per trauma. With a helmet, the average trauma center cost is \$96,700, and without a helmet, \$112,500. This means that for 2008 and 2009, 783 motorcycle patients cost \$77 million in trauma charges. Page 10, [Exhibit Z](#), shows UMC and Sunrise Hospital and Medical Center trauma data total motorcycle patients of 2,405 in a five-year period. These numbers represent the insured. The uninsured patient charges were \$45 million, which is absorbed by the hospitals, charged to Medicaid or the counties may have to make up the difference. Either way, these charges come out of our pockets or the hospitals' pockets. The trauma center considers insurance as anytime they can bill a third party, and Medicaid covers about 15 percent of the total charges.

The last page is what Louisiana has experienced since it first enacted a helmet law in 1968, then repealed, then reenacted, repealed and in 2004 reenacted. My major concern is whether adults are going to be responsible for their actions in choosing not to wear a helmet. The minimum they should be responsible for is medical insurance to keep the costs out of our pockets and that of other taxpayers. A \$10,000 medical policy is not enough, since the average charge is around \$100,000 for trauma.

SENATOR MANENDO:

How many non-helmeted riders were in off-road accidents?

MR. JOHANSEN:

Information was not for trauma data. For fatality and injury data, all were for public roadways.

SENATOR HALSETH:

Of the statistics you do have, can you tell me the percentage of off-road accidents?

MR. JOHANSEN:

I cannot. We might be able to obtain that data from the trauma centers. In the federal data, if the injury or fatality did not occur on a publically maintained roadway, it is not counted.

SENATOR LEE:

I have always been concerned with compliance to the helmet law. Some of the helmets are eggshell thin, and others are huge and bulky. Does Nevada have any laws that say a helmet has to be of a DOT rating? If it is a little covering on your head with a spike on the top, then how do we regulate the safety of the helmet?

MR. JOHANSEN:

I am not the best person to answer your question. I do know it is an ongoing problem, and one of the reasons I am reserved on the bill. There are about three or four different standards, testing criteria, listings or regulations from the federal government that can be used by inference with the laws of many states. We would reference the federal standards as opposed to establishing our own testing, which is extraordinarily expensive. There are new, standardized tests helmets must pass to meet certain criteria.

SENATOR LEE:

Are you saying it is basically officer discretion as to what is a safe helmet?

MR. JOHANSEN:

I am not sure what individual law enforcement agencies would say is the standard. Different states use different standards. I am on the behavioral side, but I can look to see what we use on the enforcement side.

CHAIR BREEDEN:

Please provide that information to the Committee.

MR. KIMSEY:

According to the latest census, the population of America is 300 million. There are approximately 17.5 million motorcycle riders, meaning the number of motorcycle accidents and fatalities is proportional to the number of riders, and not disproportional as previously claimed. Because of the enormous increase of ridership in Florida, a look at the actual motorcycle fatalities in proportion to ridership shows fatalities did go down. This is where we get into lies, damn lies and statistics. There are 67,000-plus registered motorcyclists in Nevada and 95 percent of all helmet tickets are written to members of clubs. Law enforcement is not saying they are using this as a discriminatory tool as a pretextual stop, rather than as a genuine safety issue. Judge Cedric Kerns, Department 5, Municipal Court, Las Vegas, has ruled this law as unenforceable,



because the Department of Public Safety (DPS) has said they do not know what is the standard. I will tell you the standard is predicated on the 1993 Code of Federal Regulation standard that is 17 years out of date.

My uncle was Deputy Chief Nyle Carson, Retired, Reno Police Department, a 30-year employee and a cofounder of Street Vibrations. He was in favor of eliminating the helmet law. The budget shortfall of the colleges is related to trying to increase ridership and training people. The College of Southern Nevada told me they would love to increase class size and make up for all these budget shortfalls, if given the opportunity. What dismays me is that several public officials have given their statistics but have not given all of the information behind the statistics.

One last thing. The NHP officer injured in a motorcycle crash this morning is a personal friend. He did not suffer from a head injury, he had a broken arm. If he would have had the visibility of a more open helmet, he might have avoided the accident.

MR. MOSS:

Chair Breeden, about four years ago I worked with you on license plates for motorcycles. If you recall, the DPS said it could not be done, and I proved them wrong. When it comes to training and capacity, I will determine the capacity of the four training providers in southern Nevada and provide that information to you. I learned from talking with other instructors who work for me that the College of Southern Nevada is cancelling classes and their three training ranges are empty. I can add the capacity of their ranges and show how they are wrong. I can show the actual capacity of their ranges, not what comes out of their budget, and then you would have something to work with. I see it as a lack of will or gross mismanagement by the colleges.

MR. DAVIS:

No insurance company has either raised or lowered their rates due to the repeal or reinstatement of a helmet law. The reason is that 90 percent of the time automobiles are the cause of an accident involving a motorcycle. The cost of a helmet ticket in most of Nevada is \$192, plus the time the person missed from work. North Las Vegas has their own agenda and charges \$300 for a helmet ticket. I question Mr. Kiphart testifying as a paid public official because I believe there is a NRS against testifying in a manner that would bring a change to the NRS. I would like to know if that is so. The Metro is in Carson City instead of

testifying from Las Vegas where all of us are today. I think they could have done without that added cost.

DALE ANDRUS:

A problem I see with S.B. 177 and for law enforcement, if you read the statute, is "protective headgear." Nowhere in this law does it say "helmet." This is a problem for law enforcement, as I have received several tickets for wearing a ball cap claiming it was protective headgear from the sun. Law enforcement always refers to helmet, but there is nothing in this bill or the old law that refers to a helmet. The other point is that DOT does not certify helmets, and says so on their Website. They do set a standard that allows helmet manufacturers to meet a certification. That is like having the wolf watch the henhouse. I support S.B. 177.

MR. HOBBS:

One thing that stood out about helmet usage is on page 8, [Exhibit Z](#). It showed that under the universal law, Florida had 99 percent usage, and after repealing the law, had 47 percent. Florida's motorcycle usage observational survey and trend analysis shows about 40 percent wearing novelty helmets, 0.5 percent with no helmet, and the rest helmeted under the 1998 universal law.

Senate Committee on Transportation  
March 10, 2011  
Page 27

CHAIR BREEDEN:

There being no further business before the Senate Committee on Transportation, the meeting is adjourned at 6:28 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Laura Adler,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Shirley A. Breeden, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

<b><u>EXHIBITS</u></b>			
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 49	C	Lorinda A. Wichman	Written statements
S.B. 49	D	Don Alt	R.S. 2477 Rights of Way Easement for live stock grazing
S.B. 49	E	Sue Silver	Support for S.B. 49
S.B. 49	F	Wes Henderson	Nevada Association of Counties written testimony
S.B. 49	G	Tracy Larkin-Thomason	Nevada Department of Transportation – Proposed Amendment
S.B. 49	H	Janine Hansen	How To Determine If You Are Being Mislead Or Lied To!
S.B. 177	I	Senator Don Gustavson	Presentation by Senator Don Gustavson
S.B. 177	J	Senator Don Gustavson	State Laws Concerning Helmet Use
S.B. 177	K	Senator Don Gustavson	Arizona Motorcycle Fatalities/Registrations by Year
S.B. 177	L	Senator Don Gustavson	Traumatic Brain Injuries
S.B. 177	M	Senator Don Gustavson	Conceptual Amendment for S.B. 177
S.B. 177	N	John Bland	Adult Voluntary Motorcycle Helmet Use
S.B. 177	O	John Hobbs	Prepared Testimony
S.B. 177	P	John Hobbs	George Hobbs Letter
S.B. 177	Q	John Hobbs	e-mail. Heat-related deaths are largely due to brain damage.
S.B. 177	R	Ken Wellington	Prepared Testimony
S.B. 177	S	Ken Wellington	Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 218
S.B. 177	T	Mike Davis	Prepared Testimony
S.B. 177	U	Victor Moss	Prepared Testimony

S.B. 177	V	Jim Canfield	Prepared Testimony
S.B. 177	W	James Kimsey	NRS chapter 486 – Motorcycles and Similar Vehicles
S.B. 177	X	Chris Waddle	Prepared Testimony
S.B. 177	Y	Ken Kiphart	Prepared Testimony
S.B. 177	Z	John R. Johansen	Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety