
Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety

COMMITTEE MEETING

December 14, 2023



Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NFACTS)

MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, December 14, 2023, 2:00-4:00 pm

Carson City: 3rd Floor Conference Room, NDOT HQ, 1263 S. Stewart Street

Las Vegas: Building B Training Room, NDOT District 1, 123 E. Washington Avenue

Virtual: [Teams Link](#) Phone: 702-780-6673 Code: 369 073 754#

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call**
2. **Public Comment**

The first public comment is limited to comments on items on the agenda. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item. The Chair of the Committee will impose a time limit of three (3) minutes.
3. **Approve October 31, 2023, Meeting Minutes (For Possible Action)**

Review and approve the minutes from the previous meeting.
4. **Crash Data and Trends (Information/Discussion)**

Presentation of Nevada crash data trends.
5. **FHWA Focus State Designation for Nevada (Information/Discussion)**

Provide information on Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA's) designations for Focus States and what it means for Nevada to be a Pedestrians Focus State and Intersections Focus State.
6. **National Roadway Safety Strategy "Allies in Action" (Information/Discussion)**

Review the National Roadway Safety Strategy and provide information on Allies in Action.
7. **Traffic Safety Policy Priority Recommendations (For Possible Action)**

Review and discuss traffic safety policy priority recommendations.
8. **Citation Process Working Group Update (Information/Discussion)**

Receive summary report from the Citation Process Working Group.
9. **NFACTS Annual Report (Information/Discussion)**

Provide update and discuss 2023 NFACTS Annual Report.
10. **Open Discussion**
11. **Next Meeting Date (Information/Discussion)**

The next regularly scheduled NFACTS Meeting will be Thursday, March 14, 2023, from 2:00-4:00pm.
12. **Public Comment**

This public comment period is for any matter that is within the jurisdiction of the public body. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item. The Chair of the Committee will impose a time limit of three (3) minutes.
13. **Adjourn Meeting**

Notes:

- Items on the agenda may be taken out of order.
- The Committee may combine two or more agenda items for consideration.
- The Committee may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.
- The Committee will limit public comments to three (3) minutes per speaker and may place other reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of the public comments based upon viewpoint.
- In lieu of in-person attendance, members of the public may submit public comment utilizing NDOT's online public comment form by clicking the following link: [Public Comment Form](#).

Public Comment received by 4:00 P.M. (Pacific Time) on the business day (excluding State holidays) prior to the meeting will be provided to the Committee for their review prior to the meeting and will be entered into the permanent record.

Public Comment received after 4:00 P.M. (Pacific Time) on the business day (excluding State holidays) prior to the meeting and prior to 5:00 P.M. (Pacific Time) on the day of the meeting will be included in the permanent record.

To be in compliance with the three (3) minute public comment rule, the online Public Comment Form comments will be limited to 450 words.

- Reasonable efforts will be made to assist and accommodate physically handicapped persons desiring to attend the meeting. If special arrangements for the meeting are necessary, please notify Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn at (702) 862-3609 or mike.colety@kimley-horn.com as soon as possible and at least two (2) days in advance of the meeting.
- Copies of non-confidential supporting materials provided to the Committee are available upon request. Request for such supporting materials should be made to Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn at (702) 862-3609 or mike.colety@kimley-horn.com. Such supporting material is available at 1263 South Stewart Street, Carson City, Nevada 89712 and, if available online, at <https://www.dot.nv.gov/>.

This Agenda was posted at the following locations:

<https://www.dot.nv.gov/doing-business/public-involvement-information>

Nevada Dept. of Transportation
1263 S. Stewart Street
Carson City, Nevada
Governor's Office
Capitol Building
Carson City, Nevada

Nevada Dept. of Transportation
123 E. Washington
Las Vegas, Nevada
Nevada State Personnel
555 E. Washington
Las Vegas, Nevada

Washoe County Courthouse
75 Court Street
Reno, Nevada
RTC Admin. Building
600 S. Grand Central Pkwy
Las Vegas, Nevada

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 14, 2023

Agenda Item 1: Call to Order/Roll Call

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

Chair Andrew Bennett to lead roundtable introductions of NVACTS Members and Guests.

2. BACKGROUND

N/A

3. ANALYSIS

N/A

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

N/A

5. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

N/A

6. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 14, 2023

Agenda Item 2: Public Comment

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

The first public comment is limited to comments on items on the agenda. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item. The Chair of the Committee will impose a time limit of three (3) minutes.

2. BACKGROUND

N/A

3. ANALYSIS

N/A

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

N/A

5. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

N/A

6. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 14, 2023

Agenda Item 3: Approve Draft October 31, 2023 Meeting Minutes (For Possible Action)

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

Review and approve the draft meeting minutes from the October 31, 2023 meeting of NVACTS.

2. BACKGROUND

The draft meeting minutes from the October 31, 2023 meeting are included for review and possible action.

3. ANALYSIS

N/A

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

Approve draft meeting minutes from October 31, 2023.

5. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

October 31, 2023 Meeting Minutes (draft)

6. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety
MEETING MINUTES (DRAFT)

Tuesday, October 31, 2023, 9:30-11:30 AM

Minutes only
Visit <https://zerofatalitiesnv.com/safety-plan-what-is-the-shsp/nvacts/>
to view with attachments.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Andrew Bennett (Nevada Association of Counties) called the meeting of the Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) to order at 9:32 am on Tuesday, October 31, 2023. Andrew took roll and determined a quorum was present.

Committee Members Present

Julia Peek, Department of Health & Human Services
Sean Sever (Vice Chair), Department of Motor Vehicles
Amy Davey, Department of Public Safety, Office of Traffic Safety
Lt. Col. Martin Mleczko, Department of Public Safety, Nevada Highway Patrol
Dr. Deborah Kuhls, Kirk Kerkorian School of Medicine at University of Nevada Las Vegas
John Penuelas, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Nick Haven, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Kelly Norman, Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
Andrew Bennett (Chair), Nevada Association of Counties/Clark County
Sondra Rosenburg, Nevada Department of Transportation
Lacey Tisler as proxy for Jenica Keller, Nevada Department of Transportation
David Gordon, Administrative Office of the Courts
Dr. Shashi Nambisan, University of Nevada Las Vegas Transportation Research Center
Jeremy Silva, as proxy for Christy McGill, Department of Education
Sean Robinson, as proxy for Joey Paskey, Nevada League of Cities/City of Las Vegas

Non-Voting Members Present

Kevin Tice, Department of Public Safety, Office of Traffic Safety

Members Absent

Cliff Banuelos, Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada
TBD, Nevada State Senate
TBD, Nevada State Assembly
James Weston, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County
Jason Walker, Nevada Sheriffs and Chiefs Association/Washoe Co Sheriff's Office
Shannon Bryant, Chair, Committee for Testing of Intoxication, Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor, Washoe County District Attorney's Office (non-voting member)

2. Public Comment

No public comment.

3. September 14, 2023, Meeting Minutes (Action Item – Approved)

The draft September 14 Meeting Minutes were presented (attached).

Motion: To approve September 14, 2023, Meeting Minutes.

By: Sean Sever

Second: Amy Davey.

Final Meeting Minutes will be posted online.

4. Crash Data and Trends (*Information/Discussion*)

Andrew Bennett introduced Anita Pepper, PIO, Department of Public Safety, Office of Traffic Safety (DPS-OTS), who will present the crash data and trends for future NVACTS meetings.

Anita presented the Monthly Fatality Report for Nevada, as of September 30, 2023. The report is preliminary, but numbers are looking to be an improvement on previous years (although previous years were the worst in history). Traffic crash data information for Nevada is provided at www.zerofatalitiesnv.com/nevadacrashdata.

Trends – Speed Safety Cameras (Road Safety Cameras)

At the end of 2022, there were 416 people who lost their lives on Nevada's roadways. This statistic is one of the top three highest number of fatalities in Nevada since this level of data has been collected. California recently adopted speed cameras into law after three attempts. There are 205 communities around the country that have implemented safety cameras, including New York City and Chicago. California intends to use road safety cameras in school zones, where they will review the impact and may abandon if successes are not seen.

Nye County has seen an increase in 2023, including 16 fatalities, which have been primarily on US 95 between Tonopah and Beatty. The causes of these crashes have been primarily head-on and run off the road.

Amy Davey provided an update on substance involved fatalities, which is reported quarterly. Marijuana-involved crashes have risen. The "Any Marijuana" column includes polysubstance (involving marijuana) and marijuana alone (see attached).

5. Vulnerable Road Users (VRU) Safety Assessment (For Possible Action)

Lacey Tisler provided an update from the feedback that was received on the VRU Safety Assessment. This assessment will be updated again in 2025. The outreach component of the 2023 VRU Assessment will occur after the document is formally submitted to the FHWA on November 15, 2023. Comments that have been received will be incorporated within the next update. See attached for final report.

Motion: To approve the Vulnerable Road Users Safety Assessment.

By: Amy Davey

Second: Dr. Kuhls.

A letter will be sent to NDOT to state the approval from NVACTS.

6. Traffic Safety Policy Priority Recommendations (Information/Discussion)

There are five traffic safety policy priorities that are carrying over from 2022-2023 (see attached):

Road Safety Cameras in School Zones

- Interim Growth and Infrastructure Committee adopted this in the 2023 Legislative Session as a BDR. It was introduced in the Assembly but was not heard.
- Clark County School District has had almost 30 students hit in varying severities in the 2022-2023 school year so far, 11 of them at one school in the district.
- Amy Davey shared that OTS has dedicated \$100,000 in grant funds next year to pilot a project dedicated to road safety cameras in either Clark County School District or Washoe County School District.
 - The City of Las Vegas would be in support of a pilot project within a school zone.
- California passed the law similar to this in the last legislative session.

Higher Fines in School Zones

- MUTCD includes language that if fines are higher additional signage is required, which may be a barrier for some jurisdictions.
 - Sondra Rosenberg stated that NDOT can assist with funding for safety-related measures if cost is an issue.

Road Safety Cameras

- The committee discussed that the easiest path for a Road Safety Camera bill is to start with implementation of road safety cameras in school zones.
- Ms. Tisler reminded the committee that FHWA includes road safety cameras as a proven countermeasure that has been proven to save lives. (<https://highways.dot.gov/safety/proven-safety-countermeasures/speed-safety-cameras>)
- Legislators from the 2023 Traffic Safety Summit felt that this was "government overreach," so education and advocacy for this item in advance of next session is critical.
 - Based on personal conversations on this topic, one legislator changed their perspective and has agreed to sponsor road safety cameras in the next session.

Primary Seat Belt Law

- The primary seat belt law is one of the high priority changes we can make in Nevada to help reduce severity.
- Consider other states who have successfully passed a primary seat belt law. (<https://www.ndsc.org/primary-seat-belt-law-aug-1/>)

Graduated Drivers Licenses (Fact sheet was included in the binder.)

Roadside Oral Fluid Testing

- The committee discussed this policy priority and decided to add it back to the recommendations for 2023-2024.

The seven new traffic safety policy priority recommendations include (see attached):

Transit Riders and Other Pedestrian Safety

- Erin Breen detailed the data to support this proposed priority. When reviewing a GIS map of pedestrian-involved crashes within a close proximity of bus stop locations, there are many instances where individuals are unwilling to walk back to the intersection (crosswalk) to cross the street. The policy priority recommends when the bus stop is further than 150' from an intersection, a crosswalk should be required.
 - Consider patterns in urban and rural areas.
 - Dr. Kuhls suggested adding clarifying language to limit this to areas with high ridership.
 - Consider this to be implemented at an agency level (not legislative) to adopt processes to address concerns within their jurisdiction.
 - Dr. Shashi Nambisan shared there are about 3,200 transit stops across the RTC of Southern Nevada's transit operations area. A "far side" stop is at least 100 feet away from the edge of curb (and likely more than 150 feet from the center of the intersection). If moving forward with this recommendation, consider the maximum distance and where it is measured when requiring additional pedestrian crossings such as a midblock crosswalk.
 - RTC SNV staff is working to determine the distances from transit stop loading area to the intersection/crosswalk (John Penuelas to confirm).

- The MUTCD (published by USDOT FHWA) provides guidance on pavement markings and signage (and signals). If an entity wishes to do something different, there is a process to follow to “request for experimentation.”

Complete Intersections

- Lacey Tisler recommended the implementation of a complete intersection policy to all road-owners, which takes a Safe System Approach. Nevada is an intersection-focused state. This is a proposed non-legislative priority.

Implementation of the Speed Management Action Plan

- Lacey Tisler presented key findings from the Speed Management Action Plan, which includes understanding road environments and context-sensitive speed-based policies. This is a proposed non-legislative priority, but there is desire to coordinate and implement within the local jurisdictions.
- The Safety Management Action Plan document can be found here: <https://www.dot.nv.gov/safety/traffic-safety-engineering/highways-safety-improvement-program-hsip/speed-management-action-plan-smap>

Yield to Merging Public Bus

- Lacey Tisler provided a description of this proposed non-legislative policy priority on behalf of Kate Adkins (NDOT). Yielding right-of-way to transit buses is a proven countermeasure that is being implemented in other states.

Safe Neighborhoods

- Erin Breen presented the proposed non-legislative policy priority on Safe Neighborhoods. This policy includes two components:
 - Identifying what is defined as a residential neighborhood/area by the number of driveways.
 - Extending school zones (with the 15 mile per hour speed limit) to a meaningful reach within a neighborhood for 180 hours per year (half hour before and after school).
- These changes would allow more children to walk or bike to school rather than focusing on the parent drop-offs.
- John Penuelas shared that RTC of Southern Nevada is developing a Design Criteria Manual, these items would have value being in a manual like this as supporting documentation for funding to be allocated.

Yield for Pedestrians to Stop for Pedestrians

- Erin Breen provided insight on the proposed policy priority which would provide clarifying language to the current law. Currently, enforcement may occur if a driver accelerates while a pedestrian is in a crosswalk; however, the law provides doesn't clearly state that drivers are required to stop while a pedestrian is in the entire crosswalk because a yield reinforces that a driver may pass once a pedestrian crosses half the roadway.

Traffic Records

- Amy Davey shared that DPS intends to sponsor a BDR related to clarifying language to improve traffic records data collection specific to crash records in reporting crashes.

General Updates on Voting on the Traffic Safety Policy Priorities on December 14:

- Abstaining from a vote can only occur if there's a conflict of interest.

- Clarification will be incorporated with the policy priorities with policies where legislative actions will be required or if NVACTS will be endorsing the policy.
- A more defined process for input from task forces will be instilled for future proposed policy priorities.

7. Citation Process Working Group Update (Information/Discussion)

David Gordon, Administrative Office of the Courts presented the findings from the Citation Process Working Group (see attached). There were eleven recommendations developed through the collaborative efforts from DMV, the courts, and law enforcement. There is not currently a centralized case management system, which considers data that is brought forward as evidence, as Brazos is more of a reporting vehicle.

David Gordon will join the Policy Priority Working Group and present these findings at a deeper level. The Citation Process Working Group has concluded their investigation and will be transitioning these efforts with the Policy Priority Working Group.

8. Traffic Safety Policy Priority Working Group (For Possible Action)

Andrew Bennett requested a motion to reinstate the Traffic Safety Policy Priority Working Group.

Motion: To reinstate the Traffic Safety Policy Priority Working Group.

By: Sondra Rosenberg

Second: Dr. Shashi Nambisan.

This group will be reinstated to aid in the advancement of traffic safety policy priorities. The chair will be determined after confirmation of the bylaws regarding the requirement that the chair be an NVACTS member. The frequency will be determined once the group has met. The working group meeting agenda will be sent to all NVACTS members.

9. Open Discussion

Lacey Tisler requested NVACTS join the US Department of Transportation's National Roadway Safety Strategic Call to Action, which was discussed at the AASHTO Safety Summit (<https://www.transportation.gov/nrсс/allies-in-action>). The request will be discussed at the next NVACTS meeting, for possible action.

10. Next Meetings

- Thursday, December 14, 2023, 2:00-4:00 PM
- Thursday, March 14, 2:00-4:00 PM
- Thursday, June 13, 2:00-4:00 PM

The Safer Roads Task force meeting will be held in November followed by the remaining task forces in December and January. If you would like to join, contact lindsay.saner@kimley-horn.com.

11. Public Comment

No public comment.

12. Adjourn Meeting


Andrew Bennett asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Motion: To adjourn the meeting

By: Sean Sever.

Second: Amy Davey.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:31 am.



Attachments

NVACTS Meeting Minutes from September 14, 2023

Statewide Monthly Fatality Report

Preliminary Substance Involved Fatalities Report

Vulnerable Road User Safety Assessment

Traffic Safety Policy Priority Recommendation Fact Sheets 2022-2023 (make sure to add Roadside Drug test bin

Proposed New Traffic Safety Policy Priorities 2023-2024

Nevada Citation Process Working Group Proposed Recommendations

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 31, 2023

Agenda Item 4: Crash Data and Trends

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

This agenda item includes an overview of the statewide monthly fatality report. The report includes updated preliminary fatality statistics year-to-date through November 30, 2023.

2. BACKGROUND

The Statewide Monthly Fatality Report is published monthly (on the 7th of the month) by Office of Traffic Safety. Reports will be sent out by Anita Pepper, DPS-OTS Public Information Officer (a.pepper@dps.state.nv.us). The report included here as an attachment includes the updated **preliminary** numbers through November 30, 2023.

3. ANALYSIS

N/A

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

N/A

5. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Monthly Statewide Traffic Fatality Report (through November 30, 2023)
Preliminary Substance Involved Fatalities Q1-Q2 2022-2023

6. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)

DATE OF REPORT: 12/6/2023
 DATA AS OF: 11/30/2023

TO: PUBLIC SAFETY, DIRECTOR NDOT, HIGHWAY SAFETY COORDINATOR, NDOT TRAFFIC ENGINEERING, FHWA, LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
 FROM: THE OFFICE OF TRAFFIC SAFETY, STATE FATAL DATA
 PREPARED BY: ADAM ANDERSON, FARS ANALYST
 SUBJECT: FATALITIES BY COUNTY, PERSON TYPE, DAY, MONTH, YEAR AND PERCENT CHANGE.

Month	2022 Crashes	2023 Crashes	% Change	Month	2022 Fatafs	2023 Fatafs	% Change
JAN	20	25	25.00%	JAN	31	27	-12.90%
FEB	23	15	-34.78%	FEB	24	17	-29.17%
MAR	38	26	-31.58%	MAR	40	26	-35.00%
APR	31	37	19.35%	APR	32	40	25.00%
MAY	36	30	-16.67%	MAY	38	33	-13.16%
JUN	40	32	-20.00%	JUN	40	35	-12.50%
JUL	30	32	6.67%	JUL	31	41	32.26%
AUG	30	33	10.00%	AUG	33	36	9.09%
SEP	32	30	-6.25%	SEP	33	32	-3.03%
OCT	40	34	-15.00%	OCT	43	39	-9.30%
NOV	31	31	0.00%	NOV	35	34	-2.86%
DEC			0.00%	DEC			0.00%
Reporting Period Total	351	325	-7.41%	Reporting Period Total	380	360	-5.26%
Year End Total	383			Year End Total	416		

KNOWN FATAL COMPARISON BETWEEN 2022 AND 2023.

COUNTY	2022 Crashes	2023 Crashes	% Change	2022 Fatalities	2023 Fatalities	% Change	2022 Occupants	2023 Occupants	% Change	2022 Unrestrained	2023 Unrestrained	% Change
CARSON	7	5	-28.57%	7	6	-14.29%	4	3	-25.00%	4	0	-100.00%
CHURCHILL	12	11	-8.33%	12	13	8.33%	6	10	66.67%	3	2	-33.33%
CLARK	213	219	2.82%	232	235	1.29%	98	101	3.06%	34	38	11.76%
DOUGLAS	5	2	-60.00%	5	2	-60.00%	4	2	-50.00%	2	0	-100.00%
ELKO	10	5	-50.00%	12	5	-58.33%	10	4	-60.00%	7	3	-57.14%
ESMERALDA	2	2	0.00%	5	2	-60.00%	5	2	-60.00%	0	0	0.00%
EUREKA	4	0	-100.00%	4	0	-100.00%	4	0	-100.00%	2	0	-100.00%
HUMBOLDT	8	4	-50.00%	10	5	-50.00%	9	4	-55.56%	2	3	50.00%
LANDER	3	1	-66.67%	5	1	-80.00%	5	1	-80.00%	4	1	-75.00%
LINCOLN	5	4	-20.00%	5	4	-20.00%	3	4	33.33%	2	1	-50.00%
LYON	7	6	-14.29%	7	7	0.00%	3	5	66.67%	2	3	50.00%
MINERAL	3	2	-33.33%	3	3	0.00%	3	3	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
NYE	12	17	41.67%	13	29	123.08%	9	27	200.00%	6	5	-16.67%
PERSHING	5	1	-80.00%	5	1	-80.00%	5	1	-80.00%	2	0	-100.00%
STOREY	2	0	-100.00%	2	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
WASHOE	52	43	-17.31%	52	44	-15.38%	30	17	-43.33%	9	6	-33.33%
WHITE PINE	1	3	200.00%	1	3	200.00%	0	3	300.00%	0	1	100.00%
Reporting Period Total	351	325	-7.41%	380	360	-5.26%	198	187	-5.56%	79	63	-20.25%
Year End Total	383			416			219			86		

KNOWN COMPARISON OF FATALITIES BY PERSON TYPE BETWEEN 2022 AND 2023.

COUNTY	2022 Pedestrian	2023 Pedestrian	% Change	2022 Motorcyclist	2023 Motorcyclist	% Change	2022 Bicyclist	2023 Bicyclist	% Change	2022 Other Scooter, Moped, ATV	2023 Other Scooter, Moped, ATV	% Change
CARSON	2	2	0.00%	1	1	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
CHURCHILL	2	1	-50.00%	4	2	-50.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
CLARK	61	75	22.95%	56	47	-16.07%	12	8	-33.33%	5	4	-20.00%
DOUGLAS	0	0	0.00%	1	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
ELKO	0	1	100.00%	2	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
ESMERALDA	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
EUREKA	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
HUMBOLDT	0	0	0.00%	1	1	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
LANDER	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
LINCOLN	0	0	0.00%	2	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
LYON	1	1	0.00%	3	1	-66.67%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
MINERAL	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
NYE	1	1	0.00%	2	1	-50.00%	1	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%
PERSHING	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
STOREY	0	0	0.00%	2	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
WASHOE	12	16	33.33%	10	7	-30.00%	0	4	400.00%	0	0	0.00%
WHITE PINE	0	0	0.00%	1	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
Reporting Period Total	79	97	22.78%	85	60	-29.41%	13	12	-7.69%	5	4	-20.00%
Year End Total	91			86			15			5		

THIS REPORT IS A POINT IN TIME COMPARISON

THIS DATA DOES NOT INCLUDE DATA FIELDS MARKED BY THE OFFICER AS UNKNOWN.

2022 DATA IS PRELIMINARY AND DOES NOT NECESSARILY INCLUDE FINAL REPORTS (FORM 5, CORONER, AND/OR TOXICOLOGY).

2023 DATA IS NOT FINAL UNTIL THE END OF DECEMBER 2024.

NOTE: The monthly report will be distributed by the 7th of each month.

Key: Fatalities= Total number of reported fatalities (vehicle occupants, pedestrian, motorcyclist, bicyclist, and other).

Vehicle Occupants = Driver and occupant fatalities in a motor vehicle.

Vehicle Unrestrained = Driver and occupant fatalities in a motor vehicle unrestrained.

Pedestrian = Any person on foot, on a personal conveyance, or in a building.

Motorcyclist= A person riding any motor vehicle that has a seat or saddle for the use of its operator and is designed to travel on not more than three wheels in contact with the ground.

Bicyclist= A person on an other road vehicle that can be propelled by pedaling (bicycle, tricycle, unicycle, pedalcar, electric bike).

Other = A person on a scooter, moped, ATV, or other motorized vehicle not captured above on a roadway.

DATE OF REPORT: 10/4/22
 REPORTING PERIOD: January 1-June 30, 2022-2023

TO: PUBLIC SAFETY, DIRECTOR NDOT, HIGHWAY SAFETY COORDINATOR, NDOT TRAFFIC ENGINEERING, FHWA, LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

FROM: THE OFFICE OF TRAFFIC SAFETY, STATE FATAL DATA
 PREPARED BY: ADAM ANDERSON, FATAL ANALYST

SUBJECT: SUBSTANCE INVOLVED FATALITIES BY COUNTY, MONTH, YEAR AND PERCENT CHANGE.

Key:
 Alcohol= Alcohol involved only
 Marijuana= Marijuana involved only
 Other Drug= Other single drug involved not including marijuana
 Poly-Substance= Any combination of involved drug(s) and/or alcohol

Important:
 Alcohol data reflects .08 or greater BACs.
 Marijuana, Other Drug, and Poly-Substance data reflects any amount of reported substance.
 Any Marijuana is a subset of Poly-Substance
 The data reflects the presence of substances (per NRS 484c.080) for the driver, pedestrian, motorcyclist, bike, and/or other (scooter, moped, atv) that were involved in the fatal crash; however, not necessarily the fatality.

COUNTY	2022 Crashes	2023 Crashes	% Change	2022 Fatalities	2023 Fatalities	% Change	2022 Alcohol	2023 Alcohol	% Change	2022 Marijuana	2023 Marijuana	% Change	2022 Other Drug	2023 Other Drug	% Change	2022 Poly-Substance	2023 Poly-Substance	% Change	2022 Any Marijuana	2023 Any Marijuana	% Change
CARSON	2	1	-50.00%	2	1	-50.00%	1	1	0.00%	1	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
CHURCHILL	5	2	-60.00%	5	2	-60.00%	3	1	-66.67%	2	0	-100.00%	0	1	100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
CLARK	70	67	-4.29%	85	73	-14.12%	16	13	-18.75%	9	6	-33.33%	4	4	0.00%	48	49	2.08%	24	31	29.17%
DOUGLAS	4	0	-100.00%	4	0	-100.00%	3	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%
ELKO	2	1	-50.00%	2	1	-50.00%	0	1	100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	0	-100.00%	1	0	-100.00%
ESMERALDA	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
EUREKA	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
HUMBOLDT	1	0	-100.00%	1	0	-100.00%	1	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
LANDER	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
LINCOLN	0	1	100.00%	0	1	100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	1	100.00%	0	1	100.00%
LYON	2	3	50.00%	2	3	50.00%	1	2	100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	1	0.00%	0	1	100.00%
MINERAL	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
NYE	3	5	66.67%	3	7	133.33%	0	1	100.00%	1	2	100.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	2	0.00%	0	1	100.00%
PERSHING	1	0	-100.00%	1	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	-100.00%	1	0	-100.00%
STOREY	1	0	-100.00%	1	0	-100.00%	1	0	-100.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
WASHOE	21	6	-71.43%	21	6	-71.43%	6	2	-66.67%	3	0	-100.00%	2	0	-100.00%	10	4	-60.00%	7	2	-71.43%
WHITE PINE	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%
TOTAL FOR REPORTING PERIOD	112	86	-23.21%	127	94	-25.98%	32	21	-34.38%	16	8	-50.00%	6	5	-16.67%	65	57	-12.31%	33	36	9.09%

THIS DATA DOES NOT INCLUDE FIELDS MARKED BY THE OFFICER AS UNKNOWN.
 DATA IS PRELIMINARY AND DOES NOT NECESSARILY INCLUDE FINAL REPORTS, AS SUCH, DATA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE.
 2022 DATA WILL BE FINAL AT THE END OF DECEMBER 2023, AND 2023 DATA WILL BE FINAL AT THE END OF 2024.

	2022 Total Crashes	2022 Total Fatalities	2023 Total Crashes	2023 Total Fatalities
	188	205	165	178
% Substance Involved	59.57%	61.95%	52.12%	52.81%

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 14, 2023

Agenda Item 5: FHWA Focus State Designation for Nevada

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

Provide information on Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA's) designations for Focus States and what it means for Nevada to be a Pedestrians Focus State and Intersections Focus State.

2. BACKGROUND

FHWA's "Focused Approach to Safety" provides additional resources to eligible high priority States to address the Nation's most critical safety challenges. These include additional program benefits for staff, time, tools, and training. The four focus areas include Roadway Departure, Intersections, Pedestrians, and Bicyclists. Nevada is a Focus State for Intersections and Pedestrians. More information on the FHWA's Focused Approach to Safety can be found here: [Focused Approach to Safety | FHWA \(dot.gov\)](#).

3. ANALYSIS

N/A

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

N/A

5. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

N/A

6. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 14, 2023

Agenda Item 6: National Roadway Safety Strategy “Allies in Action”

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

Review the National Roadway Safety Strategy and provide information on Allies in Action.

2. BACKGROUND

The U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) National Roadway Safety Strategy (NRSS) outlines the comprehensive approach to significantly reduce serious injuries and deaths on our Nation’s highways, roads, and streets with the long-term goal of reaching zero roadway fatalities.

USDOT launched a Call to Action campaign, inviting public and private sector stakeholders to share how they are embracing the NRSS vision of eliminating roadway fatalities. Stakeholders can share how they are committed to taking steps to actively reduce the number deaths and serious injuries, adopting the Safe System Approach and a goal of Zero Fatalities, and transforming how we think about road safety to become “Allies in Action.”

To watch the video from Secretary Pete Buttigieg and to learn more about the Call to Action, click here: [Allies in Action | US Department of Transportation](#)

7. ANALYSIS

N/A

8. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

N/A

9. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

N/A

10. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 14, 2023

Agenda Item 7: Traffic Safety Policy Priority Recommendations

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

Review and discuss traffic safety policy priority recommendations.

2. BACKGROUND

Five traffic safety policy priorities from 2022-2023 (**Road Safety Cameras in School Zones, Road Safety Cameras, Primary Seat Belt Law, Higher Fines in School Zones, and Graduated Drivers Licenses**) and four new traffic safety policy priorities (**Safe System Intersections, Traffic Records, Yield for Pedestrians to Stop for Pedestrians, and Appropriate Speed Limits for All Road Users**) for the committee's review and consideration.

3. ANALYSIS

N/A

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

Approve the traffic safety policy priority recommendations for NVACTS.

5. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Traffic Safety Policy Priorities

6. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)

MAKING NEVADA SAFER

ROAD SAFETY CAMERAS IN SCHOOL ZONES

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety
Policy Priority



Current Situation:

Our children are endangered.

- » More than 340 school-age children were injured—over 30 seriously and four fatally—within a quartermile of Clark County School District campuses during hours immediately before and after school between 2015 and 2019.⁴
- » In one day, there were estimated to be over 3,500 school bus passing violations in Nevada.¹⁰
- » Between 2011 and 2020, nationally 218 school-age children (ages 18 and younger) died in school transportation-related crashes; 44 were occupants of school transportation vehicles, 83 were occupants of other vehicles, 85 were pedestrians, five were bicyclists and one was an “other” nonoccupant.³

Recommended Solution:

Road Safety Cameras (RSCs) have been proven to save children’s lives.

- » Federal Highway Administration Proven Safety Countermeasure:
 - » Reduced crashes on urban principal arterials by 54% and injury crashes by 47%¹
 - » Reduced speeding in school zones up to 63% during school hours¹
- » Reflects that National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) has determined that they are effective at the highest level
- » For roadways with RSCs between 2015 and 2019, the likelihood of a driver exceeding the speed limit by more than 10 mph decreased by 59%

Concerns



Is the objective to generate revenue?

No. The primary purpose of RSCs is to improve traffic safety by reducing unsafe driving at intersections and on highways. Effective legislation limits systems to address traffic safety rather than act as a revenue generator.



Do RSCs violate motorists’ privacy?


No. Driving is a regulated activity on public roads. By obtaining a license, a motorist agrees to abide by certain rules, such as to obey traffic control devices.

RSCs in School Zones Nationwide

According to Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) and National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) research, at least 12 states—Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Missouri, New York, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia and Washington—conduct school zone automated speed enforcement. In Georgia and Rhode Island, school zones are the only locations where automated speed enforcement is allowed in the state.⁶

References and Additional Resources

1. **FWHA Proven Safety Countermeasure – RSCs**
<https://highways.dot.gov/safety/proven-safety-countermeasures/speed-safety-cameras>
2. **Maryland County RSC Study**
<https://www.iihs.org/news/detail/speed-cameras-reduce-injury-crashes-in-maryland-county-iihs-study-shows>
3. **NHTSA School Transportation-Related Crashes**
<https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/813327>
4. **Clark County Pedestrian Crashes Near Schools**
<https://www.reviewjournal.com/investigations/unreliable-pedestrian-crashtracking-near-schools-leaves-parents-officials-in-the-dark-2652525/>
5. **Safety Evaluation of Red Light Cameras. Report No. FHWA HRT-05-048**
Council, F.; Persaud, B.; Eccles, K.; Lyon, C.; and Griffith, M. 2005. Washington, DC.
6. **Insurance Institute for Highway Safety**
7. **NHTSA Report on RSCs Effectiveness**
<https://www.nhtsa.gov/book/countermeasures/countermeasures/21-automated-enforcement>
8. **National Conference of State Legislatures RSC Review**
<https://www.ncsl.org/transportation/traffic-safety-review-state-speed-and-red-light-camera-laws-and-programs>
9. **National Conference of State Legislatures State School Bus Stop Arm Camera Laws**
<https://www.ncsl.org/transportation/state-school-bus-stop-arm-camera-laws>
10. **Nevada Department of Education, Office for a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment**
Optional on-board survey with 35% of drivers reporting 1240 passing violations in one day during the 2021-2022 school year




Proposed Policy Recommendations for RSCs:

- 1 Eliminate the prohibition on use of stationary photographic, video, or digital equipment for issuance of a traffic citation in NRS 484A.600.
- 2 Add enabling language for the use of RSCs in school zones.
- 3 Add enabling language for local authorities to use RSCs on school buses to enforce stop arm violations.

For more information contact:

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NFACTS)
<https://zerofatalitiesnv.com> | zerofatalitiesnv@kimley-horn.com



Current Situation:

Speeding and aggressive driving are increasing and killing more people.

- » Red light running crashes are responsible for approximately 140,000 injuries and 850 fatalities each year.¹
- » Speed-related crashes are responsible for approximately 9,500 fatalities each year.¹
- » Over one-third of the traffic fatalities in Nevada are related to speed and/or aggressive driving.

Recommended Solution:

Provide enabling language that allows any agency to choose to use Road Safety Cameras (RSCs), but does not require RSC use. RSCs have been proven to save lives.

- » Federal Highway Administration Proven Safety Countermeasure:
 - » Reduced crashes on urban principal arterials by 54% and injury crashes by 47%¹
 - » Reduced speeding in school zones up to 63% during school hours¹
- » Reflects that National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) has determined that they are effective at the highest level
- » For roadways with RSCs between 2015 and 2019, the likelihood of a driver exceeding the speed limit by more than 10 mph decreased by 59%
- » Red light cameras reduced the fatal red-light-running crash rate by 21% and the rate of all types of fatal crashes at signalized intersections by 14%⁶

Concerns



Is the objective to generate revenue?

No. The primary purpose of RSCs is to improve traffic safety by reducing unsafe driving at intersections and on highways. Effective legislation limits systems to address traffic safety rather than act as a revenue generator.




Do RSCs violate motorists' privacy?

No. Driving is a regulated activity on public roads. By obtaining a license, a motorist agrees to abide by certain rules, such as to obey traffic control devices.

RSCs Nationwide

According to Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) and National Conference of State Legislature (NCSL) research, 33 states allow the use of Road Safety Cameras in all or specific situations. Red light cameras and photo radar give law enforcement agencies the ability to enforce these traffic laws remotely. About 350 U.S. communities use red light cameras and over 150 communities in the U.S. use cameras to enforce speed laws.⁶



Sources: Insurance Institute for Highway Safety and the National Conference of State Legislature

References and Additional Resources

- FWHA Proven Safety Countermeasure – RSCs**
<https://highways.dot.gov/safety/proven-safety-countermeasures/speed-safety-cameras>
- Maryland County RSC Study**
<https://www.iihs.org/news/detail/speed-cameras-reduce-injury-crashes-in-maryland-county-iihs-study-shows>
- NHTSA School Transportation-Related Crashes**
<https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/813327>
- Clark County Pedestrian Crashes Near Schools**
<https://www.reviewjournal.com/investigations/unreliable-pedestrian-crash-tracking-near-schools-leaves-parents-officials-in-the-dark-2652525/>
- Safety Evaluation of Red Light Cameras. Report No. FHWA HRT-05-048**
Council, F.; Persaud, B.; Eccles, K.; Lyon, C.; and Griffith, M. 2005. Washington, DC.
- Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS)**
<https://www.iihs.org/>
- NHTSA Report on RSCs Effectiveness**
<https://www.nhtsa.gov/book/countermeasures/countermeasures/21-automated-enforcement>
- NCSL RSC Review**
<https://www.ncsl.org/transportation/traffic-safety-review-state-speed-and-red-light-camera-laws-and-programs>
- NCSL State School Bus Stop Arm Camera Laws**
<https://www.ncsl.org/transportation/state-school-bus-stop-arm-camera-laws>
- Nevada Department of Education, Office for a Safe and Respectful Learning Environment**
Optional on-board survey with 35% of drivers reporting 1240 passing violations in one day during the 2021-2022 school year

Proposed Policy Recommendations for RSCs:

- 1 Eliminate the prohibition on use of stationary photographic, video, or digital equipment for issuance of a traffic citation in NRS 484A.600.
- 2 Add enabling language for the use of RSCs.

For more information contact:


Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS)
<https://zerofatalitiesnv.com> | zerofatalitiesnv@kimley-horn.com



Current Situation:

Nearly 50% of vehicle occupants killed in traffic fatalities in Nevada are unbelted.

- » Between 2018 and 2020, 204 of 480 (42%) vehicle occupants killed in Nevada were unbelted, plus an additional 32 (7%) were unknown.
- » Nevada's seat belt law is a secondary law, not a primary law, and violators can only be ticketed when they are pulled over for a reason other than seat belt use.
- » Nevada is one of just 15 states without a primary seat belt law.
- » Restraint use is the highest predictor of injury severity of vehicle occupants in a crash in Nevada, with those **unrestrained at 2.2 times higher risk** of a fatal or serious injury compared to those who use restraints.¹
- » Hospital patients from a crash that were unrestrained have **higher injury scores, longer hospital stays** (6.3 vs. 3.0 days), **more days in the ICU** (2.5 days vs. 1 day), **more days on ventilator support** (1.35 vs. 0.43 days), and incur a median of **\$12,110 more per person in hospital charges** compared with those who were restrained.¹



Source: FARS for 2016-2020, Nevada State Data for 2021

Recommended Solution:


Change Nevada's seat belt law to a primary seat belt law.

- » Since 2011, 35 lives would have been saved had Nevada's seat belt usage been 100%.²
- » Approximately 200 lives were saved between 2016 and 2017 as a result of a new primary seat belt law in Utah.³

Primary Seat Belt Laws Nationwide

Primary seat belt laws are being used nationally and internationally to save lives through increased seat belt usage. Primary enforcement laws are more effective than secondary enforcement laws. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), in 2019, 92% of front seat occupants in states with primary enforcement laws buckled up, in contrast to 86% of front seat occupants in states with secondary enforcement or no laws. Nevada is one of only 15 states with secondary seat belt laws.

It is estimated that over 220,000 of Nevadans are still not buckling up and are overrepresented in fatalities in Nevada.⁴



References and Additional Resources

1. **Nevada's Traffic Research and Education Newsletter**
<https://www.unlv.edu/medicine/newsletters>
2. **State of Nevada Office of Traffic Safety Annual Report, 2016**
https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.gov/files/documents/nv_fy2016_annual_report.pdf
3. **Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) 2016-2019 Final, FARS 2020 ARF, Preliminary State Data (2021)**
<https://www.nhtsa.gov/research-data/fatality-analysis-reporting-system-fars>
4. **Utah Department of Public Safety (DPS)**
<https://publicsafety.utah.gov/>

Proposed Policy Recommendations for a Primary Seat Belt Law:

- 1 Change the Nevada law by eliminating existing language that limits the issuance of a seat belt citation. This would make Nevada a primary seat belt law state.
- 2 Change Nevada law by eliminating existing language that limits the issuance of a citation, but with a sunset date to allow for data collection and analysis to evaluate the effectiveness of the law (similar to Utah).
- 3 Increase the minimum fine for non-compliance with Nevada's existing seat belt law. This could be enacted in conjunction with the other options or separately.

For more information contact:

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS)
🌐 <https://zerofatalitiesnv.com> | ✉ zerofatalitiesnv@kimley-horn.com

MAKING NEVADA SAFER

HIGHER FINES IN SCHOOL ZONES

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety
Policy Priority



Current Situation:

Speeding and aggressive driving are increasing and endangering our kids.

- » Speed-related crashes are responsible for approximately 9,500 fatalities each year.¹
- » Over one-third of the traffic fatalities in Nevada are related to speed and/or aggressive driving.
- » Nevada currently has school zone laws related to speed, but higher fines for speeding in school zones is not specified.

Recommended Solution:

Modify legislation to increase fines for speeding in school zones.

- » Legislating higher fines for speeding in school zones and at crossings will save lives on Nevada's roadways.
- » Specifying higher fines for speeding in school zones is expected to increase the number of speeding citations issued in school zones and the number of citations upheld in the court system.



National Trends in School Zone Laws

There are many different ways states address speeding fines in school zones or at school crossing zones. Most states allow fines of double or more for speeding in a school zone or at a school crossing zone. For example, a standard speeding ticket in North Carolina ranges between \$10 and \$50, but a school zone speeding ticket is \$250. Similarly, a school zone speeding ticket in Virginia is \$250. However, several states who have added safety camera enforcement in school zones have lower fines for speeding. For example, the highest fine in a school zone with added safety camera enforcement in Maryland is \$40. In Washington state, the fine is about \$240, but is capped much lower if issued through a safety camera.

References and Additional Resources

1. **FWHA Proven Safety Countermeasure – RSCs**
<https://highways.dot.gov/safety/proven-safety-countermeasures/speed-safety-cameras>
2. **Maryland County RSC Study**
<https://www.iihs.org/news/detail/speed-cameras-reduce-injury-crashes-in-maryland-county-iihs-study-shows>
3. **NHTSA School Transportation-Related Crashes**
<https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/813327>
4. **Clark County Pedestrian Crashes Near Schools**
<https://www.reviewjournal.com/investigations/unreliable-pedestrian-crash-tracking-near-schools-leaves-parents-officials-in-the-dark-2652525/>
5. **NHTSA Report on RSCs Effectiveness**
<https://www.nhtsa.gov/book/countermeasures/countermeasures/21-automated-enforcement>
6. **NCSL RSC Review**
<https://www.ncsl.org/transportation/traffic-safety-review-state-speed-and-red-light-camera-laws-and-programs>
7. **FARS 2016-2019 Final and FARS 2020 ARF**
<https://www.nhtsa.gov/research-data/fatality-analysis-reporting-system-fars>

Proposed Policy Recommendations for Higher Fines in School Zones:

- 1 Change NRS 484B.363 to increase speeding fines in school zones and at school crossing zones.
- 2 Amend NRS 484B.367 to include clear designations on higher speeding fines in school zones and at school crossing zones.

For more information contact:

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS)
<https://zerofatalitiesnv.com> | zerofatalitiesnv@kimley-horn.com

MAKING NEVADA SAFER

GRADUATED DRIVER'S LICENSE

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety
Policy Priority



Current Situation:

Too many young drivers ages 15 – 20 are dying on Nevada roads, and that number is on the rise.

- » As shown in the figure at the lower right corner of this page, between 27 and 40 young drivers died per year in Nevada between 2017 and 2021.
- » Nevada currently has some young driver laws, but other more comprehensive requirements for graduated driver's licenses (GDLs) are not included.

Recommended Solution:

Revise current GDL laws to include nationally recommended components.

- » GDL laws have been implemented nationally and internationally to protect both new and young drivers.

What Does this Mean for Nevada?

Young drivers are inexperienced on the road and often do not realize how dangerous certain driving behaviors, like improper seat belt use, can be.

Furthermore, distracted or inattentive driving has become a national epidemic, and young drivers are at the greatest risk. Currently, 38 states ban all cell phone use for GDL drivers.¹ Nevada is not one of them.



There is only 87% observed seat belt use among 16 to 24-year-olds—the lowest of any age group²




52% of young people involved in fatal crashes were unbuckled¹



Teens have the highest crash risk of any age group, and research confirms that distraction is often a factor¹



Current Nevada GDL laws do not specifically ban all cell phone use for drivers less than 18 years of age¹




Fatalities Among Young Drivers in Nevada

Source: Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) for 2017-2020, Nevada State Data for 2021

Impacts of GDL Systems for New Drivers

GDL systems gradually increase the exposure of new drivers to more complex driving situations in as safe a manner as possible. New drivers are not just 16 or 17 years old, they are every age. With troubling national trends recently highlighted in the Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA) report “Mission Not Accomplished: Teen Safe Driving, the Next Chapter,” it is clear that focus must be placed on all new drivers, not just teens. This data revealed that older teen drivers (18-20), were involved in 12% more fatal car crashes when compared to younger teen drivers (15-18). GHSA believes this upward trend is the result of teens waiting until they are 18 to get their license and bypassing GDL laws. By updating some of our laws, we can make sure that every driver who gets behind the wheel is educated and trained to avoid any behavior that could put their life at risk, including young drivers.



Source: NHTSA, 2022

References and Additional Resources

1. **National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)**
<https://www.nhtsa.gov/book/countermeasures/appendix/a6-young-drivers>
2. **Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS), 2020**
<https://www.iihs.org/topics/seat-belts#belt-use>

Proposed Policy Recommendations for Graduated Driver's License:

- 1 Change NRS 484B.165 to restrict all cell phone use, including hands-free devices, for drivers less than 18 years of age.
- 2 Amend NRS 484D.495 to include seat belt usage for young drivers and their passengers as a condition for continued licensure within Nevada's graduated driver licensing system.
- 3 Remove the age restriction to current GDL laws, thereby requiring all new drivers to obtain practical driving experience in a lower risk situation.

For more information contact:

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS)
🌐 <https://zerofatalitiesnv.com> | ✉ zerofatalitiesnv@kimley-horn.com

Traffic Safety Policy Priority: Safe Systems Intersections

Description:

Nevada specific crash data shows that reducing intersection crashes is critical to the reduction in fatal and serious injury crashes throughout the system. The 2021-2025 Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) indicates that 35% of the fatal and serious injury crashes occurred in an intersection. Nevada and the Southern Nevada RTC are designated by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Focus Approach to Safety as an intersection focused state due to the high number of intersection fatalities. This designation is based on FHWA data analysis that identifies overrepresentation within the Focus Areas.

A safe systems intersection design policy can include strategies such as:

- Minimizing and modifying conflict points
- Reducing speed of vehicles
- Improving visibility at intersections
- Providing space and protection for pedestrians and bicyclist

Safe systems intersections are built to accommodate the needs of all users. Many of the intersections in the transportation system today were constructed at a time when the emphasis was moving automobiles not people. The present and future focus is on all road users. An effective complete intersections policy will ensure cohesive action strategies that create a safe and homogenous roadway.

The most recent Fatalities Reporting System (FARS) data Nevada Specific data (2017-2021) shows that 526 of the 1661 fatalities (32%) occurred at intersections. Of these 526 fatalities, 136 involved a pedestrian, 17 involved a bicyclist and 147 involved speeding. Safe systems intersections serve as a focus point for Safe Systems approach principles:

- Death and Serious Injuries are Unacceptable
- Humans Make Mistakes
- Humans Are Vulnerable
- Responsibility is Shared
- Safety is Proactive
- Redundancy is Crucial

These benefits of focusing on safe systems intersections provide positive steps toward the SHSP goal of Zero Fatalities by 2050.

Data to Support:

[Focused Approach to Safety | FHWA \(dot.gov\)](#)

Nevada Fars Data 2017-2021 [Microsoft Power BI](#)

Subject Matter Expert(s):

1. Lacey Tisler, NDOT, ltisler@dot.nv.gov

Resources & Reference:

<https://highways.dot.gov/safety/intersection-safety/safe-system-intersections>

[Don't Give Up at the Intersection | National Association of City Transportation Officials \(nacto.org\)](#)

[A Safe System-Based Framework and Analytical Methodology for Assessing \(dot.gov\)](#)

Submitted By:

Task force or working group Intersection CEA.

Contact: Lacey Tisler, NDOT, Ltisler@dot.nv.gov

Traffic Safety Policy Priority: Traffic Records

Description:

The Office of Traffic Safety proposes, for consideration, the following conceptual changes to improve traffic records data collection:

- Add clarifying language to NRS 484E.110 to require crash notification within 10 days of the date of the crash (10 days after the investigation) or date of death.
- Require law enforcement agencies to report traffic incident arrest data within the central e-crash/e-citation system, i.e. DUI arrest, reckless driving arrest, etc.
- Require reporting of traffic offense adjudication data to the State.
- Add clarifying language to NRS 484C.170 to add required testing of prohibited substances in addition to alcohol.

NRS 484E.110 Police to report to Department of Public Safety; report not confidential; requirements for preparation of report; submission of copy of report to Department of Motor Vehicles.

1. Every police officer who investigates a vehicle crash of which a report must be made as required in this chapter, or who otherwise prepares a written or electronic report as a result of an investigation either at the time of and at the scene of the crash or thereafter by interviewing the participants or witnesses, shall forward a written or electronic report of the crash to the Department of Public Safety within 10 days after the ~~investigation date~~ of the crash, ~~or date of death, if a fatal injury occurred due to the crash~~. The data collected by the Department of Public Safety pursuant to this subsection must be recorded in a central repository created by the Department of Public Safety, ~~maintained in collaboration with the Department of Transportation~~, to track data electronically concerning vehicle crashes on a statewide basis.

~~2. State agencies may (shall?) enter into data use agreements to share crash, citation, adjudication, medical, driver, and other relevant data for the purpose of improving traffic crash and/or other relevant traffic records systems.~~

2. The written or electronic reports required to be forwarded by police officers and the information contained therein are not privileged or confidential.

3. Every sheriff, chief of police or office of the Nevada Highway Patrol receiving any report required under NRS 484E.030 to 484E.090, inclusive, shall immediately prepare a copy thereof and file the copy with the Department of Public Safety.

4. If a police officer investigates a vehicle crash resulting in bodily injury to or the death of any person or total damage to any vehicle or item of property to an apparent extent of \$750 or more, the police officer shall prepare a written or electronic report of the investigation.

5. As soon as practicable after receiving a report pursuant to this section, the Department of Public Safety shall submit a copy of the report to the Department of Motor Vehicles.

(Added to NRS by 1969, 1485; A 1985, 1945; 1987, 685; 2013, 544; 2015, 1645)—(Substituted in revision for NRS 484.243)

NRS 484C.170 Analysis of blood of deceased victim of crash involving motor vehicle to determine presence and concentration of alcohol ~~and prohibited substances~~.

1. Any coroner, or other public official performing like duties, shall in all cases in which a death has occurred as a result of a crash involving a motor vehicle, whether the person killed is a driver, passenger or pedestrian, cause to be drawn from each decedent, within 8 hours of the crash, a blood sample to be analyzed for the presence and concentration of alcohol ~~and prohibited substances~~.

2. The findings of the examinations are a matter of public record and must be reported to the Department by the coroner or other public official within 30 days after the death.
3. Blood-alcohol **and substance** analyses are acceptable only if made by laboratories licensed to perform this function.

Data to Support:



NVAdvisory_Self-assessment_20210424.x

NV Traffic Records assessment:

Subject Matter Expert(s):

1. Amy Davey, NV DPS Office of Traffic Safety, Amy.davey@dps.state.nv.us
2. Lacey Tisler, NDOT, ltisler@dot.nv.gov
3. Julia Peek, NV DHHS, jpeek@health.nv.gov
4. Sean Sever, NV DMV, ssever@dmv.nv.gov
5. David Gordon, AOC, dgordon@nvcourts.nv.gov
6. Dr. Shashi Nambisan, UNLV Transportation Research Center, shashi@unlv.edu
7. Kevin Tice, NV DPS Office of Traffic Safety, ktice@dps.state.nv.us
8. Adam Anderson, NV DPS Office of Traffic Safety, aanderson@dps.state.nv.us

Resources & Reference:

NRS 484E.070 Written or electronic report of crash to Department by driver or owner; exceptions; confidentiality; use as evidence at trial. <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/nrs/nrs-484e.html>

NRS 484A.7035 Civil infraction citation: Contents; signature; service. [Effective January 1, 2023.] <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/nrs/nrs-484a.html>

NRS 484E.110 Police to report to Department of Public Safety; report not confidential; requirements for preparation of report; submission of copy of report to Department of Motor Vehicles. <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/nrs/nrs-484e.html>

Traffic Records Coordinating Committee <https://zerofatalitiesnv.com/safety-plan-what-is-the-shsp/trcc/>

<https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-23/chapter-III/part-1300/subpart-C/section-1300.22>

https://www.courtstatistics.org/_data/assets/pdf_file/0014/23900/data-governance-final.pdf

Submitted By:

Task force or working group: TRCC

Contact: Kevin Tice, NV Office of Traffic Safety, ktice@dps.state.nv.us

Traffic Safety Policy Priority: Yield for Pedestrians to Stop for Pedestrians

Description:

Nevada law requires a driver to yield to a pedestrian in a marked or unmarked crosswalk while the pedestrian is on their half of the road or if approaching in a manner which could be unsafe. If a driver passes through the crosswalk while the person walking is still on his half of the road, or entire road if no center divider is present, that driver will be ticketed if an officer sees them for failure to yield to a pedestrian. Our law is classified as a yield to pedestrians' law and all signage in the state for pedestrians reinforces this, as do the pavement markings. The yield to pedestrians gives drivers the idea they can proceed once the walker is no longer in their lane. Changing our law to STOP for pedestrians clarifies that you must stop.

Even saying to drivers that "In Nevada you are required to stop for pedestrians" has far more weight than "you must yield to walkers".

Data to Support:

Currently, ten states require drivers to stop. As one of the worst states for pedestrian fatalities, I believe making our law stronger will equate to saving more lives.

Nebraska 1979

Maryland 1982

Washington 1990

Georgia 1995

Minnesota 1996

Oregon 2003

Hawaii 2005

District of Columbia 2005

Illinois 2010

New Jersey 2015

Subject Matter Expert(s):

1. Erin Breen, UNLV/TRC, scp.unlv@gmail.com

Resources & Reference:

Accident Analysis & Prevention, Volume 41, Issue 5, September 2009, Pages 1034-1039

Stop versus yield on pedestrian-involved fatal crashes in the United States

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0001457509001432?via%3Dihub>

International Journal of Transportation Science and Technology

Volume 8, Issue 1, March 2019, Pages 35-42

Safety ramifications of a change in pedestrian crosswalk law: A case study of Oregon, USA

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2046043018300224>

Submitted By:

Vulnerable Road Users/Pedestrians

Contact: Erin Breen, UNLV TRC/ Road Equity Alliance Program, scp.unlv@gmail.com

Traffic Safety Policy Priority: Appropriate Speed Limits for All Road Users

Description:

The National Roadway Safety Strategy and the Safe Systems Approach identifies Safer Speeds as a critical component to the reduction of fatal and serious injury crashes. The Safe System Approach recognizes the impacts of kinetic energy on the human body and the fact that effective speed management will reduce the kinetic energy in crashes.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has listed Appropriate Speed Limits for All Road Users as a Proven Safety Countermeasure due to broad consensus among roadway safety experts that speed control is one of the most important methods for reducing fatalities and serious injuries. Speeding, exceeding the posted speed limits, or traveling too fast for conditions is a repeating trend. Of the 42,939 fatalities that occurred on our Nation's roadway in 2021, 29% were speeding related. The Nevada Speed Management Action Plan (SMAP) studied speeding related data from 2015-2019 and found that 31% of the fatal crashes in Nevada listed speeding as a contributing factor.

Managing speed requires a Safe Systems Approach. Safer speeds, coupled with other Safe Systems objectives will rely on modifying behaviors to begin moving toward Zero Fatalities. As such, implementation of SMAP needs to continuously engage in learning from doing. The Safe Systems principles embody learning from doing and should be fundamental in this policy priority for implementing Appropriate Speed Limits for All Users. Appropriate Speed Limits for All Users can be achieved by understanding the roadway context and environment. Speed limits can be based on the facility and the needs of the users rather than continuing the practice of setting speeds using the 85th percentile method.

All road owners should adopt a policy to set Appropriate Speed Limits for All Road Users to reduce fatal and serious injuries on the roadway system.

Data to Support:

[Speed Management Action Plan \(SMAP\) | Nevada Department of Transportation \(nv.gov\)](#)

Subject Matter Expert(s):

1. Lacey Tisler, NDOT, ltisler@dot.nv.gov

Resources & Reference:

[Safer Speeds | US Department of Transportation](#)

[Appropriate Speed Limits for All Road Users | FHWA \(dot.gov\)](#)

[Safe System Approach for Speed Management \(dot.gov\)](#)

[Speed Management Action Plan \(SMAP\) | Nevada Department of Transportation \(nv.gov\)](#)

[Aligning Geometric Design with Roadway Context | Blurbs New | Blurbs | Publications \(trb.org\)](#)

[Understanding the 85th Percentile Speed \(strongtowns.org\)](#)

Submitted By:

Safe Speeds Task Force

Contact: Lacey Tisler, ltisler@dot.nv.gov

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 14, 2023

Agenda Item 8: Citation Process Working Group Update

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

Receive report with recommendations from the Nevada Citation Process Working Group.

2. BACKGROUND

The Nevada Citation Process Working Group has developed recommendations and will present to NVACTS.

3. ANALYSIS

N/A

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

N/A

5. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Nevada Citation Process Working Group Recommendations Summary

6. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)

To address the challenges associated with the lack of data related to traffic citations, a set of comprehensive recommendations is proposed to establish an organized and efficient system ensuring accuracy and accessibility.

The adoption of a centralized digital database has been determined to be the key to success. This database could either be a custom-built system or a specialized software solution designed for law enforcement or traffic management. Additionally, the utilization of cloud storage, provided by platforms such as AWS, Azure, or Google Cloud, is recommended to enhance accessibility, scalability, and data security.

To ensure the integrity of the data within the system, standardized entry procedures and validation checks are essential. Standardized entry promotes consistency and facilitates efficient information retrieval, while validation checks, such as cross-referencing against existing records and verifying information against official databases, guarantee the accuracy of entered data.

Security measures are crucial in managing access to the citation database. Among the required measures are implementing secure user authentication and defining user roles and permissions to control access. Access should be restricted to authorized personnel only to protect sensitive information.

Integration with external systems, such as the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and court systems, is recommended to streamline the exchange of information and maintain data consistency across different platforms.

For analysis and decision-making purposes, the development of custom reports and real-time dashboards is suggested. This enables the identification of patterns, assessment of officer performance, and generation of insights related to traffic citations.

In terms of data protection, regular backups of the citation database, along with the implementation of data encryption, are advised to prevent data loss and protect sensitive information, particularly when stored on the cloud or involving personally identifiable information.

Training programs for personnel responsible for data entry and management, coupled with comprehensive documentation outlining procedures and troubleshooting steps, are vital components to ensure the effective use of the system.

The establishment of an audit trail system is recommended to log all changes made to the citation data, enhancing accountability, and facilitating investigations into any discrepancies.

Continual maintenance, including keeping the database software up to date, conducting regular optimization, and ensuring data integrity, is essential for the sustained effectiveness of the system.

Finally, regular reviews and updates should be conducted to ensure legal compliance with relevant laws and regulations regarding data storage and privacy. To foster collaboration and coordination, the creation of a proposed Traffic Records Coordinating Committee, as a standing subcommittee of NVACTS, with defined membership requirements is suggested.

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 14, 2023

Agenda Item 9: NVACTS Annual Report

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

Provide an update on the NVACTS Annual Report.

2. BACKGROUND

The NVACTS Annual Report provides a summary of recommendations from the committee.

3. ANALYSIS

N/A

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

N/A

5. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

N/A

6. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 14, 2023

Agenda Item 10: Open Discussion

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

This agenda item allows for additional comments from NVACTS Members.

2. BACKGROUND

N/A

3. ANALYSIS

N/A

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

N/A

5. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

N/A

6. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 14, 2023

Agenda Item 11: Next Meeting Date

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

The next NVACTS meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 14, 2023.

Upcoming meeting dates:

Thursday, March 14, 2024

Thursday, June 11, 2024

2. BACKGROUND

NVACTS meets quarterly on the second Thursday of the month.

3. ANALYSIS

N/A

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

N/A

5. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

N/A

6. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 14, 2023

Agenda Item 12: Public Comment

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

This agenda item allows for the second public comment period of the meeting. This public comment period is for any matter that is within the jurisdiction of the public body. No action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item. The Chair of the Committee will impose a time limit of three (3) minutes.

2. BACKGROUND

N/A

3. ANALYSIS

N/A

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

N/A

5. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

N/A

6. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)

Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS) Memorandum

TO: NVACTS Members

FROM: Andrew Bennett, Chair

SUBJECT: NVACTS Meeting, December 14, 2023

Agenda Item 13: Adjourn Meeting

1. SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM

Adjourn the meeting.

2. BACKGROUND

N/A

3. ANALYSIS

N/A

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NVACTS ACTION

N/A

5. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

N/A

6. PREPARED BY

Mike Colety, Kimley-Horn, for Andrew Bennett, NVACTS Chair, NACO Representative (Clark County)