

COSTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF TRAFFIC FINES AND FEES IN NEVADA

Foster Kamanga, MA¹; Virginia Smercina, MA¹; Roger Pharr²; Barb Brents,
Ph.D.¹; Daniel Okamura, MA¹; Vincent Fuentes¹

¹Department of Sociology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV 89154-5033

²New York University's Public Safety Lab

March 19, 2021

A report prepared for the Fines & Fees Justice Center

UNLV | COLLEGE OF
LIBERAL ARTS
Department of
Sociology

SUMMARY

Traffic stops and traffic tickets often have far reaching consequences for poor and marginalized communities, yet resulting fines and fees increasingly fund local court systems. In Nevada, as in many states, an unpaid ticket or missed court date results in a warrant for arrest and/or having a driver's license revoked. This report will explore the context and consequences of the system of fines and fees in Nevada.

1. Where do the fines and fees go in Nevada?
2. Who is most impacted by traffic fees and fines in Nevada?

KEY FINDINGS

Existing social science research cited later in this report finds that:

- Data are mixed on how well imposing traffic fines and fees deter poor driving.
- Traffic fines and fees have a significant impact on poor and minoritized communities who, data show, are more likely to be stopped by the police.
- Traffic tickets are selectively issued to meet local revenue generating needs.

Using data from a 2017-2018 Nevada Legislative Study Interim Report we find that:

- Fines and fees assessed for traffic violations have increased dramatically in Nevada in response to budget shortfalls and have not been reduced as short-term crises have abated.
- There is no evidence that these fees have gone up to deter increases in unsafe driving.

Based on extracted data on open warrants in the Las Vegas Municipal Court issued between 2012 and 2020:

- Unpaid traffic fines constitute 83.3% of open bench warrants for arrests issued by judges in Las Vegas Municipal Court.
- The majority of open bench warrants (58.6%) are not from moving violations, but for administrative infractions largely resulting from failure to pay -- driving without a license, with an invalid, suspended or canceled license or plates, or no insurance.
- More than two-thirds of currently open bench warrants (68.9%) were issued to non-white individuals.
- Those located in the poorest areas are most likely to have open arrest warrants. Among the ZIP codes with the most open warrants all but two have incomes below median and several are among the poorest ZIP codes in Clark County. We found 58.5% of open warrants were issued to people living in block groups whose estimated household median income was \$49,000 a year or below, 3% were issued to people in block groups of incomes above \$100,000 a year.

CONTENTS

Summary	1
KEY FINDINGS	2
Contents	2
Introduction	4
RESEARCH METHODS	5
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	5
DATA SOURCES	5
WHY ASSESS FINES FOR TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS? WHAT WE KNOW	8
EVIDENCE IS MIXED ON WHETHER FINES DETER RISKY DRIVING	8
STATES USE TRAFFIC FINES TO GENERATE INCOME	9
FINES AND FEES COMPOUND RACIAL AND INCOME INEQUALITIES	10
WHERE DO FINES AND FEES GO IN NEVADA?	12
WHO GETS WARRANTS WHEN THEY CANNOT PAY? LOCATION	14
LOCATION OF INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING WARRANTS IN LAS VEGAS FROM 2012 TO 2020	14
WHO GETS WARRANTS WHEN THEY CANNOT PAY? CHARGE	15
MOST BENCH WARRANTS ARE ISSUED FOR ADMINISTRATIVE-RELATED TRAFFIC TICKETS	15
WHO GETS WARRANTS WHEN THEY CANNOT PAY? INCOME	16
THOSE LOCATED IN THE POOREST AREAS RECEIVED THE MOST ARREST WARRANTS	16
WHO GETS WARRANTS WHEN THEY CANNOT PAY? RACE	19
BLACKS ARE DISPROPORTIONATELY REPRESENTED AMONG THOSE WITH OPEN WARRANTS	19
BLACKS ARE MORE LIKELY TO HAVE WARRANTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE TICKETS	20
WHO GETS WARRANTS WHEN THEY CANNOT PAY? DEMOGRAPHICS	21
MALES HAVE DISPROPORTIONATELY MORE OUTSTANDING WARRANTS THAN FEMALES	21
WARRANTS BY AGE	22
CONCLUSIONS	23
SOURCES	24
ABOUT THE RESEARCH TEAM	26
APPENDIX	27

INTRODUCTION

The number of fines and fees imposed by the local justice systems has increased dramatically since the 1980s (Foster 2017). The majority of these impact individuals who incur driving infractions. Currently, 44 states in the US suspend, revoke, or refuse driver license renewal if they have unpaid fines and fees. There are more than 11 million driver's license suspensions worldwide.

In the US, states use revenue from fines and fees to support a judicial system that has progressively lost funding from state and municipal budgets (Montare 2019). In Nevada, a 2017-2018 legislative interim committee that studied the "Advisability and Feasibility of Treating Certain Traffic and Related Violations as Civil Infractions" cited the 1980s recession which forced cuts of about \$40 billion from the 1982 federal budget that was to be directed to states.

In the last decade, there have been growing efforts to examine, expose, and eliminate the unequal effects of fines and fees. Scholars, legislators and advocates have looked at how and why fines are imposed, the specific ways courts impose fines on individuals and how this impacts specific communities. The goal is to eliminate the extreme financial hardships that the judicial system imposes on individuals and eliminate a system that punishes those who can least afford to pay. According to the Fines and Fees Justice Center,

"Fines and fees devastate the lives of millions of Americans, People who cannot immediately pay face additional fees, license suspensions, loss of voting rights and, far too frequently, arrest and jail." (Fines and Fees Justice Center 2018).

Other research finds that fines are disproportionately imposed on poor individuals from communities of color (Alexander 2011; Burton and Lynn 2017). The conclusion of much research is that persistent targeting of low-income communities for fines and fees revenue is both an ineffective and inefficient revenue generator because so many individuals cannot pay (Garrett, Greene, and Levy 2020).

In this report, we will examine the context and consequences of the system of fines and fees in Nevada.

RESEARCH METHODS

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

What is the context and consequences of fines and fees in Nevada? We address this issue by answering two questions:

1. Where does the income from fines and fees go in Nevada?
2. Who is most impacted by traffic fees and fines in Nevada when they cannot pay?

DATA SOURCES

2017-18 Nevada Legislative Interim report

To better understand where traffic fines and fees go, we summarized data gathered from a 2017–2018 interim study produced by the Nevada state legislature. The Nevada state legislature meets every other year for a 120-day session and adopts budgets and laws intended for the following two years. Between sessions, interim committees are created by members of the legislature to work on specific issues. These committees often receive public comment, publish reports, and produce recommendations for the following legislative session. We examined reports from one such study specifically on the assessment of traffic fines and fees (Nevada State Legislature 2018). We situated this data in historical context to look for specific actors, patterns in and motives for legislation.

Open Bench Warrants as Indicators of Fines and Fees Impact

To examine the effects of unpaid traffic tickets, we examined all outstanding bench warrants that the Las Vegas Municipal Court issued from 2011 to 2021.

Courts issue “bench warrants” against road users who have not paid and/or failed to appear in court for traffic citations. Bench warrants are orders issued by a judge instructing police to arrest people for defying court requirements or rules. The warrant is sent by mail to the address that the defendant reported. In Las Vegas, the court issues an additional \$200 warrant fee.

Typically, police do not search for individuals with bench warrants issued for misdemeanors. However, warrant arrests do happen during traffic stops. If police find an active warrant after running an individual driver’s name, they will arrest the individual immediately. Bench warrants never expire, so a traffic citation becomes a bench warrant after the defendant fails to pay the fine and fees and after failing to appear before the court in Nevada.

When a judge issues a warrant, it is a matter of public record and many cities have searchable websites or lists (as PDF documents, for example) that allow people to check if there is an active warrant out for their arrest. Defendants’ information may not always be kept together in a convenient format such as a geotagged database. Instead, they are often in a form that serves the government’s and public’s need to look up active warrants.

Las Vegas Municipal Court Open Warrants 2011-2021 data

We used quantitative data on these outstanding warrants that we extracted from the “City of Las Vegas Marshal - Warrant Search” web site on January 3, 2021 (<https://secure3.lasvegasnevada.gov/ewarrantlookup/>). These are warrants issued by the Las Vegas Municipal Court between 2011 to 2021 to individuals who were ticketed or arrested within the city limits of Las Vegas, Nevada. These were the only publicly available data with needed information that we could access, and we will discuss this below.

Our analysis focused on warrants that the court issued for the period, 2012 to 2020. We excluded warrant data for the years 2011 and 2021 because we observed that the warrants were not representative enough at the time of data extraction in January 2021. The warrant data that we extracted contained 403 charges (with some listed redundantly) that we compressed into 8 charge categories for easy analysis. We considered the first 7 categories as traffic and the 8th charge category as non-traffic charge. As the appendix section shows at the end of this report, the list of 8 categories of charges include insurance, drivers' license, vehicle registration, vehicle condition, moving violations, parking, DUI, and non-traffic, respectively.

Besides traffic charges the warrant data contains defendant demographics such as known address and ZIP codes of defendants, race, sex, age, and bail amount.

Data analysis

We used the Google Maps API (<https://developers.google.com/maps/documentation/geocoding/overview>) to geocode defendants addresses into corresponding latitudes and longitudes, which we used to generate maps in Tableau Public. We linked the geographic coordinates to their corresponding census blocks that we mapped from The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) API at <https://geo.fcc.gov/api/census/>.

We used census blocks to link the warrant data set to data that we downloaded from the U.S. Census's American Community Survey, 2019, which estimates income of people in block groups.

In the end, we matched census block groups to their corresponding ZIP codes and likewise to the corresponding demographic characteristics of each defendant. In other words, geographical coordinates in different data sets allowed us to join them and be able to examine warrants even if some defendants' demographic characteristics that we are interested in are missing from the Las Vegas Municipal Court database. For example, defendants' income was not available. However, we still measured median household income from the U.S. Census American Community Survey in 2019 in each block group of Clark County. Estimates from the U.S. Census American Community Survey allowed us to approximate indirectly the income levels attained by road users that received bench warrants.

We used SPSS to estimate univariate statistics that we have used in the findings section to understand who gets impacted by the traffic fines and fees when they cannot pay and appear before the court in Nevada.

Note on available data

The court jurisdictions in the Las Vegas Valley (the City of Las Vegas, unincorporated Clark County, the City of Henderson, and the City of North

Las Vegas) all statutorily require that unpaid fines become bench warrants. This means that people can and do get arrested over unpaid traffic tickets when other areas, including Carson City, do not require unpaid tickets to convert into warrants.

We were unable to gather data from any other court in Southern Nevada on outstanding warrants or detailed information on who is issued tickets. Some U.S. cities do maintain public databases but doing so often comes down to staffing and resources. The more sophisticated a city's public-facing website, the more labor intensive and expensive it is to construct and maintain, which typically requires a larger population because it forms a larger tax base (Lidén 2017).

Prior to our data collection phase both the Las Vegas Municipal Court, which handles the City of Las Vegas, and the Las Vegas Justice Court, which handles cases in unincorporated Clark County, suspended all current warrants due to the COVID-19 pandemic. With courts closed or operating primarily on a remote basis, they were unable to process more than 250,000 active warrants. However, we were able to find new failure to pay warrants issued in both the City of Las Vegas and the City of Henderson, and news reports (Associated Press 2020) indicated that the Las Vegas Justice Court could restore suspended warrants 60 days after the state's stay-at-home order was lifted, though it had not done so by November 2020.

Reliable data allowing for sufficient transparency in the use of public funds is a critical need. Pierson et al. (2020) assert that states should collect individual level stop data that have the following measures: Date and time of the stop, location, race, gender, and age of driver, the stop reason, whether a search was conducted, and a short narrative written by the officer. The authors cite New York City's UF-250 form for pedestrian stops as an example of how to utilize this level of data.

Law enforcement agencies must continue to make their data accessible to researchers and to the public. It is also recommended that police departments regularly analyze the data they collect and ambitiously design statistically informed guidelines informing their decisions. Providing this research to the public along with their coding process would help to bring much needed transparency to the issue of public relations with police.

We thank the City of Las Vegas Municipal Court for recognizing the need to record reliable data.

WHY ASSESS FINES FOR TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS?

WHAT WE KNOW

To provide context for understanding Nevada, we reviewed current research on the outcomes in assessing traffic fines and fees. There are three general findings.

1. Evidence is mixed as to whether traffic fines and fees discourage traffic violations and make roads safer (Singla et al. 2020; Su 2020).
2. States use traffic fines and fees to generate income for services.
3. Regardless of intention, fines and fees compound racial and income inequalities that exist in the justice system (U.S. Department of Justice 2015; Alexander 2011; Farrell et al. 2004; Foster 2017; Norris 1992; Pierson et al. 2020).

EVIDENCE IS MIXED ON WHETHER FINES DETER RISKY DRIVING

Overall, data are mixed on whether traffic fines and fees impact public safety.

Fines Make Roads Safer

- There is empirical evidence supporting the view that punishment through traffic fines and fees significantly make the roads safe by discouraging road users from speeding, running red lights, driving under the influence of alcohol, etc. (Makowsky and Stratmann 2011; Luca 2015; Tay 2010).
- Just as Luca (2015) did later, Makowsky and Stratmann (2011) used data from traffic stops and citations in Massachusetts, to understand the relationship between numbers of traffic tickets and motor vehicle accidents and accident-related injuries. They found that an increase in traffic fines and fees reduced road accidents.
- Similarly, DeAngelo and Hansen (2014) found that deaths and injuries increased by 12–29 percent after highway troopers were massively laid off in Oregon. The authors found that presence of traffic police increases the probability that a bad road user would get a citation, implying that presence of law enforcement indirectly reduces risks on the road.

Fines do not encourage safe driving

- On the other hand, other studies find little effect. Li et al. found little effect on subsequent speeding in comparing drivers who paid fines and those declared not guilty in court. Indeed, in reviewing other studies Li found that, in most cases, fines are an inconvenience rather than an effective deterrent (Li et al. 2011:645).
- Rajaratnam et al. (2015) also pre- and post-tested the Massachusetts graduated driver-licensing program aimed at novice drivers. Police introduced tough penalties to discourage novice driving without

supervision, especially at night. The other component involved an educational intervention for new drivers covering 'drowsy driving' (963) and other skills. To evaluate the program, the study relied on 1,079,995 police records related to crashes from 2006–2012. The authors found the rate of road crashes involving young drivers, especially at night, fell by 18.6 percent following the implementation of education intervention on novice drivers and associated penalties against unrestricted driving in Massachusetts. However, it is not clear whether road crashes are reduced due to driving education or penalties prohibiting unrestricted driving or both.

STATES USE TRAFFIC FINES TO GENERATE INCOME

Research indicates that revenue collection may motivate issuing traffic tickets (Montare 2019; Singla et. al 2020; Makowsky and Stratman 2009) with selective enforcement determining who and when motorists are charged with traffic fines.

- According to Singla et al. (2020), between 2006 increased the percent of its revenue generated from fines from 1.46% in 2006 to 2.24% in 2012. Further, about 6% of cities in the U.S. collected more than 10% of their revenues in this manner in 2012 (Sances and You 2017).
- Makowsky and Stratmann looked at data from Massachusetts and found that police issue tickets in response to fiscal needs. The likelihood of receiving a speeding fine was higher in towns that are in a fiscal crunch caused by a rejected increase in the property tax limit. Drivers who reside outside of the municipality where they are stopped have an 11-percentage point higher probability of receiving a fine from a local officer, as opposed to a driver who resides in the municipality (Makowsky and Stratmann 2009).
- Garrett and Wagner (2009) found that reduction in tax collection preceded increases in traffic violations between 1990 and 2003 in North Carolina. They attributed an increase of traffic citations to the need to maximize state budget.
- Su (2020) used California counties to relate economic conditions to traffic reinforcement from 2004 to 2015. Some counties hiked rates of traffic fines immediately after collecting less tax revenue in the previous year. Yet these same counties never lowered traffic fines when they saw increased tax revenues.
- Similarly, traffic police along Interstate-75 in Georgia, "target Disney-bound tourists and other pass-through traffic" (Su 2020:2) This selective targeting shows that traffic citations are about generating revenue more than efforts to promote safety on the roads.

Researchers identify several problems with the states' instrumental approach to using ticket fines to generate revenue.

- Tickets that are too expensive lead to non-compliance, which is harmful to budget forecasting (Hummel 2015).
- If excessively given, traffic tickets could weaken the trust between citizens they claim to protect and those who enforce the law (Su 2020). Citizens need to trust how law enforcement institutions handle traffic revenue.

- Transparent and fair processes are especially important when traffic fines and fees get disproportionately levied against certain groups within the general population.

FINES AND FEES COMPOUND RACIAL AND INCOME INEQUALITIES

What is the evidence on whether fines and fees disproportionately impact Black and other minoritized populations? Using fines and fees to fund local services has become especially problematic when police surveillance and formal sanctions get disproportionately applied to Black people. The most common form of fine and fee revenue is the monetary fees that come from traffic violations. Research highlights that minorities are disproportionately affected by law enforcement and are overrepresented in traffic stops, citations, and frisks (U.S. Department of Justice, 2015; Farrell et al. 2004; Norris 1992; Pierson et al. 2020). More than a quarter of the 135 unarmed Black men and women killed by police since 2015 occurred during traffic stops, an NPR investigation has found (Thompson 2021).

- After police shot Michael Brown, a U.S. Department of Justice report (2015) indicated that Ferguson, Missouri, had increased its revenues from fines and fees each year while initiating revenue targets for officers to achieve.
- Singla et al. (2020) compared a random sample of cities in California using data from Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports and secondary sources. They found that cities with larger Black and Asian populations were more reliant upon fines. When law enforcement agencies are composed of a larger proportion of whites than in their resident populations, the fines revenue per capita, as well as a share of general funds, decreased. This reverses for Black communities. They concluded that revenues from fines were not driven by budgetary need or public safety but related to the race of the community and of law enforcement.
- Sances and You (2017) found that the racial backdrop of city councils and residents influence the extent to which fines are used by cities. When the percent of the population that is Black increases, so does reliance on fines and fees. Black representation on city councils, resulted in lower reliance on fines and fees.
- One study of Massachusetts law enforcement indicated racial disparities in traffic stops across the state. This disparity accounted for both verbal warnings received and issuance of citations (Farrell et al. 2004).
- Norris et al. (1992) looked at 213 police stops and 319 persons and found that persons racialized as Black by police were more than two and a half times as likely to be stopped by police than their proportion in the population would suggest. Further, these stops disproportionately affected young Black men under thirty-five and such stops disproportionately were carried out under general suspicion rather than enforcing an obvious violation of the law. Once stopped, the differences in people's comportment and in police treatment of those whom they stopped were negligible. However, because of their disproportionately high rate of stoppage, Black people were still more highly surveilled and issued formal sanctions than their incidence in the general population would expect.
- Pierson et al. (2020), examined a dataset of over 60 million patrols conducted throughout 20 states between 2011 and 2015. The authors

look at racial disparities in stop rates and post-stop outcomes. The authors find that Black drivers are stopped at an increased rate compared to white drivers relative to their share of the driving-age population. However, Hispanic drivers are less likely than whites to be stopped for traffic violations. Both Black and Latino drivers are more likely to be arrested, searched, or ticketed if they are stopped compared to white drivers. The authors note that there is a lower threshold for searching Black and Hispanic drivers than white drivers. This is consistent with data collected from the Police-Public Contact Survey.

- Miller (2010) asserts that pretextual stops are an important site to see how race and driver characteristics affect general suspicion for criminal activity. The authors note that Black drivers are subject to police suspicion more than white drivers. Using self-report data from telephone surveys of drivers in North Carolina, the authors draw from a sample of North Carolina DMV records of 2,620 Black and white residents who renewed a driver's license. The authors find that frequency of warning stops given to drivers is associated with increases in vehicle age, while frequency of ticket writing is associated with driver history of conviction and driving speed. However racial and age disparities in stop likelihood without being given a ticket, persist regardless of legal and quasi-legal factors. The findings indicate local police are more likely to use racial status and youth as measures to justify increased scrutiny.
- Newport's (1999) conducted a phone survey and found that while both white and Black people perceived racial profiling to be common and roundly condemned the practice—even when Gallup attempted to word the question in so-called colorblind language—young Black men responded that they experienced negative encounters with police to a greater degree, which led to their poor opinion of local police.
- Ramirez et al.'s (2000) quantitative analysis of opinions and crime reports find that Black and Latino people are far more likely to be stopped and searched by police despite white people having disproportionately committed speeding offenses and carrying contraband.

WHERE DO FINES AND FEES GO IN NEVADA?

A 2017–2018 interim study by the Nevada State Legislature cites the 1980s recession as its primary reason for beginning to raise fines and fees for traffic violations, as it led Congress to cut approximately \$40 billion from the 1982 budget which limited the amount of funds that Nevada and other states could use for their justice systems (Nevada State Legislature Interim study, 2018).

In 1983, the Nevada Legislature replaced these lost federal funds by authorizing a \$10 Administrative Assessment (AA) on all misdemeanors. The fee was distributed in the following ways:

1. \$1 for city/county juvenile court(s)
2. \$3 for Municipal/Justice court(s)
3. \$5 to Supreme Court/The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)
 - a. \$2 for AOC
 - b. \$2 for Uniform System of Judicial Records (USJR)
 - c. \$1 Judicial Education
4. \$1 for Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST)

Legislative sessions after 1983 continued to increase AA fees. During the 1985 session, Nevada legislature reallocated the \$1 additional fees from local courts to the Supreme Court, thus funding Supreme Court's activities from AA funds (Nevada Legislative Interim study, 2018).

In 1987, the Nevada legislature raised AA funds from \$10 to \$100 to fund expansion and upgraded technology. The legislature allocated almost \$89 of that to the executive branch, including the Criminal History repository, the Nevada Division of Investigation (NDI), the Computerized Nevada Highway Patrol (NHP) switching system, and the Victims of Crime Fund (Nevada Legislative Interim study 2018). Like other states, Nevada was expanding and upgrading its services during the 1980s and 1990s. Funds helped develop the Highway Patrol Mobile Data Computer Project. Technological expansion led to the need for training personnel and other services (Nevada Legislative Interim study, 2018). The state simply turned to traffic fees and the table below shows that subsequent legislative sessions continued raising AA fees.

Table 1 Administrative Assessment Fund Increases

Year	Outcome of the Legislative Session
1991	Redistributed AA funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 51% to supreme court • 49% the executive branch
1995	Authorized county/city to pass an AA fee of \$10 for facilities
1997	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased AA schedule from \$100 to \$105 • Authorized \$2 and \$7 for Juvenile and Justice/Muni courts respectively
2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorized Supreme court to receive higher than 51% of AA revenue.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added 'Advisory Council for Prosecuting Attorneys (AG's Office)' to the recipients of AA funds within the executive branch
2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raised AA from \$105 to \$115 Authorized \$7 as specialty court AA
2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced AA allocation to supreme court to 48% and Authorized the 'other 12% to fund specialty courts'
2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased AA funds from \$115 to \$120 and Authorized that the funds collected from the \$5 increment be sent directly to the State general fund


The data from the legislative interim study contain some troubling implications. The Nevada state legislature chose to adopt policies to make up lost revenue by penalizing drivers. Further, financial crises became the motivation for Nevada, as for other U.S. states, to continue relying on traffic citations to fund state and municipal services. For example, besides the \$120 AA fee, Nevada's legislative body authorized a \$100 fee on misdemeanor DUI offenses in 2013. The \$100 fee schedule was to 'sunset in June of 2015' but the legislature continued authorizing the fee until 2017 (Nevada State Legislature Interim study, 2018). During the same session, the legislature imposed a \$3 AA on all offenses to fund DNA testing of felony arrestees' (Nevada State Legislature Interim study, 2018). The 2015 session allocated \$558,000 to Nevada's supreme court, which had a shortfall in AA revenue. Chokshi (2015) reported in a newsletter that a drop in AA collections from a decline in traffic tickets forced the Nevada Supreme Court into a financial crisis. Thus, the system depends on citizens breaking the law.

In the case of fees imposed on misdemeanor traffic, there are probably cases of bad behaviors on Nevada roads. But a close look at the 2017-2018 Nevada Legislative Study Interim Report provides no significant evidence that could allow us to argue that the incremental increases in administrative assessment schedules was due to desire to deter increased cases of bad driving. The evidence we have found suggests that AA fees fund state services that might be unrelated to the courts dealing with the majority of violations. For example, during its 2013 session, the legislative branch used administrative assessments to expand the executive branch and to fund DNA testing of felony arrestees. The former seems not to connect directly to courts that handle traffic violations. Therefore, road safety might not be the primary reason for cost and frequency of traffic citations.

WHO GETS WARRANTS WHEN THEY CANNOT PAY? LOCATION

LOCATION OF INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING WARRANTS IN LAS VEGAS FROM 2012 TO 2020

Figure 1




This map of Nevada shows bubbles (circles) that represent the ZIP codes of individuals who have received bench warrants from Las Vegas Municipal Court between 2012 and 2020. The bigger the bubble the bigger the number of individuals who have open warrants. From the map, the biggest bubble is in 89108, the ZIP code with the most defendants. Las Vegas Municipal Court covers traffic tickets issued in Las Vegas city limits.

Note: Many people who had outstanding warrants and were not geocoded, either because of badly formed or missing address information, or because they had no fixed address. There were 44,373 distinct addresses in the dataset and 34,338 (77.3%) of those were successfully geocoded.

WHO GETS WARRANTS WHEN THEY CANNOT PAY? CHARGE

MOST BENCH WARRANTS ARE ISSUED FOR
ADMINISTRATIVE-RELATED TRAFFIC TICKETS

Figure 2



The bar chart above and the table below show that, from 2012 to 2020, very few bench warrants were due to non-traffic charges. Non-traffic charges include misdemeanors for theft, battery, domestic violence, loitering, etc.

Most bench warrants (83.3%) were due to traffic charges, the majority (58.6%) of which were for administrative violations compared to 24.7% directly connected to behavioral violations in Nevada.

Table 2 Behavioral vs Administrative Traffic Charges: 8 Categories

Major Categories	# of Warrants per Violation	Warrants %
Administrative Traffic Charges	59115	58.6
Insurance	15457	15.3
Drivers' License	26234	26.0
Vehicle Conditions	1957	1.9
Vehicle Registrations	15467	15.4
Behavioral Traffic Charges	24828	24.7
Moving Violations	16085	16.0
Parking	6515	6.5
DUI	2228	2.2
Total Traffic	83943	83.3
Non-Traffic	16801	16.7
Total:	100,744	100%

WHO GETS WARRANTS WHEN THEY CANNOT PAY? INCOME

THOSE LOCATED IN THE POOREST AREAS RECEIVED THE MOST ARREST WARRANTS

This map shows the median household income in the ZIP code for listed addresses of individuals with open bench warrants from Las Vegas Municipal Court between 2012-2020. In red are ZIP codes with the most open warrants. In blue are the wealthiest ZIP codes in Clark County.

The wealthiest ZIP codes make up 2.6% of all open warrants. Las Vegas Municipal Court deals with warrants for traffic violations in the city limits of Las Vegas and Las Vegas has a median income of \$56,354, only slightly less than the median income of Clark County as a whole (\$59,340). Nonetheless, of the ZIP codes with the most open warrants (57.1%) all but two have median incomes below \$56,354. Several are among the poorest ZIP codes in Clark County.

Figure 3 Median Income and Number of Warrants by Zip Code Clark County





Table 3 Figure 3 Key - Open Warrants by Zip Codes in Clark County, Nevada
(City of Las Vegas Median Household Income \$56,354)

Zip codes with most open warrants			Wealthiest ZIP codes		
Zip	Median Income ¹	Open Warrants %	Zip	Median Income	Open Warrants %
89108	\$46,165	8.9	89138	\$120,759	0.1
89101	\$25,310	7.2	89135	\$94,821	0.3
89110	\$44,415	5.6	89144	\$88,750	0.3
89030	\$36,275	5.5	89052	\$85,021	0.2
89106	\$29,906	5.2	89141	\$89,649	0.4
89115	\$39,412	4.8	89012	\$81,992	0.2
89104	\$36,448	4.3	89179	\$99,662	0.0
89031	\$66,270	4.1	89178	\$88,517	0.4
89107	\$44,234	4.1	89113	\$72,479	0.4
89102	\$36,729	3.9	89134	\$69,461	0.3
89032	\$60,294	3.5	Total Warrants		2.6%
Total Warrants		57.1%			

¹Data are from 2019 inflation adjusted dollars from the American Community Survey 2019 5-year estimates. Nevada Income Statistics <https://www.incomebyzipcode.com/nevada>

In this section we include data on a finer grained analysis of the likely income of individuals with bench warrants. We examine the median income of census block groups containing the addresses of individuals with bench warrants. Census block groups are typically 3-5 times smaller and have fewer people (250-550 housing units) than ZIP codes.

Figure 4



A majority of the defendants (58.5%) addresses were in block groups whose estimated household median income was \$49,000 a year or below. Median household income in the city of Las Vegas, the jurisdiction where traffic infractions occurred, is \$56,354.

The majority of warrants are issued to individuals in some of the poorest areas of the Las Vegas Valley. As the bar chart shows, the data implies that the majority of the defendants were from block groups that had household median incomes below the median for the city of Las Vegas.

Table 4 Distribution of Income of Based on Defendant's Address¹

Age Range	# of Open Warrants	Warrants %
\$49,000 and below	41412	58.5%
\$50,000 - \$99,000	27227	38.5%
\$100,000 and above	2115	3.0%
Total:	70754 ²	100%

¹Income is based on the household median income reported by the U.S. Census American Community Survey 2019 report of the Clark County block groups containing the defendant's address, not an individual's actual reported income.

²Total excludes 31,712 missing cases. These are open warrants with no zip code associated. In some of these cases, individuals may have no known home address. Missing cases are omitted from the analysis. Total open warrants were 102,466.


By contrast, an estimated 3% of defendants lived in block groups with household median income of \$100,000 and above.

The data demonstrates that the majority of warrants are issued to those least able to pay.

WHO GETS WARRANTS WHEN THEY CANNOT PAY? RACE

BLACKS ARE DISPROPORTIONATELY
REPRESENTED AMONG THOSE WITH OPEN
WARRANTS

Figure 5



According to the U.S. Census, Blacks make up 13.1% of the Clark County population while whites make up 69.5%. Yet the table and bar chart below show that from 2012 to 2020, Blacks are very disproportionately represented among those with open warrants. Black individuals make up 44.7% of those who have open warrants as compared white (31.1%). Hispanics have proportionally fewer outstanding warrants (21.9%) compared to their numbers in the population.

Table 5 Racial/Ethnic Distribution on Open Warrants

Race/Ethnicity	# of Open Warrants	Warrants %	Clark County Population
Black	43627	44.7%	13.1%
White	30341	31.1%	41.7%
Hispanic	21321	21.9%	31.6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2136	2.2%	11.3%
Indian/Alaskan Native	123	0.1%	1.2%
Total:	97548 ¹	100.0%	98.9%

¹Total excludes 4,918 missing cases. These are open warrants with no race/ethnicity associated. Missing cases are omitted from the analysis.

BLACKS ARE MORE LIKELY TO HAVE WARRANTS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE TICKETS

This table shows that Blacks, Hispanics, and Asian/Pacific Islanders are noticeably more likely to have warrants for administrative charges as compared to whites. Indian/Alaskan Natives are the least likely to have open warrants due to administrative traffic charges but much more likely to have warrants for non-traffic charges.

*Table 6 Distribution of Open Warrants by Race/Ethnicity and Charge Type
(n=95842)¹*

	Black	White	Hispanic	Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/Pacific Islander
Administrative	61.9% (26,606)	54.4% (16058)	61.0% (12853)	34.2% (8)	61.5% (326)
Behavioral	23.2% (9957)	24.1% (7106)	27.5% (5789)	25.7% (30)	23.4% (488)
Non traffic	15.1% (6492)	21.6% (6367)	11.4% (2408)	40.2% (47)	15.2% (318)
Totals	100% (43055)	100% (29531)	100 (21050)	100% (117)	100% (2089)

¹Missing values for either race/ethnicity or charge type were omitted resulting in 6,624 missing values.

WHO GETS WARRANTS WHEN THEY CANNOT PAY? DEMOGRAPHICS


MALES HAVE DISPROPORTIONATELY MORE OUTSTANDING WARRANTS THAN FEMALES

The table and bar chart below show that there are more male (65.7%) than female (34.3%) defendants with outstanding warrants. Males are disproportionately represented. Yet the U.S. Census shows that there are slightly more females (50.1%) than males in Las Vegas.

Table 7 Open Warrants by Gender

Gender	# of Open Warrants	Warrants %
Female	35012	34.3
Male	67026	65.7
Total:	102038 ¹	100%

Figure 6




WARRANTS BY AGE

The vast majority of individuals with open warrants from 2012 to 2020 in Nevada were in the 18-55 age group (89.6%). Individuals less than age 17 were the smallest category of defendants.

Table 8 Distribution of Defendants' Age on Open Warrants

Age Range	# of Open Warrants	Warrants %
17 or younger	137	0.1%
18 to 34	48280	47.1%
35 to 55	43561	42.5%
56 to 75	9992	9.8%
76 or older	451	0.4%
Total:	102421	100%

Figure 7



CONCLUSIONS

This study examined data on why jurisdictions assess fines and administrative fees, where fines and fees go in Nevada and who gets warrants when they cannot pay, using arrest warrant data from the Las Vegas Municipal Court. The current system of traffic fines and fees in Nevada is extremely inequitable, disproportionately impacting Black citizens in particular.

The most common traffic violations that led to a bench warrant were not based on driving behavior, but were based on administrative violations. Our study does not support the argument that the majority of warrants and monetary sanctions target driving behavior. Rather, fines and fees appear to be used to create revenue for the judiciary and law enforcement.

The persons most commonly impacted by bench warrants lived in poorer areas. These areas have incomes by ZIP code that are below Las Vegas median income, some significantly. Additionally, those most commonly assessed were more likely to be male and be identified as Black. Ultimately, the Nevada system of fines and fees criminalizes poverty and reinforces racial disparities, as demonstrated by the numerous administrative-based traffic violations resulting in warrants disproportionately represented by people of color.

The US Constitution forbids punishing people based on their economic status (Garrett, Greene, and Levy 2020). Sterling (2019) states, “the current system for adjudicating misdemeanors looks more like a criminal processing system meant to generate revenue than a criminal justice system meant to generate fairness,” (p. 1). Varghese et al. (2019) portray the goal of social justice reform as creating, “an equitable system that upholds human rights and the dignity of people regardless of background,” (p. 683). We seem a long way from this goal. While changing the status quo is difficult, we must address the inequalities, which criminalize poverty through monetary sanctions and incarceration for failure to pay (Foster 2017; Varghese 2019; Edelman 2020).

Limitations

Data collection attempts were made over a ten-week period from September 2020 through January 2021, focusing on Clark County, Nevada. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the staff for the district courts are working restricted hours and were unable to assist with data requests. Additionally, some courts operate using antiquated software systems which limit reporting capabilities. For example, while the North Las Vegas Municipal Court case management system does capture data of interest to this project, it is incapable of extracting data into a report format. Additionally, the charges may not be uniform across jurisdictions. Nonetheless, while we do not know what the data would look like if we included all jurisdictions, we have no evidence that it would be dramatically different.

Future Research

The impact of fines of fees in Las Vegas, Nevada is a story still evolving. More quantitative as well as qualitative research is needed. We need to know how many traffic citations become warrants. More information is needed to better understand who can pay traffic citations versus who cannot. Finally, we need a better understanding of exactly how much money is collected from traffic fines and fees, and what monetary sanctions are used for.

SOURCES

- Alexander, Michelle. 2011. *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Era of Colorblindness*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Associated Press. 2020. "Nevada Court Suspends Thousands of Traffic Warrants." Retrieved November 11, 2020 (<https://apnews.com/article/4e4e1c8914705e8239f39d3af242b214>)
- Burton, Susan, and Carl Lynn. 2017. *Becoming Ms. Burton*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Chokshi, Niraj. 2015. The Chief Justice of Nevada's Supreme Court Says a Decline in Traffic Tickets Is Starving His Budget. *Washington Post*, March 23. https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/govbeat/wp/2015/03/23/the-chief-justice-of-nevadas-supreme-court-says-a-decline-in-traffic-tickets-is-starving-his-budget/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.9914310e05db [accessed October 28, 2019].
- DeAngelo, Gregory, and Benjamin Hansen. "Life and Death in the Fast Lane: Police Enforcement and Traffic Fatalities." *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 6, no. 2 (May 2014):
- Edelman, P.B. 2020. Criminalization of Poverty: Much More to Do. *Duke Law Journal Online*, 69, 114-136.
- Farrell et al 2004 minorities Farrell, A., McDevitt, Jack, Bailey, Lisa, Andresen, Carsten and Pierce, Erica. 2004. "Massachusetts racial and gender profiling study." Northeastern University Institute on Race and Justice, May 4, 2004.
- Fines and Fees Justice Center, 2018 "Our Vision and Our Work," Fines and Fees Justice Center website. <https://finesandfeesjusticecenter.org/about-fines-fees-justice-center/>
- Foster, Lisa. 2017. "Injustice Under Law: Perpetuating And Criminalizing Poverty Through The Courts." *Georgia State University Law Review* 33, no. 3 (2017): 695.
- Garrett, B. L., S. S. Greene, and M. K. Levy. (2020). "Fees, fines, bail, and the destitution pipeline." *Duke Law Journal* 69(7):1463-1472.
- Garrett, Thomas A., and Gary A. Wagner. 2009. Red Ink in the Rearview Mirror: Local Fiscal Conditions and the Issuance of Traffic Tickets. *Journal of Law and Economics*. 52:1.
- Hummel, D., 2015. Traffic tickets: Public safety concerns or budget building tools. *Administration & Society*, 47(3):298-319.
- Li, Jingyi, Sanie Amir, Elisa R. Braver, Patricia Langenberg, Min Zhan, Gordon Smith, and Patricia Dischinger. 2012. "Are Current Law Enforcement Strategies Associated with a Lower Risk of Repeat Speeding Citations and Crash Involvement? A Longitudinal Study of Speeding Maryland Drivers." *AEP* 21(9):641-647.
- Lidén, Gustav. 2017. "Inequality in Local Digital Politics: How Different Preconditions for Citizen Engagement Can Be Explained." *Policy and Internet* 8(3):270-291.
- Luca, Dara L. 2015. "Do Traffic Tickets Reduce Motor Vehicle Accidents? Evidence from a Natural Experiment." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 34(1):85-106.
- Makowsky, M. D., Stratmann, T. 2009. Political economy at any speed: What determines traffic citations? *American Economic Review*, 99(1):509-527.
- Miller, Lisa L. 2010. "The Invisible Black Victim: How American Federalism Perpetuates Racial Inequality in Criminal Justice." *Law and Society Review* 44:805-842.
- Montare, Ariadne S. 2019. "Civil Fines and the Cycle of Poverty" *GPSolo* 36(1):37.
- Nevada Legislature, 2018. "Nevada Legislative Interim Study 2017-2018 on The Advisability and Feasibility of Treating Certain Traffic and Related Violations as Civil Infractions, A.C.R. 9, 2017," reports and data. Retrieved on 9/13/2020 from <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/InterimCommittee/REL/Interim2017/Committee/1421/Meetings>
- Nevada State Legislature. Legislative Counsel Bureau. "Fees, Fines, Forfeitures, and Administrative Assessments Imposed and Collected by Courts." Carson City, Nevada: Legislative Counsel Bureau, 1999.
- Newport, Frank. 1999. "Racial Profiling Seen as Widespread, Particularly Among Young Black Men." Gallup Poll Release, December 9. Washington, DC: The Gallup Organization.
- Norris, Clive, Neigel Fielding, Charles Kemp, and Jane Fielding. 1992. "Black and Blue: An Analysis of the Influence of Race on Being Stopped by the Police." *British Journal of Sociology* 43:207-224.
- Pierson, Emma, Camelia Simoiu, Jan Overgoor, Sam Corbett-Davies, Daniel Jenson, Amy Shoemaker, Vignesh Ramachandran, Phoebe Barghouty, Cheryl Phillips, Ravi Shroff, and Sharad Goel. 2020. A Large Scale Analysis of Racial Disparities in Police Stops Across the United States. *Nature Human Behavior*. 4, 736-745.
- Rajaratnam, Shantha MW, Christopher P. Landrigan, Wei Wang, Rachel Kaprielian, Richard T. Moore, and Charles A. Czeisler. 2015. "Teen Crashes Declined After Massachusetts Raised Penalties For Graduated Licensing Law Restricting Night Driving." *Health Affairs* 34(6):963-970

- Ramirez, Deborah, Jack McDevitt, and Amy Farrell. 2000. A Resource Guide on Racial Profiling Data Collection Systems: Promising Practices and Lessons Learned. NCJ 184768. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Sances, Michael W., and Hye Young You. 2017. "Who Pays for Government? Descriptive Representation and Exploitative Revenue Sources." *Journal of Politics* 79(3):1090–1094.
- Singla, Akheil, Charlotte Kirschner, and Samuel B. Stone. 2020. "Race, Representation, and Revenue: Reliance on Fines and Forfeitures in City Governments." *Urban Affairs Review* 56(4):1132–1167.
- Sterling, Robin Walker. 2019. "Invisible Injustice: A Review of Punishment Without Crime: How Our Massive Misdemeanor System Traps the Innocent and Makes America More Unequal by Alexandra Natapoff." *Journal of Community Psychology* 48(1):142–153.
- Su, Min. 2020. "Taxation by Citation? Exploring Local Governments' Revenue Motive for Traffic Fines." *Public Administration Review* Louisiana State University.
- Tay, R. 2010. Speed cameras: Improving safety or raising revenue? *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, 44(2): 247-257.
- Thompson, Cheryl W. 2021. "Fatal Police Shootings of Unarmed Black People Reveal Troubling Patterns." NPR morning edition, January 25, 2021. Retrieved March 15, 2021. <https://www.npr.org/2021/01/25/956177021/fatal-police-shootings-of-unarmed-black-people-reveal-troubling-patterns>
- Varghese, Femina P., Tania Israel, Guy Seymour, Rachel Becker Herbst, Lauren G. Suarez, and Candice Hargons. 2019. "Injustice in the Justice System: Reforming Inequities for True 'Justice for All.'" *The Counseling Psychologist* 47(5):682–740.
- U.S. Census. 2019. American Community Survey. Washington, D.C. Retrieved January 7, 2020 (<https://www.census.gov/acs/www/data/data-tables-and-tools/data-profiles/2019/>)
- U.S. Department of Justice. 2015. "Investigation of the Ferguson Police Department" Civil Rights Division, March 4, 2015. Retrieved March 15, 2021 https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/press-releases/attachments/2015/03/04/ferguson_police_department_report.pdf

ABOUT THE RESEARCH TEAM

Foster Kamanga, Virginia Smercina, Daniel Okamura, and Vincent Fuentes have master's degrees and are currently Ph.D. candidates in the Department of Sociology at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Roger Pharr is a Data Engineer with New York University's Public Safety Lab. Barbara G. Brents is a Professor in the Sociology Department at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. This began as a class project in the Sociology Department graduate seminar, SOC 776 Political Sociology, Fall 2021.

The team would like to thank some of the folks that helped us with this work, Terry Murphy, Chris Wakefield, and Chris Mai with the Vera Institute.

The project "Fines, Fees & Inequality" was reviewed by UNLV Office of Research Integrity - Human Subjects as indicated in Federal regulatory statutes 45CFR46.101(b) and deemed exempt (category #4) on February 25, 2021.

APPENDIX

Charges by category			
Major Category	Sub-categories		Warrants
Traffic Total			83.3%
Traffic Administrative	Insurance	Insurance	15.3% (15457)
	Drivers license		26.0% (26234)
	Vehicle Conditions		1.9%
		Vehicle conditions	0.3% (301)
		Lamps, Light, Signals	1.6% (1656)
	Vehicle Registration	Plate & car registration	15.4% (15467)
Traffic Behavioral	Moving Violations		16.0%
		Seat & Belt	0.8% (797)
		Minor/Underage	0.7% (746)
		Lane rule	2.2% (2508)
		Pass/Overtake	0.2% (180)
		Reckless and Careless driving	1.1% (1132)
		Yield to car or pedestrian or emergency or school bus	0.2% (278)
		Red Light Stop	2.3% (2267)
		Speed Limit	7.0% (5990)
		Duty	0.5% (472)
		Power Showing	0.6% (594)
		Tax/Truck and other Compliance	0.0% (28)
	Parking		6.5 (6515)
	DUI	DUI and Alcohol	2.2% (2228)
Non-Traffic	Misdemeanors	incl. those related to theft, battery, domestic violence, battery, drugs, loitering, littering, bus licensing, animal cruelty or registration	16.7% (16801)

New Value	New Label	Old Label (of Charge)
1	Insurance	NO INSURANCE/SECURITY + NO PROOF OF INSURANCE +
2	Driver license	CHANGE NAME/ADD ON DRIV LIC-IN 30 DAY + DRIVE ON CANCELLED DRIV LIC + DRIVE ON REVOKED DRIV LIC + DRIVE ON SUSP/CANC/REV DRIVE LIC + DRIVE ON SUSPENDED DRIVERS LICENSE + DRIVERS LICENSE - SURRENDER ON DEMAND + DRIVING WITHOUT VALID LICENSE + DRIVING WITHOUT VALID LICENSE-EXPIRED + EMPLOY UNLICENSED DRIVER/DRIVE MTR VEH + MOTORCYCLE DRIVERS LICENSE REQUIRED + NO DRIVERS LICENSE + NO DRIVERS LICENSE IN POSSESSION + NO MTRCYCLE DRIV LIC IN POSS-ADULT/JUV + NO NEVADA DRIVERS LIC WITHIN 30 DAYS + POSSESS ALTERED DRIV LIC +

		<p>POSSESS REVOKED DRIV LIC +</p> <p>POSSESS SUSPENDED DRIVERS LICENSE +</p> <p>USE/POSS SUSP/CANC/REV DRIV LIC +</p> <p>VIOLATE INSTRUCTION PERMIT REQUIREMENTS +</p> <p>VIOLATION OF RESTRICTION ON LICENSE +</p> <p>UNLAWFUL TRANSFER OF LICENSE PLATES +</p> <p>MORE THAN ONE DRIVERS LICENSE</p> <p>NO COMMERCIAL LICENSE W/VALID ENDORSE</p>
3	Vehicle conditions general/Road worthiness	<p>BRAKE MAINTENANCE +</p> <p>BRAKES +</p> <p>BRAKES - EVERY MOTOR VEHICLE MUST HAVE +</p> <p>BRAKES STOP WITHIN CERTAIN DISTANCE +</p> <p>EXHAUST SYS-EXTEND PAST REAR/SIDE VEH +</p> <p>EXHAUST SYSTEM - MUST BE GAS TIGHT +</p> <p>ALL MOTOR VEHICLES MUST HAVE MIRRORS +</p> <p>ALL MOTOR VEHICLES MUST HAVE MUFFLERS +</p> <p>FENDERS REQUIRED +</p> <p>MUST HAVE HORNS & WARNING DEVICES +</p> <p>MUST HAVE WINDSHIELDS-NOT DEFECTIVE +</p>

		<p>TIRES - TREAD DEPTH – UNSAFE +</p> <p>UNSAFE VEH-NOT EQUIPPED AS REQUIRED +</p> <p>WINDSHIELDS/WINDOWS NOT OBSTRUCTED +</p> <p>MIRRORS-TWO REQ NOT LESS 3" IN DIAMETR</p> <p>WINDSHIELD WIPERS-MUST HAVE & MAINTAIN</p>
4a	Lamps	<p>2 TAIL LIGHTS REQ/LOCATION & DISTANCE +</p> <p>FLASHING RED OR YELLOW SIGNAL +</p> <p>HEAD LAMPS HOURS OF OPERATION +</p> <p>HEAD LAMPS-2 REQUIRED/LOCATION ON VEH +</p> <p>HEAD LAMPS-AT LEAST ONE REQ-PROPER LOC +</p> <p>HIGH AND LOW BEAM USE - FAIL TO DIM +</p> <p>LAMPS ON PARKED VEHICLES +</p> <p>MOTORCYCLE DEFECTIVE HEADLAMPS +</p> <p>MTR CYCLE HEADLAMPS-TIMES/OPERATION +</p> <p>REFLECTOR AND CLEARANCE LAMP LOCATIONS +</p> <p>STOP LAMPS REQUIRED +</p> <p>TAIL LAMPS-REQUIRED WHEN HEADLIGHTS ON +</p>
4b	Light Color/Signals	<p>COLOR OF LAMPS +</p> <p>DISPLAY BLUE LIGHTS ON NON-EMERGENCY VEHICLE +</p>

	REFLECTORS - POSITION AND SIZE +
	EXTRA LIGHTS & REFLECT REQ CERTAIN VEH +
	NO U-TURN SIGNS - OBEDIENCE TO +
	REFLECTORS - COLORS AND DISTANCE SEEN +
	SIGNAL LT-TOWED TRAILER/TOWING VEHICLE +
	SIGNALS - HAND AND ARM – METHOD +
	SIGNALS OF INTENTION-BY LAMP/HAND/ARM +
	STOPPING SUDDENLY WITHOUT SIGNAL +
	TINTING WINDOWS - RESTRICTED VIEW +
	TOW CAR EQUIP-FLARES/WARNNG LTS/SIGNS +
	TURN SIGNAL REQ-100' CITY/300' FREEWAY +
	TURN SIGNALS +
	UNSAFE TURN WITHOUT APPROPRIATE SIGNAL +
	LANE CHANGE-MARKED HWY-AFTER SIGNAL +
	LANE DIRECTIONAL CONTROL SIGNAL +
	OBEDIENCE-NO LEFT/RIGHT TURN SIGNS +
	OBEDIENCE-RAILWAY SIGNALS/SIGNS +
	LICENSE PLATE LIGHT +
	TURN SIGNAL REQ-100\ ' CITY/300\ ' FREEWAY

5	Seat & Belt	<p>CARRY PASSENGERS-SEAT & FOOTRESTS REQ + DRIVER MST USE SEAT BLTS & SHOLDR HARN +</p> <p>ILLEGAL RIDING-NOT ON PASSENGER'S AREA +</p> <p>MORE THAN 3 PERSONS IN FRONT SEAT</p> <p>MTRCYCL-NO THONGS/SANDALS/OPEN TOES +</p> <p>PASSENGER MUST USE SEAT BELT +</p> <p>VEH MUST HAV SEAT BLTS & SHOLDR HARNES +</p>
6	Minor/Unde rage	<p>DRIVER <21 YEARS OLD-DRIVING INDUS VEH +</p> <p>PERMITTING UNLICENSED MINOR TO DRIVE +</p> <p>PERMITTING UNLICENSED PERSON TO DRIVE +</p> <p>LEAVING CHILD UNATTENDED IN MOTOR VEHICLE +</p> <p>DEVICE TO RESTRAIN CHILD UNDR 5YR/40LB +</p> <p>DEVICE TO RESTRAIN CHILD UNDR 6YR/60LB +</p>
7	Lane rule	<p>DISREGARD-ONE-WAY ST/ROTARY TRAF ISLAND +</p> <p>DIVIDED HWY-DRIVE ON RIGHT OF ROADWAY +</p> <p>DRIVE MORE THAN 200' IN 2-WAY TURN LN +</p> <p>DRIVING ON RIGHT HALF OF ROADWAY +</p> <p>DRIVING ON SIDEWALK +</p> <p>DRIVING THROUGH SAFETY ZONES +</p> <p>FAILURE TO DRIVE IN TRAVEL LANE +</p>

	HOV-CAR POOL LANES +
	LEFT TURN FROM ONE WAY ROADWAY +
	LEFT TURN TO ONE WAY ROADWAY +
	LEFT TURN-POSITION/METHOD AT INTERSECT +
	MTRCYCL NOT TO BE DRIVEN ON SIDEWALK +
	ON DIVIDED HIGHWAY-TURN ACROSS MEDIAN +
	ONE WAY STREET +
	REMOVE BARRIER-DRIVE ON CLOSED HIGHWAY +
	RIGHT OF WAY FROM PRIVATE DRIVE/ROAD +
	RIGHT OF WAY FROM YIELD SIGN +
	RIGHT OF WAY-ALLEY/DRIVEWAY/BUILDING +
	RIGHT OF WAY-PASS VEH STOPPED FOR PED +
	RIGHT OF WAY-PEDESTRIANS IN CROSSWALK +
	RIGHT OF WAY-RIGHT TURN ON RED SIGNAL +
	RIGHT OF WAY-UNCONTROLLED INTERSECTION +
	RIGHT TURN-POSITION/METHOD AT INTERSEC +
	RIGHTS OF WAY FROM STOP SIGNS +
	STOP IN TRAFFIC LANE +
	STREETS OTHER THAN TRUCK ROUTES +

		<p>TWO WAY TURN LANE-FOR LEFT TURNS ONLY +</p> <p>U-TURN AT INTERSEC WITH TRAF CONT DEV +</p> <p>U-TURN IN FRONT FIRE STATION DRIVEWAY +</p> <p>U-TURNS-BUSINESS DISTRICT OR UNSAFE +</p> <p>UNSAFE TURNING MOVEMENT - LANE CHANGE +</p> <p>VEHICLE TURNING LEFT AT INTERSECTION +</p> <p>MTRCYCL RIGHT TO FULL USE TRAFFIC LANE</p> <p>RGT OF WAY INTRSECTION-STOP</p> <p>DRIVE MORE THAN 200\ IN 2-WAY TURN LN</p>
8	Pass/Overtake	<p>NO PASSING 100' INTERSECTION/CURVE/ETC +</p> <p>NO PASSING ZONES-YELLOW LINE/MARKINGS +</p> <p>PASS VEH IN OPPOSITE DIR -KEEP RIGHT +</p> <p>PASS/OVERTAKE VEH ON LEFT-METHOD +</p> <p>PASS/OVERTAKE VEH ON RIGHT-METHOD +</p> <p>PASSING BETWEEN STOPPED OR MOVING VEH +</p> <p>UNLAWFULLY OVERTAKE & PASS VEHICLE IN SCHOOL ZONE +</p>
9	Reckless driving general	<p>BLOCK INTERSECTION - OBSTRUCT PASSAGE +</p> <p>DRIVRS VIEW OBST/PASSENGER INTERFER +</p> <p>FOLLOWING TOO CLOSE +</p>

		<p>IMPROPER OR PROHIBITED U-TURN IN SCHOOL ZONE +</p> <p>RECKLESS DRIVING +</p> <p>WILLFUL OBSTRUCTION/DELAY OF TRAIN</p> <p>WRITTEN REPORT BY DRIVERS/OWNERS W/INJURY/PROP DAM</p>
10	Careless driving general	<p>BOARD OR ALIGHT FROM MOVING VEHICLE +</p> <p>DRIVING IN A CARELESS MANNER +</p> <p>DRIVERS POSITION WHILE OPERATING</p> <p>FAIL USE DUE CARE AVOID COLL W/PED +</p> <p>FULL ATTENTION TO DRIVING +</p> <p>HAND POSITION OF DRIVER +</p> <p>HORNS - UNNECESSARY USE +</p> <p>NO TV RECEIVER VISIBLE AT DRIVERS SEAT +</p> <p>OPEN DOOR IN TRAFFIC - LEAVE DOOR OPEN +</p> <p>UNATTENDED VEH-REMOVE KEY/STOP ENGINE +</p> <p>REMOVE KEY/LOCK IGNITION/LEAVE ENG RUN +</p> <p>UNSAFE BACKING +</p> <p>UNSAFE LOAD +</p> <p>UNSAFE STARTING A STOPPED VEHICLE +</p>
11a	Yield to Car	<p>FAIL TO YEILD ON FLASHING YELLOW ARROW +</p>

		<p>FAIL TO YIELD ON FLASHING YELLOW ARROW +</p> <p>FAIL TO YIELD TO ONCOMING TRAFFIC +</p> <p>FAIL TO YIELD TO PERSON RIDING BICYCLE +</p> <p>YIELD SIGN - DISREGARD OF +</p>
12/11b	Yield to Pedestrian	FAILURE TO YIELD TO A PEDESTRIAN
13/11c	Yield to emergency Vehicle	<p>CROSSING FIRE HOSE +</p> <p>FOLLOW FIRE TRUCKS-PARK W/IN 300'-500' +</p> <p>YIELD TO EMERGENCY VEHICLE +</p>
14	Red Light Stop	<p>DRIVE THRU PRIV PROP TO AVOID RED LITE +</p> <p>RED FLAGS/LIGHTS-EXTENDED LOAD/LOAD>4' +</p> <p>RED LIGHTS & SIRENS MAY REMOVE/DESTROY +</p> <p>RED TRAFFIC SIGNAL-POSITION/METHOD +</p> <p>STOP LIGHTS +</p> <p>STOP REQ SIGNAL POL OFF-ATTEMPT ELUDE +</p> <p>STOP SIGN - POSITION/ METHOD OF STOP +</p>
15	Plate and car registration	<p>EXPIRED LICENSE PLATES +</p> <p>FAIL TO SURRENDER SUSPENDED LICENSE PLATES +</p> <p>FICTITIOUS/ALTERED-PLATES/CERTIFICATE +</p> <p>FICTITIOUS/SUSP/REV VEH REGISTRATION +</p>

		<p>LICENSE PLATES - METHOD OF DISPLAY +</p> <p>NO NV LIC PLTS W/IN 30 DAYS RESIDENCY +</p> <p>NO NV LIC PLTS W/IN 60 DAYS RESIDENCY +</p> <p>NO REGISTRATION IN VEHICLE +</p> <p>NO VEHICLE REGISTRATION +</p> <p>OPERATE UNTREGISTERED MOPED +</p> <p>OPERATE VEH W/ALT VEH NUM-SERIAL NUM +</p> <p>PERMIT TO OPERATE UNREGISTERED VEHICLE +</p> <p>REVOKED REGISTRATION +</p> <p>SUSPENDED REGISTRATION/PLATES +</p> <p>FAIL SUR PLATES/DL TO DEPT OF MTR VEH +</p> <p>UNREGISTERED VEHICLE/TRAILER/SEMI TRAILER +</p> <p>ADDRESS CHANGE-REG-WITHIN 10 DAYS +</p> <p>ADDRESS CHANGE-REG-WITHIN 30 DAYS +</p> <p>UNLAWFUL TO LEND LICENSE PLATES OR REG</p>
16	Speed Limit	<p>BASIC RLE-FSTER/POSTED 1-10 OVER +</p> <p>BASIC RLE-FSTR/POSTED 11-15 OVER +</p> <p>BASIC RLE-FSTR/POSTED 16-20 OVER +</p> <p>BASIC RLE-FSTR/POSTED 21 OR OVER +</p>

		<p>BASIC RLE-FSTR/POSTED 21-30 OVER +</p> <p>BASIC RLE-FSTR/POSTED 31-40 OVER +</p> <p>BASIC RLE-FSTR/POSTED 41+ OVER +</p>
17	Speed on Conditions	<p>BASIC SPEED-TOO FAST FOR CONDITIONS +</p> <p>FAIL DECREASE SPD AND USE DUE CARE +</p> <p>MANR/RAT/SPD-ENDGR LIF/LIMB/PROP-CRLES +</p> <p>MINIMUM SPEED-IMPEDE OR BLOCK TRAFFIC +</p> <p>MISDEMEANOR +</p> <p>SPEED CONTEST +</p> <p>IMPEDE TRAFFIC/TOO SLOW-MOVE TO RIGHT</p> <p>PRIMA FACE SPD-SCH CROSS 1-15 OVER +</p> <p>PRI/FACIE SPD-SCH ZN 16MPH/LIMIT</p> <p>PRIMA FACIE SPD-SCH ZONES-15 MPH</p> <p>SLOW TRAFFIC TO DRIVE IN RIGHT LANE +</p>
18	Parking	<p>VIOLATION PARK RULES ALCOHOL +</p> <p>HANDICAPPED PARK ONLY (PERMIT) +</p> <p>PARK TO SELL/WASH/GREASE/REPAIR VEH</p> <p>PARKING ADJACENT TO SCHOOL WHEN POSTED</p> <p>PARKING IN A TAXI OR BUS ZONE</p>

		<p>PARKING IN RED ZONE +</p> <p>PARKING NEAR FIRE HYDRANT +</p> <p>PROHIB PARK GEN- SIDEWALK/DRIVEWAY/ETC +</p> <p>STOP/STAND/PARK IN BUS STOP/TAXI STAND ZONE +</p> <p>VIOLATION PARK RULES ALCOHOL +</p> <p>VIOLATE PARK RULES +</p> <p>PARK IN ALLEY, INCLUDING BLOCKING DRIVEWAY +</p> <p>PARKING - OVER 18" FROM CURB FACE</p> <p>PROJECT INTO ST-NOT > 15 IN FROM CURB</p> <p>SET BRAKE-TURN WHEELS TO CURB ON GRADE</p> <p>STOP/STAND/PARK IN HAZARD/CONGEST AREA</p>
19	Duty	<p>DUTY APPROACHING EMERGENCY VEHICLE +</p> <p>DUTY GIVE INFORMATION AND RENDER AID +</p> <p>DUTY TO STOP - PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY</p> <p>DUTY UPON ACCIDENT W/ INJURY OR DAMAGE +</p> <p>DUTY UPON DAMAGING UNATTENDED VEH/PROP +</p> <p>IMMEDIATE REPORT OF ACCIDENT TO POLICE +</p> <p>STOP FOR SCHOOL CROSSING GUARDS +</p>
20		<p>AGGRESSIVE DRIVING +</p>

	Power Showing	<p>EXHAUST SYSTEM-MODIFIED TO MAKE NOISE +</p> <p>EXHIBITION OF POWER +</p> <p>OBEDIENCE AUTHORIZED FLAGMAN – SIGNAL +</p> <p>OBEDIENCE TO TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE +</p> <p>OBSTRUCTING TRAFFIC +</p>
21	School bus	STOPPING FOR SCHOOL BUS
22	Tax/Truck and other Compliance	<p>BEHIND ON LOG BOOK</p> <p>FAILURE TO COMPLY W/ TAXI STAND USE +</p> <p>PROHIBITED/REQUIRED ACTS - TAXI DRIVER</p> <p>TRIP SHEET-CAB +</p> <p>TAXICAB STANDS-SEEKING FARE OR PARKING</p> <p>HEIGHT-VEHICLE DISTANCE FROM ROADWAY</p> <p>EQUIPMENT VIOLATION +</p> <p>ABANDONED VEHICLE</p>
23	DUI and Alcohol	<p>DRINK INTOXICATING LIQUOR WHEN DRIVING</p> <p>DUI DRUGS CHEMICALS ORGANIC SOLVENT</p> <p>DUI LIQUOR</p> <p>DUI LIQUOR AND/OR DRUGS</p> <p>DUI SUBSEQUENT ARREST</p>

		<p>MINOR IN CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOL</p> <p>MINOR IN POSSESSION OF ALCOHOL +</p> <p>OPEN ALCOHOLIC CONTAINER IN VEHICLE</p> <p>POSS/CNSM ALCOHOL ON PED MALL FROM GLASS/METAL/ORG +</p>
24	Non-Traffic Charge	<p>ACTIONS WHICH CONSTITUTE THEFT +</p> <p>ADEQUATE WATER FOR ANIMALS +</p> <p>AFFRAY +</p> <p>AID AND ABET A PROSTITUTE +</p> <p>ANIMAL VACCINATION CERTIFICATE REQ +</p> <p>ASSAULT +</p> <p>ATMPT SMOKE/CONSUME MARI IN PUBLIC PLACE/VEH/STORE +</p> <p>BATTERY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, FIRST OFFENSE +</p> <p>BATTERY +</p> <p>BATTERY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - 2nd Offense +</p> <p>BATTERY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE - 2ND OFFENSE +</p> <p>BATTER DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, FIRST OFFENSE</p> <p>BATTER DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, SECOND OFFENSE</p> <p>BATTERY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, SECOND OFFENSE +</p> <p>BATTERY/DOMESTIC VIOLENCE +</p>

	BUSINESS LICENSE VIOLATION +
	CARRY CONCEALED WEAPON W/O PERMIT +
	COERCION +
	COMMIT ACT/INTERFERE W/PEACEFUL CONDUCT +
	CONSUME ALCHOL ON PREMISE OFF/SALE ONLY + CONTRIBUTING TO DELINQUENCY OF MINOR + CONVICTED PERSON FAIL TO REGISTER +
	CONVICTED PERSON FAIL/CHANGE ADDRESS + CREATE DISTURBANCE IN SCHOOL +
	CRUELTY TO ANIMALS +
	DEFECATING IN PUBLIC +
	DEFRAUDING AN INNKEEPER+
	DEFRAUD CAB DRIVER+
	DESTRUCTION PRIVATE PROPERTY
	DISCHARGE OF A FIREARM +
	DISTURBING THE PEACE +
	DO BUSINESS WITHOUT A LICENSE +
	DOG RUNNING AT LARGE +
	DRAW A DEADLY WEAPON +
	EMBEZZLEMENT +
	EMISSIONS OF SMOKE, STEAM OR FUMES +

	FAIL TO FURNISH INFO TO ANIMAL REGULATORY OFFICER +
	FAIL TO REGISTER GARAGE +
	FAILURE TO LICENSE DOG/CAT +
	FAILURE TO RESTRICT ANIMAL
	FALSE REPORT OF A CRIME +
	FTA-ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE/WITNESS +
	GARBAGE REMOVAL +
	GIVE FALSE INFO TO PUBLIC OFFICER, GIVE OR LEAVE MARIJUANA TO PERSON UNDER 21 + GRAFFITI +
	GRAFFITI IMPLEMENTS WITH INTENT TO VAND + HANDLEBAR HEIGHTS +
	HARASSMENT +
	INHALE GLUE/OTHER CHEMICAL +
	INTERFERENCE WITH GARBAGE CONTAINER
	JUNKAGE/DEAD STORAGE-MORE THAN 24 HRS
	LEWD AND LASCIVIOUS BEHAVIOR +
	LEWD EXPOSURE +
	LITTERING +
	LODGING IN A PASSENGER CAR
	LODGING WITHOUT CONSENT +
	LOITERING ABOUT A SCHOOL +

	LOITERING ABOUT SCHOOL/PLACE CHILDREN CONGREGATE +
	LOITERING FOR PURPOSE OF PROSTITUTION +
	MAINTAINING A PUBLIC NUISANCE +
	MALICIOUS DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY + MALICIOUS PROSECUTION +
	MINOR GAMBLING
	MINOR IN CASINO
	MISUSE OF BUS SHELTER BENCH
	NOISE DISTURBANCE +
	OBEY ORDER/DIRECTION OF PUBLIC OFFICER +
	OBSTRUCTING/FALSE INFO TO P. O. +
	RESISTING PUBLIC OFFICER
	OPEN CONTAINER AT BUS SHELTER
	OBTAIN MONEY UNDER FALSE PRETENSES + PERSONAL MARIJUANA CULTIVATION LAWS 1ST OFFENSE +
	GLASS/METAL/ORG +
	PARK BICYCLES-BLOCK PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC
	POSSESS FIREARM U/INFLUENCE DRUGS/ALC + POSSESS HYPODERMIC DEVICE +
	POSSESS LESS THAN 1 OUNCE OF MARIJUANA, POSSESS OPEN LIQUOR ON PLAYGROUND,
	POSSESS UNREGISTERED FIREARM,

	POSSESSION FIREWORKS,
	POSSESSION OF A CONTROL SUB IMITATION,
	POSSESSION OF A SHOPPING CART +
	POSSESSION OF STOLEN PROPERTY +
	PROHIBITED CONTAINER +
	PROVOKE OR ATTEMPT TO PROVOKE BREACH OF PEACE +
	PROVOKING BREACH OF PEACE +
	REMAIN IN PARK AFTER HOURS OF CLOSURE +
	ROLLER SKATES, ETC-ILLEGAL ON ROADWAY +
	SALE/FURNISH LIQUOR TO MINOR + SMOKE/CONSUME MARIJUANA IN PUBLIC PLACE/VEH/STORE +
	SMOKING UNLAWFUL IN PUBLIC PLACES +
	SOLICITING WITHOUT A PERMIT +
	SPAY AND NEUTER +
	SPITTING ON SIDEWALK +
	STALKING +
	SPILL LOAD ON HWY OR ST/COVERED LOAD + STANDARDS OF CONDUCT WHILE ON DUTY +
	RIDE BICYCLE-1 PERSON UNLESS EQUIPPED + RESTRICTED USE BY BICYCLE/PED./MOPED +
	STREET PERFORMER-DESIGNATION LOCATION + PETIT LARCENY +

	TAMPERING/INJURING A VEHICLE +
	THREATEN TO HARM STUDENT OR SCHOOL EMPLOYEE, THREATENING PHONE CALL +
	THROW BURNING OBJECT +
	UNLAWFUL PRESENCE IN A CHILDRENS PARK +
	UNLAWFUL PROSTITUTION RELATED ACTIVITY, UNLAWFUL TRANS/USE - DEALER REGISTRATI, UNLAWFUL USE OF CELL PHONE OR HANDHELD DEVICE, UNLAWFUL USE/POSSESSION OF DRUG PARAPHERNALIA, UNIFORM FIRE CODE , UNLAWFUL ACTS- STREET PERFORMERS + UNLAWFUL COMMUNICATION/EXCHANGE WITH PRISONER + URINATING IN PUBLIC +
	VEHICLE CONFINEMENT – ANIMALS +
	VIOL DOM VIOLENCE TPO +
	VIOLATE RESTRAINING ORDER, WALK IN ROADWAY WHEN SIDEWALK PROVIDED, WEAPON IN PARK,
	NON-RESIDENT DRIVE ON CANCELLED DL,
	NON-RESIDENT DRIVE ON REVOKED LIC,
	NON-RESIDENT DRIVE ON SUSP/CANC/REV DL,
	NON-RESIDENT DRIVE ON SUSPENDED LIC,
	BICYCL-LIGHTS/REFLECTRS/BRKES/WARN DEV
	BICYCL-PARENT/GUARDN-ENSURE RULES OBEY
	BICYCL-RIDE ON RIGHT SIDE OF ROADWAY
	BICYCL-SPEED TOO FAST FOR CONDITIONS

	BICYCL-TRAFFIC SIGNALS TO BE OBEYED
	BICYCLE - CARRYING ARTICLES
	BIKE/SKATEBOARD ON SIDEWLK IN BUS DIST
	BICYCL-ENTER/EMERGE- ALLEY/DRIVWY/BLDG
	HDGEAR-GLASSES/SHIELDS HELMET FASTENED
	PED CROSSING NOT IN CROSSWLK-JAYWALK
	PEDESTRIAN FAIL TO USE CROSSWALK
	PEDESTRIAN MUST USE RIGHT OF CROSSWALK
	PEDESTRIAN OBSTRUCTING SIDEWALK
	PEDESTRIAN ON HIGHWAY WHERE PROHIBITED
	PEDESTRIAN OR VEHICULAR INTERFERENCE
	PEDESTRIAN SHALL YIELD
	PEDESTRIAN SOLICITING ON HIGHWAY
	PEDESTRIAN UNDER INFLUENCE ON ROADWAY
	PEDESTRIANS TO OBEY TRAFFIC SIGNALS +
	PEEPING +
	PROHIBIT CAMPING/LODGING/ETC W/PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY
	RESTRICTED ACCESS
	TRESPASSING, TRESSPASS/LOITER/COMMIT NUISANCE ON/NEAR SCHOOL

	<p>HITCHHIKE/SOLICIT BUSINESS FROM DRIVER +</p> <p>OBTAIN PROPERTY UNDER FALSE PRETENSES</p> <p>SKATES, ETC-ILLEGAL FREMONT SIDEWALK</p> <p>SOLICITING CERTAIN LOCATIONS</p> <p>THROWING DEADLY MISSILES</p> <p>UNLAWFUL ACTS/ ANIMALS</p> <p>UNLAWFUL USE FALSE IDENTIFICATION</p>
--	---

Source: Las Vegas Municipal Court: Modified by author