

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND HOMELAND SECURITY  
AND THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**

**Seventy-third Session  
February 17, 2005**

The joint meeting of the Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security and the Assembly Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chair Dennis Nolan at 1:37 p.m. on Thursday, February 17, 2005, in Room 1214 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, Room 4412, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file at the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Dennis Nolan, Chair  
Senator Joe Heck, Vice Chair  
Senator Maurice E. Washington  
Senator Mark E. Amodei  
Senator Maggie Carlton

**ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. John Ocegüera, Chair  
Ms. Genie Ohrenschall, Vice Chair  
Mr. Kelvin Atkinson  
Mr. John C. Carpenter  
Mr. Chad Christensen  
Mr. Jerry D. Claborn  
Ms. Susan Gerhardt  
Mr. Pete Goicoechea  
Mr. Joseph M. Hogan  
Mr. Mark Manendo  
Mr. Rod Sherer

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Senator Michael Schneider  
Senator Steven Horsford (Excused)

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 2

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Barbara K. Cegavske, Clark County Senatorial District No. 8

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst  
Linda Ronnow, Committee Secretary  
J. Randall Stephenson, Committee Counsel  
Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst  
Sherry Rodriguez, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Delise Sartini, Moms on a Mission  
Sarah Stadler, Mothers Against Drunk Driving  
Jim Dunning, Children of Nevada  
Zach Zaragosa, Executive Vice President, Young Democrats of Nevada  
Susan Larimer, Parents of Teen Drivers  
Tyler Quillin  
Elizabeth Quillin  
Victoria Quinn, Moms on a Mission  
Erin Breen, Director, Safe Community Partnership  
Jeff Payne, President, Founder, Driver's Edge  
Dr. Keith Rheault, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education  
Tom Fronapfel, Administrator, Field Services Division, Department of Motor Vehicles  
Michael Hackett, Nevada State Medical Association  
Susan Martinovich, Deputy Director, Director's Office, Nevada Department of Transportation  
Charles Abbott, Chief and Highway Safety Coordinator, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety  
Leonard V. Nevin  
Gino Del Carlo, Treasurer, Nevada Highway Users Alliance  
Carolyn Bonifas, Associate Director of Research and Communications, The Road Information Program  
Daryl E. Capurro, Nevada Motor Transport Association  
Michael Pennington, Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 3

Carole Vilardo, Nevada Taxpayers Association  
Michael D. Geeser, AAA Nevada

CHAIR NOLAN:

The issues before us are very important. We are going to hear two bills jointly, Senate Bill (S.B.) 60 and Assembly Bill (A.B.) 52, followed by a presentation on The Road Information Program (TRIP) report, which outlines the financial status of transportation systems within our State.

[SENATE BILL 60](#): Makes various changes concerning drivers' licenses issued to persons under 18 years of age. (BDR 43-9)

[ASSEMBLY BILL 52](#): Makes various changes concerning drivers' licenses issued to persons under 18 years of age. (BDR 43-972)

These bills are similar in nature; the nature and gravity of the Graduated Drivers' License (GDL) bill is one of great importance. It deals with the lives of our youth and safety of our motoring public. We face a real crisis with the number of serious accidents young people are involved in every year, last year especially.

Clark County had a number of horrific accidents that took the lives of young people. This is the focus of our attention. The testimony coming before us is taken very seriously. We will do our very best to enact the appropriate legislation.

SENATOR BARBARA K. CEGAVSKE (Clark County Senatorial District No. 8):  
I have written testimony for the Committees here today ([Exhibit C](#)). I will also be referring to a bill of a previous session, S.B. No. 256 of the 72nd Session.

CHAIR NOLAN:

I would like you to go through the components of the bills which are identical, then go over the other parts last.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

The measures, identical and different, appear in [Exhibit C](#), pages 3 through 6.

I have been asked by Sean Larimer to read a letter to this Committee ([Exhibit D](#)). Sean is a young man in Henderson; he survived a car crash that

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 4

ultimately took the lives of several of his close friends. Sean was driving that vehicle. Currently, he is incarcerated in Clark County. He wanted to testify in person. He decided to write a letter and requested that I read it on his behalf. His mother, Susan Larimer, is in Las Vegas and will be testifying today.

CHAIR NOLAN:

Senator Cegavske, please have your visitors begin their testimony.

DELISE SARTINI (Moms on a Mission):

I have prepared testimony which I will read to the Committees ([Exhibit E](#)).

SARAH STADLER (Mothers Against Drunk Driving):

I have written a letter addressing this joint hearing which I will read to you ([Exhibit F](#)).

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

AAA Nevada has forwarded a letter to the Committees ([Exhibit G](#)).

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

I have a question for Senator Cegavske. Your bill states that any parent or legal guardian may be held liable for any fines or penalties imposed on the driver for a violation of curfew. Does a violation of this proposed law constitute a moving traffic violation? If it is a moving violation, and the driver is cited for curfew, the parents are responsible for the fines and penalties. Does it also mean they are responsible for any points that are associated with the moving violation?

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

The violations listed are secondary offenses. A teen driver cannot be stopped for violations of seat belts, passenger restrictions or curfew; there must be evidence of another moving violation for a teen driver to be stopped. I do not believe it has anything to do with points. A judge would determine the punishment.

JIM DUNNING (Children of Nevada):

I would like to read from my prepared testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 5

CHAIR NOLAN:

We are all very sorry that it was the death of your son that brought you here to testify. We are pleased to have you with us, and your testimony is meaningful. After hearing your testimony, I am sure your son Travis is still very proud of you.

MR. DUNNING:

Thank you.

ZACH ZARAGOSA (Executive Vice President, Young Democrats of Nevada):  
I have written my testimony and would like to read it to you ([Exhibit I](#)).

SUSAN LARIMER (Parents of Teen Drivers):

If it pleases the Chair, I would like to read my testimony ([Exhibit J](#)).

CHAIR NOLAN:

Thank you Ms. Larimer, please express to your son Sean our appreciation for his letter and testimony.

TYLER QUILLIN:

I am going to read my testimony ([Exhibit K](#)).

ELIZABETH QUILLIN:

I too would like to read my testimony ([Exhibit L](#)).

VICTORIA QUINN (Moms on a Mission):

My daughter, Kiley Quinn, was involved in an auto accident in 2002. Two of her friends lost their lives in that accident in which the driver was unlicensed. Kiley will be 18 years old next month and she still does not drive, nor does she have the desire.

I have a 15-year-old son. He wants his driver's license and feels he is responsible. As a parent, I can stop him from obtaining his license to drive. My son is not responsible. One Saturday at 1:30 in the morning he was out with friends where he was not supposed to be. They were pulled over by the police for speeding and a curfew violation. The police notified me that the car in which my son was a passenger was clocked at going 100 miles per hour.

Even though my son lived through the events of his sister's accident when she nearly lost her life and was four months in a wheelchair, it never fazed him that the same thing could happen to him. He still thinks, like a majority of kids, that a situation like his sister's is never going to happen to him.

When I picked up my son, he said they were not going 100 miles per hour, but they had run a red light. He stated there was a governor on the car and the fastest it could go was 75 miles per hour. You do not die any less whether the speed is 75 or 100 miles per hour.

I urge you to pass this law to protect youngsters who think they are responsible enough to get behind the steering wheel of a car.

ERIN BREEN (Director, Safe Community Partnership):  
At this time I will read my testimony to the Committees ([Exhibit M](#)).

JEFF PAYNE (President, Founder, Driver's Edge):  
I am testifying on behalf of S.B. 60. Many of you are familiar with our organization; some of you have had your children participate in the Driver's Edge program.

We know it is a fact that car collisions are the number one killer of our teens; more teens are killed during their first year of driving and more teens are killed when they have other teens in the car with them. We also know more teens are killed when driving at night.

The measures proposed in S.B. 60 should not be looked at as being restrictive or interfering with the lives of teens and their parents. They should be viewed as laying a solid foundation, helping us save lives of the children in this State as well as the lives of other drivers.

If you are familiar with me and my organization, you know that teen driver education means everything to me; there is nothing I can say that has not already been said. I would rather see our roads filled with educated drivers than with all the white crosses being seen today.

SENATOR CEGAVSKE:

On behalf of everyone you have heard today, we would like to thank this body for the time you have spent working on this issue. I would like to share what the Legislative Counsel Bureau has done. We were able to create a pamphlet titled "Behind the Wheel" ([Exhibit N](#)) which describes the current restrictions. I also have for this Committee a small packet of news clippings relating to GDL ([Exhibit O](#)).

DR. KEITH RHEAULT (Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education):

My remarks apply specifically to section 11 of both bills, dealing with modifications or revisions to the course of study for driver education in our schools. I am here in support of this legislation; it would not be a problem to implement this.

Current regulation requires 30 hours of instruction. We follow the statutes and allow one hour of behind-the-wheel training to be equivalent to 3 hours of classroom instruction.

The proposed provision would require, at a minimum, at least 15 of the 30 hours of instruction to be in a motor vehicle. There are a number of items that must be covered in the driver education curriculum that lend themselves better to classroom instruction than behind-the-wheel training. I would like to point out that section 11 requirement changes to the driver education course study would not be a problem and the Department of Education supports the changes.

TOM FRONAPFEL (Administrator, Field Services Division, Department of Motor Vehicles):

The mission of the Field Services Division is to ensure that only safe and knowledgeable drivers receive the privilege of driving on Nevada's streets and highways.

The proposed changes will ensure that young drivers are exposed to a longer period of controlled driving, allowing them to improve their skills. It requires exposure to controlled nighttime driving conditions. The new provisions would benefit law enforcement by standardizing the time during which drivers under

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 8

18 years of age are not allowed to transport underage passengers, and to ensure parental support of the program through the new liability provisions.

The Department supports efforts to strengthen the provisional licensing requirements for young drivers, making the requirements more consistent for all drivers. In addition, it will help us fulfill our mission.

MICHAEL HACKETT (Nevada State Medical Association):

We support both bills. It is our policy, based on national studies and other available data, that there should be restrictions placed on drivers' licenses of persons under the age of 18. We have supported previous legislation in these areas and feel the proposed revisions to current law will serve to lessen the risk associated with adolescent driving.

SUSAN MARTINOVICH (Deputy Director, Director's Office, Nevada Department of Transportation):

Data shows drivers between 16 and 25 years of age are the highest-percentage age group involved in crashes that result in severe injuries and fatalities in the State. The Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) encourages passage of legislation that could reduce those crashes and fatalities on our streets and highways.

CHARLES ABBOTT (Chief and Highway Safety Coordinator, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety):

I have a report for the Committees ([Exhibit P](#)). We are in support of this bill as it has been submitted.

LEONARD V. NEVIN:

I am a private citizen stating the importance of this piece of legislation. I am a retired police officer who worked in the traffic division. I have taught driver education. I have seen maimed, injured and deceased bodies. That is something no one wants to see. I am sure I am speaking for both of the Chairs, an emergency medical technician and the other a firefighter. This is something that is greatly needed. If we see less of this reported on television, our whole society is better off.

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 9

CHAIR NOLAN:

As you know, we have both a Senate and an Assembly bill. Our Committees will deliberate on these bills separately, but will come together and work on them jointly.

I have sat through several sessions listening to GDL bills. I know, in Chair Ocegüera's experience as a fire captain, and my past experience as a paramedic and an investigator for the coroner's office, we both have seen our fair share of carnage and loss of young lives. We are committed this session to work hard for this piece of legislation. I would like to ask Chair Ocegüera to give his comments.

CHAIR OCEGUERA:

Thank you all for coming, we appreciate your testimony. We, as the Assembly, are committed to enacting some meaningful legislation. We look forward to working with you in the future.

PATRICK GUINAN, (Committee Policy Analyst):

I request that the following notation be added to the record: Stan Olsen, Executive Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, sent word that he is in favor of S.B. 60 and A.B. 52.

CHAIR NOLAN:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 60 and A.B. 52. Chair Ocegüera will lead the joint meeting for the TRIP report presentation.

CHAIR OCEGUERA:

We can begin hearing testimony at this time.

GINO DEL CARLO (Treasurer, Nevada Highway Users Alliance):

We are a statewide, nonprofit group and supporters of continued improvement of the infrastructure and highways of Nevada. We ask that you take a close look at the findings of this extensive report ([Exhibit Q](#), original is on file in the Research Library).

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 10

CAROLYN BONIFAS (Associate Director of Research and Communications, The Road Information Program):

I have prepared a written presentation for this Joint Committee ([Exhibit R](#)).

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO:

Where is the 19 percent mentioned on page 7 of [Exhibit R](#) diverted?

Ms. BONIFAS:

To different agencies such as the Nevada Highway Patrol, the Department of Motor Vehicles and the Department of Public Safety. There is a list in the report.

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO:

The Committees have not had a chance to read all of the report. Could we get a breakdown? I am sure the Committees would be interested to see that information. According to [Exhibit R](#), the low grades given to this State are horrible; this is unacceptable. Would you elaborate on road designs the report mentions as being one of the problems?

Ms. BONIFAS:

We have found that roadway design is an important factor in 33.33 percent of serious traffic accidents. The driving environment, if it were made safer, could possibly prevent 33.33 percent of serious traffic accidents. This can be accomplished by something as simple as removing obstacles from the road, adding rumble strips, widening lanes or adding medians.

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO:

We need to start looking within the State's administrative agencies if we have this many problems and these grades. Maybe we need to look to different people to remedy these particular problems, because this is absolutely unacceptable.

Ms. BONIFAS:

I want to discuss the grade D currently assigned to Nevada. The federal government is currently deliberating the status of the next long-term federal transportation bill. The current six-year bill actually expired in November 2003. There have been a series of short-term extensions but to date the U.S. Congress has not been able to agree on a long-term extension for the new bill.

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 11

With the best-case scenario, and even with the highest funding levels currently being proposed at the federal level, it will not be enough to ensure Nevada can make all the improvements needed. Much of the time, states rely on the federal government to provide transportation funding. In this case, some will be provided but it will still be up to the State to provide a significant level of highway transportation investment.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

Is that the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) that has been authorized already?

Ms. BONIFAS:

Correct.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

Reauthorization comes up when?

Ms. BONIFAS:

The current bill, TEA-21, expired in September 2003. There have been a series of short-term extensions; the current one is a six-month extension that expires in May 2005.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

Do you know how much money is going to be put into it?

Ms. BONIFAS:

Currently, they are still deliberating on what the amount will be. The present Bush administration within the last two weeks said the proposed funding level is \$284 billion. The House of Representatives proposed a similar number but the Senate is still deliberating. They hope to have it out of committee before Easter recess. Certainly those things can change by the minute. It is difficult to say if they will have a bill and if it will be something agreeable to the President, the Senate and the House of Representatives.

That completes my presentation on the findings of the report at this time.

CHAIR OCEGUERA:

Does the Committee have any questions?

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 12

CHAIR NOLAN:

Do you prepare this same report for all 50 states?

Ms. BONIFAS:

We have not done a report for all 50 states, but we have for a number of them.

CHAIR NOLAN:

When you assign a grade is the criteria listed? How would you benchmark a D as opposed to a C or a B?

Ms. BONIFAS:

The grades are assigned based on the national level. For example, for road and bridge conditions Nevada's numbers were better than the national average.

For safety, Nevada was assigned a D grade; that is because of Nevada's traffic fatality rate of 1.91 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles of travel, whereas the national rate is 1.48 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles.

CHAIR NOLAN:

Although you may not conduct the same type of study for each state, are the criteria and data you use nationally published and accepted?

Ms. BONIFAS:

Yes.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

When you assign a grade, based on your criteria, are you looking only at highways as opposed to surface streets?

Ms. BONIFAS:

It is based on a study of the State's major highways. That data comes from the Federal Highway Administration.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

Can we go back to the TEA-21? When it is reauthorized, is there a formula for allocating funds for each state? How does the federal government determine the amount of money each state is going to receive?

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 13

Ms. BONIFAS:

I do not have a breakdown of what each state would be allocated, given all the different proposals.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

Is there no formula? Could one state get more or less? Is the allocation not based on population, growth, density or highway miles, or it is random?

Ms. BONIFAS:

That is right, there is no formula.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

We do not know how much money we are going to receive?

Ms. BONIFAS:

That is correct.

CHAIR OCEGUERA:

Is there anyone else wishing to testify at this time?

DARYL CAPURRO (Nevada Motor Transport Association):

Before I go into my testimony on the TRIP report, I would like to say that I am impressed with the quality of testimony you have received here today concerning GDL; that was some of the best collective testimony I have heard in a long time.

We have reviewed the TRIP report. The highway is our office, it is where we operator and work. Eighty percent of Nevada's communities are served only by truck. Approximately 94 percent of the value of goods delivered in this State are delivered by truck.

Miles traveled on Nevada's highways have increased by approximately 90 percent since 1991. It is estimated that miles traveled will increase approximately 85 percent between now and the year 2020.

Our State depends heavily on truck traffic. Truck drivers depend on bridges, infrastructure and rest areas to provide them the ability to deliver goods on time with as few accidents and incidents as possible.

The Highway Fund has not had a change in taxes or fees, which are found in Article 9, section 5, of the Nevada Constitution, since 1991. Since then, we have more fuel-efficient vehicles, meaning revenues have not kept up. Bear in mind, there are no General Fund appropriations to the Highway Fund. It is all highway fees and taxes generated from vehicle registrations, gasoline and diesel taxes.

The sale of bonds has been used in the last few years to good advantage. The NDOT has done a fantastic job at keeping our system in the position it is today. Nevada's highway maintenance is one of the finest of all states based upon factors that have been discussed here. Nevada has it in spite of what are dwindling revenues available for that purpose.

We simply are not able to keep up with congestion problems. People arrive in Nevada before we are able to get infrastructures built. An example of that is the new bridge over the Colorado River at Boulder Dam. The sale of bonds in the last few years, this year and next year have served to get projects such as that on the ground quickly, even though all of us would like to have seen that done before now.

There is a price to be paid for that. Although the Department has done an excellent job of selling bonds, they have been at a very low interest rate and that benefits the public and Nevada. The piper has to be paid eventually.

In the year 2000 there were no bond repayment dollars spent. Starting in the year 2007, approximately \$100 million of highway funds will go towards retiring bonds that were issued or will be issued over the next year. It is important to keep in mind that the money has to come from someplace. The federal bills currently being considered range anywhere from \$284 billion to \$313 billion over the next six years, based on the working figure of the U.S. Senate. I fully expect the amount will be resolved at approximately \$300 billion. Nevada will receive a substantial increase, but nothing that will take care of the additional problems we have here.

There is a funding formula, but at this point both bills contain different elements of how that should be allocated. What the federal government tries to do is make sure every state gets back at least 95 percent of the money sent from their state to the federal government. Quite frankly, I would be happy if we kept

our share here and spent it ourselves. But, the simple fact of the matter is, it has been irresponsible of Congress not to have passed TEA-21 in the year and a half or more they have been studying this. They have made short-term extensions at the same funding levels. That has not helped us much. It certainly does not help when the planning effort is a minimum of 3 to 10 years out, or even 20 years out, which in highway terms is extremely necessary to know where the State is going to be.

This Legislative Session needs to address highway funds. It needs to be done sooner rather than later. The General Fund may be showing surpluses that you will debate heavily this Session. The Highway Fund does not have a surplus and the Fund needs to be addressed. The shortfall, whether it is the full \$3 billion as set forth in the TRIP report, or some lesser figure, it is still a staggering sum of money when the State addresses these issues over the next decade.

We would be happy to work with the Committees to find some solutions. I suggest, if you have any loose money in the General Fund, you might look at infusing some of those funds into the Highway Fund.

CHAIR OCEGUERA:  
Are there any questions from the Committees?

SENATOR WASHINGTON:  
Can you tell me what the revenue streams are for the Highway Fund? What taxes are we looking at, or the amount of fuel consumption tax or whatever the revenue sources might be?

MR. CAPURRO:  
The current revenue streams provided for the Highway Fund are gasoline tax, both the State's share and the total local taxes from the cities and counties. There is a formula in the law that dictates how that would be distributed. The Regional Transportation Commission tax, which in many counties is up to 9 cents per gallon as allowed under the law; gasoline tax at the current State level of 24 cents a gallon; diesel fuel tax of 27 cents a gallon; and registration fees which can range from \$33 for the average passenger car, to \$1,320 for a commercial unit of 80,000 pounds are all part of the revenue stream.

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 16

Bear in mind, a lot of people complain that it costs them \$500 to register their car. It does not cost \$500, it costs \$33 for the registration; the rest of the cost is government service tax which goes back to the cities, counties and school districts under the law. That money does not go into the Highway Fund. It is from the drivers' license fees and miscellaneous fees from producing records where you will find your revenue streams.

The last time we looked at this, 1 cent per gallon of gasoline tax produces approximately \$11 million; 1 cent per gallon of diesel tax provides approximately \$3 million. Those are the two biggest generators for highway funds in Nevada.

There are some other categories in federal taxes, including a heavy vehicle use tax and tire tax which do not affect automobile owners but are specifically imposed against heavy trucks.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

This is a question for staff. Could we gather information to get a better picture of what we are looking at, as far as revenues being generated by the State? What are the State's share and the locals' share, versus expenditures for road and surface maintenance, construction and so forth?

I would like to get an idea of TEA-21. If it is to be 95 percent of the previous authorization, what did 95 percent equal on the last authorization? Maybe we could get a breakdown of how those monies are being used as well, because without really getting a clear picture, I have no idea what we are talking about.

CHAIR OCEGUERA:

We will have staff put together a breakdown for both Committees.

MR. CAPURRO:

That information is readily available from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and NDOT.

CHAIR OCEGUERA:

Is there any other testimony to be heard this afternoon?

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 17

MICHAEL PENNINGTON (Reno-Sparks Chamber Of Commerce):  
I have written testimony prepared for this hearing ([Exhibit S](#)).

CAROLE VILARDO (Nevada Taxpayers Association):  
This hearing reminds me of two we had in 1991 when TRIP did a study in which the Nevada Taxpayers Association also participated. We found this study to be very viable. It raised a few points. We did not have the International Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) in effect. The Act was passed in 1991.

Infrastructure funding for roads is probably the largest and most expensive investment with which Nevada has to deal. It is more expensive than buildings, when you consider materials that are required for building roads and how time-consuming it is.

Funding has been a problem for a long time. Unlike some states, we are not competing for General Fund dollars. However, there is a limit to the resources we do have and how we utilize the resources.

As explained earlier, one problem is Nevada uses gas tax for highway funding. However, as fuel prices go up, because the tax is per gallon, it does not reflect any change. You might want to look at something else; there are a few things on the horizon which are important for the Committee to recognize, assuming that you accept Highway Funding as a very important part of the infrastructure for the State, the rural and urban communities and for economic development.

With ISTEA, there is always a danger the eastern states will prevail and the formula distribution will wind up based on population instead of road miles as it is now.

Nevada is behind in every category of federal funding. Nevada receives much less in federal funding proportionally, in fact, the last numbers I saw on money from the federal government going to the General Funds was Nevada receives 70 cents back for each dollar we send to the federal government. If ISTEA or subsequent formulas change and they become population-based, we are in a world of hurt relative to the distribution of funds back to Nevada.

The second issue you must look at is alternate fuel vehicles. Alternate fuel vehicles are going to further erode the revenue source available for highways and transportation in general, even at a local level where they are using sales tax for buses. That is a fortunate augmentation for them, but anything else you do at a local level is going to be problematic when there is greater use of alternate fuel vehicles.

An article was written indicating that all car manufacturers combined, by the year 2010, anticipate 3 percent of vehicle sales will be from alternate fuel vehicles, which means 500,000 vehicles. That will make a big dent in fuel-tax revenue.

Yes, gas tax is an alternative, yet an unpopular one. We still have a sparse population, even though we are growing. California may receive \$150 million on a 1-cent-per-gallon gas tax but Nevada is in the range of \$11 million to \$15 million.

The Nevada Taxpayers Association has made recommendations. There has been a coalition of us working with the TRIP report study since 1990. We made presentations in 1991 and to two interim committees on transportation funding. There are some other things you may be able to do, some of them may not happen this year, but you need to start putting things in place.

On May 1, 2005, you will receive a new set of projections from the Nevada Economic Forum. It appears, by looking at the numbers, Nevada will have an even greater amount of surplus than what is in the budget right now. You need to seriously consider applying a part of that surplus to infrastructure funding and particularly road infrastructure.

MICHAEL D. GEESER (AAA Nevada):

We have a concern with any report that gives Nevada a D grade for its highways when it has to do with traffic safety and mobility. It goes further than that. It goes right to the heart of the economy of both southern and northern Nevada. All you have to do is stand up on a Friday night, look south on Interstate 15 and see all the headlights coming into Las Vegas.

There is one statistic in the TRIP report that bears repeating. According to the report, by the year 2020 vehicle travel is expected to increase 80 percent,

which translates to 35 billion miles of travel. What those numbers mean is how important mobility and transportation are becoming to Nevada.

On behalf of our more than 300,000 members in the AAA Auto Club in Nevada, we urge you to continue to look for new sources of funding, to reduce the gridlock and help make our highways safer.

CHAIR OCEGUERA:

If there are no questions from the Committees, I would like to thank everyone for the information you have provided on the TRIP report. We are going to close the joint portion of the hearing and the Assembly Committee on Transportation will convene upstairs. Chair Nolan will continue with his Committee's portion at this time.

CHAIR NOLAN:

We will add to the record written testimony from Danny L. Thompson, Nevada State AFL-CIO ([Exhibit T](#)).

I have two bill draft requests (BDRs) to introduce. The first one is BDR 15-189 requested by the Criminal Justice System in rural Nevada.

**BILL DRAFT REQUEST 15-189:** Provides that counseling and evaluations required for certain offenses may be conducted in neighboring states under certain circumstances. (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 86](#).)

The second is BDR 43-1036 requested by our committee. It was submitted by the DMV.

**BILL DRAFT REQUEST 43-1036:** Eliminates additional fee charged for renewal of driver's license by mail. (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 87](#).)

SENATOR HECK MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 15-189 AND BDR 43-1036.

SENATOR WASHINGTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senate Committee on Transportation and Homeland Security  
Assembly Committee on Transportation  
February 17, 2005  
Page 20

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS SCHNEIDER AND HORSFORD  
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR NOLAN:

If there is no further business, I will close today's hearing. The meeting is  
adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Sherry Rodriguez,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Dennis Nolan, Chair

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

---

Assemblyman John Ocegüera, Chair

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