

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**

**Seventy-Fourth Session
March 20, 2007**

The Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chair Kelvin Atkinson at 1:35 p.m., on Tuesday, March 20, 2007, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Kelvin Atkinson, Chair
Assemblyman Mark Manendo, Vice Chair
Assemblyman David Bobzien
Assemblyman John C. Carpenter
Assemblyman Jerry D. Claborn
Assemblyman Ty Cobb
Assemblywoman Susan I. Gerhardt
Assemblyman Ed Goedhart
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea
Assemblyman Joseph Hogan
Assemblywoman RoseMary Womack

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst
Christine Henriksen, Committee Secretary
Matt Mowbray, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Rusty McAllister, representing Professional Firefighters of Nevada
Josh Griffin, representing the Motor Vehicle Network, Norwalk, CT
Jessica Young, representing the Motor Vehicle Network, Norwalk, CT
Tom Jacobs, Public Information Officer, Department of Motor Vehicles
Brad Savage, representing the Motor Vehicle Network, Norwalk, CT
Ginny Lewis, Director, Department of Motor Vehicles
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Eagle Forum
Lynn Chapman, Executive Board Member, Independent American Party of Nevada
Marritt Yochum, representing Nevada Committee for Full Statehood
Joseph Turco, American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Nevada

Chair Atkinson:

I am going to turn the meeting over to Vice Chair Manendo since all three of these bills are mine. He will run the Committee until we get to the work session.

Vice Chair Manendo:

[Meeting called to order at 1:35 p.m. Roll taken.] We are going to open the hearing on Assembly Bill 264.

Assembly Bill 264: Revises provisions relating to certain special license plates.
(BDR 43-908)

Rusty McAllister, representing the Professional Firefighters of Nevada:

From a historical perspective, in 1997 there was a bill passed in the Legislature that provided for special license plates for professional firefighters. At that time there was no designation where the revenue generated from those license plates would go. It essentially went to the State's General Fund, to the Department of Transportation, or somewhere unknown to us. In 2001, we were successful in passing Legislation to change the designation for the money to go to a Level 1 burn care center in Nevada. Currently, there is only one of those in the State and it is in the University Medical Center in Las Vegas (UMC).

The nexus for this bill and our desire is to change the designation or destination of those funds. Over time, as the President of the Professional Firefighters, there were different areas where we have tried to help. We have many firefighters who have had some difficult times. A firefighter and his wife in Storey County were run over by a car, she was killed and the firefighter was severely injured. Three firefighters in the last two years were burned out of

their houses, one in Storey County, one in East Fork in the Gardnerville-Minden area, and one in Las Vegas. A couple of firefighters died in the line of duty. Since our Association is not a wealthy organization, we were able to provide those affected with only \$1,000 each. We saw this as a means to change that and set up a 501(c)(3), a non-profit association.

I have given you a copy of the Articles of Incorporation ([Exhibit C](#)) we put together. It has been set up with the IRS and is registered with the Secretary of State's Office. As a means by which we could take care of our own members of the community, we felt we could use these funds, whether for difficulties with injuries or a good source for scholarships to firefighters' children or other children in the community. One idea we discussed is letting each one of our 16 locals pick a high school in their area and provide a scholarship to each one of those high schools. It has been discussed sponsoring children to the International Association of Firefighters Burn Camp in Los Angeles, or Muscular Dystrophy Association (MDA) Summer Camp in Lake Tahoe for the children with MD.

Our hope in putting forth this bill is to see if we could get a redesignation and have some control over where and how those funds are used. On the last page of the handout ([Exhibit C](#)) is an email from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) showing how much our plates have generated since their inception in 2001.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

It says here "It shall not directly pay any monies to any individuals as charity." What is that supposed to mean?

Vice Chair Manendo:

Where are you, Mr. Carpenter?

Assemblyman Carpenter:

On their Articles of Incorporation, Article II—Purpose.

Rusty McAllister:

My interpretation, and I am not a legal expert, is that we are not going to walk down and hand money to a homeless person in downtown Las Vegas as a charitable endeavor.

Assemblyman Hogan:

This is legal speak that is attempting to make the distinction between a direct transfer of cash to a beneficiary, such as providing money to a victim, as opposed to taking care of an expenditure, either in the form of a scholarship for

longer term studies or for medical expenses connected with burns. It is safer and unlikely to get into misappropriations of cash by taking care of the bill rather than handing out the money. If that is the case, it seems to be a sensible precaution.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

A further clarification, Mr. Carpenter, once the bill is passed, instead of going to the burn unit, the money will go to the Professional Fire Fighters Of Nevada Benevolent Association. Does that help Mr. Carpenter?

Assemblyman Carpenter:

I was wondering.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

I did not want to make it seem like it was not a charitable organization or was not going there and going to another one. I think that is where the distinction comes in.

Rusty McAllister:

Further back, there are provisions within the Articles of Incorporation for an annual audit—moneys coming in and moneys going out—so there is a record of expenditures and revenues generated. During this last interim, the Committee on Special License Plates came forth with new provisions for accounting standards, which we complied with to the best of our ability. We provided accounting for the revenue that was generated, even though it went straight to UMC.

Vice Chair Manendo:

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in favor of A.B. 264? Opposed? Neutral? [No response]. I will close the public hearing on this bill and bring it back to Committee. Is there a pleasure of the Committee?

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN MOVED TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 264.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED (ASSEMBLYWOMAN GERHARDT WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Assembly Bill 265: Authorizes the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles to enter into agreements for certain placements of advertisements. (BDR 43-1189)

Vice Chair Manendo:

We are going to open the public hearing on Assembly Bill 265.

Josh Griffin, representing the Motor Vehicle Network, Norwalk, CT:

We are in favor of A.B. 265. We would like to thank the Chairman of the Committee for sponsoring this bill. Jessica Young from our office will walk you through the bill. Also, Tom Jacobs from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is here, and Brad Savage from the Motor Vehicle Network (MVN), who flew in about two hours ago, will talk about the bill as well.

Jessica Young, representing Motor Vehicle Network, Norwalk, CT:

A.B. 265 would allow the DMV to enter into agreements with public or private entities for the placement of advertisements. These advertisements would be allowed in public areas of the DMV, in official mailings sent out, and on the DMV website. This bill allows for goods and services or money to be exchanged for these advertisements. If money is received from advertising companies, it will go directly into the motor vehicle fund and be transferred to a separate account to be used for public benefit and public use by the DMV. It would increase the efficiency of the DMV, as an example, using kiosks for faster processing for the public at the DMV. Here with us is Tom Jacobs, who would like to walk you through the portion that deals directly with the Department.

We brought an amendment ([Exhibit D](#)) after talking with some of the Committee members and others who had some issues with pop-ups on the website. We wanted to amend into the language that there would be no use of pop-ups on their website with these advertisements.

Vice Chair Manendo:

We see this amendment, thank you. It was a concern in the past. Is there anything that is going to be placed in the bill that would have any discussion about advertising alcohol, tobacco, or anything that might be deemed inappropriate?

Jessica Young:

I will defer that question to the DMV. That is part of their presentation and they wanted to touch on that issue.

Tom Jacobs, Public Information Officer, Department of Motor Vehicles:

[Read from prepared text ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Vice Chair Manendo:

Do you have anybody who is currently interested in advertising on your site, billboards, or inside?

Tom Jacobs:

We have been approached. There is no one in line right now, but in the past, we have been approached to enter into contracts with advertising. We are prohibited by law so we did not do it.

Vice Chair Manendo:

In the 1995 or 1997 Session, we had a bill dealing with advertising on school buses. We actually put in a laundry list of what not to advertise, such as drugs, alcohol, tobacco, anything deemed inappropriate. I do not see that in this bill. You want to leave it up to the Director. Why do you think that is the better route than actually putting in a laundry list of things in statute?

Tom Jacobs:

It is our intention to address that in regulations which goes through a Legislative process. It seemed more appropriate to deal with that in regulation.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I talked to a couple of people at the table when they brought the bill around. I will continue to be opposed to any type of advertising in an official document. I am afraid, and I voiced these same concerns last Session, you might have a title or registration in the envelope, and you said you already put mailers in the envelope, someone looks at it and thinks its junk mail from the DMV, throws it away. I do not think it is appropriate to put advertisements in an official letter from the State.

Vice Chair Manendo:

How many did you say you could put in, up to four?

Tom Jacobs:

That is right, Mr. Chair. At this particular point, there is room for only four inserts. We have one insert which explains where the registration dollars go, one explains the organ donor program, one explains the insurance verification program, and one is a subscription card for *Nevada Magazine* which is a symbiotic relationship we have had for five years. We put their card in our mailings and they put our ads promoting alternate services.

Vice Chair Manendo:

That would be in addition?

Tom Jacobs:

No sir, those are the four.

Vice Chair Manendo:

I know that, but in addition, you can do another four?

Tom Jacobs:

No. We could do only four and there are four. Inserts in our mailings are not an opportunity at this time.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I am afraid that at a point at which there are monetary gains, we will suddenly have three other pieces in there besides.... Again, it is my personal feeling this is an official document of the State of Nevada. I do not mind putting it on a wall or on the computer, but it is completely different when you start stuffing envelopes with propaganda that people have to receive.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

Mr. Goicoechea has expressed my feelings. We do not want to start getting junk mail from the Department. Sometimes they are not too well thought of anyway.

Vice Chair Manendo:

What Mr. Jacobs is saying we already have some stuff in there, and I guess some people might consider that junk mail. If you are a fan of *Nevada Magazine* as I am, you might not think so, but most may not deem that as informational and might consider that junk mail. The rule is always be conscious of what you get in your mail before you start recycling.

Assemblyman Goedhart:

To the DMV, what have you been told would be the approximate revenues? Have they given you any type of estimates as to what that could provide to your organization?

Tom Jacobs:

We have not done this before so we do not have any data. I have queried other states that take advertising. It is not as encouraging as you might imagine. California takes advertising in several of their venues. It generates approximately \$500,000 per year. That does not cover the cost of their printing. New York also takes advertising and generates about \$100,000 per year. They do not consider that a significant portion of their budget. Minnesota used to take advertising in their mailings, and a direct quote from them "it just did not work out." They are a customer of Motor Vehicle Network (MVN), and

MVN has spots or messages on their display boards. Minnesota participates in advertising on that level. We really do not know how successful something like this would be or if it is going to be successful.

Vice Chair Manendo:

Along those same lines, maybe I need to ask Ms. Young or Mr. Griffin.

Jessica Young:

Motor Vehicle Network has a presentation they would like to give. They have comparisons from other states on what they do and can give you a description on that.

Assemblyman Cobb:

I am not so much worried about advertisement inside the packages, and we discussed this the other day, as long as there is nothing on the outside to make it appear as a simple advertisement or junk mail. My concern is sending advertisements with official correspondence of the government. It could be misinterpreted as some type of program that is endorsed by the State of Nevada. Would it be acceptable to amend this language to require that any type of included advertisement clearly and conspicuously state at the top that it is a private advertisement and is not being endorsed by the State of Nevada?

Tom Jacobs:

It is our full intention to put a statement on every piece that says "the Nevada Department of Transportation does not endorse this product or service." That is what New York does. I suspect that every state that takes advertising does that.

Assemblyman Hogan:

From the discussion so far, I am getting the impression that the largest contribution to revenue would presumably be those things that could be enclosed with your mailings as opposed to things that are shown on electronic bulletin boards. Is there an approximation based on the other states as to which of these media and submedia represents the largest amount of potential income?

Tom Jacobs:

I do not have an answer. Knowing the vehicles that we have and how they are distributed, our website would be the best opportunity. We publish 100,000 *Drivers' Handbook* per year. It is a very vertical market in the sense that the only people who see that are teens getting ready to drive or people from out of state. Advertisers would be interested in talking to this group. Our mailings, all the way across the board, have no room at this time. Motor

Vehicle Network has reader boards in our offices. Nevada is the only state of the 14 states that are customers of MVN that pays for them because we do not have sponsor messages on our boards. We pay \$1,800 per month to have those boards in our metropolitan offices. Right now our website would be the best opportunity.

Vice Chair Manendo:

I was looking at the California website and saw a small handful of sponsor listings, four or five. It does not look like it is overwhelming, and it does not interfere with the visual aspects of the site.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

What kind of an arrangement do you have with *Nevada Magazine*? You still could continue that if this bill was not passed?

Tom Jacobs:

Yes, the arrangement we have with *Nevada Magazine* is they pay to have their subscription cards inserted in our mailings. It has been a successful program for them. It realizes 2,000 subscriptions a year for them. We continue this bargain because they run our ads to promote our website in their magazine. I have had discussions with the publisher of *Nevada Magazine*. Their interest is actually to act as our agent, as far as advertising is concerned, should this bill become a law. They already have a sales staff and a system in place, so the DMV would not have to go through the efforts. They would do the solicitation for us and we would handle the content.

Josh Griffin:

Would you like to hear from Brad from the Motor Vehicle Network, who is here?

Brad Savage, representing Motor Vehicle Network, Norwalk, CT:

We are a 20 year old company working exclusively with DMV offices. We started on the East Coast and have had a relationship with Nevada DMV for approximately six years. The handout ([Exhibit F](#)) shows what our technology does and the direction it has taken over the years. Every one of the 14 states that we are in uses sponsorship underwriting to fund a product. The product, the Motor Vehicle Network, is designed to entertain, inform, and educate the public while they wait in a DMV office. By information, we have a newsroom and create our own content that can be customized not only by the state but also by the individual office. All the DMV content is customized per individual office. Currently in Nevada, we are installed in the five largest Motor Vehicle offices. We are running news, information, and DMV information. As Tom mentioned, that service is on a rental basis. Noticing the value through other

states and conferences, there is a value placed on our service, which is the ability to enhance waiting time and reduce customer complaints.

In support of this bill, Nevada would be able to upgrade its technology to do things that the other states are currently doing: digital signage which includes the ability through high-speed communications to update amber alert information, homeland security information, NDOT information, whether it be traffic patterns or major accidents on the roadways, because we can integrate this through the Internet, and instantaneous communications to customers waiting in the DMV offices. There are many opportunities, and again, it can be customized for each individual state. The funding currently in place for our service is not adequate for the upgrade of the system.

Through sponsorship underwriting we would be able to keep the DMV offices up to speed and up to date. The key is we can completely upgrade technology to today's standards for communication in the DMV offices at no cost. We have been doing this since 1990 with various states, New York, Massachusetts, Arizona, and Wisconsin, to mention a few. They have been the pioneers. We have the game plan in place and have been very successful, and we want to bring Nevada up to speed with the rest of the states.

Assemblyman Claborn:

Mr. Jacobs stated there would be money made that would go back to the DMV? How much did you say they could possibly make as profit?

Tom Jacobs:

I mentioned a figure of \$1,800 a month, which is what we pay MVN services at this time. There is no agreement with MVN that we would share in advertising revenue or sponsor revenue.

Assemblyman Claborn:

It makes sense. It could pay for some of the money that we do not receive. It looks like a good set up.

Vice Chair Manendo:

While doing a search, I noticed that New York and California have exactly the same type of website, the same sponsors; is that your attempt to go into the same ...?

Brad Savage:

Neither my company nor I get involved with the website advertising. We specifically do digital signage inside the offices. I have known the various companies that work, and whether you have Internet-type or mail advertising,

different companies handle each aspect of the advertising. For example, the American Automobile Association (AAA) is a sponsor and will go on various states' websites that sign up. New York and California may be part of one company's organization, and an arrangement has been made with the sponsors ahead of time.

Assemblywoman Womack:

I am confused; you are talking about that news screen at the DMV which continually gives you the news and sports updates.

Brad Savage:

That is correct.

Assemblywoman Womack:

Would there be advertisements on that screen? Are there advertisements now?

Brad Savage:

There are no advertisements on the screens. Nevada is the only state without them. News and information and DMV information are the only things being displayed, which is at their discretion.

Assemblywoman Womack:

Would the advertisement that goes on the website be the same as what is on the screen, or not necessarily?

Brad Savage:

Not necessarily one and the same. They are two different types of mediums. What works for one medium may not work for another. Specifically, our arrangement when we set up our system in a state is to have messages that are a branded-type of information. There is never a hard sell. It would be like AAA, providing a member-type information.

Assemblywoman Womack:

Where is the revenue stream from the advertisements done on your screen?

Brad Savage:

That is put back into technology. There have been several attempts to share revenue with the state and all of them have failed. Because the technological system is a very expensive, the goal of MVN is not to see how much money we can make but to make the DMV more efficient and a more pleasurable environment.

Assemblywoman Womack:

These are two separate forms of advertising.

Brad Savage:

Exactly.

Assemblywoman Womack:

We would not have to see the continuous news and we could have a good commercial in between.

Brad Savage:

Exactly. Because of new drivers, new residences, and new car owners, we found the information that is being displayed, such as automotive tips, can be tied into it. It is more of an informative form of advertising.

Assemblywoman Womack:

It would all be generated through the advertising with no cost to the State?

Brad Savage:

That is correct.

Vice Chair Manendo:

Regarding the reader board, you mentioned Nevada is the only state that does not ... I missed that part.

Brad Savage:

Nevada is the only state to actually pay for our service in the offices now. All the other states have sponsors within the service.

Assemblyman Hogan:

I was going to offer a suggestion. Now that we have been given more time from the federal government to arrange for all the necessities for the REAL ID requirements, we might try to build up a revenue stream that would help us pay for it. It is an encouraging aspect.

Vice Chair Manendo:

Looking at Nevada's website, it is pretty full right now. Where are you going to put advertisement on it? You have a really good setup, and I would hate to lose any information. As a big advocate of advertising, I certainly see the benefit of partnering with our business community. I do not want to lose what we have. Could you comment on this?

Tom Jacobs:

One of the advantages of the web is that page you are looking at can be as long as it wants to be. It is full when you look at the screen, but we can add things to the bottom. I admit it takes away from the value of being on the website, because you have to work a little to find it, but we could make that page longer.

Vice Chair Manendo:

Scroll down to the bottom where the phone numbers are, which is what people are looking for.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

With all due respect to my professional colleagues in web design for the State of Nevada, to be able to pay for the technology from revenues for the screen service, if you were to do web advertising, you could also spend that money on some usability design exercises and on efforts to clean that up. I say that as a fan of the DMV website because I use it a lot. Making it go longer is not necessarily the answer.

Vice Chair Manendo:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 265 and bring it back to Committee with the one amendment. I will open Assembly Joint Resolution 6.

Assembly Joint Resolution 6: Urges Congress to repeal the REAL ID Act of 2005. (BDR R-1393)

Assemblyman Atkinson:

I have asked the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to come up to the table. This is Assembly Joint Resolution 6 which is something I put in, asking Congress to repeal the REAL ID Act of 2005. The whole Committee knows the challenges this State faces with the REAL ID Act and how it is forced upon our State at this point. The DMV has given a presentation or two in front of the Assembly Ways and Means Committee explaining their concerns with the Act as well. The entire Assembly has signed onto A.J.R. 6. Some Senators have expressed their support as well, and we will be amending the bill—adding their names to it.

Our State will have ramifications dealing with this, not only by DMV, but also other agencies, such as the Social Security office, and health districts. The DMV's slogan, which for years has been "a click away from being the first in line," will go away with the REAL ID Act because every person will have to appear in the DMV office personally. They will have to have a birth certificate and Social Security Card. I hear from citizens who are trying to obtain those

documents, but don't know where they are located. In southern Nevada it is estimated that 70 percent of the residents came from other locations. They are going to have to send for these documents, burdening everyone. There have been several other states, which have been in session a little longer than we have this Session, that are asking Congress to repeal the Act. Maine has taken the strongest position saying they were not doing it at all. This resolution is our plea. I asked Ginny Lewis, Director of DMV, to tell us the impact it will have on her department.

Ginny Lewis, Director, Department of Motor Vehicles:

I have not brought REAL ID to the Transportation Committees up to this point. It has been limited to the money committees. We presented the Governor's budget request, about \$30 million for this upcoming biennium and another \$34 million for the following biennium to implement REAL ID. When we submitted this budget it was based on an Act that was passed by Congress and was a response to the war on terror. It was buried in the Appropriations Act for the war, tsunami relief, and for terrorism, as a whole. Unfortunately, REAL ID never received a hearing in Congress. When we prepared the budget, it was with the best information we had from the Act, but it lacked any rule making from the federal government. It was based on the conversations we had with Homeland Security and assumptions we had made. When I say "we" I am referring to all the jurisdictions in the country.

We are part of an association called American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA), working with the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) and the National Governors Association (NGA) as a coalition to try to bring forward our concerns to Homeland Security. Our message to Homeland Security was that we understand the intent, and the intent is to standardize the licensing process in the country and to improve the integrity of the process. I agree with that intent. There are states that have restrictions and requirements that are lower than Nevada's. All states have different processes for identification. I agree with the intent of insuring that everyone follows the same rules around the country. Insuring that the process has the utmost integrity is very important as well. What the federal government was not listening to was the impact on the states.

We—Legislators, Governors, and DMVs—are concerned with customer service and finding efficient ways to deal with public wait times, which are the things your constituents complain about. We said to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) we need money, time, and flexibility. We are currently in a public comment period which will end on May 8, 2007. When DHS released the draft rules on March 1, two things came out that day; they said we will give you an extension, and we will give you money, which the states had said they

needed. Unfortunately, the extension they offered does not allow for an extension at the end. While we may delay implementing REAL ID until December 31, 2009, they did not give us the ability to extend the final enrollment, which is May 2013. The longer you take advantage of an extension, the more compressed your "chaos" is in the offices.

The other issue was the funding. The federal government said states may use up to 20% of their portion of the Homeland Security grant money. Unfortunately, that money is already committed for other projects. While it is the priority of this Governor that those moneys go for REAL ID, I have worked with the Division of Emergency Management, and we are looking at a cost of approximately \$1 million. In the scheme of things in a \$30 million budget for the upcoming biennium, while going after \$1 million is the right thing to do, it is certainly not going to fix the funding issue.

We have decided to take advantage of the extension a little bit. We are proposing to implement REAL ID in October 2008. The main reason, as the budget reflects, is that we have requested 147 new employees to expand the hours in our metropolitan offices. The only way we are going to accommodate having everyone come back into our offices to receive a REAL ID compliant card and minimize the impact of those who are there for registration, is to expand those hours. Our budget request, which includes Carson City, is to go to 12-hour days. Hiring and training 147 employees is a monumental task. We are proposing to start hiring in August 2007. All of our new hires will go through an eight-to-ten-week new hire academy. We will phase in that staff for a one-year period until we implement it in 2008. This is huge for this State and I hope that Homeland Security listens to some of the comments we are making. Maybe some changes will come about before these final rules are adopted. I am flying to Los Angeles on Friday to meet with Homeland Security as well as the other western states to start going through these draft rules and to see if DHS will be more flexible.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

You mentioned the varying levels of integrity the different states have in their IDs, realizing the rule making is ongoing. For the issue, generally, it will help us understand: what are the levels of integrity and the components of integrity of the REAL ID Act that is being proposed? How does that square with what we have in Nevada and maybe what other states have? Specifically, what are the challenges with the ID that have to be dealt with under this Act?

Ginny Lewis:

To give you an example, a few years ago we had two neighboring states that had less strict requirements for driver's license. They did not impose the same

requirements to prove identity. Unfortunately, there were groups of illegal immigrants who were bused to those states, obtained driver's licenses and came back to Nevada. At that time, Nevada's law required that we would take another state's driver's license at face value and turn around and issue one without requiring any more proof of identity. We saw that hole. When we realized that loophole, we changed the law and said we would no longer accept.... What you have around the states are different levels of ID requirements. That is one area the federal government is trying to standardize.

The other is to make the best attempt to insure the document is as secure and tamperproof as possible by imposing different levels of security features on the card and minimizing counterfeit, fraud, et cetera. The draft rules lay out all the required security features that every state must adhere to for their card to be REAL ID compliant.

Assemblywoman Womack:

I do not understand why there was no grandfathering in of those who were already licensees.

Ginny Lewis:

We have had a lot of discussion with Homeland Security. In order to minimize the impact to all holders of driver's licenses or ID cards in this country, we are trying to find ways and offering recommendations, such as if someone has been established in the system for 10 or 15 years, we could grandfather him into the system. The flexibility we are seeing in the draft rules is that DHS recognizes that those individuals born prior to January 1, 1935, probably do not have birth certificates. Their comments are that these individuals should not be precluded from obtaining a REAL ID card. They are offering the states to establish a pre-approved exception process for those individuals. We had hoped as far as grandfathering is concerned, they would give us some more flexibility, and we could reduce the number of people who have to come back into the office to be reenrolled into the system. It is very frustrating to all of us that DHS is inflexible.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

The comments about the impact to seniors have been on the top of my list as I look at this issue. I have heard from seniors in my district who are now realizing this is coming and that is exactly their concern. They do not have birth certificates readily accessible to them.

Assemblywoman Womack:

I can see what a mess this is going to be for an individual who cannot get a driver's license and now he is driving without proper identification. Are those problems being addressed?

Ginny Lewis:

Yes, they are. Homeland Security recognizes that there are individuals who cannot meet the requirements and therefore, cannot get a REAL ID compliant card. They are saying the states can issue a non-compliant card if a person cannot meet the requirements. It must have a different header bar and clearly state that it must not be used for official purposes, meaning the federal government would not accept it as a formal piece of identification, specifically for boarding a commercial airline. They are making those provisions.

One of the pieces I am seeking clarification on is how far do you go? An example I gave to the budget subcommittee this morning was you can use a passport as a formal identification to board a commercial airline. I have a passport, probably most people in this room have one. If that is the case, why would I or anyone want to go through the hassle of getting a REAL ID compliant card? I am not sure if that was the intent of Homeland Security. When I see them on Friday, I will ask them. Millions of people in this country have passports. If that is the solution, then a lot of us do not have to go through proving who we are and bringing in our identity documents. I believe that is not their intent. They have left themselves wide open because the rules state that the federal government can accept only a REAL ID compliant card for commercial airlines, entering a federal building, or entering a nuclear power plant. They also go on to say that at anytime they can expand those requirements.

Assemblywoman Womack:

If you have a passport does that preclude you from having to prove identity for an identification card? You do that when you get a passport.

Ginny Lewis:

It is a circular argument here. We can accept a passport as a form of identification to get on an airplane, so why get a REAL ID compliant card?

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Eagle Forum:

We are very happy to be here supporting this bill today. We have been concerned about this issue for several years. We opposed it when it was being discussed in Congress. Nevada Eagle Forum helped to sponsor A.J.R. No. 9 of the 71st Legislative Session ([Exhibit G](#)) which was a resolution to protect privacy. Many of our concerns have continued since. I am the National Privacy

Chairman for the National Eagle Forum. We agree with this and encourage you in your efforts.

We are concerned about the unfunded mandate, cost, and implementation problem, but we have greater concerns than those. We support the bill without the amendment we have, but we brought this forward because we have concerns that go beyond the very large logistical problems identified by the DMV. In the Resolution on page 2, line 17, it says ..."The State of Nevada is also committed to compliance with the REAL ID Act should appropriate rules be adopted and federal funding be provided for implementation...." We do not support REAL ID whether federal funding is available or not. We hope this section that says "...appropriate rules be adopted..." would be rules that would protect the privacy and the concerns of liberty-loving Americans.

In the article that was in the *Las Vegas Review Journal* ([Exhibit G](#)) there is a quote from Missouri State Representative James Guest, one of the pioneers who started this protest nationally. He said, "This is almost a frontal assault on the freedoms of America when they require us to carry a national ID to monitor where we are."

We were very involved in opposing the Patriot Act, and we prepared these bumper stickers in opposition to that [held one up to show]. We feel the same way about this REAL ID, one nation under surveillance as Representative Guest had mentioned.

In another article I gave you from *The Tennessean* ([Exhibit G](#)), it identified all the problems you already heard from the DMV. However, the real nightmare stated is:

...of REAL ID is the law's assault on our privacy rights. The law mandates a central, interlinked database containing a wealth of personal information, including name, address, date of birth, biometric information...

That is one reason the government does not accept the State's card: because they do not necessarily have biometric information. The article continues to say:

...and an assigned identification number. Over time the database will inevitably become the repository for more and more of citizens' personal data and will be used for an ever-wider set of purposes, moving us closer to a surveillance society....

You heard the representative from the DMV talk about what you would not be able to do if you do not have one of these, including boarding an airplane, collecting social security, opening a bank account, and I suspect it will be expanded to even being able to have a job. It is a very serious issue that we face with REAL ID.

Do you have a copy of the amendment? The reason I bring this forward is to bring our concerns about this privacy issue which is not mentioned in your excellent Resolution. [Read amendment ([Exhibit H](#)).] We would like to see these issues added because we feel the bottom line issue is privacy. If you notice in the information I gave you there is an article from *Human Events* ([Exhibit G](#)) showing you how this REAL ID is planned to be expanded into a "Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative" (WHTI) card or a passport card. You can use your passport now, perhaps later they will say you cannot, and you will have to have this passport card. As stated in an article about The North American Union in *Nevada Families Eagle Forum* ([Exhibit G](#)), there is information available on the Internet. The WHTI card is planned to be in place by 2010. It is the integration of Canada, the United States, and Mexico. The government website you can go to is spp.gov. The Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (SPP) are working right now outside of Congress to harmonize our laws. I spent a week in Washington, D.C., in November attending a conference on this and meeting with our Congressional delegation, and they are aware of the North American Union. There is a resolution in Congress opposing it. There is a connection between this national ID card or REAL ID and the North American Union.

I draw your attention to the *U.S. Constitution*, Amendment 10, which says "...the powers not delegated to the United States by the *Constitution*, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." You have the power to reject the mandate of REAL ID under the *United States Constitution*. You do not have to accept it, or pass a resolution. Do not impose this on us. You can refuse to comply if you choose.

In the *Nevada Constitution*, we have reiterated in Article 1, Section 18, the same guarantees for the right to privacy as in the Federal *Constitution* where it says ...

the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable seizures and searches shall not be violated; and no warrant shall issue, but upon probable cause supported by Oath or Affirmation, particularly describing the place or places to be searched, and the person or persons, and thing or things to be seized.

What we have in REAL ID is a power grab by the federal government to seize our personal information, to put it into a Federal database which will be subject to possible identity theft, and certainly to abuse. We compliment and encourage you in your effort to oppose REAL ID and to take a greater stand than is identified in this particular Resolution. You are our last resort. We come to you as our representatives in this State to take a stand for liberty and for defending our privacy to protect us from identity theft, which Eagle Forum has testified on, in nearly every bill in this Legislature supporting the protection of our personal information from identity theft by whomever it was brought forward.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

Ms. Hansen, I am trying to look at your amendment and look at the section in which you think we need to take stronger language. That is on page 2, lines 17 through 20, is that correct?

Janine Hansen:

That is correct.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

In talking to some of our federal delegation and to some of our own caucus members, our feeling was that if we took a stance that strong, like Maine, which is what you are saying we can do, and we are aware that we can, in doing so, when the federal government tells us in 2008 that they are going to implement it, we have an ongoing fear that when they hand out money, we will not get any. That is why your amendment is a bit strong for us. We need to be careful at the same time of showing our opposition.

Janine Hansen:

I completely appreciate what you are saying. Your concern about money does not override my concern about liberty and privacy. I support your bill as it is, but I think these issues need to be on the record, and be aware that whatever the circumstances when the government mandates this, ...

Assemblyman Atkinson:

I do not want to debate this, I just wanted to explain to you why we did the language we did.

Lynn Chapman, Executive Board Member, Independent American Party of Nevada:

We too support your bill. We have that problem with that section. I have a handout ([Exhibit I](#)) from www.unrealid.com out of Alaska. They had an article dated January 11, 2007, which is about the Homeland Security plans to

outsource the REAL ID implementation to third-party data aggregators. We are concerned about that because it is our privacy going to private businesses that can do whatever they want with our personal information. On Plan C it talks about having a private data aggregator act as a central database. This is the plan advocated by DHS. It calls for an outsourcing of all drivers' licenses and ID card checks to a private corporation, who would then charge states for each check performed. The citizens of every state will not only have to be at the mercy of these companies, but also they will have to approve their identity which is scary. It will not protect our privacy whatsoever. The federal government can then gain access information without having to comply with any law, such as the Privacy Act. The other handout is rather interesting ([Exhibit J](#)). One of the questions on page 3 is:

Will the DMV share this information? Yes, in exchange for federal cash, states must agree to link up their databases. Specifically, the REAL ID Act says it hopes to "provide electronic access by a state to information contained in the motor vehicle databases of all other states."

Question, "Is this a national ID card?" The answer is "It depends on whom you ask. Barry Steinhardt, director of the American Civil Liberties Union's technology and liberty program, says: 'It's going to result in everyone, from the 7-Eleven store to the bank and airlines, demanding to see the ID card. They're going to scan it in. They're going to have all the data on it...It's going to be not just a national ID card but a national database.'" He also predicts the federalized IDs will be a gold mine for government agencies and marketers. There are our concerns.

Marritt Yochum, representing Nevada Committee for Full Statehood:

Our philosophy is that Nevada is not a territory, Nevada is a sovereign state, and therefore, Nevada is not obliged to comply with any unconstitutional mandate from the federal government. That is why I am here. This is not about security, it is about tyranny of the worst kind.

Joseph Turco, American Civil Liberties Union, (ACLU) of Nevada:

Civil rights is defined as positive acts of government bestowing on citizens' rights, like the right to vote, or freedom from discrimination. Civil liberties are the negative restraints placed upon government, like the Bill of Rights, or Nevada's Declaration of Rights. Forty-two of you, in a bipartisan way, have done a very important thing today. Libertarians come in all stripes and degrees of the political spectrum; we hope the libertarianism of the views on this bill

played a roll in 42 members signing on to this. Many of you have dealt with the hassle, money, and the rest.

When that funding comes, we are coming back and we are going to insist that we opt out. The privacy issue is far more important than the delay and hassle. You have heard of some, the corporations having their hand in this. Who is going to be in charge of this national database, with the ever-increasing personal information of American citizens? Nobody can guarantee the security of that information. If anyone says you are being an alarmist, just look at what has happened in the last ten days with the Patriot Act. Despite promises that the Patriot Act would not be abused, some of the worst abuses are occurring right here in Nevada regarding information of guests in our leading industry in the casinos, restaurants, and the hotels. The government has repeatedly lied to us. When we get to the point where the funding materializes, the issue does not go away. I urge you to start thinking about it if you have not started already. A task force was formed at the ACLU; the website is realnightmare.org and it is a very straight-forward intelligent analysis being done.

Vice Chair Manendo:

Is there anyone else wanting to speak on A.J.R. 6? Seeing none, I will close the hearing and bring it back to Committee. I will take a motion on the bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 6.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GERHARDT SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

We need to open the record back up on Assembly Bill 264 and show Ms. Gerhardt voting in the affirmative.

Vice Chair Manendo:

Please, Committee, turn to the work session. Chairman Atkinson will now take over.

Chair Atkinson:

We are going to have our research analyst, Marji, walk us through the documents at this time.

Assembly Bill 29: Adds certain vehicles of the Division of Parole and Probation of the Department of Public Safety to the authorized emergency vehicles list. (BDR 43-557)

Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:

First bill in your work session document is Assembly Bill 29 ([Exhibit K](#)). This would add vehicles owned and operated by the Division of Parole and Probation of the Department of Public Safety (DPS) to the list of authorized emergency vehicles. As you recall, the bill was heard back in February and there are four proposed amendments. The first amendment would add vehicles owned or operated by the DMV that are used primarily in enforcement actions of the control of emissions from vehicles and matters related to the use of special fuel.

The second proposed amendment is by the DPS and would add to that list vehicles owned or operated by the Investigation Division of DPS. The third proposed amendment is from the Department of Wildlife (NDOW) and would add another to the list of authorized emergency vehicles which would be those vehicles owned or operated by the Division of Law Enforcement of NDOW.

The fourth proposed amendment is from the State Department of Agriculture. They also would like the vehicles owned or operated by the Department of Agriculture that are used by Agriculture Law Enforcement Officers or Brand Inspectors II to be included.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

The Department of Agriculture was going to propose a bill defining Agriculture Law Enforcement Officers and Brand Inspectors II and then it was withdrawn. Is that designation presently in statute?

Marjorie Paslov Thomas:

Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 29.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Carpenter will you handle this on the floor?

Assemblyman Carpenter:

Yes.

Assembly Bill 57: Revises provisions governing crosswalks. (BDR 43-896)

Marjorie Paslov Thomas:

Assembly Bill 57 ([Exhibit L](#)) is sponsored by Assemblyman Manendo. It was heard in February. This bill would prohibit vehicles from stopping, standing, or parking within 20 feet of a crosswalk, regardless of location. There are no proposed amendments.

Assemblyman Manendo:

I appreciate Marji working with me on this bill. We have been going back and forth on the language. If you look on page 2, line 3, we are striking out "on a crosswalk." I have had discussions with Look Out Kids About and they are concerned about taking out that language. I received an email from Margie Saunders who is part of our working group. She mentioned that we have crosswalks in southern Nevada that are large enough for a vehicle to fit right on it, and there are cars that are using it as a red carpet by pulling up and letting their kids out right on the crosswalk. She was concerned that by deleting that language we could have legal concerns later on.

To cover our bases: if I were to make a motion, it would be to amend and do pass and put back in "on a crosswalk" just to be safe. That would hold it up because of the amendments, but I would rather be safe than sorry just to alleviate any concerns or discrepancies later.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Are you saying delete "within the 20 feet?"

Assemblyman Manendo:

No, we would keep "within 20 feet" but not allow parking on a crosswalk or within the 20 feet of a crosswalk.

Assemblyman Goedhart:

You say parking on or within 20 feet?

Assemblyman Manendo:

Parking on or within 20 feet. They are concerned about within 20 feet, which is why we brought forth the bill. But if we strike "on a crosswalk," some could say that because it is not in statute, it is legal to park on a crosswalk.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 57 CHANGING THE LANGUAGE FROM "ON OR
WITHIN 20 FEET OF A CROSSWALK."

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GERHARDT SECONDED THE MOTIONED.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assembly Bill 64: Makes various changes concerning the enforcement of a court order to complete certain training when a defendant failed to properly secure a child in a child restraint system in a vehicle. (BDR 43-268)

Marjorie Paslov Thomas:

The next bill is Assembly Bill 64 ([Exhibit M](#)). This was sponsored by the Committee on behalf of the Nevada Judges Association. The bill is introduced with revised procedures so that the person or agency which conducts a program of training in the installation and use of child restraint seats is required to provide the defendant with a certificate of completion. The defendant is then required to submit the certificate to the court. Failure to complete the training or submit the certificate results in the suspension of the driver's license until the person provides the DMV with a copy of the certificate of completion. There is a proposed amendment. It is by Judge Steven Dahl with the Nevada Judges Association. For your reference there is a mock-up behind the first couple of sheets showing what is being deleted. Behind that is the proposed language to be added to the subsection under Number 2. [Read from prepared text ([Exhibit M](#)).]

Chair Atkinson:

The Committee will remember there was quite a bit of testimony on this, and we brought it back twice. We worked with Judge Dahl and fixed the Committee's concern and the concerns of others. It is moving us in the right direction although some may think it is not strong enough.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Is there a statute of limitations that kicks in? It would be terrible if you got a couple of them and you got third one. In seven years does the statute kick in?

Marjorie Paslov Thomas:

I would have to look into that. I will have to ask our legal counsel to get back to me.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

If I remember correctly, the person from DPS said the people who were inspecting the devices and teaching the parents how to put them in right had to have 40 hours before they got their certificates. It seems to me that is a long time. I would think the NHP or a fireman within a few minutes would be able to learn how to put seats in the correct way. I agree with you if there is one thing that teaches kids to use seat belts it is these child seats. There ought to be some way that the parents could go down to the fire department or NHP and they could teach them how to put these seats in correctly in a few minutes, not 40 hours that it takes to get a certificate.

Chair Atkinson:

So you do not think they have to do 40 hours of on-hand training?

Assemblyman Carpenter:

That is the way I see it. Here are people who work with these kinds of apparatuses all of the time, NHP and firemen. My son showed me how to put one of these in my car.

Chair Atkinson:

I will have Marji address that, but I do not think the 40 hours was classroom time. I believe it was for the individuals who would be doing the certification. Marji said it was on the record for traffic safety not for....

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Maybe there is a possibility of certifying some DPS or NHP personnel in the rural communities where it is not readily available. We definitely have NHP and they can take care of these. It is better to have the training than hand out the fines.

Marjorie Paslov Thomas:

Sharon Wilkinson, Committee Legal Counsel, provided the answer to Mr. Goicoechea's question to me about the statute of limitations. Under NRS 171.090, there is a one year statute of limitation for misdemeanors, which this would be.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
WITH THE FOUR AMENDMENTS ASSEMBLY BILL 64.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assembly Bill 71: Makes various changes to procedures when a vehicle is involved in a traffic accident. (BDR 43-747)

Marjorie Paslov Thomas:

The next bill, Assembly Bill 71 ([Exhibit N](#)), was sponsored by the Committee on Transportation and heard in February. As introduced it would require a driver of a motor vehicle involved in a traffic accident that results in only property damage, to stop his vehicle at the scene of the accident and move his vehicle or cause the vehicle to be moved as soon as reasonably practical, if the vehicle is obstructing traffic and can be moved safely. The measure provides that a person who moves or causes his vehicle to be moved is not required to file a report with the police or the DMV. There was one proposed amendment that came out of the working group, which was created by the Chairman and consisted of Assemblywoman Gerhardt, Assemblyman Bobzien, and Assemblyman Goicoechea. It was to amend the bill by deleting on page 2, subsection 2 of Section 1, the provision that a driver who moves or causes his vehicle to be moved is not required to file a report with the police or the DMV.

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:

Marji covered it all. We made an attempt to check with the sponsor and also former Speaker Perkins, who originated the bill. This was also the direction they were headed.

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 71.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GERHARDT SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Atkinson:

Ms. Gerhardt has volunteered to do A.B. 71 on the floor. Mr. Manendo has volunteered to introduce A.B. 64 and A.B. 57 on the floor.

Assembly Bill 118: Requires the Department of Transportation and local governments to designate specific lanes on certain highways on which certain larger vehicles must travel. (BDR 43-762)

Marjorie Paslov Thomas:

The final bill today is Assembly Bill 118 sponsored by Assemblymen Denis, Conklin and Hardy, and Senators Beers, et al. It was heard in February. As introduced it would require NDOT and the governing body of a local government

to designate specific lanes on highways within their jurisdiction that have three or more lanes for traffic traveling in one direction upon which vehicles with a declared gross weight in excess of 26,000 pounds must travel. As it was introduced there was a fiscal impact on local governments and an effect on the State. There are three proposed amendments, and it said they were by Assemblyman Denis. However, I would like to correct that for the record, the amendment was proposed by NDOT. [Read from prepared text ([Exhibit O](#)).]

ASSEMBLYMAN GOEDHART MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS.

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Cobb:

With these new amendments, tell us what the bill now accomplishes.

Marjorie Paslov Thomas:

For each controlled access facility, which is a highway within its jurisdiction that has three or more lanes of traffic (mostly the interstates in southern Nevada or in Washoe County), the bill would allow NDOT to put up advisory signs stating which lanes the motor carriers should travel on. The signs are advisory, so if the motor carriers should get stopped, they would not be cited, as it is just a recommendation.

Assemblyman Cobb:

If it is completely permissive within the local entities, then there is no fiscal impact unless they wish to do so, correct?

Marjorie Paslov Thomas:

If the Committee decides to amend and do pass, I believe it would take away the fiscal impact on the local governments.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assembly Bill 265: Authorizes the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles to enter into agreements for certain placements of advertisements. (BDR 43-1189)

Chair Atkinson:

We have one more bill that we did not vote on today, Assembly Bill 265, which was the advertising in the DMV. We are going to vote on that today.

Assemblyman Manendo:

We need to make sure we do not have inappropriate material. We did a laundry list of those issues to alleviate some of the public's concerns in past sessions, and that particular bill did not pass. We did not have the public's concerns today. I am sure there are other members who have the same concerns. I will support the bill as is instead of making a laundry list, but I want this to be very clear: If I hear one thing from the public or see anything, where there is absolutely no question of having any inappropriate material advertising, I will come back with a bill to create a laundry list to fix it. I feel the Director will do a good job and make sure none of that happens.

ASSEMBLYMAN CLABORN MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 265.

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:

I would like to second Mr. Manendo's concerns. I was here last session and was concerned about the same things, that we would have some type of inappropriate advertising. We have families that spend a lot of time at the DMV and would not want to see anything inappropriate on those walls.

Chair Atkinson:

I agree with you Ms. Gerhardt. All of us here as well as the DMV know what is appropriate to be advertised. If that is being violated we as a Committee will certainly take action.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I support two portions of the bill; I still continue to have heartburn with the fact that official mailings will have advertising in them. I will be opposing the bill.

Chair Atkinson:

There was an amendment presented for Section 1 which will make sure there are no pop ups on the DMV site.

Assemblyman Claborn:

I have to agree with Mr. Manendo; I do not think anyone wants inappropriate language on any sign for children to see.

ASSEMBLYMAN CLABORN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 265.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman Manendo:

Looking through some notes from last session, I see that some of the things we had concerns with were things that promoted hostility, disorder, violence, attacked ethical, racial, or religious groups, invaded the rights of others, inhibited the functioning of the State, overrode the State's identity, promoted the use of controlled substances, dangerous drugs, intoxicating liquor, tobacco, or firearms, promoted any religious organizations, contained political advertising, promoted entertainment deemed inappropriate or improper.

Assemblywoman Gerhardt:

I just wanted to be sure it was in the official record today so we have no confusion over the intent.

Chair Atkinson:

I do not think Ms. Young or the DMV will have an issue with those. Although they are not going to be in the bill, we wanted to go on record clarifying that.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

If we place advertisements in their official mailings the Department sends out, we are going to get some criticism on it. If we are going to vote on the bill with that in there, I am going to vote no.

Chair Atkinson:

Mr. Carpenter, they already put advertising in their mailings when they send them.

THE MOTION PASSED (ASSEMBLYMEN CARPENTER AND
GOICOECHEA VOTING NO).

That concludes our work session this afternoon. Meeting adjourned.
[3:38 p.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Christine Henricksen
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Kelvin Atkinson, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Transportation

Date: March 20, 2007

Time of Meeting: 1:35 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 264	C	Rusty McAllister, President, Professional FireFighters Association	Articles of Incorporation and email from DMV
A.B. 265	D	Jessica Young, representing Motor Vehicle Network	Amendment
A.B. 265	E	Tom Jacobs, Public Information Officer, Department of Motor Vehicles	Prepared Written Text
A.B. 265	F	Brad Savage, Motor Vehicle Network	Presentation
A.J.R. 6	G	Janine Hansen, Nevada Eagle Forum	<u>A.J.R. 9 of 71st Legislative Session</u> , article in <i>Las Vegas Review Journal</i> , article in <i>The Tennessean</i> , article in <i>Human Events</i> , article in <i>Nevada Families Eagle Forum</i>
A.J.R. 6	H	Janine Hansen, Nevada Eagle Forum	Amendment
A.J.R. 6	I	Lynn Chapman, representing Independent American Party of Nevada	Article from www.unrealid.com
A.J.R. 6	J	Lynn Chapman, representing Independent American Party of Nevada	Questions and answers from CNET News.com
A.B. 29	K	Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Analyst	Work session document
A.B. 57	L	Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Analyst	Work session document
A.B. 64	M	Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Analyst	Work session document
A.B. 71	N	Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Analyst	Work session document
A.B. 118	O	Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Analyst	Work session document