

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

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

The Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chair Marilyn Dondero Loop at 3:18 p.m. on Thursday, March 10, 2011, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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/76th2011/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:

Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair
Assemblyman Jason Frierson, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Kelvin Atkinson
Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson
Assemblyman Steven Brooks
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblyman Joseph M. Hogan
Assemblyman Randy Kirner
Assemblywoman Dina Neal
Assemblyman Mark Sherwood
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Scott Hammond (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst
Darcy Johnson, Committee Counsel
Jordan Neubauer, Committee Secretary
Sally Stoner, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ed Wilson, Customer Services Coordinator, Communications Division,
Nevada Department of Transportation
Bryan McDaniel, General Manager, Nevada Logos, Inc.
Paul J. Enos, representing Nevada Motor Transport Association
Wayne Seidel, Administrator, Motor Carrier Division, Department of Motor
Vehicles
Jeff Richter, Administrative Services Officer II, Records Management and
Over Dimensional Vehicle Permits, Administrative Services Division,
Nevada Department of Transportation
Peter Krueger, representing Nevada Petroleum Marketers and
Convenience Store Association

Chair Dondero Loop:

[Roll was called. Rules and protocol were stated.] We will hear two bills today,
Assembly Bill 53 and Assembly Bill 232. I will now open the hearing on
Assembly Bill 53.

Assembly Bill 53: Revises provisions governing informational signage and other
programs to provide information concerning commercial attractions and
services along highways. (BDR 35-482)

**Ed Wilson, Customer Services Coordinator, Communications Division, Nevada
Department of Transportation:**

I am here to speak to you on Assembly Bill 53. With me today is
Bryan McDaniel, the General Manager of Nevada Logos, Inc. They are the
contractor for the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). I will explain
the policy of the bill, and if there are any questions at the end of my
presentation, we will be more than happy to answer them.

Assembly Bill 53 is a housekeeping bill. It has no fiscal impact, it does not have any cost to the customers, and it does not raise any expenditures. It enables us to use revenue from logo signs. We share statewide revenue from the logo signs with the contractor. The revenue that we share, which is about \$250,000 a year, goes to support our "511 Road Conditions" reporting system on our NDOT website. Of this revenue, \$10,000 a year goes to support the cost of providing internet connectivity at our state welcome centers and secure highway rest areas.

I presume the Committee has copies of my prepared remarks ([Exhibit C](#)), so I am going to get right to the heart of the issue. In 1985, the Legislature enacted *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 408.567, which created the Account for Systems of Providing Information to the Traveling Public. One of the elements of that account was the logo sign program. The intent of the Legislature was to set up a system where people coming into the state could have connectivity to hotels, resorts, et cetera. Another element of that legislation was to authorize the creation of the state welcome centers; we created four. In fact, the last state welcome center was opened in West Wendover in 2001. The other three are in Boulder City, Mesquite, and Primm.

From 1985 to 1992, the NDOT staff did their best to create a viable logo sign program. We failed miserably. State government is not suited to this kind of work. In 1992, NDOT decided to put out a request for proposals seeking a contractor to manage the program in a business-like manner. They awarded the agreement to a company called Logo Signs of America, Inc. They had the program from 1992 until 1996. The program grew, but it was slow and disorganized. In 1996, a company called Interstate Logos, L.L.C. bought the contract from Logo Signs of America, Inc. with our permission. Since 1996, it has become a very viable program and it is mature. It is mature to the extent that statewide, logo signs are all over our interstates and highways. We are now in the process of expanding because we have an expanding market. We have the Carson City Freeway and Interstate 215, which is across the southern end of the Las Vegas valley from Henderson to Interstate 15. There are a lot of signs to be built.

We recently amended the agreement with Interstate Logos, L.L.C. Currently, we are receiving \$160,000 a year. Starting next year, it will raise to \$250,000 a year guaranteed, or 20 percent of the statewide gross income from logo signs. That is what A.B. 53 is adjusting. In 1991, the Legislature authorized us to charge logo sign lease fees, which were based on a market value. Logo signs in Clark and Washoe Counties bring in more revenue than logo signs in rural counties. Rural counties are charged \$1,000 a year for each logo sign.

In Clark County and the urban areas of Clark County, they are charged \$2,400 a year. When we set out to do this, we did a complete and thorough market survey. Every single eligible business was contacted. The fee level of \$2,400 a year was acceptable. Compared to billboards and outdoor advertising, it is incredibly cheap.

The definition of market value is what a willing buyer is willing to pay a willing seller. We have an occupancy rate that is almost 100 percent. We have very few vacancies. We have a backlog of people waiting for a vacancy to use interchange signs. The bottom line is there is no friction from the market. That concludes my remarks; we would be happy to answer any questions you have at this time.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. I have a question. Nevada Logos, Inc. is a private company. Are other companies able to bid on the proposal?

Ed Wilson:

Absolutely, I would like to call your attention to [Exhibit C](#), page 4, titled "Authority Governing Various Aspects of the LOGO Sign Program." This is not a mom-and-pop type operation. The regular "Joe and Mary's Sign Shop" in Henderson could not handle this. The program is governed by federal law, state law, and the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*. It is a complex program and is heavily regulated. The sign structures have to be installed in certain ways to meet certain criteria, such as being able to withstand 120 mile per hour winds. Not everybody can do this. Interstate Logos, L.L.C. handles logo signing for 21 states, 5 turnpike authorities, 1 Canadian province, and a few other states with tourist-oriented directional sign programs. They are experienced at doing this; they know how to build good sign structures. They make signs that can withstand 120 mile per hour winds, tornados, hurricanes, heavy snow, et cetera. What I am saying is this is not the kind of thing FASTSIGNS could handle. There is significant liability involved. Working on a road to install signs and maintain them is very dangerous. There are trucks, equipment, and people on the road working on something. It could potentially become part of a tort liability. You want to make sure the company is heavily insured. Can your neighborhood sign shop handle that?

Chair Dondero Loop:

I do not know. Is this company called Nevada Logos, Inc. because it is located in Nevada, or is it just called that?

Ed Wilson:

They are a subsidiary of Interstate Logos, L.L.C., but they are incorporated in Nevada, and they are housed in Nevada. They spend all of their time in Nevada. There is an advantage. In Utah there is a company called Utah Logos, also a subsidiary of Interstate Logos, L.L.C. They share office staff with Nevada Logos, Inc. This is a mature program and Bryan McDaniel does not have to run all over the state putting up signs. He puts up one or two signs, replaces individual business placards, et cetera. The account management people are in Salt Lake City, Utah. All of the account management is done electronically: the billing, the accounts receivable, et cetera. Bryan handles the "boots on the ground" work here in Nevada, and we could not replicate that. If state employees were running this, we would have to have a small army of accountants, et cetera.

Chair Dondero Loop:

I understand that. I was just questioning if these workers were Nevada, Utah, or California residents.

Ed Wilson:

The account management people are in Utah.

Chair Dondero Loop:

I am a little protective of our state.

Ed Wilson:

The people doing the boots on the ground work are Nevada residents. Bryan McDaniel lives in Reno and his office is in Reno, but he spends about half of his time in Las Vegas. That is where the market is. That is where the bulk of the logo signs are.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Kirner:

I do not know much about this program, but it sounds like we are talking about a sign with a logo on it. Is that what it is?

Ed Wilson:

They are the gas, food, and lodging signs that you see in the urban areas. You will see them at an RV park, a campground, et cetera.

Assemblyman Kirner:

Those things go on them?

Ed Wilson:

Yes, sir.

Assemblyman Kirner:

I am just trying to clarify, thank you.

Assemblyman Brooks:

Can this project be bid on? I heard you talk about the company and how great they are, but I never heard you talk about the bidding process. Has this program been out for bid since Nevada Logos, Inc. has had it?

Ed Wilson:

This is a different kind of program. Not one penny of taxpayer money has been expended to create these logo signs. They have all been created with capital from the logo sign contractor. The program was set up to give them a 20-year period to advertise and capitalize the cost of their signs, their ongoing administrative costs of managing the accounts, et cetera. They took over the program in 1996; in 2002, following the enactment of 1991 legislation, we have been sharing revenue with Interstate Logos, L.L.C. They are still billing out signs at their cost, and as soon as they are paid off, we are getting \$250,000 a year or 20 percent statewide gross, whichever one is greater. Is it going to be rebid? Yes, sir. In 2017 this existing agreement will expire, and we will put it out for a request for proposal from qualified companies.

Assemblyman Brooks:

It was bid in 1996, and was it handed over to Nevada Logos, Inc. in 2002?

Ed Wilson:

They bought the contract in 1996.

Assemblyman Brooks:

So the last bid was in 1996, and the next bid will be in 2017?

Ed Wilson:

As a matter of fact, when we expanded the program in 2002, we did another request for proposals. We got a few small companies, but once they found out the scope of the project, they withdrew and Interstate Logos, L.L.C. was selected. There are only three companies nationwide who do this kind of work for state highway systems.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any other questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Frierson:

You seemed to have stressed the fact that the companies who can submit bids have to be qualified. What do you mean by qualified?

Ed Wilson:

It is a complicated program because you have to be in compliance with the Highway Beautification Act, the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*, and the Federal Highway Administration. The signs are located on not only flat grounds but on steep slopes adjacent to interstates. It takes heavy equipment and a lot of money. The sign structures range in cost from \$8,000 to almost \$28,000.

Assemblyman Frierson:

I am not trying to be sold on the idea. When you stressed qualified, I wanted to know if it is a regular request for proposal process and if it gets evaluated. Are there special licenses or qualifications other than evaluating every request that is submitted?

Ed Wilson:

As we make our decision, we, as the Department of Transportation, are mindful of highway safety and quality of construction and have to be aware of the ability of the prospective applicant to accomplish what we need. We also have to comply with the requirements of the Federal Highway Administration, federal law, state law, engineering designs, et cetera. If we had more time, I would be happy to go into great detail with you. I would like to bring in some engineers and have them explain to you what is involved.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there other questions from the Committee?

Assemblywoman Diaz:

How does NDOT use the \$250,000 or 20 percent of statewide gross revenue?

Ed Wilson:

Two hundred forty thousand dollars will go to support the "511 Road Conditions" reporting system on our website. It is not just on our website; it is also accessible through toll-free telephone service. Our neighboring states can access the telephone service as well as everyone in Nevada. We have email alerts for truckers and motorists. Truckers like the new service. For example, when a highway is affected by chain requirements, those who have requested this service get an email informing them of the road requirements.

Assemblywoman Diaz:

When you renegotiated the contract, you obviously saw there was a potential for earning more than \$250,000. What do you think the potential earnings will be?

Ed Wilson:

At this point in time I have no way of estimating that. We are going to be building a lot of new signs at no cost to the Nevada taxpayers. It is going to be paid by the contractor. As they pay off their cost, we will be able to renegotiate increases as earned. How much, how fast, and when? I could not tell you.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. Are there other questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Brooks:

I know that you cannot tell us what the earnings will be for next year, but can you tell us what they were for the last couple of years?

Ed Wilson:

Yes, I can tell you what the earnings were since 2002.

Assemblyman Brooks:

Can you do that please?

Ed Wilson:

I would be more than happy to email you. I can send you a bar graph that shows exactly how much money has come in since we have started sharing revenue in 2002. For the past couple of years, it has been an average of \$160,000 a year. It will go to \$250,000 with the expansion of this market.

Assemblyman Brooks:

My question was not what they paid us. What were the gross profits for the agency?

Ed Wilson:

The statewide gross right now is about \$750,000 a year. We are getting one-third of it, and the other two-thirds is going toward the administration of the accounts and the construction of new signs as well as the maintenance of existing signs.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. Are there any other questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Hambrick:

You piqued my interest. The amount of money the state is making seems admirable; we are receiving \$250,000 or one-third. You listed a lot of other costs where the other two-thirds are going. Can you tell me or estimate the profit that goes back to the vendor?

Ed Wilson:

I cannot. I do not have the financials from Nevada Logos, Inc. I have access to their online account books for the business they are doing in Nevada. I can tell you what the gross is and I already did; it is \$750,000 a year. I cannot tell you their costs of operation. I know their construction cost is \$7,500 to \$28,000 per sign structure. Remember, there is not just one sign structure at each interchange; there are up to three.

Assemblyman Hambrick:

Is this a cost-plus contract?

Ed Wilson:

No, it is not. We are paying them nothing. From the signs created with their money, they are getting the lease proceeds until those signs are advertised and paid off. Then we renegotiate as we go. The next time we renegotiate it is going to be an open request for proposal.

Assemblyman Hambrick:

You are giving me too much information. I am asking a specific question; try to keep the answers more confined to the question. I am sure it is a good program since the taxpayers have nothing at risk. You are saying the amount is going to raise from \$160,000 to \$250,000, and you have \$750,000 gross; somewhere between the difference there should be a profit margin. I do not understand why you cannot provide that to me unless there are additional funding financials available over the \$250,000 that have not come into the sphere of this Committee's purview. Overall, gross is \$750,000 . . .

Ed Wilson:

Out of which comes their profit.

Assemblyman Hambrick:

Out of which comes their profit, great. That is a direct answer, thank you. You listed x dollar amounts for expenses that the corporation and the state are going to have. I would like you to email me or provide us with a written summary of what you believe our profit will be out of the \$750,000 and the expenses you listed several minutes ago. Somewhere there has got to be a margin of profit. I do not know very many businesses that would do this below a certain margin

of profit. Whether it is 8 or 15 percent, there is going to be a margin of profit. I am just curious. I have got a feeling this bill will pass the Committee; I am not going to speak for the Committee, but if the state is making money, it is more than likely. I would like to see a more accurate description of the funding that is going on in this area. No one wants to second-guess you, but we need direct answers.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you, sir.

Ed Wilson:

We will be more than happy to provide the information you are seeking. We would like to get together with you in the near future and make all the information available to the entire Committee.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

I need clarification for the way the contract is set up. Is this a guaranteed agreement, or is it a revenue-sharing agreement?

Ed Wilson:

It is a guaranteed agreement: guaranteed \$250,000 per year or 20 percent of the statewide gross revenue, whichever is greater.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

As a vendor you can lose money on those guaranteed deals. I am guessing when you were first starting up, you probably did not make any money, so thank you for giving a check whether you could afford it or not. We appreciate that.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Mr. McDaniel, you have been very quiet, and you are the General Manager of the company. I am willing to bet that you can weigh in on some of those facts and figures Mr. Hambrick was asking for.

Bryan McDaniel, General Manager, Nevada Logos, Inc.:

Sure. Something that Ed Wilson did not mention is the investment we will be putting forth to build new signs over the next five years. We expect to spend almost \$600,000 building new signs along Interstate 215, the Carson City Freeway, and Interstate 15 in Las Vegas.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. Mr. Wilson, do you have something to say?

Ed Wilson:

I want to add one more thing. In the new agreement, Interstate Logos, L.L.C. is going to spend \$70,000 a year to reconstruct old signs that have been damaged by winds, snow plows, et cetera, as well as the effect of the wind and sun reducing the reflectivity of the sign material on the panels. That is a costly endeavor. Seventy thousand dollars a year will cover about 5 to 10 percent of the signs around the state each year. After about 10 years, signs will be refurbished. Right now, most of the signs have been out there for 20 years; it is overdue. This is the first attempt to try a prioritized basis; the worst signs will be reconstructed first. It is going to be costly, but they have allocated and guaranteed that they will spend up to \$70,000 a year on this.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

I need clarification. Right now with the fixed-rate fee, you feel that we are losing money and that is why you want to move to the fair market value, right? [Ed Wilson agreed.]

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. Are there other questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in the audience supporting Assembly Bill 53? [There was no one.] Is anyone opposed? [There was no one.] Is anyone wishing to testify neutral on this bill? [There was no one.] If no one else is wishing to testify on this bill, I will close the hearing. We will hold this bill for a future work session. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 232.

Assembly Bill 232: Revises provisions governing the payment of certain fees for permits to operate certain oversized and overweight vehicles on the highways of this State. (BDR 58-868)

Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury, Clark County Assembly District No. 23:

I am pleased to bring Assembly Bill 232 on behalf of the Nevada Motor Transport Association. This bill simply creates efficiencies in both the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and the trucking industry when obtaining permits for longer combination vehicles (LCV). I will have Mr. Paul Enos explain the details.

Paul J. Enos, representing Nevada Motor Transport Association:

We are here today to testify in support of A.B. 232. This bill, as Assemblywoman Woodbury said, creates efficiencies for the trucking industry as well as the DMV. Right now there are about 3,500 to 4,000 LCV permits issued in the state each year. In Nevada, an LCV is a vehicle that is longer than 70 feet, has more than one trailer on it, or weighs between 80,000 to

129,000 pounds. Currently, when you get a permit for these vehicles, you buy a permit in January and it goes from January 1 to December 31. Buying those permits for LCVs at the first of the year, at a time when business is traditionally slow and the cash flow is tight, does put a financial difficulty on the trucking industry. We had the same issue with registration a few years ago, where the trucking companies could only register their vehicles at one time every year. We were able to stagger that registration, and this is exactly what we would like to do with the permits. You would be buying an annual permit, but instead of only being able to buy it on January 1, you could buy it on January 1, April 1, or October 1. There would be various periods throughout the year, so the trucking companies would not have to purchase all their vehicle permits on January 1.

There is a rush at the DMV to get these permits at the end of the year, which makes their workload difficult. By staggering this process, it would not just allow us to better manage our cash flow, but it would help with the workload at the DMV. We have an amendment on this bill ([Exhibit D](#)). It originally said “. . . may be paid in installments,” and we do not want it to say installments. We think when you buy a permit, you should pay the entire cost for the year. The amendment also removes the fiscal note. Thank you.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Atkinson:

I am trying to figure this out. I am glad to see the fiscal note was removed. What is an LCV?

Paul J. Enos:

An LCV is a truck that has more than one trailer and is longer than 70 feet. These permits are also for vehicles that weigh more than 80,000 pounds. Currently in Nevada, you can get an annual permit for a vehicle that weighs between 80,001 pounds and 129,000 pounds.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

The language on page 3, line 8 reads “. . . vehicles composed of a truck-tractor and two or more trailers or” What does that mean? What is the law now? You cannot have more than two trailers now, can you?

Paul J. Enos:

Currently in Nevada, you can have up to three trailers on a vehicle. We have a cargo body length limit. If you have three trailers on a tractor, the cargo body length limit is 95 feet. If you have a straight truck with two trailers behind it,

the cargo body length limit is 98 feet. This bill would not change those configurations. It would just change the dates of when you can get the permits.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

There is something that is moving federally. Does this do anything with that? Does this somehow interfere with it?

Paul J. Enos:

This bill will not interfere with anything that is happening on a federal level. What happens on a federal level could have an impact on the types of configurations we use in Nevada. Currently in our state, we do allow LCVs. There are 19 states in the country that allow these types of trucks. We do not have that defined in statute yet, but we are working on it. This bill will not have any impact on the types of configurations that can run in Nevada. The only impact it will have is when you can purchase the permits. Instead of purchasing them all on January 1, it is going to give the trucking industry other dates to purchase annual permits.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

Is this other gentleman with you from the DMV?

Wayne Seidel, Administrator, Motor Carrier Division, Department of Motor Vehicles:

Correct.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

Where is DMV with this?

Wayne Seidel:

We are supporting the bill as amended because it removes the fiscal note that we submitted previously.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any other questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Carrillo:

What is currently in effect for vehicles that are not LCVs? Is this already available for vehicles that are not considered LCVs?

Paul J. Enos:

If the vehicle is not an LCV, if it is not over 70 feet or it does not weigh more than 80,000 pounds, it is required to have regular registration. There is a

special permit for LCVs. This bill would only be addressing the vehicles that have to get special LCV permits to operate legally in Nevada.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there other questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Thank you very much. Is there anyone else who would like to come up in support of Assembly Bill 232?

Jeff Richter, Administrative Services Officer II, Records Management and Over Dimensional Vehicle Permits, Administrative Services Division, Nevada Department of Transportation:

Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) has no problem with this bill as amended. I am the Over Dimensional Vehicle Permits Manager, so if you want more schooling about the size and weight, I can help.

Peter Krueger, representing Nevada Petroleum Marketers and Convenience Store Association:

Many of our members haul liquid gasoline diesel fuel around the state. The reason we support this bill is because it is business friendly. Instead of once a year, in a very confined period of time to get all of these permits, it allows our members and others in the trucking industry to get their permits at different times. It is still annual; the state is not losing any revenue. Instead of rushing in and getting 20 or 30 permits in the month of January, we are able to space it out on a kind of quarterly basis. That is why we are supporting the bill; it just makes good business sense.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you, sir. Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is anyone else in support of A.B. 232? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who opposes A.B. 232? [There was no one.] Is anyone neutral on A.B. 232? [There was no one.] Mr. Wayne Seidel, will you please come back up?

Assemblyman Atkinson:

I know you indicated a moment ago that because of the amendment, which removed the fiscal note, the DMV is in position to support this bill. These permits are currently being done annually, and with the proposed bill, they will be done more frequently. Will the DMV be able to handle that?

Wayne Seidel:

That is correct. Initially we did our fiscal impact related to the installments. We are doing the annual permits manually, and it is very time consuming. They all come through January of every year. With the staggered registration using April

and October, which matches our other registration periods, it does spread out the workload. There is a little programming with our computers, but it is minimal.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any other questions or comments?

Assemblywoman Diaz:

With this amendment, it is being amended to say that the permit must be paid at the time it is issued. That takes the burden off of the DMV to pursue the installment payments. Is that also part of why there is no fiscal note attached?

Wayne Seidel:

That is correct; we are not doing installments today or in the future. It is a onetime annual permit fee that we collect at the time the permit is purchased.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone who opposes A.B. 232? [There was no one.] Is anyone neutral on A.B. 232? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 232, and we will hold it for a future work session. Is there any public comment? [There was none.] Are there any comments from the Committee members? [There were none.] We are adjourned [at 4:06 p.m.].

[[Exhibit E](#) was presented after the hearing and Chair Dondero Loop asked it be included as an exhibit for the meeting.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jordan Neubauer
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Transportation

Date: March 10, 2011

Time of Meeting: 3:18 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 53	C	Ed Wilson	Testimony
A.B. 232	D	Paul J. Enos	Amendment
A.B. 232	E	Wayne Seidel	Letter