

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

**Seventy-Sixth Session
March 24, 2011**

The Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chair Marilyn Dondero Loop at 3:17 p.m. on Thursday, March 24, 2011, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 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 Scott Hammond
Assemblyman Joseph M. Hogan
Assemblyman Randy Kirner
Assemblywoman Dina Neal
Assemblyman Mark Sherwood
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

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:

Warren B. Hardy II, representing Nevada Pic-a-Part
David J. Christensen, representing Nevada Pic-a-Part
Troy Dillard, Deputy Director, Department of Motor Vehicles
Dick Mills, representing Reno Auto Wrecking
Richard Perkins, representing R&S Investments and Snap Towing
Marlene Lockard, representing Nevada Collision Industry Association
Jim Marsh, Owner, Jim Marsh Body Shop, Las Vegas, Nevada
Michael Spears, Cochairman, Advisory Board on Automotive Affairs; and
representing Nevada Collision Industry Association
Tim Waldren, President, Nevada Collision Industry Association
Frank Horn, representing Nevada Collision Industry Association
John Sande IV, representing Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association
Susan Martinovich, P.E., Director, Department of Transportation

Chair Dondero Loop:

[Roll was called. Rules and protocol were stated.] We will hear two bills today, Assembly Bill 204 and Assembly Bill 27, and then we will have a work session. I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 204.

Assembly Bill 204: Revises provisions regarding salvage vehicles. (BDR 43-265)

Warren B. Hardy II, representing Nevada Pic-a-Part:

At the table with me is Dr. David Christensen, who is the President and Chief Executive Officer of Smith/Christensen Enterprises, which owns Nevada Pic-a-Part. Due to the state of our economy, everybody is trying to find a way to streamline their business to effectively and efficiently provide their services. Assembly Bill 204 is brought out of that effort on behalf of the industry I represent today. The issue is how to effectively process end-of-life vehicles.

I am going to explain the process of an end-of-life vehicle. For example, if you have a vehicle that is no longer usable, the wrecking yard buys it from you for around \$250, and then they have to process the vehicle with the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) before they can utilize the car for junk parts. For the auto wreckers, the first step is putting the vehicle on the lot for people to come and take parts off of it. After the parts are removed, the vehicle will be crushed and sent to a shredder.

Currently in statute there are two documents for processing end-of-life vehicles. Both of them involve essentially the same amount of paperwork on behalf of both the auto wrecking company and the DMV. Auto wreckers have to produce one of two documents: a salvage title ([Exhibit C](#)) or a non-repairable vehicle certificate ([Exhibit D](#)). The salvage title allows more flexibility with the vehicle. The salvage title allows the vehicle to be resurrected someday. If somebody buys an old vehicle under a salvage title and decides to restore it, they have to go through a process to turn it back into a usable vehicle.

The other process is using the non-repairable vehicle certificate. The difference between the two forms is noticeable; the salvage title is an expensive piece of paper costing \$1 or \$1.50, and the non-repairable vehicle certificate is a regular piece of paper. The non-repairable vehicle certificate does one very important thing; it kills the vehicle identification number, so the vehicle cannot be registered again. This is important to note because once the vehicle identification number is killed, it can no longer be used on a stolen vehicle. If the vehicle identification number is not dead, a person can steal a light blue 1989 Honda Accord and go to the wrecking yard, find a light blue 1989 Honda Accord, take the vehicle identification number off of it, and because it is still alive, they can take it to another state and register the stolen vehicle.

Additionally, the proposed process is a lot less expensive for the DMV. We purchase and process about 1,200 vehicles a month. Currently, all auto wreckers process the salvage title. They might as well use the document that is more flexible. Through this bill, we want to create an incentive for auto wreckers who process the non-repairable vehicle certificate document on end-of-life vehicles. For about 10 percent of vehicles, we will still have to produce the salvage title document. We would do that for a vehicle that has some value to the frame. If we fill out the non-repairable vehicle certificate, we are forfeiting the opportunity to sell the frame of the vehicle because that is what the vehicle identification number is attached to.

This bill is designed to streamline the process for both the auto wreckers and the DMV. We get 1,200 salvage titles a month printed on expensive paper and sent first-class mail from the DMV to our establishment. There is no need for

the salvage title if the vehicle is going to be shredded. A non-repairable vehicle certificate should be completed.

We met with the DMV, and they had some very legitimate concerns regarding this bill. We have proposed a conceptual amendment ([Exhibit E](#)) to address the concerns the DMV has. The process in the original bill would have created a new method for killing a vehicle identification number. That was not necessary; the DMV felt under our proposed process there would not even need to be a non-repairable vehicle certificate issued. The DMV had very legitimate issues as to why the certificate should be attached to each vehicle, and we agree with that. The amendment makes it so the only thing changing is the paperwork sent to the DMV to produce the non-repairable vehicle certificate document.

The proposed bill would change the process to where a bonded and certified auto wrecker could send a list to the DMV stating what vehicles he wants the non-repairable vehicle certificate to cover. The DMV would then issue the form based on the list. Not every system is foolproof; there will always be a way people can cheat the system. The DMV felt more comfortable with this process being voluntary. All auto wreckers would provide an additional \$50,000 bond, which would cover all locations as long as there was at least 51 percent common ownership. We agree and it is reflected in the amendment. Instead of creating a new process, the other part of the amendment is, once they receive the request from us, they would follow the old process of producing the non-repairable vehicle certificate.

The language in section 2, subsection 1(a) (2), on lines 33 through 35 needs to be amended. It is about the affirmation that must be signed. Since there will not be a signed document transmitted to the DMV, we need to remove the word "signed" and just indicate that the affirmation for the licensed automobile wrecker will be sent to the DMV. I may have succeeded in confusing a very simple issue, but I will try to answer questions.

Chair Dondero Loop:

You answered my question about the amendment. I am clear the non-repairable vehicle certificate is not the same language we currently have. Are there any questions?

Assemblywoman Neal:

Can you explain section 3, subsection 3, paragraph (a)? I was listening to your explanation, but what is it changing? It says, "An automobile wrecker is not required to: (a) Provide the Department with a certificate of title" I thought you said one or the other can be presented depending on the activity pursued.

Warren Hardy:

To produce the salvage title requires the auto wrecker to produce the old title for the vehicle, a bill of sale, et cetera, and package it up and send it to the DMV. The DMV then has a staff person go through it, review it, and send the non-repairable vehicle certificate. That is the process that currently exists for producing both documents. What we are proposing with this bill is licensed and bonded auto wreckers with the additional \$50,000 bond would not be required to send the two documents. They will have them in their possession. If the DMV wants to look at them to verify legal ownership, they can. As a bonded agent of the state, the auto wreckers are certifying the ownership information is correct. They will send a list to the DMV, and the DMV will accept that as sufficient.

Assemblywoman Neal:

There are companies that track cars' histories as they are sold and resold. The history will not be in the same format, but because the auto wreckers are bonded, if something happens, we are going to be able to go after the correct auto wrecker and his insurance. What would the process look like?

Warren Hardy:

Correct. It is important to make sure it is clearly understood. These are end-of-life vehicles that no one would ever have a reason to get a CARFAX vehicle history report on. The auto wrecker pays \$200 for the vehicle, and the aim is to sell the parts from the car and destroy it. Part of the intent here is that these vehicles will not find their way back to a consumer; they will be destroyed. Under the terms of the proposed bill, the auto wreckers are taking all of the liability. Dr. Christensen told me that, in Pic-a-Part's 20 years of business, there were two times when vehicles were improperly processed, and they had to give the owners their money back.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

My question is about the fiscal note. There is a programming cost, but when I run the numbers, there are about 129,000 non-repairable vehicle certificates. What is the difference between the salvage title and the non-repairable vehicle certificate in cost to the state if the 129,000 non-repairable vehicle certificates were approved? What is the cost savings between the two forms?

Chair Dondero Loop:

Mr. Sherwood, remember, we are a policy committee, not a budget committee.

Assemblyman Sherwood:

I think I can keep this out of the budget committee, and we can pass the bill.

Warren Hardy:

I will allow the DMV to testify to this, but I believe the amendment will eliminate the fiscal note. We believe the passage of this bill will save the DMV money with the cost of mailing. With the proposed bill, the DMV will be sending the forms to us in bulk; there is no compelling reason to have them immediately. They will also save money with the reduction of time spent by the employees who process the titles. Every title currently goes through the same process whether it is a \$40,000 Lexus or a \$200 junk car. We believe there will be a substantial savings to the state, and I think the DMV will testify to say this bill will save money and time.

Assemblyman Hambrick:

Is the frame absolutely gone? I have a relative who builds Plymouth Barracudas from the ground up. He tries to get original frames, but most of the time, they cut the vehicle identification number out. Is the frame forever?

Warren Hardy:

That is a decision the business owner makes. If my client were to process a 1969 Plymouth Barracuda with a non-repairable vehicle certificate, I would fire him because, yes, they would be killing the vehicle identification number. On that particular vehicle, the salvage title would be processed because the frame has value. With a salvage title, you can take everything off the vehicle except the frame. You cannot sell the vehicle frame with the non-repairable vehicle certificate because you are killing the vehicle identification number at that point.

Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson:

Why the \$50,000 bonded amount?

Warren Hardy:

The DMV suggested the amount. Incidentally, you will see in the amendment that we also pulled the language. I was concerned about allowing this to be voluntary, but there is precedent for that. Currently, smog certificate stations need to have one set of bonding, but if they want to register the vehicles of their customers as well, they have to provide an additional bond. That is what we are recommending be used as the model for this bill. That was the amount requested by the DMV, which we had no concern with.

Assemblyman Brooks:

The explanation on the fiscal note says: "The vehicle identification number will be invalidated in Nevada, but could potentially be used in another state, especially states that do not participate in the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System." Can you address that concern?

Warren Hardy:

Yes, that is the reason the DMV had their concern with the way the bill was originally drafted. It was the reason the DMV wanted to continue to issue the non-repairable vehicle certificate. I should let the DMV speak, but they are part of a system that notifies surrounding states when a non-repairable vehicle certificate is issued. They want to be able to notify other states through the current system and not create any additional paperwork. That is why instead of trying to create our own system for killing the vehicle identification number, we have gone with the current system. By adopting the amendment their concerns will be resolved.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any additional questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Dr. Christensen, do you want to add anything?

David J. Christensen, representing Nevada Pic-a-Part:

Yes, we have a specialized area in our business where we restore vehicles. They wanted a doctor on board to help with the restoration. [There was laughter.]

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. Now we will hear from those who support Assembly Bill 204.

Troy Dillard, Deputy Director, Department of Motor Vehicles:

Mr. Hardy has familiarity with the legislative process; he has thoroughly explained the bill. There is not a lot I have to add. He covered it thoroughly and accurately for your consideration. The fiscal note would go away with the amendment. The fiscal note was written based on the original draft of the bill. With the three sections of the amendment, the DMV will be able to complete the portion of programming necessary to implement the bill within the time frame necessary. The DMV supports the bill with the amended language.

Dick Mills, representing Reno Auto Wrecking:

I own four Nevada auto wrecking yards, I have 38 employees, and I have been a licensed Nevada auto wrecker for 32 years. I recently sold two wrecking yards that handled a lot of cars, so I am familiar with this process. I am in support of this bill. However, I have a few minor suggested changes to language ([Exhibit F](#)), which I submitted to the Committee and will now review.

On page 2, lines 27 through 30 read, "Shall, within 2 business days after the date on which the automobile wrecker receives the motor vehicle, transmit to the Department electronically or via facsimile, as specified by the Department, a report that includes" The two-day rule is very restrictive. Currently, there

are no rules on the time frame for when we submit paperwork to the DMV. I have a financial interest in submitting the paperwork to the DMV as fast as possible. If I buy a car for \$300, I want the car to be taken apart as fast as it can be. Just this morning one of my employees handed me a document she sent into the California DMV on January 15; we just received it back yesterday. I would like to take the paperwork and submit it to the DMV. I would like to eliminate the time frame.

On page 2, lines 33 through 35 read, "An affirmation signed by the licensed automobile wrecker that the motor vehicle has been designated by the licensed automobile wrecker for processing as parts or scrap metal." Testimony earlier alerted me that we no longer have to sign affidavits. If the language stays the way it is, I would like to add, "or an authorized representative."

On page 2, lines 38 and 39 read, "Five or more business days elapse after receipt by the Department of the information required by paragraph (a)" I would like to change "receipt by" to read "the submission of an application to" because I have no way of knowing when the DMV received it, but I do have a way to know when I submitted it. That language is in other sections of *Nevada Revised Statutes* and *Nevada Administrative Codes*.

My last concern is on page 3, lines 10 through 16. This is the portion of the bill where the vehicle identification number is going to be destroyed by the DMV. In my conversations with the DMV, they said there are ways to correct this. As an example, if I submit paperwork and inadvertently switch the last two or three numbers of the vehicle identification number, I have submitted the wrong number to the DMV. I have, in effect, destroyed somebody else's vehicle identification number. This does not happen very often, but I am sure in the events that follow it will at some time. The bill says, ". . . the Department shall cause the vehicle identification number of the motor vehicle to be invalidated so that the number may not ever again be used for the titling or registration of the vehicle." It does not give the DMV any leeway to correct a mistake. The mistake may not come up for six months until a person goes to register his car. This does not happen a lot, but I would like a way to solve the problem.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you, Mr. Mills. Have you talked to the sponsors of the bill about your amendment?

Dick Mills:

Yes, I talked to them.

Warren Hardy:

We have spoken to Mr. Mills, and he makes valid points. We have no objection to his changes. The last section Mr. Mills mentioned is going to be removed because we are staying with the original process of creating the non-repairable vehicle certification. We have no objection to clarifying language to where if a clerical error is made, it can be corrected. It is in the auto wreckers' best interest to process the reports as quickly as they can. We have no objection to his comments; we think they improve the bill.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is anyone else testifying in support of A.B. 204?

Richard Perkins, representing R&S Investments and Snap Towing:

Mr. Don Ellis, Vice President of Snap Towing, wanted to support this bill. He has been involved in this industry for decades and believes this bill is a worthwhile modernization of the statute and how the process works.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of A.B. 204? [There was no one.] Is anyone opposed to A.B. 204? [There was no one.] Is there anyone neutral? [There was no one.] Is anyone else wishing to testify? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 204, and we will hold it for a work session.

I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 27.

Assembly Bill 27: Imposes additional fees for the production of certain identification cards. (BDR 43-490)

This bill was originally requested by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). I received a letter from the DMV, dated February 18, 2011, requesting the bill be withdrawn from consideration this legislative session ([Exhibit G](#)). However, this Committee received more requests for bill drafts than we had available, so I have opted to allow the Nevada Collision Industry Association (NCIA) to present an amendment ([Exhibit H](#)) that would essentially delete and replace the contents of Assembly Bill 27. At my request the Committee will hear the bill with the intent of deleting the original contents of the bill and replacing it with an amendment. Therefore, in view of the letter from the DMV, I would like to call forward Mrs. Lockard with NCIA and the gentlemen she brought with her.

Marlene Lockard, representing Nevada Collision Industry Association:

We appreciate the opportunity for NCIA to work with you to amend Assembly Bill 27 with our proposed legislation. We are here today to try to solve the problem of end-of-life vehicles. We want to save and repair them; we do not want to end their life. We also think we can save a boatload of money for the state by eliminating the salvage title and the non-repairable vehicle certificate.

My name is Marlene Lockard, testifying on behalf of the NCIA. [Read from prepared statement ([Exhibit I](#)).] With me today is Mr. Tim Waldren, President of the NCIA, and Mr. Frank Horn, state board member. In Las Vegas we have Mr. Kurtis Rosborough, President of the southern Nevada Association, and Mr. Michael Spears. We are here to propose an amendment to delete Assembly Bill 27 as a whole and replace it with the language provided to you ([Exhibit H](#)).

This proposed amendment adds an additional exclusion to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 487.790, in which "total loss vehicle" is defined. During these tough economic times, many vehicles completely safe to repair are being deemed a total loss if, the cost of repair is ". . . 65 percent or more of the fair market value of the vehicle immediately before it was wrecked, destroyed or otherwise damaged." The practical effect of this statute is a creation of hardship for seniors, single-parent families, and the working poor because they cannot replace their car, cannot get financing for the higher cost of used or new vehicles, and are not allowed to repair a vehicle perfectly safe to be repaired. Used car values have risen, driven by the fact there are fewer trade-ins due to depressed new car sales. Consequently, people are struggling to hold on to their cars longer because of the economy. [Continued to read from [Exhibit I](#).]

Jim Marsh, Owner, Jim Marsh Body Shop, Las Vegas, Nevada:

This is an amendment to the existing bill, which is necessary. The current NRS language went into effect several years ago as a result of Assembly Bill No. 325 of the 72nd Session. It was well intended but had very unforeseen circumstances. I am not normally known as a consumer advocate, but in this case I consider myself one. I am going to read a few letters I have received over the last few months that relate to why this bill should be amended. [Read from letters ([Exhibit J](#)).]

When these cars get totaled, they end up going to a salvage yard. About 90 percent of them go to Mexico. We lose the car in the United States entirely. Most of them are safe, drivable cars. That is why we are supporting this bill to amend the existing legislation.

Michael Spears, Cochairman, Advisory Board on Automotive Affairs; and representing Nevada Collision Industry Association:

Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the Committee. My name is Michael Spears. I am the Cochairman of the state Advisory Board on Automotive Affairs and a shareholder in a multilocation collision repair business in Las Vegas under the name of Collision Authority. I am here today to ask for your support on the passage of A.B. 27 with the proposed amendment as presented by the NCIA. [Continued to read from [Exhibit K.](#)]

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anybody else who wants to testify in support?

Tim Waldren, President, Nevada Collision Industry Association:

Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the Committee. My name is Tim Waldren, and I am a second-generation shop owner of Paramount Auto Body in Reno and the President of the NCIA, representing over 150 body shops in the state of Nevada. I am here in support of A.B. 27 with the proposed changes, including the electronic exclusion. I believe it will give flexibility to the consumer and the insurance companies throughout the repair process. [Continued to read from [Exhibit L.](#)]

Frank Horn, representing Nevada Collision Industry Association:

I am representing two shops in northern Nevada: one in Carson City and one in Fallon. We want to support this bill. We employ 25 people in Nevada. There will be an economic impact on our company. With the proposed legislation, we will have the opportunity to hire more people, and we want to support the bill.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Are there any questions for the speaker from the Committee? [There were none.] Mrs. Lockard, is anyone going to walk us through the amendment?

Marlene Lockard:

Yes, I can do that. Mr. Mike Harris is in Las Vegas to answer any technical questions. I would like to add that I think others want to speak in support of this bill, but the Nevada Automotive Wholesalers' Association has authorized me to say they are in support of the bill. If you look at our proposed amendment ([Exhibit H](#)), we are proposing to amend NRS 487.790 by including new language in subsection 1(b). We want to add "replacement of electronic components per manufacturer specifications; towing charges or" We also want to amend subsection 2(b) to add "Recovered theft vehicles with no structural damage, only missing tires, wheels and audio/visual system components." Very often the wheels and tires are costly, and they fall into the

same type of category as electronics. In subsection 2(b) (3), we want to add "fender." When this statute was initially considered, "fender" was inadvertently left out. In subsection 2(c), we want to insert "towing charges, or replacement of electronic components per manufacturer specifications" We also want to insert the electronic component language in NRS 487.890.

We have offered a definition of an electronic component. I am sure the Legislative Council Bureau will conform that to their language. That is what we are hoping to include.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. On page 2 of the amendment ([Exhibit H](#)), under NRS 487.890, it says, "An estimate of the cost of repair for a motor vehicle pursuant to NRS 487.800." Is that supposed to be crossed out?

Marlene Lockard:

I do not believe it should have been crossed out.

Chair Dondero Loop:

It seems that it should be there. I think it was a mistake. We need to get that corrected. Are there any questions for Mrs. Lockard? [There were none.] Is there anyone in support of A.B. 27?

Richard Perkins, representing R&S Investments and Snap Towing:

I am here to testify in support of the amendment to A.B. 27, which has been described to you as replacing the bill as a whole. When former Assembly Majority Leader Barbara Buckley worked on these issues, she had concerns that vehicles were being repaired that should not be repaired. Ninety percent of the cost of damage ruined the structural soundness of the vehicles, and we were potentially putting unsafe cars back on the street. That was her concern, and she worked very hard on this law. When the statute went into effect, I do not think we could have anticipated some of the expenses and nuances in electronic repairs. Other types of things are expensive as well, such as the navigational systems that may have been shorted out. Those things become part of the cost of repair under the current statute. Those are the types of things this amendment is intended to address. We are in support of this amendment, and I think it is a modernization and clearly meets the spirit of what Ms. Buckley intended when the law passed in the first place.

John Sande IV, representing Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association:

Wayne Frediani with the Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers asked me to be here in his absence. He is not able to make it here today but wanted to support this bill.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Does anyone want to speak in opposition to A.B. 27? [There was no one.] Is anybody neutral? [There was no one.] Thank you, we will close the hearing on A.B. 27. Are there any other comments from the Committee? [There were none.]

[Prepared testimony submitted by Kurt Rommelfanger ([Exhibit M](#)) was presented after the hearing and Chair Dondero Loop asked it be included as an exhibit for the meeting.]

We are going to start our work session. It is not customary for the Committee to take testimony or otherwise rehear the bills during a work session, but rather to take action on the bills. If a technical issue arises, the Chair, at her discretion, may ask a witness for clarification. Our Committee Policy Analyst, Jennifer Ruedy, will take us through the work session document. We will begin with 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)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from work session document ([Exhibit N](#)).] Assembly Bill 53 was heard on March 10, and it requires that fees are to be fixed based upon market value as determined by the Department of Transportation for authorizing the use of trademarks or symbols identifying an individual enterprise on certain signs in all counties. These are the logo signs. The bill further authorizes the Director of the Department of Transportation to recommend programs to the Board of Directors of the Department of Transportation that provide information to the traveling public and would be paid for by money received from fees charged on those signs. According to the Department of Transportation, the Account for Systems of Providing Information to the Traveling Public in the State Highway Fund is used to support such motorist information programs as the "5-1-1 Road Condition."

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. Does anyone have any questions? [There were none.] Ms. Martinovich, are you in Las Vegas?

Susan Martinovich, P.E., Director, Department of Transportation:

Yes, I am here.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Can you give us a little summary of Assembly Bill 53? We are uncomfortable with this bill.

Susan Martinovich:

This bill allows the Nevada Department of Transportation to operate the logo sign program in counties other than Clark County and Washoe County. Currently, there are a couple of logo signs within Winnemucca along Interstate 80, which were grandfathered in, but under the bill as it is, we can have the logo sign program only in Clark County and Washoe County. We would like to have the ability to provide service information to drivers in other areas across the state.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you, that was to the point. Are there any comments or concerns? [There were none.] I would like to entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 53.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Mr. Hambrick. Now we will move to 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)

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from work session document ([Exhibit O](#)).] Assembly Bill 232 was heard on March 10. It requires the Department of Transportation to adopt regulations providing for installment payments of the annual fee for a permit to operate a longer combination vehicle. There was an amendment presented at the Committee meeting by Paul Enos, which is on page 2 of [Exhibit O](#). It provides for different schedule times for registration of longer combination vehicles. Right now they are able to register vehicles only in January; this would allow the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to have additional dates to register the longer combination vehicles. The DMV is responsible for issuing many of the permits for longer combination vehicles and testified in support of the bill with

the proposed amendment, noting the amendment would remove the fiscal impact on the Department.

Chair Dondero Loop:

Thank you. Is there any discussion from the Committee? [There was none.] I would like to entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMMOND MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 232.

ASSEMBLYMAN BROOKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Ms. Woodbury. Is there any public comment? [There was none.] On Monday, March 28, we will be having a behind the bar meeting when we receive the Committee bill draft requests to allow for their introduction before the deadline for being introduced on the Assembly floor. This Committee will stand in recess until the call of the Chair. We are recessed [at 4:20 p.m.].

Chair Dondero Loop:

I would like to reconvene the Assembly Committee on Transportation for the purpose of Committee introduction of bill draft requests (BDR) today, Monday, March 28 [at 11:32 a.m.]. [Rules for Committee introduction of bill draft requests were reviewed.]

I would like to entertain a motion to introduce BDR 43-1111, BDR 43-222, BDR 43-1109, BDR 58-1093, BDR 58-1095, BDR 43-845, BDR 32-337, and BDR 35-1092.

BDR 43-1111—Revises provisions pertaining to the use of safety belts in taxicabs. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 513.](#))

BDR 43-222—Revises provisions relating to the towing of motor vehicles. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 512.](#))

BDR 43-1109—Revises certain provisions governing transportation. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 511.](#))

BDR 58-1093—Revises provisions governing the allocation of taxicabs by the Taxicab Authority. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 510.](#))

BDR 58-1095—Revises provisions governing motor carriers. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 509](#).)

BDR 43-845—Revises provisions governing mopeds. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 508](#).)

BDR 32-337—Revises provisions relating to taxes on fuel. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 507](#).)

BDR 35-1092—Revises provisions governing advertising near certain highways and roads. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 514](#).)

ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK MOVED FOR COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BDR 43-1111, BDR 43-222, BDR 43-1109, BDR 58-1093, BDR 58-1095, BDR 43-845, BDR 32-337, and BDR 35-1092.

ASSEMBLYMAN FRIERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Thank you. The Committee is in recess [at 11:34 a.m.].

Chair Dondero Loop:

I would like to reconvene the Assembly Committee on Transportation [at 6:46 p.m.] to adjourn. We are adjourned [at 6:46 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jordan Neubauer
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Transportation

Date: March 24, 2011

Time of Meeting: 3:17 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 204	C	Warren Hardy	Salvage Title
A.B. 204	D	Warren Hardy	Non-repairable Vehicle Certificate
A.B. 204	E	Warren Hardy	Conceptual Amendment
A.B. 204	F	Dick Mills	Suggested Changes
A.B. 27	G	Bruce Breslow	Letter
A.B. 27	H	Marlene Lockard	Amendment
A.B. 27	I	Marlene Lockard	Prepared Testimony
A.B. 27	J	Jim Marsh	Letters
A.B. 27	K	Michael Spears	Prepared Testimony
A.B. 27	L	Tim Waldren	Prepared Testimony
A.B. 27	M	Kurt Rommelfanger	Prepared Testimony
A.B. 53	N	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document
A.B. 232	O	Jennifer Ruedy	Work Session Document