

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

**Seventy-Seventh Session
April 30, 2013**

The Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chairman Richard Carrillo at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, April 30, 2013, 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 nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013. 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 Richard Carrillo, Chairman
Assemblyman Joseph M. Hogan, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Paul Anderson
Assemblyman David P. Bobzien
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblyman Cresent Hardy
Assemblyman James W. Healey
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblyman Michael Sprinkle
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Randy Kirner, Washoe County Assembly District No. 26

Minutes ID: 1039



Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Clark County Senatorial District No. 5
Senator Joseph P. Hardy, Clark County Senatorial District No. 12
Senator Greg Brower, Washoe County Senatorial District No. 15
Senator Barbara Cegavske, Clark County Senatorial District No. 8

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Vance Hughey, Committee Policy Analyst
Sean McCoy, Committee Policy Analyst
James Fonda, Committee Secretary
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Terri L. Carter, C.P.M., Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division, Department of Motor Vehicles
Brian O'Callaghan, representing Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Eric Spratley, representing Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Tim O'Neill, Traffic Sergeant, City of Henderson Police Department
Erin Breen, Director, Safe Community Partnership, Las Vegas
Traci Pearl, Administrator, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety
Deborah Cook, Administrator, Administrative Services Division, Department of Motor Vehicles
Troy L. Dillard, Director, Department of Motor Vehicles
Doreen M. Rigsby, Manager, Processing Center, Division of Central Services and Records, Department of Motor Vehicles
Katherine Miller, Deputy Executive Director, Office of Veterans Services
Neal Tomlinson, representing Frias Transportation
Sabra Smith Newby, Director, Department of Administrative Services, Clark County
Michael Sullivan, representing Whittlesea-Bell Transportation
Gary Milliken, representing Yellow Checker Star Transportation
David Goldwater, representing Desert Cab
Jaron Hildebrand, representing Nevada Trucking Association

Chairman Carrillo:

[Roll was taken. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 143 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 143 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing certain examinations for driver's licenses. (BDR 43-696)

Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Clark County Senatorial District No. 5:

I appreciate the opportunity to come before you today to offer testimony on Senate Bill 143 (1st Reprint). The bill proposes to amend *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 483.330 relating to the examination of driver's license applicants. The bill would direct the Department of Motor Vehicles to include at least one question on the state law prohibiting texting or otherwise using a cell phone or other handheld wireless communication devices on the written driver's license examination.

Senate Bill No. 140 of the 76th Session prohibited the use of cellular telephones and other handheld wireless communication devices while driving. This legislation prohibited texting and cellular telephone use and provided that voice communication was allowed only with the use of an accessory that allows hands-free operation. Senate Bill No. 140 of the 76th Session received a great deal of testimony, discussion, and amendment before it was passed out of both houses. Since we have a law on the books prohibiting the use of these devices, I believe it is appropriate we ensure driver's license applicants are aware of the law by requiring them to answer a question or questions on the driver's license examination. It is critical that Nevada drivers are aware of the requirements preserved in NRS regarding the use of cell phones and texting while driving. Senate Bill 143 (1st Reprint) is one small step in an effort to ensure drivers on the streets and highways in Nevada are knowledgeable of the law and adhere to it.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] The request is straightforward. We know as our laws change, we have to change with them. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in support of S.B. 143 (R1)?

Terri L. Carter, C.P.M. Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division, Department of Motor Vehicles:

The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is in support of S.B. 143 (R1). There is no fiscal impact for the Department to add at least one question to test a person's knowledge about the use of handheld wireless communication devices while driving. The sponsor agreed to extend the implementation date to January 1, 2014, to allow us to make other changes that may be necessary as a result of this legislation. The Department believes it is good policy to educate the public about the prohibitions against the use of a cellular device or texting while operating a motor vehicle.

Assemblyman Paul Anderson:

Do we mandate any other questions in statute?

Terri Carter:

No, we do not.

Assemblyman Paul Anderson:

Why are we doing this through statute versus policy or just adding it through DMV processes?

Terri Carter:

That might be a more appropriate question for the sponsor.

Senator Joyce Woodhouse:

The request for this bill came to me from one of the safety committees in southern Nevada. It was felt that because the cell phone usage bill is in state law, this is just a means to make it firm, that we are serious about this law. One of the concerns I have is about our young people as they start taking that first driver's test. We run into a lot of accidents when young people use their cells phone and text while they are driving. It is one more way to make it a stronger point to them as they move forward as drivers.

Brian O'Callaghan, representing Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

We are in support of anything to assist in public safety.

Eric Spratley, representing Washoe County Sheriff's Office:

The Washoe County Sheriff's Office is in support of S.B. 143 (R1). Distracted driving is a big deal in our country. We see that it looks like a drunk driver in front of you so you are ready to make that emergency call on your cell phone, when you realize the person in front of you is on his. This can be just as dangerous at some points as driving under the influence. We are committed to making it a priority at our agency to enforce the cell phone statute.

Chairman Carrillo:

Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of S.B. 143 (R1)?

Tim O'Neill, Traffic Sergeant, City of Henderson Police Department:

The City of Henderson is in support of S.B. 143 (R1). The bill assists us with the education of newly licensed drivers in Nevada. Of the neighboring states, Arizona does not have a cellular phone or texting bill. Their law refers only to school bus drivers. Anyone moving to Nevada from Arizona would not know we have a cellular phone or texting law. Some of the statistics on the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration website indicates 40 percent of

young drivers using a cellular phone while driving places people in danger. This bill would help us educate the newly licensed drivers, not just teens, but anybody coming into Nevada, that takes the written test.

Erin Breen, Director, Safe Community Partnership, Las Vegas:

The Safe Community Partnership is part of the Transportation Research Center at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Senate Bill 143 (1st Reprint) brought today by Senator Woodhouse was requested by me. At the time I made the request, traffic safety personnel thought we could qualify for incentive funds under the new MAP-21 Federal Highway Administration that was passed into law in 2012. Senator Woodhouse, who has long been a champion of safety, agreed to bring the bill forward. Just before the Senate hearing we received clarification on MAP-21 funding and discovered in order to qualify, we needed to also have an outright ban on cell use while driving for those under the age of 18.

Even though we will not qualify for funding this year, passing S.B. 143 (R1) is still important on two levels. First, we need to make sure drivers understand that handheld cell use while driving is prohibited in Nevada. This is a way to make sure they get at least one question on their driving examination about the cell law. Currently, questions are drawn at random. There are 250 questions and 50 of them are drawn at random when you take your driver's test.

Second, we could qualify for MAP-21 funding in the future. If the guidelines are relaxed, or if, in the future, a legislator takes on handheld cell use for those under the age of 18, then we would qualify. Over the last four weeks in Clark County, law enforcement has been joining forces to directly address the crash problem in our community by issuing the most important piece of education there is, a traffic citation. Roughly 1/3 of 1,000 citations issued have been for breaking the cell phone law. Updating our existing law certainly could not hurt and could help a great deal. While I am sad that we will not qualify for incentive funding right away, I am hopeful that by passing S.B. 143 (R1) people will understand how important driving without their cell phone really is. I am confident when law enforcement stops them for it, they can say they tried to educate them how critical this issue is. I spent a lot of time with teen drivers and I know what a huge problem this is. I know a lot of adult drivers who also break this law. We need to make sure they cannot say they did not know it was illegal and give the inevitable victims of these selfish drivers a legal leg to stand on. Passing S.B. 143 (R1) at least assures we know new drivers and young drivers in Nevada know how serious we are about driving with our cell phone locked up if need be.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support of S.B. 143 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 143 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 143 (R1)?

Traci Pearl, Administrator, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety:

We are a grants office pass-through. We funnel federal transportation dollars to effect behavior such as wearing your seatbelt, or wearing your helmet while riding a motorcycle. The new MAP-21 surface transportation bill does have some incentive grant programs. Two of them involve graduated drivers licensing and distracted driving. You have a handout with a table that was presented at our budget hearing. We initially anticipated some revenue from these grants and, upon implementation and final rule-making, discovered we would not be eligible ([Exhibit C](#)). The table outlines why Nevada would not be eligible for these two funds.

Assembly Sprinkle:

Why are you neutral?

Traci Pearl:

We are neutral on this bill because we are 100 percent federally funded. We cannot lobby for or against any bill in Nevada.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I would like to invite Senator Woodhouse up for closing remarks.

Senator Woodhouse:

I want to thank you for hearing S.B. 143 (R1) and ask that you join me and others who are in support of this bill as we continue to work harder and better to make sure our citizens, and especially our young people, are safe on our Nevada highways and streets.

Chairman Carrillo:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 143 (R1). We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 13.

Senate Bill 13: Authorizes the Department of Motor Vehicles to suspend the registration of a motor vehicle under certain circumstances. (BDR 43-368)

Deborah Cook, Administrator, Administrative Services Division, Department of Motor Vehicles:

Senate Bill 13 allows the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to suspend a vehicle registration if the payment for that registration is dishonored. Customers are currently able to continue driving with a valid registration as the Department does not have the authority to suspend a registration for this purpose, even though the registration was never paid for. This creates a financial burden on every entity for which we distribute funds for registration transactions. Additionally, because the registration is still valid, law enforcement has no way of knowing there is a problem with this vehicle when they run the vehicle at a traffic stop.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Section 1, subsection 2, says if the registration is suspended, the person is to immediately return their certificate of registration and license plates. What happens if they do not?

Deborah Cook:

If they do not, we flag their record. We will suspend their registration. They will still have a suspended registration; they can reinstate their registration, and continue to use the plates.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

But, no one is going to their house to get their license plates. Is that correct?

Deborah Cook:

That is correct.

Assemblyman Hardy:

Do you notify the police department that these vehicles are no longer registered? Who gets notified?

Deborah Cook:

When we get a bad debt, we flag that registration in our system. We send them notification that they have a bad debt and what they have to do to clear it up. We will follow through with a certified letter. Then we continue with further collection efforts. Other than that, there is no notification. When a law enforcement officer queries the system, they have no idea there is a problem with that registration.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

In section 1, subsection 5, paragraphs (a), (b), and (c), it talks about various registration and other fees. I can see someone paying their registration and the check bounces. What are the other fees involved?

Deborah Cook:

There are several fees when it comes to a registration, like governmental services tax, special plate fees, et cetera.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

What would it cost someone if it was a normal plate, their check bounced, and you had to assess fees.

Deborah Cook:

There is a \$25 bad check fee. There are penalties that accumulate monthly such as governmental service tax penalties. There is a statute that could go into effect, with a \$500 penalty, if they do not clear it up within 60 days.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

What does happen currently?

Deborah Cook:

We get notified there is a bad debt. We send that person a letter telling them they have a bad debt with us. If it is a check, they are charged \$25 for that returned check fee. Then there are penalties in statute against a registration.

Chairman Carrillo:

Maybe you can go through the process. If someone writes a check and overdraws their account, they will not notice right away. You send a notice to the registration holder and he has to come into DMV to correct this. Do you take a cashier's check or a money order? What leads up to that point? Are fines accruing every day until they come in and clear this up?

Deborah Cook:

If they have a dishonored payment with DMV, we will accept only guaranteed funds which are cash, money order or cashier's check. Once the bank notifies the treasurer's office and the treasurer's office notifies DMV, we send them an original letter. If they do not respond within 30 days, we send them a certified letter. After 60 days we take further collection efforts through the controller's office.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in support of S.B. 13? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition of S.B. 13? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in neutral on S.B. 13? [There was no one.] We will close the hearing on S.B.13. We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 88 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 88 (1st Reprint): Authorizes the Department of Motor Vehicles to waive certain fines under certain circumstances. (BDR 43-109)

Senator Joseph P. Hardy, Clark County Senatorial District No. 12:

Senate Bill 88 (1st Reprint) authorizes the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to remove the suspension of the registration of any motor vehicle for which the DMV cannot verify liability insurance coverage without requiring the owner of the vehicle to pay a fee or administrative fine if the registered owner proves to the satisfaction of the DMV that the vehicle was dormant during the period in which the DMV was unable to verify the liability insurance coverage.

Troy L. Dillard, Director, Department of Motor Vehicles:

I would like to thank Senator Hardy for sponsoring S.B. 88 (R1). Section 5.5, subsection 7, paragraph (b) corrects an oversight that occurred in Senate Bill No. 323 of the 76th Session, which created a tiered sanction for insurance violations for motor vehicle coverage. That bill gave DMV the authority to waive the associated fee, but did not give DMV the authority to waive the fine. When an individual has a legitimate reason that they did not have insurance on a car, for example, if it was a snowbird vehicle that was parked and they did not turn in the plates, DMV can waive the \$250 fee, but cannot currently waive the \$250 fine. This bill gives DMV the authority to do that.

Chairman Carrillo:

What is the process to prove a vehicle is dormant or out of service? Does the individual need to bring in some type of paperwork, especially if they are doing work on the car, the registration is due, and they are not going to have the work finished?

Doreen M. Rigsby, Manager, Processing Center, Division of Central Services and Records, Department of Motor Vehicles:

We have a form for dormant vehicles, which would include storage or mechanical. We accept any receipts for major components. In regulations we define what mechanical issues could be, as long as the vehicle is parked. On storage we can accept a notification from a neighbor or the owner of the

property stating it has not been driven. We look at all of the documentation and the form. We will reduce the fees and ask that the fines be reduced.

Chairman Carrillo:

If an individual contacts you before the registration has expired, are you working with them at that point, or is it automatic they will be fined? What if they have the engine pulled out of the car, they are busy and cannot get it back in in time, and they need a little extra time? Is this form available online?

Doreen Rigsby:

Yes, the form is available online. We would not penalize you if you dropped your insurance. It is only while it is actively registered. If, for some reason, it broke down during the middle of your active registration, then you dropped your insurance, that is the time period we would be looking at.

Chairman Carrillo:

I wanted to make sure I understood the process when you are coming up to the registration expiring.

Assemblyman Hardy:

Does this apply to motor homes that are generally sitting for 11 months out of the year?

Doreen Rigsby:

Yes, if the motor homes have been taken off of the insurance and we know it is a seasonal vehicle. Seasonal is defined in regulation. If we know two months out of the year you could not move it because of the snow, we would accept that form and reduce the fine.

Assemblyman Hardy:

With vehicles that are not motorized, such as trailers, is that still applicable?

Doreen Rigsby:

We do not monitor insurance on trailers because once you have it attached to your vehicle, it becomes the vehicle insurance that covers the trailer. We look at it when it is motorized.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I lapsed on a trailer, did not register it, and I was penalized and had to pay up to date on that trailer.

Troy Dillard:

This is only about insurance violations. You are talking about a registration that has expired and that is a separate issue. This bill simply gives us the ability to wave a penalty for failing to have insurance during a period when the vehicle is inoperable.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas who wishes to testify in support of S.B. 88 (R1). I do not have anyone signed in to testify in Las Vegas. Is there anybody in Carson City who wishes to testify in opposition to S.B. 88 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City who wishes to testify in neutral to S.B. 88 (R1)? [There was no one.]

Senator Hardy:

This is what we call "DMV really is a friendly organization." Thank you.

Chairman Carrillo:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 88 (R1). We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 244 (1st Reprint):

Senate Bill 244 (1st Reprint): Authorizes the indication of veteran status on instruction permits, drivers' licenses and identification cards. (BDR 43-80)

Senator Greg Brower, Washoe County Senatorial District No. 15:

It is a privilege to come before your Committee this afternoon to present Senate Bill 244. Simply put, this is the veteran driver's license bill which would allow any Nevadan who is an honorably discharged veteran of the United States Armed Services to have at their option a veteran designation placed on their Nevada driver's license. It is something that Assemblyman Kirner and I have been working on for quite some time. I appreciate his sponsorship, along with the sponsorship of many others, including some on this Committee. We have also been working with the Nevada Office of Veterans' Services and the Department of Motor Vehicles to come up with an idea we think is workable. This idea has been made into law in several other states. It has worked out well and is very popular with veterans' groups.

Assemblyman Randy Kirner, Washoe County Assembly District No. 26:

There are several reasons we wanted to bring this bill forward. The first and foremost is we have literally tens of thousands of veterans in Nevada who we do not know about. We want to help identify those veterans and share with them some of the benefits and opportunities that are available to our veterans in Nevada. The second reason is there are many benefits that are available

to veterans. Everything from shopping at Home Depot and getting a ten percent discount to Applebee's and getting a discount. These are simple things that require proof of veterans status. Most of us do not carry around a DD-214 which is a 1 or 2 page summary of our military experience.

Katherine Miller, Deputy Executive Director, Office of Veterans' Services:

Thank you for this opportunity to testify in support of S.B. 244 (R1). The number one question I have been asked by veterans is whether they can do something to identify themselves as a veteran. There are many opportunities and services available to our men and women who served, but identifying themselves as veterans, unless they have retired and have a retiree card, or unless they are disabled and have a card from the Veterans Administration, they would have to carry their DD-214, which is the form they get when they are discharged from the military. Not all of our veterans have them, not all of them carry them, and not all of those who would offer services and opportunities to veterans know how to interpret that document. We, at the Office of Veterans' Services, do support placing a veteran designation on a Nevada driver's license. Putting the veteran designation on a driver's license will allow our veterans to have a convenient government document for opportunities such as retail discounts, entrance to sporting events, and state benefits such as fishing licenses, park access, et cetera. If passed, the bill would also allow us to track the population density of Nevada veterans, supporting improved notification and placement of veteran benefits and opportunities.

Our office has added an amendment that will allow DMV to provide identifiable information to our database on a monthly basis. This data sharing would require individual veterans to consent. The Nevada Office of Veterans' Services has added a fiscal note that we will absorb the cost associated with this bill.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

I thought there was an Assembly bill very similar to this. Is there a difference in this bill from what we already passed out of the Assembly?

Senator Brower:

I was just informed of that by Assemblyman Kirner as we walked into the room. I have not had a chance to do a side-by-side comparison. They look similar. I am not sure why we did not know about that. The Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) is good about informing members that there is something similar in the works.

Assemblyman Kirner:

I have not analyzed the bill. We are ahead of the curve in Assembly. It got held up on the Senate side. Our goal is to get it passed here. At the end of session, if there are two similar bills, they are brought together, and form a common bill. It is not unusual to have two similar bills from house to house.

Senator Brower:

If a side-by-side comparison reveals the bills are identical, the appropriate approach would be to pass both bills and let LCB sort it out. We will end up with one bill that works. I do not care whose name is on the bill. We do appreciate Assemblymen Wheeler and Hogan agreeing to cosponsor this version of the bill. The important thing is to get the bill passed.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

The bill becomes effective on January 1, 2014. Why are we waiting so long?

Senator Brower:

That is an excellent question. I do not know the answer.

Assemblyman Kirner:

I do not really know. We have the DMV here and they will be able to help us out with this.

Terri Carter:

The DMV does need time to complete the programming and coordinate the efforts with our vendor, who actually produces the driver's license.

Senator Brower:

That is an excellent question that was not asked on the Senate side, so we have clarification. Thank you.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Thank you for the presentation.

Senator Brower:

I want to thank the unofficial veterans' caucus, including Assemblyman Wheeler and Hogan for their cosponsorship. My service pales compared to many of those like Assemblyman Kirner who have distinguished service records. I appreciate the team effort that has gone into putting this bill together and hopefully passing it.

Chairman Carrillo:

Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in support of S.B. 244 (R1)? [There was no one.] We have no one signed in in Las Vegas. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition of S.B. 244 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 244 (R1)? [There was no one.] Senator Brower, would you like to make any closing remarks:

Senator Brower:

Thank you again for your time. I will defer to Assemblyman Kirner.

Assemblyman Kirner:

As you look at those who have sponsored this bill, I think they are all veterans of one sort or another. It was an honor to serve. This is an opportunity to recognize our veterans and give them the access they need to some of the services available to them. At the same time it will give Nevada the opportunity to reach out to veterans. Thank you for your indulgence.

Chairman Carrillo:

Thank you for bringing this bill forth. We do need to take care of our veterans. We will close the hearing on S.B. 244 (R1). We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 262.

Senate Bill 262: Makes various changes relating to vehicles used for advertising. (BDR 43-887)

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

I am pleased today to present Senate Bill 262, which addresses safety issues caused by mobile billboards with active content that changes when the vehicle is in motion. [Continued to read from written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).]

Assemblyman Healey:

You mentioned public transit on the exemption piece. What is that defined as?

Senator Cegavske:

Section 1, subsection 2, defines traffic control, law enforcement, emergency response and a bus or other vehicle of mass transit.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

When we are talking about dynamic display, is that a still photograph? Will it be digital? Will there be movement? Is the visual actually changing? Am I correct?

Senator Cegavske:

It is digital that moves. When the vehicle is moving, it stops.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

It is the actual physical piece of equipment that does not move. It is not the visual that is being projected. Is that correct?

Senator Cegavske:

It is a permanent fixture and the screen is the visual.

Neal Tomlinson, representing Frias Transportation:

That is correct. An example would be the taxi top advertising. Some of them have a fixed, three-side triangle. Others are double-sided. Those would be examples of the fixture itself.

Assemblyman Paul Anderson:

In the display management system, are we referencing only digital displays or are we referencing still images that may rotate like on a banner system?

Neal Tomlinson:

My understanding is there are various vendors that make these types of devices. The primary function would be to change, similar to the new digital billboards where the picture or image will change. Some of them do have the ability to run motion. The primary intent is to change the advertising display only when the vehicle is in a safe location.

Assemblyman Paul Anderson:

Does the display management system include digital displays as well as stationary, or rotating images that might roll on a roller? Does that definition include both digital and banner images that might rotate on a time sequence?

Neal Tomlinson:

I believe that it would. It would be limited so that when the vehicle is not moving, or is in one of those defined locations, the display can be changed.

Chairman Carrillo:

Is there a minimum or maximum size of the display in inches or square feet?

Neal Tomlinson:

My understanding is that Clark County submitted a proposed amendment today that does have a size limitation ([Exhibit E](#)). We agreed to meet with the county to discuss the size limitations to come up with some compromise language. The county does support the bill.

Chairman Carrillo:

Did you want to get into the amendment right now or hold off?

Senator Cegavske:

We are willing to discuss any of the issues. Mr. Tomlinson can talk better about his conversation with the county commissioner.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

I have occasionally seen people who have consumer passenger cars where they will have something that stands up in the back and has a dynamic display. It will say something like "Go Rebels" and they can change the message over time. Will this bill prohibit those?

Senator Cegavske:

We are only addressing commercial vehicles. We are not addressing private vehicles.

Chairman Carrillo:

Assemblywoman Spiegel, are you referring to license plate holders where they have rolling advertising?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Yes. I have also seen ones that are free-standing.

Chairman Carrillo:

I am not sure if there is an ordinance in place for that.

**Sabra Smith Newby, Director, Department of Administrative Services,
Clark County:**

I do not think we have an agreement yet on the amendment, but I would be happy to go through what we have submitted ([Exhibit E](#)). Clark County had two issues. The first was the dynamic displays in the public rights-of-way. We had a public safety concern about any flashing or moving items or the changing of the ad in the public rights-of-way and not distracting drivers. The second issue we had was that Clark County Code Chapter 14.10 prohibits display or exhibiting signage that contains moving or flashing lights or animation of any kind. We were concerned that this bill, as is, might preempt that. We have been working with the parties involved to come to some agreement on language to limit the number of screens. In our amendment, we recommend three screens. We also have no more than six square feet for each monitor. I believe we can actually go up to 7.5 square feet. We do have some concerns about the size, but we can get to an agreement on that.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.]

Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in support of S.B. 262?

Michael Sullivan, representing Whittlesea-Bell Transportation:

Whittlesea-Bell Transportation is in support of S.B. 262.

Gary Milliken, representing Yellow Checker Star Transportation:

Yellow Checker Star Transportation is in support of S.B. 262 and is also working with Clark County on the amendment.

David Goldwater, representing Desert Cab:

Desert Cab is in support of S.B. 262.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.]

Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 262?

[There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 262?

[There was no one.] Senator Cegavske, would you like to make any closing remarks?

Senator Cegavske:

I appreciate your indulgence on hearing this piece of legislation. It did pass unanimously in the Senate Transportation Committee. On the Senate floor it passed 21 to 0. We did a pretty good job of explaining it. The amendment came to me today. There was another amendment that was brought to the Senate Committee. I was under the impression it was a different type of amendment they were going to propose. Chair Manendo chose not to accept the amendment in the Senate Committee. I spoke to a different county commissioner on another issue that I think they are going to take up in another bill. We will work with Clark County and bring you something that has been worked out on the size of the signs. Thank you.

Chairman Carrillo:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 262. We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 503 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 503 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to drivers' licenses and identification cards. (BDR 43-1159)

Terri L. Carter, C.P.M., Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division, Department of Motor Vehicles:

I am here today to introduce Senate Bill 503 (1st Reprint) which proposes new requirements for Nevada drivers' licenses, identification cards, and commercial learners' permits. This bill will allow the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to issue certain drivers' licenses and identification cards for an 8-year period and authorizes new federal requirements for commercial drivers and nonresidential commercial drivers. [Continued to read from written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).]

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Eight years seems like a long time. Are there other states that go eight years?

Terri Carter:

In our surrounding states we have Montana, Oregon, Idaho, and New Mexico that offer eight-year drivers' license periods.

Assemblyman Hogan:

When will the Department of Motor Vehicles be prepared to issue these documents?

Terri Carter:

Our anticipated implementation date is January 1, 2014.

Assemblyman Paul Anderson:

What is the length of life of the license? We are going from four to eight years. Is there a quality difference that needs to be changed if the license gets damaged?

Terri Carter:

The cards have a life of longer than eight years.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Is it mandatory in other states or do they give the consumer the option?

Terri Carter:

There is an option for four or eight years in New Mexico, Idaho, and Hawaii. There is no option in Oregon.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Has there been an analysis on how this would impact personnel and how many consumers will stay out of the office? What will be the personnel demands? Will we see a shift in the amount of personnel in the offices?

Terri Carter:

By extending this period to eight years, those people will no longer have to come into the office to renew—approximately 1.2 million transactions. The most significant impact will be to the renewal by mail process and not necessarily to those with the counter transactions.

There is an initiative for the driver authorization card which we believe will add to those numbers. We are hoping that in the event the bill passes, in conjunction with eliminating the four-year renewal cycle, we will not see a large surge or decrease in the number of transactions at the counter.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

With the provision for over 65, will they still be four-year cards?

Terri Carter:

That is correct. They will continue to receive their cards on a four-year renewal cycle.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

The reason behind that is?

Terri Carter:

There was some concern about the increased cost for those that are typically in a fixed-income bracket. At that time we worked with our programmers to find out if that was something that was doable. We feel it is something we can accomplish. There are the medical requirements they are required to submit for the renewal. This bill does not intend to change the medical requirement.

Assemblywoman Carter:

I have a concern about setting up a bifurcated system with an age delineation because it could almost be seen as age discrimination in some ways. As far as the other reason, the cost. That cost would apply to somebody who is unemployed as well, who is 25, and needs that driver's license to go to work. Now that fee just doubled. I am trying to weigh those two things. It is an unexpected expense.

Troy Dillard:

The 65 and over is related to existing statute where the medical for eyesight kicks in and they have to submit those medical forms. Rather than going with an eight-year license, which would seem to subvert the existing statute, we are keeping it at the four-year period. As far as the fee goes, the per-year fee is actually lower with this particular model. We are right in line with all of the other states that are in this particular area. I think the playing field is pretty even across the western states.

Assemblyman Hardy:

On my next birthday I will be 64. Will I have to have a renewal in five years or in eight years from that date?

Troy Dillard:

I believe the way it is worded, it kicks in at 65. I believe the medical kicks in at 71.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I tried to read that and figure it out. It is unclear, so you might want to clear that up a little.

Troy Dillard:

Very good. Thank you.

Chairman Carrillo:

Regarding the nonresident commercial licenses, will some applicants need to take some form of driving skills test?

Terri Carter:

None of these skills test requirements are going to be changing as a result of this commercial learner's permit. It is simply a new type of card.

Chairman Carrillo:

I was trying to understand why the language in section 18 was struck out.

Terri Carter:

That is striking just the fee portion. The \$30 fee and skills test is something that the Legislative Counsel Bureau did.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in support of S.B. 503 (R1)?

Jaron Hildebrand, representing Nevada Trucking Association:

The Nevada Trucking Association is in support of S.B. 503 (R1).

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.]
Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in support of S.B. 503 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 503 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 503 (R1)? [There was no one.]
We will close the hearing on S.B. 503 (R1). Is there any public comment? [There was none.]

The meeting was adjourned [at 3:34 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

James Fonda
Recording Secretary

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jacque Lethbridge
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Transportation

Date: April 30, 2013

Time of Meeting: 2:15 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 143 (R1)	C	Traci Pearl, Administrator, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety	Department of Public Safety handout
S.B. 262 (R1)	D	Senator Barbara Cegavske, Clark County Senatorial District No. 8	Written testimony
S.B. 262 (R1)	E	Senator Barbara Cegavske, Clark County Senatorial District No. 8	Proposed amendment
S.B. 503 (R1)	F	Terri Carter, C.P.M., Administrator, Management Services and Program Division, Department of Motor Vehicles	Written testimony