

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

**Seventy-Seventh Session
May 2, 2013**

The Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chairman Richard Carrillo at 3:07 p.m. on Thursday, May 2, 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
Assemblyman John Hambrick
Assemblyman Crescent Hardy
Assemblyman James W. Healey
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblyman Michael Sprinkle
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Lucy Flores (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Senatorial District No. 17

Minutes ID: 1051



Senator Donald G. Gustavson, Senatorial District No. 14
Senator Mark A. Manendo, Clark County Senatorial District No. 21
Senator Pete Goicoechea, Senatorial District No. 19
Assemblyman John Ellison, Assembly District No. 33

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Vance Hughey, Committee Policy Analyst
Sean McCoy, Committee Policy Analyst
Scott McKenna, Committee Counsel
Jacque Lethbridge, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Bill Hoffman, P.E., Deputy Director, Department of Transportation
Paul J. Enos, representing Nevada Trucking Association
Eric Spratley, representing Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Robert Roshak, representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Brian O'Callaghan, representing Las Vegas Metropolitan
Police Department
Sean P. McDonald, M.B.A., Administrator, Central Services and Records
Division, Department of Motor Vehicles
Leonard Nevin, representing Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers'
Association
John Madole, representing Associated General Contractors of America,
Inc., Nevada Chapter
Paul McKenzie, representing Building and Construction Trades Council of
Northern Nevada
Patrick T. Sanderson, representing AFL-CIO, Local 872
Alan F. Kalt, Comptroller, Churchill County
Jeffrey Fontaine, representing Nevada Association of Counties
Terri L. Carter, C.P.M., Administrator, Management Services and
Programs Division, Department of Motor Vehicles

Chairman Richard Carrillo:

[Roll was taken. Committee protocol and rules were explained.] We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 14 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 14 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing highways under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation. (BDR 43-362)

Bill Hoffman, P.E., Deputy Director, Department of Transportation:

Senate Bill 14 (1st Reprint) focuses on public safety and the ability of Nevada's Department of Transportation (NDOT) to expediently post reduced weight limit signs in advance of bridges on our roadways. [Continued to read from written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).]

Assemblywoman Swank:

If the bridge is still not able to hold heavier vehicles can you renew for another 180 days?

Bill Hoffman:

We see the 180 days as an opportunity to answer questions that are part of the bill regarding effects on traffic, safety, et cetera. I do not know what we would do after the initial 180 days.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Can you give me an example of why this is needed at this point?

Bill Hoffman:

We went through a load analysis rating and found, through our legal advisors at NDOT, there was a legal requirement to provide reports and additional information before we could post a reduced weight limit on a bridge. This is a housekeeping bill, but we have run into a situation where there was a delay in posting the reduced weight limits before a bridge. This bill is important so that we can post the reduced weight for the traveling public, and specifically the trucking community, that the bridge may potentially not support a load that is going to travel across it.

Chairman Carrillo:

I do not pay close attention to signs coming up on bridges, unless they tell you it is going to be icy when it is cold. I do not think I have ever seen a weight limit sign. Is that something that is being pushed now, or has it always been the case?

Bill Hoffman:

We have three bridges, state owned, that are posted for a reduced load limit. They are on very low-volume roads. There is one in Verdi, one over Interstate 80 over Robb Drive in Reno, and there is one in Winnemucca. Those postings are made, but because of the condition of our bridges right now, we do not see ourselves having to go through this process regularly. We are just trying to do some housekeeping and corrections with this bill.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

When you put signs up for reduced weight limits, is there enough time for truckers to find an alternate route? Do you have another means of communication to get the word out to the trucks that would be affected?

Bill Hoffman:

We have methods of communicating with the trucking community. We do a good job communicating through the channels we have. We also have a statewide 5-1-1 traffic information system, online or a voice-activated phone system.

Regarding posting the signs in advance of the bridge to give truckers the ability to turn around or navigate, we consider that when we look at putting up signs. Any time we affect trucking on any of our roadways, we do try to post signs in advance. It is one of the first things we do.

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. 14 (R1)?

Paul J. Enos, representing Nevada Trucking Association:

We are here to support S.B. 14 (R1). In 2007, we talked about preventing trucks from traveling scenic byways in Nevada. We negotiated and said, "You can close State Route 159, but before you do that we think you need to go through a quantitative process to make sure when you are shutting down a route to trucks, you are not doing it without considering what some of the ramifications are. What are the traffic impacts? What are the safety impacts? What are the environmental impacts? What are the impacts on other roads?"

In doing their load analysis, the Department felt those requirements would preclude them from posting the deficient bridges in a timely manner. We are in support of NDOT being able to make that change and post as timely as possible. We do have a good communication process with the Department to let our members know that a bridge has been closed due to a safety deficiency. I have been with the Nevada Trucking Association for almost eight years, there has only been one issue where we have not had that notification. I do not think it was NDOT's fault; it was a problem with the contractor. They were doing roadwork in Boulder City and did not provide enough time for trucks to turn around. I had a number of my members get tickets. We think this will give NDOT the ability to prevent trucks, or any vehicle, from going over an unsafe road or bridge. However, we hope if they are going to make a determination that a bridge needs to be closed down for more than 180 days, that 6 months

would give them enough time to do this quantitative data analysis, which is contained in law now.

Chairman Carrillo:

Is that something you are discussing with NDOT?

Paul Enos:

Yes. This was a discussion we had when we saw the initial bill draft request.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] We have no one in Las Vegas signed in. Is there anyone else in Carson City who would like to testify in support of S.B. 14 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City who would like to testify in opposition to S.B. 14 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City who would like to testify in neutral to S.B. 14 (R1)? [There was no one.] We will close the hearing on S.B. 14 (R1). We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 109 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 109 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to off-highway vehicles. (BDR 43-467)

Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Senatorial District No. 17:

The genesis of Senate Bill 109 (1st Reprint), like many pieces of legislation that we entertain, comes from not getting it as exact as we said we would when we originally passed this legislation. When the legislation first came up, there were some concerns about how it would apply to individuals on their own property. We were told during testimony if an individual had an off-highway vehicle (OHV) and kept it on their own property 100 percent of the time, it would not have to be licensed. Unfortunately, in the implementation of regulations or part of the drafting, it did not come out that way. If you do not use the vehicle on public property, you do not have to register it. With the OHV, if you keep it on your own property, you should not have to register it. In talking to the OHV community, we found other issues with the way the law was implemented that needed to be clarified.

I can walk through each section of the bill, the changes, and why we are trying to change the particular sections in question ([Exhibit D](#)).

Section 2, subsection 1, discusses the concept of what an OHV dealer plate is. Just as a car dealer has the ability to get a dealer plate so that individuals can drive the car on the road, OHV dealers want that same ability.

Section 2, subsection 2, discusses how the OHV dealer plate is to be displayed.

Section 2, subsection 3, defines when the dealer must have a regular sticker, not the OHV dealer plate, in certain circumstances as outlined in the bill. We want to make sure they do not have the ability to abuse the concept.

Section 3 specifies the numbering of the OHV dealer plates. Only a reasonable number of plates will be issued.

Section 4, subsection 3, paragraph (g), discusses organized functions. We may have racing functions that drive through Nevada, skirting the border. It did not seem logical to tell somebody they had to buy a sticker. It would have to be an event that is sanctioned, a permit issued by a governmental entity having jurisdiction, operated on private properties, used in search and rescue, or having a displacement of not more than 70 cubic centimeters. The OHV to my left is an 80 cubic centimeter vehicle ([Exhibit E](#)). I purchased a battery-operated pink Barbie Jeep for my daughter, and legally I would have to get a sticker if I ran it on my own property or the town park. That seemed illogical. We wanted to create a situation where if somebody is clearly riding with their parents, they do not have to get a sticker. That is where we came to the concept of 70 cubic centimeters.

Section 5 discusses the headlight requirement. If you drive the vehicle only during daylight, you do not need to have headlights.

Section 7 lists exemptions.

Section 8, subsection 1, discusses the bond requirement. Off-highway vehicle dealers have bonding authority because of some of the other stuff they do. It seems duplicative to obtain another bond beyond the bond they already have.

Section 10 is the effective date.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

I want to understand the "on your own property" portion of it. If I have a car sitting in my side yard, it has to be registered, licensed, and insured, even if it is not usable at the time. If I have a vehicle, I have to comply with the laws.

Senator Settlemeyer:

Under Nevada law, if you have a vehicle on your property, you do not have to have it registered, licensed, and insured if it never leaves your property. There are some places in Nevada where there are six or seven vehicles in the front yard. They do not have those vehicles registered, licensed, and insured,

nor do they have to, as long as they never leave their property. I had a car I worked on for 20 years. I did not bother to get it registered, licensed or insured until it could actually go on the highway. As a rancher, I have an OHV that never leaves the ranch. The concept of getting a sticker just to remain on my own property seemed a little troublesome. We clarified that previously on the floor and were told it would never apply if the vehicle stayed on your own property. I had the same question on the Senate side. It passed and unfortunately the language, as it was implemented by administrative code, did not allow that. We want to clarify that if you are completely on your own property the OHV should not have to be registered. The concept of the tag is to use public property. Some people wanted this tag because it gave them a reduced rate if they were going into another state. They could buy the Nevada tag, or the Utah tag, which was 25 or 30 percent more. That is why many of the riders asked for a Nevada tag.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

What is the cost of the dealer tag and how long will it take the Department of Motor Vehicles to come up with a tag?

Senator Settlemeyer:

It would not take too long; I would estimate that within a year it would be resolved.

Assemblywoman Swank:

Regarding the headlight, a person might lose track of time, it becomes dark, and they need to get somewhere in the dark. I can see if you are racing and want to make the vehicle lighter, you would not want the headlight. That makes sense to me. My concern is people might be out having fun and get stuck somewhere in the dark.

Senator Settlemeyer:

The headlight section applies only during the daylight. If they are out at night and did not have a functioning headlight, they would be in trouble. I understand your concern with losing track of time, but many of the older vehicles do not have headlights or the headlights have quit working. Most people I know drive them during the day because nighttime is extremely dangerous. Maybe one of the dealers can talk about the aspect of the headlights.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

In checking on the fiscal note portion, there was a notation about the implementation date and the 383 hours it would take to implement the bill. Was there discussion about changing the implementation date so they could

address getting the work done? What we have noticed through session is more work and programming hours and not being able to get things done by July 1.

Senator Settlemeyer:

That subject did not come up in the Senate. I understand your concern and it would make sense to amend that date. They could accomplish it sooner if they had the time.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 109 (R1)?

Eric Spratley, representing Washoe County Sheriff's Office:

The Washoe County Sheriff's Office is in support of S.B. 109 (R1).

Robert Roshak, representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

Pertaining to the parts of the bill that affect law enforcement, we are in support of S.B. 109 (R1).

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

The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department is in support of S.B. 109 (R1).

Chairman Carrillo:

Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in support of S.B. 109 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 109 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral on S.B. 109 (R1)?

Sean P. McDonald, M.B.A., Administrator, Central Services and Records Division, Department of Motor Vehicles:

I would like to respond to Assemblywoman Carlton's comment about the fiscal note. We do have a minimal fiscal note. We do have quite a bit of programming. We would support extending the implementation date to January 1, 2014 if possible.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

We can talk to the sponsor about that and figure out where everybody is comfortable. I do not think that will be tough.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Senator Settlemeyer, would you like to make closing remarks?

Senator Settlemeyer:

I will look at the concept of adding a few months to make sure the Department of Motor Vehicles has enough time for implementation. I also spoke with some of the dealers about Assemblywoman Swank's question regarding headlights. One said he had been riding for 20 years and does not ride at night. The other said he had been riding for 18 years and does not ride at night. Many older OHVs do not come with lights. If I need to get more clarification to address that concern, I will.

Assemblywoman Swank:

Thank you. I am concerned about 15-year-olds who are not very good at getting home on time and often want to be out after dark.

Senator Settlemeyer:

Most people load their OHV onto a trailer and go out to areas to ride. Therefore, they end up having a trailer to get home. The days are long gone in many areas where you have the ability to leave your garage, take the OHV down the road, and go for it. There are certain counties that do not allow these to be on the road.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Is January 1, 2014 good?

Senator Settlemeyer:

Yes, January 1, 2014 is good.

Chairman Carrillo:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 109 (R1). We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 191.

Senate Bill 191: Increases the maximum speed at which a person may drive or operate a vehicle. (BDR 43-729)

Senator Donald G. Gustavson, Senatorial District No. 14:

Senate Bill 191 would change current statute that frames the maximum speed limits allowed on Nevada Highways. [Read from written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).] My first concern is safety, but if you view the two articles provided by *The Salt Lake Tribune* and *Los Angeles Times*, you will read that lengthy traffic studies done in Utah and Texas have revealed fewer mishaps on highways where speeds actually increased ([Exhibit G](#)). [Continued to read from written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).]

Referring to the two traffic graphs provided by the Department of Transportation (NDOT) ([Exhibit H](#)), you can see by the 2008-2011 crash levels ([Exhibit I](#)) you are most apt to be injured traveling through a 45-mile-per-hour posted speed zone. [Continued to read from written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).] [[Exhibit J](#)] submitted, not discussed.]

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Did you think about looking at qualifications of the roads? It seems to me it would take effect in the rural areas. The road I have experience with is U.S. Route 95; it is one lane in each direction. If you have one vehicle going 85, and a truck going 55 or 60, there could be consequences. Have you thought about having two or three lanes in each direction?

Senator Gustavson:

This will be for interstate highways. Right now U.S. Route 95 is 75 miles per hour. If NDOT thought it would be safe to increase the speed, they could already do that. My bill, where I envision the speed limit being changed to 80 or 85 miles per hour, would be mainly on Interstate 80 through northern Nevada. There are sections of Interstate 15 going northeast out of Las Vegas to Mesquite that could probably be increased to 80 miles per hour. U.S. Route 95 north of Las Vegas, where it is a four-lane divided highway, is a possibility to be raised to 75 or 80 miles per hour. It is entirely up to NDOT. This bill allows NDOT to conduct further studies to determine if it is feasible to raise the speed limits.

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. 191?

Leonard Nevin, representing Nevada State Law Enforcement Officers' Association:

When I was serving in the Assembly, I chaired the transportation committee. When I went to the Senate, I chaired the transportation committee. We have had bills like this come before us previously and I have relied on NDOT. They are very good, they are experts in what they do, and if they determine a section of road can handle these speeds, with their design, that is fine with me.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I guess there is an average speed limit that is taken, even though there is a posted speed limit. People seem to keep five miles per hour above the posted speed limit. This bill makes it legal to do the speed people are already doing.

Leonard Nevin:

I went through it at 55 and 65. People sometimes do have a tendency to go five miles per hour or so over the posted speed limit. There are not that many going 10 or 15 miles per hour over the posted speed limit because that is a ticket.

Chairman Carrillo:

Would this affect the mileage between Carson City and Reno?

Senator Gustavson:

That would be up to NDOT.

Chairman Carrillo:

Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in support of S.B. 191? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 191?

Paul J. Enos, representing Nevada Trucking Association:

The Nevada Trucking Association is opposed to S.B. 191. We are concerned with safety as well. I know that is the concern of NDOT; they have a zero fatality campaign. Sometimes I feel trucks are featured too prominently in some of the billboards. While there is no speed differential in this bill, there is a speed differential in practice. That is where we have the issue. If everybody were going 75 or 85 miles per hour, traveling at the same rate of speed, we would not have any issues with safety. Two objects traveling at the same rate of speed will never hit each other.

Where we have the issue, and where the trucking industry is concerned with this bill, is many of our trucks are governed anywhere from 62 to 70 miles per hour. When you are traveling on Interstate 80, you get behind a truck and try to get around it. You want to go 75 to 85 miles per hour and the truck is going 65 miles per hour. The faster the vehicle is going that hits a slower vehicle, the more severe the accident. Speed cuts down on reaction time. We do have issues with the speed differential that is in practice.

Why do trucks govern their speed? They do it for safety. They also do it to save fuel. FedEx has just reduced the speed of their vehicles to 65 miles per hour. That saves them millions of dollars a year. When you are confronted with high fuel prices, you look at ways to save money. The benefit of that is you also have fewer emissions because you are not burning as much diesel fuel. That is one of the side benefits. Most large companies govern their trucks because of safety and cost savings for fuel.

I appreciate Assemblywoman Spiegel's question about which roads these are going to be. We have the same question. I am used to driving Interstate 80. In urban Interstate 80, everybody is on that road. Truck count studies from about three years ago showed 50 percent of the vehicles on rural Interstate 80 are trucks. You do have a tremendous amount of trucks and you have owner-operators who are not going to be governed. They may be going 90 miles per hour. Most trucks, especially company-owned trucks, are going to be governed to that lower speed between 62 and 70 miles per hour. Sixty-five is the mean that most companies govern their vehicles.

The Department of Transportation can answer this question, but I believe most of Nevada's roads are not designed for more than 75 miles per hour. Before we move forward, we need to do some experimental test zones to see if it would work, to see what that would do for safety. We get back to that quantitative analysis that was being conducted so that we can make sure we are not going to impact safety and have more fatalities on the road. How would NDOT address doing that? What kind of studies would it take? How long would it take NDOT to make those decisions? We have those questions with the bill and with NDOT.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Do you have statistics regarding vehicles that rear-end semitrucks?

Paul Enos:

There are a number of studies done on speed differentials. I looked at eight studies on this and there is nothing conclusive. I wish I could tell you conclusively that if you raise speed limits you will see fewer fatalities. The studies are different in different states. In Idaho, they found when you have that speed differential between cars and trucks, and they do not talk about increasing speeds, you do have more rear-end crashes. In Idaho, it was a 42 percent increase in rear-end truck collisions. The data is not conclusive, except that when you have a speed differential you are going to have more accidents and fatalities. Dr. David Solomon conducted a study in the late 1950s that was published in 1964 for the Federal Highway Administration that showed the relationship between average speed and collision rates of automobiles. I can get you a copy of that study.

Chairman Carrillo:

The Department of Transportation seems to be doing more truck-passing lanes. Is that a factor into the rear-end collision as well? Oftentimes trucks are in the far right lane, unless they are passing each other.

Paul Enos:

When you are stuck behind the faster truck trying to pass the slower truck going up Emigrant Gap outside of Carlin, that can become an issue. The Department of Transportation does look at where a truck-passing lane makes sense. They determine where they are going to put that passing lane and make that investment. What is that additional lane going to cost and where do you put it? The reality is, when you are going faster, you have less time to react when you see the faster truck trying to pass the slower truck.

Assemblyman Hardy:

You said Utah did an experiment. Have they stopped that experiment?

Paul Enos:

Utah has allowed for an 80-miles-per-hour speed zone. However, before they did that, they did an experiment so they had data on what the impact was going to be on increasing the speed limit.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I have been along that stretch of highway. They began that test section from Beaver to Nephi, Utah. They have expanded that from the Cedar City area to just past Nephi. It is now a permanent speed. If it is an experiment, can we use other people's data?

Paul Enos:

I think you need to take a number of factors into consideration. Once again, NDOT can answer better than I. You need to consider what type of traffic is on that road. What is the average speed of that road? What is the geography of that road? How many hills? What are the grades? Those are all things NDOT would take into consideration before making a determination of increasing or decreasing speeds.

Assemblyman Hardy:

I would be interested to hear from NDOT. There are more grades on the Interstate 15 (I-15) corridor than there are on the Interstate 80 corridor. I believe the I-15 corridor from Las Vegas to the junction of Interstate 70 is one of the busiest routes across the country.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

You mentioned there were a lot more rear-end collisions in the study you were looking at.

Paul Enos:

There are a number of studies. I did not present studies because the data is inconclusive when you look at it across the country. I believe it was a study done by the Federal Highway Administration in 2004 where they looked at different states. They were not looking at increasing speeds, they were looking at the speed differentials, when you went from a uniform speed for cars and trucks to a different speed. The study that sticks in my head is a study they did in Idaho when they looked at taking a uniform speed to a differential speed and it did result in more rear-end truck collisions. I will be happy to get you that study. Once again, when you look at the studies, data is inconclusive as far as what happens with the higher speed, lower speed. They will say when you have a differential, at least a legal differential, you do have more accidents.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I would be interested in looking at the study. I think most of those rear-end collisions actually happen in town, not out on the road where speeds are higher. Do they already do this in California?

Paul Enos:

California does have a truck differential. They cannot go faster than 55 miles per hour on California roads. You will have more accidents with that differential. There are many problems with that speed limit.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 191? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 191?

Assemblyman Hogan:

We depend heavily on bias-free information and research you can provide for us in a safety-oriented way, more than a profit-oriented way. I represent an urban area in the center of Las Vegas and most of my constituents do not venture out too often and are not in ranching country. They are not necessarily familiar with high-speed driving. I am safety-conscious and worried when we get reliable testimony that says, "Better watch out, this may put us all at risk to some degree as these numbers keep going up." I am interested in whatever information you can provide us that would indicate two things: one, what your studies to date have suggested to you that the safety-conscious agency would question; and two, a summary of the type of testing you can apply to these questions and concerns before they are activated and before your folks have to make challenging decisions whether or not to increase speeds to 80 or 85 miles per hour.

Bill Hoffman, P.E. Deputy Director, Department of Transportation:

The Department of Transportation is neutral on S.B. 191. There is a lot of information that needs to be looked at and studies to be done. There is roadway geometry, grades, hills, and everything we have talked about that would need to be looked at. We would also look at other states that have already done this, their crash rates, speed differentials, et cetera. We would have to do that same amount of work and look at all of the segments within Nevada that may qualify for something like that. We would have to look at roadway friction, skid resistance, runoff, shoulder width, banks, and super elevations, to make sure the road is safe. I suspect if the bill were passed, we would immediately create a freight corridor planning study, along with a speed study process that would allow us to walk through and make sure we check every box. We would need to select a piece of roadway in Nevada that could handle a higher speed limit in order to make sure we have met all national design standards and speed differential studies. There is a lot of work NDOT would have to do to make sure the road is as safe as it could be.

Assemblyman Hambrick:

Should the bill pass, when would be the end of your decision-making process? When would we see an 80- or 85-miles-per-hour speed limit in Nevada, if we do?

Bill Hoffman:

That is a difficult question. I would love to hand you a date. It would be longer than six months. It would take 8 to 12 months to finish the evaluation of whether that roadway would meet the criteria to enable us to increase the speed limit. There might be some additional work we have to do; widen shoulders, flatten slopes, or something else from a safety standpoint, to make the road safe. That might be an additional construction season to do some of that work.

Assemblyman Hambrick:

The evaluation could come up negative as well.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

When this was discussed earlier, did we talk about NDOT's cost to do these evaluations? There is time, money, and programming. Was that discussed on the Senate side?

Bill Hoffman:

We have people that track bills. I would have to check with the person assigned to this bill and report back to you if that would be helpful. If I remember correctly, programming costs for studies was not discussed.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

I would like that, because if it is going to have an impact, we are going to need to address it.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.]
Senator Gustavson, would you come up for a closing statement?

Senator Gustavson:

I do not have anything further to say. I could go on about speed limits, but I think we know the speed differential happens on most highways. If this bill were to be implemented, it would be on divided highways, such as Interstate 80, where you have little traffic. Traffic is spaced pretty far apart and trucks generally arrive two or three together. It is wide open and during daytime, you can see far enough ahead to determine if there is a truck in front of you. Thank you for hearing the bill.

Chairman Carrillo:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 191. We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 217 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 217 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the manner of performing work on roads in smaller counties. (BDR 35-925)

Senator Mark A. Manendo, Clark County Senatorial District No. 21:

Senate Bill 217 (1st Reprint) addresses language regarding public works projects performed by small counties with their own workforces [Continued to read from written testimony ([Exhibit K](#)).]

John Madole, representing Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Nevada Chapter:

Senate Bill 217 (R1) would allow a small county, under 45,000 in population, to exceed the \$100,000 threshold for certain public notice provisions so there would be some consideration given to whether or not that was the most efficient way to perform those projects. It would assure the taxpayers they are getting the best value. When we originally prepared language to discuss this, we put language in our draft that said if the probable cost of the new construction exceeds \$100,000, but does not exceed \$250,000, but when it came back from the bill draft, the language in section 1, subsection 3, was changed to say "if the estimated cost of a project is \$100,000 or more but less than \$250,000" It is my understanding that the definition of what a public work is, addresses the reason that was changed. We did not change the intent.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Is this going to change the prevailing wage on these projects?

John Madole:

This is not meant to affect the prevailing wage. There will be a friendly amendment that would clarify if someone hired a day laborer, it would be covered by prevailing wage.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Thank you. I appreciate your putting that on the record.

Assemblyman Hogan:

Section 2 states, subsection 1, "No bridge shall be constructed or repaired except on the order of the board of county commissioners, or unless a petition is filed as provided in NRS 403.610." I would be surprised if the Department of Transportation (NDOT) does not have authority when they are asked to repair or construct a bridge, without having to first have the approval of a county board of commissioners. Is this a change in the law or is it just in accordance with our normal procedures? I represent an urban district. We rely on NDOT for safety and good construction practices. We are put on alert when we think this is a project where we will not have the assurance to rely on NDOT and its expertise.

John Madole:

This particular statute is an old statute that affects counties under 100,000 in population. It has nothing to do with an NDOT bridge. You see references to county road commissioners, which show you how far back this statute goes. This is meant to clean up language that has caused some confusion in the past.

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. 217 (R1)?

Paul McKenzie, representing Building and Construction Trades Council of Northern Nevada:

Jack Mallory from the south submitted an amendment which we think clarifies the discussion regarding prevailing wages ([Exhibit L](#)). If the county uses their own workforce to do the work, they are not subject to the prevailing wage. If they hire day laborers to do the work then they are subject to the prevailing wage. In section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (b), subparagraph (2), we have added the language "pursuant to NRS 338." We support the legislation with that amendment.

Patrick T. Sanderson, representing AFL-CIO, Local 872:

We are in support of S.B. 217 (R1) as amended.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.]
Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to S.B. 217 (R1)?

Alan Kalt, Comptroller, Churchill County:

Churchill County remains opposed to S.B. 217 (R1) even with the amendment. Pursuant to existing structure in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 403, Churchill County has a full-service road department. We maintain 196.11 miles of paved road. We are responsible for, and maintain, 271.42 miles of nonpaved roads. Our total budget is \$2 million. In addition to that, because we are in the Newlands Project, which has irrigation canals, we maintain over 100 bridges. Every winter we do a rehab on a major bridge within our community. We do not have enough money to adequately maintain our infrastructure, as many rural counties do not. Arguably, neither do the urban centers. Over time, we are building an infrastructure deficit where we are not able to maintain the roads to the level we would like. That creates a safety issue as well as a financial obligation.

The Department of Transportation proposed to do a total reconstruction of Airport Road, which goes from our airport to Highway 50. This was on their long-term plan at a cost of \$3.4 million. That road is part of our gateway. We have business jets fly in and out because of the geothermal and dairy industries. They drive into town on that road. The county paved a three-inch overlay on that road for \$277,000. That road is a smooth road and we did it internally by collaborating with our local paving company. The material cost was \$246,329 and 88.9 percent of the cost of that project was paid to private industry as a public/private partnership. The labor on that project was \$15,005. The equipment charges, according to Orange Book standards, were \$16,015. We had to do that in order to adequately maintain that road, and the project was completed in October 2012. We did not have \$3.4 million, we only had \$2 million available to us.

Per the Department of Taxation, the most recent projections for the county share of our gas taxes were \$2,046,625.60. I take that number and divide it by the 467.53 miles of road and I only have \$4,377.53 to maintain 1 mile of road. The NDOT folks tell you that you cannot do it. That NDOT project we did was over this \$250,000 threshold. We would have had to go out to bid. That project probably would have come in significantly higher than what we paid.

In rural counties, we have a board of county commissioners. They also serve as a member on the regional transportation commission and they serve as highway commissioners for the highway board. The highway commission holds a separate meeting that evaluates everything the road department does and develops our five-year maintenance plan. As we review this five-year maintenance plan, we look at what projects there are. If we had to go out to bid on certain projects and the cost of those projects were to increase, we would not be able to pave my neighbor's road. County commissioners get calls that roads need to be taken care of. We need to do it, and we need to be fiscally responsible. In Churchill County, we have a road department, and we have a private/public partnership with one of the construction companies that provide all of the asphalt. When we do not have enough equipment to do these bigger projects, they rent us the equipment and the man. We do not hire day laborers to supplement our labor. We use the private sector partnership. If we do not have enough money to maintain the roads, the county is going to be in a position to abandon some roads and not do any maintenance because of the liability associated with that. Is that what the taxpayers want?

Another side effect of this legislation could be that some of our county roads that we have chip sealed may deteriorate because we may not be able to provide maintenance. Now, what used to be asphalt roads, become gravel roads. We do not want that as it is another liability and safety issue for the county.

This proposed amendment places additional administrative burdens on the counties and with that, there could be loss of some efficiency, delays in the process of being able to complete projects, and perhaps litigation costs if there were disagreements between the private sector and local government.

Churchill County offers some suggestions. First, in the amendment that was proposed, there was a population threshold of 40,000. The original legislation said counties up to 100,000. Say that this legislation applies to those counties with a population of 40,000 to 100,000. Those counties that have less than 40,000 would be exempt from this legislation. Second, we have an inventory of 196.11 miles of paved roads, 271.42 miles of gravel roads, and 100 bridges. That inventory is certified. We have to give it to NDOT annually for gas tax revenue distribution, and they know what roads those are. Let us maintain those. This amendment would then apply to any new roads or bridges that come onto our system. Third, raise the threshold from \$250,000 to \$500,000. That gives us the opportunity to maintain the infrastructure our residents demand, whether they go to our Regional Transportation Commission meeting, highway commission meeting, or board of county commissioners

meeting when they complain about paving or upgrading their road, and we keep telling them we do not have the financial resources.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

In section 1, subsection 3, it says that the board of county highway commissioners "may" hold a hearing, it did not say "shall." In light of that was I missing something? It does not seem you would be bound by this.

Alan Kalt:

We have a five-year maintenance plan and that plan includes all of our projects, even those over \$250,000. Those go in front of the board, they are prioritized, we do traffic counts, and they approve that on an annual basis for what projects we want to move forward and have the financial resources to do. Our board is very active. In rural counties, roads are a big issue. In fact, in our audit report, it does not meet the definition of a major fund by the accounting definition, but our board wants the road fund treated as a major fund. We display that prominently in our financial statements because that is how big an issue roads are in Churchill County. Our board takes a very active role in which projects we move forward because it is very near and dear to the constituents.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Later it says the board can vote to determine whether the project would be performed by county employees or through the employment of day labor. Even if you have the hearings, it does not seem to be a requirement you are bound by.

Alan Kalt:

My understanding of the bill is if you have a project that costs more than \$250,000 we would not be allowed to do it in-house with our own road crew or equipment. We would be required to go out to bid. There are times we do go out to bid if we do not have the technical expertise or equipment. If it is economically to our advantage to keep that project in-house with existing county employees, we utilize them. If this bill were to pass in the current form, and we have projects we are now required to go out to bid on, we would likely have a reduction in our workforce at the road department.

Assemblyman Hambrick:

How many projects on your pipeline would exceed that \$250,000? If the bill passes in its present form, how would that hinder your projects above \$250,000? How many is that?

Alan Kalt:

I have a summary of some recent projects. With Tarzan Lane, an asphalt overlay, the budget was \$340,000 and we came in at \$339,000. With Bench Road, a double chip seal, the budget was \$350,000 and we came in at \$299,000. With River Village, a stabilization resurface, the budget was \$250,000 and we came in at \$215,000. Those were three projects we would not have been able to do in-house.

If we look at bridges over the last four years, the budgets were \$250,000, \$300,000, \$295,000, and \$250,000. The good news is we did them for \$144,000, \$231,00, \$202,000 and \$162,000 respectively. We were under that \$250,000 threshold, but our engineer's internal estimates were at \$250,00 or higher, so we would have had to contract those out.

Assemblywoman Swank:

Can you give me examples of projects that are under \$250,000 that you would be doing in-house?

Alan Kalt:

Some of the projects include asphalt overlays, double chip seals, stabilization projects because of clay, and resurfacing.

Assemblywoman Swank:

What are the projects you have done that cost just under \$250,000?

Alan Kalt:

All of those. One was \$339,000. It depends on the length of the road.

Assemblywoman Swank:

I am looking for projects less than \$250,000 to get a feel for where that divide is. I have an idea of what the projects are that cost more than that. I need a feel for what the projects are that cost less than that.

Alan Kalt:

Some of the projects that could cost less than that include crack seal, chip seal, guard rail, small bridge, shoulder upgrades, and blading of gravel roads.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

In larger projects, where it goes out to bid, if there is an overage, mistake, or it takes too long, typically, the contractor pays those extra costs. In this situation if the county does the work, who ends up paying for those extra costs?

Alan Kalt:

On the projects with a cost overrun, the contractor will request a change order. There might have been excess clay or water in the subservice. Before they move forward with the project, it could potentially be a \$100,000 change order. We ultimately pay that additional cost. In their bid, they say "under ideal conditions" or something like that. When it comes to the county and an internal project, we have had some clay problems and were still able to get it under budget. Did that answer your question?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Partially. I understand if a private contractor has a contract and it falls within the contract that is okay. What if the contractor makes a mistake, if they are the one that messes up. The way I understand it, they are in violation of the contract, and they must pay for whatever extra costs are associated with that project. If it is an internal project, if there is a mistake that is made or there is an overrun, the county, in essence the taxpayers, pay for that. Is that correct?

Alan Kalt:

We had to file a lawsuit against a contractor and it took three years for them to come back and correct the deficiency we had on an asphalt overlay problem. We paid for repair to peoples' cars because the product was getting onto their cars and into their tires. When it is in-house, we pay for it and we get it done as quickly as possible. The road department and supervisor are held accountable to the county commissioners to explain the situation. They would have been advised of what was going on as the project moved forward. The taxpayers would have paid for that overrun.

Assemblyman Hardy:

Does your department handle streets, drainage, airports, and everything under the public works side? How does this function? How many employees do you have?

Alan Kalt:

The road department is a standalone department. We have a road superintendent, road assistant supervisor, a department lead, two maintenance staff, four equipment operators, an administrative aide/clerical specialist, and the balance are the laborers. The laborers maintain the roads, do snow removal, and control traffic.

Assemblyman Hardy:

It seems more like you are trying to accomplish maintenance projects. I found myself when you have certain sized projects, going out to bid saves the end

user money. It sounds like the majority of your projects are under \$250,000 and are maintenance projects. By the time you go to the design phase to get these streets done, are you adding in all of your maintenance costs? Do you have an in-house engineer?

Alan Kalt:

Our road department does not build brand new roads or bridges. We maintain existing infrastructure. We have expertise in-house, but on big projects that are beyond our abilities, we do contract with an outside engineer. We have contracted projects of large magnitude to the private sector. With a limited budget of \$2 million, we cannot have a huge project.

Assemblyman Hardy:

The bill reads as though it exempts maintenance. The bill talks about construction projects.

Alan Kalt:

In Churchill County, a developer is responsible for building and maintaining those roads for two years. The roads are inspected for maintenance and to make sure everything was done properly. If they were built to county standards, then we take them over for maintenance. In 15 years there may need to be an overlay on that road and that is what we do. Our road department does not put in new roads.

Assemblywoman Swank:

Can you get me some data? It would be helpful in these three cost categories, under \$100,000, between \$100,00 and \$250,00, and over \$250,000, if I could see what percentage of your projects fall into each of those categories.

Alan Kalt:

I would be happy to get several years for you.

Chairman Carrillo:

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

Jeff Fontaine, representing the Nevada Association of Counties:

We worked with the bill sponsor and others to create the amendment. The amendment, for the most part, did address many of our concerns. It was useful in harmonizing language between two statutes that addressed how the rural counties deal with road maintenance projects. However, we would rather see the threshold of \$250,000 be higher.

You heard from Mr. Kalt about some of the projects that fall under that category. I went through the NDOT website to look at some of their construction contracts in that \$250,000 to \$500,000 price range to give you some examples and ideas of the kinds of projects we are talking about. There is a project in Lander County that would be a chip seal project that was awarded for \$333,000. There was a contract in Elko County, the paving of various areas, for \$410,000. A project in Eureka County, installing right-of-way fence, for \$300,000.

We believe many of the county road crews, including those in rural counties, are very committed to what they do and take their job seriously. Many of them participate in ongoing training and become certified through the Transportation Technology Transfer Center at University of Nevada, Reno and are recognized through the center's Road Scholar Program. They do gain useful experience and get training. They know their limitations. The types of projects we are talking about are generally maintenance projects. I cannot imagine a county road crew wanting to take on a project that is beyond their technical capabilities. Why is it important for these rural counties to be able to work with their county forces? In many of our rural counties, you do not have contractors. If you take a \$250,000 or \$300,000 contract, you do not get the same value in a rural county as you would in an urban county because you have to get a contractor out there to mobilize and pay their workers per diem to go out there. You have taken a \$300,000 contract and gotten less value because of those constraints. Those situations still exist and I believe that is the reason we have the statute in place to begin with because rural Nevada is a vast place and it is not easy for contractors, particularly from the urban areas, to bid in a cost-effective manner on some of these projects.

We understand what the bill is about. We would rather see the threshold increased to maximize the efficiency of the counties' limited tax revenues to be able to put them to work.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral on S.B. 217 (R1)? [There was no one.]

John Madole:

I did hear a series of concerns. Is there a particular question someone would like answered that they felt was not addressed earlier?

Assemblyman Hardy:

Is this new construction or is it addressing maintenance as well?

John Madole:

This is meant to address things that are not routine maintenance. I would agree with you that I do not know where new construction stops and starts in the NRS. We define public works and I think we are going to leave the maintenance alone and go after the things that would be better served by a contractor who is accountable for the cost. Does that answer your question?

Assemblyman Hardy:

I believe it does. When you are talking about construction that is better left to contractors, the discussion of them wanting to pave a certain overlay of a road for a distance of repair, are you considering that a project to be put out to bid?

John Madole:

I do not know how many miles were talked about. If there were a considerable number of miles in the three-inch overlay, then a contractor should tell them what it would cost. I find it hard to believe that 15 or 20 miles is routine maintenance. It is more appropriately put out to bid.

Chairman Carrillo:

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

John Madole:

I would be one of those who would appreciate and respect the hard work the road department in a small county does. There is certainly nothing in this bill designed to have any of those hard-working people laid off or to cause a reduction in force. It is our opinion that those people have developed expertise in patching, small chip seals, et cetera. They are good at what they do and that is where they should concentrate their efforts. If a contractor makes a mistake, it will be fixed at the contractor's expense because the contractor bonds that work to the county. If they do not repair it, the county will go after the bond and the bonding company will pay for it. The county is much better protected on a job that is bonded, with the county guaranteed payment if it is done improperly.

Chairman Carrillo:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 217 (R1). We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 343 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 343 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to off-highway vehicles. (BDR 43-630)

Senator Pete Goicoechea, Senatorial District No. 19:

Senate Bill 343 (1st Reprint) would give you the option to register and insure the larger off-highway vehicle (OHV) through the Department of Motor Vehicles. In rural areas, and some of the urban areas, they are traveling off-road on what are truly county or secondary roads. We have done significant work on what the stickers would look like. The major issue we have is with OHVs traveling the rural areas, and there may be an accident. If that vehicle is unregistered, and you are traveling on a county or secondary road, you are probably at fault. This bill would give you the ability to have that vehicle registered and insured and avoid some of the liability. The only way it is legal to travel on those county roads would be if it were established by county ordinance. There are some areas in Clark County where it would be considered safe for these registered, insured vehicles to travel. We would leave it up to local jurisdiction on the majority of these roads to say that an OHV can travel a secondary road if they are registered and insured. It is difficult to fine an OHV that is traveling on a secondary road or in an urban or rural area. This bill establishes a fine not to exceed \$100. It does give law enforcement the ability to write a citation. This is about public safety and the ability for these people to protect themselves from automatic exposure.

Assemblyman Paul Anderson:

Would the insurance limits be the same as a regular vehicle? Are those types of insurance plans available? You can insure your OHV, but they are not typically roadworthy.

Senator Goicoechea:

The bill states that the insurance would have to be comparable to that of an automobile. Most insurance companies will provide the liability insurance as well as full, comprehensive insurance for you. How good is your coverage if it is not registered?

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.] Section 3, subsection 2, says "A truck bed." Are you referring to the Polaris RZR that have the bed in the back?

Senator Goicoechea:

We are referring to the little John Deere Gators that have a box. We want to make sure we covered the multipassenger vehicles with whatever design they had.

Chairman Carrillo:

I wanted to clarify that.

Assemblyman John Ellison, Assembly District No. 33:

I am here to support S.B. 343 (R1). You see many special events crossing roadways, going up and down roadways. We had a person flip over going down a dirt path over a county road. He died. By the time the family was done, they filed suit against the county. That is why we are taking every precaution we can to make sure these are registered and insured. You will see a lot of ranchers, even though they are exempt, still come off one hayfield, drive down a county road and drive into another hayfield. Legally they are in violation. This bill cleans this stuff up.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

I have run into tractors and other farm equipment on roads. They are exempt if they are on the road for a short period. Are we going too far with licensing and insuring?

Senator Goicoechea:

This is only enabling. It does not require registration and insurance. This is a gray area right now; what we have authorized them to do, what streets you can be on, and how far you can go for gas. This is for the person who wants the protection. As we talk about farm tractors, there was a bill passed last session that becomes effective in January, that gives the same ability for agricultural equipment for a \$20 plate, but you have to show you are carrying the \$300,000 liability. As we continue to have this urban/rural interface, I do not think you can have enough protection.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Last session allowed the OHV to be licensed. They are licensed on public lands. People want them to be registered now because of the number of them being stolen. We had a county commissioner where a thief went into his backyard, cut his gate, and stole four brand new OHVs on a trailer. Between Battle Mountain, Winnemucca, Elko, and Ely, about 1,700 were stolen in a month.

Senator Goicoechea:

As of July 1, 2013, you will be required to have them registered.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

I do not own one of the large OHVs. What are the top speeds?

Senator Goicoechea:

I do not own one of the larger ones. My little ones will do 55 or 60 miles per hour. Some of these have 50 or 60 horsepower. I am sure you could reach speeds of 70 miles per hour.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.]
Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 343 (R1)?

Eric Spratley, representing the Washoe County Sherriff's Office:

The Washoe County Sherriff's Office is in support of S.B. 343 (R1). These are a relatively new style of vehicle. We are seeing them on the roadways, we are seeing them cross roads, et cetera. While they are not designed to go 70 miles per hour on the asphalt, they are designed to have that speed on dirt. If they are going to be on the roadway, we do want them registered and insured. We think this is a good way to do that. We will be able to see the tag and call in the plate number if necessary.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.]
If someone is crossing the roadway, is he cited for doing that?

Eric Spratley:

He would be, and the liability falls on the law enforcement agency that does not cite him. If he ends up crashing and we did not take enforcement action and impound the vehicle, we might be liable. With them being registered, we are able to do appropriate enforcement. Being insured is the most important point. If they do crash, there is some insurance coverage.

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

We are in support of S.B. 343 (R1). You are allowed to travel down the roadway from one point to another point up to one-half of a mile.

Robert Roshak, representing the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

We support S.B. 343 (R1) as presented.

Chairman Carrillo:

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support of S.B. 343 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition of S.B. 343 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral to S.B. 343 (R1)?

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

The Department of Motor Vehicles is neutral on S.B. 343 (R1). We have worked with the sponsor as far as minimizing any fiscal impact for implementing this. I would like to note however, as this bill is written, it gives

the director of the department the ability to design the decal. We are aware there is another measure being considered by this body that will reduce the size of that decal. We would like to leave the provision in this bill for the director to make that determination because we would like to work with the sheriffs and chiefs to make sure the size is adequate and distinguishable enough to know that these are the vehicles that have met the requirements of being insured and capable of being operated on the roadways.

Chairman Carrillo:

Are there any questions from Committee members? [There were none.]
Senator Goicoechea, would you like to make any closing remarks?

Senator Goicoechea:

This is a good piece of legislation. It gives you the opportunity to provide some protection to you and your family. It also gives flexibility to local jurisdictions to clean this up a little bit, about where folks can or cannot drive.

Chairman Carrillo:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 343 (R1). We have a special guest. Assemblyman Hambrick's wife, Nancy, is with us today. Is there any public comment? [There was none.]

The meeting is adjourned [at 5:29 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jacque Lethbridge
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Transportation

Date: May 2, 2013

Time of Meeting: 3:07 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 14 (R1)	C	Bill Hoffman, P.E., Deputy Director, Department of Transportation	Written testimony
S.B. 109 (R1)	D	Senator Settelmeyer, Senatorial District # 17	Notes regarding changes to S.B. 109
S.B. 109 (R1)	E	Senator Settelmeyer, Senatorial District #17	Off Highway Vehicle pictures and brochure
S.B. 191	F	Senator Donald G. Gustavson, Senatorial District No. 14	Written Testimony
S.B. 191	G	Senator Donald G. Gustavson, Senatorial District No. 14	<i>The Salt Lake Tribune</i> and <i>Los Angeles Times</i> articles
S.B. 191	H	Senator Donald G. Gustavson, Senatorial District No. 14	Crash statistics charts
S.B. 191	I	Senator Donald G. Gustavson, Senatorial District No. 14	Traffic Safety Facts sheet
S.B. 191	J	Senator Donald G. Gustavson, Senatorial District No. 14	Imposing Speed Limiting Technology on America's Trucks article (OOIDA)
S.B. 217 (R1)	K	Senator Mark A. Manendo, Clark County Senatorial District, No. 21	Written testimony
S.B. 217 (R1)	L	Paul McKenzie, representing the Northern Nevada Building and Construction Trades Council	Proposed amendment