

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

**Seventy-Eighth Session
February 12, 2015**

The Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chair Jim Wheeler at 3:16 p.m. on Thursday, February 12, 2015, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/78th2015. In addition, copies of the audio or video of the meeting may be purchased, for personal use only, through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Jim Wheeler, Chair
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblywoman Victoria A. Dooling
Assemblywoman Michele Fiore
Assemblyman Edgar Flores
Assemblyman Brent A. Jones
Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick
Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill
Assemblyman Stephen H. Silberkraus
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None



GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michelle L. Van Geel, Committee Policy Analyst
Melissa N. Mundy, Committee Counsel
Joan Waldock, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Troy L. Dillard, Director, Department of Motor Vehicles
Nancy Wojcik, Administrator, Division of Field Services, Department of Motor Vehicles
James M. Wright, Director, Department of Public Safety
Dennis S. Osborn, Chief, Nevada Highway Patrol
Traci Pearl, Administrator, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety
Keith Lee, representing California Nevada Cement Association
Thomas R. Tietz, Executive Director, California Nevada Cement Association
Tom Adams, P.E., Technical Sales Representative, Nevada Cement Company

Chair Wheeler:

Welcome to the Assembly Committee on Transportation. [Protocols and procedures were explained.] We have three presentations today. We have asked everyone to keep those presentations down to 15 minutes, although I realize that some of them may run a little over. Before we get started on the presentations, I am going to change the order of the agenda because we have some people who have to get to other committees. We are going to go right into the work session on Assembly Bill 103. [Roll was called.]

Assembly Bill 103: Provides for the issuance of special license plates for veterans who are awarded the Silver Star or Bronze Star Medal.
(BDR 43 22)

Michelle L. Van Geel, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 103 was heard in Committee on Tuesday. It requires that the Department of Motor Vehicles design, prepare, and issue special license plates honoring veterans who received the Silver Star or the Bronze Star Medal.

The bill specifies that no fee in addition to applicable registration and license fees and government service taxes may be charged for the issuance or renewal of these special license plates. Chairman Wheeler proposed a conceptual amendment to enable a person who has suffered a 100 percent service connected disability to obtain a Silver Star or a Bronze Star Medal license plate that is also inscribed with the international symbol of access. The amendment also exempts vehicles displaying these license plates from paying any parking fees. The proposed conceptual amendment is right behind the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)). It can also be found on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

Chair Wheeler:

I am going to open it up for discussion about the amendment, if there is any, because we only briefly touched on that during the hearing. Do we have any comment on the amendment?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Could somebody comment on the new part, about exempting from payment any parking fees? Are there other license plates that also exempt the person who has them from paying parking fees?

Melissa N. Mundy, Committee Counsel:

In response to the question, the Disabled Veterans plates do have that exemption. Also, the ex-Prisoner of War license plate, I believe, is the only other one that has that parking fee exemption.

Chair Wheeler:

That is correct. Since this would be with the international symbol of access on it, it would mean that they were 100 percent disabled, so it would be disabled veterans. We are just bringing it in line with the other ones.

Is there any more discussion on the amendment or discussion on the bill? I will accept a motion from Mr. Sprinkle.

ASSEMBLYMAN SPRINKLE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 103.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

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

Chair Wheeler:

The bill will be sent to the floor as amend and do pass. Would anyone like to volunteer to make the floor statement? Thank you, Assemblyman O'Neill.

Let us move on to the presentations. Our first presentation today will be the overview of Department of Motor Vehicles. Mr. Dillard, please go ahead.

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

I have 15 minutes to review 26 slides, ["Department of Motor Vehicles: Department Overview," ([Exhibit D](#))]; this is going to be fast.

Going into the overview and jumping right to slide three, I will highlight that we have 1173.5 staff positions. We have eight divisions within the department. We have 18 offices statewide, and we also use eight counties as agents for vehicle registration purposes.

Department Goals is the next slide. The number one goal I want to highlight is customer service. The second goal I want to highlight is technology services. The rest, I will let you read, since I have only 15 minutes.

The bulk of the department is funded through State Highway Fund appropriations (slide 5), so we are a Highway Fund agency. We receive a very, very small stipend from the State General Fund for the purposes of voter registration. We collect in excess of \$1 billion in revenue each year for the state.

Slide 6 gives a picture of exactly the distribution of that revenue. Forty-five percent, or the bulk of it, is collected and goes to the county and school funds. The Highway Fund is next. The smaller pieces are State General Fund, DMV-specific fees, and other small areas of revenue.

I am going to run through our divisions quickly. I want to introduce each of the division administrators because you will be seeing them before you regarding bills. Our last administrator is actually in Las Vegas, so you will see her in a very small little picture, but the rest of them will be standing before you. The Director's office (slide 7) has the oversight of the department as a whole. Our media relations comes out of this office, as well as our administrative hearings and human resources. Rhonda Bavaro, who is behind me, is the Deputy Director of the Department.

Sitting next to me is Amy McKinney. She runs the Administrative Services Division (slide 8), which conducts all of our budget and other administrative

activities: payroll, travel, and mail services. She also runs our facilities and warehouses for stocking of forms and supplies.

Next up is Terri Albertson, the administrator of the Management Services and Programs Division (slide 9). Ms. Albertson's group is probably the one you will be most familiar with throughout the session. They handle most of our bill responses, our preparation, and our response for fiscal notes. They coordinate all of that. They do our project management and a lot of the analysis, the results of which you will be seeing through bill management.

Next up is Mark Froese. He is our Division of Information Technology (IT) administrator (slide 10). We live and breathe through IT. There is no running the Department of Motor Vehicles these days without IT. It is essential. I will be touching on this a little later in the presentation.

Next is Wayne Seidel who is administrator of the Motor Carrier Division (slide 11). The trucking industry is the big focus here, as well as fuel tax collection for the State of Nevada. All fuel taxes in Nevada are collected through this division.

Our Division of Central Services and Records administrator is Sean McDonald (slide 12). This is our back office function. Every time something is ordered on the Internet or through mail processing—titles, all of that, his personnel take care of that for the public.

The Division of Compliance Enforcement (slide 13) has oversight and regulation of the automotive industry. Wreckers, body shops, salvage pools, brokers, garages—those types of industries—are under its oversight, as are traffic safety and driving under the influence school. The Division is also responsible for the testing side of the emissions program for the state. One of the biggest things they look at is abuse of department services, meaning the biggest crime they investigate is identity theft.

Next up is Nan Wojcik, who is in Las Vegas (slide 14). She is responsible for what is really the face of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), which is the offices throughout the state. She has the largest and most diverse division within the Department, Field Services. It is the one that deals with the vast majority of our constituents face-to-face, across the counters.

Getting into some of the programs, probably more interesting stuff, first is our kiosk program (slide 15). It was implemented several years back and has been incredibly successful at moving transactions to an alternate service. We have 18 located in the 12 DMV offices, and 27 are in partner locations, such as

universities, grocery stores, and AAA offices. With those partnerships we have with businesses in the community, we try to put our services right in your neighborhoods, where you work, where you shop, so that you do not have to come down to the offices. The transactions on those continue to expand within the capacity of our IT services. We did more than one-half million transactions—closing in on 600,000— just in the last year through our kiosk services.

One thing I want to mention is that over 30 percent of our customer volume is cash-based customers. That is a large volume of folks coming in and paying across the counter for whom we do not have a lot of alternate services. Cash does work in some of our kiosks, including the ones within our offices. Kiosks in partnership locations do not take cash because of the cost and the liability of cash handling for the partners. That is an area we continue to look at—how we can continue to move our cash customer base to some of the alternate services and expand those programs.

Slide 16 shows the web portal. This is a program that we rolled out a little over two years ago. We can now identify you as a specific customer within the DMV. Previously we had web transactions, where you could do basic minor transactions, such as renewing a vehicle registration. Now we can actually identify you as an individual based upon your identity and the products that are assigned to you and open up the ability for you to conduct additional transactions that you previously were not able to handle.

This also helps us greatly in other areas. Last year, we expanded this to work with the auto dealers. We went to mandatory submission of dealer reports of sales. We call it the electronic dealer report of sale program. If you purchase a vehicle from a dealer in Nevada, they now send us that information electronically. In the past, it was mailed in and had to be typed in by our technicians, which took additional time and created additional errors. Now it all comes in electronically. That does two primary things for us. One, it allows you to go onto the Internet and register your first-time vehicle without having to come to a DMV office. Please take advantage of that. Only 10 percent of the customers purchasing vehicles today are taking advantage of that. That is a statistic that we want to increase. On the other hand if you do come into the office, the technician does not now have to type that information in. They are able to pull it up, which means that transaction can go much more quickly. We do not need to add additional staff with the additional volume received for title processing because now they do not have to type as many titles as they did in the past.

Chair Wheeler:

When someone comes into the DMV, can you sign them up for this there so that they would not have to come back for future events?

Troy L. Dillard:

In this case, it is a one-time event because it is the purchase of an automobile. Do we educate them? Yes. We try to. One of the things we are focusing on is how to better educate this population so they know how to use this. We are doing this in a few ways, including considering making it a requirement for dealers to provide either a sign-off form or information or incorporate this somehow into the deal jacket. We were exploring that today. We are also looking at a budget enhancement, which allows us to do much better at marketing the information. We have had so many culture changes in the DMV in the last year alone that trying to get customers educated on what those changes are is an overwhelming process for us with our current abilities. We are trying to address that.

Back to the web portal: we have 338,000 accounts currently and we have done over one-half million transactions on the web portal since it was created.

Next up is "Veteran's Exemptions" (slide 17). About two years ago, we deployed a program whereby veterans in the state of Nevada are issued a certain credit through the county assessor's office toward either their vehicle taxes or their property taxes. This was all a manual process in 4 by 6 cards or 3 by 5 cards that they had to bring in so they were excluded from being able to use some of these alternate services. We are very pleased that we were able to work with all 17 counties, 16 of which deployed. We have been online with those counties for some time now so the veterans have the exact same capacity to use our alternate services for their vehicle registration renewals as everybody else does. The one exception to that has been Clark County, which has our largest population. The good news is that, as of yesterday, I received an email from them that they are now ready to start testing on their end. Hopefully by the end of the legislative session, we will have that live in Clark County. It will help the veterans in Clark County and also help with some of the waits that we have in our Las Vegas offices today.

Slide 18 deals with off-highway vehicles (OHV). In this program, the Department is responsible for titling and licensing OHV. The Nevada Commission on Off-Highway Vehicles actually is responsible for the oversight of the program itself. They have the people in charge of the regulatory structure, the funding structure that goes to them, and the granting process that they use with that fund. On our side, we also regulate the dealers who sell OHV within Nevada. Seventy-five of those dealers are currently licensed. There are

39,323 active OHV registrations. You will notice the original program estimate was 280,000. We missed it by that much.

The DMV currently receives 15 percent of the revenue from registrations for the purpose of running that side of the program. Eighty-five percent goes to the Nevada Commission on Off-Highway Vehicles for the purposes of their program. We are submitting a bill that would change that structure so DMV would keep what covers the expenses of running the program and everything else would go to the Commission.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Director Dillard, could you explain to me why our estimates were off by that much?

Troy L. Dillard:

Certainly. Those projections were provided by the lobbying group that was behind getting that bill passed. It took three sessions before that bill actually was approved in the format in which it was. Those were the numbers used from the side that was proposing it. Recently there was an audit conducted on that. The biggest issue that it found was a lack of education and enforcement with regards to that program. They still believe those numbers are true. It is simply that the program has not been enforced; therefore, the registrations are not there.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Is the program of value or would it just be better, since it really is not being enforced, just to do away with it? Are we causing an onerous burden on these operators and sellers?

Troy L. Dillard:

This body debated that issue greatly at the time. That is also why it took three sessions before an agreement could be reached on what was appropriate. I certainly do not want to go back and say that it was not right or the best thing and that now it has been blown out of proportion. It needs focus. It needs work. That was the point of the audit itself, to identify where those issues are and to start working toward making sure that the program meets the expectations for which the legislature passed it.

Assemblywoman Fiore:

As you are looking to have 100 percent of the funds going to the Nevada Commission on Off-Highway Vehicles, what exactly will they do with these funds?

Troy L. Dillard:

The Nevada Commission on Off-Highway Vehicles has guidelines, either statutory or regulatory, that require that a certain percentage of the funds they receive be allocated for specific purposes, including enforcement, education, and improvement of trails. I do not have the breakdown, but they have guidelines which they are required to follow.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

We did debate this for three sessions and an interim committee. It was Senate Bill No. 394 of the 75th Session. It was about being consistent with the western states, many of which already require OHV registration. Specifically, we talked about Utah, where your vehicle will be confiscated if registration is not current. There was some discussion on trails upkeep because at the time we were seeing some matching dollars to help with that. It was a small amount. I think the projections came in lower because people did not realize you could have sticker reciprocity that worked in different states.

I think it took us almost two sessions to even get the size of the sticker and the registration approved because that was a big controversy, even at my home with my husband: "Why does Nevada have this huge honking thing and every other state has a very small one?" Statute specifies where the dollars go.

There is a lot of legislative history if people want to go back and see it. An interim committee followed up, resulting in some vagueness in the regulations. The statute had no dollars for trail improvements, so in southern Nevada we were working to get that big playground for OHV. Legislators thought this would be a growing industry. Education has probably been the biggest problem. Now many of the new dealers tell you right away that you are required to register your OHV. It is getting easier and we are doing a better job. There have been some real improvements to the trails for the people who use them.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Will the purchasers be able to use that same program you have for new car purchases for registering their off-highway vehicles? Is that a possibility to increase compliance?

Troy L. Dillard:

No. This program is not a highway-funded program; it is fee-funded. There are many competing interests; hence, the sticker is one size one year and a different size another year. Having all those people agree on what to do has been very difficult for obvious reasons. They all have a different aims. Ultimately, these are arguments that are before the OHV Commission in trying

to set policy issues to carry forward. For the Committee, I think it is very important to understand that we do only the titling and registration.

Slide 19 is about specialty license plates. This Committee has seen many bills concerning these. As a quick history on this, statute sets a limit on the number of specialty license plates allowed and an approval process through which they must go. Last session, that number was increased by the addition of a second tier. There had been 30 specialty plates, another five were added. The difference in the tiers is that those in the first tier have to have a \$5000 bond and maintain 1000 active registrations at any given time. The second tier requires a \$20,000 bond and a minimum of 3000 registrations at any given time. All the plate requests go through the Nevada Legislature Commission on Special License Plates for recommendation to the Department of Motor Vehicles for approval.

System modernization for the DMV (slide 21) is our number one initiative this legislative session. Our system is a Common Business Oriented Language (COBOL)-based system. Many of you have or will receive fiscal notes on bills that impact DMV specifically regarding programming the system. Because COBOL is old and linear in its computing process, it takes a great deal of effort to be able to make changes. It is also difficult to attract, hire, and retain personnel with the skill set that programming positions for this system require. They are outdated. It is a major initiative and undertaking for the department to modernize the system so we can deliver on policy issues and changes to keep up with the times and to be able to provide our customers with the service they deserve. We do not like having people waiting hours to receive governmental services at our offices. We can do better. One of the very first things we need to do is bring ourselves into the modern world, from a technology perspective, in order to be able to deliver those services to our customers and residents of Nevada.

I will now jump right to the bills. Assembly Bill 37 (slide 22) is a consignment auction bill. It was heard earlier today in the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining. It will not be coming before this Committee. This clarifies that the bill that was passed last session allowing for consignment auctions to forego the official testing of emissions on vehicles is limited to the exact purpose for which it was intended. Dealers who have inventory are not able to sell their inventory through that process.

Senate Bill 21, a motor carrier fuel tax bill, is simply a cleanup bill for legislation that was passed last session. It deals with refunds in regard to tax in Clark County on motor fuel.

Senate Bill 34 (slide 23) refers to "authorized maintenance station." This also is a clean-up bill that eliminates archaic station classification. It is not much of a policy issue.

Senate Bill 43 relates to railroad crossing rules. This is a bill that brings us into compliance with Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration laws. It has been sitting for some time on the audits that the State has had from the federal government. We are finally moving forward to get that cleaned up.

Our largest IT project (slide 24) is deploying a new placard for our dealers. Those handwritten pieces of paper on cars dealers sell that we have seen for years and years are being phased out. This is now a computer-generated system. When a vehicle leaves the lot, it is accessible to law enforcement. The placard runs just like a license plate. It provides vehicle and owner information. It ties into the system that gives law enforcement the ability to see if the registered owner has outstanding warrants and things like that.

We have an electronic lien and title program underway now. This also is a bill that was passed last session. It changes the paper titles that are going out to lienholders into an electronic one. This is a win-win-win situation for all parties. Everybody was in favor of it. It is moving forward on schedule. The contract was just awarded, and the work is beginning as we speak.

The Commercial Driver's License Information System is to keep up with federal changes. We are dealing with that. It involves thousands of hours of programming.

I would be happy to take any additional questions.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

Director Dillard, let me congratulate you and DMV for some tremendous work. I have used your online programs for registration. I am planning to purchase a new vehicle and look forward to registering it online. I will test the dealer to see if he tells me about it. My question is, could you talk to us about REAL ID and what we are doing to inform citizens as they come in to prepare for this, for the challenges they may face?

Troy L. Dillard:

I was remiss in not highlighting this in the presentation. In November 2014, Nevada became a REAL ID-compliant state. What does that mean? The federal government passed the REAL ID Act of 2005. Fraudulent driver licenses were used by individuals to get on airplanes in the 9/11 attacks. The federal

government set a requirement standard that states have to meet if their driver licenses and identification cards are going to be accepted for federal purposes.

One is not required to obtain a REAL ID; I want to be clear about that. However, if you want to use your driver license at a federal building that requires proof of identity, such as the White House or the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) headquarters, it must be REAL ID-compliant. They will not accept a driver license or an identity card from a state that has not issued a REAL ID-compliant card.

The biggest impact is going to be at airports. The DHS had indicated they would begin enforcing the REAL ID requirement at some point in 2016 for airline travel. Most Nevada residents have a license in their wallet that does not have the REAL ID symbol on it. Under the federal guideline, those are just as good as a REAL ID-compliant card up until the final date of implementation, which has now been changed to 2020. The vast majority of Nevadans will come up for license renewal prior to that date. If you are having your license renewed today, you have to choose between a REAL ID-compliant license or one that is non-compliant. To obtain a REAL ID-compliant license is much like when you got your first driver license. Most of us have not presented documents to the Department of Motor Vehicles since we were 15.5 years old. Now we have to, to get a REAL ID. One has to bring proof of name and age—a birth certificate or a passport are the two primary means; proof of social security number—a social security card or a W-2; and two forms of proof of residency in Nevada: power bills, mortgage bills, rental agreements, et cetera. That is all you need to redocument; you only have to do it one time. You do not have to do it after that at renewal. You do not have to do it when you move to another state either.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

I want to ask about the one problem I have heard, at least from my constituents. My daughter is one of my constituents, as she often reminds me. She does not have a power bill or mortgage bill or something in her name. It prevented her from getting the REAL ID. How is that addressed? In today's world, many children live at home, many of our elder folks live at home together. What is an additional piece? I think that is the biggest problem for many constituents right now because we have multiple generations in one house. They do not necessarily have those bills in their names. If they had their own bills, they surely would not be living at home.

Nancy Wojcik, Field Services Administrator, Department of Motor Vehicles:

We have two affidavits that we created for these situations. We have a document that the person they are living with can sign that validates that they

are living in their household. That person provides us proof of residency with a power bill, utility bill, or some acceptable document. There is a second form that can be signed by the applicant that says, "I do reside in this location," which is acceptable proof [when properly completed] that they are a resident of Nevada.

Assemblyman O'Neill:

If you have had your driver license since you were 15.5 years old, they mail you the notice and you come in to get your license. Is that not proof? Can we use that as proof that you live at that residence? I have lived at the same residence for 20-some years now. Why do I have to show additional proof? When notifications go out that renewal is coming up, are we telling them of the options, and if you choose REAL ID—come with all this material?

Troy L. Dillard:

The first part of that is that proof of residency is a federal requirement for REAL ID enrollment. We cannot issue a REAL ID-compliant license without meeting that standard. We have to keep a copy of those documents on an image status, scanning and maintaining them.

As to your second question about educating the public—we have identified this as being very difficult. How do we change the culture? How do we ensure that every person has knowledge of the need for REAL ID and which documents they need to bring in with them? It is not simple. Explaining it just to you all took at least five minutes. We have a multiphased marketing approach in an attempt to get this information out. Yes, it is on the renewal notices, but if you have looked at those notices, you have seen that they are jam-packed with information. There is no way we can include all that they need on the notice. That is why it directs people to the website to get their information. On the front page of the website is the question, "Are you renewing?" It immediately directs you to that information. In all of our offices, that information is available. Technicians ask them. It is on the application forms.

Unfortunately, many people do not know until they get to the office. People are not checking those informational sites, so they come in without the documents they need. They either leave and come back with the documents or they get a non-compliant identification and return at some point and switch to a REAL ID so that they do not have to worry about carrying passports and other proofs of identification. It is a problem for us, too. We want our customers to come in once and get taken care of.

We have placed ads that are going to start as early as next week, I think it is. Plans were solidified this morning to move into a different marketing campaign.

We also have a technological unit in our budget that expands our fiscal ability to get that information out to residents. To the many people who are hopefully listening on the Internet, tell your friends, tell everybody else, put it on Twitter, and re-tweet because we want the information out so that we can issue that card the first time you come in.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

At the beginning of your presentation, you said that your whole computer data system is being run off of COBOL programming, correct?

Troy L. Dillard:

COBOL is the base language. There are also other languages that you have probably never heard of. We also use some .NET for the Internet pieces.

Assemblyman Sprinkle:

With REAL ID, you are going to be requiring some of the most sensitive identity documentation a person can have, and you will be uploading it because you have to store it permanently. I assume you are not keeping hard copies in some file cabinet. This is a system highly vulnerable to attack.

Troy L. Dillard:

The software is being loaded up through a vendor's software program that goes into a data storage. The Department of Motor Vehicles database is the golden key for hackers. It has sensitive information on almost every adult resident in the state and that is even without scanning documents—just with what is contained in the standard fields.

Enterprise Information Technology Services (EITS) still has the security oversight for the State. We are compliant with all state requirements and also have our own security. We have focused on that very piece recently. Last year we converted an open position to an information security officer, so that we have someone with specific expertise to continue to identify vulnerabilities and to improve our system. We have seen incredible advances this last year alone in the ability to protect that data. The request for proposal that we are building is for a new system with an absolute focus on security.

Assemblyman Jones:

I want to apologize in advance. I am not as fond of the DMV as my colleague. I have been frustrated with the Department of Motor Vehicles. You can wait there for hours and hours. Now you have the Dash Pass system where you can go online to see your place in line. Why, after providing these services for so long, can you not be more efficient? You have had years to improve. No business in the private industry would stay open if customers had to wait

hours for service. No matter which DMV office you go to, there is a wait of hours.

Troy L. Dillard:

It is a simple question, but not a simple answer. The first aspect is the requirements placed upon the Department through state and federal mandates and federal requirements. I will be happy to submit to you a list of all that DMV is responsible for, which is more than simply registering vehicles and licensing individuals. It involves hundreds of connections to various areas—organ donor, parking, the National Driver Register, Problem Driver Pointer System database. I cannot answer your question to say why, but I can tell you that a year ago the average wait time was 37 minutes. Now it is hours. That is in response to conditions that have changed in the past year: new programs that have been implemented, new people DMV was not seeing before, economic recovery, the drive for registration of new vehicles. We are the second-fastest-growing state in the nation. We have 7,800 people a month moving to our state to whom we are issuing driver licenses. There are a myriad of reasons.

Does that mean that we are as efficient as can be? Absolutely not. We are constantly seeking ways to address the issues that come up. January 2014 was when the increased volume hit us like a freight train; we have been trying to keep up with it ever since. Our budget contains 75 positions to be filled, so that we can help service customers, move them through, and drive those wait times down. Regarding system modernization, it takes seven screens to conduct a transaction at the counter as opposed to two screens required to do the same transaction on the Internet. I would be happy to expand on that with you in writing.

Assemblyman Jones:

Is it budget constraints that are not allowing you to get ahead of this? I have been waiting more than 37 minutes for many years.

Troy L. Dillard:

Are there budget constraints? Yes. Are there resource constraints? Yes. Are there technical constraints? Yes. All of those things play into it. It is not just a straightforward, simple answer. When the economy crashed, we used to have what we called 100 percent staffing—every window with 100 percent coverage throughout the workday. Today, that is not the case. We lost staffing. We have budgeted to get those windows covered again. That, in and of itself, is projected to remedy about 40 percent of the current wait time. That is a big impact. The second-largest impact will be moving customers through much faster.

What are we doing? We are trying to identify and educate the customers who do not need to be in DMV offices. One of the constraints that we have is cash customers. We can now do cash transactions in our kiosks. That is our number one kiosk use. In our office, we do more cash transactions on kiosks than we do across the counter. Eighty percent of vehicle registration renewals are handled through alternate services, which is a pretty good number. The problem is that the other 20 percent equals 25,000 people who are still going to the counter to do their transactions. The bulk of those people do not have to be there. We are trying to identify how to deal with them, how to move them to alternate services so they are not there causing customers who do have to be there to wait. We continue to target these things piece by piece. I hate to use this analogy, but we have to eat the elephant one bite at a time. That is what we are trying to do today.

Assemblywoman Fiore:

Can you send me the list you to offered Assemblyman Jones?

Troy L. Dillard:

I would be happy to send it to the Committee.

Assemblywoman Fiore:

When you say that you are going to require a birth certificate or a passport and other proof of residence documents for REAL ID, is it "and" or is it "or?" Is the purpose of REAL ID to see if they are U.S. citizens? What is the purpose of the REAL ID?

Troy L. Dillard:

The answer to your first question is, "It is 'and'." It is proof of name, age, social security number, and place of residency. As far as citizenship is concerned, if you are a legal resident from anywhere else and you have Department of Homeland Security (DHS) documentation showing proof of residency, you still qualify to obtain a REAL ID-compliant card. If you are here on a limited term, your card expires at the same time the DHS document expires. They are tied together, but you can still obtain a REAL ID with legal standing.

Assemblywoman Fiore:

How do you know—with birth certificate, social security number, and proof of residency—that citizenship is legal or if they are here legally?

Troy L. Dillard:

Are you asking regarding someone who is presenting a DHS document? We have federal interfaces with DHS to validate a person's status. A person presents a document and we scan it and enter the information into the database. It goes to DHS and they confirm whether or not the document is valid. Sometimes they do not know. There are secondary and tertiary processes for follow-up before we will issue that REAL ID card.

Assemblywoman Fiore:

Can you provide me with what secondary documents will be required?

Assemblyman Carrillo:

I recently received a call from a constituent regarding wait times being caused by updates in the system. Are you going through a change right now? What is happening? He had a three-hour wait. He was upset that the phone calls—the callbacks for Dash Pass—were an issue as well. I want some clarification on that.

Troy L. Dillard:

Certainly. There are no delays from system upgrades going on. What I referred to in the earlier presentation is policy changes that were put in place. January 2, 2014, we added a new card type—a driver authorization card (DAC). That brought a significant number of new customers to the Department. At the same time, there was a change in federal requirements for commercial driver licenses in regard to medical certificates. Shortly after that, we moved to the new queueing system, as our old system was no longer functional. We went to our new system—Dash Pass. The intent of that was to change how customers wait. We do not want people to be waiting at DMV offices. We want to give them the freedom to come in when they are ready for service and to have some control over that. Dash Pass allows you to adjust yourself in line. If we sent you a text that said, "You are going to be served in approximately 20 minutes," and you are on your way but get stuck in an accident, you have the ability to move back so you do not lose your place in line. That is a customer convenience issue. It is the first of its kind in the nation to have a statewide rollout.

It is not perfect; there are issues that we are learning about. We continue to try to adjust things and we are working with the vendor to deal with the issues. For example, now that we have provided that freedom to our customers, we have a no-show rate as high as 41 percent. How does that impact us? We call that person, causing a 45-second lapse when nobody shows up. Then we call the next person. If that happens in the Flamingo Road office in Las Vegas 600 times a day, it starts adding to the wait time. That is an issue we are

trying to address. We still believe that providing our citizens that level of convenience is important, but we need to fix that in the best way to provide what we want.

Right on the heels of that, we also had the REAL ID compliance aspect. Each time the process changes, our technicians have to learn new things. They become less efficient at turning customers over. Driver authorization cards added new types of forms; there is a completely new process for a DAC versus a driver license. With REAL ID, it is the enrollment process. Now they have to take more time making sure that the customers have the documents that are necessary before they start the transaction. This adds time. Those little pieces of time over a day are significant. The even bigger issue we have now is that in an office that has the capacity—with current staffing—to conduct 1100 transactions a day, we have 1600 requests for service.

That is why we have some of the problems we are trying to address through the means I have been discussing with you today, continuing to target ways to improve. We also need to fill vacancies so that we have technicians to serve the people who are coming in requesting service.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

I want to give you kudos on your online service, which I use as much as I can. I rarely go to DMV, unless I need to pick up plates. I think the last time I got vanity plates, they were mailed to me. I just had to wait for them to show up.

Troy L. Dillard:

If I could share quickly, to spin off of that. Just last year, we did one-quarter million more online transactions than the year before, which is a significant jump. At the same time, we had one-quarter million more people requesting services at our offices. That is a one-half million increase in volume in one calendar year.

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

A couple of years ago, we saw a loss of a little over 100,000 car registrations when the economy went bad. Fewer people were utilizing your services, but they are coming back, and we are seeing more and more folks that probably had dropped off the service. At the same time, we have not restored staffing and resources to the 2005 level when we were at our highest. We tend not to restore services as fast as people need them, as the economy recovers. In 2009 we had a huge drop in driver licenses and car registrations. In the last year we have had an increase in people utilizing those services. Is that correct?

Troy L. Dillard:

I think that is correct. When we had all those positions filled, we were handling 1.2 million customers. Today we are handling 2 million customers.

Chair Wheeler:

Thank you for your presentation and for the job that you do. Living in a rural area, we have nowhere near the wait times these guys are talking about. We are now scheduled to have an overview of the Department of Public Safety.

James M. Wright, Director, Department of Public Safety:

Thank you for the opportunity to give us a few minutes here to do an overview of the Department of Public Safety ["Nevada Department of Public Safety: Department Overview," ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Chair Wheeler:

Thank you, Director. Before you get started, I do want to give you some kudos. I had a problem in the last two days, at one of my facilities. I called your office and it was taken care of instantly. I really appreciate that.

James M. Wright:

With me today is Traci Pearl, administrator of the Office of Traffic Safety, and Dennis Osborn, of the Nevada Highway Patrol division. I brought them along because I am just going to give you a quick introduction to the Department. We felt that it would be important to your Committee to highlight some transportation-related issues that both of these divisions within our Department deal with.

As we start out, you should have our overview with you. Our mission (slide 2) is to provide public safety services "in support of protecting our citizens and visitors by promoting safer communities through prevention, preparedness, response, recovery, education, and enforcement." It is a lot we do. It has been my vision and direction that the Department be a unified multidiscipline, and total-force organization where every employee at the Department of Public Safety (DPS) has a very important role to perform in our public safety mission. "Make it important!" That goes for the administrative assistant answering the phone to the officer on the road. We instill importance in them. They are very proud of our mission and of working for our organization.

Our Department staff numbers about 1400 (slide 3), divided into about 60 percent sworn and 40 percent civilian to support our mission and organization. One thing that I want to bring out is that DPS is more than just the Nevada Highway Patrol. They are the largest and the most visible of our divisions. They reach out and touch more people. We are more than that.

We are organized into eight divisions and three offices (slide 4). The divisions are: Capitol Police, Emergency Management and Homeland Security, Highway Patrol, Investigations, Parole and Probation, General Services, State Fire Marshal, and Training. Our offices consist of the Office of Criminal Justice Assistance, the Office of Professional Responsibility (our internal affairs unit), and the Office of Traffic Safety. The Department also provides administrative support for the State Board of Parole Commissioners. The next slide (slide 5) shows our organizational chart. If there are any of you who would like more in-depth information on the Department or any of its divisions, feel free to get in touch with us. We would be glad to come over and explain further. I know a couple of you have taken advantage of that and we appreciate it because we want you to know who we are and what we do. We are proud of what we do. With that, unless there are any questions, I would like to roll right into our transportation-related things for you, as it relates more to your Committee. I think we are ready to start off with Chief Osborn.

Dennis S. Osborn, Chief, Nevada Highway Patrol:

The Nevada Highway Patrol (NHP), as the director mentioned, is the largest division in DPS. We have 478 sworn and 79 civilian staff, all dedicated to NHP's mission, which is to promote safety on Nevada highways by providing law enforcement and traffic services to the motoring public. ["NHP and Office of Traffic Safety: Transportation Issues" ([Exhibit F](#)).]

Many think of the Highway Patrol as ticket-writers, those making driving under the influence (DUI) arrests, crash investigators, and helpers of stranded motorists. We do much more than that. We are very engaged in our communities. I will give a couple of examples of those engagements. On slide 3 ([Exhibit F](#)) you see "NHP's 'Big 5'." I want to point out that these are the big five, the priorities for the Highway Patrol. All of these issues are choices that each and every one of us make when we drive on our highways. They impact the Nevada fatality rate and the number and severity of crashes. Enforcement involving impaired driving is near and dear to our hearts to reduce crashes and their severity, along with distracted driving, mostly with cell phones and texting; occupant restraint; speeding; and hazardous moving violations. I am happy to report that in 2014, we did increase enforcement for four out of those big five priorities.

As far as issues facing NHP (slide 4), crash fatalities are always our number one concern. We dearly believe in the "Zero Fatalities" campaign. As they say, nothing else is acceptable. Everything that we do is geared toward reducing the number of fatalities. Distracted driving is still on the rise. Our enforcement numbers have increased, even with all the public service announcements and the educational components.

A new trend, specific to Clark County, is hit-and-run accidents. They have spiked in the last calendar year specifically. We believe one of the reasons that occurred is that Las Vegas Metropolitan Police had to take a "no response to property damage crashes" stance. Many Nevadans get confused between law enforcement agencies. Some in Clark County believe that highway patrol stopped responding to property damage crashes. That is the excuse we are getting, which is somewhat believable. We are trying to get public service announcements out and educate the public that the Highway Patrol will respond to property damage accidents. We have assigned a full-time investigator to do nothing but follow up on hit-and-run crashes. Some people are reporting the crash to the office the next day and saying, "Oh, I did not realize that you would come out to the crash." We are addressing this trend.

A fourth concern is implied consent, which is in Assembly Bill 67, which we talked about the other day. That is a big one for the Highway Patrol because we patrol the whole state. We have 17 counties and currently have to defer to local prosecutors on how they want us to address implied consent for evidentiary testing of blood or breath for a DUI. I hope to see this resolved this session.

My last slide (slide 5) is our "three Es," as I call them: education, enforcement, and engagement. The Highway Patrol is trying in various ways to get compliance with traffic safety laws. Under "education," I listed, "Below 100" and "D.R.I.V.E. (Driving Responsibly Includes Vehicle Education)."

"Below 100" is geared to officer safety. It includes wearing the ballistic vest and the reflector vest, speed, complacency kills, and what is important now.

Driving Responsibility Includes Vehicle Education is a program to educate our youth on driving. A lot of times parents teach their children to drive. In some cases, they are not necessarily the best teachers. We try to get involved with professional drivers from the community and from the Highway Patrol. We have programs geared toward education.

For enforcement there are a lot of things we are doing with my colleague from the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS): joining forces in saturation patrols, High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area interdiction, and our Badge on Board. That has been a successful program geared toward vehicles driving around commercial vehicles. Our studies have found that it is the traffic around big rigs that cause a lot of their accidents. This program actually puts a trooper in the truck with an L-3 digital recorder and a radar gun. They are looking for violations with commercial vehicles, but also with what is going around those

commercial vehicles. The program has had a lot of success in reducing those crashes.

Engagement is what I was alluding to in my opening with the community. I would like to talk about two programs, one in Clark County and one in the north. We had a successful pilot program called, "It Can Wait for 28." We have been enforcing the cell phone and texting law since it passed in the last session [*Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 484B.165] and have seen the number of stops increase. We are enforcing this. Our numbers show that we are, but we were not getting compliance. In this program we partnered with many people—OTS, the legislature, and the courts. For one week our motor squad in Las Vegas enforced this law in a program that Captain Anne Carpenter put together for us. The point of the program was that if you were cited for distracted driving, you were asked if you wanted to participate in a social media campaign. For 28 days you had to watch videos or read literature, then had to share what you learned on social media. The objective was to educate as many people as we could. We reached hundreds and hundreds of people every day from 287 participants. If they complied with the program, they had their citation dismissed by the court. So, there was an incentive, but it also helped us get the word out about how dangerous texting and driving or talking on the cell phone is.

In northern Nevada, working with Secretary Anthony Foxx from the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), we have placed an emphasis on pedestrian and bicycle safety. One of our troopers, John Protain, who lives in Pleasant Valley, saw that bicyclists were in danger despite the move-over law for bicycles (NRS 484B.270). Many have heard of the law for emergency vehicles, but there is also one for bicycles that requires you to move over at least three feet or into the adjoining travel lane, if it is safe to do so. Nobody knew this law existed. The program started out as an enforcement issue, but quickly turned into an educational one. I wanted to mention both of these as successful pilot programs in which we are involved in communities across the state.

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

We are a grants office, applying for federal highway safety grant funds from USDOT, and sub-awarding them to local and nonprofit agencies throughout the state. Our mission is primarily to provide funding and expertise, create partnerships, promote education, and develop programs and projects that will eventually eliminate deaths and serious injuries on our roadways (slide 7). The statutory authority for our federal programs (slide 8) was established upon enactment of the Highway Safety Act of 1966, the Surface Transportation Bill.

Slide 9 shows statutory authority for the motorcycle training program, a state fee-based program. Six dollars of every motorcycle registration goes to support that program. Training is statewide, including the rural areas.

The state has a strategic highway safety plan (slide 10). It involves many state, local, nonprofit, and advocate partners. It was implemented in 2006. Nevada's Priority Safety Program is very similar to what Colonel Osborn alluded to: impaired and distracted driving, pedestrian safety, seat belts, motorcycle safety, and speeding. If we could get everybody to buckle up and not drink and drive, we would get rid of two-thirds of our fatalities immediately.

We have a constant mission of trying to educate both existing residents and new residents that come to our state. The E's (slide 11) that Colonel Osborn mentioned: education, enforcement, engineering, and emergency medical systems—we work with all of these disciplines.

Our office primarily funds projects to change bad driving behavior: drinking and driving, not wearing a seat belt, and others. The Department of Transportation (NDOT) is a strong partner of ours. Their federal funds are for engineering fixes for traffic safety problems, like rumble strips to prevent drivers from running off the road when they are tired. Between our behavioral projects and NDOT's engineering projects, we have made some great strides with the Strategic Highway Safety Plan. In 2006 we had our highest recorded number of fatalities, 432. Three years later we had our lowest number of fatalities, 243. To give you an idea of how fatalities rates have gone in the state, slide 12 gives the rates from 2005-2012 per 100,000 population, in this state per licensed drivers, and per registered vehicles. You can see by those rates that there has been significant improvement, but we have a ways to go.

Slide 13 looks at issues facing OTS. Pedestrian and motorcycle crashes, fatalities, and serious injuries have significantly spiked in the past year and a half. We are focusing more resources on those problems with NDOT right now, and have been for the last couple of years. Another issue is the movement to legalize recreational marijuana in the nation and how that would relate to impaired driving. Currently, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) expired September 30, 2014. We are working on continuing resolutions until Congress reauthorizes that act.

Assemblyman Jones:

I do not know which one of you should answer this question. Do all the public service announcements, such as promotion of the Zero Fatalities campaign, run through your Department? Do you fund them? Or are they funded through a different department, and you just benefit from it?

Traci Pearl:

The Zero Fatalities campaign is a statewide campaign primarily funded by NDOT and our office. We also put out individual public service and safety announcements like "Click it or ticket, wear your seat belt." Zero Fatalities is the umbrella for all of traffic safety. It is primarily our two offices that pay for those with federal dollars.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

You mentioned the number of fatalities that drinking and not using seat belts causes. Nevada does not call for primary enforcement of seat belt laws; we have secondary enforcement. How would the percentage of fatalities decrease if motorists not using seat belts had been using them? How much would it have been reduced if we were not using secondary enforcement from 2001 to 2013? According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, we are at 94.8 percent seat belt usage. California, which practices primary enforcement has 97.4 percent compliance; Utah, which has secondary enforcement has 82.4 percent compliance, and Arizona has 84.7 percent compliance. Many people have moved here from California, which has increased the use of seat belts. That 94.8 percent is not a bad percentage for seat belt usage. It would be great to have 100 percent usage, but when I look around at an intersection I still see people texting and holding their phones down, not out of sight. That will always be an issue. But seat belt usage? I see people using them. Current usage is phenomenal, but even for a primary offense, or primary enforcement, you still are not going to have 100 percent usage.

Traci Pearl:

That seat belt usage rate of 94 percent is an observation survey that every state has to conduct to qualify for the federal funds. As of three years ago, all states have to use the same methodology. I truly believe that the 94 percent is mistaken and paints an inaccurate picture, because observations are only daytime and front seat, first of all. We know from our crash statistics and from nighttime surveys that drivers take more risks at night. They do not wear their seat belts as much at night. Consistently for the last 14-15 years, fifty percent of our fatalities have been unbuckled. There is a big gap between what is being observed in the front seat while standing on a corner for 40 minutes during the day and what we are really seeing happening year after year after year. That is why we continue to try to educate folks to wear that seat belt. With primary enforcement, even if we could only raise the observed rate one or two percent, that would result in saving 3-6 lives.

Chair Wheeler:

We have our last presentation. We are going to hear from the California Nevada Cement Association.

Keith Lee, representing California Nevada Cement Association:

Some of you who were on this Committee last session have heard this presentation. We have updated it and added a few more bells and whistles. We have some information updates on progress we have made. I hope our presentation gives you some ideas about how over time we can save money for the state in construction of highways and other thoroughfares by the use of concrete construction. On my far left is Tom Tietz, executive director of the California Nevada Cement Association. On my near left is Tom Adams, who is with our homegrown Nevada Cement Company, headquartered out of Fernley, Nevada. I will turn it over to Mr. Tietz.

Thomas R. Tietz, Executive Director, California Nevada Cement Association:

I want to mention that this presentation ["Opportunities to Capitalize on Competition: Strategies for Doing More with Less in Nevada," ([Exhibit G](#))] is done with the Southwest Concrete Pavement Association and the Sierra Nevada Concrete Association. We just had a technical meeting over at the Department of Transportation (NDOT) this afternoon. We come here today with a real sense of gratitude. As Keith mentioned, we gave a similar presentation two years ago and have seen tremendous progress on what we believe to be commonsense policies for life cycle cost analysis (LCCA) and alternate design/alternate bid (AD/AB) process. We have one case that we will celebrate as we go through this presentation today. I wanted to particularly thank past chair, Assemblyman Carrillo, and NDOT director, Rudy Malfabon, for supporting these policies, which I think are making a real difference.

Tom Adams, P.E., Technical Sales Representative, Nevada Cement Company:

We would like to express our support for the Committee's work in the past, particularly in regard to two major areas: first, transportation and alternate funding, and second, support of alternate delivery policies for construction projects. For the first I am really referring to creative funding solutions, such as the [Washoe County Ballot Question, 2003] RTC-5 and the Clark County gas tax indexing that we are all working through right now. Those concepts have a tremendous impact on some of the deficiencies we have with the transportation infrastructure within the state. Looking at slide 2, here are some numbers from TRIP, a national transportation research group. This is 2013 data. Even though we have gone through with some gas tax indexing (slide 2), Nevada is still looking at 51 percent of our urban roadways being in poor or mediocre condition. We have had a 137 percent growth in vehicle miles traveled from 1990 to 2011 without any major overhaul to the revenue source. In Reno/Carson, the result is about 86 percent of our urban roads are in poor or mediocre condition. It costs Nevada residents about \$2.1 billion per year because of potholes and traffic delays resulting in gas being burned in traffic jams.

We have about \$53 billion in goods shipped from sites in Nevada and about another \$77 billion coming into the state, mostly by truck. The dollars used are for infrastructure. I would like to express our support for funding, but also for the alternate delivery mechanisms that this Committee has supported in the past. Those delivery mechanisms include concepts such as design-build construction and construction manager at risk deliveries, great tools to help spend the money appropriately. We also have a slide (slide 11) that demonstrates other things that happen when we look at alternate design/alternate bid techniques. We end up with more efficient designs and more competitive bids; we invite innovation when we provide these opportunities for contractors. Lastly, when we add life cycle cost analysis to our concepts, we end up analyzing the economic implications of pavements or infrastructure using the best available methodologies over the full cycle of a project pavement, rather than by looking at it as a first-cost bid. By doing so, we can save dollars.

I will touch on life cycle cost analysis (slide 7). A lot of you have seen this presentation before. The concept of life cycle cost analysis is cradle to grave for a transportation infrastructure project. It includes construction and maintenance costs, any costs for rehabilitation, and disposal costs through the duration of that project. We encourage the Department of Transportation and local and county agencies to look at life cycle costs when they are making decisions about allocation of funds for transportation projects. The next slide (slide 8) shows that by looking at life cycle cost analysis, you can get a lot more information about long-term performance and the cost of a project. In the initial construction costs in this example, design A versus design B, we would say this is an asphalt project versus a concrete project. Initial construction costs might be higher for concrete, but through a 30-year design life it minimizes the cost for maintenance rehabilitation, showing a significant savings over the life of the project by using the concrete option, or design A. Life cycle cost analysis and alternate design/alternate bid techniques that this Committee has supported improve our cost estimating and reduce our risk of budget overruns by getting contractors involved early and getting valuable feedback during the design process. It allows our designers, specifiers, and agencies to make better decisions, make more accurate estimates of current and future costs, and ultimately to select the most economically sustainable alternatives.

Thomas R. Tietz:

I would like to touch briefly on alternate design/alternate bid, a policy that we think makes sense. We are seeing some progress being made using this here in Nevada. It is a policy that is important to recognize. It is supported by the Federal Highway Administration, and is being used in a number of states around

the country. Alternate design/alternate bid increases competition by putting two paving materials on a specific project bid, increasing the number of bidders on the project, and lowering its cost. We have seen examples from around the United States where that has been good. We have a recent example here in Nevada (slide 11) where this policy was employed and deserves to be celebrated. If you look at phase 1 of the Boulder City Bypass, NDOT put out designs for both concrete and asphalt. This doubled the number of bidders from two to four, as there were two bidders for each type of pavement. The Department of Transportation included a life cycle equivalency factor over a 35-year life. With those calculations, they determined this section would be a concrete pavement. We think that inspiring more competition and more innovation is healthy, not just for the industry, but also for the economy. The other thing worth considering here is that, while this analysis was done over 35 years, the state will likely enjoy a pavement that will last much longer than that. I have provided an example (slide 12) of a section of Interstate 10 going through southern California where you see the outer lanes, built in 1947, the inside lanes built in 1965. Those surfaces are still in existence and performing well beyond 35 years. Here in Nevada, we saw this technology employed on Interstate 80 in Reno not too long ago. A great example of a project with a lot of durability is Center Street (slide 13) in downtown Reno. Slide 14 is a project from just last week. I arrived in Las Vegas where some concrete pavement is being placed at the airport. This is an example of a contractor based here in Las Vegas who has the capacity to do this sort of project. We think this is a good direction for the state. Thank you again for your support. I am going to ask Tom Adams to wrap it up for us.

Tom Adams:

In summary, we would like to ask for continued support from the Committee for alternate design/alternate bid. It increases competition by increasing the number of bidders, and results in the best first costs. We would also like you to continue to consider life cycle cost analysis during bid and award of projects. We will get increased competition and lower cost estimates, and it will allow better-informed decisions. It allows our engineers to do more with the dollars that they do have. Moving forward, we would like to ask for the support of the Committee to assure that policies like life cycle cost analysis and alternate design/alternate bid are being used (slide 17). They provide value for projects. We are looking forward to USA Parkway. We want to see what the bid numbers look like on that. We ask members of the Committee to keep these in mind when you do go to your home districts and have interactions with your constituents or projects. Ask about LCCA. See if your design teams have considered that prior to award. Ask questions locally. See if those policies are being employed in your district. We do want to support our common goal, more

funding for transportation. Our industry, the cement and concrete industry and the construction industry, is committed to improving our economy by improving our transportation infrastructure. It is going to take funding to do that.

Chair Wheeler:

Do you happen to know if USA Parkway is using LCCA?

Tom Adams:

USA Parkway is a design-build project. As such, by definition, it will use life cycle cost analysis. Design teams will compete with the most cost-effective design for the specified duration of that project.

Assemblyman Jones:

Is the concrete that is used in roads made in Nevada or is it brought in from somewhere else?

Tom Adams:

The majority of concrete that is made and used on Nevada infrastructure is made right here at home. We have a single cement plant operating in Nevada, Nevada Cement Company in Fernley. It provides the bulk of cement for the state, with the exception of Clark County. The ready mix suppliers that are making this concrete are typically family-owned businesses. They have their own quarries and make this stuff here. It is locally-sourced, typically with the benefits of long durability and low carbon footprint.

Assemblyman Jones:

Driving on Interstate 15 south from Las Vegas, in the truck lane are small rectangles that were cut into the concrete and then refilled. Can you tell me what those do? Does it extend the life?

Tom Adams:

I assume it is what is called a "dowel bar retrofit." The Department of Transportation has a number of pavement strategies that extend pavement life without having to replace it. One of those is to go back after a duration of time and saw cut a pocket into the pavement and drop reinforcing steel into it, ensuring appropriate load transfer between panels. It does extend the life of the pavement. When you run over them they make a little bit of noise.

Chair Wheeler:

I will open the floor to public comment. [There was none.] Is there any public comment in Las Vegas? [There was none.]

The meeting is adjourned [at 4:47 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Joan Waldock
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Jim Wheeler, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Transportation

Date: February 12, 2015

Time of Meeting: 3:16 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 103	C	Michelle L. Van Geel, Committee Policy Analyst	Work session document
	D	Troy L. Dillard, Department of Motor Vehicles	DMV Department Overview
	E	James M. Wright, Department of Public Safety	DPS Department Overview
	F	Dennis S. Osborn, Nevada Highway Patrol	NHP Department Overview
	G	Thomas R. Tietz, California Nevada Cement Association	Association/Industry Overview