

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session  
April 11, 2017**

The Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chairman Richard Carrillo at 3:20 p.m. on Tuesday, April 11, 2017, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4404B 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/79th2017](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Chairman  
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Vice Chair  
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod  
Assemblyman John Ellison  
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo  
Assemblyman Richard McArthur  
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno  
Assemblyman Michael C. Sprinkle  
Assemblyman Justin Watkins  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler  
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus, Assembly District No. 38

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst  
Darcy Johnson, Committee Counsel  
Joan Waldock, Committee Secretary  
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 723



**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Andy McAfee, Captain, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety  
Roy Baughman, Lieutenant, Coordinator, Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program,  
Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety  
Brad Keating, Legislative Representative, Community and Government Relations,  
Clark County School District  
Jeanette K. Belz, representing Friends of ACE Charter High School  
James R. Lawrence, Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and  
Natural Resources  
Greg McKay, Chairman, Commission on Off-Highway Vehicles  
Jude Hurin, Administrator, Division of Management Services and Programs,  
Department of Motor Vehicles  
Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association  
Mike Ramirez, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective  
Association Metro, Inc.  
Scott A. Edwards, President, Las Vegas Peace Officers' Association; and representing  
Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs  
Irma Fernandez, Legislative Aide for Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams,  
Assembly District No. 42  
Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association  
John Sande, IV, representing Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association  
Alfredo Alonso, representing Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers,  
Bethesda, Maryland  
Sean P. McDonald, Administrator, Division of Central Services and Records,  
Department of Motor Vehicles  
Michael G. Alonso, representing Caesars Entertainment

**Chairman Carrillo:**

[Roll was called. Committee protocols and rules were explained. The Committee recessed at 3:22 p.m. and reconvened at 5:54 p.m.]

We will take the bills out of order. We will start with Assembly Bill 485. The sponsor of Assembly Bill 208 has requested that we pull that bill.

**Assembly Bill 208: Prohibits certain vehicles from being operated in the extreme left lane of certain controlled-access highways. (BDR 43-189)**

[Assemblywoman Spiegel assumed the Chair.]

**Vice Chair Spiegel:**

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 485.

**Assembly Bill 485: Makes various changes relating to school buses. (BDR 43-36)**

**Assemblyman Jim Wheeler, Assembly District No. 39**

As the former chair of this Committee, during the interim I was asked by the Nevada Highway Patrol's Colonel Dennis Osborn to clean up language regarding school bus inspections. There has been more added to the bill by Chairman Carrillo. I would like to turn to law enforcement to present the bill.

**Andy McAfee, Captain, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety:**

What inspired us to reach out to Assemblyman Wheeler was a Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) audit that identified that part of what we commonly refer to as the "white fleet"—Department of Education or county school district vehicles used to transport students to and from various school functions—were not being inspected by the Nevada Highway Patrol's Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program, as prescribed by an older version of the law that had us wrapped up with the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). Many of those vehicles transport fewer than what would typically be defined as a school bus number of students—perhaps as few as four students. In adherence with the audit and in an attempt to meet the recommendations, we approached Assemblyman Wheeler and asked that this law be changed so that we can inspect what we need to inspect or find the resources with which to do so. The meat of the work was done by Lieutenant Roy Baughman, who is the head of our Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program. I would like to turn this over to him so that he can answer any detailed questions.

**Roy Baughman, Lieutenant, Coordinator, Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety:**

One of the issues we looked at is the definition of a school bus, found in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 484A.230 which broadly defines school buses. We looked at aligning that with the *Code of Federal Regulations* definition of a school bus as a "passenger motor vehicle designed to carry a driver and more than 10 passengers . . . ." This would narrow it into the four class types of A, B, C, or D bus, which technically eliminates calling a passenger car a bus for our inspection purposes.

We have changes that Assemblyman Carrillo will talk about ([Exhibit C](#)). We will be adding language to NRS 386.830, referred to in section 4 of the bill. As Captain McAfee testified, there were sections that named the Department of Motor Vehicles as responsible for inspecting buses. The Department of Public Safety (DPS) has always done this type of inspection, so we will clean up the language in statute, as this is something we have done and will continue to do for types A, B, C, and D buses.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

There is a friendly amendment submitted by Friends of ACE Charter High School that will change the language in the original bill from 10 passengers to 15 ([Exhibit D](#)).

**Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Assembly District No. 18:**

I am addressing section 3, referring to school bus safety belts. [He played an ABC *Nightline* segment that showed crash tests of school buses.]

Every time I see that bus crash into the wall, I cringe. We know that could happen in real life, with students not faring well. As many of you know, there have been an unusual number of school bus crashes in Clark County since the beginning of 2017. Last week a Clark County School District bus carrying 70 students was involved in a crash with another vehicle. Two students were reported injured. According to NRS 484D.495, all passengers in motor vehicles must wear seat belts. This provision is exempted for school buses. For most people, getting into their cars and putting their seat belts on is second nature. For our children, this is very clear. The action has become ingrained in all of us; however, every day students throughout the state get on school buses that are not equipped with safety belts.

During the last school year, 2015 to 2016, Clark County reported 495 school bus-involved crashes. In 2017, there have been 64. Clark County is not alone. You can find articles about school bus crashes in other counties in Nevada. This has become a national problem as you can see from the video. Last year, six people were killed when a school bus in Baltimore, Maryland, crashed head-on into a public transit bus. Three weeks later, six elementary school students were killed in a school bus crash in Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Section 3 of the bill requires that any new bus purchased by a school district must be outfitted with a shoulder-harness-type safety belt assembly. I have been talking to Clark County School District and am hoping they will testify on this bill. With this change, they said they would go on the record differently than how they originally had planned. The amendment changes the effective date from July 2017 to July 2019, giving them time for working with their budgets.

As someone who has a small grandchild who will be taking the bus to school, or as I see young children waiting for their school buses, I think this is the right thing to do. We cannot keep kicking this can down the road. This is a win-win situation. We do not have to endure stories such as the young mother who will not see her child grow up.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

Thank you for the bill. This is something that is needed. Are there any other states that are implementing similar policies?

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

There are six states that currently require seat belts on school buses.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

This is a good bill. We will be protecting our children.

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

I know this is a policy committee. At the end of the day, it is the fiscal note that kills this bill. I am not looking to retrofit every bus. I want the school districts to start budgeting for this. It always comes down to the money; but if we lose one child, how do you put a price on that?

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

This bill will apply to new buses, correct?

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

That is correct. There will not be retrofitting of current buses. This bill would mean that buses purchased after July 2019 will have to be equipped with seat belts. As new buses are purchased, they must have seat belts. That is why we amended the effective date from 2017 to 2019—to allow school districts to budget for this.

**Vice Chair Spiegel:**

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] I will open the meeting to take testimony in support of A.B. 485.

**Brad Keating, Legislative Representative, Community and Government Relations,  
Clark County School District:**

We are here in support of A.B. 485. The reason we asked for the amendment to change the effective date to 2019 is that we are currently in the middle of a contract for new buses. The effective date of July 2017 would have hurt the budgeting process. We finalized our budget in the Clark County School District and have a bid and purchase agreement. This allows us to finish that purchase agreement and then, starting July 1, 2019, begin having seat belts installed in any new buses we purchase. We cannot put a price tag on any of our students' lives, and we want to make sure they are as safe as possible at all times.

**Vice Chair Spiegel:**

How long does it take to turn over the fleet and replace the existing inventory of buses?

**Brad Keating:**

We turn over our buses every five to seven years. Due to our policies, we cannot use them any longer than that. They will then go to a rural district. The intention is that, as we get these new buses in our fleet, they will flow down to the rural districts.

Lindsay Anderson, representing Washoe County School District, could not be here. Washoe County has already started purchasing all of their buses with seat belts, so they are obviously in support of this bill.

**Vice Chair Spiegel:**

Are there any questions from Committee members for Mr. Keating? [There were none.] Is there anyone else here or in Las Vegas to testify in support of A.B. 485? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition?

**Jeanette K. Belz, representing Friends of ACE Charter High School:**

Because of your rules, we are deemed opposed to the bill because we submitted a proposed amendment ([Exhibit D](#)). We worked through the amendment with the Department of Public Safety (DPS) this afternoon, so the original proposed amendment we presented ([Exhibit D](#)) is not contained in the section 1 language we are proposing now [paragraph 1 of ([Exhibit C](#))]. Thanks to Darcy Johnson, Committee Counsel, we have a revised proposed amendment that would, in section 1, exempt from the definition of a school bus those vehicles that are defined per the federal definition as "multi-function school activity buses." These buses are not used to transport children from school to home or home to school. They are used to transport students to attend specialized programs, taking students from a parking lot to a parking lot. They do not stop in travel lanes or discharge or take on students in traffic. These are basically small shuttle buses; ACE owns two of them. One has 12 seats, the other has 14 seats. What this exemption would mean is that they would not have to be yellow, would not have to have the bar that comes out, and would not have to have flashing lights since they do not stop in traffic.

**Vice Chair Spiegel:**

Just to clarify—there are two amendments on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), one is dated April 6, 2017, the other is titled "Conceptual Amendments to A.B. 485." Are you speaking about the second one ([Exhibit C](#))?

**Jeanette Belz:**

That is correct. What I am referring to is the first paragraph of the conceptual amendment in ([Exhibit C](#)). It is language clarification suggested by your Committee Counsel.

**Vice Chair Spiegel:**

It would be great to have DPS come back up to speak.

**Roy Baughman:**

The exemption Ms. Belz talked about will be put into section 1 of Assembly Bill 485. The second conceptual amendment, submitted by Clark County School District, is the one Chairman Carrillo already talked about. It will change the effective date to July 1, 2019. The third part of the conceptual amendment, submitted by DPS, relates to section 4 of the bill. We will remove section 4, subsection 1, paragraph (c) and revise it so that semiannual inspections by DPS only apply to school buses as defined in section 1.

**Vice Chair Spiegel:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Do we have anyone in Las Vegas who wishes to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Do we have anyone wishing to testify as neutral in Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was no one.] I will ask our Committee Counsel, Darcy Johnson, to enter some comments.

**Darcy Johnson:**

It is LCB's mistake that number 2 of the conceptual amendments appears to make a date change that is not a date change. It should state that we are changing the date from July 1, 2017, to July 1, 2019.

**Vice Chair Spiegel:**

I will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 485.

[Assemblyman Carrillo reassumed the Chair.]

**Chairman Carrillo:**

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 29.

**Assembly Bill 29: Revises provisions governing off-highway vehicles. (BDR 18-220)**

**James R. Lawrence, Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:**

[He read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).] It is a pleasure to be here this afternoon to introduce and support Assembly Bill 29 regarding the Commission on Off-Highway Vehicles (OHVs), commonly referred to as the OHV Commission. During this past fiscal year, the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) was asked by the Executive Branch to add the OHV Commission to the Department, as the OHV Commission did not reside within any state department or agency. The DCNR received approval from the Interim Finance Committee last year for this transition. Part of the advantage to locating a commission within a department is that necessary staff and fiscal support can be provided to the program. Currently, DCNR is home to 11 separate boards, commissions, and councils, so this is a function that is well understood in our department. Assembly Bill 29 formally places the Commission within DCNR statutes and also proposes some efficiency changes to the Commission membership, grant awards, and other administrative matters. Briefly, the proposed statutory changes are as follows:

Section 1, pages 2 and 3, establishes the Commission within the Director's Office of DCNR, establishes that the Director will submit a budget for administering the program, and maintains the requirement that a report on the activities of the Commission will be submitted to the Legislature for each regular session.

Sections 2, 3, and 4, pages 3 through 5, add the OHV Commission to the relevant statutory sections related to DCNR and existing commissions.

Section 5, at the bottom of page 5, provides that the Director may adopt regulations as necessary to carry out the program.

Section 6, pages 6 through 7, modifies the membership of the Commission from an 11-person voting membership to a 9-person voting membership. Specifically:

- Because the OHV Commission is proposed to reside within DCNR, we propose to replace the DCNR representative on the Commission with a representative of conservation organizations;
- With the addition of a conservation organizations representative, along with other current representation on the commission, we believe that the interests in existing section 6, subsection 2, paragraph (g) will be covered so, as such, that representative is proposed to be eliminated;
- We also propose to combine the two current off-highway motorcycle representatives into one representative.

While a nine-person voting membership is still relatively large for a commission, we believe that these modifications will result in a more efficient composition without losing any stakeholder representation.

In addition to the voting membership, subsection 3 of section 6 (page 7) adds the State Director of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Forest Supervisor of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, and the Directors of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs as nonvoting, ex officio members. This replaces the nine nonvoting advisors that are currently identified in statute. I would add that we hold public meetings and that anyone wishing to attend and comment will be encouraged to do so.

Section 8, page 10, removes the existing percentage requirements in the grant-funding categories. The grant-funding categories remain the same; however, we removed the percentage requirements so that the Commission has the ability to fund the best projects regardless of category constraints. Assembly Bill 29 also provides that the Director may appoint an advisory committee to provide input on the grant applications as needed.

Section 8, page 11, allows for a reserve account to be established in the operating budget. This is to address the revenue stream peaks and valleys that are typical with budget accounts that are dependent upon license or fee revenue.

Section 9, subsection 4 (page 13), proposes to reduce the registration late fee from \$25 to \$10. This reduction is proposed to encourage more compliance with the program. This has been the most frequently identified barrier to registration renewal, as there is no grace period and most individuals own more than one OHV. Therefore, an inadvertent miss of a deadline is very costly, and it causes many to simply skip reregistering their vehicles.



Finally, we are proposing an amendment based on conversations with interested stakeholders from the environmental and wildlife community ([Exhibit F](#)). The amendment proposes three things. First, we are proposing to amend the section 6, subsection 2(f) definition of the Commission member representing the conservation community to be consistent with the conservation community member statutory definition for the State Environmental Commission and the Board of Wildlife Commissioners. The proposed amendment for section 7, subsection 3(b) makes it clear that regulations for the program should promote projects that satisfy multiple grant categories and, within available funds, encourage grant distribution across eligible grant categories. The final amendment, to subparagraph (6) of paragraph (c) of subsection 2 of section 8, allows for projects that prevent impacts to be eligible for funding in addition to only those projects that restore damaged areas. This adds language that helps with wildlife and environmental protection that is important.

This concludes my testimony, and I would be happy to answer any questions.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Are there any questions?

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

Who would make up the Commission?

**James Lawrence:**

The makeup of the Commission is outlined on page 6, in section 6. Currently, the Commission has 11 members, which is a large number for a program of this size. We are reducing. The remaining members currently in the statute are these:

- one member who is an authorized dealer, appointed by the Governor;
- one member who is a sportsman, appointed by the Governor from a list of persons submitted by the Department of Wildlife;
- one member who is a rancher, appointed by the Governor from a list of persons submitted by the Director of the State Department of Agriculture;
- one member representing the Nevada Association of Counties, appointed by the Governor; and
- one member representing law enforcement, appointed by the Governor from a list of persons submitted by the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association.

Those remain and are currently in the program.

We changed out the representative from the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources since we would be housing the program. We substituted it with a representative from the conservation community. There are an additional three members

appointed by the Governor. They must reside in the state of Nevada, have participated in recreational activities for off-highway vehicles for at least five years, and represent three different groups. The first group represents persons who own or operate all-terrain vehicles; the second represents persons who own or operate all-terrain motorcycles and participate in the racing of off-highway motorcycles. That previously was two members; we have now combined that into one member representing the motorcycle community. The third member is one who represents persons who own or operate snowmobiles. That is consistent with the previous statutory language. These would make up the nine-person voting membership.

We proposed to take the nonvoting, ex officio members from nine to four. Those four ex officio members would be the State Director of the Nevada State Office of the BLM; the Forest Supervisor for the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest; the Director of the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs; and the Director of the DMV.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

Can people statewide apply to be members?

**James Lawrence:**

The names are submitted in an application process that goes to the Office of the Governor. That office will choose and select from the names to represent these areas.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

I have a question on section 6 of the bill. What do you see as the role of ex officio members on the Commission?

**James Lawrence:**

The role of the ex officio members is to bring their areas of expertise to the Commission. I see much value in the roles of the BLM and Humboldt-Toiyabe representatives. A lot of the use of OHVs is on public lands that are managed by these two entities. They would bring their perspective of what is going on in lands they manage. The DMV is the entity collecting the registration fees, so they would be aware of where current registration is and would know how to better promote registration. The use of our public lands and OHVs has an impact on our tourism, so that department's perspective is valuable, especially in the areas of education and promotion.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

In section 9, subsection 4, you propose to lower the late fee. I wonder if by lowering the late fee people will be less likely to pay the fee on time. It seems that if you raised the late fee, there would be more incentive to pay the registration on time. I want to try to understand why you are lowering the penalty.

**James Lawrence:**

We had a lot of internal discussion on that issue. Regarding the late fee, we heard a lot of anecdotal information. Many folks and families who have off-highway vehicles may have

five or six of them of different ages. They may have one vehicle that sits in the garage most of the year—it might be used for only a week or two. Maybe they have three or four vehicles in the garage. They receive a notice from the DMV. Because these are vehicles that are not being used very often, registration is not on their radar. If they miss the deadline by one day, the late fee for the four vehicles is \$100, which is even more than their registration. What we heard from folks was that if the fee was lower, they would be more inclined to register and pay the late fee. When the late fee for multiple vehicles is higher than the registration fee on vehicles they do not use very often, they will take their chances in not being registered. We think this is more of an incentive to bring folks into compliance if they miss the deadline.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Are people registering their OHVs all at the same time? I have only one. If people have four of them and registration on all of them is due at the same time, that is a big hit. When I did the registration on my vehicles, I registered so that I could have them spaced out over the year instead of having them all due the same month.

Also, how long is considered late? Is it a month? Is it three months?

**James Lawrence:**

My understanding is that if the registration is not paid by the due date, it is late. If it is due on January 25, and payment is not received by January 25, the late fee applies. You mentioned staggered registration. I am sure it varies for different families and when they purchased their vehicles. Registering off-highway vehicles is relatively new compared to registering an automobile. With the new program, folks that had more than one OHV in their garages registered them all at once.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

We will hear testimony in support of A.B. 29.

**Greg McKay, Chairman, Commission on Nevada Off-Highway Vehicles:**

Our full Commission supports this bill.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Is there anyone in southern Nevada in support of A.B. 29? [There was no one.] Is there opposition to A.B. 29 in southern Nevada or northern Nevada? [There was none.] Is anyone neutral in southern Nevada or northern Nevada? [There was no one.] Are there closing remarks?

**James Lawrence:**

There is something I neglected to mention regarding registrations. Some of these vehicles are snowmobiles. If they were originally registered in June or July, owners are not thinking

about renewing registrations in the summer on vehicles they have not used in months. They then get hit with a late fee. We think reducing the late fee is going to get us more compliance with the program.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

I will close the hearing on A.B. 29.

[([Exhibit G](#)) was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

We will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 252.

**Assembly Bill 252: Authorizes a peace officer or retired peace officer to request the display of an alternate address on his or her driver's license or identification card. (BDR 43-692)**

**Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus, Assembly District No. 38:**

My district is all of Churchill County and most of Lyon County. Assembly Bill 252 allows peace officers in Nevada to withhold their home addresses from being printed on their driver's licenses or identification (ID) cards. [She read from written testimony, ([Exhibit H](#)).] The alternate address to be displayed on the card will be the address of their employer, such as the sheriff's office or police department. A retired peace officer may also request the use of an alternate address to display on a driver's license. The sheriff's department would not allow an out-of-state retired police officer to use an alternate address in Nevada. Both the retired peace officers and those still serving must continue to provide their home and mailing addresses to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) when they apply for or renew their driver's license. With that being said, if a peace officer chooses to use an alternate address, the license will not meet REAL ID requirements.

Other states have implemented such provisions. For example, the State of California has taken measures to protect the privacy of all public officials, including peace officers, by not making any of their private information, including home address, accessible to the general public. Other states, including Arizona, Wyoming, and Georgia, allow for the display of a post office box or other mailing address on a driver's license to protect the privacy of the license holder.

After submitting this bill, several other issues regarding privacy were brought forward, such as allowing private citizens to use a post office box on their driver's licenses and allowing people such as fire inspectors and others who are involved in investigations to use an alternate address the way this bill allows peace officers to do. The Legislative Counsel Bureau informed me that, because of the title of this bill and the fact that it addresses a single subject, it strictly relates to peace officers and is not germane. I asked the DMV about this

because someone told me that a parent did not want a 16-year-old daughter's address on her license. The DMV informed me that, while they do not encourage it, a post office box could be used in place of the home address. If we need to clarify that in future legislation, we can do so.

I will quickly go through the bill. Section 2 of the bill allows for a request of the DMV by a peace officer or a retired peace officer to use an alternate address on a driver's license. The alternate address must be the address of the peace officer's employer so they can still reach the officer. This section also requires that the peace officer still provide home and mailing address to the DMV for their records and mailing purposes. Section 3 of the bill applies the same provisions as section 2 to any request for an alternate address on an ID card. Section 4 of the bill applies the same provisions as section 2 to any request for an alternate address on a commercial driver's license or commercial learner's permit.

Again, thank you for allowing me to present this bill before the Committee. It is important that we continue to make an effort to protect those who protect us. I encourage your support of A.B. 252 and welcome any questions.

**Assemblyman Watkins:**

I appreciate the policy consideration behind this bill. If we were going to protect peace officers, should we not also want to protect everyone involved in the criminal justice process—the district attorneys, the public defenders, and the judges? Have you explored that with the DMV the way you explored protecting someone's 16-year-old daughter?

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

Absolutely. When people, including fire inspectors, told me these are serious issues for them, I thought everyone had legitimate reasons. It is not just peace officers. When I reached out to the DMV to discuss it, they reassured me that anyone can use a post office box address now. If, in the future, we need to add others, we can. We are prevented from doing that now due to the way this bill is written. This opened my eyes to others who have serious concerns about protecting their physical addresses.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

My question is for our Committee Counsel. Can you clarify what a private person can do now about requesting the use of a post office box or an alternate address on a driver's license? How would this bill be different than what is in existing statute?

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

We have someone here from the DMV who might be able to answer that for you.

**Jude Hurin, Administrator, Division of Management Services and Programs,  
Department of Motor Vehicles:**

Assemblywoman Titus is correct. I spoke with our Director and the Assemblywoman this morning. We had a similar request earlier when we presented Assembly Bill 68. As a result, we have reviewed this. It would take about 100 hours of programming, which we would absorb, to allow for individuals to use post office box addresses on regular driver's licenses or on ID cards. We would still collect the physical and mailing addresses. If they chose to do this, we would create that option for them. One other point I would like to make is that the REAL ID does allow for the alternate address options due to the need for protection from domestic violence, for law enforcement privacy, or that sort of thing.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

If a private person came into the DMV today and requested to use an alternate address, would he or she be able to?

**Jude Hurin:**

Right now, the DMV defaults to the physical address, stemming from the REAL ID Act of 2005. Even though, as a standard, we have a REAL ID and a standard driver's license, we are consistent across the board in using the physical address. As we reviewed that process, we found that we could be flexible for a standard card or for a driver authorization card.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

Would it require a statutory change?

**Jude Hurin:**

No, it would not.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

If you get a permit for carrying a concealed weapon, you would have to match your street address with your driver's license. Many have been told they must have their physical address on their licenses. If they use a post office box on their licenses, they have been told they cannot use their licenses for identification purposes. Can an individual request how they want to do that? Is there a way we could mark the licenses of law enforcement personnel in a way that would identify them as such?

**Jude Hurin:**

The proposal is to allow for an option. If a person is applying for a concealed carry permit, that person would know the requirements and would probably not choose to use a post office box address. If a person did not choose the option, it would default to the physical address. I have forgotten your second question.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

Could we put a mark on the license of law enforcement or retired law enforcement?

**Jude Hurin:**

The intent behind the alternate address is to not bring notice to the card. To identify it with a symbol of some sort would defeat the purpose.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

Firearm dealers are required to have the addresses of concealed weapon carriers. They tell me the problem with that is now the bad guys know where the guns are. They would rather be able to use cards with post office box addresses as IDs. I hope we will be able to figure out something in the future that will address that issue.

**Jude Hurin:**

I agree. I believe that would require a joint effort with the Department of Public Safety that oversees that program. It is a Catch-22 that puts people in a situation they should not be in.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

I have a question for Committee Counsel. If I heard Mr. Hurin's answers correctly, a change in statute is not required in order to accomplish the legislative intent of this bill or to allow private citizens to request that their home addresses not be on their ID cards. Did I hear that correctly?

**Darcy Johnson, Committee Counsel:**

As I understand what Mr. Hurin said and in looking at it the statutes, I know that when you apply for your driver's license you are asked to provide both the address of principal residence and mailing address, if different. The mailing address would be the post office box. What I have not yet found is the section that tells the DMV what has to appear on the card. I think that is what Mr. Hurin is referring to. This bill carves out a particular benefit that is actually available to everybody but is not widely known.

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

When a peace officer approached me, his problem was that he needed to use a physical address on his driver's license. He wanted to know why he could not use the address of his last place of employment as opposed to a post office box. His concern was the fact that the license required a physical address. This bill would be different in that he would want to be able to use the place of his last employment as his physical address instead of using a post office box, as exists in California statute. That way, he could be found because his last place knows him. Using the place of last employment would not work for police officers from out of state, as the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association will testify.

**Jude Hurin:**

In statute, we are allowed to identify additional requirements in our regulations. The physical address and the mailing address are defined and established in our regulations. Under REAL ID, the physical address is required. With the standard driver's license or ID, there is no set requirement. Our computer system defaults to using the physical address. That is where the system needs to be modified to allow for the post office box address option.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

Assemblywoman Titus spoke about retired peace officers, who are referred to in sections 1 and 3. If someone is retired and no longer physically at the last place of employment but is using that as a mailing address, would that person be required to make sure the employer had their contact information and that the DMV had a current mailing address for notices?

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

I do not understand your question.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

A retired person no longer goes to work. Would the place from which that person retired be required to have current information on the retiree so that if something came to that address it could be forwarded? Also, would the DMV have an appropriate mailing address so that materials would not be sent to a place where the person no longer works?

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

That would make sense. We could use clarifying language in the bill if needed. The intent is that the place of employment would agree to do that. We still have to be able to reach peace officers. The intent is that they be able to use something as an alternate to their physical address for their protection. There is current language to protect judges and some others.

**Jude Hurin:**

Senate Bill 79 (1st Reprint) deals with a proposal of allowing judges and certain court staff to have a confidential record. Amendment 310 was presented to us for consideration; that would allow those individuals to actually have an alternate address, which relates to Assemblywoman Titus' intent as well. The alternate address approach is the method of choice.

To address your question regarding a retiree—if that person used a post office box, the DMV would still have the actual mailing address in our system. The card would actually be sent to the real mailing address, but the license or ID would show the alternate address.



**Chairman Carrillo:**

How did this bill come about? I would assume the DMV does not sell its records for personal information. The only time I show my driver's license is at the airport. I understand that law enforcement wants to have information kept private, but why do we need this in statute now?

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

A retired police officer from my community asked me if I would carry this bill because he had seen that similar bills for police officer information protection were being considered in several other states. I agreed to do so after talking with him about it. I use my driver's license a lot, in fact. I had to produce it yesterday. My phone died and I had to go to AT&T. They wanted to see my driver's license before they would replace my phone. The officer who talked to me about presenting this bill was concerned about having to show ID when using a credit card. This is an issue of keeping his physical address private. It is important in small communities where everybody knows just about everybody, but they do not know where your actual home is. A young person serving you dinner to whom you give your credit card and ID might be the son of a mother you put in jail.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

We will now take testimony in support for A.B. 252.

**Robert Roshak, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:**

We support A.B. 252. Assemblywoman Titus reached out to us with the bill, which I sent out to our membership. They do not have an issue with the bill.

**Mike Ramirez, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc.:**

We have 8,000 members. We would like to thank Assemblywoman Titus for bringing this forward, as our members have had similar concerns. We would urge your support.

**Scott A. Edwards, President, Las Vegas Peace Officers Association; and representing Southern Nevada Conference of Police and Sheriffs**

We represent the majority of the law enforcement organizations in southern Nevada. Ditto.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Is there anyone else in support of A.B. 252 in Carson City or in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there opposition in southern or northern Nevada? [There was none.] Is there neutral testimony in southern or northern Nevada? [There was none.] Are there any closing remarks? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 252 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 410.

**Assembly Bill 410: Authorizing a new vehicle dealer to file a claim for compensation with a manufacturer of motor vehicles under certain circumstances. (BDR 43-1024)**

**Irma Fernandez, Legislative Aide for Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams, Assembly District No. 42:**

For the sake of time, I am going to pass this over to Mr. MacKay.

**Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association:**

From the time the Committee recessed earlier today, we met with the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers. We have resolved our differences and put together what is tantamount to a complete rewrite of Assembly Bill 410 ([Exhibit I](#)). This bill applies to used motor vehicles in the state of Nevada that have open recalls for which no parts are available and no remedies exist. These vehicles are subject to stop-sale or do-not-drive notifications. These recalls are limited in nature to that specific subset of vehicles. These are not vehicles under general recall along the lines of typographical errors in the owner's manual or faulty radio knobs. As you are aware, in 2015 there were 900 different recalls that ultimately affected 51 million vehicles in the United States. With this many recalls on the books, consumers are negatively impacted the most since their trade-in values can be substantially reduced if their current vehicles are subject to an open recall, which ultimately forces them to incur greater out-of-pocket expenses when they buy new vehicles from auto dealers.

If this bill is passed, A.B. 410 would ensure that costs associated with recalls on used and pre-owned vehicles will not be absorbed by Nevada customers. Dealers will be able to accept in trade vehicles that are subject to stop-sale or do-not-drive notices with open recalls when parts or remedies are not yet available. For these vehicles, dealers have to bear significant carrying costs, reducing the value of a buyer's trade-in, which is generally the largest component of the down payment on a new vehicle purchase.

I posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) a J.D. Power and Associates study that evaluated the aggregated holding costs of this type of vehicle ([Exhibit J](#)). They found that, on average, these vehicles result in dealers' holding costs of 2.43 percent per month.

This concept is not unique, and involved the majority of our discussions with the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers. This derives from what is in federal law for new motor vehicles. The federal law says that dealers would be compensated at a rate of 1 percent per month for new vehicles that are subject to open recalls.

We worked closely with not only Global Automakers, but with the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers as well. We came to a resolution just before this Committee reconvened. While you recessed, we put together the mock-up. We are looking at a compensation rate

valued at independent third-party guide at 1 percent per month. After that vehicle is in the dealer's inventory and a remedy is not available for 30 days, compensation can be collected. It will be administered in accordance with what is currently in statute for warranty work for reimbursement. This aligns with language that has been passed in Arizona and is awaiting its governor's signature. It is also agreed-upon language in Oregon that is working its way through the state house there. Alabama and Georgia passed similar legislation. Last year, Maryland and Virginia passed something similar.

I would be remiss if I did not thank both Global Automakers and the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers for working with us. We went back and forth and are now at a spot that everybody is content with. I want to apologize in advance for the mock-up amendment I gave you. Some of the editing marks do not appear. Anything in purple strikethrough ink is language that has been removed. You will see everything from the proposed conceptual amendment moving forward.

We would greatly appreciate the Committee's support on this. Recalls and warranty repairs contemplated by manufacturers are part of the manufacturer's suggested retail price of the vehicle. This will not result in higher vehicle prices. I stand ready for questions.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Are there any questions from Committee members?

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

Who initiates the do-not-drive order? Is it from the manufacturer or from a government entity?

**Andy MacKay:**

Generally those come from the manufacturers. Sometimes stop-sale or do-not-drive notices are issued by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).

**Assemblyman Fumo:**

Can a used car dealer sell a car that has a stop-sale or do-not-drive order on it?

**Andy MacKay:**

If the order has been issued, they should not sell the car, especially if the order is issued by NHTSA. This bill is limited to vehicles that are sold by franchised dealers. Pursuant to every franchise agreement between the franchisee and the manufacturer, only the franchisee is authorized to perform warranty and recall work on those vehicles. Getting back to your question about whether a dealer should sell a car under a stop-sale notice . . .

**Assemblyman Fumo:**

My question was not about whether or not they should sell such a car. My question was, "Can they?"

**Andy MacKay:**

The answer is no.

**Assemblyman Fumo:**

In section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b) of your proposed amendment, the language says "... the dealer sells, trades, or otherwise disposes of the affected used motor vehicle." Is it a public policy problem to sell or trade something with a do-not-drive order on it?

**Andy MacKay:**

Could you please repeat your question?

**Assemblyman Fumo:**

Section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b) refers to a deadline of the date on which a car dealer "... sells, trades, or otherwise disposes of ..." a vehicle that has a do-not-drive or stop-sale order on it. I think there is a public policy reason why such vehicles should not be sold. It looks as if paragraph (b) says you can sell or trade them.

**John Sande, IV, representing Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association:**

That might be a drafting error. That was one of the parts we negotiated. The manufacturers wanted to make sure that if a dealer took a vehicle in trade and a part was not made available for repairing it for a very long time, the dealer could not recover more than the value of the vehicle; value would not be accrued in perpetuity. I believe the second part of the compensation cut-off should be "... until the dealer has received compensation from the manufacturer that is equal to the value of the vehicle."

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Are there any other questions from Committee members? [There were none.] We will now take testimony in support of A.B. 410. [There was none.] Is there testimony neutral to A.B. 410?

**Alfredo Alonso, representing Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, Bethesda, Maryland:**

We worked hard to achieve consensus on this bill, and have achieved that in concept. There are some tweaks here and there that we are still working on, so it is not perfect. We hope to make it perfect. This is basically the proposal put forth in Oregon. Almost 80 percent of recalls are made voluntarily by manufacturers. We are hoping this is a small fraction of those recalls in unique circumstances. This resolution is fair to both sides.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Is anyone in opposition to A.B. 410? [There was no one.] We will now close the hearing on Assembly Bill 410.

[([Exhibit K](#)), ([Exhibit L](#)), ([Exhibit M](#)), and ([Exhibit N](#)) were submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

We will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 442.

**Assembly Bill 442: Revises provisions governing the redesign of certain special license plates. (BDR 43-476)**

**Assemblyman Jim Wheeler, Assembly District No. 39:**

This bill requires an organization that has an active special license plate to make a request to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) if it wants to redesign the plate. This interim, I chaired the Commission on Special License Plates, which is a statutory body authorized by the Legislature. The Commission makes recommendations to the DMV to approve applications for special license plates and the issuance of special license plates by the DMV. The Commission may also make requests for legislation concerning special license plates. During the 2013-2014 Interim, the DMV made a presentation to the Commission concerning the redesign of active special license plates. It was noted that the Director of the DMV has the discretion and the authority concerning redesigns under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 482.270; however, the statute was created to address the change in the standard-issue plate backgrounds from the bighorn sheep to the sunset design. At this time, there is no specific statute that addresses redesigning special license plates that were recommended by the Commission. It was suggested that statutory language or regulations be developed to address this issue. Therefore, the Commission requested the bill which is before you today.

I will review the provisions of Assembly Bill 442. Section 2 of the bill provides that an organization with a special license plate, not less than five years after that special license plate has been issued, may apply to the DMV for a redesign of the plate. Section 3 requires the Commission on Special License Plates to recommend to the DMV that the Department approve or disapprove an application for such redesign of that plate. This mirrors the current process for an organization applying for a special license plate. Section 4 requires a holder of the plate who wishes to obtain a redesigned plate to pay a replacement fee. However, a person may keep the original special license plate at no extra fee. A redesign of a special license plate is not considered a new special plate.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Are there questions from Committee members?

**Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:**

What was the catalyst for this bill?

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

It was a request during the 2013-2014 Interim to the Commission on Special License Plates. During the last interim, that Commission wrote the bill.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I remember that the state was trying to reduce the number of types of special license plates to make it easier for law enforcement to keep up with them. Would this open the door to let organizations do whatever they wanted?

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

No.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Is there support for A.B. 442 in Carson City or in Las Vegas? [There was none.] Is there neutral testimony?

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

We submitted a fiscal note on this bill due to its effective date. There are 24 plates that would be eligible for redesign. The biggest challenge we would have is that quite a number of organizations could do this. There is a programming component as well as the design work that goes with it. On the back end, there are 80 hours of programming; there are also 80 hours of programming on the front end. Even though we would hold the positions and current counts of the charitable organizations, there would be multiple versions of a particular plate in effect. We will work with Assemblyman Wheeler and members of the Committee to discuss this further.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

If someone were to change a plate from a specialty license to a standard plate or vice versa, would he or she be required to pay the \$25 replacement fee?

**Sean McDonald:**

If one were switching from the old specialty plate to the new one?

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Or vice versa.

**Sean McDonald:**

If a person held an organization's specialty plate and wanted to go to a new version?

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Is someone wants to change a current plate from a specialty license plate to a standard one, or vice versa, does the replacement fee apply?

**Sean McDonald:**

No.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

There are no further questions from Committee members. Is there anyone in southern Nevada wishing to testify as neutral? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition in Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was no one.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 422. We will now move into our work session.

**Assembly Bill 68: Revises provisions governing the administration of laws relating to transportation. (BDR 43-223)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 68 was heard on March 21. [He read from the Work Session Document ([Exhibit O](#)).] It rearranges the provisions relating to the confidentiality and authorization for disclosure of certain personal information that is in the possession of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). The bill authorizes the Department to adopt regulations authorizing the operation of vehicles that use advanced technologies such as an advanced automated vehicle system and driver-assistive truck platooning technology. The bill also alters the requirements for certain instruction permits or driver authorization cards to state the full legal name, address of principal residence, and mailing address. The bill removes the requirement that the photograph on a driver's license be in color. Assembly Bill 68 also adds to current acts or practices for which the DMV can refuse to issue a license for operating a driving school and requires that a vehicle be inspected within 30 days after initial use by the school. The bill clarifies the fees for a person 65 years of age or older who applies for an identification card. Lastly, A.B. 68 removes the authorization for the Department to issue a nonresident commercial driver's license or learner's permit to a resident of a foreign jurisdiction that the Federal Highway Administrator has determined does not test drivers and issue commercial driver's licenses in accordance with federal standards.

There are two amendments to this bill. The one proposed by the DMV removes the sections related to releasing personal information in the possession of the DMV. It also removes the sections related to autonomous vehicles and other vehicles using certain advanced technologies. The second amendment was proposed by Assemblyman Carrillo. It removes the provisions concerning requirements of an applicant for instructional permits or certain driver authorization cards to provide certain information.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Let me remind you that this is not a rehearing of the bill. I would like to have Mr. Michael Alonso come forward on this. I want to make sure we are not leaving anything out of this bill.

**Michael G. Alonso, representing Caesars Entertainment:**

We have spoken with the Chairman and to the bill's sponsor, who agreed to an amendment. I did not know if this would be heard today or on Thursday. I can go through the conceptual amendment if you would like.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Do you have that with you?

**Michael Alonso:**

I did not bring copies of it.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

We will remove this from the work session and reschedule it for Thursday. We will close the work session on A.B. 68 and move to Assembly Bill 368.

**Assembly Bill 368: Revises provisions governing total loss vehicles. (BDR 43-314)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 368 was heard in this Committee on April 4. [He read from the Work Session Document ([Exhibit P](#))]. It revises the formula by which a motor vehicle is considered a total loss. It also allows an insurance company to claim a total loss vehicle in a damage settlement, unless the vehicle was stolen and recovered. Lastly, the bill allows an owner of a damaged vehicle who obtains a salvage title to declare it a total loss vehicle.

There are two amendments on this bill. One is proposed by Mr. Compan, with Farmers Group Inc. It would reinstate fair market value calculation, remove vehicles that were submerged in water, change the percentage for the cost of repair to 75 percent, and clarify the calculation for cost of labor and parts. The amendment also makes a conforming



change to a provision relating to certain estimates to the costs of repair. That amendment is attached to the work session document. The second amendment was proposed by Mr. Wulz with the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada. It adds a definition of seriously damaged repairable vehicles and requires an insurer who obtains such a vehicle in a settlement to obtain a salvage title for such a vehicle.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 368.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblyman Watkins:**

I will vote yes to get this out of Committee, but with all of the amendments combined into one, I have not had time to digest it all. I reserve the right to change my vote.

**Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:**

I reserve my right to change my vote.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

I reserve the right to change my vote.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

There are two amendments. Both of those are being accepted.

**Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:**

I reserve the right to change my vote.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

The floor statement will be made by Assemblyman Wheeler.

**Assembly Bill 419: Creates provisions governing casualty insurance. (BDR 57-1034)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 419 was heard in this Committee on April 4. It reenacts provisions, repealed in Senate Bill 162 of the 78th Session, that require the provision of certain medical reports,

records, and bills to a party against whom a claim is asserted for personal injury under a policy of motor vehicle insurance. There are no amendments to this bill. [He read from the Work Session Document ([Exhibit Q](#)).]

**Chairman Carrillo:**  
Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 419.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATKINS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, McARTHUR,  
WHEELER, AND WOODBURY VOTED NO.)

The floor statement will be made by Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod.

**Assembly Bill 455: Authorizes electronic delivery of certain notices and documents relating to policies of insurance. (BDR 57-112)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 455 was heard in this Committee on April 4. [He read from the Work Session Document ([Exhibit R](#)).] The bill allows a notice or other document required by law to be provided as part of an insurance transaction or which serves as evidence of insurance to be delivered by electronic means in certain circumstances. The bill also allows an insurer to post a standard policy of property or casualty insurance or a standard endorsement of such a policy on its Internet website rather than mailing or delivering it if the policy or endorsement does not contain personally identifiable information and the insurer satisfies certain conditions.

There is one amendment to this bill by Mr. Werbeckes, with EMPLOYERS Holdings. It requires insurers to deliver a notice or document in physical form to the insured if the insurer does not receive verification or acknowledgment of receipt of electronic notice within three days of delivery. It also replaces "insurer" with "insurance producer" for the purposes of providing immunity from civil liability for a failure by an insurer that is related to electronic transmission of notices or documents.

**Chairman Carrillo:**  
Do I have a motion?

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 455.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Watkins.

**Assembly Bill 487: Revises provisions relating to vehicles. (BDR 58-783)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 487 was heard in this Committee on April 6. [He read from the Work Session Document ([Exhibit S](#)).] The bill authorizes the Taxicab Authority (TA) to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Nevada Transportation Authority (NTA), which confers upon the TA concurrent enforcement jurisdiction over a transportation network company (TNC) in the county where the TA has jurisdiction. The bill removes the requirement for money from the technology fee collected by the TA to be spent on a computerized real-time data system and authorizes its use for the implementation of technological improvements in safety. The bill removes the requirement that the TA has to approve the design of cruising lights of taxicabs and authorizes the use of advertisement on the exterior of taxicabs if it does not impair the ability of the driver to operate the vehicle safely. The bill simplifies taxicab vehicle usage by mandating that any vehicle used as a taxicab may only be used as a taxicab for 120 months after the date on which the vehicle was manufactured. The bill newly requires each taxicab to display a statement indicating whether the certified holder accepts credit and debit cards and, if so, listing the maximum fee a customer will be charged for the convenience of using a credit or debit card. The bill revises the requirement for random taxicab inspection by the Taxicab Administrator of the Department of Business and Industry to be at least once each year. The bill authorizes an independent contractor of a certified holder of a taxicab license to use the taxicab to provide transportation services pursuant to an agreement with a TNC. The bill revises the requirement for an applicant for a driver's permit to drive a taxicab to prove that he or she is a resident of this state or a state that adjoins the county in which the applicant has applied for the driver's permit. The bill revises prohibitions against long-hauling. The bill requires each TNC and common motor carrier of passengers to collect the required excise tax from passengers when they pay a fare. The bill repeals prohibitions against dynamic displays.

There is one amendment to this bill. It is by the Livery Operators Association of Las Vegas. It removes the necessity of a memorandum of understanding and removes the section that

imposes an excise tax on contract motor carriers. It changes the inspection requirement of taxicabs to be only annually. It revises the authorization to use electronic trip sheets. It limits the maximum number of outstanding leases.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN SPRINKLE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 487.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

I will be voting no in Committee until I receive clarification about what the powers are that are being authorized. It looks to me as if the NTA will have control over all regulations for TNCs as a result of this bill.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I will be voting no, but will reserve my right to change my vote. I would like to ask questions of some of those who testified.

**Assemblywoman Woodbury:**

I ditto what Assemblyman Wheeler said.

**Assemblyman McArthur:**

I am doing the same thing. I will be voting no, but reserve the right to change my vote.

**Assemblyman Watkins:**

I am going to ditto in reverse. I will vote yes to get it out of Committee because I understand that the parties are talking. I will reserve my right to change my vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, McARTHUR,  
WHEELER, AND WOODBURY VOTED NO.)

**Chairman Carrillo:**

The floor statement is assigned to Assemblyman Sprinkle.

**Assembly Bill 233: Authorizes a lessor of a motor truck to impose certain additional charges. (BDR 43-52)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Bill 233 was heard in this Committee on March 2. [He read from the Work Session Document ([Exhibit T](#)).] This bill authorizes a lessor of a motortruck to impose

additional charges to recover any costs incurred by the lessor in conducting his or her business. Any such charges must be disclosed at the time the lessor provides a price quote or estimate for the lease of the motortruck. There are currently no amendments to this bill.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 233.

ASSEMBLYMAN SPRINKLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN FUMO AND WATKINS  
VOTED NO.)

The floor statement will be made by Assemblywoman Spiegel.

That concludes our work session. Is there any public comment in Las Vegas? [There was none.] Is there public comment in Carson City? [There was none.] This meeting is adjourned [at 7:47 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Joan Waldock  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Chairman

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a conceptual amendment to Assembly Bill 485 presented by Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Assembly District No. 18.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 485 presented by Jeanette K. Belz, representing Friends of ACE Charter High School.

[Exhibit E](#) is written testimony presented by James R. Lawrence, Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.

[Exhibit F](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 29 presented by James R. Lawrence, Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.

[Exhibit G](#) is proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 29 submitted by the Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club.

[Exhibit H](#) is written testimony presented by Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus, Assembly District No. 38, regarding Assembly Bill 252.

[Exhibit I](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 410 presented by Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association.

[Exhibit J](#) is a document titled "Supplemental Analysis: An Economic Assessment of Trade-In Value Reduction Caused by Preventing Auto Dealers from Selling Passenger Vehicles with any Open Recall," dated May 16, 2016, by J.D. Powers & Associates, presented by Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association.

[Exhibit K](#) is a letter dated February 2, 2017, regarding dealer reimbursement for used motor vehicles with open recalls subject to stop-sale orders, from Damon Shelby Porter, Director, State Government Affairs, Association of Global Automakers, Inc., Washington, D.C., to Robert Glaser, President, North Carolina Automobile Dealers Association, Raleigh, North Carolina.

[Exhibit L](#) is a letter dated April 10, 2017, regarding Assembly Bill 410, from Josh Fisher, Manager, State Government Affairs, Association of Global Automakers Inc., Washington, D.C., to Chairman Carrillo, Assembly Committee on Transportation.

[Exhibit M](#) is a letter in support of [Assembly Bill 410](#) from C. Coleman Edmunds, Acting General Counsel, AutoNation, Inc., Fort Lauderdale, Florida, to Chairman Carrillo, Assembly Committee on Transportation.

[Exhibit N](#) is a document dated February 3, 2017, and titled "Framework for Used Motor Vehicles Subject to Stop-Sale Orders," submitted by Josh Fisher, Manager, State Government Affairs, Association of Global Automakers, Inc., Washington, D.C.

[Exhibit O](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 68](#), submitted by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit P](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 368](#), submitted by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit Q](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 419](#), submitted by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit R](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 455](#), submitted by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit S](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 487](#), submitted by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit T](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 233](#), submitted by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.