

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**

**Seventy-ninth Session
April 13, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chair Mark A. Manendo at 9:18 a.m. on Thursday, April 13, 2017, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Mark A. Manendo, Chair
Senator Kelvin Atkinson, Vice Chair
Senator Don Gustavson
Senator Scott Hammond
Senator Patricia Farley

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michelle Van Geel, Policy Analyst
Darcy Johnson, Counsel
Debbie Shope, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Scott Scherer, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Jeanette Belz, Property Casualty Insurers Association of America
Sophia Romero, Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada
Mike Draper, eDealer Services, Inc.

CHAIR MANENDO:

We are going to work on Senate Bill (S.B.) 215.

SENATE BILL 215: Revises the circumstances under which the holder of a driver's license or identification card must report a name change to the Department of Motor Vehicles. (BDR 43-673)

MICHELLE VAN GEEL (Policy Analyst):

The work session document for Senate Bill 215 removes the requirement for the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to define the term "full legal name," and instead it defines the term "full name" for the purposes of the sections governing driver's licenses, instruction permits, driver authorization cards, identification cards and motorcycle driver's licenses. The bill sets forth the situations under which a person must and may change his or her full name on a driver's license or identification card. The person is required to include an original or certified copy of the certificate or decree evidencing the applicable event. A person may choose various options for a full name, including a hyphenated last name or replacing a middle name with his or her last name and using the last name of his or her adoptive parents or spouse ([Exhibit C](#)).

Behind the work session page is a conceptual amendment offered by Senator Woodhouse, which addresses the issues the DMV raised during the original hearing. Also for your reference is the original letter from the DMV which expressed its concerns.

Senator Woodhouse's conceptual amendment section 1 would use "full legal name." In section 5, it would delete the 30-day requirement, which would also apply to the other sections in the bill. In section 5, it would add "maiden name".

SENATOR HAMMOND:

After telling us about the bill and then explaining the changes, what is the outcome of the bill?

DARCY JOHNSON (Counsel):

It revises the procedure by which a person can change the name on his or her driver's license or identification card. The existing procedure requires you to bring a court order showing that your name has been legally changed. With this bill, if you bring a divorce decree or marriage certificate, you can go on record with the DMV stating I would like to use my maiden name as my middle name, even though that may not be reflected on the document presented.

SENATOR FARLEY:

Can you go over this again because that has not been my experience. I had to have a court order to go back to my maiden name or make any changes whatsoever. I could not use a social security card to change any part of my legal name. I do not understand what the bill is actually changing.

Ms. JOHNSON:

The existing law does not specify what documents are needed to make a name change. It is handled in regulations. What the DMV has been requiring is a court order or a court decree that shows the court acknowledges the name you are seeking to use and that it has been included in that court document.

SENATOR FARLEY:

Are you saying it is not consistently done that way now?

Ms. JOHNSON:

I cannot speak to how the DMV has been handling it, I can only speak to what the bill seeks to do, which is to make it so that it is up to the person which name he or she chooses. All they have to do is show evidence of either a divorce decree, death of a spouse, adoption, whatever the reason is they are seeking the name change. They will not have to go to court. For example, if you get divorced and you forget to have the divorce decree include your maiden name, you do not have to go back to a court and request a legal name change to get the DMV to allow you to change your driver's license.

SENATOR FARLEY:

That is good, because it costs about \$10,000 to get your name changed if you forget to change it during your divorce.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

Are we going to consider deleting the 30-day requirement; is it in this amendment? If we accept this amendment, would it delete the 30-day requirement?

CHAIR MANENDO:

Yes.

Ms. JOHNSON:

I am wondering if both conceptual amendments, one and three, would also apply throughout, not only where they are mentioned. We use the term full name throughout the bill; we will change that to full legal name each time it appears. There are a couple of other places in the bill where we probably need to add maiden name, not just in section 5, subsection 3. There are other items which appear later in the bill such as death of a spouse, the identification card,

those sort of things. I am presuming since this is conceptual that means change it here and then as needed for conformity.

CHAIR MANENDO:
Yes.

SENATOR HAMMOND MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 215.

SENATOR FARLEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR MANENDO:
We are going to take things out of order. We will work on S.B. 448.

SENATE BILL 448: Revises provisions relating to public works. (BDR 28-603)

MS. VAN GEEL:

Senate Bill 448 extends the provisions authorizing a public body to accept a request from a person who wishes to develop, construct, improve, maintain or operate a transportation facility to other facilities, including tourism improvement projects. The bill also provides for the use of a public-private partnership to plan, finance, design, construct, improve, maintain, operate or acquire the rights-of-way for an eligible facility. The measure provides for the financing of certain eligible facilities and the disposition of money that is received and is to be retained by a public body pursuant to a public-private partnership.

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Southern Nevada offered the attached mock-up amendment, which makes various changes including changing "this State" to "the county in which the revenue is generated" when referring to where money may be used that is generated by a public body pursuant to a public-private partnership. The other change was changing the definition of "transportation facility" to match the definition of S.B. 517 from earlier this Session ([Exhibit D](#)).

SCOTT SCHERER (Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada):
The first proposed amendment is in section 10 to make clear the factors listed are factors that may be considered. The public body going out to bid can set forth the factors that it is going to consider in the request for proposal process along with the weights for those factors.

Section 13 is to ensure that if there is any excess money after the project is paid for, that money will stay in the county where it is generated. The change to section 14 is the required confidentiality of the procurement or negotiation. There was concern expressed by some individuals that the documents would remain confidential until after the contract was executed. This amendment will change it to until the notice of intent to award, which is the standard procurement process. At that point, most of the documents with regard to the bidding process become public, so bidders who were not successful can review them and decide if they think an appeal is warranted. There is an appeal process in the standard procurement procedures. The documents would become available after the notice of intent to award and before the contract is executed.

Section 17 is the change to the definition of transportation facility and this will conform to S.B. 517 that was the State infrastructure bill, so we have the same definition in both bills ([Exhibit E](#)).

SENATE BILL 517: Establishes the Nevada Transportation Infrastructure Bank.
(BDR 35-602)

The RTC of Washoe County requested the change to section 19, and they felt the word "impacted" was a better term for any utilities that might be impacted by the transportation facility. Section 21 has the final change. It referred to a Metropolitan Planning Area. This may have been a large county bias because both Washoe County and Clark County are the Metropolitan Planning Areas for their region. Not every county in the State is designated as a Metropolitan Planning Area. We changed that term to county to take into account the other counties in the State.

SENATOR HAMMOND MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 448.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR MANENDO:

We will now work on S.B. 426.

SENATE BILL 426: Requires drivers and passengers of mopeds and trimobiles to wear protective headgear. (BDR 43-1011)

Ms. VAN GEEL:

Senate Bill 426 requires the driver and any passenger of a moped to wear protective headgear while the moped is being driven on a highway. By deleting the word "trimobile" in the bill, trimobiles are included in the definition of motorcycle and therefore those drivers and passengers are required to wear protective headgear while the trimobile is being driven on a highway. The bill also requires the driver and any passenger of a moped to wear protective glasses, goggles or a face shield unless the moped has a transparent windscreen ([Exhibit F](#)).

SENATOR FARLEY MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 426.

SENATOR HAMMOND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR GUSTAVSON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR MANENDO:

We will work on S.B. 308.

SENATE BILL 308: Revises provisions relating to motor vehicle insurance. (BDR 43-938)

Ms. VAN GEEL:

Senate Bill 308 increases the amount of coverage that must be provided by a policy of motor vehicle insurance. Specifically: for bodily injury to or death of a person in any one crash, the amount is increased from \$15,000 to \$25,000; for bodily injury to or death of two or more persons in any one crash, the amount is

increased from \$30,000 to 50,000; and for injury to or destruction of property of others in any one crash, the amount is increased from \$10,000 to \$20,000.

The bill also prohibits a policy of motor vehicle insurance that includes uninsured and underinsured vehicle coverage from including an exclusion, reduction or other limitation of coverage where the insured is injured while in the course of his or her employment or pursuing a business activity or purpose.

Senator Harris offered a conceptual amendment that would delete provisions that prohibit a policy of motor vehicle insurance that includes uninsured and underinsured vehicle coverage from including an exclusion, reduction or limitation of coverage where the insured is injured while in the course of his or her employment or pursuing a business activity or purposes. The amendment also would change the effective date to July 1, 2018. Essentially, the amendment takes out the last paragraph that I read ([Exhibit G](#)).

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I believe this bill will affect over 300,000 people, and the majority of those are people who cannot pay more insurance or are struggling to get by now. For that reason, I will be voting no on this bill.

CHAIR MANENDO:

Do insurance companies use credit scores to determine insurance rates?

JEANETTE BELZ (Property Casualty Insurers Association of America):

Some insurance companies do, and some do not use credit scores. Several sessions ago, there was a bill passed that required the Division of Insurance to indicate on its Website the insurance companies that do and do not use a credit score. I would be happy to forward that to you.

SENATOR FARLEY:

This is a tough bill, but the conversation is worthy of continuing and to be explored. I will make the motion to amend and do pass as amended, but reserve my right to change my vote on the Floor.

SENATOR FARLEY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 308.

SENATOR ATKINSON:

I have tried to come to grips with this. I am alarmed that no one has been able to address the concerns that I shared, and I have not heard from anyone. I am still concerned how it will affect people, because we all know that people in certain zip codes are affected and pay higher premiums. I am still not convinced showing us numbers on a piece of paper, that it will be the case. I agree with the intent of this bill and understand that some people do not have enough insurance and are driving on our roads and injuring other people. I get that. However, I am also concerned that if premiums are raised, people will not maintain insurance, so we will be in a bigger predicament. I am with Senator Farley on this, just for the sake of keeping the conversation going and hopefully at some point, some time, someone will be able to give me better numbers and better evidence of what is going to happen. I am concerned that for a matter of \$10 or \$15 a month, some people will drop their insurance, or choose not to pay their monthly premiums and then they are dropped from insurance. I will vote yes today, but I do not want the proponents of this bill to think it is a yes vote from me, when and if the Chair sends this down to the floor. I will vote yes today, but I am apprehensive.

CHAIR MANENDO:

I appreciate those comments. I think all of us expressed some concerns about this piece of legislation. There are definitely many people underinsured, there are definitely a lot of people that are watching their wallets and an increase may put people in a position that they will not buy insurance at all. That is a dangerous thing as well. I received a one-page FAQ sheet and that is all I was given for this bill. I think there are a lot of questions that people are not answering, but I am hoping they might take this a little more seriously and maybe work it a little bit and start going around and answering questions of the members who had questions. We do have a motion by Senator Farley.

CHAIR MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR GUSTAVSON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR MANENDO:

We will turn to S.B. 452.

SENATE BILL 452: Revises provisions governing certificates of title for vehicles.
(BDR 43-1067)

MS. VAN GEEL:

Senate Bill 452 authorizes a person who is unable to provide satisfactory information to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) that the person is entitled to a certificate of title for a vehicle to obtain a new certificate of title by filing a bond with the Department. The bond must be in an amount equal to one and one-half times the value of the vehicle and meet certain conditions. The bond must be returned by the Department at the end of three years, or sooner if the vehicle is no longer registered in this State and the title is surrendered to the Department, unless the Department has been notified of the pendency of an action to recover on the bond.

Please ignore the amendment that is in your packet; a later amendment came in last night after the documents were printed. There should be a replacement amendment, and it has been loaded to NELIS so everyone should be able to see it. It is a mock-up of the bill. It was provided by Sophia Romero of the Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada ([Exhibit H](#)).

SOPHIA ROMERO (Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada):

After working with the DMV and getting some input from them regarding their concerns, as well as discussing it with the Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association, and getting input from other sources, we came up with the proposed amendment. The amendment does add the requirement that the vehicle must also be submitted for a vehicle identification number inspection as well as filing the bond. The DMV had some concerns that this unintentionally leads to title washing if the vehicle is titled here and then taken to another state and retitled. The provision originally allowed for the fact once the vehicle is retitled in a new state, that Nevada DMV might return the bond. It takes out that provision, so the bond is retained for three years no matter if the vehicle is retitled in a different state or not. Section 6 subsection 3 clarifies the salvage language, which was in our original proposed amendment. This also adds section 7, which is language the DMV requested in its amendment regarding liability of the DMV or lack thereof. The newly amended section 8 states people utilizing this process have the option to use the electronic lien system, pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 482.4285. Finally, the new section 9, which was formerly section 7, changes the effective date from January 1, 2018, to July 1, 2018, which is also at the DMV's request.

Ms. JOHNSON:

My question has to do with your new section 8 about the electronic lien system. Obviously, the inspection for the vehicle identification number will have to be done live at the DMV. How do you intend the electronic lien to work, does it mean that the DMV sends them the bonded title electronically, or that they can submit their own documents electronically? I am not sure which side of that is applicable or both.

Ms. ROMERO:

The way that I understood it, and it was explained to me, is that they can request their titles electronically so they can utilize the electronic lien system. There is someone here to speak to the electronic lien system portion of this.

MIKE DRAPER (eDealer Services, Inc., Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association):

We at eDealer Services, Inc. have worked with the DMV to set up the electronic lien system. This is a program this Committee passed in 2013 that has only just begun to be utilized, but it has been set up. We feel this bill can benefit from this system more than we are giving it credit for at this point. We hope to flush that out over the coming weeks. At least for right now, it can certainly expedite the process by allowing people to request their titles electronically, which speeds up the process and makes it a lot more convenient.

Ms. JOHNSON:

I noticed that the language refers to subsection 1 of this new section 8. Is that intended to mean if they are just obtaining regular titles and not salvage titles, or is it intended to include both?

MR. DRAPER:

Right now, it is just a regular title. We are still trying to figure out if the salvage title is something the system can handle or be built in to handle. That is the intent right now, but we hope to expand on it over the coming weeks. This has all developed in the last 24 hours or so.

SENATOR HAMMOND MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 452.

SENATOR FARLEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR MANENDO:

Committee, please turn to S.B. 428.

SENATE BILL 428: Provides for the issuance of special license plates indicating support for the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument. (BDR 43-1015)

MS. VAN GEEL:

Senate Bill 428 provides for the issuance of special license plates indicating support for the Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument. Two amendments are offered on this bill. The first would be to change "Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument" to "Tule Springs State Park" and change the "Tule Springs Fossil Beds National Monument Advisory Council" to "Ice Age Park Foundation." As the Committee will recall, there was discussion during the original hearing that required a nonprofit be set up to accept the funds, and the way the bill was drafted it would not have worked. In conversations with the Division of State Parks and the City of Las Vegas, it was decided to change the name from the National Monument to the State Park ([Exhibit I](#)).

Another caveat to that is Tule Springs State Park does not exist yet, and if you would like Ms. Johnson to go into details of how it will be drafted, we can do that. It essentially will be set up once the State Park is created. It would be two years from that to give them the opportunity to set up all the rest of the State Park details, and they then would be able to move on with this license plate.

MS. JOHNSON:

Ms. Van Geel is correct; we would simply put a transitory provision at the end that makes the Tule Springs State Park license plate provision effective upon the official designation of Tule Springs State Park.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

Essentially, if the park never comes to fruition then this is invalid?

Ms. JOHNSON:

That is correct. It would appear in NRS with what we call a lead line that has parenthetical language explaining when it will become effective and there it would sit, waiting for that event to happen. Either the event happened or the statute would need to be repealed.

Ms. VAN GEEL:

The second amendment would add provisions to this bill to allow for the issuance of special license plates for the Las Vegas Raiders. Other than the applicable registration, and license fees and governmental services taxes, no fees may be charged for the issuance or renewal of these license plates. The bill allows the DMV to accept any gifts, grants, and donations or other sources of money for the production and issuance of these special license plates. Essentially, it would be set up like S.B. 283 that the Committee passed earlier for the Las Vegas Golden Knights.

SENATE BILL 283: Provides for the issuance of special license plates indicating support for the Vegas Golden Knights hockey team. (BDR 43-924)

SENATOR ATKINSON:

When will both of these license plates go into production?

Ms. VAN GEEL:

The question was about the effective dates of each of the provisions of the bill if there are two plates in it, and we can certainly make different effective dates. The intent for the Tule Springs license plate would be two years out from when the park is actually designated as a State park. The Raiders plate could be an earlier date. The original effective date currently is July 1, 2017 for the Raiders license plate.

CHAIR MANENDO:

We would have to change the effective date for Tule Springs and use that language.

Ms. JOHNSON:

My understanding is with the Tule Springs portion of the bill, that special license plate will have to wait its turn in the queue through the Commission on Special License Plates. The other license plate will not, so you might consider an

effective date for the Raiders license plate that is tied to some event we know is completed, for example, their first win.

SENATOR ATKINSON:

The date needs to be closer to when the Raiders are here. They do not necessarily have to be here, but they have to be at least breaking ground for the stadium. The Golden Knights are different because they are already here, and we know their season starts this year.

CHAIR MANENDO:

I agree with you, Senator Atkinson. That was my belief also. We will have the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Legal Division work on this and do a conceptual amendment because Senator Atkinson makes a good point. We are all optimistic at this point, and people have said they want to move forward with this license plate. I was open to do it. Ms. Johnson, we will be able to figure this out?

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I have concerns about this license plate and would like to make a suggestion after my comment. I support the Tule Springs license plate. But for the same reason I did not support the Golden Nights license plate, I will not be able to support the Raiders license plate. Has anyone talked to the Raiders about them funding this license plate as the Golden Nights have committed to do on their license plate?

CHAIR MANENDO:

There actually has been communication with members of this Committee and some of the unions who are looking forward to having this license plate, as well as funding it.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I think everyone else supports it, but I will not be able to support it for that reason. I suggest if you amend the license plate bill with funding, I would be able to support the Golden Knights but not this bill.

SENATOR ATKINSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 428.

SENATOR HAMMOND SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senate Committee on Transportation
April 13, 2017
Page 14

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR GUSTAVSON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR MANENDO:

Committee, we did not put S.B. 401 on the work session, which was Senator Parks' bill.

SENATE BILL 401: Revises provisions relating to the Nevada Transportation Authority and the Taxicab Authority. (BDR 58-86)

CHAIR MANENDO:

My understanding is it was not going to move. He has requested we make no recommendation and rerefer it to the Senate Committee on Finance. It does have a fiscal note and apparently, Senator Parks has ideas on the legislation.

SENATOR FARLEY MOVED TO REREFER WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION S.B. 401 TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

SENATOR ATKINSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR MANENDO:

Lastly, we have S.B. 427 for the work session.

SENATE BILL 427: Revises provisions governing the crew of certain freight trains. (BDR 58-1014)

MS. VAN GEEL:

Senate Bill 427 requires any Class I Freight railroad, Class I railroad, or Class II railroad for transporting freight that operates a train or locomotive in this State, and any officer of such a railroad, to ensure that the train or locomotive contains a crew of not less than two persons, with certain exceptions. This bill provides that a violation is a misdemeanor, and a railroad or officer of a railroad who violates the provisions is liable to the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada for certain civil penalties.

The attached amendment was provided by Matt Parker, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen and Jason Doering, Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers-Transportation Division, provided the attached amendment. The amendment would remove the criminal penalty and increase the civil liability to \$1,000 for the first violation and \$5,000 for a second or subsequent violation that occurs within three years ([Exhibit J](#)).

SENATOR FARLEY:

This issue has been lobbied extensively on both sides. I want to let the Committee know I have reservations about putting into statute an item or measure that I believe should be handled through the collective bargaining unit, and I understand that they are currently in negotiations on this. I have talked with the Teamsters; they are supportive of this. I think there is merit on both sides. I will be voting in favor of them continuing in those conversations, but reserve my right to change my vote to no on the floor, should they not be able to get this resolved and/or clean up some of the concerns on both sides.

CHAIR MANENDO:

There is a fiscal note on this bill, and the Senate Committee on Finance has been looking at everything.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I recall the day we had this hearing in this Committee and I thought the proponents of the bill did a fantastic job of being persuasive and passionate about this particular issue. However, I find the argument compelling when talking about the current situation and the fact that it is in the collective bargaining arena. The bill we heard here in Committee had a similar bill passed in California, and it is problematic. I think we are waiting on the federal government to weigh in on this. Having said that, I will vote no today. I know they will continue to work on this bill and will bring back more information.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I share the same concerns as Senator Hammond as they are in negotiations now. I am not sure this is the right time to pass this particular piece of legislation. For now, I am a no vote.

SENATOR ATKINSON:

I agreed to vote yes in Committee so they can continue to work on the bill, but like I said on an earlier bill, my vote should not be taken for granted that I will

vote yes on the floor. I think they need to continue to talk about it. I will vote yes today.

I noticed there is a fiscal note, I do not know if we can just rerefer it to the Committee on Finance without recommendation and let them continue to work on it. The Committee on Finance is going to get it anyway.

CHAIR MANENDO:

I would like to send the Committee on Finance a clean bill. If we do amend and do pass as amended and rerefer, that way it places the amendment. When it goes to the Committee on Finance it will have a clean mock-up of where we are potentially going.

SENATOR FARLEY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED AND TO REEFER S.B. 427 TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

SENATOR ATKINSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR HAMMOND AND SENATOR GUSTAVSON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

Ms. JOHNSON:

For the Committee to consider, people have been working on our Raiders license plate dilemma. They suggest a triggering event such as the signing of the stadium agreement with the team or the stadium authority lease with the team which is to bind them for 30 years. That signifies the beginning of the construction process. We might want to set it a year or two after the signing of the agreement, or upon the signing of the agreement. It is at the pleasure of the Committee.

CHAIR MANENDO:

That is a great idea. Yes, once they sign the agreement it will take a couple of years, but I think that will get the license plate in motion and get people working on it.

Ms. JOHNSON:

The other consideration is after the lease agreement, there is supposed to be a development agreement. That is actually what needs to be in place for ground

breaking to happen, so that might work instead. It has to do with the 30th Special Session documents and the various steps involved. I do not know how confident the Committee is and which date they want to choose. The development agreement would happen later and might be a better indicator. It would still give you some lead time in terms of getting the license plates up and running and out to the public before the team arrives.

CHAIR MANENDO:

I am OK with that, it would be the Committee's intent to use that date.

SENATOR ATKINSON MOVED TO RESCIND THE PREVIOUS ACTION
TAKEN ON S.B. 428.

SENATOR HAMMOND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

SENATOR ATKINSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
WITH THE ADDITION OF THE TRIGGERING EVENT TO S.B. 428.

SENATOR HAMMOND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR GUSTAVSON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Transportation
April 13, 2017
Page 18

CHAIR MANENDO:

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting is adjourned at 10:17 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Debbie Shope,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Mark A. Manendo, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	3		Attendance Roster
S.B. 215	C	2	Michelle Van Geel	Work Session Document; Conceptual Amendment from Senator Woodhouse
S.B. 448	D	1	Michelle Van Geel	Work Session Document
S.B. 448	E	3	Scott Scherer / Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 426	F	1	Michelle Van Geel	Work Session Document
S.B. 308	G	1	Michelle Van Geel	Work Session Document
S.B. 452	H	3	Michelle Van Geel	Work Session Document
S.B. 428	I	1	Michelle Van Geel	Work Session Document
S.B. 427	J	2	Michelle Van Geel	Work Session Document