

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

**Seventy-Fifth Session
March 26, 2009**

The Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chairman Kelvin Atkinson at 1:38 p.m. on Thursday, March 26, 2009, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/75th2009/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Kelvin Atkinson, Chairman
Assemblyman Mark A. Manendo, Vice Chair
Assemblyman John C. Carpenter
Assemblyman Chad Christensen
Assemblyman Jerry D. Claborn
Assemblywoman Marilyn Dondero Loop
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea
Assemblyman Joseph M. Hogan
Assemblyman Ruben J. Kihuen
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Moises (Mo) Denis, Clark County Assembly District No. 28
Assemblyman Tom Grady, Assembly District No. 38

Minutes ID: 726



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst
Darcy Johnson, Committee Counsel
Marlen Schultz, Committee Secretary
Steven Sisneros, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Michael Geeser, Media/Government Relations, California State Automobile Association, Las Vegas, Nevada
Tom Roberts, Lieutenant, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, Las Vegas, Nevada
Tim Kuzanek, Captain, Administrative Services Governmental Affairs, Washoe County Sheriff's Office, Reno, Nevada
Frank Adams, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association, Mesquite, Nevada
Tiffany Hunter, People First of Nevada, Carson City Chapter, Stagecoach, Nevada
Carol Hunter, People First of Nevada, Carson City Chapter, Stagecoach, Nevada
Norman Chamberlin, Owner, Valley Towing, Carson City, Nevada
Jack Mayes, Executive Director, Nevada Disability Advocacy and Law Center, Las Vegas, Nevada
Troy Dillard, Chief, Division of Compliance Enforcement, Department of Motor Vehicles
Steve Amestoy, Owner, Capital Towing, Incorporated, Carson City, Nevada
Andrew (Andy) J. MacKay, Chair, Nevada Transportation Authority, Department of Business and Industry, Reno, Nevada
Clark Whitney, North Star Towing, LLC, North Las Vegas, Nevada
Thomas J. Fronapfel, P.E., Administrator, Field Services Division, Department of Motor Vehicles
Jennifer Lazovich, representing Kummer Kaempfer Bonner Renshaw and Ferrario, Las Vegas, Nevada

Chairman Atkinson:

[The roll was taken.] Ms. Dondero Loop would like to go on record noting her car engine's light came on without any warning.

The Committee has three bills to discuss during today's meeting as well as a work session, which we postponed from the previous meeting of this body. We will take a bill out of order and delay the work session to accommodate

Assemblyman Goicoechea's scheduling conflict and provide him with adequate time to return so he might participate in any vote. Now we will take Assembly Bill 412 and ask the proponents to come forward to testify.

Assembly Bill 412: Makes certain changes concerning the towing of occupied vehicles. (BDR 43-111)

Assemblyman Jerry Claborn, Clark County Assembly District No. 19:

I am bringing a very simple bill to your attention today. This legislation proposes a change to towing services. It would permit the towing of certain occupied vehicles which had run out of gas, suffered a flat tire, or experienced engine problems, but had not been in an accident. This bill is designed to help people who use wheelchairs or endure a handicap limiting their mobility, and I would like Mr. Geeser to explain the details of this proposal.

Michael Geeser, Media/Government Relations, California State Automobile Association, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I would like to begin by thanking Assemblyman Claborn for listening to our concerns and responding with this bill, which we believe will help a group of people in this state. When we respond to a service request where the motorist is handicapped or has some restricted mobility and they are physically unable to get into the tow cab, we have to wait with them at the side of the road until another suitable vehicle or a paratransit vehicle can respond. This is inconvenient for a number of parties. Our company would like to answer the service call and get these folks off the road as fast as we can. Under the present circumstances, we cannot do this. Law enforcement would like to see all vehicles and occupants removed as quickly as possible, and we are not doing that either. More importantly, the people calling us for assistance have to continue to wait long after we have arrived on location. Whether the individual is in northern Nevada when the temperatures drop below freezing or in southern Nevada on a summer day when it is over 100 F, we know how uncomfortable it is to spend one more minute than we have to on the side of the road. This bill will allow tow operators to verify the motorist is properly restrained in their vehicle and pull them to the nearest, safest location, and continue with the process of fixing their car. We ask for your vote in support of this bill, which we believe will make the lives of many of our handicapped people safer.

Assemblyman Christensen:

One of our huge problems occurs when traffic slows because of the rubbernecking when another vehicle stops alongside the road.

Chairman Atkinson:

Does anyone on the Committee have a question?

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Are there other states with laws like this allowing a vehicle to be towed with the occupants still inside? My other question relates to the safety factor involved with the people in the towed vehicle. Have you ever had any experience with these passengers sustaining injuries while being towed?

Michael Geeser:

California is currently working on the same type of legislation which is also being proposed by us. I want to point out the language in bold type on line 4 says, "an operator of a towed car may tow a vehicle." If it is determined at the scene that the car will be at an unsafe angle or the person inside the car would be unsafe, then both parties, the motorist and the tow car operator, would have the option to wait until a paratransit vehicle arrives to assist. This proposal gives us one more option to get the distressed car off the road as soon as possible, if all parties involved agree.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

This bill is landmark legislation, then?

Michael Geeser:

I am not aware of another state where this exact legislation exists. Although, I do believe there are states with a provision similar to this.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any other questions from the Committee members? Mr. Claborn, are you going to stay at the witness table or come back to your Committee seat? Do you have anyone else you would like to testify?

Michael Geeser:

We do have a few supporters in Las Vegas as well as several present in this room. So, we will leave it to your discretion to choose where you want to begin.

Chairman Atkinson:

Very well, then we will ask those in Carson City who want to speak in favor of A.B. 412 to please come forward to present your testimony, and then we will entertain speakers from Las Vegas.

**Tom Roberts, Lieutenant, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department,
Las Vegas, Nevada:**

For the record, we support this piece of legislation. It is a commonsense solution to a problem which occurs frequently to towing companies. We believe

removing inoperable vehicles from the roadside would decrease gawking motorists and reduce secondary accidents.

**Tim Kuzanek, Captain, Administrative Services Governmental Affairs,
Washoe County Sheriff's Office, Reno, Nevada:**

I want to echo the comments of my colleague from the south and let you know we are also in support of this bill.

**Frank Adams, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association,
Mesquite, Nevada:**

The Association wishes to be included in the support of this legislation.

Chairman Atkinson:

Does the Committee have any questions for these witnesses?

Assemblyman Hogan:

If the person has a disabled car but is not personally disabled, would there be any restriction preventing him from riding in the cab with the tow driver? I see everyone shaking their heads in the negative, so there is no problem. Thank you.

Tom Roberts, Lieutenant:

Currently, there are no restrictions allowing them to climb into the cab. However, the reason Mr. Geeser approached us about this bill was in order to provide a potential solution for motorists with a physical handicap impairing their ability to lift themselves or their wheelchair into the cab necessitating an additional wait for secondary transportation.

Assemblyman Christensen:

I would like to ask for some clarification. Would this also be for a large family, like mine, where it is impossible for all the members to safely ride in the cab? Could we remain in our own vehicle and be towed off to a safe place?

Tom Roberts, Lieutenant:

For the purposes of this bill, that would not apply. I believe the intent of this proposal was to accommodate handicapped people and to safely get them off the side of the road. This is not to imply your family is any less important, but I think there other means readily available to you, and that would not be the case for this segment of the population.

Assemblyman Christensen:

That certainly answers my question. Thank you for the explanation.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any other questions from the members for either of the gentlemen at the table? Is there anyone else in Carson City who wants to speak in favor of the bill?

Tiffany Hunter, People First of Nevada, Carson City Chapter, Stagecoach, Nevada:

This bill is important to me because I travel frequently between Carson City and Reno. If my assistable van needed to be towed, I would be stranded on the side of the road which would not be a good place for me. Therefore, I would like the Committee to support this proposal.

Carol Hunter, People First of Nevada, Carson City Chapter, Stagecoach, Nevada:

I am Tiffany's mother, and some of the places we travel to are located in very rural areas. We live in a small town called Stagecoach, and we travel quite a bit for my daughter's job and for other reasons. Some of the roads are virtually deserted, like U.S. 95 between Stagecoach and Fernley, and Washoe Valley where bus service is not available. Cell phone coverage is intermittent, and a taxi would not travel so far to pick us up. Therefore, it would be helpful to have this bill passed so we could stay in the vehicle if it was towed. I could ride in the cab of a tow truck, but Tiffany could not. Thank you very much for your support of this issue.

Norman Chamberlin, Valley Towing, Carson City, Nevada:

We definitely support this bill because we are the people out there providing the services to people like Tiffany, and it is an extremely difficult problem in some instances. In regards to Assemblyman Christensen's comment about additional people in the vehicle, it is my opinion this is the most common situation we face on a regular basis. Tow truck operators will respond to a call and find a large group of people inside the vehicle, which they cannot accommodate. These situations do create a safety concern, because it is safer to get them off the road than to have them remain alongside the road where the occupants can inadvertently become a target for passing traffic.

Chairman Atkinson:

Is there anyone else who wishes to testify in favor of A.B. 412? Then we will change our venue to Las Vegas. I believe there are a few people who would like to speak in favor of this proposal.

**Jack Mayes, Executive Director, Nevada Disability Advocacy and Law Center,
Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I often travel between my offices. I live in Reno, but I have offices in Elko and Las Vegas. I have chosen not to fly, and I drive these long distances frequently. This bill will benefit me as an individual because I have had arthritis since the age of ten which has caused me to undergo surgery for multiple joint replacements. Getting into any type of truck is difficult and sometimes even dangerous. I wanted to share with you how strongly I support this legislation and also go on record for the Nevada Council on Developmental Disabilities which also supports this proposal.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any questions from the Committee members? Seeing none, is there anyone else who wants to testify? Then, we will close the hearing on A.B. 412 and bring it back to Committee. I believe Mr. Christensen has a motion for the Committee.

Assemblyman Christensen:

Before we delve into the motion, I have a question for you, and I would also like to say a word to the sponsor. This is a great example of commonsense legislation. After hearing the tow operator's testimony and realizing multiple occupant vehicles are a typical problem encountered by the towing companies, and hearing the safest practical option is to get them off the freeway, is there any way to make an amendment without mangling the bill? If we are able to transport one individual with restricted mobility in a safe manner, then can we transport the entire family in their vehicle if they are wearing seat belts by amending the language?

Chairman Atkinson:

As long as they are properly restrained, you want the tow company to take the vehicle with the family inside?

Assemblyman Christensen:

Correct, Mr. Chairman, the bill refers to the individual inside the vehicle being properly restrained.

Chairman Atkinson:

This is not my bill, so I am not familiar with what the issues, if any, may be. Perhaps Mr. Geeser could help us.

Michael Geeser:

I would not be opposed to an amendment of the nature posed by Assemblyman Christensen. However, I would need to find out if the other

interested parties are in agreement. While it makes perfect sense to me, I could not speak for any other party supporting the original proposal.

Assemblyman Claborn:

If we have an opportunity to pass it out of our Committee, then it could be amended on the Senate side. I would like to see this bill passed today to avoid any unnecessary delays because we are short on time for Assembly action.

Assemblyman Christensen:

I am completely open to your suggestion, Assemblyman Claborn. I hope most people agree that in taking care of people, whether it is one or five, safety is the key and we need to keep this in mind.

Chairman Atkinson:

Then we have two options. We could pass it "as written" to move it forward, and then amend it during the Senate's review, or try to put an unreviewed amendment on the bill today which will require an additional hearing through our Committee.

Assemblyman Claborn:

If we do as you suggested in the second option, then Mr. Geeser could take the initiative to run this by all the interested parties and come back to us. However, we know what the bill states now and I would hate to lose our momentum.

Chairman Atkinson:

We could amend it now, if that is what you want.

Assemblyman Claborn:

I do not think it is fair to Mr. Geeser, because he has not had a chance to talk to his own organization, yet.

Assemblyman Manendo:

Mr. Mayes in Las Vegas reminds me of my own father who was 100 percent disabled from the Korean War, and there were many times I drove him. In the early days when he could still drive, we broke down on occasion and required assistance. In those instances, we were unable to get our vehicle off the road until we had someone who could pick us up, and this was extremely difficult. We were still stranded until someone moved us to a safer location and then went back for the vehicle.

So, I agree we could pass the bill to ensure it moves forward, and by the time it is scheduled for a floor session, we would have enough input to amend it at that time.

Chairman Atkinson:

As Chairman, I would like to move this out of Committee, and we can figure out the amendment later.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHRISTENSEN MOVED TO DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 412.

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

Chairman Atkinson:

Assemblyman Claborn will explain this bill when it is discussed during the floor session. We will now move on to A.B. 333. However, we will take a brief recess while we attempt to locate our next presenters. Assemblyman Denis has arrived and we will start with his testimony.

**Assembly Bill 333: Revises certain provisions relating to the towing of vehicles.
(BDR 58-835)**

Assemblyman Moises (Mo) Denis, Clark County Assembly District No. 28:

Thank you for the opportunity to come in front of this Committee. I believe this is the first time for this Session. I would like to provide you with a brief background to help you understand why I have brought this bill forward. A few years ago, a constituent of mine gave a car to a neighbor down the street. The neighbor did not have any money to register it, and the car was eventually towed. The constituent had completed her due diligence by going to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and turning her plates in. A few months after she had given the car to the neighbor, the tow company called to advise her she owed them \$3,000 in fees for towing and storing the vehicle. She informed them she no longer owned the car, but the tow company insisted the DMV still showed her as the owner of record and as a result they would affect her credit if she refused to pay.

I initiated a bill two sessions ago allowing the former owner of a vehicle the ability to sign an affidavit stating the conditions of surrender which could be given to the tow car company as proof of transfer. Since then I have had two more constituents with the same experience. It seems the tow car company is not required to notify you about submitting an affidavit if you no longer own the vehicle.

Therefore, A.B. 333 has been written in response to this problem. In section 1, on page 2 it states, "shall reduce any charge if the authority determines the charge is unreasonable," because the charge is attributable in whole or in part to failure of the operator to satisfy his lien in a timely manner.

Section 2 requires the tow company to send a notice advising the recipient of their right to submit an affidavit. This is the extent of the original proposal, however, since then we have added a couple of amendments.

The first one changes the number of days for notification. Currently, it is 21 days and we are suggesting it be revised to 14 days. There is another deadline which we are proposing to change from 15 days down to 8 days. The larger companies are familiar with providing these notifications, but the smaller companies wait a minimum of five days before sending it out, and if there is a three-day weekend, the notification would not be sent until 8 days later. Therefore, the proposed recommendation is to specify business days which would provide sufficient time for the smaller companies to comply.

In speaking to representatives at the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) there was a fiscal note involved, because when you sell the car you could go on the website and enter this information and list the new owner, but an update fee would be incurred. However, DMV has agreed to fit it into their normal workload when they are handling other entries and there would be no additional cost. Troy Dillard from DMV is with me today to answer any questions relating to this issue.

Chairman Atkinson:

Before we hear from Mr. Dillard, I have a quick question about your proposal changing the number of days from 21 to 14 and then changing the 15-day requirement to 8 business days. Does your proposal mean 14 business days as well?

Assemblyman Denis:

The only reason for the eight business days is to accommodate small companies which may have to deal with a three-day weekend. The 14-day time frame allows sufficient time even with a three-day weekend for a smaller company to comply with the notification requirement.

Chairman Atkinson:

It sounds like both of these time frames will end up being 14 days, in some cases.

Assemblyman Denis:

You are correct. That could happen in certain instances.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any questions for Assemblyman Denis before we go on to the next speaker?

Assemblyman Carpenter:

How does this help the person in the example you gave concerning who had to pay the towing company?

Assemblyman Denis:

First, it is already stated in the law a person can file an affidavit when they no longer own the vehicle. However, this new proposal will help those individuals who do not know about this provision. The tow company must notify them that the vehicle has been towed and if they no longer own it, then they can submit an affidavit to that effect. I had another constituent who did not turn in his plates, and when the tow company took the vehicle he was not informed of the affidavit. So the tow company turned over the bill to a collection agency, and the agency called him every day trying to obtain the fees from him.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any other questions from the Committee members?

Troy Dillard, Chief, Division of Compliance Enforcement, Department of Motor Vehicles:

We are neutral on the bill, but Assemblyman Denis approached us regarding the concept for this proposal during the 2005 Session. However, originally the fiscal note was so large the bill did not pass. Together we have come up with an amendment which would allow the same process to occur but on a voluntary basis without any cost. A new section would be added to the bill requiring the Department to provide an electronic method for the legal owner of a vehicle to notify the Department of a sale of such vehicle. The Department would then be required to notify the inquiring party, primarily the tow companies, of the notice filed and the individual who supposedly purchased the vehicle as well as the last registered owner's information. In turn, the tow company would be required to send notices to both parties. In effect, when you sell your vehicle, you could notify us via the website of the sale of your vehicle, and we would append your record to say the vehicle had been sold. If the vehicle was not retitled or reregistered to the new owner and a tow company came into possession of it through hauling an abandoned vehicle, the information sent out would contain both the last registered owner and the information provided by the person who sold the vehicle. This would allow the tow company to notify both parties. If

the vehicle was falsely reported to the Department stating it had been sold and it was not, you would still receive notice the vehicle was in possession by the tow company. This is effectively what A.B. No. 169 of the 73rd Session provided when submitted in the 2005 Session.

We would prefer it became effective upon the Department's ability to implement it, allowing our internal programmers time to input the information within our schedule. This flexibility would avoid any fiscal note for programming purposes.

The second proposed amendment was already addressed by Assemblyman Denis, but I will give you some additional details. On line 44 of the bill, page 2, the new subsection 5, the intent was to reference *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 482.220 which gives the registered owner the rebuttable presumption to prove the vehicle was sold and he no longer has any responsibility for it. The lien holder must accept this and cease demanding further payment from this individual.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Carpenter:

Do you need to change the days on the third page, line 9 of the draft, to be consistent with the changes in section 2?

Assemblyman Denis:

I noticed those dates as well, but I do not know if this ties into the first changes or relates to what we need to accomplish in this proposal.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

This section talks about placement and storage like the other section.

Chairman Atkinson:

The way I read it, I believe it is the same. One area mentions the notification and the other provision mentions the compliance. So I believe the timelines would be the same.

Assemblyman Denis:

It does mention something about law enforcement following an accident and the other side lists some other conditions.

Chairman Atkinson:

One side seems to suggest it is dealing with the registered owner and the other side refers to not knowing who the registered owner is. Therefore, I believe this would be the difference. Are there any other questions?

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I am trying to come up to speed on this proposal now that I am out of the other committee. How easy is it for a tow company to access this information? Will they have to send a certified letter out to both?

Troy Dillard:

When a tow company comes into possession of a vehicle and the registered owner is unknown, they contact the DMV and we send them the last registered or legal owner of the vehicle. They would send certified notices to both individuals advising them of their possession of the property, the resultant lien, and the amount of money required to pay it in order to reacquire the vehicle.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

They tow the vehicle, remove the tags, and notify you they have this vehicle. In turn, the DMV lets them know who the legal owner is. Is this how it works?

Troy Dillard:

Depending upon which state the vehicle is from, the corresponding DMV would be contacted by the towing company and that is the information released back to them.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

So if it was a California DMV, then it is their responsibility to contact California to obtain the information? After they receive this, then they would send out the certified notices, and the clock is running during this entire process?

Troy Dillard:

That is correct on both points.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Your turnaround at DMV is very fast. It is basically a phone call. Do you send it back in hard copy format, by phone, or electronically?

Troy Dillard:

I believe the requests are coming in via fax and going out using the same method.

Assemblyman Kihuen:

I have a simple question for Mr. Dillard regarding the date this bill would become effective. You indicated you would need the latitude to program this information into your computer. How much time would you need approximately? Also, how much do think the fiscal note would be?

Troy Dillard:

I will address the latter question, first. I believe the original fiscal note was calculated at \$800,000 for programming, and it also was related to the time frame. The answer to the first part of your question is it is contingent upon how much legislation is passed during this session which requires programming by a certain date. We have existing programming staff, but depending upon their workload demands, this particular need would be implemented when they have the ability to do so. Initially, I believe we are looking at July of 2010.

Assemblyman Kihuen:

Then you would suggest this bill be extended until July 2010? A year would suffice in order for you to implement these provisions?

Troy Dillard:

My recommendation would be to include some type of verbiage which would say as soon as the DMV's internal programming schedule was completed, this bill would be effective. No one is mandated to do this, it is a voluntary program. Sellers would log onto the Internet site, and as soon as it was entered, it would be available. We will begin appending the records at that point. Once we had the program in place, then we would initiate sending back both names on the links to the tow company for the notification letters.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

How long does it take to get through to the Records Division?

Troy Dillard:

I do not know the specific answer to this question, but I think some of the tow company operators who plan on testifying might be able to answer you.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

I have tried to get through, but I eventually give up. It is pretty difficult. I think the 14-day time frame will expire before you can reach DMV to find out the ownership information unless you can do something to facilitate telephone requests.

Assemblyman Denis:

I wanted to clarify Assemblyman Kihuen's question. The effective date of the bill would be July 1, 2009, but because of the programming requirements the provisions would be coded in as their schedule permitted.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any other questions from the Committee members? Is there anyone else who wants to speak in favor of A.B. 333?

Steve Amestoy, Owner, Capital Towing, Incorporated, Carson City, Nevada:

In response to Assemblyman Carpenter's question, when we submit to DMV for legal and registered owner they are back within less than a day. That is how fast we receive the information. It has to be a bona fide law enforcement tow. We cannot just pick somebody's car and try to find out the information. It must have an impound sheet or it has to be involved in an accident.

On the title, when we were talking about ownership of a vehicle, the title goes with the vehicle when it is sold, so if I sell a car to someone I must sign off as the seller on the back of the title. The buyer then signs his name, provides a date, and an odometer reading. This constitutes a legal document, and the person who sold the vehicle would make a copy of the executed title transfer. The transaction is finalized at that point, whether it is recorded at DMV or not.

If we impounded the vehicle, and the individual who purchased it came to the tow yard, we are required to accept the title as proof of ownership and release it to him.

We do not have a problem with your proposal to include a provision of 14 days, if the car is a Nevada-registered vehicle. Currently, we submit a request to DMV and by the following day we have the legal and registered owners of record. So, we can comply with the new bill and send out notifications. However, if the car is registered in Mississippi, and there is no license or papers in the car to advise us where the car was registered, then it becomes a 50-state check. We do have our sources where we can obtain this information sooner, but our first source should be DMV. We should submit our request to the DMV office, and using the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) computer, they can tell us the ownership information needed. We are being unduly delayed by not being able to obtain this information for out-of-state vehicles as readily as we can for Nevada registrations. If we would be allowed to obtain this information or pay \$5 for each type of ownership we need, this would facilitate our ability to operate under the provisions set forth. However, the law states we must wait at least 96 hours before we can start our inquiries. Therefore, implementing a provision limiting us to eight days, really only allows

us four days to complete our search. If the information is not available through the DMV, then it could take up to 50 days.

Chairman Atkinson:

You mentioned during your testimony you had another source available to obtain this information, would you mind sharing this source with us?

Steve Amestoy:

I will tell you who my source is, and they are obligated to give it to us, Mr. Chairman. If the Nevada Highway Patrol tows a car, by law they are required to provide us the legal and registered owner.

Chairman Atkinson:

That is fine. I just wanted to verify who your source was and whether you would give them up.

Norman Chamberlin, Owner, Valley Towing, Carson City, Nevada:

I wanted to speak in regards to our ability as tow operators to get those searches completed. If it is a Nevada-registered vehicle, it is easy and quick. We have no problems with providing notifications within the time limits. However, a typical scenario occurs when we tow a car and it does not have a license plate, or it has a fictitious registration. We send off our initial request to DMV, and this search takes about a day to come back with a notation that there is no record on file. There is absolutely nothing indicating where we should look next, and we are forced to send an employee out to rummage through the vehicle which contains questionable bodily fluids, glove boxes with used syringes, and usually little information of any relevance. We begin asking questions and try searching different states hoping for a positive response.

However, we begin processing our lien sale packet to DMV using their printout indicating there is no record on file. The car is sent to the lien sale auction, and someone bids on it and is declared the winner. Then we take the lien sale packet, obtain the purchaser's information, and send it to DMV. The purchaser is given another slip of paper which they take to the DMV, and it will be registered in his name with the proper insurance. Approximately two or three weeks later, the DMV sends the packet back stating we have not contacted the owner, because they have accessed information on their NCIC computer and found a legal or registered owner in another state. Now, we have a person in possession of the car that we cannot provide with a clear title. The purchaser has spent \$1,000 repairing the vehicle, and we are left hanging.

If the DMV has access to the information, we are willing to pay a little bit more money to obtain it, too. We just want the information so we can send out notifications as quickly as possible.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any questions from the Committee members? Thank you for your testimony. Is there anyone else in Carson City wishing to testify in favor of this proposal?

Andrew (Andy) J. MacKay, Chair, Nevada Transportation Authority, Department of Business and Industry, Reno, Nevada:

We are in support of the bill as well as the amendments which have been proffered. The reason is because we will have a good consumer protection bill as it relates to reducing the potential for excessive storage fees associated with the lien process referenced in NRS 484.220.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any questions for Mr. MacKay? Is there anyone in Las Vegas who wants to speak in favor of A.B. 333?

Clark Whitney, North Star Towing, LLC, North Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am in favor of this bill for the same reasons mentioned earlier. I do have a somewhat different opinion concerning the proposal to change the provision to eight business days. One of the reasons eight days is not long enough is because we cannot begin the lien process until the fifth day. Also, we cannot begin to charge a lien fee on a car which was towed as a result of an accident for 15 days, so maybe 14 days would not work either. Our turnaround time in Las Vegas for Nevada-registered cars has been two or three days, but with many cars it is difficult to determine which state they are registered in. Any help we can receive in this area would be appreciated. I agree wholeheartedly with the other amendments offered.

Chairman Atkinson:

Does the Committee have any questions for Mr. Whitney? Does anyone want to speak in opposition? Does anyone want to comment on this bill in a neutral position? Seeing none at this time, does Assemblyman Denis want to close?

Assemblyman Denis:

This is an important issue to me and many of our constituents. It is not an isolated issue. I think we can make these amendments work, and I will consult with staff to ensure it is written correctly for your next work session.

Chairman Atkinson:

We will work together, and Ms. Paslov Thomas on my staff will assist in compiling everything for this Committee's review and vote.

Assemblyman Denis:

The issue which originated during the out-of-state discussion can also be addressed at the same time.

Chairman Atkinson:

Thank you, Assemblyman. I believe this will satisfy everyone's concerns. We will close the hearing on A.B. 333 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 323.

Assembly Bill 323: Revises provisions governing refunds of vehicle registration fees and governmental services taxes. (BDR 43-668)

Assemblyman Tom Grady, Assembly District No. 38:

Assembly Bill 323 is a fairness issue. It concerns money collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) for registration fees not being returned to our Nevada citizens when personal circumstances change or when the vehicle registration is cancelled (Prepared testimony submitted as [Exhibit C](#)). Let me briefly explain how this proposal transpired. I have had a number of calls since the last session from people turning in a vehicle and asking for a rebate and they receive a credit, instead. One gentleman had \$163 remaining for a motorcycle registration, and another person had \$700 on a motor home. It says they can apply for a rebate, so I decided to test this process. I went into a DMV office outside of my area and inquired about the rebate. I was informed I could receive a credit. There was no mention of any hardship case or how I would actually handle the transaction. I asked if there was any way I could obtain a refund of my money, and I was told to contact my legislator to change the law.

After my experience, I returned home and began drafting a bill. I placed numerous calls regarding NRS 482.399 and found that when a person turns in the plates they do not receive a refund, only a credit. If they purchase another vehicle, the credit may be applied to the new registration. If they do not, their credit is amortized over the remaining months of the current registration period. Waivers may be granted under conditions listed on page 3, lines 25 to 33. No mention is made in these waivers if a head of household has lost a job, must reduce obligations, or must relocate because of employment or other circumstances. They may choose to relinquish a driver's license due to age or personal problems but do not qualify for the refund on the vehicle registration.

Mr. Chairman and Committee members, the State should be compensated but at what level? As mentioned previously, a gentleman sold his recreational vehicle (RV), and turned in the plates because of the gas prices. His credit was over \$700, but he received no refund. I understand the DMV has attached a \$10 million fiscal note which only proves we have a serious problem of charging the unfortunate more money than many can afford in these trying times. This represents fees paid by the public for registrations they no longer have. I realize the State of Nevada is in difficult financial straits, but so are many of our citizens who are being forced to downsize. Under the present system, they are being penalized.

The proposed changes appear on page 3, starting on line 22 to line 35. We want to eliminate the present language and insert new language on line 35 stating the DMV must refund any amounts above \$50. If necessary, let us make DMV accountable to their customers, our constituents. If we must, amend the bill, but require DMV to provide information on the process to qualify for the refund as outlined in section 1, subsection 9, and require a signed affidavit by the customer acknowledging they have received this information. Our colleague from District No. 4 has a similar bill pertaining to military personnel, so this is a statewide issue. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to work with you, your staff, and the DMV to correct this injustice to our constituents. I would be happy to answer any questions at this time.

Chairman Atkinson:

I do have a quick question. You are proposing at the time of a surrendered or cancelled license plate, the customer be given a full refund for the nonusage?

Assembly Grady:

Yes, for the period of nonuse of the plates, less a \$50 surcharge because the State of Nevada should receive something for the paperwork required.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are you concerned about the \$10 million fiscal note?

Assemblyman Grady:

I am very concerned, because I have no idea how they could estimate the number of plates turned in during the next two years. I do not know how they could derive this figure. How many people would be under the \$50 limitation, or how many would be over the \$50? How many would apply for a hardship waiver if they learned about this option? I have no way of verifying how they came up with this fiscal note, unless they were deliberately trying to kill the bill, as we have seen in the past.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any other questions from the Committee members? I guess you did a good job, because we do not have any questions for you.

Assemblyman Grady:

I am going to return to my Committee on Taxation, then, if you no longer require my presence.

Chairman Atkinson:

Please do, Assemblyman. If we need you again, we will give you a call. Is there anyone in Carson City wishing to speak in favor of A.B. 323? Is there anyone in Las Vegas? Does anyone want to speak in opposition to A.B. 323? Is there anyone who wants to take a neutral position?

Thomas J. Fronapfel, P.E., Administrator, Field Services Division, Department of Motor Vehicles:

The Department has no position on the bill, but I wanted to have the record reflect there is a fiscal note we prepared. I did notify the sponsors of the bill by email yesterday, as well as the Chairman, that the fiscal note will vary from year to year. The fiscal note is based on the actual number of registration refunds reflected in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008. The calculations were based on an actual number of refunds issued over \$100 with the extenuating circumstances in place.

Assemblywoman Dondero Loop:

In your opinion, is \$50 a fair fee?

Tom Fronapfel:

We do not have a position for the record on what we would deem as fair or not. We have not evaluated what our cost associated with this might be. So we are not prepared to speculate whether this would be an adequate service fee. We could look into it, but I do not have an answer at this point.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any other questions? I do not know what we will do at this point based on the \$10 million fiscal note attached to the bill and our financial crisis. I understand the spirit of the bill, but it is difficult. We will close the hearing on A.B. 323 and move on to our work session.

Assembly Bill 127: Requires certain pro rata refunds for the cancellation of the registration of vehicles owned by Armed Forces personnel assigned to serve abroad on active duty. (BDR 43-538)

Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:

The first bill today is A.B. 127 ([Exhibit D](#)), and as you will recall, this is sponsored by Assemblyman McArthur. We heard this proposal on March 12, and it would require the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to refund a portion of the registration fee and governmental services tax paid on the motor vehicle of a person who is a member of the United States (U.S.) armed forces assigned to serve on active duty in another country. This refund would apply only to the nonused portion of the registration period. The amount eligible for the refund must be \$20 or more, and there were no proposed amendments.

Chairman Atkinson:

There is going to be an issue with this proposal. It will need to be referred to the Assembly Ways and Means Committee due to the fiscal note attached. I wholeheartedly agree with the intent, and we certainly want to do everything we can to help out our armed forces personnel. I understand the predicament they are in and the challenges they are experiencing, but it will have to be reviewed elsewhere.

Assemblyman Manendo:

I totally agree that we want to do everything we can, but money is tight. However, in order to keep this bill alive I would like to propose a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN MANENDO MADE A MOTION TO REREFER
ASSEMBLY BILL 127 TO THE ASSEMBLY WAYS AND MEANS
COMMITTEE WITHOUT A RECOMMENDATION.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assembly Bill 153: Revises provisions governing the issuance of drivers' licenses to certain persons. (BDR 43-77)

Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:

The next bill under consideration is Assembly Bill 153 ([Exhibit E](#)). This proposal was sponsored by this Committee and was originally heard on February 19th. It requires a person who is 16 or 17 years of age to complete 6 hours of behind-the-wheel training while in a motor vehicle by a licensed private driving school. Not more than three hours of behind-the-wheel time may take place in an automobile simulator. A person is exempt from such training if the training is not offered within a 30-mile radius of the person's residence. There are four proposed conceptual amendments, and I would also like to mention there is a

note on the current graduated licensing system behind the first page in your work session document binder.

The first three conceptual amendments are proposed by Mr. Kenneth Kruger, and a copy of his letter is behind this page ([Exhibit F](#)). The first one is to amend this bill requiring a person under the age of 18 to complete 10 hours of driving experience logged on the form provided by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), or complete a 6-hour basic driving course from a licensed driving school prior to taking the 6-hour behind-the-wheel course offered by a licensed driving school as required by A.B. 153. The second is to amend the bill to delete the provision on page 3, subsection 2 of section 2, requiring the DMV to adopt regulations regarding the standards for the 6-hour behind-the-wheel course. The third amendment revises the bill to allow the licensed driving schools to adopt standards rather than having them in regulation and for the DMV to approve such standards for the behind-the-wheel class.

The fourth proposed amendment is submitted by Judy Odell, and a copy of her letter is also behind this tab in the Committee's work session binder. It would amend the bill to provide a person may complete six hours of behind-the-wheel driver training if it is offered by a school district or other governmental entity meeting the DMV's requirements.

Chairman Atkinson:

Thank you, Marji. Does the Committee have any questions? If you will recall this is the bill we heard during the first or second day by our Committee, and I know members had concerns about burdening families with an additional expense of \$300 to \$400 to send the teenager to the 6-hour course in these difficult financial times. I do not believe this issue has disappeared as of today, however, I said we would take a vote on this bill, and we will go ahead with the plan. I do understand the hardship it places on a family, but I also appreciate the reason for proposing this legislation. It is up to the Committee, and the Chairman will entertain a motion.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

We have done a lot for teenage driving since I have been in this Legislature, and I think we have a good program in place. Accident rates are dropping for this segment, and with an unfunded mandate to the parents, it will be extremely difficult to find the money required. Maybe in good times we can reconsider a proposal like this, but I do not believe we can do it now.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I just want to be clear on this bill. It says between 16 and 17 years old, but under the age of 18 years old. So if the teenager does not obtain a driver's license until he is 18, then he is not required to comply? Is that correct? Then I fear in these hard times we will have teens continuing to drive without a license, because they do not want to spend the money.

Chairman Atkinson:

Is there a motion?

Assemblyman Claborn:

I agree with Mr. Goicoechea. I do not believe is it appropriate to spend all that money for a driver's license, either.

ASSEMBLYMAN CLABORN MADE A MOTION TO INDEFINITELY
POSTPONE ASSEMBLY BILL 153.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Atkinson:

We are going to move on and discuss Assembly Bill 163 ([Exhibit G](#)). This is Assemblyman Ohrenschall's bill, and he is waiting in the back. Ms. Paslov Thomas will brief the Committee first.

Assembly Bill 163: Requires the Department of Transportation to adopt regulations to allow certified low emission and energy-efficient vehicles to be operated in a lane on certain highways designated for the preferential use or exclusive use of high-occupancy vehicles. (BDR 43-40)

Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 163 was sponsored by Assemblyman Ohrenschall and heard on February 26. This proposal requires the Nevada's Department of Transportation (NDOT) to adopt regulations to allow certified low emission and energy efficient vehicles to be operated in a lane on a highway under its jurisdiction designated for the preferential use or exclusive use of high-occupancy vehicles (HOV). There are two proposed conceptual amendments. The first one was submitted by the sponsor, and he is proposing to allow NDOT to adopt regulations and change the effective date to July 1, 2010. Jennifer Lazovich proposed the second amendment to enable a county to adopt regulations allowing low emission and energy efficient vehicles such as electric vehicles and carts within the designated lane on streets within a planned community. This provision

would also be effective on July 1, 2010. A copy of the definition of a planned community is provided behind the tab in the Committee's work session binder.

Chairman Atkinson:

Before we entertain a motion, is there any discussion from the Committee members?

Assemblyman Manendo:

I like the original piece of legislation. I believe if we want to make a statement and want to improve the environment, we should take a firm view by using the word "must" instead of inserting "may" for "shall." However, the sponsor has agreed to change his phrasing to "may" even though I feel we will need to revisit this bill in a few years. During the hearing, Assemblyman Ohrenschall did a great job on this bill, and I commented at the time how much I liked the intent as presented. Saying all that, I will support this bill with the changes as proposed.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I agree with my colleague from southern Nevada, but the bottom line is we heard the testimony clearly stating if flex fuel were included in this bill, we would have too many vehicles in the HOV lanes. It did not adequately focus on what qualified. I think NDOT will have the ability to narrow the focus as well as using the word "may," which would give them the ability to accomplish their objective. I will be supporting it with the amendment.

Assemblyman Claborn:

I, too, echo Assemblyman Goicoechea's sentiments. I believe it will put too many automobiles in the special (HOV) lane, but I will support the bill with the amendment.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

I think this is an excellent bill and support it with the revised language, but I also want to bring up Ms. Lazovich's amendment which I feel is an outstanding proposal. I know there is a planned senior community in Henderson with many people using golf carts to get around. It is dangerous to have these carts on the same roadways coexisting with vehicular traffic. There is sufficient room to put in a designated lane which will help with safety issues in Henderson as well as elsewhere around the state.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

I believe you could have hybrid vehicles in these lanes, so Assemblyman Goicoechea and my mules will be okay.

Assemblyman Manendo:

I wanted clarification on the designated lane. Would this be in a new or existing community?

Jennifer Lazovich, representing Kummer Kaempfer Bonner Renshaw and Ferrario, Las Vegas, Nevada:

In response to Assemblyman Manendo's question, the amendment was designed to establish permissive language allowing the local governments to determine how they wanted to handle the situation. However, I drafted it as a prospective amendment for new communities which have not yet been designed with the idea it would be a designated lane prohibiting vehicle occupancy. Standard vehicles would continue to occupy bona fide roads constructed for this purpose, and there would not be any conflict. This could be done for any planned community, such as Coyote Springs, which will be a very large master planned community when it is finished. They are trying to determine the best way to incorporate this type of design without interfering with proposed travel lanes.

Assemblyman Manendo:

I was simply wondering if we already have an existing planned community, especially with homeowners' associations (HOAs). I am always concerned about what one of these associations will say if given the flexibility. I appreciate your forethought for a new community and developing an actual lane just to accommodate carts. I am not quite convinced on the feasibility of this particular amendment, but I will yield to listen to the other comments.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

I want to comment back to Assemblyman Manendo. I do not see anything precluding it, and in a community such as Sun City Anthem where there is ample room to put in a lane if the community so desired, I really do not see what the problem would be to help remove these carts from normal street traffic.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any other questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Manendo:

What if the designated lane is taken from an already existing traffic lane? Maybe there are two lanes on a heavily trafficked roadway within a community, and they decide to use one of those lanes for golf carts only. In comparison, designating an entire lane for the exclusive use of golf carts may be extreme when considering there are a minimal number of golf carts on the streets, but if

there is room to build an additional lane, then a designation for a specific use would be acceptable.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

In the case of Sun City Anthem, which I am using as my example, those streets are public and any decision to change the designated purpose would require submitting the proposal to the City of Henderson's Planning Commission. There would be public hearings, and it is not a process which could be implemented through a board or association.

Assemblyman Manendo:

What if these were not public streets?

Chairman Atkinson:

I believe this is why Ms. Lazovich mentioned it would also need to be decided upon by the local county. As long as there was an adequate amount of right-of-way to provide a strip for another purpose, an existing roadway could be altered to accommodate both types of traffic. This concludes the discussion, and the Chairman will entertain a motion from Assemblyman Christensen. However, Assemblyman Carpenter is raising a point of order.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

Cities have the authority to regulate these planned communities, and so I feel you should add them to the amendment as well.

ASSEMBLYMAN CHRISTENSEN MADE A MOTION TO AMEND
AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 163 TO INCLUDE BOTH
AMENDMENTS WITH THE ADDITION OF CITIES.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SPIEGEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Atkinson:

Assemblyman Ohrenschall, I assume you will want to present this on the floor. Thank you very much. We have one more bill.

**[Assembly Bill 247](#): Revises provisions governing the operation of bicycles.
(BDR 43-1046)**

Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 247 ([Exhibit H](#)) was sponsored by Assemblyman Bobzien and heard on March 12. This requires a person operating a bicycle to signal his

intentions to turn at least one time unless the bicycle is in a designated turn lane or when safe operation of the bicycle requires the operator to keep both hands on the bicycle. In addition an operator of a bicycle may signal for a right turn by extending his hand and arm horizontally and to the right side of the bicycle. Finally, A.B. 247 provides an operator of a bicycle may operate a bicycle upon any sidewalk unless a local ordinance prohibits or restricts such operation. Any ordinance enacted by a local authority requiring the operation of a bicycle only upon sidewalk areas is void. There are two proposed conceptual amendments. These were proposed by Assemblyman David Bobzien and the Nevada Bicycle Coalition. Behind this tab is a letter which also states the proposed changes. The first change is to amend the bill to delete subsection 1 and subsection 2 of section 4 which allows the operator of a bicycle to operate a bicycle upon any sidewalk area unless a local ordinance prohibits or restricts such operation. The second proposed change is to amend subsection 3 of section 4 to add the definition of a side path which would be defined as a usable path for bicycles provided adjacent to a highway. Also, it would clarify that any ordinance enacted by a local authority requiring the operation of bicycles only upon sidewalks or side path areas is void.

Chairman Atkinson:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Carpenter:

On the one amendment where it says in section 4, "any provision made by a local government requiring bicycles to operate on the sidewalk or side path is void," and it goes on to define a side path. The NDOT in our area has gone to significant expense to construct a bike path next to a highway. In situations where the path is well-maintained and off the highway, I do not consider it appropriate to tell people not to use the bike path and allow them to travel on a dangerous stretch of highway instead. I would suggest some clarification, if the path is well-maintained and a usable bike path, they can be allowed to ride on it.

Chairman Atkinson:

I am not sure this provision prevents a bicyclist from using the path. I believe it allows them to choose the safer path.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

It says a local authority which requires the operation of bicycles only upon sidewalks or side paths is void. The reason the NDOT spent the money to improve this area was because the local government required bicyclists to ride upon paths which were unsafe. Now it is well-maintained and I believe they should be required to use it.

Chairman Atkinson:

I am reading the entire sentence, and it also clarifies that an ordinance enacted by a local authority requiring a bicycle to operate "only" upon sidewalks and side paths is void. In my opinion, this gives the bicycle operator flexibility. Darcy, could you respond to this issue?

Darcy Johnson, Committee Counsel:

I am not sure the flexibility remains with the way the amendment is written, because it deletes subsections 1 and 2 of section 4.

Marjorie Paslov Thomas:

Assemblyman Carpenter, I believe this amendment takes away the requirement that mandates them to use either a sidewalk or side path, and allows them more flexibility to choose the safest path. In a county where side paths are not as well-maintained as in Elko, then they would have the flexibility to use the street.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

I understand what the intent was meant to do, however, when an agency goes to a significant expense and posts it for bicycles to use this path, it seems counterproductive to pass a bill making it void.

Assemblyman Hogan:

My understanding is if the path is near a highway, then riders should have the option, particularly when the path is not maintained, to use the highway. If the local jurisdiction in its judgment feels the path is the best and safest place for bicycle riders, it seems they should be able to make an ordinance to that effect. I believe you can still use the path, but the locality could not require it. By overruling their judgment before we even know what it is, I am not sure it advances the idea of bicycle safety.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

Sometimes it is not safe for a bicycle rider to use a particular path, because it is used by joggers and pedestrians or dog walkers, and if it becomes too busy, the bicyclist may be safer to himself as well as others by using an alternative route on the street.

Assemblyman Carpenter:

Your statement makes perfect sense for sidewalk use, but everybody wants these paths, and if you have one which is well-maintained and completely safe, it is a lot better to stay on the path and avoid the highway. I do not know if you could change it to reflect what I just said or not. I believe it does not give the local authority or NDOT the opportunity to put the bicycles in an area which is considered safer.

Chairman Atkinson:

We will delay making a motion at this time and ask Assemblyman Bobzien to meet with Assemblyman Carpenter to clarify these issues. Then we will bring it back to the Committee before April 10 so we can move this bill through our Committee. Is there any other business which needs to come before the members? Is there any public comment? This meeting is adjourned [3:33 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Marlen Schultz
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Kelvin Atkinson, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Transportation

Date: March 26, 2009

Time of Meeting: 1:38 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance roster
A.B. 323	C	Assemblyman Tom Grady	Prepared testimony
A.B. 127	D	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work session document
A.B. 153	E	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work session document
A.B. 153	F	Kenneth S. Kruger	Letter with amendments
A.B. 163	G	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work session document
A.B. 247	H	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work session document