

A quorum being present, Chairman Price called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. on May 25, 1981 in room 214 of the Legislative Building.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Price, Chairman
Assemblyman Polish, Vice Chairman
Assemblyman Beyer
Assemblyman DuBois
Assemblyman Mello
Assemblyman Prengaman
Assemblyman Schofield

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Glover
Assemblyman Westall

GUESTS PRESENT:

Heber Hardy, Public Service Commission
Darryl Capurro, Nevada Motor Transport Association
Hale Bennet, DMV
Al Stone, Department of Transportation
Garth Dull, Department of Transportation
T. Tankavich, Department of Transportation
John Madole, Association General Contractors

SB 673, Simplifies procedure for motor carriers to change rates, fares and charges.

Darryl Capurro, Nevada Motor Transport Association, stated that this bill basically cleans up some antiquated provisions that are currently in the Motor Carrier Section of the Public Service Commission under Chapter 706.

The current law has some provisions in it which have had some unfortunate side effects to them that are not the same as they are currently in the Utility Section of the PSC. One of these is found on page 1, line 19 of the bill. There is a problem currently and this would provide an implementation plan for clearing up the current inconsistency. Mr. Capurro stated that with the passage of SB 477 and the fuel tax there will be a need for a method of recovering costs as quickly as possible after they are incurred. Under the current system they would not be able to do anything with regard to rates in less than 30 days time. This would put the rate portion of it consistent with what is applied to other items that the commission can consider on less than 30 days notice. It does not mandate them to do anything in less time but it gives that flexibility. The entire bill is aimed at giving the commission a little more flexibility than they currently have and to clean up some language that has been added to over the years and is a little hard to interpret for both the PSC and for the carriers themselves.

The other major consideration is on page 2 and it basically eliminates the situation that allows a single protest from someone to send the thing to a formal public hearing. It does not restrict the commissions right to order a public hearing on a rate case but does provide them with a flexibility if their staff agrees that on the basis of the evidence presented as required under general order 3, rule 17, to handle it other than with a public hearing. In many case the person who originally protested does not even show up for the hearing. The hearing itself involves a great deal of expense and is sometimes used as a delay mechanism. He stated that they have worked with the PSC to come up with the language and urge the committees passage of it.

Herber Hardy, PSC, stated that this doesn't go as far as the promulgation of simplified rules of procedure that is applied to small water companies. If this bill were passed it would allow them to work out an agreement and handle it on an agenda notice meeting as opposed to a full fledged public hearing. This would save some costs and it is in the direction of the small water company regulations.

Mr. Prengaman moved to "do pass" SB 673 and Mr. Mello seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Glover and Mrs. Westall absent.

Mr. Mello moved that in accordance with Rule 91, the five day notice of hearings on bills be hereby suspended. Mr. Polish seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Glover and Mrs. Westall absent.

SB 235, Makes various changes in law regulating place of business, licensing, disciplinary action of dealers in vehicles.

Hale Bennett, DMV, stated that this was a housekeeping bill that was primarily designed for clarification of existing law as it applies to motor vehicle dealers. Sections 2, 3, and 4 all deal with the dealers place of business. It is simply cleaning up the language to define the exemption for branch places of business and that all books and records shall be kept at the principal place of business. Section 5 is an attempt to give some examples and better define the term "unfitness" as it applies to an applicant for a dealers license. Current law tells them they shall not issue a license to somebody that is unfit. They have had some problems in giving some examples of what unfitness really is. Section 6 is sequential device to identify whether the city issues their business license before the state issues theirs. The way the new language is written the city must issue a city business license before the state will issue a motor vehicle dealers license.

Darryl Capurro, representing the Nevada Franchise Automobile Dealers Association, stated that they concur with and have worked with the department in this bill and urge favorable consideration by the committee on this bill.

Mr. Polish moved for a "do pass" and Mr. Beyer seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mrs. Westall and Mr. Glover absent.

AB 701, Increases taxes on motor vehicle fuel and special fuel.

Al Stone, Director, Department of Transportation, stated that sliding scale is responsive to inflation; it goes up and down, but it always protects the taxpayers investment in the existing system. Flat cents per gallon can only be too much or too little. He stated that his "crystal ball" says that he will be \$5.4 million short in the next few years. The opponents have criticized the department making a survey; he would gladly accept AAA's survey or anyone else's survey for the sliding scale. The opponents have testified that the sliding scale could go to 17½¢ this year if gasoline reached \$2.00. If gasoline did reach that high this year then the department would be \$51,000,000 short of preserving the existing system in the cost of products to overlay, reconstruct and maintain that system.

Mr. Price inquired if the long term contract work escalates with rise in prices or is in on a fixed price no matter what the costs go up. Mr. Stone replied yes. He explained that the federal government in many of its contracts for asphalt has tried to get cheaper bidding prices to take the guessing out of the bid on the initial contract allows for an escalation clause. He stated that in some cases in the last two years they have escalated from almost 50% on the cost. Without that type of clause in many cases the final cost might have been much higher as the contractor would place his own "guesstimate" into the original cost of the project.

Mr. Price stated that Mr. Stone is then stating that the State doesn't enter into any long term contracts with a fixed price. Mr. Stone stated that it becomes part of the contract that if the price does escalate then the contractor will get additional funds for that escalation. That is their choice and since he has become director he has cut that choice out. He stated that he doesn't believe that that saves any money.

A copy of the departments proposed projects was distributed (Exhibit A). Mr. DuBois inquired if these relate to the 12-year construction program. Mr. Stone replied that they did. He continued that the \$5.4 million that he feels he will be short and the \$51 million that they would be short if gas would go to \$2.00.

The priority list indicates that the department's number 1 priority is to preserve the existing system and it is found in the column listed RRR. This is what they would do at the sacrifice of everything else on the list. The number 2 priority is the Interstate; because this is a one time federal program and if they don't take advantage of it they will lose it. Third priority he could break into two parts; it would be the bottom column going across the page. The reason that he feels that this

is so important is because it makes the system operational and it also corrects safety deficiencies based on actual accidents. If gasoline does go to \$2.00 in the next two years, he would have to switch this federal aid in the primary secondary and urban system to preserve the existing system. The projects that they are talking about would be:

1. U.S. 50 in Fallon - \$5,000,000
2. Sunset Road in Henderson - \$1,000,000+
3. U.S. 95 from Boulder City to Railroad Pass - \$6,000,000-
4. Blue Diamond Loop - \$3,375,000
5. Flamingo Road - \$5,000,000
6. Blue Diamond Loop (2nd phase) - \$1,000,000-
7. Glendale Road - \$2,500,000
8. U.S. 395 at Stead - \$6,250,000
9. Computer and signal work in Las Vegas - \$4,000,000

The department feels very strong that it cannot build anything new that it cannot maintain.

Mr. Price remarked that most of the interstate is federal money and 3 RRR is where the majority of the money from the gas tax is. Mr. Stone replied that is where all of the money from increases will go. Regardless of what resources this legislature chooses to provide the department, Mr. Stone stated that he could certainly pledge for himself and his staff that they will get 110% out of whatever resources they have.

Mr. Mello inquired if he understood Mr. Stone to state that he would not build any more highways unless he can maintain them. Mr. Stone replied in the positive. Mr. Mello inquired what would happen to the federal funds to continue the interstate highways. Mr. Stone stated that the only funds that the state would lose would be if they don't take advantage of the interstate funds, which they would lose forever as it is a one-time program. Under existing law this is supposed to be completely under construction by December of 1986 or they are lost forever. All the other federal funds are available for use for reconstruction, overlay and resurfacing.

Mr. Price stated that he would gather from the testimony that Mr. Stone was opposed to this bill. Mr. Stone replied that was correct but he would do what he could with it.

Mr. Price inquired if this bill were passed Mr. Stone wouldn't build any new roads. Mr. Stone replied that was not what he said.

Darryl Capurro, Nevada Motor Transport Association, said that he believes that under the circumstances that exist today and from what he reads and talks to people about, that it may very well be possible that the amount of money that will be created by this bill will be very close to what going to the sliding scale tax up to the 12¢ level would produce. The advantage to this is that the legislature will have a handle on the situation.

Mr. Capurro stated that many experts feel that the price of oil may come down now that there appears to be a glut on the market. He pointed out that this probably will continue as Iran and Iraq are producing only about 2,000,000 barrels per day of oil where they had produced 9,000,000 before the war and that once they settle the war situation they will be back into the market. The experts believe that they will continue to have sufficient supplies of oil over the next year to year and a half. He stated that he believes that this bill will provide the money that is necessary to carry on the activities which are contemplated.

He acknowledged that under flat tax it is possible to have too much or too little but this is the way they have always operated since the fuel tax came into being. Using this analogy it would appear that in the years before 1971 there was a surplus and that it should have been adjusted since that time. But that he felt that with 3½¢ to the department along with the other increases many of the problems that currently exist should be addressed. He stated that matching funds are also tied up in the allocation received.

In answer to Mr. Mello's question, Mr. Capurro stated that in the first year 8¢ would go to the state and then in the second year another cent would be added.

Mr. Price distributed a handout which demonstrated this and which is attached to these minutes as Exhibit B.

Mr. Mello inquired what federal taxes were on a gallon tax and if a raise in these was being contemplated. Mr. Capurro stated there is currently 4¢ and that he was not sure what will happen with this. He added that at one time they were talking about going to 26¢ and then the Reagan administration indicated that they would go with the current program but now there is talk about having to take another look at the funding at the federal level.

Mr. Stone stated that he keeps in contact with U.S. Department of Administration and NASH&TO and there is nothing in the administration's bill to increase taxes or is anything planned at this time.

Virgil Anderson, AAA, stated that he would agree with the statement of Mr. Capurro. He added that they have a membership of 75,000 in this state and that as far as the consumer is concerned they feel that a 6¢ increase over the next two years is of substantial impact upon the consumer and the gas buying public of this state. He pointed out that there are a number of other bills that are going to seriously impact the automobile owner as well and for this reason they feel that this would be adequate. Although it may not be what the department would want they feel it is a program that can be sold.

Pete Wooley, Nevada Gasoline Retailers Association, stated that this bill if passed would preserve their industry. He stated that there were many pitfalls in SB 154 that were not addressed

but it would have destroyed the competitive edge in their industry. It would also have given windfall profits to major and minor oil companies. He stated that the problem with the oil glut today is that there is no demand for petrochemical or asphalt. When gasoline was a low priced commodity it was because it was easily pervade and got out on the street. Now there is a captive market and the price is raised to everybody. He stated that he felt that petroleum prices as a whole will start dropping.

Mr. Price stated that in the subcommittee meeting he asked Mr. Stone how many dollars the department needed for the next two years for the program and he gave them a figure. The committee then came up with this flat tax to generate pretty much the amount requested. Mr. Stone remarked that it would be \$5.4 million short and that he had stated that he needed 4¢.

Mr. Price stated that they had not asked that but did they not come up with close to \$46,000,000 because that is what Mr. Stone had stated to them that was needed. Mr. Stone stated that it was close but he could not deny that this bill will not fund the department for the next two years. He stated that he could not guess that far but that he does know that from the testimony that was just received and there is a glut of gasoline on the market that the sliding scale would not take as much.

Mr. Price inquired if he felt that whole state budget would be better if the agencies came in with a sliding scale. Mr. Stone replied that 90% of the general fund is by a variable tax.

Mr. Mello stated that it was difficult for them to pick a flat fee if the figures from the department keep changing. Mr. Stone stated that from the beginning that in order to protect the existing system the department needed \$29,500,000 at today's dollars. He added that there are other things that take away funds from the department other than switching bills. He stated that he has a gasohol bill that is in the making that may take \$2,500,000; the maintenance for park service, etc.

Mr. Price pointed out that only two have indicated that they would go along with the sliding tax and so what they have tried to do is find out how many dollars were needed to do the job for two years and then design a bill to accomplish this.

Mr. Stone stated that as he recalled he said that he thought that they were close and then Mr. Price asked him to come up with figures and go over with Dan Miles and that is exacting what he did. He added that this is not responsive to inflation.

Mr. Beyer moved for "do pass" and Mr. Prengaman seconded the motion.

Under discussion, Mr. Price stated that at the subcommittee meeting it was the concensus of opinion that they should go for the either or option which would give the county commissioners the option of going for a vote of the people or imposing the RTC extra cents

themselves. He stated that he has had the bill drafted in this manner; however, he also obtained another amendment which would require a vote of the people with no other option.

Mr. Mello inquired if anyone had talked to the Senate to see what compromise is going to be raised on this issue. He stated that in a conference committee he would envision that this would probably be raised. With this in mind, Mr. Mello amended the motion to change the amounts by lowering them 1¢. This would allow for a bargaining option. This would place the first year at 9½¢ and the second at 11¢. Mr. DuBois seconded Mr. Mello's amended motion.

A discussion was held on the amended motion. The vote on the motion was 4-3 with Mr. Beyer, Mr. Prengaman and Mr. Polish voting against the motion and Mrs. Westall and Mr. Glover absent.

Mr. DuBois further amended the motion by requiring that it go to a vote of people for RTC funds. This would be found on page 5, line 5; change the word may to must. Mr. Beyer seconded the motion. This motion failed on a vote of 2-5 with Mr. Beyer and Mr. DuBois voting in favor of the motion and the remainder of the committee voting no; Mrs. Westall and Mr. Glover were absent from this vote.

Mr. Prengaman moved for "do pass as amended" and Mr. Mello seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Mr. Glover and Mrs. Westall absent.

To further define the amendment, Mr. Price stated that the 1¢ being dropped would be ½¢ from counties, ¼¢ from cities and ¼¢ from the state.

Mr. Price read a letter from L.P.G. Association, a copy of which is attached to these minutes as Exhibit C.

As there was no further business to be considered, Chairman Price adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandee Gagnier
Assembly Attache

ASSEMBLY

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION

MONDAY

Date MAY 25, 1981 Time 5:00 P.M. Room 214

Bills or Resolutions
to be considered

Subject

Counsel
requested*

GAS TAX BILL

SB 455

Amends provisions of traffic laws relating to persons who have become incapacitated.

SB 673

Simplifies procedures for motor carriers to change rates, fares and charges.

FY 1981-82 & 1982-83
 PROPOSED HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS (COSTS IN \$M)
 (SUBJECT TO AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS)
 (State FY July thru June)

5-7-81

| COUNTY | CC | CH | CL | DO | EL | ES | EU | HU | LA | LN | LY | MI | NY | PE | ST | WA | WP | TOTAL F.Y. |
|-------------------------------|-----|-------|-------|------|-------|-----|-----|------|------|-------|------|------|-----|------|----|-------|-----|------------|
| INTERSTATE 1982 | | 0.09 | 48.1 | | | | | | 3.9 | | | | | 15.3 | | 3.0 | | 70.59 |
| 1983 | | | 52.3 | | | | | 4.5 | | | | | | 7.7 | | 2.6 | | 65.13 |
| TOTAL INTERSTATE | | 0.09 | 98.4 | | | | | 4.5 | 3.9 | | | | | 23.0 | | 5.6 | | 135.72 |
| PRIMARY 1982 | | 5.1 | 21.3 | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | 4.2 | | 33.70 |
| 1983 | | | 16.0 | | | 4.1 | | | | | | 4.7 | | | | | | 24.80 |
| TOTAL PRIMARY | | 5.1 | 37.3 | | | 4.1 | | | | | | 8.0 | | | | 4.2 | | 58.50 |
| SECONDARY 1982 | | | 0.1 | | 1.7 | | 2.4 | | | 2.4 | | | | 1.3 | | 0.36 | | 2.26 |
| 1983 | | | 3.4 | | | | | | | | | 1.0 | | | | | | 4.40 |
| TOTAL SECONDARY | | | 3.5 | | 1.7 | | 2.4 | | | 2.4 | | 1.0 | | 1.3 | | 0.36 | | 6.66 |
| URBAN 1982 | | | 5.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5.1 |
| 1983 | | | 4.7 | | 0.06 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4.76 |
| TOTAL URBAN | | | 9.8 | | 0.06 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.86 |
| R.R.R. 1982 | 0.8 | | 7.6 | 3.2 | | 3.7 | | | | 4.4 | 2.1 | | | | | 12.5 | | 34.50 |
| 1983 | | 5.5 | | | 8.9 | | | | | 3.2 | | 1.6 | 7.2 | | | | 7.2 | 33.60 |
| TOTAL R.R.R. | 0.8 | 5.5 | 7.6 | 3.2 | 8.9 | 3.7 | | | | 7.6 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 7.2 | | | 12.5 | 7.2 | 68.10 |
| SAFETY/TRAFFIC Op/Exp 1982 | | | 1.3 | 0.88 | 10.6 | | | 0.28 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.3 | | | | | 0.27 | | 14.64 |
| 1983 | | | | | 0.87 | | | | | 0.57 | 0.2 | | | | | | | 1.63 |
| TOTAL | | | 1.3 | 0.88 | 11.47 | | | 0.28 | 0.13 | 0.62 | 0.1 | | | | | 0.27 | | 16.27 |
| GRAND TOTAL | 0.8 | 10.69 | 160.7 | 4.05 | 22.15 | 8.0 | 2.4 | 4.73 | 1.03 | 10.62 | 2.80 | 10.6 | 7.2 | 24.3 | | 22.93 | 7.2 | 303.48 |

EXHIBIT A

867



A. E. STONE
Director

TRANSPORTATION BOARD
ROBERT LIST, Governor, Chairman
RICHARD H. BRYAN, Attorney General
WILSON MCGOWAN, State Controller

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

1263 SOUTH STEWART STREET
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89712

EXHIBIT B

May 22, 1981

IN REPLY REFER TO

TO THE ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION
AND TAXATION COMMITTEES

Dear Committee Members:

For your information, enclosed is a copy of the information supplied to the Legislative Counsel Bureau yesterday in response to your request.

The first table is the amount of additional revenue generated by the proposed Assembly motor and special fuel tax measure. It also contains information on the amount of revenue that will be generated by SB 262 (increase in motor vehicle registrations) and SB 477 (increase in licensing of motor carriers and other motor vehicles) if passed.

The second table is the amount of monies the counties could expect to receive as a result of the proposed Assembly motor fuel tax increase discussed Wednesday.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

A. E. STONE
Director

AES:TT:cc

Enclosure

268

ADDITIONAL REVENUE GENERATED BY
PROPOSED ASSEMBLY MOTOR & SPECIAL
FUEL TAX MEASURE PLUS REVENUE
GENERATED BY SB 262 & 477

Total Taxes Proposed by Assembly Measure:

| Motor Fuel | <u>Existing</u> | <u>7-1-81</u> | <u>7-1-82</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| State | 4.5¢ | 8.0¢ | 9.0¢ |
| Counties | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.25 |
| Counties/Cities | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.75 |
| Total | 6.0 | 10.5 | 12.0 |
| Special Fuel | 6.0¢ | 10.5¢ | 12.0¢ |

Additional Revenue Generated (based on \$4,688,000 for each 1¢ of motor fuel tax and \$829,000 for each 1¢ of Special Fuel Tax).

| STATE | <u>F.Y. 1982</u> | <u>F.Y. 1983</u> |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Motor Fuel | \$16,408,000 | \$21,096,000 |
| Special Fuel | 3,730,500 | 4,974,000 |
| Sub Total | 20,138,500 | 26,070,000 |
| SB 262 | 6,201,322 | 6,201,322 |
| SB 477* | 953,478 | 1,906,956 |
| Total State | \$27,293,000 | \$34,178,278 |
| Less Increased Appropriations to other agencies | -1,466,233 | -876,437 |
| Net to D.O.T. | \$25,827,067 | \$33,301,841 |
| Deficit to D.O.T. | <u>29,500,000**</u> -3,672,933 | <u>35,050,000**</u> -1,748,159 |
| LOCAL | | |
| Counties | \$ 2,344,000 | \$ 3,516,000 |
| Counties/Cities | 2,344,000 | 3,516,000 |
| Total Local | \$ 4,688,000 | \$ 7,032,000 |

*Does not become effective until 1-1-82

**Amount needed to meet our 12-year schedule.

LOCAL SHARE OF PROPOSED INCREASED REVENUE FROM PROPOSED
ASSEMBLY MOTOR FUEL TAX INCREASE

| | <u>F.Y. 1982</u> | <u>F.Y. 1983</u> |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|
| Carson | \$ 171,112 | \$ 256,668 |
| Churchill | 97,042 | 145,562 |
| Clark | 2,114,757 | 3,172,135 |
| Douglas | 87,665 | 131,498 |
| Elko | 260,184 | 390,276 |
| Esmeralda | 34,691 | 52,037 |
| Eureka | 39,379 | 59,069 |
| Humboldt | 138,296 | 207,444 |
| Lander | 103,605 | 155,407 |
| Lincoln | 87,666 | 131,498 |
| Lyon | 80,634 | 120,950 |
| Mineral | 63,757 | 95,635 |
| Nye | 171,112 | 256,668 |
| Pershing | 82,040 | 123,060 |
| Storey | 6,563 | 9,845 |
| Washoe | 1,024,797 | 1,537,195 |
| White Pine | 124,701 | 187,051 |
| TOTAL | \$ 4,688,000 | \$ 7,032,000 |
| State Share | 16,408,000 | 21,096,000 |
| Grand Total | \$21,096,000 | \$28,128,000 |

1/2 County/City Share RTC Tax

| | FY 1980 1/2d | % | F.Y. 1981 1/2d | % | (114) 1982 2,754 | (157) 1983 3,254 | 1980 | 1981 | 41 1982 | 41 1983 |
|---------------|-----------------|-------|-------------------|-------|------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| | \$ | | \$ | | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Carson | 0.259 | 3.65 | 0.226 | 3.66 | 0.468 | 0.558 | 0.433 | 0.455 | 0.895 | 0.904 |
| Cibola | 0.147 | 2.08 | 0.152 | 2.07 | 0.289 | 0.345 | 0.171 | 0.175 | 0.345 | 0.348 |
| Clark | 3.200 | 45.11 | 3.284 | 45.07 | 5.784 | 6,702 | 4,768 | 4,895 | 9,632 | 9,728 |
| Douglas | 0.133 | 1.88 | 0.137 | 1.88 | 0.278 | 0.332 | 0.241 | 0.247 | 0.487 | 0.492 |
| Elko | 0.394 | 5.56 | 0.404 | 5.55 | 0.737 | 0.879 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Esmeralda | 0.052 | 0.74 | 0.053 | 0.73 | 0.096 | 0.114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Eureka | 0.057 | 0.81 | 0.061 | 0.84 | 0.112 | 0.134 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| French | 0.209 | 2.95 | 0.214 | 2.94 | 0.405 | 0.483 | 0.233 | 0.240 | 0.471 | 0.472 |
| Lander | 0.157 | 2.22 | 0.161 | 2.21 | 0.213 | 0.255 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lincoln | 0.133 | 1.88 | 0.137 | 1.88 | 0.246 | 0.293 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lyon | 0.120 | 1.72 | 0.126 | 1.73 | 0.233 | 0.278 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mineral | 0.096 | 1.36 | 0.097 | 1.35 | 0.177 | 0.211 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mojo | 0.259 | 3.65 | 0.267 | 3.67 | 0.482 | 0.576 | 0.168 | 0.172 | 0.337 | 0.342 |
| Parshing | 0.124 | 1.75 | 0.128 | 1.76 | 0.233 | 0.278 | 0.056 | 0.057 | 0.225 | 0.228 |
| Storey | 0.010 | 0.14 | 0.011 | 0.16 | 0.018 | 0.022 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washoe | 1.551 | 21.81 | 1.571 | 21.85 | 2,816 | 3,357 | 2,324 | 2,386 | 4,695 | 4,742 |
| White Pine | 0.187 | 2.67 | 0.187 | 2.67 | 0.352 | 0.421 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Totals | 7.094 | | 7.284 | | 12,940 | 15,439 | 8,404 | 8,627 | 17,090 | 17,261 |
| State Share | 21,110 | | 21,670 | | 39,110 | 46,870 | | | | |
| Local Share | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1/2d | 7,094 | | 7,284 | | 12,940 | 15,439 | | | | |
| RTC | 8,404 | | 8,627 | | 17,090 | 17,261 | | | | |
| Total | 15,498 | | 15,911 | | 30,030 | 32,700 | | | | |

F.Y. 1981-82 & 1982-83
 PROPOSED HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS (COSTS IN \$M)

(SUBJECT TO AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS)

5-7-81

(State FY July thru June)

| COUNTY | CC | CH | CL | DO | EL | ES | EU | HU | LA | LN | LY | MI | NY | PE | ST | WA | WP | TOTAL FY |
|------------------------------|-----|-------|-------|------|-------|-----|-----|------|------|-------|------|------|-----|------|----|-------|-----|----------|
| INTERSTATE 1982 | | 0.09 | 43.1 | | | | | | 3.9 | | | | | 15.3 | | 3.0 | | 70.37 |
| 1983 | | | 57.3 | | | | | 4.5 | | | | | | 7.7 | | 2.6 | | 65.13 |
| TOTAL INTERSTATE | | 0.09 | 95.4 | | | | | 4.5 | 3.9 | | | | | 23.0 | | 5.6 | | 135.49 |
| PRIMARY 1982 | | 5.1 | 21.3 | | | | | | | | | 3.3 | | | | 4.2 | | 33.70 |
| 1983 | | | 16.0 | | | 4.1 | | | | | | 4.7 | | | | | | 34.87 |
| TOTAL PRIMARY | | 5.1 | 37.3 | | | 4.1 | | | | | | 8.0 | | | | 4.2 | | 58.70 |
| SECONDARY 1982 | | | 0.1 | | 1.7 | | 2.4 | | | 2.4 | | | | 1.3 | | 0.36 | | 2.26 |
| 1983 | | | 3.4 | | | | | | | | | 1.0 | | | | | | 4.40 |
| TOTAL SECONDARY | | | 3.5 | | 1.7 | | 2.4 | | | 2.4 | | 1.0 | | 1.3 | | 0.36 | | 12.66 |
| URBAN 1982 | | | 5.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5.1 |
| 1983 | | | 4.7 | | 0.06 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4.76 |
| TOTAL URBAN | | | 9.8 | | 0.06 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 9.86 |
| R.R.R. 1982 | 0.8 | | 7.6 | 3.2 | | 3.9 | | | | 4.4 | 2.1 | | | | | 12.5 | | 34.50 |
| 1983 | | 5.5 | | | 8.9 | | | | | 3.2 | | 1.6 | 7.2 | | | | 7.2 | 33.60 |
| TOTAL R.R.R. | 0.8 | 5.5 | 7.6 | 3.2 | 8.9 | 3.9 | | | | 7.6 | 2.1 | 1.6 | 7.2 | | | 12.5 | 7.2 | 68.10 |
| SAFETY/TRAFFIC OP/EX 1982 | | | 4.3 | 0.85 | 10.6 | | | 0.28 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.3 | | | | | 0.27 | | 16.64 |
| 1983 | | | | | 0.27 | | | | | 0.57 | 0.2 | | | | | | | 1.83 |
| TOTAL | | | 4.3 | 0.85 | 11.47 | | | 0.28 | 0.13 | 0.62 | 0.7 | | | | | 0.27 | | 18.47 |
| GRAND TOTAL | 0.8 | 10.69 | 160.9 | 4.05 | 22.15 | 8.0 | 2.4 | 4.78 | 4.03 | 10.62 | 2.80 | 10.6 | 7.2 | 24.3 | | 22.93 | 7.2 | 303.48 |

53%

872

| COUNTY | 1976 | | 1977 | | 1978 | | 1979 | | 1980 | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------|
| | Gallons* Gas Sold | % of State | Gallons* Gas Sold | % of State | Gallons* Gas Sold | % of State | Gallons* Gas Sold | % of State | Gallons* Gas Sold | % of State |
| Carson | 16.55 | 4.16 | 18.22 | 4.28 | 20.25 | 4.41 | 23.06 | 4.65 | 22.15 | 4.69 |
| Churchill | 7.97 | 2.00 | 7.74 | 1.82 | 9.42 | 2.05 | 9.38 | 1.89 | 8.54 | 1.81 |
| Clark | 199.49 | 50.12 | 212.61 | 49.97 | 230.04 | 50.19 | 247.50 | 49.53 | 258.42 | 51.52 |
| Douglas | 8.45 | 2.12 | 9.08 | 2.15 | 9.81 | 2.14 | 11.35 | 2.29 | 12.05 | 2.55 |
| Elko | 19.92 | 5.01 | 20.10 | 4.72 | 20.13 | 4.39 | 20.68 | 4.17 | 18.57 | 3.94 |
| Esmeralda | 1.11 | 0.28 | 1.19 | 0.28 | 1.15 | 0.25 | 1.05 | 0.21 | 1.12 | 0.24 |
| Eureka | 1.05 | 0.26 | 1.09 | 0.26 | 1.21 | 0.26 | 1.50 | 0.31 | 1.40 | 0.30 |
| Humboldt | 11.71 | 2.96 | 12.07 | 2.84 | 12.99 | 2.82 | 13.02 | 2.63 | 11.67 | 2.47 |
| Lander | 5.17 | 1.30 | 5.28 | 1.24 | 5.60 | 1.22 | 5.96 | 1.20 | 5.40 | 1.15 |
| Lincoln | 2.70 | 0.68 | 3.01 | 0.71 | 3.14 | 0.72 | 3.31 | 0.67 | 3.13 | 0.66 |
| Lyon | 6.82 | 1.71 | 7.01 | 1.65 | 7.20 | 1.57 | 8.25 | 1.66 | 7.80 | 1.65 |
| Mineral | 4.29 | 1.08 | 4.11 | 0.97 | 4.07 | 0.89 | 4.71 | 0.95 | 4.03 | 0.85 |
| Nye | 7.28 | 1.83 | 8.50 | 2.00 | 8.42 | 1.84 | 8.83 | 1.78 | 8.40 | 1.78 |
| Pershing | 5.80 | 1.46 | 6.23 | 1.46 | 5.99 | 1.31 | 6.13 | 1.24 | 5.58 | 1.18 |
| Storey | 0.34 | 0.09 | 0.31 | 0.07 | 3.70 | 0.08 | 4.15 | 0.08 | 4.04 | 0.09 |
| Washoe | 91.43 | 22.97 | 101.37 | 23.82 | 110.74 | 24.12 | 123.54 | 24.90 | 113.22 | 24.62 |
| White Pine | 7.94 | 1.97 | 7.57 | 1.78 | 3.00 | 1.34 | 7.49 | 1.51 | 7.21 | 1.49 |
| Total | 397.98 | 100.0 | 425.51 | 100.0 | 457.08 | 100.0 | 496.17 | 100.0 | 471.94 | 100.0 |
| Special Fuels Statewide | 51.26 | | 55.57 | | 60.98 | | 66.53 | | 71.87 | |
| Gr. Total | 449.24 | | 481.08 | | 520.06 | | 562.70 | | 543.81 | |

* Millions of Gallons

Note: Special Fuel Records are not kept by Counties and are only 4% of the total special fuel revenue. The remainder 96% comes from the mileage exemption.

P. O. Box 641
Carson City, Nevada 89701
May 20, 1981

Transportation Committee
Assemblyman Robert Price
Nevada State Legislature
Building Room 224
Carson City, Nevada 89701

Re: S. B. 154

Dear Sir:

The Nevada L.P.G. Assn. is in opposition of S.B. 154's sliding scale method of motor fuel taxation. We feel a fixed rate per gallon of motor fuel is a more equitable method of taxation. If the sliding scale method is used, L.P.G., should be considered as a Special Use Fuel, as in the past in Nevada and many other states.

As a Special Use Fuel, we feel it is unfair to tax L.P.G. the same as gasoline. For example in the U.S. there is only 1 billion gallons of L.P.G. (Propane) used as motor fuel versus gasoline at 100 times over that. We are willing to pay our share or whatever price propane falls in under the sliding scale based on L.P.G. prices.

The majority of our users are ranchers and small business owners. The amount of propane they utilize is minute compared to gasoline and diesel users. In view of the above we feel in the Nevada L.P.G. Assn. representing all L.P.G. dealers in Nevada it is unfair to categorize us with gasoline. We therefore request this work committee amend S.B. 154 to retain L.P.G. as a

Special Use Fuel and taxed at the average selling price by itself.

We feel the Amendment could read as follows:

Sec. 3. 1. The department of transportation shall provide by regulation for quarterly surveys of the actual selling price of motor vehicle fuel and each special motor fuel at retail outlets amounting to at least 60 percent in number of outlets and volume of sales of the total for the state, and for the weighting of these prices in such a way as to determine a representative price of motor vehicle fuel and each special motor fuel for the state as a whole. The department of transportation shall report this price whenever determined or revised to the department of taxation.

In Section 3. subparagraph 2 line 13 should be amended to read: motor vehicle and special fuel taxes imposed by the state pursuant to this chapter

Also page 2 line 15 should read:

department shall deduct all future increases in motor vehicle and special fuel taxes

In view of the short time frame, I am unable to furnish any figures now but will be glad to if called upon.

Very truly yours,



Tony Larson
President Nevada L.P.G. Assn.