

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session  
March 30, 2017**

The Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chairman Richard Carrillo at 3:16 p.m. on Thursday, March 30, 2017, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Jim Marchant, Assembly District No. 37

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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



**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Valerie Michael, Consultant, Reno, Nevada  
Jennifer Baker, Owner, Performance and Engagement Consulting Group,  
Reno, Nevada  
John M. Terry, P.E., Assistant Director, Engineering, Chief Engineer, Director's  
Office, Department of Transportation  
Britta Kuhn, Broadband Manager, Office of Science, Innovation, and Technology,  
Office of the Governor  
Sondra Rosenberg, P.T.P., Assistant Director, Planning, Director's Office,  
Department of Transportation

**Chairman Carrillo:**

[Roll was called. Committee protocols and rules were explained.] We have one bill on the agenda. We will open the hearing for Assembly Bill 360.

**Assembly Bill 360: Revises provisions governing transportation. (BDR 35-885)**

**Assemblyman Jim Marchant, Assembly District No. 37:**

I am here to present Assembly Bill 360 for your consideration. Assembly Bill 360 seeks to authorize the Department of Transportation (NDOT) to enter into public-private agreements that would allow the Department of Transportation to conduct an analysis of establishing a high-speed ground transportation system between Las Vegas and Reno. I would also like to note that after talking to stakeholders, we have introduced some friendly amendments that you should have (Exhibit C). It should also be on Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

There has been a great deal of interest in high-speed ground transportation for decades. We have witnessed the successes of other developed countries. I believe it is time to make Nevada a leader in high-speed ground transportation technologies. From Italy to China, developed countries have made substantive investments in high-speed ground transportation projects that are expected to make large economic advancements in those countries. For example, China plans to invest \$5.4 billion in ground transportation construction that will create thousands of jobs.

A high-speed ground system in Nevada would deliver fast, efficient transportation; encourage revitalization and economic development in communities between Las Vegas and Reno; create thousands of jobs across Nevada; and take our One Nevada concept to a higher level. This is not an overnight project. We will bring stakeholders to the table, from federal and state governments as well as private parties.

The first step to making our goal a reality is to incorporate an analysis of technology into ongoing planning efforts at the Department of Transportation to take a look at the impact of high-speed ground transportation—from costs, ridership, and potential routes to economic and environmental impacts. Nevada has the opportunity to become the leader in ground

transportation technologies. This is the first step in realizing that opportunity. I would like to invite all of you to be bold with me and continue to enable prosperity and innovation in Nevada.

I would like to call up the others I have with me to present this bill. Then I will give you the bill description, and then take questions. I have Valerie Michael with me to present. She has been a transportation consultant for 20 years.

**Valerie Michael, Consultant, Reno, Nevada:**

As someone who has worked in the transit industry for nearly 20 years, I can say that bringing high-speed rail to Nevada will provide innumerable positive benefits. Connecting north and south delivers an economic impact that would be unprecedented in our state. When initiating any kind of new service I know it is very safe to stay inside the box, utilizing current situations as a marker for what will happen in the future, but that does not apply to Nevada because we are a unique state.

Connecting north and south provides greater mobility. If we look just at tourism—those who visit Las Vegas and Reno may want to see other parts of the state, but are currently limited in their travel options. A day trip or an overnight trip becomes nearly impossible because fares are cost-prohibitive and flights are often sold out. Rail provides an alternative that is quick and cost-effective.

Rail also results in job creation. Passenger rail really could become commuter rail as workers could travel longer distances to work without having to move. Those who reside in rural areas will have access to Reno and Las Vegas. There would no longer be constraints on where one lives versus where one can work.

Currently, there are about one-third of the states in this country that are looking at high-speed rail as an alternative in transportation. Nevada has an opportunity right now to get in on the ground floor, becoming a model for the rest of the country, and maybe even helping the United States to become a leader in high-speed commuter and passenger travel. I would ask you all to seriously consider this bill.

**Jennifer Baker, Owner, Performance and Engagement Consulting Group, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a small business owner and a best-selling author, but most of you know me as an advocate for small business, innovation, and common sense. I am a mother who wants to leave this state in a better condition than we started with. I am here to support Assembly Bill 360 and ask you to not only support the transportation innovation under the concept of One Nevada brand, but also to focus on creating a stronger community I fondly call "One Nevada." It is about time we stop worrying about north, south, east, west, black, blue, green, or purple, and realize we are all one state, a very small one.

I jokingly call Nevada a small city. If anyone wants to know about Nevada, I tell them that Nevada really is just a small town—all of us one together, working together. Unfortunately, we are incredibly siloed. We have a business opportunity to open up industry across the state as Ms. Michael just mentioned. When I was at CES [a consumer electronics show], I found that the technology brings in about half a million people each year—most of you from the south are very familiar with that. While I was there, people from across the world who were attending were very excited about the record snowfall at Lake Tahoe. When they asked me how they could get there, I told them it was about a one-hour-and-ten-minute flight. The problem is that the cost to get here from Las Vegas is about \$500 round-trip. For those interested in trying to take that trip, they found that every flight was sold out for the entire time they tried to come up here. When we in the northern or southern part of the state offer special events, the state suffers. Instead of being siloed, like we recommend most businesses not do, we would recommend that we open up opportunities.

To take it one step further, look at business economic development when Indian gaming began across the country in 1998. As One Nevada, we should have opened opportunities to cross-market properties in just the north and the south. Unfortunately, we missed that boat.

The time it takes to build this will be far in advance. We needed this done back in 1998 to be able to compete and empower businesses across this state. People come here from across the nation, and they think that we are so close and so connected. When they get here, they realize that once they get to Reno or Las Vegas, they are stuck—they cannot go to the other end of the state easily. This will give a second or third opportunity for people to commute between the two. At this point, we have about a half a million people—which is more than one-fourth of our state population—traveling between Reno and Las Vegas, leaving out all of our rural opportunities. An airline ticket at an average of about \$460 per person shows that there is a financial impact that would create opportunities for us in the state, both for financial gain—to keep the money in our pockets or in our business development—as well as allowing families to connect better. Did you realize that it costs less for a family of four to fly to Los Angeles and use 2-Day Park Hopper passes at Disneyland than it does to go down to see their family in Las Vegas? That is something to consider when the prices are so high.

There is another option that would open up—and I believe this would be the most important part. There are state competitions in most states of the nation for athletics and for education purposes. Nevada cannot have those. We have competitions between the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas only. I used to be able to go down and participate in a state competition when I was a child. Today, my son gets a "North State" state title for one of his competitions. There is also a "Southern State" state title because schools cannot afford—in time or in money—to travel between the two ends of the state. We have created a silo situations in which we have no connections from north to south.

I ask that we all "walk the talk." We say it is important to us that we create a One Nevada concept to open opportunities for all of us. Typically, investors and analysts look at

feasibility studies for current conditions. I am talking about better communication, closer families, better experiences, more opportunities to cross market, and increased income from tourism and travel all across the state in a more fiscally responsible way.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Assemblyman Marchant, are you finished with your testifiers?

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

I am. Would you like us to go through the bill now?

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Committee members would like to ask questions.

**Assemblyman Sprinkle:**

Some of my questions have been answered by the amendment. I have been hearing about high-speed trains, studies, and working groups for the last two legislative sessions. Now I am hearing about them for a third time. What makes you think this is going to be any different than the other studies that have already occurred without success?

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

At some point, we need to get it right and get it done. We need to figure out what went wrong with the other proposals and get it right. This type of technology and transportation to connect northern and southern Nevada is needed. We are going a different route this time than using the Nevada High-Speed Rail Authority. As part of the public-private partnership, we are going to give NDOT the authority to hire consultants to get things right this time.

**Assemblyman Sprinkle:**

What is it about this bill specifically that is going to make the fundamental change that you refer to, as opposed to all the other work that has been done in southern Nevada?

**Jennifer Baker:**

Part of it is that we have opened the opportunity for NDOT to go out and look at and solicit bids rather than sitting in their own silo hoping that someone comes up with a good idea. At this point, NDOT is not allowed to solicit public-private partnerships. Looking at the other attempts, we wanted to know why they were not working. You asked a perfect question, which is one I asked. The answer came back that NDOT is not allowed to enter into any efforts of looking for anything that makes sense. A typical business person would put out a bid and bring in the best opportunity to figure out how much money the project will take, what it takes, how long it will take—without it being the State's financial responsibility. We want to open up the opportunity for NDOT to go out and have discussions that, at this time, we do not allow.

**Assemblyman Sprinkle:**

That is not what I see, even in the amended version. I am seeing two things. One is the initial language in the bill that talks about building a transportation facility and being able to

put bids out. The amended version removed the \$30 million fiscal note, which I assume was going to be used to start working on this. Now you are talking about just a study. It does not seem to me that we do studies by putting things out to bid. That is almost like a false contract if all you are trying to do is gather information. You would not put something out to bid with no intention of actually following through with the project. The amendment seems to say that we are going to do a study and make recommendations. What am I missing?

**Jennifer Baker:**

Forgive me for overstating by using the word "bid" improperly. This bill allows NDOT to have conversations with anyone regarding this project, allowing them to solicit information to bring in concepts they may already have in place. They are not allowed to take something that makes sense to you and me and ask who is interested in doing such a project. At this point, they are stuck in a silo waiting for someone to come in to give them ideas. I do not know where that is in the bill, as it was just rewritten. It was in our conversation about what we have changed. We are asking that NDOT be given authority to go out and start conversations, which they are currently not allowed to do.

**Assemblyman Sprinkle:**

Then what is the point of including section 1 in this bill?

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

When we first wrote this bill, we got it back from the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) in a form that was not what we wanted, so we started amending it. We had a lot of input from NDOT and the Office of the Governor on how to structure it. This is fluid. Please keep that in mind.

**Assemblyman Watkins:**

I am confused about what we are trying to accomplish with this bill. If the point is to open up NDOT to having conversations, why would we limit them to conversations about train or rail only? Technology is moving pretty fast, so why limit it to the method of transportation?

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

We can consider anything we want at this point. High-speed rail is one consideration. I would like to connect the north and south with methods other than flying and driving. High-speed rail is one option; the Hyperloop is another that could benefit from this bill.

**Assemblyman Watkins:**

I was born and raised in Las Vegas. I understand the points made about school teams traveling. I have always felt that people want connection between Reno and Las Vegas, but it does not seem as if the marketplace does. If it did, we would have more than one-and-a-half airlines getting into the market with flights between Las Vegas and Reno—we would have a lot of airlines because there was public demand. That would drive the price of tickets down, but none of that seems to happen. It seems that if you look just at the private

economics of this, there is no demand. I would hate to waste taxpayer resources to chase down something that we have evidence that people do not want. Do we have any evidence that points the other direction?

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

This project requires vision, because current numbers would not justify this project. Part of building the technology here in Nevada would make Nevada a leader in this industry, exporting the technology. Just looking at the raw numbers, it probably does not make sense to do this project, but it will in the future. I think the casinos will get on board with funding and financing. We are looking at private industry coming in and financing this.

**Jennifer Baker:**

The concept of north and south being siloed is true because we have no other opportunity to travel to the entire state. Just for competitions alone, you are asking students to be taken out of school an additional two days to travel from the north to the south or the south to the north. It is impossible to create an opportunity for this at this time. People from the rural areas cannot even easily travel to get on a plane to go somewhere—they do not have that opportunity. Any other form would be great.

If you look at how much money we are spending in flights between Reno and Las Vegas, the amount is astronomical. You have half a million flights per year at an average ticket price of \$500 per person. If you do the math, you will see that it is financially feasible to do this project just in existing business. I will drive two-and-a-half hours to Sacramento, California, to work, but I cannot get on a plane and fly down to Las Vegas, in my own state, to put on a seminar. In my mind, the opportunity is huge, but there is a huge financial need for both. The problem is that we have been doing business as usual for so long that we have given up on the opportunity and stopped even thinking that there is potential.

In the last four months, I have been stuck in Las Vegas after doing business there. Three times I have had flights cancelled and have had to stay an additional night because weather conditions in Reno did not allow flights to land. This would open another way for travelers who are stuck to jump on a transit of any other kind. Let us take the rail out of it, because I am not stuck on rail—I look at that as old-fashioned. When you talk about something that would be high speed—making it two-and-a-half to three hours to get to Las Vegas, the same as it is by plane, for less than half the cost—what you are doing is saving a huge amount of money for our families and our businesses to dedicate to something else better than an airline. There is a huge need for this.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

My question goes back to demand. In Las Vegas, we do not have enough demand to sustain Amtrak service. What studies or evidence do you have that even suggests there would be enough demand throughout the state to warrant this? I love train travel, but I am not sure we have a big enough population to sustain the cost of putting this together or to doing it in a way that is cost-effective for Nevadans. Could you please elaborate on some of the underlying research you did to think this was viable?

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

Even if we build this, it probably would not be for 10 to 15 years. Hopefully, our population will have grown by then. Let us also remember that we are now going to have a National Football League team. We would encourage people from the northern part of the state to come down to our games. I think Ms. Baker touched on this—we do not know what the numbers are going to be. If we had high-speed ground transportation between Las Vegas and Reno, it would open a lot more opportunity and a lot of people would use it. It is hard to speculate as to what the projections are, which is the purpose of this study—to see if it is feasible. This will not cost the taxpayers anything as we will try to get that through private funding.

**Valerie Michael:**

Amtrak has not been a priority for the government or anybody else for a very long time. The efficiency of the rail has not been there, and it is failing in many locations. This is an entirely different type of rail system. A public-private partnership will pull in the rail experts, the people and private companies who know how to operate service cost-effectively and efficiently. As far as our having one-and-a-half airlines right now—we do. We have to provide the services and we have to open up the state in order for more industry to come in. Industry is already coming in, north and south. There are booms in Las Vegas and Reno. At some point, they have to come together. In the same way, we have rural areas that have a lot to offer, but they have no means of getting anywhere—they cannot get north or south without spending a lot of time and money. That is what makes this system unique—public-private partnerships are going to make this system successful. As Assemblyman Marchant said, part of the study is to come back with those numbers in order to know exactly what we are looking at. I think you will be really surprised.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

Assemblyman Marchant, in your answer to my question you said you expect the study to be privately funded. If the study is going to be privately funded, why not just have private industry conduct the study, work with the Office of Economic Development, Office of the Governor (GOED), and come back to the Legislature with a report? Why have legislation to authorize a study that is outside of the scope of what we do?

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

I think we need the expertise of a department like NDOT to help out with the organization, the studies, and to pull everybody together.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

Why could they not start working with GOED? They do a lot of initiatives without having the Legislature approve them beforehand; they come to us when they need us.

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

That is a possibility. We were trying to jumpstart the process to get started now.



**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

When I first read the bill, I was confused. I think I understand what you are trying to do. I would like to get some of that intent on the record. It is poorly written, which happens occasionally when we prepare a bill. What you are trying to do is allow NDOT to start conversations regarding a public-private partnership on a transportation system—not just rail. What I read here is "transportation facility," not rail. The study itself would be to see the feasibility of building some type of a transportation facility to connect the north and the south to bring this great state a little bit more together. The private economics of it would also be part of that study for future economics, is that correct?

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

We all know that when you ask the LCB to write a bill, they do their best to get us what we want. You know how hard they work on this and how challenged they are. I applaud them, but the bills do not always come out the way you wanted. That is why we are trying to amend this bill, and doing the best we can to try to communicate.

**Assemblyman Fumo:**

I know there have been studies about having transportation between Las Vegas and California. It looks as if NDOT did a study in 2011 regarding transportation between the north and the south. I found information on the Internet that indicated a study was completed in December of that year. Can you get that information?

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

If NDOT is here, they can answer that. They have completed many studies. You know that Interstate 11, the corridor between Las Vegas and Reno, is being formulated right now. We have talked with them about using some of their current studies regarding that corridor.

**John M. Terry, P.E., Assistant Director, Engineering, Chief Engineer, Director's Office,  
Department of Transportation:**

I could give my presentation, which is neutral on the bill, or simply answer questions.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Let us get the members' questions answered.

**John Terry:**

Our view of this is that it is enabling legislation. Even though 50 years ago we changed into the Department of Transportation, we are still in many ways the Department of Highways as we were years ago. You have made changes within NRS Chapter 408 that would enable us to enter into some of these things. Right now, we could not ask for public-private partnerships to do any of these things. We would need changes to NRS Chapter 408 to allow us to do that.

As to studies that have already been done—we are currently engaged in an Interstate 11 study, from Las Vegas to Reno. As a part of that, should we be studying rail or more advanced technology? This legislation would allow us to pursue that with interested private entities such as Hyperloop One. Without this, we are restricted and could not do that.

I do not know about the 2011 study. I am not familiar with the details of that.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Are there any other questions from members of the Committee? [There were none.] Is there support for A.B. 360 in Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was none.] Is there opposition to A.B. 360 in Las Vegas or Carson City? [There was none.] Is there neutral testimony in Las Vegas? [There was none.]

**Britta Kuhn, Broadband Manager, Office of Science, Innovation, and Technology, Office of the Governor:**

I am here to testify as neutral on this bill, but there is a very important component to this bill in sections 1 through 4 that would allow NDOT to solicit from any person or company a proposal for an agreement to partner on projects involving transportation facilities. Assemblyman Wheeler was correct when he noted that this bill is beyond just rail. This is regarding transportation facilities, which can include a number of things that impact transportation.

When we think of public-private partnerships in the transportation context, we think of them in terms of being big-budget or partnerships involving construction of highways or toll roads. But they are not just about big projects. They can involve very small collaborations between a state entity and a private entity to leverage resources. In my work as the broadband manager, I have witnessed the power of collaboration and have seen how things can get done, through trades, sharing the work, or partnering to help share the costs. Under the current law, NRS 408.548, NDOT can only enter into a partnership if it receives an unsolicited proposal. This precludes the Department from exploring any type of partnership opportunities or initiating discussions with potential partners. This bill would allow NDOT to solicit information on proposals or partnership opportunities with a private entity. Our office is working closely with NDOT right now in order to implement a statewide "dig once" policy and a fiber trade policy, which are subjects of Senate Bill 53. This bill would dovetail nicely into that effort.

One main issue our office is faced with right now is how to reduce the cost of broadband deployment in underserved areas. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 408.548 is a roadblock to finding any kind of innovative solution. For example, NDOT was doing a construction project up at Lake Tahoe. Had NDOT been able to explore partnership opportunities or been able to even pick up the phone to call them to find out if there was any kind of alternative funding, or if there was a way to partner to accomplish more, they could have coordinated with the Tahoe Prosperity Center who had raised funds to help pay for conduit needed to pull their

fiber lines. These two entities could have shared resources to enable Tahoe Prosperity Center to work with NDOT to achieve more than just what either one of them could do standing alone.

In the area of communications in particular, the ability to have an opportunity to explore what can be shared, leveraged, or optimized is precluded by the current language in NRS 408.548, therefore sections 1 through 4 of this bill would allow them greater flexibility to explore options. It is important to relax the current restrictions that are placed on NDOT and allow them the ability to inquire, collaborate, and form partnerships when they find opportunities to improve a transportation facility for the public's benefit.

**John Terry:**

We are testifying as neutral on this bill. Currently the Department of Transportation (NDOT) may not explore opportunities for public-private partnerships. Under statute, the Department may only consider unsolicited proposals from a private company or entity. Section 1 of the amendment would allow NDOT to explore opportunities for partnerships involving a transportation facility if the Department determines there may be a public benefit to the transportation facility and that the transportation facility serves a public purpose. The Department has no current projects of this type planned, but this bill would allow for solicited partnerships in the future. Established procedures for handling unsolicited proposals are already in place, and this bill would not change those. This bill would simply apply the existing procedures to both solicited and unsolicited proposals to develop, construct, improve, maintain, and operate a transportation facility.

The federal government has been proposing additional infrastructure funding using public-private partnerships. This bill would position NDOT to utilize federal infrastructure funding should it materialize.

With respect to sections 5 through 7 of the amended bill, the Department is currently developing the One Nevada Transportation Plan, our statewide long-range plan. As part of that effort, we will be evaluating our critical corridors throughout the state, including the U.S. 95, future I-11 corridor. We will be evaluating the needs in those corridors for transportation, including potential future modes, and identifying the next steps for corridor development. Including an evaluation of high-speed surface transportation in this corridor would be appropriate and not overly burdensome within the scope we are already undertaking. This will not include detailed engineering or environmental analysis, but will provide information, opportunities, and constraints for potential ridership that will help determine if this corridor might be a candidate for future high-speed transportation modes.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

Both you and Ms. Kuhn said that NDOT is not allowed to solicit public-private partnerships, but does NDOT not send out requests for proposals for work on highway projects? Is that soliciting the private workforce?

**John Terry:**

There is a difference between those two. Public-private partnerships would be partnerships wherein the private sector brings money to the table as a part of it. Yes, we solicit with private engineering and other types of firms to do work for us, but that is work that we pay them to do under an agreement with us. A public-private partnership is different in that they bring money to the table, looking for some payback of that money. We are currently not allowed to do those. We are not allowed to do public-private partnerships without receiving an unsolicited proposal.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

If you receive an unsolicited proposal from an entity for a public-private partnership, are you then allowed to make the proposal competitive?

**John Terry:**

Yes, that is exactly what we started to do on the Project Neon in Las Vegas, before we decided to cancel the public-private partnership and do the project with our own funds. That is the way it is structured. All this bill would say is that we could go out and solicit without first receiving the one proposal. All of the procedures that were in place when we receive that proposal would apply.

**Assemblywoman Spiegel:**

If a private entity interested in developing high-speed rail throughout the state came to you with a proposal, would you have the ability to put out for bid the feasibility study or any other component? Could anyone in the private sector that met the qualifications bid on that?

**John Terry:**

I believe we would be able to do that currently.

**Sondra Rosenberg, P.T.P., Assistant Director, Planning, Director's Office, Department of Transportation:**

I am here to support Mr. Terry's statement and to answer any questions.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

Is there anyone else wanting to testify as neutral? [There was no one.] Are there closing remarks from the bill's sponsor?

**Assemblyman Marchant:**

Assembly Bill 360 is a great opportunity for Nevada. We should take the first step by authorizing the Department of Transportation to enter into a public-private agreement to allow the Department to conduct an analysis of establishing a high-speed ground transportation system between Las Vegas and Reno. Almost 500,000 people a year travel between the two cities. There would be a lot more if we had other transportation options like

high-speed rail. In an effort to get on board with the One Nevada concept, I am asking all of you to join me to help expedite Nevada's transportation innovation. I urge the members of this Committee to join me and fast-track this project.

**Chairman Carrillo:**

We will close the hearing on A.B. 360. We are now open for public comment in Las Vegas or Carson City. [There was none.] This meeting is adjourned [at 4:06 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Joan Waldock  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Chairman

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

## **EXHIBITS**

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 360, submitted by Assemblyman Jim Marchant, Assembly District No. 37.