

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**

**Seventy-ninth Session
March 14, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chair Mark A. Manendo at 8:09 a.m. on Tuesday, March 14, 2017, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Kelvin Atkinson, Vice Chair (Excused)

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Brian McAnallen, City of Las Vegas
Scott Scherer, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Tina Quigley, General Manager, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Donald D. Snyder, Presidential Advisor for Strategic Initiatives, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Danny L. Thompson, Transportation Resource Advisory Committee, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Peter Guzman, President, Latin Chamber of Commerce NV

Senate Committee on Transportation
March 14, 2017
Page 2

Warren B. Hardy, II, Associated Builders and Contractors of Nevada
Todd P. Sklamberg, CEO, Sunrise Hospital and Medical Center
Gary Milliken, Keolis Transit America
Sean Stewart, CEO, Nevada Contractors Association
Jonas Peterson, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
Ric Jimenez, Chair, Maryland Parkway Coalition
David Frommer, Executive Director, Planning and Construction Services,
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Paul J. Moradkhan, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce
Kelly Crompton, Office of Administrative Services, City of Las Vegas
Susan Fisher, Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association, Nevada Homebuilders
Association, Nevada State Apartment Association, Reno-Tahoe Airport
Authority
Robert Herr, Director, Public Works, Parks and Recreation, City of Henderson
Lee G. Gibson, Executive Director, Regional Transportation Commission,
Washoe County
John Fudenberg, Clark County
Craig Madole, CEO, Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors of
America, Inc.
Helen Foley, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Paul J. Enos, CEO, Nevada Trucking Association
Andy MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association
Peter D. Krueger, Nevada Petroleum Marketers and Convenience Store
Association
Fran Almaraz, Nevada Alliance for Retired Americans
Bobbi Thompson, Nevada Airports Association
Ray Bacon, Nevada Manufacturers Association

CHAIR MANENDO:

We are going to open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 149.

SENATE BILL 149: Revises provisions governing regional transportation
commissions. (BDR 22-318)

BRIAN MCANALLEN (City of Las Vegas):

I am here to discuss S.B. 149. This evolving bill has significance for the City of
Las Vegas, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
(RTC-SN) and the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County
(RTC-WC). I will review the process of how we got to this point and then turn it

over to Chair Manendo. For those who may not be familiar, the last two years, we have had the Southern Nevada Forum and have been an organization which has coalesced around issues which are important to southern Nevada. It has been my pleasure to help foster, wherever possible, the dialog and conversation around important issues. As we have evolved, our agenda has gotten larger. We have broken down into a variety of subcommittees working on issues from health care to education. In the committee, I had the pleasure of working on transportation infrastructure. Senator Manendo and Senator Hammond are both current and past Chair of the Senate Committee on Transportation, and have really helped lead this with their background and engagement on all of these issues. We had two other co-Chairs, Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Assembly District No. 16 and Assemblyman Chris Edwards, Assembly District No. 19. The two Chairs, Senator Manendo and Senator Hammond, both proved exactly what we were trying to do with the Southern Nevada Forum, which was to have members of both Chambers, the Assembly and the Senate, and have a bipartisan mix of Legislators; I think our four Chairs did a great job moving us toward the discussion. This bill is a product of those discussions. I will now turn it over to Chair Manendo to talk about the specifics.

SENATOR MARK A. MANENDO (Senatorial District No. 21):

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee of the Southern Nevada Forum held 12 meetings. We had presentations from the RTC-SN; on the monorail from Brookings Mountain West; on light rail and public transit; the utilities, including the Southern Nevada Water Authority; the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), and the Nevada Preservation Foundation. Representatives from the City of Las Vegas and City of Henderson also attended the meetings. We really had a good Committee. I do not think there was a time in our Southern Nevada Forum Transportation and Infrastructure Committee where we did not have two or three members of the Senate Transportation Committee present, and most of the time, there were four members. It was significant to move forward with pieces of legislation we feel in southern Nevada is important. It showed the members took an interest and cared about the issues and were able to dive in to what was important to move southern Nevada forward.

SENATOR SCOTT HAMMOND (Senatorial District No. 18):

I would like to talk more about the process. Last night, we had Congressman Mark E. Amodei, Congressional District No. 2 of Nevada, talk about his fondness for the process. I can understand more about where he is coming from

because this is exactly what happened during the Interim. The goal was to find out what our needs were in southern Nevada. We culled them to about four different ideas that we wanted to present and ended up with three things needing to be brought forward from the Committee. To understand the stakeholders involved, there were members such as RTC-SN, NDOT, Las Vegas Paving, City of Las Vegas, City of Henderson, Clark County, Las Vegas Visitors and Convention Authority, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, Frias Transportation, Cox Communications, NV Energy, Southwest Gas, Las Vegas Valley Water District, Century Link, NAIOP Southern Nevada, J. Barrett Company, AET Environmental, Showtime Tours and multiple lobbying firms. There are members of the community who would also come and give their feedback on what we were doing. At the end, there were several votes to focus on what the community really wanted to have. We felt this was the right direction we needed to take. It was rewarding to be involved and with so many different people, and come up with some needed legislative priorities.

SENATOR MANENDO:

We were a large coalition of community leaders who went to Denver, Colorado a year ago. We toured Denver, Colorado, rode their rail system and saw the remarkable changes they had been able to accomplish to bring infrastructure in and around the light rail area.

It is frustrating in southern Nevada to continue to lag behind when it comes to transportation infrastructure. I listen to my constituents who ride public transit. I do ride along Boulder Highway and Nellis Boulevard as often as I can. I know we can and must do better on enhancing mobility for our community. If we can lead in the travel and tourism industry, accommodating more than 42 million visitors a year, I find it hard to believe our community cannot come together to help build a world class transportation system to accommodate the movement of our residents and our visitors. Improving capacity and better connectivity between cities creates growth, prosperity, more jobs and improved quality of life for our residents. As we look to our neighboring communities such as Phoenix, Salt Lake City, and Denver, we learn that an investment in transportation directly correlates to billions of dollars in economic return. This means more jobs, enhanced connectivity and improved quality of life for our residents. As a community, we need to start somewhere.

We talk about enhanced transportation options preparing us for the future, and our residents deserve nothing less. Senate Bill 149 does just that. It modernizes the regional transportation commission (RTC) legislation providing the RTCs with the ability to move our communities forward in transportation enhancements through collaboration with local governments and industry partners. We are not unique and I am sure every person in this room wants to see the benefit that improved infrastructure can provide their local community and the wide support for long-term economic development.

When the State has a high-quality transportation infrastructure, the economy is also more productive because goods can be moved easily to the market. Employees can get to work more quickly, consumers can more easily reach vendors, and less money is wasted on overdue repairs. I envision economic development, a healthier environment, and a stronger economy and community.

My message today is simple: together, we are stronger and more prosperous. This should not be about turf wars and paranoia, we can do this in Nevada and we should. This is our time. Heavy is the burden of leadership.

There are community leaders who want to testify. I know both Senator Hammond and I support these efforts. The process which we agreed to early on in the Southern Nevada Forum process, regardless of the outcome of last November's elections, was that we would work together to support this important piece of legislation. I am honored and proud to have worked with Senator Hammond on this legislation, and all our community partners and leaders.

SCOTT SCHERER (Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada):

The urban areas of our State are growing more congested. Growth is good, and it beats the stagnation and decline which we experienced almost a decade ago. In southern Nevada and in Washoe County, traffic continues to increase. Getting Nevadans to work, school and to needed services in the State's urban areas is becoming increasingly difficult. Senate Bill 149 is about planning for and tackling these challenges. It will allow the RTCs to look at innovative technologies and flexible approaches to determine the best ways to improve transportation and reduce congestion. It will benefit not only the people living in our urban areas but also those who drive through highly congested areas on their way to work, school or special events. The RTCs will be able to fulfill their responsibilities by allowing them to plan and develop high capacity transit

including innovative transportation projects such as autonomous vehicles with S.B. 149.

The future of the transportation field is uncertain. This bill allows for all sorts of technologies which are emerging and being discussed. This bill allows Nevada's RTCs to be prepared for whatever occurs in the transportation field. It gives the express authority, rather than the vague authority which exists now, to construct various forms of high-capacity transit. Current law is heavily oriented towards either traditional bus transit or fixed guideway transportation. This bill will allow more flexibility to adapt to changing technology. It will give RTCs authority to continue improving transit in Nevada by clarifying the ability to invest in transit developments and work with local governments in developing transit projects.

I will walk you through the bill with the RTC-SN's proposed amendment ([Exhibit C](#)).

Section 1 of the bill starts on page 4, and is just the language. Section 2 is the definition of high-capacity transit, and you will see this definition is broad to allow for flexibility. It does mention certain types of technology which might be used for high-capacity transit including bus rapid transit, fixed guideway, light rail transit, commuter rail, streetcar and heavy rail, but the language itself does not limit the types of transit technology that might be used.

Section 3 allows a commission to provide grants to conduct research and implement transportation projects using innovative technology. This is one of the key parts of the bill is intended to allow for innovation going forward, to ensure we use the most efficient and best way to meet the needs of all your constituents.

In section 3, subsection 1, paragraph (b), we have a proposed amendment. There is already language that would have us enter into agreements in accordance with federal law; this amendment also includes applicable laws of the State in the agreements.

Section 4 says if a commission enters into an agreement with the local government, they will share costs relating to a transportation project with an appropriate account created and administered.

Section 5 allows for the RTC in Clark or Washoe Counties to propose a sales tax increase to fund a particular transportation project. In order to do this, the RTCs have to specify the proposed rate of the increase, specify the duration of the increase, and they have to specify the projects for which the increase is used. It is then submitted to the county commissions and the county commissions may put the question on the ballot. The county commissions are not required, if they determine it is not appropriate or the timing is wrong, to put the question on the ballot. That is a second check by the county commissions.

The original proposed amendments of the bill would have allowed either a sales tax increase or property tax increase. The proposed amendment strikes out the ability to ask for a property tax increase and all the related language which goes with those.

Section 6 says upon approval of the registered voters, the county will then adopt an ordinance to put into effect the sales tax increase. The language is the standard language found in any sales tax increase, we have to follow the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 374 and all its amendments. The ordinance will parallel State law in regards to the sales tax.

Section 7 simply provides for the monies collected by the tax increase to be remitted to the commissions for the use in accordance with law. We did strike out "or county treasurer," as it goes along with property tax increase and we have struck out the property taxes portion.

Sections 8 and 9 begin the changes to existing law, and are changes to the existing definitions to incorporate high-capacity transit.

Section 10 provides for the language of the chapter to be liberally construed. The need was for flexibility to adopt innovative technologies, and the idea was if we wanted to do a pilot project with proven innovative technologies, for example, we could. We do not want it to be said that we cannot do a pilot project because there is no specific language to allow for it.

Section 11 simply adds the ability to have a mayor on a RTC. It is our understanding there are certain cities in the State whose mayors are not designated as members of the council by their charter. The old language simply said it was the members of the council or commission and excluded the mayor.

We wanted to make this clear that a mayor could serve as a member of a RTC or RTC board.

Section 12 is new language. This would require us to enter into agreements with the local governments who have jurisdiction over the rights-of-way to ensure we are collaborating with them and not building a project in their rights-or-way without their permission.

DARCY JOHNSON (Counsel):

"Commission shall" means they have to enter into an agreement, that means both Washoe County and Clark County RTCs would be required to enter into an agreement.

MR. SCHERER:

We could not construct a transit project in a right-of-way of a local government without entering into an agreement with them, yes.

Ms. JOHNSON:

The way this is written, you do not have a choice about entering into the agreement, you have to whether the agreement offered is one you do or do not agree with. You want the authority to enter into it, correct.

MR. SCHERER:

My understanding is, and this has been a subject of negotiation with many of the local governments, the local governments want us to be required to enter into an agreement with them before we build a project in their rights-of-way.

Ms. JOHNSON:

I understand, before you can proceed.

MR. SCHERER:

Yes, before we can precede building the project, we must enter into an agreement.

We struck out section 13, subsection 2, saying we would be deemed a public body by corporate and political subdivision, but would still have perpetual succession subject to termination in accordance with statute. If the Legislature for some reason decided there was no need for RTCs in the future, it could still eliminate them, but until then, they would still be perpetual in succession. The

new paragraph (b) in the proposed amendment would require us, and we believe it is already required, to simply make clear we are required to adhere to all land use and zoning regulations and the terms of any and all local agreements we have entered into with the local government.

Section 14 expands, to some extent, the authority in adopting regulations and in particular allowing us to adopt regulations with regards to unauthorized vehicles in a transportation facility. There is a problem, for example, with the park-and-ride lots. People are using them as parking lots and not carpooling. We need to be able to address the issue in order to serve the people who are using the transit facilities.

Section 15 then allows us to operate, develop and maintain a system of public transportation including high-capacity transit systems. It will also allow to construct high-capacity transit systems if approved by the city or county which has jurisdiction over the public rights-of-way. The proposed amendment to the original bill requires the approval of the city or county which has jurisdiction.

The prior language in paragraph (g) would have stated we “may” enter into agreements and has been struck in favor of we “shall” enter into agreements.

In section 16 of the bill, there was heavy emphasis on fixed guideway; it has been replaced with high-capacity transit. We will have more flexibility as to what technology is best to serve the needs of the public in a particular area.

Section 17 simply adds the RTC into to the sales tax ballot initiative; it allows the RTC to put forward a valid initiative just as a school district, public library or water district could do. They are all in existing law; it just adds the RTC to the existing law. It is subject to the earlier requirements I mentioned in terms of putting it forward to the county commissions, having them approve it and putting on the ballot.

The former section 16 has been struck out in this proposed amendment. It was related to the potential property tax. Section 16 and section 17 are both in NRS 361 with the property tax. The new section 18 is simply the repeal of NRS 277A.345 which is the establishment of regional rapid transit authorities, which was put into law several years ago. Unfortunately, it has not been used, so we felt if it was not going to be used, we did not need to have it in the statutes.

TINA QUIGLEY (General Manager, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada):

This discussion is to define the RTC and its role. I think our role is to convene the community, to have conversations just like the conversations we had through the Southern Nevada Forum, through our Transportation Resource Advisory Committee (TRAC) and through our Southern Nevada Strong Committees. The purpose is to really learn from the community, listen to the community, what they want to invest in, and then effectuate that investment.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I know we spent a lot of time looking at other regions, and some of the ideas that materialized in this legislation did not just come out of nowhere. There are things we studied in Phoenix, Salt Lake City and in Denver and some other areas as well. Could you quickly explain what you discovered in these other areas? Salt Lake City is a good example of what they did with their RTC equivalence in order to accomplish the goals and a great infrastructure. Can you highlight what you thought you could do now, but wanted to make sure there was clarification through statute?

Ms. QUIGLEY:

We spent some time establishing mentor relationships with Denver, Salt Lake City, San Diego and Phoenix. We turn to these cities because they are part of the Intermountain West; we understand their territories and have relationships with them. They are cities where they have been able to grow, diversify and develop strong economies. We learned from them, how they organized in terms of government structure and abilities they had to implement. We and our legal team spent time in each of those cities, pulling some of their statutory language that we could incorporate into ours, particularly the transit-oriented development. We wanted to define clearly that we have the jurisdiction to implement high-capacity transit systems. We learned those cities that have healthy relationships jurisdictionally, a strong understanding of what their role is in the big picture and collaborate at a larger regional view are the ones which are starting to see the fruits of their labor. The City and County of Denver is one; it has over 33 different jurisdictions or cities and a separate transit agency. Denver's Regional Transportation District is not a part of the Denver Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO); however, they come together regularly, develop a regional plan, and each takes a role in implementing the plan.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

Probably the most astounding thing we learned is the cooperation that developed. It did not happen overnight, it took 30 years to get there. They had many different jurisdictions that said they were going to try find some way to work together, and they did. We do not have quite the obstacle in the south; we have six jurisdictions and will work to get them involved. The fruit of their labor is a transit system that is ten years ahead of where we are right now. We need to move more people, more goods and move them faster. I am grateful for the opportunity to gain the knowledge on that trip.

CHAIR MANENDO:

One of the points we are astounded by is there are so many moving parts in Denver and they were able to find a way to make it work. The federal government mostly paid for it. It is amazing that we have been sitting idly by and losing opportunities because we just cannot get it together. This is remarkable and a game changer for our State.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I understand this has been an ambitious project, and obviously, we do have serious transportation issues in Washoe and Clark Counties and throughout the State. I would like to see some of these changes made. I am trying to get all the information now. Does this whole project depend upon a vote of the people? Will the people have to vote for a sales tax increase, or is there other funding available? If something happens and the people did not vote for it, what would you do?

MR. SCHERER:

There are a number of different potential funding sources. Chair Manendo mentioned the federal government, and we would seek funds from the federal government. The RTC-SN has been designated as the MPO for southern Nevada. It has the ability to seek those funds from the federal government for transit projects, but is one significant source. There are other potential sources as well.

MS. QUIGLEY:

The language in front of you is not to go forward with a ballot question and not for any particular project. It is to expand the enabling language of the RTC to be able to undertake those things in the future.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I know there is funding and the federal government has money. With the new administration, we have no idea what is going to happen. The federal government wants to do something for infrastructure, which is great because we definitely need it. We need to convince the people this is what they need, too.

MR. SCHERER:

It is possible there will be a need for matching funds or other funds, somewhere along the line for some of those programs. This gives us the opportunity to be flexible as new opportunities come up to meet those needs.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

This funding mechanism, it is not going to be the RTCs themselves imposing a tax on people, is it?

MR. SCHERER:

They would not. The RTC would have to put together a question, it would have to specify what it is for, how much it is for and for how long the tax increase would last. Then they would have to submit it to the county commission. The county commission would then have to approve it. If the county commission approves it, it would then have to go on a ballot. It would only go into effect if the people vote for it once it has been through all of those steps.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I read it that way; I just wanted to make sure there was nothing else in here that said otherwise.

DONALD D. SNYDER (Presidential Advisor for Strategic Initiatives, University of Nevada, Las Vegas):

I am the Chairman of the RTC-SN's TRAC. I am here today in support of S.B. 149 because through the process of chairing the Committee I have become involved with the dialog and acutely aware of the importance of transportation in our region and in our State.

Technology is rapidly developing as it applies to transportation. At no other time has it been more critical to take the right steps forward, as other states have done, to ensure we have the transportation infrastructure in place which will support our communities for generations to come. During our TRAC meetings,

we heard firsthand from our neighbors in California, Arizona and Utah about their best practices and the importance of having the right statutory authority. Right now is our opportunity, and our obligation is to do just that. The world of transportation is changing as rapidly as any other industry you can think of, and we owe it to ourselves to make sure we are prepared to meet those changes. The critical needs are for high-capacity transit and options for transit-oriented development using emerging technologies, such as connected and autonomous vehicles. I urge you to support S.B. 149 as the next logical step in preparing southern Nevada and our State for the next generation in transportation innovation.

DANNY L. THOMPSON (Transportation Resource Advisory Committee):

I think Senator Gustavson's question is exactly the point. This bill allows the RTCs to have the flexibility to deal with technology which is changing the world beyond what we can comprehend. We did a seminar where a futurist came and talked about disruptions. For disruptions because of technology, an example would be autonomous vehicles. One thing that was presented to us about automated highway systems was that a vehicle can be hailed to your house, and then it goes back to the highway, hooks together and takes you one place. The vehicle then hooks up together again and takes everyone else to another place. It is crazy that this can be done right now. I follow robotics and things like that closely because robotics is replacing people, replacing jobs. Robots do not call in sick, you do not have to give them vacation pay, and they do not need insurance. As this happens, we need the flexibility to make change. Faraday Future is going to produce an electric vehicle in Las Vegas. That is Chinese manufactured electric vehicles.

Tesla is now producing the batteries for those vehicles; those vehicles do not pay gasoline tax. We build our roads on gasoline tax. As these cars proliferate, we are going to have to do something about funding. One of the presentations shown here last week was a little video on autonomous vehicles and what they mean for the future. In a high-density area where you can have mass transportation, people are not going to have cars. There will not be as many vehicles at the Department of Motor Vehicles, consequently they are not going to pay the vehicle registration, and you who serve on the tax committees know what that means. You are dependent on that money. Hyperloop is going to be a train which will do 700 miles an hour. As I recall, we have an aviation fuel tax. Hyperloop will travel faster than an airplane. You need to be aware of that. This will cause disruptions in the work force; it will cause disruptions in government

and the way government pays for things. This will allow the RTCs to react quickly to these changes and will lessen the problems for us in the future. The future is not 20 years from now; the future is right now. Within the next ten years, you are going to see crazy things that are going to happen with both robotics and artificial intelligence, but specifically in the transportation world, autonomous vehicles are going to change everything. I urge you to support this bill, it is critical that the government has the ability to react quickly and not wait every two years for us to get together.

CHAIR MANENDO:

People think the Transportation Committee is not a big deal. I look out into the audience and see people who have an interest in transportation and the things you are talking about, where we need to go and, as a government, need to talk about for the future in transportation.

PETER GUZMAN (President, Latin Chamber of Commerce NV):

I have had the opportunity to serve on the RTC-SN's TRAC. To be around high-level, intelligent, forward-thinking, passionate people was amazing and it clearly opened my eyes to the fact that now is the time. The RTC practices foresight, and we have to give them the proper tools to create a landscape which is going to look different than the one we are used to seeing, but we need to embrace it as a good thing. This is why I urge you to support S.B. 149.

On a more personal note, and as the president of the Latin Chamber of Commerce, and representing a minority demographic and the Hispanic Latino community, any improvement in transportation is a huge improvement in their lives and in their dignity. They rely on transportation. I urge you wholeheartedly to support this and am grateful to be a part of this wonderful journey we are about to go on.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

Technology is changing quickly and is changing our lives. I know I will be around for the next ten years and will see a many of these changes take place. My concern, with those of us that have classic cars, are we eventually going to be forced to convert these over to autonomous vehicles if we want to ride around in them?

MR. THOMPSON:

I do not know if you will be forced to, but in urban areas, it will just be easier. Having a car in Washington, D.C., is a negative. You cannot park anywhere and when you do park, it costs you a lot of money. Insurance is expensive there as well. I will tell you in urban centers, you will see cars disappear as these things proliferate.

MR. SNYDER:

I think one of the greatest challenges we will have is integrating the old with the new. It will take a lot of conversation and much thought. It is important to have this type of process to react, to study and to implement in a way that is sensitive to the past. There are those things which are real issues and we have to be able to accommodate them. It adds to the challenge.

MR. THOMPSON:

At a presentation by a futurist, he showed a slide of New York City in 1899 or 1900, completely covered with horses and buggies and many people. The biggest problem in New York City at that time was horse manure. Because there was so much of it, there was literally an army of people to pick it up and then they could not dispose of it. Ten years later in approximately 1910, a picture was taken on the same corner, and there was not a single horse. Everyone said we will never give up our horses because they are members of our families; it was all automobiles in that same spot. It was pretty telling about then, and now. Fast-forward to today and the technology we have — this is going to fly by because things are changing.

MR. GUZMAN:

I would like to say, even with the challenges, there will be opportunities for people who are holding on to those cars and opportunities for people to sell parts, do mechanics, etc., even within that, there will still be opportunities.

WARREN B. HARDY II (Associated Builders and Contractors of Nevada):

I am also a member of the TRAC. The TRAC was an important thing for southern Nevada. Something has concerned me over the years as I have watched the Legislature and watched where we progressed. It was an eye opener to see what is happening in technology with regard to transportation and other things. It is not just in transportation. I have noticed across the board we have statutes which are outdated. In some cases, they do not match our aspiration to be a leader in the center of the world in terms of autonomous

vehicles, in terms of clean energy and other things. To Senator Gustavson's point, this bill is designed to correct that. To make sure we are positioned to take advantage of whatever may come. None of us could have imagined the things we learned in terms of what is going to happen, not only in the future, but also in our lifetimes and careers. This bill is extraordinarily important to getting us on track to quickly respond, react and be able to participate in those things.

TODD P. SKLAMBERG (CEO, Sunrise Hospital and Medical Center):
I am here in support of S.B. 149 and will read from my testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I took two or three trips to Denver, but one of the things I took away from one of those trips was from a regional medical center. Within five to seven city blocks, they had developed the hospitals, they had research centers, they had a university, and everything was in one area. They had a fantastic transportation system coming into the center. It was an economic boon for that area, and provided transportation to those who could not otherwise get to medical facilities for medical attention. It is a comprehensive transportation system, integrating everything together. Students who are going to school will have a much easier way to get to the university at the medical center.

MR. SKLAMBERG:

Many of our patients rely on mass transportation to access health care. Looking at this legislation, it will serve as a significant enhancement as access for care for residents of Las Vegas and Nevada.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

This is about a community and how it is integrated. Your presence here shows it is more than just construction companies, and more than just TRAC.

GARY MILLIKEN (Keolis Transit America):

Currently, we have a contract and operate the Las Vegas Strip bus routes for RTC-SN. We are also involved in autonomous shuttles. We run autonomous shuttles in Dubai, Saudi Arabia, also in Lyon, France. We are currently in negotiations with the City of Las Vegas for the autonomous shuttle. In December, we ran the shuttle on Fremont Street from Las Vegas Boulevard down to The Container Store area. We had several thousand riders, two bus stops and 30 to 40 people at a time were waiting in line to ride the shuttle.

Senate Bill 149 is important to the RTC-SN, as mentioned before. You will not only see the autonomous shuttle from us, but many innovative systems that this bill will let the RTC-SN look at.

SEAN STEWART (CEO, Nevada Contractors Association):

I am also a TRAC member. I agree with everything that has been said so far. I should point out, as a TRAC member, we were a diverse group of 35 individuals with a lot of time put into this. On behalf of the contractors of southern Nevada, we are in support of this bill.

JONAS PETERSON (Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance):

After careful review, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance supports the passage of S.B. 149. Further, we feel this is needed to enhance our economic competitiveness in an increasingly globalized market. Both in the north and the south, you see an economy that is improving; in fact, Nevada was named by Gallup polling the No. 1 State in the Country recently for job growth. Our population is growing; we are creating jobs. If we are going to continue to meet the demand, we need innovative transportation solutions. If we cannot meet that demand, businesses may start to look elsewhere again for locations. Senate Bill 149 adds another tool to our economic development toolbox, a tool which benefited competitors like Phoenix and Salt Lake City. We also need the authority to research, fund and develop projects that relate to innovative transportation such as autonomous vehicles. We think Nevada is well-positioned to be a leader in this industry. With downtown's Innovation District, the City of Las Vegas maintains a test-ready grid system for terrestrial autonomous vehicles with built-in vehicle infrastructure capabilities. With the growth for Nevada's Center for Advanced Mobility, we think S.B. 149 can help grow this emerging industry, and we encourage your support.

RIC JIMENEZ (Chair, Maryland Parkway Coalition):

I am here today to testify in support of S.B. 149. I am the chair of the Maryland Parkway Coalition, which exists to bring new life into the area that is ready for redevelopment and revitalization. As Mr. Sklamberg from Sunrise Hospital eloquently said, Maryland Parkway is critical to the future of our inner city. Our coalition members are not the only ones who believe that way as the Maryland Parkway is featured prominently in both the Southern Nevada Strong regional plan and the RTC's transportation investment and business plan. Maryland Parkway is in dire need of better transit options. Maryland Parkway's location connects the airport to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), Sunrise

Senate Committee on Transportation
March 14, 2017
Page 18

Medical district, Boulevard Mall, historic neighborhoods, downtown and all the way to Cashman Field. I strongly urge you to support S.B. 149.

DAVID FROMMER (Executive Director, Planning and Construction Services, University of Nevada, Las Vegas):

I am the Executive Director of Planning and Construction at UNLV, university architect and a member of the Maryland Parkway Coalition. I am here to offer a few brief words in support of S.B. 149 and RTC's efforts. The University has worked closely with RTC over the years related to Maryland Parkway transportation and transit improvements, including looking at bus rapid transit and urban streetcars. We have a transit center on our own campus, which is a function of collaboration between UNLV and RTC-SN. We see RTC-SN's efforts on transportation and transit being a major part of not only connectivity among the many assets in southern Nevada to make them work better, make them more accessible and enhance them, but to grow the community and provide access. We support RTC-SN's efforts and are happy to be a part of this conversation.

PAUL J. MORADKHAN (Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):

The Chamber would also like to offer its support on S.B. 149. This was a priority out of the Center for Nevada Forum, which is a committee partnership and a collaborative approach, and the Chamber is happy to support it. We also want to acknowledge the efforts the RTC-SN has put into this bill as you have heard today. They have had substantial feedback, and they have come to the table to make amendments so they could get more people in support. We appreciate those efforts; I think their approach has been important to listen to the community and to have the bill in front of you today.

KELLY CROMPTON (City of Las Vegas):

The City of Las Vegas is also in support of S.B. 149. As Mr. Moradkhan stated, it was a Southern Nevada Forum priority. The City of Las Vegas is excited about connectivity to downtown and to the Las Vegas medical district in the future.

SUSAN FISHER (Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association; Nevada Homebuilders Association; Nevada State Apartment Association; Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority):

The Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association greatly appreciates the opportunity to work on the TRAC over the past year with all the parties, and we appreciate you bringing forth S.B. 149 and support it. The benefit here is it

takes into account all types of housing from single family homes to urban core homes to apartment complexes, and for that reason, the Nevada State Apartment Association is in support. With so many senior citizens in southern Nevada and people with disabilities, having this sort of transit program will help people maintain independent lifestyles.

ROBERT HERR (Director of Public Works, Parks and Recreation, City of Henderson):

We would like to express our support for this bill with the proposed amendments that have been introduced by the RTC this morning.

LEE G. GIBSON (Executive Director, Regional Transportation Committee of Washoe County):

I want to thank Tina Quigley and the RTC of Southern Nevada for bringing this bill forward. At the end of 2015, we looked at the question of public transit in Washoe County and the dimensions surrounding it. The principles of this bill support the initiatives to look in Washoe County for more public transit across a wide spectrum of services. From a legal technical standpoint, we are particularly appreciative that language has been included in NRS 277A.180 which clarifies that the city councils may appoint council members or mayors to serve on a RTC. Due to a recent Nevada Supreme Court decision on term limits, the Court has clarified city charters can treat mayors differently, and some mayors are not considered council members. This change included in the bill would allow mayors to serve as RTC members if appointed by their colleagues. I appreciate the RTC-SN for working on the language with us.

I believe your legal counsel touched on the idea of these agreements where everybody comes together, under the mandate of shall, works out the shared responsibilities and assigns specific duties related to rights-of-way, construction and all of the other matters which are related to the development and construction of such project. We think the model will help reduce risk, will help build political consensus, but also leverage all the legal and technical capacities. We have a workable section under NRS 373.140, similar in concept to what the process of S.B. 149 will promote. The RTC chooses the projects, the county authorizes the funding and then implementation agreements are worked out amongst all of the entities. In Washoe County, we have had two excellent examples where by this has worked effectively for us. One was the Virginia Street Project, where we worked with the City of Reno, and we brought in Federal Highway Administration bridge rehabilitation money as well as RTC-WC

money and flood project money. The other was the 4th Street/Prater Way RAPID Transit Project. If there is another category of funding we have not brought into a project, I seek to bring it in. We have U.S. Department of Transportation dollars helping us to buy new advanced-design electric buses. We have fuel tax, sales tax, congestion mitigation air-quality funds and surface transportation block grant funds coming together.

As I mentioned last week in my testimony, we want to take care of all issues in one construction project so we are not back there again and delaying people. You created RTCs to provide community-wide views of road and transit systems in Nevada. I have heard discussion today about how we are improving RTCs. I just want to highlight one thing: your bill continues the wisdom of the Legislature, in my opinion. I serve as the Chair of the American Public Transportation Association's Policy and Planning Committee. What is here is a continuation of a national model. We are looking forward to this bill continuing the balance of members from each jurisdiction providing guidance and oversight. We believe our board structure with elected officials from each jurisdiction has been a model of cooperation, shared governance, and we want to maintain that regional view in the future. We look forward to working with everyone as this bill continues through the legislative process.

JOHN FUDENBERG (Clark County):

Clark County is neutral on S.B. 149, and we have offered a few proposed amendments ([Exhibit E](#)).

In section 13, subsection 3, we would like to withdraw our proposed amendment to this section because RTC-SN's proposed amendment to section 12, subsection 1, addresses our concern in regard to agreements related to the commission in Clark County.

In section 13, subsection 8, our language needs to be modified. We have discussed it with the RTC-SN; we agree on the intent of that section and would like to continue working with them on modifying the language to match our actual intent. I am confident we can do so without a problem.

CRAIG MADOLE (Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors of America, Inc.):

We had the same concerns as Clark County, we want to make sure the language they are proposing and the application of those funds from

transportation-based roadway highway structure projects are protected appropriately under this law. I talked with Ms. Quigley, and she has agreed in concept to the proposed amendment. We just want to make sure we work with everybody to ensure it is done.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I am trying to understand the proposed amendment. What I did hear was Washoe County RTC came up and talked about using several different funding sources in order to accomplish a project. Sometimes, a certain project starts to expand; you can get many things done while you are working on the project and able to use different monies to complete it. That is what I am envisioning. I want to make sure we are using all kinds of monies. Certain money can only be used for certain things, and I understand that. However, when a project begins, I would like to be sure we can accomplish many projects. We have been hearing a lot during this Session about how we can more fully utilize money.

We had a bill dealing with fiber optics. Once a project is started, streets are removed, everything is dug up, we are much more effective we are by going ahead and putting in other projects when we have the chance. We are getting smarter about how we approach things, such as building and construction. Certainly as consumers and tax payers, we really do not like to see roads dug up, projects started, then two years later the same street dug up again and the inconveniences it brings. We like to see everything managed and thoughtfulness put into every single project. I hope that is what you are keeping in mind, because I really appreciated RTC-WC's forethought. When bringing all the different kinds of monies and looking at the project, how we can get all these different elements done at the same time is my concern. I hope that is what you are aiming at.

CHAIR MANENDO:

Every week that goes by in this Committee, we continue to talk about digging once. I think you are on target. We hear it from our constituents. We all feel the same way: dig once for many projects. We want to make sure we do dig once, as often as we can.

I do want to mention after the Denver trip I was energized, as was the whole coalition that went. I felt compelled that we needed to get a bill in place and move forward with it so all the working parts could start coming together. I

know Senator Hammond wants to sign on to be part of the proposed amendment.

We will close the hearing on S.B. 149. We will open the hearing on S.B. 207.

SENATE BILL 207: Creates the Legislative Committee on Transportation.
(BDR 17-529)

DONALD D. SNYDER (Presidential Advisor for Strategic Initiatives, University of Nevada, Las Vegas):

As you heard before, I have had the pleasure of being Chair of the TRAC. The TRAC and all the testimony you have heard, speaks to the benefit of forming the Interim Committee on Transportation. Bringing together a group of people that had incredible insight in terms of both what was going on and what needs to happen to meet the needs of the community is important. As you have heard, TRAC is a volunteer group of 36 business and community leaders. That group of 36 represents all demographics of southern Nevada, which was important when the TRAC was put together. The other thing that is important to talk about is TRAC really is meant to look at things from a business point of view because it has to make good business sense for it to make good public policy sense. It has been a privilege for me to sit on the TRAC and see what has been accomplished. The TRAC has spent the last year or so having in-depth discussions on roadway planning, funding and transit. It is important to note along the way, TRAC recognized the need to look at the emerging technologies which you heard about in S.B. 149 and to consider longer-term recommendations. The tremendous funding shortfall of nearly \$6 billion was part of the conversation we had at TRAC in terms of infrastructure needs. Prior to the voters approving the extension of the Fuel Revenue Index (FRI), it became evident to the TRAC that our monthly meetings would not provide enough time to address the long-term transportation funding needs of southern Nevada. A reminder, Clark County voters did approve the extension of FRI for only ten years. I think it is important for us to look beyond the horizon.

The TRAC's key recommendation to the RTC-SN was to create an Interim Legislative Committee to explore long-term transportation and long-term funding options necessary. We feel a deeper dive is needed to explore policies around permanent sound funding options for long-term transportation priorities. Nevada is also beginning to explore the emerging transportation technologies you have heard about today and how these innovative approaches can assist us with the

demands on our transportation network. We know there is a real shift taking place in transportation.

You have heard about today, but we must prepare for the next evolution of transportation in Nevada. The TRAC, along with the transportation officials within the State, believe an Interim Committee on Transportation that would be created by S.B. 207 will help create sound policies around emerging transportation technology and provide long-term transportation funding options. This Committee would help ensure Nevada continues to lead the way when it comes to implementing innovative transportation solutions. To provide more information on the bill, Helen Foley is here to go through it.

HELEN FOLEY (Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada):

I have been serving as the project manager for TRAC. I will also say that there was a large contingent of women serving on TRAC. I know you have seen many men up here today, but we had many business women representing the Nevada Taxpayers Association, gaming organizations, cyclists, transit riders and wonderful representation of individuals. Most of the time when you think of a 36-member committee you think, "Oh, my heavens." There was a lot of dialog, innovation and excitement.

One of the main things we continue to hear from TRAC is, "Please, do not stop." After this Legislative Session, we want to come back and delve into these big issues. I am here to walk you through S.B. 207, which creates a statutory Committee on Transportation and authorizes it to review transportation infrastructure needs and funding mechanisms. I will say when we were looking at this and trying to determine if there should be an Interim Committee, we decided the best approach was to create a statutory Committee. It will be a permanent Interim Committee which looks into transportation issues because they are not going to be resolved in one Interim period. When you take a look at the statutory committees that are on the books right now, they deal with education, public lands, senior citizens, health care, energy, child welfare and juvenile justice system, as well as water. We have high nuclear waste, we have everything, and one big hole is in transportation.

We feel this is the appropriate time to add this Committee. Senate Bill 207 was one of the key TRAC initiatives. It takes an essential step to improve our region's transportation infrastructure by working with State Legislators to study transportation issues and make recommendations on transportation policy when

the Legislature is not in session. The Committee will be made up of three members of the Senate and three members of the Assembly. The leadership will rotate between the Chairs of the Senate and Assembly Committees on Transportation. The impact of emerging technologies on roadways and transit systems, options for funding the development of high-capacity transit systems within our urban areas and any other matters that concerns transportation and transportation infrastructure in Nevada will be examined.

The Committee will conduct investigations and make recommendations to the Legislature as well as work with the Congressional Delegation to ensure the ability to pay for transportation infrastructure on a long-term basis. The new Committee will consult with experts in best practices and will report to the Legislature every other year before the beginning of the next session. We thank you for the opportunity to present this bill and certainly thank Senators Manendo and Hammond for working with us all the way through this process. I know TRAC will be interested in participating with you during the Interim on this Committee. One clarifying note: This in no way diminishes the role of the State Transportation Board, they identify the funding projects for the State of Nevada, and this will not usurp its authority or power. This is to have a deeper look and discuss how we fund roads, not roads we are going to fund.

MR. SNYDER:

This new Committee is important to us, certainly from a businessperson's point of view. We do not want to duplicate efforts. One of the questions I asked when we talked about creating an Interim Transportation Committee was how many other states have or do not have an Interim Transportation Committee. Most states meet annually, so it is not quite as much of an issue. Legislatively, Nevada is the only state which does not have an Interim Transportation Committee that meets every other year. When you consider how fast things are changing, it just reinforces the need to have a way to do this deeper dive and have the type of conversations needing to take place.

CHAIR MANENDO:

I agree it is the drilling down on these important issues and not just funding, but also a lot of public safety-related issues that have come before us. I know there are many organizations who have some thoughts on Legislative issues that could come before this Committee and have long conversations about what we need to do for our future. I thought we would get this type of Legislation during the last Session, and we are going to work hard to make sure we finally do. To

hear that we are the only State which does not have a committee like this is disheartening. We are playing catch-up again.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

We have worked hard; many people looked at the Senate Transportation Committee in the past and thought it was not a significant Committee. That changed about two to four years ago. I recognized that during last Session when I served as Chair of this Committee. Transportation Infrastructure is an issue which fosters bipartisanship and cooperation. A couple of years ago we saw in Congress, both the President of the National Chamber of Commerce and the President of the AFL-CIO testifying together. It is easy for us when we got together and discussed that these were our issues, no matter what the outcome was in November. For the State of Nevada, for our areas this was important for us. It fosters a lot more cooperation. We cannot get it done without meeting in the Interim and talking about the issues. That is why this bill is important, because we still have public safety issues, too. We also want to make sure we are talking about regulation, how much do we need, how much do we pull back, and how do we foster innovation in an area where technology is coming into its own in the transportation area. Things are changing so quickly. You want to ensure it is the best infrastructure there is so commerce can go on.

MR. SNYDER:

This is my thirtieth year here in Nevada and being actively involved in the business community as well as the community as a whole. The bipartisan aspect of this effort that you highlighted, I find incredibly refreshing. I think the two of you as Chairs, depending on which Session we are in, have done a wonderful job of recognizing the need for the Interim Committee.

MR. PETERSON:

As the regional development authority for southern Nevada, we are charged to position southern Nevada for long-term economic growth. We believe if we are going to be successful in economic development, we need to take a deeper dive, a more extensive look at how we position our region for the next evolution of transportation. Changes are going to happen quickly, we are going to need to be able to react quickly. We think S.B. 207 will help us do that and we are in support and encourage your support as well.

PAUL J. ENOS (CEO, Nevada Trucking Association):

I am here today to testify in favor of S.B. 207. I do think it is time we start to focus at a State level on funding. This is why the Nevada Trucking Association supports this bill. On a federal level, we have been having a debate about, "Do we need to devolve the federal highway program down to the states and let the state control that money." In the State of Nevada, we have devolved the level down to the local government. That is where we have seen all the new revenue and investment come in. Those roads are important, and are important to us in our everyday life when people are going to school, to work, or to church, to the dry cleaners or grocery store. However, in terms of how we move things, 92 percent of the freight in this State and 70 percent of the freight in this Country, happens on those roads which are part of the Nevada State Freight Plan, which has not had any real funding to since 1992. We have the same problem on a federal level, and it is something I hope will be addressed with a new President and a new Congress. I sit on TRAC, I sat on Blue Ribbon Task Forces and one of the things we discuss is funding. However, there is no authority to do it. We talk about many ideas. I appreciate section 5, subsection 2 in which the Committee is going to consult with experts and consider input from outside because a lot of work has already been done.

The State of Nevada last year adopted its first freight plan. I know many stakeholders did a lot of work in developing that plan to move forward. Focusing on how to take care of our shippers, how to help our economy to grow, issues like truck parking, autonomous vehicles, sustainability and how we get cleaner vehicles on the road. We may be able to create a system or committee where we work with the people at NDOT on the State Transportation Board and with the State Transportation Advisory Committee. Legislators used to be on that committee but it has kind of ebbed and flowed. It may be something we want to look at again and put some Legislators on that committee.

My only concern is this is almost too broad in all the things we are looking at because the real crux of the issue is funding. Where we are making those investments in our roads and our infrastructure, once again, we have done a great job in our urban areas. We have done a good job with the money we have, but in terms of really making that investment, we have done a poor job. This is really a good place where we can focus on how to get revenue there and get the best return for our dollars.

MR. GUZMAN:

I am here today as a TRAC member in support of S.B. 207. I have the privilege of being President of the Latin Chamber of Commerce, representing a thriving Hispanic business community, and people who come into the Chamber in search of help. We have a senior center where 80 to 120 seniors come and hang out and live a dignified life. One of the biggest obstacles is transportation. We are around all these great minds and we talk about autonomous vehicles and the future, important things. Transportation also hits home, it is about people and people who need to go see a doctor.

One of our biggest obstacles in the Hispanic community is transportation and a transit system. Some people do not go to doctors because transportation is an issue. It will assist them with getting to and from work, to and from senior centers, attending doctor visits and assessing employment opportunities. It all matters. I strongly urge the passage of S.B. 207 as a positive step in planning, building and investing in the future of our community. I want to say, the spirit of bipartisanship and working together that is being shown here today shows what should and could be done not only here but also at a national level.

MR. MILLIKEN:

Back in 2015 with Senator Hammond, we mentioned autonomous vehicles several times and had some brief discussions on it. Now here we are in 2017, and we have an autonomous shuttle parked right outside this building. That shuttle runs along Fremont Street in Las Vegas and is also being used in other places. By 2019, who knows what topics we will be discussing. This is why we think this bill is so important, to having this Interim Committee is important because things change almost on a weekly basis.

MR. STEWART:

I am also a TRAC member. If we get to the bottom line, the issue here is funding. There are so many innovations and so many ideas coming out that having an Interim Transportation Committee address funding for transportation is key, and we support it for that reason.

MR. HARDY:

I am also a member of TRAC. I agree with everything that has been said. I do want to associate myself with the comments of Mr. Peterson. The TRAC I served on was as effective as any citizens' advisory group in which I have served. We got to the point where some of the questions that were remaining

would better reside at the Legislative level. This is why I feel strongly about the need for the Interim Committee. We want to make sure the expertise is as excellent as Mr. Enos points out; but again, these are questions that need to reside at the Legislative level. This is an important bill.

MR. THOMPSON:

It is critical we have this standing Committee. There are issues you do not think about, but funding is critical to make it happen. As an example, the State's budget is controlled by seven miles of the Las Vegas Strip. If you own one of those properties, and the opportunity to expand happens, it lies within your parking facilities that you have. Employee parking is the first thing they look at to go because you need the parking for your customers. The ability to get that number of people on a shift change on The Strip is incredible. They make sure it always happens properly so those businesses can provide the services they do to their guests, and they pay the taxes for the State of Nevada. Literally, right now, it is the State's budget.

The coming of Interstate 11, which is happening now, is critical to economic development as well. One of the crazy things about autonomous vehicles is 40 percent of the vehicle is printed on a 3-D printer. As time goes along, the manufacturing process will be refined, and more parts will be printed 3-D. You will be able to manufacture these vehicles in a warehouse by setting up a 3-D printer and printing vehicles. That is where everything is going. I just want to echo my support for this bill and the need for this Committee.

ANDY MACKAY (Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association):

I want to express the Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association's support for this measure. We are the industry which is responsible for selling vehicles to individuals who use the roads. We cannot emphasize enough about a robust economy in Nevada is directly related to transportation and infrastructure. One cannot exist without the other. We appreciate the Committee looking into this and taking this issue seriously.

PETER D. KRUEGER (Nevada Petroleum Marketers and Convenience Store Association):

These are the men and women who collect the taxes every day. They are on the front lines collecting fuel taxes. It has been 26 years, and I am looking at probably only 2 individuals who were here on this panel in 1991, the last time

we raised the State gasoline tax. It was 2.5 cents and increased another 2.5 cents over a 2-year period. Therefore, it is time. This is why we are here supporting S.B. 207 and believe that 26 years is excessively long to address this important issue. Our two populous counties went out on their own and became successful with the voter-approved indexing. It is about time and we support your efforts.

MS. FISHER:

I represent four separate clients that have asked to be put on the record in support of this bill. We think S.B. 207 is long overdue and thank you for your leadership in bringing this forward. These clients are the Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association, Nevada State Apartment Association, Nevada Housing Alliance and Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority. They all stand with you on this bill.

MR. MADOLE:

We have long advocated for such a Committee, we are grateful this bill was submitted and supportive of it. We encourage you to endorse it.

MR. SKLAMBERG:

Sunrise Hospital is in full support of S.B. 207 and looking for alternative means of improving access to health care and mobility for all of our residents.

FRAN ALMARAZ (Nevada Alliance for Retired Americans):

I too served on TRAC for seniors. Transportation for seniors is so important. Many of them lose their driving privileges. In our city, and for the ones who live in the outlying areas, it is difficult for them to get around. I was honored to serve on that committee. I would also like to thank you for hearing this bill. I respectfully ask that you pass this important legislation.

MR. MORADKHAN:

The Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce offers its support for S.B. 207 and believes it is important for an Interim Committee on Transportation to exist during the Legislative Interim. I also would like to indicate support from the Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce. They are not here today but asked us to have them put on the record as expressing their support for this bill.

MR. MCANALLEN:

We are also here in support of this bill. The only comment I have is section 5, subsection 1, paragraph (e) is extremely timely. This deals with working with the Congressional Delegation to find long-term solutions to transportation problems. I suggest that is one of the key elements this Committee should look at.

CHAIR MANENDO:

We do have a letter from the Henderson Chamber of Commerce in support of S.B. 207 ([Exhibit F](#)). We have a letter from Congressman Mark E. Amodei, Nevada Second Congressional District, who is a former member of this body in support of S.B. 207 ([Exhibit G](#)). It was also good to hear his brief remarks last night.

MR. GIBSON:

A particular area of emphasis I want to put on the record that is going to be a timely subject is the question of operation and maintenance of our road system. We have been fortunate in both Washoe County and Clark County where FRI has now been put in place, but now we need to focus on the question of how are we going to deal with utility bills, light fixtures, snow removal in the north, cleaning of the drains, simple things. When we talk about autonomous vehicles, we tend to forget about the other things. Equally important to us to have a well-maintained road system. That is something we support in this bill as a subject for the Committee to look at, because we need to deal with it.

BOBBI THOMPSON (Nevada Airports Association):

I am representing the Nevada Airports Association, a body of more than 40 publicly owned airports within the rural areas of our State. I have heard several comments this morning that I think apply to airports.

In a previous testimony to this same Committee, I presented information that in 2015, this Legislature provided \$200,000 to the Aviation Trust Fund. That money parlayed into \$25 million in federal grant money. If we are behind and are concerned about a robust economic development and use of funds, I respectfully request this Committee consider an amendment to this piece of legislation to add the Aviation Trust Fund, which is found in NRS 494.048. This allows for funding of the Trust Fund to use as match for federal grants for the State's rural airports. I believe that within section 5 the information could be added and ask your consideration.

RAY BACON (Nevada Manufacturers Association):

I have given you my written comments for inclusion in the record ([Exhibit H](#)) and will summarize it. If you take a look at just the transportation portion, we are only looking at part of our infrastructure issues. My thought process after reading what was proposed in S.B. 149 and also what was done with TRAC was maybe this needs to be done on a State basis to take that broader look at what we are doing on our infrastructure. That would take a look at the energy issues, the water issues, the housing issues, the growth issues in general and communications, as well. I do not know if you want to expand on this bill or take a look somehow, but at some point in time, that statewide effort needs to be done on a statewide basis. I am not sure it can be done with this bill. To the best of my knowledge, we do cost-benefit analyses on most of our transportation issues, we do not do cost benefit analyses on other projects that are going on. I suspect if we took those cost benefit analyses from different infrastructure issues, it might change our priorities. It is a broader issue and is one of those things for you to consider.

CHAIR MANENDO:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 207. There are many things that could potentially be done in asking for this bill draft request. I did communicate with the past Chair of the Committee, Senator Hammond, before asking for this bill introduction to make sure we were on the same page. I do not think we envisioned replacing any committees or are side stepping any committees. This is just an opportunity to expand the good hard work that people are doing at every level in transportation. They could then have a venue to come before the Legislative Interim Committee on Transportation to have a deeper dive into those issues. I know there are public safety advocates that are excited about having an opportunity to have further discussions about the things that matter to them other than just funding, which is obviously important to our State.

Senate Committee on Transportation
March 14, 2017
Page 32

CHAIR MANENDO:

There being no further business to come before the Committee, we are adjourned at 10:14 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Debbie Shope,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Mark A. Manendo, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
S.B. 149	C	26	Scott Scherer / Region Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 149	D	1	Todd Sklamberg / Sunrise Hospital and Medical Center	Testimony
S.B. 149	E	2	John Fudenberg / Clark County	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 207	F	1	Senator Mark A. Manendo	Aviva Gordon, Henderson Chamber of Commerce Position Statement
S.B. 207	G	1	Senator Mark A. Manendo	Mark E. Amodei, Congressman, Letter in Support of Bill
S.B. 207	H	2	Ray Bacon / Nevada Manufacturers Association	Memorandum in Support of Bill