

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Eightieth Session  
April 30, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Yvanna D. Cancela at 1:38 p.m. on Tuesday, April 30, 2019, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E 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 Yvanna D. Cancela, Chair  
Senator Chris Brooks, Vice Chair  
Senator Marcia Washington  
Senator Joseph P. Hardy  
Senator James A. Settlemeyer  
Senator Scott Hammond

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Senator Moises Denis (Excused)  
Senator Pat Spearman (Excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Shea Backus, Assembly District No. 37  
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Assembly District No. 14  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Assembly District No. 29  
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez, Assembly District No. 12  
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen, Assembly District No. 10  
Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst  
Darcy Johnson, Committee Counsel  
Debbie Shope, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Patrick J. Conmay, Chief, Investigation Division, Department of Public Safety  
Ryan Miller, Deputy Chief, Investigations Division, Department of Public Safety  
Eric Spratley, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association  
Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union Nevada  
Janine Hansen, Nevada Families for Freedom  
Juanita Cox, Citizens in Action  
Bob Russo  
Joannah Schumacher  
Kendra Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office  
Jim Hoffman, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice  
Brian Rothery, Enterprise Holdings  
Matt Walker, Enterprise Holdings  
Jude Hurin, CPM, Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division, Department of Motor Vehicles  
Jason Doering, International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers  
Matthew Parker, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen  
Thomas D. Dunn, District Vice President, Professional Firefighters of Nevada  
Mark Roberts, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen  
Jeffrey Proffitt, Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation  
Tyson Kindred  
Alfonso Lopez, Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation  
Nathan Copas  
Vasilios Suarez  
Justin Barnes  
Gaby Treleani  
Rebecca Roberts  
Rusty McAllister, Nevada State American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations  
Joseph Guild, III, Union Pacific Railroad  
Nathan Anderson, Union Pacific Railroad  
Richard Perkins, Union Pacific Railroad  
Paul Moradkhan, Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce  
Bryan Wachter, Retail Association of Nevada  
Mark Fiorentino, Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway  
Miranda Hoover, Northern Nevada Development Authority  
Amber Stidham, Henderson Chamber of Commerce

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure  
April 30, 2019  
Page 3

Tennille Pereira, Director, Vegas Strong Resiliency Center; Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Inc.  
Robert L. Gipson, II, Vegas Strong Resiliency Center; Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Inc.  
Marty Elzy, BM, CPM, Management Analyst, Central Services and Records Division, Department of Motor Vehicles  
Craig Stevens, Cox Communications  
Lynn Chapman, Independent American Party  
Kelly Crompton, City of Las Vegas  
James W. Puzey, Hertz Global  
Joe Casey

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 45.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 45 (1st Reprint)**: Creates the Nevada Threat Analysis Center and the Nevada Threat Analysis Center Advisory Committee in the Investigation Division of the Department of Public Safety. (BDR 43-348)

PATRICK J. CONMAY (Chief, Investigation Division, Department of Public Safety):  
I am here today to present A.B. 45. This bill is intended to set forth responsibilities for the Nevada Threat Analysis Center (NTAC) and for the NTAC Advisory Committee.

Briefly, this bill describes the creation of the NTAC. As you will see in our presentation, NTAC already exists today. Ryan Miller will cover the history of why that is so in the presentation.

RYAN MILLER (Deputy Chief, Investigations Division, Department of Public Safety):

It is important to understand the history of fusion centers in order to understand the request of this bill. Fusion centers were created prior to 2008 and are part of a national effort to share threat information, criminal intelligence and hazard information with other federal, state, local and tribal public safety entities. This is in an effort to deter, detect, prevent and/or mitigate terrorism and other criminal activity and public safety hazards.

The fusion centers were essentially created in the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks and in the report from the 9/11 Commission, they looked at the gaps.

When the federal government evaluated some of the gaps, they determined there was a lot of different information from different entities, federal and state agencies, that was not being shared.

The federal government is not necessarily stating it would have changed anything with the 9/11 terrorist attacks. It was determined it could have made an impact if everyone had been sharing their threat information with what they knew about some of those individuals.

As this was looked into, they recognized that not only did the federal partners have a lot of information, but a lot of state agencies and travel entities could have information as well. What was born out of this was the idea of the fusion center and it was an effort to fulfill a significant security gap. The rule for the fusion center was to basically be a conduit of state, local and tribal information with the federal government and vice versa.

When we talk about NTAC, it is important to understand it has existed since 2008. It was established by then Governor Jim Gibbons. It was initially housed within the Nevada Commission on Homeland Security, and funded by General Funds and Homeland Security grant funds.

In the same year, it was determined the duties of NTAC required a law enforcement function. The Department of Public Safety (DPS), Investigation Division already had several of those functions within some of their operations. The Governor basically moved the management of NTAC over to the DPS Investigation Division where it continues to reside to this day.

In 2015, Governor Brian Sandoval issued an executive order which established an advisory board. Their function is to basically do just that; to advise us on some of those threat sharing information activities.

It is important to understand that the NTAC is 1 of 79 federally recognized fusion centers in the United States. There are two in Nevada. There is a NTAC in the North, and the Southern Nevada Counter Terrorism Center which is in Las Vegas, Nevada. It is also important to note the Washoe County Sheriff's Office operates the Northern Nevada Regional Intelligence Center which we work closely with.

When we talk about what A.B. 45 is attempting to achieve, we are talking about enhancing the current statutory authority and identifying primary responsibilities in Nevada law. It would establish the criminal intelligence and other sensitive public safety data collected by us as confidential, the disclosure of which could jeopardize homeland security or public safety.

To give a hypothetical example of what we are talking about, we might get information about vulnerability to a critical piece of infrastructure within the State from the federal government. We need to be able to share the information with the entity in order to help them mitigate vulnerability. We certainly would not want to put that vulnerability out into the public realm by exposing the infrastructure to an attack on their vulnerability. When we talk about keeping that information, we are talking about threat information, vulnerabilities, critical infrastructure information and those types of issues.

In addition, the bill provides some criminal penalties for unauthorized disclosure of confidential information. In Nevada law, it establishes the Nevada Threat Analysis Center Advisory Committee as noted earlier by Chief Conmay. Governor Sandoval processed an executive order, but this bill will put this into law. It additionally allows the Advisory Committee to hold closed meetings when necessary to discuss public safety or Homeland Security threat information. The bill also establishes the material created by the Advisory Committee would be confidential.

Last, it is important to note a couple of things. As was stated earlier, A.B. 45 does not create any new financial responsibilities; it already exists. This just establishes NTAC and the Advisory Committee in law.

When we talk about the Advisory Committee, the intent is not to close all meetings. As a matter of fact, the intent would be to have open meetings unless there is something that needs to be discussed which is sensitive and deals with threat information.

CHIEF CONMAY:

That is the presentation and I tried to present it in a concise fashion. I just want to re-emphasize, there is no intent to have routine, closed Advisory Committee meetings. Those meetings would be noticed as open meetings, they would be held as open meetings and only closed for a specific topic if it met the criteria we tried to outline here.

SENATOR HARDY:

Is there judicial oversight?

CHIEF CONMAY:

That is the intent of establishing the Advisory Committee statutorily. Then the Committee would provide oversight and direction to the NTAC.

ERIC SPRATLEY (Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):

We are here in support of A.B. 45. The NTAC is the fusion center for all of the other counties outside of Clark County in Nevada and a vital partner in keeping the State and our smaller counties safe.

HOLLY WELBORN (Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union Nevada):

I submitted a letter yesterday to the Committee ([Exhibit C](#)) which has a thorough analysis on the basis for our opposition to A.B. 45 and to the expansion of threat analysis centers in multiple jurisdictions. It is a matter of policy and, in some instances, a matter of law. I will touch on a few points.

In order to understand our opposition you heard about the history. At the time threat analysis centers were being developed, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) national was one of the only organizations and entities that really spoke out about the depth and breadth of information being collected through Threat Analysis Centers. We expressed deep privacy concerns; many concerns about the way these Threat Analysis Centers can circumvent transparency laws.

Our major concern is a lot of the information being collected through fusion centers is not used for the purpose of counter terrorism, ever. In many instances, it has been used to spy on activist groups, such as the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe. They were trying to collect information in order to force some kind of criminal prosecution for individuals who were protesting. We have seen information collected being used against groups and organizations such as Black Lives Matter. It is a particular concern to us.

As far as the bill, in the letter, [Exhibit C](#), I went through specific sections which we find problematic. For instance, in section 5, the Nevada Threat Analysis Center, is already in existence. The ACLU is opposed to any kind of expansion to that program. In reality, the intent of this bill is to create closed meetings as was stated on the record, which means an attempt to circumvent those laws.

We do understand there is the interest of public safety. It would be necessary for information to be shared privately among federal agencies and local government, but Nevada case law protects that type of information. They need to go to court through the public records law. The government does have the ability to express their desire to withhold information and that is why it is of utmost importance to public safety.

For these reasons, we oppose A.B. 45.

JANINE HANSEN (Nevada Families for Freedom):

In 2002, I testified against a terrorism definition which took the federal terrorism definition and placed it wholly into Nevada law. Essentially it would make someone like me a terrorist who opposes the government in different political circumstances.

Later on in 2004 when I was petitioning and expressing freedom of speech at the Reno Bus Depot, I was arrested, handcuffed, thrown in a paddy wagon and hauled off to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. I was later defended by the ACLU and the case went all the way to the Nevada Supreme Court. I was exonerated for it. That is the basis of some of my concerns of this bill.

I think we need some civilian oversight. Traditionally in American law, we do not have police without civilian elected oversight. Our sheriff and local police chiefs are elected and the oversight is the people. We always have civilian oversight. Senator Joe Hardy asked about it. There is no one who is elected there, no one who is a civilian. It is all police and law enforcement. Nobody has any responsibility or accountability to the people for oversight for this NTAC.

There are some analyses that have been done about the Federal Bureau of Investigation. One is on Black Lives Matter and another is on pro-choice groups. They are calling them terrorist groups. There is another article which talks about 72 different organizations being called terrorist groups, including those that believe in the right to keep and bear arms, pro-lifers, Evangelical Christians and others.

There should be civilian oversight to protect our privacy as individuals. We do not want to have secret police. Give us somewhere to complain if there is abuse of power. It happens in government.

JUANITA COX (Citizens in Action):

Assembly Bill 45 appears to be like a Star Chamber, where a police state exists in which anyone can be a suspicious person and certainly I can be a suspicious person. They are going to collect data on us, but yet there is no civilian oversight or transparency. There are no checks and balances. We will have no ability to speak except through a police state. It certainly appears to be unconstitutional where we do not have any rights and no open meeting laws, no oversight, anybody can be a suspicious person. Do not pass this bill.

BOB RUSSO:

I oppose this bill. Everything has been said which covers my concerns. I just want to add there is a concern about the lack of oversight when this measure goes into effect. I am concerned about our loss of privacy and potentially the threat to our free speech. We live in a constitutional republic and with those liberties comes a certain amount of risk, as Americans, we have chosen to take on. We all want to be safe, but there is a price to be paid for too much safety. That price is our inherent liberties given to us by God. I ask you to please oppose this bill.

JOANNAH SCHUMACHER:

I am here to oppose this bill. I will say ditto to all those who came before me in opposition. I would like to remind you that those of us who believe in the *Constitution of the United States* and look to the *Constitution of the United States* to protect our rights, are looking to you. We have a contract with you, you swore an oath to defend and uphold the *Constitution of the United States*, as well as the *Constitution of the State of Nevada*. I believe this particular bill would be unconstitutional because it would not protect our right to privacy. I think it is important it be noted, as well as all the previous information.

SENATOR BROOKS:

As far as the makeup of the task force, should we have anyone on the board who is an expert on civil liberties or a legal analyst besides law enforcement and the people outlined in the bill? Was there any thought given to outlining all the members and where they should come from?

CHIEF CONMAY:

We are advised by the Attorney General's Office. Beyond that I do not recall any conversations specifically along those lines. I am not sure whether there would be significant opposition to it. I would have to have some discussions in



Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure  
April 30, 2019  
Page 9

order to answer you more precisely. We are required to follow guidelines concerning civil rights and civil liberties that were established for the fusion centers.

SENATOR BROOKS:

Is there a Deputy Attorney General in all the meetings?

CHIEF CONMAY:

Yes.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 45. We will open the hearing on A.B. 110.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 110 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions relating to minor traffic and related violations. (BDR 43-427)

ASSEMBLYMAN STEVE YEAGER (Assembly District No. 9):

This afternoon I am presenting A.B. 110 in its first reprint. Assembly Bill 110 comes out of an Interim Committee which I chaired this past Legislative Interim. I would like to tell you about the Committee and then discuss the bill.

The Interim Committee to Study the Advisability and Feasibility of Treating Certain Traffic and Related Violations as Civil Infractions was created as a result of the adoption of A.C.R. No. 9 of the 79th Session. That legislation asked for a study of the advisability and feasibility of treating certain minor traffic infractions as civil violations. Many states treat minor traffic infractions as civil rather than criminal offenses. Nevada still treats these infractions as criminal. For example, if you get a speeding ticket or run through a stop sign or stop light, it is a criminal misdemeanor and could carry six months in jail under our State laws.

Our Interim Committee included six members; three from the Assembly and three from the Senate. Four of the members were from Las Vegas and two were from more rural parts of the State. We met five times and ultimately voted to advance four pieces of legislation.

Of those four, one of them seeks to transition to a civil system. That is not this bill today. The other three bills seek to make improvements to our current

system of how we process traffic infractions. Assembly Bill 110 is one of those three bills that tries to make positive changes to our current system.

I would like to take you through the bill in its first reprint and then discuss a few amendments I have in conceptual form ([Exhibit D](#)); just three or four bullet points to make clarifications and I will go through those as we get to the text of the bill.

The first real change is in section 1, subsection 7. This change mandates the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), on request of a court, shall share information with the court about a driver's mailing address and any other contact information the DMV may have so the a court can communicate with the offender.

The problem here is many communications from the courts are returned as undeliverable, particularly in Las Vegas due to the transient nature of the population.

Sometimes the DMV will have a mailing address which is different than what actually appears on the person's driver's license. Of course, that is the address the officer in the field places on the citation. The hope is that more people will be informed about their court dates and we will have fewer people failing to show up in court.

Section 2 of the bill allows a court to set up a system where a person can make a plea by mail, email or over the internet. This section is permissive so no court would be required to set up such a system. It is not a mandate, but this section tries to streamline proceedings on minor traffic infractions. Very few traffic infractions of a minor nature go to trial. Almost all are negotiated in some fashion. Setting up a system like this would allow people to either contest liability or admit liability and provide mitigating circumstances without having to come to court.

There are some exceptions to this section. We added those in the Assembly. For example, if you have a current driving under the influence offense, you would not be able to use this system.

Bullet point one of my proposed amendment gives the court flexibility to mandate an offender come to court. We do not want someone who continues

to get traffic infractions each and every time to process it remotely without having to see a judge. If a person chose to use this option, the person would have to do so before they are to appear in court. By choosing this option, the person would be waiving a right to a trial and waiving the right to confront witnesses.

For its part, the court would need to validate the person using the system is actually the person to whom the ticket was issued and would also need to provide notice that a person is waiving his or her rights by using this system.

Bullet point two of my proposed amendment makes clear that the court would not need to use all of the factors listed in the bill to validate identity. It allows the court to have the discretion to require whatever it needs to feel comfortable that the person using the system online, by email or by mail is actually the person who received the citation.

There is an exhibit I uploaded that states Los Angeles (LA) Superior Court is using a traffic avatar named Gina ([Exhibit E](#)). It is an article which explains how LA County has been using technology like this to be able to help process their tickets. I think this could be a model should any of our courts in Nevada decide to use this system.

Section 3 of the bill suggests a better way to design a traffic citation to try to limit failures to appear in court. There was some research done in New York City and I have submitted the article ([Exhibit F](#)). Basically, it is an article written about the science behind the brain related to citations. It states how best to ensure people cited for traffic infractions actually understand the citation and what must be done to avoid missing court or having a warrant issued. Simply stated, the way the citation looks and what it states impacts how a person reacts to it and how seriously they take it.

Section 4 of the bill allows a law enforcement officer to request an email address or a cell phone number from those who are being cited so the contact information can be conveyed to the court. I want to reiterate; this is optional. The officer is not required to ask for it and the person being cited does not need to provide the information, but it allows the officer to ask for the information.

Collection of the information would allow the court to have the most up-to-date contact information. Think about your dentist right now. If you have an

appointment, they give you a reminder card and you probably will get a postcard in the mail. If you have the dentist I do, you actually get a text message and a phone call as well. You are communicated with in three or four different ways to remind you. We do not do that in court right now. We simply send a postcard. Most are returned undeliverable to the court. But if we were to have a text message or email reminder, I think the appearance rate in court would be much higher.

Bullet point three of my proposed amendment makes clear if someone chose to provide this information, the person is consenting to this communication. The consent in that manner is to avoid any violation of federal law with respect to no contact and cell phone lists.

Section 4, subsection 2, I am striking language which reads "unless the person charged with the violation demands an earlier hearing." It is being removed because no one demands an earlier hearing, and the courts need at least five days to process most of the citations.

Section 5 makes conforming changes to the bill.

Section 6, subsection 3 states a court cannot issue a bench warrant for a parking ticket if the notice of the ticket is undeliverable. It is simply a policy change. We should not be issuing bench warrants and arresting people for parking violations unless we can be sure they actually received notice of the parking ticket from the court. I want to make clear, this is only for cases which start out as parking tickets. If you get a speeding ticket and it gets reduced to a parking ticket, this section would not apply.

The last bullet point of my proposed amendment removes the 50 year sunset on the \$10 court construction assessment which is allowed in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 176.0611. This would make sure the courts can continue to collect the assessment fee to upgrade facilities to make them more user friendly for the public.

CHAIR CANCELA:

I am interested in what LA County is doing. I think shifting to a more digital system is interesting and helpful.

Is the court construction assessment fee limited to just construction work or could that money be used at some point for a digital infrastructure to shift to an online system?

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

I did print the statute and have it in front of me. Generally speaking, the court assessment fee can be used for land acquisition, construction, furnishings and it does allow the assessment fee to be used to acquire advanced technology for use in the additional or renovated facilities. I do think the court construction fee could be used to set up a system, much like they have in LA County.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Have any courts indicated they are interested in shifting to a more digital system?

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

I have had some informal conversations with the Las Vegas Justice Court. Volume-wise they are probably one of the top courts, either them or Las Vegas Municipal Court. They have expressed an interest in doing some kind of online interface to help with the volume of citations they have. I do not want to say what that volume is, but it is easily in the tens of thousands of citations every year.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We did have an interesting and robust discussion in this Committee on a bill which Majority Leader Cannizzaro brought forward related to servicing of traffic tickets. One of the things discussed was how do they know for sure they have to be in court. I think changing to a place which is more visible creates more urgency. It will lead people to know where they have to be.

KENDRA BERTSCHY (Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office):

We want to thank Assemblyman Yeager for bringing this bill forward. As you indicated, one of the reasons why we are here in support is to make sure our clients actually receive the notice. We have discussed in previous hearings about making sure individuals know when they have their court hearings. This provides an additional notice, requirements and allowances.

Something we discussed in this Committee as well was dealing with the bench warrant provision. It is important to understand just how devastating it can be on individuals. Not only on the individuals themselves who may lose their jobs, housing and employment, but also on the taxpayers of our system. If we can find better systems, which is what this bill does, we believe this will benefit our community.

JIM HOFFMAN (Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice):

Ms. Bertschy has said everything we were going to say. Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice agree with her comments and we also support this bill.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Why did the amendment come to our house? Usually I do not see things being amended on this side. What is the reason? Cleaning up the language makes sense because when people contact the courts, it gives the court reason to believe they have the right to contact them using the same information they provided.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

There are four different bills in this area which are all moving to, or in front of, this Committee. Those were all in different committees as well. After we passed this out of the Assembly, we actually had a meeting on Saturday over lunch with some of the local court officials in Las Vegas.

The first three amendments really come from those conversations which had some additional clarification. The fourth one, about the construction of the sunset fee, we are just trying to get that put into each of the four bills in case one of the bills fails. I will say I am 100 percent sure my bullet point 4 is germane to this bill, I asked legal and am waiting for an opinion on it. I will certainly let the Committee know if it is not germane, then I will be pulling proposed amendment bullet point four and hopefully try to get it in one of the other three bills.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 110. We will open the hearing on A.B. 177.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 177 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing short-term lessors of vehicles. (BDR 43-88)

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

It is my honor to present A.B. 177.

Right now, there are over 65,000 rental vehicles in the State. The owners of these rental vehicles are required to manually track down and individually renew the registration for each vehicle in the fleet. You understand as you get your registration renewal decals on an annual basis you have to put the new one on the license plate.

Additionally, the DMV has to individually process each of these 65,000 rental car registrations. This bill allows the DMV to issue a permanent decal for fleet vehicles, which would eliminate the need to individually track down each vehicle in a given fleet. I want to briefly explain why I think this bill is a good idea.

First of all, I think all of our neighboring states are doing this; Nevada is the outlier here. A permanent fleet registration would increase efficiency and decrease the hassle for both the owners of the fleet vehicles and the DMV which processes these applications.

The evidence suggests that such a system would be revenue neutral on registration fees. In the long run the system efficiency would lower administration costs for the DMV.

BRIAN ROTHERY (Enterprise Holdings):

Assemblyman Yeager did a great job of outlining the need for the bill and the value we see from the bill.

I would like to walk through each section to explain what the bill does.

Section 1, subsection 1 requires the DMV to establish a registration system which would allow fleet owners to register their vehicles as fleet vehicles.

Section 1, subsection 2 gives DMV the authority to issue a permanent registration for fleet vehicles.

Section 1, subsection 3 states the decal issued does not need to be replaced as long as the fleet owner annually renews the vehicle registration.

Section 1, subsection 4 requires the DMV to notify the fleet owner at least 30 days before renewal payment is due.

Section 1, subsection 5, paragraphs (a) and (b) require fleet owners to pay annual renewal fees and to notify the DMV when they remove a vehicle from their fleet.

Section 1, subsection 6 excludes vehicles having a declared gross weight in excess of 26,000 pounds from the fleet registration program.

As Assemblyman Yeager indicated, virtually all neighboring states have already implemented a permanent fleet registration program. Assembly Bill 177 would increase the efficiency of the fleet registration process saving money for both fleet owners, such as Enterprise Holdings and DMV without affecting collected registration revenue.

We see this as a benefit to the efficiency of our operation and as an opportunity to ensure none of our customers have unintended contact with law enforcement. This would be due to an administrative mistake by a rental company not properly switching out the decal. As hard as we try to make sure every vehicle gets the proper renewal decal before it is rented, there are times when the decal does not appropriately make its way to the vehicle.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I rented an Enterprise rental car a while ago and saw a "Perm" decal on the vehicle and tried to determine what "Perm" meant. When I uncovered what it meant, I decided to introduce a bill which would allow everyone to have this benefit.

The legislation I was trying to put forth was modeled after Arizona, which indicated as long as you had two vehicles, you had the right to register all of them at once. My desire with the bill was to take away the line at the DMV. Now you can go once and you can get all your vehicles registered on one date, which is what I assume you are doing as a fleet. What is the definition of fleet and how many vehicles do you have to have in order to take advantage of this?

MATT WALKER (Enterprise Holdings):

We did get an identical fiscal note. This allows for the design of the decal and the threshold for what is considered a fleet to adopt in regulation in the future.



We want DMV to get the program up and running. They could potentially reduce that number if they found it had limited fiscal impact and a benefit to do so. I believe the initial number for a fleet is set at 200. In future years, they would be able to reduce or increase the number should they deem it necessary.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

That is not within the legislation. It is within *Nevada Administrative Code* where the determination would occur, correct?

MR. WALKER:

Correct. We want to allow them flexibility; allow law enforcement and other stakeholders to have discussions when it came to the decal, the design and the threshold for who should be eligible for that decal. We wanted to be able to have further conversations and flexibility.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

The life of the decal will be eight years, since our State has dictated vehicles have to receive a new license plate style every eight years.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER:

I want to make it clear for the record, one of the potential concerns is the smog check which is required for Las Vegas and Washoe County, and this did not come up yet. Typically rental cars are not kept as rental cars beyond a two year period. With the current exemption in law we would not be implementing any smog checks with this legislation.

This could be a good stepping stone to amplifying that in the future. I know for convenience it would be wonderful to have a permanent decal. I have a way of losing mine as well, every time I receive it.

SENATOR HARDY:

How is anyone going to see the decal through the cover over the license plates on those Enterprise cars?

MR. ROTHERY:

It was important to us to make sure the vehicle is distinguishable to law enforcement and the decal is valid, but at the same time not drawing attention to the existence of the rental car. We feel the anonymity or safety of the customer is important. I am not sure it it addresses your question or not.

JUDE HURIN (CPM, Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division, Department of Motor Vehicles):

The DMV is in a neutral stance on this bill. We look forward to implementing this and going further in the future.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 177. We will open the hearing on A.B. 337.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 337 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing railroads.  
(BDR 58-957)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SUSIE MARTINEZ (Assembly District No. 12):

I am pleased to present A.B. 337 for your consideration. Assembly Bill 337 is a public safety measure related to railroads. The bill specifies crew requirements for certain railroads transporting freight in Nevada and provides civil penalties for certain violations. The bill also requires vehicles to stop at railroad way crossings for on-track equipment and repeals outdated provisions relating to employment protections for certain railroad employees.

Right now there are five states, Arizona, California, Colorado, West Virginia and Wisconsin that have passed legislation requiring two-person crews on certain railroads transporting freight. Colorado was the most recent state to enact such legislation. Colorado Governor Jerad Polis signed the bill last month.

This year, Nevada is one of more than a dozen states considering legislation that would require two-person crews on these trains. Assembly Bill 337 is necessary for the safety of our rail works and the members of our public. Recent accidents in other countries offer support for this bill. In November 2018, a runaway ore train in Western Australia reached speeds of 62 miles per hour before being forcibly derailed. The train only had one crew member who left the train to inspect an issue with the brakes. Thankfully, no one was injured in that crash.

In September 2018, a driverless train in Tasmania, Australia was derailed after the train became unresponsive to remote control commands, including an emergency feature designed to make the train stop. Two pedestrians were injured due to flying debris in the accident. One of the worst accidents happened in 2013, when the brakes disengaged on an oil train in Quebec, Canada. The train was operating with a single person crew when it derailed and

caused a fire which killed 47 people and destroyed the center of the town of Lac-Mégantic, Quebec.

I want to re-emphasize this is a matter of public safety, not only for railroad workers, but also for our communities. This is where A.B. 337 comes in.

I would like to provide a brief section by section overview of what the bill does.

Section 1, subsection 1 requires any Class I freight railroad, Class I railroad or Class II railroad for transporting freight which operates a train or locomotive in Nevada, and any officer of such a railroad to ensure the train or locomotive contains a crew of not less than two persons. The bill provides that the requirement does not apply to a train or locomotive engaged in helper or hostling services.

Section 2 provides any railroad or officer of a railroad who violates these provisions, is liable to the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN). Subsections 1 through 3 specify civil penalties of \$5,000 for a first violation, \$10,000 for a second and \$25,000 for a third and any subsequent violation within 3 years of the first violation.

Section 6 repeals NRS 705.390, outdated provisions concerning employment protections for certain railroad employees.

I will turn this over to Jason Doering from the International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers who will be able to answer any technical questions about the bill.

JASON DOERING (International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers):

I am representing the International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers and will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).

I would also like to highlight section 3 of A.B. 337 on behalf of Charlie Hogue with the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees of the Teamsters Rail Conference. Maintenance of Way on-track equipment, railroad contractor's on-track equipment and other railroad on-track equipment are not included in the State statutes mandate of motorist responsibilities when approaching a crossing. This issue is the on-track maintenance equipment that has been

developed into train-like machines, which present the same dangers as a train engine or a train engine that is pulling cars not being able to stop within a reasonable distance.

It is imperative that if a motorist sees the approach of an on-track piece of equipment, they stop a safe distance from the grade crossing until it is safe to proceed exactly as they would for a locomotive or a locomotive coupled to and pulling railroad cars. Most of the public understands that trains occupy the tracks in their respective neighborhoods, and to avoid them at all costs. Not everyone is aware of the on-track maintenance and construction machines which travel by on-track infrastructure in Nevada and around the Country.

Similar legislation is already passed in 22 states and currently there is active legislation in several other states. The crossing safety piece of this legislation is supported by rail labor, the railroads themselves and railroad contractors. Amending and updating the State statute will improve public safety to clarify that there are other types of equipment traveling on railroad tracks and present the same dangers to motorists and trains.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

There have been versions of this bill over the last few years. I believe this is the sixth time this bill has tried to go through. From the veto message and discussion, it impedes negotiations between labor and management. Two-person crews are currently the norm in Nevada. I do not think we have any single member crews.

How were the numbers obtained for the fine structures of \$5,000, \$10,000 and \$25,000?

MR. DOERING:

After speaking to the PUCN, we determined the civil penalties were not excessive. They are the agency the carrier would be liable to if they were to violate the law.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

But where do they come from, are they borrowed from another state, and where were they established?

MR. DOERING:

We have copied other state legislation introduced throughout the Country.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

With that evite what states have that fine structure so I can take a look?

MR. DOERING:

No states have the current fine structure we are introducing. Nevada has increased the fines. We copied it from the original bill from the 2017 Session.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

In section 2, why did the penalty go up so much from the \$500 to \$5,000, then to \$10,000 and then to \$25,000?

MR. DOERING:

After discussions with the PUCN about the proposed fines and speaking to others in leadership, we determined we did not want this to become the cost of doing business for the carriers if they were to violate this law. For a carrier who earned \$1.9 million in the first quarter, a \$500 fine would basically just be the cost of doing business.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARTINEZ:

It was an amendment the Assembly did when we were working on the bill at the beginning.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Can you talk about enforcement and how we would make sure the law is complied with?

MR. DOERING:

Matt Parker, who is also here representing the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen (BLET), may be able to answer that better but it would be enforced by the PUCN. They currently have inspectors who are out along with the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) inspectors we have in the State. But truly for the men and women who work on the railroad, we are the eyes and ears for these inspectors as well. If a violation were to occur, it would be sent to the legislative department within Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation workers and BLET and then it is sent to Mr. Parker and myself who work on the railroad as well. We then turn the violation in to the PUCN.

MATTHEW PARKER (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen):  
I submitted written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)) regarding the risks borne by the public related to the issue of freight train crew size. I ask that you take time to review my testimony and I will be brief.

The railroad companies opposing crew size legislation have been telling you their railroads are safer than ever. It is my co-workers and I, who through our team work and professionalism, have achieved that record. Our knowledge and experience make us the subject matter experts on the safe operation of trains in Nevada.

We are here today to warn that if the railroads are allowed to proceed and force future crew size reductions, unnecessary deaths, injuries and/or property damage will result. Perhaps it will be a burning house in Carlin, Nevada located on the opposite side of the tracks from the fire station, while my train has broken down and is blocking every crossing in town. These days trains are twice as long as the average train length seen at the beginning of my career. The employee who could fix the problem to get us moving again is no longer on the train. That person could at least separate the train at one of those crossings, clearing a path for emergency responders.

Perhaps it is because we failed to mitigate a post-derailment fire near Lockwood, Nevada or Las Vegas, Nevada by moving additional cars of flammable material away from the scene. This was not done in high hazard flammable train accidents in Casselton, North Dakota and Graettinger, Iowa, because the employee who needed to facilitate that move is no longer on the train.

Perhaps it will be the employee who could summon a prompt response is no longer on the train if I am suddenly stricken by a heart attack or stroke while operating a train across the Black Rock Desert. Therefore, I am left to die awaiting the arrival of an employee dispatched to drive out to where my train is stopped to determine why radio calls have gone unanswered.

Must we face catastrophe before we take this risk seriously? I hope we in Nevada can be better than that. I hope as my colleague said we can agree that safe enough is not enough. We should expect train operations in our State to be as safe as possible. To be as safe as possible means both implementing new

safety technology and ensuring freight trains in this State continue to be operated by crews of at least two professionals by passing A.B. 337.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SHEA BACKUS (Assembly District No. 37):

I am here in my personal capacity. I did submit written testimony ([Exhibit I](#)). I am married to a pilot of a cargo airline. By analogy this bill struck home. The key point is a minimum crew size should not be reduced to collective bargaining. Safety should be taken seriously. When we look at the impact on our cities within Nevada, and any potential harm that could come to those cities by an accident, we can impose legislation which would be legal in our State. Therefore, I am in support of A.B. 337 and ask this Committee to support it as well.

THOMAS D. DUNN (District Vice President, Professional Firefighters of Nevada):

We are here today in support of A.B. 337. I testified last Session on a similar bill in support as well. Our agencies and the people who work for the agencies we represent have numerous calls for the railroads on a yearly basis.

Just recently in northern Nevada just outside of Verdi, we had a person who was attempting to commit suicide by train. He parked his recreational vehicle which was full of five gallon propane bottles on the railroad tracks. It was knocked off the side of the road. There was a time lag of trying to get definitive care to the person, as well as creating an issue with the crossing which had been impacted by a vehicle crash.

We have had numerous wildland fires in Washoe County all the way through the Truckee River Canyon. It was sparked by a train wheel and we had three miles plus of spot fires all along the railroad that the train engineer was unaware his train was creating. We received numerous phone calls. We had 30 to 50 firefighters on the ground trying to put out 3 to 10 miles of fire along a railroad.

Technology fails. One of the things we discuss in the fire department, as well as with our United States Fire Administration Incident Management Teams, is do not rely on technology. Always have a paper map and a compass with you. You cannot rely on your iPad or iPhone to work out in the middle of nowhere if you do not have a cell signal or you do not have reliable service.

The same thing applies to railroads. There has been this discussion for a period of years when positive train controls (PTC) are going to be implemented. My testimony from last Session was to recommend everyone watch a Nova program on the Lac-Mégantic, Quebec accident. There was a long discussion about PTC and how it has been put off again until after 2019. One of the issues we have today, and is still continuing, is the fact that there is no PTC on the majority of the tracks.

The military has a saying; two is one, one is none. They do not go into combat with one flashlight; they do not go into combat with one radio; they do not go into combat with one helicopter. As Mr. Parker stated before, if there is a medical emergency with personnel on these trains, at what point is the train going to be safely stopped? At what point is that person going to get definitive care, if there is only one person on the train and that person is incapacitated?

MARK ROBERTS (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen):

I am here today to show support for A.B. 337. My father is also a track inspector so this makes me understand better than others here some of the things brought up so far with the fines being an issue with certain representatives. What amount is needed to keep our public safe? When a train derails because a second crew member was not on board, we are going to be asking a lot of different questions.

In the last six months, I personally have been on four trains which had incidents involving at least six people. Three of them were walking near the track; the other was a truck filled with who knows how many people. The second crew member has been the difference in stopping those trains. This is 100 percent a public safety issue. It is not a funding issue; it is not a collective bargaining issue. Please pass A.B. 337.

JEFFREY PROFFITT (Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation):

We are in favor of this bill. One thing I would like to address is with the collective bargaining comment. Collective bargaining ensures the safety of the employee. It is the Legislator's job to ensure the safety of their constituents. Please vote yes on this bill.

TYSON KINDRED:

I agree with everything that has been said. I am in support of A.B. 337.



Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure  
April 30, 2019  
Page 25

ALFONSO LOPEZ (Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation):  
I am also in support of A.B. 337.

Ms. COX:

I am testifying for this bill and realized how many times I cross over the railroad tracks. I know how many fires were started in the Truckee River Canyon by these trains. I was stunned to learn there was only one person on these freight trains; there should be at least two.

Looking over the bill, I think the fine is ridiculously small and not a threat to make anyone comply. Hiring a second person would be more expensive. I ran across this type of situation when I was fighting other environmental impacts. It was cheaper for them to pay a small amount of a fine. One is not a crew and at least two would be considered a crew. Please support A.B. 337.

NATHAN COPAS:

I am in support of A.B. 337 for all the reasons that have been previously stated.

VASILIOS SUAREZ:

I am also in support of A.B. 337.

JUSTIN BARNES:

I am in support of A.B. 337.

GABY TRELEANI:

I am also here to support A.B. 337.

REBECCA ROBERTS:

I am married to a locomotive engineer with Union Pacific Railroad and I am also in favor of A.B. 337.

RUSTY McALLISTER (Nevada State American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations):

Ditto. We are also in support of this legislation after having spent the majority of my working life to fight wildland fires for years and I also worked in the city fire department. I have seen numerous fires started by trains and gone through training for the possibility of a train derailment within the city limits. For those reasons, it is imperative we pass this bill.

JOSEPH GUILD, III (Union Pacific Railroad):

We are in opposition to A.B. 337. I have represented Union Pacific Railroad for 37 years. In those 37 years I have never heard anything from the railroad I represent that compromises the Union Pacific Railroad commitment to safety. That is the safety of the public interacting with the railroad; safety of its customers utilizing rail services and mostly the safety of the employees of Union Pacific Railroad.

Indeed, as crew sizes have been reduced through the repeal of full crew laws and by collectively bargained agreements, safety has greatly improved.

Uploaded on NELIS is a chart ([Exhibit J](#)). This chart was published by the FRA's Office of Safety Analysis published in 2015. What it shows is the transition from five crew members to four from the early 1950s to 1985, at the same time steam locomotives were being replaced by diesel locomotives and thus the necessity of not having a fireman on the locomotives. Then came a transition to a three-person crew in the 1990s where electronic end-of-train devices were replacing cabooses on trains. Then, finally in the 2000s, because of safety improvements and technology, it transitioned to two-person crews.

In that period of time, the incidents of rail accidents have had a 1,136 percent decrease at the same time the crew sizes were being decreased. I would submit that this proves there is no credence to the proponent's argument this bill is all about safe rail operations. Countries around the world and Amtrak, here in the United States, operate trains with one crew member in the cab.

Some freight rail operations in this Country are currently being conducted by collective bargaining agreements with one crew member in the cab. It is in limited situations, but the point is the agreements have governed this situation.

In conclusion, as to collective bargaining agreements, no rail operations can be conducted which violate a bi-partisan bargained agreement. On one side or the other, rail labor or management cannot unilaterally change that agreement. In the future, any rail operations that would result in one person in the diesel locomotive cab, can only be conducted pursuant to an agreement which is bargained for in good faith by both sides. In fact, there is an ironic point I would like to make. Collective bargaining is the essence of the labor union movement which has been so successful in this Country, and in my opinion, A.B. 337 will undermine the basic precept of labor law if it is passed.

NATHAN ANDERSON (Union Pacific Railroad):

I wish the proponents of this bill had annotated their slide show so we could identify each of the incidents that were displayed and we could discuss the crew size was not a factor in any of them. I have firsthand knowledge that one of the pictures was a controlled burn of liquid propane, which was the safest way to address the situation after cars have become disabled or found structurally unsound following a derailment, which again was not caused by crew size.

I have a 191-page report from the Transportation Safety Board of Canada ([Exhibit K](#)). Eighteen contributing factors to the Lac-Mégantic, Quebec fire are addressed. None is a function of crew size. The one-page summary report is available to you to review ([Exhibit L](#)).

When what cannot be secured through collective bargaining pursues a legislative track, we lose the good faith opportunity to continue negotiating. It is a fact of how the world works. In this particular case, passing this bill will reverse an existing agreement between labor and management and cause us to change operations we have invested in Nevada.

Those agreements allow us in certain cases to run remote control locomotives with one crew member. In fact, if this legislation does become law, Union Pacific Railroad will no longer have a need to keep high-tech remote control locomotives in Nevada. Thus, the potential is to no longer need to keep the personnel who maintain the radios, repeaters, track transponders and electrical control systems in Nevada either. Not to mention management personnel who ensure federal railroad association compliance with the requirements necessary to operate this technology. If this bill passes, highly paid, highly skilled Nevada jobs could be taken elsewhere.

Proponents of the bill have cited small, non-union railroads do not have protection because they do not collectively bargain. However, those railroads are not included in this bill.

Proponents have also suggested it would be impossible for a single crew member in the cab of a two to three mile long train to know what is happening on the back of the train. The answer is technology. This bill does not address that issue when both crew members are in the cab.

The facts are that the North American rail system provides the safest, greenest, most economical transportation of goods in the world. Of course, we have to compete in the marketplace as well. This bill will stifle rail technology innovation. It will make rail less competitive while Nevada simultaneously pursues and supports innovation in other freight systems, including autonomous vehicles and platooning of autonomous trucks. This bill is bad policy with bad ramifications for Nevada and we encourage you to vote against it.

RICHARD PERKINS (Union Pacific Railroad):

It was said earlier public safety is important. Public safety is not just important, it is paramount. I have spent a career in law enforcement, including in this building keeping my community safe. Public safety is increased in the rail industry because of technology.

I want to focus on the technology we have collectively worked on here in Nevada, which established the Nevada Institute for Autonomous Systems. We continue to pursue driverless vehicles, drones and many other technological advances. If adopted, A.B. 337 will negatively impact the advancement of railroad technology. It will simply go other places.

CHAIR CANCELA:

It is frustrating to me when people claim if this bill passes, high paying, highly skilled Nevada jobs will be taken elsewhere. That is a claim with no real explanation. I need you to clarify why that would be the case because of the passage of the bill.

MR. ANDERSON:

It is a reality of competing in a marketplace. When a rule comes into effect which states you can no longer use a specific technology, we have no use for that technology, or for the people who would maintain or use that technology. We would not keep those jobs where the technology is no longer allowed to be used.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Is it because of the on-track equipment part of the bill or because of the portion of the bill which would allow for a two-person crew?

MR. ANDERSON:

We are in full support of the on-track equipment portion of this bill; we have stated that for the record.

It is specifically the two crew member's portion of the bill. Let me be very specific; we operate remote control locomotives in Sparks, Nevada and we have operated them in other places in Nevada. It is done under a collective bargaining agreement which allows us to have one operator moving the locomotive, as opposed to two who are in all of our other agreements. It is a unique situation.

If this bill passes, we will no longer be able to work under that agreement. State law would supersede our agreement. We would no longer be able to use those locomotives in that capacity. There would no longer be a need to have that asset here. There would no longer be a need to have personnel who maintain equipment or support the equipment here in Nevada.

CHAIR CANCELA:

I am obviously not in the train industry, so I do not know your business model. It seems to me there is a use for the technology today. The bill would add one-person to the crew of the locomotive. How would it eliminate the reason for having the locomotive in place today if it has an operation which is functional and necessary to your business?

MR. ANDERSON:

We have about 8,000 locomotives in our fleet; some are idled, some are moving. Each locomotive is somewhat different, not every one, but we have different classes of locomotives. We would take those locomotives which could be used still in a remote control service to other areas where it is still a viable business operation.

CHAIR CANCELA:

I still need clarity around that. The other issue which was not addressed, but brought forward by the proponents of the bill, is what happens if the person in a one person crew has a medical emergency? What kind of protocols are in place for this type of situation? It seems to me it is real, possible and could be catastrophic.

MR. ANDERSON:

There are a couple of ways to address it. First of all, we have not brought up one-person crews in our negotiations; it is forward-looking. We would not bring it up unless there is available and proven technology which allows us to address all of those questions before trying to move it through the collective bargaining process.

Today, we do have two people in the crew except for those remote control locomotives. Where we are right now, I will need to answer hypothetically. There is emerging technology; PTC has been brought up and PTC has been installed on all Nevada rail where it is required. That means it is going from east to west along the northern Nevada border near Idaho, as well as through the Las Vegas Valley between California and moves into the Salt Lake Valley.

There are a number of call and response type technologies which are already implemented: hitting buttons, answering bells, moving dials which keep the locomotive functioning under the PTC. A lack of response will shut the locomotive down. I worry about discussing hypotheticals for technology which does not exist yet.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

I am confused and do not understand what it would hurt to have two individuals on a train. I know humans make errors and I know machines make errors. I would prefer a human next to me rather than a machine. I know everything is computerized and technology is really going forth, but I really cannot see myself getting on a train with one person operating the front and one operating the back. You stated this was for freight trains, where there is one in the front and one in the back, not passenger trains, correct?

MR. ANDERSON:

To clarify, in a freight operation, two crew members are in the front or the cab of the train. There is no person in the back of the train. In passenger trains, there is one person in the cab. Union Pacific Railroad does not run passenger trains. Those are run by Amtrak. I would defer to them for more specifics on crew practices.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

You explained that in the freight trains, it is different compared to passenger trains and you cannot address passenger trains. I would feel more comfortable

with two people in the cab of a freight train, because it is safer if an error was to happen, or if one of the individuals was to get sick. How would the computerized machine know what to do?

MR. ANDERSON:

A couple of issues, from a technology standpoint today, we are not proposing a single person crew. We have two people in the crew in our freight trains which go through the State.

I guess the question is for the members of the Committee and those considering the bill, what other modes of transportation are you also considering adding people or requiring a minimum number of people? It is a germane question to this Committee, and saying are you going to require two people in an Uber or two people in every vehicle, two people in every truck, bus or taxi that moves through the State. Because that is what you are saying to me is "do not invest in technology; continue to operate as you are and we are going to make it statutory with substantial fines."

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

First of all, Uber is not transporting chemicals across the Country. That is the big difference between a freight train and Uber. I was a fire inspector and I know these trains are carrying things which could be detrimental to a whole community if an accident happens. I cannot see requiring Uber to have two people in the vehicle. Sometimes truck drivers do have other people in the truck with them. But there is a big difference between freight and what an everyday taxi or regular driver in a vehicle is carrying.

PAUL MORADKHAN (Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce):

The Chamber opposed this bill on the Assembly side. We have had concerns with this bill on the policy side, but more specifically on the fines. In the first version of the bill, it was no less than \$1,000 and up to \$5,000. As you see in the reprinted version, the new fine structure is \$5,000, \$10,000 and \$25,000. The Chamber has significant concerns with this.

When looking at the Nevada Labor Commission from the employers side, typically fines are up to \$5,000. Obviously, this is within the PUCN so it is a little different. We are concerned about the precedence it would set on the fine side of the bill structure.

BRYAN WACHTER (Retail Association of Nevada):

We too are opposed to this bill. There is a larger conversation which needs to take place about this bill and several others that the Legislature is considering. It deals with the fear of automation and the potential loss to the labor market, if and when Nevada actually starts moving into an automated new environment. I think it is something deserving a longer conversation.

I do want to echo the comments of Mr. Moradkhan. We believe these fines are pretty inconsistent with labor fines we see throughout the State. We think the fines speak more toward the desire to punish, as opposed to a desire to correct behavior we have not actually seen. We would consider lower fines. We thought we had the conversation with several members of the Assembly including the bill sponsor on an amendment, but that turned out not to be the case. It is what puts us in opposition.

MARK FIORENTINO (Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway):

Our clients' concerns are consistent with what you heard from Union Pacific Railroad. We are in opposition to this bill.

MIRANDA HOOVER (Northern Nevada Development Authority):

A couple of our points, the Northern Nevada Development Authority and Nevada Department of Transportation know of no incidents involving on-track equipment. Railroads maintain lower employee injury rates than most major industries including trucking, airlines, mining and manufacturing. The Northern Nevada Development Authority is in opposition to A.B. 337 and hope the Committee opposes this bill.

AMBER STIDHAM (Henderson Chamber of Commerce):

I just want to echo the comments of our colleagues over at Metro Chamber of Commerce and the Retail Association of Nevada. We also share the same concerns about the increase of fines.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MARTINEZ:

This bill may sound very familiar to some of you. A very similar piece of legislation was passed during the 2017 Legislative Session, but was vetoed by the Governor. I believe A.B. 337 is an important public safety measure, not only for railroad workers, but for the general public as well. Safety of our railroad workers and communities is non-negotiable. We have seen too many examples of tragedies in the railroad industry. Having a two-person crew not only helps



prevent potential accidents and derailments, it also strengthens the safety and security for the railroad workers and our communities. I appreciate the Committee's consideration of the bill and urge the Committee to support A.B. 337.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 337. We will open the hearing on A.B. 333.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 333 (1st Reprint)**: Provides for the issuance of "Vegas Strong" specialty license plates. (BDR 43-273)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLEY E. COHEN (Assembly District No. 29):

I am not going to make the presentation. Assemblywoman Nguyen stepped in for me when I had many bills to be worked on. She did the majority of the leg work which I really appreciate, and I will let her move forward with presenting the bill.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ROCHELLE T. NGUYEN (Assembly District No. 10):

I am here to present A.B. 333 which is a license plate bill. With this bill we presented, there were some changes made to the bill and I will work off the amendment.

We did change it from 1 October to Vegas Strong and were able to do so after getting licensing permission to use the logo, which is on NELIS ([Exhibit M](#)), as a potential for the license plate, but also the name Vegas Strong. I do have with me in Las Vegas, Tennille Pereira, the Director of the Vegas Strong Resiliency Center, as well as Robert Gipson, a victim advocate with the Center. They can answer any questions. It is our intent with this bill for any proceeds which come from the license plate fees go to the Vegas Strong Resiliency Center.

TENNILLE PEREIRA (Director, Vegas Strong Resiliency Center; Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Inc.):

We are honored to provide victim-centered services and we work with the survivors of the Route 91 Harvest Festival on a daily basis. We would like to thank the sponsors, cosponsors and all supporters of A.B. 333 for recognizing the needs of those impacted by the Route 91 Harvest Festival.

Each day we work to provide services which support survivors as they navigate their own healing process and attempt to find a new normal. As part of that, the

most frequent request we get at the Center is for financial assistance. Unfortunately, we do not have the ability to provide financial assistance. What we do is provide victim services, connect them to the services they need, and navigate the system and various legal services.

One example, recently we had a family in California and both parents were at the Route 91 Harvest Festival. They have four children and both parents work. The father was severely injured at the Festival and he is no longer able to work. They lost that income. The mother is now the full-time caretaker of the father. She is working sporadically, but she still has a full household to support and four children to raise.

They lived off of their savings, and did the best they could. Family and friends helped out. Unfortunately, they never heard about the National Compassion Fund for Las Vegas. They never received any of that money despite the serious injuries they sustained. When we did hear from them, it was because their power was being shut off that day and they were looking for some financial assistance to keep their power on.

We did not have any money to help them keep their power on. What we did do is navigate the system for them, get them all the benefits they did qualify for, but unfortunately we did not have the means to provide them financial assistance. This is a common scenario we see consistently; small holes which need to be plugged to keep them afloat while they deal with the trauma and heal to find again their new normal.

This proposal would make it possible to plug some of those financial holes to help them through the process.

ROBERT L. GIPSON, II (Vegas Strong Resiliency Center; Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Inc.):

I want to echo the sentiments of Ms. Pereira. If you would refer to my written testimony ([Exhibit N](#)) it definitely captures a lot of the work we do at the Vegas Strong Resiliency Center. What we do see is a number of the survivors struggling to not only cope with their trauma, but also to keep themselves afloat financially. Often this is not discussed when we talk about mass violence in these tragedies that visit our public so often now. As a best practice, I do think the Vegas Strong Resiliency Center would be able to assist their survivors if we

did have a means to plug those financial holes and get the survivors to a better long-term solution.

CHAIR CANCELA:

There were a couple of different GoFundMe accounts set up following October 1, which allowed money to be disbursed to victims. Does the victim's center help connect victims to that fund or to ensure we are exploring other ways to get people the assistance they need?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN:

It is my understanding the funds which were initially collected in the GoFundMe account were later transferred to the compassion fund and it has since been depleted. This is separate from that.

MS. PEREIRA:

Correct. The fund was the largest set up to help the survivors immediately get what they needed. Those funds were given out as quickly as possible and parameters for the fund were set up and then distributed right away. In the example I gave previously, they would have qualified for the fund, but they did not even know about it. What we have found is a lot of survivors went back to their homes and cut themselves off from media, social media and a lot of them did not know about the Compassion Fund. There are several families we have worked with; some even had family members pass away and they did not get any of those funds.

They have had to spend at least one night in the hospital to even qualify for those funds. It was not a large amount of money because there were so many victims in this case. Even that large of a fund did not make individuals whole.

CHAIR CANCELA:

If there is any litigation filed by a number of survivors, this would in no way interact with that, correct?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN:

No, it would not.

CHAIR CANCELA:

I do not see anywhere in the bill where the license plate fee would sunset. The idea is for it to exist in perpetuity and have the Victim Services center access the funds in perpetuity?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NGUYEN:

Yes, that is my understanding.

MARTY ELZY, BM, CPM (Management Analyst, Central Services and Records Division, Department of Motor Vehicles):

The Department is neutral on this bill.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 333. We will open the hearing on A.B. 344.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 344 (2nd Reprint)**: Makes various changes to modernize the provision of cellular coverage. (BDR 58-838)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MAGGIE CARLTON (Assembly District No. 14):

I am here to make opening comments on A.B. 344 which makes changes to modernizing the provision of cellular coverage. This bill basically clarifies several important issues which are creating road blocks to the installation and deployment of small cell antennae across Nevada.

As most of you know, small cell deployment is critical in providing cell phone coverage and is the key technology that will bring fifth generation (5G) service to our State. You and I all know there is nothing more frustrating than when you pick up your cell phone and there are no bars or no dots showing service connectability. Hopefully, this bill will help address that.

While small cell can be deployed in many ways, this bill takes a narrow approach and speaks only to the type of small cell which is placed on the strand of the video provider networks. Specifically, the bill clarifies who can use the strand for purposes of hanging small cell antennae and clarifies the scope of what a local government can charge for such service.

Finally, the bill ensures that all powers of managing the rights-of-way remain within the local government and deploying small cell on the strand will continue

to be a partnership between the local government and the video service provider.

You will see this is the First Reprint of the bill that was amended and there was a safety issue brought forward in the Assembly. Under section 8, subsection 3, "A video service provider shall install a switch at a pole near each location where a radio antenna is mounted on [a] strand of the provider to allow the disconnection of power from the antenna."

A lot of workers use cherry pickers or baskets and go up to the top of the pole, but there are still workers who put on gear and climb the poles. We want to make sure no one is put in harm's way when they climb the pole. It will ensure there is a disconnect they can use if there is any work which has to be done on the pole.

I have learned a lot about small cell in the last couple of months that I thought I could absorb, but by no means am I an expert on this issue. I have Mr. Stevens with me from Cox Communications to walk through the different provisions of the bill.

CRAIG STEVENS (Cox Communications):

Before we get into the bill, I want to discuss what A.B. 344 is not.

First, it is not an omnibus small cell bill which wrestles control away from local government on how they can determine technology on their furniture. It does not codify U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) ruling on small cell, nor is it the intent to cloak and dagger any SEC order into Nevada law that is currently being argued in court. It does not take any of the decision-making power from local government; they have the right and the ability to determine their own process, looks and permitting on small cell. As well, it does not change any processes which are currently in place. It is important to us how we are working with our local government.

Basically what this bill does, it codifies another tool in the toolbox which will allow for better cell phone coverage for all the users. It will open the door to the next broadband speeds, lower latency and we will be in the forefront of the smart community's movement.

I would normally go over what a small cell looks like, but you have documentation ([Exhibit O](#)) in front of you.

It is important to note that government property is not the only place small cell can be placed. In one of those pictures on page 2 of [Exhibit O](#), is a light pole with small cell on it. While using that is the preferred method, if a light pole is not available, the company can choose to put a small cell either on a building or put it on our strand. If you look at the pictures on page 5 of [Exhibit O](#), it is the wire between one telephone pole and another telephone pole, which is what we call our strand, as it is known in the business. It is a pretty flexible tool. We are able to do a lot with it and one of those is to put a small cell device on it.

We now have our strand in the rights-of-way, due to an agreement we have through our State cable franchise agreement. For being in the rights-of-way, we pay a 5 percent franchise fee to local government on revenues from our cable services. In 2018, Cox Communications paid over \$20 million in franchise fees.

Bringing us here today and our ability to hang small cell on our strand is to make it clear Cox Communications is not a wireless company. We simply place the small cell on our strand at the request of our customers. Those customers are AT&T, Sprint, Verizon and T-Mobile. There are benefits of being able to hang small cell on strand, and the preferred method is being on furniture of local governments. It does not clutter up the rights-of-way. If you have three poles in the right-of-way, sometimes it can look untidy. The construction is significantly less and not an inconvenience to motorists on their daily commutes once the construction is happening.

Strand may be available where their pole is not. It gives more options to provide better service, as well as more energy efficient management since the strand is already powered up and is a lesser burden on local government.

There was some confusion on the debate between strand on government furniture and strand on our own property. Some clarification was needed as well on defining the work. Deploying small cell on our own strand has been a struggle.

Assembly Bill 344 helps solve these problems with a narrow approach. The bill you see before you has gone through several iterations. It is on the Second

Reprint. It is a product of many hours of discussion and cooperation between local government and as the bill sponsor stated, labor.

Cox Communications appreciates the hard work of our partners in helping refine this bill so it does exactly what it is needed to do and no more.

In section 1, the reason we moved it to Chapter 711 of NRS, is because it is the cable franchise section and is the narrow scope of the bill. Cox Communications, of course has a State franchise fee and there are several other companies which have a State franchise fee that also would be able to do this. However, we wanted to make sure it pertains to just strand and those who own the strand.

In section 3 we changed the definition of affiliate because one of our local governments had an issue where an affiliate was trying to access strand. Because the law was ambiguous, they did not know if they could actually allow it to happen. This just allows it to take place.

Section 8 is about safety requirements, making sure the small cell is up to standard when it comes to federal regulations, how it is installed, as well as the safety of the workers and those climbing the pole. Section 8, subsection 4 basically states the local government has the ability to manage their rights-of-way. It takes away no ability of theirs to determine what is actually happening in their rights-of-way even though we are there.

Section 12, subsection 3 states again we pay a 5 percent franchise fee to be in the rights-of-way. This will make sure when we put up those small cells in the rights-of-way, whether it is an amplifier, shot tracker or whatever it might be, we cannot be double charged because we are already paying a franchise fee.

Ms. HANSEN:

We recognize there have been some changes to the bill but our main concerns remain. We understand this is about business, making money and technology. But there are concerns and those are in section 8, subsection 1. It states, "A political subdivision of this State shall allow." In my reading of this, "shall allow" is the same as they have to do it, they have to allow this to occur.

The concern is with the placing of 5G technology. Towers for 5G cell are far more dangerous than other cell towers for two main reasons. First, compared to

earlier versions, 5G is ultra-high frequency and high intensity. Second, since the shorter length millimeter waves used in 5G do not travel as far, our current number of cell towers with the cell signal will not be reliable. To compensate many more cell towers must be installed. It is estimated there will be a need for a mini-cell tower about every two to eight houses. This will greatly increase our radio frequency radiation exposures.

What this bill essentially does is tell local governments they cannot say no to 5G technology.

Firefighters in California have had a fight for almost 17 years trying to remove cell towers off their buildings because of the innumerable health problems caused by them and they have had some success. The problems include: headaches, extreme fatigue, cognitive impairment, inability to sleep, depression, anxiety, unexplained anger and ultimately cancer.

I have an article from the United Nations about a whistleblower there, Claire Edwards. She talked about getting the cell towers off the United Nations buildings. She has also been in communication with people in Indiana. They have been reporting they have 5G technology installed and are already reporting the classic symptoms of electromagnetic radiation poisoning: nose bleeds, headaches, eye pains, chest pains, nausea, fatigue, vomiting, tinnitus, dizziness, flu-like symptoms and cardiac pain. These are noted problems people are having around the world. In Brussels, Belgium they have stopped 5G installation because of health concerns.

There are serious problems with this that need to be explored. We do not want to stop technology, but we are concerned about mandating the local governments.

Ms. Cox:

I spent three years of my life at the City of Reno fighting against cell towers before they came out. Why? Because of health problems. There were only health studies performed outside the United States. Evidentially mine and others' complaints created the Telecommunications Act of 1996 which stopped us against bringing up anything health wise. All I accomplished was the cute little palm trees and the evergreens.



Now comes 5G. This is worse; my health concerns are worse. But this time there are studies within the United States. I will submit some of these with my testimony. What this does is it destroys your cells and your deoxyribonucleic acid. For you Democrats, President Donald Trump wants 5G, 6G and 10G, I believe was his quote. Well, I do not, it kills cells, it kills and can kill all mammals.

MR. RUSSO:

I am also here to oppose A.B. 344. Given the questionable health risks associated with 5G technologies, cities and counties should have the option to prohibit this technology in their communities. It appears they do not have that option with this bill.

I believe there are too many unanswered questions with this new technology and I am not trying to say I am not for technology, because I am. It has been wonderful to have the internet for example. But I want it to be safe.

As you are aware, 5G requires small wireless facilities to be placed in the vicinity of residential households. According to the Environmental Health Trust, they are a think tank which promotes a healthier environment through research, education and policy. This is what they basically state, wireless antennae emit microwave, nonionizing radio frequency radiation and essentially function as cell towers. Each installation can have a thousand antennae which are transmitting simultaneously. 5G will add to, not replace, our current wireless technology in order to transmit data at super-fast speeds.

Basically, we are going to be exposed to these frequencies 24/7. It has already been discussed, we know the cumulative long-term exposure to radiation can have serious health consequences, including cancer risks. For young children or babies who are developing, they could have issues with brain development. Damage to sperm, there have been episodes of infertility associated with this technology. I was talking with my own doctor the other day and he told me this technology could disrupt calcium cellular metabolism which as a result of that, there can be issues with the heart.

I would like to conclude with a quote from the 2017 5G Appeal, which was signed by 200 doctors and scientists in 35 countries. "We recommend a moratorium on the roll-out of the 5G for telecommunication until potential

hazards for human health and the environment have been fully investigated by scientist's independent for the industry."

I plead with you to oppose A.B. 344. Please do not jeopardize our health, and especially the health of our children, for a technology I believe in only a matter of time will be shown to be dangerous and we can live without. How fast do we need this technology to go? This is a safety issue.

LYNN CHAPMAN (Independent American Party):

The Independent American Party opposes this bill. Doctor Stein from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem recently wrote a letter to the Federal Communications Commission outlining her major concerns. She talks about human skin having the ability to absorb more than 90 percent of microwave radiation. It will cause major problems especially for the vulnerable such as kids, the elderly and pregnant women.

They are also believed to cause physical pain. A recent article in *Eluxe Magazine* takes a deeper look at the issue. It discusses that microwave radiation can cause pain receptors to flare up in the human body and cause great damage to our eyes, cell growth and compromise our immune systems.

To give an example of some of the things that could happen, a few sessions ago I was in the lobbyist's room for a number of hours working on things and it is when everyone started to bring in their laptops. There was a lot of electricity in the room. I am very sensitive to electricity. Another lobbyist came up to me and asked, "Are you okay?" I said, "Yes." She said, "But your eyes are very red." My eyes had turned blood red and it looked like I had blood leaking into my eyes; it was terrible and they hurt. A while later, I went upstairs to a hearing and within 20 minutes my eyes were almost back to normal. That is how it affects people. That is just electricity in a small room. It is not 5G.

There are things which happen to people and if the 5G bill goes through, the fact is I will not even be able to be in my home without having problems because we are going to have antennae everywhere.

MS. SCHUMACHER:

I want to accept your oath of office and again remind you of the contract you have with me. As part of your duties, you are charged with the health, safety and welfare of all of the men, women and children living in Nevada. I submitted

information at the request of the Assembly Chair regarding insurance and military applications of these frequencies.

Lloyd's of London, a large insurance company, covers insurance beyond what normal insurance companies want to cover. Where Lloyd's leads, all the insurance companies follow. Lloyd's of London is refusing to insure claims made against wireless technologies and other insurance companies are following their lead. If you follow the money; this is huge. After all, if cellular is so safe, why is Lloyd's of London leaving all that additional money on the table? Lloyd's 2010 risk assessment report gives us a very solid clue as to what is going on. The report compares these technologies with asbestos. In the early research on asbestos it was inconclusive. Only later did it become obvious to anyone paying attention, asbestos causes cancer.

Lloyd's risk assessment study of wireless fidelity (WiFi) was published over eight years ago. Now Pacific Gas and Electric Company has followed close by, slipping in its own legal clauses when they were rolling out their smart meters, they claimed no liability for WiFi related to health damage.

In conclusion, I am urging you to please vote against this. It is important everybody be able to be insured and this includes for both property damage and health damage. If our insurance companies will not cover these things, where will we go to have that indemnification? Is the State going to take on that large risk at this point?

KELLY CROMPTON (City of Las Vegas):

I want to go on the record and thank the sponsors for working with us on the Assembly side to make sure we had the local governments added. We are neutral on this bill.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 334. We will open the hearing on A.B. 365.

**ASSEMBLY BILL 365 (1st Reprint)**: Revises provisions governing certain motor vehicle rentals. (BDR 43-695)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN:

I am speaking to you about a common sense reform which will increase access for Nevada's visitors to the luxury and exotic vehicles which will give them a

unique experience in our State. The goal of A.B. 365 is to one, allow access to rent luxury vehicles and two, to ensure visitors renting high-end vehicles have access to quality, reliable and transparent financial protection in the case of a crash with those vehicles.

With me are Matt Walker and Brian Rothery, who is the Assistant Vice President of Government and Public Affairs for Enterprise Holdings to cover the details of A.B. 365.

MR. ROTHERY:

I would first like to say, a damage waiver is not insurance and is a different entity altogether. It is an agreement between a car rental company stating if something goes wrong and damage were to occur to the rented vehicle, the rental company would not hold the car renter responsible. That agreement is in place for a fee and it is different than insurance. Insurance in this content often relates to liability insurance and an obligation to pay for damage to other objects out on the roads, or other motorists. It is entirely different than a damage waiver.

Nevada has existing law which caps the amount rental companies can charge for a damage waiver. By all accounts the law appears to be functioning normally, with respect to the vast majority of the rented cars in Nevada. There is no issue with that whatsoever.

When we look at rental fleets, the average Enterprise Rent-A-Car, Alamo or National Car Rental, you will see the vehicles fall below the threshold declared in this bill, which is \$60,000. For example, a Manufacturer's Suggested Retail Price (MSRP) of a Chevrolet Tahoe for 2019, is roughly \$48,000; the MSRP of a Chevrolet Suburban is about \$54,000. There is no vehicle we offer through our regular brands which eclipses the mark which was put forth in this bill at \$60,000.

Since the passage of the existing law which relates to damage waiver, which was most recently amended in 2017, there has been a new industry category. It relates to high-end, more expensive vehicles ranging in prices of \$60,000 all the way up to over \$100,000. We are talking about Porsche, Lamborghini, Ferrari and those type of vehicles.

These are unique experiences or somewhat unique to the tourist experience in Las Vegas, Nevada that we want to offer and have since offered in the last five years. Some of these customers do not want to be liable for themselves or make their own insurance policy liable for damage to a vehicle which has a high value.

As a service provider, we would like to sell the customer a product which gives them the ability to waive themselves of the responsibility. But we are not willing to do so at the current statutory rate which is about \$29. For this reason, we have chosen vehicles above \$60,000 MSRP as a line for which products can be sold for up to \$150, which we think is a reasonable amount. It is up to \$150; it is not requiring all products be sold at \$150.

If you look at markets where there is no cap, for example, California, you will see vehicles in this price range, are charged anywhere from \$90 to \$150 for a vehicle worth \$175,000.

JAMES W. PUZEY (Hertz Global):  
Hertz Global is here in support of A.B. 365.

JOE CASEY:

I have more than ten years in the automotive industry in both original equipment manufacturer, resellers and in the high-performance racing industry as well. I urge you to oppose A.B. 365 because essentially it is not going to bring in any new previously prohibited customers; it is just going to make renting a vehicle more expensive.

As one of the previous presenters stated, the damage waiver is supplemental; it protects the consumer from being charged for a small dent in the door. It has nothing to do with liability, which is required by the State. Generally with a lot of these companies, you need to bring in your insurance from your vehicle or some of them will let you purchase insurance from their said company.

Vehicle prices have gone up and are more expensive than they used to be. The average price of a vehicle is \$37,000, an increase of 4.2 percent over last year. At this rate, by 2021, a Chevrolet Tahoe will be over \$60,000. If we are really talking about exotics, the average cost for one of those vehicles is over \$200,000. While there is a lot of good faith from the presenters, there is no

mechanism in this bill which would prohibit a company from charging that \$150 maximum cap on a vehicle which is \$60,001.

MR. ROTHERY:

I want to address a couple of the issues raised. First, I would like to say there is an ample market. Enterprise Holdings offers an exotic division in 17 markets around the United States. The collision damage rates for those prices range from roughly \$90 to \$150 on those vehicle MSRPs which were described here.

This is market driven. It is an agreement the customer can choose to purchase as an ancillary; they are not required to. We are prohibited by law from requiring them to take these products; it is their choice some customers want.

Some people just do not want to be on the hook for something that has a high value of \$175,000 MSRP which is the highest priced vehicle we offer. Some customers want this product and we are only willing to offer it at a rate which is higher than what is allowed by law. We do not offer damage waivers under current law; they are not available to our customers. It does not make any financial sense for us to do so. This would just give us the ability to offer it to a customer who may or may not choose to accept it and relieve themselves of the responsibility of something so expensive as a \$175,000 vehicle.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure  
April 30, 2019  
Page 47

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 365.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting is adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Debbie Shope,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Yvanna D. Cancela, Chair

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

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit / # of pages</b>		<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	2		Agenda
	B	8		Attendance Roster
A.B. 45	C	3	Holly Welborn / American Civil Liberties Union Nevada	Letter of Opposition
A.B. 110	D	1	Assemblyman Steve Yeager	Proposed Amendments
A.B. 110	E	1	Assemblyman Steve Yeager	Gina – LA's Online Traffic Avatar
A.B. 110	F	19	Assemblyman Steve Yeager	Using Behavioral Science to Improve Criminal Justice Outcomes
A.B. 337	G	7	Jason Doering / Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers	Testimony
A.B. 337	H	5	Matthew Parker / Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen	Testimony
A.B. 337	I	2	Assemblywoman Shea Backus	Testimony
A.B. 337	J	1	Joseph Guild, III / Union Pacific Railroad	Office of Safety Analysis Safety Chart
A.B. 337	K	189	Nathan Anderson / Union Pacific Railroad	Report from the Transportation Safety Board of Canada
A.B. 337	L	1	Nathan Anderson / Union Pacific Railroad	Oppose Legislation to Mandate Train Crew Size
A.B. 333	M	1	Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen	Vegas Strong Sample
A.B. 333	N	2	Robert L. Gipson, II / Vegas Strong Resiliency Center; Legal Aid Center of Southern Nevada, Inc.	Written Testimony



A.B. 344	O	5	Craig Stevens / Cox Communications	Presentation
----------	---	---	---------------------------------------	--------------