

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

**Eightieth Session
May 7, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Yvanna D. Cancela at 1:41 p.m. on Tuesday, May 7, 2019, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4404B 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 Moises Denis
Senator Pat Spearman
Senator Marcia Washington
Senator Joseph P. Hardy
Senator James A. Settelmeyer
Senator Scott Hammond

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Teresa Benitez-Thompson, Assembly District No. 27
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

April Sanborn, DMV Services Manager III, Division of Management Services and Programs, Department of Motor Vehicles
Jude Hurin, Administrator, Division of Management Services and Programs, Department of Motor Vehicles

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure
May 7, 2019
Page 2

Jessica Ferrato, Arrow Electronics, Inc.
Joe Verrengia, Arrow Electronics, Inc.
Sam Schmidt
Susan L. Fisher, Piaggio Fast Forward
Kat Miller, Director, Department of Veterans Services
Darrol L. Brown, Welcome All Veterans Everywhere; United Veterans Legislative Council
Sean McDonald, Administrator, Division of Central Services and Records, Department of Motor Vehicles
Neal Tomlinson, Hyperion Advisors
Edward Fu, Legislative/Regulatory Counsel, Bird
Dylan Shaver, City of Reno
Gary Milliken, Lime
Jon Hopkins, Lime
Aleta Dupree
Mendy Elliott, Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce
Kelly Crompton, City of Las Vegas
Teri Baltisberger, DMV Services Manager III, Division of Management Services and Programs, Department of Motor Vehicles
Taisacan Hall
Arash Ghafoori, Executive Director, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth
Emily Paulsen, Executive Director, Nevada Homeless Alliance
Fuilala Riley, CEO, HELP of Southern Nevada
Omar Saucedo, AT&T
Thomas Martin, Management Analyst III, Division of Management Services and Programs, Department of Motor Vehicles

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 23.

ASSEMBLY BILL 23 (1st Reprint): Authorizes Department of Motor Vehicles to adopt regulations relating to certain electronically controlled vehicles and transportation devices. (BDR 43-365)

APRIL SANBORN (DMV Services Manager III, Division of Management Services and Programs, Department of Motor Vehicles):

I will provide a brief overview of A.B. 23. The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) submitted A.B. 23 to create a new chapter in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 482B, to regain our authority to work with industry on a variety of

technologies which are not currently defined under the autonomous vehicle chapter 482A.

With the addition of this new chapter, the DMV will be equipped to authorize and welcome the testing of any new technology in Nevada.

The DMV worked with the industry and the Assembly Growth and Infrastructure Committee to amend the original language. The first reprint reflects those agreed on changes.

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

Earlier, I was alerted to the fact that there was language amended in Senate Bill (S.B.) 408 of which Senator Dondero Loop is the sponsor. It is the robotics type of technology in respect to the language regarding mobile carrying devices. It was represented by Susan Fisher regarding the Gita technology.

SENATE BILL 408 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public safety.
(BDR 43-805)

We have reached out to Ms. Fisher, as well as to Senator Dondero Loop, to see if the language in S.B. 408 could be implemented within our bill. Our bill, A.B. 23 is intended to encapsulate all alternative technologies. Their technology is exactly what our bill is trying to achieve. We are working with her to see if we can collaborate and see if we can bring the language from S.B. 408 into A.B. 23.

CHAIR CANCELA:

I want to point out when S.B. 408 was on the Senate Floor, we were trying to get a visual for the driverless technology and what it would look like. If you look at the PowerPoint in NELIS, it actually brings it to life.

JESSICA FERRATO (Arrow Electronics, Inc.):

I would like to introduce Joe Verrengia, who is in Las Vegas and will discuss this technology and what it can do in real time.

JOE VERRENGIA (Arrow Electronics, Inc.):

We are thankful for the ongoing support of the State and for our relationship with DMV for our unique and celebrated Semi-Autonomous Motorcar (SAM).

We are also proud to be associated with Sam Schmidt, our driver of the SAM Car and his home state of Nevada, which is one of Arrow Electronics critical locations.

The SAM Car Project started in 2013. The person sitting next to me is the driver who operates the SAM Car with his head and with the help of electronics. There is also a second, fully able co-driver who has a full set of conventional controls for safety. We also lead and follow the SAM Car with conventional vehicles for added road safety.

The SAM Car is not remote controlled. It does not conflict with commercial autonomous technologies. In fact, some of those technology companies are valued Arrow Electronics customers. In 2016, as a result of all of this technology, the SAM Car was in the top of automotive innovations in the world. Sam Schmidt is the Project's only driver. He is one of the best drivers in the world. With the SAM Car, I have come to realize Sam Schmidt is the astronaut for the disabled community in their quest for improved mobility. It is really the goal of the SAM Car Project.

As a result of Sam Schmidt's success with us, we are engaging with hundreds of disabled people again so they can drive not only on the street, but on private, controlled courses. We are especially focused on disabled veterans who have been injured protecting our freedoms and lost their own mobility in the process.

The SAM Car Project and Sam Schmidt have been to Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in Washington, D.C. Those men and women were ready to go when we showed up. We look forward to going to other veteran locations.

In addition to the example Sam Schmidt sets for all of us, please remember that the SAM Car Project is a humanitarian technology. It is a technology which makes life better.

Arrow Electronics is not selling this commercially. We will not sell it, but will donate it to innovators who apply to us for its use. We are exploring ways the technology package can operate smarter wheelchairs and can partner with Sam Schmidt and his surroundings to enhance mobility and freedom.

We believe driving is freedom and that is why this is a semi-autonomous car with a driver.

SAM SCHMIDT:

I am a 25-year resident of Henderson, Nevada. I have been a professional race car driver most of my adult life. My entire life I had dreamed of competing in the Indianapolis 500, which is the world's greatest motorsports event. I was very fortunate to do it in 1997, 1998 and 1999. The ultimate career goal happened in September of 1999, when I won the race in Las Vegas. I received the trophy from Oscar Goodman as he was beginning his first term in office as Mayor of Las Vegas.

Unfortunately, four months later, I was testing in Florida, where I hit the wall with my car at 200 miles per hour. The crash blew apart my C3 and C4 vertebrae. I was on a ventilator, not given a lot of chance to live. I got through it. Through intensive rehabilitation, I was able to get off the ventilator and effectively move on with life.

Nineteen years ago, I started my own race team and I am proud of the fact we compete full time in the IndyCar Series with two drivers. We will be competing at the end of this month at the Indianapolis 500, representing Las Vegas.

It is wonderful, but I had worked my entire life to drive fast. One of the things that was devastating and disappointing after the crash was coming to the realization I would never drive again.

You can only imagine when in 2013, Arrow Electronics called me and said, "How would you like to drive again?" At first I thought I was being conned. Once I got past it, I was elated at the thought this could possibly happen. We worked as a team for about eight months, able to develop a prototype. Like anything in technology, it was pretty raw, but it worked, and shortly thereafter we went 100 miles per hour, then 152. At the most recent air show at Nellis Air Force Base, we went 192 miles per hour.

We have made some great steps forward with this technology, eliminated all of the issues, and now the car is complete. I turn my head to the left, the car turns left and I turn my head to the right, it turns right. I also do the gas and brake with my head. There is even voice control. It has become entirely intuitive. It is fantastic.

All of the speed goals and all of the things we have done on the track have been unbelievable. The full circle moment for me was at the Las Vegas Motor Speedway in 2016, when we drove the car effectively for DMV to get our driver's license.

I cannot stress enough what this does for someone with disabilities to get back this level of independence. Now subsequently, we will be able to take this technology and get these veterans in a car and see their faces.

It is also great because the semi-autonomous mobility side of it really protects me from making mistakes in the car. It also protects the others around us on the roads.

What Arrow Electronics has done is nothing short of incredible. Nevada has taken huge steps toward encouraging technology companies to operate in this State. This ties into it.

I am proud to be a resident of Nevada and proud that three years ago, DMV and the State worked together to allow me to have this driver's license and this opportunity. It is safe; there are redundancies. There is always someone in the car with an operating system who can take over. Again, this level of independence is huge for anyone with a disability.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Thank you Mr. Schmidt for your endurance and being a role model for everyone in this State. We are proud to call you a Nevadan.

SUSAN L. FISHER (Piaggio Fast Forward):

I came into the Committee room and got to speak with Mr. Hurin from DMV. I found out there are amendments which have been put in place for A.B. 23. With our provision, we were looking for a way our vehicle would fit into this bill. When we met very early in Session the first week or so, it did not fit in.

There was a bit of confusion when it was added as a Floor amendment to S.B. 408 because it was a surprise; it was not discussed in Committee. That was Amendment No. 535 which is now sitting on S.B. 408, but it actually fits better in this bill.

I had hoped to have a Gita device here for display so you could see it. It is a personal mobility device. It is small, similar to a wagon without a handle and it pairs with you electronically. It is artificial intelligence which takes a picture of you and recognizes your legs and feet. It will follow wherever you go. Each time you take it out, you need to pair it to you electronically.

Gita works very well for people with disabilities who cannot carry things. This could carry items such as groceries. It has cameras all the way around so if there are any obstructions, it will stop. The optimal operating speed is about 4 to 6 miles per hour, which is what you walk at a normal pace on a sidewalk.

Gita is not intended for anyone to sit on or ride on. It has a payload of about 45 pounds, which coincidentally is about the weight of a case of wine. It was made by the Italians.

The intent of the Gita by Piaggio Fast Forward is to get people out of their vehicles and walking in their communities, walking to marketplaces and leaving their vehicles behind.

Ms. SANBORN:

I do want to point out in our PowerPoint presentation which we did not present, but you have a copy of ([Exhibit C](#)), the little red-orange device in the center of page 5 shows the Gita device.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

I am looking up this technology and am looking at the website for the SAM Car. It looks like you steer everything with a hat or a device which is on your body and then corresponds by infrared cameras. What happens if you are in a convertible and the hat flies off and you now have no way to maneuver the vehicle? You said there are some built-in redundancies. What are those redundancies? Is there a kill switch; does everything shut down?

MR. SCHMIDT:

It has advanced from some of those early pictures to where we now have sunglasses, or for high-speed runs, obviously we wear a helmet. The sunglasses have built-in transmitters for the cameras which follow the movements of my head. I have never had a problem.

The key redundancy is the second driver who has the same driving controls I do. If something like that was to happen, they would have the ability to switch over and take control of the car. Just like vehicles on the road now, we have the lane crossover prevention, braking assist and those type of things which are in modern vehicles.

We have been driving the car several times a year for six years. I have never had the issue where anyone has had to take over. It is Arrow Electronics technology and they deal with the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD). They put people into outer space and this is relatively simple technology for them. I do not want to understate the need for safety, because it is their number one concern. I did not want to get into a car unless it is 100 percent safe.

MR. HURIN:

Prior to this Session, A.B. No. 69 of the 79th Session was introduced. We worked with Arrow Electronics and Sam Schmidt in 2016. This was one of our biggest pioneer projects for the DMV, other than building the first autonomous regulations.

One of the things your question pinpointed was the redundancies. Our regulations at the time actually factored in and allowed us to have the authority to create the regulation to have those redundancies, to have the second person next to them. Arrow Electronics worked with us. Their technology already had this where the passenger had a steering wheel and the floor peddles so in a split second they could take over. The DMV put in additional features of having a pilot car in front of the vehicle for added protections and redundancies. Those are in our regulations.

What happened in the 79th Session is the Governor's Office of Economic Development introduced a new version of chapter 482A of NRS. They removed a lot of our authority to do alternate technologies, like with Arrow Electronics and others.

This is a step for DMV to try to regain and add to those authorities when we are dealing with technologies coming forth, so that we actually have the authority and ability to work with the technology companies. We will be able to tell them, "Nevada is a place you can test your technology and we will work with you."

Their system is going to be better when it actually gets deployed to the public. It will have been thoroughly vetted and tested in Nevada territory, where in Las Vegas there is extreme heat and to the north with the upper elevations. We have a variety of climate change situations.

We look forward to bringing back those regulations and putting them in place. Then Sam can continue testing and help the disabled community, not only on the race track, but the public roads as well.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 23. I ask you to work with the sponsor of S.B. 408 to figure out where you want the language to go.

We will open the hearing on A.B. 28.

ASSEMBLY BILL 28 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the evidence satisfactory to declare status as a veteran on an instruction permit, driver's license, identification card or commercial driver's license. (BDR 43-242)

KAT MILLER (Director, Department of Veterans Services):

Assembly Bill 28 is pretty simple. It would allow an additional form of evidence to be used by DMV to verify a veteran's status.

Nevada veterans are eligible for many federal, State and local non-governmental services and programs. The challenge Nevada and other states face is finding and informing veterans of these benefits. In 2013, the Nevada Department of Veterans Services (NDVS) began the first steps to create a database of veteran's information to assist, locate and inform veterans. The database is called the Veteran's Information System (VIS). We received a federal grant from the Veterans Administration to create the VIS and the primary sources of information for the VIS is the Department of Defense, Discharge Data, Office of Vital Statistics data and DMV information. For DMV, it is to specifically include current contact information; addresses, phone numbers and emails.

There are many steps needed to make this happen, but key among them was collecting and sharing agency data. To allow DMV to share data with us, S.B. No. 244 of the 77th Session was passed in 2013. Sponsors of the bill included Senator Hardy and Senator Spearman of this Committee. This bill

authorized a discharged veteran to obtain a designation on their driver's license indicating their veteran status. The bill also required the DMV to submit on a monthly basis to NDVS a list of Nevada veterans.

To get this designation on their driver's license a veteran had to show the DMV a paper copy of the discharge document (DD214). In 2014, we were informed the DOD would no longer be sending each state paper copies of the discharge. Instead they began sending us electronic data, and each month we receive the previous month's list of veterans who indicated they are moving to Nevada.

Prior to this, if the veteran or spouse lost their DD214 they could come to us and receive a paper copy, but they no longer can do that. We now give them an electronic verification.

We have 12 volunteers who are manually scanning over 80,000 archived pre-2014 paper DD214s into the VIS.

Assembly Bill 28 would allow the DMV to accept this electronic verification of the veteran's status which includes the character of discharge. This will help when a person indicates they are a veteran, but do not have their documents with them.

As we were drafting this bill, DMV commented about some of the language from the existing statute governing the release of veterans information as being vague and would benefit from an interlocal agreement. This agreement would specify what information would be collected, such as voter information on driver's license applications. There is no reason for us to collect this information in the VIS.

Therefore, with the approval of the Office of the Governor, we submitted an amendment which would require this interlocal agreement and you will see the amended language in the bill. Additionally, Assemblywoman Brittney Miller asked to have the discharge document form numbers added to the bill language. This was done and to ensure any new DOD discharge documents can be used, the term "without limitation" was added before the list of acceptable evidence.

In conclusion, we are very excited to report the VIS is functional, although we are at the early stages. We are starting to use it to locate and inform Nevada veterans of benefits. As we add more data to VIS, we will get closer to the goal

of ensuring every veteran or service member in Nevada and their families have information about benefits and services which will enrich their lives.

DARROL L. BROWN (Welcome All Veterans Everywhere; United Veterans Legislative Council):

It is my honor and privilege to represent Chairman Tony Yarbrough who asked me to speak on behalf of United Veterans Legislative Council on this bill. It is something which has been needed for a long time and we are here to say we support the bill 100 percent.

SENATOR HARDY:

We are no longer blaming the fire in the National Personnel Records Center in St. Louis for not getting the correct document to the veterans?

MR. BROWN:

It has been contentious for many years. People claim they lost their records in the St. Louis fire. Most of them are incorrect. If they served in World War II, then yes, they may have lost their records. Anyone after that war, 99 percent of the time their records were saved.

SEAN McDONALD (Administrator, Division of Central Services and Records, Department of Motor Vehicles):

The DMV is neutral on this bill. We have been working with Director Miller and her staff. There have been a lot of discussions and we believe we are in a good place at this time with the language of the bill.

MS. MILLER:

In conclusion, we are going to a paperless world. Requiring our veterans to carry around discharge documents they may have received 30 years ago is not the right direction. We need to make sure every State agency can access this database and verify a veteran's status without depending on the veteran to provide it.

Every week or every day we will have someone go to the DMV and say, "I would like to get the veteran designation on my license," and they do not have the proper identification. To turn away a Korean War veteran, a Vietnam veteran and even a current generation veteran because they do not have the correct documentation with them is not how we should operate. I hope you will favorably consider this bill.

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure
May 7, 2019
Page 12

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 28.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 28.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will open the hearing on A.B. 485.

ASSEMBLY BILL 485 (1st Reprint): Enacts provisions relating to electric foot scooters. (BDR 43-1107)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SARAH PETERS (Assembly District No. 24):

I am introducing to the Committee A.B. 485, which enacts provisions for electric foot scooters. We all know how important it is to start diversifying our transportation for accessibility, climate change and many other areas. As we diversify, we come across scenarios in which we need to address some limitations with our current laws.

This is an attempt to create and authorize local authorities to regulate scooter share programs as appropriate with some limitations. I will let my colleagues continue the presentation, who are well versed in what this bill does and will walk you through it.

NEAL TOMLINSON (Hyperion Advisors):

As Assemblywoman Peters stated, the goal of this bill is to provide for the legal operation of electric scooters and authorize local authorities to regulate scooter share programs.

These are zero emission electric vehicles. What was required was to have a new vehicle definition which would allow the legal operation of them. These are similar to a bicycle or an electric bicycle which has a separate vehicle classification. That is the goal of this bill.

Section 1 creates a new vehicle definition for these types of electric vehicles. It is an important part of this bill.

The heart of the bill is section 16 which is essentially enabling legislation. It allows local governments to adopt regulations for the health and safety of the public and to create ordinances on the time, place and manner of operation.

The local governments are able to create an ordinance where they can control where these scooters are allowed and not allowed to operate. The bill provides for and allows them to prohibit the use of scooters in certain jurisdictions and it allows them to set speed limits in certain areas.

By ordinance they can also allow the operation of scooter share programs. Mr. Fu will discuss in more detail about his company's scooter-share program which is called Bird Rides. They are currently operating in more than 125 cities across the Country and have about the same number operating on college campuses.

Also in the bill, section 16, subsection 3, paragraph (a) of an ordinance, the local governments can require scooter operators to pay a reasonable fee for the privilege of operating a scooter-share program in their jurisdiction.

Section 16, subsection 3, paragraph (b) is a requirement for a scooter-share operator to indemnify the local government against claims and other liabilities and costs.

Section 16, subsection 3, paragraph (c) is a requirement which the local jurisdiction can dictate where scooter-share operators may or may not stage the scooters. It means they can create areas where they must be parked and prohibit them in certain areas as I discussed.

Section 16, subsection 3, paragraph (d) a local government enabled to enact or identify moving or parking violations specific to shared scooters and assess penalties for such violations.

Section 16, subsection 3, paragraph (e) allows the scooter-share operator to provide the local government with certain trip data to allow them to better manage where the scooters are best utilized. We do not want to have scooters in areas where they are not being utilized. The trip data allows the local

government to share in the decisions as to where these scooters are allowed and where not to allow them.

Section 16, subsection 5, paragraphs (a) and (b) of the ordinance requires local governments to prohibit scooter-share operators from knowingly allowing persons under the age of 16 to operate the scooter share program. This is important because these electric scooters are certainly meant for transportation, they are not meant for playing on or anything like that.

It is important because the scooters under this bill are to be regulated very similar to electric bicycles, so they would have the same rules and restrictions which would apply to those. It is important for the users to understand the rules of the road for safety reasons.

Section 16, subsection 5, paragraph (d), subparagraphs (1) through (3) are also provisions in the bill which require the scooter-share operators to have minimum insurance requirements. Those requirements include commercial general liability coverage of \$1 million per occurrence, and \$5 million aggregate. It also requires casualty insurance with a combined single limit of \$1 million and umbrella or excess coverage which has limits of \$5 million each occurrence and \$5 million aggregate.

This bill was a result of a collaborative effort between many stakeholders. This included the local governments, trial lawyers and many others who had an interest in this bill. We ask for your support.

EDWARD FU (Legislative/Regulatory Counsel, Bird):

Assembly Bill 485 allows cities to work with companies like Bird to bring shared electric scooters to Nevada. These low speed, affordable and zero emission devices have sparked a revolution in micro-mobility and how people get around in cities.

In our first year, people took more rides on shared electric scooters than on every bike share in the Country combined. Cities like Denver and Phoenix have taken thousands of cars off of their streets every single day. You can just imagine the congestion, environmental and safety impact of thousands of cars and being able to eliminate it every day. We want to do the same for Nevada, but we need A.B. 485 to do this.

As Mr. Tomlinson stated, we have worked extensively with cities and other stakeholders on this bill. As such, it allows us to work with cities to help them design a transportation system which suits their local needs. Assembly Bill 485 unlocks this transportation technology for Nevada and I hope you will support it.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

It seems \$1 million in insurance and \$5 million in aggregate is high, since most corporations do not even have umbrella policies this large. I am curious why you need such a large umbrella; are they extremely dangerous?

MR. TOMLINSON:

This language was a result of the bill proponents and the electric scooter industry working closely with all the stakeholders to come up with something reasonable. This is the amount which scooter-share operators currently provide in other cities; that is how we arrived at the language. We met with Legislative Counsel, Darcy Johnson, to work out the details of the insurance language. Yes, they are high limits. It is not because they are dangerous; they are actually safer than bicycles. They are high limits because it is what they have carried in other states and we did not see any reason to lower it for Nevada.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I am a little concerned with the level, because I think it creates a barrier to trade for other corporations. Your company may be okay with it, but if someone else wanted to start up, it is arbitrarily too high. It is a limitation and barrier to others.

SENATOR HARDY:

I suspect the trial attorneys helped you to come to this decision for the limits?

MR. TOMLINSON:

It was a collaborative effort.

CHAIR CANCELA:

I have issues with relying on short-term transportation solutions without being mindful of long-term goals. We need to be more creative about the bigger picture. We need transportation strategies which move a lot of people in a big way. It is why I am interested in things such as light rail and figuring out how to do much more with the resources we have. Generally I am skeptical of these kinds of technologies.

Does anything in the bill bind the cities in any way to make them have to enact regulations around electric scooters?

MR. TOMLINSON:

There is no requirement they would have to do this. I would like to add we worked with the Regional Transportation Commission on this bill. They are supportive of this as part of the overall transportation plan.

We have been in discussions with many local governments, both the north and the south, as to best incorporate these into existing transportation plans. I believe the goal is exactly your concern, which is to make this part of an overall plan and not just willy-nilly deploy it.

Essentially, what we have been working on with local governments is a pilot program. We will find an area where we think these will work best, we have a defined time for a trial period, and we collect the data to see how it works. From there we will decide how to move forward. The bill will allow the local governments to work this into their existing transportation plans.

SENATOR DENIS:

In the bill, you want to treat these like bicycles, right? Do you anticipate where there are no bike lanes, they would ride on the road like a bicycle would? Would it mirror all of it exactly?

MR. TOMLINSON:

Yes. It would be up to the local jurisdiction as part of their ordinance to define it. Obviously, there are areas which have more bike lanes than others. It is part of the whole idea with the pilot program to help define where these best operate and where they can and cannot be on the road.

This bill will allow the local governments to specify through ordinances where and how they operate, time, place and manner, which is better left at the local level. They have so many different components to certain streets and sidewalk areas of which they are better aware.

In Las Vegas is an example. We know the City of Las Vegas does not want them on Fremont Street. This bill would allow the local government to not allow them to be operated on Fremont Street. We know the county does not want them to operate on the Las Vegas Strip. This bill certainly allows them to

prohibit them on the Strip. There are going to be certain areas in all jurisdictions where they are just not appropriate. This allows the local governments to define where they can operate.

SENATOR HARDY:

Are these small enough they could go on a train? For instance in Denver, if you only have so many places where you can get on the train or the light rail, this would allow you to get to the train or light rail. Then you get off and go somewhere else on the scooter. It would augment the opportunities for trains and light rails.

MR. FU:

Correct. One of the things we are most excited about this technology is in areas where mass transit is limited and has not yet expanded as far out as it could be. What this allows is for people who do not live within walking distance of mass transit to ride the scooter to a location and then take it from there to their final destination.

We believe it unlocks mass transit, not just for people who are fortunate enough to live right next to mass transit, but those who live further from it. It may be a little too short to drive the distance, but at the same time a little too far to walk.

SENATOR SPEARMAN:

I want to follow up on Senator Settelmeyer's question about the high bar for new entrants. How would you address it or how could this become more equitable and not prohibitive because of regulations and such for other entrants to come into this?

MR. FU:

The limits in this bill match what cities across the Country have generally required for the industry. My understanding is they match what most others within the industry already carry for their purposes. For the insurance requirements, we are happy to work with stakeholders and cities to find a more appropriate level which would allow everyone to compete within the market.

When new technology is introduced, sometimes there is a sense people want to have assurances this is something which is safe and not just a fly-by-night operation. Perhaps when we came into the industry, we took the step of very

high or more than necessary insurance requirements to demonstrate we are serious about this.

CHAIR CANCELA:

I have questions on the amendment language. In section 16, subsection 5, paragraphs (a) and (b) the language related to those under 16 years of age not being able to use the scooters. The language states a scooter-share operator would be prohibited from knowingly allowing the person who is under 16 years of age to operate a shared scooter. Who would be enforcing this? Would it be on the cities?

MR. FU:

The enforcement takes place on multiple fronts. Our software allows people to report underage riders and then allows for us to link it to a specific action taken through the application. We can identify the underage riders and take them off of the platform. Of course, there is also some local law enforcement who will raise alerts or concerns they have about riders at certain times who are riding underage. We track them down and make sure they are no longer on the platform.

I see this provision of the law as having two functions. One, making sure we are not allowing children on the platform. Second, as a separate measure, ensuring children are generally not being permitted.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Is there an age check or license check which would allow it on the front end to be stopped, or is it entirely reliant on the back end of enforcement? Is it stopped on the front end when someone signs up to rent a scooter?

MR. FU:

We do have front end age verification. We have a driver's license scan when you first create an account. Of course, sometimes it is not perfect. Apparently, people acquire fake licenses, and there is some back end enforcement taken in conjunction with local law enforcement for those situations.

CHAIR CANCELA:

The language states there is a civil penalty of \$250. Where does the money go? Is it something that is designed by an agreement with the company and the municipality?

MR. FU:

I think that is exactly right.

CHAIR CANCELA:

I have been in a number of cities where scooter companies are operated and you see scooters everywhere lying on sidewalks. Depending on where you are, there is high congestion areas where people drop them all over the place and they are not dealt with right away. I am wondering if it is something you have been dealing with and how you deal with it as a company? I am concerned what this will do to mobility for other folks, not just because of ridership, but because of the way the platform works. It allows people to leave them everywhere.

MR. FU:

It is certainly one of the concerns that as an industry we face and work with local governments on the issue. Since the industry launched about a year ago, I think we have made great strides as far as combatting this issue. We have this technology within the scooter to detect when they are tipped over on their sides. We have a community mode allowing people to report instances of blocking sidewalks. We have what we call "bird watchers" stationed within the city looking and going around cleaning up issues which happen in the city.

The Senator pointed out earlier the free market allows for competition. We believe the companies which demonstrate they are best able to resolve these issues are the companies the cities should reward and allow to operate. We look forward to competing in Nevada.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We are going to close this hearing briefly so we can go into the work session on A.B. 333 while we have all members here.

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

MARJORIE PASLOV THOMAS (Committee Policy Analyst):

Assembly Bill 333 provides for the issuance of "Vegas Strong" specialty license plates. I will read from the work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).

SENATOR HAMMOND MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 333.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the work session and reopen the hearing on A.B. 485.

DYLAN SHAVER (City of Reno):

The City of Reno is here in support of this legislation on a number of fronts, but first and foremost, this is part of the City of Reno's sustainability plan. We are trying to find ways as we move further into the 21st Century to ensure our population is not relying on their vehicles to travel those one to one and a half mile distances on our roads. It is not only bad for the roads, it is bad for our air. We appreciate the industry working in such a collaborative manner to bring forward this piece of legislation.

There are a couple of questions I might be able to answer which were asked earlier by the Committee regarding the insurance. The way we would implement a program like this in our city would be via a franchise agreement. The numbers in the bill are in line with what we would require in a franchise agreement of this nature. It is done to protect the riding public. This is a service the Renoites would be allowed to use. They are granted to do this under our authority, using our sidewalks and roads.

We would ensure the levels of insurance would be allowed with what is in the bill. Of course, everything in a franchise agreement is negotiable. In other franchises, and when we were doing bike sharing last year, we stuck to those limits.

The question about scooters being left everywhere, one of the "big gives" in negotiating with the companies was our ability to regulate the time, place and manner. We make sure we cannot only cite people or the company for scooters which have been parked or left inappropriately behind, but also to get code enforcement involved. Again, it is something to be negotiated in the franchise agreement, but it is something of which we are cognizant. Reno streets are not very wide. We have sidewalks which date back to before urban planning. We

are aware of the mobility issues this could cause if the program was implemented poorly. We intend to keep a close eye on these types of things.

We ask the Committee to allow us this sort of authority. We do think these are important programs.

GARY MILLIKEN (Lime):

I will echo what Mr. Tomlinson stated. This has been an effort from many groups. We worked on this in the Assembly, we worked on it since it came to this house, and Lime supports the amended version.

JON HOPKINS (Lime):

We all know Nevada is recognized widely as being an innovator of transportation. On this front, passing this bill will allow Nevada to continue to be an innovator as are hundreds of cities around the world that are adopting these sorts of transportation tools.

As everyone has mentioned, the companies here today are focused on partnering well with communities, cities and states. The effort on the bill has been a partnership to get a consensus view among the industry and cities in the State to what should be in the bill.

Passage of this does allow cities to reduce pollution, congestion and consistently improve transportation equity for cities across the country. We find a third of riders on scooters say they have been driving or ride hailing, and among visitors the number is about 50 percent.

For example, a 4 month pilot in the city of Portland, Oregon in late 2018, found it reduced vehicle miles traveled by 200,000 miles, and reduced carbon emissions by 86 tons. Overall about a third of the people say they are taking scooters in order to get to work or school. About 40 percent are using them to get to dining or entertainment. Twenty percent of users say their last trip was to connect to public transit. In fact, in large cities, 40 percent say they have done this sort of trip in the past week and 64 percent in the past month.

Because we agree with the Chair, it is our view about the importance of a rich, seamless and connected transportation system of all sorts of tools. We would like to see more people on scooters, but also more people on public transit or other modes which do not impede traffic.

Ultimately, this allows the city to regulate scooters as they see fit, given their varied urban context. It also allows innovation on parking and other tools. It allows cities to innovate together with the industry.

Based on this, we do hope the Committee supports this bill. We look forward to innovation in Nevada with the many cities here.

ALETA DUPREE:

I support this bill. I am a user of scooters as I have used them in Los Angeles, California, using several of the scooter share programs. They have been very helpful to me and they would be helpful to me in my home in Nevada. I live 0.4 miles from the nearest bus stop. I am a frequent user of public transportation. In Los Angeles the vast majority, if not all my trips on scooters were connections to and from public transportation.

Wherever I am in the Country I use lots of public transportation whether it is buses or rail. This is complimentary for me; not replacing. It is essential these vehicles be regulated consistently as electric bicycles are. They share similar characteristics and they should be treated similarly.

I am an advocate for responsible scooter operation, I wear a helmet, and I am not going to put my Nevada driver's license at risk. In my experiences with scooters I have not encountered any situations where my mobility on sidewalks has been impaired by the presence of scooters.

When I park, I take a picture of the scooter, so they see where I parked it. It is a part of responsible operation and I am accountable with these companies. I am not worried about them going away. My money is on the line here. I have comfort with that.

I feel this bill is worth supporting. It is just another one of the many tools which I need in my toolbox to navigate the city with the challenges I have. This would have helped me years ago at times when I wish a scooter would have been available to me. This bill is worth supporting and I believe it is appropriate to be passed.

MENDY ELLIOTT (Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce):

We have talked about the integrated approach to the scooters. One of the benefits on behalf of our 1,600 members with over 70,000 people those

members represent, it is small businesses who could benefit from the scooters, especially in downtown Reno where it is difficult to park. We will work with the City of Reno as to where the scooters will actually be parked. A lot of businesses are going to want to have availability in front of their businesses. The Reno + Sparks Chamber is no different than any other business in the downtown area.

We also see a benefit between the downtown Reno area and the University of Nevada system as it continues to shift downtown with the students utilizing those scooters to move around our community. It will be a benefit to our small and large businesses and we look forward to working with the City of Reno as the ordinances are promulgated. On behalf of the Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce, we urge you to support this bill.

KELLY CROMPTON (City of Las Vegas):

The City of Las Vegas wants to go on record as neutral. We thank the proponents of the bill for working with local governments to maintain some of the local authorities put into the bill and also to clearly define these mechanisms so we can look to working on the ordinances.

TERI BALTISBERGER (DMV Services Manager III, Division of Management Services and Programs, Department of Motor Vehicles):

The Department of Motor Vehicles is neutral on this bill.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 485. We will open the hearing on A.B. 363.

ASSEMBLY BILL 363 (1st Reprint): Revises certain provisions relating to homeless youth. (BDR 43-1033)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TERESA BENITEZ-THOMPSON (Assembly District No. 27):

I am presenting this on behalf of Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson. The comments I am going to make are his written comments. He was excited about this piece of legislation and had already prepared his comments and his presenters for this hearing. It seemed fitting we forge ahead. I will read Assemblyman Thompson's comments ([Exhibit E](#)).

TAISACAN HALL:

I have been a client at Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth (NPHY) for over a year. I became homeless in March 2018 when I was evicted from my home alongside my mother, my 1 year old brother and my mother's dog. I carried most of what we could grab in a short amount of time. In a way it was as if I was carrying my family. I carried them for most of the day until we were fortunate enough to make it to a weekly living quarters. It was only a few weeks later when we were evicted again, which was the first of a number of evictions to come.

After my situation with my mother became more and more abusive, I moved into the NPHY transitional housing program, where I currently reside.

I joined the Southern Nevada Youth Action Board, Young Adults in Charge (YAC) in June 2018. This group gave me a purpose outside of surviving my experience with homelessness and allowed me to commit to something much bigger than myself.

Young Adults in Charge is a leadership group for youth under the age of 25. It is intended to eradicate youth homelessness by empowering youth voices via advocacy.

In the past year, we have made great strides in the community through our active involvement and community-wide projects. This includes identifying the process of obtaining vital documents which is an essential barrier to youth who are working toward exiting their homeless situation.

We are interested in this bill because we understand vital documents provide access to virtually everything. It is your passport to your life. Without them, youth cannot safely exit their homeless situation into self-sufficiency. Youth are not able to open a bank account, rent a home or drive a vehicle without their vital documents. The absence of these documents forms barriers for youth experience and homelessness which further endangers an already vulnerable population. Youth experiencing homelessness cannot gain access to medical services which can lead to health hazards as medical conditions go untreated. Youth also cannot obtain safe and legal employment, which further places them at risk of becoming victims of crime.

For all these reasons and more, YAC is in support of this bill. I have a support letter from YAC which I will be submitting as part of my testimony today ([Exhibit F](#)). For many youth the process of retrieving vital documents is only lessened in difficulty, once they are able to receive assistance from their managers.

Homeless youth in schools who are not in homeless service programs, might only have their McKinney-Vento Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program liaison for support. This is why this bill would allow licensed social workers and school liaisons to obtain vital records together with their clients. I myself experienced difficulty obtaining my identification (ID) card until my case manager at NPHY helped me. It took me nearly a year of trying, but I was able to get it.

This law could help thousands of homeless youth. The absence of vital documents can prevent youth from employment and post-secondary education. It can even keep youth from unifying with their families. This was the case for two young sisters who were also clients of NPHY. The safest way for them to exit their homeless situation was for them to move in with their grandmother who lived in a different state.

Because they did not have their ID, what would have been a short flight of a few hours ended up being a bus ride which took approximately five days. These girls were 14 and 15 years old. Being on a Greyhound bus for five days as unaccompanied minors could be extremely dangerous. This is due to the possibilities of kidnapping, sex and labor trafficking, having their belongings stolen or getting lost in an unfamiliar location. Although they successfully reunited with their grandmother, this is not the case for all youth who are experiencing homelessness.

ARASH GHAFORI (Executive Director, Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth):
Assemblyman Thompson and I met to talk about this piece of legislation from conception. He was our teammate sitting next to us either up in Carson City or here in Las Vegas, as we made our way through the Legislature with this bill. It is with a heavy heart that Assemblyman Thompson is not here with us, but I want to thank Assemblywoman Benitez-Thompson for picking up the torch of A.B. 363 and helping to carry it through. I know Assemblyman Thompson would have us do exactly that.

Youth homelessness is a crisis in Nevada. I want to frame this issue. Nevada has the fifth highest number of homeless youth of any state in the Nation. On a given night, more than 1,400 youth and young adults in Nevada are living on the streets or in shelters. This crisis reaches every corner of our State. The prevalence of youth homelessness is identical in rural and urban communities throughout the Country.

Nevada school districts Statewide identified almost 17,000 students experiencing homelessness in the 2016-2017 school year. There are almost 1,500 of those students who are unaccompanied by adults. This is a striking 43 percent increase over the prior year.

Without services and support, youth experiencing homelessness are extremely vulnerable. They are vulnerable to assault, where 70 percent of homeless youth report experiencing some form of violence and 32 percent of which included sexual assault. They are vulnerable to sex trafficking, where 40 percent of homeless youth are victims at least once in a year. They are vulnerable to suicide, where homeless teenagers are 7.2 times more likely to attempt suicide than housed teenagers.

Tragically, despite their best efforts, homeless youth cannot access help because they lack basic documents like birth certificates and photo IDs. Without these vital documents, youth cannot secure employment or enroll in post-secondary education and training programs. They are striving in their efforts to work toward independence and leave their homelessness permanently behind.

Existing law already provides a one-time fee waiver for homeless individuals for duplicate IDs or driver's licenses. Assembly Bill 363 would add additional language to explicitly include homeless children and youth, and provide for a one-time fee waiver for either an original or duplicate ID or driver's license, including waiving the driver's license fees. At no cost, it will provide birth certificates to homeless youth, their school district liaisons and their social workers. It will allow unaccompanied youth to obtain statements of birth at no cost for the purpose of admissions to school or for employment. States like Florida, Kentucky and Wyoming have passed similar laws. Facilitating access to vital documents is an extremely low-cost way to provide key support to homeless youth who are striving to work, study and find independence and stability.

As Taisacan previously stated, removing barriers to youth's vital documents are a passport to a whole new life for them. In the words of Assemblyman Thompson, particularly about A.B. 363, as we know proper identification allows access to mainstream services, employment and overall independence. We owe it to our homeless youth. We do not want them to become homeless adults.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

I can go through the bill sections; it is doing exactly as the testifiers provided.

Section 1, subsections 1 through 4 are dealing with the examination of applicants. Within section 1, we are creating a new subsection 5. It states the Department shall waive the fees as prescribed by NRS 483.410, which are the fees and penalties charged by DMV for one time, for the administration of the examination. It prescribes a way by which to do this for a youth who is under the age of 25 years to sign an affidavit. The Department would prepare the form.

Section 1, subsection 6 defines homeless youth and we are keeping it in line with the federal definition of homeless youth, which is up to age 25.

Section 2 is where the fees and penalties are within this process. We are referencing NRS 483.330 which is how to waive those fees and the ability to have them waived for this particular population.

Section 3 is regarding the furnishing of a duplicate driver's license and adding in the language you will see again in subsection 4. This is in regard to the fees and penalties, and waiving the one-time cost for the original and duplicate for a homeless child or youth.

Section 4 deals with the ID cards. Once again you see the language about being able to waive the fee for those cards.

Section 5 deals with vital statistics and the fees. Looking at subsection 5, paragraph (c) we will be waiving the fee for a local educational agency to get the certified copy of a birth record for a homeless child or youth who is enrolled in their school. Paragraph (d) addresses the ability for a social worker to get a copy of the birth record as well for the youth.

Section 5, subsection 7 goes on to discuss the unaccompanied youth and being referenced by the federal definition in subsection 9, paragraph (c).

With the great testimony from the south, we hope this is a great step toward how we can help our homeless youth get their footing under them.

SENATOR HARDY:

What address do the youth use on their ID or their driver's license?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

I will refer to Mr. Ghafoori to answer the question.

MR. GHAFOORI:

With our organization, we have a facility which allows them to use our address. We also work with the school district and many other providers to look up addresses very near our housing facilities and they can use those addresses as well. For homeless youth who do not even have temporary housing, they can use drop-in center addresses or addresses from other providers as their place of residence.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

It tends to be true for the practice of the adult age homeless as well. They are using those addresses in which they are presently located.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

As long as the youths register with one of the homeless facilities, they can use one of those addresses, correct?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

I do not think it is necessarily register per se, but if they are a participant of and working with one of these groups, yes.

SENATOR HARDY:

On the affidavit which is alluded to in Section 1, subsection 5, is it the affidavit which states they at one time had a driver's license, they have taken the test or have passed the test or had a learner's permit? What does the affidavit do if they get a driver's license? Have they gone through the hoops to get one originally?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

The affidavit is specific to stating the child is a homeless youth; it is not anything other than to declare they are indeed a homeless youth.

SENATOR HARDY:

If they had a driver's license before and they lost it, then DMV has a record of it and can give them a duplicate? Then they do not have to go through the whole ordeal of trying to prove they knew how to drive.

Ms. SANBORN:

The affidavit is something the DMV currently has right now for homeless individuals, and it is to just attest they are homeless and eligible to receive a card free of charge. It has nothing to do with the fact they have been previously licensed or have an ID card.

SENATOR HARDY:

Are they able to drive with the new driver's license?

Ms. SANBORN:

They would still have to go through the process of obtaining a driver's license; there are a lot of factions to this. If they are coming in for a duplicate, obviously we would provide them with a duplicate of their current license. Otherwise, they would still have to go through the process of testing if they have never been licensed in the State.

SENATOR HARDY:

There is no shortcut with insurance for it?

Ms. SANBORN:

Insurance is not required to obtain a driver's license.

EMILY PAULSEN (Executive Director, Nevada Homeless Alliance):

I want to take a moment to think back to your first job as a teenager and the process you went through in order to obtain work. I remember when I was 15 years old I got my first job as a lifeguard. It was a dream job. There was a lot of planning and preparation which went into being able to do the work. What I remember most is how dependent I was on my mom. I remember her having to look through our records and files and discovering she no longer had a copy of my birth certificate. I remember she took care of getting the copy completely

without me. I did not have to go through any hoops to get my birth certificate. An adult in my life took care of it for me.

She took me to the DMV and paid for my driver's license, or at the time my ID which was a requirement at the time of employment. I realized many youth do not have a parent, guardian or adult in their life who can help them through this difficult and complex process.

This is a real simple solution to an overall complex issue. It can make a huge impact for our homeless youth to gain self-sufficiency and get employment and be on a better path. We support this bill and hope you will too.

FUILALA RILEY (CEO, HELP of Southern Nevada):

We operate the Shannon West Homeless Youth Center. This morning 93 homeless youth woke up in our facility. Through the year, several hundred and upward of 400 will access our services each year. Approximately 60 percent of the individuals who access our facility could benefit from this legislation. With this legislation we are here to support my colleague, Arash Ghafoori, and our partners, NPHY.

OMAR SAUCEDO (AT&T):

We appreciate and look forward to all of the discussions revolving around the homeless youth population. The reason AT&T is testifying here today is because AT&T is launching a national campaign in multiple cities across the Nation to address issues identified by those individual jurisdictions. The issue AT&T has identified for southern Nevada, particularly in Las Vegas, revolves around homeless youth. For this reason, we wanted to come here today to give you a heads-up that we are hoping to have a launch date sometime this summer. so we will be communicating with you when you head back down south.

The AT&T belief campaign is essentially a partnership with legal aid, Help of Southern Nevada and the courtyard facility of the City of Las Vegas. In discussion with our partners, we have learned these essential documents are barriers for success for our homeless youth in Las Vegas. In order to instill a belief this population can become successful and successfully transition away from being a homeless youth to become an employed, successful adult, we believe it is critical to allow them an avenue to access these documents.

On a personal note, it was an honor and a privilege to talk with Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson about the launch we were going to have in Las Vegas. I am sure I speak for many people in the audience that we are happy to champion and work in this area as we head home to celebrate his memory.

MR. GHAFORI:

I forgot to mention earlier we have a couple of members of YAC with us and they were the ones who submitted the letter today [Exhibit F](#). They were involved with the idea of this bill. It was something they identified as a priority, helped draft the bill and are here helping us present it today.

THOMAS MARTIN (Management Analyst III, Division of Management Services and Programs, Department of Motor Vehicles):

The DMV is neutral on this bill. It was a pleasure working with Assemblyman Thompson with the amendment regarding the examination fee being waived and the extra time on the implementation date.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON:

Assemblyman Thompson did have a quick closing remark and I will read from the remainder of his testimony, [Exhibit E](#).

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on [A.B. 363](#). I would take a do pass motion, but there is a question about the fact that Assemblyman Thompson is the only sponsor of the bill. We want to get clarity from legal and not mess up the bill's movement. Once we get clarity on it, we will move the bill.

SENATOR HARDY:

I believe there are a few of us who would be willing to co-sponsor with an amendment or just on the Floor.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I suggest the whole body co-sponsor this bill.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will work on the amendment with the list of co-sponsors.

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure
May 7, 2019
Page 32

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I would like to request Majority Leader Benitez-Thompson go back to her legislative body and also determine if their legislative body would like to have their names added to the bill.

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

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure
May 7, 2019
Page 33

CHAIR CANCELA:

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting is adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Debbie Shope,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Yvanna D. Cancela, Chair

DATE: _____

| EXHIBIT SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Bill | Exhibit / # of pages | | Witness / Entity | Description |
| | A | 1 | | Agenda |
| | B | 7 | | Attendance Roster |
| A.B. 23 | C | 9 | April Sanborn / Department of Motor Vehicles | Presentation |
| A.B. 333 | D | 1 | Marjorie Paslov Thomas | Work Session Document |
| A.B. 363 | E | 3 | Assemblywoman Benitez- Thompson | Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson Written Testimony |
| A.B. 363 | F | 1 | Taisacan Hall / Young Adults In Charge | Supporting Document |