

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

**Eightieth Session
May 9, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Yvanna D. Cancela at 1:42 p.m. on Thursday, May 9, 2019, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator 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. Settlemeyer
Senator Scott Hammond

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Assembly District No. 14
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo, Assembly District No. 18
Assemblyman John C. Ellison, Assembly District No. 33
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt, Assembly District No. 23
Assemblyman Tom Roberts, Assembly District No. 13
Assemblywoman Jill Tolles, Assembly District No. 25

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst
Darcy Johnson, Committee Counsel
Tammy Lubich, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Cole Mortensen, P.E., CPM, Assistant Director, Engineering, Chief Engineer,
Nevada Department of Transportation
Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services,
Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Eric Spratley, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Jennifer Noble, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Nevada District Attorneys
Association
Mary-Sarah Kinner, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Joe Ingraham, Chief, Washoe County Department of Alternative Sentencing,
Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Scott Swain, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety
Kendra Bertschy, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's
Office
Gerard Mager
Illona Mager
Jude Hurin, CPM, Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division,
Department of Motor Vehicles
Debbie Martinez, CPM, Management Analyst III, Motor Carrier Division,
Department of Motor Vehicles
Paul J. Enos, CEO, Nevada Trucking Association
Eduardo Martinez, Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors of America
Roy Baughman
John Amestoy, Commercial Enforcement, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department
of Public Safety
Tyler Ingram, District Attorney, Elko County, Nevada
Reverend Joshua Krintz
Priscilla Krintz
Corey Solferino, Lieutenant, Administrative Bureau; Research and Development,
Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Carrie Power, APRN
Larry Robb
Jean Fierro
Jerod Marsh
Elisa Cafferata, Nevada Commission for Women
Scott Anderson, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State
Marty Elzy, BM, CPM, Management Analyst, Central Services and Records
Division, Department of Motor Vehicles

Aleta Dupree

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will begin with the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 198.

ASSEMBLY BILL 198 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the sale or lease of certain real property owned by the Department of Transportation. (BDR 35-953)

ASSEMBLYMAN GLEN LEAVITT (Assembly District No. 23):

I would like to give you a bit of context and background on how this bill came about. A constituent came to me with a problem concerning property owners with the frontage of their property being miscalculated, even though the property line ended at the back of the curb. The property owners had been treating this 10-foot piece of frontage as their property for 40 to 50 years and were worried that proposed improvements to the street would cause them to lose access to that property, detrimentally affecting their businesses.

The bill does have a conceptual amendment, ([Exhibit C](#)). We have been working with stakeholders to make sure that everyone is on board and no one is harmed.

Section 12, lines 14 through 21 are stricken. It is not my intention to force the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) to offer up the land for any price. After talking to NDOT, we realized this could cause NDOT to break federal law. Therefore, that language was removed and what remains is what will work with NDOT and their current lease program. The NDOT stated they can lease land to property owners and I wanted to work within those provisions. Section 12 also clarifies the NDOT is not required to offer a lease of any real property if the lease or transfer of the land has a detrimental effect to public safety or future transfer of sale of the publicly owned land. The bill also authorizes the NDOT to offer lease property to an abutting property not being used, and requires a county, city or town to honor such a lease before the property is relinquished or disposed to a county, city or town.

Last, the conceptual amendment adds a new section to clarify that prior to development or redevelopment of land owned by any municipality, the municipality will provide the first right of refusal to any abutting property owner to acquire the land at fair market value. This way, the property owner has a chance to buy the land if the land line is incorrect or owned by the municipality,

and before the property is redeveloped. The municipality can also give the property to the owner should they deem it eligible. The caveat is the municipality is not required to do so if it affects public safety. We do not want to make the roadway unsafe by annexing or selling the land to a property owner or if it affects the way they are going to sell the land for future use by another public sector.

The intent of the bill is to promote public benefit for my constituents. I can see the scenario going Statewide and I wanted to make sure that we codified the logistics.

In Nevada, the United States owns 84.9 percent of the State land. In my region a lot of the land is owned by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of Land Management. I bring this up to highlight the limited amount of private land actually available for the citizens to expand. Congress regularly passes legislation that authorizes the conveyance of certain lands. Assembly Bill 198 is in that spirit.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Is there a way to deal with this at a local level through either the city or the county?

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT:

It was the intent with this bill to balance the needs of the public sector with the needs of the private property owner.

COLE MORTENSEN, P.E., CPM (Assistant Director, Engineering, Chief Engineer, Nevada Department of Transportation):

The NDOT still has concerns about the language in the bill. We are working with the Assemblyman, and before we are in agreement, would like to see where the language fits into the statutes.

SENATOR HARDY:

In fair disclosure, I have been involved with parking places that are under the control of NDOT. Would this affect leasing parking places under the control of NDOT or preclude them from doing this?

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure
May 9, 2019
Page 5

MR. MORTENSEN:

The NDOT would have to see the final language before I can give you a definitive answer.

SENATOR HARDY:

Would you be optimistic that it could if the language was right?

MR. MORTENSEN:

Yes, the current law and this law would still allow NDOT to lease property to individuals for use in that scenario.

SENATOR HARDY:

Is there language that NDOT would like to make them more comfortable with this bill?

MR. MORTENSEN:

The NDOT would have to look at the language first.

SENATOR HARDY:

Would you like to suggest language?

MR. MORTENSEN:

Without knowing what the final language in the bill is going to be, it would be difficult for me to suggest language.

SENATOR HARDY:

To make a more pointed suggestion, would you like to suggest language for the bill and then decide if you like that language?

MR. MORTENSEN:

Yes, I would be happy to do that.

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT:

I have been working with NDOT and as long as we can maintain the balance between the public sector and the private property owners, I am happy to include language they would wish to put in this bill.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 198 and open the hearing on A.B. 201.

ASSEMBLY BILL 201 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing certain traffic laws. (BDR 43-604)

ASSEMBLYMAN TOM ROBERTS (Assembly District No. 13):

Before I retired from the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, we had a significant problem in southern Nevada with groups of 25 to 30 stunt motorcycle riders, trailed by trucks and cars, stopping traffic on the freeway, doing trick riding and disrupting traffic. This was causing some motorists to get into fights.

We started combating this problem by creating a deployment plan every weekend. We would use social media to try to find them and on certain days of the week when we knew they were going to be out we would spend a considerable amount of resources to try to mitigate these events. Often, we would only catch one or two of the offenders.

There are no penalties for the people who are participating or assisting in the blocking of traffic or filming of the stunts. We did not have much success in prosecuting or deterring people from doing the stunts. Therefore, after I retired, Mr. Callaway approached me and the result was A.B. 201.

CHUCK CALLAWAY (Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department):

I will show the Committee a short video which helps explain why A.B. 201 is needed. The video is of a group of trick riders driving recklessly through Las Vegas. On several occasions, tourists in crosswalks are almost hit. In one clip the riders almost run a red light but decide at the last second to stop for some pedestrians in the crosswalk. It is only a matter of time until someone is hit or killed by one of these riders. At the rate of speed they are traveling, if a rider were to lose control and a motorcycle went onto a curb or into a crowd, it would cause a significant amount of damage.

In part of the video a group does stunts in front of Caesars Palace on a busy weekend. It also is common for some members of these groups to block traffic so others can do stunts in the middle of an intersection. The video shows the riders stopping traffic at several intersections and in the middle of the road.

The video shows these riders can lose control at high speeds. The riders often claim to be professional student drivers and that nothing bad ever happens, but

the video disproves that claim. At one point in the video the group sees a police camera on the side of the road, makes a comment and waves to the camera. Part of the appeal is doing these stunts illegally.

These groups are very organized and use social media to communicate. They will pick a spot to film and then put it on YouTube. They like to do it on the Las Vegas Strip. One recent video was done on the Bay Bridge in San Francisco. The whole purpose of this type of stunt is notoriety. The video clips I showed today were taken directly off of YouTube and were specifically of the Las Vegas Strip.

We have reached out to these groups and tried to convince them to do this the legal way, to get a permit to shut down the road to do their stunts. They do not want to do this the legal way. The appeal is in doing these stunts illegally. As one gentleman's shirt said, "We Don't Stop for the Cops."

For safety reasons, we do not pursue the people we encounter due to the speeds at which they are traveling, but do try to track them using an air unit. Often there are no plates on their vehicles so we cannot run a plate to find out who they are. We have gotten lucky on a few occasions. In one case they accidentally turned into a gated community and our units were able to stop them.

The statutes for reckless driving or for speed contests do not adequately address this type of behavior. The original bill created a new statute for stunt driving and for facilitating stunt driving for the people who are blocking the roadway and helping this type of activity occur.

The main purpose of this bill is to give us the ability to charge more serious penalties than just a misdemeanor reckless driving charge. The original version of the bill would have given us the ability to seize the motorcycle but was removed in the reprint. Assembly Bill 201 allows the courts to impound the motorcycles for 30 days, but the forfeiture language was removed.

We worked closely with the public defenders on the Assembly side and reduced the penalty for first time offenders to a misdemeanor offense for the facilitator, the person blocking traffic, and a gross misdemeanor offense for the person who is actually doing the stunt and endangering the public. Section 3, subsection 11, paragraph (c) defines a trick driving display. The person would

have to meet the criteria established in the bill in order to be charged with this offense.

CHAIR CANCELA:

The definition of trick driving display uses the word "vehicle." Does that encompass anything motorized?

MR. CALLAWAY:

Our intent was to focus on any group that might be engaged in this type of activity regardless of the type of vehicle.

CHAIR CANCELA:

You mentioned it is difficult to actually stop people when they are engaged in these acts. How do people get caught?

MR. CALLAWAY:

We have to do an in-depth investigation going to social media and getting a subpoena for the records of their IP addresses and serve search warrants. For a misdemeanor offense, this does not happen.

We also want to send a message to deter this in other jurisdictions. Florida passed a trick driving law a few years ago and there has been a decrease in this type of activity. Hopefully, the word will get out not do this in Las Vegas, because you will lose your motorcycle for 30 days and be cited with a gross misdemeanor offense.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Will this change the ability to prosecute someone for vehicular manslaughter if they hit a pedestrian while doing this type of activity?

MR. CALLAWAY:

This is a stand-alone legislation and is not intended to impact any of the existing manslaughter or vehicular manslaughter laws.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Page 6, line 8, states "Facilitate an unauthorized trick driving display on a public highway." Is the objective to give you the ability to ticket individuals who are blocking traffic?

MR. CALLAWAY:

Yes, we want to be able to cite the person who is blocking traffic with a first offense misdemeanor.

SENATOR HAMMOND:

Are you seeing more confrontations with people in the cars who do not want to be stopped, and is there already a mechanism in place where you can cite them?

MR. CALLAWAY:

We have had fist fights in our jurisdiction and there was one case back east where a person in a van drove through their barriers and ran over a motorcyclist causing him to be crippled. In another case, someone was shot because they said they were in fear for their life. There are no statutes prior to this bill to address this activity and it is difficult to prosecute these cases under reckless driving.

ERIC SPRATLEY (Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association):

We are in support of A.B. 201. Throughout Nevada, we have a number of motorcycle related special events, such as Street Vibrations in Reno and Run-A-Mucca in Winnemucca. These events are designed to attract riders and will occasionally sanction trick riding in certain areas and venues that are permitted and approved.

We do see these types of motorcycle trick riding displays on our public streets across the State at all hours of the day and night. This is a detriment to the safety of the traveling public and visitors on our roadways. I would like to reiterate that this trick driving would apply to a car or truck. If you google search the term "sidewall skiing," you will see how they take a perfectly good four-wheel vehicle, put it up on two wheels, then the passenger hangs out and does all kinds of stunts on the high side of the vehicle. If you can imagine that happening on the Las Vegas Strip, it would be detrimental to the people.

JENNIFER NOBLE (Chief Deputy District Attorney, Nevada District Attorneys Association):

We are in support of A.B. 201. These are acts that cause danger to the public and to the people performing them. In terms of penalty, this bill is an appropriate step.

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure
May 9, 2019
Page 10

MARY-SARAH KINNER (Washoe County Sheriff's Office):
We support A.B. 201 and ditto the prior comments.

CHAIR CANCELA:
We will close the hearing on A.B. 201. I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 201.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR BROOKS WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

We will open the hearing on A.B. 316.

ASSEMBLY BILL 316 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to driving under the influence of alcohol or a prohibited substance. (BDR 43-312)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JILL TOLLES (Assembly District No. 25):

In 2016, I was contacted by a gentleman who was interested in voting for me but wanted to know where I stood on drunk driving. I met with him and he shared the story about his son who was a high school valedictorian, quarterback of the football team and who was one week away from graduation. He explained how his son was coming home after school at 3:30 in the afternoon and was hit and killed by a drunk driver.

The same day, I received a message from another voter who wanted to know where I stood on public safety issues, specifically road safety issues. I answered that just this morning I had a meeting with a man who lost his son to a drunk driver and explained I am very committed to looking at solutions to this issue. The gentleman named the same student from my previous conversation and he stated he was the officer on the scene of that crash. I am pleased to stand before this Committee and offer this bill on behalf of those constituents, specifically the constituent to my right. Scott Swain is a retired officer for the Department of Public Safety (DPS) who has spent a tremendous amount of time researching the program we are bringing forward. The Sober 24 program (24/7)

has been successfully implemented in Washoe County and we are hoping to make it Statewide.

There is a presentation under DPS on NELIS ([Exhibit D](#)) which will give you an overview of the 24/7 program. The 24/7 is a National Highway Safety Administration authorized program with grant funds for states with laws that qualify. There is no fiscal note with this bill, because putting this into statute allows the State the ability to apply for available federal grants. These grants can help take the program Statewide if local jurisdictions choose to implement the 24/7 program.

The 24/7 program originated in South Dakota in 2005 as the South Dakota 24/7 Sobriety Program, and 11 states have authorizing language and have implemented the program. Multiple states have implemented pilot programs, including the one in Washoe County. There are four core tenets which include twice daily alcohol testing, random drug testing, immediate sanctions and a restricted driver's license.

The tenet that has made this so successful for the participants is the restricted driver's license. It is important participants have the ability to drive to and from the testing center and to their jobs. This keeps their means of employment and income providing a positive impact, not only for that individual, but for their family. This program is designed to deal with the root cause of keeping the participants sober and out of our jails.

The overall discussion this Session has been about how we can reduce recidivism, finding programs to address the root cause and striking a balance to keeping our roads safe.

Chief Ingraham of the Washoe County Department of Alternative Sentencing will explain the statistical success of the program in Washoe County. A study by RAND Drug Policy Research Center ([Exhibit E](#)) can be found on NELIS, which shows the success in South Dakota.

JOE INGRAHAM (Chief, Washoe County Department of Alternative Sentencing, Washoe County Sheriff's Office):

In 2016, we partnered with the Office of Traffic Safety and put together a team to view the South Dakota model of 24/7. The first time I saw the program, I was skeptical because I did not understand the process of the twice a day

testing and the random drug testing. I was excited after seeing the results in South Dakota where people were tested twice a day, paying for the test to help offset the operating cost and holding those folks accountable.

We went to a national conference in Montana and expanded our team to include members of law enforcement, judges and a district attorney. At that point, we were getting a lot of synergy and knew this was a program we wanted to bring back to Washoe County. With help from Judge Scott Pearson of the Reno Justice Court, we started a pilot program and were awarded \$45,000 funding from the State. In a short period of time, we had 200 people in the program. I was still skeptical of the success rate, but we found 99 percent of the people testing for alcohol were successfully completing the testing requirements.

In 2018, we conducted over 84,000 drug and alcohol tests in Washoe County with a 98 percent success rate. One of the dynamics of this program is the participants can remain productive people by maintaining their employment by holding them accountable. The participants pay as they go to offset the operating costs so it does not cost the taxpayers money.

We also do testing for Washoe County Child Protective Services to ensure the children are in a safe environment. At this time, we are supervising and testing just under 1,100 cases. After operating for approximately three years, there have been huge successes. After the first year of successful completion, the recidivism rate is low; 9 percent. I encourage the Committee to look at this bill because it would be very dynamic for the rest of the State.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Most drug courts require a person to wait a period of time before getting a restricted driver's license. Will your participants be able to get a restricted driver's license immediately or is there a required period of time?

CHIEF INGRAHAM:

They do not get their license right away. This is one of the benefits of the South Dakota model. If a person agrees to participate in the program, they would get their license reinstated.

There is a high percentage of people who are still driving who have revoked or suspended licenses due to a DUI. Why not reinstate their license and test them to make sure they are clean and stay clean? We start at 5:30 a.m. and test until

about 9:00 a.m. and then start testing again about 3:00 p.m. and test until 8:30 p.m. This way we have a span to ensure that they are staying sober.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Most counties have gone to transdermal alcohol monitoring and are testing more than twice a day; it is literally every two minutes. Is the bill stating there is no delay or a period of "good behavior?" Do they get their license right away?

SCOTT SWAIN (Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety):

As the bill is written, it would take a court order and a judge would have to sentence the person to the program. As long as they are in the program and complying with the program, they would be eligible for a restricted driver's license. Immediate sanctions are one of the cornerstones of the 24/7 program. Other states have found this is effective because the participants in the program know if they test positive for any substance, they are subject to immediate sanctions. With the transdermal, there is not always an officer next to you and there would not be immediate sanctions. With the 24/7 program, there is an officer there who would enforce those sanctions right away.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

You are basically allowing the judge to make that determination. This is an individual drug diversion court in many respects. Some counties have added regularly scheduled medical care, the ability to drive children to the hospital if necessary or even go to the store once a week to get groceries. I am concerned you do not have the aspect of saying they can get their driver's license right away and are only giving them flexibility under certain parameters. The "one shoe fits all" approach does not work because every case is individual. Would you want to create a more flexible list?

MR. SWAIN:

Are you asking if a judge should be able to make the decision on where they can drive with their restricted driver's license?

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Page 3, lines 44 and 45, shows the parameters to utilization of a restricted driver's license; to and from a testing location, to and from work, to and from court appearances and to and from counseling. These are all logical but other counties add additional parameters. Other drug diversion courts in this State have added being able to go to the grocery store, taking a child to a doctor's

appointment or things of this nature in order to keep up the consistency of a normal life. Do you think a parameter should be added for any other matters that the court prescribes?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

This bill does give judicial discretion and it outlines the basic core components. Any judge can add to the basic core components and they may be used in conjunction with other programs, such as the Interlock program. There is nothing restricting judicial discretion. In order for this to be called a 24/7 program, it has to have the listed basic core components.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

That is all I need to know.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

With the approval of the marijuana lounges in Las Vegas, are you prepared for the influx of people driving under the influence?

CHIEF INGRAHAM:

We have been challenged with that ever since recreational marijuana came into existence. I am sure it is going to have an impact on us.

SENATOR HARDY:

Does the restricted license have any identifying mark so the arresting officer or the checking officer knows it is restricted? My other questions concern the prohibited substances. Does prohibited mean they do not have a prescription or are prohibited because they are Schedule I through Schedule IV drugs? What other prohibited substances are you checking on a random basis?

CHIEF INGRAHAM:

We test for 12 different substances, and with the opioid crisis we have added several others and are looking to test some of the synthetics. Washoe County will be putting in a drug analyzing lab in our facility so we can do in-house testing. This will give us many options to test several different substances. In Washoe County, we watch the trends and get the medical examiner's report annually to see what is causing the overdoses. This way we can try to also test for those.

SENATOR HARDY:

Are you always checking for marijuana?

CHIEF INGRAHAM:

Yes, marijuana and alcohol are always checked.

SENATOR HARDY:

Are you always checking for heroin?

CHIEF INGRAHAM:

Not always. We do random testing so they do not know what we are testing for. We could test for 1 or 50 different drugs. This keeps them on their toes and that is why the 24/7 program works.

SENATOR HARDY:

Are you capable of checking for all opioids, benzodiazepines, marijuana, the Schedule I through Schedule IV drugs and the drug of the week cocktail as it were?

CHIEF INGRAHAM:

That is one of our challenges. There is Kratom, Spice and K2. There are so many different drugs and the analyzing manufacturers are trying to stay on top of them.

SENATOR HARDY:

Are you checking for Kratom because it has been shown to be a problem?

CHIEF INGRAHAM:

Yes, the new lab will be able to check for Kratom.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

Section 1, subsection 1 provides for the issuance of the restricted driver's license to individuals who participate in the 24/7 program. The restricted license is for drivers with a revoked or suspended license who participate in the program created pursuant to this bill. It permits the applicant to drive a motor vehicle for specific purposes.

Section 2 identifies Chapter 484C of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) that the bill will amend.

Section 3 names the bill the "Nevada 24/7 Sobriety and Drug Monitoring Program Act."

Section 4 provides a legislative declaration and purpose for the bill.

Section 5 states that the definitions provided are specific to the sections where they appear.

Sections 6 through section 9.5 contain definitions for the terms "core components," "designates law enforcement agency," "immediate sanction" and "political subdivision."

Section 14 establishes a Statewide sobriety and drug monitoring program and authorizes any political subdivision in the State that may elect to participate. This section also defines certain provisions that must be included as core components of the program regarding testing for drugs and alcohol. The core components generally require twice daily testing for alcohol, and twice weekly testing, at a minimum, for other prohibitive substances. Of course, "as appropriate" can be added to that.

Section 15 provides that if a political subdivision elects to participate in the program, the DPS is authorized to assist the political subdivision in the establishment and administration of the program and the political subdivision is required to designate a law enforcement agency to enforce the program.

Section 16 authorizes a court to assign an offender who is found guilty of driving under the influence of alcohol or a prohibitive substance for the second or third time within seven years, to the program for a specified period to be determined by the court. In section 20, it defers to section 16 under subsection 1, paragraph (b) where it states "or the person is assigned to a program pursuant to section 16 of this act." It is also stated in section 20, subsection 1, paragraph (c) "except as otherwise provided in NRS 484C.340 and unless the person is assigned to a program pursuant to section 16 of this act." This is the judicial discretion we talked about.

Among other provisions, if the offender fails to participate in the program for the period determined by the court, or fails to comply with the program, the court may require the offender to serve the remainder of the previously suspended sentence. This section also authorizes the DMV to adopt any

regulations necessary to provide for the issuance of a restricted driver's license should a person agree to the program.

Section 17 provides certain provisions for anyone participating in the program including the abstinence and testing requirements.

Section 18 requires each political subdivision that elects to participate in the program to adopt guidelines relating to the program.

Section 19 requires law enforcement agencies that enforce the program to collect any fees, deposit the fees into applicable local program accounts and establish programs relating to the distribution and use of those fees.

In 2017, Washoe County served 743 participants and administered 39,090 preliminary breath tests with 99.74 percent of those tests being negative for alcohol. They administered 28,265 drug tests with 94.38 percent of those tests being negative. The success rates are similar to the programs we have seen in South Dakota. Through February 2019, remembering this was first established in 2005, there were almost 11 million breathalyzer tests and the pass rate was consistently 99 percent.

This works, keeps people sober, keeps them safe on the road and deals with the underlying problem. Additionally, not only did recidivism reduce by 12 percent, domestic violence rates went down Statewide by 9 percent. This is due to the correlation of substance abuse and domestic violence.

MR. CALLAWAY:

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department supports A.B. 316.

MR. SPRATLEY:

Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association supports A.B. 316.

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

The Washoe County Public Defender's Office, along with John Piro of the Clark County Public Defender's Office, support A.B. 316.

We are implementing this program, believe it has been successful and has been used in conjunction with other programs such as drug court specific or community court programs.

SENATOR HARDY:

Do you make a little mark on the restricted driver's license in indelible ink or how do you distinguish a restricted driver's license from a regular driver's license?

Ms. BERTSCHY:

That would be a question for DMV.

SENATOR HARDY

Are you doing this with a special license?

Ms. BERTSCHY:

In Washoe County, we are implementing the 24/7 program specifically with the testing provision. The officers and representatives of the Department of Alternative Sentencing are here and would be able to better answer that question.

SENATOR HARDY:

So you are not aware of any special driver's license?

Ms. BERTSCHY:

I am aware that unless they have the interlock device, they cannot receive the driver's license. That is the purpose of this program. But there are representatives here who would be better able to answer your questions.

GERARD MAGER:

As the parent of a 17-year-old who was killed by a driver high on marijuana, I support A.B. 316.

Our son's life was not worth someone else's high. No one's life is worth someone else's high or intoxication. This bill will save lives, reduce recidivism and help people with addiction. It is imperative this bill is passed for those reasons. Remember the life you save may be your own or one of your family. Driving under the influence is very dangerous and it needs to be controlled.

ILLONA MAGER:

Mother's Day is approaching and I lost my only child. I can guarantee you that every mother with a child who is not present any longer is thinking of that child on Mother's Day if not every day. This bill is not only an opportunity to save lives, it also allows the courts to direct offenders into a program that can address their drug or alcohol use. There is no way to describe to you the pain of losing a child or the sudden loss of being told through a phone conversation with an emergency room of the loss of your child. The last thing any parent wants to hear is that their child's death was a wake-up call for an offender to stop driving impaired. Please pass this bill.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Mr. and Mrs. Mager, this is the second time you have been before this Committee and I cannot say how much we appreciate your courage in taking what is undoubtedly an awful tragedy and turning it into such passionate activism. Thank you for being here today.

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

The Department of Motor Vehicles is in a neutral position on A.B. 316.

SENATOR DENIS:

How do you identify a different type of license for this situation?

MR. HURIN:

With this bill, we would be enhancing our restricted driver's license program to allow for those conditions. To address your question, the Washoe County program does not deal with a restricted license at this point in time. This bill would bridge those two and allow for a restricted license while under the court program.

SENATOR DENIS:

Is the license still an ID, or is it treated like a regular ID and is just restricted?

MR. HURIN:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

You are saying the restricted license looks identical in all outward appearances to a regular license. However, if an individual comes in contact with law enforcements and it is pulled up on the computer it will state there is a restriction.

MR. HURIN:

Yes, you are correct.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Is there an amendment to this bill?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

At this time there are no amendments to the bill.

CHAIR CANCELA

Are you working on any changes to the bill in any way?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

No, I am not.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 316. I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 316.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TOLLES:

There was an amendment. You wanted to add yourself as a co-sponsor.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Yes, I want to be added as a co-sponsor on the bill, as well as Senator Hardy, Senator Denis, Senator Hammond, Senator Spearman and Senator Settelmeyer.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO RECONSIDER AND AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 316.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will open the hearing on A.B. 320.

ASSEMBLY BILL 320 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing commercial motor vehicles. (BDR 43-255)

ASSEMBLYMAN RICHARD CARRILLO (Assembly District No. 18):

Thank you for allowing me to present A.B. 320. Paul Enos with the Nevada Truckers Association and Debbie Martinez with DMV will explain the bill.

DEBBIE MARTINEZ, CPM (Management Analyst III, Motor Carrier Division, Department of Motor Vehicles):

I will read my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).

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

The Nevada Trucking Association supports A.B. 320.

Assembly Bill 320 was created after one of our trucking safety summits, where regulators, law enforcement and industry come together to talk about issues that are impacting the industry. This bill concerns making permits truck specific and was brought forward by both the Nevada Highway Patrol and the DMV.

For years, the Nevada Trucking Association opposed this because we felt the permits were expensive and should be transferrable from one truck to the other. This way if one truck breaks down, another truck would be able to carry multiple trailers. Too often people were gaming the system by buying one permit for multiple trucks that could be transferred from one vehicle to another.

When the Highway Patrol pulls a truck over, they weigh the truck to see exactly how they are going to cite them and that is a labor-intensive process. It is also hazardous for a law enforcement official to be out on the road weighing a truck with portable scales. They would then go to court and the citation is dismissed by the court, because the permit that was not in the truck during the traffic stop now shows up when they go to court.

We want to make sure that we are complying with the law and these permits will now be truck specific. This will streamline the process for the industry since the registration will be on a cab card instead of a separate piece of paper. A truck will be registered for up to 129,000 pounds with any configuration that is legal.

The DMV did an analysis and there is potentially an additional \$800,000 revenue to the State in registered vehicles based in the State.

EDUARDO MARTINEZ (Nevada Chapter, Associated General Contractors of America):

We are in support of A.B. 320 for the previously mentioned reasons.

ROY BAUGHMAN:

I am a retired Lieutenant with the Highway Patrol. Prior to retirement, I was in charge of the Commercial Enforcement Section of the State. Our officers on the roadside have to make a judgement call when a vehicle is registered at 80,000 pounds and the permit is not in the vehicle. They take their time to weigh it, inspect it, cite it and by the time the trooper is done with the traffic stop the citation is being dismissed. We have worked with industry over the last couple of years to streamline the process so trucks coming into Nevada do not have to get a permit. They will register their vehicle under the International Registration Plan for the correct weight they are hauling in Nevada and will pay their fair share.

JOHN AMESTOY (Commercial Enforcement, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety):

I want to echo what the former Lieutenant said in support of A.B. 320.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO:

This bill levels the playing field for the trucking companies. It is important to ensure that every commercial motor vehicle we are focusing on in this bill is properly registered.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 320. I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 320.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR WASHINGTON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

We will begin the work session with A.B. 54.

ASSEMBLY BILL 54 (1st Reprint): Revises certain provisions relating to energy efficiency. (BDR 58-327)

MARJORIE PASLOV THOMAS (Committee Policy Analyst):

I will read the summary of the bill from the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).

CHAIR CANCELA:

I will entertain a motion on A.B. 54.

SENATOR SPEARMAN MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 54.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR WASHINGTON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

We will now move to the work session for A.B. 363.

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

MS. PASLOV THOMAS:

I will read the summary of the bill and the amendment from the work session document ([Exhibit H](#)).

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure
May 9, 2019
Page 24

CHAIR CANCELA:

The entire body of the Senate was also added as co-sponsors, but because we did it on the Senate Floor it is not part of the amendment. I will entertain a motion on A.B. 363.

SENATOR SPEARMAN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 363.

SENATOR HAMMOND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR WASHINGTON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

We will now move to the work session for A.B. 485.

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

Ms. PASLOV THOMAS:

I will read the summary of the bill and the proposed amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit I](#)).

CHAIR CANCELA:

I will entertain a motion on A.B. 485.

SENATOR BROOKS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 485.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

It seems odd to have such high insurance limitations such as \$1 million and \$5 million. Limousines are \$1 million and \$2 million. I will not support it at this time.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS CANCELA AND SETTELMAYER
VOTED NO. SENATOR WASHINGTON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will open the hearing on A.B. 403.

ASSEMBLY BILL 403 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to certain traffic offenses. (BDR 43-42)

ASSEMBLYMAN JOHN C. ELLISON (Assembly District No. 33):

I am here to present A.B. 403 for your consideration. The young man in the picture, ([Exhibit J](#)), was killed in a Walmart parking lot. He was a member and pastor of our church and was hit and killed by a young man who was not paying attention while he drove through the parking lot. This bill is about people driving through parking lots not paying attention, texting and driving too fast without a driver's license or insurance.

Driving on private property still carries many of the same inherent risks and dangers as driving in a public space. Some may infer that the danger is significantly lessened, or that private property allows for a more "controlled environment" in comparison to that of a public space.

Nevada reckless driving and vehicular manslaughter laws only apply to motor vehicles operated on highways. This creates a loophole to roadways that have public access, such as parking lots, parking garages, business parking, apartment complexes and gated communities.

After presenting this bill in the Assembly, a policeman told us that there was a kid hit by a vehicle, but was not hurt. The driver of the vehicle was not paying attention and fortunately, the kid was not hurt.

This shows how often this is happening in parking lots and those doing the driving are not being held accountable. The district attorney in Elko will explain how an individual's sentence was overturned for killing with his vehicle in a parking lot because it was on private property in a commercial parking lot.

TYLER INGRAM (District Attorney, Elko County, Nevada):

I was the District Attorney when this case came to trial. Although I did not personally prosecute it, I am very familiar with the specifics.

The defendant in this case was driving through the Walmart parking lot too fast and the judge found there was proof beyond a reasonable doubt to that fact. There was a set of gauges installed to the left of the steering wheel that partially blocked the view to the driver's left and the defendant hit and killed a member of our community. The case was tried in Elko Justice Court where he was found guilty of vehicular manslaughter and sentenced.

On an appeal to the District Court, one of the District Court Judges in the Fourth Judicial District overturned the conviction because the incident occurred in a private parking lot. In the past, the Nevada Supreme Court has ruled that in order to be convicted of vehicular manslaughter, you had to have committed an unlawful act or omission which would warrant a traffic violation. Our traffic laws in statute apply to public highways, not private parking lots. In this particular instance, since it was a private lot, a traffic violation could not have been committed.

The language in the bill Assemblyman Ellison is sponsoring is not unprecedented. We have driving under the influence (DUI) statutes permitting prosecution and conviction of a DUI on a premises to which the public has access and would include getting a DUI in a Walmart parking lot. The purpose of this bill is to include premises that the public has access to and take this interpretation away from the judges. This is not to remove the judge's discretion; it is to make it clear going forward that as prosecutors, we can prosecute these cases.

REVEREND JOSHUA KRAINTZ:

On July 15, 2015, my brother was crossing an entrance crosswalk and was hit and killed by a vehicle. Our family does not have any ill will toward the gentleman who hit him and caused his death, but was shocked to hear that his court case had been overturned due to a technicality.

I have been watching the previous bill throughout this hearing and if the trick rider with the motorcycle ripped through Walmart's parking lot tomorrow, hit and killed somebody, they would not be charged for the manslaughter. It would

be the same as the gentleman who was not charged as was the case of my brother, simply because he was on private property in a parking lot at Walmart.

There is no true price for anyone's life. To give you an idea of his reputation in our community, he sang for every event you could possibly imagine; every funeral, type of celebration and Fourth of July celebration. Though our congregation runs between 40 and 60 people, there were nearly 1,000 people at his funeral service. The impact on this community and the overall sense of a lack of safety when you are in a parking lot has been overwhelming.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON:

As Mr. Kraintz stated, there were 1,000 people and the funeral had to be moved to the convention center. This pastor was walking across the parking lot and was hit, the conviction overturned due to a technicality. I am not asking for him to go to prison forever, but he should be held accountable.

This type of crash is happening every day in the State and drivers are not being held accountable. This is why A.B. 403 is so important. This bill is not for the people who are backing up and hitting someone. It is for the people who are not paying attention, drag racing and texting.

Assembly Bill 403 provides an exception to the traffic laws related to motor vehicles and applies uniformly throughout the State and the highways to which the public has a right to access; or to which the persons have access to as invitees or licensees.

It expands the law pertaining to reckless driving and vehicular manslaughter offenses to apply to premises to which the public has access. This includes parking lots, parking garages and other access roads or ways that provide access to or belong to the public or business, apartment building, mobile home parks and gated residential communities.

An amendment adopted in the Assembly clarifies the relationship between NRS 484A.400 and the amendatory provisions of this bill.

SENATOR BROOKS:

Are there any other violations that would be applicable to private property that the public has access to besides the vehicular manslaughter?

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure
May 9, 2019
Page 28

MR. INGRAM:

The bill would make the actual crimes that are listed in the bill applicable to premises to which the public has access. It would not make speeding illegal in a Walmart parking lot. However, if you are speeding and kill somebody, vehicular manslaughter would apply and be prosecutable.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON:

It would be the same if you pulled out of a Walmart parking lot into the crosswalk on the roadway. There would be no difference in the law if you are in a crosswalk on the street or in a private parking lot. This will not hold the stores liable, it only holds the driver liable for negligence.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We are going to close the hearing on A.B. 403.

I am reopening the work session for A.B. 363 to correct the amendment. I will entertain a motion to reconsider A.B. 363.

SENATOR SPEARMAN MOVED TO RECONSIDER A.B. 363.

SENATOR HAMMOND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

* * * * *

SENATOR SPEARMAN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED WITH ASSEMBLYWOMAN BENITEZ-THOMPSON'S AMENDMENT AND INCLUDE THE SENATE GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE MEMBERS AS CO-SPONSORS TO A.B. 363.

SENATOR HAMMOND SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

We will reopen the hearing on A.B. 403.

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure
May 9, 2019
Page 29

PRISCILLA KRAINTZ:

My name is Pricilla Kraintz and I am in favor of A.B. 403.

It was my son who was killed in the parking lot in Elko on Wednesday, July 15, 2015, and I am speaking on his behalf. I want you to understand, as a family we do not feel vindictive or vengeful toward Tyler. We are moving through the sadness of this unfortunate situation and are trying to look forward with faith and optimism. We wish the same for Tyler and his family. It has always been our hope that lessons will be learned and lives will be changed for the better as a result of this tragic accident. This is what Jared would want for all who are involved. This has been our family's attitude since the time of the accident.

I was shocked when I received the call from the District Attorney's Office explaining Tyler had appealed the conviction of vehicular manslaughter to the District Court and the conviction was reversed. This young man was speeding around the parking lot and he killed my son. He did not have a driver's license. He was driving a borrowed car he was planning to buy; therefore, he had no insurance. Now because of the way the law is written, he was given the ability to walk away from his sentence with no accountability. This turn of events does not seem just or reasonable in the light of the loss of my son. I encourage all of you to support A.B. 403 and protect the citizens of Nevada.

MS. NOBLE:

The Nevada District Attorneys Association is in support of A.B. 403.

MR. SPRATLEY:

The Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association supports A.B. 403.

MR. CALLAWAY:

The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department supports A.B. 403.

COREY SOLFERINO (Lieutenant, Administrative Bureau; Research and Development,
Washoe County Sheriff's Office):

We are in support of A.B. 403.

CARRIE POWER, APRN:

I am a family nurse practitioner in Elko, Nevada and as a member of the public, it is important that laws apply everywhere, not just in elected locations.

Whether it be on public highways or in parking lots, I believe the law should be applied the same for the protection of the public.

LARRY ROBB:

I am here as a community member, a family friend and an owner of a traffic safety and DUI school for over 30 years. I support this bill and believe that where a person's life is at risk, the law should be able to apply if they endanger or kill another person on a property to which the public has access.

Driving in Nevada is considered a privilege; it is not a right. For whatever it is worth, I had the opportunity to conduct one of my traffic safety classes. There were ten students in attendance. In an informal survey, I asked them as students if they should be required to attend traffic school and if they thought where a death occurs the law should be changed. It was unanimous, even though they were students attending my class, because they had violated a traffic law. They too agreed that in serious cases traffic laws should apply.

JEAN FIERRO:

I am a resident of Spring Creek, Nevada, a business owner and in complete support of bill A.B. 403. I am a friend of the family, attend their church and do not want to ever see another family or person going through this horrible situation.

JEROD MARSH:

I am here as a concerned member of the community and a friend of the Kraintz family. I have been a school teacher in Elko for the last 22 years. I fully support A.B. 403 and I believe that the same penalties that are applicable on public highways should be applicable in all places of public access. The responsibility of safe driving should be maintained no matter where the setting, and so should the legal penalties for reckless driving.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON:

It is a crime for someone to kill a person, be tried and convicted, and then have that conviction overturned on a technicality. This is a crime and is happening every day in the State. If A.B. 403 saves one life, it is a justified bill.

CHAIR CANCELA:

I had a constituent who reached out because his daughter was struck by a moped in a parking lot and he had no recourse. He could not file a lawsuit or

prosecute the person. The hospital bills his family was amassing were incredible and his daughter was in the hospital for a long time. I appreciate you bringing this bill forward.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I would like to request my name be added to the bill as a co-sponsor and request to amend and do pass with those members of this body who wish to be added if that is acceptable to the Assemblyman.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON:

It would be an honor.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 403. I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED WITH THE ADDITION OF THE SENATE GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE MEMBERS AS CO-SPONSORS ON A.B. 403.

SENATOR WASHINGTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

We will open the hearing on A.B. 499.

ASSEMBLY BILL 499: Provides for a special license plate of limited duration commemorating the 100th anniversary of women's suffrage. (BDR 43-1265)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MAGGIE CARLTON (Assembly District No. 14):

I am here to present A.B. 499 which has been sponsored by every woman who serves in this historic Legislature with the first female majority in the Country.

In processing this bill in the Assembly, I thanked the gentlemen for keeping their ink off of the bill so that it could stay Assemblywoman, because in our house if a man had added his name it would have automatically gone to Assemblyman.

This bill is historic in a couple of ways. The former Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce from Assembly District No. 3 and I did a license plate bill numerous years ago, the citizenship plate bill, and when that bill was done we hugged in the foyer downstairs and pledged to each other we would never do another license plate bill again in our careers. I think she would be happy I am doing this bill and is smiling about it.

Another reason this bill is historic is due to the photo on page 2 of the bill. I can only confirm there being three times in the history of Nevada where a photo or any color was put in an actual bill. The first was the State Seal, the second was the State Tartan, and now you have the photo of the Women of the 80th Legislative Session.

This license plate bill is basic. The fees from this plate will go to the Nevada Commission for Women. This plate will be issued for 1 year with the issuance needed to be from January 1, 2020, through December 2020. This way any women elected in the next legislative cycle, or any incoming freshmen, will have the opportunity to get the license plate. This also includes a motorcycle plate for those women who either serve or lobby and ride a motorcycle.

In 1869, when women's suffrage was being discussed, Assemblyman Curtis Hillyer of Storey County introduced legislation to amend the Nevada Constitution. He argued that politics were corrupt and women, historically, had been a civilizing, moralizing influence and that is why women should have the vote.

Later in history between 1911 and 1913, when the bill to allow women to vote was being processed by a partisan effort on both sides, there was an anti-suffrage group and a Reno businessman, George Wingfield, who gave it a lot of support. George Wingfield was one of the most powerful mining, banking and political bosses in the State. Mr. Wingfield announced to the world if Nevadans approved women's suffrage, he would shut down his enterprises and leave the State. In response, the *Manhattan Post*, published in a Nye County mining camp a poem, "Where You Goin' George?"

ELISA CAFFERATA (Nevada Commission for Women):

I am a member of the Nevada Commission for Women. There are ten members who represent different geographies, political parties, professions and points of view around the State.

We are undertaking an effort to get more diverse and younger women to serve on the Nevada Commission for Women. The funds received from the license plate will provide funding to help with our operating expenses and provide support for workshops and programs to encourage women to apply for boards and commissions and to run for office.

SCOTT ANDERSON (Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State):
The Office of the Secretary of State supports A.B. 499.

MARTY ELZY, BM, CPM (Management Analyst, Central Services and Records Division, Department of Motor Vehicles):
The DMV is neutral on A.B. 499. We have been working on preliminary designs with the Nevada Commission for Women and will begin the design work as soon as there is an approved design and the law moves forward.

CHAIR CANCELA:
We will close the hearing on A.B. 499. I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR WASHINGTON MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 499.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

ALETA DUPREE:

Thank you for passing A.B. 485. I walked .47 miles to the bus stop. I like a good walk, but sometimes a vehicle would be helpful. The electric bicycle law was passed in 2009 and we have had 10 years of successful electric bicycle usage in our State. In March, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada had a two week pilot program of electric bicycles in the downtown bike share program. I am looking forward to having a new kind of vehicle in the toolbox with similar characteristics to our successful use of electric bikes in this State. I thank you and look forward to your continued advocacy and eventual passage of this bill into law.

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure
May 9, 2019
Page 34

CHAIR CANCELA:

There being no further public comment, this meeting is adjourned at 3:37 pm.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Tammy Lubich,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Yvanna D. Cancela, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	5		Attendance Roster
A.B. 198	C	1	Assemblyman Glen Leavitt	Conceptual Amendment
A.B. 316	D	4	Assemblywoman Jill Tolles	Presentation Nevada Department of Public Safety
A.B. 316	E	14	Assemblywoman Jill Tolles	RAND Drug Policy Research Center Study
A.B. 320	F	1	Debbie Martinez / Motor Carrier Division, Department of Motor Vehicles	Written Testimony
A.B. 54	G	1	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 363	H	1	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 485	I	3	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
A.B. 403	J	1	Assemblyman John C. Ellison	Photo