

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Eighty-First Session
April 1, 2021**

The Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 1:06 p.m. on Thursday, April 1, 2021, Online. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair
Assemblyman Howard Watts, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblyman C.H. Miller
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters
Assemblyman Tom Roberts
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler
Assemblyman Steve Yeager

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman John Ellison (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst
Jessica Dummer, Committee Counsel
Devon Kajatt, Committee Manager
Joan Waldock, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Frank R. Baumgartner, Richard J. Richardson Distinguished Professor of Political Science, Department of Political Science, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Sean Sever, Administrator, Division of Management Services and Programs, Department of Motor Vehicles
Tonya Laney, Administrator, Division of Field Services, Department of Motor Vehicles
Joseph (J. D.) Decker, Administrator, Division of Compliance Enforcement, Department of Motor Vehicles
Matthew Walker, representing Enterprise Holdings, LLC
Eddie Bowers, Lieutenant, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety
Nicholas Shepack, Program and Policy Associate, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada; and representing Washoe County Public Defender's Office; and Office of the Public Defender, Clark County
Paul Klein, representing Nevada Police Union
Eric Spratley, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Michael Hansen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Christopher Ries, representing Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] Today we will hear one bill and will have a work session. This meeting is starting earlier than our normally scheduled time because we are at a deadline. You will notice as our agendas are posted for the next few meetings, they will meet at "call of the Chair." The latest our meetings will start is at 1:00 p.m. I hope we will be able start earlier than that, but all the committees are making adjustments, trying to get bills heard and work sessions completed. Please bear with us and be flexible.

I will open today's hearing on Assembly Bill 379, which will be presented by Assemblyman Miller.

Assembly Bill 379: Revises provisions governing license plate decals. (BDR 43-985)

Assemblyman C.H. Miller, Assembly District No. 7:

I am here to present Assembly Bill 379 for the Committee's consideration. Last week, I presented another measure before this Committee, Assembly Bill 301, which revises provisions related to the towing of motor vehicles. During the presentation, I referred to numerous reasons why vehicle registration decals, commonly known as "stickers," can be problematic in identifying current vehicle registration status and can create other issues for vehicle owners. During the hearing for A.B. 301, we heard from representatives of

the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) who explained that current vehicle registration and insurance status are maintained on a searchable real-time database that has updated the monitoring process from 1960s' technology to meet the needs of the Information Age. While consulting with members of Nevada's law enforcement community, I received varied responses to the idea of what A.B. 379 would do. I am sure they will be expressed in the public testimony today. What was consistent throughout all my conversations is that vehicle registration stickers are not always used to verify vehicle registration status. Rather, verifications are typically conducted by law enforcement officers in their vehicles using their information terminals or by requesting verification by radio. This is often done before officers decide whether to engage a vehicle for a traffic stop. The DMV and the majority of Nevada's law enforcement community are the primary stakeholders invested in vehicle registration monitoring. They have made many updates and moved toward not depending on those stickers but depending on electronic measures. This bill is perfectly in keeping with the DMV's modernization project which was presented to this Committee in a previous meeting.

Since stickers are no longer the most reliable indicator of current vehicle registration status, this can result in issues for vehicle owners. There is a cost to produce and distribute the stickers, which A.B. 379 proposes to eliminate altogether. Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and three Canadian provinces have eliminated vehicle registration stickers and realized savings ranging from \$100,000 to \$12 million between January 2017 and 2021, as reported to me by David Lapadat, Deputy Director, Office of Legislative Affairs within the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT). In Pennsylvania, PennDOT, customers, and the Pennsylvania State Police have reported they vastly prefer the elimination of vehicle registration stickers to the alternative since Pennsylvania eliminated vehicle registration stickers four years ago. I believe our DMV is looking into the potential savings Nevada could realize by following suit. We will have that information presented to you.

I am thankful to staff at the DMV and members of Nevada's law enforcement agencies who have shared their insights, information, and input with me. I am joined by Dr. Frank R. Baumgartner, Department of Political Science, a political scientist affiliated with The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He analyzed data related to traffic stops due to expired vehicle registration stickers in North Carolina. He will discuss his research findings and the implications of law enforcement activities on drivers and law enforcement officers.

Frank R. Baumgartner, Richard J. Richardson Distinguished Professor of Political Science, Department of Political Science, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill:

I am not an expert on license tags, but I wrote a book about traffic stops and the racial dynamics of traffic stops. In particular, we looked at the odds that a given driver would be searched following a traffic stop. In 2018, I published a book titled *Suspect Citizens: What 20 Million Traffic Stops Tell Us about Policing and Race*. The book was based on an analysis of every traffic stop in North Carolina since 2002, which was about

20 million traffic stops at the time of publication. Now, we are up to about 24 million traffic stops. North Carolina was the first state in the nation to mandate the collection of traffic stop data, so it is a very rich data collection.

North Carolina mandates that the officer fill out a form. The form lists nine reasons for a traffic stop. I provided the Committee a one-page summary of highlights [\[Exhibit C\]](#). Among the nine reasons why a state trooper or police officer might pull over a vehicle, the most common is speeding. There might be a drunk driving violation suspected or running through a stop sign. The one that is most relevant is the regulatory traffic stop, which is mostly for expired tags. Similar to that in dynamics is equipment violations, such as broken or cracked taillights.

I want to mention the racial differences in the traffic stops and in the searches that result from those stops based on the stop's purpose. Overall in North Carolina, out of the 24 million traffic stops, about 57 percent of them were white drivers and 32 percent were Black drivers. North Carolina's population is about 22 percent African American. Overall, Black drivers are significantly overrepresented in traffic stops compared to the population numbers, but that differs depending on the type of stop. In speeding violation stops, Blacks are 29 percent of the traffic stops, and whites are 62 percent. For regulatory traffic stops, Blacks are 40 percent of the stops, and whites are 51 percent of the stops. For equipment violations, such as broken taillights, Blacks are almost 40 percent of the traffic stops, and white drivers are 49 percent of the stops. There is a greater likelihood that regulatory violations are going to target the poor. You cannot see that, but I can tell you that it is more likely to target the poor. In particular, with regards to race, it is more likely to target African Americans, at least in North Carolina.

Similarly, you can look at the searches that result from these traffic stops. For a speeding traffic stop, searches are very unlikely, occurring about 1 percent of the time following a speeding violation. While that is 1.6 percent of the time for Black drivers, it is 0.7 percent of the time for white drivers. Black drivers are significantly more likely to be searched following a traffic stop for speeding, but most speeding violations do not lead to a search. For a regulatory violation—for an expired tag or something similar—the overall search rate is 3.5 percent. But for Blacks it is just over 5 percent, and for whites it is just over 2 percent. So, there is a similar racial disparity, but the numbers are significantly higher with regards to regulatory, expired tag traffic stops. Equipment violation stops lead to searches about 5 percent of the time, but for African Americans it is almost 7 percent, and for whites it is about 3.5 percent. So, Blacks are twice as likely to be searched in those cases.

I could go on and read you all kinds of statistics, but the point I wanted to lay out for the Committee is a very simple one. North Carolina has been collecting traffic stop statistics for longer than any other state and has a very large data collection. It may or may not be relevant to what is happening in Nevada, but I think that most likely eliminating or reducing the number of regulatory traffic stops for expired tags would have a positive impact on racial

disparities in traffic stops and the searches that result from them. I would be happy to answer any questions. Obviously, my research is mostly based in other states. I do not think Nevada collects the kind of traffic stop data that I typically analyze.

Assemblyman Miller:

I would like to note that traffic stops are some of the most dangerous encounters for law enforcement officers. So, if you can curb unnecessary stops, it is an overall better equation for everyone involved. That is one of the things this bill aimed to do with some of the amendments that are available on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System [[Exhibit D](#)]. The first of those would eliminate the requirement for the issuance and display of a front license plate on vehicles, which 19 other states have already done. Existing law already provides an exemption to the requirement of a front license plate if a motor vehicle is not manufactured to include a bracket, device, or other contrivance to display and secure a front license plate. This provision would no longer require the DMV to send two plates. The goal is to increase savings to the DMV as they modernize, to improve efficiency, and to reduce waste.

The second amendment will allow for businesses with fleet vehicles, such as short-term lessors, rental car agencies, to issue new license plates for their vehicles once they receive them. This will reduce or eliminate new fleet vehicles being placed into service without having actual license plates. The way it works now, rental car companies get a new car and put a permit on the window that allows the vehicle to be on the road. There is no real license plate, not even the type of placard required on a brand-new car. As you can imagine, this leaves our tourist community open to being pulled over because the rear license plate is not on the rental car. This amendment would allow rental car agencies and other businesses that have fleet vehicles to enter the information on the DMV's portal, then issue a license plate from the stack of plates they have for distribution. Mr. Matt Walker is on the call to answer questions relating to that.

I would urge the Committee's support of [A.B. 379](#). This measure will align Nevada's laws with current DMV and law enforcement practices, improve convenience and equity for vehicle owners, realize efficiencies in Nevada's vehicle registration process, and preserve state funds that would otherwise be used to produce and distribute redundant stickers.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

There are questions in the queue.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

We went through a lot of data. I assume the purpose of this bill is to eliminate stops for registrations that are valid but not displayed on the vehicle. Do you have data indicating the percentage of vehicles pulled over for registration violations that were actually registered but did not have the registration displayed properly versus those that were not registered?

Assemblyman Miller:

I do not have data that specifically speaks to that. The Nevada Transportation Authority may be able to provide more insight into that. I can get that information from them as they deal more directly with vehicles identified as having expired registrations. That did not relate to traffic stops, but there may be something that could provide some insight. If not, I can reach out to law enforcement to see if they have data they can share in that regard.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

I think that is important data since it is the purpose of the bill. Even if it is data from North Carolina, it is important to know if people are being pulled over because they forgot to put the sticker on their license plates.

Assemblyman Roberts:

I pulled cars over for 34 years. My eyesight was not always good, so I could not see the number on the stickers; I learned the color of the year. I would always verify with the computer, often prior to pulling the car over. I cannot think of any departments that do not have that capability now. We have transient folks who come to Nevada. They have to learn what each state requires, and there are many states that do not use stickers. I do not see an issue with this.

I have a couple of questions regarding the money savings. The DMV will not be issuing initial or renewal stickers. For renewals, that should save a significant amount of money considering the hard cost of the stickers and mailing. What is the projected savings?

Assemblyman Miller:

Mr. Sever from the DMV is on the line.

**Sean Sever, Administrator, Division of Management Services and Programs,
Department of Motor Vehicles:**

We are still working on the fiscal note; we are almost finished with it. There will be savings, but there will also be costs involved. When we make a change to our old system, we have to include programming fees. Also, some of the paper stock in our kiosks will have to be discarded and needs to be accounted for. We are working on that. I want to thank Assemblyman Miller. He has been good with us on his outreach; we have been working with him on questions on this bill for a long time.

Assemblyman Roberts:

If you realize a certain amount of savings, would you adjust the fees Nevadans pay for registration? If we no longer have the expense of mailing or printing stickers, would the savings be passed on to the consumers?

Sean Sever:

There are others on the call who may be able to answer your questions.

Tonya Laney, Administrator, Division of Field Services, Department of Motor Vehicles:

We will submit a fiscal note once our numbers are finalized. We would initially lose revenue on collections of fees for the decal, but we would see immediate savings in contract costs from the vendor in the 2021-2022 biennium; the savings would be even greater in 2022-2023. Taking into consideration the loss of revenue from the decals and the contract savings, our rough numbers indicate we would save approximately \$532,000 in the future biennium.

Assemblyman Roberts:

Do you charge a separate fee for the decal now? Would people no longer pay that fee?

Tonya Laney:

That is correct. The decal itself has a separate fee. That is where we would lose and gain the numbers for that cost.

Assemblyman Roberts:

I do not look at my registration too closely. What is the fee for the decal?

Tonya Laney:

I only have the total numbers here. We can get that information to you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I do not look at the breakdown of my registration bill when I get it; I just cringe and pay it. I assumed that the decal fee was included in the regular registration fee. Is it detailed in what is on the registration? I thought it was all-encompassing. Where would the consumer see the specific fee for the decal? Why would that have been listed separately and not included in the total registration fee?

Tonya Laney:

If I remember correctly, the decal fee is included in our overall registration fee now. Where you would see the decal fee by itself would be if you lost your decal and ordered a duplicate through the DMV or the kiosk. Upon original registration, I believe the registration fee is an all-inclusive cost for registering your vehicle and getting your plates and decal.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Would you then have to discount the original registration, or would you not discount it and the only revenue you would lose would be the fee for a lost decal?

Tonya Laney:

I believe that is correct. The revenue the DMV would lose would be the cost of the decal itself. The registration fee would represent the cost of the plates, taxes, and everything involved with the registration, minus what the decal costs would have been that was added in the registration fee previously.

Assemblywoman Peters:

This is an interesting topic, in part because during the COVID-19 pandemic, we have not been enforcing the practice of pulling over for expired registration stickers. What has law enforcement been doing with this since the pandemic? How much of an impact has it made?

**Joseph (J.D.) Decker, Administrator, Division of Compliance Enforcement,
Department of Motor Vehicles:**

At the beginning of the pandemic, the Department sent a notice to Nevada sheriffs and chiefs for distribution to Nevada law enforcement agencies that requested leniency in using an expired sticker as probable cause for traffic stops, knowing we would not be able to process registrations and get stickers out to the public. There are people who are taking advantage of the pandemic and not registering their cars on time, and there are people having problems because they are unable to get their vehicles registered for legitimate reasons. Our understanding is that Nevada law enforcement is still somewhere in the middle of not using expired stickers for probable cause to stop a vehicle unless there are obvious circumstances.

Assemblywoman Peters:

That answered part of it. What impact has that had for law enforcement? Have they seen any impact or collected data and assessed it? It does not look as if there is anybody on the line right now who can answer that question. Chair Monroe-Moreno, if someone comes on in opposition or support testimony, would you mind if I ask that question then?

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

That would be fine.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

Thank you, Assemblyman Miller, for your presentation. I am proud of our freshman class. I have a question for the folks at the DMV about the single license plate. I hope someone has information about the cost of sending only one plate instead of two. Would you please provide a dollar amount on that?

Sean Sever:

We will have to get back to you on the cost of the front license plate. We just heard about that amendment the other day. We will examine it and get back to you.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Mr. Sever, I will make a comment. When I have a bill that has a fiscal note from your department, you guys are quick to get that to me, but you are slower when we need a fiscal note from you. Could we reverse that so that you are slow in getting us fiscal notes on our bills?

Sean Sever:

Sure.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong asked the question I planned to ask.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions from members?

Assemblyman Roberts:

We heard in another bill that private property companies, security companies, or tow companies can access the DMV website to find out if vehicles have valid registration if you are in a homeowners association or on private property where a vehicle could be left for an extended period of time. Without the sticker, they would need some way to verify that so a car is not tagged for removal. Is there a way for private companies to do that? Is there a cost involved in checking that through the DMV?

Assemblyman Miller:

That would be the same website that the tow operators currently have access to. It is a public page on the DMV's website. Anyone can access it to verify registration if he or she has the last four digits of the vehicle identification number and the license plate number.

Assemblyman Roberts:

I thought the information was available at no cost. Thank you for the information.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] Mr. Walker, is there anything you would like to contribute to the testimony for this bill?

Matthew Walker, representing Enterprise Holdings, LLC:

Thank you for the opportunity. I wanted to express our thanks to the bill's sponsor, especially for section 1, subsection 7, of the amendment that would enhance the permanent fleet registration program that was put into place by Assemblyman Yeager through Assembly Bill 177 of the 80th Session. Combining that with the existing authority of *Nevada Revised Statutes* 482.293 to self-plate vehicles, this will be a tremendous win for the industry, for the DMV in not having to handle these requests, and for all tourists and visitors who come to our state and may be nervous when they approach their rental car and see there are no plates on the vehicle. This is a wonderful improvement. We appreciate the opportunity to support the amendment.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I see that Lieutenant Bowers was able to join us. Lieutenant Bowers, Assemblywoman Peters had a question earlier. I will have her ask it again. Hopefully, you will be able to answer the question for her.

Assemblywoman Peters:

As law enforcement relaxed on pulling over people for expired registration tags, have you seen or calculated the impact that has had on law enforcement?

Eddie Bowers, Lieutenant, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety:

We have not tabulated any data on any sort of loss of revenue because this is not in our purview. Early in the pandemic, we were asked to ease up on enforcement with respect to that. It was not reasonable for us to take enforcement action for registration violations when many people could not make an appointment with the DMV. We are still operating under that to an extent. The DMV has rallied in many respects; it is much easier to get an appointment. Some leniency is still being utilized, but the drivers encountered whose registration has been expired for a very long period of time might still be cited for a registration violation now.

Assemblywoman Peters:

Have you qualitatively experienced any impact to not using that as a reason for stopping drivers? Has there been any noticeable impact?

Eddie Bowers:

No. The initial correspondences that came out did not speak about probable cause, meaning they did not say, "Do not stop a car for this." A registration or tag showing as expired would, of course, still be probable cause for a stop, but if that is the only issue at hand, it is highly likely we would not take enforcement action. It has not precluded officers from actively seeking out traffic violations and things of that nature.

Assemblywoman Peters:

Have you seen a reduction in the number of traffic violations because of it?

Eddie Bowers:

If you are talking about citations being issued to drivers—in the early stages of the pandemic we limited our interactions to serious traffic violations. Given that many of our staff are vaccinated now, we have responded in kind and started to reintensify our efforts with enforcement and simply do the job we are employed to do now.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

Dr. Baumgartner, earlier one of the members asked if you had data on traffic stops in North Carolina. Is there any extrapolation that can be made from the data having to do with whether tags were truly expired? If so, would you share that with us?

Frank Baumgartner:

We do not have information on the enforcement actions that followed the traffic stops. We know why the traffic stop occurred and whether the driver was issued a warning, a ticket, or was arrested. We do not have the follow-up about whether the car was not registered.

Sean Sever:

I want to clarify the fiscal note. We submitted an unsolicited fiscal note on the original bill. That is what we have almost completed. We will have to take another look at the amendment, which we just learned about the other day. Our initial take on it is that if it were optional for people to use the front license plate, it would not have an effect on the DMV because we would still have to mail owners two license plates. It would be the owner's option whether to use both.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

If this piece of legislation were to pass, you would not have to create and mail two license plates to vehicle owners; you would only have to send one. That would ultimately result in a savings for the department.

Sean Sever:

Ultimately it would, but in the meantime, it depends. If it enables us to do that in the future, it will result in savings but, for now, we will have to continue issuing two plates.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Assemblyman Miller, would you like to respond?

Assemblyman Miller:

I would like to provide some context. The goal is to allow the DMV to not issue the plate. I understand there are contracts and agreements in place. If they were to be abruptly ended, it would create a financial shortfall. The goal is to enable them to not have to issue the plates so as they look ahead to renegotiating certain contracts, they can consider not continuing to provide both plates and realize more savings.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] Are there any callers who wish to testify in support of Assembly Bill 379?

Nicholas Shepack, Program and Policy Associate, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada; and representing Washoe County Public Defender's Office; and Office of the Public Defender, Clark County:

We are in support of this legislation. We want to thank Assemblyman Miller for bringing forward this logical and good piece of legislation. We believe that through the elimination of these tags, we will reduce unnecessary contact with the police. As Assemblyman Roberts stated, the majority of stops include the police checking to make sure the registration is expired.

I have a personal story to share. A few months ago, in Douglas County, my father was pulled over because he did not have the proper tag on his vehicle. The officer double-checked and found out that he was insured, but he kindly let my father know what he needed to do. As a result, my father had to go into the DMV during the pandemic to get the tags.

This is just unnecessary at this point. We have plenty of technology to ensure that we do not have these accidental encounters with police. It is a waste of time for everybody involved. We believe that while we do not have all the traffic stop data—there is a bill that will give us more data about how many traffic stops this may involve—it will decrease unnecessary contact between the community and the police. It will allow police officers to go about their jobs and run license plates as they normally would using the technology they have. An individual may not receive his tag in the mail, or he may have moved abruptly. We know there is an eviction crisis looming. We also know that people who often have the most difficult time registering their vehicles are lower-income individuals. Any savings this bill might bring to vehicle registration could also ease the burden among our most vulnerable populations.

This seems like a simple and clean bill that everyone should support that would make everybody's life a little easier. While we love our friends at the DMV, I think we can all agree that if we had to go in a little less often, we would all be a little happier. Thank you for your time. We urge you to support this important piece of legislation.

Paul Klein, representing Nevada Police Union:

The Nevada Police Union includes your statewide highway patrol officers. We appreciate Assemblyman C.H. Miller for this forward-thinking legislation that not only removes an outdated and archaic sticker system, but frees up millions of budget dollars that we would like to see reallocated to programs that improve public and traffic safety services.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

May we have the next caller? [There was no one.] Do we have any callers who wish to testify in opposition?

Eric Spratley, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

We are here in opposition to A.B. 379. This is a solution looking for a problem. While we recognize the license plate decal system in Nevada and other states might not be ideal or without flaws, it is a tried-and-true system that still works in Nevada and surrounding states. It is and has been a very noninvasive method for quickly determining potential validity of a vehicle registration, and, conversely, it is a quick way to develop probable cause if that vehicle needs to be stopped, which has led to serious crimes being discovered and lives being saved by the display of a registration sticker. Many law enforcement agencies can run license plates via a mobile computer or through dispatch, but this is not always an option, especially in our rural, remote, and often even congested urban environments. We ask you to consider our rural and remote locations. They cannot always get on a mobile data terminal (MDT) to punch a plate in or have access to radio traffic. Geography, radio traffic, cellular

signals, and other factors play a part in technologies not being available. So, the display, or lack thereof, of registration stickers is a key component in law enforcement operations on a daily basis. It sounds silly, but it is true. It is not always about making the traffic stop, but also about not making a traffic stop. It is about public service for our amazing frontline officers, troopers, and deputies in Nevada, not North Carolina.

While this legislative body is going after law enforcement operations this legislative session, the data presented in this hearing is information for North Carolina, not Nevada with our unique and significant demographic makeup. All our neighboring states have license plate stickers on their license plates because they work. They are efficient, and they are standard.

There are a lot of assumptions about the data and the cost savings. We have an out-of-state doctor and the Department of Motor Vehicles here, and they do not have the numbers, the statistics, or the data you are asking about. You have heard, "I believe," "I do not think so," "It should be," "It might be," and "It depends." Clearly, there is not a lot of factual, hard information for Nevada being presented. This has been pitched as a race issue, an injustice issue, and a cost-saving issue for Nevada, but it has all been speculation. For that reason and the fact there is not a problem here, we oppose the bill and ask you to do the same.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Mr. Spratley, please do not get off the phone. I have a question for you. You mentioned how this is Nevada and things are done differently here. As we lived through COVID-19 over the last year and the DMV has not been able to get people their stickers in a timely manner, what has law enforcement throughout the state been doing during this time? What were the options in those rural communities that you mentioned? As a Black woman who wore a uniform, I was pulled over a number of times—not because of the sticker on my car, but simply because of the color of my skin—so I take offense at some of the statements you made. Would you please answer my question?

Eric Spratley:

You can take offense; it is true. We are trying to deal with it. That is why you are coming after the things that have proven to be problematic this session. We are in agreement with that. We want to see reform throughout Nevada as well. We are addressing that. I do not think the statistics that were brought up in North Carolina are true here. We have a data collection bill that we are trying to support as it moves through the system so we can provide the legislative body the data you are asking for. We are trying to be cooperative partners in this. A decal seems like a small thing, but it is a good thing for public safety. We can look at a car and determine quickly if there is something that needs to be given further attention. We do not always have radio traffic available to run a registration check on a vehicle or an MDT that can do it, to check that little thing throughout Nevada—in the rural jurisdictions, as I said, and in the congested areas.

As for the pandemic, as the executive director for the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association, I received a request from the Department of Motor Vehicles asking us to put information out to law enforcement statewide, which we did because during

the pandemic the DMV had issues processing registrations. They were shut down for a long time. We sent that to our agency leaders and asked them to show grace and mercy for registration violations for Nevada and out-of-state vehicles. It did not take away their ability to have probable cause to stop the vehicle, but we saw a decrease statewide in the number of stops being made to avoid contact by approaching drivers. There was a significant decrease, but I do not have the numbers. I was not asked to provide any data. We saw a decrease statewide for those reasons. It was just a matter of grace and public safety. It is not always about enforcement or hammering people; it is about serving the public and making sure people are in compliance. You are still seeing vehicles running around in Las Vegas, Reno, Carson City, and the rurals that have the white paper plates that expired in July of last year, and the owners still have not registered them. I am of the belief that the DMV has now gotten to the point where that person should be registered, so that vehicle would probably be stopped today regardless of the race of the driver, Madam Chair.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I do not believe I asked for data. My question was, "What did police agencies do during this time period?" I was hoping that because you planned to call in on this bill, you might have done research to have that information in hand. Thank you for calling in with your comments. May we have the next caller?

Michael Hansen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am the old-fashioned sort. I am merely a citizen of the state of Nevada. I am urging you to vote down this bill because there is no consideration of any second-order effects this would have. Right now, having a sticker on your car supposedly indicates the registration is current. It provides a flag to police officers, whether they choose to use it or not, that your vehicle may or may not be properly registered. If it is not registered, the officer has the discretion to pull the vehicle over or not. However, without having, essentially, a little tattletale on your rear end that says, "I am a scofflaw," the impetus to not register your vehicle also means you do not pay insurance on it, although you are supposed to; you do not have to have emissions inspections, although you are supposed to. The officer, in the best of worlds, does have a way of checking a license plate if it suits his or her fancy, but there is no visual indication they ought to unless they have reason to do it anyway. I think all of us know that there are a lot of cars on the highways and roads; there are not a lot of police cars in comparison.

If you increase the number of people who do not register their cars properly because they think they have a pretty good chance of not getting caught, that means they probably are not going to have insurance because the mindsets go the same way. That is ultimately going to cause our insurance rates to go up. Anecdotally, everybody is aware that Nevada has some of the highest insurance rates in the country. I did some research about moving to the Salt Lake City, Utah, metropolitan area, about eight months ago. My insurance rates for the same coverage from the same company would be cut in half if I moved. That is a cost that would offset the state income tax I would have to pay as a resident of Utah that I do not have to pay in Nevada.

I do not believe the savings are being accurately represented because the only immediate savings out of this, once contracts expire, is not having to have stickers. You are still going to have to mail registration slips to people who are not registered because not everyone uses the kiosks. Eventually, with the amendment, you will not have to send out two license plates. The other impact to this is it would diametrically work against Assembly Bill 349.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Mr. Hansen, you have reached your three minutes. Thank you for calling in. If you have anything else you would like the Committee to know, I strongly encourage you to send it to us in writing. May we have the next caller?

Christopher Ries, representing Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

I would like to thank Assemblyman Miller for speaking with us regarding this bill. Unfortunately, at this time we are opposed to A.B. 379. I will be brief and just echo Director Spratley's testimony as we share the same concerns that were raised by the Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else in opposition? [There was no one.] Do we have any callers who wish to provide testimony in neutral? [There were none.] Assemblyman Miller, do you have any closing comments?

Assemblyman Miller:

It is my hope this measure will do all the things we have spoken about today. Change is difficult; it is not always easy. It can be hard to accept and difficult to implement. One thing we know for sure is that change is inevitable. I suggest the easiest changes to make are the ones we have already adjusted to. I want to thank everyone who helped me on this bill, my presenters, and those who were here for questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

With that, we will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 379. We will open our work session with Assembly Bill 188.

Assembly Bill 188: Abolishes the Commission on Special License Plates. (BDR 43-476)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 188 was first heard before this Committee on March 16, 2021 [[Exhibit E](#)]. It was presented by Assemblywoman Brown-May. Assembly Bill 188 abolishes the Commission on Special License Plates and transfers its duties and approval procedure to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). The measure requires the DMV to hold public hearings to approve or disapprove applications for the design, preparation, and issuance of special license plates and to compile and submit a list of each approved special license plate

design with an accompanying report containing certain information to the Legislature annually. The DMV may request the legislative auditor to conduct a review of a charitable organization to determine compliance with statutory requirements or whether an audit is reasonably necessary to assist in the administration of the program.

One amendment has been received from Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, the Chair of both the Committee and the Commission. The amendment proposes that charitable organizations submit their financial information directly to the legislative auditor, rather than submit this information to the DMV who would then transmit this information to the legislative auditor. Eliminating the DMV from the financial reporting process would allow the legislative auditor to provide the annual report by September 30 annually, rather than January 31.

Two fiscal notes have been submitted for this measure. The DMV and the Legislative Counsel Bureau have determined there is no fiscal impact from the measure as introduced.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 188.

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Brown-May. The next item on our work session is Assembly Bill 281.

Assembly Bill 281: Revises provisions governing the retention of certain records by short-term lessors, brokers and dealers of vehicles. (BDR 43-794)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 281 was first heard before this Committee on March 25, 2021, where it was presented by its sponsor, Assemblyman C.H. Miller, joined by Sophia Romero, who is with the Legal Aid Society of Southern Nevada [[Exhibit F](#)]. Assembly Bill 281 removes the requirement that records containing the identity of short-term lessees and the duration of short-term vehicle leases be considered public records open to inspection by any member of the public. Records of a short-term lessor may be maintained electronically and, if so maintained, must be made available for inspection within 72 hours upon request by

the Department of Motor Vehicles, the Department of Taxation, or local government employees for the purposes of determining compliance with local ordinances or business licensing requirements. The bill also authorizes dealers and brokers of motor vehicles to maintain their books and records electronically.

There have been two conceptual amendments proposed. The first extends the time period short-term lessors have to produce electronic records upon request from 72 hours to 3 business days. The second provides for the production of electronic records of brokers and dealers of vehicles.

There have been two fiscal notes received from the Departments of Motor Vehicles and Taxation. Both notes show no fiscal impact for the measure as introduced.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 281.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Watts. That closes the work session on A.B. 281. I will now open the work session on Assembly Joint Resolution 7.

Assembly Joint Resolution 7: Urges the Congress of the United States to pass the National Infrastructure Bank Act of 2020. (BDR R-765)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Joint Resolution 7 was first heard before this Committee on March 16, 2021, when it was presented by its primary sponsor, Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod, joined by State Treasurer Zach Conine and Ms. Alphecca Muttardy, who is a macroeconomist with the Coalition for a National Infrastructure Bank [[Exhibit G](#)]. Assembly Joint Resolution 7 urges the Congress of the United States to pass the National Infrastructure Bank Act of 2020, also known as H.R. [House Resolution] 6422 of the 116th Congress. There has been one amendment that requests adding Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno to the measure as a nonprimary sponsor. There are no fiscal notes associated with this measure.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.J.R. 7.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 7.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod. That will close the work session on A.J.R. 7 and open our final work session for today on Assembly Bill 320.

Assembly Bill 320: Revises provisions governing the operation of large all-terrain vehicles on certain streets and highways. (BDR 43-196)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 320 was first heard before this Committee on March 25, 2021, where it was presented by the bill sponsor, Assemblyman Leavitt [[Exhibit H](#)]. Assembly Bill 320 permits the operation of a large all-terrain vehicle (ATV) on a city street within cities having populations less than 25,000 or on a portion of a highway designated as a main county road if:

- The large ATV satisfies requirements in existing law for safety equipment and registration with the Department of Motor Vehicles; and
- The governing body of the city or county having jurisdiction over the street or highway enacts an ordinance or resolution authorizing the operation of large ATVs on any portion of such a street or highway.

There has been one amendment proposed by the bill's sponsor which would: (1) authorize a city or county to prohibit the operation of a large ATV on any portion of a main county road in the city or county; (2) authorize a large ATV to operate on a street within a township whose population is less than 25,000; (3) remove the requirement that a city or county adopt an ordinance or resolution authorizing a large ATV to operate on a street or highway in its jurisdiction as a prerequisite to its operation; and (4) provide a definition for "large all-terrain vehicle" within statute. There are no fiscal notes associated with this measure.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 320.

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblywoman Peters:

In your presentation, we talked about whether crossing over a highway would be cleared or a violation based on the language of the bill. Would you clarify that?

Assemblyman Leavitt:

I am sorry I did not clarify that for you. It is identified in the statute already that it is permitted to cross over a highway.

Assemblywoman Peters:

Would you please send me the reference in statute?

Assemblyman Leavitt:

Yes.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Assemblyman Watts, did you have a question?

Assemblyman Watts:

Members of the Committee received a letter from the Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle Association after the meeting. They were in opposition to the measure. Has the sponsor had any communication with them? Did the amendment help address their concerns?

Assemblyman Leavitt:

I have not heard from them since the bill hearing at which they proposed an amendment. We included their amendment.

Assemblyman Yeager:

I originally had some concerns about the bill, but what satisfied me on this amendment was that we are limiting this to places where the population is under 25,000. I would have concerns if we opened it up to larger municipalities. We heard in this Committee about some of the issues we have with traffic safety and pedestrians. I want to thank the sponsor for the amendment. I will be supporting it.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for your comments. Is there any other discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Leavitt. That closes the work session for Assembly Bill 320, and it brings us to the last item on our agenda for today. Is there anyone wishing to make public comment? [There was no one.]

That will conclude today's meeting. We are at a time in our legislative session where things are hectic, and schedules are changed. Our next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 6, 2021, at the call of the Chair. The latest the meeting will start is 1 p.m. I hope we can start earlier than that. Members, please pay attention to your emails. You will get the notification of when our meeting will start as soon as I can get it to you. This meeting is adjourned [at 2:21 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Joan Waldock
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a summary of data drawn from the book, *Suspect Citizens: What 20 Million Traffic Stops Tell Us about Policing and Race*, presented and submitted by Frank R. Baumgartner, Richard J. Richardson Distinguished Professor of Political Science, Department of Political Science, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

[Exhibit D](#) is a conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 379](#), presented by Assemblyman C.H. Miller, Assembly District No. 7, submitted by Matthew Walker, representing Enterprise Holdings, LLC, presented by Assemblyman C.H. Miller, Assembly District No. 7.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 188](#), presented and submitted by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 281](#), presented and submitted by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Joint Resolution 7](#), presented and submitted by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 320](#), presented and submitted by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.