

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eighty-first Session
March 17, 2021**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Marilyn Dondero Loop at 3:32 p.m. on Wednesday, March 17, 2021, Online. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair
Senator James Ohrenschall, Vice Chair
Senator Dina Neal
Senator Pete Goicoechea
Senator Ira Hansen

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Roberta Lange, Senatorial District No. 7
Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert, Senatorial District No. 15

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alysa Keller, Policy Analyst
Heidi Chlarson, Counsel
Janae Johnson, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Michael Tassi, City of Henderson
David Cherry, City of Henderson
Amanda Kern, City of Henderson
Greg Toth, City of Henderson
Nick Vander Poel, City of Fernley
Matt Walker, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association
Calli Wilsey, City of Reno
Wesley Harper, Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Arielle Edwards, City of North Las Vegas
Josh Hicks, Builders Association of Northern Nevada

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
March 17, 2021
Page 2

Graham Kent, Ph.D., Director of the Nevada Seismological Laboratory;
Professor, Department of Geological Sciences and Engineering, University
of Nevada, Reno

Kacey KC, State Forester Firewarden, Nevada Division of Forestry, Department
of Conservation and Natural Resources

Tiffany East, Chairwoman, Board of Wildlife Commissioners

Kyle Davis, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife

Ernie Adler, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 1245

Cyrus Hojjaty

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

We will open the meeting on Senate Bill (S.B.) 138.

SENATE BILL 138: Revises provisions relating to planned development.
(BDR 22-566)

SENATOR ROBERTA LANGE (Senatorial District No. 7):

I have worked with staff from the City of Henderson on S.B. 138. Planned Unit Developments (PUD) are referenced on Slide 3 of the presentation ([Exhibit B](#)). The City of Henderson includes parts of District No. 7 and has approximately 2,000 PUDs as referenced on Slide 4. The purpose of S.B. 138 is to give entities flexibility when making modifications to PUDs as referenced on Slide 5. A minor modification example is referred to on Slide 6. What S.B. 138 does not do is referenced on Slide 7. We have reached out to stakeholders for valuable feedback on this proposed legislation. The conceptual amendment was submitted ([Exhibit C](#)) and reflects stakeholder input.

MICHAEL TASSI (City of Henderson):

The issues experienced in Henderson and the purposed solution is on Slide 8 of [Exhibit B](#). There are numerous old PUDs, and the City has encountered issues during minor amendments to the PUDs, exclusively the nonresidential variety. As we considered a *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) amendment, it occurred to us the statute was written almost 50 years ago. The development codes have come a long way since then, and it is not uncommon to update development codes every ten years. The proposal is described on Slide 8.

On Slide 9 the intent to modernize and be transparent and permissive is listed and explained in the three blue boxes. The intent is to streamline the process for minor amendments or decisions made at the administrative level that remain

appealable to the planning commission and city council per NRS. Streamlining the process is referenced on Slide 10. For example, Henderson's designer reprocessed the site design architecture for landscaping that is administrative in nature, assuming the proposal is for minor modifications and complies with the development code. An emerging issue with vacant buildings is listed on Slide 11. Types of minor modifications for such buildings through an administrative process are listed on Slide 12. For example, if a tavern in Henderson was not already approved in a PUD, it would still need a conditional use for a change that is not a minor modification to a PUD. Regardless, any new tavern operator whether for an existing location or not would be required to obtain a city council-approved business license in Henderson. The proposed change would help create procedural equity. An example for a proposed office building feature is referenced on Slides 13 through 15, if S.B. 138 is passed.

The opposing processes are presented on Slide 16. The PUD process described in NRS 278A takes six weeks longer than a non-PUD with a similar request to change. The proposal will allow and not require a jurisdiction to adopt an ordinance for minor modifications to PUDs that would mimic non-PUDs as referenced on Slide 17. The purpose and intent of this bill is referenced on Slide 18. This bill does not permit administrative minor modifications in residential PUDs nor does it allow for major changes to PUDs like additional buildings or uses that are not already allowed under the PUD. Senate Bill 138 does not affect how taverns are approved or provide any avenues to bypass any code-required discretionary reviews.

DAVID CHERRY (City of Henderson):

I will walk you through to the proposed amendment, [Exhibit C](#). Section 1 adds the words "without limitation", which was added by the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). It changes the definition of "plan" as referenced on Slide 19 of [Exhibit B](#). Sections 2 and 3 are listed on Slide 19. Section 4 is restoring language that was deleted in the original bill at the request of stakeholders as listed on Slide 20. The new language in section 4, subsection 3 on page 2 of [Exhibit C](#) is outlined in green. Sections 5 and 6 are referenced on Slide 20 of [Exhibit B](#). Sections 7 through 9 are allowing specifics to be set by ordinance and are listed on Slide 21. The changes are referenced in blue by adding ordinances in the amendment on pages 3 and 4 of [Exhibit C](#).

Section 10, subsection 1 changes the enforcement and modification of any PUD plan which is subject to an ordinance adopted by a city or a county in various

sections of NRS 278A as referenced on Slide 22. Section 11 restores NRS 278A.390. Section 12 restores existing language in NRS 278A.400 as referenced on Slide 23. Section 13 establishes the ability for a city or a county to create its own minor modification process. There are some specific exceptions that require any change to go through the existing public hearing process as referenced from NRS 278A. Section 13 modifications are listed on Slide 24. Senate Bill 138 would allow for these modifications to be granted as long as the existing procedures are for review and approval for a follow-up. Section 14 is for tentative and final approval. Section 15 strikes out the word "tentative" on the amendment as referenced on Slide 25. Sections 16 through 18 are listed on Slide 26 and the changes are marked in the amendment on pages 6 and 7 of [Exhibit C](#).

Section 19 eliminates all changes in the original version of the bill and restores existing NRS language regarding minutes as referenced on Slide 27. Section 20, subsections 1 and 2 eliminate changes and restore existing language from NRS. This change was requested from stakeholders as referenced on Slide 28. Section 21, subsection 1 deletes reference to final which allows for flexibility and approval from earlier sections of the amendment as referenced on Slide 29. The approval is required in order to be granted. Section 22 deletes references to the final as referred to on Slide 30. Section 23 adds back in existing NRS language on "tentative and final" as requested by stakeholders, who use this two-step process to clarify the judicial review available for either stage. We will restore the ability to cities and counties to reobtain their process for approving and modifying PUDs. New section 24 is the effective date for the bill if enacted.

SENATOR NEAL:

In section 2 on jurisdiction: Why the need for expansion? Chapter 278 is pulled in which is a catch-all. What are we doing by inserting this chapter?

AMANDA KERN (City of Henderson):

I would point out this language was modified by LCB. We want to make clear that if there is something not addressed in 278A, but generally in the authority of cities to adopt an ordinance and it is authorized under chapter 278, it is okay for the intent of the provision.

SENATOR NEAL:

Was that an authority you had before?

MS. KERN:

Not an authority we have under the existing statute?

SENATOR NEAL:

Yes.

MS. KERN:

I think that we did. It was basically trying to expand and make it clear the general zoning authority within chapter 278 would be applicable.

SENATOR NEAL:

I refer to the amendment section 13, subsection 2, the language on modification for removal or release: A release can happen without a public hearing. What is considered substantial compliance that would lead you to no public hearing is required? Can you put circumstances and instances to clarify when a public hearing is not appropriate?

MR. TASSI:

We had intent to provide an exhaustive list of administrative changes. The idea would give the jurisdiction ability to define what it was. The intent is for changes and increases at building sites that comply with code, such as color changes to a building. We do not have a clear ability within NRS to adopt or do this through a minor modification process which requires both the planning commission and city council approval.

SENATOR NEAL:

There is a lot without limitation. Section 13 ties into section 3, right? I am looking at section 1 for what a plan can include. The original language in NRS 278A.060 has a finite group of things; in section 1 LCB inserted "without limitation." But "without limitation" dragged in, several other things can be in the plan. The ordinance provision in section 3, which allows to set forth the provisions around the application for the plan that includes "without limitation," I am trying to understand the expansion. What real life examples are encountering? I understand the intent of this bill. How can it be used if your intent is not followed? The power given by the sentence can be greater than that.

MR. TASSI:

I think I understand your question of how this can be manipulated in a way that might not be the intent. Someone could take something that is not a minor modification and use this State law to push something through that is not intended. The idea is to give the cities the ability to adopt an ordinance to establish what it is and to preserve the appealability of NRS 278. If our interpretation of "minor" is not agreed upon by landowners with PUDs, they have the opportunity to appeal the decision. The city has the opportunity to deny the minor modification of a PUD. We do not agree that it meets the intent.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

Referring to the proposed amendment on page 2, section 4, subsection 3 in the red language, would this deferral of common open space change the square feet or acreage of the common space?

MR. TASSI:

The orange or red underlined language exists in NRS 278A. We have added this language back into the bill.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

On page 3 of the amendment concerning the deletion on section 5, subsection 2 of NRS 278A.120, I am a bit confused on what is being deleted and returned. Can you explain what the intent is on section 5, subsection 2?

MR. CHERRY:

We try to use what LCB sends out. The language structured in purple represents the language that is taken out. The orange language is being put back in from the existing NRS. We had removed the language before and the amendment restores the language in section 5.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The intent is clear to allow them by ordinance to change or modify a PUD. Is there anything that triggers back if you have to go back to a public hearing?

Ms. KERN:

In NRS 278.3195, statute requires an appeal be granted for administrative decisions for an aggrieved party. If you are an aggrieved party, you can appeal the decision and go to a public hearing in front of the planning commission. That would be appealable to the city council.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

On the amendment page 5, section 13, subsection 3, paragraph (a), who decides what is minor? Who decides what "substantially complies" with this?

MR. TASSI:

The idea behind the bill is to allow the cities and counties to adopt the ordinance and make the decision if something is "minor" or "substantially complies." I believe the "substantially complies" language is in NRS and the "minor in nature" has been added.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

Are there other cities that want this? Where is the start of this bill and what was done or happening that we need S.B. 138?

MR. TASSI:

We have several examples of how the language in NRS 278A has impacted our ability to amend a PUD through a normal process. For example, a car wash that was built 20 years ago is a certain size and was established through a PUD. The owner wanted to update, expand and modernize the car wash. The increase was bigger than 10 percent of the size of the existing car wash. The size still complied with the development code and would have been approved in a normal course. Since this was PUD, it required the property owner to go through a full public hearing process, since NRS 278A lacks the clarity to give local jurisdictions the ability to make those decisions administratively.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

If this affects the City of Henderson or you feel a need to change it, why have the Legislature change it? Why not just specify the City of Henderson or cities of the same size with population caps? Why not look into who wants this instead of requiring the entire State to make these decisions?

MR. CHERRY:

We are looking at a statute that does affect all cities and counties in terms of which of them have PUDs. We felt the change would be beneficial to anyone who wanted to do this. Our goal was to create a second level by leaving in the existing language in NRS when it comes to making minor modifications to a PUD. Those who wanted a new ordinance could take advantage of this to simplify the procedure. If we are experiencing issues with PUDs, then other

cities and counties must be experiencing the same thing. We could go back to the sponsor to discuss putting a cap on the population for the bill.

SENATOR NEAL:

I see homeowners would have appeal rights, but in section 10, subsection 2 there is a strikeout in red. With this strikeout, what would a resident challenge under? There is no longer a mutual interest, so what would the resident challenge under?

MR. TASSI:

A resident can establish aggrieved party status on any administrative approval in the City of Henderson. The resident can write a letter in opposition for any change made through the PUD that has affected them. The establishment of aggrieved party status can appeal the application.

SENATOR NEAL:

In section 14, subsection 2, the ordinance requires both tentative and final approval. Does this happen simultaneously? When would the opportunity exist for a resident to grieve on tentative and final at the same time? If section 14, subsection 2 is not simultaneous, then tell me how to read the timing of the provision.

GREG TOTH (City of Henderson):

If a tenant is in a final approval process, the first part of the process has a public hearing. The final approval process does not have a hearing. It would be approving a tentative map and following up with recording a final map. A final map recording is an administrative procedure. If a jurisdiction uses a one-step approval process, it is granting a tentative map at the same time. There will be a public hearing to create a new planned unit development. The planning commission and city council will still hold public hearings. The public would be able to speak and grieve.

SENATOR LANGE:

Senate Bill 138 gives the needed flexibility to the cities and counties. When it comes to approving minor modifications, it will help modernize the section of NRS that is 50 years old. It will be a more streamlined process that will be better for everyone.

NICK VANDER POEL (City of Fernley):

The City of Fernley supports S.B. 138. Mr. Cherry shared the proposed amendment for S.B. 138 which the City's Planning Department had the opportunity to review earlier today. As a growing community in northern Nevada, we had early concerns about the impact to the City and our ability to modify the existing plan for a development ordinance. We are satisfied with the proposed amendment language because it will not require a complete overhaul of the existing ordinance.

MATT WALKER (Southern Nevada Home Builders Association):

We support S.B. 138. A significant amount of work has gone into this bill with communication and outreach. The amendment presented before the Committee today significantly limits the application of this bill to residential communities. We still think there is great value and additional efficiencies to help get the product to market. This will open up additional public meeting spots for residential communities to get started and bring down the cost of getting to market. The PUDs are a great value for local governments and communities for facilitating development. This will allow for unique solutions that can buffer and transition when a parcel is surrounded by different zoning types. This is a common sense bill. It captures 80 percent of the administrative process.

CALLI WILSEY (City of Reno):

The City of Reno supports S.B. 138. We appreciate the proactive outreach and flexibility on this bill. The proposal will allow local jurisdictions to make their own processes more efficient and at the same time maintaining the major key components of the original PUDs and protect those community expectations.

WESLEY HARPER (Executive Director, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities):

The League supports S.B. 138. This bill is a thoughtful and permissive adjustment to existing law. Henderson and other Nevada jurisdictions have many existing old PUDs that are often amended with relatively minor changes. The statute can make the process burdensome for the applicants and municipal planning departments. Under S.B. 138, each jurisdiction would be empowered to set their own standards for amending PUDs. The basic requirements are left intact if approved jurisdictions would be able to outline all their own approval process through ordinance and not have a statute outline that is particularly for amendments and PUDs.

ARIELLE EDWARDS (City of North Las Vegas):

The City of North Las Vegas supports S.B. 138. We believe this bill modernizes adequate language and streamlines the process for minor modifications. This will provide the City with more flexibility and ownership with their own local ordinances for PUDs. We agree with the amendment language submitted from the City of Henderson.

JOSH HICKS (Builders Association of Northern Nevada):

On behalf of the Builders Association of Northern Nevada, we are opposed to S.B. 138 with the deletion of the landowner consent provisions in section 21. The conceptual amendment proposed by the City of Henderson restores that language, and with the restoration of that language, we would not be opposed to S.B. 138.

SENATOR NEAL:

Is this trying to get at any other space? The Badlands Golf Course—is this related to what is going on over there with these issues?

MR. CHERRY:

It does have broad applicability. The areas we are speaking of are big box retailers. Businesses that have gone out business like Toys "R" Us, Sears and Kmart with vacant space that can be repurposed. The City of Henderson does use PUDs for the community.

MR. TASSI:

No. There is no intent for this to apply to golf courses. In fact, the residential provisions in NRS 278A have been removed as proposed. Golf courses are associated with residential, but these minor modification provisions would not allow that.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 138 and open the hearing on S.B. 180.

SENATE BILL 180: Revises provisions relating to fire prevention. (BDR 42-601)

SENATOR HEIDI SEEVERS GANSERT (Senatorial District No. 15):

Senate Bill 180 will ensure the State Forester Firewarden is able to purchase or acquire cameras or other equipment for early warning detection of fires. On a personal note, I was made aware about the AlertWildfire systems while at the

University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). We had a number of fires in northern Nevada, and during those fires anyone can log on, since it is public domain to see where the fires are located. The sensors and cameras are located on mountain tops around the Lake Tahoe Basin and the Reno area. If a fire starts in our area, we know about it quickly.

As someone who lives on the edge of the Toiyabe National Forest, I have pulled the system up a number of times to see which direction the wind is blowing and if my home is potentially threatened. Some of the fires from last year include the Caughlin Ranch and Little Valley Fires. You can see the progress and what is happening. It is an incredible early warning system to help us minimize damage from fires and potentially prevent them from starting.

GRAHAM KENT (PH.D., Director, Nevada Seismological Laboratory; Professor, Department of Geological Sciences and Engineering, University of Nevada, Reno):

I am the vice president of WildfireLive as referenced from my presentation ([Exhibit D](#)). The Numbers Fire photo is from last summer and captured with a newly installed NV Energy camera that took the footage on Slide 1; NV Energy is supporting this program. This did a couple of things. The fire was caught early on and allowed firefighters to size up the fire and respond appropriately. This was a dicey situation as it was a very explosive fire behavior around homes and people. The thing you might not understand is it allowed NV Energy to look at the picture and understand how it was going de-electrify the area without a sledgehammer. You do not want to knock power down all the way to Carson City. By having situational awareness, the power company can do a better job to keep the power on and shut it down to let people get out safely.

AlertWildfire is a university consortium between UNR, University of California San Diego and University of Oregon, as referenced from Slide 2. WildfireLive is expanding and moving around the Country. This all started with one camera in Nevada with funding from the Tahoe Prosperity Center. In 2013, AlertTahoe started, and by 2018 there were 85 cameras. The fires in 2017 and 2018 for California were catastrophic. Nevada has been growing like gangbusters ever since. We have most of the major utilities in six states in the West signed on with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire). Nevada is up to about 769 cameras and will have 1,000 cameras by next summer.

Why do fire services want to do this? I want to talk to folks not in California. There is always a sense things are bad in California, but we are not California, especially concerning fire behavior. On Slide 3, the bottom video is from Colorado last year, the largest fire in their state. There were catastrophic fires in Oregon and Washington in September. In Oregon, a million acres burned in several weeks along with record fires throughout the West. The reason we want to put out this system is getting eyes on the fire.

The first thing we want to do is reduce the respond time on wildfires when they start. The list of key advantages of the alert system is referenced on Slide 4. Understanding fire behavior is critical for firefighter safety. Cameras will be parked on fires that have been put out for several days to make sure they do not restart.

On Slide 5, the video shows how fires look. What does 20 to 30 minutes buy you? Those minutes can buy you a lot and give you asset protection. On Virginia Peak, the golf ball dome is the radar dome for the airport. On Slide 6 is a picture of the Perry Fire on Virginia peak. There are examples of the August Complex Fire on Slide 7. This was one of several fires that merged with California and turned into a gigafire, burning a million acres. Nevada could have a fire burn a million acres. The Martin Fire burned over 400,000 acres. On Slide 8 is an example of the website. It is our crowd source for a 21st century lookout, and the public can see this in real time. For example, CalFire had a lot of fires one evening. How did they know who to evacuate? The cameras helped to figure out what to do for life safety.

We have habitat protection from this system. Sage grouse habitat, for example is destroyed as referenced from Slides 9 and 10 showing the Hotpot Fire burning. We need to protect animal and landscape habitats for mining and other sources if we end up having gigafires around Nevada. Fire cameras cost money and firefighting costs money. The Lilac Fire in California is referenced on Slide 11. In this case, it had the worst fire conditions in San Diego history. There were four cameras on the Lilac Fire as referenced from Slide 12. The Woodson Fire is referenced on Slide 13 and was a large wind-driven fire.

The Kincade Fire in 2019 started during three consecutive Diablo wind events as referenced from Slide 14 where a comparison of these fires is listed; the difference in numbers is due to cameras available in 2019. There is video of the Kincade Fire on Slide 15. We have 42 AlertWildfire cameras in Nevada with

funding through BLM and NV Energy. We have 24 more fire cameras on the hook as referenced on Slide 16. Working with Firewarden Kacey KC, we went through the systems to find the holes in the network that potentially the State could help with. We came out with a list of 15 sites which would cost \$1.5 million over two years. The early action is located in the central west portion of Nevada. The proposed list has many sites in southern Nevada. Last year, the southeastern side of the State had extreme fire behavior. Slide 17 shows where potential sites for fire cameras could be.

We are trying to bend back the curve on fires. The key points for rapid expansion of AlertWildfire is listed on Slide 18. When the cameras are not being used for fires, Life Flight services is using the cameras. The cameras are for weather conditions and also used for watching wildlife as referenced on Slide 19.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

The bill has enabling language to allow our Forester Firewarden to purchase equipment for fires. We have some significant needs in southern and eastern Nevada. Western Nevada is pretty well covered right now, and this is will go toward the entire State.

SENATOR NEAL:

How will this be paid for? Is there disaster money that came from the recent fires?

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

This bill does not request any money. I believe we get quite a bit of federal dollars.

KACEY KC (State Forester Firewarden, Nevada Division of Forestry, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

Senate Bill 180 does not have any particular funding. We have an NV Energy contract for matching funds from S.B. No. 508 of the 80th Session. We put in cameras from the funds from the contract with NV Energy. A lot of the grant funding comes through the U.S. Forest Service. We are always looking for preventative methods for wildfire detection and other equipment that may be necessary to help. We have small amounts of funds. The language is in the bill to use the money to purchase cameras quickly.

SENATOR OHRENSCHALL:

If S.B. 180 is passed, would it cover nonfixed cameras, such as cameras in airplanes, drones or satellite technologies that monitor forest fires? Would this just be for fixed cameras on towers?

DR. KENT:

My presentation only has fixed cameras on towers. But there is whole ecosystem out there right now. We are pulling data from GOES-16 and GOES-17 satellites as a backstop for when there is not a camera or something is not being detected. The cameras plug into other things in technospace. It is more than just the cameras themselves. They play a critical part but not the only part. The cameras play a critical part in fuel reduction monitoring prescribed burns. Last year, there were fuel reductions as another step in prevention. The more prescribed fires Nevada has, the more AI can be trained on these cameras so we do not always have to rely on 911. The machines can help us with AI pilot projects in California.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

This language is broad and technology will evolve. The language is broad enough to cover what was described today. But beyond that, it is about the equipment and cameras necessary for early warning detection. As technology changes, so can the use of the funds.

SENATOR HANSEN:

The advances in satellite technology can make cameras like this archaic in the future. How far are we advanced on the satellites being able to detect fires early instead of relying on land-based cameras?

Dr. KENT:

The GOES-16 and GOES-17 satellite pair is pretty sophisticated. In the southern Californian test bed last year, the average detection time for the satellite was between 15 to 45 minutes. The average 911 call is about 4 to 8 minutes in California. The satellite-only feeds found one fire last summer. The reason the land-based cameras are not ever going away is you get a critical situational awareness to understand how the fuel reacts to the fire, how the wind is setting up and whether you might have wind shear on two different levels that you would never see with a satellite.

SENATOR HANSEN:

You mentioned fuel reduction. Nevada needs to do some reductions in fuels with serious advances. I am scared of a Paradise Fire with the existing ideal conditions in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

Do you know how this shortens your response time?

Ms. KC:

We use these cameras in our dispatch centers. When the call goes into 911, the dispatch centers turn the cameras for a better view. The response time is shortened, but also we can see where it is. One of the issues with 911 is many people are directionally challenged and do not know exactly where or what hilltop they are looking at. It has always been a challenge for the dispatch centers to find the exact point of origin. We send things out and they do not land in the right spot. When the call comes in and we can turn the camera, we know exactly where the fire is and what needs to be sent. When we are looking at the fire, we know what fuel type the fire is in and the road access. Instead of sending ground crews, we send helicopters, for ground access can be difficult. All of this makes it easier for us. It is not just the shortened response time but a more effective firefighting response.

DR. KENT:

If things are clicking clearly, you are going to save on average 20 to 35 minutes for most responses. The Kincade Fire was 35 minutes based on dispatch. In many cases from before, the response time was longer when there were no cameras to help give the right location of the fire. In California, it is in between 20 to 35 minutes. In extreme fire conditions, that is lot of time.

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

Does this help save firefighters lives and their safety?

Ms. KC:

It can definitely help with what we are sending. It is dangerous to have folks on the road. This reduces the drive time, and we know exactly where it started. We can reduce the amount of people we send if we know the terrain and how the fire will move through the terrain. We are able to send the right things to the right places. Early detection means we can get resources out for structure protection quickly. The local government is using the cameras as well. There are

certain conditions under which all the wrong conditions will arise and we are not able to put people in front of it. Regardless of getting early detection from a camera; however, for the most part this is helping save those lives.

DR. KENT:

Unfortunately, we have an after-action video that records fire behavior. After-action video is used when people are injured or lose their lives or there are close calls. The after-action video helps us understand what happened to make sure it does not happen again.

TIFFANY EAST (Chairwoman, Board of Wildlife Commissioners):

The Legislative Committee of the Wildlife Commission supports S.B. 180. Just in the last few years, wildfires have destroyed hundreds of acres of habitats for Nevada's wildlife, habitats wildlife depends on for summer and winter ranges. We agree early detection will enable first responders to assess the situation and get resources on the ground quicker; especially in some of tough-to-access rural areas, to limit loss of habitat. Last week, the Utah Division of Forestry Fire and State Lands announced the addition of camera detection to assist with wildfire mitigation efforts.

KYLE DAVIS (Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife):

We had a presentation from Dr. Kent at our board meeting. Wildfire has ravished Nevada's landscapes, and we have lost over 9 million acres in the last two decades. When wildfires burn on the landscape, our native sagebrush habitat comes back with invasive species like cheatgrass. The problem is our wildlife do not eat it. This is why we see challenges for sage grouse and mule deer. The primary thing we can do to benefit wildlife in the State is to control wildfires and stop the loss of habitat. The Coalition supports S.B. 180. Anything that we can do to detect wildfires earlier is going to help us maintain wildlife habitat and maintain healthy wildlife populations.

ERNIE ADLER (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 1245):

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers for NV Energy supports S.B. 180. In terms of prevention of fires and fire dangers, if there is a fire and NV Energy employees respond, they run a risk of serious injury or even death.

Ms. KC:

I am neutral to S.B. 180 as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 180 and open public comment.

CYRUS HOJJATY:

It is pretty awesome to see steps taken to improve urban planning. Urban planning is the primary concern I have living in Las Vegas. The reason I moved here is to provide alternatives and for new projects. The area is car dependent, and the worst part is the housing units are close together. The Las Vegas area is the fifth densest urban area in the Country behind New York. Yet other nearby areas are far less car dependent and are in-transit oriented. I object to this car dependent land use segregated with heavily set regulations. However, we do need a more pedestrian friendly, transit oriented system and mixed use of development. I do not believe certain organizations are the solution.

We need to preserve the vast amount of homeownership to keep reforming traffic and keep real alternatives of getting around. We need to reduce regulations and encourage people to build other things. So many problems we have around the world are the result of horrible urban planning. We are the richest society in the world, and it is disgusting the kinds of cities and public spaces that we build. The housing tracts, strip malls, vast parking lots and large collector roads—all of this is devastating. We need to preserve some of the benefits and create other alternatives. We need to return to urban planning principles from the early 1920s and prior. Why did we ever change this system in the first place?

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

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
March 17, 2021
Page 18

CHAIR DONDERO LOOP:

Seeing no further business, I adjourn this meeting at 5:22 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Janae Johnson,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Marilyn Dondero Loop, Chair

DATE: _____

| EXHIBIT SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|----------------------|
| Bill | Exhibit Letter | Begins on Page | Witness / Entity | Description |
| | A | 1 | | Agenda |
| S.B. 138 | B | 3 | Senator Roberta Lange / Senatorial District No. 7 | Presentation |
| S.B. 138 | C | 1 | City of Henderson | Conceptual Amendment |
| S.B. 180 | D | 1 | Kent Graham / University of Nevada, Reno | Presentation |
| S.B. 180 | E | 1 | Kacey KC / Nevada Division of Forestry, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources | Testimony |