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

# Eighty-Second Session March 14, 2023

The Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Howard Watts at 1:35 p.m. on Tuesday, March 14, 2023, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. 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/82nd2023.

# **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Howard Watts, Chair
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Max Carter
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman
Assemblywoman Danielle Gallant
Assemblyman Bert Gurr
Assemblywoman Heidi Kasama
Assemblywoman Elaine Marzola
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong

# **COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

# **GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None

# **STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst Jessica Dummer, Committee Counsel Connie Barlow, Committee Manager



> Kathy Biagi, Committee Secretary Garrett Kingen, Committee Assistant

# **OTHERS PRESENT:**

Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League
Donna Laffey, representing Biotechnology Innovation Organization
Angela Dykema, representing Southwest Energy Efficiency Project
Kyle Davis, representing Western Resource Advocates
Will Drier, Policy Manager, Electrification Coalition
Mathilda Guerrero, Digital Manager, Battle Born Progress
Gabriela Olmedo, Associate, Advanced Energy United
Rodney Schilling, Chief Traffic Operations Engineer, Traffic Operations Division,
Department of Transportation

#### **Chair Watts:**

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We will start with a bill draft request (BDR) introduction and then we will go into our bill hearing followed by our work session.

**BDR 58-113**—Revises provisions relating to the towing of a motor vehicle under certain circumstances. (Later introduced as <u>Assembly Bill 303</u>.)

First, we have bill draft request (BDR) 58-113 to consider. As a reminder, a vote to introduce a bill does not imply any support for the bill moving forward. It just allows the BDR to be introduced, assigned a bill number, and potentially moved forward through the legislative process. With that, I will entertain a motion to introduce BDR 58-113.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BROWN-MAY MOVED FOR COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION OF BILL DRAFT REQUEST 58-113.

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

With that, we will move to our bill hearing for the day for <u>Assembly Bill 262</u>. I will pass the gavel over to Vice Chair Brown-May. [Assemblywoman Brown-May assumed the Chair.]

**Assembly Bill 262:** Revises provisions relating to state-owned vehicles. (BDR 27-124)

#### **Vice Chair Brown-May:**

I will now open the bill hearing for Assembly Bill 262. You may begin.

#### Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15:

I am here to present <u>Assembly Bill 262</u> for your consideration. <u>Assembly Bill 262</u> seeks to encourage our State to lead by example in reducing tailpipe emissions and transitioning to a zero-emissions fleet. Our State has set goals to reduce carbon pollution. Additionally, we are under requirements from the Clean Air Act to reduce unhealthy air pollution in our communities, something that has at times been a serious issue for both Clark and Washoe Counties. Unfortunately, they have often been ranked poorly for air pollution, and one of the major contributors to both of those things is transportation. It is the largest source of carbon pollution in our state. In addition, it is one of the biggest sources of particulate matter and a contributor to the formation of smog, all of which have significant negative health impacts—asthma, lung disease, even cognitive impairment—and other issues. This body has passed a variety of policies to try to support the development of zero-emissions vehicle infrastructure from charging, fueling, and other policies. I think it is important that we try to have the State also lead by example in taking on this transition.

What this bill does is amend some of our procurement standards for State vehicles. Walking you through the bill quickly, section 1 adds to some of our automobile procurement policies that to the extent practicable will give preference to the purchase of automobiles that minimize emissions from the automobile and the total cost of the automobile over its service life, which may include, without limitation, fueling costs, maintenance costs, and any rebates or financial incentives offered for the purchase of the automobile. With the passage of some of the federal legislation, including the Inflation Reduction Act, for the first time governments can take advantage of what were tax credits. Governments do not file tax returns, but now there is what is called a direct pay provision that allows local governments to take advantage of some of these incentives, thus lowering the upfront purchase cost of a vehicle. In addition, the fuel and maintenance costs for many zero-emission vehicles, particularly electric battery-powered vehicles, are about half those of internal combustion engines. Sometimes putting in an additional investment on the front end is going to yield significant savings over the lifetime of a vehicle, which for most of these passenger vehicles is going to be 10 years or 100,000 miles, which is the standard State policy. Again, doing that lifecycle analysis helps us figure out what is going to be in the best financial interest of the State for the long term, not just at the point where the purchase is being made. It will factor in some of these new rebate and incentive programs as well as the fueling costs, which would include charging costs related to these vehicles. Where all else is equal, we would choose whatever is going to have the greatest reduction of tailpipe emissions from those vehicles.

Section 1, subsection 4, paragraph (b) emphasizes that to the extent practicable, we purchase motor vehicle fuel that is blended with ethanol or biodiesel. Again, we are trying to look at reducing the carbon intensity and the emissions of those fuels when it is available and affordable. Subsection 4, paragraph (c) specifies that if we are purchasing a new diesel vehicle, we want to ensure it is capable of using what is known as B-20, a diesel blend that is at least 20 percent biodiesel. Then, subsection 5 asks that we keep a record of the type of fuel used by our vehicle fleet so we can understand what that makeup and mix is and how the

makeup of our vehicle fleet may be shifting over time. One of the things I will note, and I will be submitting a follow-up amendment, is that we list a range of fuel types but did not include compressed natural gas in that and I will add that in. Although it is not an exhaustive list, I do want to make sure that is added.

Section 2 also has language related to tracking the fuel types of our state fleet. In addition, I do have a proposed conceptual amendment [Exhibit C]. What this does is add in a legislative declaration that provides some additional context about the importance of this issue, including the contributions of vehicles to our air pollution, the importance of moving away from volatile out-of-state fossil fuel prices to improve our energy security. Crucially, it also sets goals for our state to aspire to, to reach zero tailpipe emissions from our light-duty vehicles. So again, think of that as essentially the passenger vehicles we all use to get around by the year 2040, and for our heavier duty vehicles to get to zero tailpipe emissions by the year 2050.

Ultimately, I think that provides some guidance about where we want to go. The rest of the bill points us on a path to get there by making decisions that are economically smart but prioritize reducing pollution when all else is equal. For the vehicles we already have that use fossil fuels, we want to make those as clean as possible during our transition to vehicles with low, and eventually no, tailpipe emissions. I would like to add that the zero-emissions technology can be electric, it can be hydrogen fuel cell—anything that emits zero tailpipe emissions would help us reach our ultimate goals.

One other thing I will say is that we have some state agencies that are taking the lead on this. I was in a budget presentation today where an agency is looking at vehicle replacement and has already decided one is going to be an electric vehicle and another will be a hybrid because it fits their use case, so agencies are already starting to look at these issues. In addition, our State Department of Administration did conduct an analysis and found that overall, particularly for light-duty vehicles, they are today already cost-effective purchases over the life of the vehicle. Even putting aside the air pollution, health, and other benefits, they just make economic sense. That is before we factor in some of these new federal incentives that are available to help lower the upfront purchase costs even further. Again, the goal is to help codify some of this into practice and set a clear path and direction for our State to lead by example in transitioning to zero-emission vehicles, helping support our local clean technology and transportation economy in the process. With that, I would be glad to stand for any questions that members of the Committee may have.

# **Assemblywoman Kasama:**

I think this is a good path. It is what we are looking to for the state. My question is in section 1, subsection 4, paragraph (a): "To the extent practicable, give preference to the purchase of automobiles which minimize . . . ." Then there is the list of everything to be taken into account. If for some reason there was some particular vehicle that could not fit all of these guidelines, does the agency still have the authority to purchase something else?

If for some reason we do not get enough incentives, but there is a special truck and it is a \$40,000 difference, can they still buy a traditional truck if it is calculated that is what is needed?

#### **Assemblyman Watts:**

That is a great question. Yes, this is designed to provide that flexibility and practicability. As I see it, it is both financially and logistically practical. So sometimes, the charging or other infrastructure may be an issue. Figuring out the use cases, as some of this technology continues to develop, the range and the fueling availability may be an issue. So again, right now there might be some things that are better suited for hybrid technology, and then looking at full zero emissions a little bit further down the road. Again, if we look at setting a goal of 2040 with our vehicle fleets, with the amount of turnover we have in our vehicle fleets and the speed at which this technology is deploying, I think we are well on our way to meeting that goal. Some of those specialty vehicles, particularly those heavy-duty vehicles, are either not available or are not compatible with our current policies, although there is policy for that, too, that is under consideration. They might not be financially or logistically feasible at this time. Absolutely they can go in the direction of what makes sense now. This bill encourages a constant evaluation of what is out there so that as some of those dynamics shift and some of these newer technologies and options become cost competitive and logistically practical, we move in that direction.

## **Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

I like it. I think it is a great idea, but one of the things I am wondering is if there are departmental policies that take into consideration right-sizing of vehicles. One of the things I noticed in my 26 years working in public service is that for instance, I would see a lot of trucks, 150s and above, on the road doing work in urban communities that did not necessarily require off-road. Now you are using a vehicle that is expending way more fuel and expending way more pollution than it should when it could have been done by a smaller vehicle. I am wondering if there is any room or if you have any idea about how we can add or strongly suggest a review of right-sizing. Just because we work in the construction industry, we do not necessarily need a truck. It is something to consider.

#### **Assemblyman Watts:**

Again, not knowing the details of the needs each agency has for each different vehicle use, it is a little bit tricky. What I can say is when I first came up with the idea for this policy, I was really thinking about fuel sources and comparable vehicles with different fuel sources. However, looking back at this in terms of, to the extent practicable, minimizing emissions from the automobile and total costs over a lifetime, if you move to a smaller, more efficient vehicle from a pickup truck, that is going to lower the emissions and it is going to lower the cost of that vehicle for fuel. Based on your question, I think this would help encourage people to make sure they are right-sized to the most efficient model possible to meet the needs associated with it.

### **Vice Chair Brown-May:**

Anyone else with questions? Assemblyman Watts, I have two. On page 3, section 1, subsection 5—"Each department, office, bureau, officer or employee...shall maintain records...." Could you talk us through what that looks like? Is it each individual state division, or would this data be collected somewhere and then reported out? To whom would we report it?

# **Assemblyman Watts:**

Again, we are trying to create some flexibility but also trying to create some transparency and accountability about what we are doing and where we are heading. The State has already entered into a contract. It was approved by the Interim Finance Committee to track some of its climate-related pollution emissions. Fleet Services Division, Department of Administration, is one of the things that is going to be tracked from. To do that, they are also going to be looking at fuel source and other information about vehicles within the fleet. What that subsection, as well as the very last portion of the addition to the bill means, is we are having Fleet Services maintain records. The goal is that they would be able to maintain some records on what the makeup is because they would have that historically and hopefully able to be easily pulled and analyzed. We can see, Where are we at? What is the progress we are making as time goes by? We can compare that against the goals we aim to move towards. Potentially, we can ask questions and investigate how that is going. What are the barriers? What are the opportunities to continue to make progress towards those goals. That is really what we envisioned, but Fleet Services and the Department of Administration are not the sole owners of vehicles. Agencies also own their own vehicles, particularly in the Department of Transportation. So section 1, subsection 5 is really trying to make sure we can work towards something holistic across all of state government, all of the vehicles we own, to understand the breakdown of the makeup.

#### **Vice Chair Brown-May:**

Anyone else have questions? Seeing none, we will hear testimony. Anyone here in support of <u>A.B. 262</u>, please come forward.

# Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League:

[Read from Exhibit D.] This bill will encourage state agencies to add more electric and hybrid vehicles to their fleets, which will reduce emissions and toxic pollution, all while improving public health and saving the state money. Gas-powered vehicles produce many pollutants, including particulate matter, ozone, and carbon monoxide. These tailpipe emissions are damaging to our health and are a link to many respiratory illnesses, including asthma.

Additionally, transportation continues to be the top contributor to carbon pollution in our state. By getting more electric vehicles (EVs) on our roads, we can take a major step to clean up our air. A recent report found that a 2 percent increase in EVs on the road can lead to a 3.2 percent decline in asthma-related emergency department visits. Electric vehicles also cost less to operate as they do not have any expenses for oil changes or smog checks. This makes the total cost of owning an EV much less. A recent analysis of Nevada's fleets found

that the State could save money by electrifying. Getting more EVs in our State fleets is good for public health, good for our planet, and good for our wallet. We urge the Committee's support. Thank you.

# Donna Laffey, representing Biotechnology Innovation Organization:

Biotechnology Innovation Organization has supported efforts to increase the use of ethanol and biodiesel in motor fuel, most recently supporting <u>Assembly Bill 411 of the 81st Session</u>. Ethanol has been shown to emit about 46 percent less greenhouse gas emissions and that is more than conventional gasoline. We urge the Committee to support <u>A.B. 262</u>, and we thank the bill sponsor for bringing this forward.

# Angela Dykema, representing Southwest Energy Efficiency Project:

We are in full support of this bill for the reasons already stated. I urge you to please move it forward.

# **Kyle Davis, representing Western Resource Advocates:**

On behalf of Western Resource Advocates, there is a letter on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System detailing our support [Exhibit E], so I will not go into it any further. It is a good bill and we urge your support.

#### **Vice Chair Brown-May:**

Is there anyone else here in Carson City in support of <u>A.B. 262</u>? [There was no one.] We will go down to Las Vegas. Is there anyone in Las Vegas in support of <u>A.B. 262</u>? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the phone lines in support of <u>A.B. 262</u>?

#### Will Drier, Policy Manager, Electrification Coalition:

I am speaking in support of <u>A.B. 262</u>. We submitted a letter in support and an analysis of the Nevada fleet that I will point your direction to and keep this short [<u>Exhibit F</u>]. We know that EVs are generally cheaper to own and operate over the lifetime of the vehicle, and a major barrier of adoption is their upfront costs. <u>Assembly Bill 262</u> would encourage agencies to use the total cost of ownership rather than purchase price in making procurement decisions. I encourage you to review the analysis submitted which we conducted on a portion of the Department of Administration's fleet. It showed that 92 percent of the vehicles we analyzed would create a savings for the State by shifting to electrification today prior to any incentives or rebates. For these reasons, we support <u>A.B. 262</u>. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and please feel free to reach out with any questions regarding our analysis.

# Mathilda Guerrero, Digital Manager, Battle Born Progress:

I am calling on behalf of Battle Born Progress, and we are in unwavering support of A.B. 262. I want to ditto the previous statements made as we are already living through the effects of the climate crisis. As Nevada makes plans to fight the climate crisis, this body must consider creative solutions such as this bill that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions

and make a necessary stride to, one day, zero emissions. This bill is one of the necessary steps to ensure that Nevadans today and future generations are able to thrive in our state. We urge this Committee to vote yes on this bill. [Written testimony was also provided Exhibit G.]

### Gabriela Olmedo, Associate, Advanced Energy United:

We are working to make the energy we use clean, affordable, and reliable. We represent over 100 companies across the clean energy spectrum, including electric vehicle manufacturers, fleet operators, and charging infrastructure providers. I am calling to express support for A.B. 262. Total cost of ownership analysis is the most fiscally responsible approach to State vehicle procurement and would be an excellent move to allow the State to make sound, long-term investments that benefit the State well into the future. This approach will ensure that Nevada procures vehicles that are most affordable over their lifetimes, which can result in significant savings for the State and for taxpayers, and free up money for other State priorities. Electric vehicles often offer considerable operational maintenance and fuel savings. As we have heard, fuel costs for EVs are just a fraction of what they are for equivalent gas-powered vehicles, and maintenance costs are three times lower than that of gas vehicles. If their procurement would save the State money over the course of their operational lifetime, they should be evaluated accordingly. Thank you to the bill sponsor for bringing this forward.

[Exhibit H was submitted in support of A.B. 262.]

#### Vice Chair Brown-May:

Are there more callers in support? [There was no one.] Next we will move into testimony in opposition. Is there anyone in Carson City in opposition to <u>A.B. 262</u>? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas in opposition to <u>A.B. 262</u>? [There was no one.] Are there any callers in opposition to <u>A.B. 262</u>? [There was no one.]

We will move to neutral. Is there anyone in Carson City neutral to <u>A.B. 262</u>? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas neutral to <u>A.B. 262</u>? [There was no one.] Are there any callers neutral to <u>A.B. 262</u>? [There was no one.] Assemblyman Watts, would you like to provide wrap-up comments?

# **Assemblyman Watts:**

I appreciate the time, the consideration, and the questions today, and I would ask for your support in moving this bill forward as soon as practicable. Thank you.

#### **Vice Chair Brown-May:**

I will now close the hearing on <u>A.B. 262</u> and hand the gavel back to Chair Watts. [Assemblyman Watts reassumed the Chair.]

#### **Chair Watts:**

Thank you, Madam Vice Chair. Members, with that we will move into our first work session of the legislative session for this Committee. I will now turn things over to our policy analyst, Mr. Stinnesbeck, to walk us through our work session document, and I will begin by opening the work session on <u>Assembly Bill 2</u>.

**Assembly Bill 2:** Revises provisions relating to public safety. (BDR 43-355)

# Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit I.] Assembly Bill 2 was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the City of Sparks. It was heard on February 14, 2023, and authorizes a vehicle used by a local government agency for the construction, maintenance, or repair of highways or a vehicle owned or operated by a person who contracts with a local government agency to aid motorists or mitigate traffic incidents to be equipped with lamps located toward the rear of the vehicle that emit nonflashing blue lights. The bill further authorizes the use of such blue tail lamps under certain circumstances. Lastly, the bill requires the driver of a vehicle to take precautions when approaching such a vehicle that is making use of its blue tail lamps.

#### **Chair Watts:**

Members, are there any questions? Seeing none, I will take a motion to do pass A.B. 2.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 2.

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Dickman. Our next bill on today's work session is <u>Assembly Bill 47</u>. Mr. Stinnesbeck, whenever you are ready.

Assembly Bill 47: Revises provisions governing the operation of off-highway vehicles. (BDR 43-394)

# Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit J.] Assembly Bill 47 was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Nevada Association of Counties. It was heard in this Committee on February 16, 2023. The bill provides that a governmental entity is not prohibited from constructing, operating, or maintaining a trail for use by off-highway vehicles that is adjacent to or near a highway, including, without limitation, a paved highway.

#### **Chair Watts:**

Members, are there any questions on <u>A.B. 47</u>? Seeing none, I will take a motion to do pass A.B. 47.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BROWN-MAY MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 47.

ASSEMBLYMAN GURR SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Brown-May. Our next bill on today's work session is Assembly Bill 56. Mr. Stinnesbeck, whenever you are ready.

Assembly Bill 56: Revises provisions relating to the operation of certain motor vehicles on certain portions of a highway. (BDR 43-257)

# Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit K.] Assembly Bill 56 was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Department of Transportation and heard on February 14, 2023. Assembly Bill 56 authorizes certain vehicles to overtake and pass upon the right of another vehicle under certain circumstances by driving for more than 200 feet on the paved right shoulder of a highway where lawfully placed signage allows the vehicle to use the shoulder in that manner. The bill prohibits a driver, upon the immediate approach of an authorized emergency vehicle or official vehicle of a regulatory agency making use of certain flashing lights, from driving to and stopping on a paved right shoulder of a highway where lawfully placed signage allows such vehicles to drive on the shoulder. The bill also authorizes such vehicles to drive on a paved shoulder of a controlled-access highway where lawfully placed signage allows that vehicle to use the shoulder in that manner.

There was one proposed amendment to this bill. The attached mock-up amendment proposed by the Department of Transportation:

- Removes references to the "curb" of a highway.
- Removes the word "right" when describing the shoulder of a highway, which may be used to overtake and pass in the manner authorized by the bill.
- Clarifies what constitutes a "hazardous material vehicle."
- Adds coroner vehicles and hazardous material vehicles to the list of vehicles authorized to overtake and pass on the right in the manner authorized by the bill.
- Replaces the term "accident" with "traffic incident."
- Changes the effective date.

#### **Chair Watts:**

Thank you, Mr. Stinnesbeck. Before we move forward, members, I want to make sure everyone is aware. During the presentation on this bill, there was substantial talk about the effective date and having time for the Department to educate the community about the changes that would be enacted under this bill. Instead of being effective upon passage and approval, as was included in the original bill, this allows the ability to adopt regulations and perform any other preparation associated with the implementation of this upon passage and approval, and creates a new effective date for the provision of January 1, 2024, for providing some certainty with the window for public education.

I will put on the record that members would like to have some additional clarity from the Department on its plans to conduct that public education so that folks are aware before there is any potential enforcement of the provisions of this going into effect. With that, members, are there additional questions on <u>A.B. 56</u>?

# **Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

With the removal of the word "right" as it pertains to shoulder in the proposed amendment, I am confused now whether we can move the traffic in the left shoulder or the right shoulder. I need clarity. Why do we need to have a designation for right shoulder if it can be either shoulder?

#### **Chair Watts:**

We will have somebody from the Department of Transportation come up to provide some clarity on that. My understanding is there may be certain circumstances in which only limiting this language to the right shoulder could limit its appropriate implementation. Sir, welcome. Please go ahead.

# Rodney Schilling, Chief Traffic Operations Engineer, Traffic Operation Division, Department of Transportation:

That is correct. We do not know the right and left as to what issues may be out there that we need to address. That is why we want the option to be able to use both the right and left shoulders in this instance.

#### **Chair Watts:**

Thank you. Again, given some of the conversations that happened when the bill was heard, your plan is to provide clear signage and guidance related to the implementation of the provisions of this bill, as well as to conduct public education so that when these circumstances come into play, people are aware of them. Is that correct?

# **Rodney Schilling:**

That is correct. That is why we are allowing this time period for us to establish all of those procedures and to put that signage lawfully out there for that.

#### **Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

If you do not mind I would like to talk to you offline about this bill because I am just confused now. If an incident happens and you can direct traffic to either side, what would your messaging to the public be? Would it be to stay in their lane and not to move? What is now the new direction you would be sending the general public into? We have always been told to move to the right. What would the new direction be and would that also now be part of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) instruction as far as training for new drivers and people getting their licenses renewed?

# **Rodney Schilling:**

Absolutely. That is why we want to be able to look at both the inside and outside shoulders and then come up with that, which is similar to the DMV. We did the same process for the high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. We had to educate and then update the HOV part of that instruction in the DMV manual. It would be very similar, and I would be happy to sit with you and go over some of that.

#### **Chair Watts:**

I do want to make sure to encourage members to engage with either me as the Chair or folks bringing forward bills as soon as possible to discuss some of these items. Again, I think these are fine as clarifying questions, but we do want to make sure we do not re-hear the bill during our work session. Any other questions? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass <u>A.B. 56</u>.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BROWN-MAY MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 56.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any discussion on the motion?

# **Assemblywoman Miller:**

I do appreciate some of the changes that have been made in here, especially like terminology from "accident" to "traffic incident" because that is more inclusive of issues and scenarios that happen on the roads. I still remain concerned with the amount of public education that will be out because again, my concern is people generally not knowing and being pulled over and ticketed for changes they truly were not aware of. I will vote it out of Committee but would like to talk to you further, and I reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

#### **Chair Watts:**

Any additional discussion on this motion?

#### **Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:**

Thank you, Chair. The same.

#### **Chair Watts:**

Any other discussion? [There was none.]

#### THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Miller. With that, we will move on to the last bill on our work session today, Assembly Bill 57.

**Assembly Bill 57:** Revises various provisions relating to motor vehicles. (BDR 9-274)

# Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

[Read from Exhibit L.] Assembly Bill 57 was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and heard on February 16, 2023. It authorizes certain persons who have a statutory lien on certain property, including a motor vehicle, motorcycle, motor equipment, trailer, mobile home, or manufactured home, or any part or parts thereof, in connection with the provision of certain goods and services to satisfy the lien by selling the property by private sale in an arm's-length transaction under certain circumstances. The bill further requires every aspect of a sale held to satisfy such a lien to be commercially reasonable, regardless of whether the sale is held by public auction or private sale. The bill authorizes the advertisement of the sale to be published in a publication of a nationally recognized media outlet made available on the Internet instead of in a newspaper.

The bill revises the date by which the director of the DMV is required to submit the annual report concerning garages, garage operators, and body shops to be on or before February 1 of each year. The bill revises outdated references to certain standing committees of the Legislature related to transportation and energy to instead refer to the Senate and Assembly Committees on Growth and Infrastructure. Lastly, the bill repeals provisions relating to special license plates issued to honorary consuls of foreign countries.

There is one proposed amendment to this bill that is attached. The mock-up amendment proposed by the DMV:

- Requires a sale at public auction held to satisfy a lien to be made at fair market value.
- Requires a private sale to satisfy a lien to be made directly to a third-party purchaser.
- Limits the applicability of the bill language related to private sales to remove language related to aircraft, mobile homes, and manufactured homes.
- Removes the authorization to advertise a lien sale in certain publications made available on the Internet instead of in a newspaper.
- Defines "fair market value," "public auction," and "arm's-length transaction."

#### **Chair Watts:**

Members, any questions on  $\underline{A.B.\ 57}$ ? Seeing none, I would accept a motion to amend and do pass  $\underline{A.B.\ 57}$ .

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 57.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BRITTNEY MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign that floor statement to Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong.

Thank you, members. That concludes our first work session and most of our business for the day. The last item on our agenda is public comment. [There was none.] I think we had a very productive meeting. We will have our next meeting on Thursday, March 16, 2023, at 1:30 p.m. We are adjourned [at 2:21 p.m.].

	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:
	Kathy Biagi
	Committee Secretary
APPROVED BY:	
711 THO VEE D 1.	
Assemblyman Howard Watts, Chair	_
DATE:	_

#### **EXHIBITS**

Exhibit A is the Agenda.

Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster.

Exhibit C is a proposed conceptual amendment titled, "A.B. 262 Conceptual Amendment," presented by Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15.

<u>Exhibit D</u> is written testimony submitted by Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League, in support of <u>Assembly Bill 262</u>.

Exhibit E is a letter dated March 10, 2023, submitted by Jermareon Williams, Government Affairs Manager, Western Resource Advocates, in support of <u>Assembly Bill 262</u>.

Exhibit F is a letter to the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure, dated March 14, 2023, submitted by Will Drier, Policy Manager, Electrification Coalition, in support of Assembly Bill 262.

Exhibit G is written testimony presented by Mathilda Guerrero, Digital Manager, Battle Born Progress, in support of Assembly Bill 262.

Exhibit H is written testimony, dated March 14, 2023, submitted by Nick Christenson, Volunteer Member, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club in support of <u>Assembly Bill 262</u>.

<u>Exhibit I</u> is the Work Session Document for <u>Assembly Bill 2</u>, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

Exhibit J is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 47, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

<u>Exhibit K</u> is the Work Session Document for <u>Assembly Bill 56</u>, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

Exhibit L is the Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 57, presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.