

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

**Eighty-Second Session
March 28, 2023**

The Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Howard Watts at 1:32 p.m. on Tuesday, March 28, 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:

Assemblywoman Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst
Jessica Dummer, Committee Counsel
Dylan Small, Committee Secretary
Garrett Kingen, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 601



OTHERS PRESENT:

Rico Ocampo, Lead Organizer, Make the Road Nevada; and representing Nevada Immigration Coalition

Paul Catha, Political Director, Culinary Workers Union Local 226

Paula Luna, Operations Manager, Battle Born Progress

Nicole Winckelmann, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada

Hector Fong, Jr., Communications Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada

Rosalia Martinez, representing Make the Road Nevada

Amy Koo, Acting Deputy Director, One APIA Nevada

Rosario Moreno, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Elizabeth Lopez, Private Citizen

Yajaira Rimendes, Private Citizen

Roberto Renteria, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Tony Ramirez, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada

Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles

Chair Watts:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocols were explained.]

We have two bills on the agenda today. We will begin with Assembly Bill 316, and welcome Assemblyman Miller, who will present the bill. I will open the hearing for Assembly Bill 316.

Assembly Bill 316: Revises provisions governing motor vehicles. (BDR 43-154)

Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller, Assembly District No. 7:

I am here today to present Assembly Bill 316, which revises the penalty for the unlawful possession of unregistered vehicles unfit for use. My goal is to keep this short and sweet. We will see how that goes.

Under current law, a person who keeps on private property more than two unregistered vehicles that are no longer intended for or in condition for the lawful use on highways is guilty of a misdemeanor, which is a criminal penalty. This has been in effect since 1973. Yes, you can potentially go to jail for having one too many unregistered, unfit-for-use Oldsmobiles on your property. But do not sound the alarms. There is no need to repurpose your Free Brittney signs and rush down to your local jail in protest. It turns out, most jurisdictions are not arresting people for having one too many Oldsmobiles. In a request for information regarding this issue, only a few jurisdictions took the time to respond, reporting they have never prosecuted anyone with a misdemeanor based on this statute since 1973, when it was put into statute. While all law enforcement agencies handle this slightly differently, they mostly consider it a public nuisance to their municipal codes and apply enforcement measures through administrative and civil penalties.

The goal of this bill is to align or modernize state statute with the common practice of our local jurisdictions. Some would ask, Why take on an issue that is not really an issue? The bottom line is, as legislators we have a responsibility to update our statutes as times change. When we become aware that a law is out of touch with our common practice, beliefs, or values, we must make those changes in our statutes.

I will walk through the bill briefly and the amendment [[Exhibit C](#)]. The bill reduces the penalty for those with vehicles that are not registered from a misdemeanor to a civil penalty of no more than \$100 for each day of the violation. The amendment, in addition to the provisions of this bill, authorizes a local authority to adopt an ordinance prohibiting the same conduct which is prohibited by *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 487.290 and establishes a different civil penalty, and provides that if a local authority adopts an ordinance as described in section 1, subsection 1, a person who commits the conduct prohibited by NRS 487.290 shall be subject to the provisions of the local ordinance, including the civil penalty established by a local ordinance rather than state law.

The reason the amendment was necessary is because the goal of this bill was not to prescribe how local jurisdictions were handling it. They are already having success in their measures, and we just want to align the statute to still give them the brevity to apply the codes in the way they are handling it, but removing the misdemeanor from state statute.

I will take any questions you may have.

Chair Watts:

Are there any questions from the members?

Assemblyman Gurr:

I think this is a wonderful bill. I do not think it has ever been enforced in my district, which is 50,000 square miles. It is almost a requirement when you move out into the country to find at least two broken-down cars to park on your lot. I think I have counted as many as 15 or 20 on a two-acre parcel. It is a great bill and I hope it is effective.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

This may come down as the shortest amendment of the session. Kudos on that. I am curious if it is a flat \$100 penalty or is it per car?

Assemblyman Miller:

It would be \$100 per day for each violation. As of now, it is my understanding one violation is if a person has five or ten cars on the property, that is one violation and would be \$100.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

That sounds reasonable.

Assemblywoman Kasama:

I know you just answered the question, but since we are changing the statute, should we make it clear whether it is \$100 per car or \$100 per property?

Assemblyman Miller:

I did not do that last time, but I do not have a problem clarifying that for the statutes. That part really applies for places that do not have a local jurisdictional or municipal code because with the amendment, it would automatically revert to whatever the local jurisdiction is doing. I can add a clarifying word or two.

Assemblywoman Kasama:

Or maybe something to the point of what it would be if there were no local jurisdiction. Once we fix a statute, we need to make it as clear as possible.

Assemblyman Miller:

Absolutely. If there is no local jurisdiction or code, it would automatically revert to the state statute. We can clarify how a violation is defined.

Chair Watts:

I just looked at NRS 487.290, which is the language listing what is prohibited. It states, "a person shall not for any reason keep more than two unregistered vehicles on real property owned by or under possession or control of the person if the vehicles are no longer intended for or in condition for lawful use on the highway." It does not mention if it is for each vehicle. Essentially, if someone has gone outside those boundaries, that is what triggers the violation, not on a per-vehicle basis under this reading. When it is combined with the provisions of the bill, at least in my opinion, your understanding of how it would be applied is correct.

Are there any additional questions?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

One hundred dollars per day is not inconsequential even if it is just on the property. I think that would make sense.

Chair Watts:

Seeing no other questions, thank you for the presentation. We will move to testimony in support of A.B. 316. Is there anyone here in Carson City or in Las Vegas wishing to provide support testimony? [There was no one.] Is there anyone waiting on the phone to provide support testimony? [There was no one.] We will move to opposition testimony for A.B. 316. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas who would like to provide opposition testimony? [There was no one.] Is there anyone waiting on the phone to provide opposition testimony? [There was no one.] We will move to neutral testimony for A.B. 316. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to provide neutral testimony? [There was no one.] Is there anyone waiting on the phone to provide neutral testimony? [There was no one.] Are there any closing remarks from the sponsor? [There were none.]

I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 316. I believe we are still waiting for the sponsor for Assembly Bill 336. We will take a brief recess while we wait for the sponsor to arrive.

[The meeting was recessed at 1:45 p.m.]

[The meeting was reconvened at 1:50 p.m.]

Chair Watts:

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 336 and welcome Assemblywoman González to the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure.

**Assembly Bill 336: Revises provisions governing driver authorization cards.
(BDR 43-837)**

Assemblywoman Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16:

I am presenting Assembly Bill 336. With me today to present is Rico Ocampo with Make the Road Nevada. There was an amendment submitted [[Exhibit D](#)] that is on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). However, we forgot to add the effective date change, which will be 2024-2025, when the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is projected to finish the revamping of their system. The second part of the amendment, which changes the effective date, will be coming to the Committee after the hearing. We honestly forgot to include it, but we had those conversations with stakeholders. [The amendment was not received.]

Driver authorization cards, also known as DACs, were first introduced in Nevada in 2014. Those cards were designed to provide driving privileges to individuals who are not eligible for a traditional driver's license due to the inability to provide proof of identification requirements, such as undocumented immigrants, who were able to obtain a DAC with a birth certificate or passport from another government or foreign government. Before the implementation of DACs, undocumented immigrants in Nevada were not able to obtain driver's licenses or insurance, which made driving a risky and potentially dangerous activity for both driver and other motorists on the road. The implementation of DACs was seen as a way to improve safety on the roads and provide more opportunities for undocumented immigrants to work and contribute to our beautiful society, specifically Nevada.

Since the program's inception, thousands of Nevadans have obtained DACs, which allows them to legally drive and obtain insurance. However, the program has faced some challenges, including long wait times for appointments and sometimes difficulty obtaining documentation needed for appointments. Despite these challenges, the program remains an important tool for improving road safety and providing opportunities for undocumented immigrants in Nevada.

As introduced, A.B. 336 would have removed the prohibition against a DAC being used to determine eligibility for government benefits, licenses, or services. In the amendment [\[Exhibit D\]](#) we put that provision back in because it was not the intent for that to come out of this bill. That is the amendment you have in front of you. Additionally, A.B. 336 changes the expiration date of the DAC to be prescribed by regulation so it is consistent with federal law and follows the same time period of issuance and expiration of a driver's license. Essentially, we are making all renewals for driver's licenses, whether it is a driver's license or a DAC, to be streamlined, universal, and on the same renewal time. The proposed amendment restores this provision that was stricken in the bill. Therefore, A.B. 336 would only propose a change to the expiration date of the DAC, streamlining the renewal process.

At this time, I will turn it over to my copresenter, and thank you for your patience while I got it together.

Rico Ocampo, Lead Organizer, Make the Road Nevada; and representing Nevada Immigration Coalition:

I want to start by thanking Assemblywoman González for sponsoring A.B. 336, and for her unwavering commitment to improving the lives of all Nevadans. It is a privilege to be here in the people's house, a privilege to be in front of this Committee, and an honor to copresent this important piece of legislation with Assemblywoman González.

I am here on behalf of the Nevada Immigrant Coalition. The Coalition ensures immigrant, refugee, and new American voices are heard at the local, state, and federal levels, and we advocate for humane and fair immigration policies in Nevada. I am also the lead organizer for Make the Road Nevada. Our organization was formed in 2017 in response to the Route 91 Harvest Festival shooting, when many undocumented immigrant workers, and now survivors, faced significant barriers in accessing medical and mental health services due to their immigration status. I am proud to have the opportunity to bring the voices of the community to this chamber, and I look forward to sharing the positive impact A.B. 336 will have on Nevada.

As a representative of an organization that is on the ground speaking with community members every day and listening to their concerns about driver authorization cards, I am in a unique position to provide insight into the impact of this legislation. The passing of Senate Bill 303 of the 77th Session in 2013 and its implementation in 2014 allowed undocumented immigrants living in Nevada to receive driver authorization cards, making Nevada among 20 states and the District of Columbia to implement such a program. Since then, thousands of Nevadans have had the opportunity to obtain a driver authorization card, also known as a DAC, providing them with a measure of mobility and independence. However, as we approach a decade since the implementation of S.B. 303 of the 77th Session, it has been clear there are lingering challenges that remain for those who possess a DAC, and I think this is an opportunity for us to move along with the changes.

One of the primary challenges is the discrepancy in expiration dates between driver authorization cards and driver's licenses. The former is valid for four years; the latter is valid for eight years. This means those who possess a DAC are required to pay more just to maintain their ability to drive on Nevada's roads. We want to change that. I feel like this Committee wants to change that too.

Another challenge we have seen is the lack of recognition of DACs as a valid form of identification. The DAC states "Not valid for identification" on its face, causing widespread confusion among businesses and institutions, and frustration among the communities we serve. Our outreach efforts have shown that DAC holders often face rejection and disappointment when trying to perform essential tasks. It reinforces the need for action with A.B. 336.

The confusion faced by DAC holders is not just limited to everyday situations, but extends to financial institutions and grocery stores as well. In our outreach efforts, we contacted several major banks, including U.S. Bank, Bank of America, Citibank, and Chase Bank. All of them confirmed that DACs are not accepted. However, Wells Fargo and Nevada State Bank indicated they would only accept it as a secondary form of identification. You can imagine the confusion just for DAC holders alone not knowing where they can go to open a bank account in Nevada.

We also reached out to major grocery stores, including Smith's Food and Drug, Albertson's, Vons, and Walmart Neighborhood Market stores. They all confirmed that DACs would not be acceptable as a form of identification. Their reasoning was that DACs would not pass their scanner and therefore would not be accepted. One Walmart Neighborhood Market employee even stated their confusion as to why DACs are technically issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles but cannot be used as a privilege to identify oneself. It is not just customer service lines we are getting this from, it is actually cashiers who do not know what to do when a DAC is presented to them.

This leaves many individuals without viable options, particularly those who do not have a passport or *matrícula consular*. I think it is important to note that here in Nevada, or at least where I am from in Las Vegas, we only have two consulates—the Consulate of Mexico and the Consulate General of El Salvador. That means if you are from Africa, South America, or Central America that is not El Salvador, you are out of luck in obtaining a passport. Folks oftentimes have to carry their passports with them.

Assembly Bill 336 will address some of those issues. We hope we can work together to rectify the situation by aligning the renewal provisions of DACs and driver's licenses, providing DAC holders with the same level of security and stability as those who hold driver's licenses.

In conclusion, I believe, based on the conversations I have had with the community and the conversations we have had with businesses, if we can streamline the process to make DACs equitable in the same way as driver's licenses, we could get some good things done. I think it is also important for me to say, and I will end with this, that we are open to working with Assemblywoman González and all relevant stakeholders who have an important say in this process when it comes to driver authorization cards. We want all stakeholders to be in this conversation, and we want community input as well. Right now, the community is telling us DACs are just not accepted. They are not being recognized the same way as driver's licenses. It has been ten years since the passage of S.B. 303 of the 77th Session, and I think we could add a transformational change by passing this bill.

Chair Watts:

Thank you for the presentation. I would like to take a moment of personal privilege to say it is great to see you here, Mr. Ocampo. Thank you for taking time to share the stories from the community about why you felt it was important to bring this measure forward. Before I open the hearing up to questions from other members of the Committee, I would like to note I have received—and I think many of us have received—some questions and feedback from other members of the community. While I think you addressed this during the presentation, I just want to make sure we get a clear record. Nothing in the bill, especially with the proposed amendment, changes any state or federal laws related to eligibility for any programs. Is that correct?

Assemblywoman González:

That is correct. It does not change anything. A question did come up that if the Hope Act, which is in the Senate currently, passes, would DACs be allowed to be determined for eligibility? Obviously, we have to see if that bill passes and then we would have to come back to address that. As it currently stands, you are correct; it does not change any federal or state laws for benefits.

Chair Watts:

Driver authorization card holders do pay for those applications and for those cards to cover costs. As it stands now, because the renewal period is four years instead of eight years, they actually pay double what driver's license holders pay to the DMV. Is that correct?

Assemblywoman González:

Yes, that is correct. That is the problem we are trying to address here.

Chair Watts:

They also need to go to the DMV twice as often. Is that correct?

Assemblywoman González:

That is correct.

Chair Watts:

I just wanted to make sure we got that clear on the record because of some of the concerns that have come in. I want to say I honestly wish this policy was not necessary. I think there have been a lot of concerns expressed by some folks about those individuals being able to obtain citizenship and access driver's licenses. I would love to see that. I wish driver authorization cards were not necessary. I wish friends I met in high school were not still waiting for a path to citizenship. I wish we had made more progress since the time I was in high school on border security and the border wall than we have on providing green cards or a path to citizenship for Dreamers. I wish the best advice to give an undocumented American in our community was not to marry a citizen or be the victim of a crime to qualify for a visa. Unfortunately, that is where we are right now. The only option we have to allow people to utilize transportation and get insurance is driver authorization cards. I appreciate your bringing forward this measure to create some consistency between the different forms of identification and driver authorization we have in this state.

I will open the hearing to Committee members for questions.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

I have a couple of questions. One has to do with the cost. Is it not correct that people over 65 years of age have to renew their driver's licenses every four years? I also believe it costs less than the eight-year renewal.

Assemblywoman González:

For a point of clarification, are you asking if people over 65 have to renew every four years?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

Yes. I am quite sure they do.

Assemblywoman González:

I do not know that policy. It would definitely be a DMV question. I believe DMV is in the room. Chair Watts, would you like them to come to the table now or would you like them to wait for testimony?

Chair Watts:

We do have representatives from DMV here to provide neutral testimony. Mr. Sever, I see you are taking notes, so please address that question when you come up to testify.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

The way I understand this bill, you are talking about the DAC and making it more mainstream so it can be used for identification for certain things. Does the amendment [\[Exhibit D\]](#) actually allow the bill to do that, or does this bill now just change the time frame?

Assemblywoman González:

As of right now, the bill is just changing the renewal time. My copresenter was giving the background and history. The bill and amendment do not change that.

Assemblyman Miller:

Thank you for bringing this bill. As many of you probably know, I am recently married to a new immigrant to the United States. While she has a path to citizenship because we are married, it is a long path. Even getting all of the pieces in play to get her green card and other things is months or even a year or so out. She is still working on driving on the right side of the road because she is from a country where they drive on the other side of the road. Having something like this would be beneficial, especially when I am away at the Legislature and she may need to go to the bank or somewhere else.

My only question is why I was not asked to be a primary sponsor. I see there is a place for a primary sponsor, so my ask is to be added as a primary sponsor to the bill.

Assemblywoman González:

I think we both share the newlywed immigrant story here. I would love to have you as a primary cosponsor. I apologize for not asking.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

Mr. Ocampo, could you give a little clarity on the topic you started with about banking? I would like some more information about how this fits into the whole scheme of finances. We do not want people putting money underneath mattresses. We also know in order to prepare people for integration and matriculation into our societal norms, banking is one of those important things. At least in the community I represent, if they do not have access to banking, there are problems with people going to payday loan centers and they could certainly be caught up in some trouble. I would appreciate you clarifying that for me.

Rico Ocampo:

What we were seeing as a common pattern when we were speaking to banks, primarily banking institutions, and when we went in person to a bank and showed the image of a DAC, they were confused. It was something they had never seen before. If you are someone who has never had to have a driver authorization card or do not know anyone who has a driver authorization card, it can be very new to you. What we heard during these interactions was why the DMV rolls out a different card for four years and why it is not for eight years. Trying to have that conversation while in the middle of their workday is hard enough and then trying to explain to them this is more of a state issue. Asking them if someone came to their establishment presenting a DAC to open a bank account, the common reception we received was, We do not know. Folks do not know. That is the issue we are trying to address, to ensure all Nevadans, regardless of the immigration status, are treated the same

and have access to basic functioning needs, like being able to access money from bank accounts to pay bills. Being able to address this issue, even if we have to have uncomfortable conversations about immigration—because I know this is oftentimes not an easy topic to discuss—we believe DACs and this bill should be nonpartisan. It should not be a Democrat or Republican bill. It should be a bill everyone should jump on. That is what we are hearing on the ground.

Assemblywoman González:

As we heard, immigration is a complex and deeply intertwined issue. For us in the future, we would definitely like to see them operate as identification cards as well. However, this is the starting point to streamline the process. As we all know in this building, we get our wins where we can. The testimony on the history and currently what is happening provides the background on why, number one, there are challenges, but number two, why we need to streamline this process. I definitely agree this is a problem that needs more time to discuss.

Chair Watts:

Thank you for providing the information on some of the ongoing outreach and education efforts going on in regard to this. I know when this was implemented, the bill's goal was to make sure there was never going to be any confusion that would allow the requirements associated with the driver authorization card to be confused with more stringent identification requirements and lead to potential misidentification or misqualification. The fact that in most cases people will not accept it as proof that someone is 18 or 21 years old because of the way it is designed and designated is worth bringing to the Committee's attention. We do have another question.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

I just looked up on the DMV website how much I pay every eight years. For an eight-year license, it is \$41.25 for ages 65 and younger. For 65 and older, it has to be done every four years and is \$22.25, which is the same amount the DACs have been charged. I understand they have to go to the DMV more often, but it does not appear they are necessarily paying more than someone 65 or older. If this bill were to pass, would the expectation be that the charge would then be \$41.25 like the rest of us?

Assemblywoman González:

The expectation is that it would be charged the same. I do not think in any of our conversations with the community or stakeholders the monetary charge was the issue. The issue is having to go to the DMV, having to wait, having it expire while you are working—then having to make the decision to break the law or go to work. Folks are fine paying. That is not the issue. The issue is everyone else being able to have an eight-year renewal. My license now is eight years. I do not have to worry about it or think about it. People get into a bind when there is such a short renewal time. We know it is very hard to get appointments with DMV as of right now, let alone what happened during COVID-19. These are some of the challenges, along with it not being a real identification or used as identification, that come along with it that we are trying to chip away at.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

I can renew my driver's license online and it gets mailed to me. Is that the same with DACs? If not, is that a discussion you are having with DMV as well? I appreciate what you are doing. It is making it easier and having fewer people in line. I love that. I am wondering if those conversations have been had.

Rico Ocampo:

I will leave it to the experts to provide the data around DACs, but there is an estimate of over 70,000 eligible renewals for DACs. I am confident in saying the DMV would love fewer people in their office renewing whatever it is they are renewing. That is one of the things that is beneficial from this bill.

Could you repeat the question so I can capture it?

Assemblywoman Gallant:

Are the renewals online now, and if not, are you having conversations for it to be online renewal?

Rico Ocampo:

It is my understanding the DACs have to be done in person.

Chair Watts:

Thank you for that question and the clarification. Perhaps we would want to explore, especially for our senior citizens, that we are fully aligned between the DACs and driver's licenses. Seeing no other questions, we will open the hearing for testimony. We are asking folks to limit their remarks to two minutes and we will be limiting testimony in support, opposition, and neutral to a total of 20 minutes each. I will open the hearing for testimony in support. We will rotate between Carson City, Las Vegas, and over the phone. Anyone wishing to provide support testimony, please come forward.

Paul Catha, Political Director, Culinary Workers Union Local 226:

I know we have a lot of folks here to testify, so I will say we support and leave time for other folks.

Paula Luna, Operations Manager, Battle Born Progress:

We are testifying in support of A.B. 336. We want to thank Assemblywoman González for sponsoring the bill. We would first like to recognize the importance driver authorization cards have been for our community. Driver authorization cards facilitate having tested and insured drivers on our roads, just as driver's licenses do, and both should have the same renewal standards. It is as simple as that. We urge the Committee's support.

Nicole Winckelmann, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am here today in support of A.B. 336. This bill represents an opportunity to decrease additional time-consuming logistical barriers for individuals who have DACs, a population that is primarily undocumented. I urge your support of this bill so we can empower our immigrant population.

Chair Watts:

We are going to go to Las Vegas, then take three callers by phone. We will then come back to Carson City.

Hector Fong, Jr., Communications Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:

I am also a member of the Nevada Immigrant Coalition. As a constituent of Assembly District 12 and a member of a mixed-status family, and also on behalf of Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada, I am here to ask you to support A.B. 336 so immigrants are not subjected to an additional burden when driver's licenses and driver authorization cards serve the same purpose. Different members of my family are forced to take additional days off of school or work to make sure they are able to preserve their method of transportation for work, school, or whatever it may be. Driver authorization cards are meant to be accessible, and by subjecting them to differing renewal standards, we are maintaining an additional barrier to safe driving. These differing processes are continuously holding immigrants to a different standard. This one small, systematic change could have a huge impact on lessening the separation between our communities in the state. Nevada needs to make driver's licenses and DACs valid for the same length of time. Passing A.B. 336 means more drivers in Nevada who are tested, insured, trusted, and more importantly, are able to safely continue their lives, their day-to-day activities, and so they can drive.

Rosalia Martinez, representing Make the Road Nevada:

I am here to express support for A.B. 336. Currently, there are different renewal standards for driver's license and driver authorization card holders. One is eight years while the other is four years. This bill will reduce unnecessary hurdles, like facing rejection for holding a DAC, and it promotes equity, like not feeling like criminals for renewals and penalizing the DAC holders. This bill aims to provide the same level of stability to all Nevadans regardless of their immigration status. We want access to the same opportunities to fully participate in our state's economy.

Chair Watts:

Is there anyone wishing to provide support testimony for A.B. 336 over the phone?

Amy Koo, Acting Deputy Director, One APIA Nevada:

Ditto to the comments before. We are here to support this bill.

Chair Watts:

There are no other callers waiting on the phone to testify in support. We will return to those in Carson City.

Rosario Moreno, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

[Testimony was in Spanish and translated to English by Rico Ocampo.]

I am a member of Make the Road Nevada. I am writing to you today to express my strong support for A.B. 336, which seeks to equalize renewal conditions for driver authorization cards and Nevada driver's licenses.

As a DAC holder, I often face difficulties in identifying myself in everyday situations due to the lack of recognition of this document. Like many other members of our community, I am a hardworking individual with good morals who fulfills my annual tax obligations. My family depends on me, and together we strive to support our children and grandchildren.

I firmly believe that by passing A.B. 336 we will be given the opportunity to have identification with the same renewal standards as a regular Nevada driver's license. This will not only make our daily lives easier but also reinforce equality and fair treatment for all drivers in our state. Our community works hard to contribute to the well-being and growth of Nevada. Therefore, I urge you to support and pass A.B. 336 to ensure that individuals with DACs are treated with equality and justice in the renewal process.

Thank you for your attention and consideration of this important matter.

Elizabeth Lopez, Private Citizen:

[Testimony was in Spanish and translated to English by Rico Ocampo.]

I am a member of Make the Road Nevada. I stand before you today in strong support of A.B. 336, which seeks to equalize the renewal standards for driver authorization cards and Nevada driver's licenses, promoting fairness and equality among all drivers.

The current discrepancies in renewal standards also create unnecessary bureaucratic challenges and confusion for DAC holders. Assembly Bill 336 aims to streamline the licensing process and enhance its efficiency, benefiting both drivers and regulatory authorities.

We are asking you to support this for the sake of equal rights and recognition so we no longer have to be turned away in our daily lives. By supporting A.B. 336, you can help make this a reality for all Nevada drivers and contribute to a more inclusive and efficient driving system in our state. Thank you.

Yajaira Rimendes, Private Citizen:

I am here today to express my strong support for A.B. 336, a bill that aims to equalize renewal standards for driver authorization cards and Nevada driver's licenses, promoting fairness and inclusion for all drivers in the state. As someone with close family members and friends who are immigrants, I have witnessed firsthand the challenges they face in obtaining driver's licenses and valid identification. The lack of proper identification creates barriers when accessing essential resources and other important documents, ultimately affecting their quality of life. I attest that some of my family members have struggled for years to gain legal status and/or driver's licenses while also providing for their families. The journey to legal status and citizenship has also caused separations from their spouses and children, causing immense emotional distress.

Assembly Bill 336 is a crucial step toward addressing these challenges by ensuring all drivers, regardless of their documentation, have equal access to a well-regulated driving system. By supporting the bill, we can alleviate the hardships faced by immigrants while fostering more inclusive and supportive communities. This is why I support A.B. 336 and urge you to do the same.

Chair Watts:

We have about six minutes left for support testimony. We will continue in Carson City.

Roberto Renteria, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

[Testimony was in Spanish and translated to English by Rico Ocampo.]

I am a member leader with Make the Road Nevada. I traveled from Las Vegas to give my testimony and support of A.B. 336.

Driver authorization cards make me feel like trash. They make me feel like I do not belong. They are treated differently than standard driver's licenses and sometimes I do not even want to present it when I am in front of people. One day, I wanted to get my daughter's passport. She was very excited. She is 11. But we could not get it because this document was not enough to identify me, even though I have all of my information on the DAC; my name, my date of birth, and I proved who I was when I got it. Why does it not work as identification? I still have not been able to get her passport because I was not able to prove who I was. I felt really sad not knowing how to explain to her what happened.

This is a process that generates confusion and a lot of frustration. I ask that we can make the simple change to transform a bad experience into a good one. I ask that you support this bill and the opportunity for my daughter to have her American passport be an experience that fills her with pride and happiness.

Tony Ramirez, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada:

I would like to echo all of the testimony and would be happy to bring any of those who testified to your offices to discuss this bill.

Chair Watts:

Is there anyone on the phone wishing to provide support testimony for A.B. 336? I believe we have time for one caller. [There was no one.]

[[Exhibit E](#), [Exhibit F](#), [Exhibit G](#), [Exhibit H](#), and [Exhibit I](#) were submitted in support of A.B. 336 but not discussed.]

We will move to testimony in opposition to A.B. 336. Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to provide opposition testimony? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide opposition testimony waiting on the phone? [There was no one.]

[[Exhibit J](#), [Exhibit K](#), [Exhibit L](#), [Exhibit M](#), [Exhibit N](#), and [Exhibit O](#) were submitted in opposition to A.B. 336 but not discussed.]

We will move to neutral testimony for A.B. 336.

Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles:

Today is my birthday as well. I had to add that. The Department of Motor Vehicles is neutral on A.B. 336, but we do have a fiscal note that has not posted yet on NELIS. This is an interesting bill because it actually results in a positive overall impact to the DMV if we tie the driver authorization cards to our current renewal cycle. There will be a revenue decrease for DAC renewals beginning in fiscal year 2028, but we cannot indicate that on the fiscal note because it is too far out. There are also programming changes needed. However, the impact to DMV will be reduced if the implementation date is moved to when the DMV transformation is complete. We greatly appreciate the bill sponsor including this language in the bill. We do want to thank the bill sponsor for reaching out to us on this bill and we are happy to work further with her.

I also have Thomas Martin with me to help with any questions you may have. I can answer the two questions that have been asked. For drivers 65 and older, the renewal is every four years. Driver authorization cards do not pay double. The eight years is roughly double what those pay for a four-year license.

Chair Watts:

Happy Birthday, Mr. Sever. I do have a couple of questions, and I believe other members do as well. I do appreciate the clarification on the driver's license and renewal periods by age. You referenced there is a fiscal note that has not been posted yet. I assume that is for the bill as it was originally written. What would be the programming costs to align the DAC with the driver's license?

Sean Sever:

It is roughly \$60,000. However, with the language moving the date to when our transformation is complete, I believe that would zero out.

Chair Watts:

You mentioned it would be a net benefit. I assume that is by reducing in-person traffic to the DMV. Is that your understanding?

Sean Sever:

Yes, it would reduce traffic to the DMV.

Chair Watts:

Is it your understanding the fee to be charged would be adjusted and it would be the same amount someone would pay for an eight-year driver's license so there would be cost parity?

Sean Sever:

Yes, that is correct.

Chair Watts:

I think that will provide clarity to the Committee. I am pleasantly surprised by the amount of programming that would be needed. I would be interested in getting this implemented sooner rather than later, both to reduce the workload in your department as well as to provide some relief to the community. We will discuss that as we consider some of the fiscal matters moving forward.

Are there any questions from the Committee members?

Assemblywoman Dickman:

For confirmation, DAC renewals cannot be done online.

Sean Sever:

They are required to be in person.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

One of the testifiers said they want fairness for all drivers. What about seniors and people over 65? Is there some way we can address that in this bill so people over 65 can go eight years as well?

Chair Watts:

I believe that is more of a policy determination for us to make than the DMV. Speaking from my perspective, I think we should definitely have some alignment between the driver authorization card and driver's licenses, although I believe there are some public policy reasons for having a shorter renewal period for seniors. It is my intent as Chair to make sure there is alignment in the policy.

Seeing no other questions from members, is there anyone else wishing to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 336? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony by phone? [There was no one.] Are there any closing remarks from the sponsor?

Assemblywoman González:

I want to thank you, Chair, and Committee members, for hearing this important piece of legislation. I do want to note the confusion that may have arisen from testimony and the intent of the bill. The intent of the bill is to streamline and standardize the renewal process. The testimony was really regarding the many challenges people who hold these cards have. This is the one thing we can get done this session. I definitely urge your support.

Chair Watts:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 336. That brings us to the last item on our agenda for today, which is public comment. [Public comment rules and protocol were explained.] Is there anyone wishing to make public comment in Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone waiting on the phone to provide public comment? [There was no one.]

That concludes our business for the day. Our next meeting will be Thursday, March 30, 2023, at 1:30 p.m.

This meeting is adjourned [at 2:43 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Dylan Small
Recording Secretary

Lori McCleary
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Howard Watts, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 316](#), submitted by Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller, Assembly District No. 7.

[Exhibit D](#) is a conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 336](#), submitted by Assemblywoman Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16.

[Exhibit E](#) is a letter dated March 28, 2023, submitted by Deanna Hua Tran, Coalition Coordinator, Nevada Immigrant Coalition, in support of [Assembly Bill 336](#).

[Exhibit F](#) is written testimony from Luz Salgado, Private Citizen, in support of [Assembly Bill 336](#).

[Exhibit G](#) is a letter from Jarrett Yost, Private Citizen, in support of [Assembly Bill 336](#).

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter from Mary Wolfrom, Private Citizen, in support of [Assembly Bill 336](#).

[Exhibit I](#) is a compilation of emails in support of [Assembly Bill 336](#).

[Exhibit J](#) is a letter from Bruce Parks, Chairman, Washoe County Republican Party, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 336](#).

[Exhibit K](#) is a letter dated March 28, 2023, submitted by Lynn Chapman, State Treasurer, Independent American Party, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 336](#).

[Exhibit L](#) is a letter dated March 26, 2023, submitted by Lisa Mayo-DeRiso, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 336](#).

[Exhibit M](#) is a letter submitted by Reva Crump, Private Citizen, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 336](#).

[Exhibit N](#) is a letter dated March 27, 2023, submitted by Ann Sweder, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 336](#).

[Exhibit O](#) is a compilation of emails in opposition to [Assembly Bill 336](#).