

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

**Eighty-Third Session
February 4, 2025**

The Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Howard Watts at 1:34 p.m. on Tuesday, February 4, 2025, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3 of the State of Nevada Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, 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/83rd2025.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Howard Watts, Chair
Assemblymember Max E. Carter II, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Shea M. Backus
Assemblymember Tracy Brown-May
Assemblymember Jill Dickman
Assemblymember Danielle Gallant
Assemblymember Bert K. Gurr
Assemblymember Venise Karris
Assemblymember Cinthia Zermeno Moore
Assemblymember Duy Nguyen
Assemblymember Toby Yurek

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Keely Latham, Committee Policy Analyst
Jessica Dummer, Committee Counsel
Christopher Probst, Committee Counsel
Cindy Glass, Committee Manager
Jeff Kirst, Committee Secretary



Lori McCleary, Committee Secretary
Maria Benamati, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Tracy Larkin-Thomason, Director, Department of Transportation
Kandee Bahr Worley, Division Chief, NV2X Planning, Department of Transportation
MJ Maynard, Chief Executive Officer, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Dale Keller, Deputy Executive Director, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County
Alexis Hill, Chair, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County
Chris C. Martinovich, Director, Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization; and Transportation Manager, Carson City Public Works, Carson City Regional Transportation Commission
Julie W. Regan, Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Ellie Waller, Private Citizen, Minden, Nevada
John Eppolito, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada
Dora Martinez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Ronda Tyser, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada
Elizabeth Lenhardt, Private Citizen, Zephyr Cove, Nevada
Ann Nichols, President, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance

Chair Watts:

[Roll was called.] Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the first meeting of the 83rd Session of the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure.

I want to welcome everyone joining us today in Carson City, where we have a full house for Transportation Day; Las Vegas; and anyone following our meeting online. Today on our agenda we will have introductions of members and staff. We will conduct the adoption of Committee Policies and hear from both our staff as well as our transportation agencies, the Nevada Department of Transportation, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada, the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County, the Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

Before we start, I would like to make a few housekeeping announcements. This Committee is scheduled to meet at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and it is my intention to start each meeting on time. I ask that all members be here promptly at our agenda start time. If you wish to testify, please sign in at the table by the door and provide a business card, if you have one, to our committee secretary. We may take agenda items out of order, items may be combined, and they also may be removed from consideration at any time. In addition, I would like to note that anyone providing exhibits to this Committee provide them electronically as a PDF to our Committee Manager, Cindy Glass, via email, no later than 1:30 p.m. the business day before the meeting.

Members of the public may provide testimony in various ways, all of which are listed on the agenda. Today we will have a public comment period at the end of the meeting. Lastly, any public comments may also be submitted in writing either in addition to testifying or in lieu thereof. Written public comments may be submitted before, during, or up to 24 hours after the adjournment of our meeting.

We will move into our first item of the day. I would like to take a few minutes to allow Committee members to introduce themselves. Members, if you would like to provide the district that you represent, any experience you have with this Committee, and any issues that you are interested in that are relevant to our jurisdiction this session, I would welcome it. We will start off with Vice Chair Carter.

Assemblymember Carter:

I am Max Carter, representing Assembly District 12, down in southern Nevada at the base of Sunrise Mountain, the far east side of the Las Vegas Valley, and the far north side of Henderson over by the Wetlands Park. This is my second session on this Committee. I had experience in some related fields in my working career as an electrician. We are going to have a good time this time.

Assemblymember Gallant:

My name is Danielle Gallant, Assemblymember for District 23. That encompasses Anthem, which for those of you who are from Henderson, all of Anthem, and then it jumps over to Boulder City, and then all the way down to Laughlin. I have one of the third-largest districts in Clark County. I am excited to be serving again on Growth. This is one of my favorite committees.

Assemblymember Nguyen:

My name is Duy Nguyen, and I have the honor of serving in District 8 in southwest Las Vegas. This is my second term with the Assembly, but my first on Growth and Infrastructure. I am very happy to be here. I look forward to learning from all my colleagues and, of course, in the leadership of our Chair Watts, and learning about all the exciting things in growth that we have here in Nevada.

Assemblymember Karris:

I am Denise Karris, Assemblymember for District 10, which is in the Las Vegas area, from Interstate 15 all the way west to Cimarron, and basically between Charleston and Sahara. It widens out a little at the bottom. This is my first term serving in the Legislature. I am excited to be on Growth and Infrastructure.

Assemblymember Moore:

Cynthia Moore, Assemblymember for District 11, east Las Vegas, a little bit of North Las Vegas, Fremont Street, Container Park, Symphony Park, and the best part of the arts district is in my district. This is my first session. I have done some work in the past on transportation and energy issues. I am excited to be on this Committee.

Chair Watts:

Thank you, and I do have final approval over the minutes, so your remarks related to the arts district will be stricken from the record.

Assemblymember Yurek:

My name is Toby Yurek. I have the privilege of representing Nevada's Assembly District 19, which for those who are not familiar, encompasses south Henderson, the kind of old school part of Henderson. Some call it "Hendertucky." Then I also go around the lake representing a lot of fish and bighorn sheep, and then I come back into the rural part of northeastern Clark County, the Moapa Valley, which includes, of course, Logandale and Mesquite. I have a diverse district. I look forward to serving on this Committee in a second session. This is my second time. I was first elected in 2022. This will be my first time on Growth and Infrastructure. I look forward to serving with you, Chair, and the rest of these distinguished Committee members.

Assemblymember Gurr:

I am Assemblymember Bert Gurr. I represent District 33. I know some of you in the room have heard this geographical speech of mine before, but I have 50,255 square miles in my district. It goes from the Idaho border to the California border, from Tonopah to Utah. It is a district you do not walk. I can guarantee you that. Although Assemblymember Yurek has a few animals in his district, where he does not have people, I have 1.49 people per square mile in my district. It is a lot to travel. If anybody wants to take a road trip, I can certainly provide one for you. This is my second term and my second term on this Committee. I was duly impressed last session by being on this Committee. It changed my thought on growth and infrastructure. I love it. I am glad to be serving with Chair Watts.

Assemblymember Backus:

I am Assemblymember Shea Backus. I have the privilege and honor to serve Assembly District 37. Since we are in transportation, I figured the way to describe it would be by some of our highways. Assembly District 37 is hugged by Interstate 95, Interstate 215, and Summerlin Parkway. There is a little opening to the west of Interstate 15 near Lone Mountain that is also included in Assembly District 37. This is my third time serving in the Nevada Legislature, my second time on Growth and Infrastructure. I have to say, I probably lobbied to get my way back here this time because I truly enjoy this Committee. When I am not serving in our Nevada Legislature during the legislative session, I am an attorney. Some of the work I do is in construction. I like everything concrete, structural steel in A&E [architectural and engineering], so this is a great Committee for me. I take a lot of interest in it.

Assemblymember Brown-May:

Assemblymember Tracy Brown-May representing Assembly District 42 right in the heart of Las Vegas. My district, conversely, to my colleagues, is 12 square miles with plenty of domestic animals, with 74,000—more than 74,000 residents. I can ride the perimeter of my District, 19 square miles, shorter than a marathon. Half of Chinatown, Koreatown, all of Spring Valley are in the district, so we are historic in nature. On this Committee, I am excited

about the opportunity to talk about another license plate, some energy infrastructure, and cost affordability for our residents across the valley, and then access for vulnerable road users. I would like to safely ride the perimeter of my district at some point. We have a little bit of work to do. This is my third session serving on Growth and Infrastructure. I had no idea how much I was going to enjoy this when I first started in 2021. Thanks for having me back.

Assemblymember Dickman:

Assemblymember Jill Dickman, I represent District 31, which is north of Baring Boulevard. It goes into Spanish Springs, parts of Lemmon Valley, all the way out to Lockwood off of Interstate 80. It grew considerably, after redistricting, in geographic area. This is my fourth term in the Legislature and second term on Growth and Infrastructure. In 2015, it used to be called Transportation, and I was the vice chair.

Chair Watts:

I am Howard Watts. I represent Assembly District 15. It is right in the heart of Clark County. I will describe it by some of the related infrastructure that it has. I live right off Maryland Parkway, which has, I think, one of the most exciting mass transit projects in the state going on right now with the addition of Bus Rapid Transit connecting our downtown and medical district all the way to the airport, as well as the university. I am fortunate to represent that university. I have a large portion of Interstate 15 in the center of town, where hopefully we will be wrapping up some major construction along Tropicana soon. I have many of the large energy users along the Las Vegas Strip. I am in my fourth session. It is my fourth session serving as a member and my second serving as Chair of this Committee after serving as vice chair in 2021.

The issues this Committee is dealing with, energy, communications, transportation, are fundamental to the quality of life of everybody in this state. They are critical to the economic health and vitality of our businesses, but they help people access everything they need from work opportunities to healthcare to recreation. The issues that we deal with really have an immense impact on all of the people of this great state. I am very happy to serve with all of you and to serve as Chair of this Committee. I plan to have a committee that runs efficiently. I really prioritize communication. I hope both for those coming before this Committee, as well as the members, that we maintain open lines of communication, that we collaborate whenever possible, knowing that we are not always going to agree. We will try to have, while maintaining a professional atmosphere, a little bit of fun as well. I think those who are returning know what to expect.

I would now like to introduce our Committee staff. I am going to read some very brief biographies of our committee staff so you can get to know them. I will ask as I note who you are to raise your hand so that people know who you are.

We will start with Cindy Glass, our committee manager. Cindy has been retired for the past year and a half after 30 years of State service as a project manager with the Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy. This is her first session in the Legislature, and she is excited and thankful to participate in this process.

Next, we have Maria Benamati, who is one of our committee secretaries. She retired from the State after 30 years of service. She and her husband spent several years coaching their children and volunteering their time with youth sports in Carson City. After retiring from the State, she spent the next ten years in private industry working in the medical and legal fields. This is her first session, and she is excited to participate in our legislative process.

Jeff Kirst is another of our committee secretaries. He volunteers as a trustee of the Other Post-Employment Benefits fund for teachers in the Washoe County School District, as a member of the Advisory Council for the Northern Nevada International Center, and as a member of the Nevada State Financial Literacy Council. He worked in financial services and banking; developed, owned, and operated restaurants in five states; and later in life served youth as a public school teacher.

Our committee assistant this session is Cheryl Williams. Cheryl, in addition to taking care of all of us, likes to say that she is a double native Nevadan as she comes from the People of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe. She loves horses and all that comes with them.

Sara Mellen is my personal attaché. This is her first time serving in the Legislature after interning last session through the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). She graduated from UNR in May 2024 with a bachelor of arts degree in general studies and minors in environmental studies and public policy.

Next is Keely Latham, our committee policy analyst from the Research Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). She was born and raised in Gardnerville, Nevada. She has graduate degrees in public health and occupational health. She will be serving in her first session.

Jessica Dummer is our committee counsel from the Legal Division of LCB. This is her fifth session and fourth time staffing this Committee. Also from the Legal Division, we have Christopher Probst. This is his first session, and he will be based out of Las Vegas.

Terese Martinez is our research policy assistant from the Research Division of the LCB. She will be providing background support for the Committee.

Finally, I want to recognize all the staff behind the scenes throughout every division, including our wonderful legislative police, who help ensure that our Committee meetings and the entire Legislature run smoothly, and everyone from our broadcast production services, our audio-visual public hearings, our information technology services, janitorial services, and again, our wonderful legislative police. Thank you for all that you do to help us make this happen.

I believe we can move on to our first order of business. It is the adoption of the Committee Policies [[Exhibit C](#)], which are posted on the Committee's website. One of the things I do want to note is that we are going to run this as a mostly paperless committee. As exhibits come in, I welcome you to pull those up on your computers. If you would like to print any of

those, please work with your staff to do so. In that way we reduce the amount of unnecessary recycling that happens in the building.

Our policies are fairly standard. They are similar to those that were approved in this Committee in the past and in other committees and serve to complement the Assembly Standing Rules and the Joint Standing Rules. Are there any questions on the Committee Policies? I think the fundamental point of it is openness and communication.

The primary thing for those coming before this Committee is to get materials to us as soon as possible. We can make sure they are distributed to members and that they have time to review them and be prepared for our meetings, whether that is exhibits or proposed amendments. Then for members, you know you have the right to make any decisions you want. I just ask again that you please have an open line of communication so that as we are planning our business, we understand where folks are at. With that, I would take a motion to adopt the policies for the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER CARTER MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE
2025 LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE POLICIES.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER YUREK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Our next item of business is the presentation of our committee brief. Our committee policy analyst, Ms. Latham, will present the Committee Policy Brief. Go ahead whenever you are ready.

Keely Latham, Committee Policy Analyst:

I am a senior policy analyst with the Research Division of the LCB for the record. Just to note, as nonpartisan staff, I cannot advocate for or against any measure the Committee will consider. I am available to assist the Committee and the members on any issues related to policy. The Research Division is available to provide information and assistance to individual members of the Legislature on any topic. Please feel free to reach out to me or my colleagues at any time.

Moving on to the Committee Brief [[Exhibit D](#)], I will just give a short overview. However, the complete document can be found on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. The Committee Brief provides each member with information on committee staff, the committee's jurisdiction, session deadlines, historical information, anticipated topics for the session, a list of prefiled bills, and pertinent reports that may be of interest to the Committee. The Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure considers bills and resolutions on a wide range of topics related to transportation and energy, and as a point of

reference, last session the Committee received a total of 28 Assembly measures, and 25 Senate measures. At the conclusion of last session, a total of 40 bills were reported to the Governor. With that, I will leave the members to review the Committee Brief at their convenience. Please feel free to reach out to me with any questions.

Chair Watts:

Thank you very much, Ms. Latham. We know that everyone can read so we did not want to read the brief to you. That is also a note for any presenters coming before the Committee in the future. If you have any questions about any of the information within the brief, please reach out to our committee staff.

Members, are there any questions before we move on to our next item? Seeing none, we will now move into our presentations for the day, as we begin our slate of Transportation Day presentations. First, we are going to have the Nevada Department of Transportation joining us.

Welcome, Director Larkin-Thomason, and your team. Once you get situated, please remember to state your name for the record before you begin. Whenever you are ready.

Tracy Larkin-Thomason, Director, Department of Transportation:

It is with pleasure that I come before you today talking about one of my favorite subjects. I have made a living out of it and will continue to do so. To my far left is Sajid Sulahria, Deputy Director of Project Delivery and Engineering. To my right is Felicia Denney, Assistant Director of Administration, and to my right is Joe Harrington, Director of Communications and Government Affairs. They are here to help me answer any questions you might have that I might overlook.

Jumping right in on Transportation Day, we will start off with a quote from Lily Tomlin [page 2, [Exhibit E](#)]: “The road to success is always under construction.” Lily Tomlin, going back, but it seems very prudent here. Nevada is one of the fastest-growing states. We are in the top five. For the type of transportation system we need to support the economic growth, our citizens, the quality of life across the state, it is important to remember that we need to expand this system, enhance the system, and preserve the system, and basically make our decisions on all three and balance that.

Paving the way since 1917, we have been around for a little over 100 years [page 3]. We have 5,400 center lane miles of highway, more than 1,200 bridges. We have about 1,946 employees when we are fully staffed. One of those things I do want to say, we have gone from 26 percent vacancy down to 14.5 percent. I am very excited about that. Those numbers came out yesterday. A lot of that is due to passages of benefits from the last session. We appreciate that. Our budget is approximately \$1 billion a year, which is a combination of federal dollars and State Highway Fund dollars. I say approximately because some years it will be a little bit less, some years, a little bit more. It usually varies between about \$800 million to about \$1.2 billion, depending on the types of grants we get.

Of our core functions [page 4], I always want to say that we are not just roads and bridges. We talk about the pavements, the bridges, our drainage systems, and so on, but we also have roadway maintenance. We do the services you see there, striping and plowing, emergency response, but also things like freight, truck parking. You see the TSMO [Transportation Systems Management and Operations] signs there. We are looking at using technology on how best to reach out to the traveling public, warn them of real-time road conditions in emergency response, what they need to do, and how to redirect them. We work with the operations center and certainly with our transportation partners across the state.

Moving on to financial outlook [page 5], we are highly reliant on the state and federal fuel tax revenues that were established in 1993. Our main thing is the state gas tax. Fuel tax is 18.4 percent; I am sorry, 18.45 percent, and the federal tax is equivalent to about 18.4 percent. And it is important to note, for those who are not familiar with it, that whether the gallon of gas costs \$2 or \$4, that tax remains the same. Now some of my partner agencies later on will be talking about some other indexing efforts around the state, and I can say how that relates. The majority of what we get is a flat fuel tax that comes in.

Unfortunately, when we talk about construction costs [page 6], over the last several years we had received in the federal bill, there was a bump in the money that was a 20 percent increase in the general formula funds that we get and that remains relatively untouched. Then there was a bump of about 2 percent each year to 2026. However, during that time, as we looked at inflation, inflation has gone up 68 percent in the construction industry, so it has basically devalued the dollar of what we can buy.

While we are still making the decisions of what we move towards preservation and a new infrastructure, we have to really take into account just getting steel, asphalt, concrete, and labor. Labor is at a premium around the state. While we said we are doing much better with the reduction of vacancies, we are still having trouble getting engineers, particularly in the rural areas. Our maintenance crew vacancies are coming back up, but in the rural areas we also compete with mining. It is still a great department. I am going to keep saying that because it is.

Program impacts, a couple of things that we want to point out [page 7]. Over the years, these are things that used to be ancillary to our program. But now the need for homeless and trash abatement, that is several million dollars a year. Copper theft, that you might have seen in the news article earlier today where there was the copper theft in Vegas that took down some of the power at the airport. When they take it down, it has effects such as on those overhead dynamic message signs or even safety lights. We are paying for extra security so that we can maintain greater safety for the public, as well as deal with environmental and storm water permits and mitigation. It is just part of doing business. The cost of doing business has gone up. It takes more employees, it takes more programs, it takes more funding to take care of those programs. We already talked about skilled labor shortages.

Here we are talking about the needs [page 8]. These numbers were just updated in January. In a ten-year transportation program, we are telling the estimate of the needs that we have. On a

one-year average, it is really about \$1.6 billion to \$2 billion dollars a year. We are funding about half of our needs roughly. These numbers did change, for those who have seen some of our presentations earlier, because of a removal of a project in Las Vegas. Just because of that, it has adjusted the numbers, but these are current as of January.

Over the next 10 years, we could use between \$17 billion and \$20 billion [page 9]. We are really a state that people are very attracted to. We have wide open spaces. I think of the quality of life, and I think of the diversity of what we have here from going to Vegas, up into Lake Tahoe, and then out in the rural areas. I have had the fortune over my career to work in all four, both at headquarters and at the district level. And yes, I know I sound like a cheerleader today, but it is a great place to be.

And then the last one, a couple of other things just to highlight on the 10-year, saying that we are behind about half a million to about just under \$9 million a year in what we could actually be putting out and using. We need the capacity both in the north and south of where the expansion is along our freeways. We do not have a lot of redundancy in our system. Once you get outside of the urban areas, it is critical that we create some pathways for our citizens to get around during emergencies, which we happen to be seeing more of. The fires over the past year, we have had three major ones that have impacted the state, closing down portions of Interstate 80, closing down Interstate 15, and closing down Interstate 95 for, in some cases, several days—18 hours was one, 48 hours was another, and the other one was about 6 hours.

Learning how to divert, learning how to react to them, we are working very hard on working with our first responders, partners, and how we can better coordinate getting the message out to the people ahead of time. As everyone knows today, it was critical getting in. We could not get in because of flights that were down, but also because we had dust storms that closed down Interstate 95 between Hawthorne and Luning for several hours. The detour was through Gabbs and Beatty. For those not familiar with that part of the state, that is 157 miles. I like a nice drive, but not when I am trying to get somewhere fast.

We also worked a lot of a special program we have had as wildlife crossings over the last years [page 10]. I have been doing this probably for 20 years. We followed migration efforts around the state and need them to make sure that we can safely have them go across and not have the interface of the traveling public with them. This is for many different types of animals, some bighorn sheep down by Boulder City, and you have the antelope and other things in northern Nevada. Then, of course, also horses in different areas.

The Nevada lawmakers in 2023 established a wildlife crossing account [Assembly Bill 112 of the 82nd Session] to provide state funding to leverage the federal dollars [page 11]. We have worked with the consultants to develop the top priorities, and this bill said there is a wide variety. The desert tortoise is one of the ones that is currently endangered and we need to take care of. We submitted six different grant applications. Finally, we did get one these past few months for \$16.8 million to assist with construction to build 61 wildlife crossings along U.S. Highway 93 and install 68 miles of barrier fencing to avert wildlife and vehicle

collisions. That was A.B. 112 of the 82nd Session that started the conversation and that provides the matching funds for these grants along with some other local funds.

I will talk a little bit later, after the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula (NEVI) Program, that there are some things—we are looking at the effects on our program. The NEVI Program [page 12] is a federal initiative for building a national network of electric vehicle charging stations. Our role is to allocate resources to enhance the EV [electric vehicle] infrastructure, reduce range anxiety, and support the transition to cleaner transportation along the alternate field corridors, which in Nevada are primarily Interstates and also U.S. Highways 95 and 93.

We do have some challenges because of the rural nature. Some of the things like charging stations every 50 miles just is not real from a safety point and having the energy to fuel the stations. There will be more on that to come. One of the things we really do want to point out: private industry is moving faster than the State. With the change of administrations, there are some challenges in fully understanding what those impacts of the executive order are to our program along the way. While we are comfortable with our formula funds and any projects that we have with that, anything involving grants and some of the others are under review. The reports have been submitted to the federal government, but we are looking at least a 90-plus time to look at whether the programs are still solvent or not. We have pulled in a lot of what we are doing and that is just common sense of making sure that we can put our state dollars out there. Hopefully things will return back to what we are more accustomed to. In the meantime, we just need to be prudent and make sure we have the funding available to take care of the bills we already have going. That is the end of my presentation.

I believe transportation is one of the most important things we have that supports the quality of life, however you define your quality of life. Maybe if you are staying at home, or someone is delivering stuff to you, or you are out there hiking and you are getting to the trails and around the state. I am happy to be here and happy to take any questions if you have any.

Chair Watts:

Thank you very much for your presentation. Members, do you have any questions?

Assemblymember Carter:

You mentioned about the charging network. Is there some mechanism for holding vendors accountable? And the reason I ask is, the drive up from southern Nevada to Carson City, the charging station in Beatty, which is very important, has been down for at least the last three sessions and all of the time in between. It has been down for quite a while, and I did not know if there was any enforcement mechanism or way that the public can report those deficiencies.

Tracy Larkin-Thomason:

It will depend on whether that is a public charging station or a private charging station. And honestly, I am not sure what Beatty's is. They would be more directly responsible. I do know that when they did a pilot program, and I am going back probably about a decade, we had

some in Tonopah and two areas around the state. One of our great difficulties on when they went down, even when they reported, is getting someone out there who had the expertise to work on them. And oftentimes it would be reported, but it could be two days before someone was down there to fix it. It is not quite as simple as resetting. I hope that answers your question, sir. Probably not completely, but I hope it gets close.

Assemblymember Carter:

I understand the difficulties and that you were not prepared for that, and also trying to pull it out anywhere. Do you know how many chargers have been built, upgraded, or in development now that we are three years in on NEVI?

Tracy Larkin-Thomason:

I have just the person who can say she either knows it or not, and I will bring her up here.

Kandee Bahr Worley, Division Chief, NV2X Planning, Department of Transportation:

To date, the NEVI funds have not been spent to put in infrastructure along our roadways. We are currently working with professionals within the industry to determine the best foot forward, to meet the federal Title 23 rules and regulations. That has been the holdup, not only in our state, but in the majority of the states throughout the United States. Some of the states have been able to figure out how to get around some of those rules and regulations or how to meet them. But when you add in the Title 23, you add in the available electricity, you add in the ruralness of our state, we end up with a big ball of how do we make this work? We are at the point where we are ready to spend some money, and the President has shut down our program for the time being.

Chair Watts:

This is an issue of ongoing confusion and concern with some of the chaotic happenings in Washington, D.C. It is unfortunate that it sounds like we are finally at the place where we could start deploying some projects, and now things are in a bit of limbo. Could you just speak a bit briefly to what, I believe was Title 23, are some of those challenges that you were working to navigate?

Kandee Bahr Worley:

The majority of the challenges are that these titles are written specifically for pavement. They are not written for infrastructure above ground. We run into the issue of the NEPA [Nevada Emergency Preparedness Association] certifications. We run into the issues of right-of-way. The infrastructure for charging vehicles will not be sitting on Department of Transportation (NDOT) right-of-way. If it is on our right-of-way, we cannot charge for the electricity. We would be losing money in that sense. We are looking for partners. It is trying to develop that partnership and how it reads with Title 23 and the right-of-way rules and regulations. Those are the top two that come to the top of my mind right now.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. I appreciate that. And I also made a recent trip up to Carson City in an electric vehicle and made it without incident, but I also have run into issues. There are several

chargers that are not functioning. The charger in Tonopah does . . . the 50-kilowatt charger does not communicate with several vehicle models. There are also some Tesla chargers along the way, and even as models are moving onto the North American charging standard, I think those are in need of upgrades to be able to serve a wider range of vehicles. I appreciate where you are coming from, especially the challenges with federal funding accessibility in this moment. It is just unfortunate because there is certainly a need for additional investment along our highway corridors to make sure they are accessible for all of our drivers in the state.

Assemblymember Backus:

I may have a convoluted question, but I want to commend you on your website and emails providing updates with respect to the ongoing projects, especially those that impact traffic in the Las Vegas area, the Interstate 15 and Tropicana project. As you stressed the concern about grant funding not being there, I am googling what projects are subject to grant funding. I recall that being subject to grant funding. That project is not complete, if the grant funds are not available—I am assuming they are probably reimbursement—what are we looking at with respect to these projects that are kind of underway? What other projects are out there that may be in addition to the Interstate 15-Tropicana project?

Tracy Larkin-Thomason:

It is a good question and one that we have been paying a lot of attention to over the last few weeks. The Tropicana is nearing completion, Thank you, God. There is some funding still left. It was an older grant, an INFRA [Infrastructure for Rebuilding America] grant, one of the older grants prior to IRA [Inflation Reduction Act] or IIJA [Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act]. If there is any delay, and I am worried more about delay of funding coming in than I am about losing that grant funding, we do have some bond funding we would use to cover it in the meantime.

Around the state, there is a \$98 million grant for the North Valleys phase two, which is just northwest of the Reno area, which we will be advertising later this year. We will probably be looking at going up to meet the grant requirements. We are moving forward on there but would delay start of construction until we are certain on that. We are looking at the Interstate 80 widening from Vista out to TRIC [Tahoe Regional Industrial Center]. That one is farther out. The NEPA gets done this summer about June, July. As we look at how we are going to deliver the project in different phases or so, it is very long. It is 13 miles in very challenging terrain with a railroad, a river, and cliffs on either side. There are \$275 million worth of grants on that, but I also recognize that we will probably have at least a year and a half or two years of geotechnical work because of the cliffs. We will continue to ascertain that as we move forward.

Around the state and different areas, there is funding in Ely. That project has let, and the construction is there. We are being very cautious, looking strategically at what is going out, the timing of what is going out. We are looking in southern Nevada. The Brightline West, the train, is a large one there with a \$3 billion grant. That one, as it moves forward, that money cannot be spent down until they are fully funded on the other side, and that is going on at this

point, generally favorably. I am cautiously optimistic of what I am hearing from FRA [Federal Railroad Administration], and on that, we are looking at the cash flow. We are looking at the state dollars. I do not know if many of you realize that the federal grant program is a reimbursement program. We always put out state dollars first and then get reimbursed. We are going to make sure that we can cover what we have promised and then very much look at the timing of both cash flow and the projects going out. Understanding that as we do that, as they delay, people who are bidding on it are going to put in a percentage of, if I am not going to build until next year, what are my costs going to be, then? We recognize the hit to the bids that will be coming in.

Assemblymember Backus:

I appreciate that update.

Assemblymember Brown-May:

My question is a little bit peculiar, I think, in that so many of us have just traveled by car from Las Vegas up here to Carson City. I have now done that three times in the last four weeks, although unexpectedly. The one thing I noticed this time in particular was the signage on the side of the road, particularly after Walker Lake. I had never driven that road at night until Sunday. The reflective material that is utilized on some of the signs is very visible during the day and was stark in the dead of night, in that there are no streetlights in sections of that road, and that bright white reflective material was actually painful with newer headlights.

I am curious to know about the reflective materials that we are using. Are there alternate materials perhaps for, or has there been any study done with new headlights? Newer vehicles that are on the road, they have brighter headlights, they are different colors than older models perhaps. You can see the difference when you are in traffic. You have that oncoming traffic and then there is this stark white reflective sign to the right, which was very problematic to see in the middle of the rural territory. I am just curious to know, do we have crash data relative to safety incidents for some of the reflective materials? Are there differences in older headlights versus newer and how they are utilized on that reflective material? I know that you spend a lot of time working on signage to make sure we have safe highways. I am just curious to know is there any data surrounding what materials are best to utilize for those signs?

Tracy Larkin-Thomason:

You have not stumped me, but I am going to have to get back to you on some of that. There are studies on reflectivity material, and we have been adopting them over the years and changing, particularly for overhead signs, too, so that they are more reflective. It is funny that you mentioned the lights because I have been noticing when I drive at night, and I drive in a lot of rural roads, where there is no other one, the oncoming ones can be actually painful for me to deal with. I am just driving down, and some are much brighter. I will get back to you on that. We have a lot of studies out and usually at a national level. There are likely studies or some information from other states. I do not have an immediate answer. Good question, though.

Chair Watts:

That was a unique question indeed. Members, are there any other questions for our presenters?

Assemblymember Gurr:

This is a multi-various question. Different areas. If I am off base, let me know. The wildlife crossings, you said 61. Is that what you said, or 61 miles?

Tracy Larkin-Thomason:

I did say 61. Now, some of these are tortoise crossings and I have to admit, when they first told me a tortoise crossing, I was like, what is a tortoise crossing? It is really like a small pipe and some ramps. If you want, we will send some pictures of it. They are not huge like an over-the-highway pass where you are doing that for bighorn sheep. We can send you some additional information, provide what the range of costs are. I do have Nova Simpson from our environmental division, if you want a little bit more on that. It is just a variety of the type of the animals. Yes, 61. When I say 61 tortoise crossings, that is different than 61 antelope crossings.

Assemblymember Gurr:

Considerably different cost. Could you get me that information offline? We do not have to have it here today to bore everybody, but I would really like to see it. Interstate 80 has various speed limits going through rural Nevada. Elko County has three or four different speed limits. I realize 65 miles per hour through Elko, not downtown Elko, but through Elko is a good thing. Then we go to 75, then we go to 80, then we get to Wells, we go from 80 to 75 to Wendover. That makes absolutely no sense to my county commissioners who bugged me about it, and now I am bugging you about it. Then even from Winnemucca down, it changes several times from 75 to 80 back to 75. Then you get to Fernley and it just . . . I will leave that alone. That is a question that my county commissioners have asked me to ask you.

Then rest areas, maintenance on rest areas in these rural areas. There is one off of Emigrant Pass that has been closed off and on for the last five years. It will be open for five days or five weeks and then it is closed again. I have driven that highway so many times, and that rest area in particular is a perfect spot, but it is closed. I am just asking about that and maintenance on the ones on Highway 93 are lacking. Those are my questions. They are not meant to be negative comments, but those are things that need to be answered for some of the people who talk to me.

Tracy Larkin-Thomason:

With regard to the speed limit, I would have to go back and look at the actual . . . I remember when they were put in there and they were looking at different factors along the way. It seems to me there is part of when you get away from a town and the speed going back, but I will get the specific criteria that was used for that, and that will be a follow-up.

With regard to the rest areas, we are having a problem with a lot of our structures, and particularly our rest areas, around the state. We just closed down the Wadsworth rest area

because of total septic failure. The Beowawe right now is closed because there is a spike in the water. It has to be closed until we can figure out what is wrong with the water. You mentioned a couple others. I know, like Trinity, where Highway 95 comes up into Interstate 80, it is functioning, but there is supposed to be additional work being done. We are working on getting the permits out there. That is on hold. We have employee housing around the state and most of these were built many, many decades ago, basically more than half a century ago. The use that they are getting now is really affecting mostly water and septic issues. If there are other ones specifically, we will follow up with you offline to talk about specific ones in your area.

Assemblymember Gurr:

One more question, quickly. I noticed legislation passed many years ago; John Ellison and Pete Goicoechea asked for it, had it put in. It becomes more and more prevalent every day with the hundreds and hundreds of trucks on Interstate 80, just signs that say move right unless passing. Because they will run down the road, I will go 10 miles behind a semi doing 67 miles per hour because the one next to him is doing 65. I do not see any of those signs up that are supposed to have been done years ago. Are there any of those signs out there?

Tracy Larkin-Thomason:

I actually thought you were going to talk about the passing lights, lights on two-lane highways, also. I had a good answer for that one. With regard to that, I am going to look at it; I am unaware of a specific legislation. I will just have to research that myself. In some areas depending on, like USA Parkway, where the trucks are very much on one side, they are exiting. There is just as many exiting as going through, something we have been looking at. Are we causing more issues for the cars that are actually there, too, because when they get in between, they cannot see really beyond the trucks there. We try to look at the whole pattern of traffic when it moves on through. But again, I apologize but I am going to have to get back to you on that separately.

Assemblymember Gurr:

That is fine; I appreciate it.

Chair Watts:

I believe it is not on this side of the state line, but I have also experienced on Interstate 15, trucks taking up maybe three lanes, passing each other at certain points in time, so I can relate. Not seeing any other questions from members, I thank you again for your presentation. Please follow up with some of that information that was requested to the members offline. And again, members, I appreciate the questions.

Obviously, the Department of Transportation does a tremendous amount of work, and I think it is important for us to note, even though we are not a money committee, the substantial infrastructure investments that are needed and the challenges that we are facing. We are not going to solve all of those challenges this session, but the longer we wait, the more of an impact our constituents are going to see in many of the issues that we brought up in our

questions. We appreciate your diligent work to try to address this and help provide transportation across our state. Thank you for your time today.

Next up, we have a presentation from the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada. Welcome, Ms. Maynard. Go ahead and take a moment to get yourself settled. Once you are ready, please introduce yourself and begin.

MJ Maynard, Chief Executive Officer, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada:

Happy that we are up here to celebrate Transportation Day and share with you our priorities for this upcoming legislative session. Before I begin, I would like to recognize my bosses. I have more than one and I am very lucky because they are awesome. I would also like to recognize our board members, our track committee members, and our Transportation Day partners. Our chairman, Justin Jones, could not make it due to the weather issues, but I would like to recognize Councilman Brian Knudsen from the City of Las Vegas, our vice chair; Isaac Barron from the City of North Las Vegas; Mayor Joe Hardy from the City of Boulder City. We also have Jim Seebock, our new commissioner, from the City of Henderson.

In addition, we have many members of our Transportation Committee [page 2, [Exhibit F](#)] who have joined us for this special day. If they are here in the audience, if you could stand up to be recognized. They have worked really hard, many of them for the last ten years, to help us move forward priorities in southern Nevada. Please be recognized. My bosses, if you could also; I would like to give you a round of applause. If you could stand up, please. You can see it today, this really takes an effort from the community. Not only is it our elected officials and our community stakeholders, it is also many of the organizations that you see here on the slide before you [page 3]. I cannot thank them enough for their contributions to today's Transportation Day.

Who is the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Southern Nevada? I think everyone on this Committee is very aware that we are the only agency in the U.S. that provides all these functions under the one roof [page 4]. We are the public transit provider. We are also the metropolitan planning organization. We are the Roadway Funding Agency. We also are the planning at the MPO [Metropolitan Planning Organization] for the planning agency. We implemented and oversaw the bike share system in downtown Las Vegas. It makes us very effective. Not sure if our forefathers all those years ago realized that they were putting together a model that other states wish they had today. Very fortunate that we are under one roof, able to work collectively and effectively together.

As we begin the 2025 Legislative Session, the following are our top priorities [page 5]: we are looking to continue the fuel indexing program in Clark County. We are also looking to extend RTC's ballot authority until 2028, and we are looking to improve transit security based on input from our transit riders, bus operators, and community stakeholders.

Our first priority is working with legislators to allow Clark County to continue the successful Fuel Revenue Indexing (FRI) program [page 6]. Southern Nevada roadways are funded, here

on the screen [page 7], see it is broken down in three ways very similar, except for the indexing piece, well, some of the indexing piece are Department of Transportation, but very similar in that is motor vehicle fuel tax, it is sales tax, and again, it is our FRI program. Roadway funding has allowed RTC to grow and expand and improve significantly since the implementation of the program back in 2013. Certainly, we as the funding agency, this funding is provided to our member cities: the City of North Las Vegas, City of Las Vegas, City of Henderson, City of Boulder City, City of Mesquite, and unincorporated Clark County. It has been a very successful regional effort.

Since 2014, 702 roadway projects have been started with 484 of those completed. These are projects made possible, again, by all the local funding sources including FRI, motor vehicle fuel tax, and sales tax. Through roadway funding, as you can see in the slide, 78 local small businesses have been put to work, \$2.9 billion in roadway projects and contracts have been awarded, and more than 20,000 jobs have been created because of this program [page 8].

This revenue provides the necessary funds for the RTC and the local jurisdictions to advance projects that will, of course, improve our mobility, enhance safety, and create jobs to make southern Nevada a better place to live, work, and play. This is a visual of just how far and wide the program has been, the success of the fuel revenue indexing program [page 9]. Again, this slide represents the inception of FRI beginning in 2014. Those projects that are in red have been directly supported by fuel revenue indexing, and those in green reflect other funding sources to include motor vehicle fuel tax.

I think many of you that have seen this slide; you hear me say, this is one of the most important slides, and I believe that to be the case. This is the funding slide [page 10]. This is a snapshot of our roadway funding model that takes us through the current Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that is a ten-year program. The purple bars represent revenues, the orange bars represent expenditures, but the most important piece of this is that gray shaded area in the back. That represents our cash flow available. If you look in 2027, that is about at the peak of what we will be able to have in bonding capacity. After 2027, if fuel revenue indexing is not continued, you can see that the decline in the cash balance available is going in a projection we do not want to see.

Because of FRI the RTC, it has been wonderful to work with all the jurisdictions; they on average annually spend about \$300 million for roadway infrastructure in southern Nevada [page 11]. If the fuel revenue indexing program is not continued, we will, we believe, have about \$100 million again for all of the cities in Clark County to share annually to try and complete road projects that have been identified in the CIP.

But what is even more important? We asked our member agencies, aside from the projects you have in the Capital Improvement Program that have been identified and have funding associated with them, what other projects do you have that currently do not have funding available? We heard from all of them, and about 167 projects totaling \$2.7 billion need additional funding today [page 12]. Obviously, these projects are critical not only to ongoing maintenance, but again to the infrastructure development in our valley. The jurisdictions have

identified 167 unfunded projects, the areas in this map [page13]. You see Apex, El Dorado Valley, Ivanpah Valley, the SNV Supplemental Airport, and Sloan. Those are projects that today do not have any funding identified for the infrastructure development that is needed again to grow out in these areas.

Our second priority this session is RTC's bill draft request. It is Assembly Bill 28 [page 14]. It will allow the RTC to extend our ballot authority through 2028. We think this is going to be, again, another opportunity to address the funding challenges that we have been letting you know about for the last number of years. In our transit fund, we provide a broad range of mobility options in southern Nevada [page 15]. Aside from what you see, we are the fixed route transit provider, and the law says when you are the fixed route transit provider, you must also provide paratransit service, and we do. But the law says you do not have to provide service to your seniors, and we do that. The law says you do not have to provide service for your veterans, and we do that. And then, of course, the law says you do not have to provide service to your students, and we do that as well.

We also are the 12th busiest bus system in the United States. We moved over 52 million passengers last year, 39 transit routes, about 404 fixed route buses, and about 400 paratransit buses. We operate one of the busiest paratransit systems in the United States, with about 6,000 daily paratransit trips on our system, and 51,000 senior trips last year, 29,000 veteran trips last year, and over 166,000 student trips last year. We also offer reduced fare passes to students at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, to Nevada State College, and to the College of Southern Nevada. Additionally, we are able to receive grant funding. We are able to provide thousands of free transfer passes to those college students who depend on public transit to get to where they need to be.

I want to also note, if you see the on-demand slide, we were able to utilize funding during the COVID-19 stimulus funding to implement on-demand service in the area of the Southwest Valley that was a real transit desert. It is not always just about the buses, so it is the best and most effective way to move members of the community.

I do want to say, despite offering these mobility services, we have not invested in public transit in southern Nevada in over 20 years. We know that the community continues to grow. The need outweighs the resources that we have. We are committing to doing what we can today to get people to where they need to go. Public transit is not only a job creator, it is a job connector; 80 percent of our 155,000 daily boardings are people going to work or looking for work.

This is another important slide. This shows the revenues and expenditures, and that gray shaded area is the most important piece, what you see here. I am going to show you two slides [pages 16 and 17]. Currently our expenditures exceed our revenues. We anticipate this fiscal year to have an expense overage of over \$30 million; in 2026 of \$75.6 million; and then 2027, again, about \$75 million. We were fortunate during the pandemic to receive \$304 million in stimulus funds. Those funds have kept us going. We actually have a cash overflow. We have an excess cash balance, which in public transit you never had; never. We

love it, because what we are going to do is we are going to balance the budget. That is our job. We are certainly going to ensure when there is that cash, with the cash availability, we will continue to ensure our customers are the number one priority and that we provide the services they rely on.

The gray shaded area, while we have the cash overage to address the deficit in 2025, 2026, and 2027, if you look at 2028, that is when we begin to dip into our cash reserves. We have an RTC board policy that we must have six months of operating revenue or operating cash. That is a dramatic problem, and this is not the sky is falling; these are the facts. We have been talking about the deficit in our transit fund for the last ten-plus years. So here we are. We believe that having the authority to potentially go out for a ballot question is an option to look at how we are going to address the funding deficit issue that we are facing.

Our last priority is security [page 18]. I will tell you security is important in southern Nevada, not only for our operators but also for our passengers. Prior to the session, we worked closely with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and with the Henderson Police Department. We rely heavily on the partnership that we have in law enforcement. I cannot thank them enough for all that they do for us every single day. We engage the Acute Treatment Unit (ATU), we engage the ACLU [American Civil Liberties Union], we engage the Clark County District Attorney's Office.

Currently, our security officers have the ability to trespass disruptive passengers from our transit facilities or from our bus shelters. They do not have the authority to trespass disruptive passengers on board our vehicles. And for those folks, as I mentioned, 80 percent of those thousands of folks that take public transit every day, they are going to work. If there is a disruptive passenger, the bus must pull over to the side. We contact our operations center and security. We have to wait for Metro to get there. All the while the people on the bus are stuck. They cannot get to work. We will be working closely with you as we advance this priority to ensure that we have the ability for our security officers expanding our authority to trespass from our facilities, our bus shelters, and now our buses.

I want to thank the ATU of the union. They have been really wonderful to work with because they provided a lot of insight. They are the ones doing the job and I cannot say enough for the input that they provided us in order to come to this third priority for the RTC. That concludes my presentation. I am certainly happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chair Watts:

Members, any questions for the RTC?

Assemblymember Yurek:

I do not want to dive into the pool of a much larger topic, but on the issue of security, I am just curious. Have you experienced any sort of impact with the recent Supreme Court case and now the ability for local entities and some of the laws that they have enacted, dealing with the homeless issue. Has that had an impact at all on the security that you have experienced at the bus stations as well as on the buses themselves? Any appreciable impact?

MJ Maynard:

I will tell you that if you see, whether it is an urban setting or a rural setting, if in your community, seeing the number of unhoused folks continue to grow, or mental health, addiction, if that is happening in your community, public transit is one of the last truly open public spaces. I say, We love all, serve all. And you will see it; we are sort of a rolling microcosm of what happens in any jurisdiction. And so we have invested more in security so we could add more security officers. They are all now armed.

We were the first agency in the United States to implement Artificial Intelligence ZeroEyes (ZeroEyes AI). It is AI weapons detection system in our transit facilities. We are one of the first systems to implement driver barriers. We are now going to refine those, so they are fully enclosed. All of our security officers have, again the first of the nation, a GPS-based system. It is called a Nano Panic Button. So, we are looking for ways that we can enhance security for our passengers. What we are finding, we work closely with the local jurisdictions, particularly the City of Las Vegas that has a social service program called the MORE Team [Multi-Agency Outreach Resource Engagement], that comes out to our facility to help us, that we connect to our transit riders that may need those additional resources, housing, you know, mental health services and things like that. The laws have not necessarily changed the way that we do business. We are just expanding, again, the opportunity to work with social services, and again, to work very closely with Metro and how we are dealing with any issues that may arise.

Assemblymember Moore:

I have always been a supporter of public transportation and thank you for the presentation. I do have a question about the ballot initiative. Clark County already has one of the highest sales taxes in the country. Why are you going the sales tax route for this?

MJ Maynard:

We came to the Legislature in 2017. We have known for 10-plus years that this deficit was here, and it is still here. In 2017, we asked for authority to go out to a ballot question as a potential opportunity to solve the deficit. We were granted authority to go in 2020 and 2022. In 2019, we came back up and asked for authority to go out in 2024; 2020 was not the prime time to go to a ballot question. But at that time, Assemblymember, to answer specifically your question, that was the mechanism which we were told would be applied to a ballot question.

I know that raising taxes is a tough conversation for everybody. We have done our research. We are connected to transit systems all over the United States and we ask, how do you pay for transit in your communities? And quite frankly, it is almost two major sources and not necessarily just one. It is either a combination of sales tax and property tax; it could be a DMV [Department of Motor Vehicles] fee; a Transportation Network Company (TNC) fee. These are things, Assemblymember, that we are also looking at. We have had conversations about the TNC fee or any other opportunity aside from a ballot question. As you saw the numbers deficit, now after all these years is so large it may take the community to tell us what it is they like to invest in. But, I agree, it is not an easy topic.

Chair Watts:

Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you again so much for the presentation. With that, we will move on to our next presentation, which is from the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County. We will give you a few minutes to get all the technology reconfigured. Welcome, Mr. Keller. Whenever you are ready, you can begin, but we will take a couple of minutes to get everything set up.

Dale Keller, Deputy Executive Director, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County:

With me today I have Washoe County Commissioner as well as Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Washoe County Chair, Ms. Alexis Hill, and she will be offering some closing remarks as we finish this presentation. I am pleased to provide the Committee an overview of who we are, what we do, and a few initiatives that the RTC will be watching this session. Our mission is building a better community through quality transportation. Created in 1979, the RTC extends about three core functions [page 2, [Exhibit G](#)], the first one being the metropolitan planning organization or MPO. The RTC is responsible for the long-range transportation plan in Washoe Valley and figuring out the transportation needs for the Truckee Meadows.

The second one is the engineering construction. Unlike RTC in southern Nevada, not only does our agency collect the street funds, but we also implement, design, and construct the funds on behalf of the three local jurisdictions. And the third is the operations of our public transportation system, with one of the goals to ensure that our service is both safe, reliable, comfortable, and customer focused.

The RTC of Washoe County is a cooperative regional board [page 3] comprised of five elected representatives appointed from the three government jurisdictions. There are two from Washoe County, two from the City of Reno, and one from the City of Sparks. The Nevada Department of Transportation is represented by the Director, Ms. Tracy Larkin-Thomason. Also, our Executive Director is Mr. Bill Thomas.

Regarding public transportation, the backbone of our transit system is our fixed route bus system named RIDE [page 4]. There are 25 routes in the Reno-Sparks area, 2 what we call RAPID or BRT [bus rapid transit] bus lines. We have one regional route between Reno and Carson City. Roughly about 5.5 million trips per year and 60 percent of those trips are work related, which is a huge benefit. We are very proud, and we continue to grow our services with 30 straight months of ridership growth. We do have an all-alternative-fuel fleet. We have all-electric, diesel-electric hybrid, and hydrogen fuel cells. We have two, we have another six on order as well.

In order to fund our three major programs, the RTC relies on revenue sources from the motor vehicle fuel tax as well as local sales tax [page 5]. These two revenue sources comprise about 42 percent of fuel and 18 percent of sales tax, respectively. Other revenue sources include federal grants. We have a regional road impact fee based off new development as well as passenger fares. This fiscal year, for year 2025, for us, we have over \$250 million of revenue.

For this year's expenditures, we are really divided up in about thirds [page 6]. Thirty percent is used on transit, 30 percent is used on delivering road projects, another 30 percent on what we call our payment preservation program and multimodal jobs, and the rest remaining is related to debt service and operating cost.

I would like to pause and say one of the main reasons RTC has been very successful with our program and maintaining our purchasing power is because of the fuel tax indexing. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 373.066 allows Washoe County to adjust its fuel tax each year based off inflation, ensuring that we have the funding needs for our road construction. Voters approved this back in 2008 with ballot question RTC-5, and in 2009 Senate Bill 201 of the 75th Session officially made it into law. Indexing went in effect on January 1, 2010, and it has no sunset date. Since then, tax has been automatically adjusted every year based on state law and county ordinances.

The Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) handles the calculation, and it is collected under an agreement between the county and the state. If you look at the slide [page 7], you will see that since 2010 RTC has collected over \$1.23 billion of revenue based off fuel tax. Of that, \$713 million, roughly about 58 percent, is due to the FRI [fuel revenue indexing]. That is really allowing us to keep up with inflation and continue to invest in the road projects that are needed in Washoe County.

However, this funding source is plateauing, and as you can see, it has been flattening over the tax collected per year [page 8]. One of the main reasons for this is, as we all know, vehicles are becoming more fuel efficient, and they are using less gas, and in turn, generating less fuel tax revenue. Another factor that is growing is alternative fuels, between electrical vehicles as well as hybrid vehicles, which further reduces the amount collected from the gas tax revenue [page 9]. Additionally, people in Washoe County are driving more. See in this graph [page 10] we continue to see more vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, per capita. The demand for transportation infrastructure is increasing; however, the revenue collected is not keeping pace with that growth.

Switching gears, maybe touched upon from our partners down in southern Nevada, regarding southern Nevada's Fuel Indexing Program and the fact that it is going to expire here in 2026. Here in Washoe County, the RTC fully supports their efforts to extend indexing so they can maintain their infrastructure and ensure that the long-term mobility and economic stability is reached. If their Fuel Revenue Index is not continued, Clark County will face major funding gaps in their critical road projects. It will not just impact them. It also could impact financial pressure with the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and the state highway system, potentially diverting some state funds away from Washoe County as well [page 11].

As the state looks at sustainable ways for the future of transportation funding, the RTC supports maintaining and expanding regional transportation funding through fair and equitable taxation. We are committed to working with NDOT, the DMV, our agency partners, as well as state legislators to explore different solutions, including potential fees for electric and hybrid vehicles [page 12].

For all of our southern Nevada colleagues and Assemblymembers, maybe touch base on a few major transportation needs and things we are working through. The first one, and I think the biggest transportation economic development challenge in western Nevada, is access to the Tahoe Regional Industrial Center, or the Tri-Center, with over 15,000 jobs today and projected about 35,000 to 50,000 jobs by 2040. There is currently only one way in and one way out of this major employment hub. We appreciate NDOT's efforts to secure roughly \$275 million from the U.S. Department of Transportation as a federal discretionary grant to address this issue.

At the RTC, we are also exploring different alternative routes [page 13], including a northern route from Sparks down the USA Parkway; a southern route from South Meadows, which is in south Reno, to USA Parkway; and even the possibility of a commuter rail. We recognize these solutions come with a high price tag and that is why we are working with our partners and looking at different funding opportunities, such as grants, public-private partnerships, and even tolling to make this a reality.

Now for the urban core of Reno-Sparks [page 14], the RTC continues to work with NDOT to keep the Reno Spaghetti Bowl project moving forward. Phase one, which was called the Spaghetti Bowl Express, was a tremendous success and we are encouraged to see and to continue to make proposed improvements on the largest bottleneck that we have on Interstate 80 in Sparks by the Nugget there. And finally, I would like to close and leave you with what we are hearing from our community. Recently, we had a survey through our long-term transportation plan called the Regional Transportation Plan and Long-term Training. We had a survey, and two key concerns keep coming up [page 15]. The first one is traffic congestion and delays, and two, unsafe driving conditions and behaviors. We have a plan to ease and tackle congestion, and also make roadways very safe. We are always looking for ways to improve safety.

With that in mind, I think the RTC will be closely following any potential legislation related to traffic cameras [page 16]. In the past, I know the Legislature considered different bills allowing traffic cameras in school zones. We are aware of a southern Nevada bill that could possibly allow traffic cameras on school buses when the stop sign, as you see on the picture, comes out, when vehicles are trying to pass. Then also, we are aware of the AGC [Associated General Contractors of Nevada] advocating for speed cameras in construction zones to reduce crashes and improve worker safety. Other jurisdictions have already implemented traffic cameras with positive results. This is something we will continue to monitor as we work to enhance safety across our region. At this time, I would like to turn it over to Commissioner Hill.

Alexis Hill, Chair, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County:

Just to highlight our three major priorities. Supporting southern Nevada's fuel revenue indexing because it will support northern Nevada projects, and obviously want to see safety on their roads as well. Public safety: we have done so much at Washoe RTC to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists and vehicles are safe. We are engineering roads to the best of our ability, but we can only do so much. That is why we are looking at these safety cameras very

closely. Then obviously, the support of NDOT with the Spaghetti Bowl Project and our alternative routes to the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center, making sure our workers are safe and that we can grow our economy. Thank you so much for your time and passion on this subject.

Chair Watts:

Members, are there any questions for the RTC of Washoe County? Seeing none at this time, we will now move to our next metropolitan planning organization, one that probably wins the award for best acronym. We have a presentation from CAMPO [Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization]. Welcome to the Committee, sir. Go ahead and take some time to get everything situated, and whenever you are ready, you can introduce yourself for the record and begin.

Chris C. Martinovich, Director, Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization; and Transportation Manager, Carson City Public Works, Carson City Regional Transportation Commission:

Today I wanted to first start off by thanking you all, and for allowing me as well as our other transportation partners to present. I will be focusing today a little bit on the Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO), as you mentioned, as well as the Carson City Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). First of all, we will start with the Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization [page 2, [Exhibit H](#)]. It is the metropolitan planning organization (MPO), that serves this region of Nevada—Carson City, northern Douglas County down to Johnson Lane, and western Lyon County, including the areas of Dayton and the Dayton Valley. The MPO was established in 2003 after the region surpassed 50,000 in population. I think we are the youngest MPO in the state. Our governing body is made up of seven members of a combination of elected officials from the representing counties, member counties, as well as appointed members of the public. We have two of our commissioners here in the audience today that I am aware of. The CAMPO itself is staffed by Carson City Public Works Department staff.

We serve and split our time between the MPO, the Regional Transportation Commission in Carson City, as well as general public works, and city government functions. Similar to what RTC of southern Nevada mentioned, we wear many hats and do many functions at CAMPO, switching those as our duties require. Our primary role at CAMPO is to conduct the regional transportation planning and to ensure that federal compliance, managing our funds, and develop those long-term transportation plans. The Legislature is in Carson City and within the CAMPO boundary. Welcome to all of you.

On the other hand, the Carson City RTC in accordance with *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 277A is focused on implementing and maintaining the transportation infrastructure specific to Carson City and Carson City itself [page 3]. I will note that our member agencies of Lyon County and Douglas County do have their own RTCs as well, but ours is specific to Carson City. We have a five-member governing body of elected and appointed members of the public and we oversee our transit service, Jump Around Carson. That is the buses you see

running around Carson City. We implement our transportation projects in alignment with CAMPO and Carson City Public Works.

The mission and vision of both CAMPO and the RTC are listed here [page 4]. Our vision is really to promote a safe and efficient transportation system that allows for freedom of choice, accessibility, sustainability, equity, economic vitality, and improves the quality of life. Our primary goals out of our regional transportation plan are listed on the screen here.

I am often asked, what is the difference between CAMPO? What is the difference between Carson City, RTC? What is Carson City? Are you not all the same? What is the difference? Well, I wanted to touch on relationships for a moment but none of those relationships would be as good and as strong as they are without support from the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) [page 5]. Nevada Department of Transportation is invaluable in supporting us. Their headquarters is here in the CAMPO region as well, and they support us in delivering our federally funded projects and collaborate and ensure alignment with statewide priorities as well as the other MPOs and RTCs across the state.

Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization itself focuses on that regional planning while the RTC handles the project implementation, delivering projects, building projects, repairing roads, fixing roads in the region, while following CAMPO's guide on planning priorities. Then Carson City, the City of, provides that administrative hub for both organizations. We all house ourselves in the Carson City Public Works offices, and so that really presents a lot of efficiencies and streamlining of government functions.

But of course, we could not do our projects, we could not deliver our projects, without funding, as you have all heard today, and our revenue sources. Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization does not have a lot of revenue sources, but we do have some [page 6]. We rely heavily on our federal grants, whether those are formula funds such as our surface transportation block grants, discretionary grants such as those that we have been fortunate enough to get for large projects, and then our FTA [Federal Transit Administration] grants to operate our transit service, Jump Around Carson.

Excluding transit operations, just by comparison with some of the numbers you have seen today, CAMPO was apportioned formula funds of \$1.85 million in federal dollars. So that is CAMPO's share on an annual basis, and you can compare that to some of the other RTC dollars. We rely on those discretionary federal grants to actually do larger projects: Tiger grant, from a number of years ago back in 2017, reconstructed South Carson Street beginning at Fifth Street all the way down to basically the interchange with Interstate 580. We received a RAISE [Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity] grant back in 2022, I believe, to reconstruct William Street by Mills Park and out to Interstate 580 at that interchange. We received a Safe Streets and Roads For All grant to do and update our safe routes to school master plans.

Our state provides funding for our planning projects. We rely on that, given our limited federal dollars. On the local side, the RTC relies solely on fuel taxes where you have no sales

tax for transportation in Carson City, and CAMPO has no local revenue source other than local matching. As comparison, RTC has a 9-cent-per-gallon flat rate, 9 cents per gallon, and that results in around \$4.4 million in both gasoline and diesel—5 cent diesel tax back in 2024. With our coupling that with our federal funds, we have about a \$6 million program, and you can compare that to some of the other agencies how we operate our projects.

From time to time, the Carson City Board of Supervisors does provide city general funds for specific projects and is a match for our transit operations. Transportation funding, as you have all heard, is definitely important, and we rely on a diversification of funding and reliability of funding. We have such a little amount of funding that we need to ensure that it is coming year over year so that we can plan to deliver projects year over year.

We need to meet the needs of our growing population, our aging population, and our aging infrastructure. Population ages in Carson City and Douglas County are increasing year over year. We are seeing some growth, but we are also seeing a growth in the age of our residents. We have not been sitting idly by. And looking at solutions for our transportation issues, we recently worked on a project called Preserve Carson City Roads [page 7], where we looked at funding specifically local neighborhood streets, those streets that run in front of your houses, for example. We did a significant effort to examine what our needs were, what our solutions were, and how do we go about solving those issues.

That resulted in two ballot questions going to the Carson City voters. One of the ballot questions was to raise the sales tax and the second ballot question was to increase the government services tax applied to vehicle registrations. Those were taken in November 2024. Unfortunately, both of them failed, but that does not mean we are going to give up. We are looking at some other options. We are really looking at all options, including potential government improvement districts, GIDs, and other types of smaller improvement districts to really do projects on a limited basis.

But that dovetails into our priorities [page 8]. On the federal level, we are looking for increased formula funding to ensure reliability, year-over-year assurances, of what we are going to get at a lower local match so we can stretch the little dollars we have locally to do larger projects. On the state side, we are going to continue to collaborate with NDOT on safety priorities and multimodal enhancements in our region.

We would definitely support legislation similar to what the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada and the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County mentioned to enact fuel indexing, continue that, as well as allow local governments across the state and all counties to allow that if they so choose to do that, even for a limited time. We look to ensure funding for any alternative fuel vehicles, if that were to ever move forward, that it is distributed to the counties and not collected or held only at the state or used in individual areas. There are electric vehicles operating, or hydrogen fuel vehicles, or any other type of vehicle operating everywhere, and we have those same needs as anyone else. We would like to support legislation to expand roadway transit and transit funding, traffic operations funding for that sustainable future.

We are needing to keep up with maintenance, let alone new projects. But how do we maintain what we already have? We need to keep up. On the local side, I mentioned maintaining our current infrastructure is our key initiative. Looking to maintain what we have, looking to increase funding to continue to maintain what we have, given, as you have heard, the rising costs of construction. We are going to continue to focus our planning efforts primarily on our growing and, as I said, aging population.

Those are the items I wanted to highlight. I wanted to thank you all for your attention and the opportunity to speak today. I am happy to take questions.

Chair Watts:

Members, any questions for CAMPO? Seeing none at this time, we will move on to our last presentation of the day from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. Welcome, Ms. Regan. Whenever you are ready, please introduce yourself for the record and you can begin.

Julie W. Regan, Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency:

We have other Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) staffers in the audience and a few members of our 15-member Bi-State Governing Board. I want to thank them for being here. We appreciate the chance to present on this beautiful Transportation Day in the Legislature with our colleagues from other parts of the state. Lake Tahoe's stunning environment and outdoor recreation opportunities support residential quality of life and attract millions of visitors each year—many of you, I am sure. However, the lack of a fully connected transit system causes congestion at popular recreation sites, increasing vehicle impacts on air and water quality, and disproportionately affects underserved community members.

I have a few slides to talk a little bit about the history and then to move into some of our challenges and opportunities this session. Tahoe's modern history began in 1960 with the Palisades Winter Olympics at what is now Palisades Tahoe ski resort. This international event put Tahoe on the map and soon plans were developed for the region to grow, believe it or not, to be the size of San Francisco, complete with a multilane freeway circling the Tahoe Basin and a bridge across the mouth of Emerald Bay, as you can see pictured in this historic rendering, which did not happen [page 2, [Exhibit I](#)]. That sparked a conservation movement.

Then Nevada's Governor Paul Laxalt and California Governor Ronald Reagan came together and signed a Bi-State Compact to create our agency, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. The compact was then adopted by Congress and signed into law by President Nixon in 1969. We just celebrated our 55th anniversary. So, where does our role in transportation enter into the picture? It was actually outlined in our compact, and it mandates that we develop a transportation plan for the region that reduces dependency on the private automobile and provides preference for transit, biking, walking, and works within our existing roadways without expansions [page 3].

To further enable TRPA to implement the transportation goals of the compact, the federal government recognized TRPA as a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in 1998, just a couple of years before CAMPO from Carson City, and the speaker you just heard. Now,

this designation, as you heard, is typically reserved for regions with populations larger than we have in Tahoe. But we have a special dispensation to count the Nevada and California sides of the basin to qualify. And then in 2015, the federal government and the highway transportation bill actually recognized some of Lake Tahoe's visitor population for transportation formula funding, because money passes through based on population. While this federal change resulted in an increase in federal transportation funding, we still remain largely and substantially underfunded, as you heard from other MPOs and other transportation providers in the state. This is a huge challenge.

Article 9 of the same Bi-State Compact also created the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) to implement transportation projects and operate transit and now on the South Shore. Our chair of the TTD formerly was member Alexis Hill, who you just heard from a few moments ago, and is now Andy Chapman who works in Incline Village.

Couple of themes about transportation I wanted to share today. As you have heard across the state there are many unique configurations. Ours is no exception. Our transportation system serves three primary functions: (1) moving around our local residents and businesses; (2) recreation access to the great outdoors, we are a visitor-serving, recreation-based economy and tourism; and (3) critical connections across the snowy Sierra Nevada mountain range. So, we are a thruway on Highway 50 and Interstate 80 for getting goods and services across the West. Tahoe is one of Nevada's premier outdoor resources. In fact, one-third of all Nevada State Park visitation occurs at Tahoe at Sand Harbor State Park [Lake Tahoe-Nevada State Park]. This visitation and our transportation system support a \$5 billion annual economy [page 4].

Our transportation system and economy are closely connected to northern Nevada with upwards of more than 50 percent of Tahoe's workforce now commuting from outside of Tahoe into the basin. Many workers right here in Carson City commute to Tahoe daily, and that is only more pronounced with the cost of housing in the Tahoe Basin. The transportation system today is also deeply connected to the health of Tahoe's environment. Our aging roadways contribute stormwater runoff that harms lake clarity and vehicle use contributes to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.

Importantly, our transportation system is also the backbone of our emergency response system as we have seen in recent years. Wildfire evacuation is a critical concern for residents and visitors alike. I am proud to report that last year, our agency, TRPA, received a \$1.8 million federal project grant to complete a regional infrastructure resilience plan that will assist with evacuations. Because Tahoe spans two states, five counties, one incorporated city, the federal government, and many other partners, our transportation system is funded differently, and it is complicated.

Complicating matters further, our small year-round population makes us a rural community on the weekdays with big-city traffic on the weekends. The map that you will see in the next slide [page 5], is a little hard to read, but the main point is that we are the backyard of some very large metropolitan areas, really, from the San Francisco Bay Area all the way up

through northern California and across northern Nevada onto Interstate 80. These populations are growing. The roadways in different colors show trip density on the left and just really help our transportation identification of travel patterns and understanding of densities. The next map on the right shows their overall vision for the region with an interconnected system that promotes alternative transportation modes connected to our town centers. We even have a vision for a cross-lake ferry system at some point, so we are hopeful that we will get to that in our career lifetimes.

The project map that you see before you [page 6] is just some of the highlights of our priorities in our transportation action plan that the two states have worked together on with our local communities to prioritize. It really can boil down in four ways. We call it the four Ts of our transportation plan: transit, trails, technology, and our town centers and connecting them. I want to note that we, TRPA, do not implement these transportation projects. The Bi-State Compact makes us accountable, however, for achieving environmental standards. We must rely on our partners, whether it be the Tahoe Transportation District, Placer County, which runs transit on the north shore, our local jurisdictions, and the private sector. We must rely on our partners to achieve these standards and our goals as mandated by the compact. That truly is the core of how we do business in Tahoe. We call it epic collaboration and that is how we do our daily work.

I have a couple of additional slides to leave with you about some priorities that we wanted to share [page 7]. Most of you are familiar with Lake Tahoe's State Route 28 up the east shore, one of the most beautiful sections of Lake Tahoe. The corridor is home to several state parks, and Sand Harbor State Park alone being one of the most visited, as I mentioned. When you think of the short season it has versus the Valley of Fire State Park, which has visitors all year round, we really have quite an epic experience there. We have a corridor plan to enhance safety, protect the environment, and move people through.

I will not go through this map, but we have very identified segments and a plan for connecting those segments with a trail from Spooner Summit that connects up to the East Shore Trail right at Sand Harbor and Incline Village. This is a very big endeavor. We were able to receive a \$24 million federal RAISE [Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity] grant last year to implement key sections of this. We are hopeful that these federal funds remain intact.

You have heard a great deal about transit funding. I will not get into many of the details other than to say we also struggle with funding transit at Lake Tahoe. It is one of our very largest challenges. It really is about that ongoing expense of the operation maintenance of the system for both fixed route and on-demand transit services. Microtransit, however, has seen great success in the last few years when it launched both on the north end of the lake and the south shore [page 8]. Just as an example, the Lake Link service served more than 160,000 riders in its first year with 50 percent of riders being residents. So, we also are seeing microtransit services, which are free and app-based, for people to get to work. Our goal is to secure more funding for transit to meet the demand that we now know exists. We are also looking to update our regional transportation plan. This \$2.4 billion plan, updated every four years, sets

the regional vision for goals and all the projects that our project implementers are putting forward [page 9].

The plan is informed by continuous public involvement, and we have had more than 9,000 people who have participated in this over the last several years. There are about 300 transportation projects included in this 25-year planning horizon. I would really like to highlight the role of Nevada in this overall public-private partnership and the importance of the Department of Transportation, the Legislature, the Governor's Office, all the folks that are working so hard to improve transportation in our state and at Lake Tahoe.

The last slide I will leave you with are some actions that you have taken in the past, those of you in the Legislature, and some that will be coming before you [page 10]. Over the last three legislative sessions, transportation at Tahoe has been highlighted. Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 of the 81st Session was adopted, asking us to coordinate with our partners to develop the transportation action plan. Our agency succeeded in that, launching that plan in 2022. The Legislature adopted Assembly Concurrent Resolution 5 (ACR 5) of the 82nd Session to endorse that plan.

Then last year during our interim oversight committee session—we have a committee that meets in the interim—we discussed a lot of details of how to now implement this very expensive transportation action plan. This resulted in several bill draft requests that will be considered here over the next several months. Bills include funding opportunities, parking management, and other provisions. I thank you for your time. I invite all of you to Lake Tahoe for a tour. We would be happy to answer any questions. Thank you for your support for the lake.

Chair Watts:

Thank you so much, Ms. Regan. I look forward to visiting again. I do not think I am going to get on the East Shore Trail if there is snow on it, though. Members, any questions for TRPA? Seeing none, one thing I do want to note. I think it is probably of interest to all the members. You mentioned wildfire preparation evacuation planning. Given the events in Southern California, I think it is particularly on folks' minds, and when we think of areas of the state that are particularly vulnerable, and that we want to have top-notch planning for, I think Tahoe is probably at the top of the list. I think we would love to get some additional follow-up information about some of those efforts, and particularly ways that some of the recent events in other areas are helping inform and maybe improve some of those processes.

Julie Regan:

We would be happy to bring back information. Fortunately, at Lake Tahoe we have had some firsthand experience with the Angora wildfire of 2007, and the Caldor fire, which burned over 10,000 acres in 2021. We would be happy to report back on that because it is a top concern for all of us.

Chair Watts:

I see no other questions from members. It has been a long ride, but we have now arrived at the last item on our agenda, which is public comment. Is there anyone here in Carson City who wishes to provide public comment at our meeting today? I do not see anyone in Las Vegas, but if there is anyone in Las Vegas who would like to provide public comment, please head to the seats down there as we will get to you shortly.

Ellie Waller, Private Citizen, Minden, Nevada:

Over 55 years of progress and change has resulted in the need to revisit how the TRPA has now addressed growth as part of a dire need to update their regional plan update to capture the cumulative impacts of the past that goes unchecked. Hundreds of amendments have not course-corrected the problems, one of them being a goal for a sustainable funding source of transportation without taxing the local population through jurisdictional buy-in.

Many in the public have a different opinion about the steadfast mission. They say they are protecting the lake. We attended the TRPA oversight committee meetings during the intersession. Many of us commented at each session mostly to point out past and present issues related to TRPA's failures.

Directly related to the transportation system is the proposed 777 Plan, ACR 5 [sic] that many of you have probably heard about, that will be brought in by most of the jurisdictions. But remember that Carson City and Douglas County are much smaller, and a \$7 million contribution may not be available. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency should prioritize preservation, protection, and restoration of the lake, which may include limiting parking for tourism. Examples are multiple, direct, and indirect problems in the planning conjunction which end up by adding more parking lots, which add more people, which significantly increases fire danger in a disaster-based wildland evacuation efforts in a very fixed, unexpandable infrastructure. Building out trails and visitor services not only destroys the local residents' well-being, but degrades environmental quality, increases fire ignition risk and public safety impacts, and obviously brings more visitors and vehicles. When TRPA asks for additional funding sources, please consider that there must be more accountability. The environmental improvement plan tracker shows progress towards goals, but endless plan strategies, et cetera, bury the reality of environmental degradation and the potential disastrous consequences of unchecked cumulative impacts.

John Eppolito, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada:

I have been selling real estate in both states on the north shore of Lake Tahoe for 27 years. Photos one, seven, and nine of Julie's presentation [[Exhibit I](#)], that is the East Shore Multi-use Trail. It is a very beautiful three-mile trail. It goes from Sand Harbor to Incline Village. Some say people come from all over the country, or even all over the world, to use this trail. The issue is we still have the same two-lane road that runs parallel to the trail and not close to enough parking, even for weekdays in the summer. Because of the overcrowding on Highway 28 in this area, and actually the entire east shore of Lake Tahoe, Sand Harbor State Park has now had to go to a reservation system.

Twice last summer, I sat in traffic for about an hour to go five or six miles past Sand Harbor. In the event of an evacuation because a wildfire, that hour would be much longer. The latest study I have seen said it would take an estimated 9 to 14 hours to evacuate Lake Tahoe in the event of a fire. Is it wise to add numerous busloads of people to Sand Harbor State Park with no transportation out in the event of a sudden wildfire? Julie just gave you some history. She left out one thing. In December 2023, the highest-ranking member of the TRPA Governing Board, Secretary of State Cisco Aguilar, voted against the latest updates to the TRPA regional plan. As I recall, Mr. Aguilar said something like quote, "the TRPA really needs to start listening to the residents of Lake Tahoe." We are still waiting for that to happen.

Chair Watts:

Not seeing anyone else here to provide public comment in Carson City, we will move on to Las Vegas. [There was no one.] With that, we will move on to anyone wishing to provide public comment remotely.

Dora Martinez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am not calling to advocate for Braille on the tracking stations. Let us just put that out there and much sized relief to the general public. For those of you that do not know me, I am totally blind, and I just want to take the opportunity to thank the RTC folks who are there, especially Alexis Hill, who always hears our people with disability here in the Reno-Sparks area, when we ask her for help, and Mayor Ed Lawson and everyone at the RTC.

I just wanted to let you all know, especially people in Las Vegas, and you know how you folks say, When you see something, do something. Well, I hear something, so I am going to remind the RTC people in the south that in the northeast of Las Vegas are some people who are disabled and in minority. I heard in one of the town hall meetings that they are wanting and needing some of the benches for the bus stops because some of them are elderly and cannot stand and then sometimes they will sit on the dirt and wait for the bus. So please, be aware of that and hopefully that you guys can all put the bench out there for people in Las Vegas, because we are working that here in the north.

Ronda Tyner, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada:

Like other long-term Tahoe residents, I want TRPA to succeed in its mission of protecting the Lake and the basin community. But I and my fellow Nevadans at the lake are concerned that TRPA's primary mission has been hijacked by the California Legislature's affordable housing rules, which are directly related to transportation, mobility hubs, and denser housing near transportation hubs.

The TRPA says it must make regulations that allow the two California counties and the City of South Lake Tahoe to abide by California housing rules. Okay, but then the TRPA says it must unify its code around the basin, so TRPA applies California regulations to the three Nevada counties as well. We Nevada residents at the lake now live under California housing and transportation laws, which include S.B. 375, promoting denser housing near transportation hubs; S.B. 35, the RHNA [Regional Housing Needs Allocation] numbers whereby cities and counties lose grant money and are fined if they do not build enough

affordable housing units each year; S.B. 9, the Home Act, it increases density by allowing four homes on a single lot; and S.B. 10 that allows up to two accessory dwelling units on each parcel and allows the state to override local initiatives restricting zoning. We ask the Nevada Congress to please stop TRPA from applying California legislative dictates on the Nevada side of the lake. Please give us back our Nevada property rights.

Elizabeth Lenhardt, Private Citizen, Zephyr Cove, Nevada:

I can really feel the need like the last commenter that we need to look at the mission of TRPA. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency is not following the Bi-State Compact mission. It is not going through a vote for the additional funds that it is asking and that its director asks again today. Assembly Concurrent Resolution 5 in the last session was clearly asking for money and got approved. Now she is asking for money again. If it says in the Bi-State Compact that it has to be approved by two-thirds of a public vote if there are any new taxes that be levied. I wish they would be reminded to that. And I wish you as a legislative body to act accordingly because otherwise this compact is null and void. And we do not have protection from an agency that has literally no oversight and does what they want.

Just this weekend in the rains, there was a huge flood on Laura and Kale Drive in Stateline at a construction site where the residents opposed the construction, and all of us had mentioned for the last half year that it was not safe, and there is a huge mud lake there now. Finally, TRPA reacted to this, but there are many [unintelligible] including last year's sewer plant leak at the north lake in which 84,000, I believe, gallons of sewage ran into it. They need to be proactive in doing their job rather than trying to mandate high-density housing. We know what that leads to in southern California.

Highway 50 is the largest road out and it is a four-lane road and hopefully stays that way and they wanted to take two lanes away for their bike lane. It would have doubled the evacuation time. We have a study for the simulated evacuation done by Doug Flaherty from Tahoe Clean Air. It clearly states the east shore has 5 hours and the west and north shore has up to 13 hours' evacuation time. That is because you have that highway. Please think about these fires.

Ann Nichols, President, North Tahoe Preservation Alliance:

I am a Washoe County property owner and 50-year resident real estate broker, California and Nevada. Regarding the TRPA, you know, they have gone from a million dollar-a-year budget to now it is \$30 million a year. They spend about \$400,000 on enforcement. But over, boy, almost \$10 million on contracts, which I know, you know, it would be nice to know exactly where all that is going. Three billion dollars has been spent on the lake. Now, they want another \$2.4 billion for transportation, and they want to do, they want to tax the locals, which they are not really being transparent about. They want you to pass, to approve a BID, a business improvement district, for Tahoe to pay for things, and you know who pays for that is the locals and the visitors and no one really knows about it. This needs to be transparent. I hope you folks will allow the public to weigh in on this before you decide. It has been done in Placer County, and it has been a disaster as far as the transparency of it. And you know, we own the local businesses.

So as far as the transportation, we have the achievable housing for deed-restricted housing has no income cap, so you could make a million a year and qualify. That is just wrong-headed. And then the 50 percent of the workers commuting, there is thousands of units down in the surrounding areas of Carson and Reno, if we could get a way to do transportation to get people back and forth from that housing, because by the time anything gets built here, when there is so little land available, it will be forever. Anyway, this is difficult. We have got the microtransit it is a free Uber. We have got to get some creative out-of-the-box thinking.

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

Chair Watts:

That concludes our business for today. Our next meeting will be on Thursday, February 6, 2025, at 1:30 p.m. We are going to continue to have some educational presentations throughout this week, and we will also have some next week as well, but then we will start getting into some bill hearings. This meeting is adjourned [at 3:41 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jeff Kirst
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblymember Howard Watts, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Keely Latham, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure Committee Policies 2025
	D	Keely Latham, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure Committee Brief
	E	Tracy Larkin-Thomason, Director, Department of Transportation	PowerPoint presentation titled "Transportation Day"
	F	MJ Maynard, Chief Executive Officer, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada	PowerPoint presentation titled "RTC Let's Go, 2025 Nevada Legislative Session"
	G	Dale Keller, Deputy Executive Director, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County	PowerPoint presentation titled "RTC Legislative Update, February 4, 2025"
	H	Chris C. Martinovich, Director, Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization; and Transportation Manager, Carson City Public Works, Carson City Regional Transportation Commission	PowerPoint presentation titled "CAMPO and the Carson City RTC"
	I	Julie W. Regan, Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	PowerPoint presentation titled "Lake Tahoe Transportation Action Plan"