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

Eighty-Third Session
February 20, 2025

The Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Howard Watts at 1:31 p.m. on Thursday, February 20, 2025, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3 of the Nevada Legislature 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 Jill Dickman
Assemblymember Danielle Gallant
Assemblymember Bert K. Gurr
Assemblymember Venise Karris
Assemblymember Cinthia Zermeño Moore
Assemblymember Duy Nguyen
Assemblymember Toby Yurek

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblymember Tracy Brown-May (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16
Assemblymember Heather Goulding, Assembly District No. 27

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Keely Latham, Committee Policy Analyst
Jessica Dummer, Committee Counsel

Cindy Glass, Committee Manager
Maria Benamati, Committee Secretary
Lori McCleary, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Angela Smith-Lamb, Deputy Director, Department of Motor Vehicles
Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Division of Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles
Martin Hefner, Management Analyst, Division of Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles
Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director, Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities, Department of Health and Human Services
Dora Martinez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Andrew MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association
Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families for Freedom
Janine Hansen, Chairman, Independent American Party of Nevada
Theresa DeGraffenreid, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada; and First Vice Chairman, Douglas County Republicans
Bob Russo, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada
Casey Rogers, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada
Katrin Sienkiewicz, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada
Karen Stephens, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Elisabeth Lernhardt, Private Citizen, Zephyr Cove, Nevada
Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Jim DeGraffenreid, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada
Michael Ryan, Private Citizen, Nevada
Erika Castro, Organizing Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada; and representing the Nevada Immigrant Coalition
Molly Lennon, RPM Administrator, Division of Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles
Tara Webster, Policy Manager, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Eric Jeng, Executive Director, One APIA Nevada
Noé Orosco, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada
Vincent Nava, Senior Advisor, Office for New Americans, Office of the Governor
Salma Garcia-Hernandez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Melissa Corral, Deputy Managing Attorney, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Denise Bolaños-Heredia, Associate Director, Return Strong!
Ashley Dotson, Private Citizen, Nevada
Leslie Vega, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Joy Trushenski, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Pauline Lee, Private Citizen, Nevada
Ky Plaskon, Secretary, Nevada Bicycle Coalition

Olivia Tanager, Director, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club
Isaiah Berke, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Jay Howard, Private Citizen, Nevada
Misty Carter, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Mason Baca, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Aeva Plaskon, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Chelsea Kincheloe, President, Muscle Powered
David Swallow, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Nic Ciccone, Government Affairs Manager, City Manager's Office, City of Reno
David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager, Government and Public Affairs, City of Henderson
Adrian Hunt, Police Detective, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Kelly Crompton, Government Affairs Manager, City of Las Vegas
Jeff Rogan, representing Clark County
Jason Walker, Lieutenant, Administrative Division, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Jonathan Mayer, Private Citizen

Chair Watts:
[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocols were explained.] Good afternoon everyone, we have one presentation from the Department of Motor Vehicles and three bill hearings on our agenda for today: Assembly Bill 20, Assembly Bill 140, and Assembly Bill 168. We are going to begin our agenda with a presentation from the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Angela Smith-Lamb, Deputy Director, Department of Motor Vehicles:
Good afternoon, Committee. Joining me at the table today is Sean Sever, deputy administrator for the Division of Research Project and Management and dubbed our legislative liaison. He is your connection if you need to reach out to the DMV [Department of Motor Vehicles]. He can get you in touch with anyone to help you with your DMV needs. I do apologize, I know some of you guys have already seen this and hopefully you will get some new content out of this.

The DMV exists and operates under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 481 [page 1, Exhibit C]. The DMV remains focused on its vision and mission to move most services online while maintaining an emphasis on premier customer service in a secure environment [page 2].

The DMV is comprised of seven divisions supported by the Division of the Office of the Director [page 3]. There are 1,292 authorized positions and 18 field offices statewide, 2 of which primarily focus on commercial services. Thanks in large part to the raises provided last session, we have seen our lowest vacancy rate yet at just around 5 percent. The DMV continues to partner with county assessors and AAA [American Automobile Association] for vehicle registration transactions. In addition, there are more than 50 kiosk

partner locations statewide that are not shown on this slide [page 3] but can be found on our website. The department completes roughly 8 million transactions annually which averages about 28,000 transactions each business day. Appointments are required in DMV metro offices for most services, and we have rolled out a hybrid walk-in model in our rural offices.

The DMV strategic goals are identified in this slide [page 4] and help us to direct our decisions over the next fiscal years. The DMV Transformation Effort will help us to achieve many of these goals. This slide [page 5] displays our DMV executive leadership team, who are a dedicated team of experienced professionals who hold steadfast to promoting DMV's mission and vision to better serve and improve operations for DMV staff and our fellow Nevadans alike. A special shout-out to our dedicated DMV team members, so many of them show up every day to give their very, very best, even though the DMV has a stereotype of not being the favorite of state agencies. We cannot do what we do without them.

A quick overview of our different divisions and the services they provide: Bethany Musselman is the administrator of our Administrative Services Division, which handles budgeting, accounting, mail services, facilities, contracts, and leases for the department. Jessica Vargas is the administrator of our Division of Central Services and Records, which oversees the contact center, title processing, insurance lapses, license plate issuance, OHV [off-highway vehicle] records management, mail-in registration, and driver license services. JD Decker is the administrator for the Division of Compliance Enforcement, which is our law enforcement arm of the Department. This division employs sworn officers, non-sworn investigators, VIN [vehicle identification number] inspectors, and business licensing staff who regulate the automotive industry. They have oversight of our pollution control program, and they are responsible for the licensing of body shops, garages, and dealerships and investigating fraud and other vehicle-related enforcement.

Renato Lara is the deputy administrator of our Division of Field Services and oversees our front-line customer service for 18 offices statewide that handle all in-person vehicle and registration services. Karen Stoll is the administrator of our Motor Carrier Division and oversees commercial vehicle registration, oversight and processing of international fuel tax agreement licensing, and collections of all fuel taxes in Nevada. Suzie Pollard is the administrator of our IT [Information Technology] services, which we call "Move-It." Molly Lennon is the administrator of our Division of Research and Project Management, which heads up our transformation project and handles all other large projects and legislative work for the department. Our hearing office division is not reflected on this slide [page 5] but reports to the director's office and provides hearings for various DMV-related matters.

The DMV is primarily funded with State Highway Funds, fees, cost allocations, and commissions from fees collected by the department [page 6]. While the DMV receives State General Funds for Automatic Voter Registration, it is a very small amount of the funding we receive. The DMV is subject to a cap on the Highway Fund appropriations that it can receive for operations. The cap has been set at 22 percent in the past but is currently set at 27 percent, to account for a transformation effort. The cap is set to return to 22 percent in

FY [fiscal year] 2026. With the continuation of our project efforts, we anticipate the need to continue the extension of the cap and have submitted a BDR [bill draft request] for this.

In FY 2024, the DMV collected approximately $1.8 billion. The $1.8 billion collected by the department annually is divvied up as reflected on this slide [page 7]. A significant portion of the funds collected are going to the counties, school districts, and the Highway Fund. The DMV receives around 6 percent of the fees for operational expenses. These charts illustrate DMV's funding sources for operations [page 8]. As previously identified, roughly 46 percent of DMV's funding comes from the Highway Funds, but over 53 percent of DMV's funding comes from other revenue sources such as fees and commissions.

The DMV's priorities for the next biennium can be organized into four major categories, which include the continuation of our modernization efforts, ensuring operations continue to run smoothly, addressing growing resource challenges and operational issues, and a reorganization to align staffing with our modernization efforts [page 9].

The DMV's top priority remains our Transformation Effort, with a heavy focus to move most of DMV services online [page 10]. The DMV recognized the need to increase the processing efficiency of customer service transactions to meet demands resulting from increased population and the demand for improved services. This multiyear, complete transformation pertains to DMV work processes and systems currently utilized to handle department transactions. This program intends to modernize legacy systems, thereby improving the efficiency and effectiveness of DMV operations; enhance customer service; and increase the department's online presence, making it easier for customers to conduct business with the DMV. This does not mean our fellow Nevadans cannot visit an office, it just offers more choice and convenience for the services we provide and helps assist with the growing demand in our resources.

The DMV has published the DTE [DMV Transformation Effort] road map on the website of all core DMV services and products we are working towards transforming. Our primary focus for the next biennium is to continue to develop and improve vehicle programs and services, completing core vehicle products by the end of the biennium, and then we will begin designing for credentials.

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

We have had tremendous success, and the public has benefited from the rollout of our services that previously were major pain points, such as the ability for customers to submit online complaints regarding violations in vehicle sales, concerns with mechanic garages, emission stations, driving schools, and reporting identity theft [page 11]. We modernized our appointment system, allowing for ease of use and reminder notifications with the ability for customers to cancel appointments, freeing up more appointments for other Nevadans. We also added the ability for Nevadans to submit documents electronically for out-of-state and first-time registrations. We made improvements for commercial businesses to process titles through partnerships. We rolled out a pilot program to allow electronic submission of titles

for individuals. Our modernized contact center allows better management of communication channels and more efficient service for customer chat, telephone, and email inquiries. We will soon be converting some old manual invoice processes for businesses to electronic billing. As a result of these new services, we have saved many Nevadans from having to make unnecessary repeat trips to the DMV, freeing up capacity in our offices and giving Nevadans some of their precious time back.

I want to talk about our 2023 bill implementation and thank everyone who worked with us last session to delay the implementation of your bills and include the language, when the DMV determines sufficient resources are in place for the implementation [page 12]. That gave us great flexibility, and once again, this session we are working out of two IT systems. I am happy to report we have implemented all but one and a half bills from last session. Assembly Bill 161 of the 82nd Session is still left over; we did add the medical symbol to the front of the driver's license, but we have yet to add it to the registration, and that is coming. The other bill left over is Assembly Bill 203 of the 82nd Session. It allows for personalization of military license plates and should be completed in April of this year.

Our bills this session include Senate Bill 22 [page 13]. We have received some concerns on this bill, so we are going to submit an amendment when we present it. Regarding our required fuel tax payments, the current statute says monthly, but we would like to further define it for clarity to say they are due at the end of the month. Senate Bill 80 is from our Compliance Enforcement Division. It clarifies existing statutes for activities they have been performing for the past five years, which address stolen vehicles, unlicensed motor vehicle industry involvement in the trafficking of stolen vehicles, and emissions tampering. Assembly Bill 20 is our DMV housekeeping bill, and I will save that one for later. That is our infamous housekeeping bill.

We also have three budget BDRs. We have our emissions certificate fee increase. It would increase the fee for diesel and gasoline emissions certificates from $6 to $7, which is needed due to increased expenditures in the pollution control budget and a gradual decrease of gasoline- and diesel-fueled vehicles on the road. Assembly Bill 349 of the 81st Session also increased the time period when new vehicles are not required to have smog checks, which also decreased the growth of this revenue source. We have two more budget BDRs—we mentioned earlier extending the DMV cap to 27 percent, and we are hoping to continue that. We have another budget BDR to change some of our divisional names. Our Field and Central Services Division is being combined into one division called Customer Service, and our Administrative Services Division is going to be called Fiscal Operations.

Last, but not least, we are very excited—we have spent a lot of time revamping the DMV website [page 14]. We are going to launch it next week. We have edited a lot of copy—150 web pages—to make things easier for our customers and organized major categories of doing business with the DMV into different sections so people can find things easier. Believe it or not, you can find most answers to your DMV questions on our website; finding them is the hard part. We are launching this next week, and we are very excited about it.

To go along with that is our "DMV Wherever" branding campaign. You might have already seen it around the state, on social media, and billboards. It features outdoor scenes in Nevada with a person completing their DMV transaction on their mobile device. If it is at a campsite, a beach at Lake Tahoe, or hiking in Red Rock, the idea is to show off some of the most beautiful areas of our state while asking people if they would rather be at DMV or in one of these beautiful places. And of course, this can all be accomplished from someone's living room. That concludes our presentation, and we are happy to answer any questions.

Chair Watts:
Thank you very much for the presentation. Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] As a reminder, those bills will have hearings, so try not to discuss those and focus on any other aspects of the presentation.

We are going to move into our bill hearings. I will provide just a couple more housekeeping items before we go into the hearing. We are going to take these bills in order to make sure we can get through our agenda in a timely manner. We are going to limit testimony in support, opposition, and neutral to 20 minutes for each of these bills. We are going to limit every speaker to a maximum of two minutes. Again, feel free to submit additional comments in writing if you have comments that are going to exceed the limit. If you have heard things that have been brought up by previous speakers, "ditto," or "me too," works as well so we can try to accommodate as many people as possible and give everyone the chance to be heard.

I am going to open the hearing on Assembly Bill 20, which revises provisions relating to the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Assembly Bill 20: Revises provisions relating to the Department of Motor Vehicles. (BDR 43-305)

Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Division of Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles:
This is a DMV [Department of Motor Vehicles] housekeeping bill that does two things: first of all, it would revise provisions passed in Senate Bill 362 of the 2023 Session to clarify that the DMV can continue to print medical codes on the back of driver's licenses and ID cards to go along with the new medical symbol on the front. When this bill was codified last session, the LCB [Legislative Counsel Bureau] notified us that we can no longer print the codes on the back of the ID and the driver's license. Our director decided to continue what we have been doing for two decades and proposed fixing it during the 2025 Legislative Session.

I realize there has been some concern over the bill, and I am sorry for all the emails, but I do not think people understand the intention of this bill and hopefully we can alleviate some of those concerns: 1) we are not doing something new, we have been doing this since the early 2000s; 2) adding the code is the option of the customer, you do not have to put anything on your card if you do not want to, this is a benefit to our customers to alert law enforcement or first responders if you have a certain condition you want them to know about; 3) the codes are numbers, we do not print any medical conditions on cards, it is a small number law

enforcement emergency responders can lookup—The average person would have no idea what it means; and 4) we believe the intent of S.B. 362 last session was to allow the driver to give law enforcement emergency responders a heads-up on their medical condition without the code on the back. Law enforcement would know a person has a medical condition from the symbol on the front, but they would have no idea what the condition is without the code on the back, which I think would defeat the purpose of the bill, so the symbol and the code can work together.

The other parts of this bill would give the DMV mailing flexibility when we send out insurance notices, so we are not forced to use the United States Postal Service. Insurance notices need to be sent immediately, and with the postal service getting slower or potentially moving their processing center to Sacramento someday, we would like the flexibility to use other means such as UPS [United Parcel Service] or FedEx. When I met with some of you, I mentioned email, which we do not use for insurance notices, but if we ever do default to electronic mail and other notifications, we will always give our customers a choice on their preferred communication method. We appreciate your considering our request, and I have Martin Hefner from the DMV here to help me answer any questions. Thank you for your time.

Assemblymember Nguyen:
We are on the end of the thousands of emails we received in the last couple of days around this issue. Many of those emails are around the same question about HIPAA [Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act]. Please clarify for us that this is something which has been done for many years. If someone wants to use this benefit, they will obviously have to sign a HIPAA release, and they are able to use this information. Is that correct?

Martin Hefner, Management Analyst, Division of Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles:
To answer your question, Assemblymember, what a person would need to do is indicate to the department that they want to participate in this program. They would fill out a confidential physician form and take it to their physician. The physician has to sign off and attest that this person does indeed suffer from this particular condition. Then they have to note on the back that they are releasing this information to us. And then, and only then, will we go ahead and imprint the code—it is an ICD-9 [International Classification of Diseases] code. It is a common standardization code for International Classification of Diagnosis [*sic*], I believe. It pertains particularly to the condition the person suffers from. And then they will go ahead and imprint the code on the back of the card. But yes, it is voluntary; there is a form that denotes they are participating in the program.

Assemblymember Nguyen:
I just want to make sure we are putting it on the record that it already exists. We are not doing anything new and everything, including HIPAA disclosures, are already in place.

Martin Hefner:
That is correct, this program has been in place since 2005.

Assemblymember Dickman:
I really appreciate the question because I want it stressed that this is nothing new. I was not aware of this program, that these codes have been put on a driver's license for 20 years. My question, to be clear, is what caused you not to be able to do this?

Sean Sever:
The bill last session, Senate Bill 362 of the 82nd Session, triggered the need for this cleanup language. Senate Bill 362 of the 82nd Session was a medical indicator on the front of the driver's license, and when that bill was codified, LCB notified the DMV that we can no longer print the medical codes on the back. That really defeats the purpose of the bill of giving law enforcement emergency personnel a heads-up about medical conditions. Our DMV director decided to continue what we were doing, which we have been doing for 20 years, and then try to correct it this session.

Assemblymember Dickman:
So, you have been doing this for 20 years—we also in the past had the symbol we allowed last time. Do you keep a database of the people who have had these on their cards for the past 20 years?

Martin Hefner:
If you are talking about a separate database, no; these are indicated on a person's general driving record. The forms themselves and everything are maintained separately in a database only accessible by certain DMV staff. It is not readily accessible to any other outside or even internal DMV individuals.

Assemblymember Karris:
Another great presentation; we are going to know it by heart soon. I just wanted to clarify the purpose and that the original intent of these codes is to possibly prevent an incorrect incarceration of someone who might just need their medication, and that it was not a DUI issue. Is that correct?

Sean Sever:
Yes, that is correct. If a motorist is pulled over on the side of the road, say they are passed out, law enforcement—emergency personnel most of all—can check what this person's condition is and maybe help them sooner than if they did not know what is going on.

Chair Watts:
I will follow up briefly on this, and again, there has been a lot of clarification going on the record, but I think it is helpful to understand a little bit more about the legislative history. There is a lot of information that has historically gone on the back of a driver's license, from the endorsement about what vehicles you can operate—I have had the corrective lens note on mine for quite some time. Then what we looked at last session—at the request of folks with

particular medical conditions who are concerned there might be interactions with law enforcement or emergency personnel where they are not aware of their conditions and how to appropriately respond—was requested legislation to allow them to come to you and ask that they have this information added to their records so that, in the event of interaction with emergency personnel, that could be identified. That could include a range of health issues—hard of hearing, or other issues which may impact people, so folks can interact appropriately.

So again, I just want to get that on the record. What you are saying is, basically, we allowed you to have some indication on the front of the ID so somebody could realize there is something that needs to be looked at. When that was put into place, we accidentally impeded the ability for the DMV to put information on the back with a code so people can understand. What this does is clean that up. It is still a 100 percent voluntary program and is not envisioned as ever being anything different. Someone could come forward if they wish to have this information available to other people, and it sounds like it has an even higher level of data security to ensure the information is protected. Is my understanding correct?

Sean Sever:
You got it, Chair.

Assemblymember Gallant:
I am just curious, because you do keep this information, every time somebody renews, is it automatic that this form is done so you just do it the same way? Is there a process if somebody says, Hey, I do not want that information on my ID anymore. What would that look like?

Martin Hefner:
In those instances, yes. Typically, people who have the indicator on there keep it there for the duration of however long they maintain their license, and it is automatically renewed at each renewal. If someone were to come at renewal time and indicate they did not want the indicator on there, they can submit a letter to DMV so we can go ahead and process it accordingly to have the indicator removed.

Chair Watts:
Members, any other questions for the presenters? [There were none.] We are going to move on to testimony. A couple of additional notes on testimony—I see the room is full here, and I think we have some overflow. I am going to ask a couple of things: if this is the issue you have come here to speak about, please consider leaving the room after you have finished your remarks so others can come in. As I stated before, we are going to limit comments to 2 minutes per person, 20 minutes each for support, opposition, and neutral testimony.

Testimony in support means you support the bill as it is written. Opposition means you oppose the bill as written. If you like the bill, but you have an amendment you want to provide to change the bill, that still means you are in opposition to the bill as it is presented. Neutral testimony means you have no position on the bill whatsoever, it is essentially to

provide neutral information. So that is how we are going to proceed. We are going to begin with testimony in support of Assembly Bill 20.

Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director, Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities, Department of Health and Human Services:
We testified last year several times on the bills that brought forward the symbol on the driver's license. After all of the concerns were worked through, the bill passed with no concerns on our front. We did have conversations with the DMV about this change, and we do realize it is just as simple as adding back in those codes, so we have no concerns.

I have epilepsy, my daughter is a type 1 diabetic, and we do see the very big benefit to notifying police, especially as the member has noted that we do not want to get pulled over and thought we are drunk or something of that nature if it is just a medical thing. Thank you so much, we have no concerns.

Dora Martinez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
I ditto Ms. Catherine Nielsen. I do not have a car, but I am blind, and I think it makes sense and hopefully it is voluntary. Thank you.

Chair Watts:
Thank you, Ms. Martinez, it definitely is. It is wonderful to see you here in person. You have brightened all of our days.

Andrew MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association:
I was going to say nice to see you all again, but I guess it is nice to see you since this is actually my first time I have been at the table in the Committee. I will keep my remarks very short. We supported the bill last session, obviously because many of my dealer members, their family members, our employees, as well as our customers, saw the definite utility in it and did not anticipate the unintended consequence of it. We support the bill under those auspices as well as the fact we appreciate what DMV is doing as they continue to streamline and modernize their efforts and going to more electronic communications.

And then lastly, it is wonderful to see Ms. Martinez in person. She has the most wonderful voice when she testifies telephonically. It is cool, like I have seen a legend for the first time in my life. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, thank you for your time.

Chair Watts:
Thank you very much, Mr. MacKay, and yes, Ms. Martinez is a legislative celebrity. It is true.

Seeing no one else coming forward in Carson City and seeing no one coming forward in Las Vegas, is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in support of Assembly Bill 20 by phone? [There was no one.]

We will move on to testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 20. If you would like to testify in opposition, either in Carson City or Las Vegas, please come forward.

Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families for Freedom:
I know there has been something on the back of the driver's licenses for many years saying there is some type of medical problem, and I think that is great. I do not have a problem with that, but I was worried about the HIPAA laws, but that was addressed already.

I did have a question. If a person has more than one condition, how many conditions are you going to put on the back? All the little numbers for each condition, or is it just going to be one? What would happen with that, and would all of the person's medical information be available to DMV? Who would be authorized to collect the information from the DMV? I heard it was private, but what about insurance companies, tow yards, attorneys, police, private investigators?

I know in years past the DMV would sell our personal information for one cent a piece, and I testified to that back in the early 2000s. The Department of Motor Vehicles was making millions of dollars all around the country, all the DMVs around the country were doing that. I do worry about having another national or state government database. We are in so many databases, and I worry about it because our banking information and national security and so many other entities in our lives have been hacked. Our private information is private until it is not, and I do worry.

Janine Hansen, Chairman, Independent American Party of Nevada:
I am representing the Independent American Party today; I am the State Chairman. I have had quite an experience this last week. I had two credit cards hacked and my bank account. I had no access to money and, for a woman, that is a really bad thing. This is a particular concern to me because I found this article from autoinsurance.org, and it shows the worst DMV and DOT [Department of Transportation] data breaches by state, and Nevada is listed as fourth, that we have had the most data breaches with our DMV.

This is a significant concern. We do not want our private health information creating an opportunity for invasion of privacy, discrimination based on whatever disease or problem we might have, or mental health issues. Who knows what might be available, not only to the police, but who knows who else, and data breaches. We are very concerned about this particular bill, and we do not think it is necessary. They can wear a bracelet if they have a significant condition they need to be aware of. My son has been suffering with cancer this last year, and he has to have special alerts for him because he has a medical problem. So, there are other ways to do this. And once again, we need to be very concerned because there is not a database, including the federal government, that has not been breached, and this is open to that.

Theresa DeGraffenreid, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:
I am speaking in opposition to A.B. 20 on behalf of myself. I am opposed to the idea of this bill on lots of fronts, but mainly ditto on it being wrought with data breaches. I noticed that

adding these new items has no fiscal note attached to it, yet money has to come from somewhere for the computer systems that will surely be put in place to accommodate such an idea.

The third thing is, my husband is a retired EMT [Emergency Medical Technician], and he spent 20 years coming upon accident scenes and never once looked in a victim's wallet to see what disease they may have had. They assessed the situation, did what needed to be done to aid the person, and when someone is injured who has a medical condition, it is best to have notification of that on their person, such as a medical bracelet, not in their wallet. Vote no on A.B. 20.

Bob Russo, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:
I want to express my opposition to A.B. 20. I believe that allowing the DMV to adopt individual symbols and codes on driver's licenses and keeping the personal medical information of Nevada residents in their databases—which to my knowledge would be available to law enforcement—is a direct intrusion into the private lives of Nevadans. What is to prevent one's personal medical data from being leaked to other agencies or actually stolen, as you know that happens—common—and where could this lead?

I understand this is optional; a person can, you know they do not have to do it, but what is to prevent this from at some point in time becoming mandatory? This could potentially lead to that. So just given that alone, I cannot support this bill, and I cannot support having one's private medical information in a government database that could end up who knows where. In my opinion, that information should be kept within one's family and between patient and physician.

Casey Rogers, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:
I would echo everything that has been stated before, but it is our right and our liberty to choose whether we want something like this on our driver's license. It is our medical information and, therefore, does not belong to the government. It does not belong in a database, and if you make it mandatory, you are undermining those who do not believe it is your right to have it. That is all I would say. Thank you.

Chair Watts:
Thank you. I want to take a moment to clarify that nothing in this legislation is mandatory. I think the question was asked regarding what the protection against it is. It is the Legislature. So, nothing in statute would authorize the mandatory collection of any of this data. In order for that to happen, another bill would have to be brought before this legislative body.

Katrin Sienkiewicz, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:
I am very concerned about the potential for the serious violation of people's civil liberties and our rights to medical privacy. I also want to clarify that the presenters indicated that this has been done for the last 20 years. But from what I am understanding, medical codes and medical information has not been done for 20 years. That was just introduced in 2023 as a

new aspect to go onto the back of the IDs. So, if somebody wants to clarify that later, that would be great.

But I just want to point out that that is new as of 2023—that we are talking about medical information on your driver's license. Existing language in the bill that begins on page 3, line 39 lists the medical conditions that currently qualify for that single code on the back of the driver's license. It shows 15 ICD [International Classification of Diseases] codes in that list of included diseases. Item 16 [*sic*] says mental illness. Now, the APA [American Psychiatric Association], which is the psychiatrist association's DSM [Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders] manual of their diagnostic codes, has 297 different medical conditions that qualify as a "mental illness." So, you already have 312 different disorders in law as it is written that would need to be individually classified on the back.

Furthermore, the existing language in the bill says that it requires that the public be given a means to request additional diagnoses to be added. There are more than 17,000 ICD codes. Where does it end? Who is going to approve those individual codes to be added? What is the process? Who makes the decision? And how long is Nevada's list going to be? Is it going to be that entire DSM database of more than 17,000 codes plus the DSM codes? Sorry, I am almost done.

Chair Watts:
Yes, you are at two minutes, so if you could wrap it up, please.

Katrin Sienkiewicz:
And lastly, I was just going to mention good luck to the first responder on scene trying to figure out what that code means. I just want to say the medical portion of Assembly Bill 20 seems very poorly thought out and needs to be removed from the bill.

Chair Watts:
If you have any additional remarks, please feel free to submit them in writing to our staff.

Karen Stephens, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:
I am here to oppose this bill, and everybody has spoken so eloquently about the reasons not to approve this that I am just echoing their remarks.

Chair Watts:
Is there anyone else here in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to provide testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 20? [There was no one] Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 20 by phone?

Elisabeth Lernhardt, Private Citizen, Zephyr Cove, Nevada:
I reside in Zephyr Cove, and I am testifying against this bill. As a physician, I have never thought I would like the HIPAA law. It was brought forth as a federal law, but today I really wholeheartedly appreciate it because this law protects exactly this kind of release of medical conditions. As a physician, I know that these diagnoses are fluctuating, they are not a static

situation, and there are many other ways, including a medical alert bracelet like Ms. DeGraffenreid mentioned, that should be used to put on the wrist or around the neck of a person who has a condition that needs immediate attention.

In addition, this law violates Article VI of the *Constitution* because it supersedes state law. Further, the DMV has never really rebounded from COVID-19. They still do not have enough people to have walk-in appointments. They certainly do not have the medical expertise nor the function to make any of these determinations. Nor does the police or any other people in the field who would encounter a victim. Where would the DMV obtain such information?

As a physician, I can tell you that you cannot rely on self-reporting, it is not accurate. It would create an enormous burden on physicians and hospitals and would also put them at a conflict of liability. A HIPAA law for the first incident of violation is $50,000. Vote no on this bill; it is overreaching and violates our civil liberties as well as multiple laws. It is superfluous because there are many other ways to basically deal with these problems.

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I will oppose this bill. I will ditto the previous comments. That will yield my time.

Jim DeGraffenreid, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:
I am a resident of Douglas County, and I am here on my own behalf in opposition to A.B. 20. I want to ditto the comments that were made earlier regarding the privacy of the information if the DMV is going to keep a database of medical conditions, and the hacking issues that go along with that, even if the program is voluntary.

I would also like to echo the comments about first responders being able to use these symbols at accident scenes or medical calls. I was a firefighter/EMT for 20 years. What we look for is medical ID jewelry. There is not going to be time in an emergency situation to search for a driver's license and then to look up the meaning of one of maybe hundreds or even thousands of codes that could be on one of these licenses. The current system works very well.

Finally, section 3 of this bill addresses an unrelated subject, authorizing and requiring the department to send notification by email in addition to U.S. mail when verifying insurance coverage. I own an insurance agency, and I am aware that the current practice of the department is to supplement U.S. mail with the email. My clients do forward me the emails to assist them in verifying coverage. This shows that the department has been able to address this commonsense issue by regulation, and we do not need to further expand NRS [*Nevada Revised Statutes*] to address this. So, for these reasons, I urge the Committee to not pass Assembly Bill 20.

Michael Ryan, Private Citizen, Nevada:
I am a long-time resident of Nevada and a Marine Corps veteran. Please vote no on A.B. 20. This is big government which continually expands. Now, this bill is being positioned

100 percent voluntary. Next, it may become mandatory. There is potential for data breaches in HIPAA violations. This is very, very concerning. Please vote no on A.B. 20.

[Exhibit D includes a collection of letters and emails in opposition to A.B. 20.]

Chair Watts:
Next caller please. [There was no one.] Is there anyone here in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to provide testimony in the neutral position on Assembly Bill 20? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in neutral position on Assembly Bill 20 by phone? [There was no one.]

I will invite our presenters to come up for closing remarks. Perhaps if you want to talk about any potential sale of data and reiterate the limits of what can be disclosed in your closing remarks, that may be helpful.

Sean Sever:
Once again, this is a housekeeping bill to correct S.B. 362 from last session. We are not tracking people; we do not share people's medical information. We have been putting the codes on the back of the driver's license for 20 years. The medical indicator was new the last session. This is totally a voluntary option for our customers. We have no plans to make it mandatory. In fact, if we did have to make it mandatory, I think we would have to come back here for a statute change. We never put the medical conditions on the driver's license, it is just a code, it is a number.

The information about a data breach, that is news to us because we have a very strong security team at the DMV. I am not aware of any data breaches, and I have been at DMV for five years. Then to add more medical codes, we can do that through regulations, but there are no plans to do that. One of the last comments is that DMV does not have enough people to serve our customers. That is actually true. That is why we are moving all of our services online. We are happy to work with anybody who has concerns over this bill, and I appreciate your hearing it today.

Chair Watts:
Thank you very much, Mr. Sever. With that, I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 20. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 140, which revises provisions governing driver authorization cards. We will welcome Assemblymember González to our Committee.

Assembly Bill 140: Revises provisions governing driver authorization cards. (BDR 43-200)

Assemblymember Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16:
Good afternoon, members of the Committee on Growth and Infrastructure. My name is Assemblymember Cecelia González, and I have the pleasure of representing Assembly District 16 in Las Vegas, Nevada. I am presenting to you Assembly Bill 140, which is actually a reintroduction of A.B. 336 from the 2023 Legislative Session. I appreciate those of

you who supported it in this Committee that time, and this time we are bringing it back as we all are aware of our very short legislative process. Hopefully this time we have more time to get it through. I will now kick it to my co-presenter Erika Castro, who will give a brief history of the bill, and then I will give you a short walk through and hopefully we will wrap up in 15 minutes.

Erika Castro, Organizing Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada; and representing the Nevada Immigrant Coalition:

I first want to thank Assemblymember González for bringing A.B. 140 once again to this body. We are continuously grateful for her commitment to working with our communities to make sure that the state is fair and just for all. It is my privilege to be here presenting with her today. I am here on behalf of the Nevada Immigrant Coalition, which works to ensure that immigrants, refugees, and new American voices are heard at all levels of government to advocate for humane and fair policies across the state. We believe in working towards a Nevada that welcomes, respects, and protects everyone regardless of their immigration status.

Additionally, I am also the organizing director with PLAN, the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada. As a community organizer, I often hear about the benefits of having the privilege to drive and the sense of stability it can bring to those who are not eligible for a standard or REAL ID license. Before the implementation of DACs [driver authorization cards], such immigrants in Nevada were unable to obtain driver's licenses and auto insurance, which made driving a risky and potentially dangerous situation not only for the undocumented immigrants, but also anybody who is driving on our roads. This makes DACs crucial to our public safety since it ensures all drivers regardless of their immigration status are tested and insured while on the road. Driving with DACs allows folks to feel safe and secure. Thousands of Nevadans have been able to obtain their DACs and become trusted, tested, and insured drivers on our roads, allowing many of them to drive safely to school, to their jobs, to drop off their kids at school, to make doctor's visits, and become full members of the state they call home.

It has been over ten years since this bipartisan law was passed and signed by Governor Sandoval, and we have some changes we would like to make. The goals for A.B. 140 is for DAC holders to have the same renewal process as their standard driver's license. This would mean that the renewal process and fees for DACs would mirror that of our standard Nevada driver's license to ensure equity for all. As it currently stands, DAC holders have to renew their driving privileges more frequently than those who have standard or REAL ID-compliant driver's licenses, four years versus eight years.

This means DAC holders are spending more money and time at the DMV compared to those with standard driver's licenses or REAL IDs. We all know that it is not a quick trip to the DMV, and with limited walk-in options, this means DAC holders might need to take time off work to renew their DACs, especially since DAC holders are not able to renew online. For many in this economy, taking time off work is not always feasible. By making these updates we are lessening the cost burden of DAC holders and also reducing congestion at the DMV,

given that DAC holders would need to renew less often, creating a positive impact for all Nevadans and the DMV.

Lastly, it is important to know, as stated by Senator Moises "Mo" Denis in his original presentation of Senate Bill 303 of the 77th Session in 2013, that there are other Nevadans who can benefit from DACs as well, not just undocumented immigrants. For example, someone who lost their original documentation due to a natural disaster, such as the fires we sometimes see in northern Nevada, or a student who just moved to our state and does not have their passport or original birth certificate but does have a driver's license from another state. Even a military member who only has a U.S. military identification card and is unable to produce the REAL ID or standard license required proof of identification could obtain a DAC to legally drive on our roads. Now, I will pass it over to Assemblymember González to speak more directly on the provisions of the bill. Thank you for your time and consideration of this bill. We look forward for your support or discussion if you are not there yet.

Assemblymember González:
Section 1 makes changes to subsection 6 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) by removing provisions that the DAC expires after four years and also by deleting provisions that would have provided an exception to the four-year expiration requirement. This exception authorizes the DMV to defer the DAC expiration to those on active duty in the military, which is now part of subsection [*sic*] 2. Section 2 amends NRS by changing the expiration date of the DAC to be prescribed by regulation, so that it follows the same period of the issuance and expiration of a regular driver's license unless otherwise required by federal law. It also allows the DMV, again through regulations, to defer the DAC's expiration date for military members. Section 3 prescribes the effective date, and with that, we will take any questions.

Chair Watts:
Thank you very much for your presentation. Members, do we have any questions for the presenters?

Assemblymember Carter:
Do applicants for DAC have to pass all of the same exams and provide all of the same information, such as maintaining insurance and everything else just like I do?

Assemblymember González:
I want to say yes. I also believe that is probably a question for the DMV. I believe they are still in the room.

Chair Watts:
We can have them come up just to provide that clarity.

Molly Lennon, RPM Administrator, Division of Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles:
The driver authorization card does not verify that they carry insurance, but they are required to be tested just like any other driver's license holder. Insurance is required when they register their vehicle legally.

Assemblymember Moore:
I was here in 2013; I was the committee manager for that committee when this original bill was first heard. I do have a question around the DAC, and it is probably more for the DMV, but does the DAC look any different than the regular driver's license or REAL ID, like the one I have?

Assemblymember González:
It does look different. I think the only difference is it actually has a provision on there that is written—I want to say in the right-hand corner—that says, Not for identification purposes, or, Not for federal use, something of that nature. So, it is marked differently on the physical card.

Chair Watts:
I do have one question. I know there were conversations about this issue during the last legislative session. One of the concerns with the original version of that prior bill was making sure that it aligns, because sometimes the renewal periods change, particularly for our senior citizens. As this bill is presented, it is intended—as long as authorized by federal law—to mirror the driver authorization card's every four-year renewal period, except for a potential extension if there is an extenuating circumstance. This would have it be an eight-year renewal if that person is in that age range to get an eight-year extension and meets those qualifications. But, if they were a senior or in another qualification group where they would have a four-year renewal, they would mirror that four-year renewal. Is that correct?

Assemblymember González:
Yes, that is correct.

Chair Watts:
Seeing no other questions from the members of the Committee, thank you very much for your presentation. We will now move on to testimony. We will start with testimony in support of Assembly Bill 140. Is there anyone here in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to provide testimony in support of Assembly Bill 140?

Tara Webster, Policy Manager, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:
I am here on behalf of the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada (PLAN). I would like to begin by thanking Assemblymember González for introducing this important legislation that addresses the social burdens and inefficiency of the current driver authorization card process. This legislation also creates a pathway for everyday Nevadans who utilize DAC cards to avoid severe consequences if they lose their card or need a replacement to safely operate their vehicles on public roadways.

Since the pandemic, wait times at the DMV have hit an unprecedented average of two months, sometimes longer. If you cannot log into the DMV portal to schedule an appointment, then you might as well kick rocks. I am here to testify because this week has been especially stressful after I lost my wallet and driver's license while I was taking my son to the farmer's market on Sunday. I looked high and low for it, could not find it, so I decided it was time to order a new card. I was able to log into the DMV this morning. I clicked duplicate license, entered my billing information and voila, a new card is on the way. So, this process was really simple for me. It was streamlined, took less than five minutes, and it required no human interaction. I do not have to waste any time thinking about my driver's license until it expires years down the road.

I am telling you this story because having a DAC does not have a direct impact on me, but it does for those who possess these cards. They do not share the same streamlined experience that I had. Not only do they have to renew their card every four years in comparison to my eight, but if they lose their card, they have to schedule an in-person appointment. They cannot do that online, or they have to take a chance that they might get in as a walk-in and be seen the same day. Unfortunately, walk-ins are only on Wednesdays and that is only at some DMV locations. Last summer that was not an option halfway through the year when the DMV suspended walk-in services due to extreme heat across the state. There was someone who was affected by this who said, I was there thinking it was a walk-in day, late to work, lost four hours of my shift because I thought I could get in without an appointment, and there was no sign on the door saying walk-ins were canceled.

As you can see, these types of obstacles are a huge social burden to Nevadans who rely on DACs. Taking time off work puts people's jobs at risk, and having to renew every four years instead of eight adds an unnecessary congestion at the DMV offices. So again, on behalf of PLAN, we urge your support for A.B. 140.

Eric Jeng, Executive Director, One APIA Nevada:
I am the executive director of One APIA Nevada, advocating and organizing the fast-growing Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander community. We have sent in our support statement to the Committee [Exhibit E]. It echoes our support statement from the last session for this bill, but I just want to highlight, from a public safety perspective, A.B. 140 encourages and enables more drivers to maintain valid licenses, take required tests, and carry insurance, which benefits everyone on Nevada's roads. Safer, insured drivers mean fewer accidents and lower costs for all in one of the highest auto insurance rate states.

Noé Orosco, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada:
I am the government affairs manager for Make the Road Nevada, and we are a member of the Nevada Immigrant Coalition. Having a driver authorization card enables individuals to perform essential daily activities and improve their overall quality of life. For example, parents can safely transport their children to and from school without the added stress of either public transportation or carpooling. Beyond school transportation, having the ability to drive grants people access to crucial medical care. Individuals can visit a doctor's office, seek

medical emergency treatment, and fill prescriptions without being dependent on friends, family, or what can quickly become costly rideshare services. Access to personal transportation also plays a key role in addressing food insecurity. As many of us know, Nevada is no stranger to food deserts.

These are just some of the things people do not have to worry about if they have this driver authorization card. I want to reiterate that this is not something new they are trying to create. It is simply trying to extend it from four to eight years. We urge you to support this bill.

Vincent Nava, Senior Advisor, Office for New Americans, Office of the Governor:
I am a proud resident of Nevada speaking in strong support of A.B. 140. This is a bill about fairness, efficiency, and ensuring Nevada's roads remain safe for everyone. I also want to thank Assemblymember González and the bill sponsors for their leadership in making Nevada policies more just and equitable. For Nevadans, driving is not a luxury, it is a necessity. It is how parents take their kids to school, how workers get to their jobs, and how families access basic needs. But right now, driver authorization card holders face more frequent requirements than other drivers, costing more time and money. These hardworking Nevadans already follow the law, take their driving tests, and pay their fees just like anyone else.

Assembly Bill 140 simply brings fairness by aligning DAC renewals with standard driving licenses. This is not just good for DAC holders; it is also good for Nevada as a whole. Fewer renewals mean less congestion at the DMV, more time for staff to serve the drivers, and more insured, tested, and responsible drivers on the road. This is why I am wearing this pin as a symbol of importance for transportation in our community, access to safe and reliable transportation, opportunity, stability, and security. Overall, A.B. 140 is a simple fix with a big impact and removes the unnecessary barriers for working families and ensures fair and common [unintelligible] for all Nevadans. I urge your support for this bill, and I thank you and the Committee once again for your time.

Salma Garcia-Hernandez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am a mother, wife, and active community member residing in Assembly District No. 3. I am here to testify in support of Assembly Bill 140. As an immigrant, I have personal experience with the driver authorization card process and the current DMV system. While I am fortunate to be a green card holder, which now allows me to have a standard driver license, I feel compelled to advocate for those who hold driver authorization cards. I know the DMV profits from the current system, but many of these individuals are also mothers and hardworking Nevada taxpayers who deserve a renewal process that is just like the rest of us. I believe it is crucial that driver authorization cards have the same expiration system as standard licenses. As an immigrant mother, I understand the challenges of frequently having to renew both my driver authorization and immigrant statuses. I urge you to support this policy to lessen the burden on our communities who are simply trying to drive safely on our roads. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Chair Watts:
Seeing no one else coming forward in Las Vegas, do we have anyone wishing to provide testimony in support of Assembly Bill 140 by phone?

Melissa Corral, Deputy Managing Attorney, William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas:
I am the deputy managing attorney of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) Immigration Clinic. I am speaking today on the clinic's behalf but not on behalf of UNLV as a whole and/or Nevada System of Higher Education. As an attorney, I am here to testify in support of A.B. 140. In 2013, the Nevada Legislature and Governor Sandoval created driving authorization cards for immigrants living in this state. The purpose of these cards is simply to help make Nevada's roads safer. As of now, these cards are renewable every four years. What this bill asks for is to make the renewal periods the same as most driver's licenses, which currently is eight years. While some Nevadans do still have to renew their licenses every four years based on age, these requirements would also apply for those holding a driver authorization card.

A driver's license is an essential lifeline for people to get to work, pick their kids up from school, visit the doctor's office, and travel around their communities safely and easily. Driver authorization cards allow Nevadans to perform these essential day-to-day tasks legally, the same way driver's licenses do for the rest of Nevada's population. Additionally, driver authorization cards ensure Nevada roads have trained, tested, licensed, and insured drivers on the roads. One of the main purposes of driver authorization cards was to allow immigrants to obtain car insurance, which is something they were unable to do before the creation of these cards. Driver authorization cards ensure everyone is covered and protected at the time of an accident. Standardizing the requirements will allow the DMV to streamline renewals and ensure consistency in licensing regulations. It will also avoid making some Nevadans pay more government fees because their driver's licenses expire faster and must be renewed more often.

Chair Watts:
Thank you, and if you can begin to wrap up your comments please.

Melissa Corral:
This bill is carefully drafted to avoid any conflict with federal law. The functions of a driver authorization card is the same as driver's licenses and as such there should be no difference in the renewal period. I thank you for your time.

Denise Bolaños-Heredia, Associate Director, Return Strong!:
I am the associate director of Return Strong! Nevada, and we are in strong support of A.B. 140. This bill is a simple fix that makes a big difference. Right now, people with driver authorization cards must renew more often than those with standard licenses, meaning that they pay more in fees. Aligning the expiration dates would save working families money and also reduce unnecessary workload at the DMV.

This is also a criminal justice issue. Many formerly incarcerated individuals rely on driver authorization cards after release if they cannot meet strict identity verification requirements for a standard license. Reducing renewal costs and bureaucratic barriers makes reentry easier and it helps prevent unnecessary financial hardship. Assembly Bill 140 is about fairness, efficiency, and this is a good bill. I urge you to support it.

Ashley Dotson, Private Citizen, Nevada:
This is Ashley Dotson on behalf of [unintelligible] calling in full support of A.B. 140. Thank you so much.

Leslie Vega, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I urge you to vote in favor of A.B. 140. I grew up in the state of Nevada with parents who benefited from a driver authorization card. I want to share that as a child it brings great relief to know that parents are safe, that we are safe. I urge you to approve and to vote in favor of A.B. 140.

Chair Watts:
Next caller please. [There was no one.] With that, we will move to testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 140. Anyone wishing to provide testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 140 in Carson City or Las Vegas, please come forward.

Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families for Freedom:
We have people from all around the world coming to our country, and we do not know who they are and what they are up to. We have many good people coming here with no ill intent to our people or our country, but we also have gangs, terrorists, and criminals coming here. We do not know who is who and that is a problem. Giving driver's licenses to people when we do not have any way to know who they are is difficult enough, but now you want to give driver's licenses to anyone and everyone and to extend the time in between expiration dates; they would have the same privileges as American citizens.

American citizens are told they have to have the REAL ID by May of this year, and there is a lot of documentation that we as American citizens have to provide to prove who we are. There is a lot of documentation if you have gone through marriage and divorce and a lot to do. Do illegals have to provide the same documentation? I doubt it. Extending the time between expiration dates is the wrong action to take. We American citizens who are 65 years of age and older do not have the privilege of an extended time between expiration dates. We only get four years at a time; that is called discrimination, I believe. Please vote no on A.B. 140. Thank you.

Chair Watts:
Thank you, Ms. Chapman. I do just want to make it clear that senior citizens would be treated the same regardless of their identification card status under this bill as proposed.

Theresa DeGraffenreid, First Vice Chairman, Douglas County Republicans:
I am here on behalf of the Nevada Republican Party in opposition to A.B. 140. Our party platform states that we support legal immigration, assimilation, and that we oppose sanctuary jurisdictions. Providing full driver's license with reduced documentation is a form of sanctuary. When Nevada first decided to make it easier for noncitizens to get a driver's license compared to citizens, the argument was we could not stop noncitizens from driving on the roads illegally, so we needed to issue them some kind of card so that the state could track registration and insurance laws and make our roads safer. That argument is false, and the facts show it to be untrue.

Driver authorization cards are required by law to look exactly like a driver's license, but they do not carry the same penalties. For example, under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 485.326 a licensed citizen driver in Nevada can have their registration and driving privilege suspended if they fail to carry insurance, but the same penalties do not apply to driver authorization cards, which are not defined as licenses in NRS. This law is nothing more than an attempt to further erase differences between driver authorization cards and driver's licenses and allow noncitizens to continue to enjoy greater driving privileges than Nevada citizens, but with lower requirements. That makes no sense. If we are requiring less documentation from a driver to get a license, then we need to follow up with them more often than we do with those going through the complete process. Please do not continue to prioritize noncitizens over Nevada citizens. Vote no on A.B. 140. Thank you.

Janine Hansen, Chairman, Independent American Party of Nevada:
Nearly every session since 2013, since DAC passed, there have been bills to lessen the regulations and to make them more like driver's licenses. Of course, that is always what happens with legislation, is it not? Originally, they are supposed to be up and down in their orientation rather than side to side like ours are, but that was done away with, as well as many of the other regulations that were required for those who are not American citizens.

One of the biggest problems that I have discussed previously with the Office of the Secretary of State—the previous Secretary of State—was that there is no difference on those driver authorization cards in the numbering system for driver's licenses than there is for driver authorization cards. This has created a huge problem in trying to determine for those who register to vote at the Department of Motor Vehicles who is actually a citizen and who is not, because there is no difference in the numbering system for a driver authorization card and a driver's license.

We think there should be certain rights and privileges for being American citizens and being born here, and we think it is important to maintain some of those privileges to make sure that it makes a difference to be an American citizen. We are also concerned with the continual degeneration and making them altogether exactly the same, and we need to be able to know who the people are who are here. We appreciate what you are trying to do, but we are opposed to this bill. Thank you.

Joy Trushenski, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:
I am a non-paid lobbyist for conservative causes. I oppose A.B. 140. I support legal immigration, but I do not support people coming across our border that have not been vetted. I know we have thousands of illegals in Nevada and the driver authorization cards were established for illegals and are different. I believe they should remain different and should not be similar to the Nevada driver's licenses. I oppose changing the renewal dates for driver authorization cards, and I think illegals should not be given more privileges than Nevada citizens. Thank you for your time.

Casey Rogers, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:
I would just echo exactly what Mrs. Hansen had brought forth. It is enough to oppose the bill on that alone.

Chair Watts:
Anyone else wishing to provide testimony in opposition here in Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone that would like to provide testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 140 by phone?

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I will definitely ditto the comments made by the previous speakers. We are at a time right now where the vast majority of the population—highest approval was concerned about unauthorized immigration. We believe this bill will incentivize this act. We also are concerned that people who had that status before were the ones who presented this bill. So we need to understand that this bill comes with a lot of red flags and thank you so much. I will yield my time.

Michael Ryan, Private Citizen, Nevada:
I am a long-time resident of Nevada and a Marine Corps veteran. Please vote no on A.B. 140, extending the renewal for driver authorization cards for illegal aliens from four to eight years. This bill is attempting to treat illegal aliens like U.S. citizens. They are not U.S. citizens. Please stop this nonsense. Vote no on A.B. 140.

Elisabeth Lernhardt, Private Citizen, Zephyr Cover, Nevada:
As a legal immigrant who has obtained citizenship, I have spent thousands of dollars. I feel insulted by the previous testimony to get upset about a $15 fee for a driver's license, which is what I paid with my recent renewal. I think it is clear that the DMV is overwhelmed with their tasks, as we have heard from multiple people giving testimony. Why would we overburden them in addition to this? I do not understand why we preferentially treat illegal aliens over legal aliens that are following the law and are willing to abide by the law.

I feel discriminated by this law, and I think this makes it harder on U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to verify the location of illegals in this country. It also, as I can prove, shows that the DMV cannot separate legal and illegal people here when it comes to voting. They have sent me voters' registration and told me I am a legal voter when I was not, and it did reflect this on my driver's license. So I really do not think we could trust DMV to make it

illegal to be able to vote. I urge you to consider this aspect of the law and vote no on it. Thank you for your attention.

Pauline Lee, Private Citizen, Nevada:
This is actually a highway safety issue if A.B. 140 passes. Driver authorization cards are supposed to serve as a temporary gap measure to give the driver experience in operating a vehicle so that the driver can then ultimately pass the driver's test. The goal is for the person to obtain a driver's license issued by the State of Nevada. You not only need additional documentation, but as you remember, the person also has to go through the dreaded practical driver's license test. So, as some of our teenage drivers recall, this was one of the most difficult practical tests they have to take.

Many of the advocates for A.B. 140 talk about it being a simple fix, a simple renewal process, but there is nothing simple about extending a driver authorization card. The goal for them should be to eventually get a driver's license. If they are here with a simple driver authorization card, it should not be that hard for them to extend for another four years if in fact they have an intention to stay in this country and to apply for citizenship. This is a true public safety issue.

In 2024, Nevada experienced one of the deadliest years in terms of fatalities on our roads. In Clark County alone, traffic deaths rose nearly 14 percent in 2024 with 293 deaths compared to the 258 in 2023. These numbers can all be found in the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. My fear, and I think the fear for all of us Nevadans, is that the extension of the driver authorization cards will result in an increase in terms of insurance premiums, which continue to grow because of the number of fatalities in Nevada. In conclusion, I urge you to please not vote in favor of A.B. 140. Thank you.

[Exhibit F includes a collection of letters and emails in opposition to A.B. 140.]

Chair Watts:
Next caller please. [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in the neutral position on Assembly Bill 140.

Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Division of Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles:
We are neutral on A.B. 140. But mark this moment in time, the DMV has actually submitted a positive fiscal impact in our fiscal note for this bill, and this is just a result of the timing when DACs are due for renewal. The DMV will see a spike in revenue with people renewing the first four years and then a drop when people do not have to come back until their eighth year. The main positive is that the programming costs will be absorbed by the DMV. I guess it is DMV day today in the Committee. So, if I can clear up some of the questions that were asked?

Chair Watts:
Go ahead, please provide some additional information.

Sean Sever:
On the card it does say "not for identification purposes," and the reason for that is the original intent for DACs was just to allow for driving privileges. The second one is on our appointment system. We did cancel our walk-in system, but we do have a hybrid system now online where customers can sign up on Tuesday evenings for immediate next day appointments on Wednesdays. Last but not least, adding DACs online is part of our department Transformation Effort, but we possibly could even do that sooner and we are going to take a look at that. Thanks.

Chair Watts:
Thank you. Though this is not a fiscal committee, Christmas has come early with a positive fiscal note from the department. We will make note, see if we can get it into the Assembly floor journal as well. Seeing no one else coming forward to provide neutral testimony in Carson City or Las Vegas, do we have anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony by phone? [There was no one.] Would the sponsor like to make any closing comments?

Assemblymember González:
I just want to thank the Committee for your time today in hearing this bill and I look forward to working with all of you. Thank you.

Chair Watts:
With that, I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 140. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 168, which revises provisions relating to bicycles, electric bicycles, and electric scooters, at least for now.

Assembly Bill 168: Revises provisions relating to bicycles, electric bicycles and electric scooters. (BDR 43-598)

Assemblymember Heather Goulding, Assembly District No. 27:
I represent Assembly District No. 27 in Washoe County. It is my privilege today to present Assembly Bill 168, which seeks to revise certain traffic laws that impact the safety of bicyclists in Nevada. I am joined now by Ky Plaskon, who represents the Nevada Bicycle Coalition, and he will be able to assist in addressing any questions that you might have.

Intersections are the most dangerous places for bicyclists. In fact, more than 25 percent of all cyclists' fatalities occur in intersections. This presents a significant concern, as cyclists are naturally eager to clear intersections as quickly as possible to minimize their exposure to these potential hazards. However, current Nevada traffic laws require cyclists, just like motorists, to come to a full stop at stop signs. The challenge is that bikes are not like cars. While both cars and bikes lose momentum when stopping, bicycles require a significantly higher level of effort to regain speed and momentum. This struggle to regain momentum in order to safely proceed through an intersection is a real concern to cyclists. They often approach intersections cautiously, checking for traffic before proceeding if it is safe to do so. However, this safe practice is disrupted under current laws that mandate a full stop at every stop sign, even when the intersection is clear.

This brings me to Assembly Bill 168, which proposes a solution to this issue by introducing the "Stop-As-Yield" approach, often referred to as the "Idaho Stop Law." This practice was first enacted in Idaho in 1982 and was expanded in 2005. It allows cyclists to treat stop signs as yield signs, enabling them to proceed through intersections after yielding to traffic, provided it is safe to do so.

This bill would also address a second issue that cyclists frequently face: being stuck at red lights. In many cases, traffic sensors that trigger a green light do not detect bicycles—you must be familiar with that—so you get stuck at the light, you are stranded until a car comes and triggers the traffic light, and this delay not only frustrates cyclists, but also poses safety concerns as cyclists are forced to remain stationary in potentially dangerous areas. Under A.B. 168, cyclists would be permitted to stop at a red light, and if no other traffic is present, safely proceed through the intersection. This would increase both cyclist and motorist safety.

Since Idaho adopted the Idaho Stop, several other states, including many of our neighbor states—Utah, Arizona, Colorado, Oregon, Washington, and also Delaware on the East Coast—have all followed suit enacting similar laws. In fact, studies in Idaho and Delaware have shown positive outcomes following the adoption of the Idaho Stop. Idaho saw a 14 percent decrease in cyclist injuries from traffic collisions the year after implementing this law. Delaware reported a 23 percent decrease in cyclist-related accidents at intersections within 30 months of adopting the law. While we do not have comparable studies in the other states that adopted the law, the data from Idaho and Delaware is promising, and we believe Nevada could achieve similar results.

To provide some context, the Nevada Department of Transportation reports that between 2019 and 2023 there were 66 fatalities and over 2,400 injuries resulting from bicycle accidents. This represented a 55 percent increase in bike fatalities and a 44 percent increase in injuries during that period. These statistics highlight the urgent need for safer practices in our state.

Some of the key provisions in A.B. 168: first, the bill would allow cyclists to treat stop signs as yield signs at intersections, enabling them to proceed safely through if no other traffic is present while yielding to pedestrians and vehicles. And secondly, it addresses the issue of traffic lights that fail to detect bicycles. It would allow cyclists to proceed through a red light if no traffic was present, further reducing delays and enhancing safety.

Importantly, Assembly Bill 168 does not change the right-of-way laws. Cyclists must yield to oncoming traffic and stop if they are not the first to a stop sign in an intersection. Adopting Assembly Bill 168 would align Nevada's laws with recommendations from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, which found that similar laws have led to increased safety for cyclists in states where these laws have been evaluated. Furthermore, these laws can have positive effects on traffic flow, the environment, and overall transportation.

We understand that the concept of a cyclist proceeding without stopping may seem counterintuitive to some. In our discussions with law enforcement, their main concern

centered around electric bikes and electric scooters. To address this, a conceptual amendment [Exhibit G] has been introduced that excludes electric bikes and electric scooters from the bill, ensuring that it applies only to traditional bicycles.

As someone who is deeply committed to the safety of cyclists, I can personally relate to the concerns facing cyclists. I always wear my helmet, and I made sure my kids always wore their helmet—and they do even as adults, I am happy to report. Like many cyclists, we care deeply about promoting safe and responsible cycling practices. Chair Watts and members of the Committee, Assembly Bill 168 aims to reduce risk for cyclists, improve safety, and create a more bicycle-friendly environment in Nevada. By adopting this bill, we can make intersections safer for cyclists and better align Nevada with the growing movement towards safer cycling laws in other states. I will hand this over to Mr. Plaskon to provide additional information.

Ky Plaskon, Secretary, Nevada Bicycle Coalition:
We wanted to keep our comments brief, so we did not call all our supporters to come in and see you and speak. But we did ask people to come and stand, so if you are here in the audience to support this bill, would you mind standing up for just a moment? [Mr. Plaskon gestured towards members of the audience standing up.] You can see some of the folks who might like to speak, and we have some really young kids here who are interested in speaking, some small business representatives, and then my parents there in the back who have ridden around the world on their bicycles and they are here to support it as well.

I want to provide a little bit of why this is important from an anecdotal perspective. As you can imagine, we can probably talk about the benefits forever. Assemblymember Goulding talked about how you wait at a stop light until a car comes, then suddenly when a car comes, you are in danger, and when you are a little kid, you are even harder to see. I have been commuting my whole life to work from Reno, even to Carson City, sometimes on a daily basis. As you can imagine, as an advocate myself, I think that it is really important that I teach this to my kids, but they are scared on our roads. Whatever we can do to help them be safer, we need to bring here to the state of Nevada. We see that it is working throughout the United States. We learned about this law at the National Bike Summit in Washington, D.C., a couple years ago and brought it here when we learned that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration recommends this as a safety measure for bicyclists and recommends that it be passed in states across the United States.

I want to talk a bit about money, which is something I think Assemblymember Goulding had touched on. What we learned here in the state of Nevada and in Washington, D.C., is that metropolitan planning organizations are trying to encourage biking to cut down on expenses on roads, and they are having a lot of difficulty doing that. Why are they trying to encourage biking as a daily transportation option instead of just as recreation? Mainly because of state budgets, personal budgets, and local budgets. They are all burdened heavily by the impact of solo drivers in cars. These giant vehicles with a small person inside are impacting the roads, and people are realizing this is expensive from every level of government all the way down

to the people like us. So, they are choosing more sensible, cheaper transportation options, and they are cheaper from top to bottom.

The expense of the current methods of transportation management is astounding from long-term impacts on our health to the expense of roads, which are extremely expensive. These changes in the law are proven to increase safety at no cost to taxpayers, and they will help save money across the board in the long run. Your approval of A.B. 168, Stop-As-Yield, will save lives right away in some cases in the first year, that is what we have seen. I am available for comments. So please support A.B. 168.

[Exhibit H was submitted but not discussed in support of Assembly Bill 168 and will become part of the record.]

Chair Watts:
Members, any questions?

Assemblymember Dickman:
I just have one question. Since the amendment takes out the electric vehicles, I really like this bill. Could you amend your amendment to put me on as a sponsor?

Assemblymember Goulding:
I would be absolutely delighted.

Chair Watts:
Anyone else who is interested, please reach out to Assemblymember Goulding.

Assemblymember Yurek:
It is fun to come hear bills that hit you. When you were talking about this, I was like, This makes total sense as somebody that used to cycle quite a bit. It does seem counterintuitive that we are going to let a bicyclist go through a red light. But having done that and having experienced it, it definitely does present risks. If I was able to cautiously proceed through, it is actually safer. So, for my colleagues on the dais, it is a safe option. I agree with my colleagues who have mentioned this already, and I applaud your willingness to work with law enforcement on pulling out the e-bikes and the e-scooter issues. To help establish the record on why, can you share with us some of the reasons law enforcement shared with you and what you agreed with regarding why we would pull those out?

Assemblymember Goulding:
I think we have folks coming up later, so you might ask them directly instead of getting it filtered through me. Some of the concerns revolve around a gray area between an electric bike and a progression to a motorcycle. There is a lot more clarity by eliminating electric bikes from this bill. You could ask them directly, and I think they might have a better answer or a more thorough answer from personal experience. There was one other thing, particularly in southern Nevada: there are some groups of young bicyclists who have been biking

irresponsibly on electric bicycles who have caused some public safety concerns, so I think it would be good to hear it directly from the horse's mouth.

Chair Watts:
Members, any additional questions? [There were none.] We will move on to testimony in support of Assembly Bill 168. If anyone would like to provide testimony in support in Carson City or Las Vegas, please come forward.

Olivia Tanager, Director, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:
I am the director of the Sierra Club's Toiyabe Chapter. The Toiyabe Chapter is the state's largest grassroots environmental organization representing over 40,000 members and supporters across our great state. We work on issues pertaining to transportation and would love to see more incentives for bike commuting. We know that it lowers air pollution, promotes public health and safety, and with that in mind, we are in full support of this bill, and that it will support bikes and support biking safely across the state of Nevada.

Isaiah Berke, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
I am speaking today in my personal capacity. As a resident of the biggest little city and an avid commuter cyclist, I want to thank Assemblymember Goulding for bringing forth this commonsense bill that allows cyclists to ride safely and comfortably. The Legislature should do everything in its power to encourage healthy, sustainable transportation. I urge you to support this bill. Thank you.

Jay Howard, Private Citizen, Nevada:
I am going to be brief. I just want to take a moment to throw my support behind Assembly Bill 168. I can tell you as a private citizen—and I am also a program coordinator for a regional trails program called Truckee Meadows Trails—and a cyclist, I certainly support all of the testimony and the presentation that was given wholeheartedly. I can tell you from experience, like I am sure many others can, that we feel very vulnerable when we are out on the road. We want to be out there. For me it is about health and fitness and just the fun behind cycling, but I also understand that for many people it is about transportation, getting to work, getting from point A to point B, that sort of thing.

Cyclists are out there, and it is a good thing we want to see things be a little bit greener these days, to get people out of their cars. Again, I can attest to the feeling of vulnerability when you are to an intersection, you are just sitting there waiting, and a very large vehicle comes up next to you. That is a bad situation. So, for those reasons and the safety reasons that have been described, I echo the words: please support Assembly Bill 168.

Misty Carter, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
I am a real estate agent here in Washoe County and northern Nevada, and I love bicycles. I support A.B. 168 because I believe it will make our roads safer for not only vulnerable road users but also drivers, and it will improve the quality of life for our commuters here. Generally, it is safer to walk and bicycle; it is healthier. I find my clients are requesting homes away from busy streets and highways because it is simply unsafe for them and their

children to go outside. When we make it safer for healthy forms of transportation such as bikes to exist, people are happier, and home values increase. For example, we see when new bus lines are put in home values increase, showing that implementing alternative modes of transportation is very valuable. I believe supporting A.B. 168 is supporting our local economy, supporting small businesses like mine, and most importantly it supports a healthy lifestyle for our Nevadans. Thank you so much.

Mason Baca, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
I am in seventh grade, and I go to High Desert Montessori School in Reno. I am a member of the Tumbleweeds Mountain Bike Team and a graduate of the Major Taylor Program. I am also a junior bike mechanic in training. I love biking. I ride my bike to school every day, and I also ride my bike around Reno as much as my mom will let me. If you are like my mom, you worry about kids when you see them biking in the street. Thank you for caring, but I am here to tell you that we kids totally get how dangerous the road can be, sometimes even better than most drivers do.

When I am on my bike, I am super careful because I have the most to lose when there is an accident. Intersections are really dangerous for people on bikes. Right now, the law says I have to make a full stop, but stopping is tough because it takes a lot of effort to start biking again. When I move slowly through an intersection, it makes it harder for me to get through and easier for drivers to hit me. Plus, a stopped biker is a lot harder to see than a moving one. The law right now puts me at risk. I do not want to get hit by cars, and I do not deserve a ticket for keeping myself safe. Please support A.B. 168 for young bikers like me.

Aeva Plaskon, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
I am in eighth grade at Swope Middle School. Thank you for having me here today. I ride my bike just about every day. I know many of you see kids riding bikes and it makes you nervous. Thank you for being worried about us. What is important for you is to know that we are very aware of the dangers on the road, probably more so than a lot of drivers. When I am on my bike, I know I have the most to lose if a driver crashes into me, so I am very hyper aware of my surroundings, and I am paying close attention to where cars are. I also know that intersections are the most dangerous for us. That is why when I come up to an intersection I look left, right, and left again. When it is safe, I go rolling through without stopping so I can get out of the danger zone as quickly as possible.

Unlike a driver, stopping creates a lot of problems for kids on bikes like me; we are hard to see. We have to push hard to get going and then we are really slow and that makes us a moving target for drivers who often do not stop at signs anyway. Right now, the law puts me in danger of, or risk of, getting a ticket or having the police come and talk to my dad. This discourages me and others from riding, and it is unsafe for kids on bikes. Please support A.B. 168. Do it for the safety of kids like me. Thank you.

Chelsea Kincheloe, President, Muscle Powered:
I represent an advocacy group here in Carson City called Muscle Powered, where we advocate for a walkable and bikeable Carson City and have done so for the past 26 years. We are in support of A.B. 168.

Chair Watts:
I just want to congratulate some of our presenters who I think were giving public testimony for the first time. You did a great job, and we are always happy to have people participating in our democratic process. We hope you will continue to keep it up. With that, we will go down to Las Vegas.

David Swallow, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada:
The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), and me personally, would like to express our support for Assembly Bill 168. We commend the Nevada Bicycle Coalition and Assemblymember Goulding for their efforts in advancing protections for bicyclists.

Assembly Bill 168 is a crucial step forward toward improving bicyclist safety and mobility in our state. The RTC of Southern Nevada recognizes and promotes bicycling as a viable mode of transportation. Intersections pose a significant risk for bicyclists, accounting for 26 percent of fatalities nationwide in 2020. Assembly Bill 168 addresses this concern by allowing bicyclists to treat stop signs as yield signs and when safe, to proceed cautiously through red lights after stopping under specific conditions. This change will help bicyclists clear intersections more quickly and efficiently, reducing their exposure to potential conflicts when it is safe to proceed. Similar laws have been successfully implemented in eight other states, leading to fewer crashes and improved traffic flow.

The RTC values their strong partnership with the Nevada Bicycle Coalition and other stakeholders, such as the Southern Nevada Bicycle Coalition, in promoting bicycle safety, education, and advocacy. Updating Nevada's traffic laws to reflect the practical realities of cycling will not only enhance safety but also encourage more people to bike as a mode of transportation, advancing our regional goals of sustainability and multimodal connectivity. We appreciate the Committee's time and consideration. We urge your support for A.B. 168. Thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment.

Chair Watts:
Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in support of Assembly Bill 168 by phone?

Jonathan Mayer, Private Citizen:
Can you all hear me? [Unintelligible]…My name is…[Unintelligible.]

Chair Watts:
We are having trouble hearing you. You can also send your remarks in writing if you are not able to get better reception to us. Please connect with our staff and we will make sure we get your comments submitted. Sorry for that. Can we go on to the next caller please. [There was no one.]

With that we will move on to testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 168. Anyone wishing to provide testimony in opposition either in Carson City or Las Vegas, please come forward. Seeing no one coming forward at this time, is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 168 by phone? [There was no one.]

Now we will move to testimony in neutral to Assembly Bill 168. We will begin here in Carson City.

Dora Martinez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
Dora Martinez with my handy dandy Jerry Lee the German shepherd, my two-year-old service dog. I am in neutral because we walk a lot because we use our [unintelligible.] We use the sidewalk, we use the crosswalk, and I know some of you may know me.

A couple of years ago, I had a black lab cross golden retriever. I was with him walking on the sidewalk and a bicyclist came and said, Right behind you to your left. I did not hear him because I was focusing on my dog. He hit my dog. Who are we going to hold accountable?

I understand environmental and health issues; I get it because I walk a lot. I use the bus and all the walking trails and hike. So, while I appreciate Assemblymember Goulding, I just want the safety measure to be there because the sidewalks and crosswalks are for everyone. I am just going to throw this out there that maybe bicycles need to have a license plate because I take pictures, and then I can turn them in. Whose bike was that, and what number was it?

Also, with RTC Reno coming up, are they going to do flowing bus stops where they stop in the middle of the road and let pedestrians out? How am I going to know if the bicyclist is going to stop and let me go? They are going really fast, and sometimes there is a bike trail, but they are scared of the traffic, so they get on the sidewalk. That is why we are neutral. Thank you.

Nic Ciccone, Government Affairs Manager, City Manager's Office, City of Reno:
While we support and encourage Reno residents and visitors to use micromobility options, we felt it was important to limit the bill's application to bicycles. We appreciate Assemblymember Goulding's willingness to work with us on the conceptual amendment she has submitted [Exhibit G].

David Cherry, Government Affairs Manager, Government and Public Affairs, City of Henderson:
We also just want to thank the bill sponsor for working with us. We have the same concerns the City of Reno had, and we feel the amendment addresses those in relation to the electric [unintelligible] bikes.

Adrian Hunt, Police Detective, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:
I represent the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVPD). With the consensual amendment, LVPD will be in the neutral for A.B. 168.

Kelly Crompton, Government Affairs Manager, City of Las Vegas:
The City of Las Vegas is also in neutral. I wanted to provide a little bit of context as the City of Las Vegas has a Vision Zero Action Plan. That plan promotes a culture of safety; it coordinates, educates, and communicates to get everyone working together towards a common goal of Vision Zero. Vision Zero is a multidisciplinary approach where a mix of diverse stakeholders must collaborate to address the complexity of fatal and serious injury crashes. Implied messaging that not abiding by traffic control devices is acceptable distracts from some base message that we all have a responsibility to keep ourselves and others safe.

The City of Las Vegas is very determined to make sure that bicycling inside of the City of Las Vegas limits is accessible. We have a lot of federal dollars going into bike lanes along major corridors and so we are very supportive of bicyclists in our city limits, but we do have some concerns about safety. We are appreciative of the amendment. We think it takes this bill and puts us in a neutral position, although we do have slight concerns about bicyclists within those areas.

Chair Watts:
I will say, be careful with your neutral with concerns.

Jeff Rogan, representing Clark County:
Like the other municipalities that have come up and testified, we are very appreciative of the Assemblymember for bringing this amendment, and with the exclusion of electric bikes and electric scooters, we are also in the neutral position on this bill. Thank you.

Jason Walker, Lieutenant, Administrative Division, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:
I am testifying in the neutral position on behalf of the Washoe County Sheriff's office.

Chair Watts:
Thank you very much. We will go down to Las Vegas now.

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am the team leader of the Las Vegas local chapter of Strong Towns, an urban planning organization that promotes a more traditional urban planning system. We do appreciate that there is a bill to incentivize bicycling and electric scooters. I am kind of in support and neutral; I apologize about that. I just wanted to hear if there was potential opposition that maybe I should be aware about. We know this system encourages people to obviously get around more effectively. It is funny how the last bill we are talking about is driving. I think we should incentivize people to do other modes of transportation.

One of the concerns we have, while bicycling has benefits such as parking, it has a higher capacity per lane. I wanted to show you this diagram. On the top part of the diagram, you can see this is a typical arterial like Flamingo, Rainbow, or Blue Diamond—45 miles an hour and 6 lanes. It kind of functions as a highway and a street. The issue is that, if we are going to promote bicycling, we want to be in a street that is safe for bicyclists, including the speed, the design, the median, the width, protected lanes. We want to make sure these things are really considered or brought forward in a future bill or in some kind of ordinance policy because we really want the whole package. If we do not, we will not be able to really meet our goals. [Diagram was referenced but not submitted as an exhibit.]

Chair Watts:
Seeing no one else in Las Vegas, do we have anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony on A.B. 168 by phone?

Jonathan Mayer, Private Citizen:
My name is Jonathan Mayer. I tried to call earlier but my connection was bad. I am not sure what the rules are, am I still permitted to testify in support?

Chair Watts:
Yes, you are. We will classify your testimony as in support. Please go ahead.

Jonathan Mayer, Private Citizen:
Thank you. I appreciate that. I am 25, and I am on vacation right now. I am not really the type to call in about politics, but I hope that reflects the importance of this bill to those it plans to protect. With some of your previous bills that they are talking about, it is left and right and what the rights of a citizen are and constitutional justice and all those kinds of things. This is not really any of that. You can tell that from the testimony so far, this is just the basic nuts and bolts of civilized coexistence. I am a newish neighborhood cyclist, but it is more difficult than it needs to be.

The aim of this bill, in my view, is to ease those difficulties. When I am in an intersection, I try to get out of the way the best I can and even try to help the best I can, but it is not always safe or legal. If you do not think it is unsafe, then getting rear ended by a bicycle or getting [unintelligible] is not a pretty picture. And I think that is just the kind of thing we should change.

We have seen this working in other states and making it easier to be a cyclist means less traffic for drivers too. Those who are going to blow through stop signs already do, and who are not going to respect the rules of the road are already doing that. This only enables people who want to be good cyclists to continue to be good cyclists. Assembly Bill 168 is not about pushing out cars or prioritizing bikes, it just recognizes that bikes are not cars, that my bike is not an SUV, and helps us coexist as neighbors on the road. So, I wanted to call in for my support of Assembly Bill 168.

Chair Watts:
Next caller please. [There was no one.] We will have our historians check to see if we set the record for the most neutral testimony on a bill. With that, we will invite the sponsor to make any closing remarks. [There were none.]

With that, I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 168. We will move on to the last item on our agenda for today, which is public comment. Is there anyone wishing to provide public comment here in Carson City or Las Vegas?

Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families for Freedom:
I just wanted to take a moment to say thank you to the Chairman for his egg bill. Yay. That was great.

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
Before I begin, I want to talk about a very local issue, a local matter. I am going to read this form right here. This is a neighborhood watch, subject property 1361 Range Lane. I am talking on behalf of a friend who lives in the northeast section of Las Vegas, Nevada, 89110. They have the parcel number. There was a violation given, the property has no certificate of occupancy, original home and property was burned down in the 1990s.

The property was abated to remove the remains of the fire in the year 2000. The accessory structure shed was converted without permits or inspection, then the owner installed a kitchen and a bathroom, and he was living in the accessory building. He was in violation and cited with a case number and sent to the district attorney and prosecuted and found guilty in 2004. He was fined and served community service.

The new owners were cited again on January 20, 2005, and the same violation was given in 2007. All of these citations were given due to somebody living in an accessory building without permits, without proper inspections, never given a replacement, housing was never replaced on the property. No certificate of occupancy was ever given to accessory dwelling as it was never permitted, inspected, or issued. Code enforcement refuses to do the necessary investigation to remove the current residents from the accessory dwelling that the early residents were cited and removed from the property.

So, my friend is having this issue. It is ongoing, and they claim the people in charge are not doing their jobs. We are going through the local level, but I am thinking about bringing this through every other issue. My friend asked me to talk about this and maybe you guys can really look into this. I can give you the forms if you can. Thank you so much and I ditto the last commenter too.

Chair Watts:
Seeing no one else coming forward, is there anyone wishing to provide public comment by phone? [There was no one.]

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

That concludes our business for the day. Our next meeting will be on Tuesday, February 25, where we will continue some bill hearings. Thank you all for your time. This meeting is adjourned [at 3:53 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Maria Benamati
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblymember Howard Watts, Chair

DATE: _____

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Angela Smith-Lamb, Deputy Director, Department of Motor Vehicles	PowerPoint presentation titled "DMV Overview – NRS 481"
A.B. 20	D	Various Individuals and Organizations	Collection of Letters and Emails in opposition
A.B. 140	E	Eric Jeng, Executive Director, One APIA Nevada	Written Testimony in support
A.B. 140	F	Various Individuals	Collection of Letters and Emails in opposition
A.B. 168	G	Assemblymember Heather Goulding, Assembly District No. 27	Proposed conceptual amendment titled "AB168 Conceptual Amendment"
A.B. 168	H	Ky Plaskon, Secretary, Nevada Bicycle Coalition	Fact sheet titled "Bicyclist "Stop-As-Yield" Laws and Safety Fact Sheet"