

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

**Eightieth Session
May 9, 2019**

The Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 1:35 p.m. on Thursday, May 9, 2019, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair
Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Shea Backus
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblywoman Rochelle T. Nguyen
Assemblyman Tom Roberts
Assemblyman Greg Smith
Assemblyman Howard Watts
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Chris Brooks, Senate District No. 3
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6
Senator James Ohrenschall, Senate District No. 21
Senator Marcia L. Washington, Senate District No. 4



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michelle L. Van Geel, Committee Policy Analyst
Jessica Dummer, Committee Counsel
Joan Waldock, Committee Secretary
Alejandra Medina, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Tony F. Sanchez III, Executive Vice President, Business Development and External Relations, NV Energy
Kyle J. Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League; and League to Save Lake Tahoe
Jessica Ferrato, representing Solar Energy Industries Association
Chris Ferrari, representing Sunrun Inc.
Scott Leedom, Director, Public Affairs, Southwest Gas Corporation
Garrett C. Weir, General Counsel, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada
John Sande, IV, representing Las Vegas Sands Corporation
Kanani G. Espinoza, representing Boyd Gaming Corporation
Jeffrey Thau, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Chuck Ayers, Owner and Instructor, Mr. Chuck's Driving Academy, Carson City, Nevada
Andrew Bennett, Public Information Officer, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety
Zachary Cord, Management Analyst, Division of Management Services and Programs, Department of Motor Vehicles
James R. Lawrence, Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 300 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 300 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the rates charged by electric utilities. (BDR 58-302)

Senator Chris Brooks, Senate District No. 3:

Before I present the bill and go any further with the presentation, I want to make sure the Committee has the amendment I submitted, dated May 7, 2019 ([Exhibit C](#)). I would like to make my presentation based on that amendment.

Senate Bill 300 (1st Reprint) positions the state of Nevada to create the type of flexible and nimble regulatory environment necessary to develop a modern, reliable, and efficient electric grid. This will be done through the use of alternative rate-making plans, as I will explain later.

For background, I am a member of the Renovate Task Force. Renovate is an initiative sponsored by the Smart Electric Power Alliance (SEPA) that launched this initiative in partnership with leading electric industry organizations, including the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, the Environmental Law and Policy Center, the National Governors Association, the American Public Power Association, the National Association of State Energy Officials, the Edison Electric Institute, the Natural Resource Defense Council, the Rocky Mountain Institute, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the Regulatory Assistance Project, among many other organizations. I am one of two legislators in this group.

The Renovate initiative brings together thought leaders to collaboratively identify problems and their required solutions. We provide implementation guidance to policymakers and regulators. The initiative's goal is to identify a series of potential solutions to each of our identified problems as soon as this year. Some of the concepts that are in this bill came from the work I have been doing with this group and some other groups going back to 2016.

Before I go any further, I would briefly like to explain the utilities business model that creates some of the problems we have. Imagine a business that does not necessarily make money off of the product they sell, but makes all of its money from the investments in the infrastructure to deliver that product. They recover the monies they need to make their earnings, as well as pay back the investments they made, by selling that same product on a unit by unit basis. If you can imagine some of the things we have done in this building and that have come out of this Committee that try to have public utilities sell less of their product—by energy efficiency measures, energy storage, renewable energy mandates, or distributed generation incentives—we end up being at odds with our policy initiatives and their business model as defined in current statute.

Ultimately, we must look for ways to redesign the business model of public utilities, and that is what Senate Bill 300 (1st Reprint) is attempting to do. The bill establishes the processes and methods through which alternative rate-making plans are adopted by electric utilities. For approval by the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN), such utilities would have to meet defined criteria stipulating that any plan does the following:

- Aligns an economically viable utility model with state public policy goals;
- Provides for just and reasonable rates;
- Fosters statewide improvements to the economic and operational efficiency of the electrical grid;
- Furthers the public interest including, without limitation, the promotion of safe, economic, efficient, and reliable electric service to all customers of the electric utility;
- Enhances the resilience and security of the electrical grid while addressing concerns regarding customer privacy;
- Ensures that customers of an electric utility benefit from lower regulatory administrative costs where appropriate;

- Facilitates the research and development of innovative electric utility services and options to benefit customers;
- Balances the interests of customers and shareholders by providing for services that customers want while keeping rates low and preserving reasonable shareholder value;
- Provides that customers of the electric utility have an opportunity to share in an electric utility's earnings taking into account each customer class's contributions to electric utility earnings; and
- Has a robust collaborative process of customer participation in the planning and implementation of the rates.

I have been working with a variety of stakeholders to ensure that the bill, to the best of our ability, does not disrupt any practices of electric utilities, PUCN, or affected groups and ratepayers. I want to be clear, [S.B. 300 \(R1\)](#) will help us attain an innovative electric grid, one that people of this state deserve. Electric vehicle charging, distributed generation like solar and rooftop solar, energy storage, and integrating large amounts of renewable energy are all the future of energy in Nevada. The future is coming fast. We are obligated to embrace it. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill. I would like to walk you through the legislation. It is a relatively simple concept in a very complicated bill.

Again, I will be working off of the amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) that I submitted. It is a proposed amendment for the Committee based upon the reprint of the bill as it was passed out of the Senate. Hopefully, there is an explanation page that came along with the amendment ([Exhibit D](#)), which is a table that explains the bill.

It really starts in section 5 and goes through section 15, where it explains the concepts that are in the bill, which are basically definitions. I want to touch on just a few of those. Sections 6 and 7 define "alternative rate-making mechanism" and "alternative rate-making plan." Section 8 defines "decoupling mechanism," which means "a mechanism that disassociates an electric utility's financial performance and results from the sales of electricity by the electric utility." For instance, that is what Southwest Gas Corporation has in Nevada. When I spoke earlier about there not being a natural incentive to sell less of the units of the product that the electric utility sells to recover its costs, this is one of the ways that can be done.

Section 9 defines "earnings-sharing mechanism." Fully bundled customer is also a term in section 9. There will be some differentiation between those when I discuss a few of the components of the bill later. A "fully bundled customer," as defined in section 12, means "a customer of an electric utility who receives energy, transmission, distribution, and ancillary services from the electric utility." That includes all the residential ratepayers in Nevada, all the small businesses in the state, and most of the large businesses in the state. You have heard about some of the large consumers that have left using the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 704B process. They would not be considered a fully bundled customer. There are some customers who just use the transmission lines of the utilities in the state. They would be a transmission only customer. There is distribution only, transmission only, and then fully bundled, which is the majority of the state of the Nevada.

Section 14 defines "performance-based rates." Those are "rates that are set or adjusted based on the performance of an electric utility as determined by such performance metrics as the Commission may establish." In other words, having the utility achieve goals put forth by PUCN based on public and policymakers' input to be able to establish how they earn their return as opposed to how many units of energy they can sell.

Section 16 adopts the regulations for establishment of procedures for an electric utility to apply to the PUCN for an alternative rate-making plan. At this point, it is important for me to make sure the Committee understands that although this piece of legislation would allow for an alternative rate-making plan, it would not direct to have an alternative rate-making plan. This is enabling language for PUCN to create an alternative rate-making process, if requested by an electric utility. It establishes what kinds of alternative rate-making plans may be submitted and outlines their limitations; some of those I spoke about earlier regarding protecting the ratepayer, the shareholder value, and ratepayer value. Section 16 outlines all of those different metrics that they would be measured by.

Section 17 further clarifies the manner in which alternative rate-making plans would be deliberated upon. It is very important that we have transparency and participation in this process by all the ratepayers. Currently, in rate cases, there are interveners in the process. The Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Office of the Attorney General is there to look out for the ratepayers of Nevada. There are environmental organizations that want to make sure our environmental goals and renewable energy goals are looked out for in this process. Then there are the largest consumers in the state of Nevada, such as mining, retail, and gaming, that are also interveners in that process so they can make sure the earnings are appropriate and the rates are set in a manner that, quite frankly, benefit the ratepayers as best as they possibly can. We are trying to maintain that same participation and, in some cases, make it even more robust, so that if alternative rate making is put into place, all the representatives of the ratepayers of Nevada have the ability to participate and have a transparent process.

Section 17 of the bill also defines that the PUCN would have 210 days to consider, with or without any modifications, alternative rate-making plans that were submitted to them by the electric utilities. That time can be extended by 90 days for good cause. During this time, at least one customer information hearing must be held to educate the public regarding the proposed rate-making plan. The PUCN would further have the right to supersede just and reasonable rates, regulations, and practices for those established by an alternative rate-making plan. This would be done after a hearing and due investigation if one of those interveners that I spoke about earlier found or believed it was not in the best interest of the ratepayer.

Section 18 clarifies that it maintains the current rate-making authority held by the PUCN. Nothing in the bill takes away any of the current authority that the PUCN has in setting the rates for electric utility customers.

Section 19 makes some conforming changes to make NRS consistent with the changes in section 17 of the bill.

Section 20 updates dates and times when general rate-making plans are filed by electric utilities and establishes that said times may be different per what is outlined in the alternative rate-making plan.

Section 21 states that nothing in this bill can be used to invalidate the effectiveness of any rate, charge, classification, or joint rate set by the PUCN before the date of enactment. This does not undo any deal that has been done by the PUCN on rates.

Section 22 is not necessarily related to the rest of this bill, but is a vehicle to clean up something from Assembly Bill 405 of the 79th Session, which was a bill I worked on with most of this Committee to get passed last session. It created a study and report that had to be done by the PUCN on the value of solar and how well the rooftop solar industry was working out based upon the results of Assembly Bill 405 of the 79th Session. We are here to say, it worked out very well. There does not seem to be a lot of desire or need to do that study at this point and generate a report to give back to the Legislature. I wanted to use section 22 of this bill as an opportunity to delete the language we established in Assembly Bill 405 of the 79th Session.

Section 23 of the bill says it becomes effective upon passage.

That is the bill in its entirety. [Written testimony was also submitted ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Carrillo:

You mentioned gas utilities earlier. I saw on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) that Southwest Gas Corporation had submitted an amendment ([Exhibit F](#)). You also mentioned that other states have implemented alternative rate making. In those states, are they limited to electric utilities, or do they apply to all utilities in the respective states?

Senator Brooks:

Some of the principles that are in this bill already apply to Southwest Gas. In other states, it is a mixed bag of what types of regulatory models are used for both the electric utilities and the gas utilities. In some situations, the gas utility and the electric utility are one and the same. Southwest Gas did submit an amendment. While I am supportive of the concepts they want to get done, this is not the appropriate bill to get it done. I have made the offer to work with them in the interim to come up with a piece of legislation. This bill is very narrowly tailored to an electric utility and is not the appropriate vehicle for the Southwest Gas concept.

In the 2015 and 2017 Legislative Sessions, and in this legislative session, Southwest Gas has created pieces of legislation that have directed the PUCN to look at how they recover rates on certain projects and programs in a different way and would achieve some of the goals that we are trying to achieve here for an electric utility.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Are you saying this amendment from Southwest Gas ([Exhibit F](#)) is not germane to the bill? Is that part of the issue, or is it just not the right time? I was not sure if they were involved in the stakeholder meetings or if this was something they were left out of. Can you explain that?

Senator Brooks:

Honestly, they were never a part of the conversation. This was about electric utility rate making. My work in the last year and a half has been on electric utility rate-making concepts that I wanted to bring to this legislative session. Southwest Gas was doing their job and found a bill they wanted to jump on and say "me too." In my opinion, it would have caused some structural issues with this bill, and it is just not the appropriate vehicle. While I consider them friendly, I do not consider the amendment friendly.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

It is good to hear you are working with them.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Just a week or so ago, we heard a renewable gas bill that came through this Committee that we have passed out. There are other alternatives that Southwest Gas is looking at this session that will be moving to the floor and we will be voting on very soon, but the conversations have been had. Are there any further questions from the Committee? [There were none.]

Senator Brooks:

Chair Monroe-Moreno, I would like to follow up on the statement you just made about the renewable gas. That is a perfect example of alternative rate making. Instead of looking at how they recover the infrastructure investment made based on a per-unit sale, it applied a whole different metric on how they could recover the monies in that investment. That is a good example of what we are trying to achieve for electric utilities.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Seeing no further questions from the members, I will open the hearing to those in support of S.B. 300 (R1).

Tony F. Sanchez III, Executive Vice President, Business Development and External Relations, NV Energy:

I am here to testify in support of S.B. 300 (R1). With me is my colleague, Shawn EliceGUI, formerly our senior vice president of regulatory affairs; he is a consultant for our company now. He can answer any technical questions the Committee may have.

Today the Committee has before it S.B. 300 (R1). Earlier this session, this Committee and the Senate and the Assembly as a whole passed Senate Bill 358 that increased Nevada's renewable portfolio standard to 50 percent by 2030. The legislation also establishes the state's goal of becoming a leading producer and consumer of clean and renewable energy with the objective of achieving, by 2050, an amount of energy production from zero carbon resources equal to the total amount of electricity sold by providers of electric service in this state. These laudable goals are transformative and will require significant changes in the way Nevada's electric providers do business.

Senate Bill 300 (1st Reprint) complements Nevada's energy goals, including those established by S.B. 358, by establishing a framework for the PUCN to develop equally flexible and transformative regulator models. The bill provides the Commission the flexibility necessary to regulate the electric utility of the future rather than the electric utility over the past century.

The energy industry is evolving rapidly. In many regions, like Nevada, renewable energy is at or approaching cost parity with traditional fossil fuel generation. Modernization of the electric grid could provide new opportunities to capture efficiencies, create a better understanding of grid usage and management, and improve customer service and satisfaction.

Senate Bill 300 (1st Reprint) establishes a framework for reform. It gives the PUCN the power to adopt regulations and approve alternative pricing mechanisms and plans that deliver the services customers want and value. With this type of flexibility, the PUCN can act nimbly, anticipate rather than react to changes, and adopt plans that deliver value to electric customers and consumers, whether that value comes in the form of enhancing customer service, new pricing plans, or more renewable energy. The flexibility will also facilitate research into and the development of innovative electric services for the benefit of our customers.

Overall, regulatory reform could allow customers and, more generally, society to leverage and benefit from technological changes and innovative operating practices. In this regard, the simplicity of S.B. 300 (R1) is its elegance. The bill simply establishes a framework by which the PUCN can supervise a collaborative process to reform Nevada's electric utility framework.

In short, NV Energy supports S.B. 300 (R1) because it is consistent with our basic objective of providing better service to our customers at predictable, stable, and lower prices. It provides the PUCN the authority to develop regulatory plans that achieve the Legislature's energy policy goals—the addition and integration of additional renewable energy and carbon emission reductions through innovative approaches. It maintains the PUCN's full authority to protect consumers, and it provides a framework for developing regulatory processes that ensure the company delivers the services customers value while maintaining economic viability.

Kyle J. Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League:

Since I do not get this opportunity very often—Mr. Sanchez did a great job of outlining all the great reasons for this bill—I will be very brief. One of the points that was raised in Mr. Sanchez's testimony and Senator Brooks' presentation is the evolving nature of the electric market, not only in Nevada but in the West and throughout the country. That requires us to have a lot more flexibility in terms of thinking about the ways in which we deliver energy and the ways in which our rate-making structures are situated so we can best take advantage of the new clean technologies that are coming and move to a place where we are getting more and more of our energy from renewable sources and that we are using less energy than we were using before in an effort to get to our overall goal of what we did see in S.B. 358, which is the ultimate goal of getting to a carbon-free grid by 2050.

We think this bill gives the PUCN the ability to have that kind of flexibility and to align these rate-making structures with public policy goals, so we can reach our overall goals as a state. We support this legislation and encourage its passage.

Jessica Ferrato, representing Solar Energy Industries Association:

We are in support of S.B. 300 (R1). I would like to echo the comments made previously by the utility as well as Mr. Davis. The bill will allow the utility more flexibility to adapt to the changes, not only in the market but policy changes that are put forward by this Legislature. With our state moving more and more toward renewable resources, we think the utility needs the ability to adjust, as well as the PUCN, to the changing needs of the state.

Chris Ferrari, representing Sunrun Inc.:

Sunrun Inc. is proud to serve Nevadans with affordable clean solar for their homes and is the nation's largest leading residential solar, storage, and energy services company operating in 23 states, Puerto Rico, Washington, D.C., and serving more than 233,000 customers. I am echoing the comments of the previous speakers as Nevada establishes itself, and continues to do so, as a renewable energy leader and plans for a 100 percent clean energy future with the strengthened renewable portfolio standard, also shepherded by Senator Brooks.

Measures like S.B. 300 (R1) can lead to more options for customers to install home solar, batteries, and other clean energy solutions, as well as more efficient use and investment in the electrical grid. This benefits all electric utility customers. For these reasons, we ask for your support of S.B. 300 (R1). [A letter in support was also submitted by Sunrun Inc. ([Exhibit G](#)).]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else in Carson City or Las Vegas who would like to testify in support of S.B. 300 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone present who would like to testify in opposition to the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone present who would like to testify as neutral to the bill?

Scott Leedom, Director, Public Affairs, Southwest Gas Corporation:

I am the friendly lobbyist with the unfriendly amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) that Senator Brooks referred to earlier. Southwest Gas supports the process established by this bill that would allow an electric utility to apply to the PUCN for an alternative rate-making plan. We would like to thank the sponsor for bringing forth this innovative piece of legislation. It really has the potential to change the way rate making works in Nevada.

Alternative rate making is a departure from traditional rate making, as was explained earlier. If this bill passes, the PUCN will have an important task of opening a rule-making process and drafting regulations that establish this new framework for rate making.

As the second largest investor-owned public utility in the state of Nevada, we feel strongly that if the PUCN, along with NV Energy and other stakeholders, are going to put in the great amount of time and effort into the rule-making process that is required for this policy to be successful, the legislation should apply to more than just one utility.

To that end, we have submitted an amendment ([Exhibit F](#)) that simply makes S.B. 300 (R1) apply to the largest natural gas utility in the state, which is Southwest Gas. The amendment does not make any changes that would affect the way this bill applies to electric utilities and, again, only seeks to make it apply to our company as well.

We feel it is good policy for this important piece of legislation to include other utilities that want to take advantage of the benefits of this bill and subsequent regulations it will provide. We realize we are somewhat late to the process and that these discussions began well before the legislative session began. However, we reached out to the bill sponsor and others as soon as possible after we were made aware of this proposed language during the work session in the Senate. Again, we believe there are good policy reasons for this bill, not only to apply to electric utilities, but to gas utilities as well. We would ask for the Committee's support in considering this amendment.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for your work with the sponsor of the bill and thank you for the time you took sitting down with me to explain the amendment. You worked hard on it, and I appreciate it.

Garrett C. Weir, General Counsel, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada:

I would first like to begin by thanking Senator Brooks for reaching out to and working with the PUCN to ensure that this bill provides adequate protections for ratepayers, that the PUCN retains its existing authority, and that the bill provides sufficient discretion to the PUCN in reviewing these alternative plans.

The PUCN is neutral on this bill, but it does believe it presents an opportunity that could benefit both the electric utility and its customers. As you have heard, it would enable the PUCN to consider alternative approaches to traditional methods of regulation. It is our

experience and the experience of our fellow regulators in other jurisdictions that electric utility customers want options and innovation, but electric customers also support strong consumer protections and, in particular, safe and reliable electric service.

With the requirement for broad stakeholder input, S.B. 300 (R1) gives Nevada the ability to strike the right balance of consumer-centered innovation with strong consumer protections. As Senator Brooks explained, traditional cost of service regulation rewards utilities for investing in large capital-intensive projects—projects that may be less needed as renewable energy and distributed energy resources become more prevalent, available, and affordable.

The traditional cost of service regulation does not always promote consumer-centered choices by the utility. This bill would allow the PUCN to consider various models of alternative rate making that start by asking the question, What do customers want? These alternative rate-making models then align utility incentives with the identified customer demands.

We think Nevada should also have this conversation, and that is what S.B. 300 (R1) facilitates—an opportunity to take a holistic look at various consumer-centric methods of alternative rate making to determine if there are benefits for Nevada. I am available for any questions regarding the effect of the legislation or how it might be implemented by the PUCN.

John Sande, IV, representing Las Vegas Sands Corporation:

We are testifying neutral on S.B. 300 (R1). Before I touch on the bill, I would like to thank Senator Brooks for keeping an open door and an open mind to our concerns. While many of those concerns were addressed in the revision, we have some lingering questions as the bill gets implemented, which we will continue to discuss with the Senator and other stakeholders.

Please do not misconstrue my testimony in neutral as being opposed to the goals of this legislation. We are firmly supportive of Senator Brooks and what he is attempting to accomplish through an alternative rate-making process and modernizing the structure on how we create and implement just and reasonable rates in our state. Our goals, which I am certain are shared by Senator Brooks, are to ensure transparency through the rate-making process as well as through the implementation of the alternative rate, and to ensure that the rates adopted through the alternative rate-making process are and continue to represent a reasonable rate of return for the utilities in the state.

Should the adopted rates permit utilities to earn an excess of their reasonable rate of return, we are hopeful that the new process will have safeguards to ensure the rates will adjust to account for the excess and compensate all ratepayers for having paid in excess of the just and reasonable rate.

With that said, the Las Vegas Sands Corporation looks forward to participating in this new and innovative process. I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

Kanani G. Espinoza, representing Boyd Gaming Corporation:

Aaron McMullen and Russell Rowe could not be present today, but we would like to echo the comments of Mr. Sande and we particularly want to thank Senator Brooks for being open to our input on S.B. 300 (R1). We greatly appreciate his accessibility and continued dialogue with us on this bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there any further testimony in neutral? [There was none.] Are there any closing remarks from the sponsor?

Senator Brooks:

I want to thank you and the Committee for scheduling this complicated and lengthy presentation and all your thoughtful questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 300 (1st Reprint). I will open the hearing for Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to license plates for amateur radio license holders. (BDR 43-1138)

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6:

I am pleased to be here today to present to you Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint). Madam Chair and members of the Committee, S.B. 429 (R1) actually came to me by way of a constituent, who is in Las Vegas on the videoconference. Mr. Thau, who I am sure will address the Committee also, first brought this to my attention because he is what we call an amateur radio station license holder. For those of you who are not familiar with amateur radio licensing, it has existed since 1912 and came about as a result of the U.S. Navy's concern about interference to its stations. You might commonly refer to these as ham radios. If you know someone who is a ham radio operator, that is who we are talking about.

The Federal Communications Commission currently regulates amateur radio station licenses, and they are issued for a period of ten years. Individuals as young as five years old have been able to obtain them, and individuals here in Nevada who are able to drive can also obtain, through the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), a special license plate distinguishing that they are amateur radio station license holders.

A \$10 fee waiver for renewal stickers is also permitted for these plates if the individual submits a statement to the DMV, signed under penalty of perjury, that they have a license and that they will assist in communications during local, state, and federal emergencies.

The issue brought to my attention was that this request for the renewal waiver also requires those individuals to bring in hard copies, every single year, to provide proof that they do have this license, which has been issued for a period of ten years. I am trying to cut down on the paperwork the DMV has to continue to go through, as well as the individuals who are obtaining this \$10 fee waiver in exchange for the understanding that they would be able to help out during a state of emergency. We have brought this bill forward, which allows for the statement to be submitted once as long as an individual owns an unrevoked, unexpired, official, amateur radio station license.

Finally, in section 1, subsection 6, you will see a provision that says if a holder is no longer eligible to hold those license plates, he or she would have to surrender them to the DMV.

With your permission, I would ask if Mr. Thau in Las Vegas would be able to offer his perspective and then we could take any questions.

Jeffrey Thau, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I would like to thank Senator Cannizzaro for bringing this bill forward. As she explained, the current provisions that this legislation allows for is an additional \$10 fee that is charged to amateur radio licensees who have amateur radio license plates on their vehicles. As stated, the current requirement is that every year when individuals renew, they have to physically bring into the DMV office the waiver form printed from the DMV website as well as a copy of the amateur radio license. The clerk looks at it, verifies that it exists, and then checks a little box on his or her computer which then removes the additional \$10 fee. The regular registration fees are still paid for that vehicle based on the other criteria the DMV utilizes. There are no deductions other than this \$10 fee.

Alternately, individuals can fill out all the paperwork, make a copy of their license, and mail it to DMV. Someone there has to go through it, read it, look at it, check that little box, and then accept the check submitted with the registration fees minus the \$10. If there is a discrepancy somewhere along the line, it backs up the whole process.

All we are looking for is the ability to either have DMV continuously waive the \$10 fee once the initial form has been submitted, or alternately, every ten years when the license is renewed from the federal government, reestablish that the license is still valid and they are still willing to assist in emergency operations should they be needed, and simply not have to go through this annual process.

As an example, states like California do this one time when the amateur plates are requested. It is never done again unless the license is suspended, revoked, or expired, in which case the plates would then be surrendered because the individuals are no longer eligible.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Do you know why the \$10 fee was originally assessed?

Jeffrey Thau:

I contacted DMV a number of a years ago about it. They simply have the legislation. It may have been just an additional fee similar to a number of personalized plates within the state that are issued by DMV. Someone determined that by offering to volunteer to assist in emergencies or other situations, the extra \$10 could be waived for the privilege of having a personalized plate, in essence, since it is a unique call sign that just goes to that operator. Perhaps that is the rationale.

Assemblyman Ellison:

We had an Admiral here recently to talk about what shape our electrical grid is in. If the grid were to go down, the only ones who could make contact to the outside areas are these ham radio operators. They are so important, so we should do whatever we can do to help these individuals. Ten dollars is not much, but it is still something we should do to back these operators. It is very important what these operators could do for this country.

Senator Cannizzaro:

I again want to thank the Committee for letting us present this bill today. I do want to clarify that what this bill does is not allow for the \$10 fee waiver that already exists in law, it just changes the type of documentation needed to provide to the DMV. That is based on the fact that these radio licenses are valid for a lengthy period of time. It cuts down on operators having to bring in all the documentation every year when the license plate is renewed. It would allow for it to be something that is checked once. Once the license expires, the plates would then be surrendered.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Smith:

I am curious as to how many of these plates are out there. I do not see them very often. In addition, are they in jeopardy of falling below 1,000? I think it is in statute that they can lose the privilege if the number falls below 1,000.

Senator Cannizzaro:

I do not have an accurate number, but when Mr. Thau and I were talking about this bill originally, it was about 1,100 through DMV. It is near the threshold. We determined that there are about 7,000 licensed amateur radio station license holders in the state.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Seeing no further questions, I will open the hearing to those wishing to testify in support of S.B. 429 (R1). [There was no one.] Is there anyone present who would like to testify in opposition to the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone present who would like to testify as neutral to the bill? [There was no one.] Are there any closing remarks? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint). I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 474 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 474 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to drivers' licenses.
(BDR 43-1139)**

Senator James Ohrenschall, Senate District No. 21:

I am very proud to present Senate Bill 474 (1st Reprint). This is a bill sponsored by your sister committee in the Senate, the Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure. Senator Cancela, the Chairwoman of that committee, was very kind to entertain this idea when I approached her, and the committee had a bill draft to go forward with this bill.

Senate Bill 474 (1st Reprint) deals with trying to prevent teen crashes and fatalities of teen drivers. There is some data that hopefully made it into the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (Exhibit H) from the Advocates for Highway & Auto Safety, which talks about how much more likely a teen driver is to get into a fatal crash.

Senate Bill 474 (1st Reprint) was amended in the Senate. What the bill does now is increases the amount of hours of behind-the-wheel experience a teenage driver would need with a licensed driver 21 years old or older to 75 hours from the 50 hours currently required under Nevada law. It also increases the amount of mandatory nighttime hours required from 10 hours to 15 hours.

The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety certainly recommends that most states have at least a minimum of 50 hours of behind-the-wheel experience, but the optimal is the 70 hours that Maine has. If Nevada were to adopt this, we would actually lead the nation in terms of the number of hours of behind-the-wheel experience that a teenager would need before he or she could take that next step to an unrestricted, full driver's license.

I believe this bill has tremendous potential to help kids get more experience before they are behind the wheel alone and could help prevent crashes and save lives. I flash back to when I got my license. I remember going to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) on my sixteenth birthday. I was only going to take my learner's permit test. One of my best friends' grandmother was there and she had her car. I had taken hands-on driver's education at Chaparral High School [Las Vegas] before the end of the spring semester, but I had not driven all summer. My friend's grandmother told me to just take the test and see what happens. She let me use her car. I passed the written test with a 93 percent. The driving test I passed with a not-so-stellar score, but good enough that they gave me a license on my sixteenth birthday. I thought I was invincible. Notwithstanding the fact that I had not driven all summer and only had hands-on driver's education, that was pretty much the extent of my driving experience; I thought nothing could touch me. I got into a pretty bad crash before I turned 18. Luckily, I walked away and the other person walked away, but I think something like this bill would have helped.

The laws have evolved quite a bit since those eons ago when I was 16, and we have a graduated driver's license system now. I would like to give a huge shout-out to Senator Cegavske who worked very hard when she was a State Senator during the 2007 and 2009 Sessions to push the graduated driver's license.

Senate Bill 474 (1st Reprint) builds on our current graduated driver's license system, and I think it has the potential to give kids more behind-the-wheel experience in a controlled environment where there are no other kids in the car and with a licensed driver.

Madam Chair, with your indulgence, I do have with me Mr. Chuck Ayers, who has been a driving instructor for over 20 years. He is here willing to provide background information and some support for the bill. In southern Nevada, I have Mr. Andrew Bennett from Zero Teen Fatalities, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety. He is the public information officer. He will be testifying as neutral on the bill. He has some very good background information and statistics. I would ask to turn it over to Mr. Ayers and Mr. Bennett, then I would be happy to answer any questions on the bill. [Written testimony was also submitted ([Exhibit I](#)).]

Chuck Ayers, Owner and Instructor, Mr. Chuck's Driving Academy, Carson City, Nevada:

I teach classroom training of 30 hours in Fernley, Dayton, Carson City, Gardnerville, and Minden. I used to teach a class at the local college, but they raised the price to \$100 and I thought that was too much for people to afford, so I opened my own business.

I have been providing behind-the-wheel training since 1994. It is reflected on my teaching license. I am a retired school teacher from Lyon County. I went to Las Vegas for training for three weeks in a classroom. The next year, I went back for three weeks of training for behind-the-wheel.

I have been talking to Mr. Ohrenschall about the increase in driving required. The number of students I have who barely have 50 hours is not good enough. That is why I asked him to look into getting more hours of driving experience. I will give some of the students I have a one-hour lesson and then a month later they will call me back. We go driving again, but they have forgotten everything they learned in the first lesson.

Many 16-year-olds are not ready to take that driving test. The youngest I have had was 14. The oldest one I had was a 92-year-old World War II veteran who was a prisoner of war. They both passed. I want to put safe drivers on the road and I want to reduce the teen fatalities we have.

Last year in the state of Nevada there were 331 fatalities, up 35 from the previous year. Much of that has to do with speeding. Teens will speed. We have all done that when we were that age. I have done it. I think this will help the parents make sure that teens drive

a full hour, not 15 minutes to the store and 15 minutes back. I have a two-hour driving test. I also drive from Carson City to Las Vegas for seven hours. They do not really learn anything driving short distances.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

A while back you were part of a bill about if kids took a class, they could omit the 50-hour driving requirement. Am I remembering that bill correctly?

Senator Ohrenschaal:

I am a cosponsor of Assemblyman Wheeler's bill. I believe it is Assembly Bill 338 that deals with a driver's education class. I do not have that bill in front of me, but I can look it up. I do support that bill as well, and I think it is an excellent bill. I think that bill was amended in the Assembly and I am not up to speed on the amendment. I do not believe there is any conflict between this bill and that bill. Both could pass and be harmonious as I understand both bills.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Assembly Bill 338, as amended, and this bill, would be in conflict of one another. There would have to be some work to bring the two bills together if they were to move forward.

Senator Ohrenschaal:

I apologize that I misspoke. I am certainly willing to work with Assemblyman Wheeler. We have had conversations on the issue of trying to increase safety for young drivers, so I am certainly able to work with him if there is any conflict on the two.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

We are talking about increasing the hours to 75. How many additional daytime hours and nighttime hours will that be?

Senator Ohrenschaal:

I believe it would be an increase of 20 hours for the daytime driving and 5 hours for the nighttime driving. It is currently 50 hours total with 10 hours of nighttime driving. This would raise it to a total of 75 hours with 15 hours of nighttime driving being required.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

I have a 15-year-old who I am in the car with quite regularly. She has an app that she starts up when we start driving. When she stops driving, she turns the app off. I mistakenly let her drive here for spring break. I had to have her promptly pull over. I learned a valuable lesson as a parent not to let a child drive on a two-lane road, especially when you ask her to pass a semi-truck. That was my learning curve. In your expert opinion, is that additional 25 hours the end-all and be-all. Are we going to come back later and increase it to 100 hours? Do you believe 75 hours is enough, and how did you get to that number?

Senator Ohrenschall:

To get that number, I talked to folks in the field, like Mr. Ayers. I also talked to folks with Zero Teen Fatalities. I believe they are going to testify in neutral today due to their policies, but I also looked at the recommendations from the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS). They would like every state to have the minimum of 50 hours behind-the-wheel experience for teenage drivers before they can get that full, unrestricted license, but the optimal recommendation is currently 70 hours or more. Maine has 70 hours. If Nevada went to 75 hours, we would have the highest in the nation.

As to whether things would need to be revisited in future sessions, that is certainly a possibility. The original version of Senate Bill 474 (1st Reprint) would have required the teenager to have the instructional permit for nine months. That was amended out in the Senate. The original version of Senate Bill 474 (1st Reprint) also dealt with another issue of teenage drivers not going to get the instructional permit at all, but waiting until they turned 18, getting a fair amount of practice right before the test, passing the test, and then becoming licensed drivers with an unrestricted license but without having had any experience. There was not an appetite for that in the Senate.

You talked about having a young driver in your house. My boys are not old enough to drive yet, but I would certainly like the age pushed to 21 or 25 because I am so worried about them driving. However, I think the more we can do to get kids in a safe, controlled environment with a licensed driver, the safer they are going to be. That is the recommendation of IIHS.

Chuck Ayers:

The additional hours would provide 20 more hours of daytime driving and 5 more hours at night because the teens have a curfew. In the summer, it does not get dark until 9 p.m., but they have a curfew of 10 p.m. On weekends, it is a little different. That is why it was only increased 5 hours at night and 20 hours in the day. This would get them to exactly where they want in order to drive. For example, teens go to Yerington to take the driving test for one reason—there are no traffic lights in Yerington. There are no lane changes because there is only one lane through town. The only thing that resembles a traffic light is a four-way stop with a flashing red light. Yes, they go through a school zone like everywhere else, and they have to make five right turns and five left turns. The recommendation for the increase of hours is to provide more daytime driving as well.

Senator Ohrenschall:

Hopefully, we can strike that from the record. I do not want my boys to know there is an easy test in Yerington. It is a little more challenging in the south.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I would like to put on the record that we actually have three traffic lights in Minden.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Seeing no further questions from the Committee, I will open the hearing for those wishing to testify in support of S.B. 474 (R1). [There was no one.] Is there anyone present who would like to testify in opposition to the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone present who would like to testify as neutral to the bill?

Andrew Bennett, Public Information Officer, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety:

Traffic safety is an ever-evolving practice. As the Senator mentioned, the graduated driver's license hours and the required hours have increased over the years and vary state to state. There are states that have zero required hours and, as has been mentioned, Maine currently requires 70 hours. This would put Nevada at the top with 75 hours.

To go into a little more detail with the IIHS study that was mentioned, it specifically points out if Nevada were to increase these hours just to 70, it would decrease crashes involving teens by 5 percent and reduce fatalities involving teens by at least 1 percent. Our office is here to answer any questions you may have about the specifics of teen driving laws.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Do you have any statistics about the increased time compared to defensive driving training? Are there any statistics of how that improves teen safety records?

Andrew Bennett:

We have a program in Nevada called Drivers Edge, which has been mentioned several times this session. Our office supports that program through grant funding. It is currently being evaluated through the University of Nevada, Las Vegas School of Medicine. I do not have any information at hand, but it is something our office is looking at to put together in the future.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.]

Zachary Cord, Management Analyst, Division of Management Services and Programs, Department of Motor Vehicles:

The DMV still stands neutral in regard to S.B. 474 (R1). I am here if you have any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there any further testimony in neutral? [There was none.] Are there any closing remarks?

Senator Ohrenschall:

Thank you for hearing the bill and for the good questions. I will reach out to Assemblyman Wheeler to make sure we harmonize both bills. I support his bill, and I hope he supports mine.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 474 (1st Reprint). I will open the hearing for Senate Joint Resolution 7.

Senate Joint Resolution 7: Expresses support for finding innovative transportation solutions in the Lake Tahoe Basin and for the efforts of the Bi-State Working Group on Transportation. (BDR R-441)

Senator Marcia Washington, Senate District No. 4:

I am here to introduce Senate Joint Resolution 7, which is sponsored by the Review and Oversight Committee of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System. Last interim, the committee had six meetings addressing a variety of issues relating to Lake Tahoe and the Marlette Lake Water System. Upon conclusion of the interim, the committee voted to forward six recommendations as bill draft requests to the 80th Session of the Nevada Legislature, including the one we are discussing today.

Of the many topics discussed during the interim, the committee received an overview of the Lake Tahoe Bi-State Working Group on Transportation and its efforts to collaborate with various regional governments to address long-term transportation issues in the Lake Tahoe Basin and surrounding areas. The Bi-State Working Group on Transportation consists of 21 people representing federal, regional, state, and local public agencies, business groups, the environmental community, and the resort and tourism industries. To show support for bi-state collaboration, the committee voted unanimously to draft a resolution expressing the Nevada Legislature's support for finding innovative transportation solutions in the Lake Tahoe Basin and to help protect the lake and surrounding ecosystems from the increasing impacts of congestion and other transportation-related challenges.

Mr. Lawrence, Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, is here to provide an overview of the resolution. I would like to turn it over to him at this time.

James R. Lawrence, Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:

I appreciate the opportunity to testify in support of Senate Joint Resolution 7. I would also like to thank the interim legislative committee for all the time and work they spent dedicated to Lake Tahoe issues over the interim, and for Senator Washington for introducing this legislation.

Senate Joint Resolution 7 expresses support for finding innovative transportation solutions in the Lake Tahoe Basin and for the efforts of the Bi-State Working Group on Transportation. Lake Tahoe is a renowned destination drawing visitors not only from nearby major metropolitan areas, but the beauty of the Lake Tahoe Basin draws visitors from across the nation and from around the world. It has been estimated that nearly ten million vehicles are driven on the basin's roadways each year.

The large amount of visitors to the Lake Tahoe Basin provides for a multibillion dollar tourist economy that is of great importance not just to the local economy, but also to the economies of both Nevada and California. However, the increased number of visitors to the Tahoe Basin is causing more traffic congestion and parking shortages that have impacts to the region's environment, the quality of life, and the visitor experience.

The challenges of increased tourism are not unique to the Tahoe Basin and are being experienced by visitor-dependent communities nationally. However, Lake Tahoe is unique in that the basin includes two states, five counties, one incorporated city, and a major transportation route with U.S. Highway 50 passing through the southern part of the basin connecting northern Nevada with metropolitan areas in central and northern California. All of these planning challenges are amplified by the presence of a large body of water, being Lake Tahoe, right in the center, making traditional transportation solutions based on the grid system impossible and not feasible to implement.

Recognizing the importance of the Tahoe visitor economy and the need to protect the Lake Tahoe environment, the director of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and the Secretary of California's Natural Resources Agency convened a bi-state consultation on transportation. The goal was to bring together key stakeholders representing the two states, local governments, transportation agencies, resort associations, environmental interests, and the private sector to develop transportation strategies unique to the challenges of the Tahoe Basin.

The bi-state consultation consisted of a series of meetings over an 18-month period. The consultation process resulted in a ten-year transportation action plan that identifies top priority projects and services with the goal of increasing the number of people bicycling, walking, and using transit to increase the non-auto mode share by 5 percent in the ten-year period.

The bi-state consultation involved five working groups that included a physical working group, a transportation and recreation corridor planning working group, a mega-region transportation coordination working group, a private partnership and innovation working group, and a U.S. Highway 50 South Shore Community Revitalization Project working group.

Some of the recommendations from the bi-state consultation have been implemented or are currently under way. A few examples include: a private-public microtransit pilot project for the south shore that was headed by the League to Save Lake Tahoe last summer; planning for the Highway 89 corridor around Emerald Bay has begun; and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency recently issuing the permit for the south shore revitalization project last fall. The corridor planning for Emerald Bay is building off the success of the east shore Highway 28 corridor plan that includes the Incline Village to Sand Harbor bike path that is scheduled to open later this year. While some immediate success has been achieved, the intent is for the momentum of the bi-state consultation to continue forward in the upcoming years.

Passage of S.J.R. 7 sends a strong signal for the need to implement innovative transportation solutions in the Lake Tahoe Basin in order to protect the fragile beauty of the Lake Tahoe environment while maintaining a vibrant tourist economy.

That concludes my testimony. Thank you for your time this afternoon. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I have more of a statement than a question. I have sat on the interim committee a couple of times. Of course, part of Lake Tahoe is in my district. I just want to say that if there was ever a place that needs innovative solutions, it is Lake Tahoe. If you have ever tried to park or just drive through in the summer, it can take most of the day just to get around the lake. That drives tourism away. As we see in the Stateline casinos, especially with the advent of the Indian casinos in California, tourism keeps going down. Part of that, I truly believe, is the traffic not being able to get there from northern California and not being able to drive around to see the beauty of that lake. If we ever needed something, this is it.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

I think this is a great thing, and I really support it. My question is, what is the next step beyond this resolution?

Jim Lawrence:

Quite honestly, this cannot remain idle. There are a lot of moving parts. There are many next steps that are currently underway. For instance, in the summer, we know one of the biggest pinch points, so to speak, regarding driving around the lake is Emerald Bay. Everyone wants to go to Emerald Bay but they cannot get out of their cars, they cannot park, and, in fact, they cannot see anything because they are too busy looking for pedestrians. The corridor planning group is underway for that effort. There are no solutions immediately identified, but they are looking outside the box. They are looking at things like perhaps taking a shuttle. It may be open to through traffic, but instead of parking, there has to be an innovative solution to get people to and from Emerald Bay. The idea is to get those solutions in place and identify the cost of implementation.

Everything in the basin is about collaboration and finding the appropriate cost share. How much of that is a local commitment, a state commitment, and a federal commitment being U.S. Department of Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture land.

That is just one step. We are also convening in the public/private partnership arena. I have recently been on some calls about what it would take to get a carpool share. We know there are people driving from the north shore at Tahoe City to the south shore at Stateline to go to a meeting. There are several people who do that, so why can we not get a car share app up and going that is specific to the basin in order to reduce vehicles. We are currently working

on getting more bike lanes instituted. Given the fact that we are in the legislative session, the whole bi-state consultation has taken a little pause, but we are certainly going to be reconvening the appropriate stakeholders to continue the momentum, identify the most critical projects that can make the biggest difference, and still remain engaged with our counterparts in Sacramento because it is not just in the basin, it is also how people get to the basin.

That is a long answer to what the next steps are. Passage of this resolution sends a signal to the stakeholders that have been involved and have invested a lot of time. Both the states of California and Nevada want to see the momentum continue, and that will give them the incentive to remain engaged.

Assemblyman Yeager:

I agree with my colleague, Assemblyman Wheeler. I still remember the first time I saw Lake Tahoe. When I came around that bend and saw the lake, I was amazed at how beautiful it was. One of the things I love to do is take my family there when they are in town, but traffic is an issue. You have to find enough time in the day to get to some of those points and find parking. My question is not so much about the resolution—obviously I support the resolution—but there is a reference to bike or pedestrian paths. Is there currently an ability to walk or bike all around Lake Tahoe without having to be on the road? In driving that route, I have seen some paths here and there, but I do not know if they connect all the way around the lake.

Jim Lawrence:

Currently, there is not. There is a plan in place to accomplish that. Some areas are more difficult than others. Nevada actually has one of the more difficult areas because of the topography on the east shore. This summer we will have reached a huge milestone. A very large project for the bike path connecting Incline Village to Sand Harbor is scheduled to open this summer. That took a lot of work, and it was a pretty expensive project because of the topography and doing work in that sensitive environment right next to the lake. That is a key piece on the Nevada side. That is not where it stops. If you are riding that bike path and want to go around the lake, then you would have to get back on the highway once you get to Sand Harbor. The next step is to take Sand Harbor and connect it to Spooner Summit.

There are many miles around the lake where we could have a bike path and not be on the highway. Nevada still has some places like I just described. On the California side, if you are on a bike, you have to be on the highway to see Emerald Bay. That will be a difficult task to figure out a bike path that is not connected to the highway around Emerald Bay due to the topography.

The short answer is, yes, there are plans to get that accomplished, but there are some logistical things that need to be accomplished first.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

In the 21-person makeup of the bi-state working group, there are representatives from state, local, regional, and federal public agencies, businesses, the environmental community, and resorts and tourism, but I do not see any representation of the actual citizens who live in the community. Are there any residents included or currently working with you?

Jim Lawrence:

While the consultation group did not necessarily have specific representatives from the general public, many of the members live in the community and they are very aware of the community issues and what the private citizen needs are for the lake. It was not necessarily meant to exclude them, but we really wanted to have a stakeholder group to identify the next steps and where we need to go. As I mentioned the Emerald Bay corridor plan, there is also going to be a main street management plan for the casino area to accommodate the loop road. We will have specific working groups to do the final plans and designs. There are many workshops and processes in which we are bringing in the local citizenry to have impacts on those very specific projects.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any further questions from the Committee? [There were none.] I will open the hearing to those wishing to testify in support of S.J.R. 7.

Kyle J. Davis, representing League to Save Lake Tahoe:

As a member of the Bi-state Working Group, I have had the opportunity to work with a number of people over the last year and a half on these issues. You have heard a pretty detailed explanation of the need to work on transportation issues in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Certainly, we come at it from the environmental perspective. The overwhelming amount of traffic itself in the basin causes environmental impacts, both to air quality and the health and clarity of the lake. The more we can do to get more cars off the roads and get people into alternative modes of transportation is going to be beneficial for the overall health of the lake.

One other thing I would like to add is that a couple of years ago, the League to Save Lake Tahoe did start the pilot project in the South Shore area with Lime bike, and the next year expanded that to electric scooters. It has proven to be very successful in offering new modes of transportation for people in that resort area. We are hoping to expand all different types of efforts as we continue to work with this group and other people to come up with new transportation solutions in the basin.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone present who would like to testify in opposition to the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone present who would like to testify as neutral to the bill? [There was no one.] Are there any closing comments?

Senator Washington:

I would love to have your support on S.J.R. 7.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will close the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 7. We have two bills on work session today. We will start with Senate Bill 299 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 299 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Demonstration Program. (BDR 58-916)

Michelle L. Van Geel, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 299 (1st Reprint) was heard in this Committee on May 7, 2019, and is sponsored by Senators Brooks and Spearman (Exhibit J). The bill revises provisions governing the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Demonstration Program. A public utility may include in its annual plan for carrying out the Program an incentive to a public school that installs electric vehicle infrastructure on the school's property or purchases electric vehicles for transporting students. The public school may receive 75 percent of the cost to install electric vehicle infrastructure or purchase electric vehicles for transporting students. There were no amendments for the measure.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 299 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 299 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT SECONDED THE MOTION

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE).

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Smith. The last bill on work session is Senate Bill 329 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 329 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the prevention of natural disasters. (BDR 58-1132)

Michelle L. Van Geel, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 329 (1st Reprint) was heard in this Committee on May 7, 2019, and is sponsored by Senator Brooks (Exhibit K). The bill requires an electric utility to submit a natural disaster protection plan to the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada on or before June 1 every third year, beginning in 2020. The plan must contain certain information relating to the efforts of the electric utility to prevent or respond to a fire or other natural disaster, and

the prudent and reasonable expenditures made by an electric utility in developing and implementing such a plan must be recovered by a separate monthly rate charged to all customers of the electric utility.

The bill prohibits a person from performing work on electric infrastructure of an electric utility unless that person is a qualified electrical worker or an apprentice electrical lineman under the direct supervision of a qualified electrical worker. The Commission may authorize a person who is not a qualified electrical worker to perform tree trimming relating to line clearance under the direction of a certified arborist. There were no amendments for this measure.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 329 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 329 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Leavitt. That brings us to the last item on the agenda, which is public comment. Is there anyone present for public comment? [There was no one.] This meeting is adjourned [at 3:02 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Joan Waldock
Recording Secretary

Lori McCleary
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to [Senate Bill 300 \(1st Reprint\)](#), dated May 7, 2019, presented by Senator Chris Brooks, Senate District No. 3.

[Exhibit D](#) is an explanation table for the proposed amendment to [Senate Bill 300 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Senator Chris Brooks, Senate District No. 3.

[Exhibit E](#) is written testimony in support of [Senate Bill 300 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Senator Chris Brooks, Senate District No. 3.

[Exhibit F](#) is a proposed amendment to [Senate Bill 300 \(1st Reprint\)](#), submitted by Southwest Gas Corporation.

[Exhibit G](#) is a letter written to Chair Monroe-Moreno in support of [Senate Bill 300 \(1st Reprint\)](#), dated May 8, 2019, submitted by Alex McDonough, Vice President, Public Policy, Sunrun Inc.

[Exhibit H](#) is a document titled "2019 Roadmap of State Highway Safety Laws, 16th Annual Edition," published by Advocates for Highway & Auto Safety, regarding [Senate Bill 474 \(1st Reprint\)](#), submitted by Senator James Ohrenschall, Senate District No. 21.

[Exhibit I](#) is written testimony regarding [Senate Bill 474 \(1st Reprint\)](#), dated April 4, 2019, presented by Senator James Ohrenschall, Senate District No. 21.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 299 \(1st Reprint\)](#), dated May 9, 2019, presented by Michelle L. Van Geel, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is the work Session Document for [Senate Bill 329 \(1st Reprint\)](#), dated May 9, 2019, presented by Michelle L. Van Geel, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.