

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

**Eighty-Second Session
February 23, 2023**

The Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Howard Watts at 1:32 p.m. on Thursday, February 23, 2023, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Selena La Rue Hatch, Assembly District No. 25
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Assembly District No. 34



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

M.J. Maynard, Chief Executive Officer, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Justin Jones, Chair, Board of Commissioners, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Dale Keller, Director of Engineering, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County
Brian Fadie, State Policy Manager, Appliance Standards Awareness Project
Angela Dykema, representing Southwest Energy Efficiency Project
Kyle Davis, representing Western Resource Advocates
Annette Magnus, Executive Director, Battle Born Progress
Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League
Ryan Bellows, Vice President, Government and External Relations, NV Energy
Michael Hillerby, representing The American Institute of Architects
Michael Willoughby, representing Climate Power
Lakshmi Albright, Member, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club
Dora Martinez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Dylan Keith, Assistant Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Marcos Lopez, Outreach and Coalitions Director, Nevada Policy Research Institute
Wiz Rouzard, Deputy State Director, Americans for Prosperity-Nevada
Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada
Alex Tanchek, representing Sierra Cannabis Coalition
Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Athar Haseebullah, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Lilith Baran, Policy Manager, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices
Elyse Monroy-Marsala, Private Citizen
Jason Walker, Sergeant, Administrative Division, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office; and representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Christine Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Andrew MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association
Christopher M. Ries, Detective, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Richard P. McCann, representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; and Member, Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition
Todd Ingalsbee, President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada

Erica Roth, Government Affairs Liaison, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County Public Defender's Office
John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public Defender's Office
David Clyde, Associate General Counsel, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Eric Jeng, Acting Executive Director, One APIA Nevada
Anwar Allums, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Aesha Goins, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Ricky Gourrier, representing Opportunity Village
Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Jim Hoffman, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice
Richard Hodgson, Officer, Service Employees International Union, Local 1107
Brittany Bas, Founder/President, AMUSE Foundation
Gerald Mayes, Veterans Affairs Chair, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles
Anna Binder, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada
Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director, Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities

Chair Watts:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We have a few items on our agenda for today. We will be hearing presentations from the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada and the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County. We will then be hearing two bills, [Assembly Bill 144](#) and [Assembly Bill 161](#). I do intend to take the agenda in order. First, we will hear the presentation from the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada. Thank you for joining us today. Whenever you are ready, you can introduce yourselves for the record and begin.

M.J. Maynard, Chief Executive Officer, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada:

With me today is Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Southern Nevada Chairman and Clark County Commissioner, Justin Jones.

The fundamental role of the RTC is to connect people. I think people are always surprised to learn we are the only agency in the United States to house all these functions under one roof. We are the public transit provider, we are the metropolitan planning organization, we are the roadway funding agency for the region, the traffic manager for the region, and we oversee the bike share system in downtown Las Vegas [page 2, [Exhibit C](#)].

As many of you know, roadways in southern Nevada are primarily funded by motor vehicle fuel taxes, including fuel revenue indexing, otherwise known as FRI. Thanks to the Nevada Legislature in large part, fuel revenue indexing became something that we could do in 2014.

In 2016, because of a successful ballot question in southern Nevada, we were allowed to continue to index fuel tax to inflation. It has been a very successful program allowing us to work closely with all the local jurisdictions, contractors, labor, et cetera, to ensure that we have funding not only to maintain and operate the roadways in southern Nevada today, but to grow the roadway infrastructure for the future.

What have we done with this money? If you look on the slide [page 3], 614 contracts have been awarded, of which 336 have been completed; 78 local small businesses have been put to work; over \$2 billion has been spent on roadway infrastructure; and over 15,000 jobs have been created.

The intent of today's presentation is to focus mainly on the hat we wear as a transit provider and the funding challenge we have had. This is not a funding challenge that just appeared this year. We have actually spent time in previous legislative sessions, including 2017, 2019, and 2021, talking about the fiscal cliff and our transit fund that we knew was imminent.

Before I get into that, I would like to provide a quick overview [page 5, [Exhibit C](#)]. This is our budgeted transit operating revenue for fiscal year (FY) 2023. This is what funds public transit. The majority of that, as you see on the slide, is sales tax, about 76 percent. We anticipate \$218.5 million in sales tax revenue this year.

Budgeted transit operating expenditures for FY 2023 [page 6]: The majority of what we spend is on our contract services, which is providing the fixed route service itself, paratransit, senior services, veterans services, and the like. That is about 87.2 percent of the total expenditure pie.

I want to share a video that talks about the impact and the value of transit in southern Nevada [page 7]. [The video was played.]

People are also surprised to learn that the RTC operates the fourteenth-busiest bus system in the United States. Prepandemic, we were actually ranked the twelfth-busiest bus system. We moved approximately 65 million trips that year. Coming out of the pandemic, we are not quite back to where we were. In 2022, there were 41 million annual trips just on our fixed-route system alone. That is 39 routes that utilize about 400 buses that service about 3,300 bus stops. We had over a million paratransit trips and used about 400 vehicles to operate that service as well.

Another thing people are surprised to know, if they do not use transit, is the thought might be that just poor people use transit. However, we know of the 150,000 daily boardings that happen in southern Nevada every day; 80 percent of the folks using transit are going to work. We are connecting employees to employers. We are part of the economic ecosystem in the community. This may be a bit of a proud moment for the agency, but for the last eight years

we have been ranked the most efficient bus system in the United States. What does that mean? It means we use less taxpayer subsidy per trip. We like to stay lean and mean. We take our role as a steward for taxpayer dollars very seriously and try to make the most of what we have.

I will move on to our funding challenges. I know this is a busy slide, but this slide represents our ten-year financial model to operate transit [page 11, Exhibit C]. The dark blue bars represent revenue that we receive to operate public transit. The light blue bars represent the cost or the expenditures to operate public transit. The green is the fund balance. It is important to note that it looks the way it does because we received a one-time infusion of \$304 million in stimulus funds. That allowed us a little breathing room. We were able to push the imminent fiscal cliff out for a few more years. The black line on the slide is the board-approved six-month reserve policy. It represents what we would need to have in place to operate transit for an additional six months.

This is the same slide [page 12] except this shows if we had not received the stimulus funds, this is what the funding model would look like.

If I were to look at the bottom line where it shows where the fiscal cliff starts—I should say expenditures over revenues begin in FY 2026 [page 13]. If you were to take that out to FY 2034, it is over \$800 million in expenses over revenues. If you concentrate on the first three years, we anticipate about \$231 million of expenses exceeding revenues. Because it is such a significant number, if we are not able to identify a funding solution, we will begin retracting service as early as July 2024. However, we will begin making cuts internally first, as we had to do during the Great Recession, whether that is laying off staff, employee wage reduction, or things like that. Before we impact our community, we look internally as to where we could be to make sure we are the most efficient with taxpayer dollars, and we take this very seriously.

One last thing I want to note is when you look at this model, we know in order to maintain the current level of transit service for the next ten years, we need about \$40 million each year.

How did we get here? It did not happen overnight. We have known for a while this day was approaching. We like to do our research. We looked around the United States to see how other transit systems invest and what they invest to maintain public transit in their communities [page 14]. What we learned was in Las Vegas, the annual spent per capita is about \$113. When you compare that to some of our peer cities or other cities around the United States, they spend \$80 to \$270 more per capita on an investment in public transit in their respective communities.

We used to have bragging rights because of the world-famous Las Vegas Strip. We were the only transit system in the United States that had a profitable transit route [page 15, [Exhibit C](#)]. Unfortunately, transportation is not a moneymaker; it is a subsidized service. However, we actually generated a profit every single year, and we used that profit to help stand up the local service we provide to the residents of southern Nevada.

When transportation network companies began operating in October 2015, we saw a decline in both ridership and revenue beginning in November 2015, which has continued today.

Our job is to be problem solvers. That is what we are paid to do. Anytime we have conversations around identifying a revenue source, they are not easy conversations to have. However, I will go over a couple of potential solutions.

This leaves us with the need to secure additional revenue to sustain transit service in southern Nevada. We understand that any conversation around revenue is difficult, and over the last seven years, we have explored several potential options. Most recently, we met with our RTC Board of Commissioners and the Transportation Resource Advisory Committee (TRAC), which is a committee made up of about 35 key stakeholders in southern Nevada. It represents the business community, the chambers of commerce, labor, education, seniors, and veterans, just to name a few. Both our RTC Board of Commissioners and TRAC looked at our financials. We scrubbed the numbers. We wanted to make sure we were being as transparent as we could be. They concurred that we had a significant funding problem and recommended we continue to explore revenue options.

One potential option we are looking at is allocating funds from revenue the State already collects that may more appropriately be directed to mitigate the impacts upon public transportation. For example, the transportation connection tax is currently collected for activities that have a direct impact upon public transportation. Another potential option would be for the Legislature to give local governments flexibility to address the needs of our transit system at the local level.

We are continuing to socialize these options. If we are unable to find a legislative solution, the last option to try to avoid service cuts and maintain existing service will likely be to seek a ballot question in 2024 to increase the sales tax. If none of these solutions is successful, then unfortunately, cutting service will be our only option.

This slide [page 18] is an example of what that would look like. Probably about 8.5 million trips would be impacted on an annual basis. Certainly, the people who will be impacted will be the workforce who rely on us to get them to work—paratransit customers; folks living in low socioeconomic conditions; carless households, which include many families who have just one car so they take public transit as a subsidy in terms of getting around; and, of course, veterans, seniors, and students [page 19].

I just want to mention one other thing before I end this presentation. Our legislation, Senate Bill 17, received a hearing in the Senate Committee on Government Affairs last week. This bill is essentially cleanup language in Chapter 277A of *Nevada Revised Statutes*. This will include updates to the Yellow Dot program. Due to changes in technology and community interests, we would like to make the program permissive rather than mandatory. It also requests to remove requirements from the statute for the Bus Shelter and Bench Advisory Committee, such as the annual number of meetings and specific membership requirements to allow the RTC Board of Commissioners to make changes to the committee based on the community need.

Finally, S.B. 17 requires clarification that allows us to invest in innovating and emerging transportation technologies that will better align with federal infrastructure bill policies, such as investments in battery and hydrogen fuel cell electric buses and autonomous vehicle technology.

That concludes my presentation. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Chair Watts:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

You said the dollar amount was over \$800 million. Could you please tell me how that breaks down by fiscal year?

M.J. Maynard:

If I could draw your attention to fiscal year (FY) 2026 [page 11, [Exhibit C](#)], the deficit begins at negative \$54.6 million; FY 2027 is negative \$75.8 million; FY 2028 is negative \$100.7 million; FY 2029 is negative \$105.2 million; FY 2030 is negative \$113.1 million; FY 2031 is negative \$17.6 million; FY 2032 is negative \$33 million; FY 2033 is negative \$103.7 million; and FY 2034 is negative \$222.4 million.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

You do not need it all at once. You need incremental, yearly dollars. What would that amount be?

M.J. Maynard:

Looking at the numbers and looking at our capital program and the cost of doing business, we think we need about \$40 million per year to sustain the current level of transit service with some moderate growth based on population growth—about 2 percent each year for the next ten years.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

That is a much different pill to have to swallow.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

Last session, I do believe we talked a little bit about first mile/last mile and a pilot program that was being done relative to some of the paratransit and accessibility features. I know that we continue to expand development in the valley, but we do not always reach them with regard to transit services. I am curious to know, do you have any updated information relative to the success of that pilot? Are we continuing it?

M.J. Maynard:

We do. Actually, because of the stimulus funds, we were able to add service to areas of the valley that had been growing for many years that we had not been able to provide transit service to. For example, the southwest part of the valley has been one of the fastest-growing portions of West Henderson and the northwest part of Clark County. We did not have the money to expand services so we did introduce an on-demand service. We do that because it is much more efficient to cover the square miles the southwest represents. They are not pilots anymore but are now programs. We partner with Uber, Lyft, and a private company in southern Nevada called Tango. We are looking for the most efficient way to operate service based on the needs of a sprawling community, is it a dense community, and what makes the most sense fiscally.

Justin Jones, Chair, Board of Commissioners, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada:

I live in the southwest valley. The on-demand service came on board about 18 months ago. It has been not just a boon to the people who live in the southwest, but also to the small-business owners. I can tell you the restaurant owners and tire shop owners have really taken advantage of partnerships with the RTC. If you blow a tire, you go to a tire shop, but want to get home or to work, you can take advantage of door-to-door service. If you go out to a bar and need a safe ride home, the on-demand service has been fantastic for that. If we were able to have sustainable funding, that is something that we would definitely love to be able to expand through other areas of the valley.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

As I am sure you all already know, I am a big bike advocate. Some of the multimodal accessibility features that we have relative to how they interact with our transit system are really important. I am curious to know if you have any updated information that perhaps you could provide even after this meeting relative to how we are doing with regard to bike share, how many bikes are we carrying on our buses, and to see the accessibility and how we are able to help folks who are utilizing multiple modes of transportation.

M.J. Maynard:

Assemblywoman Brown-May knows our system well. We carry over 50,000 bikes on our transit system every single month. A lot of people use their bikes as a first mile/last mile. You are right, we are multimodal and it really is about options for people to move about southern Nevada, including bikes and bicycle safety. I will make sure to get with your office

to provide you updated maps. It is still a priority for many of the jurisdictions to invest in bike lanes. We are seeing a keen interest in electric bikes because you do not have to pedal as hard. We are looking for federal grant opportunities to expand the bike share system with an emphasis on even more electric bikes.

Chair Watts:

Are there any further questions from the Committee? [There were none.] I do have a couple of questions. I would love to hear a little bit more about trying to preserve transit and that is important. You talked about some of the innovative initiatives around first mile/last mile. I know the Maryland Parkway corridor has been a longtime priority for improving the quality of transit along that corridor. Could you talk about some of the big-picture projects to improve transit, understanding at the same time that we do have some issues with being able to sustain it long term.

M.J. Maynard:

That is a great question. We have been working on the Maryland Parkway Bus Rapid Transit project for quite a while. I hate to say fingers crossed, but fingers crossed. We will know sometime this spring if we are going to receive federal funding through the Capital Investment Grant Program. We are at 90 percent design, and we should start construction in 2024. The service will be up and running by 2025. Again, a great connector for the airport, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), through the downtown area, and UNLV's medical district. We are very excited about that. We have been working on an on-board plan. We talked to the community—we cannot make decisions without talking to the community. What would you like to see in southern Nevada as we grow up as a mobility region? We have certainly heard the customers would like to see more high-capacity transit such as light rail, bus, or rapid transit. They want more frequent service, safer service, and upgraded amenities. We stand prepared to implement some of those major projects if funding becomes available. Unfortunately, unless there is a stable funding source, the federal government is not prone to giving out federal dollars for big projects.

Chair Watts:

Regarding the piece on federal funding, with the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act, I know there are probably some different programs the RTC may be eligible for. Could you speak to including conversion towards zero-emission or alternative fuel vehicles are also considered in that? Could you just speak to any of the opportunities you have identified to harness some of the new federal funding programs.

M.J. Maynard:

I am sorry I did not mention that because that is a priority for the RTC. We put together a zero-emission vehicle plan to align itself with the goals of the state to be zero-emission by 2050 with a big asterisk that says if funding is available.

First and foremost, we go after every federal dollar. In the last year and a half, we have received \$14 million from the federal government to test battery electric buses and hydrogen fuel cell electric buses. We really want to get smart on the technology before we make

a very large investment. There has been a supply chain issue and buses are running late. We should have had them in service by now, but we will have four battery electric buses coming in this year and two hydrogen fuel cell buses coming in. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act is very specific. There is a lot of opportunity with a focus on clean energy. We are going to go after every opportunity.

Chair Watts:

One thing you had touched on briefly is that riders need safe service. I think some of us have been hearing about a variety of safety issues across the county. Would you provide a little more information on some of the safety issues you are facing and working to address?

M.J. Maynard:

Public transit is really this moving microcosm of what happens in any urban setting. For example, if crime, homelessness, mental illness, or drug addiction increases, it is happening on the streets of the city you live in and it is happening on public transit. As we have seen an increase here in southern Nevada, we have also seen an increase on our public transit vehicles. We try to use technology where we can, so we work closely with all the police departments in Las Vegas. We have the ability right now to do a live look-in. We can look into any bus at any time and monitor what is happening. We contract with a private security firm. We use data to understand where the security officers should be positioned. We are using federal dollars to ensure that we are lighting all of our shelters to make sure the customers feel safe standing at those stops. It is listening to the customers and the drivers and then reacting as we receive that data.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

Regarding the electric buses, you were doing studies. Have you completed them or are you in the process of completing them?

M.J. Maynard:

There could be a manufacturer trying to sell something, but we want to make sure what they said they were going to sell us is exactly what they are going to sell us. We had them come to Las Vegas in the hottest month and test the battery electric bus on the Strip by opening doors a lot with all the heat. Actually, we were really pleased with the success of that battery electric bus. It worked out really well. Just from doing that test first, we knew it was a great opportunity to start investing in battery electric buses because it proved to be so successful in really extreme conditions. Through grant funding, we will receive four battery electric buses this year, which we will continue testing. We will also receive two hydrogen fuel cell electric buses.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

I would like to see your studies with the buses. I personally just bought an electric car, and it has a lot of electrical stuff to it. Unfortunately, it has been rear-ended twice now, and they cannot figure out why the drive train just stops in the middle of the road. I have this vision of these buses getting into accidents, which happens sometimes. They are driving okay but then, all of a sudden, we have this huge backup and the bus cannot be moved because it just

stops and there is no talking to it. I would be interested to see about that because I think that would be a mess. Even though I love the car and I love the idea, we are finding other issues we were not aware of.

M.J. Maynard:

Absolutely, we will provide you with what we have. As we update our Board of Commissioners on the buses themselves as we receive them, we will make sure to share that with you as well.

Chair Watts:

Seeing no other questions from the Committee, thank you for your presentation. We definitely appreciate your highlighting some of these issues and look forward to continued conversations to address them and continue to maintain quality and innovative transit options for southern Nevada.

With that, we will move on to our next presentation from the RTC of Washoe County.

Dale Keller, Director of Engineering, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County:

With me today is Paul Nelson, our government affairs officer. I am pleased to provide the Committee an update about who we are and what we do.

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Washoe County is a cooperative regional board consisting of five elected representatives appointed from three government jurisdictions: two from Washoe County; two from the City of Reno; and one representative from the City of Sparks [page 2, [Exhibit D](#)]. The Department of Transportation Director, Tracy Larkin-Thomason, is an ex officio member. Our chair is Ed Lawson, the Mayor of Sparks. The RTC Executive Director is Bill Thomas, who was unable to be here today.

Created in 1979, the RTC's duty extended to three very core functions [page 3]. The first is transportation planning. The RTC is a metropolitan planning organization for Washoe County. We are responsible for the development of our long-range transportation plan, as well as anticipating the transportation needs for the future of the Truckee Meadows.

Second is the engineering construction for our street and highway program, including the Transit Capital Project. This is where we differ from the RTC of Southern Nevada. Not only does this agency fund the street projects, we perform these projects on behalf of the local jurisdictions. That consolidation under one RTC roof—the planning, the funding, the engineering, and the construction—really increases the effectiveness and implementation of the transportation program in Washoe County.

Third is the operation of our public transportation system with one of our goals to ensure the service is safe, reliable, comfortable, and customer focused.

Regarding public transportation, the backbone of our transit system is our fixed route bus system named RIDE [page 4, [Exhibit D](#)]. There are 25 routes, including two rapid bus lines and one regional route between Reno and Carson City. There are roughly 4.5 million trips a year on this network, and 60 percent of those are work-related trips.

Now I want to share some good news, and our team is very excited. The RTC achieved our goal of a 100 percent alternative-fuel fleet last year [page 5]. This is 13 years ahead of schedule over our 2035 goal. The RTC of Washoe was an early adopter of electric buses. We were the first in Nevada to put them in service in 2014. Today our fleet includes 23 electric buses, which is about one-third of our fleet. These buses roughly get about 100 miles per charge, but our fixed route typically travels about 300 miles. Moving to an all-electric fleet would be challenging; however, the technology is improving. The remaining two-thirds of our fleet operate on diesel electric hybrids, biodiesel, or compressed natural gas. We also have plans to add our first hydrogen-fueled buses in this calendar year.

Overall, our transit systems are keeping millions of pounds of carbon dioxide out of our air. The bar chart shows the amount of carbon savings from 2022 [page 6]. The gray area accounts for the greenhouse gas reductions for fixed routes, and the blue area illustrates the success of our VANPOOL program, which I will highlight a little bit later.

I would be remiss if I did not talk about the significant impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on public transit service in Washoe County [page 7]. Ridership was analyzed both before and during the pandemic. This graph depicts ridership in the spring of 2021 with the blue dots. It is smaller than the ridership in the fall of 2019, which is the red dots. Ridership decreased about 48 percent in the early days of the pandemic, but only rebounded to about 65 percent of pre-pandemic levels. That is a 35 percent decrease in our ridership.

This is a trend with transit agencies across the country; it is not just unique here in Washoe County. The RTC recognizes the need to be strategic, innovative, and nimble. Our 2023 to 2027 Transit Optimization Plan Strategies, or TOPS, identifies strategies for retaining current transit riders as well as attracting new ones.

Through our Board of Commissioners, the agency's number one strategic goal is to rebuild our public transportation by rethinking and redefining what the system is as a whole [page 8]—how we can use these new solutions, technologies, and system improvements for sustainable ridership growth with a focus on equitable and accessible ridership, reliability and safe services, service innovation, and then financial sustainability.

Furthermore, our peer review of ten transit agencies was completed for both our fixed-route and paratransit systems or services [page 9]. The peer agencies were selected based on the likeness of RTC Washoe as well as similar local settings. Overall, RTC spends a similar amount on overall transit services and more per capita. We provide a similar amount of bus services, and Washoe County residents use more transits than our peers.

To attract and grow sustainable ridership, RTC is focused on the end-to-end customer experience [page 10, [Exhibit D](#)]. We are focusing more than just the time spent on a vehicle. We are leveraging our existing investment to improve the speed of service whenever possible and feed the rapid transit lines. We are enhancing our digital capabilities by integrating and streamlining the customer experience, as an example, through a single app on our phones. Lastly, we are increasing and improving education and using very smart and targeted communication.

One way we are achieving this goal is by expanding our on-demand, curb-to-curb service called FlexRIDE [page 11]. Our goal is to increase FlexRIDE by the total number of square miles served in the next five years. FlexRIDE began in 2019 and currently serves three zones. The first one is Sparks and the Spanish Springs area, the North Valleys in Reno, as well as the Northwest Reno and Somerset/Verdi area.

Another resource RTC Washoe provides is senior mobility rides and VANPOOL [page 12]. The RTC currently offers Washoe seniors—60 years and older—as well as veterans and people with disabilities, a subsidized taxi program. Uber and Lyft are included in that to provide mobility options to areas that are not provided by public transportation.

At the bottom of the slide is the RTC VANPOOL program. It is a transportation alternative for groups who share commute routes. This VANPOOL program is the most cost-effective public transit service we run. Our biggest users are employees who work at the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center. Our fleet is roughly about 350 vans and is the sixth-largest in the nation. We are very proud of that program.

Switching from our transit to our transportation investment, in fiscal year 2022, we invested over \$77 million into the community and created over 1,700 direct jobs [page 13].

Currently, we have 65 active projects in various stages of design, construction, or project closeout [page 14]. To quickly highlight, our team did an excellent job completing our Mill Street Complete Streets project in the heart of Reno. The picture on the bottom left shows the completion of the Lemmon Drive project. We just completed a very important connection at Sparks Boulevard, and likewise, keeping good roads good with our pavement preservation program, we repaved 60 regional roads equating to over 10 million square feet of roadway.

This can be possible with the revenue we receive [page 15]. Our main sources of revenue are the motor vehicle fuel tax and sales tax. These two revenue sources comprise about 49 percent and 22 percent of RTC's revenue respectively. Other revenue sources include the Regional Road Impact Fees, which impact new development, federal grants, and passenger fares. This fiscal revenue is over \$200 million. As a side note, just to make sure I am clear, the cost to operate our public transportation system relies 100 percent on local sales tax and passenger fares.

As Ms. Maynard from the RTC of Southern Nevada mentioned, it ebbs and flows. In addition, federal funding we receive through the United States Federal Transit Administration can only be spent on capital investments and improvements.

For this year's expenditures, fiscal year 2023, 30 percent is used on transit, 30 percent is used on roadway projects, and 30 percent is used on preservation and multimodal projects [page 16, [Exhibit D](#)]. The remaining 10 percent is spent on debt service, and a very small portion is spent on our overall operating costs.

Washoe County and Clark County are the only Nevada counties with fuel tax indexing. On this screen is the history of indexing since 2010, which has allowed the RTC to keep up with the transportation needs of the community [page 17]. However, this money source is plateauing with more effective combustion engines and the saturation of electric vehicles.

As the State looks at alternatives for this loss of gas tax revenue, the RTC does support maintaining and increasing funding for regional transportation through equitable taxation. We would like to ensure any new funding methods are transitioned gradually. We also want to ensure any new funding methods have been tested and vetted.

Thank you for your time. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Watts:

I will open it up to questions from members of the Committee.

Assemblywoman Kasama:

I am curious about electric buses and hydrogen buses. It sounds like you have not placed them in service yet. However, I am sure there is information about the efficiency of a hydrogen bus versus an electric bus. What are the big differences between them, or are they very similar with different methods?

Dale Keller:

We are at the edge of where technology has taken us with electric vehicles. We are about 100 miles per charge. We are looking to supplement that with the hydrogen fuel cell. We are testing that, as this is a very new technology for the bus fixed routes. We are going to test them to see how much mileage we can get out of them as well. We can report back to you with more information, and I can also find more information about the comparisons as well.

Chair Watts:

To get clarity, you do have fully electric buses within your fleet running service now, is that correct?

Dale Keller:

Yes, Chair. About one-third of our buses are fully electric, which is about 23 buses.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

I have a couple of questions about expansion. I live in southern Nevada and I watch our sprawl. We continue to expand development of residential communities outside of the existing RTC transportation corridor. I am curious to know, do you have that same issue with regard to development here in northern Nevada?

Dale Keller:

Yes, we do. That is always a balance of where we provide service and making sure there is a value to those services. We are playing around with that. FlexRIDE has been a good example of that from the curb-to-curb network. The way our current system is set up, we have these pockets of growth and we can do a pilot study to ensure we collect those and they can travel anywhere inside that service area. They then come to a fixed route to put them into one of our main transfer stations. We do see some success with that and can report any additional information you would like.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

I would appreciate the detail. I do have one unrelated question about some of the services you provide. I work within the disability community. There have been a number of times when constituents from northern Nevada have reached out with regard to accessibility for service animals and complaints about some of the VANPOOL pieces. I am curious to know the standardized training. Do you have complaint logs relative to accessibility issues, perhaps for people with disabilities?

Dale Keller:

We do have a record. We can talk about how that is different, maybe if there is an outlier or if we are receiving more of those Americans with Disabilities Act accessible challenges from our program. I do not have that information in front of me, but I can get that for you.

Assemblyman Gurr:

I have a two-part question. How long does it take to charge an electric bus, and how much electric energy does it take to charge that battery?

Dale Keller:

It all depends. We want to keep these buses in service. It is not good to have a bus just sitting at our station not being utilized, so we charge as we go. We look to charge in off-peak times as well. I do not have the exact information, but I can get back to you.

Assemblyman Gurr:

I thought I heard you say they go about 100 miles. Is that correct?

Dale Keller:

Yes, sir.

Assemblyman Gurr:

What is the cold weather doing to it? I know they have experimented with the hot weather in Las Vegas. Have you looked at what the cold weather is doing to the charges?

Dale Keller:

Yes, we see the same challenges. Any extreme heat or cold, when we run the heaters, and when the passenger doors open and close, that completes complexities and we may not be getting the optimal mileage we planned on. However, we account for that as part of our transit operations.

Assemblywoman Peters:

Are any of your facilities invested in solar? Do you have solar in any of your facilities, whether that is the transportation center in downtown Reno or anywhere you are offsetting your energy costs through that investment?

Dale Keller:

At this time, I do not believe we have any solar panels on our transit facilities. We look for alternative funding sources but will continue to explore those options at our facilities.

Assemblywoman Peters:

It sounds like a great way to get some community solar going.

Chair Watts:

Are there any further questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Thank you for your presentation. We will now move to our bill hearings for the day. We will begin with Assembly Bill 144, which revises provisions governing the sale of certain lighting products. I will open the hearing for A.B. 144.

**Assembly Bill 144: Revises provisions governing the sale of certain lighting products.
(BDR 58-621)**

Assemblywoman Selena La Rue Hatch, Assembly District No. 25:

I am here to present Assembly Bill 144, which is a bill phasing out fluorescent light bulbs. I will pause for a moment to allow my copresenter to introduce himself as well.

Brian Fadie, State Policy Manager, Appliance Standards Awareness Project:

Good afternoon, Chair Watts, and members of the Committee. My name is Brian Fadie. I am a state policy manager with the Appliance Standards Awareness Project.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

We are going to start with some key terms. As you may have noticed looking at this bill, it is extremely technical and not all of us are electricians or prepared to understand the terms. I am going to pass this to Mr. Fadie to explain at least one of the common terms we see in the bill.

Brian Fadie:

You see the term "lamp" used in the bill [page 3, [Exhibit E](#)]. This is actually the industry term for a light bulb. When you see the word "lamp" in the bill, it is only referring to the light bulb itself, not to an entire fixture. Most people, if they hear the word "lamp" might think of a whole lighting fixture sitting on a desk, but it is only referring to a light bulb.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

Before we dive into the bill, we would like to discuss why this bill came about and the problem we are trying to solve. In traditional fluorescent tubing, there is mercury inside the tube, which not everyone is aware of. That mercury causes a health hazard to those who are disposing of it, to those who are nearby when it breaks, and to our landfills when it seeps into the water supply. We want to make sure we are removing this environmental health hazard for both our consumers and our workers.

I will allow Mr. Fadie to add a little bit to that.

Brian Fadie:

If you notice the bottom bullet point about broken fluorescents [page 4], they release a mercury vapor into the air, which really is a threat to human health for anyone who might be around it. When you think about workers who have to handle fluorescent light bulbs as part of their job, such as custodial workers, those who collect garbage, workers in the waste stream, or folks who work in recycling centers or landfills; unfortunately, the vast majority of fluorescent light bulbs do not get properly disposed of and end up in the regular waste stream. When they break, they pose a human health hazard. One of the benefits to this policy would be to remove that hazard to workers and anyone else who might be around a fluorescent light bulb when it breaks.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

In addition to the health hazard, there are replacements in LED lamps which can be plugged into any current fixture and have many benefits. One, they are a benefit to the consumer because they cost significantly less to operate. Consumers make their money back from the purchase of the lamp in a very quick turnaround. Two, they burn out at a much slower rate, so the lamps are not replaced as often. Three, they can be disposed of more cheaply. People do not need to call someone to have them hauled away; they can just be thrown in the trash. Four, they use about half the electricity, so we also have the carbon emission savings from them as well.

Brian Fadie:

We will touch on this more in just a moment with the savings that could be seen by transitioning to LEDs. All of this information comes from a report from my organization as well as the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE) we released last year where we looked at the lighting market and compared LEDs and fluorescents.

We really answered the questions about whether LEDs are ready to go as replacements for fluorescents. We are happy to provide more information on that and certainly on any of the technical issues. There is a tremendous amount of utility bill savings and other savings to be had by the transition to LEDs, which I think we will see on the next slide.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

I am a freshman Assemblywoman, but I learned quickly that we love data in this building. We have a couple of charts, and Mr. Fadie is going to walk us through the next three slides, which are all about the data of this bill.

Brian Fadie:

We did an analysis of how many fluorescent light bulbs are still being shipped into states and compared it to those transitioned into LEDs, what sort of savings would be seen on utility bills, greenhouse gas emission reductions, and how much mercury pollution would be avoided because there would not be fluorescent light bulbs containing mercury coming into the state. On this slide [page 6, [Exhibit E](#)], there are two time horizons for the state of Nevada. The top time horizon is annual savings that would be seen in the year 2030. I will note, from left to right, mercury being saved from fluorescents not being shipped, about 7.7 pounds. There would be some additional mercury saved from powerplant emissions being avoided. There would be 99,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide avoided. Annual statewide electricity savings would be 339 gigawatt hours. On the far right, annual electricity bill savings statewide in 2030 is about \$24 million by making the conversion to LEDs.

The bottom table is cumulative savings through the year 2050. They are the same categories, just adding up all those years through 2050 to see how much savings the state would see.

The other part is the economics of fluorescent compared to LED and the prices involved [page 7]. We took a look at all of the different sizes and shapes of the fluorescents compared to the LEDs. On this graph is just the largest sales volume, sizes, and shapes. They all end up being the 4-foot size, but there might be some recognizable terms if you have purchased light bulbs, T8s or T12s. These are all the highest sales volumes. We also looked at whether the LED cost more and how much more it cost, which is the first column. We then looked at what sort of first-year electricity bill savings would be seen from purchasing the LEDs. The next column is life-cycle savings from the LED versus the fluorescent.

Finally, on the right is the payback period—how long does it take to recover that increase in price from using an LED versus a fluorescent. As you can see, these numbers all came back really great. Everything is less than a year, and a lot of it less than a couple of months. I will note the one in the middle, the 0.03, is by far the most common type of fluorescent, which is a 4-foot T8. Basically, in any office setting with fluorescents, it is going to be a 4-foot T8. Consequently, the LED makers have made the most replacements for that. There is a payback period of basically a month and then there are savings from using the LEDs. These came back really nice on the economics.

We took a look at how many fluorescent light bulbs are still being shipped to states [page 8, [Exhibit E](#)]. There are a lot of numbers on the left side, but basically these are all the different sizes and shapes of the fluorescents in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors. These are estimates in the thousands for how many fluorescents are still being shipped. The 2023 estimate is about 1.8 million general-purpose fluorescents will be sold in Nevada this year.

I should note, there is no general-purpose fluorescent lamp manufacturing being done in the United States anymore, and that would include Nevada. All that manufacturing has moved overseas. However, there are LEDs being made in the United States, including in Nevada. Through a quick search, we were able to find a couple of companies, Green LED Solution in Henderson, Elemental LED in Sparks, and Ecolocity LED Lighting Solutions in Sparks. There could be others as well.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

I will briefly walk you through the bill, and Mr. Fadie can offer some technical explanations. We have two phase-out dates [page 9]. The first phase-out date is in January 2024. After that date, no one can sell or distribute compact fluorescent lamps with a screw or bayonet base type. If you notice the pictures, it is those types of light bulbs with the curlicue and screw base.

The second phase-out date is for the pin based and tube lamps. I will note, there are asterisks because we are presenting an amendment [[Exhibit F](#)] to push those two dates out by one year. In the amended text, the date would be 2025 and 2026. This is because we talked to many industry partners and they felt that was enough time to correct the supply chain and prepare for any changes for the retailers. The amendment is a result of compromise and a lot of dialogue with many stakeholders.

We also have an exceptions list. The full list is in section 6 of the bill. Again, it is very technical, but it was all the lamps we felt were for a specific use. We did not want to impact those uses in this bill. We are really going after the lamps that are in the ceilings now, in households, and offices, not the niche uses. I will note, we have talked to the auto manufacturers. They are bringing an amendment to add one small exception for them. Apparently, there are vehicles that were produced in the '80s that have a little fluorescent lamp in the dashboard that they cannot get in LED yet, so we will be bringing that as well.

I will let Mr. Fadie speak as to why we have two separate dates.

Brian Fadie:

The date on the left is for the screw-based fluorescents, or the curlicues we saw through the 2000s and early 2010s. Those have really left the market pretty well already. LEDs have pretty well replaced those, but there are still a few stragglers. Retailers have already transitioned out of the screw-based fluorescents. A faster timeline would be appropriate there.

We give additional time for the rest of the fluorescents that still have the higher sales volume. This is a standard length of time which we also use on the appliance efficiency standards front as well to give retailers and others a little time to adjust their inventory, sell through any existing inventory, and make any other adjustments they need to before the sales deadline kicks in.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

We want to make very clear that this bill does not require anyone to change out current light bulbs and it does not require any change to fixtures. It just means when your bulb burns out and it happens to be 2025, there will not be a fluorescent on the shelf. No one will have to change anything immediately. All of the LEDs are compatible with the current fixtures, so no one would have to change their fixtures, upgrade anything, or rip anything out. It simply changes what kind of bulb is on the shelf when you go to the store. I will let Mr. Fadie speak to that a little bit more in depth.

Brian Fadie:

We have this closing slide [page 11, [Exhibit E](#)]. On the right is the research report my organization and ACEEE put together. I would be happy to pass that report on or answer any questions about the technical side. On the top left, we have an advertisement from Philips lighting. This is one of those "do not take our word for it" images. The same manufacturers who make the fluorescents mostly make the LEDs with big brand names that folks know. It says, "Real pros say farewell to fluorescent." We have marketing material from other LED makers, big-name brands as well, saying about the same.

I would be happy to take any questions or to follow up with any members.

Chair Watts:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblywoman Miller:

I did not find it very clear in the bill or the amendment [[Exhibit F](#)]. My question pertains to the actual issue of supply and demand and the impact, especially on our public buildings. We know schools, hospitals, and governmental buildings already have these fluorescent lights. If we are saying by 2026 or 2027, we are not requiring it in homes, but for everyone to switch out and it is supposed to pertain to the same fixtures. I guess I am wondering about supply and demand. Come 2026, will we have the supply here in the state, and also, is there a financial impact on all our public buildings?

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

In talking with stakeholders, that is why we pushed out those dates. They felt that was enough time for the supply chain to react appropriately and for us not to experience any shortages or issues. By those dates, 2025 and 2026, most of the fluorescent lamps will have burned out and need to be replaced in those buildings you are talking about. This should not be you have to change everything overnight; it is as it burns out, you switch out a new one.

We talked to retailers, and they felt this was enough time for their industry to change out the shelves and start changing out the stock. It is not an overnight change; it is a gradual one. I will let Mr. Fadie add to that.

Brian Fadie:

We did run economic analysis on a couple of typical buildings that might be switching over from fluorescent to LED. Schools were one of those. I am happy to provide the information we found. A typical school would save about \$3,700 per year on electricity bills. They would save, over the life of the LED, about \$24,000 in lifecycle savings for a school that switches over from fluorescent to LED.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

In talking to many government agencies, of which we have had many over the last few days, a lot of them said they were already switching to LEDs because it costs less for them. It is a pretty quick turnaround time for that payback. I think this is something many government institutions are already looking at, so I do not know if it would be a dramatic change for them.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

I want to clarify the inspections in section 9 of the bill. It is not of the businesses who happen to be using fluorescent lights, it is of the retailers that are selling them. Is that correct?

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

That is correct. It is not businesses. This is simply on the retailers.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

In my business, for example, I do not have to change all of my bulbs at once. If I were to have bulbs that go to 2027, if they live that long, could I still use them until they die?

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

Yes, you absolutely could. This is simply controlling what is on the shelf at the store. It is not controlling anything else as far as businesses or homes.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

I just wanted to make that clear for the record.

Assemblywoman Peters:

Thank you for bringing this bill and for your enthusiasm for the effects these kinds of changes can have in our state. I have a question about the impact to online sales of fluorescents and how the bill addresses that issue in our state. Also, how many other states are transitioning like this through statutory requirements?

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

I am absolutely going to phone a friend on that one, Mr. Fadie.

Brian Fadie:

For other states, last year California adopted the same policy, and also Vermont. This year ten states are considering this same fluorescent phase-out policy. In the West, Colorado, New Mexico, Oregon, Washington State, and Hawaii are considering it in addition to states in the East.

For online sales, online retailers would be expected to comply the same as a bricks-and-mortar store in the state. Because California adopted, which is quite a large market, I think we are going to see additional states will likely be adopting. We will see strength in the number of manufacturers becoming more aware and retailers becoming more aware. States can communicate with each other if they spot any violations. This is similar to what we see on the appliance standards front. It is something a couple of states have adopted, and we are looking forward to more.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I am looking at section 8 of the bill. It refers to, "A person who violates any provision of section 7," which is the sales ban. Would that also include those online sales? I am curious about enforcement for online sales in particular. If there is an eBay sale or a private sale online somewhere, how does this impact them?

Brian Fadie:

The bill would not prohibit the sale of used fluorescent light bulbs. In the case of an eBay sale, if someone had fluorescents and they took them out of their storeroom or were already using them and wanted to resell them, they could, in fact, do that. This would only cover the sale of new products.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I have other questions on that piece. I would like to take it offline and go over those concerns.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

We had a meeting before with the Governor's Office of Energy. They felt the Office of the Attorney General would probably be the more appropriate enforcer. That meeting happened literally ten minutes before I came in, so we do not have an amendment. But I wonder in that discussion if we could also address your concerns.

Chair Watts:

I look forward to a continued conversation on that issue.

Assemblyman Gurr:

I still think you are right on line going this way, but is this not a solution looking for a problem? If Philips and General Electric and others are converting, how long is it going to be before anyone could buy the old incandescent bulbs? In looking at legislation, the less we put into law today, the better off it is, in my opinion.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

The reason we felt this was important to put into legislation is, yes, many people are transitioning to LEDs. This is for consumer protection and a lot of businesses agree with it. However, with the number of states considering this legislation, we do not want to be the last state that bans this and then we become the dumping ground for everyone's fluorescent lamps because they cannot sell them anywhere else. We want to make sure we are in line with other states for that reason.

Assemblyman Gurr:

Getting in line in first, or second, or third is a good idea. But if the manufacturers quit making them, what difference does it make? Those people are out of business if they are still making incandescent bulbs, so there will not be a dumping state anywhere.

Brian Fadie:

One reason is there does still seem to be an inertia, particularly in the commercial buildings sector. That is where the bulk of the sales are still taking place. I think we can see building managers and folks who manage the lighting in buildings who are used to purchasing fluorescents. They are still purchasing fluorescents, so we are still seeing good-sized sales of the fluorescents.

As Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch mentioned, this is about accelerating a transition that is underway, but it is a way to gain those savings on utility bills faster, emissions, air pollution, and mercury pollution in the state. It is a way of cutting off the supply of mercury pollution that is coming into the state. There does not appear to be a terribly robust mercury take-back program currently available around Nevada. In Carson City, it sounds like you can call a local government and they bag your bulbs, but if you are anywhere else, there does not seem to be a local government option. People are stuck making their own arrangements with a private recycler or garbage hauler, which is a barrier that perhaps most people will not get over. It is cutting off a source of mercury pollution as well, which is a nice benefit.

Assemblyman Gurr:

I have more questions, but I will ask them offline with Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

I do think this is going in the right direction. I do not like fluorescent lights. We have been changing over to LED in all our rental properties and our personal homes. If a tenant needs a tube lighting changed out, we have to send someone because it is dangerous to do it. I do appreciate that. However, in our experience, we have had to do some simple wiring in order to bypass the ballast when converting those light bulbs. I am curious, with the cost savings, has the labor and the extra wiring been accounted for in the cost for businesses? That would require licensed electricians—who are expensive and few and far between, at least in Las Vegas. I am not so worried about a personal residence because it is smaller, but if we are talking about 100 fixtures, that is a lot.

Brian Fadie:

We did run economic analyses on situations for ballast bypass, as you referenced. I can get those numbers for you. The long story short is they came back positive economically for the user in all but one instance. In the residential sector, if there were an 8-foot length fluorescent and a ballast bypass were being done, we found people do not usually run a light bulb in that situation for very many hours. The fewer hours run, the less people are able to make up for electricity bill savings because it is not being run very much. In the other instances, even with the ballast bypass and the cost of labor, it still came back lifecycle break even or save money.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

What year was that study done? We have had massive inflation since then.

Brian Fadie:

We released the study in early 2022. Some of the numbers were rated late in 2020.

Assemblywoman Gallant:

When you have a chance, could you email me that report?

Chair Watts:

Mr. Fadie, if you could provide that follow-up to our Committee staff, we will make sure it is distributed to all members. We do have further questions.

Assemblywoman Kasama:

My question is along the same lines as my colleagues' questions when talking about public buildings, schools, and hospitals. I was wondering about the resort communities, the casinos, and the big convention halls. Were they also part of the stakeholders you reached out to and questioned? I am concerned if there are some huge costs; I think about the big convention halls.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

We did include the Nevada Resort Association in this conversation. They were comfortable with the amendment [[Exhibit F](#)], pushing it out one extra year so they had time for exactly what you are describing. I know many of them are already switching to LEDs because of the cost, but they were part of the conversation and that is part of where the amendment came from.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

This is actually almost a little different topic. I was wondering if there is any evidence detailing the extent of the toxic contamination with the current fluorescent bulbs.

Brian Fadie:

There is actually a companion report to my organization's report which talks about that situation you are describing—the human health hazard associated with fluorescent bulbs and the mercury they can release. I know there are a couple of studies about workers at landfills being overexposed to mercury, and a couple of other situations where folks are overexposed to mercury. We can certainly pass that along as well.

Chair Watts:

I look forward to all the members reading the many pieces of follow-up information that will be distributed. I appreciate the fact that so much of this information has been compiled. One of the questions I was going to ask was to put those pounds of mercury in context. Seven pounds may not sound like a lot, but it is a highly toxic substance. I would appreciate some additional follow-up in the form of that report you mentioned.

In some of the additional materials that were provided, it was mentioned there are some local LED producers. I was wondering if you have any additional information you could provide about those LED producers.

Brian Fadie:

We do not have additional information at this time. It is part of demonstrating that the fluorescent light bulb manufacturing has, unfortunately, left the United States. Now, LEDs are being produced in the United States. Certainly, some of it is being done overseas as well. However, it is the kind of product where it can be produced locally as well. We were able to identify three companies doing that. Again, there could be additional companies as well.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

There is Green LED Solution in Henderson, Elemental LED in Sparks, and Ecolocity LED, which is also in Sparks. We want to highlight that these are local Nevada businesses that we would be supporting in this bill.

Chair Watts:

To make sure we have a fine point on this, we have talked a lot about it on the retailer side. Some questions have been brought up about individual homeowners or businesses. Folks can stock up on as many of these mercury-ridden, more expensive fluorescent bulbs prior to the implementation date and use them until their stockpile runs out if they would like to, is that correct?

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

That is, in fact, correct. If you want to make a bunker of fluorescent lamps and just ride out the end times with it, you are welcome to do so.

Chair Watts:

I will note for members, many of the resorts have already made this transition and it is one of the more cost-effective energy efficiency measures that has been identified.

I believe my next question is best suited directly for Mr. Fadie. There were questions about taking this on sooner rather than later. My first question is, by the time this is implemented, based on the cost trends you have seen, do you think the payback periods that are currently estimated are going to be even shorter as LEDs are scaled up more and become more available?

My second question is, at a very high level for members who are not familiar with some of the standard setting processes, could you discuss how states tend to set standards and then over time that leads to a federal standard and how much time that may sometimes take?

Brian Fadie:

We do anticipate the cost of LEDs will continue to come down, as they have pretty dramatically over the last ten years. With the bill and the amendment [\[Exhibit F\]](#), the sales date would not be coming into effect for the vast majority of the bulbs for about three years. There would be additional time for the price gap to close.

We put together a robust database comparing light for light, fluorescent versus LED, across the different sizes and shapes. However, today you can go to the store and see the LEDs are very closely priced to the fluorescents. I was checking Home Depot yesterday and found a ten-pack of 4-foot T8s with LED and fluorescent. There was about a 30-cent difference. The economics are already quite good and will only get better.

On the question of state action leading to federal action, yes, with so many things, states have often led the way. We have seen this on the appliance efficiency front where once a momentum of states adopted the policy, we see the federal government take action and adopt it for the rest of the country. We could see that here. We will see. This also plays into internationally where there are conversations taking place amongst countries about phasing out the fluorescent light bulbs because of the mercury. It is the utility bill savings and the energy savings, but mercury is such a nasty, toxic substance and causes a lot of problems to a lot of folks, that people are eager not to have to use that technology anymore. There is an alternative that does not have those negative effects. In fact, it gains everyone a whole lot. As states take action, it will push federal action, and even international action eventually.

Chair Watts:

Thank you to all the members for your questions. I encourage you to take any additional questions you have and follow up directly with the presenter. Mr. Fadie, we look forward to the additional information.

Before I open testimony for [A.B. 144](#), it sounds like there is one very clear amendment [\[Exhibit F\]](#) and some other conceptual amendments that are in the works. As a quick reminder for everyone, support testimony means support for the bill with a friendly amendment, including amendments in the works. Opposition testimony is opposition to the

bill. If you have an additional amendment you are seeking outside of the scope of what has been discussed, that is opposition. If you would just like to provide some additional context but do not have a position, that is neutral testimony. We will begin with testimony in Carson City in support of [A.B. 144](#). If there is anyone in Las Vegas, please come forward as well.

Angela Dykema, representing Southwest Energy Efficiency Project:

Southwest Energy Efficiency Project is a nonprofit organization dedicated to advancing energy efficiency, decarbonization, and clean transportation in order to save customers money, protect the environment, address the climate crisis, and build a more resilient, sustainable economy. I am the Nevada representative, and we also work across the Southwest.

We are here in strong support of the bill because it saves consumers and businesses money, reduces toxic pollutants in our air and water, and saves energy. The bill accelerates the market transition from fluorescent light bulbs to cleaner, safer, more efficient, longer-lasting LEDs. As you have seen by the presentation, they have advanced tremendously in the last ten years and are now widely available and cost-effective to replace fluorescents in many different shapes and sizes. By 2030, Nevada consumers and businesses would save \$24 million annually from this transition, in addition to preventing 8 pounds of mercury—as Mr. Fadie noted, is actually a lot—and 99,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide from entering our atmosphere.

The bill is not only cost-effective but also necessary for public health and aligned with our state policy to reach our climate goals. We encourage all of you to please support it. [Written testimony was also submitted [Exhibit G](#) and [Exhibit H](#).]

Kyle Davis, representing Western Resource Advocates:

There is a letter on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System detailing our support [[Exhibit I](#)], so I will just leave it with the letter.

Annette Magnus, Executive Director, Battle Born Progress:

I am here today in support of [A.B. 144](#). As you heard, fluorescent bulbs are a huge health hazard for our communities, and we know we have better methods for lighting in 2023. We believe this bill is the direction our state must move in to ensure we continue to address the very real situation with climate crisis. It also will save Nevadans money by using more efficient bulbs. We hope you will support this important legislation.

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

I am here in support of [A.B. 144](#). Transitioning away from old, inefficient, toxic, fluorescent light bulbs is a proven mechanism to save consumers and businesses money on their utility bills, reduce greenhouse gas emissions from our homes and buildings, and protect public health. In comparison to fluorescent light bulbs, LEDs use about half the amount of energy, last twice as long, and typically cost less. Additionally, switching to LEDs is estimated to prevent 1.1 million metric tons of carbon dioxide per year by 2050. That is the equivalent of

238,000 gasoline-powered vehicles driven for a year. Fluorescent light bulbs also contain mercury, which we have heard a lot about, while LEDs are mercury-free, making them a much safer option.

We urge the Committee's support on this bill, and we would like to thank the Assemblywoman for bringing it forward.

Ryan Bellows, Vice President, Government and External Relations, NV Energy:

I am here today in support of A.B. 144. NV Energy is certainly supportive of measures that are going to address and increase energy efficiency, and also measures which will help the state achieve both carbon reduction goals and environmental goals. NV Energy has already worked with customers and businesses across the state to help them transition toward LED bulbs and all these energy-efficiency measures. We certainly believe this bill is going in the right direction and are here to urge your support of it.

Michael Hillerby, representing The American Institute of Architects:

The American Institute of Architects is pleased to support measures such as this. The build environment is an important part as we increase efficiency in meeting the state's climate and energy policy goals. We are happy to support this bill.

Chair Watts:

Seeing no other testimony in support in Carson City or Las Vegas, is there anyone wishing to provide testimony in support of A.B. 144 over the phone?

Michael Willoughby, representing Climate Power:

The Climate Power campaign is in support of A.B. 144. Transitioning away from fluorescent light bulbs that contain mercury and replacing them with LED lights presents numerous benefits both for the environment and for our economy. By making the switch, we can reduce the amount of mercury released into the environment, which can harm wildlife and negatively impact human health.

According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, mercury-containing bulbs can contribute to soil and water pollution if they are not disposed of properly. Thus, making the switch to LED lights helps to reduce the amount of mercury pollution in our environment.

In addition to the environmental benefits, there are economic benefits to using LED lights as well. LED lights are more energy efficient than traditional fluorescent light bulbs, meaning they use less electricity to produce the same amount of light. This can translate to lower energy bills for households, businesses, and municipalities, ultimately saving money in the long run and reinforcing our clean energy goals.

Furthermore, LED lights have a longer lifespan than fluorescent bulbs, meaning they need to be replaced less often. This contributes to further cost savings and reduces the amount of waste produced by spent bulbs.

Transitioning away from fluorescent light bulbs that contain mercury and replacing them with LED lights is a crucial step toward creating a more sustainable and prosperous future. By reducing the amount of mercury pollution in the environment, lowering energy costs, and supporting a growing industry, we can reap the benefits of a cleaner, more efficient, and more prosperous future.

Thank you very much to the sponsor and the cosponsors of this bill. We urge your support. [Written testimony was also submitted [Exhibit J](#)].

Lakshmi Albright, Member, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:

On behalf of the Sierra Club and our more than 30,000 members statewide, I am speaking today in support of A.B. 144, banning the sale of compact fluorescent lights (CFLs). This type of light bulb was energy-efficient compared to incandescent options in the past. However, since then, better technologies have become available and CFLs have been proven to have significant drawbacks that outweigh any potential benefits.

Many of the other benefits have been mentioned by previous speakers. I have also submitted a written testimonial to the Committee [\[Exhibit K\]](#).

Dora Martinez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am representing the Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition. I am the advocate for my grassroots organization, and I want to ditto the prior callers. As a blind person, I do not really see the point of electricity and light bulbs, but my daughter said it is useful for others. I agree and support this bill.

Chair Watts:

Thank you, Ms. Martinez. We appreciate your comments and you always bring a smile to our faces. Next caller in support, please. [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in opposition of A.B. 144. Anyone wishing to provide testimony in opposition in Carson City or Las Vegas, please come forward.

Dylan Keith, Assistant Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

We are in opposition to this bill as currently drafted. We have been working with the sponsor and thank her for taking our amendment. Once it is drafted with that amendment, we are happy to move to the neutral position. Until that time, we are in opposition.

Chair Watts:

Thank you, Mr. Keith. Please follow up once the amendments have come forward on this bill. Is there anyone else wishing to provide testimony in opposition? Seeing no one in Carson City or Las Vegas, are there any callers wishing to provide opposition testimony by phone?

Marcos Lopez, Outreach and Coalitions Director, Nevada Policy Research Institute:

We are in opposition of A.B. 144 largely because we believe it is unneeded. Consumers are already transitioning over to LED lights with the U.S. Department of Energy noting that nearly half of United States households use LED light bulbs for all or most of their indoor lighting already. Market share continues to grow in both commercial and residential for LED lights at an extremely high rate, and it is all because of the reasons the sponsor is listing. We do not need to impose a ban that will increase cost on late adopters by preventing them to be able to choose. This is fundamentally a decision about choice.

A lot of these economic benefits they are saying about cost savings because of the ban are actually being overestimated by the erroneous belief that consumers will not choose LEDs on their own. The economic case is very clear to switch. People will do this on their own. There is no need. There are plenty of studies showing consumer behaviors are smart enough to make their own decisions and that regular presumption of consumer irrationality is wrong. Whether it is fuel-efficient vehicles, energy-efficient light bulbs, or appliances, all heavy-handed government regulation does is impose greater cost and limit choice of late adopters. [Written testimony was also submitted [Exhibit L](#)].

Wiz Rouzard, Deputy State Director, Americans for Prosperity-Nevada:

On behalf of Americans for Prosperity-Nevada and 100,000 activists, we urge the legislators to oppose this bill. Although the intent is well-received and there are some great insights there, we believe in free market principles. As previously stated in multiple testimonies, we recognize the march is already going in that direction. Manufacturers are limiting the production of fluorescent light bulbs due to efficiency and what consumers are demanding. We feel this is an overreach of government that will lead to unintended consequences.

Lastly, we also do not want to be considered the state that actually sends an inspector into retail facilities to hit them with a fine for light bulbs. Thank you, and I urge you to oppose this bill.

Chair Watts:

Is there anyone else waiting on the phone wishing to provide testimony in opposition? [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in neutral on A.B. 144.

Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada:

We appreciate the sponsor's willingness to consider extending the timeline in her amendment [\[Exhibit F\]](#). We appreciate the additional time. To answer the question from the Assemblywoman from southwest Las Vegas, we think this time will give us the ability to make sure we have met with manufacturers and vendors to be able to get the supply chain prepared as well as to be able to start explaining to customers who, for whatever reason, seem to have a preference for these types of light bulbs for them to start making that change. There is a generation of Americans who remember somewhat fondly playing with mercury in high school, so they have a slightly different relationship with some of these issues. We appreciate the ability to be able to move the supply chain.

I do want to address the question from the Assemblywoman from central Reno. We are looking at online companies and being able to go after those folks; it is just not possible. Given Nevada, we do not have the information or the manpower to be looking at those, but we would consider and strongly urge the Legislature to take a look at additional provisions you could put into online marketplaces that would seek to solve the problem that Assemblywoman Peters addressed.

Chair Watts:

While I have you here, I do have one quick question for you. I really appreciate your working with the bill sponsor on this amendment. I know in the past you have worked with the sponsors of measures on adjustments and amendments to resolve your concerns, but your organization has graded members negatively in your legislative matrix based on supporting it even after those concerns were addressed.

For the benefit of the sponsor of this measure, I would just like to know if you have any insight to share as to how your organization will proceed after these concerns have been addressed via amendment.

Bryan Wachter:

I appreciate the question. I do not recall, and I would have to look back, actually, going to the table on the previous legislation. We are always happy to work with the bill sponsors. I think in the case you are referencing, I am not sure that we and the bill sponsor ever had a direct conversation on that bill. Working with stakeholders to be able to make sure first and foremost that as a retail industry, we can comply with the wishes of the Legislature. Can we actually implement the bills and what you are looking at? Do we think overall that those are going to have negative impacts on consumers, and how we can best mitigate those consequences, both the unintended consequences that we cannot adjust for and the exact intended consequences that the Legislature is looking for? You are going to hear from us on several different manufacturing bills that I think fall into this category over the course of the session. We hope to be able to be consistent in our response.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. I hope for that as well. We will move on to the next person wishing to testify as neutral.

Alex Tanchek, representing Sierra Cannabis Coalition:

I was asked to put on the record that cannabis cultivation is a lighting-intensive process. Some of them may be using fluorescent lighting. Currently we are polling our members to see what kinds of lighting they use. As soon as we hear back from members, we will report to Committee members and to the sponsor of the bill.

Chair Watts:

Please keep us posted on that. Is there anyone else wishing to provide testimony in the neutral position on A.B. 144? Seeing no one in person, do we have anyone wishing to provide neutral testimony by phone?

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am neutral on this bill. I do believe the situation with mercury is a serious concern. I mean, heck, we have a lot of it in our food, believe it or not. I have noticed that many countries doing research in Europe, Iran, and China have put a ban on these things. This is not just a few states, it is all over the world. However, I have some concerns. I do not want it to increase costs for businesses and low-income people, and I am pretty suspicious about things that are first approved by states like California and how they use the term climate to address this. I do not know how this is going to address the climate, but I do believe we have to move away from these bulbs. It all depends on how it is done. By the way, I work for an architectural firm, so this matters a lot.

Chair Watts:

Are there any other callers wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] I would like to thank the presenters of this bill. In the interest of time, we are going to move on to our next bill presentation. [[Exhibit M](#) and [Exhibit N](#) were submitted but not discussed.]

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 161.

Assembly Bill 161: Revises provisions governing drivers' licenses. (BDR 43-635)

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

It is my extreme pleasure and honor to present Assembly Bill 161 today. Obviously, we had a whole program planned, but my cosponsor and colleague, Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, has to get back to her committee. We are going to go a bit out of order and allow her to make her remarks first, and then I will follow.

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Assembly District No. 34:

It is a pleasure to be in front of the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure. I have no problem saying I loved this Committee when I had the pleasure to serve on this Committee. Unfortunately, the Assembly Committee on Education meets at the same time, so I am no longer able to serve on this Committee, but I am jealous of all of you.

I had a bill that I submitted specifically for deaf and hard-of-hearing folks. We do have someone doing American Sign Language right now here in the room. As you all know, we all work in silos when we are submitting our bill draft requests. Assemblyman Miller came to me saying he had a very similar bill. We realized they were completely germane in the same section. Instead of submitting two bills, I basically folded my bill into his, like you fold in cheese. Basically, what our bill is doing, instead of specifically about autism or hard of hearing, we are addressing it as communication challenges.

How this bill came to be as a person who is deaf or hard of hearing—which is where I was coming from—they have interactions with law enforcement that could otherwise be avoided. Initially, we had thought about putting a designation on the driver's license, but when working with the deaf and hard-of-hearing community, we realized that is not something they would want to be handing over to someone. They are already feeling vulnerable with their hearing loss, so handing their identification over to someone to purchase alcohol, they now know you might be someone who is a little more vulnerable. It is just not a position we wanted to put them in.

Talking with my colleague, we decided we were going to specifically ask for it to be on registration. When a person is pulled over, the officer is aware there is a communication issue, whether that be hard of hearing or other things my colleague will talk about. Personally, I have an issue. I lost partial hearing when I was in my 30s. I had an infection. Had I gone to the doctor immediately, I may have been able to get it fixed, but I did not, as we sometimes do in our 30s. It has gotten progressively worse. A lot of you know me well, and when you go to whisper to me, I turn to give you my right ear because I cannot hear whispering in my left ear.

If you could imagine me being pulled over, the police officer comes to my window, and I immediately lean my right ear to the window out of habit. The police officer could easily think I am going to grab something. This is just a commonsense solution. It protects the folks who have a communication impairment, and it is also a technique to help our officers realize that because someone is not communicating well does not mean they are under the influence of something. That is how the bill came to be.

I submitted an amendment [[Exhibit O](#)]. The proposed amendment defines a person with communication impairment as any person who is deaf, any person who has a speech or language disorder, any person who has an auditory processing disorder, any person who is impaired due to neurodivergence and has a communication impairment. This would be the original intent of my bill, [Assembly Bill 133](#), that I folded into [A.B. 161](#).

I also want to stress that this is completely voluntary. This bill does not require a person who is deaf or hard of hearing to have the designation placed on their driver's license. My proposed language gives people the option to apply for the designation.

I will turn it back over to my colleague. Thank you for your indulgence.

Assemblyman Miller:

I definitely wanted to make sure we got my cosponsor's remarks on the record in the presentation so she could get back to her business in the Education Committee.

Along with me is Athar Haseebullah of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). He is going to go through some of the details of the bill so we are all clear on exactly what the bill will do and what it looks like in action. However, I am going to provide some background on how I got to this particular bill and working on this issue.

I received a phone call one evening from a friend who would have ordinarily been full of bad, questionable jokes and a lot of laughter. However, on this night she was a worried mom. I could hear in her voice that she was trying with all her might to hold it together because she had just gotten word that her young adult son who has autism had been arrested. He had been stopped and questioned by police, and at some point during the encounter, officers believed he was under the influence of a substance even though he was not. They ultimately arrested him for a DUI.

As she explained the details of what happened, she said, "You know, if there was just something on his ID, I think it would have helped." The officers would have at least known that he was not impaired by a substance, but that it just takes him a bit longer to process and respond to information because he is a little different. She said he does not always interpret social cues the same way as everyone else, to which I agreed.

While this situation is unfortunate, it resulted in another young man of color unnecessarily involved in the legal system. We must recognize that it could have been worse for both my friend's son and the officers involved. I know we have all heard the tragic stories from other communities across the country of people who are differently abled losing their life or being severely injured due to a misinterpretation of their actions.

Autism spectrum disorder (ASD) is where this started for me. It is a neurodevelopmental disorder that is often characterized by repetitive behaviors and challenges relating to communication and social interaction. Multiple studies indicate that people with ASD are more likely to become incarcerated and are more vulnerable to injuries and fatalities during police interactions.

As a legislative body, we have a duty to provide options for vulnerable people to have a choice in the level of protection they deem necessary and to support our law enforcement officials in their responsibilities. Assembly Bill 161, as my colleague said, is a commonsense solution that will do both by giving Nevadans with communication impairments and those who are differently abled the choice to add an indicator to their Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) records and by giving law enforcement an additional tool to alert them that someone's response or actions during an encounter may be a matter of how they receive or deliver communications rather than a threat or an act of defiance.

Again, this is a commonsense measure that gives people the choice and creates a safer environment for all parties involved, which is why I am happy to see the amount of support we have seen in putting this bill together. While this bill started for me with autism and for my colleague with her personal hearing impairment, it was brought to my attention by the ACLU that there are people with other neurodevelopmental disorders who could be helped

by the bill. I then learned of my colleague's bill, and we all worked together on the amendment you have [\[Exhibit O\]](#). To move forward and get the ball rolling, I am going to pass it over, with the Chair's permission, to Athar Haseebullah of the ACLU to go through the details of the bill and what it looks like in action.

Athar Haseebullah, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

I am joined by my colleague, Ms. Baran from the ACLU. She has a couple of statistics that she would like to share with you before we get into the technical specifics. I do know there is some sort of snowstorm that is coming, so we will attempt to keep it brief. I do want to make sure that we give enough time to those who have testimony to offer in support, but also to answer any questions that come up. There are a couple of technical quirks here that I do want to share with the Committee. I will pass it over to Ms. Baran to share some of that information, then we will swing back to the technical specifics.

Lilith Baran, Policy Manager, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

In one of the books that we researched, *Policing – A Journal of Policy and Practice*, there was a finding that in a survey of parents and caregivers of individuals with autism spectrum disorder, 60.3 percent of respondents were fearful of police contact with their loved one with autism spectrum disorder. Of those respondents, 30.1 percent reported that their fear of police contact was due to the potential from misunderstanding behavior. Of those respondents, 34 percent reported that their fear of police contact was due to communication issues. Respondents who have had prior police contact were more likely to report being fearful of police contact than those who had not had prior contact with police.

I would like you to keep those numbers in mind as we go through our presentation. We are currently experiencing a small technical difficulty. I know the Committee can view our presentation; however, the audience cannot. That will be remedied shortly.

Athar Haseebullah:

It is quite simple. I do want to go through this phase by phase. It is a very to-the-point bill. The amendment we offered [\[Exhibit O\]](#), which Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod has spoken to, has been uploaded to the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System. I think the amendment resolved some of the technical challenges some folks had regarding what might have been viewed as nonvoluntary. This is absolutely voluntary every step of the way. Certainly, it would never be the ACLU's position to overshare information with the government. I think that probably goes without saying.

I will go through a couple of key distinctions. First, as Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod specified, section 1 of the amendment [page 2, [Exhibit O](#)] has an expansive definition of "person with a communication impairment." That is to include individuals who have auditory issues, individuals who have challenges with respect to neurodiversity that might preclude or prohibit what might be viewed as otherwise ordinary communication styles that one might have, but also anything else that is going to impair function to a physical perspective.

Because of that, we believe we have a broader definition than otherwise would have been allotted. The one element that was added here, and a distinction in why we used the verbiage, "Person with communication impairment . . ." is because Chapter 50.050 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* defines a person with a communication disability. This is distinct from that. The reason why this is specifically distinct in the language is because we did not want to run into or raise issues surrounding other forms of remedies or relief that others might be entitled to when coming up with this very simple solution, as we are addressing it with respect to law enforcement contact effectively with civilians. That effectively deals with individuals who are entitled to interpreters, and we recognize those provisions will still apply. For the purposes of DMV and to make this as simple as possible, we wanted to make sure that language was distinct, so that verbiage is included.

Another provision that was struck in section 1 and is also not included here, is a medical diagnosis or medical requirement. Part of this bill was modeled after a bill that came out of Texas. I know, it is shocking that the ACLU would submit something that comes out of Texas, but we did in part. However, one of the key distinctions from a practical standpoint that folks are not aware of is how registration is actually viewed. If someone is pulled over in many other states, all their information, whether it is the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) criminal justice history, any past warrants, any concealed weapons permits, or driver's registration, is centralized under their version of the Department of Public Safety (DPS). We do not have that here. Effectively, when someone is pulled over, there are multiple databases that law enforcement may be able to access. One of those is the vehicle registration, which comes through the DMV in Nevada. Another one will be a separate database for NCIC, which might produce other alternate information. Because that information is not centralized, it is not as easy to streamline things and bring those forward.

In Texas, part of the challenge was as they were offering that bill forward and the reason they may have had it, was because additional benefits might have been derived by a showing of a medical need to the DMV or would become centralized through their version of DPS. Here, that is not the case; it comes through the DMV. Instead of doing that, we have removed that requirement altogether. It would be rather illogical for people to appear at the DMV and say they have a communication impairment when, in fact, they have none. I do not know a majority of folks or any level of folks who would want to have a flag in the system for a communication impairment without that being present. That portion has obviously been stricken via our amendment that was submitted.

The second section of the bill, which is really the operative part, becomes voluntary disclosure to the DMV with a marker on the driver's license showing communication impairment, and then a note atop the vehicle registration that also says communication impairment.

It is important to note why this communication impairment is not specified or broken down. Some have asked why the specific impairment is not shown. The core concept of this bill is it is supposed to be a flag for officers. As they are approaching the vehicle when someone

has been pulled over and before they approach the vehicle, they recognize they should approach more cautiously. This is the simplest solution to get there without having to overly share additional information than is necessary.

The other element that may exist with respect to confidentiality and privacy is certain individuals may not want whatever specific impairment they might have to be shown on an ID or to be shown on a vehicle registration.

Finally, we were asked why this is not on a driver's license or a license plate and should this be noted on a license plate. We think this potentially creates a series of issues. We do not have any exclusionary language there for this body to consider that in the future. However, at this point, there are additional risks that are involved with having those types of flags on an actual license plate.

With that, we are happy to answer and entertain any questions that might come up. I do know we have had conversations with the DMV, and I am sure that might be one of the questions from this body. My understanding is that the DMV is in the process of updating their registration system. We do not believe there will be a fiscal note with respect to the ID portion. We do believe there will potentially be a fiscal note with respect to updating the electronic registration that the DMV shows that law enforcement officers have access to is identical to what is in writing. From our vantage point, obviously any cost there would end up being justified because the alternative is taking away human life.

I would also finally mention that the widespread nature of support for this bill has really been outstanding, as Assemblyman Miller has said. The Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc., supports this bill and has submitted their letter of support [[Exhibit P](#)]. The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Managers & Supervisors Association supports this bill and has submitted their letter of support [[Exhibit Q](#)]. We have support from labor groups. I believe the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department will be here to testify in support. Disability rights advocates and those who are advocates for the differently abled have also offered their support. It is pretty widespread.

This is about as common sense of a solution as we can get here. I know some would like to see this expanded into other areas, including Shared Computer Operation for Protection & Enforcement (SCOPE) and to potentially include other classes of individuals who may have other communication impairments. However, it is important for us to take that first step right now. Without running into other potential barriers, we need to get this tool in place. I will reemphasize, if I am on the same side of an issue as the police unions, we should get a skip one and just cut right to the front of the line. You should just pass it. We are happy to take any questions at this time.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. I will remind all members that we do have 2 minutes until our 4 o'clock committees begin. We want to keep everything brief so we can hear from as many people as possible. Are there any questions for the presenters on this bill?

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

Thank you for your presentation and your thoughtful crafting of this very sensible piece of legislation. I do have a couple of questions. First, thank you for the pieces and parts of the community you did consult with relative to this. The whole disability movement in general is, "Nothing about us without us." I know the members of the deaf community were involved with this, in particular in the very beginning, and some members of the autism community. Did you have an opportunity to meet with the Nevada Statewide Independent Living Council through the State of Nevada or the Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities, and perhaps get their feedback on any of this? That was my first question.

My second question is, you talked about this being on the car registration or a driver's license. I am curious to know about a state-issued ID. There are a number of members of our community who do not drive but still have communication barriers that they experience and use state-issued IDs for bus rides, medical appointments, and things like that.

Athar Haseebullah:

With respect to the first question, we are happy to provide you with a list of those we have spoken to, but I do not have the list handy. However, it is pretty wide. We also spoke to individuals outside of the state. I do want to make this clear for the record. We specifically used the term "communication impairment" not to be disparaging but to cast a wider net. I have heard from some folks in the community that they did not prefer the term "communication impairment" because "hearing impairment" is a term that has been frowned upon. However, on our end, one of the things we wanted to do was create the widest level of verbiage as possible to incorporate the most number of people without being specific enough to overly share a condition.

I would be happy to share the list of groups. We can send that to you privately to make sure that feedback is presented. It is the same within community-representing individuals or children who have autism. I am happy to provide that to you.

With respect to the actual identification card and not the driver's license, we are happy to consider that. Part of the goal and onus for this, in the very first portion, was because we recognized that the interaction during traffic encounters had been the most heightened, which is why vehicle registration ended up playing a role. In many instances, by the time the initial contact has been made, things have gone awry. We have seen that in multiple scenarios. I think when we conversed with law enforcement, the very first thing that popped up was misunderstanding and a lack of knowledge creates barriers because they are uncertain whether an individual is being noncompliant or being compliant. I would be happy to consider that, and I am certainly not opposed. If the DMV does not have another fiscal note—and I do not believe they would—associated with it, I think that would be a great potential addition. Obviously, the biggest thing for us was the flag atop the registration because when they start shouting orders from outside the vehicle, it becomes almost impossible for an individual to comply.

Chair Watts:

I believe Assemblywoman Brown-May has a follow-up question. I am going to ask you to take that offline. We have a question from Assemblywoman Peters.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I am not a lawyer, so I am hoping you can help me out with this. When you are sharing with the DMV that you have some medical disability or issue, does that potentially affect your insurance rate at all?

Athar Haseebullah:

No. Part of the reason why is because the actual nature of it would be a communication impairment but without a specific disclosure. With the broad language that is utilized here, it would be impossible to state that something is a specific condition. The specificity portion I think would have potentially done that. For instance, if you had to disclose to the DMV that you are hard of hearing and that was not something you previously disclosed to your health insurance, that may be potential grounds—although it would be subject to litigation—for an insurance company to increase a rate or something of that sort. Because this is a broad category, the category itself is not specifically asked about. From our vantage point, it would be compliant in that regard.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I was thinking more about car insurance.

Athar Haseebullah:

That would be the same thing. There is not a request for information that comes up in the same regard.

Chair Watts:

Are there any further questions from the Committee? [There were none.] I will open the hearing for testimony in support of A.B. 161 to those here in Carson City or Las Vegas.

Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices:

Today, I am actually testifying in the most important role that I have, which is as a mom of an 8-year-old autistic child. I am not going to cry, because I am not going to mess up my makeup. I want to say first and foremost, I am really grateful for this piece of legislation.

When you become a parent, there is always that notion of worrying; you worry about your kids all the time. When you find out that your children are special needs—my son is on the autistic spectrum—there is a whole different level of worrying that is part of your day-to-day life. A lot of it is how society looks at our children, the judgment they receive, and also just the overall interactions with government agencies.

I would just say that I am really appreciative of this. Luckily, I have an 8-year-old and do not have to worry about his learning how to drive and all of that yet, but knowing that a piece of legislation like this could be possible will make worrying about driving a lot easier.

Elyse Monroy-Marsala, Private Citizen:

I am here today on behalf of my family. Thank you, Assemblyman Miller, for bringing this important bill forward. This bill will help people with communication barriers or people who do not communicate in a typical way, like my stepson, Rudy. We understand this bill is being amended to replace much of the original language. Our family is in full support of the new amended language.

Additionally, we would support the proposed amendment from Steven Cohen [[Exhibit R](#)], specific to training for law enforcement.

Our family believes that autistic people should be able to have the same expectation of participation in the legislative and policy development process as neurotypical people. Autism is often thought of as a child's disease or affliction. Autistic children grow up to be autistic adults, so ensuring our state enacts laws and policies to help people of all abilities live in our communities safely and inclusively is very important.

We met with the bill sponsor and had a great meeting. Our initial concerns were specifically related to the medical diagnosis information. We are glad to see that information has been removed.

Autistic adults should have the same voice and agency as neurotypical people as it relates to how they navigate the world, even if that voice is not auditory. Thank you for hearing my testimony, and the Marsala-Hawkins family urges your support of [A.B. 161](#). I will be submitting a letter signed by my family [[Exhibit S](#)].

Jason Walker, Sergeant, Administrative Division, Legislative Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office; and representing Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

We are in full support of this bill. Any piece of information we can get to help us bridge any communication gap is helpful for us.

Christine Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:

In order to let as many people talk, I am just going to say we support this bill.

Andrew MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association:

Brevity is the soul of wit. We love this bill. We have members for whom this issue is near and dear to their hearts, meaning autism. I have met with the bill sponsor on this bill. We had minor additional language suggested. I think the omnibus amendment captures that. We urge the Committee's support and thank both Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod and Assemblyman Miller for bringing it forward.

Christopher M. Ries, Detective, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

To be brief, I will echo my partners in Washoe County. We support this bill.

**Richard P. McCann, representing Nevada Association of Public Safety Officers; and
Member, Nevada Law Enforcement Coalition:**

What a concept. You are going to give cops more opportunities to avoid bad encounters. You are going to give them an opportunity to know more about the people they are about to encounter. Where the hell has this bill been? I have been sitting on my rear end doing nothing about it. This is a great bill. It is a genius bill, and I am going to give credit where credit is due. We fully support A.B. 161 and its amendments. I would offer, as apparently has been considered, putting it into SCOPE as well. At the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, it is a vital resource for them when they take a look at arrests and convictions of people they encounter. Having it right there as one of the first elements of the resources Metro looks at would be really kind of cool. I think this is a fantastic bill. We support it. We need to expand it to SCOPE and we will be happy.

Annette Magnus, Executive Director, Battle Born Progress:

We are in full support of this bill. I have a nephew who has autism, and I hope you pass this for him.

Todd Ingalsbee, President, Professional Fire Fighters of Nevada:

We definitely support this bill. We support our partners whom we work with and who help keep this community safe every day.

**Erica Roth, Government Affairs Liaison, Deputy Public Defender, Washoe County
Public Defender's Office:**

I echo the sentiments of all those who went before me. I will just note that police officers are trained that traffic encounters are one of the most dangerous situations they will be in. It is important to ensure they have all the tools they need to avoid any miscommunications. We support this bill.

**John J. Piro, Chief Deputy Public Defender, Legislative Liaison, Clark County Public
Defender's Office:**

We thank the sponsor for bringing this bill forward. I am familiar with the case Assemblyman Miller spoke of. It is rather unfortunate that an innocent young man had to spend time in custody, get handcuffed, transported to the police station, not understanding what was going on, all because the information was not available to officers. This will prevent situations like that in the future. We are grateful for the sponsor bringing the bill forward.

**David Clyde, Associate General Counsel, Regional Transportation Commission of
Southern Nevada:**

We are in support of this bill.

Eric Jeng, Acting Executive Director, One APIA Nevada:

Ditto to all the sentiments. We are fully in support of this bill and looking forward to translating this bill to our community for the outreach.

Chair Watts:

Seeing no one else wishing to provide testimony here in Carson City, we will move to Las Vegas. Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 161?

Anwar Allums, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am the person from the case Assemblyman Miller was talking about. I support this bill. The fact that this happened to me, I do not know what I could have done differently. I get nervous now just talking about it. If this could have been avoided, I think my life would have been better. Sometimes I feel like my future has been cut short. It is just hard sometimes. Just being able to know this is in the bill and have it signed and being able to have this be avoided for anybody else. Sometimes I am glad it was me because if not me, then who else? It is nice to have people around me who are able to put power to stop things like this. I am in support of this bill. Thank you for allowing me to talk.

Chair Watts:

Thank you, Mr. Allums for sharing your story with us. I think I can speak on behalf of the Committee in saying we are sorry for the experience you went through, but we appreciate your sharing it in helping create a better policy for this state. Is there anyone else in Las Vegas wishing to testify in support?

Aesha Goins, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

It was my son who was accosted. It is my son who is on the spectrum. It is my son who had to go through this and was shackled and taken to jail. It is me who did not know where my son was for 24 hours. It is me who has taught my son to tell them that he has severe anxiety disorder and to please pay attention. I could not understand why my well-mannered, soft-spoken, and loving son could be shackled and taken to jail. He is so well-mannered that the police noted it in the police report. However, they thought my son was driving impaired because he did not respond as quickly as others. My son is a highly functioning young man on the spectrum. He suffers from high anxiety disorder induced by stress. Anxiety shows up a little different for people on the spectrum. With my son's anxiety, when he gets anxious, he shuts down. All people, no matter the impairment, should have the opportunity to be treated with respect and dignity. I urge the Committee to please pass this bill.

Chair Watts:

Thank you, Ms. Goins. We are listening today. We will hear the next person wishing to provide testimony.

Ricky Gourrier, representing Opportunity Village:

We are in full support of this legislation for reasons already stated.

Chair Watts:

If there is anyone else wishing to provide testimony in person, please come forward. [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to provide testimony by phone?

Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I will keep it short and sweet. Ditto.

Wiz Rouzard, Deputy State Director, Americans for Prosperity-Nevada:

I just want to applaud the bill sponsor for bringing this forward. This is an amazing bill. I echo exactly what everyone has shared. My heart goes out to those parents who have dealt with those situations. It is unfortunate. I applaud the sponsors for taking a step in the right direction with this bill to ensure no other Nevadans have to experience that. I appreciate that this remains voluntary. There are those who do deal with these issues but do not want it known publicly. If there is an option to ensure this bill can be voluntary to provide it in the system but not on a driver's license that can get lost and shared publicly, that would be great. Overall, thank you so much for bringing this forward. On behalf of Americans for Prosperity-Nevada, you have our support.

Jim Hoffman, representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice:

We are in support of this bill.

Richard Hodgson, Officer, Service Employees International Union, Local 1107:

We are also in full support of A.B. 161.

Dora Martinez, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I support this bill.

Brittany Bas, Founder/President, AMUSE Foundation:

The AMUSE Foundation is advocating and maintaining unity with special needs in everyone. My colleagues and I are writing to express our support for A.B. 161 [[Exhibit T](#)]. The AMUSE Foundation is a 501(c)(3) certified nonprofit organization out of Huntington Beach, California, with a mission of advocating, connecting, educating, and training first responders in our community about autism spectrum disorder (ASD), along with other intellectual and developmental disabilities and the possible scenarios that may occur when interacting with someone on the spectrum or with an invisible disability. Please visit our website at amusefoundation.org.

In short, A.B. 161 will save lives. The latest estimates suggest that about 1 out of every 68 children, or 1.5 percent, have ASD. It is a complex, neurological and developmental disorder that affects how a person acts, communicates, learns, and interacts with others. Fifty percent of those with ASD will elope or flee when confronted. A recent 18-month study of 284 Ontario, Canada, adolescents and adults with autism found that in 19 percent of police interactions, physical restraints were used. In 30 percent of the cases, the person was escorted to an emergency department. Only two of the interactions resulted in criminal charges.

Children and adults with disabilities will have integration with police. Assembly Bill 161 will provide a clear and concise way of informing first responders what they need, and it will provide more tools for their belt to proceed with communication support in assessing for the dangerousness and prioritizing each situation.

The voluntary license plate DMV state registry would allow the medical information to be displayed through a law enforcement information system. Informing all parties who have access to necessary information about the registered individual will provide tools to proceed in an educated manner. These are forms of proactive de-escalation and preventive measures for unforeseen emergent scenarios. It could be the driver registered as nonverbal, or a person with autism, or a minor known to ride in that vehicle. Providing scenarios such as lack of communication ability, examples of possible aggression—such as my son, 8 years old—and information for how an officer might proceed to interact while also providing a form of autonomy for high-functioning autistic adults.

Additionally, the Proloquo2Go communication app would be a great tool to provide in the patrol vehicles—

Chair Watts:

Could you wrap up your comments, please?

Brittany Bas:

Yes. If approved, this bill will help reduce the likelihood of harmful encounters between individuals with communication impairment and law enforcement, primarily during traffic encounters, by creating a system where individuals can voluntarily advise the DMV.

Chair Watts:

You have gone over your two-minute limit. If you would submit your comments in writing, we will make sure to include those in the record [[Exhibit T](#)]. Are there any other callers waiting to testify over the phone?

Gerald Mayes, Veterans Affairs Chair, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People:

I am in support of A.B. 161 for a multitude of reasons. As a veteran and a father myself, in the city there are some issues with communication as it pertains to my 100 percent posttraumatic stress disorder. It would be imperative for people like me to be able to have the protection and reap the benefits of this bill. It would be very important for me and my family to be able to have the support for communication issues to be considered prior to any issues.

Chair Watts:

Is there anyone waiting on the phone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 161? [There was no one.] Is there anyone here or in Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone waiting on the phone to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas wishing to testify in neutral?

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

We are neutral on A.B. 161. We did provide a no-impact fiscal note on the original bill. Implementing this on our current driver's licenses is not a big impact to the DMV because we already have this in place. The specific conditions, namely autism and hard of hearing, are already offered on the driver's licenses. If we want to add this to the registration or make changes to our driver's license medical coding, that would result in a pretty large impact to the DMV.

The DMV, as you know, is going through a transformation right now to move most of our services online. We are between information technology systems at the moment and are hoping not to make big changes to our old system. When we make a change, something basically breaks later. Our estimated fiscal note to include the registration changes would be pretty high. It would be a pretty large change to our system, and we have not spoken to our kiosk vendor yet about their costs.

One idea we had would be to implement the driver's license portion on July 1, 2023, and then the registration and medical coding portions when the DMV transformation is complete. We did propose this to the bill sponsors and appreciated meeting with them. We totally understand the intent of the bill and are happy to work with the bill sponsors.

Chair Watts:

Is there anyone else in Carson City or Las Vegas who would like to provide testimony in neutral on A.B. 161? [There was no one.] Is there anyone waiting on the phone to testify in neutral?

Anna Binder, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:

I am here individually, but I am a member of the Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities. I am also a member of the Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders, and the vice chair of the Special Education Advisory Committee.

Although I appreciate and I fully believe with all my heart that the intentions of A.B. 161 are being brought forward for the betterment of everyone involved, the lack of any of our committees having been included in this and seeing a huge lack of feedback from our special ability citizens, it is kind of disheartening. I hope in the future the bill sponsor and the ACLU can bring more of us to the table to see how making this happen would be warranted or wanted in the community.

We fight really hard to be included without labels. It is hard sometimes. I myself am autistic. I have handicap plates and the battle I have in parking lots over my using my handicap plates can sometimes cause a lot of friction.

I look forward to having some more coordinated conversations. Again, I do believe this is well-intentioned, but I am wondering how many more of our citizens are really in support of this, but we do need to do something. I thank everyone for the conversation today and this bill.

Chair Watts:

You can find Assemblyman Miller's contact information on the Legislative website. I would encourage you to reach out and to be included in the conversation moving forward. Next caller, please.

Catherine Nielsen, Executive Director, Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities:

Thank you for allowing me to make a short comment today. We echo many of the comments stated here today, so we take a neutral position on the bill. Ms. Binder was correct, we have not heard from the bill sponsor, as Assemblywoman Brown-May had asked. We would encourage having a conversation with the bill sponsor as well.

I am glad to hear the mother mentioned disclosing medical diagnoses on their driver's license. This could cause an unintentional backlash to the individual who is trying to communicate or receive services of some sort. Imagine an individual with autism going to a night club or trying to purchase an age-restricted item. Many businesses do have the right to deny access or deny the right to serve that individual. We do believe disclosing medical conditions is the right of the individual, and protecting that is also the right of the individual. We want to ensure that is taken into consideration when discussing this bill.

Chair Watts:

I will take a moment of personal privilege to note that it is difficult sometimes when bringing a policy forward for legislators to identify all the stakeholders. We appreciate your finding out about this measure and coming forward. Again, I encourage you to connect with the bill sponsors to be included in the conversation moving forward. Is there anyone else waiting on the phone to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Assemblyman Miller, would you like to make any closing remarks?

Assemblyman Miller:

I would quickly like to thank everyone for their comments today, for your time, and acknowledge that anyone who feels they were left out of the conversation, I want them to know my phone is available and my door is open so please reach out if there is more work we need to do on this bill. I am open to doing that. [[Exhibit U](#) and [Exhibit V](#) were submitted but not discussed.]

Chair Watts:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 161. That brings us to the last item on our agenda today, which is public comment. Is there anyone wishing to provide public comment either in Carson City or in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone waiting on the phone wishing to provide public comment? [Public comment was heard.]

Thank you to all the members for sticking with us through the agenda today. I know it was quite robust. Our next meeting will be Tuesday, February 28, 2023, at 1:30 p.m. We are adjourned [at 4:17 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Dylan Small
Recording Secretary

Lori McCleary
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Howard Watts, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled, "Serving the Southern Nevada Community, RTC," presented by M.J. Maynard, Chief Executive Officer, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada.

[Exhibit D](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled, "Regional Transportation Commission. Metropolitan Planning, Public Transportation & Operations, Engineering & Construction. Metropolitan Planning Organization of Washoe County, Nevada," presented by Dale Keller, Director of Engineering, Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County.

[Exhibit E](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled, "Phasing Out Fluorescent Light Bulbs," presented by Assemblywoman Selena La Rue Hatch, Assembly District No. 25, and Brian Fadie, State Policy Manager, Appliance Standards Awareness Project.

[Exhibit F](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 144](#) submitted by Retail Association of Nevada, and presented by Assemblywoman Selena La Rue Hatch, Assembly District No. 25.

[Exhibit G](#) is a letter dated February 22, 2023, submitted and authored by Angela Dykema, representing Southwest Energy Efficiency Project, in support of [Assembly Bill 144](#).

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter dated February 23, 2023, submitted by Angela Dykema, representing Southwest Energy Efficiency Project, and signed by 11 advocacy groups in support of [Assembly Bill 144](#).

[Exhibit I](#) is a letter dated February 22, 2023, submitted by Jermareon Williams, Nevada Government Affairs Manager, Western Resource Advocates, and presented by Kyle Davis, representing Western Resource Advocates, in support of [Assembly Bill 144](#).

[Exhibit J](#) is written testimony submitted by Michael Willoughby, representing Climate Power, in support of [Assembly Bill 144](#).

[Exhibit K](#) is a letter dated February 23, 2023, submitted by Lakshmi Albright, Volunteer Member, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club, in support of [Assembly Bill 144](#).

[Exhibit L](#) is a letter dated February 23, 2023, submitted and authored by Marcos Lopez, Outreach and Coalitions Director, Nevada Policy Research Institute, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 144](#).

[Exhibit M](#) is an undated letter from Clean Lighting in support of [Assembly Bill 144](#).

[Exhibit N](#) is a fact sheet dated February 2023, titled, "AB 144 Nevada Can Protect Health and Lower Energy Bills by Phasing Out Fluorescent Light Bulbs," submitted by Clean Energy.

[Exhibit O](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 161](#), submitted by Assemblyman Cameron (C.H.) Miller, Assembly District No. 7, and Athar Haseebullah, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada.

[Exhibit P](#) is an undated letter submitted by John Abel, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association Metro, Inc., in support of [Assembly Bill 161](#).

[Exhibit Q](#) is a letter dated February 23, 2023, submitted by Troyce Krumme, Vice Chairman, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Managers & Supervisors Association, in support of [Assembly Bill 161](#).

[Exhibit R](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 161](#), submitted by Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada.

[Exhibit S](#) is an undated letter submitted by Elyse Monroy-Marsala, Private Citizen, in support of [Assembly Bill 161](#).

[Exhibit T](#) is a letter dated February 23, 2023, submitted by Brittany Bas, Founder/President, AMUSE Foundation, in support of [Assembly Bill 161](#).

[Exhibit U](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "AB 161 Protection for Drivers with Communication Impairments, ACLU Nevada," submitted by Athar Haseebullah, Executive Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada, regarding [Assembly Bill 161](#).

[Exhibit V](#) is a letter dated February 22, 2023, submitted by Ashley Dodson, Co-President, CEIC, in support of [Assembly Bill 161](#).