

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Eighty-second Session
June 2, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Julie Pazina at 11:04 a.m. on Friday, June 2, 2023, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Julie Pazina, Chair
Senator Melanie Scheible, Vice Chair
Senator Edgar Flores
Senator Pete Goicoechea
Senator Ira Hansen

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alysa Keller, Policy Analyst
Erin Sturdivant, Counsel
Donna Crawford Kennedy, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

James Settelmeyer, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Rebecca Palmer, Administrator, Office of Historical Preservation, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Robert Mergell, Administrator, Division of State Parks, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Trevor Parrish, Vegas Chamber
Katie Ryan, Dignity Health-St. Rose Dominican
Andy MacKay, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association
Paul Enos, Nevada Trucking Association

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
June 2, 2023
Page 2

Aaron Kressig, Western Resource Advocates
Alex Pike, Western Way
Kyle Davis, Washoe County School District
Chelsea Capurro, Las Vegas Urban Chamber of Commerce
Tom Clark, Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce
Shelly Capurro, Republic Services
Barry Cole, Nevada Clinicians for Climate Action
Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Nevada Conservation League
Laurel Saito, The Nature Conservancy
Gabriela Olmedo, Advanced Energy United
Kelly Trombley, Ceres
Will Drier, Policy Manager, Electrification Coalition
Melissa Ramos, American Lung Association in Nevada
Mendy Elliott, Nevada Battle Born Growth Escalator, Inc.
Jennifer Carr, Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State
Department Conservation and Natural Resources

CHAIR PAZINA:

I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 46.

ASSEMBLY BILL 46 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to historical markers. (BDR 33-240)

JAMES SETTELMAYER (Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

With me today is Rebecca Palmer from the Office of Historical Preservation (OHP) and Robert Mergell from Division of State Parks (DSP). This bill was originally brought forward by the previous administration to look at historical markers across the State to see how many are damaged. We have a fair amount that are stones with brass markers. Since taking the Director position, I have been to 96 of the 274 markers. In the past, we have tried to have people investigate these markers to make sure that they are not faded, damaged with graffiti or stickers, and things of that nature. That being said, the Department has always had a problem finding someone to do that. The previous administration was going to transfer the responsibilities to the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and the Public Works Division, both of whom requested fiscal notes that they were not able to obtain. They were, consequently, unable to do the work. The Division of State Parks stepped forward. I will ask them to continue the presentation.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
June 2, 2023
Page 3

REBECCA PALMER (Administrator, Office of Historical Preservation, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

I am here today to present A.B. 46 in its first reprint along with my colleague, Bob Mergell, Administrator, Division of State Parks.

Put simply, A.B. 46 is a bill that will, if enacted, reinvigorate the Nevada historical markers program by creating a more cost-effective method of constructing and maintaining these roadside interpretive icons.

Assembly Bill 46, in its first reprint, reassigns the maintenance and construction responsibilities for Nevada's 274 historical markers from the OHP to the DSP.

Pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* 383.091, the OHP is responsible for establishing the qualifications and standards for the historical markers program as well as historical research, designation, inventory, and updating of text for the markers. These responsibilities fit well and are aligned with the mission and responsibilities of the OHP. However, the OHP does not have the staff, resources, or expertise necessary to fulfill the maintenance and construction responsibilities for this program.

From 1977 to 2019, the OHP used revenue from multiple sources including the Commission on Tourism and NDOT to hire contractors who were willing to undertake the construction and maintenance tasks for the markers program. While not a cost-effective approach, these contracts did ensure that the OHP could undertake a minimum level of maintenance and replacement.

Since 2019, however, the OHP has been unsuccessful in locating contractors willing to submit a proposal to continue the construction and maintenance program despite numerous attempts. It is highly unlikely that such parties will be any more willing to submit proposals in the future.

Without the continued maintenance required for the program, markers have been damaged or even removed from Nevada's roadways without feasible plans for their repair or replacement. This high-profile public interpretation program will continue to deteriorate unless a more cost-effective and collaborative approach for their maintenance is found.

Assembly Bill 46 serves as that cost-effective and collaborative approach needed to ensure the long-term preservation of this roadside historical interpretive program.

Section 1 removes the responsibility for the construction and maintenance of the markers from the OHP. Section 1 also codifies the review process for new markers that has evolved since the program was transferred in 1977, when OHP did not have a professional historian and the Nevada Historical Society served in that capacity.

Section 2 assigns the installation, maintenance, and repair responsibilities to the DSP.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The way I understand it, the DSP will be the ones that travel the State and put up the markers. We have gone from the big old Nevada signs to a lot of rock monuments. I remember when we started advertising Highway 50 as the "Loneliest Highway in America." Once signs were installed, the State could not get them out fast enough because people were stealing them faster than we could install them; and, in some cases, they were taking them somewhere else. That is a concern of mine; are we going to put them up just so someone can steal them?

The signs are in somewhat disrepair across the State. Are you going to reface them, give them a different logo or change them out? I know this is a long-term plan, but I would like to know.

MR. SETTELMAYER:

Since DSP personnel travel the State so much, they will be able to investigate the monuments. As I have been going out, I have been categorizing the GPS locations because some of them are not exactly where the map originally said they are.

Some signs only need new State seals; that is an easy fix since we have them in stock. The DSP will have the ability to take signs and repaint them if necessary. Then, as they go around the State, they can exchange the current signs with updated signs. There are some signs that have antiquated language that Ms. Palmer updated on the website that will have to be updated on the

ground. We will pay for those new signs over a period of time with available funds.

MS. PALMER:

We do have a number of the stanchions in the shape of Nevada; those are the blue woven steel stanchions.

If the bill is enacted, we can replace some of the missing markers. In addition, we have a highly active public base who love the markers, and they will inform us if there is a marker missing. They are eager to ensure that we know a marker is missing. I am now aware of at least ten that are missing. We have stanchions warehoused in various NDOT yards, because NDOT staff have been kind to place them in their nearest supply yard when they find them lying down or damaged.

ROBERT MERGELL (Administrator, Division of State Parks, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

We have recently deployed a mobile app, the OuterSpatial app, which was designed for mapping all our State Parks. When you go to a State Park, you can geotrack yourself on the trails. If the bill passes, we will be able to add all the historical markers throughout Nevada. Checking on the markers will not necessarily be done by State park employees since the public will also be able to use the app to post pictures of the markers to inform the Division of State Parks of any needed maintenance.

Because we have maintenance personnel scattered throughout the State, we can fabricate those markers, and that will be a lot more cost-effective. We will not have to contract the work out every step of the process.

MR. SETTELMAYER:

One of the benefits of the OuterSpatial app that Mr. Mergell has within the Division is that people will be able to take pictures as they drive by if they do not have enough time to stop and read the marker. Maybe their copilot could read its information off the app. This will be beneficial in bringing a new level of technology to the public.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I want to be clear; the Nevada Historical Society will prep the designs or whatever, do whatever work on them, and then the Division personnel are going to install them. Is that correct?

MR. MERGELL:

The OHP will continue to provide the language on the signs. Our office will fabricate and install the sign and then maintain it as necessary.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Is there a fiscal impact, and is the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources going to absorb the cost?

MR. SETTELMAYER:

There was an agreement with NDOT that they give us funds every year to the maintain the signs. The problem is, as Ms. Palmer mentioned, no one has wanted to do that for the last four to five years. Contractors have declined the work because of the cost and location of the signs. Consequently, the funds have been reverting to NDOT. There will not be a fiscal impact or fiscal note since we will finally be able to use those funds from NDOT to do what was originally discussed.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

Are we still adding new signs to commemorate new historical landmarks?

MS. PALMER:

The answer to that question is yes; we are adding new markers primarily for public interpretation related to mitigation for federal projects. The latest marker that we are working on installing is for the Veterans' Affairs (VA) Medical Center in Reno. Prior to that, we installed a marker for the VA Nursing Home in Reno, on the Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services Campus, to discuss the history of that facility.

CHAIR PAZINA:

Is there anyone testifying in support? Hearing none, is there anyone testifying in opposition? Hearing none, is there anyone testifying in neutral? Hearing none, we will close the hearing on A.B. 46 and open the work session on A.B. 46.

ALYSSA KELLER (Policy Analyst):

Assembly Bill 46, just heard by this Committee, transfers responsibility for the installation, maintenance and protection of historical markers from the Office of Historical Preservation to the Division of State Parks of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. There were no amendments.

CHAIR PAZINA:

I will entertain a motion to do pass A.B. 46.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 46.

SENATOR FLORES SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PAZINA:

I will now open the hearing on A.B. 184.

ASSEMBLY BILL 184 (2nd Reprint): Establishes an incentive program for the purchase of certain zero-emission medium-duty and heavy-duty vehicles. (BDR 40-588)

ASSEMBLYMAN HOWARD WATTS (Assembly District No. 15):

This bill will create a new incentive program to help support small business owners, local governments and State government in procuring zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles.

We have taken a lot of actions to try to reduce air pollution, both greenhouse gas emissions and particulate matter, and other pollution harmful to human health. When we look at all those types of air pollutants, transportation is a significant polluter. The larger duty vehicles, which are about 5 percent of the vehicles on the road, make up a significant share of the pollution. They make up about a third of carbon emissions that come from fleet vehicles.

If we take actions to help clean up that sector, each one of those vehicles we convert makes a larger difference than a passenger vehicle. When we talk about

medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, we are talking about delivery vans, delivery trucks, semitrucks and utility vehicles such as garbage trucks and buses.

It is important to note that, compared with discussions about passenger vehicles and increasing transit, these uses for last-mile delivery are going to be needed no matter what. These vehicles are going to be on our roads, and they emit quite a bit of pollution. They have a significant impact on air quality and public health. Converting them will help support our economic development strategy.

One of the key pillars of the U.S. Economic Development Administration is to support a move toward an electric clean technology economy and support the development of those businesses. This bill will continue to support and spur that innovation.

This bill has further economic benefits to small businesses. They need help getting to cost parity to move from older vehicles, which have much more significant fuel and maintenance needs, into these newer vehicles that not only have clean air benefits but also have lower operating and maintenance costs. This bill seeks to help make that transition possible.

A handful of other states have set up similar programs. Our Division of Environmental Protection (DEP) has administered similar programs in the past, both through the federal Diesel Emissions Reduction Act funding as well as the Volkswagen settlement. They used those funds to help oversee replacement and upgrade programs. We have a new opportunity to fund this program using a new federal infrastructure program, the Carbon Reduction Program, that comes from the U.S. Department of Transportation to the Nevada Department of Transportation specifically for programs to reduce carbon emissions from the transportation sector.

Assembly Bill 184 seeks to have the 35 percent inflexible funding the State has under the Carbon Reduction Program dedicated toward this program. That would also give us the opportunity to leverage additional federal investments and additional dollars to support this program. This bill is the product of significant work with many stakeholders and agencies.

Instead of walking you through the bill, the general structure of the program is a collaboration between NDOT that receives these dedicated federal funds and

DEP that has administered similar programs in the past. They would work with manufacturers, dealers and purchasers of these vehicles. Much of this would be fleshed out in rulemaking to create the details of the program. Essentially, they would work together to submit applications and receive incentive funding. That funding can only cover what a comparable diesel vehicle would cost. The goal is to create, at the most, cost parity with internal combustion vehicles. The vehicle must be zero-emission; it can be fully battery electric or hydrogen fuel cells; it just has to have zero tailpipe emissions. The incentive payment would be applied to the upfront cost of the vehicle making it more accessible for the purchaser.

This is open to any entity: businesses, nonprofits, and State and local government agencies. Some incentives vary based on the size of the vehicle and the weight rating of the vehicle. There are some amplifiers as well that are aimed, primarily, at helping disadvantaged small businesses and assisting independent owner-operators. You will hear from the Nevada Trucking Association about the reason that is so important.

Again, we are trying to help small business owners upgrade their vehicles that are carrying out some of these functions because they do not have the capital to make some of these investments that larger entities can. We also have an amplifier set aside for school districts. I know Clark County has received some funding and is starting to roll out zero-emissions buses for their fleet.

We want to continue to help Clark County and others because, even with that funding, those fleets are quite large. The program only covers the vehicle costs. There are other costs as well, as you will hear in testimony, but the goal is to help get this to a point where the upfront financials make sense. Then those operators can realize savings over time.

There are no State dollars being used for this program. We are using a new federal program. Money is not being diverted from another use that currently exists. Ultimately, the purpose of those funds is to reduce pollution. This is a great way to balance that goal and do it in a way that provides significant economic benefits to the State as well.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

What is the definition of a small business?

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

We have also referenced disadvantaged small businesses. Those are defined under the Small Business Administration. I will research that.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I appreciate that. I know it would not change, but I am curious—the bill states that if you are disadvantaged or a minority, you could get an additional 5 percent on top of the 20 percent.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

I did not touch on that much. There is a list of different categories and incentives. You can only get up to two of them. So, if you are a small business, I believe that is 20 percent. If you are a disadvantaged small business, that is an additional 5 percent, totaling 25 percent. If you are an independent owner-operator, that is the largest incentive. That is how we put it together, but we also did not want to get to the point where someone could stack four or five incentives and get a 200 percent kicker.

CHAIR PAZINA:

We will open testimony from those in support of A.B. 184.

TREVOR PARRISH (Vegas Chamber):

The Vegas Chamber is in support of the financial provisions of this bill and the economic benefits that it will have. Therefore, we urge your support.

KATIE RYAN (Dignity Health-St. Rose Dominican):

We believe that contributing to a healthy environment and collective quality of life continues to be a key measure of our organization's success. With over 30 percent of Nevada's greenhouse gas emissions coming from the transportation sector—and that number is expected to grow—the adoption of A.B. 184 is critical to preventing the worst impacts of climate change and air pollution.

In particular, addressing the medium- and heavy-duty sector, is critical, given its outsized role in harmful emissions that cause asthma, cardiovascular disease and premature death. This program is an important step to increase access and consumer choices in transportation and investment in clean energy resources, which will have enormous public health benefits. We have joined others signing a letter (Exhibit C) submitted as written testimony signed by 17 organizations.

ANDY MACKAY (Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association):

I am the executive director of the Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association, and our members are those heavy-duty truck dealers.

This bill is transformative. It is going to put most independent operators and small operators in a position of being able to afford these vehicles. When you look at the cost of these vehicles today, prices are so high, coupled with a 12 percent federal excise tax on trucks, that independent mom-and-pop folks simply cannot get into cleaner, more fuel-efficient and safer vehicles. This bill solves that conundrum, particularly when you look at zero-emission, medium- and heavy-duty trucks.

It is important to note that this is money from the federal government. I do not know about you, but I think I would rather save Nevada taxpayer money, capture and keep this opportunity in the Silver State, and help the small businesses here. We enthusiastically support this bill.

PAUL ENOS (Nevada Trucking Association):

A lot of our folks are those small operators. The average trucking company has about six trucks. When they think about buying zero-emission vehicles, there is some simple math to do. The cost for these vehicles today is three times the cost of an internal combustion engine. For our Class 8 vehicles, you need three times the zero-emission vehicles to do the job of one internal combustion engine today because of the increased weight of the battery. Companies are doing the math and determining they cannot afford to change.

A lot are owner-operators and those small one-truck people who are for hire; they have their own authority. They typically will work for contractors or other companies or go out on the load board. They tend to hold on to their trucks a lot longer because it is such a big investment on the front end. They are typically the folks that are driving around in trucks that are 25 years old.

We have made some tremendous strides. It takes the emissions of 66 trucks today to meet the same emissions from one truck in 1988. While we have made tremendous strides, a lot of folks are holding on to those vehicles a lot longer because of the cost of new ones.

We need to have incentives like this to get those folks, especially those who are doing the local and the medium-duty deliveries around town, to be able to buy

new trucks. We appreciate that 33 percent increase to the base incentive. Mr. MacKay is absolutely right—his dealers are fantastic. They are the conduit to work with a lot of our folks who do not have the sophistication and understanding of the law to get those incentives. The truck dealers are the people that help when you are considering buying a new truck here in the Silver State. The buyer must pay the 12 percent federal tax as well as an additional 12 percent to 13 percent for sales tax, depending on which county you pay for registration. So if you are looking at a \$400,000 vehicle, you would pay close to an additional \$100,000. We need these incentives to be able to move forward in this direction.

SENATOR HANSEN:

Did you say that we need three times the number of trucks because of the weight of the electric vehicles?

MR. ENOS:

Yes, the battery weight on Class 8 trucks is a lot heavier than diesel fuel. This bill, as I see it, is going to be useful to the small- and medium-duty trucks. Of course, a bigger battery is needed for the Class 8 long-haul trucks. That is why this opportunity makes a lot more sense for small vehicles that typically stay local and do not need a huge battery that you would need if you if you are trying to go over Donner Summit or long distances.

The weight of the battery in the long-haul truck adds approximately 20,000 pounds to the weight of the cargo. That means you get the battery weight taken away from the normal cargo weight. Consequently, more trucks will be needed for cargo. That is why the bill will benefit small- and medium-duty trucks more than Class 8 trucks.

SENATOR FLORES:

I know some folks who are in the trucking industry who have some federal contracts. There is a requirement that the fleet not be older than a specified number of years to use them for some specific jobs. Local runs are not affected, but some of the long-haul routes are affected. Will this change when you move to this type of truck?

I am curious to know about that specifically because I know some truckers, at some point, end up selling their trucks to other countries because they can no

longer use them for some of those national contracts. Would the new trucks change any of that?

MR. ENOS:

I am not sure about the federal contracts. I can tell you that California has an age limit for diesel trucks. They do not have an age limit on the zero-emission trucks. These are exactly the kind of vehicles they want going into California. This is how they want to transition.

I know a lot of companies in Nevada are scratching their heads asking how they will be able to work in California. This bill is exactly the kind of incentive that will give those folks the opportunity to be able to compete and stay in business.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

As we look at this bill, do you think it is for the independent trucker for hire?

MR. ENOS:

It is probably not going to be for private trucks. That is a definition that we would probably be working on with NDOT as we move forward.

For-hire trucking is a much different business than doing private hauling. Private hauling can be anything—a guy hauling his own hay or a construction company. A lot of times they do that to defray the cost of business as opposed to going out there in the market and bidding on loads and hauling for a living. That is where I would probably put the definition.

When you look at trucking companies, you have different kinds. There are truck load carriers; typically, everything on that load is all owned by one entity. It is somebody who is hauling an entire load for a specific company. Companies like UPS and FedEx have a myriad of different packages that are on a vehicle. The third classification of trucking is private carriers, such as Walmart hauling for Walmart, McDonald's hauling for McDonald's or a construction company or rancher who hauls his own product. That is where it is a little different. I think we can work with NDOT in terms of definitions. But, yes, in my mind, I would say owner-operator is a for-hire trucker with their own authority that either works for other trucking companies or bids on loads. They are not dedicated to that one company and forced to dispatch. They must own their own truck, have their own insurance, have their own authority and have the same business challenges that other folks do.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I appreciate that. That is why I asked what small business was. Again, you are talking about an age cap, especially in California, on these older trucks. In my world, they are qualified with the farmer/rancher exemption, which helps lessen the registration costs. But by the same token, they are probably as bad as any trucks for pollution.

MR. ENOS:

Typically, we do see those older trucks in local areas. The straight trucks—the smaller trucks are a straight truck—are a lot older. People do not put 100,000 miles on them every year like your average Class 8 trucker does, so they can hold on to them longer. As I mentioned, I am proud of the fact that through private sector innovation and government regulation, this industry has been able to reduce emissions where one 1988 truck equals 60 of today's 2010 or newer engines. So we are in a pretty awesome place. A bill like this helps us get further in terms of tailpipe emissions.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Yes, I appreciate that. I am just trying to figure out how we can capture the farmers and ranchers who do their own hauling. I think they would like to access this program.

The only reason that people are not hauling hay to California is because they cannot run those older trucks there. So, they are running them in-State, and it is a problem we are going to have to address at some point. Again, they are not truly independent, but there are a ton of them out there. I do not care if they are hauling hay, cows or carrots, they are on the road and are guilty of adding to the pollution.

AARON KRESSIG (Western Resource Advocates):

I am the transportation electrification manager for Western Resource Advocates. We fully support A.B. 184. Western Resource Advocates is a regional nonprofit advocacy organization fighting climate change impacts to sustain the environment, economy and people of the West.

The people of Nevada are subject to dangerous levels of air pollution, which are driven, in large part, by the transportation sector. Transportation also represents the single largest source of greenhouse gas emissions that are worsening

climate change. Electric trucks and buses have zero tailpipe emissions, which leads to huge reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and improves air quality.

Another benefit of this bill is the impact it will have on agencies and businesses in Nevada, as has been noted by some of the other commenters. These entities will greatly benefit from the operational cost savings that electric trucks and buses provide and help them overcome the higher upfront costs, which are still persistent with electric trucks today, although we are seeing decreases in those costs over time. The bill also provides additional support for entities like minority-owned businesses and independent owner-operators who could benefit the most from these operational cost savings of zero-emission vehicles but face the greatest barriers to purchasing them.

Assembly Bill 184 is designed for Nevada's businesses and citizens to capture all these benefits while relying entirely on federal funding and making the State more competitive. We submitted a letter of support ([Exhibit D](#)) where we provide more in-depth reasons why we support this bill. We urge the Committee to support A.B. 184. It will greatly benefit Nevada's air quality and our businesses.

ALEX PIKE (Western Way):

The Clean Trucks and Buses Incentive Program aligns environmental economic and health benefits for our State. This legislation fosters job creation in a bright and clean energy sector, reduces our greenhouse gas emissions and moves Nevada in the right direction. We urge your support of A.B. 184.

KYLE DAVIS (Washoe County School District):

The Washoe County School District has been a proud champion of alternative fuels for decades and believes that A.B. 184 could provide another avenue to diversify our fleet and improve environmental justice at our Title 1 schools. We urge your support of this bill.

CHELSEA CAPURRO (Las Vegas Urban Chamber of Commerce):

We urge your support on A.B. 184.

TOM CLARK (Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce):

I have worked in the renewable energy and energy efficiency world for a long time and know that these types of incentive programs encourage people who want to get into the market. They want to demonstrate to themselves and their

customers that they are looking for ways to do whatever they can to reduce the emissions that they bring forward. Leveraging federal dollars makes it even better. We are very much in support of A.B. 184.

SHELLY CAPURRO (Republic Services):
We are very much in support of A.B. 184.

BARRY COLE (Nevada Clinicians for Climate Action):
Have you ever been behind a truck and noticed what color the air is or what it smells like? You hope you can get your recirculating system going before the smoke comes in. I will not even address the geopolitical concerns about fossil fuels, but I represent Nevada Clinicians for Climate Action, and we are concerned about the quality of the air we are all breathing. We are especially concerned about our youngsters, specifically those in urban cities: Reno and Las Vegas.

Sure, when you are in rural Nevada, the air is always clean. That is why I love the drive from Reno to Las Vegas. But when you are in Reno in the winter, you have bad air. Now, it is also bad in the summer because of the fires. But when I am in Las Vegas in the summer, I do not inhale too deeply. I would like to suggest your strong support of A.B. 184.

CHRISTI CABRERA-GEORGESON (Nevada Conservation League):
We are here in strong support of A.B. 184. We submitted a letter in support ([Exhibit E](#)).

LAUREL SAITO (The Nature Conservancy):
We support policies that help Nevada reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and we support incentives to help businesses and independent operators in the State to invest in a climate-friendly option for their transportation needs.

GABRIELA OLMEDO (Advanced Energy United):
Advanced Energy United is a clean energy business association working to make the energy we use clean, affordable and reliable. We represent over 100 companies across the clean energy spectrum, such as large-scale renewables, transmission, solar, as well as electric vehicle manufacturers, operators, fleets and charging developers.

I am speaking on behalf of our association to express business support for the Nevada Clean Trucks and Buses Incentive Program. This program would enable Nevada to take advantage of federal dollars to lower the upfront cost barrier for the adoption of medium- and heavy-duty electric vehicles by Nevada fleet operators.

As we have heard, businesses want access to these vehicles, which offer considerable operational maintenance and fuel savings over their lifetimes. The purchasing of clean fleets will also drive additional private investment into the electric vehicle charging industry, bringing more clean energy industry investment into Nevada. The Clean Trucks and Buses Incentive Program will make the best use of this unprecedented federal funding moment before us by kick-starting Nevada's new and promising clean truck market and driving economic development and diversification into a growth industry. Nevada is incredibly well positioned to become an electric vehicle hub and this bill will demonstrate Nevada's commitment to that industry in a big way. We have also signed a letter expressing support from a wide range of business voices in this space, [Exhibit C](#).

KELLY TROMBLEY (Ceres):

Ceres is a group of over 80 major employers—large electricity customers, leading consumer brands and fortune 500 members here in the U.S. We support [A.B. 184](#). I also am one of the signers of the letter mentioned earlier, [Exhibit C](#).

Our member companies support policies that accelerate the adoption of the Clean Trucks and Buses Incentive Program in Nevada because it makes good business sense. Transportation is a significant cost center in business operations, and it is vital for how employees and customers travel to facilities.

Lowering barriers, like upfront costs, helps drive economies of scale and improves access to electric vehicles. It unlocks their considerable benefits, in addition to addressing pollution, stimulating the economy and creating local jobs. We also see that medium- and heavy-duty vehicle incentives are even more valuable right now, as we expect continuing progress toward parity. This program could position the State to secure and leverage further federal dollars. We respectfully urge your support for [A.B. 184](#).

WILL DRIER (Policy Manager, Electrification Coalition):

I have supplied written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)) in support [A.B. 184](#).

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
June 2, 2023
Page 18

MELISSA RAMOS (American Lung Association in Nevada):

I have submitted a letter ([Exhibit G](#)) on behalf of 13 health organizations in support of this legislation.

VICE CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

Seeing no testifiers in opposition, is there anyone who wishes to testify in neutral?

MENDY ELLIOTT (Nevada Battle Born Growth Escalator, Inc.):

I have an answer for Senator Goicoechea's question about small businesses. The Small Business Administration defines a small business with 500 or fewer employees with a revenue stream of no more than \$20 million.

A small, disadvantaged business is one that is at least 51 percent owned by a minority or a woman.

JENNIFER CARR (Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

If this bill is enacted, DEP is prepared to implement the proposed Clean Trucks and Buses Incentive Program created under this bill. The Division has many years' experience with administering an effective diesel emissions reduction vehicle replacement program funded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, as well as administering the national Volkswagen settlement on behalf of the State. This program opportunity for reducing exhaust emissions from Nevada's fleets of medium- and heavy-duty trucks and buses is well suited to the Division's Bureau of Air Quality Planning.

The Division reviewed the original bill language, as well as the two amendments, with proponents of [A.B. 184](#) and NDOT. Once federal grant guidelines are established, the Division will continue to work with NDOT on grant requirements and then host a stakeholder process to establish the regulations as required by the bill.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

I appreciate that information, thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

You heard from the different folks providing testimony about the benefits and opportunities of this bill. It is a great way to harness these federal funds that are

coming in and deploy them in a way that has clean air benefits and economic benefits too, and does it on a completely voluntary incentive basis.

You have heard about the collaboration, and we actually pared some of this back to create some flexibility in rulemaking. We want to hear from different stakeholders to make sure that the nuts and bolts of the program are going to be set up in the best way for the State and all the various entities who want to take advantage of it. We are going to have dealers and others helping those that are interested to walk through the process so they can understand it.

For the large vehicles doing the long hauls, there are still some logistical issues that must be worked out. But, for example, on a tour of Caesar's, I noticed they have vans running laundry from their properties to a laundry facility in North Las Vegas and back every day; that is the type of opportunity that can make an impact.

These independent owner-operators, who have their own vehicles and are trying to get as much life out of them as they can, might have an opportunity to make a huge step up into a new vehicle. That is what we are trying to do.

You have heard from a diverse coalition of folks who want to help support people in identifying and seizing those opportunities where they make sense and, again, doing it on a voluntary basis.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Maybe the truck will not have to be new, just electric. Maybe some people cannot afford the \$400,000, but they can repower a truck for \$100,000 and take that vehicle, which typically is one of the worst offenders, off the road.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS:

Repowering is also contemplated within this bill as well.

VICE CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We have received two letters ([Exhibit H](#)) in support of A.B. 184. That closes the hearing on A.B. 184. I will entertain a motion to do pass A.B. 184.

SENATOR FLORES MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 184.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR HANSEN:

I have some issues with some of this. It is a great program and the bill is well put together, but I am concerned about several aspects of it.

We are getting addicted to federal money. It is not magic money. It is taxpayer money somewhere. Somebody is paying the federal dollars and our State is getting to the point where the minute somebody starts talking about federal funds coming to Nevada, everybody pounces on it. But it is getting to the point where we are getting addicted to it.

An equal or greater concern is that we are going to need three times the trucks because of the battery weight. That means three times more traffic. For example, the mention of the traffic from one casino to the laundromat means there is going to be three times more trucks doing that if they are to convert completely to this fleet. There is also concern about the toxicity of the batteries themselves, which we did not address, and the amount of lithium that must be produced as well as the electricity that must be generated. We are talking blackouts now with current demand. How are we going to meet all these increased demands?

We also did not talk about how much fossil fuel is needed to create these electric vehicles and electric batteries. I have seen some statistics that indicate that, at best, it is a dead-even break. In other words, we use as much fossil fuel and create as much carbon footprint producing this stuff as we are going to save.

I am not sure that Senator Flores's question was addressed about the older vehicles. Those are the more polluting ones that do not go off the market but are shifted to either other states or foreign countries. Consequently, the amount of pollution, at least for the immediate future, remains at the same levels or in some cases greater.

The greater concern to me is the carbon footprint argument, which was mentioned, and the whole greenhouse gas discussion. Since 2004, the U.S. has, to its credit, cut our carbon footprint by 400 million metric tons. But in that same window of time, China has increased their carbon footprint by 2 billion metric tons. In the last five years, they have built 1,200 or more coal-fired power plants. We are at least on the carbon footprint side of this thing, but we are watching one of the great swindles of all time. China has conned us for

30 years. They have been claiming that they are going to convert to green energy, which they promised in a treaty in 1998, yet to this very day, they have dramatically expanded their carbon footprint, and we have been hamstringing our own industries, making them less competitive, giving China a huge advantage in the world markets. While that is way beyond what this bill deals with, it is a much bigger discussion that we need to have in our Country.

The Assembly voted in favor of this bill. I suspect I will be the only no vote. It is not because I do not think it is a great program; I just think we need to raise the awareness of what is going on globally. This is the same environment, the same atmosphere. Whatever China is doing is impacting us every bit as much as what our automobile industries or trucking industries or any anything burning carbon fuel is creating. We need to look at the bigger picture.

So, while this is a great program for Nevada and the bill overall is something I would normally gladly support, I am going to be a no vote simply to raise awareness of some of these issues I have addressed.

VICE CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We appreciate you putting your comments on the record.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR HANSEN VOTED NO.
SENATOR PAZINA WAS EXCUSED FOR THE VOTE).

* * * * *

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

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
June 2, 2023
Page 22

VICE CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

Seeing no public comment, we will close the meeting at 12:14 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Donna Crawford Kennedy,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Julie Pazina, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Introduced on Minute Report Page No.	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
A.B. 184	C	10	Katie Ryan / Dignity Health	Letter of Support from 17 organizations
A.B. 184	D	15	Aaron Kressig / Western Resource Advocates	Letter of Support
A.B. 184	E	16	Christi Cabrera-Georgeson / Nevada Conservation League	Letter of Support
A.B. 184	F	17	Will Drier / Electrification Coalition	Written Testimony in Support
A.B. 184	G	18	Melissa Ramos / American Lung Association in Nevada	Letter of Support
A.B. 184	H	19	Senator Melanie Scheible	Letters of Support