NEVADA LEGISLATURE
JOINT INTERIM STANDING COMMITTEE ON GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

(*Nevada Revised Statutes* [NRS] 218E.815)

MINUTES

May 19, 2026

The fifth meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Growth and Infrastructure for the 2025–2026 Interim was held on Tuesday, May 19, 2026, at 9 a.m. in Room 165, 7230 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3137, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and video recording of the meeting are available on the Committee's meeting page. The video recording may also be found at https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/. Copies of the video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) (publications@lcb.state.nv.us or 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Assemblymember Howard Watts, Chair
Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Max E. Carter II
Assemblymember Venise Karris
Assemblymember Heidi Kasama
Assemblymember Jason Patchett

COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Senator Ira Hansen (alternate for Senator Carrie Ann Buck)

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Senator Fabian Doñate (Excused)

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Keely Latham, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division
Anthony Ciaramella, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division
Terese Martinez, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Lauren Spratt, Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order. [Indicates a clarification.]

AGENDA ITEM I—OPENING REMARKS

Chair Watts:

Good morning, everyone. Welcome to today's meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Growth and Infrastructure. Would our Committee staff please take the roll?

[Roll call is reflected in Members Present.]

Thank you. We have a quorum of members present. We will note that Senator Doñate is absent-excused. Also, extending my appreciation to Senator Hansen for serving in his role as an alternate at today's meeting. Thank you.

A few quick housekeeping items before we get started. We will have public comment at the beginning and end of today's meeting. In order to make sure we can accommodate everyone—as well as our agenda—we are asking folks to limit their public comment to two minutes. Please sign in at the table in the back—either here in Las Vegas or in Carson City—if you would like to speak. If you would like to make additional public comments, you can always submit those in writing. You can find the email to send those comments on our agendas, as well as on the Nevada Legislature's website, and you can submit those after the meeting as well. If you would like to make public comment by phone, you can find the call-in information on our agenda, which is also posted on the Nevada Legislature's website. For today, the call-in number for public comment will be (888) 475-4499, and when prompted for a meeting ID, please enter 881 0279 8698, and then press the # [pound] sign. We are going to be hearing several items today related to traffic and transportation safety in the state; but before we start to go into those agenda items, we will begin with our first item, which is public comment.

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Watts:

Anyone wishing to provide public comment in person in Las Vegas, please come forward—fill the three seats that we have up here. Also, anyone in Carson City who would like to make public comment, please come forward at this time.

Thank you. We will start here in Las Vegas. Just remember to state and spell your name for the record before you begin. Then, if there is anybody other than these three gentlemen who would like to provide public comment, as soon as you finish, you can take your seat, and anyone else who would like to speak can come up and fill that seat. We will begin with you. Please go ahead. You need to hit the little button and turn your microphone on. There you go.

Brandon Venturo, Veteran, United States Marine Corps:

Hello. All right. Hi, good morning, Chairman, Board. Thank you guys for allowing public comment. I am a United States Marine Corps Veteran and a longtime motorcycle rider here in Nevada. Unfortunately, I have seen firsthand how quickly things can go wrong. Even in low-speed crashes involving motorcycles, they can result in catastrophic injuries and sometimes fatalities. I support lane filtering because I believe that traffic safety laws should be reflective of proven safety practices and common sense. Motorcycles are not like passenger vehicles—there are no bumpers, crush zones, or airbags. There is nothing

separating the rider from the impact, and when traffic stops abruptly, it can leave the rider in a very exposed position. Lane filtering reduces that exposure by allowing the motorcyclists to move safely through stopped traffic and not leave them in that vulnerable position. This is not about giving special treatment—this is about allowing the motorcycle options in congested traffic. I appreciate the work on traffic safety this Committee does, and I hope that you continue to support thoughtful motorcycle legislation going forward. Thank you.

Chair Watts:

Thank you.

Miguel Williams, Rider Coach, Motorcycle Safety Foundation; Motorcycle Safety Specialist, College of Southern Nevada; Lead Safety Officer/Lead Road Captain, Las Vegas Post, Buffalo Soldiers Motorcycle Club:

Good morning, Chairman Watts, members of the Committee. I am a Motorcycle Safety Foundation Rider Coach. I am also a Motorcycle Safety Specialist for the College of Southern Nevada. I am the Lead Safety Officer and also Lead Road Captain for the Buffalo Soldiers Motorcycle Club—Las Vegas Post; but more importantly, I am an avid and daily commuter. I am also here to advocate for lane filtering. I am in favor of it, because it is a practical traffic safety measure that helps prevent motorcyclists from a common cause of crashes, which is rear-end collisions. When traffic stops in Nevada—and we have all seen it out there—we are extremely vulnerable. Oftentimes, we are sitting in full safety gear, in the heat, on—essentially—what is an [inaudible], and our temperatures do reach several hundred degrees—internal temperature of those engines. We are also exposed to exhaust, which also reaches several hundred degrees. Especially this time of the year, heat exhaustion—heat exposure—is real. It is a thing—leaves very little protection for motorcyclists. Lane filtering, when done properly, allows a rider to slowly and safely move to the front of traffic instead of remaining trapped between vehicles. In essence, we have an infinite safety buffer. When done correctly, this is not reckless riding. Controlled, low-speed maneuvers have been implemented safely in other states, not to mention Europe. It puts us in a safer position. Also, what it does is—and as we know, we are in the top 15 largest, fastest-growing communities in the nation—so it also will aid in traffic congestion. I—and other folks with me—we ride these roads every day. We actually beseech you to continue supporting policies that reflect real-world roadway conditions and modern safety practices. Thank you so much for your time today.

Chair Watts:

Thank you for your comments. Please go ahead.

Kenny Piefer, Owner, Boulder Choppers, and National President, Soldiers for Jesus Ministry:

Good morning. I am a Nevada small business owner of a custom motorcycle shop, Boulder Choppers, and the National President of Soldiers for Jesus Ministry. I have prayed over riders and families and spoke at many funerals, memorials, and candlelight vigils. We all want to get home—after we ride—to our families. Motorcyclists are a part of the broad transportation community, and we contribute to the economy, tourism, charitable events in our communities across the state. Lane filtering is not a reckless behavior when done legally and responsibly. It is a safety-focused practice designed to reduce rear-end collisions and

improve traffic movement during stopped or slow traffic conditions. Nevada has an opportunity to continue thinking forward on traffic safety while educating the public about sharing the road responsibly with motorcyclists. I appreciate the Committee's attention to this issue and your willingness to hear directly from Nevada riders. Thank you.

Chair Watts:

Thank you.

Annie Houston, Resident, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Hello. I am a resident of Las Vegas and a mother of an angel rider. I am speaking today because our streets are not safe, especially for anyone who is not inside a car or a truck. Whether you walk, ride a bicycle, use a mobility device, or ride a motorcycle, the message is the same—southern Nevada, your life is at a higher risk than it should be. Las Vegas has become one of the most dangerous metro areas in the country for vulnerable road users. Every year we lose pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists in crashes that are very preventable. These are not statistics; they are parents, children, neighbors—and in my case, my own family. There is another issue that we must acknowledge—the stigma surrounding motorcyclists. The public often sees us as riders who weave in and out of traffic, rev their engines, or speed. Those behaviors are real, but they are not representative of all of us—they are simply the most visible. When we rev our engines, we are to be seen—not to be a nuisance. As a mother who lost her son in a fatal motorcycle accident and as a fellow rider myself, it is devastating when I read comments like, "Another one bites the dust," or "Not news anymore—dropping like flies every day." These are real comments that are made. These comments are cruel—but even worse, they reflect how many view motorcyclists. The reckless shape the public's perception while the responsible riders are the ones being killed. The truth is that a lot of the riders being killed are overwhelmingly the ones doing the right thing. They are the ones wearing helmets, following the speed limit, entering intersections legally, and riding defensively. They are the ones struck by drivers who fail to yield, who turn left without looking, who are distracted, who misjudge distance because a motorcycle is smaller than a car. Yet when a rider dies, the assumption is, too often, they must have been doing something reckless. The stigma not only dishonors the victims, it also prevents meaningful safety reform. The pattern is clear—drivers routinely speed, fail to yield, and make left turns without properly scanning for smaller road users. Intersections are designed around vehicle flow, not human safety. Lighting is inconsistent, crosswalks are too far apart, and enforcement is reactive instead of preventative. People outside of cars are paying the price with their lives.

I am asking this body to take meaningful action. Strengthen the infrastructure that protects pedestrians, cyclists, and motorcyclists. Include protected lanes, better lighting, and safer intersection design. Increase accountability for drivers who injure or kill vulnerable road users. We seem to not have very much accountability for that at this time. Fund public education campaigns that address speeding, left-turn risks, visibility, and the harmful stigma towards motorcyclists. And prioritize data transparency, so families and communities can understand where and why these crashes happen. No one should have to bury a loved one because a driver did not see them. No one should fear walking across the street or riding to work. No family should have to stand where mine has stood—grieving someone who should still be here. We can prevent these deaths. We can build a city where all road users are protected—but it requires urgency, investment, and the political will to put human life above convenience. Thank you for your time and choosing to act before another family suffers its loss.

Chair Watts:

Thank you.

Cheryl Guanzon, Member of the Public:

Good morning, Chair, and the members of this Committee. My name is Cheryl Guanzon—my friends know me as "City." I have been riding here in Nevada and across state lines for many years. I am here today to share personally an experience of how dangerous stopped and slow traffic can be for motorcycle riders. Recently, while stopped in traffic, I watched a vehicle approaching behind me that was not slowing down. Fortunately, my head and my eyes were standing for that danger already, and I was able to move out of the way in time. But many riders are not that lucky. Just a few weeks ago, a well-known rider in this community—a husband, a father, a son—was killed while stopped in traffic at a traffic light. He was violently struck from behind by a vehicle and killed. His family, friends, and this community were devastated. Had he been able to filter forward at that stopped traffic, he would likely be with us today. Motorcyclists do not have the protection drivers inside vehicles have. Lane filtering provides riders a way to reduce that risk of being trapped between vehicles during traffic backups and sudden stops. This is a practiced safety measure rooted in prevention. It is about reducing injuries, reducing fatalities, and helping riders safely return home to their loved ones. I respectfully ask this Committee to continue supporting motorcycle safety efforts and to keep Nevada moving forward on lane filtering, education, and awareness. Thank you for your time today.

Chair Watts:

Thank you for your comments. Please go ahead, sir.

Eric Craig, Resident, Nevada:

Good morning, Chair and members of the Committee. I am just an everyday Nevada Harley rider. I ride to work, run errands, meet friends, and enjoy the state we live in. I am here today because lane filtering is a real-world safety issue for people like me. We are not trying to save a few seconds in traffic; we are trying to avoid being the smallest and least-protected vehicle sitting stopped when larger cars and trucks—who are either distracted on their phones—and they are not watching out for us. Lane filtering gives riders a safe option in those situations by allowing slow, controlled movement through stopped traffic. It helps reduce rear-end crash risks, improve visibility, and can help reduce congestion for everyone on the road. As more and more Californians move here, they are already used to lane filtering, and now—as it is legal in our surrounding states of Arizona, Colorado, and Utah—Nevada riders are asking for thoughtful safety policies based on real traffic conditions and real rider experience. I appreciate the opportunity to speak today and thank you for considering Nevada motorcycles. Thank you for your time.

Chair Watts:

Thank you.

Jaenah Marie B. Guanzon, Member, Ghost Ryderz Extreme Motorcycle Club:

Good morning, Committee. My name is Jaenah Marie Guanzon, also known as "Shorty" of Ghost Ryderz Extreme Motorcycle Club. I am one of the younger motorcycle riders here today. I am speaking in support of lane filtering because younger riders like me want to see Nevada continue moving towards smarter and safer transportation policies. Traffic today is more congested than ever, and distracted driving has become a major issue. Riders are

especially vulnerable because we are smaller and harder for drivers to notice. Lane filtering helps create separation between motorcycles and stopped vehicles. It reduces the chance of rear-end collisions and can improve overall traffic flow when done properly and legally. Many young riders take safety training seriously and want to ride responsibly. Policies like lane filtering encourage education, awareness, and safer riding behaviors—instead of forcing riders into more dangerous situations. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today and for considering the perspectives of Nevada riders of all ages.

Chair Watts:

Thank you.

Amy Smith, Motorcycle Safety Instructor, College of Southern Nevada, Nellis Air Force Base, and Harley Davidson:

Good morning, members of the Committee. My name is Amy Smith, but most call me "Pineapple." I am a motorcycle safety instructor for College of Southern Nevada, Nellis Air Force Base, and Harley Davidson. I am a daughter, a mother, a sister, a grandmother, a Nevada resident, and a motorcycle rider. I am speaking here today in support of lane filtering because I want riders to make it home safely. Many people picture motorcyclists as thrill seekers, but most of us are everyday people—parents, workers, veterans, business owners, and caregivers. We ride because we love it, but we also understand the risks. One of the biggest dangers riders face is stopped traffic. A distracted driver looking at their phone may not see a motorcyclist until it is too late. Lane filtering gives riders the opportunity to move out of that danger zone in a slow and controlled way. Nevada has already taken an important step in recognizing lane filtering as a safety issue. I encourage you to continue supporting education and policies that help reduce these preventable crashes and save lives. Thank you. Thank you for listening and considering the safety of Nevada riders.

Chair Watts:

Thank you for joining us today. Please go ahead.

David Sampson, Attorney, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Good morning. Thank you for the chance to speak with you today. I have been an attorney in Las Vegas and an officer of the court for the last 28 years. I am a father of four daughters, and I have served as a bishop in my church—and I love riding my motorcycle. I enjoy it very much. In fact, my youngest daughter—who now is a mother of her own—has a little Sportster, and we love to ride together. Going up Red Rock Canyon is just a wonderful thing for us to do. And, guys, we are safe. We have done all the training; we have done all the classes. We are safe when we ride—but as safe as we are, we have to stop for red lights. We have to stop for traffic—and we are so vulnerable when we do that. Every time I stop for a red light and I see the car behind me come to a safe stop, I shoot a little peace sign as a thank you and to give them—I do not think anybody ever sees it, but it is important to me that I shoot them a little nod and the peace sign to thank them for protecting me when I cannot protect myself. It is not lane splitting. No one is looking—we are not looking to zoom in between traffic and get home any quicker. It is lane filtering. Just let us pull a little forward, tuck in between a couple of the cars that are on the road with us, so that we are not as vulnerable. I am getting emotional, and here is why—this was

mentioned earlier. A client of mine—who became a friend of mine—died a few weeks ago when he was stopped for traffic and hit from behind. I would like you to hear his name—it is Josh Barber. Lane filtering would have saved Josh's life, and he would be here today. I ask that you please protect us and allow us to lane filter. Thank you all.

Chair Watts:

Thank you so much for providing your comments today. Seeing no one else coming forward in Las Vegas at this time, seeing nobody coming forward in Carson City, AVH [Audio Visual Hearings Unit], do we have anyone wishing to provide public comment by phone this morning?

AVH, Information Technology Services, Administrative Division, LCB:

Thank you, Chair. If you wish to provide public comment, please press *9 to take your place in the queue. Again, if you wish to provide public comment, please press *9.

Dora Martinez, Member of the Public:

Good morning, Chair and members of the Committee. As an avid walker—and before my surgery, I was a jogger with my guide dog, Jerry Lee. I just want to bring the disability community to the space, because we do utilize accessible sidewalks—Complete Streets—and so when you guys are discussing all motorized vehicles, please be mindful of the disabled people. I know we are not always seen, but we are here—and I appreciate everything you do. And Chair, I need to confess. Last year I helped myself to a table that says, "Employees only," and I took coffee and water—and I did not see the sign because my dog cannot read—and I apologize. Thank you. Take care.

Chair Watts:

Thank you, Ms. Martinez. We always appreciate hearing from you. AVH, next caller please.

Heather Penachio, Resident, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Good morning, members of the Committee. I am both a Nevada rider and a certified trauma and ER [emergency room] registered nurse here in the City and also someone who has seen the consequences of serious traffic crashes firsthand. I am here today on the phone because lane filtering is a safety conversation that deserves thoughtful consideration based on risk reduction. Motorcycles are uniquely vulnerable in traffic. When a motorcycle is stopped between larger vehicles, the rider has very little protection from a rear-end impact. Lane filtering helps reduce that exposure and risk by allowing motorcycles to move ahead carefully and predictably at low speeds. Studies and experiences from other states show that when properly implemented and understood, lane filtering can reduce certain types of severe motorcycle crashes. Traffic safety policy should focus on reducing crashes, preventable injuries, and fatalities wherever possible. I appreciate this Committee for examining these issues seriously and listening to Nevada riders directly. Thank you for your time.

Chair Watts:

Thank you for your comments. AVH, next caller, please.

AVH:

Thank you, Chair. The line is open and working; we have no additional callers at this time.

Chair Watts:

All right, thank you. As a reminder, we will have a public comment period again at the end of today's meeting. Before we go into our first presentation, I wanted to take a moment to thank Vice Chair Nguyen, who put a lot of effort into coming up with the agenda for today's meeting. We both agreed that traffic safety was an issue of extreme importance in our community, and we wanted to dedicate a meeting to hearing from members of our community about what is going on and generating ideas for how the state can make improvements in this area. I just wanted to take a moment to thank Senator Nguyen for her work in helping put today's meeting together and turn the microphone over to her for a moment for any remarks she would like to make.

Senator Nguyen:

Thank you. Yes, I also want to thank our Chair and all the members of this Committee. I know that traffic safety—all things traffic—are something that we definitely hear from our constituents, probably on a more regular basis than anything else—with the exception of sometimes water. Thankfully, that is a different branch of government that helps us out on those kind of things as well. But today, I am really excited to hear some presentations focused on traffic safety related issues, including presentations on motorcycle lane filtering, e-bikes [electric bikes] and e-scooters [electric scooters], traffic safety data, targeted safety strategies, as well as other related topics.

But before we get started with the presentations—and I appreciate the Chair giving me an opportunity to talk about this—one of the things that I know that the members of this legislative body believe is important, and I think we should do more of, is following through and following up on bills that we passed in the previous legislative sessions. I would like to mention that this Committee—we did reach out to some organizations, including the Clark County School District, to provide a status update on Assembly Bill 527 that was passed during the 2025 Legislative Session. I think we always make a concerted effort during session to address issues, including those of traffic safety, and for those of you that need a reminder—because those numbers stay the same every session—Assembly Bill 527 authorizes a board of trustees of the school district to authorize the installation and use of infraction detection systems on school buses to enforce laws against overtaking and passing a stopped school bus in certain circumstances—so, essentially, school bus stop arm cameras. I will note that in our request for an update from the Clark County School District, they did refer us to a statement that they have published in public record, that they—while they had completed the initial phases of exploring this program, they are continuing to evaluate the implementation models and the experiences of other jurisdictions across the country. At this point, they declined to be able to come in and talk about that. I did not want this Committee or the public to think that we were not following up on pieces of legislation that we passed, and hopefully this will lead way to more discussions about what we may need to do in the future. I do not know—did you want to go ahead and do the rest of that? Or do you want me to just head on into introducing the next agenda item, Chair?

Chair Watts:

Thank you, Vice Chair. I think we will go ahead and just start moving into our presentations for the day.

AGENDA ITEM III—PRESENTATION ON MOTORCYCLE LANE FILTERING

Chair Watts:

First up, we have a presentation on motorcycle lane filtering. We have representatives of Motorcycle Rights for Nevada joining us today. Thank you so much for being here. Go ahead and take a moment—get everything set up—and just remember when you are ready to state your name for the record, and you can begin your presentation.

Jessica Begnal, President, Motorcycle Rights for Nevada (MR4NV):

Good morning and thank you Committee for this opportunity to present. (Agenda Item III A-1) (Agenda Item III A-2) I am the President of Motorcycle Rights for Nevada, a grassroots organization focused on practical, safety-driven policy that protects riders while improving roadway safety for everyone. Personally, I own two motorcycles, and I have been riding almost nine years. I try to average about 10,000 miles a year, and I often commute from Henderson to Nellis Air Force Base on two wheels. It is during these daily commutes, stopped on the I-15 [Interstate 15], I often place both of my feet on the pavement on the freeway. This is where I experience firsthand how vulnerable being on a motorcycle can be on Nevada roads.

Motorcyclists are among the most vulnerable road users. Even a little fender bender, or a low speed, rear-end collision, can result in catastrophic injuries or fatalities. Additionally, Nevada's extreme heat and heavy congestion compounds these hazards. In stopped or slow moving traffic, motorcycle riders can easily disappear when they are positioned between or behind large vehicles.

Intersections are dangerous for everyone, but especially dangerous for a motorcycle rider. With multiple conflict points, limited visibility, stop and go congestion—intersections create an environment where even small mistakes can lead to serious or deadly consequences. For riders on two wheels, a rear-end collision of even 15 miles an hour can end in a fatality—making intersections the bull's eye of danger for motorcyclists. We all know that motorcycles have a much smaller visual profile than surrounding vehicles, making riders easy to overlook; they can virtually disappear. In many accidents, the drivers often state, "We did not even see them," and we actually believe them.

Recently one of our four-wheeled supporters sent this photo with this caption, "On the way to an event—and I was so tired my eyes were burning. As I rolled up to the light—I am not going to lie—I had to strain my eyes to see that there was even a motorcycle." This was taken with an iPhone 15, a camera far more advanced than the average driver. In Nevada, drivers can legally operate a vehicle with 20/40 vision—meaning they can see at 20 feet what a normal visually-impaired person can see at 40 feet. Now combine that with darkness, fatigue, congestion, distracted driving, and the already small profile of a motorcycle. This is exactly why riders are vulnerable in stopped and slowed traffic and why conversations around visibility, awareness, and policy change are important.

Lane filtering is a safety maneuver. It is for riders to use in dangerous intersections. Lane filtering is when the motorcycle navigates slowly and controlled between stopped or slowed traffic. It allows a rider to move to the front of the line, increasing visibility both for the rider and for traffic at the intersection. By allowing the motorcycle to reposition away from that rear-end collision zone, lane filtering provides riders with greater visibility, maneuverability, and safety.

Next, I would like to introduce—I would like to pass this presentation and introduce Jared Richards, the Vice President of Motorcycle Rights for Nevada and CEO [Chief Executive Officer] of Full Throttle Law [& Clear Counsel Law Group].

Jared Richards, Vice President, MR4NV, and CEO/Litigation Attorney, Full Throttle Law & Clear Counsel Law Group:

Good morning. I am a father of four, a husband, a small business owner—my business employs about 40 people here in southern Nevada—and I am a rider. I have been a rider for ten years, and my wife owns a motorcycle, and she rides with me.

In the Southwest, nearly every state—or at least the majority of the states—have already adopted some form of lane filtering. And so, when we cross state lines—into California, into Arizona, into Utah—we are in jurisdictions where that is a practice. That also means that the thousands of riders from those jurisdictions that come here—for tourism, for travel, for whatever reason—they are bringing with them their driving behaviors and their practices that are legalized and normalized in their jurisdictions, and that can cause some confusion—and frustration, quite frankly—in both the riders and the people operating cars. By updating our laws so that we are more consistent with those of our neighbors, then we make the pathway clear, and we reduce confusion. By implementing low-speed lane filtering policy, we decrease risk, and we increase clarity. And we can tailor it to the needs of our community—we can tailor it to our traffic needs and our climate needs.

We are proposing a targeted safety measure designed to specifically decrease one of the highest-risk situations that we have in traffic, and that is—as other people today have so eloquently said—being stopped in traffic. Whether it is on the freeway or whether it is at an intersection, you are extremely vulnerable. The testimony we heard earlier of somebody seeing—it is a pretty common practice—where you have to look behind you at the mirror, and you are just hoping that the person behind you stops because, quite frankly, with the cars in front of you, there may be no place for you to go.

Lane filtering—we propose a very simple framework—where we would allow controlled, low-speed motorcycle movement in between stopped or significantly slowed traffic on multilane highways. With that, it would allow the motorcyclists to move safely and reasonably in between cars. Now, this is going to address two primary safety concerns—that which has already been addressed—that of rear-end accidents. It gets—as David so eloquently testified about his client and his friend who passed away, and we have lost members in our community. I represent clients who also have been injured in that exact same type of scenario. This allows the rider to get out of that kill zone and into the relative safety of using the vehicles on either side of him as shields.

It also addresses a heat issue that is going to become a significant issue here in the coming months. Every year, riders deal with heat issues in stopped traffic, with the ambient temperatures on that pavement reaching above 120 degrees for the rider. In addition, we have these really hot helmets that sort of absorb this heat—and while I personally only wear a full face helmet and I advocate the use of full face helmets—it is very difficult to do that. Other states, Utah and Arizona, have helmets optional—in part because of the heat issue. We do not advocate for that, but we do think that allowing for lane filtering is a rational and reasonable compromise that would decrease the heat issues that our riders face when caught in traffic—and heaven forbid they are caught in traffic for an hour trying to get into California. That would be—that creates a real serious health issue.

With that, I am going to pass the time over to Dazzlin' Venturo to talk about education and implementation.

Dazzlin' Venturo, Instructor, Motorcycle Safety Foundation, Accident Scene Management, and Outreach Director, Full Throttle Law:

Thank you, Jared. I am a motorcycle safety foundation instructor, an accident scene management instructor, the President and Founder of an all-female motorcycle club, and a longtime Nevada rider. I also serve as the Motorcycle Community Outreach Director for Full Throttle Law, where I have had the opportunity to work very closely with the riding community, organizing and hosting safety awareness events, and building relationships between the motorcycle community and the public.

Successful implementation is just as important as the policy itself. For this to work, both riders and drivers need to clearly understand when and how lane filtering is appropriate. Education will be key. As an instructor, I see how effective structured training can be. This policy can seamlessly be integrated into existing systems—including motorcycle safety courses and DMV [Department of Motor Vehicles] education—making it a low cost and efficient rollout. At the end of the day, this is about giving the 80,000 Nevada resident motorcycle riders and all two-wheeled visitors to our great state a safer option when they are most vulnerable. It is about reducing preventable crashes, especially rear-end collisions in stopped and congested traffic. While we all recognize that we may never fully reach a Nevada Department of Transportation zero-fatality goal, this policy represents a proven and practical safety solution that aligns with approaches that are already being successfully used in other states.

Over the past nine months, Motorcycle Rights for Nevada has taken a strategic and community-focused approach through public, rider, and legislative outreach. Over 430 constituents have used our platform to contact their Legislators. This helped spark meaningful conversations with 15 separate lawmakers about lane filtering and motorcycle safety. In addition, we have hosted and participated in multiple community outreach events focused on rider awareness, education, and roadway safety. Our efforts have also led to a proclamation from Nevada Governor Joe Lombardo, and two additional motorcycle-related proclamations signed by Senators Rochelle Nguyen, Julie Pazina, Michelee Cruz-Crawford, and Richard "Skip" Daly. Most importantly, this issue matters to a diverse and passionate group of Nevadans from all walks of life, like you have seen represented here today—backgrounds, age groups—and all sharing a common goal of making Nevada's roads safer for everyone. Thank you to those that have helped us get here today—and thank you for your time. I am going to turn it back over to JJ, and we welcome any questions.

Ms. Begnal:

As you have heard from a lot of us, we are excited and honored to be here—and we are here and ready to answer any questions you may have.

Chair Watts:

All right, thank you so much for the presentation. Members, any questions for our presenters? All right; we will start with Vice Chair Nguyen.

Vice Chair Nguyen

Thank you, and thank you for that presentation. I will be honest; I was not as familiar with the difference between lane splitting and lane filtering until I met you all about six months ago—so I am really excited to make sure that the rest of my colleagues are educated on this matter as well. When we were looking at that map, you were talking about how our neighboring states have adopted legislation—to various levels—around lane filtering. Can you tell us the difference? Is there one standard language that has been adopted universally in those surrounding states, or do they vary/differ? Are they different depending on where you are?

Ms. Begnal:

First, I want to address the beautiful map for a second. Nevada is growing. I would actually like to pass this question to Jared—that has a lot more detailed information about the individual laws in the individual states.

Mr. Richards:

Thank you. The answer is there is no universal, uniform language that has been used across all the states. They all have their own twist, based on their jurisdiction. California embraces full lane splitting, which is—so long as you are following all other laws and following the speed limit that you can, essentially, lane split at any speed. Lane filtering, which is adopted by Utah, and Arizona, and Colorado, and, I believe, recently, Montana—but I might be wrong there, but I think so—they also do not have unified language, but they focus on lane filtering. But the core pieces of those legislations is that traffic has to be either stopped or slowed, and there are some jurisdictions that require just stopped—and some that are okay with slowed traffic as well. Then they generally put a speed limit on either a cap of around 25 miles an hour for the bike, or they limit the motorcycle for going maybe 10 or 15 miles over the speed of the adjacent traffic. But as far as the specific question of, "Is there uniform language?" To my knowledge, there is not.

Ms. Begnal:

Senator Nguyen, I do want to add on to it that—that is where this conversation is really important—is to figure out how we can work together to find something that works for everybody.

Senator Nguyen:

So, am I clear? The recommendations that you are making to this Committee are not regarding lane splitting, but more geared towards, specifically, lane filtering.

Ms. Begnal:

That is correct. Our Nevada infrastructure, highways, and roads are drastically different than California—where it is legal there. As an everyday rider, we just do not feel like it is a perfect fit for Nevada. We think that the biggest thing that we need to focus on are these dangerous intersections and on the freeway—being able to just get through congested traffic.

Senator Nguyen:

I am sorry; just for the clarity of our record, whenever you speak—and as awkward as it is—if you could tell your name before.

Ms. Begnal:

Yes, ma'am.

Senator Nguyen:

I do not have any further questions. Thank you, Chair.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. Assemblymember Patchett.

Assemblymember Patchett:

Thank you so much for the presentation. Like many of you that spoke, traffic safety is very personal to me as well. I applaud your efforts to advocate for increased traffic safety, especially here in Clark County. As you all know, if not on the daily, at least the weekly, there are fatalities on our roadways that need to be addressed—so, thank you for the presentation. Just a quick question, as I think about the opposition and why Nevada has not instituted a law as you are advocating today. What do you think is the strongest argument against lane filtering? And how do you propose to address that argument, if it exists?

Ms. Begnal:

First, I want to thank you for your time, Assemblymember Patchett. Having conversations around traffic safety with you was probably the most heartfelt conversations that we have had with the other—as opposed to the other 15 Legislators that we met—so, thank you. To be honest with you, we are really not concerned about opposition, because we know that this is what is a perfect fit for Nevada. I think any opposition will probably fall into that line of, "Oh, well then you are just going to open the floodgates for lane splitting." I think my rebuttal to that is that there are already those guys out there doing it, and unfortunately, we are not going to stop those behaviors. What we are hoping is that this conversation drives culture change on our roads, and it creates visibility from the Legislature down to our roads—making motorcyclists more visible.

Assemblymember Patchett:

Thank you—and thank you, Chair.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. Members, additional questions? Okay, I do have one. Following up on your last point, you mentioned that there are folks out there on the roadways who do some form of lane splitting currently, even though it is not legal. But we have also heard the stories of people who have been struck and even killed in traffic here—following the letter of the law. The goal here is to make sure that there is a legal pathway for folks that want to make

sure that they are observing all the rules of the road to be able to also get into that safe position in stopped and slowed traffic. I guess my first question is—is that really the goal is to make sure that there is—that people feel comfortable taking that option and feeling like they are within the rules of the road?

Ms. Begnal:

That is a great question. The first part of that question is—the goal of Motorcycle Rights for Nevada is to create a visibility of motorcyclists in this great state. The second piece is to create the visibility on the roads. When you move your motorcycle out of the lane of traffic—next to the people checking their Instagram—and going to the front of the intersection, we are more visible. Creating that option is what we are looking for.

Chair Watts:

Thank you so much, and you are doing a great job with building visibility. You have got fantastic turnout down here in the building today. It is great to see new faces joining and participating in this process—and also challenging some of the stereotypes and stigmas that were mentioned in the public comments. My other piece then—on that education piece—is there anything in particular that you see the Legislature participating in or the state participating in when it comes to public education? So, if we were to enact lane filtering, do you see a role for the DMV or other state public education efforts in helping inform both motorcyclists and all other roadway users about the new law?

Ms. Begnal:

Thank you, Chair. I would like to pass this question to Dazzlin' Venturo.

Ms. Venturo:

Hi. Again, education will be key. But we already have a system to train Nevadans, and it is a very low-cost way. Several of our surrounding states have adopted language in the DMV testing that includes specific questions about motorcyclists. It can be included on what you will be seeing right now during the month of May. One of our amazing sponsors, coupled with Lamar, has over 8,000 billboards in the month of May that simply say, "Watch for motorcycles." They are done at a cost that is combined with Lamar and some of our sponsors. Those are great ways that we can use. They are not the traditional, "In a wreck, get a check" billboards that you see out there about motorcycles. These really are about being aware. When I first bought a Ford F-150 pickup truck, all I saw out there was my tribe—other people that were driving Ford F-150 pickup trucks. I think when we open up the dialogue about motorcyclists in general, you begin to see motorcyclists. If you do not ride, you probably do not see them. I rarely miss seeing a motorcyclist out on the road. This, in itself—when you do, as Legislators, begin to talk about these safety issues—not just in Channel 8 or Fox 5 reports of another fatality—those are ways that we can educate the public that it is coming. Thank you.

Chair Watts:

Thank you so much. Certainly—following some of our conversations, I have certainly had increased visibility of motorcyclists when I am on the road as well—and been talking with constituents who have expressed their concerns about the metal plates that go over the road during construction and the safety issues those pose—and now I notice those quite a bit more too. I do think that it is important that we make sure that there is that partnership with the community to do broader public education work—but that we also integrate this

both in the education and testing for motorcyclists—but also, in particular, for all other vehicle drivers, so that they have some understanding of those rules of the road, and hopefully it improves the awareness and safety from other vehicle drivers and road users as well.

Members, any additional questions? All right, seeing none. Thank you so much for your presentation and for joining us today.

AGENDA ITEM IV—PRESENTATION ON POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE NEVADA ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC SAFETY

Chair Watts:

All right, we will now move on to the next item on our agenda, which is a presentation on policy recommendations by the Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety or NVACTS.

We have representatives joining us both in northern and southern Nevada. As soon as you are ready, you can introduce yourselves for the record and begin your presentation. Thank you.

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

Hello, Chair, Vice Chair, and interim Committee members. I feel like I should be testifying in neutral—but today I am representing the Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety or NVACTS, which I proudly became the Chair of earlier this year. Traffic safety is something that I am passionate about, and when I heard about the high number of students that were getting hit in Clark County school zones this year—which is way over 300—I felt like I had to do something about it. (Agenda Item IV)

I have a couple of people with me today, including NDOT [Nevada's Department of Transportation] Traffic Safety Engineer Lacey Tisler, who is down in Las Vegas with you guys, and then Office of Traffic Safety Law Enforcement Liaison Todd Hartline.

Just a brief mention of what our Committee does—the purpose of the NVACTS Committee is to save lives on Nevada roads. We do that by meeting regularly, contributing to the highway safety plan, providing an annual report to the Governor, and recommending policy initiatives that we hope will save lives on Nevada roadways—and this is all detailed in statute. But you can also look to our group whenever you need some data on traffic safety, or better yet, when you want to put something forward to help reduce crashes or fatalities on our roadways.

I will briefly cover this slide. As you can see here, NVACTS is widely represented by transportation agencies, law enforcement, public health officials, the court system, and two legislative representatives. We have a diverse group of people that are looking to improve traffic safety every day in Nevada.

Now I would like to briefly go over the traffic safety policy priorities that were unanimously passed by our members at our last meeting. Now, do not freak out. These are not necessarily legislative bills; these are concepts that have been proven to save lives in other states. We can break them apart into smaller initiatives as well, like we did with road safety cameras in the last session—for a pilot program for school bus stop arms, as mentioned before. But just keep these in mind if you are ever thinking, "Too many people are getting

injured or dying on our roads, and I want to do something about it." Our job with NVACTS is not to twist your arms to ask you to pass legislation—it is to be a resource if you ever want to improve traffic safety.

The first one is helmets for all riders. This one is kind of common sense. Helmets are a simple yet powerful tool to prevent serious injuries and reduce burdens on emergency services. E-bikes, e-scooters, skateboards, rollerblades, bicycle riders are equally vulnerable to head injuries in the event of a fall or a collision.

The second one deals with distracted driving. Updates to Nevada law could be made to address missing elements, such as cell phone use, not manual texting for phone communications, streaming video in-car systems, and even a cell phone ban for younger drivers.

The third one is DUI [driving under the influence] interventions. This policy recommendation aims to improve state DUI laws to help address challenges that impaired drivers can cause using the following interventions, including possibly lowering the BAC [blood alcohol content] to 0.05. Now, this is a very aggressive initiative that one state has implemented, and that is Utah. I recently was at a conference where they spoke about the positive effects that it has had on their DUI numbers. What Utah was trying to do is they were trying to completely separate drinking from driving. Surprisingly, they have not had a lot of pushback on that and that law.

The next section are our priorities—continuing priorities—that we previously put forward and decided to move forward again the next two years. The first one is Graduated Driver License (GDL) enhancements—which Nevada already has a GDL program. For example, drivers who are 16- or 17-years-old are not allowed to carry passengers under the age of 18—except for immediate family members—for the first six months they drive, and we currently have that in place. Current graduated driver's license laws can be enhanced by restricting cell phone use for drivers under 18, amending current law to include seatbelt usage for young drivers and their passengers, and removing the age restriction of current GDL laws—requiring all new drivers to obtain practical driving experience.

The next one is road safety cameras, which we already discussed. There was also a bill last session to put road safety cameras in construction zones, which failed. But have you ever driven in another state with automated camera enforcement? I was in Edmonton, Canada, for a conference last year, where those intersections were clearly marked with cameras. I am not saying whether I like them or not, but I guarantee you, when I drove those intersections, I was driving exactly the speed limit—and I am pretty sure everyone around me was doing the same thing—so they are a really good way to slow people down.

The last one is safe system intersections. That is another good measure that has proactive design—it is a proactive design approach that anticipates human errors and reduces crash severity to zero deaths or serious injuries. This moves beyond traditional safety by prioritizing safe speeds, physical separation of users—such as pedestrians and bikes from vehicles—and reducing conflict points through infrastructure design rather than relying solely on appropriate driver behavior.

The next section is—the first one is primary seatbelt law—which most of you probably all know Nevada is a secondary primary seatbelt law. Nevada statute requires all occupants to wear a seatbelt in vehicles. However, the current language allows for enforcement of the

law only when a driver is pulled over for a reason other than seatbelt use. The citation issued results in a $25 fine. The stat I want to throw out at you is approximately 5 percent of Nevadans, 200,000 people, still do not regularly buckle up, and the crashes—resulting in almost 17 percent of Nevada's 2025 Nevada fatalities.

Number eight is appropriate speed limits for all road users. Speeding is a persistent issue on Nevada roadways, contributing up to 27 percent of all fatal crashes between 2019 and 2023. Speed-related fatalities are disproportionately high in rural areas and on specific roadway classifications, including principal and minor arterials. The rising prevalence of extreme speeding over 100 miles an hour further highlights the need for systemic and sustainable speed-management solutions.

Then the last one is my one of my favorites—it is "yield to stop." Currently, our laws ask drivers to yield when pedestrians are in a crosswalk. I do not know if you have ever been in a crosswalk where the car stops, but it is kind of edging forward on you—not coming to a complete stop. It is an uncomfortable feeling, and, personally, I would like the car to stop for me, but Nevada law is classified as "yield to pedestrians." All signage in the state for pedestrians reinforces this, as do pavement markings as well. The "yield to pedestrians" drives the idea that they can proceed once the walker is no longer in their lane. Changing a law to "stop for pedestrians" clarifies that you must stop.

Right now, we want to switch gears a little bit and talk about e-bikes and scooters. This is another pressing traffic safety issue in our state. I would like to turn it over to Mr. Hartline at this point, but one thing I wanted to say is that we are happy that ACR [Assembly Concurrent Resolution] 4 passed in the last special session because when you see a younger person who has not been trained on the rules of the road darting in and out of traffic on a scooter without a helmet, you realize something needs to be done about it. So, we look forward to sharing ideas with you on what other states are doing to regulate the mini e-scooters and e-bikes that are showing up on our school zones around the state. Thanks.

Todd Hartline, Law Enforcement Liaison, Nevada State Police, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety:

Good morning, Chair Watts, members of the Committee. On this slide here, we have listed NRS references for e-bikes and e-scooters. We have not attempted a thorough review of Nevada law or local law related to e-micromobility devices—that is tough to say, micromobility. There—I got it right that time. But most states reviewed are operating under the same three-class e-bike system Nevada is using. We are also aware of Clark County and the City of Henderson recently passing ordinances to regulate e-bikes and e-scooters, and we appreciate their efforts to establish guidelines which will increase public safety for e-riders, drivers, and other vulnerable road users. Requiring helmets for minors, establishing where riding is lawful and where it is prohibited, limiting speed limits, creating clear definitions for e-bikes and e-motorcycles, listing required equipment, and establishing penalties for reckless behavior individually and collectively contribute to safer micromobility commuting for everyone. These ordinances also significantly help law enforcement to understand when and why to take appropriate enforcement action.

Slide ten—this slide depicts the alarming rate at which e-bike and e-scooter fatalities are rising. You can see from 2023 to 2025; there was a 400 percent increase from two fatalities to ten at University Medical Center in Las Vegas. From the ACR 4 presentation in March,

Dr. Deborah Kuhls, from UMC's [University Medical Center's] Trauma Intensive Care Unit, provided even more concerning injury data, which included:

- E-bike injuries now exceed 20,000 nationwide, with approximately 3,000 hospital admissions;
- Between 2019 and 2022, e-bike injury rates increased by 293 percent;
- Head injuries are the most common serious injury for e-bike and e-scooter riders;
- 12.7 percent of e-bike injuries require hospitalization—higher than other micromobility devices; and
- For southern Nevada in 2025, 602 patients were injured on e-bikes and e-scooters, and 26 percent of that total were under 18 years of age—and just 34 percent, or 203 of the 602 injured, were wearing helmets.

On this slide, we have listed several resources we have reviewed and wanted to note them here to assist with the Committee's edification of this topic. I specifically want to highlight the first link from the National Conference of State Legislatures. They indicate there are over 30 states actively defining and regulating e-bikes. They list the common state-by-state variations include power limits, helmet requirements, trail access, and age restrictions. They also authored a report called *State Electric Bicycle Laws*, which discusses safety research and scans all states for e-bike legislation on registration, licensure, insurance requirements, helmet use, and multi-pass use.

I also wanted to highlight the *Massachusetts Special Commission on Micromobility Report*. It seems they are experiencing many of the same issues we are here in Nevada. They took a deep dive into the issue and included considerations for police training, how to obtain crash report data, food and package delivery services, secure funding for infrastructure upgrades, and creating a model municipal traffic control ordinance.

Finally, HB 381 [House Bill] from Utah is also attached, which we think considers several important components that may help Nevada craft future e-bike/e-scooter legislation—and Mr. Sever wanted to share a little more with you about this law.

Mr. Sever:

Thanks, Don. I would like everyone to pay particular attention to number six—this number six bullet point down—which is a bill that Utah put forward that we think has many components which would work well in Nevada, including a mandatory online safety course for all e-bike/scooter users under 15½ years of age, minors wearing helmets, and the prevention of tampering with these devices to make them faster. The money appropriation for this bill was $0, so it was self-funded. I would really like everyone to take a look at that one in particular. Now I would like to turn the presentation over to Ms. Tisler, who will cover more possible actions on what we can implement in Nevada.

Lacey Tisler, P.E., Member, NVACTS, and Chief, Traffic Safety Engineering, Planning, NDOT:

Thank you. I am here as one of NDOT's members of the Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety—putting together a summary of the actions regarding the e-devices. It is not intended to be comprehensive; I am presenting options of what we have found so far. These considerations may merit further study through either ACR 4 or by this Committee.

Updating definitions and connecting existing requirements. There continue to be emerging trends in the types of personal conveyance devices and motorized wheel devices—and bikes, scooters, motorcycles, et cetera—and they may be modified to operate outside their originally intended specifications. A broader-based approach to identifying motorized personal devices may provide more long-range adaptability. This is cross walking existing motor vehicle statutes to e-device applicability and should be considered—much like Utah's proposal—to identify impaired riding as unlawful, speed limit requirements, creation of more encompassing terminology that recognizes vulnerable road users as a category of road users.

Also, our helmet laws—this could be used for all users or limited to certain ages or device types.

Age-based rider restrictions. Utah's bill is seeking to define age categories for use of electric vehicles and requirements for parental involvement.

Education for riders, ranging from online courses to in-person training.

Licensure and/or registration.

Delegations of local authority. We are seeing examples of municipal governments adopting codes related to the use of e-devices. This may be enhanced by guidance in NRS regarding the scope of local authority.

Location restrictions for operation.

And infrastructure—in the Massachusetts report we see three infrastructure recommendations. So, adopting unifying design guidelines for trails and paths with micromobility accommodations. Implementation of micromobility integration plans for existing infrastructure that also include public transportation and funding for upgrades and expansion of the existing infrastructure. I would like to note that when we are talking infrastructure, our speed limits for motor vehicles are based off a roadway, not off the vehicle device driving, and that may serve when we are looking at e-devices.

Not listed on the slide—but included in one or more of the resources—are enhanced product regulations, including regulations for the handling of lithium batteries, providing charging stations, law enforcement e-device impound authority, updating requirements for data collection to specify e-device crashes, use of enforcement cameras, police training, and education campaigns.

That concludes my part of the presentation. Thank you for the opportunity to share some of this information that impacts the mobility of all Nevadans and all people who use our roadways. I believe that with this we will take questions. Sean?

Mr. Sever:

We are open for questions now. Thank you.

Chair Watts:

All right, thank you all for the presentation. We do have some questions. We will start with Vice Chair Nguyen.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

Thank you. This is a topic that comes up all the time. I am the carpool mom—drop off at a middle school and high school here in town—so I see kids probably a lot younger than 15, especially around the middle schools and elementary schools, on these electric scooters, as well as electric bikes. It makes me very nervous as a parent and a driver on these roads to come in contact with them. You had mentioned this Utah bill—has it passed, or was it just introduced?

Mr. Sever:

I believe it has just been introduced.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

Chair, if I may follow up with a couple of questions around this. You had indicated that it does not cost any money, and one of the questions we had asked our motorcycle advocates that were in here earlier is—what kind of education or re-education programming is associated with some of these that we are enacting or trying to re-educate parents and the public around e-scooters and e-bikes?

Mr. Sever:

Thank you for the question. I was recently riding around in Las Vegas myself one day, and I see an 11- or 12-year-old on a scooter without a helmet—weaving in and out of traffic, up on the sidewalk, back in the intersection, turning left, no signals, nothing—and so it got me thinking about it too. But I think at a bare minimum, these younger folks should be educated on rules of the road. Obviously, you get your permit at 15½, your driver's license at 16. These folks are 11 and 12; no training on the road whatsoever, and now they are out there navigating Las Vegas traffic. So, I would like to highly encourage an online education system, and that is—I believe Utah is proposing the same format. As you know, we are trying to keep people away from the DMV because we have too many people in our buildings, so if we could come up with some kind of an online mandatory course, of course, for people using these devices, I think that would be a really good idea.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

Have you looked at any partnerships? Or have any other local jurisdictions, either municipalities or counties, looked at ordinances around this that we might be able to take statewide? Or are they still in the beginning procedures of what these might look like?

Mr. Sever:

I believe Clark County did implement some measures recently, but all of it is still in the early phases. I do not know if you want to add to that, Lacey? Or Todd?

Ms. Tisler:

I am not aware of any that are enacted in Nevada. However, there is a lot of conversation about ensuring that young people—well before the driver's education age—understand how to move safely on the transportation system with any mode available to them. We can find resources and share.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

Have you had any conversations with local schools—Clark County School District or any other—I am imagining this is a problem across our state, not just here in Clark County—but have you had any initial conversations with school police? Anything about incorporating some of these educational pieces into overall school safety? I know you had mentioned that there is driver's ed, and there are tests that you have to take, but we have a growing number of people that, quite honestly, are priced out of becoming a licensed and insured driver at the age of 16. So, they are not necessarily getting those classes earlier on and—as you had mentioned—I routinely see middle schoolers, so 10- to like 14-year-olds on these scooters driving in and out of traffic. I think in—my kids' school is around Charleston and Valley View, which is one of the deadliest intersections in Clark County. I am curious on what kind of conversations—or if there are any proposals around incorporating that into our schools, even in the elementary age?

Ms. Tisler:

I have been working with Clark County on their School District Working Group and applaud their efforts. I do not have a comprehensive list of everything that they have available, but I understand they are looking at engineering and planning education policy. Then there is one other option that they will be making recommendations for to build that community and ensure that everybody coming and going to school can get there safely.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

I guess if we are looking at these holistically, and we are looking at proposed legislation that—and it looks like the Utah bill; it was House Bill 0381—it was signed into law in March of this year, so that is a good resource to potentially look at. You had talked about how this would not— Obviously, my ears perked up when you said the DMV would not have a fiscal note on something, so I am curious on where the resources would come for this education piece.

Mr. Sever:

I believe it would reside with the Office of Traffic Safety; they get a lot of grants that they can apply to this. It is an online course. I will have to do some more research to see how the Utah one works exactly, but I believe the riders have to carry something with them saying that they passed the course. There might be a better way to do it. But anyway, it is—to me it is a good no-cost alternative.

Mr. Hartline:

Senator, I will add—through the Motorcycle Safety Foundation, there is an e-bike class that I am pretty sure is already on the shelf and something that we could take and use. In that Utah legislation—when you have a chance to review it—for this year they have not implemented it yet, but next year for a certain age rider and under, they have to complete a safety course and have a safety certificate with them. Now, I do think—Mr. Sever is not going to be happy—I do think that resides at DMV in Utah, but we might be able to find somewhere else to put it here in Nevada if we did something similar.

Chair Watts:

Alright; yes, always lively conversations about fiscal notes. This was an area of interest of mine too—where does the—what is the cost? Who bears that—if there is a cost for individuals or families to get this education—as well as what are the consequences associated with that? Because I think if the— In my opinion, the goal is to make sure that we have got that education and that we are improving safety and not creating too many barriers or penalties on folks. We want to make sure that there is that education in place—so that there is a little bit more awareness and safety on the roads. I think we also—again, going back to the previous presentation—need to figure out how we are going to continue to increase education among other road users as well, to make sure that folks are keeping an eye out for the many different devices that are on our roadways now. It is not just bicycles and motorcycles, but now we have got all of this e-mobility as well. We have a question next from Assemblymember Carter.

Assemblymember Carter:

I am shifting away from the e-bikes—I do wonder why we do not just have a break where they have to have an M endorsement to use them; they are a motorcycle at a certain point, but that is not my question. My question has regard to—there is a note in your policy priorities about road safety cameras, and we are going to be talking about that more in depth in the next agenda item. I have talked—asked about this before and been told that yes, that a lot of the agencies use high-visibility enforcement efforts. But I have come to realize that what that means is more program visibility—meaning Big Bird walking, jaywalking, or in the crosswalks, catching people going through that—and wonder how they get the officer who gets to dress up in the costume, but—and also DUI checkpoints that are highly advertised and stuff. In regard—rather than—what I want to understand why we are not looking—or maybe we are—looking at operational visibility. The safety cameras and stuff—they are very inclusive in the European model, and that is what I am talking about. A significant part of that is high-visibility enforcement vehicles, high-visibility uniforms for traffic officers—to where the emphasis is more on public safety rather than traffic enforcement. Has there been any real studies and looks at shifting to a model that gets away from the hide and seek and moves towards generally trying to create public safety rather than enforcement?

Mr. Hartline:

I am also a retired Captain from the Nevada Highway Patrol. I will try to answer this one the best I can. I have been retired for a couple of years—so not in the day-to-day operations of a police organization any longer. But I think one of the reasons that we are advocating for traffic safety cameras—and I will go back to what Senator Hansen said during the testimony when we tried to—they were in front of the Legislature before. You talked about your District—your very rural District—and the fact that when you go from Reno out to Winnemucca—or wherever it might be, Battle Mountain out there—that you like to be able to travel the speed limit, and the speed limit is 80 out there, and you are able to get across the District in a relatively small amount of time, and that is important to you. There is no one that is advocating for putting a traffic camera safety system out there on Interstate 80 between Winnemucca and Battle Mountain. That is not what we would want to do with these. However, when we see the issues that have happened with the Clark County School District and the vast number of schools and active school zones that may be happening at any one given time in the morning, there are not enough cops that can be in all of those places at once. That is where we think there is the ability for a camera system to help. To the Senator's point, yes, there is a way that high-visibility enforcement certainly does

mitigate these issues, but law enforcement agencies across the state are also dealing with high vacancy rates and priority calls—where they cannot always be doing this at the same time, with the same exact manpower. So, I think when we are talking about issues like this—like what is happening in Clark County School District in the school zones—there is definitely a way for these cameras to help with that issue, and also for the way for the Legislature to put guardrails on something like that. Where you know there is an elevated crash problem, we put cameras in there for a while, and if the crash rates are reduced, then the legislation that you pass also says that once it is reduced, they have to be taken out. We also have to make sure that we do not have any entities across the state that are trying to stand up one of these programs just to pad their bottom line. We are totally against that and want to make sure that it is all safety related. I hope that answers your question, sir, but we do think, in these certain circumstances, there is no way to have enough cops in school zones trying to make the difference that we really need to see. There have almost been 400 kids hit in Clark County School District this year alone.

Assemblymember Carter:

Apparently, I phrased that wrong. What I am talking about is moving from putting officers in high-visibility clothing, putting them in high-visibility cars. We all know that the minute somebody gets pulled over, everybody obeys the law. Why do not we take and start with that, to where we have highly visible officers in safety vests or safety clothing, high-visibility day-glow orange, day-glow green vehicles—as in Europe, where the idea is more about encouraging traffic safety rather than traffic enforcement. No, I am not implying that [inaudible] generating, with the cops hiding and trying to go out there, but that is the public perception—and we know that the minute that they see a cop, they slow down. Why are not we looking at making the cops more visible?

Mr. Sever:

Thank you for the question. Yes, I believe we already do that—a lot of schools—school zones and safety areas in Nevada. I witnessed one the other day in front of the Nevada Department of Transportation, actually—where the officers were out front in neon vests and pulling people over, left and right. And there was an individual in the crosswalk—very obvious clothing—he was not wearing a chicken costume or anything, but he was wearing bright neon colors. It is very interesting to watch that whole operation unfold. I agree with you; it is a great way for enforcement. I do realize—we do realize that traffic safety cameras are controversial in some cases, so the way you have to look at it is—these are just tools in the tool chest you can pull out if you want to utilize them. We are not advocating for traffic safety cameras all over Nevada, obviously. They can be used in certain areas. I think school bus crossing—the stop arms is a good solution. Construction zones is another great area where—if you want to slow people down. But those are just concepts that you can grab if you need them; they are not necessarily legislative initiatives that we are putting forward.

Chair Watts:

Thank you.

Ms. Tisler:

To expand on that a little bit more—Sean talked about this—and we do see our speed and speeding-related fatals occurring on minor and principal arterials, and I think we are still young in sharing that information. A lot of the time when you talk about speeding, you assume it is our long, two-way, two-lane rural highways, but around 60 percent of our

fatalities occur on arterials. Continuing to share that information—whether it be high-visibility enforcement or conversations like this—that this is where our biggest risk is underdeveloped, and I look forward to building more.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. I appreciate that. I think it is important to understand that and also understand how the overlapping jurisdictions interplay with that. Obviously, we do have certain state highways that are within our urban areas as well. I appreciate the comments made by Mr. Hartline—thank you for your service to the state and for bringing up, I think, a really important issue, which is that we are going to struggle particularly with Highway Patrol to have visibility at all when we have a 50 percent vacancy rate among our officers. I think it is important that we make that clear. There have been ongoing efforts to increase outreach and promotion to get those positions filled, but it is kind of a revolving door as people move on from Highway Patrol to—or from State Police—to other law enforcement positions that have better pay and better benefits. Until we address that, we are going to struggle to actually have the officers in vehicles out on the roadways that have the impact that is being discussed—which is when folks see that, they check themselves and make sure that they are following the rules of the road. We need to address that issue—which I know is more of a budgetary issue—but we need to make sure that we have the positions that we have already identified as a necessity filled across our state to help enforce the laws that we currently have on the books. Then we need to figure out if there are some of these smaller roadways that are within local law enforcement jurisdiction or the schools—as we discussed some of the school zones and the areas surrounding those facilities—what their role is to play in that enforcement as well. I believe next we have a question from Senator Hansen.

Senator Hansen:

Thanks, Chair. Yeah, several actually. It is kind of ironic we just had the motorcycle folks here. My sister and brother-in-law were super active in the Iron Nation Motorcycle Club for years, and I used to be invited to be a speaker there. If I brought up in there the elimination of mandatory helmet laws, I got a standing ovation. Okay, so the question as to how to deal with safety issues is—it varies from group to group. Obviously, the motorcycle people, overall, do not like our current mandatory helmet laws. Now, I am not advocating against that. I am just saying—here we are talking, now we are going to make little kids driving—riding their scooters or whatever wear helmets.

Question on the overall presentation you guys gave though. My impression is there has been a substantial improvement in public safety on public roadways. The number of fatalities have, over the last 25 years, dropped dramatically. Even though, at the same time, I think that fatalities are dropping, the number—I do not know how you guys measure it—100 million miles traveled or however it is—have dramatically gone up. It seems to me like things are getting much, much safer—less and less fatalities—and when there are fatalities, they are disproportionately based not on speed, but on substance abuse. How are you guys actually measuring your safety standards in Nevada?

Mr. Sever:

Yes, thanks for the question, Senator. We measure fatalities in our state—we get a report every month—and those numbers have been down this year. However, they were at record highs during the pandemic, primarily. If you look at a bar chart—bar graph—they were pretty steady for a while, and then they creeped up during the pandemic. Then they have gone down a little bit now. However, our campaign is always "Zero Fatalities." We ask

people what is acceptable for roadway deaths in Nevada. What is the yearly amount, 200 people? Yeah, that is fine with me. What about in your family—what is acceptable? How about your immediate family members? Well, zero, right? And so, even one death on our roadways is concerning to us.

Senator Hansen:

Oh, I got it, and it is concerning to me too, okay? But the reality is what you did not mention is how many million miles traveled versus fatalities. Yeah, it has gone up; but the population of that in my lifetime has gone from half a million people to 3.5 million people almost now—and all those people drive. Now, when I was younger, it was common for people to have a single car in the family; now, everybody has got a car in the family. So, the total number of miles traveled in Nevada has got to be some form of measurement, and then compare that to the number of fatalities or accidents in general. I know you guys were aggressively opposed to the 80-mile-an-hour speed limit, and one of the arguments was you are going to see a huge increase in potential deaths. I am old enough to remember when President Nixon made the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit. There was a big backlash in Nevada against it, but that was the speed limit clear up into the 1980s across all of Nevada. Now, thanks to Senator Gustavson—what 8 or 10 years ago—we are allowed to go 80 miles an hour. Is there any evidence that the 80-mile versus the old 65-mile speed limits, that there has been a substantial increase in the number of fatalities on the roadways where that is allowed?

Mr. Sever:

Ironically, I was at NDOT when we passed the 80-mile-an-hour speed limit bill with Senator Gustavson. But yeah, we can get back to you on those numbers. I am probably overdue with meeting with you and going over the fatality data in Nevada. I would offer that up to you that—with the Director of the Office of Traffic Safety—we would be happy to get with you and further look at the numbers.

Senator Hansen:

Sure, I would like to see that. But I would like some comparison on 100 million miles traveled—however you guys measure that—over time. I read Ralph Nader's book long ago, *Unsafe at Any Speed*, and he was a big advocate of a lot of the things that we do now. There has clearly been a change in that. Last issue along those lines—so, you got safety—

If you are down 50 percent in officers that can enforce—or whatever the number currently is—have you seen, in the absence of those officers on the roadways, any evidence that there has been a substantial spike in illegal activities? Are there more accidents—more whatever measurement you would use? Because if you have 50 percent less officers, but you have not seen any substantial increase in traffic-safety problems, then are those officers somewhat redundant? If they are, could you put them more or less in school zones, where you obviously have a much more significant issue in Clark County, with 400 kids hit this year?

Mr. Hartline:

I will say, sir, during the pandemic, we saw a huge increase, even though there were less vehicles on the road—because more people were working from home and all those issues—there were more people traveling at 100 miles an hour or greater than we have seen in a long time, and we were able—that data is available through the number of citations for people traveling that fast or faster—that we have on record. For the issues that

you are talking about with the law enforcement agencies and—it is hard for me to speak on that. But it is also the priority of the people that are running that agency on whether or not that is the priority to put officers in school zones—or it is with a burglary call, or what may be happening with Metro, the home invasions, or something else that they have going on. Even the Clark County School District Police Department has a very large department, but it is a relatively small number of their officers that are dedicated to their Traffic [Bureau] unit. Then you got to pull somebody else from their normal assignment—or some issues that might be happening in another school dealing with students—to now go deal with the traffic issue, and that—they have to make those decisions on what the priority is. Of course, we would love to see more officers in the school zones and enforcing traffic issues, but it is just not always a reality for the agencies to get the number of officers they need in there.

Senator Hansen:

Oh, I got it. I am just saying that if you were down that much—and, like you said, there was a substantial increase—I would like to see what those numbers actually are. If you had 25 fatalities and you jumped to 50 fatalities—or whatever the number is—that is a 100 percent increase, right? If you had a total in the State of Nevada of 75 fatalities or 100 fatalities, and it bumped to 125, then the question is—is there any evidence that by substantially increasing the number of law enforcement officers on the highway, for example, you saw a big drop-off in those fatalities? I do not know—there are some statistics here that I would like to see, because it seems to me with computerization, my car, if I am not paying attention, I am pulling up on somebody too fast, it literally says, "Brake!" There are so many safety factors in—and I have a Toyota Tacoma, and I put my cruise control on—that thing brakes the car for me if I am getting too close to somebody and literally forcibly reduces it. Clearly, as more and more—the older cars go off the road, and more and more ones like that one come on—there should be a substantial decline in the number of accidents that occur because of computerization. Anyway, lots of things to discuss on these issues though. I did vote for the school bus stop cameras, but I did so reluctantly, because I do want to protect kids in school zones, but I am very—well, we are going to discuss that in a minute—but I am very leery about any significant expansion of, frankly, Big Brother. Chairman Watts, thank you very much for indulging me. We will cover that, I guess, in the next presentation. Thank you.

Chair Watts:

Thank you, Senator.

Ms. Tisler:

May I expand on question two?

Chair Watts:

Go ahead.

Ms. Tisler:

You asked what data points are tracked. The Office of Traffic Safety, under a requirement from NHTSA [National Highway Traffic Safety Administration], tracks all fatalities and all of the information that goes along with those fatalities—so, all of the contributing factors—impairment, speed, all the way down to intersections, pedestrians. And the Nevada DOT also reports—and they have to report on every fatality, every serious injury, fatality rate, serious injury rate, and the rate of vulnerable road user fatalities. Annually, it

is a requirement for FHWA [Federal Highway Administration], and it is packaged up for Congress. It is also given to the Legislature every year in the NVACTS Annual Report. All of that information is just a couple of pages in, and either the Administrator of the Office of Traffic Safety, Amy Davey, or myself would love to go through that in any detail with anybody who wants to know how we report, what we report, the information we get in that conversation.

Chair Watts:

Thank you so much. I believe next we have a question from Assemblymember Kasama.

Assemblymember Kasama:

Thank you, Chair. I am going back to the slide under the possible action. One of the sections there you highlighted location restriction, and I was just wondering if you could give some examples—what you were thinking about with the location restriction.

Ms. Tisler:

I think the easiest location restriction would be staying off the interstate. Right now, we prohibit anybody other than a motor vehicle on the interstate, as an example. But that could be considered on different pieces of the infrastructure, certain highways, as determined by this group. I believe that is detailed in one of the bills, but I cannot tell you which one right now.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. Yes, that sounds pretty common sense. Members, additional questions? Thinking about it? Senator Nguyen.

Senator Nguyen:

Sorry, this is kind of a follow-up question, and maybe during their presentation the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police might be able to answer this. I was recently reading some of the most recent reports, and it kind of goes into what Assemblymember Carter had been mentioning. We are—traffic fatalities, at least here in Clark County, appear to be down about 38 percent, which is significant as far as I am concerned. When I was looking at that significant statistic, I was like—what has changed in Clark County to result in such a decrease in traffic fatalities? One of the things that I noticed is that officer-initiated traffic stops—so, lights and sirens—people actually making a priority to be visible in the community, much like Assemblymember Carter had mentioned—were also up about 42 percent. Those traffic stops were up. I cannot help but wonder if there is a direct correlation between that increased visibility—that prioritization by the Clark County, our Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department—and those corresponding results. I was wondering if some of the decrease that you have seen—you had mentioned a little bit about it, Sean, in your initial remarks—have you seen an increase in officer-initiated traffic stops throughout the state? Or is that like an anomaly in Clark County that maybe we should look at collectively to see if what they are doing here is having an impact that we could translate across the state?

Mr. Sever:

I am going to let Todd take that one.

Mr. Hartline:

Senator, I would 100 percent agree that law enforcement reengaging in the traffic safety realm has played a major part in what we are seeing. Again, I hate to keep bringing up the pandemic, but there was a huge sort of hands-off approach from law enforcement there for a little while because of what was happening—do not want to make contact with a bunch of individuals. Those numbers that we talked about—we saw fatal crashes increase with less vehicles on the road; we saw people committing those violations that we talked about that are extremely dangerous. There has been sort of a reengagement and recommitment the last couple of years. The Office of Traffic Safety's statewide Joining Forces program has more participation than we have had probably in the last couple of decades, and we are seeing more traffic stops. We know they are out there—but again, there are those agencies that have fewer officers to get out there. But I would say, yes—there is a direct correlation. The gentleman from Metro will probably be able to enhance what I am telling you, but certainly there has been a reengagement of law enforcement, and we think it has made a big difference on what is happening with traffic statistics in our state.

Senator Nguyen:

Thank you, Chair. That is all I have.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. We have a question next from Assemblymember Karris.

Assemblymember Karris:

Thank you, Chair, and thanks for the presentation. I am going to kind of go slightly off track here with my question. I know you are a traffic safety committee, and we are very concerned with injuries for these e-bikes and scooters on our roadways. But I am also concerned with injuries to our pedestrians because these things are on sidewalks. Have you looked into anything of that?

Mr. Hartline:

Lacey, do you want to take that question?

Ms. Tisler:

Thank you. That is one of the data points that is a little harder to track because a crash in Nevada requires being involved with the motor vehicle in transit. That is why we are relying on our partners in the trauma centers to get that information. Dr. Kuhls could not be with us today, but she is tracking that information from the trauma side—and we are seeing an increase.

Assemblymember Karris:

Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. I do have one question [inaudible] helmets a little bit. Can any of you speak on what the current state of helmet laws are? Obviously, you know we are talking about e-mobility, but we have got bicycles; we have got motorcycles; we have got adult users; we have got minor users. So, pop quiz—anybody know what our current state of helmet laws are in Nevada?

Mr. Sever:

I will let Todd Hartline answer that one.

Mr. Hartline:

Chair, we will get you that information. I know during my research for the e-bikes and e-scooters, there is a lot of information where the National Conference of State Legislatures has done basically a nationwide kind of scan of what is been passed and where those laws stand, and we can pull that information and get it to you. Sorry, we do not have it available.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. That sounds good. Yes, you can work with our staff to get that out to the members as a follow-up. Okay, last call for questions.

Mr. Sever:

Mr. Chair.

Chair Watts:

Yes.

Mr. Sever:

If I can add something really quick. Todd and I were just talking about the program in Utah, and I believe the participants in that program have to pay $15 each to have the online education done. If you want, we can craft some ideas on how that would look in Nevada and share those with the Committee as well.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. Yes, if you could send, again, that information to us as a follow-up. I think since we are basically wrapping up this item—obviously, there were many ideas that were brought up during your presentation today. I think what we have heard is that there has been interest expressed in working with the Legislature to figure out what policy solutions may be able to be advanced in some of these areas. Obviously, there are many priorities and areas of interest that were listed by the Committee. I think it would be helpful for us to continue this conversation to figure out which among those many different areas are top priorities and then having some additional conversations to start to figure out what solutions we could potentially get a critical mass of consensus around. That is my ask to you to work on, particularly, in considering any legislation that may be recommended by this

Committee. We did make some recommendations related to traffic safety policy in the last interim, and at least one or two of those were ultimately enacted. I think working with us to figure out what concepts we might want to try and advance over the next couple of months would be helpful.

Mr. Sever:

We are happy to work with you on that, Chair.

Chair Watts:

Thank you very much. All right, seeing no other questions, that will conclude this agenda item. Thank you so much for your time.

AGENDA ITEM V—PRESENTATION ON AUTOMATED TRAFFIC CAMERAS AND TRAFFIC SAFETY-RELATED EFFORTS

Chair Watts:

Next, we will have a presentation on automated traffic cameras and traffic safety-related efforts from representatives of the Metropolitan Police Department, and we are joined by Councilman Knudsen from the City of Las Vegas. Welcome, Councilman. Good to see you. State your name and you can begin.

Brian Knudsen, Councilman, Ward 1, City of Las Vegas:

Good morning, very happy to be here. If it is okay with you, Mr. Chair, I figured I might provide a brief overview of why I am here. Then I am going to flip through a PowerPoint. I am going to go relatively quickly to give you all a chance to answer some questions—or ask some questions. Right off the bat, I am here, I think, primarily, I am a— My legacy, right now, as an elected official, is all the orange cones. Instead of fighting that, I am just going to lean in on it. I get asked at every single community meeting I go to—every single constituent I meet with—it used to be homelessness, now traffic comes up. I am doing my very best to be responsive to my constituents. I have tried a hundred different things to be responsive, and not all of them work.

I am going to run through a quick overview of some of the things that come up as a local elected official. One is speed humps in neighborhoods—comes up every other meeting, I think. About 50 percent of the people hate me when I put them in; 50 percent of the people love me—but later hate me when I put them in. They ask for stop signs. They ask for blinky, flashy stop signs. They ask for lower speed limits. They ask for painted crosswalks. They ask for pork chops in the road, so people can only make right turns. I have done all of those things—and to no avail. It does not have an impact on the traffic safety. People like it for a minute, and then they do not.

What does work—and to the point in the earlier conversation—is at certain times I will call on both an area command from the Metropolitan Police Department and ask them to put police officers stationed there—because for whatever reason there are lots of things going wrong in traffic in that area in a certain time period. When I do that—when I make that request—the traffic calms. It does work—and so visible police officers have a direct impact on traffic calming.

To the extent that I have been able to change infrastructure—I want to point this out because it comes up a lot in my world—our town was built for a much smaller community; it just was. My part of the community is much older—the most established part of southern Nevada—and it was built for a town that was very small. I have been trying my very best to upgrade it to meet the needs of our current population. To that end, the City has invested about $150 million into the [Las Vegas] Medical District.

That is the next request I get is—can you change the infrastructure? It is incredibly expensive, and there is not enough money that you have, or I have, to be able to do that. You can see the investment in the area that I represent—it is the orange cones. We have wider sidewalks—and I talk about this from a visibility standpoint to make it look good—but, Assemblymember, to your point, we needed to underground power lines and move light poles so that people walking on sidewalks, running on sidewalks, or using those electric vehicles on sidewalks were safer. So, we did that in the Medical District. We did tree-lined streets. We painted everything.

Currently, Rancho is under construction. Rancho [Drive] and Oakey [Boulevard] is one of the most dangerous intersections in the state as well. I actually had the City buy a plot of land to make it a dog park, and I can say politically that it was about dogs, but it really was about providing a space for people to see that this is a residential community. When that dog park goes in, I hope it makes it safer. Also, in that area I put monument signs because cut-through traffic is a big issue in neighborhoods—and people are terrified about people speeding through the neighborhood—so I put monument signs. The reason I am here today is because after I put in a monument sign in Glen Heather Estates neighborhood, someone was speeding down Rancho, took a hard right, and knocked the sign over. It is going to cost us $30,000 to put that sign back in.

My point of being here is that no matter what I do from a local elected official's standpoint, if people do not want to follow laws, they do not. I know this is an issue for the Sheriff, and so I went to the Sheriff and asked if I could participate or help in any way. To that point—to the Senator up north—at this point, I am Big Brother. I am desperately trying to figure out how I can have an impact on making our community safer, because it is what my community asked me to do. I drive around every single day, and it is dangerous. I am scared to drive around.

With that, I am going to run through how the City has responded, and there is no group of secret officials at the City. There is no group of secret officials at Metro. It has been me pulling everyone along. So, if you have any criticisms, I welcome them—but I also would ask you to offer up some suggestions as well. I am going to try and figure out how to do a PowerPoint. It is not my skill set, so give me a second.

Chair Watts:

We have folks here to assist.

Councilman Knudsen:

Thank you. I can hit a button, but that is the extent. (Agenda Item V) Okay, so you can see that. The City is starting an automated traffic enforcement pilot. The reason is just because of what you have all discussed before, and I do not think there are any secrets here—it is just more dangerous to drive around here.

This is how many total crashes there are—there are lots of them. There are lots of fatalities in southern Nevada. I am going to get to some of the questions that you have asked earlier, so I am going to go through this relatively quickly. If there is anything you want to point out, please do.

I want to point out this is the intersection that Senator Nguyen discussed earlier in the presentation. This is one of the most dangerous intersections in the state. This is right here in my ward. This is people that just run red lights—for whatever reason.

This is incredibly expensive for our community as well. The cost to send Metro, the cost to send firefighters, the cost to change traffic patterns during that day has an economic impact that far surpasses anything that I could have imagined. This is not just the individual that is impacted—this is everyone around that individual that is impacted. So, the City did some estimates of how much it costs us to have these very dangerous traffic accidents and fatalities.

I put this in here because I got my insurance bill last week, and I thought it would be important to note that my insurance went up. I have had a clean driving record for 30 years, and my insurance goes up every single year. There is a variety of reasons for that, but one of them is the zip code that I live in—because this is dangerous to live in Nevada, and insurance companies know that.

There are examples of this working in other states, and what we are talking about is an automated enforcement pilot. I originally intended to do something a little bit more aggressive. I wanted to send letters to people to say, "Hey, we caught you speeding. We caught you running a red light. Could you please slow down?" Representatives at the City did not want to go that far. It was complicated—and I am going to get into some of the complications with law enforcement, with the lawyers, with the procurement folks. But essentially what we are doing now is just making sure people are aware that we have cameras up. We are not collecting data, but we want to make sure that—if what we think is true is—if they are aware that someone is watching, they are going to slow down. And that does work in other cities and other states.

These are the number of cities and states that have a program like this, with a little bit more automated enforcement. It is not new to Nevada—it is new to Nevada, but it is not new in the country; this is something that has been tested out in other places.

This is the pilot program—so this is why I think we are here. The site selection—so the City of Las Vegas is broken up into six wards. There are seven representatives. The Mayor is representative of the entire City. The idea that we came up with was to put 2 cameras in each ward, so a total of 12. We wanted to cover high-crash intersections. We wanted to cover school zones. We wanted to cover construction zones. If the City Council passes this tomorrow, we would do a media campaign. We want to make sure everyone is aware that yes, we are trying to do something. Yes, we are installing cameras. We are also installing signage. The signage is the key part, because we want to see if that signage does make a difference. To the point earlier, does highly visible enforcement work? Yes. Will highly visible signage work? I hope so. That is the intention—is putting up signs, doing a social media campaign, doing a communications blitz, saying, "We are putting up signage; we are doing cameras;" and we want to track to see if that makes a difference.

My hope is that I can work collaboratively with the state, with you, to see if that data makes a difference—if we can impact traffic safety and evolve this program or change it. Our hope is to establish some baseline data. We already do have a good amount of data around

people who are speeding. We are also going to track people running red lights, people speeding, and in what times of the day, where they are doing it, how they are doing it, so we have a better understanding of how to roll out a program if it were enacted by the Legislature. We are hoping to share this data with you on a regular basis—and do so in whatever way is possible.

This is an example of what it is going to look like. It is solar-powered little cameras. The signage will be placed at key intersections. Like I said, it was jointly picked out by the City of Las Vegas and the Metropolitan Police Department. There is no data sharing with the Metropolitan Police Department; this is solely within the City of Las Vegas. I do have representatives from the Metropolitan Police Department here if there are any specific questions, as well as representatives from the City of Las Vegas Public Works team if there are any specific questions about that. But essentially this is a camera that will take a picture. There is no facial recognition, no identifying information. It simply is to track who was speeding—not who—to track what times they are speeding, how they are speeding through, if—they are tracking if they are running through red lights, essentially.

You all know the challenges. This is a highly controversial topic. The question about joint jurisdictional—are we working together? Metro and I have been working together on this for about six months. It has taken six months to work through some of the challenges, the questions that come up. I have had conversations with representatives from Clark County, North Las Vegas, and Henderson—all of them, I think, are willing to kind of jump in and see how the City of Las Vegas does. So, this is putting us out front to see if what we are doing is the right thing to do. The questions around—how do we get to this point? We talked about doing a request for proposal (RFP). We talked about soliciting vendors from around the state. This is really a very small study, and I wanted to make sure that we had enough information that we knew how to develop an RFP—being this is a pilot study. We do not know what we do not know, and we wanted to make sure that as information came in, we are able to develop a more comprehensive look at how we would look at vendors. We also wanted to incorporate your feedback before we really dove into this process. Those kind of conversations lasted for four or five months between the City and Metro, and they did engage the County in North Las Vegas and Henderson as well, just to keep them updated.

These are the success measures that we are looking at. We hope that signage does reduce speed—that we can change crash trends in Nevada and change traffic signal violations.

These are the tentative locations. Like I said, we have also been pretty open to changing them, but based on the conversations today I think we picked the right spots. It is construction zones, school zones, high-impact injury zones, and it is spread out amongst our six wards. We are trying to be geographically diverse to account for as many factors as we can to provide you as much data as you need.

This is just an example of what it could look like if you are going through one of those intersections.

This is an expensive program; there is nothing cheap about this. The program was funded through funding that we got from the RTC [Regional Transportation Commission] that is intended for traffic safety. This is about $400,000. With that, I could maybe install three additional speed humps that would have no impact. This is definitely a pilot program. This is something that we are trying to see if it makes a difference. I do not know that it will, but I really hope that it does. I would like to be able to provide you enough information to make good decisions in the next legislative session.

I did ask Metro—this probably answers some of your questions as well to provide a slide. So, this is the crisis in our roads. There have been, definitely, changes in how people drive, I think, since COVID. I have noticed it; I am sure you have noticed it as well. There has been a decrease specifically because of the folks behind me—because Sheriff Kevin McMahill changed how he deployed officers, and Captain Dudley, who is sitting right behind me now, runs the Traffic Division, and he deployed officers differently—and therefore we see a reduction in the number of crashes.

This is coming to the conclusion of the presentation. When we talked about this in the very beginning, we did talk about sending out letters. We talked about what if the Legislature were to enable automated enforcement. It would take a good amount of resources from the jurisdictions to make this successful. We would have to have uniformed officers reviewing data, pictures, and license plates. They would have to match those up with time stamps. They would have to sign off on any citations that went out. We talked about the question about money. Are we going after money? That has not come up in any one of our conversations. I do not know that— Between me and the Sheriff, our conversation was, I do not really care what happens with the money. We have to be able to pay for the program, but beyond that, it is just a—that has never been the point of the conversation. So, Big Brother is not doing a money grab. Big Brother is not trying to gather data. Big Brother is just trying to make it safer for people driving on the streets.

Working with this Committee—and really anybody else who wants to come in—we would like it to be collaborative. This is the beginning of a conversation; it is certainly not the end of a conversation. I am not here to [inaudible] data. I can tell you that if I talk about collecting license plate information, more than likely you are going to start getting Instagram ads to put tape over your license plate, so cameras cannot read them. Everybody is collecting your information at some point. I am not a big fan of collecting information; it is a scary conversation to have. But I am trying to be responsive to my constituents, and I do not have any other options. If you have options, I would welcome them. With that, I will conclude my presentation, and, like I said, there are experts behind me who can answer any technical questions that you might have. Thank you.

Chair Watts:

Thank you very much, Councilman, for the presentation. I do certainly appreciate your emphasis on trying to evaluate and bring forward solutions that are backed up by data and real meaningful impact. I get many of the same requests that you do, and I am in communication with the folks from city and county government about those issues. Again, I think we all share the goal. The question is how do we actually get there and make meaningful changes to improve safety for our residents in our neighborhoods? We will open it up to questions. We will start with Vice Chair Nguyen.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

You will probably come back to me. I think I have made it no secret that I am skeptical. Even seeing some of the implementation problems that we have had with our previous session with the bus camera legislation, the focus always came back to the money. It may not be your intention, but I think when you are using third-party vendors that are profiting off of this—that is where, really, my concern comes into play—is what kind of legislation are you going to be able to propose that puts in those necessary guardrails about exploitation?

I guess I will start with probably an easy question for you in this piloting program that you are attempting to do in the City of Las Vegas. For those 12 cameras that are going to be placed in there, along with the educational and marketing campaign to educate the public that these are going up in these different wards around the City of Las Vegas, what is the total cost of that program? Without the technology and the absence of ticketing associated with this pilot, what are the costs associated with it?

Councilman Knudsen:

Thank you for the question. The pilot program is about $400,000—that is coming from RTC funds intended for traffic safety. The informational campaign will be done with existing General Fund dollars. We will do press releases; we will do social media campaigns. I imagine this will come up in the Mayor's press conference, and so we will do everything we can to make sure the media talks about it in as many ways as we possibly can. If you have suggestions on how we can do it better, we are open for that as well—but those are essentially going to be General Fund dollars that are already within our budget.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

Then when we talk about automated enforcement programs becoming revenue-generation tools instead of those true public safety measures—have you— As a part of these ongoing conversations that I know you have been having for months, if not years, around traffic safety and around these cameras—and this might be a question for Metro as well—have you come into any suggestions that would have legal protections that would ensure that those funds are either reinvested into traffic safety and infrastructure improvements?

Councilman Knudsen:

I am not going to speak for Metro; they can choose if they want to come up here. But the brief conversations—and I have only been involved in this for about the last six months—it was really that sign that got knocked over that brought me in. But in my conversations with the Sheriff, it has really never been about the money. I think it would be good to be able to track the cost of the program, to be able to pay for that. Anything above and beyond that, if the Legislature were to give direction, that would be great. My personal feeling is we should invest more in traffic school for people to get their driver's licenses, but I think—I do not really care if you want to put that money somewhere else—go for it.

Dori Koren, Assistant Sheriff, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

Hi, good morning. If I can, before I answer the question, I do want to begin with a brief thank you to Chair Watts and Vice Chair Nguyen and the entire Committee for focusing on this topic. This is something that, internally at Metro, we have had a lot of in-depth conversation about traffic fatalities. It is really hitting home to a lot of our officers because they are the ones in the field. They are responding to these fatalities. They are seeing it. They are smelling it. They are—it is going home with them, and it is really affecting their psyche. And so, we are taking it very personal about trying to address this, not just the sheer numbers that we are dealing with.

As the Councilman talked about, behind me is Deputy Chief Esmeralda Boveda and Captain Jarvis Dudley, both of them are intricately involved in our traffic initiatives. I know, speaking on their behalf, myself, on Sheriff Kevin McMahill's behalf, and really the entire Department, we are really looking for help. We are looking for ideas and solutions to try to address the traffic fatality crisis that we are dealing with—and I am happy to go into some of why we see it as a crisis. I know that in the last five years, as just presented in the

slides, we are seeing the numbers continuously go up. We have had tremendous success in the past four to six months—but it is not enough. If you look at it, compared to 2021 numbers, we are still high. As mentioned earlier, we are viewing every single one of these fatalities as a significant incident and one that we should try to prevent at all costs—not just the numbers. We are not trying to drop the number by 10 percent from 160 to 150 annually. We really want to try to have less people die on our roadways. The thought process behind that—this is why I think—thank you to the Councilmember for taking charge on this and trying to come up with some new ways to do things—is this is a difficult conversation to have, because we also understand the privacy implications and the challenges when you talk about these types of technology solutions. We have to keep it balanced with the second part, which is, from our view—and this is why I thank you, Councilmember, for doing this is—at the end of the day, what we are noticing as crime fighters in our community, is the traffic fatalities are truly indiscriminate. Every single person in this room is subject—hopefully nothing happens—but is subject to the dangers that you are seeing on the roadways. Whether you are driving to and from work, whether you are walking to and from school, whether you are driving a very nice car in one area of town, or driving a different car that is not very nice, or you are a pedestrian—it really is indiscriminate. We are seeing just too many people die—so, thank you for taking the lead on that.

I will—just to briefly jump into the question—and please forgive me if I misunderstood it. But in terms of the cost—actually, Vice Chair, so I answer it correctly—your question was specific to the cost—the $400,000—and the impact of that. Is that what I understood?

Vice Chair Nguyen:

I was wondering what the cost was for those 12 cameras, and if you have looked into what it would be to expand this to wherever you need. If we passed a law today that said that you could do whatever you wanted in this area, how much would it cost? And would you still take a targeted approach on where these cameras went? Or would they be everywhere? Or how does that look, and what are the best practices based on the research that you have done over the past couple of years in this area?

Assistant Sheriff Koren:

Thank you, Vice Chair, for the question. From my perspective and the Agency's perspective, the $400,000 cost for a 12-camera pilot program is actually much smaller than what it costs for us to deploy the officers. We have talked about—we have had a lot of success with our L.I.F.E. [Lives Improved; Fatalities Eliminated] Program. Just to give you a comparison—rough numbers—if you compare it to cover 12 intersections with these traffic cameras to be able to try to reduce the behavior that is causing the fatalities, in comparison to put officers there—like, for example, our L.I.F.E. Program that we are doing now—you are talking about a $400,000 comparison to a $12 to $15 million comparison. It is substantially cheaper—which is what we have learned about technology; it is designed to make things more efficient, more cost-effective—but substantial reduction in costs. So, yes, of course we would love more officers, and if that is the only solution, we do need more officers to try to get ahead of the traffic fatality problem. But we also understand that it is unlikely and unreasonable to ask for anywhere from $50 to $100 million more in police officer funding just to cover the traffic problem alone. In comparison, if you look at this, to cover 12 areas—and I would also think it is important to point out the traffic camera or the technology is 24/7—for us to put two officers on an intersection for one shift can

range from anywhere from $300 to $400,000 for the benefit—the cost of those officers annually, and that is not seven days a week, 24/7; that is four days a week, ten hours a day. It is probably—if we pulled the specific numbers—you would probably see even more drastic cost savings by using technology, rather than just using solely police officers.

Then the other thing to mention that we are looking at is—with a limited number of police officers—we have to balance all of the issues, including our homicides, our robberies, our aggravated assaults—all these other issues that happen in addition to traffic fatalities. An important perspective, I think, to share is we have had tremendous success in combating crime in the last four years or so with Sheriff Kevin McMahill. We reduced homicides, murders in particular, by 43 percent. Just remarkable. It is a lot less people getting killed in Las Vegas and Clark County as a whole. We have reduced officer-involved shootings by 57 percent last year alone. It is also just truly historical. But now that we have shifted to try to also address the traffic fatality crisis, we are starting to lose ground on murders. We are up a little bit right now. And we are not willing to give up; we are still fighting that. We are still going to do everything we possibly can to succeed in all areas at the same time, but there are limited resources, which is why we are often looking at technologies to help augment what we are doing.

Michael Cunningham, Acting Director, Public Works, City of Las Vegas:

Good morning, Chair, Committee members. Just to add a little bit to that—as we were looking through this pilot, one of the things we did look at was, if something was implemented further, what that cost would be. This current pilot—because it is a pilot—the cost is a little bit different. We are only renting these cameras; we are not purchasing the cameras. Moving forward, if this was to become something permanent, we would purchase the cameras, which would ultimately reduce the long-term use of them. It is something we have looked at. We have not gotten firm numbers because there are different technologies out there. There are different types of systems, but if this pilot was—that would be the first thing we would want to look at is—how much would it cost per intersection to implement a camera system like this? Then what is the long-term maintenance cost? Right now, we are using the RTC funds for traffic safety improvements. That is something we would try to do moving forward. Obviously, there are a lot of other costs involved with that.

Then just to hit on some of the best practices—so we also did look at some of the other states that have had similar systems that have been allowed. Some of the safeguards we looked at was—at a specific intersection, as a jurisdiction—have we already done a traffic study to ensure that there are no other improvements that we can make that are going to increase the safety of that intersection? Can we change signal timing? Can we add some additional signal indicators ahead of the intersection? [Inaudible] can change—and if we have done everything we can and with the funds that we have, then we can make a recommendation to implement one of these cameras. I think it was mentioned earlier in the legislative—it could be—once you put it in there you are allowed to have a camera at an intersection for so long, and then you have to remove it. There are a lot of things we could—you could—put into a legislative bill that would give some of those safeguards to ensure it is not being rolled out everywhere and that we are not using it excessively.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

My question goes to what Senator Hansen had mentioned earlier. When we were talking about these traffic cameras—whether it is speed, running stop signs, any of those deterrent factors—I do not have to tell you; you know that the number one reason for fatalities is—it

may be speeding, but it is also speeding in conjunction with being under the influence. Taking a holistic approach, what other policies do you think we need to enact holistically to make sure that this addresses—it addresses one part of the problem, but when you have 80 percent of your traffic fatalities are under the influence related, no amount of traffic cams are going to act as a deterrent. Or do you have data or statistics that show that when people are intoxicated, they are also slowing down at a traffic camera?

Assistant Sheriff Koren:

I can only speak to Clark County for our jurisdiction—I am not sure what the stats are statewide—but there is a high number that are related to DUI or under a controlled substance. It is not as high as 80 percent, I believe, from the numbers I saw. It is close—it is a little over 50 percent, from what I saw, but I do not know what that range was for those numbers. But to your point, Vice Chair, I think that the holistic approach is designed to use the methods we have now, like DUI blitzes—which is our officers going out to DUI enforcement—and checkpoints, and those kind of things that we have done in the past—in addition to adding some technology. What we believe is—it is important to change driver behavior. Presumably, when you are drunk or some kind of intoxicated, or under a controlled substance, your decision-making is flawed, and you are making worse decisions. But if we can get to the root cause of the person's behavior day to day—not just when they are under a controlled substance, or not just when they are under influence—the idea is that hopefully it would help with reduction of DUIs and reduction of the unsafe driving that is happening across the Valley, even when people are not intoxicated. Our goal is to address bad driving behavior regardless of whether the person is under the influence or not.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

Thank you, Chair.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. Next, we will go to Assemblymember Carter, and then after that we will go to Senator Hansen.

Assemblymember Carter:

Thank you, Chair. My question/statement has got to do with privacy concerns. During the last session, this issue was the number one issue that came up—from phone calls, from emails, from social media responses—and it was overwhelmingly negative—do not do this. I see now that, I believe—and it is already starting—that it is going to be worse because of the Flock [Safety] scandal. We have cameras deployed all over the Valley that are not controlled by elected officials—or elected representatives, more often—so they are just clandestine, and it is being seen that they are already doing this and just setting the stage for that. What is the plan to restore public trust in law enforcement, in the traffic safety realm, and in our governments? When we have something like that—that it is being said, "Yeah, we have got no control over that—none of us sitting here do. Brian does not have control." What are we going to do to fix that public perception?

Assistant Sheriff Koren:

Thank you for the question. I think it is a valid question. I think having more conversations like today will help with addressing the issue. I can tell you, personally—I have been involved on both sides of the spectrum of dealing with privacy, civil rights, civil liberty issues. I have had opportunities to speak on panels at Rutgers about this specific issue over

the years. Particularly, as a law enforcement officer in the last ten years alone, you can see this exponential growth of use of technology, whether it is automated license plate readers (ALPRs) and body-worn cameras. I would like to think I still look young, but ultimately, when I started, we did not have body-worn cameras; we did not have tasers; we did not have a lot of the technologies that have become mainstream in policing across the country today. There has always been this discussion about trying to address the Big Brother concerns, which honestly—from my view—is seen on both political spectrums. Does not really matter if it is right or left, both have valid concerns when it comes to it.

I can tell you that the way that we have had success by restoring public trust, and the way that—we still have room to go—I am not assuming that—not minimizing it—I think we have a lot of room to go, and I think you are right with the conversations about Flock Safety cameras. We have a lot to try to educate the community and also get feedback and try to overcome some of those issues. But I think that it is important to point out that the way we have had success with all technologies—not just automated license plate reader technology—is we have been—one—ultra transparent. I will explain how we have done that with ALPR—not enough, clearly—but we have been ultra transparent as an Agency—where we open our doors; we share our policies; we allow people to come in and view things—the media—to be able to view our units and see exactly how we are operating. But then the most important aspect is we have self-limited ourselves on how we use these technologies, and we allow for—not allow—we enable data retention periods. The big issue in terms of mass surveillance, or Big Brother, a lot of it is collecting data indefinitely and using that for long periods of time—if not indefinitely, years, for example. So, whether it is automated license plate readers, public safety cameras, now drones that are in the policing space, or all these other technologies—if you collect large amounts of data and you keep it forever so you can cross-reference it for long periods of time or forever—that raises a lot of valid concerns. However, with automated license plate readers as an example, we self-limit ourselves—more so than a lot of other agencies around the country—where it is a 90-day retention period. So, for 90 days that data exists, and it does not exist beyond that. The idea behind it is—it is only used to try to address the crimes that are happening or to prevent the next crime. So, ultimately—just for a 90-day period.

I will give you a concrete example from last week. For example, we had two elderly females, African-American females, that went on their morning walk. They were up in the southwest part of town. Ultimately, an individual walked up with a firearm and robbed them—and this is very tragic to even think about. It is a fresh case. I do not even know if the public really understands exactly what happened, but from the reporting we have, the individual that robbed them with the gun basically asked for their purses. One of the elderly females is hard of hearing, and she basically could not hear and said, "What?" And in that hesitation, he shot her in the chest, and she died. We were able to apprehend that person and hold them accountable for the murder very quickly only because of the Flock Safety cameras we had. That is the only way we were able to apprehend that person.

To give you another specific example of how we are using—which I think is the other way to get past the public trust issue, so people understand—we are not using it indefinitely for long periods of time, and we are not using it for everything. We are using it truly to solve crime—to see the reductions that we have seen now with murders is— Just a couple of years ago, to give you an example, we had a robbery series that happened at a Subway—two Subways, and 30 minutes apart. The robbers went into one, robbed the citizens in there, and then 30 minutes later went to another Subway. One of the victims that was robbed, they took a family heirloom—a chain—a necklace that she had handed down

from generations. We were able to catch the suspects fast enough—right before they were able to pawn off that family heirloom—and return it to her. The feedback we are getting from those victims and then the community in general, when they are seeing how we are using these technologies, is overwhelmingly supportive for us—at least within LVMPD.

But I think that beyond having a data retention period, beyond having policies, procedures, and transparency, and auditing mechanisms—which we now have as well—I think that the other critical thing that we do in terms of addressing the public mistrust, particularly with Flock, is we need to better educate folks on some of the misperceptions that exist within our community. I will give you an example. Flock is under fire right now, but it is a vendor for an automated license plate reader, an ALPR system. We have, not just Flock, we have a vendor called Vigilant Solutions as well, which is owned by Motorola. We started that in 2017, and we were probably ten years behind California; they were already using these ALPR systems. So, it was not anything new that we were doing, but we had those Vigilant Solutions ALPR camera systems initially—and we presented to Fiscal Affairs Committee—we shared it with folks of what we were doing then. Then, in 2022, we presented it again with our UASI [Urban Area Security Initiative] grants, being able to spend about $250,000 to buy additional ALPR technologies, and once again, it was presented in a public forum to the Fiscal Affairs Committee. At different times, you have various people from the political spectrum that sat on it. From one point, you had Commissioner Steve Sisolak, when he was a county commissioner, all the way to now, to Commissioner Naft, and various folks that are involved. We are doing the best we can to be transparent, but I think you bring up a valid point. It is clearly not enough because there is still a lot of concern within your constituents, but also the community we are serving in policing. We have to figure out a way to try to educate folks, allow for more feedback, and then tweak things based on what the community expects us to do.

Assemblymember Carter:

First off, I owe you an apology, Councilman Knudsen. I did not give you the respect deserved by not using your title, and I apologize for that. I do want to take and just address, my District is the base of Sunrise Mountain, both sides, Henderson and the east Las Vegas side. We had an issue there nine, almost ten years ago, where Metro did things right. We had an issue with problems on construction in Lewis Family Park, and Metro came in and put one of their freestanding cameras—highly visible. The public was outraged—so many town board meetings, people screaming, and then the public realized, "Oh, I can take my kids to the park after dark now. Oh, that kid on the motorcycle that drives through the park at 3 in the morning ain't doing it anymore. Oh, there is not a homeless infestation in the bathroom." So, we went from public coming out telling us, "Do not improve the parks. Lock the bathrooms up," to "Hey, we want cameras in our parks, highly visible ones." That worked, and now there is a constant demand for that. Right now, we are dealing with a perception that is pretty hard to refute—that some billionaire decided he wants to put license plate readers around the Las Vegas Valley—that has no oversight by electeds—and it has broken the public trust. That is what I think needs to be addressed first, before we can even attempt to have a conversation with our constituents about this—is that the trust needs to be reinstituted. Thank you.

Assistant Sheriff Koren:

Assemblymember, I just want to say thank you for the feedback and the question asked, and also sharing the story about what we were able to do well within your District. I will add one comment, if I could. There are a couple of things. One is—our Sheriff is elected, and he is responding to the community in terms of the demands to reduce crime. As I mentioned

earlier, when they saw the reductions for murders, the reductions for aggravated assaults, for sexual assaults, for different things like that, and then seeing the success in reducing officer-involved shootings, which is a lot of pressure to reduce that as well. A lot of that was done by the use of technology. Sheriff Kevin McMahill made it a point to try to make LVMPD the most technologically advanced police department in the country, and the reason why is we saw a direct correlation—by using some of these technologies, we are able to save lives—and he wants to do that. Now, we are not doing a good enough job messaging that out, so people understand that—and understand that he is elected, and if they do not like that, then that is an avenue for people to take. But the second aspect of that is that even with this pilot program, for example, I think the way that we restore public trust, with the misperception you brought up, is we are accountable still to you and to the public. So, whatever we do, including with our ALPR systems, is having these types of hearings where you get to ask questions or challenge us on things, and then ultimately the power of enacting laws to be able to change things, and this is why we want to be collaborative. We are not trying to do anything in a silo—we are trying to really share everything we are doing.

Then the last thing is, I understand the misperception about the donor that provided funding to provide some of the technology, but I will point out that there is some misperception there—because as I said, in 2017, when we bought ALPR cameras, we used department funds, and then we used grant funds as well, Urban Area—Homeland Security Grant funds. So, it is not just purely privately funded from that technology perspective, but we do have a lot of people—not just that one donor that I think is being mentioned—that have come through, including the Engelstad Foundation—to various donations, philanthropic, to help with our technology, help with our—for example, building our Joint Emergency Training Institute, which has a lot of technology, new building for training to reduce officer-involved shootings and prevent and address things like 1 October that happened. But you have the like Engelstad Foundation; you have the Golden Knights; you have the Raiders; you have—the list is extensive in terms of different hotels, companies, individuals who have all donated hundreds of millions of dollars now to help the police department and other entities in the community. Hopefully people will understand that, but we are open to feedback and whatever else we need to do differently.

Chair Watts:

Thank you, and I think it would probably be helpful for us to get some of those policies and procedures for the use of these technologies as a follow-up to the members of the Committee. Vice Chair, would you like to add anything else on this item?

Vice Chair Nguyen:

I think that would be very helpful. As we were talking about this—and I know the City Councilman had mentioned this—that you are open to figuring out what those guardrails look like—what they look like legislatively as we are developing policies. I think it would probably be very helpful, and hopefully you would be open to providing some of that information to the legislative body as we are preparing those. Like, specifically, if we are having issues with contracts and data collection—and who owns the data, and who it can be shared with—if we could have access to those contracts that you have with those outside agencies. I think it is always difficult when there are outside donors or foundations that are running some of these programs without the oversight, and we do not have access to those contracts. So, if you have those contracts, I think it would help guide the legislation that we are looking at moving forward.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. One moment, then I will let you jump in, Councilman. This is an issue that has come up on other topics—even before this Committee, during this interim. I think what you are hearing is there is concern, and we want to make sure that there are strong guardrails in place. Often that falls to the Legislature as kind of the backstop to make sure that we have a foundation that ensures that there is clear guidance for those who are implementing something, and then it also allows us to say that those protections are in place and that it is not a, "This is what is happening now," or "Take our word for it," but that there is something clear that we can point to. I think what you heard is as much information as you can share with us to help us inform how we establish some of those guardrails and help provide clarity and peace of mind to our constituents in the community, the better. Go ahead, Councilman.

Councilman Knudsen:

Thank you, Chair. I would say you can call me Brian anytime—unless you are complaining about cones, and then it is Councilman. But I want to get to the basics—what does that collaboration look like? Do you want me to email you the contracts and the stuff, so you can sift through them? Or do you have a representative that you want to assign to sit on a committee? I want to get to the logistics because, at the end of this process, for me, I would like to have an outcome. Hopefully, I will be able to present you data that can help you make meaningful decisions in the Legislature, but I do not want to take a misstep and assume that you want something that I do not know about.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

Obviously, there are individuals that sit amongst the 63 of us in the Legislature that probably have an interest in supporting pieces of legislation like this. I know that there are organizations—and I am volunteering Sean Sever and NVACTS—that already have a group that is compiled to specifically address some of this. It is in some of their priority policy things. I think providing that— I know that we routinely, when we ask for information in hearings like this, you can provide it to our Committee staff, and they will get us those contracts, and we will be able to incorporate them into any potential legislation that moves forward to make sure that they are concerned. I do not know if that answers your question. You know how to get a hold of me, as I am your Senator. I would be happy to facilitate that too—just as helping out a constituent in my District deal with a real issue that I believe that you are genuinely trying to come up with solutions for, as we all are. I would say those are some good starting places. The other thing, as we are collecting data—and I am looking at you again, Assistant Sheriff—is around—you had mentioned that there was an audit procedure. I am curious to see who is doing that audit, like where that audit information comes from, including in this pilot program. Like who—not only who is collecting that data in contract, but who has access to it, how they can sell it, how they can utilize it, who else can utilize that kind of information, and is it a third party that is doing that audit? Is it an internal audit? Obviously, it gives me more comfort knowing that it is a third party doing it. I think that makes it more accurate data, as opposed to the company that is contracted with the cameras, or even internally, I think. For public perception, having a third-party independent auditor is always something that makes legislating a lot easier, at least on our end. Those are some of my questions.

Chair Watts:

To keep things moving along—hopefully you are taking notes. Our staff is also taking notes. As was mentioned, I think the immediate next step will be following up to work with our staff to get some of this information to our staff so it can be shared among the Committee. Sounds like Vice Chair is volunteering to continue to do some ongoing engagement on some of this moving forward. We are going to move on to Senator Hansen, who I believe had one or more questions.

Senator Hansen:

Thanks, Chairman. Yeah, I actually have several. First, somebody stated earlier that Nevada is more dangerous than any other state, and that is why our insurance rates—auto insurance rates—are so high. Can somebody provide some data on that and how they measure that? Is Nevada drivers—are we worse drivers than people in New York or Wyoming or somewhere else? I would like to find that out. Because one thing that we should look at in the next legislative session is capping the amount that trial lawyers get on these insurance settlements. I would recommend 20 percent. I think that is the biggest issue that for the average person listening to us right now, who have been watching their insurance rates go through the roof for the last five or six years—and anybody new to Nevada who drives around the state cannot help but notice that about half of the billboards out there are all for lawyers who are encouraging people to sue over auto accidents. That is something we need to look at—because I do not buy that Nevada's insurance average is higher because we are worse drivers; I think there is an absolute correlation between this constant escalation of lawsuits and these outrageous settlements.

Question on the data collection. I was a little surprised to hear that you have—you rent the cameras. Now obviously, for an insurance company to be able to get the data and—like me, I believe it was the City Councilman mentioned he has a clean traffic record for 30 years; I am guessing ten years for me now. But if an insurance company can get a hold of that plate information and find out that Ira Hansen went speeding through a red light one time, that is more valuable than having a citation because—at least for my automobile—that way they can jack up my insurance rates. I am a little . . . You guys have covered that a little bit, but I think the idea of protecting the actual data—and while I am glad the officer said that he is going to self-limit—the average person out there—honestly, I do not trust self-limitation by government. There are so many examples of governments abusing those things that self-limitation just is like a red flag to me. So, insurance is the biggest issue.

The other thing that came up, somebody said that it is indiscriminate—the accidents are indiscriminate—which is true for the victim. But what I have looked at—and maybe you guys can share the data on this—the people that perpetrate the crimes, the . . . If I am sitting, driving in traffic, and some idiot goes blowing by me, inevitably it is a male—usually a younger male. Have you guys got any data based on the perpetrators? Because if we are really trying to focus in on curing the problem, it seems disproportionately males under the age of what, 30 or so. Anybody got any actual data on that when it comes to victims—I mean, excuse me—perpetrators of crime?

Councilman Knudsen:

Mr. Chair, I heard three questions in there, so I am going to try and go in order.

Chair Watts:

I believe I heard three as well, so go ahead.

Councilman Knudsen:

The first question—and Senator, I appreciate it—I threw up the insurance slides simply because my insurance rates went up. I am not going to take credit for anything that is in there or any information that may be inaccurate or accurate. What I am going to suggest is that there are a number of factors that insurance raters rate our state on—and bad driving is one of them. There are multiple other factors, and I am not going to have any other comments around what those other factors are—simply that we are 30 percent higher than the national average. That is something to take into account. I believe Michael Cunningham, who is our Director of Public Works, can speak to the contractual limitations on how the data is used.

Mr. Cunningham:

Thank you again, Chair, Committee members. I am going to talk specifically about the pilot. Our pilot, as Councilmember mentioned, we have modified what the original intent was. With this current one—it is within their contract—the City ultimately owns this data. The vendor that is processing the data for us, they send it to us. We have access to a dashboard. It is written in their contract—they cannot reuse the data; they cannot sell the data; it is solely our data. At the end of the pilot—once it is done—once we give them the clear that the pilot has completed after the 12 months—at 30 days, they have to wipe their system completely of any data that they have through this pilot—and completely wipe their system. Then, at that point, we just have our summary reports that we have—that we have gathered from them through this pilot. Specifically, to this pilot, that was a concern that was brought up, so through the contract we try to make sure those were addressed to ensure that we are the owners of this data.

Councilman Knudsen:

I believe we will have to get back to you on the third question related to the demographics of who are the perpetrators.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. Yes, we will add it to the data and other follow-up items. Senator, do you have any follow-ups?

Senator Hansen:

Just briefly, I had a bill last session—died in Judiciary—but it was to limit the ability of government agencies to collect data on ordinary citizens—would include things like this. My focus was the cell phone data. Everybody here has a cell phone; that is all super trackable. While there are federal laws that are against it, we do not really have anything on the state laws. There were examples that I found out—that I could not verify—but there are abuses of these things by law enforcement agencies, I believe, in the state. I think it is important for us to look out—number one—for the civil liberty issues involving the citizens of Nevada. I think that is as important—maybe more important—than people running red lights because that involves all 3.5 million of us. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. I think that was a statement—not a question—but I do appreciate it. I actually feel the same way, and I always love it when there is a moment when we are on the same page. I want to make a note that I do believe the Interim Commerce and Labor Committee had some discussions around auto insurance rates during this interim—so I think we will leave that specific piece to the jurisdiction of another Committee.

Members, any other questions? All right, seeing none. Thank you all so much. Councilman, I consider you a friend, but I am still going to use your title. My neighborhood is going crazy about construction cones—just for the record. But we appreciate all of your time and your presentation answering our questions.

AGENDA ITEM VI—PRESENTATION ON TRAFFIC SAFETY-RELATED EFFORTS

Chair Watts:

With that, we will move on to our next agenda item, which is a presentation on traffic safety-related efforts from representatives of the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. Thank you for joining us today. Go ahead and take a moment to get everything ready, and once you are, go ahead and state your name for the record. You can begin.

Joe Colacurcio, Captain, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:

Good day. My name's Captain Joe Colacurcio with the Washoe County Sheriff's Office, and we have—

Adam Miller, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:

Adam Miller, Director of Government Affairs for the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. I believe we have a data packet that was sent to the Committee, so if we can get that pulled up. One minute. (Agenda Item VI A-1)

Captain Colacurcio:

I believe—earlier, listening to most of the conversations—a lot of the questions that were asked by Senators and Assemblymembers here may be answered, inadvertently, through some of the data that we pulled through Nevada's Department of Transportation. So, that information—we are completely here today to do a presentation on our initiatives, on what we are doing in Washoe County to help reduce fatalities and traffic accidents. Some of the things the Washoe County Sheriff's Office does—and we can go through that—or if you would like to go through the data first, that is up to—however you wish to do that. I will give you guys the choice.

Director Miller:

Real quick—this data that we were able to pull is from 2019 to 2023. While not inclusive of the last couple of years, it does show historical trends and some of the specific breakdowns that, specifically, Senator Hansen mentioned—and Senator Nguyen, I believe, you as well—with impaired driving. We can go to those slides upon request, but just for clarification, this is 2019 to 2023.

Captain Colacurcio:

This is all data that is sent in. Every agency within the State of Nevada is required to send this data into the state for record through the Brazos/Tyler Tech [Tyler Technologies Inc.]—it is our ticket writing system—it is how we make that data available. We could flip through it real quick. We will go through the Nevada Fatal Crash Data, from 2019 to 2023, which is available. You could see those numbers as they are.

Some of the breakdowns that you are looking at here—just for that information—735 since 2019 to 2023 have been impaired driving. So, impaired driving includes anything from drug use all the way down to alcohol, and that will be broken down in another slide too.

This is a hot map or a placement map of pretty much where those fatal crashes have occurred throughout the state—showing that from 2019 to 2023 with 1,689 across the state.

I believe, Senator Hansen, you asked earlier about age and male/female breakdown. This breaks it down for you—if you can see that, sir—with what we have. Pretty much, roughly, that age from 21 to 25, from 2019 to 2023 has about 153 males. Obviously, you can see the males are dominating the data for at-fault driver by age group and then sex here.

Then, a little bit, broken down, based on month, day of the week, time of day. For us, we use that data. We get even finer into that data with using some of our unique technologies that we have through traffic data collection, which pretty much is only collecting vehicle type, size, and speed with date and time. It allows us to do directed enforcement, so that we are not putting officers out in the middle of the night when there is no traffic—but hitting those appropriate times.

Then a little more data to go further. All of this is available on the Department of Traffic Safety's website. You can pull this data yourself and be able to look through it—sift through it—make some changes as you wish for that data.

This was one of the other things that, I believe, was questioned earlier is—was it alcohol, marijuana, or polysubstance use. That is broken down as well from 2019 to 2023. That data is here and available for you if you wish to see that. I believe we have one more slide attached to this.

Director Miller:

For some context on this slide, specifically—if you go back to the first slide that shows the total number of fatalities, it is 1,600 plus. If you add up all the substance-involved fatalities, it is roughly 1,400. So, out of the 1,600 plus fatalities, 1,400 of those had substances involved. That leaves 200, roughly, with no substance involved fatalities. So, quite a large discrepancy—substance versus non-substance.

Captain Colacurcio:

A breakdown all the way across for fatal crashes based on county as well, from 2019 to 2023.

This is a little more updated data for 2024 and 2025. (Agenda Item VI A-2) (Agenda Item VI A-3) You can see that changes based on—overall changes. So obviously, looking at this year right now into 2025, we had about a 10 percent change for fatalities and about a

5 percent change for fatal crashes throughout the state. You could see that all in this data as well, broken down by years, fatalities. All that, like I said, is available on the state website, which everyone is required to report to. I know it is tough to read and further down, but this breaks it all the way down, and the state has broken it down for fatal crashes, actual fatalities, the occupants, were they restrained/unrestrained, pedestrian involved, bicycles, motorcycle, and then scooter/mopeds as well.

Moving forward and talking about some of the initiatives that the Washoe County Sheriff's Office has put together, one of the things that we work well with is the Nevada—excuse me, National Highway Traffic Safety Authority, Department of Transportation here, so NDOT and then Nevada Office Traffic Safety, they subgrant and put out Joining Forces grants. Those are different grants that allow directed enforcement based on different things that include—from impaired driving, speeding, distracted driving, seatbelt violations, and pedestrian safety. Those campaigns are all grant funded above and beyond, so it allows officers to work directed enforcement, not be called or pulled away from other—their duties, to take other calls for service. This allows for directed traffic enforcement throughout the county and with partnering agencies. It is a great program that we use, and we are very grateful to have that ability. The Sheriff's Office has a motor unit, so we have officers directly working inside or—excuse me—on motorcycles. Those officers are also working. We also have two officers that are assigned to cars. They are in our A-ride unit. Those A-ride units are directly set up for DUI enforcement, so their job is directed DUI enforcement. If an officer is driving down the roadway, they come in contact with an individual that is under the influence or suspected to be under the influence, they call that A-ride unit, which allows that A-ride unit to complete the DUI investigation. Then it frees up that patrol officer to go back to handle regular calls for service throughout the day and their shift. We work directly with—we have a major accident investigation team that allows us to track that fatal data, major injuries, serious property damage, and those things as well. It allows for detailed crash investigations. It also provides us information to see what the contributing factors are, if there is a criminal investigation tied to it because it is a cause of death, or they are the cause of a death. It allows us to use that information to do more directed enforcement.

We also track our community complaints; we call them service requests. Any individual that lives within Washoe County wishes to make a complaint about traffic, enforcement in school zones—anywhere; that complaint is submitted, and then it is sent to our traffic office. Then, those complaints are worked based on—usually a phone call is made to the complainant, "Hey, what are the exact times? What is the location? What are we looking for?" so that we can provide that directed enforcement to hopefully mitigate any of the traffic issues, speed, any of those things—e-bikes and stuff like that.

In Incline Village, specifically, we worked this year directly with Incline Village High School, so the Washoe County School District, and we did an actual e-bike education period. It is a very hot topic in Incline Village. We used our student resource officers that—we have two deputies that work out of the Incline High School. Working with the schools and the resource officers, we were able to put a presentation together that we put out to all the high school kids and the middle school kids. Most of the individuals do not understand that there are three different classes of e-bike, from 1 to 3. Class 3 is pretty much considered a motorcycle, for those that do not know. So, it is—no pedals, pretty much pegs; they could do up to almost 50 miles an hour when they jailbreak them, as they call it—all the way to a pedal-assisted bicycle. That education was provided to the high school, and then enforcement was provided further. Education was provided to the parents on those individuals that were riding those bikes—and we had conversations with or we had stopped. We see a large reduction and an understanding from the parents with that education to explain to them that what your child is riding is actually considered a motorcycle, based on

state law and not an e-bike, or a scooter, or anything along those lines. The education, directly working with Washoe County schools, and being able to provide that out, was something that has been beneficial. We are currently working with the Reno Police Department and Washoe County schools to get information out. Hopefully, we can get the news and media to jump on it and do a big presentation to allow that information to be provided to parents. Most parents truly, I believe, buy these e-bikes and have no understanding of what they are actually purchasing for their children.

I know someone asked about helmet laws. Bicycles—right out of the gate—there is no helmet law for a bicycle. Class pretty much 1 and 2 on the e-bike fall under bicycle rules, so you do not need a helmet. You are required—operator of a motorcycle and the passenger of a motorcycle, or anyone on a trike as well—is required to wear a helmet in the State of Nevada. Those do fall under NRS, and you will lose demerit points through Department of Motor Vehicles if you are a Nevada driver, if you fail to—if you are issued a citation and convicted of that as well, for that.

Going further, for initiatives and things like that, for the Sheriff's Office, we do special events and high traffic enforcement. We go out and do—we use radar collection boxes, so they look like sprinkler boxes—they are about the size of a shoebox. The only data that they collect, I was speaking about earlier, is actually the class of vehicle—so, 1, 2, and 3. Is it a sedan? Is it an SUV? Or is it a large truck? It collects time, date, and travel speed with direction. It gives us pretty much an overall look to say, "Hey, maybe from 7 a.m. to 9 a.m., we have approximately 3,000 cars that travel on this roadway, and the average speed or 80th percentile may be 33 in a 25. It gives directed enforcement to go out to target those areas to make sure that the public is safe and that those areas can be enforced directly. Those traffic data collector boxes are usually those radar signs that you see—the high-speed, high-score radar boxes that I like to call them—as you drive by. We have those as well. That collects the same data, but that is usually a little skewed—when people see the sign, they either speed up or slow down—so that is a little tough. The indiscreet shoebox works a little better for directed enforcement, and they are movable, which is a nice thing, so you do not have to have it fully mounted. It works off a battery—lasts about seven days, so you can get a good view of that seven-day data set.

Also, we have some grant-funded initiatives and, like I was talking about, the OTS school zone—so, Office of Traffic Safety—they provide a DUI grant, school zone grant, and OTS Drive grant, which supports the teen education on DUIs as well. Those are all grant funds that allow us to do directed enforcement or directed education and allows us to pull an officer directly off the line, so he is not responsible to take certain calls for service—he is completely set up for that.

I will talk a little bit further—and I know we brought up—have we seen—or does directed enforcement make a change, and does that change behavior? We have some data. Pretty much last year, we wrote approximately 14,000 citations in Washoe County. That is Washoe County—it includes parts of Sparks and Reno—depending on where an individual, or a motor officer, or traffic officer is. We are currently on track to almost double that this year for the Sheriff's Office—simply based on directed enforcement and key goal crime initiatives, looking at that. Putting cars on the curb is a typical motor officer comment, and that allows us to change the behavior, and it allows us to work in an area—they see that behavior change usually for about a week to ten days. At about three weeks, the behavior returns to normal, and we are back in the same area doing the same enforcement continuously. So, you get about a seven to ten day change when they see a working area for a couple of days. Then, about three weeks later, it goes back to that normal speed—80th percentile.

Last year, for the Washoe County Sheriff's Office, we took 592 accident reports—12 of them were major accident investigations, with 8 of them being fatals for Washoe County. We had 389 DUI arrests—85 of those DUI arrests were based off an accident which had occurred. Most of those incidents occurred between 8 p.m. and 2 a.m., so 64 percent of that occurred pretty much at nighttime. Then our average BAC for that DUI breakdown for those 389 arrests was 0.174—so, easily double the legal limit for that.

We have, like I was saying, a directed traffic and Motor Unit—that is their whole goal is traffic-related incidents. They work any of those specialties from pedestrians, school zones, all that stuff. That is pretty much what the Washoe County Sheriff's Office does for traffic initiatives. I am available for any questions.

Chair Watts:

Thank you for the presentation. Members, any questions for our presenters from Washoe County? Senator Hansen, any questions from you?

Senator Hansen:

No, Chair. Thank you though.

Chair Watts:

All right, thank you. Seeing no questions. Thank you very much for the presentation.

Captain Colacurcio:

Chair, Vice Chair, thank you.

AGENDA ITEM VII—PRESENTATION ON LIVE BETTER LYON TRAFFIC SAFETY CAMPAIGN AND OTHER COLLABORATIONS TO IMPROVE HIGHWAY SAFETY

Chair Watts:

We will now move on to the next item on our agenda, which is a presentation on Live Better Lyon Traffic Safety Campaign, and other collaborations to improve highway safety from representatives of Lyon County. Thank you for joining us. Go ahead and take a moment to get your presentation ready, and then you can state your name and begin.

Shayla Holmes, Director, Human Services, Lyon County:

I think it is good afternoon now. I want to start off by thanking the 2023 Legislative Session for passing Senate Bill 118, which is what made this marketing campaign possible. SB 118 was public health infrastructure dollars. It was continued on in 2025 under a different bill, but in 2023, when these dollars came out, we were concerned about a potential fiscal cliff, and in public health, creating a program that may drop off is dangerous. So, we went back to our data, and we saw—what our community continued to tell us was that they were unaware of existing services. So, we put a subcommittee together and we identified one way to address that with potential fiscal cliff dollars is a public health marketing campaign. With that, that led to Live Better Lyon. (Agenda Item VII)

We looked at our data, and what it told us, unfortunately, is that our highways are a leading contributor to premature death. What you can see here is we had 1,000 plus Lyon County drivers caught exceeding 100 miles per hour over the last four years. We had 29 lives lost between 2016 and 2020, and we had 14 deaths in that same time frame related to speed. Then the positive there is that from 2024 to 2025, we saw a decrease from 11 to 6 in fatal crashes. So that is an early signal that perhaps our marketing campaign did some good out there. When we shared with our contractors that we wanted to do a safe driving campaign as one of our top priorities with these dollars, they really encouraged us not to. They said impacting driving behavior is perhaps one of the hardest things to do, and so they were concerned about being able to see positive outcomes from these dollars if we focused on driver safety and driver behavior. However, we pushed it, since the data showed that we really needed it. Right now, it looks fairly positive.

We did this in a few different ways. We ran it in the fall, so it was—one of the legs over the quarter of the year. We ran it from October to December. There are some of the billboards that were out there. What we got from—in addition to the data showing positive response—we also heard back from our community members—pretty loudly—that they really appreciated the collective responsibility messaging. Such as "Let's all make it home today," or "I will be home for the holidays if you drive safe." There was a really positive response to that collective responsibility.

I am not a marketing expert, so I am going to parrot here a little bit from what I am told from our contractors. We contracted with Hey Frank; they were the most responsive bidder to our request for bids. We had—let us see here— The four sites for our billboards which you guys just saw—Fernley, Dayton, and Silver Springs, running on Highway 50, and then also on I-80. We had bigger impacts on Highway 50 than we did on I-80 but, a lot different mix on I-80. We also did social media, Facebook, audio streaming, which I think you will see in the next slide some positives there. In regards to the audio streaming, they are a captive audience while they are driving, and we had 30-second spots on both Pandora and Spotify. Then we also had additional digital displays online and in a few other areas.

On the next slide, here is the Facebook and Instagram—similar messages to what was on the billboard.

The next one—here we see our social media, our audio streaming, and our display ads all exceeded the benchmarks. These are the marketing terminology as far as click-through rates. The benchmark for a click-through rate is 0.08 on display ads, 90 percent listen-through rate for audio streaming, and 0.2 percent on social media. You can see that our safe driving campaign exceeded all of those benchmarks, particularly the audio streaming at a 94 percent listen-through rate, which means the individual heard—94 percent of individuals listened to the whole message.

This is why the audio rate is really impactful, because it has got a captive audience. When you are in your vehicle—and that is also when you are driving—most people are listening to something, which is Spotify or Pandora, some other things as well, but most listeners have shifted towards these other media platforms other than the traditional radio. So, having a 94 percent listen-through rate there is great, because you can just go forward if you wanted to, or tell your Google to go forward. We are being told by our marketing campaign that this is a positive impact.

Here is a little bit more information on where those billboards were placed.

Here is a little bit more on the fatality trends or—in regards to what it looked like in 2024 and 2025. Fatal crashes in '24 were at 11; that went down to 6 in 2025. Total fatalities in 2024 were 12, and that went down to 7 in 2025. Vehicle occupant fatalities were at 11 and went down to 5. Then unrestrained fatalities went from 3 in 2024 to 0 in 2025.

In regards to all of the different campaigns, we had three priorities, five legs of the campaign. Our safe driving campaign had the best results in regards to what those benchmarks are for media.

Really, what that tells us is it is a great start, and we need to get additional data back from NDOT for 2025 into 2026. That way, we can continue to track what that looks like. Utilizing public health infrastructure dollars, we are continuing portions of this towards media. Right now, we are working on an off-highway vehicle safety campaign—as that is also seeing high rates of death, unfortunately.

Taylor Allison, Director, Emergency Management/Government Affairs, Lyon County:

I wanted to add briefly that from— My office, we hold a very unique role—like most public agencies, multiple hats—but we have the experience of responding directly to transportation incidents. Seeing the effect that it has on our first responders, as well as our public works staff, the community—particularly, the County—has taken a holistic approach to traffic safety—as you see here—a public health population-based intervention on safe driving behaviors, as well as working with our law enforcement on their increasing presence in traffic stops and interventions. At all levels we are receiving positive feedback on what we can do to address the concerns. It would be very difficult to find anyone in any one of our communities that has not been personally impacted by one of these fatal transportation accidents—so, thank you, Shayla—and thank you all today.

Chair Watts:

All right; I am guessing that concludes your presentation. Thank you very much. Members, any questions for our presenters? Okay, not seeing any at this time. Oh, we do have one from Vice Chair Nguyen.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

You know, we have been talking a lot about different educational campaigns and informational—how you get the information out to the public. I appreciate that you highlighted some of that work that you have been doing in the community. When you are looking at those kind of things, do you have an idea, or can you share what the costs or what the investment has been in some of those educational campaigns?

Director Holmes:

This campaign, specifically, using SB 118 dollars, we took the $270,000 appropriation and put that all into the public health marketing component. About $45,000 of that was particular to the safe driving component. There was also a website built for the Live Better Lyon brand, and safe driving is on there as a piece of it. I want to say we put $90,000 in this last year from our public health infrastructure dollars into that marketing campaign as well. I do not know if that answers your question fully, but it is costly, and we are being told that we are being very frugal on how much we are investing in it—and yet it is what we have available, so we are trying to maximize it.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

No, thank you; I appreciate that. I imagine that it is an expensive thing to get out and educate the entire public or community around concerted issues, so I appreciate the information. Thank you so much. Thank you, Chair.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. I was just wondering if you could say anything else on the OHV injuries or fatalities that you are seeing in your County.

Director Holmes:

I do not have specific data available today with me on that. What we do know is that through some of our highway corridors, we experienced, within the last several months, deaths of youth crossing highways on OHVs. That is what brought this to our attention and our desire to shift some of these dollars towards that specific population. So, we are just getting our feet wet within that one. Hopefully, we should have more information available soon.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. If you are able to get any information and send that as a follow-up, I would appreciate that. I am interested in hearing about this from all of our folks who are involved in this across the state. This—going back to some of the earlier conversations that we were having about e-mobility—and trying to make sure that there is some degree of education for anyone using those devices and how to do so safely and responsibly. We have this for hunters; we have this for boaters, but we do not have a requirement for folks using off-highway vehicles to ensure that they have got some specific education on how to safely and responsibly operate those vehicles—which is something that, I think, is a gap that should be addressed. So, any information, data, or some of the incidents that are being seen, I think, is helpful for me, in particular, but I also think for members of this Committee, so thank you. Members, any additional questions? All right, hearing none, thank you so much for your presentation. We appreciate you being here today.

AGENDA ITEM VIII—PRESENTATION ON SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL AND COMPLETE STREETS PROGRAMS

Chair Watts:

We will move on to our last presentation for the day, which is a presentation on Safe Routes to School and Complete Streets programs from representatives of Carson City. Welcome, Mr. Gresh. Good to see you again. Go ahead and take a moment to get ready, and once you are, state your name, and you can begin.

Cameron Gresh, Government Affairs Liaison/Public Information Officer, City Manager's Office, Carson City:

Thank you very much, Chair Watts. Nice to see you again as well. I am joined today by Chris Martinovich, Carson City Public Works, Transportation Manager, to take everyone through a very brief explainer of two programs that we are proud to be operating here in Carson City—Safe Routes to School and Complete Streets. (Agenda Item VIII)

We take an integrated approach to active transportation. These two programs anchor that work. Complete Streets is a policy framework. It is adopted by Public Works and CAMPO; that is the Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization. It is incorporated into the CAMPO 2050 Regional Transportation Plan. It governs how every city-funded and privately-funded project is designed, so that pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists are all considered from the start. A big part of that is also choice—making sure that no matter which mode of transportation you choose in Carson City, you are equally served in using that mode, especially when it is not car focused.

Safe Routes to School, on the other hand, is our targeted implementation strategy for youth safety. It is organized around schools in the one-mile walking radius around them. It is now guided by the 2025 Safe Routes to School Action Plan, which replaced our 2020 Safe Routes to School Master Plan. This was adopted in December of last year. These are not separate efforts—SRTS projects are delivered through Complete Streets design standards, and Complete Streets corridor improvements often pass directly in front of schools that are subject to SRTS, so they reinforce each other.

Complete Streets—adopted in 2014, it is kind of a foundational definition that has held up well. What is a Complete Street? It is designed and operated to enable safe, comfortable, and universal access for all users, regardless of age or ability. You are going to see four main categories here—that is pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and motorists of all types. Our vision is to build a network where every user can travel comfortably in the mode they choose.

Policy goals that I want to highlight here really quickly are a connected, integrated network that supports compact, sustainable development.

Of course, as you have heard today from many other presenters, safety is a pretty big one, along with accessibility, and easy transfer between modes.

Third, to cap it off is context-sensitive design. What works on South Carson Street may not work on a street right next to it. The policy expects us to recognize and adapt to that. When it comes down to a Complete Street, it really is that individual street and what that means for the community around it. This applies to all city-funded and private projects so that everything is united when we are talking about who is building what where in Carson City.

Operational requirements that make the project real—they must be built into every project phase—so new construction, major rehab, or significant repair. When we are looking at anything, we are looking at Complete Streets—and making sure that whatever we do moving forward rhymes with this policy.

To bring it back to bicycles, specifically—during the 2021 Legislative Session, SB 285 added a requirement that to the extent practicable, projects must integrate bicycle lanes, bicycle routes, facilities, and signs into all plans, designs, construction, and maintenance of roads. We updated our policy to reflect that requirement, and that was approved on January 12, 2022. That would be one of the most recent bicycle-focused additions to our plan.

As you can probably imagine, ADA compliance certainly is a major pillar of what a Complete Street is. This includes, when required, upgrading infrastructure to current ADA standards, so you will be thinking of curb ramps, detectable warnings, accessible pedestrian signals where warranted, and the like.

Then, again, finally, transit amenities—so you will see things like good passenger shelters for things like our Jump Around Carson bus, ADA features at our stops, and bus pullout areas as part of the policy—just to keep everything connected but secure.

Moving on to integration—this is the story of how Complete Streets and Safe Routes to School are woven into our regional planning documents; they are not bolted on. The CAMPO Regional Transportation Plan is our long-range, fiscally constrained plan for the region.

Then the CAMPO Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP)—it covers the full CAMPO region, obviously, but Complete Street elements are considered where the LRSP makes recommendations.

Major corridor improvement projects include South Carson, North Carson, East William, and others that I will cover in a moment. This is, again, just a very local—I understand that we are the smallest county in front of you today, so, realistically, we are talking about neighborhoods in a city, as opposed to areas of a county. But we have incorporated these things into all of our planning documents to make sure that everything stays connected and supports each other, as you will see further on when I talk about some of these key projects here.

We have got a lot going on here—protected pedestrian median islands on Colorado Street, separated multi-use paths on South Carson Street, and then the U.S. 50 East Carson Complete Streets feasibility study. We have also handled that as well; it is in progress right now.

We have got East William Street and North Carson Street on deck for further improvements here. For the North Carson Street, we have actually got a public comment period open right now. Restoration of pavement and sidewalk improvements are going to be kind of the major themes of that one.

All right, so now moving on to Safe Routes to School. Just like you have heard in the other presentations today, this is the one that is really safety-focused. What may surprise you is that we run SRTS, Safe Routes to School, not just for Carson City, but also for our good friends in Lyon County, Douglas, and Storey Counties as well. The current guiding document that we use for Safe Routes to School is the 2025 SRTS Action Plan adopted in December that I mentioned earlier. It was developed in close collaboration with our vulnerable road user task force, which includes the school district, school resource officers and personnel, crossing guards, parents, and Public Works staff. We are developing these plans with—always at the forefront—the input of the people who will be using the infrastructure that these plans are designed to create. Right now, Safe Routes to School covers six elementary schools and two middle schools. Carson High School and the Washoe Head Start School in the Stewart Community were also very recently added into the SRTS area of responsibility, if you want to call it that.

Eight infrastructure projects have been completed under the SRTS umbrella, representing about $1.3 million in total investment. Those projects delivered curb extensions, high-visibility crosswalks, pedestrian-scale lighting, rectangular rapid-flashing beacons, and filling of sidewalk gaps—where kids were previously having to leave a sidewalk to walk into the street to get back to the sidewalk—we really want to eliminate those where we see them.

Over here, you have got a SRTS recommendations map that is set up into Tier 1 and 2 recommendations. Tier 1 represents our highest priority projects. Those are locations with the strongest combination of safety needs, student exposure, and feasibility. Tier 2 are the next priority projects that are programmed as funding becomes available. We have existing facilities on here as well—that are sidewalks, paths, and crossings already in place. You can see where the network is strong and where the gaps are and what we are focusing on there. Just a nice little visual to give you a scope of everything we are looking at when we talk about six, seven, eight schools.

All right, the West Carson Vulnerable User Pedestrian Improvement Project. This is a flagship example of Complete Streets and SRTS working together on a single, federally funded project. We have almost a full mile of improvements that includes ADA roadway repairs and sidewalk improvements. We identified and prioritized the Carson City Safe Routes to School Master Plan here, as we always do, data and community input that drives the plan—drives the capital project. Connecting those together is, I think, a pretty important feature of these programs. This is located on the west side of Carson City along West Musser Street, West Telegraph Street, and West Fifth Street—I am naming these off because they are the primary walking routes to Carson Middle School and Bordewich-Bray Elementary School. This is what it looks like when SRTS analysis directly informs federal infrastructure investment. That is to bring it down to one area of the City to tell you about something that we are most excited about.

All right, funding—none of this happens without funding. We resource these programs through a couple of federal sources that you have very likely heard of—the Surface Transportation Block Grant is the real workhorse federal source. You will see that funding all sorts of things throughout our state.

Transportation alternatives, or TAP, specifically aimed at active transportation and SRTS, so those are little bit easier to spend there.

Then Congressionally Directed Spending (CDS), when applicable and appropriated. We have some very hardworking federal legislators in both the Senate and House, who have been working with us since Congressionally Directed Spending became available to members of Congress about five or six years ago. One of the very first CDS projects that Congress was ever—our members of Congress—were able to get into an appropriations bill was a Complete Streets project. So, that is just some federal sources here.

Local sources would include our fuel and sales tax and redevelopment area assessments for projects within designated redevelopment areas.

To talk about some specific federal grants, we have gotten $9.3 million in RAISE [Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity] Grant funding and another $7.5 million in federal TIGER [Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery] Grant funding. Those are two different names for the same type of program that has existed throughout administrations and usually gets renamed upon the assumption of office of a new administration—so, different names, same activities. Then, we have gotten $4.1 million in Congressionally Directed Spending there—with another sub-$1,862,000 in TAP [Transportation Alternatives Program] funds for the Western Nevada SRTS program since 2023.

Outcomes and metrics—here is what we are measuring and what the data shows. We do not have final 2024 safety data yet, so we do not want to speculate, but Complete Streets use average daily counts in 2024. We have got downtown Carson City—lots of

pedestrians—230—and 29 bicyclists per day. Then, if you will notice, on South Carson Street, we have got 61 pedestrians and 39 bicyclists. This is, I think, a little bit skewed in terms of bicyclist-to-pedestrian ratios. Numbers like this show you just how important having a bike lane is in certain areas, especially South Carson versus North Carson. That is a pretty huge difference in proportions to pedestrians versus bicyclists. That shows you why going street by street and accounting for the literal community within a stone's throw of that street is how you responsibly build using Complete Streets.

That is pretty much, I think, all of the data I wanted to highlight there. We do not have as much—as you might have seen with my other presenters—traffic data and stuff like that—though, we can get that for you. In a more granular sense, I wanted to provide a high-level overview there, but we are certainly happy to follow up with that if you would like more safety-focused data on either program. With that, that is everything. I know we are the very last item, so I do not want to linger too long, and I would like to yield the floor back now to you, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much for this opportunity, and Chris and I stand ready for questions.

Chair Watts:

Alright, thank you so much for the presentation. We have a question from Vice Chair Nguyen.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

Hi there. Thank you so much—and thank you for your patience with this morning of information. You probably noticed that in some of the previous presentations they made various—maybe not specific, but policy recommendations. Is there anything that you are seeing as a part of this program—or any of the other things that you are tackling there that have been successful—that you believe could be emulated across the state or supported?

Mr. Gresh:

Thank you, Vice Chair Nguyen, for the question. I would need to take a little time, I think, to consider what we might want to—we are so small here in Carson City, and we would never want to speak for another part of the state as far as what might work for you. Though we are happy to have more of those conversations, if you would like. Chris, I do not suppose there is any part of this that you would maybe want to highlight? Otherwise, Vice Chair, I am certainly happy to come back and talk about what policy recommendations we might have, if any. But, Chris, do you have anything?

Chris Martinovich, Manager, Transportation Division, Public Works, Carson City:

Yes, thank you. I wanted to note that one of the successful programs that we see at the voluntary Complete Streets donation that people in Carson City can make that $2 donation on their vehicle registration. We are able to use that and leverage that for matching some of our federal grants. It is a small dollar amount for Carson City, but it is a local source that we can match federal grants with. We have used that for planning studies and some other activities. Continuing that or making that more solid through the state is something that we have been successful and appreciate that opportunity in the state law. Thank you.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

I guess my other question—thank you for that. Do you have—when you are looking at your Complete Streets program, and you are looking at some of the—you highlighted some of those areas that you have been working on. What kind of metrics do you utilize on the back end to show the success of increased bike lanes or any of the things that go into the overall mission that you are arranging these projects around?

Mr. Martinovich:

Yes, thank you. We do track our data. Cameron provided a summary of—a spotlight of—the most recent data, but we have been tracking our Complete Streets data on those major corridors—North Carson, South Carson, Downtown, and East William—for a number of years, and we can see the trends increase over time. We report that through the Carson Area MPO, through our annual Network Monitoring Report. We are not only tracking pedestrian and bicycle usage, but we are tracking population changes; we are tracking age changes of the population, and we have seen those metrics change over the last decade and beyond. We use that data to inform—what are we going to do about projects and where. Yes, we have that data; we have tracked that data, and we can report that data as to how these projects are successful over time.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

Do you know of any other jurisdictions that have a similar project, and if they carry the same metrics?

Mr. Martinovich:

I believe many agencies track data. I cannot speak to specifics—how they report that data, but I think it is relatively common. I know the Nevada Department of Transportation provides an annual report, and other agencies may provide that. I do not know any off the top of my head. Thank you.

Vice Chair Nguyen:

Thank you. I appreciate the presentation and the answers. Thank you.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. I am glad you brought up the state Complete Streets voluntary contribution made through the DMV. This has come up a few times in the past. I know that especially for a smaller municipality like Carson City, it is not a large amount of overall money, but it sounds like that is something that can be leveraged with matching funds for some of these grant applications or other federal dollars that are available. I wanted to confirm, first of all, that that understanding is correct. So, probably not enough to actually do a single project, but does help Carson City leverage some of those other funding opportunities that you mentioned in your presentation. Is that right?

Mr. Martinovich:

Mr. Chair, yes, that is correct. At a 95 percent federal to 5 percent local—even small dollars on the local level can leverage some federal dollars—yes.

Chair Watts:

Thank you. One of the things that has been brought to my attention is—I do not remember exactly when the Complete Streets program was put into place; it has been around for several decades now—and I think it has been $2 the entire time. While that does adjust with the population growth in registrations, that is not adjusted at all for the impacts of inflation over that time period. I think there has been some interest in seeing if—what level we could go to that folks would still be willing to—we would not get a decline in the number of people voluntarily making those contributions but might be able to get a bump in the amount that is coming through those. Five dollars, I think, is something that comes to mind that might be a nice round number that people might still be willing to contribute that could help get the revenues up to support Complete Streets projects across the state. I do not know if you have any thoughts that you would like to add on that, but I wanted to make sure that I note for the record that is something that has been brought up in a couple of conversations as a way to help support some of the initiatives, like those that you have laid out.

Mr. Martinovich:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do not think I have really anything to add. I appreciate your comments, and I appreciate the Legislature and you all considering that. Thank you.

Chair Watts:

All right, thank you. Members, any additional questions? All right, seeing none. Thank you so much for your time and your presentation today. We appreciate it.

Mr. Martinovich:

Thank you.

AGENDA ITEM IX—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Watts:

With that, we are going to move to our second period of public comment. If anyone would like to provide public comment by phone, please go ahead and dial in now and get prepared. If anyone would like to make public comment in Las Vegas or up in Carson City, please come forward now, and fill the chairs. We have one person here in Las Vegas. Thank you for sticking through with us today. Just a reminder to state and spell your name for the record before you begin.

Annie Houston, Previously Identified:

Hello, I am here not only as a concerned citizen, but as a motorcyclist and a parent who has endured the worst pain imaginable—the loss of a son. On December 17th—sorry, so I do not have to look down. On December 17, 2024, I lost my 20-year-old son in a motorcycle accident. He was 153 of 161 traffic fatalities in 2024. It was the worst day of my life—my family's life—and the tragedy could have been avoided if the driver who hit him had followed the traffic laws when turning left on a flashing yellow. Now I find myself deeply worried for my autistic son—who is a teen—and who wants to ride his electric scooter on the same streets. He deserves to navigate our city safely, just as every vulnerable road user does. What I have heard today mostly speaks to what the vulnerable road users will be required to do to protect themselves or what they have been doing wrong and very little

about what can be done to educate the main driving population on the road when it comes to sharing the road with our vulnerable road users. Some families cannot afford traditional vehicles and rely on electric mobility. Some people have disabilities that keep them from operating traditional vehicles. We should not be punishing these demographics. And to the person who always says—or who is going to come out and say, "They can take the bus." Well, here in Vegas, buses get hit too. The concerns surrounding vulnerable road users are understandable, but they are not the root cause of the danger on our streets. I see many kids on traditional bikes doing the same reckless behavior that I did when I was young and that I am seeing on the road with these e-bikes and e-scooters. I also see many cars weaving in and out of traffic at a high rate of speed—which is the typical stigma of motorcycle riders—but they do not get noticed as much. The real crisis is the transportation system failing all vulnerable road users—this includes pedestrians, cyclists, motorcyclists, mobility for the disabled, and now e-bike/e-scooters—not because of the presence of new transportation options, but due to the reckless driving, excessive speeds, and infrastructure that prioritizes traditional vehicles over people. It seems as though everyone is concentrating on placing the blame on everyone but the traditional drivers on the road. The issue is not that there are more kids riding bikes, it is that their bikes are now a mix of standard and electric. The reckless behavior that they exhibit is the same as it was on traditional bikes.

Chair Watts:

Ms. Houston, if you could begin to wrap up your remarks, please.

Ms. Houston:

Yes.

Chair Watts:

Thank you.

Ms. Houston:

We must invest in the streets designed for safety. As of right now, I feel the painted bike lanes do not keep my child safe—or my family—from speeding cars. My husband is a road bike user and a motorcyclist, as am I. We fear—I fear more when he leaves the house on his road bike than I do the motorcycle. If the state shows— I will conclude it. Allowing lane filtering for motorcyclists is a major step forward, but if the state shows respect and concern for the motorcyclists by doing this on the road, then their constituents will follow. If you continue to view them negatively, the hatred and resilience to change will follow. Let us shift the conversation from blame to responsibility, from reaction to action. Of course, we need to understand that every life on the roads and sidewalks matter, and we really need to pay attention to all aspects—and honestly, the drivers really need more education. Thank you. (Agenda Item IX A)

Chair Watts:

Thank you so much. Okay, seeing no one else coming forward in Las Vegas, seeing no one coming forward in Carson City, AVH, would anyone like to provide public comment by phone?

AVH:

If you would like to provide public comment, please press *9 to take your place in the queue. Again, if you wish to provide public comment, press *9.

Dora Martinez, Previously Identified:

Hi, Chair. Good afternoon to you and Vice Chair and members of the Committee. This is Dora Martinez. I want to thank all of you—everyone who presented and made public comments. For those of you who know, I am blind, and I utilize sidewalks a lot and the buses. And I use a guide dog. I just hope that Mr. Sean Sever—and whoever is coming up with the bill draft request—that somehow people with disabilities will not be an afterthought and be included in composing that bill draft request—because we do utilize the sidewalk, as I said, and we go everywhere. I am so grateful that you guys did not stop the Zoom because I am walking right now to register to vote, and I hope that everyone will take an opportunity to go vote. I want to thank Washoe County for providing an ADA unit for—a cart/side units for people who are temporarily disabled—let us say they have surgery—they can call a number and a person, a manager—a voting poll manager—can wheel out that portable unit, and it is ADA accessible too. They can vote on the curb as well. So, please exercise, go vote, and thank you, Chair, for everything you do. Be safe and take care.

Chair Watts:

Thank you very much, Ms. Martinez—and appreciate the promotion for everyone to do their civic duty in the upcoming election. AVH, any other callers?

AVH:

Chair, the public line is open and working; we have no additional callers at this time.

Chair Watts:

Okay, thank you. That concludes our agenda for today. A couple of quick notes. This is the second to last meeting of this Committee for the interim. Our final meeting will be on August 18th, and during that meeting we will be considering potential bill draft requests and other recommendations coming out of this Committee—so that will be our action item agenda.

A couple of things that I want to note—we do have a Solicitation of Recommendations posted on our Committee website. If you just do a search for this Joint Interim Standing Committee on Growth and Infrastructure, you will find that Solicitation of Recommendations. Anybody that would like to bring up a potential idea for consideration can submit that, along with appropriate background information. We are asking that all of those submissions come in by Friday, July 17th, so that we can review them. Providing a recommendation does not guarantee that we will adopt it or bring it forward, but it does give us the opportunity to take any ideas into consideration that have not already been brought forward. Obviously, during the last five meetings we have looked at several issues related to: worker safety and corporate accountability for transportation projects; funding for transportation and mass transit; data centers and the impacts on electricity rates and clean energy standards; electric utility rates, regulations, and planning; and roadway and road-user safety. We will be continuing to look at those and remain in conversation with

presenters and other stakeholders on potential action items that we can take, including bill draft requests to make advances in some of those areas. Members, be on the lookout for follow-ups as we get those solicitations and begin to build an agenda for that final meeting. Thank you all for your time and participation so far. This meeting is adjourned.

The following public comment was received for inclusion in the record:

- Cheryll Acevedo, Loan Officer, All Western Mortgage, Inc. (Agenda Item IX B)
- Lu Anna Brown, Registered Respiratory Therapist, Boulder City Hospital (Agenda Item IX C)
- Robbin Lopez, Resident, Nevada (Agenda Item IX D)
- Tanya Deitrich, SCM, Community Manager, Prime Community Management (Agenda Item IX E)

AGENDA ITEM X—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 12:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Terese Martinez
Research Policy Assistant

_____

Keely Latham
Senior Policy Analyst

APPROVED BY:

_____

Assemblymember Howard Watts, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item III A-1	Jessica Begnal, President, Motorcycle Rights for Nevada (MR4NV) Jared Richards, Vice President, MR4NV, and CEO/Litigation Attorney, Full Throttle Law & Clear Counsel Law Group Dazzlin' Venturo, Instructor, Motorcycle Safety Foundation, Accident Scene Management, and Outreach Director, Full Throttle Law	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item III A-2	Jessica Begnal, President, MR4NV	Flyer/Handout
Agenda Item IV	Sean Sever, Chair, Nevada Advisory Committee on Traffic Safety (NVACTS), and Deputy Administrator, Research and Project Management, Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Todd Hartline, Law Enforcement Liaison, Nevada State Police, Office of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Safety Lacey Tisler, P.E., Member, NVACTS, and Chief Traffic Safety Engineer, Nevada's Department of Transportation	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item V	Brian Knudsen, Councilman, Ward 1, City of Las Vegas Dori Koren, Assistant Sheriff, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Michael Cunningham, Acting Director, Public Works, City of Las Vegas	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item VI A-1	Joe Colacurcio, Captain, Washoe County Sheriff's Office Adam Miller, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County Sheriff's Office	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VI A-2	Joe Colacurcio, Captain, Washoe County Sheriff's Office Adam Miller, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County Sheriff's Office	Report
Agenda Item VI A-3	Joe Colacurcio, Captain, Washoe County Sheriff's Office Adam Miller, Director, Government Affairs, Washoe County Sheriff's Office	Report
Agenda Item VII	Shayla Holmes, Director, Human Services, Lyon County Taylor Allison, Director, Emergency Management/Government Affairs, Lyon County	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item VIII	Cameron Gresh, Government Affairs Liaison/Public Information Officer, Carson City Chris Martinovich, Manager, Transportation Division, Carson City Public Works	Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation
Agenda Item IX A	Annie Houston, Resident, Las Vegas, Nevada	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX B	Cheryll Acevedo, Loan Officer, All Western Mortgage, Inc.	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX C	Lu Anna Brown, Registered Respiratory Therapist, Boulder City Hospital	Written Public Comment
Agenda Item IX D	Robbin Lopez, Resident, Nevada	Written Public Comment

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item IX E	Tanya Deitrich, SCM, Community Manager, Prime Community Management	Written Public Comment

The Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are available for viewing with a Nevada Legislature online account and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm.