

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eighty-Second Session  
March 28, 2023**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Selena Torres at 9:04 a.m. on Tuesday, March 28, 2023, Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023](http://www.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair  
Assemblywoman Bea Duran, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Max Carter  
Assemblyman Rich DeLong  
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva  
Assemblywoman Cecelia González  
Assemblyman Bert Gurr  
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts  
Assemblyman Gregory Koenig  
Assemblyman Richard McArthur  
Assemblyman Duy Nguyen  
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor  
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst  
Asher Killian, Committee Counsel  
Sarah Delap, Committee Counsel

Minutes ID: 623



Judi Bishop, Committee Manager  
Geigy Stringer, Committee Secretary  
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Juan Carlos Guardado, Community Organizer, Chispa Nevada  
Reuben Nwando, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Barry Cole, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Alicia Cruz, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Ivon Meneses, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Maria Navarrete, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Emily Woodall, Senior National Campaign Manager, Dream.org  
Cecelia Di Mino, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Janet Carter, Secretary, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club  
John D. Solomon, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Jollina Simpson, Grant and Policy Researcher, Make It Work Nevada  
Vanessa Dunn, representing Nevada Public Health Association  
Sarah Park, Private Citizen, North Las Vegas, Nevada  
Aaron Ibarra, representing Southern Nevada Building Trades Unions  
Patrick Donnelly, Nevada State Director, Center for Biological Diversity  
Juan Jose Lizarraga, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Daryl John Meier, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Jose Luis Chavez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Nour Benjelloun, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Estefania Rangel, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Angel Lazcano, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Victoria Flores, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Kassandra Lisenbee, Outreach and Program Coordinator, Great Basin Resource  
Watch  
Jiromi Peña Martinez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League  
Roberto Renteria, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Areli Sanchez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
David Arnold, Logistical Policy Associate, The Nature Conservancy  
Maria Reyes, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Jose Ramos Sanchez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Marisol Vizuet, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Olivia Tanager, Environmental Justice Program Manager, Progressive Leadership  
Alliance of Nevada  
Gerardo Velasquez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Tony Ramirez, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada  
Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber  
Chase Whittemore, representing Nevada Builders Alliance  
Nikki Bailey-Lundahl, Director of Government Affairs, Nevada Mining Association

Lindsay Knox, representing Nevada Home Builders Association; Builders Association of Northern Nevada; and Southern Nevada Home Builders Association

Andrew MacKay, Executive Director, Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association

Terry K. Graves, representing Nevada Trucking Association; and Nevada Manufacturing Association

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom

Bryan Wachter, Senior Vice President, Retail Association of Nevada

Alexis Motarex, Government Affairs, Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors of America

Glen Leavitt, Director, Government Affairs, Nevada Contractors Association

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

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Jim DeGraffenreid, National Committeeman, Nevada Republican Party

Misty Grimmer, representing State Contractor's Board

Joanne Leovy, representing Nevada State Medical Association

**Chair Torres:**

[Roll was taken. Committee rules were explained.] Welcome to the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, the hardest-working committee in the Nevada State Legislature.

I want to notify the Committee that there will be people testifying in the hearing who will need the services of translators. We will have translators who will be joining us by Zoom so the public can give testimony in their native language, and the translators will assist in the translation.

I will ask the translators, when that does occur, to please let us know if there are any additional communications that need to be sent out to members of the public. We will open up the hearing on Assembly Bill 312.

I will invite Assemblywoman Peters up.

To the members of the public: we will not need to translate the hearing, but some public comment may need to be translated into English to assist in the Committee members' understanding of the public and also to assist our secretaries in documenting the testimony appropriately.

I know there is probably someone who has coordinated the testimony in Spanish. If you have testimony available in written remarks, please send that immediately to our committee manager who can then send them to our interpreters. That aids their translation.

**Assembly Bill 312: Establishes provisions relating to environmental justice.  
(BDR 40-157)**

**Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24:**

Thank you, Madam Chair. I do believe my colleague, Juan Carlos Guardado, will be testifying in Spanish and require the translation, but that has been coordinated prior to the meeting. I am honored to present Assembly Bill 312 to you today. Assembly Bill 312 provides the framework for establishing a Commission on Environmental Justice and an associated environmental justice review process for proposed state regulations. I want to be clear from the get-go. Today, we are not proposing an environmental impact statement. Today, we are talking about environmental justice, which is steeped in the disproportionate impact of environmental pollution on historically underserved communities.

Can we talk for a minute about the difference between environmental quality and environmental justice? Environmental quality is a qualitative or data-driven assessment of the impact from a baseline of a natural resource. Typically, as an example, in a National Environmental Policy Act review process, assessments are conducted to predict the amount of air pollution that will be released over a period of time and to analyze the impact that will have on air quality and the receptors. Environmental justice is a concept that has been around since the '70s-ish. Many states have recognized environmental justice as an issue prior to the modern movement, and existing statutes in states such as Illinois have existed for decades. Recently, however, several states have introduced bills relating to environmental justice, including Colorado, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Washington, and California, to name a few.

What is environmental justice? Broadly, environmental justice refers to the disproportionate negative impacts of environmental hazards suffered by historically underserved communities. These communities include low-income and Black, Indigenous, and People of Color, or BIPOC, communities. Additionally, environmental benefits are often unequally distributed, resulting in limited access to clean air, outdoor spaces, and clean water for underserved communities. The environmental justice movement is about social justice, a recognition that without addressing the social determinants of health, historically underserved communities will continue to disproportionately shoulder the burden of environmental pollutants and be limited by access to the environmental benefits.

I hate this term "benefit" because really these are clean air and water and access to green and outdoor spaces, which should be considered a right of a community, not a benefit. You have all read the bill as introduced. However, today I would like to direct you to a very tardy amendment [[Exhibit C](#)]—and I apologize for that—that would revise the language in the following ways: The amendment ensures that the bill does three things. One, it creates an Environmental Justice Commission with authority to develop metrics to determine environmental justice communities and develop a regulatory process for environmental justice impact assessments with transparent and quantifiable metrics. Two, it creates a process for environmental justice impact assessment on regulations that may impact an identified environmental justice community. That is important—a specifically identified environmental justice community—not every regulation has the potential to do that. Three, it

gives authority for the Commission to pursue private and public funding to support a grant program for projects that benefit environmental justice communities.

The Environmental Justice Commission must be representative of communities that have been impacted by environmental injustices. These are listed on the amendment. Additionally, the Commission must have representation from industry that impacts historically underserved communities and scientists that can assist in identifying and quantifying the factors that result in the negative impacts. What is not on that list is a physician. I think, after hearing the testimony today, you will agree with me that we should have a physician or a representative from the health care community also on the Commission. It is important that the Commission makeup is representative of the demographics of the state to ensure diversity is upheld within the Commission's makeup. It is also important that there is representation from all parts of the state: rurals, Washoe, and Clark Counties.

The Environmental Justice Commission will be tasked with the development of two things. First, the definition and identification of environmental communities, and second, the environmental justice impact statement framework. The definition of environmental justice communities may be broader than the previously defined historically underserved communities which are now listed in the bill and should therefore be given its own definition. There are tools available both federally through the Environmental Protection Agency and developed by individual states that use data and set metrics to identify or screen for environmental justice communities, which can then be used to address the potential for impacts.

I would like to provide the Committee with some historical context around the state's existing review processes. Nevada has a small business impact statement process for reviewing regulations; we have had this for several—I do not know when it came up, but that has been in place for a very long time. More recently though, Senate Bill 347 of the 80th Session sponsored by the then Senate Minority Leader established a requirement for the hemp industry to provide proof that hemp crop management practices would not impact natural resources, and allows the State Department of Agriculture to assess whether the impacts are negatively affecting natural resources and assess a fine for those impacts.

I say this to assure you that this is not nearly the first time our body has addressed the need for ensuring state decisions do not inadvertently cause negative impacts on sensitive communities, specifically those that do not have large representative bodies, such as paid lobbyists and employed legal counsel.

The first step is to identify the communities that are most likely to be impacted by environmental injustices. Second, the Commission will be tasked to develop a framework for the environmental justice impact statements. The intention of this is to be similar to the current small business impact statement in that the Commission would define environmental justice communities and develop a screening process to identify whether proposed regulations met a criterion to be reviewed for environmental justice impacts. Upon

determination that the regulation would have such impacts, the impact statement would be prepared. This impact statement would likely have both quantitative and qualitative measures for which the regulations would be assessed. It is difficult to know what the metrics would look like from the outside. This is the importance of the Commission, to establish these metrics using experience and available science to screen for the potential of regulations being considered to impact environmental justice communities. Finally, for regulations that met the screening requirements, the Commission would develop a regulatory structure as necessary to define the process for how the impact statement should be prepared. Lastly, the Commission will be authorized to pursue private and public funding for a grant program that prioritizes projects that benefit environmental justice communities.

I would like now to ask my copresenters to speak more on the effects and impacts of environmental justice in our communities. I would like to start with Mr. Juan Carlos Guardado who has some lived experience in this area.

**Juan Carlos Guardado, Community Organizer, Chispa Nevada:**

I am a member of Chispa Nevada. I am going to speak in Spanish. But after that, you are going to have the translation for my story.

[Translated from Spanish by Sergio Morales, Interpreter] I arrived in the United States eight years ago, and after two years of staying here in the United States, I had respiratory issues. I went to see a doctor. The doctor asked me if I have ever suffered this respiratory issue before, and I said no, never. The doctor told me it was due to the high level of pollution in the city of Las Vegas. The doctor prescribed medication to control the asthma that I had developed. I am not the only case in the state of Nevada. There are so many people like me in this community, and I feel it is one of my duties to come before you to let you know what is going on exactly with my and other people's situation.

As we know, the state of Nevada has one of the highest levels of pollution. Last year, for instance, the state received the letter F. It also is one of the highest contaminated cities in the United States; it is number 12. The water levels, the reserves in the states of California and Nevada, are running down to 45 percent. In California, Arizona, Utah, and Mexico, the level of water is running low. Therefore, I believe if A.B. 312 is implemented, it will really help in the way the community will have a voice, and they will be able to say what the issues are. My concern is the air pollution and the water pollution, and I believe the Commission should take into consideration all of these issues before they act on it.

Passing A.B. 312 would be a very good, positive result. That will be something that will be really fair for this generation and also for the future generations. I believe it is important for you to take everything I have said into consideration. Thank you very much. [Written testimony was submitted [Exhibit D.](#)]

**Chair Torres:**

As a reminder to the interpreters, our interpreters are going to continue to stay online because I believe we are going to have some testimony on the bill in Spanish as well.

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

Thank you so much for providing interpretation today so that we have voices at the table, truly, who have not had the opportunity to be here previously.

During this last interim, I began talking with several doctors, and it came to my attention that the issue I see on the ground and the work I do in the advocacy for communities that are disproportionately impacted by environmental hazards and degradation is also of concern to the scientific community and to the medical health community. I have a couple of folks here today who are working in this space and have identified these issue areas. This is important because it speaks to the economic qualifier of the impacts that environmental justice has on our communities. These are people who are suffering from asthma, who are triaging their children suffering from asthma or diabetes. These are people who live in cancer clusters and have lost their livelihoods and their jobs. That is an economic loss that has yet to be quantified, the impacts that environmental degradation has had on our communities. I would like to ask that Mr. Reuben Nwando speak a little bit to the work he is doing at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), and then ask that Dr. Barry Cole speak a little bit to the impact of environmental degradation on psychiatry.

**Reuben Nwando, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

Hello everybody. My name is Reuben Nwando. I am a medical student at the UNR School of Medicine, and I am also part of the Nevada Clinicians for Climate Action. We are a group that comes together, and we talk about some of the things we need to do to create change, like educating the people around us.

I wanted to start off by talking about some of the issues that we have studied through our articles. This first article here is in *The New England Journal of Medicine*. Here, it says 8.7 million people die worldwide because of fossil fuel-generated particulate air pollution, and the total number of deaths attributable to climate change is not even known. Some of the other things that really stood out to me in this article talked about air pollution and climate change causing exacerbated conditions, heat-related illnesses, cardiovascular respiratory disease, allergic conditions, and so on and so forth. With that being said, although nearly everyone is affected, to some extent, health consequences are distributed inequitably. Owing to economic injustice and systemic racism, low-income communities and certain racial and ethnic groups often experience the greatest harm despite their contributing the least to greenhouse gas emissions, which is not fair in the slightest.

In this second article that we looked over, it was pretty impactful hearing that COVID-19 killed nearly 200,000 Americans. Black and Indigenous and Latinx Americans are three times more likely to die of COVID-19 than whites. In 23 states, there were 3.5 times more cases among American Indian and Alaska Native communities than in white communities. I do not know if that makes sense to you, but I just want you to know that. This is definitely something that—in the medical community, we are trying to create a culture where this is talked about a lot more in the clinics and in the lecture halls. [Testifier submitted [Exhibit E](#), which was not discussed.]

**Barry Cole, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am also with Nevada Clinicians for Climate Action. This is my alternate identity when I am not freelancing. I am not officially representing the group, but I am here representing the ideas of the group. I know you all are laughing and [spoke in Spanish] so we can get that translated later.

I am here more because I have been a psychiatrist all over the United States. For three years, I left Nevada. I went to a place in Arkansas where they would crop dust literally on my building where I was seeing my patients. It scared me because the plane would literally swoop down, spray the field in front of my office, and then rise up when it got to my children's elementary school. I was asked by the Presbyterian minister, How come we have such a high cancer rate in this community? I am thinking, Have you looked outside recently? Did you inhale when you went outside recently? Because if it is crop dusting season, you probably should not be inhaling. I always wondered what was going through the mind of the man holding the umbrella who would be shifting 10 or 15 feet with each pass of the crop duster. That person was being saturated with whatever was being dumped and had nothing but a common umbrella over his head. That is crop dusting. I often thought that would be a fun job—if you got to fly the airplane.

As a physician, what concerns me is that I have lived my life as the beneficiary, I guess you would say, of white privilege. I got where I am because it was really easy. I went to Berkeley; I went to medical school; I did a residency; I have lived wherever I wanted, and I never thought twice about what was in the creek behind my house. I have never had to think about the power station that was way, way far away. But I know other people have. The patients who I took care of one year ago in Flagstaff, Arizona, did not have running water. They did not have electricity; they did not have paved roads; they did not have flush toilets; and even worse, the only source of heat would be the wood they could chop and burn so that even in their homes there was a lot of ash and smoke. In the summertime, there was no way to cool off because they did not have air conditioning.

Now, why did that matter to a psychiatrist? I prescribe meds called antipsychotic medications. That is what helps a schizophrenic or bipolar hopefully get back to normal, and the problem was those meds interfere with body temperature regulation. Now I have to factor into my care plan not only their mental illness and the way the meds work, but to also accept that I would have to think about their environmental consequences. When I look at the populations that could be medically adversely impacted by the next construction plan, whatever it may be, I have to think about everything: from a small child to a mother who could be carrying a child, to someone who is postpartum, to some older person like me. We are all being impacted by what is going on around us.

I am really excited about studying it because the one thing I have learned in medicine is when we study things, we understand them, and then we can actually effect change. I am up here supporting A.B. 312 because I think this is the front door to understanding what the issues are, who has been impacted already, and how we stop impacting them going forward. We all know the expression, "not in my backyard," or NIMBY. Who wants a power plant in



their backyard? Who wants a transfer station for garbage in their backyard? It is going in somebody's backyard; that is pretty much assured. The question is, How do we do it in the least impactful way? I hope you will give consideration to A.B. 312 and see it as the beginning of what will evolve for years to come after I am long gone. On the continuum of newlywed to nearly dead, guess which end I am on. Hopefully it will not be too soon, but I am a realist.

**Chair Torres:**

Thank you, Dr. Cole, for coming. It is great to see the many different alter egos of Dr. Cole. Assemblywoman Peters, does that conclude the presentation?

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

Yes. We stand for questions.

**Chair Torres:**

At this time, I will open it up for any questions. Members, go ahead and begin.

**Assemblyman Nguyen:**

Thank you, panel and my distinguished colleague, Assemblywoman Peters, for this excellent presentation. I know it is going to come up, and I want to give you an opportunity to address it. My question is, What do you think about lawsuits that may be impending or folks that say this is going to slow down the agencies or permitting? What kind of effects will the creation of this Commission have on the economy?

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

In its original draft, Assembly Bill 312 may have resulted in consequences related to establishing a regulatory process. However, we are bringing that into a narrower scope with the amendment—or the intention is to. I am not a lawyer; I work in the expertise world. In the expertise world, what we would do is offer comments on regulations. This body, the Environmental Justice Commission, would look at regulations in the context of what has been agreed upon—transparent metrics—to determine whether that regulation would have a disproportionate impact on an identified environmental justice community. If that regulation would have an impact, that information would then be given to the entity proposing the regulations. The entity proposing regulations would then have an opportunity to think critically about that impact.

One of the things I know from working with the State is, there are quite a few white people who live in Carson City—that is not a group of people who have the experience of the diversity of our state. Therefore, when we expect them to draft regulations that affect the entire community of our state—a diverse community—I do not think it is fair to expect them to be able to identify the nuances between North Las Vegas versus more a southern area or the Las Vegas Strip, or Washoe County's needs versus Elko's needs. It is their job to try. Pulling this Commission together gives them an opportunity to hear from the voices of those who are historically impacted, from those who work in this world, such as physicians or scientists who can offer suggestions on how to reduce those impacts so that we have a more

equitable spread of the burden of our decisions at the state and mitigate those potential impacts.

Would it result in lawsuits? This bill does not give authorization for lawsuits. It does give an opportunity to consider those impacts in a different way than we currently do.

**Assemblyman DeLong:**

I actually have two questions, if I may. The first is, is environmental justice defined in statute?

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

Not at the moment in Nevada, but it is in several other states.

**Assemblyman DeLong:**

Is there a plan to incorporate that into statute?

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

That is a really good question. I have been thinking about this since last session when we defined "historically underserved communities." As I described in the previous response, it is very difficult for me to feel integrity in trying to define something that I do not live daily. Putting the burden of that definition on an Environmental Justice Commission, which is supposed to be made up of people who represent the diverse body of the state, allows them the flexibility of defining that in regulations and defining it around the communities that would be impacted by the definition. Instead of having it in statute, we would have it be a living document that could be designed to identify the needs as we grow as a state and hopefully reduce the impacts that have historically burdened these communities.

**Assemblyman DeLong:**

With regards to environmental justice definition, that seems such a fundamental part of what you are talking about. It is the responsibility of the Legislature to establish that and then regulations that come from that.

My second question is, most of the testimony here has been about air quality issues whether it be diesel particulate matter or carbon dioxide greenhouse gasses. Rather than a study, why not propose more stringent air quality standards that, in the case of Clark County, the Clark County Air Quality Management District would implement versus having Carson City do a study?

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

Air quality is an indicator. It is one of the most heavily studied because we know what lung health looks like, and the impacts on lung health affect other parts of your body. We see higher rates of cardiovascular disease in people who have exposure to PM 2.5 and PM 10. That is a result of the exposure in the lungs. It is just a single indicator, but it is easier to identify those health impacts and those personal impacts. Because of the density of the population in our state—in Las Vegas which has, as we heard, not great air quality and

exceeds standards in many cases—the population density of those impacted down there just provided a body that allows for that discussion to happen here.

I can give you this definition from the National Caucus of Environmental Legislators. They say that environmental justice occurs when all people, regardless of race, gender, socioeconomic status, or national origin have meaningful involvement. Sorry, that is environmental justice. The injustice piece is this: Environmental injustice is the disproportionate exposure of BIPOC communities in low socioeconomic status to pollution and poor quality of life through inequitable environmental protection laws, regulations, and practices. It is not just air quality. It is the decisions that are being made to allow for pollutants to enter into our environment. We see that in our rural communities and groundwater contamination. The Erin Brockovich story is a very famous story of exactly that impact: the state did not do their due diligence to ensure that populations were taken care of, and it took a cancer cluster, people dying, children dying, for the state to react. It often takes the federal government getting involved.

This Environmental Justice Commission, while it may not heal those historic impacts, can keep us from making decisions that inadvertently impact already disproportionately affected communities. That is where the priority is. It is not just in air quality standards; it is in affecting our water quality; it is in affecting the way that we run our buses or our waste management transportation, or where we place electric vehicle charging stations to reduce the potential for diesel-generated emissions in communities that are already affected by air quality issues. Those are all decisions that we make at the State, that we set regulations for, and that we make decisions on, and those deserve to be looked at through a lens that includes people at the table who have historically been impacted. To your point, Assemblyman DeLong, it does not get to the historic injustices. That is a separate issue.

**Assemblywoman Thomas:**

I think this is a long time coming, so I do appreciate the presentation and the bill. My question has to do with the conceptual amendment [[Exhibit C](#)] and section 10 of the bill.

We heard in the bill presentation that this has a lot to do with people who have been underserved and have been in communities that have high pollution because of where they are and how the cities have not taken care of them.

Looking at the conceptual amendment, at what the Commission would be made of, the nine people who will be comprising the Commission, I do not see where the Black community is in it. We know the area that I live in, North Las Vegas, Assembly District 17, is not affected as much as Assembly District 7 or Assembly District 6, which is the historic west side. We know for a fact that community has been neglected for years, and a lot of the residents are driving older vehicles that have emissions not conducive to the air quality that we are entitled to and deserve.

My question is a personal one because in the last few months, I was diagnosed with adult asthma. How did that happen? It is something to lose your breath just to be able to walk

across a street. I wonder how many other people of my hue have experienced this. I think they should be represented in this Commission because it affects us, because we have been underserved for many, many, many years.

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

Thank you for the question, and this gets down to legalese. Your Committee Counsel may be able to weigh in. We attempt to pull in our BIPOC communities, particularly those in Las Vegas, in two ways: first, by expressing that the makeup of the Commission be reflective of the diversity of Nevada which is, in my understanding, one of the ways we in our body look at ethnic representation or representation from different diverse communities. Secondly, through the first bullet point [[Exhibit C](#)], "Two representatives from census tracts with poor air quality as identified by the Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool." Additionally, we require that five members be "living in Clark County." With those three metrics in place, it is highly probable that the folks who would be appointed would be Black and from those communities that you identified, or at least several of them. It is a nine-person Commission. When you are talking about sharing experience, it is not a lot, and I recognize that. But nine people coming to a decision on whether standards are meeting the criteria necessary for the State to be able to establish a baseline of environmental justice that should be held to a standard, that is enough people to be able to come to a consensus.

I am open to suggestions on what the Commission makeup should be, and I have shared this with my colleagues who have all been helping on this Commission and this bill. I live steeped in white privilege, and it is not my place to know exactly who should be on this Commission, so I am more than open to hearing ideas or suggestions on how to build it better. But that was how we attempted to get at the populations that you expressed.

**Chair Torres:**

Assemblywoman Thomas brings up a unique point. I have had similar conversations about different legislation this session. One of the things that stakeholders brought to me was to consider diversity in legislation, adding a section that requires, in the appointment process, a consideration of the cultural diversity as well. Maybe we can add language to strengthen the Commission; that would probably meet the request of the Assemblywoman. Members, are there additional questions?

**Assemblyman Hibbetts:**

My questions are more procedural. I am reading both the bill and the conceptual amendment and nowhere in here am I seeing anything about how often this Commission will meet. Is it weekly, quarterly, once a year, or is this envisioned to be a new full-time commission?

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

I am glad you brought this up because I think one of the most important pieces in this bill is the standard for a daily rate. We have an \$80-per-meeting rate for members of the Commission. I am going to put that on hold for a moment while I answer your specific question.

It is going to be cost-limited because we have the requirement to pay the members of the Commission. They could meet as often as how much we can pay them, how much we can budget for. I have not identified what that number looks like. Additionally, the requirement to review regulations makes it more complicated to set those dates. We see this with the State Environmental Commission and with the Mining Oversight Accountability Commission; we see it in a variety of areas where their job is to review regulations. It will be fleshed out as we look at the budget and also as we look at the need for that review process as the state moves forward with regulations.

About the \$80: when we are talking about communities of color and socioeconomically disparaged communities, trying to bring them to a meeting for free in a volunteer capacity to discuss their lived experience is degrading. It is demeaning. Please tell us about your lived experience for free so that we can benefit from it by making better legislation. That is not fair. By ensuring we are paying members of this Commission, we are offering them value for their service to the State, which to me is more important, really, than many aspects of this bill.

**Assemblyman Hibbetts:**

Thank you for bringing that up because that dovetails into my second question. According to the bill—and I am not saying that I disagree that members be paid up to \$80 per day plus per diem—there is nothing in here that describes how that is going to be funded. Is that going to come out of the budget of the office or is there some sort of a funding stream that I am not seeing here?

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

That is a great question. It has yet to be determined.

**Chair Torres:**

I am sure this bill will be seeing the Ways and Means Committee as well.

**Assemblywoman Taylor:**

To our colleague Assemblywoman Peters and to all of you who are here, thank you for sharing your story. Mr. Juan Carlos Guardado spoke a little bit about other states. What does this look like in other states? Are there other states with similar commissions? Can you give us an idea how many states have it or do not?

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

I wish I had those numbers in front of me. I sent several commissions from many states to the Legislative Counsel Bureau for the drafting of this in an attempt to get to something representative. The initial draft did not include any of those suggestions and representation. There are, as I named earlier, several states that in 2021 and 2022 were standing up environmental commissions that look very similar to our own. Those states include Colorado, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Washington, and California. Many of those include environmental justice commissions. Potentially not all of them include that, but they have

some kind of environmental justice review process proposed in legislation. I did not follow up on whether those have been approved in those states, but I can tell you that they are disproportionately carried by Democrats too.

**Assemblyman Carter:**

My question is more about how this gets applied. We hear about regulation. What I see as a big problem is the application. For example, the Interstate 11 (I-11) corridor, the Department of Transportation (NDOT) made sure it was routed around Boulder City. They are now going to route I-11, a truck corridor, instead of circumventing the valley like most metropolitan communities do with high traffic. They are routing it right down the Interstate 95 corridor through the most densely populated section of Las Vegas and arguably some of the highest densities of minority communities. Would this Commission have the power or the ability to say to organizations like NDOT, Hey, check yourselves because you need to look at the bigger picture here.

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

I love this question because it brings up a really great example of how we are already experiencing areas where this thought process would better the decisions being made by state decision makers. However, the current iteration of this is limited to regulations. Therefore, if those decisions are being made based on regulations, those regulations could be commented on by the Commission. If they are existing regulations, they would not go through the process presented here.

Maybe that is a suggestion for an amendment—to review existing regulations and to provide comment on decisions being made to represent the interests of environmental justice communities. But we have to stand it up first. We have to stand it up and get the people in place and have the process begin before we can expect them to become anything more. We have got to get it going. I love the idea, and long term I think it is of great benefit to the state to have a voice, a body, that can say, Hey, the little guys did not get a voice in this, so let us talk about the impacts here. But quantify it in a transparent way so it is not individuals and public comment talking about their experience or their concerns; that it is a Commission the State has designated as the authority on these issues that has a process in place to identify the impacts and suggest mitigations for those impacts. I love the idea, but it is not entirely what we are getting at in this bill to date; it gives a mechanism for that future work.

**Chair Torres:**

Thank you, members. Are there any additional questions? Seeing none, we will go ahead into testimony.

Members of the public, we will take 30 minutes in support, 30 minutes in opposition, and 30 minutes in neutral. I will allow opposition to figure out, if there are specific stakeholders who are of interest, who among them want to express their concerns; they can do so at that time. As much as possible, I will not cut people off. We are going to start with individuals wishing to testify in support of A.B. 312. We are going to bounce back and forth between Carson City, Las Vegas, and phone callers if there are any.

Is there anyone wishing to testify in support? Remember, those in the public wishing to testify, to talk on this bill, make sure that you are coming up in support. I know we have a lot of folks here for whom it may be their first time testifying. I want to make sure that the process is really clear for those individuals. If you are here to testify in support, you can come up at this time. We will have public comment at the end, but that public comment is not for us to rehear bills. Make sure, if you are wishing to testify in support, you are coming up at this time. We will go ahead and open up for support. It is 9:58 a.m. When you are ready, you may begin.

**Alicia Cruz, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

[As translated by Sol Garza, Interpreter] I am a member of Make the Road Nevada. I am here to express my thoughts on A.B. 312. As someone who has lived in this state for many years, I have seen at firsthand how the environment is affecting our health. We need regulations to help the earth if we want it to be able to fight this environmental crisis. People like me are risking their health, and there are many communities that do not end up surviving. With these high temperatures that sometimes reach a high of 127 degrees, this affects climate change, extreme heat, our clean air, and also the water we drink. The state of Nevada needs a team that can counsel the leaders of our state on environmental issues since there needs to be science and data to fight this climate change that we have not been able to stop before. In general terms, A.B. 312 is a law that has been proposed for the government that would legitimize environmental justice and establish regulations to be able to help our Mother Earth. Please listen to our community. We need environmental action now. Thank you for your time.

**Chair Torres:**

Thank you, Ms. Garza, for helping with the translation. To our audience here in Carson City and in Las Vegas, I am going to request that anyone wishing to testify in Spanish provide any written remarks and make sure you get them to the Committee staff so we can send them to the interpreters ahead of time; that would really help in their translation. [Reiterates in Spanish] This ensures that the translation comes through a little bit quicker. At this time, I am going to hear the remaining two in Las Vegas.

**Ivon Meneses, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am a volunteer for Chispa Nevada. I want to thank you for allowing me to be here to testify. I had my son 18 years ago, and three months later he developed asthma. I took him to the hospital because he could not breathe. They told me he had asthma. I was told it was going to be temporary, but throughout his life he had a lot of episodes of asthma attacks, to the point where he was almost ready to be intubated, and many trips to the hospital. I could see that he got worse when he was at school because he was taking the school bus.

I figured out there was something wrong with the pollution. Now that he is 18, he moved to another state, and he got better from his asthma. Every time he comes up to Nevada, he gets those asthma attacks. I am pretty sure it is because we have high contamination; we have pollution here in the state. Now I know how he feels because two years ago I developed asthma myself, and it is pretty hard to breathe; sometimes I feel like I will pass out. I do not

feel good when I have those episodes. Many times I think, Now I know how my little baby was suffering from not being able to breathe. It is very frightening to have those asthma attacks.

I am here because I want to support A.B. 312, which will create a state commission on climate justice. I know from experience that a lot of Latino families live in areas that are highly polluted; they pay more in their energy bills and gas, and maybe they do not have access to clean energy. We deserve to be part of this process and take all these decisions to the Commission that will create this project of law and make it a priority. This is a priority for Chispa Nevada, which is in support of this law.

**Maria Navarrete, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am an organizer with Make the Road Nevada, and I am here to support A.B. 312. During my time organizing, I have been given the opportunity to listen to members of community who are extremely affected by the climate effect. In the state of Nevada, it is common that underserved communities such as Latin and BIPOC communities are disproportionately impacted by poor air quality and pollution exposure. The state of Nevada needs a Commission that will set regulations in place to protect these underserved communities across the state. East Las Vegas is known to be right in the center of the largest urban heat island in the valley. This affects our community in drastic measure. Assembly Bill 312 gives the opportunity to community members to potentially take part in environmental policies and allow us to fix what we can prevent in the future. I urge the Government Affairs Committee to listen to our communities and move forward with A.B. 312.

**Chair Torres:**

We will come back to Carson City.

**Emily Woodall, Senior National Campaign Manager, Dream.org:**

I am representing Dream.org in support of A.B. 312. Dream.org works to ensure that all communities benefit from the shift to a clean energy economy. The communities that have been systemically underserved are able to maximize the benefits generated by the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 dollars. With the amendment to allow the Commission to accept gifts, grants, awards, donations, and federal funding, Nevada will ensure that no money is left on the table.

The impacts of climate change are exacerbated in communities that have historically seen a lack of infrastructure and climate resiliency investments such as North Las Vegas, tribal communities across the state, and many of Nevada's rural communities. Dream.org envisions a Commission on Environmental Justice created by A.B. 312 to create community involvement and spur economic development, ensuring that the state's most under-invested-in communities have the opportunity to receive funding. With the Commission on Environmental Justice, Nevada would begin to implement neighborhood-level, climate-ready projects that would significantly improve the health of its citizens and drive local job growth and resiliency.



Dream.org can also provide technical assistance to the Commission or potential subgrantees in applying for and accessing these funding opportunities. We have submitted a full letter of support as well [\[Exhibit F\]](#) and want to thank you for your consideration. Thank you to the bill sponsor for bringing this important piece of legislation forward.

**Cecelia Di Mino, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am here as a constituent in support of [A.B. 312](#). I grew up in East Las Vegas, near Russell and Interstate 95, with a power plant in my backyard, and I do have asthma today. I am newly relocated back home to Nevada, and I am so excited to see this kind of initiative proposed. Community-based practices are by far more effective and efficient than those that are top-down. It makes me proud to see Nevada thinking in terms of sustainability and community sovereignty. I think this kind of mindset is going to ultimately put our state ahead of others. It shows we are able to learn lessons from other states that failed to enact accountability, failed to incorporate community and experts' voices, and failed at environmental justice, ultimately suffering extensive socioeconomic damage.

**Janet Carter, Secretary, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:**

You have heard a lot about adult asthma today. I am suffering a little bit from something like that, so please bear with my voice. On behalf of the Sierra Club, which is the world's largest environmental volunteer organization, and our more than 30,000 members and supporters statewide, I am speaking in support of [A.B. 312](#).

We know that every Nevadan deserves the right to live in a clean and healthy environment, regardless of his race, his income, or his Zip Code. We also know that disadvantaged communities suffer from the effects of pollution and climate change far more than other groups, and our two major urban areas are the fastest-warming in the country, and their residents are often subject to intolerable heat and air pollution. As you have heard earlier, these lead to pollution-related diseases such as asthma. Asthma rates are skyrocketing in these areas, especially among the most vulnerable of our population—our children—and we need to protect them better.

This Environmental Justice Commission established by this legislation would include representation from across the state and from the communities and the tribes most affected by climate change. The Commission would allow increased community engagement on environmental issues that affect these groups and give them the opportunity to advocate for themselves for just solutions that allow them to have access to clean air and water, healthy food, adequate transportation, and to live safe and healthy lives. It is time Nevada moves forward and protects all of our residents against environmental racism and injustice. For these reasons, the Sierra Club strongly supports this bill. We thank in particular Assemblywoman Peters for giving the people of Nevada a voice on this very important issue. Thank you for your time and consideration.

**John D. Solomon, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I am a member of Faith in Action, and my faith is the inspiration for this testimony. This bill was written to make sure communities that historically have had their environmental needs

ignored, do not anymore. This bill does not attempt to fix the environmental problems that exist already but stops our government from making things worse. That is always the first step in making things better.

I suffer from chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), and generally someone with this disease can arrest or at least slow down the symptoms by walking regularly. Since I am a politically active person, I decided to spend a lot of time during the last election canvassing, which involves doing a lot of walking in all the neighborhoods in my Assembly district. Some neighborhoods were a lot more pleasant than others in terms of the environment—the temperature and the air quality—and some neighborhoods would leave me coughing and wheezing by the end of the canvass. These neighborhoods were always the neighborhoods where people of color lived. The interactions with the people were always pleasant no matter the neighborhood, but the physical environment was always more stressful, unhealthy, and challenging in the neighborhoods of color. The freeway or other major arterial streets were always close, and the background sound was always too loud to hear birds. I realize urban environments are loud, but they were always louder in these neighborhoods. The air was always worse, as I can attest because my COPD makes me a human air quality monitor.

We need to be able to protect the water on our Native American reservations, or soon there will be no reservations with potable water. Until our government learns to treat everyone equally, we as a society never will. It is obvious that we ignore the basic needs of some people because they do not live in a neighborhood full of NIMBYs with political clout. That is my neighborhood. It is an important part of my faith that all people are a blessing, and we need our government to start treating people as such, no matter the color of their skin or economic status. Thank you for your time and consideration.

**Chair Torres:**

We are going to stop there. We are going to go back to Las Vegas. I want to let people know that we have received written testimony. I do not believe the interpreters have received them just yet. They are actually already translated, so that should be very helpful for the translation. For anybody wishing to testify in Spanish, do not worry, we are still working on it. [Reiterates in Spanish.] We will make sure you all have the time to participate today. We are going to go back to Las Vegas, and then we will come back to Carson City.

**Jollina Simpson, Grant and Policy Researcher, Make It Work Nevada:**

I am testifying in support of A.B. 312. Seeking to establish an Environmental Justice Commission is a social and civil rights movement to address the unfair exposure of poor and marginalized communities. Make It Work Nevada is a state-based advocacy organization that wants to influence the mainstream and cultural conversations to shift the narrative towards the needs and voices of women of color and working poor women, with a particular focus on Black women and their families. As you have heard, Nevada is failing our communities. Black and Brown families bear the weight of the disproportionate effect of environmental justice in our bodies.

Additionally, we need more metrics in order to supply our communities with the health and well-being they need and deserve to be active and working people in our state. I want to thank Assemblywoman Peters for bringing this bill forward, and I want to thank the speakers for sharing their very important stories. Make It Work Nevada urges the Committee to make the intentional choice, not only to listen, but to hear and to feel the needs of our communities by supporting A.B. 312.

**Chair Torres:**

Next in Las Vegas. [Interrupts testimony in Spanish.] Translators, have you already received a copy of the testimony? [Translators had not. Chair explains delay to testifier in Spanish.] Next testimony. [Chair again explains interpretation-related delay to next testifier.] I have Committee staff there in Las Vegas who can assist in making sure testimony has been submitted to the translators. It really is going to help the process of translation. I am going to come back to Las Vegas. We are going to Carson City, but we will come back to Las Vegas shortly. Go ahead in Carson City.

**Vanessa Dunn, representing Nevada Public Health Association:**

Nevada Public Health Association would like to offer their support on Assembly Bill 312. Thank you so much for your time.

**Sarah Park, Private Citizen, North Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am with the Sunrise Movement's Las Vegas hub, and the Nevada Environmental Justice Coalition. I am testifying in support of A.B. 312 because of the implications this bill will have for vulnerable communities. I am a senior at Clark High School and I am an incoming freshman at Harvard, but firstly, I am in high school, and I am currently missing school because I feel the issue this bill touches on is extremely important.

This bill will empower historically marginalized communities by giving them more autonomy to make choices regarding environmental justice. After this bill, communities will be able to take part in the policymaking process through the Commission on Environmental Justice. As others have said before in introducing this bill, this bill requires the agency to inform and consult these underserved communities and utilize their viewpoints to develop regulations. This is important because in Nevada, as we have heard before, underserved communities are disproportionately impacted by environmental issues because their neighborhoods are closer to pollutants, and residents in these communities have a higher risk of developing health conditions. If this bill is passed and the Commission is created, communities can make their voices heard to ensure their right to a safe environment. Overall, I urge the passage of this bill.

**Aaron Ibarra, representing Southern Nevada Building Trades Unions:**

I am here in support of this bill. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health created a study in 2016 that listed the occupations that are most at risk when it comes to the detrimental effects of climate change. Unfortunately, construction workers were at the top of that list. One of our jobs in Southern Nevada Building Trades Unions is to make sure our workers are safe when it comes to their working conditions. That becomes a very daunting

task when just going outside and doing their job puts them at a higher risk of having detrimental health effects in the future.

I believe this bill is a stepping stone to creating a Commission that will ensure we have people at the table who will give our perspective and pass laws in the future that will hopefully help reduce some of these risks to our members and to other folks in the community whom I know are also affected by these negative effects of climate change.

**Patrick Donnelly, Nevada State Director, Center for Biological Diversity:**

The Center for Biological Diversity does support this bill, but you have heard support from frontline community members, and those are really the important voices here. I instead wanted to take my two minutes to address some myths about this bill, with regard to the environmental justice impact statement.

This is a bill of disclosure, not of mandated action. It requires that agencies disclose the impacts of new regulations—regulations only—on environmental justice communities. It does not mandate an environmental impact statement like California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). A CEQA environmental impact report can be thousands of pages long. This environmental justice impact statement is modeled very closely on the small business impact statement, which is typically several pages long and is a disclosure by agencies of the impacts of regulations on small business. It is a very similar mechanism in this bill.

What this bill does not do is create powers of litigation. I am speaking to you as the group who sues; we are the ones filing the lawsuits, and I am telling you right now this bill does not give us any new avenues for litigation. As I said, the language for the environmental justice impact statement is almost identical to the language already in statute about the small business impact statement. We did an extensive search of case history in Nevada. No one has ever sued over the small business impact statement. There is not an independent cause of action in statute for that lawsuit. Similarly, this bill does not provide an independent cause of action for litigation over the environmental justice impact statement.

Additionally, the environmental justice impact statement applies only to regulations, not to specific projects. For instance, if someone is going to permit a mine or a highway, this bill would not apply to that permitting process. It is only for regulatory impact. Because of those reasons, it is very clear this bill will not cause an avalanche of litigation or anything like that. We urge you to support it.

**Chair Torres:**

I would like to ask the interpreters whether you have received the copies of the testimony at this time. [They had.] The testimony from Make the Road Nevada has already been received, for anybody wishing to testify in Spanish. [Reiterates in Spanish.] We are receiving the ones from Chispa as well. [Reiterates in Spanish.]

I would like to let the public know that we will extend the testimony in support because of those technical difficulties by another 15 minutes. I will let the opposition have an additional

15 minutes, if desired, to ensure that this is a fair hearing, and everyone has an opportunity to participate. When you are ready, I am going to go to Las Vegas, and we will come back to Carson City.

**Juan Jose Lizarraga, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am here as a volunteer for Chispa Nevada. One of my biggest concerns is, as a father of an 8-year-old, I have seen that there are more conditions that are affecting certain demographics in the city, especially respiratory conditions. That is why I am here in support of A.B. 312, especially because I feel this is the right time to create a council of environmental justice that can actually have the technical capacities to provide advice to all the unfortunate families that live in certain areas of the city where the smog can really create problems for the future generations.

**Daryl John Meier, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I voluntarily represent myself with respect to the greater Las Vegas community. I am a 31-year-old Las Vegas-born local. I am in support of A.B. 312. This day presents another opportunity to improve living conditions for us all, the people of the planet and animals. Where would we be if this land that we call home is polluted and broken? What would it look like if there were no responsibility for our actions?

We can respect each other by continuing the work of the stewards, before and around us, at protecting, at every opportunity, those affected by environmental injustices. Speaking for the young and incapable, the people affected by environmental pollution have the right to be represented by voices in their community. In the east side of Las Vegas, the people want to keep their community and surrounding communities from falling further into despair. Please do not refuse recognition afforded to the people hurt by societal pollution. It is difficult to help people whom we do not recognize as friends, family, or coworkers. I ask you to help your greater society in providing for their own protections; standing alongside their opinions and authority in matters is what we can do.

The lower classes of the wealth holders are predominantly composed of Black, Indigenous, and people of color. They, being on the wrong side of the economy and, sadly, the wrong side of this ethical treatment, require the assistance of those who are familiar and partnered with the governing bodies. They are not asking for judgment in what is environmentally justified; they know the experiences; they know the suffering. They are asking for people to hear their stories. They want to share their sadness. They want to be respected in every sense of the word. Ultimately, they want to help themselves. If we can respect and believe what they have to say, they can take care of the rest. Please, I ask of you to give the power to the people. Thank you for your services and thank you for my freedoms. [Written testimony was submitted [Exhibit G](#).]

**Jose Luis Chavez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

[As translated by Sol Garza, Interpreter] I am a volunteer of Chispa Nevada, which is a program that gives power to Latin voices in the community so we can be a voice in making decisions that affect the environment.

The reason I feel the need to testify is because I worry about the adverse effects caused by climate change on our communities. I observe even more people in my close environment being affected by respiratory issues, which later on end up causing even more threats to other parts of the body. Like every cycle or every process, climate change does affect other aspects of our life; for example, in paying our energy and gas bills or our limited ability to access clean energy and other technologies.

As everyone knows, the ones who are more impacted by these issues are those families that have been unattended historically. For this reason, I see the need for an environmental council to be established with the capacity to assess diverse state agencies for their ability to have adequate policies that evaluate and recommend what is best indicated to preserve our environment in order for us to have health, and for whatever is most beneficial for the residents of Nevada.

You now have the opportunity to approve this into law. Think of the benefits this will give our communities and, not only that, but also future generations that hopefully will receive less impacts when it comes to climate change. Thank you for the opportunity you have given me to express myself. Please take this into consideration.

**Chair Torres:**

We are going to go to the phones; we have individuals on the line wishing to testify in support of A.B. 312.

**Nour Benjelloun, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

First of all, thank you so much for your service to the state of Nevada. I am a graduating senior at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), and an incoming law school student hoping to pursue immigration law. I want to testify in support of A.B. 312 for the Commission on Environmental Justice.

I have been doing a lot of research recently within the environmental realm. I was actually at the Capitol yesterday for Nevada Conservation Day. Under a few research projects I am undertaking at UNLV, I found various statistics, one of them being that Nevada ranks as one of the worst states in the country for air quality. We are actually number two in the nation for having bad air quality. Not only that, according to *National Geographic*, as it stands, 75 percent of our landfills are degraded. Heading into 2050, if we stay on the path we are on now, 95 percent of the landfills will be degraded.

I just wanted to testify in support of this bill because I believe we need to take some measures moving forward for the environment. We can look at the regulations that come through. We can look at the impacts we are having on the environment. I just ask that our representatives do vote in support of this bill.

**Estefania Rangel, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am here in support of Assembly Bill 312. As a community member spending half of my life in east Las Vegas, I have had firsthand experience living in an urban community that lacks access to nutritious foods, safe transportation, structures, and heat protection.

Underdeveloped and underserved communities have had to endure heat and pollution-related illnesses due to extreme climates and racial and economic inequities. Equity and accountability from the council must play a role and remediate environmental effects to where there is public transportation where people live, work, and go to school. Mandating an agency to inform and consult historically underserved communities that are likely to be affected by any proposed regulation related to environmental effect is deserved equity and involves them in the process of developing regulations. Addressing climate change includes consulting communities that have been exposed to health and environmental hazards from extractive industries. Study shows that residents in underserved communities have lower life expectancies due to historical environmental injustice and racism.

I support this bill because of the goal of reducing climate change and its effects that fall disproportionately on people of color and lower-income areas. Giving the decision-making power back to the most vulnerable communities is crucial in regulating and providing equal protection for historically underserved communities. We encourage the members of this Committee to stand with these communities and support Assembly Bill 312.

**Chair Torres:**

I know we have more callers. I am going to get through the callers, and we will come back. I would urge anyone repeating something that somebody else has already said—I understand that there is a lot of support—please feel free to just say your name and say you support this bill. [Reiterates in Spanish.] I really do want to ensure everyone has time to testify, and I know there has been a couple of different technical difficulties with today's hearing.

I want to give everyone that opportunity, so if you are saying something that somebody else has said, please just say, "Ditto," and we will make sure the record reflects your support. We will finish taking those on the phone line. [Translator gave instructions in Spanish.]

**Angel Lazcano, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am calling as a resident of Assembly District No. 3 and as a supporter of environmental justice issues. We have already heard a lot; just to keep it short, ditto to what everyone said. We have to create a healthier green future for our communities because it is what they deserve.

**Victoria Flores, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am an environmental organizer and founder of the Solidarity Fridge giving garden, here in support of Assembly Bill 312. Ditto.

**Kassandra Lisenbee, Outreach and Program Coordinator, Great Basin Resource Watch:**

We are a nonprofit located in Reno, Nevada, and we work with communities that are facing adverse effects from extraction in the Great Basin. Just a big ditto to all the things you have heard here today. It is time we think about people—all people—and their relation to the environment and the impacts the environment has on people's health.

**Jiromi Peña Martinez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am the Hispanic Student Union president at Rancho High School, and I am in favor of A.B. 312 because this is a step closer to solving the inequities within our community. It should not be okay that lower-income communities be subjected to environmental injustice. Additionally, children are often suffering and develop from a young age. Allowing this bill would allow us to make sure our generation and the next will not suffer from environmental diseases like those we are suffering in low-income communities.

**Chair Torres:**

Is there anyone else on the line to testify in support at this time? [There was no one.] We are going to come back to Carson City, and then we will go to Las Vegas.

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

We are here in support of A.B. 312, and ditto to what everyone else has said.

**Roberto Renteria, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

[Translated by Sergio Morales, Interpreter.] First, I would like to tell you that I have been living in Las Vegas for the last 28 years. I have been working under very high temperatures, and lately the temperature has been higher and higher. I am here to support A.B. 312 in order for me to protect the community and to protect the workers also. I believe we need more support. Please support A.B. 312 to protect not only our community but also our future generations.

**Areli Sanchez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

[Translated from Spanish by Sol Garza, Interpreter.] I am a leading member of Make the Road Nevada. I have come here today to ask for your support and to advocate for proposed legislation that will protect our environment and natural resources, specifically A.B. 312. In the most impoverished areas, we suffer the consequences of excessive summer heat and exposure to pollution that affect our health, causing problems such as asthma for people such as my daughter. This leads to emergencies. For this reason, I believe A.B. 312 is fundamental to identifying the areas that need more support in getting green areas to improve air quality in high temperatures. Having the type of commission proposed in A.B. 312 would mean an improvement in the quality of life in general, since they will improve air quality. This would reduce temperatures and allow children to have a place for recreation and develop better than being cooped up at home. Therefore, I support the implementation of a Commission on Environmental Justice and ask that you also support this bill.



**David Arnold, Logistical Policy Associate, The Nature Conservancy:**

The Nature Conservancy supports A.B. 312 with the proposed amendments [[Exhibit C](#)]. As a global organization dedicated to conserving the lands and waters on which all life depends, we believe that to be effective in helping the environment, we must implement solutions that are inclusive, just, and equitable, to ensure that our environmental solutions do not repeat past mistakes by manifesting harm or injustice. Assembly Bill 312 provides a way to incorporate standards of equity in our institutional norms and decision-making processes. We thank the bill sponsors for bringing this bill forward, and we hope you will support A.B. 312. Thank you for hearing our testimony.

**Chair Torres:**

As a reminder to anybody wishing to testify in support, we are going to go quickly at this point because we have been at support for about 50 minutes now, which I think is sufficient time. I would ask anybody remaining to just say your name, that you support this bill, and then move on. [Reiterates in Spanish.] Any written remarks we have received, we will have posted and sent to Committee members as well. [Reiterates in Spanish.]

At this time, please just say your name, that you support this bill, and then move on so we can get it on the record. Thank you. We will go to Las Vegas first.

**Maria Reyes, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

[Translated from Spanish by Sol Garza, Interpreter.] I am with Chispa Nevada, and I do support A.B. 312.

**Jose Ramos Sanchez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

[Translated from Spanish by Sol Garza, Interpreter.] I am with Chispa Nevada, and I support A.B. 312.

**Chair Torres:**

Next here in Carson City.

**Marisol Vizuet, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

[Translated from Spanish by Sol Garza, Interpreter.] I am a member of Make the Road Nevada and I do support A.B. 312.

**Olivia Tanager, Environmental Justice Program Manager, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:**

We support A.B. 312 and all the community members here today who testify in support. [A letter was submitted [Exhibit H](#).]

**Gerardo Velasquez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

[Translated from Spanish by Sol Garza, Interpreter.] I am also a member of Make the Road Nevada. I am also here supporting A.B. 312.

**Tony Ramirez, Government Affairs Manager, Make the Road Nevada:**

I am here in support of A.B. 312.

**Chair Torres:**

At this time, we will close testimony in support. We will go ahead and move into opposition. Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 312? The time is 10:55 a.m. I will note that, and I will allow for opposition to run 55 minutes, if necessary. [Translated in Spanish by interpreter.]

**Paul J. Moradkhan, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:**

In regard to A.B. 312, the Vegas Chamber has concerns about the bill—not the intent or what we are trying to achieve, but the mechanical components that have been highlighted in section 8 of the bill about the turnaround time of 45 days. We also have concerns about the economic development impact it would have, with some of the components of the bill as mentioned in other sections. We again understand the intent and desire to bring this forward, but we are concerned about how this will have unintended consequences on economic development efforts throughout our state.

**Chase Whittemore, representing Nevada Builders Alliance:**

We all want to live in a place where we not only protect the environment but where we minimize, to the practical extent, the impact our collective society has on the environment. Protecting those persons who live in underserved communities should be a goal for everyone. I certainly applaud Assemblywoman Peters. The Assemblywoman's love for the environment and environmental justice is admirable and should be celebrated.

I apologize to the bill sponsor for not reaching out before the hearing, but as it stands now, Nevada Builders Alliance is opposed. We have some questions, ideas, and concerns. Generally, we are concerned how this impacts the economy. This legislation deals with regulations moving forward. If we are going to study regulations, why do we not set up a way to study existing regulations and study whether those regulations have caused a disproportionate environmental health burden on underserved communities, then provide a mechanism for those communities and experts to offer comments on that study? We can then come back and figure out which of those regulations we can change in a way that limits the burden the regulation might have on those identified communities in a way that also takes into consideration the economic impact of changing the regulation.

Additionally, section 11 includes language that implicates basically every state agency in the state. It is extremely broad. The Department of Taxation's regulations probably do not have an impact on environmental justice. So why not limit this to state agencies that do have regulations that impact the environment?

We also have concerns around timing. This legislation will ultimately slow down necessary regulations we may desperately need that have no real impact on the environment.

Again, studying which state agencies need to be reviewed for their impact, we believe is a good starting point. For those reasons, we are opposed.

**Nikki Bailey-Lundahl, Director of Government Affairs, Nevada Mining Association:**

Nevada's mining industry recognizes and respects the communities we work and live in that support our industry. The well-being and health of our employees and their families are at the forefront in the planning, operation, and closure of our operations in the state. We pride ourselves in meeting and exceeding state and federal requirements to ensure the protection of public health and Nevada's unique environment.

This bill creates new criteria for regulatory development that will result in unnecessary delays when placing significant burdens on already resource-strapped state agencies. For mining, if this bill were to pass, regulations would have to be reviewed by the Mining Oversight and Accountability Commission, the Commission on Environmental Justice, the State Environmental Commission, and the Legislative Commission.

This bill establishes a process not dissimilar to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and its Council on Environmental Quality. One only needs to look to California and other states with NEPA-like provisions to understand the inefficiencies, gridlocks, and delays that can occur and the associated impacts to jobs, communities, and economic development. Almost all mining projects in Nevada have public land components requiring federal NEPA evaluations from environmental, social, economic, and cumulative impact perspectives, making the provision of A.B. 312, duplicative. For these reasons, we are opposed to A.B. 312.

**Lindsay Knox, representing Nevada Home Builders Association; Builders Association of Northern Nevada; and Southern Nevada Home Builders Association:**

Homebuilders follow and support a myriad of federal, state, and local rules and regulations designed to promote environmentally sound construction practices. Assembly Bill 312 would create additional regulatory barriers for the construction of Nevadans' most treasured possessions, which are our homes.

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

First, I would like to begin by thanking the bill sponsor. We reached out to her with several questions. She was extremely responsive, especially on a very busy day such as Monday, so I thank her for that. I will limit my comments to those from a procedural standpoint.

Our concerns are, by adding this additional layer to the current rulemaking process as promulgated in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 233B, this is a process that oftentimes—and this is somebody speaking who both represents an industry that is highly regulated, as well as being somebody who used to be a regulator—can take an awful long amount of time. We are concerned that this is going to unduly broaden and expand that process.

We respect where the Assemblywoman is coming in on this. She was very responsive to my questions on that. The only thing I would also like to add from a procedural standpoint is, in the event the regulatory agency submits its draft statement to the Commission on Environmental Justice, and its response is that it is deficient, is there going to be a mechanism to challenge that? I presume, based on—and I would certainly refer to the Legal Division on this—the general provisions within NRS Chapter 233B, there will be a written-in process in which the agency could dispute it if it was not properly vetted. I did raise that to the Assemblywoman, and we are continuing to have that dialogue.

**Terry K. Graves, representing Nevada Trucking Association; and Nevada Manufacturing Association:**

I will not repeat the comments already made as to the regulatory process and how we feel this might impede regulatory matters and the approval of projects. I would like to point out to this Committee that in the country at this time, we need to be expediting processes to move the manufacture of critical goods and materials back into this country and get our supply chain in the domestic arena. Having proposals like this can impede that process.

Ever since I arrived here in Carson City, all I have heard is how staffing of all the agencies is down, and how they are looking for people, and here we are, adding another layer of commissions to that process. These agencies are here to protect all people in the state of Nevada, not just the underserved community. The first gentleman who testified, the Hispanic gentleman—I live in an area which is probably not declared an underserved community, but I breathe the same air and drink the same water he does. This is where I am having a problem with this proposal—exactly where the lines get drawn between underserved and not underserved. For example, is the Las Vegas Strip in downtown Las Vegas an underserved community where tens of thousands of workers live in probably what is the most highly polluted part of the Las Vegas Valley? These are some concerns I have about the broad proposal that this is.

In conclusion I have a couple of points on the other side of this argument. There was a study made: If the entire grid of the country was shut down, the electrical grid and the fuel systems were shut down, within six months, 90 percent of the population would probably perish. Before we get too critical of the energy sources of our industrial strength, we need to think about what the downsides are sometimes. Lastly, the biggest threat to the environment is a failed economy. We always want to keep that in mind. We do not want to be doing things that impair our economy. The worst environmental disasters in the world are in third world countries where they do not have any economy to deal with it. I would close with that, and I thank you Madam Chair.

**Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:**

We oppose this bill. This creates another taxpayer-funded, unelected, unaccountable commission. Its mission is completely undefined and will expand as it goes forward to who knows whatever it will become. One of the things we do need in this state is a taxpayer impact statement and a family impact statement, because we have all of these new commissions which do not take into account how much taxpayers are already paying now.

According to the Institute for Policy Innovation in the United States, the total U.S. tax burden, including federal, state, local taxes, and hidden taxes, is equal to 56 percent; 56 percent of the personal annual consumption spending. Fifty-six percent is more than a person spends on housing, food, health care, transportation, education, and recreation. How can people possibly take care of ourselves and our families when government takes 56 percent of our income? Government taxation is a major cause of family financial distress, particularly now when inflation, which is caused by federal government printing of dollars, is taking more and more of our dollars every day and destroying the value of our purchasing power. No wonder more and more people are slipping into poverty. We oppose a new commission and especially one which is so undefined, and which has no accountability.

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

We appreciate the opportunity to come here in opposition to A.B. 312. The first thing I would like to do is set an expectation. We heard a reference that this was modeled a little bit after the small business impact statement. I can assure you, if you go back and read all of the official small business impact statements from all the agencies that are required to operate under that code, you are going to find that, suddenly, no government action has an impact to business because that is the way most of them come out. We would hope, if this Commission is going forward, there is some teeth to it to be able to understand what those impacts are going to be, because in the small business impact statement, we certainly do not have that.

Our opposition as far as A.B. 312 goes comes because we think this is perhaps an unnecessary addition to the Nevada Administrative Procedure Act and how regulations get adopted, heard, and ultimately enacted in the state. It is true, as the sponsors said, state government looks one particular way, but the check on that state government is actually the Legislature and the Legislative Commission. We have in front of us today one of, if not the most, diverse legislatures in the country. When we are taking a look at all the nuances that go into crafting regulations and crafting state activity, it is important we take into account all of those voices, whether they be underserved communities, whether they be small businesses, whether they be a local community—wherever that project is being considered. That is ultimately the responsibility of the elected officials that we put in place—the Governor through the Executive Branch, as well as through the Legislature. We think the number of hearings, workshops, and ultimately, the Legislative Commission approval process, provide ample opportunity to be able to address and hear some of the very valid concerns we heard today. We just believe the process already exists to be able to take those into account. For those reasons, we are opposed.

**Alexis Motarex, Government Affairs, Nevada Chapter Associated General Contractors of America:**

For many of the same concerns and many of the same sentiments we share with previous speakers, currently, we are opposed to this bill.

**Glen Leavitt, Director, Government Affairs, Nevada Contractors Association:**

I am here for the Nevada Contractors Association, representing over 450 contractors, subcontractors, and industry affiliates, primarily in southern Nevada. I am a big fan of not repeating what everyone else has said. For some of the reasons previously stated, we are in opposition to this bill, but look forward to working with the sponsor.

**Chair Torres:**

Is there anyone else here in Carson City or in Las Vegas wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 312? Seeing no one, is there anyone on the line wishing to testify in opposition?

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

Although I share a lot of the sentiments shared here today, I do agree with a lot of the points shared in regard to the mechanics of this bill, the litigation issues more importantly—the stipulations that would harm the economic development of the state. As Americans for Prosperity, we oppose this bill. We urge you to do so.

I might even personally add that my doctor shared with me that the different plants and the lack of grass in Las Vegas, in particular, and the wind, have been leading to a lot of asthmatic-like respiratory responses. It is a huge problem when we are not allowing people to have grasses let alone trees. We have this water issue.

What everyone has shared, we are addressing in the wrong way. There are already processes directed towards certain industries to ensure that if the industry is causing direct harm or may impact the community, the community has the ability to share their concerns upon having some of those projects or developments approved. We urge you to definitely oppose this bill and reaffirm some of those processes that are in place for communicating with the community members how they can make their voices heard to ensure that any impact that might be relegated to the project can be shared. We greatly appreciate your time, and please oppose this bill.

**Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

This water issue is largely due to mismanagement, and I want to make sure we are a great climate for manufacturing to come back from overseas. We have had similar policies that have worked in the state of California, and just look at it now. Companies are leaving in droves. It is not looking good.

Where are we going to get the funds to support all these programs? The Federal Reserve is just going to continue to create dollars out of nothing and fail states like this one now. How is this going to work?

If you really want environmental justice, why are we not having an effective mass transit system? The monorail is not connected to the airport. Why are we not getting rid of land use regulations such as parking minimums? We have a lot of empty parking lots.

How is this racial justice? Our Asian and Persian Americans are negatively affected. Why are they not being pushed around? By the way, many of these organizations are being paid—I have done the research for testifying in support. I see the Craigslist ads. Many of these organizations defend illegal aliens. You can see a lot of the red flags with these organizations. Other than that, I urge you to not support this bill.

**Jim DeGraffenreid, National Committeeman, Nevada Republican Party:**

We are here today in opposition to A.B. 312. We are concerned that this bill's language is vague and nonspecific, delegating far-reaching powers to unelected bureaucrats that should be reserved to the people's elected representatives. The bill establishes an unaccountable and unelected nine-member Commission that has unlimited authority to require all agencies in Nevada to review all proposed regulations and legislation for environmental justice. As mentioned earlier, there currently is no definition of environmental justice in statute, which would give the proposed Commission and others writing regulations an unacceptable amount of latitude.

If the proposed Commission on Environmental Justice does not approve an environmental justice impact statement, the regulation or bill is returned to the agency. Assembly Bill 312 has no language preventing an endless cycle of rejection, potentially eliminating jobs, tax and fee revenue, and hurting all communities including the communities the bill seeks to help.

The Nevada GOP platform opposes environmental social governance legislation and executive actions in general. In regard to A.B. 312, if there is an environmental issue that needs to be addressed, it should be addressed regardless of the racial and economic composition of an affected area. Being distracted from addressing an environmental or climate issue by efforts to determine the race or social status of an affected population delays the resolution of the actual issue.

Supporters of A.B. 312 testified today, the government should treat all people equally regardless of race or socioeconomic status. This bill does exactly the opposite and as a result has potential to harm the very people it claims to want to help by focusing on extraneous issues rather than directly addressing any core problems that exist. Assembly Bill 312 may also prevent members of underserved communities from benefiting from economic development in the state. Please support fairness for all Nevadans and oppose A.B. 312.

[In addition, [Exhibit I](#), [Exhibit J](#), [Exhibit K](#), and [Exhibit L](#) were submitted in opposition to A.B. 312.]

**Chair Torres:**

Is there anyone else on the line wishing to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] At this time, I invite anyone wishing to testify in neutral to A.B. 312. When you are ready, we will start here in Carson City, and then we will go to Las Vegas.

**Misty Grimmer, representing State Contractors' Board:**

Assembly Bill 312, as drafted, applies to all boards and agencies subject to NRS Chapter 233B, including the State Contractors' Board and other professional licensing boards. The Contractors' Board only pursues rulemaking when needed to protect the public and conditions for lawful productive contractors. Our regulations are authorized under NRS Chapter 624 and address contractor qualifications, financial soundness, and discipline, all for the protection of the public, so the public can trust the integrity of the construction trades. Our regulations have zero impact on the environment or any specific segment of the community. In licensing and discipline of contractors, we do not even collect information related to race or gender of the licensees.

The statutory definitions in A.B. 312 of a historically underserved community tie back to the issues such as pollution, sanitation, water, environmental covenants, et cetera. The Board has no jurisdiction over any of these areas. All of our regulations go through the required public workshop and hearing process, Legislative Counsel Bureau review, and ultimately the Legislative Commission. The requirements of this bill would add a minimum of an additional 45 days to that process where the review could derail the regulation, not for its substance, but for the contents of the environmental justice impact statement. This could delay or hinder the creation of a necessary or useful regulation to protect the public or better the construction industry. Assembly Bill 312 raises more questions for us in trying to understand how regulations of the contracting trade would fall into any definition of having an environmental impact on a historically underserved community.

We know the intent of the bill and of the sponsor, in seeking consideration and protections for historically underserved communities, is noble and overdue, but we would request that the sponsor and Committee consider the impact on professional licensing boards that have no nexus with the environmental justice issues.

**Chair Torres:**

Thank you. We will go ahead and go to neutral in Las Vegas.

**Joanne Leovy, representing Nevada State Medical Association:**

I am a family medicine physician speaking today on behalf of the Nevada State Medical Association (NSMA) which has not taken a formal position on this bill. However, we wish to provide some environmental health context.

Nevada State Medical Association supports measuring, studying, and addressing environmental health impacts for underserved populations in Nevada and is on record for supporting comprehensive measures to reduce climate impacts, including reducing power plant and transportation emissions and mitigating urban heat island effects; NSMA advocates for studies of health cobenefits of environmental and climate measures to include cost benefit analyses of reducing air pollution, and we are a member organization of the Medical Society Consortium on Climate and Health, which specifically seeks to address disproportionate impacts on historically marginalized communities.



Research clearly documents greater impacts of environmental degradation and pollution on communities of color, Indigenous populations, and low-income people. Historically underserved communities have higher airborne pollutant exposure due to proximity to fossil fuel power plants and to major roadways. For example, the Reid Gardner coal plant in southern Nevada directly affected the health of members of the Moapa Band of Paiutes for years. Asthma rates are 3 percent higher in people living in poverty, and Black Americans have twice the asthma death rate of non-Hispanic whites. Blacks, Latinos, and low-income people have higher rates of heat-related illness due to more exposure and greater vulnerability. Racial and income disparities are documented in highway siting and in disaster evacuation and recovery.

Environmental health experts recommend that policy recommendations address cumulative impacts and directly involve affected communities. Assembly Bill 312 would further both these goals. Additionally, studies suggest that the health cobenefits of reducing pollution will accrue quickly and amount to substantial cost savings. Underserved communities tend to have a high burden of chronic disease and high health costs borne by the public sector. Thus, a commission with the capacity to define and set parameters to measure environmental justice impacts could potentially benefit health and health costs.

**Chair Torres:**

Thank you. Is there anyone else wishing to testify in neutral here in Carson City or in Las Vegas. I do not see anyone. Is there anyone on the line wishing to testify neutral to A.B. 312? [There was no one.] I invite the bill sponsor for any closing remarks.

**Assemblywoman Peters:**

I would like to thank the folks who have attended today for sharing their stories and for Chair Torres for making that possible. First of all, I am really excited to look beyond the current scope of this bill and address some of the comments the opposition presented today.

I want to respond to the desire for prescriptive statutory language. The regulatory process is designed to define many of these concerns. However, I do appreciate the folks who have reached out with concerns and believe that we can come to some agreement on a fleshed-out amendment.

I also want to respond that the screening process would effectively remove the entities that do not impact environmental justice. Those concerns should be addressed by that screening process.

Lastly, I want to say we are behind, but we can do better. We can identify disparities early, and we can create equity in benefit and burden. It does not have to be an us-versus-them. It can truly be about economic health, physical and mental health, and environmental health. I truly believe that is our job here.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this bill. I appreciate your time today, and I look forward to speaking with you further.

**Chair Torres:**

I will clarify for the record that we did give ample time for support and ample time for opposition. I allowed for opposition to run as long as it needed to and gave ample time for neutral as well. I hope the bill sponsor can continue to work with all interested stakeholders before we bring this bill to a work session.

At this time, I will close the hearing on A.B. 312, and we will go ahead and move on to public comment. [Rules for public comment were reviewed.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in public comment? I do not see anyone here in Carson City, and I do not see anyone in Las Vegas. Is there anyone on the line wishing to testify in public comment?

[Public comment was given.]

[Meeting reminders were given.] Is there any discussion on the comments at this time? [There was none.] Assemblyman McArthur, you had requested a McArthur minute today? He said there must have been an error. All right, at this time the meeting is adjourned [at 11:29 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Geigy Stringer  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is an amendment to [Assembly Bill 313](#), dated March 27, 2023, submitted by Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24.

[Exhibit D](#) is written testimony submitted by Juan Carlos Guardado, Community Organizer, Chispa Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 312](#).

[Exhibit E](#) is a document titled "Environmental Justice Commission AB 312 Frequently Asked Questions," submitted by Reuben Nwando, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 312](#).

[Exhibit F](#) is a letter dated March 25, 2023, submitted by Emily Woodall, Senior National Campaign Manager, Dream.org, in support of [Assembly Bill 312](#).

[Exhibit G](#) is written testimony submitted by Daryl John Meier, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 312](#).

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter dated March 28, 2023, submitted by Olivia Tanager, Environmental Justice Program Manager, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 312](#).

[Exhibit I](#) is a copy of email dated March 28, 2023, submitted by Yolanda Knaak, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 312](#).

[Exhibit J](#) is a letter submitted by Ann Sweder, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 312](#).

[Exhibit K](#) is written testimony dated March 27, 2023, submitted by Ralph R. Sacrison, Private Citizen, Elko, Nevada, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 312](#).

[Exhibit L](#) is a letter dated March 27, 2023, submitted by Aviva Gordon, Chair, Legislative Committee, and Emily Osterberg, Director of Government Affairs, Henderson Chamber of Commerce, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 312](#).