



STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY
TAXICAB AUTHORITY
2090 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 200
Las Vegas Nevada 89119
Telephone (702) 668-4000 • Fax (702) 668-4001
<http://taxi.state.nv.us>
BEFORE THE STATE OF NEVADA TAXICAB AUTHORITY
BOARD MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

BRUCE BRESLOW
Director
TOM ELY, CAPTAIN
Interim Administrator
ILEANA DROBKIN
Chairman
VACANT
Vice Chairman
Members
VACANT
DENNIS NOLAN
DEAN COLLINS
BRUCE AGUILERA, ESQ.

December 15, 2014

The Board Meeting and Public Hearing of the State of Nevada Taxicab Authority was held on Monday, November 17, 2014. The meeting was held in the Taxicab Authority Boardroom at 2080 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 114, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119. The meeting began at 9:35 A.M.

Present were: Chairman Ileana Drobkin, Member Dennis Nolan, Member Dean Collins and Member Bruce Aguilera. Others present: Captain Tom Ely, Interim Administrator, Ryan Sunga, Deputy Attorney General, Legal Counsel for the Taxicab Authority; Ruben Aquino, Chief Investigator; Christine Guerri-Nyhus, Deputy Attorney General, Legal Counsel for the Board, and Recording Secretary, Barbara A. Webb.

1. Call to Order.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:35 A.M.

2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was led by Member Nolan.

3. Compliance with Open Meeting Law.

Interim Administrator Tom Ely stated that we are in compliance with the Open Meeting Law.

4. Public Comment.

There was no public comment, therefore, public comment was closed.

5. Approval of the October 20th, October 30th and November 17th, 2014 Board Meeting Minutes.

Motion:	To approve the October 20 th , October 30 th and November 17 th Board Meeting Minutes
By:	Member Aguilera
Seconded:	Member Nolan
Vote:	Passed unanimously.

6. Discussion with Maria Soto, Traffic Manager for LVCVA, regarding recent taxicab service.

We had Motor Trend in house November 28th through the 30th. We had moderate bus and monorail and cab usage during the show. Cowboy Christmas kicked off December 4th, ran through the 13th. Show close was challenging every day; however taxi texts and (inaudible) field supervisors were on site each day. We had approximately 250 plus in line at show close each day, but they were able to clear the lines by 5:45 with minimum wait times of about 20 to 25 minutes, so it wasn't bad.

CES, right around the corner, January 6th through the 9th. I've scheduled a tabletop meeting this January 2nd from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. I invited Fast, Metro, RTS bus representatives, Jeff from the Sands, and our taxi family management and supervisors. RPMS is the CES transportation specialists. Show managements (inaudible) of

others who will be affected by our transportation efforts for the show, so we're hoping to stay on top of this, and hopefully won't experience any landscaping maintenance on Las Vegas Boulevard or construction in the area.

Chair Drobkin: I'm going to add to that so everyone is aware. I've been working with Ms. Soto and Councilman Ross is running with that, and he's composing a letter and getting that out. Commissioner Sisolak is working with us as well to send everybody down, maintenance, anything you can think of on all of the streets that will be affected during CES and the week after when we have the 246,000 people. So we're working on our end but we can't promise that it will actually work out that way.

Member Aguilera asked if SEMA was a success. Ms. Soto commented that it was very successful. As always, it's a challenge due to traffic. We had to place our taxi stands on the outside perimeter of our property, so we had one off of Sierra Vista, right behind the Renaissance, in our (inaudible) parking lot. The other one was in the gold lot. That did pose a challenge for the taxis to get in. We opened the Rivera gate to allow access earlier in the day, around 2:00, so that the taxis could pull up to there. They did everything they could to get cabs there. From what I understand, the cabs were booked about 98% throughout the city. So it wasn't a matter of them not being able to come. They were full and they were running. Limos were running. We did a post convention meeting for that, and we have spoken to SEMA, and we're working on possibly having the Beach lot across the street, which is easier access for them, and it will make them happy. So we've begun including them in more of the larger planning for taxi cab stands, and have their involvement, and get some say as to what works well for traffic flow and present that information to the show management teams for each of these large shows so that they can understand where we're coming from. If cabs can't get there, they can't provide the service that they're expecting. So we're trying to bridge that gap.

Member Aguilera questioned if the Linq event had any problems. Ms. Soto stated that 12,000 reservations were put in, 15,000 people came through. About 800 cars that took us two days to load into the show floors, exited the show floors in a matter of two and a half hours. They had some issues with transportation due to the parade that went down to The LINQ from the Convention Center. But I'm working with Jeff at the Sands, and including him in future planning for that so that they're prepared and they understand what's going to happen down in their area so that we'll bring a lot more people in down to The LINQ.

7. Discussion with Freddie Kirtley, Assistant Director, Landside Operations, McCarran International Airport.

Chris Anderson in for Freddie Kirtley commented that they are at a 4% increase for the year, so we're looking at another record year. We will probably load over 3.6 million cabs by the end of December. Right now our record for last year was 3.5, so we want to try for that. The Chair asked there was any projection for 2015 and he responded that they would be conservative and say flat, so another 4% probably, depending on air traffic, obviously, and their projections are flat to 1%. So pretty even.

Member Aguilera asked if are there any problems with people getting to the airport on a Monday and Mr. Anderson said no that everything moves very fast even when the Cowboys were in town, departures were busy as normal for a Monday morning, a lot of cabs, a lot of traffic, and we just pushed them all through. Service seemed very adequate.

8. Discussion with Jeff White, Security Manager, Sands Expo, regarding recent taxicab service.

Since my last time here, we had APEX, as far as the large shows needing cabs and we also just finished up with Country Christmas. During the APEX show we had really good results. We had constant cab flow throughout each day. When the shows would close and the guests would start piling out there, we had real good response from the taxicab industry with support from field supervisors from Frias and Yellow down there to help us with that. The final show we had some delays, there was a total gridlock actually out on Sands Avenue, so that was going to be traffic control related, not necessarily cab related. We just couldn't get them in there, but that finally cleared up. He stated that he has met with Maria several times since the last meeting, and actually talk to her quite often and she's been a big help. We're all kind of starting to come up with an organized approach on how we can collaborate and work with all of the events that are occurring simultaneously. The two big ones are going to be CES and SHOT Show, which are coming up. So we're gearing up for that, we're doing the best we can.



9. Discussion and Possible Decision regarding the Voluntary Use of Electronic Hailing Applications by Certificate Holders, such as those approved by the Nevada Transportation Authority.

Neal Tomlinson, 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100. I'm here representing Integrity Vehicle Solutions Company. As most of you know, Integrity Vehicle Solutions Company has two primary transportation technology products. One is called Ride Integrity, which is a product for regulators. The second project is Ride Genie, which is an electronic hailing application for all-for-hire vehicles, including limousines and taxis. With me today I have Keven Ellison who is Vice President of Marketing. Neal Tomlinson handed out a brochure regarding Ride Genie. This is available at the Taxicab Authority.

Keven Ellison introduced Greg Valdov, Product Manager. He went on to explain how the e-hailing application works from either an Android phone or an iPhone or other OS version. The Chair asked if there is a default for the tip amount? They've defaulted 20% (inaudible) for the tip. By defaulting it to 20%, it's in there so that they didn't walk out and the driver never got paid. So if they want to take the time to go ahead and fill that information out, they can. They can move it down if they feel that the tip needs to be lower, or they could increase it if they'd like to. It's disclosed not only on the receipt, but it's also on the website. We also provide instructional videos.

Chair Drobkin: Is this currently working in San Francisco? Mr. Ellison: This is not. Chair Drobkin: So is this working in any other jurisdiction with taxis? Mr. Ellison: No. I think what you're referring to is our other system, which is the RideIntegrity system. It's being used in San Francisco. Chair Drobkin: Right. So is Ride Genie, other than on the limo side, for taxis, is it in any other jurisdiction currently? Mr. Ellison: No, it's not. Currently it's just here. In fact, we launched the product about four months ago on August 15th, so we're just actually working through and have completed a whole new host of upgrading all of the technology, as we learn how to improve the user experience, as well as working with the fleets. But it is now ready and commercially available to be... Chair Drobkin: Are you fairly confident that it's accurate? Mr. Ellison: Oh, absolutely. He went on to describe how the fee is charged, how the company ensures that it's the same as what's on the taxi meter.

Neal Tomlinson explained that it is voluntary among the certificate holders and Desert, Whittlesea Blue/ Henderson Taxi and Frias support it. The Chair stated that people complain about the wait time and Mr. Tomlinson explained that it is significantly reduced because it goes to the first cab in the area of the call. The driver has a tablet that he responds from even if they are in a cab line they can pull out to answer the call. If a ride is canceled there is no fee, if there fare is a no show there is a \$10 no-show fee. Member Nolan agreed with that.

Member Nolan asked DAG Guerri-Nyhus if the Board has to approve the fees and charges and the DAG said definitely because it is a rate change and must be published 20 days prior to whatever meeting it will be discussed at. DAG Guerri-Nyhus asked Mr. Tomlinson if there were any other fees and he said the 2nd fee is the 3-hailing fee and that the NTA has approved a \$5.00 e-hailing fee which was reduced to \$4.00 which, Mr. Ellison explained goes back to Ride Genie for development and support and maintenance. Mr. Tomlinson stated that this system is completely voluntary in two ways and went on to explain. There was further discussion between Mr. Tomlinson and the Board.

Mr. Tomlinson stated that NRS 706.8819 is the statute where the Board is charged with deciding whether to adjust any rates, charges, or fares. I don't believe that this would be a rate. I believe it would be considered a charge, there are other charges that have been approved. But I don't think it's really classified as a fare. These would be charges--because they are voluntary, so they're charges. So the e-hailing fee, in my mind, is a charge. I think that it does require the Board to approve it. Of course, the Board always has the authority to go back, re-examine it, and re-adjust it if they want to do that, too. So I think with respect to the two voluntary fees that we have on here, the no-show fee in the event the customer cancels the ride, and the driver isn't able to get the fare, and then we have the e-hailing fee of \$4.00. I believe that both of those would require Board approval.

There's been numerous changes that we've put in place over the last three legislative sessions, and this is part of that. Obviously, the statutes contemplate cooperative dispatch, which is happening here, and e-hailing. So under the 706.8819, as far as the rates, charges, or fares, we do ask that the Board approve the \$4.00 e-hailing fee and the \$10.00 no-show fee, subject to the terms that we've presented here, the timing that allows them to cancel at no charge for three minutes.



Interim Administrator Ely stated his concern at this point is not whether or not this is good technology, or whether or not this would be good for the industry, but rather the Taxicab Authority has not been provided the opportunity to look in depth at all of their details and their proposed fare structure. Normally, we get an opportunity to review and have workshops with industry participants. And I'd recommend that that would be a fairer course of action at this point, rather than rushing into making any decision at this time. I think we need to look at their product a little more and vet some of the information they're providing.

DAG Guerri-Nyhus stated that the concern she has about Open Meeting Law issues, and that we talked about. I'm going to ask (inaudible) for his opinion as well, because we've got on here "Discussion and Possible Decision" regarding voluntary use. But I don't know that we detailed out that there are additional fees that we're contemplating, as well as the addition of a tip on there, which yes, while it's (inaudible), I don't know if that's a change in rate, but I don't know that we have agendaized it properly if we're going to be putting or approving additional fees.

Neal Tomlinson commented that he'd like to address the administrator's comments stating that they think it's a benefit. It's a voluntary-use-type situation. It's not an exclusive arrangement whatsoever. Any app that can use certificated carriers and come to this Board, can ask for approval of the same thing. So it's not like this could be the only app out there. There could be 10 of them, there could be 12 of them.

Further discussion went on and Member Collins wondered if there was any feedback regarding fees or service and also wants to hear from the other operators whether they feel it's an added value for them. Again more detailed discussion continued from Ride Genie representatives and Neal Tomlinson.

Member Nolan stated that they have to be very careful because of Uber. He feels the Board wants to be sure they are on solid ground and legal before making any decision.

DAG Guerri-Nyhus stated that her problem is just with the fees. It's not with the program because the program sounds like a great program. But nowhere in the backup material, and that's why I asked to review the backup material, does it have any fees. It doesn't detail what the fees are. When we talk about the authority, you have under NRS 706.8819, you certainly have the authority to entertain and hear applications for fees, and you have the authority to impose fees. But the problem we have is under NAC 706.909, when a certificate holder or someone wants to come in with an application for a new fee or a change in the rate, they're supposed to give you the statement, in writing, with the rates. They're supposed to give you references. They're supposed to show you how they arrived at those rates. Are those rates in line with what other hailing apps charge. So are other e-hailing apps charging \$4.00? Are other e-hailing apps putting 15% on, are they putting 20% on as the tip? What is the no-show fee? That's the problems that I have with legally how they're proceeding down this road. Our Agenda says we're going to talk about it and approve it, but nowhere in the backup material, nowhere on the Agenda do we have an actual application for new fees. So I think that what you can do is certainly look at this and approve use of this pending a separate hearing when you've gotten that information on exactly what all of the fees are going to be, how they were calculated, how they stand in line for other e-hailing apps, so that you make at least proper decision.

Interim Administrator Ely stated that he'd still like to make a point. We, as an agency, would request that this be postponed to another hearing. And the reason for that is, we haven't had the opportunity to vet the information, plus that no certificate holders have actually applied to the Board to use this application. You have the vendor here.

The Chair commented that it's voluntary.

Interim Administrator Ely stated that per NAC 706.88184, it says that, "Any real time data system established by the TA, it must be established if two or more certificate holders apply to use the computerized real tracking system." None have applied, and regulations must be established prior to the implementation. We haven't had the opportunity to provide any input and to determine this. I'm not opposed.

Jonathan Schwartz, Yellow Checker Star Transportation and Marc Gordon, general counsel for Yellow Checker Star Transportation came to the table with concerns. Mr. Schwartz stated he wanted to enter some things on the record. First of all, I want to make it clear, we're in talks with RideIntegrity to test the system. I'm encouraged by



some of the developments that they've made in the system, and I look forward to testing it. I think some of the Board members and some of the staff made some interesting comments that I think need to be vetted out more fully. Number one, it's my understanding that RideIntegrity at this time, or Ride Genie in this case, does not integrate with a meter. It must integrate with the meter. It cannot operate unless it integrates with a meter. What shows up on your phone and what shows up on the meter must be the same.

Chair Drobkin asked Mr. Tomlinson if they integrated with the meter and he commented that what they do is, the driver actually inputs the amount, but there's checks and balances in place. The reason I spoke about the smart meter, when the smart meters are available, it will be fully integrated with the meter. But as it is now with the Legacy meters, it cannot be fully integrated, but there are checks and balances to make sure that the amount on the Legacy meter is the same thing...

Mr. Schwartz said that it's not permissible for a driver to input the fare. It must integrate with the meter in the final analysis. It can be tested privately this way, and I've love to test it privately. We could roll out 200 accounts with our private employees to go test it, but it can't roll out publicly until it integrates with the meter. And that's what I know they're working on, and I wish them Godspeed to get it working as soon as possible. He commented that the next issue is that he would just like the Board, if it decides to approve these fees at some point--and I'll agree in part, absolutely, \$10.00 no-show fee mandatory. Otherwise you're not going to get drivers to show up for these trips. It's got to happen. But if fees are approved, I would like the Board action to clearly recognize that this is for Ride Genie only. Another company, and there's going to be several tested, could charge another fee structure if it wanted to. As I mentioned earlier, another key point is that there has to be an actual agreement with the certificate holder to use the system, an actual agreement. And that's what I would ask, if such a thing exists. Respectfully, if you're leaving it up to a driver to input the fare, that's subject to tremendous fraud.

Mr. Marc Gordon of YCS stated that he would just like to add to what Mr. Schwartz has said. By making it--and one of the reasons I was chomping at the bit, sitting back there, is I think the Board needs to be very, very clear that although we're all working so hard to get an app that works with taxi meters, that works with our industry, we have to be very careful to understand that at the end of the ride, when the passenger looks at his Smartphone, the fee that he sees there is paired, it's called pairing, is paired up with the taxi meter. And that has been the challenge that we have had for several months now, is finding an app that can pair up with the taximeter. What we've been told is that Ride Genie still cannot do that. They have not overcome that challenge. We know of a company or two that have overcome that challenge and we've been negotiating and discussing with them for a long time now. But that's critical under our statutes. The taximeter is the final say, and if there's any conflict or question between the phone and the meter, we're having problems.

Further discussion went on about this.

The Chair asked for intervenors.

Intervenors were Desert, A Cab, Nellis, YCS, Western, Whittlesea Blue/Henderson Taxi, Lucky, Frias. Deluxe and ITPE Union.

George Balaban, Desert, commented that he is currently using the Ride Genie application in his sister companies, On Demand Sedan and Odyssey Limousine. So we've been piloting it for the last four or five months. It's had some hiccups, as is working through anything would be, not from the customer's point of view, as far as complaints as to overcharges or anything like that. It's actually just been more on getting our drivers to get used to a new type of system. But the thing that we did find out is that people want an e-hailing system. And because the way the limousine industry is designed there are hourly minimums and limousines are \$50.00 or \$60.00 an hour, if you e-hail and there is no taxi on there and you have to choose a limousine, it's \$60.00 to go 40 feet. I mean, it's--if you want to go three blocks, it's \$60.00, and people don't like that, needless to say. Because of the price constraints, it's just not being used as much as we would like to see it used because there's not taxi rates in there.

The Chair asked about the smart meter and Mr. Balaban went on to explain. Information available at the TA.

Ray Chenoweth, Nellis Cab stated that he is in conversations with VeriFone, CMT, and Curb, I believe it is, about this type of a dispatch system. And I don't know if theirs is good or bad, or better or worse than the other ones. I



attended one meeting recently and looked at what they had to say. I don't know why they're here talking to the Board because if that's the case, then they're asking for your approval. If they need it, then do these other people all have to come in? The Chair responded yes. Mr. Chenoweth stated then why shouldn't they all have been here today when... Chair said that they asked to be here. So your folks would have to--or you would bring the request. Mr. Chenoweth said whatever judgment you come to or decision you make, I would appreciate it if you would give the other folks a chance, I don't have any stock in any of the other companies. Rumor has it that some of the people here might have some stock with these people, but I don't know if there's anything to that. The point being is that there are other systems out there that are probably as good or maybe better, I don't know, that I would like you to reserve any judgment until we hear from them because I haven't made up my mind as to what I want to do yet either. The Chair said she appreciates that. And I can absolutely tell you that we give everybody equal weight because we want this to be fair, and most of all, we want the public to be able to benefit from this.

Marilyn Moran, Western Cab Company. At this time, I'm going to have to agree with Yellow Checker Star. I just feel that there's a lot of intricate things that have to be worked out before we sign on, even though I know it's a voluntary sign on. I just feel that there's more information that we need.

Brent Bell, Whittlesea Blue Cab, Henderson Taxi. I just want to point out that Ride Genie is here today, and the taxi cab industry is going to benefit tremendously from them because of what we learned five months ago when they started out in the limousine industry. We've learned a ton over the last four or five months. They've been extremely responsive to all of our concerns and our complaints about the app. I want to echo what George Balaban said. Most of the complaints or the problems are the cost, because like you said, in limousine, minimum charge is one hour. So it's important that we get going with taxi cabs as soon as possible. I understand the concerns in tying into the meter, but I think with respect to George's smart meters, I think a pilot test should be approved as soon as possible because one of the things that we've learned is that we've got to get going, we've got to test this technology. And if George's 30 meters can tie to the app, then I say we get going and we get started because over the last five months, since August, we've learned a ton. And my management team meets with the Ride Genie people once a week to go over problems and issues, and they're the first one to the table, and they're helping solve our problems. So I would encourage a pilot test in George's cabs as soon as possible.

Chair Drobkin asked if they were implementing smart meters as well and Mr. Bell said eventually. George is the test baby on this one. So we trade off, and George has taken the lead on this, and I'll be anxious to hear input. Durability is an issue that George discussed, and that's a concern of ours, also. One of the other things that I wanted to point out that we've learned, is that you've got to have supply in order to turn one of these things on and for it to be successful. Part of the other issues with the app was not having enough supply, and you'll be hearing that proposal later today. I don't want to get into that, about supply, and that's extremely important. It doesn't matter whose app that you have, if you don't have adequate supply, the app isn't going to work.

Member Collins asked him if he was advocating for a pilot test, and is he waiting for results possibly from George's group. What's the timeframe? Is that another three months of activity and feedback, another six months, a year? Mr. Bell replied it depends on how well the meter works. We're in contact with George all of the time, and we're evaluating the meter as we speak. But I want to see it working with the app, just like everybody else does. So I can't give you a definite answer. I speak from my experience in the last five months with the limousines. I mean, there were things that came up that we never even thought of. No one has done this legally. There's a lot of companies that have done it illegally, but when you're doing it legally, a lot of issues have come up that you have to work your way through, and that's what we've been doing with the Ride Genie folks for the last five months.

Desiree Dante, Lucky Cab, we are in support of this form of technology. However, we have also met with several different vendors, and have yet to sign on with one exclusively. But we are in support of this type of technology.

Member Collins asked her if Lucky has some kind of contract or agreement that you have to sign with them? She answered yes that would be something that we would, just to do the test pilot. She continued that they still don't know which is the correct company to go with or who has the best product. That's why we are personally are meeting with several different vendors to find that out.

Member Aguilera asked if they were exclusive to one, or did you have three or four different companies (inaudible) Ms. Dante commented that if she thinks that would kind of depend on where the industry is going. You know, are



they going to interlink, or is it going to be a central text system. I think that's all kind of up in the air. I think they would probably want an exclusive agreement, the technology companies.

John Hickman, Frias. I apologize for not being able to expand too much on Mrs. Frias' thoughts regarding all of this, but I can share with you that she's very interested, and the Frias companies are very interested in getting in to this type of technology as quickly as we possibly can. And I don't mean to be saying that we'll do it in haste. I think we'll do it properly, taking all regulations in mind and all of the things you've been talking about. The Frias companies are in active support of the Ride Genie product and company, that's the product and company right now that's out there for us. This is kind of a desperate situation in that we need to get something like this in place, and we're interested in testing and we'll continue to work with the Ride Genie product and the company that provides it as we move forward. And we're as anxious to know where this is going to end up as anybody. But I echo many of the statements from Brent Bell. That's where we find ourselves, and Frias companies have been in support of the product and the technology, more importantly, from day one.

The Chair asked if they were implementing smart meters as well. Mr. Hickman said that got 900 cars. That's a lot of money. And we're going to watch the test. We're working with the vendor, the local vendor, that's supplying the particular meter you're talking about. Chair asked if he was waiting for results from Desert and he replied that's part of it, but we're working with the vendor, too. We've got a quote. We're knee deep in this thing. I mean, this technology is very important, and although it's not going to happen overnight and we've been party to trying to work out the bugs on the limousine side and all of those things, we're actively anxious in trying to make sure that we figure this out because this is going to be very important for not only us, but for our industry.

Rick Flaven, Deluxe, stated that he's been down this road with the new technology. I'm in support of that, but what I have was with TaxiPass, and they came up with some--another guy that had applications to add to the meter, so I did tests. And I've had other meters to add that to it called Metrolink, which most of the industry was using. And that was supposed to be the best. Well, here's the problem. I put in the Metrolink meters when I started the company, but you can't get the parts. They're overseas. So Metrolink eventually failed and went away because you couldn't get the stuff fixed. Last year through TaxiPass, another company they brought out here. This is the best. Hook it all up. Got approval from the Taxi Cab Authority to do the test, and they put in the PIN number like they say--and this is what I'll emphasize to everybody. It's durability, durability, and durability. I can't tell you how many times my driver would finish the shift, want to upload to go, and it wouldn't upload.

The Chair asked if it was TaxiPass or another company and Mr. Flaven said another company. The point I'm trying to make you to is, until it's tested, until it works with the meter, it's all got to be about durability, durability. For instance, they would actually boot up my cab, my driver wanting to go to work, and it would take me three days to get it repaired, because they have to break the seal, get the people out, get the parts, figure it out, and it becomes annoying, you know, two or three days. He told them get your stuff out of his cabs, I've had enough, went back to what is durable, the Silent 610s with the current technology. So I'm all about durability. I support the technology, but I don't approve any approval right now. We need to take this slow and make sure it works. Until today, I didn't even hear about these meters. And I've already been down that road where I've lost shift after shift because the durability test, which they all brought up, doesn't pass. That's my point.

Bob Winner, attorney for Deluxe, stated that he wanted to make a few legal points. I think your counsel said, has this been noticed right. It hasn't for you to approve this. You can't. This is about money. I can appreciate this technology, and with Uber going everywhere, and now having trouble everywhere. But there's a reaction. Everybody's kind of going, oh, it's new, it's cool, it's great. This is something you should be exploring, and we're happy. There are two past technological events at this agency, much more important than the NTA's decision, whatever it was, five months ago, cameras, credit cards.

When cameras--there was a Nellis cab driver burned to death. It was really bad. It was a bad time and it was safety, and the drivers are here. Safety. And we had hearings and hearings and workshops, and two companies, I think the same two that are here, Brent Bell and George Balaban, went out and bought cameras. They said, we're going to do it, and they led the way. The TA never ruled. There's no rule, I don't believe, saying you have to have cameras. It was, technology came in, things were tested. I hear, had the TA acted in haste, as Mr. Hickman said, good word, haste, we would have some stupid rule. Bad word, sorry. There would be a rule that said, this is the camera, this is what it's got to be, and it would be outdated in two years. That's how it's working now.



Credit cards were the other thing. A company came in here and yelled at all these companies saying, why don't you take credit cards, it's easier. And it was slow, but they got to it. And the company was in here, and they were charging three bucks a fee, and you guys didn't approve it. Do you know why? It wasn't for service. It wasn't taxi service. It was for transactions. The same lawyer, I don't know who his client is today or the guy behind this company, but the same lawyer was in here wanting to do it as well. And the reason he was in here is because he wanted you to approve the fee.

At this point--this may be a great idea, four bucks might be right. We don't know. But what they want you to do is approve the fee so they can say, this is the law, we have to charge that. If somebody comes along that can do it for two bucks once you've said four bucks, it ain't going to go to two bucks. The guy is going to pocket the two. You shouldn't act in haste, and you have not been noticed properly. And this may be a good idea, but your knee-jerk reaction to do something with apps, with technology is understandable, but you're supposed to pump the brakes. That's your job.

Chair Drobkin: I can tell you, we've been hearing about this for two years in different forms. There is no knee-jerking here. I can promise you that. Bob Winner: Well, if you approve the \$4.00 fee and a \$10.00 no-show on nothing... Chair Drobkin: Well, we're not--we've already discussed, and we're not approving fees today, so I appreciate that. We'll be noticed properly. Bob Winner: With that, I'll be quiet.

Chair Drobkin: ITPEU. Let's try to get this moving a little bit, guys. We still have the heavy stuff coming, and we're not taking any breaks for lunch so (inaudible).

Ruthie Jones, ITPE Union, representing the drivers for Yellow Checker Star and Henderson. We had no knowledge of what this was all about, and I feel there should be additional vendors proposing whatever you're doing. And another thing I want to be able to see, how this is really going to impact the drivers. We're talking about a \$4.00 fee. They're already having a fit with the \$3.00 fee that's being charged, and they do not get a portion of it, and customers are assuming that they do. And the technology, I don't see this as an instant anything because of the fact that the drivers have to be taught on whatever system you have in place, and they are going to be many bumps in the road with that because some are able to adapt quicker than others. So anything that you're doing, I don't feel it should be immediately done without more investigation to see exactly what the system is all about, and is this system going to be conducive to everybody, and how does this system really impact the whole industry, and the drivers are part of this industry. So we need to know what's going on, what you're going to do, and we realize the fact that the companies are the ones that are going to install their equipment, but we want to make sure that this doesn't have any negative impact on the drivers.

Chair Drobkin: You know I asked about the tip earlier for that? It's because at least it's something that for most people who don't really pay attention will just approve it, and you guys actually get a decent tip. So I can promise you, that is the first thing that I was thinking about, is that you guys actually, out there doing the hard work, actually get a decent tip. Ruthie Jones: Well, thank you very much.

Chair Drobkin: That was absolutely excruciating.

DAG Christine Guerri-Nyhus: When we talk about fees, I also want everybody to remember that there's NAC 706.471, which says that rates, charges, and fares in the county have to be uniform, I don't know that legally you could allow a ride hailing app to have a \$10.00 no-show fee, and not let Jay not have a \$10.00 no-show fee because it does say they have to be uniform charges. So we need to think about that going down the road. So my suggestion for the Board would be to have whoever wants to be the first to use this program, come back at the very next meeting with an application for the pilot program so that we can get this started. They come in with an application, how it's going to be used, what fees they're going to ask for. We can notice it properly. Public will be aware then of what system it is, what company it is, what program it is, what fees you're charging. Fees have to be in accordance with what's in statute. They have to be reasonable, there's got to be a basis for them, and all of that, as well as the gratuity. I don't know that 20% is the standard, and if that's the standard then we need some evidence to come in and show that that's the appropriate thing to be. So that's my best advice to you, is to continue this and ask for whoever is going to be the company to come back with that application.



Chair Drobkin and Member Aguilera agreed in uniformity. She suggested that an early January meeting be scheduled, Neal put everything in writing or whatever company, to put in for the pilot, put in the rates, and to be very careful. I hope the Board shares this, is that I would like to get this up and running as soon as possible so we can work out the bugs, and join the rest of the country and the rest of the world, on having this. And I think it's going to be very important. Neal said it not a pilot program but a vendor demo.

Member Nolan commented he thinks that it is important to have staff included in the process. I think it will just save us from getting to this point again and then having possible objections from staff who hasn't been integrated into this. So if we can integrate staff into the test project that you're going to do so that--I guess one of the bigger questions that was whether or not we're actually syncing the software with the meter, in real time. And if they can validate that, it would save us an extra step, too.

Neal Tomlinson: I have just a couple of closing comments. First off, I just want to address the no-show fee. The way it is, 90% of that no show fee, it goes to the certificate holder so they can pay their drivers because it's their time that's using it. Obviously, they're using our system, so part of it goes to the company, but that does go to the driver. So any company would share in that same thing. The second part of this, we think the consumers really want this, there is a demand for it. I think that that's been proven over the last few months of what's happened. We will certainly meet with the AG and with the administrator and staff to make sure that whatever you need from the certificate holders, as far as an application includes the fares, rates, and charges. We'll do that.

Chair Drobkin: And I'm not going to--we're not going to wait until January 29th. So we're going to figure out, after this meeting, so can you help us to get a quorum together (inaudible) the first week or (inaudible) of the new year. Second week, oh yeah, that's right. Yes, sorry. That was my fault. The second week of January, and that way we can move this along. Is everyone okay with that? Okay. So we're...

Discussion followed with DAG Ryan Sunga, Member Aguilera, Chief Aquino, Member Collins and a representative from Ride Genie regarding the no show fee, what consummates a ride if cars are around and no one is coming does that constitute refusal to transport, what if no acceptance from driver – Neal said that the app would get the closest driver or next available closest vehicle. Member Aguilera stated it might help security which Chief agreed with.

Member Collins feels that the cart is being put before the horse when many issues have not been proven to work. He said some of the other operators, mainly Frias, are in support of this, but they haven't plunged in to make that commitment to test. So I'm a little concerned that there's not any consistency in the industry where everyone is like, this is great. And nobody is debating the quality or the interest in this technology. I'm a firm believer, it's great and we need it. However, I'm really concerned about making sure--we can all talk about costs, profit, everybody is going to be making a lot of money. That's all the back-end stuff. You've got to make sure that it works properly from the get go. So to me that's still a very, very important issue, and we don't have the logistical and the hardware figured out yet. That's my main concern.

Neal Tomlinson: We'll make sure we address that in the next proceeding. Sairam, a representative of Ride Genie, has concerns about the integration, some alternative solutions will come up so that everybody can be comfortable about it. So you essentially have a dual-use system. We've got people who have chosen to go ahead and proceed with the smart meter. There's no problem. It's integrated, fully integrated. People who want to maintain those Legacy meters, and there may be a transition period, as there is with every technology. You've got to configure things a little differently while there's a transition. You can't expect 2,000 vehicles to go and purchase smart meters and have them all installed over night. It's just not going to happen. So I think what Sairam was talking about is we'll present a dual program where you have smart meters that would include full integration with the meter, and then you'll have the Legacy meters that have the alternatives as far as, how do we make sure that the fare is being charged correctly. So that's what we'll do.

DAG Guerri-Nyhus said that a motion to continue the item pending an application is needed.



Motion: Continue the item pending an application with specifics discussed
By: Member Nolan
Seconded: Member Aguilera
Vote: Passed unanimously

Chair Drobkin: We discussed that to death. Okay. We're going to go ahead and take a five-minute break.

10. Discussion and Possible Decision regarding the Annual Review of Medallions.

Kelly Kuzik made his presentation talking about the current request before the Board from the industry to increase the 2:00 to 2:00, the Thursday to Monday medallions. It looks like they want to add one shift. They also want to add five additional Thursday to Monday 2:00 to 2:00 medallions, which is an additional 80. If you do the time equivalency, it's like adding 43 24/7 medallions. They also want to add 80 24/7 medallions, and the final partner request is to add 10 additional geographically-restricted medallions for all companies, which is an additional 160 geographically-restricted medallions. Currently, there are 154, so the request for more than double what they currently have for geographic medallions. Unfortunately, we were not provided with any of the support or backup information related to any of the requests. The only piece of information we do have, if you look at the supplemental packet that we handed out this morning, the very last page, the blue and white lines, that is blown shifts for 2014. We used the first 11 months. We wouldn't have included December anyway because we know they're going to blow a tremendous number of shifts for vacations, so we wouldn't have included it. But in the first 11 months of this year, approximately 10,000 shifts have been blown, 7,000 of those, 70%, have been geographically-restricted medallions. So, the conclusion is that they're only utilizing 30% of their current capacity for geographic medallions, yet they want to increase that number by double. So we provided that chart so that you could see where the numbers shake out there. And the only other thing that we can provide--I've got all of the statistical information with rides and things in the original packet, but one of the things that we could like, if this Board does decide today to allocate, that we return to a practice that was common for many years, even when I got here. And that is that any medallions be allocated temporarily for a year, and be re-evaluated at the next review of medallions. The reason being, the question you have to ask is, what if you're wrong. If they're granted as permanent medallions, it becomes almost like a property right. There's virtually no way to take them back. So what had been done in the past, they would be allocated on a temporary basis. That way the industry would be able to provide staff with statistical information that we can review and could even do a status check for six months ahead, whatever it is that we decide when we can evaluate to see if these medallions are actually being productive and if they were properly allocated. At the following review of medallions, we would be able present that data, and then the Board would be a little more informed. And again, unfortunately, we just don't have the support documentation for any of the current requests, that we just happened to track the blown shifts, but other than that we don't have any information that would support or refute any of the requests being made by the operators at this time.

Member Nolan: Kelly, you may have answered this somewhere in the presentation you just gave, so I apologize if I missed it. With regards to the data that your analyzing, you indicated that it looks as though right now that they're utilizing, I guess, maybe on average about 30% less. Would you clarify that because maybe I got that wrong.

Kelly Kuzik explained that, actually, they're only utilizing 30% of their current capability, of the current capacity. So they've got 154--of the blown shifts in 2014, for 11 months, 7,000 of the 10,000 shifts were geographically-restricted medallion shifts. So they're only using 30% of their current capacity, yet they're requesting more than double the number of geographic medallions that are out there now. And our concern would be that they're not using what they already have, yet they're requesting more. Does that answer your question, sir?

Member Nolan: It does answer my question. Okay. Thank you for clarifying that.

Member Aguilera: One of the sheets that we had in the packets is quick facts. And if I read this correctly, it says there are 2,410 active taxicab medallions now. And the Las Vegas taxi fleet averaged 19 trips per shift. This is for 2013. There are 10,000 permitted taxicab drivers, and there are approximately 3,000 taxicabs in Las Vegas. Kelly Kuzik agreed, 3,064 this morning. Member Aguilera: 3,064, okay. I just wanted to confirm that those were the actual... Kelly Kuzik: Yes, sir. Member Aguilera: Thank you.



Intervenors were Desert, A Cab, Nellis, YCS, Western, Whittlesea Blue/Henderson Taxi, Lucky, Frias, Deluxe and ITPE Union.

Chair Drobkin: Okay. We'll allow interventions at this time. I understand the interventions are going to be a little unorthodox this morning. So should I just ask who wants to come up first or as a group? Okay.

Cheryl Knapp, WB/Henderson Taxi, along with George Balaban of Desert, and John Hickman of Frias: Thank you for allowing us to do this in a rather unorthodox manner. There seems to be a little confusion, which I'd like to address right away. Our interventions are slightly different than what staff has presented. Not all of the interveners are in agreement with what we are going to present to you today. We would like to make our presentation to you in a two-fold manner. We are going to be addressing a new geographic restricted medallion, but we would like to do that after all of the other interveners have spoken and the Board has made their deliberations on what we are going to ask for, separate from those 10 that Kelly had referred to. If we have the Board's approval to do that, then I would like to go ahead and get started.

Chair Drobkin: Sure. Yeah. That's going to help us make a decision and I'm very (inaudible).

Cheryl Knapp presented a few graphs to the Board.

The first is purple which is the enplaned and deplaned passenger count from McCarran's website, and they can be verified by staff. The one thing that I want to address is the last time that we came before this Board and received an allocation was August 2011. So what I'm going to be presenting to you in these first three graphs are statistics having to do with what things were in August of 2011 versus what we have today. She went on to explain that there was a dramatic increase in the enplaned and deplaned passenger count at McCarran Airport, over 1.2 million more since the last allocation. Now, the numbers for November and December were not in at McCarran, so I estimated those numbers using 2013 stats, which we believe 2014 will be higher than that. So as dramatic as this graph is, it would be even more so, once we could get to the end of the year and see those actual numbers.

The next graph, this data was retrieved from the Las Vegas Convention and Visitor Authority website. It is the visitor volume from August 2011 and there's a dramatic increase with over 2 million more visitors in 2014. Again, I estimated the November and December stats using those from last year, and believe this year this number will increase in 2014.

The third graph represents our own industry's trips. When you look at this graph, 2014 is depicted in a dark blue, are the increases this year versus every other year since August 2011. The only exception to that is February of 2014. Those numbers fell below that of February of 2012. The reason for that is 2012 was a leap year, so we had one extra day of statistics in with those numbers. If you were to remove that last day's worth of trips, then you would see that every single month this year we have exceeded everything in the prior months back to our last allocation.

The last graph is really important because what you might hear from some people is that the allocation from 2011 has not been fully absorbed, which we think that the allocation from 2011 was not only absorbed, but now we are at a point where we need to start allocating for today and into the future and into this next year. With dramatic

increases in the enplaning and deplaning of passengers as well as in visitor volume, therefore, they are asking for five unrestricted medallions.

George Balaban: The statistics that are available through the Taxicab Authority, are monthly statistics. We're not required to turn in the actual daily shift numbers. We just turn them in for the whole month. So the graph that I presented to you is just Desert Cab statistics because I don't have access to the entire industry statistics.

We're asking for more weekend medallions. Currently, we run medallions that start at noon on Thursday and run all the way until 2:00 Monday afternoon, and we have 17 of those extra medallions to handle weekend business. Yet, if you look at that graph you'll see that the trips per shift on non-weekends is about 19 trips per shift, yet on the weekends it's 25. That's even with the 17 cars. We're talking about trips per shift. So we have 17 cars per company out there - 30% more trips per shift on the weekends.



The Convention and Visitor Authority does a fantastic job bringing conventions into town, and they usually run them mid week, which is why we are asking for temporary allocations for those midweek conventions. But Las Vegas is still a weekend town and we do still have special events on the weekends, a fight, motocross, the rodeo, UFC, concerts which adds to the regular weekend business. A majority of those special events, unless it's something like EDC, we're not in here asking for an allocation. With the regular weekend business and if there is one special event, people are not getting serviced properly. When looking at how high the numbers are on weekend with tourists, conventions and the locals, we are under allocated. The outlying areas that want taxi cab service, we can't even provide service on the strip because we're swamped, and it just kind of snowballs into this problem which is why we're asking the five extra medallions to run in sync with the existing 17 that are already out there, which run from Thursday at 12:00 noon until Monday at 2:00 p.m. during the busiest times.

John Hickman: Stated he wanted to just lend the Frias support to the ideas presented by Cheryl and George, with the idea of the five additional unrestricted taxi cab medallions. He agrees with comments made about the steady growth and visitor volume, the steady growth in the McCarran Airport traffic, and the steady growth in our industry trips, as evidence that shows what I call organic growth in the market and hopes the Board considers our request.

With regard to the 2011 allocation, he feels those medallions have been absorbed by the marketplace, and then some. And so it's time to add some additional medallions at those times. He commented that there are two regulations, Board orders that were issued in the past that we'd like you to revisit. First, as has been the case with the Convention Center and geographically-restricted taxi cabs since 2005, cabs can pick up at the Convention Center, and they do. We would like to ask the Board to consider an order that would allow geographically-restricted taxi cabs to pick up at the Sands Convention Center as well. Currently, geographically-restricted cabs cannot pick up there.

The second one is even a little of an older Board order from sometime in the mid '90s that required the certificated operators that have handi-van medallions, to include at least one vehicle in their fleet that is able to carry two wheelchairs at one time. And over the last couple of years, it's become very difficult to buy those type of vehicles for our use as there were only two manufacturers, Ford and Dodge offering in the area that were designed to carry two wheelchairs. The Ford Windstar vehicle is no longer offered. The Caravan offers the ability to carry two very small wheelchairs. So in today's wheelchair world, which we've had to expand the size of the throat entry in the vehicles and that kind of thing, there just isn't an affective vehicle in the market for us as taxi cab operators, to be able to carry two wheelchairs at a time. He's asking the Board to reconsider the Board order that might reverse that original mid '90s order where we had to have one two-passenger wheelchair vehicle because it's almost impossible anymore to get those.

George Balaban: The vehicles that you can get, that are going to be able to handle that conversion and that weight, basically don't fit into or under almost any of the porte-cocheres and parking garages, therefore, you're limited in to where you will have access. Another consideration is whether you have an advertising sign on it, or the top of it, it won't get into these parking garages. Therefore, when transporting the handicap passengers, they will have be taken into the parking garage to those entrances that are by the elevators to be dropped off instead of the front door of the hotel. I don't think I've ever had a two-wheelchair request ever, even though we have the older vehicles that are coming out of service that can do that.

Member Aguilera: Asked George if he also was talking about scooters as he sees a lot of them at his hotel and George said yeah, stating that's where the issue is, is that if you advertise that it's going to haul two wheelchairs, and it needs to be very big to haul two of those types of wheelchairs because if they're traveling together, odds are they're both in those big wheelchairs, and again, I've yet to have the request for two wheelchairs.

Kelly Kuzik: I just have one point of clarification about something that Mr. Hickman had said. On page three of your evidence packet, I provided an allocation history. In 2011 there were six additional weekend medallions, and also, they expanded the hours. But there were also six county wide medallions that were allocated, and those went out one per month from September of 2011 through February of 2012. John Hickman: Because they were put out one a month, I missed it.



Cheryl Knapp: I'm glad Kelly actually brought that up because in the five unrestricted that we are asking the Board for, we would ask that two be allocated when the Board order goes into effect, and then one incrementally each month thereafter until the full five allocation was actually placed into service. She asked the Board if she could go through them and refresh everybody's memory on what we actually have in the industry and her request was granted.

She went on to explain –

- 24/7 medallions, they are unrestricted - can operate anywhere within Clark County within that certificate holder's restrictions

- Time-restricted medallions - these medallions operate seven days per week between the hours of 12:00 noon and 2:00 a.m. for any 12-hour period. Most certificated companies have 17 of these medallion.

- time and day restricted medallions that operate from Thursday at 12:00 noon until Monday at 2:00 p.m., two shifts on those appropriate days, which would be Friday, Saturday, and Sunday - each company have 17. These are the type of medallions that we're asking you to add an additional five more operating during those same days and times.

- Wheelchair accessible vehicles of which most companies have four. I believe Virgin Valley has three. The only thing that we're asking for is that one of those existing medallions be now permitted to operate with a vehicle that can only serve one wheelchair, as opposed to two wheelchairs simultaneously, as was pointed out, there is a lack of requests for two wheelchair accessible vehicles and because of the restrictions, they are not feasible.

- Geographically-restricted medallions. Most companies have 12 – these have the following restrictions - they are prohibited from operating on the strip, downtown, and airport, with the exception that they can pick up currently at the Las Vegas Convention Center, at any point in time. We are asking you to expand that authority to also allow them to pick up at the Sands Convention Center off of Sands Avenue, still, you know, leaving them off of the boulevard.

- South of Sunset medallions. Six of the companies that currently serve all of Clark County have three medallions. Those medallions are typically known as the Deluxe area medallions, and frankly I think we should call them south of Russell starting now.

She asked that they can come before the Board after the intervenors have spoken to clarify that they are not asking for additional geographically-restricted medallions, as Kelly thought. We are going to ask you for the creation of an entirely new medallion to serve an area of the public that we believe needs to receive some more timely service. Chair Drobkin asked what the difference was in the medallion?

Cheryl Knapp stated that they want a new geo medallion that has new geo-fencing around it that the boundaries are exceedingly different on a temporary basis which will, hopefully, provide better service to the residents of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, and Henderson.

Member Collins commented that in comparing Kelly's stats from 2002 to 2013 and Cheryl's stats there is a discrepancy and he wanted to know if they were comparing apples to apples. He was told that Kelly and Cheryl were presenting different type of stats. Conversation went back and forth regarding the stats for clarification.

Chair Drobkin pointed out that the Board was given this information late Wednesday of last week, and so if it appears that we're a little disheveled, we're trying to figure out all of these numbers because we didn't have adequate enough time to do so. So I just want to clarify that for the record. She commented that because she in contact with Maria Soto of LVCVA, regarding 300 people standing in line, and they're giving out passes to the monorail, and every limo is activated. Those are the things that concern me. And as all of the conventions, the different hotels have their smaller conventions of 10,000, 20,000, 30,000, and again people are moving around, they're stuck in traffic. You've seen the congestion on the strip. You work there, you know that that's very concerning for me as I'm taking the calls, and there's nothing that I can do. And a lot of those shows don't get on our radar and that's going to be happening all year long, so I can absolutely testify to that.

Further discussion went on about long cab lines, no cabs available, limos and shuttles being used, congestion on the strip, blown shifts and what needs to be done about it.



Jay Nady commented that Uber has made at least my company realize that there's a lot more people out there in the burb that want a ride. Uber has let us know that there is unmet demand for people to get in taxi cabs. It has embarrassed us. Regarding blown shifts, I blow shifts intentionally every Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and I don't blow any shifts on the weekends because drivers don't call in sick on Thursday, Friday, or Saturday. I'm not going to put a cab out there if they can't book enough money to make a reasonable wage, and they're not going to show up for the same reason. He commented that they are not going to put cabs out that aren't going to make money. Calls usually starts about 5:00 on Thursday and goto about 8:00 on Thursday, and then it starts about 4:00 Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. When they call us they are told that we'll get one there as soon as possible, but you should expect an hour, and hopefully we'll get there sooner. They know we'll be there in an hour and we don't exaggerate. If you allocated 100 more cabs to every company, it would still be an hour. There's so much going on in Las Vegas on the weekends, you can't over-allocate on Thursday, Friday, Saturday. It's not possible. Uber did embarrass us and it also enlightened us that there is more demand out there, and that it's an expression of the public that wants to use transportation to get themselves home when they want to go to a party. If this Board allocates an abnormally large allocation, that we will grow into it by creating a market that we haven't done before. And I think, give us a chance because we probably know how to do this better than most.

Ray Chenoweth, Nellis Cab: I want to point out something, I'm not sure I understand why, but no one has used Uber except Mr. Nady. The 2,000-pound gorilla in the room is Uber. Uber is what brought us all here together. Having said that, I'll read the prepared testimony that I have submitted to you. His handout is available at the Taxicab Authority.

Jamie Pino, Nellis Cab: After hearing all of this new technology coming in, he feels he has the solution. He agrees with George that there are many events that come to Las Vegas and the only way to provide better service is by an allocation, commenting that it is more important to look at what's going on in the city, not just looking at stats and graphs. There are more hotels being built, Terminal 3 at McCarran was recently added, many new restaurants, new freeways and more people coming to the city. As an industry we have to keep up with that and that's through an allocation. He handed the Board 3 exhibits which are available at the TA office.

His first exhibit is the October 2014 monthly trip stats and which indicates an allocation is needed, especially because we saw this "outlaw" (Uber) come into our city and operate, and not obeying the laws that we have. They had a lot of rides - where do those rides come from? They got them, illegally, but they got them. He feels the industry needs to do their share of building this industry, and to stop worrying about who can make more--who has more shares than others or what's better for me or what's better for the other. Let's worry about the riding public. He went on to talk about averages.

His second exhibit - stats for Thursday morning through Monday night. Everything that you see highlighted is a \$300.00 average at Nellis Cab - all company averages are different. Look up on the day side of Thursday which is in pink and blue for nights, you can see that it's busy on Thursday morning. So I'm asking to expand the 17 cabs that they are already in existence on Thursday and have them run in the morning. Let the companies run them as they can. This management of this type and different type of medallion, is kind of getting a little bit old. There are companies like Deluxe and A Cab who blows shifts because there's nothing going on in their area. We put the cabs when they're needed. And hopefully with this new technology, we will be able to communicate with those people when they need those cabs. Take the 17 medallions that sit in everybody's yard and put them on day shift, 2:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., and then start the 2:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. This will give the chance to give another person a good shift to work because he will be making money and providing service to the riding public. He feels that the blowing shift barometer should be not included in allocations.

His third exhibit - these five 24/7 cabs - Monday through Sunday, five 24/7. This is what we need when it's weekend when the whole strip is busy. The 12 existing geo-restricted cabs that we have, they get diverted by the doorman - not a secret anymore - they're not out there serving the outlying areas, they get diverted. They came from The Rio, they drop at Caesar's. The doorman will not allow him to leave empty. He gets loaded. He goes to the MGM. The same thing happened at the MGM. We need to have cabs at Caesar's Palace so when this geo restricted companies picking up on the strip because the doormen will not let them leave empty, so they load them.



He feels the five medallions that will be allocated will help to divert these guys back to the outlying areas and with the new technology, we can create different ways to protect the locals that on Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday when they need a cab, there will be enough, east and west. At every convention you will find buses from out of state making money in our city and it's not the Convention Center's fault. It's CES, for example, they had a bad experience with us in the past for being under allocated, and they decided to contract these big companies to move their people out of the Convention Center.

Chair Drobkin asked Mr. Pino to "wrap" up his comments due to time constraints. Jamie Pino said his presentation is the same except to expand the time of the 17 medallions

Jonathan Schwartz, Yellow Checker Star: We're in support of the presentation made by Whittlesea, by Desert, and by Frias.

Bill Shranko, YCS: Agrees with a lot of what Jamie said and stated that Kelly's figures were absolutely right on. We haven't had an allocation since 2008, The Chair commented about visitors wanting to have a good experience. There's a lot of free shuttle buses and limos and a lot of that form of transportation causes a bad experience, even a bus, which is one of the worst experience. It's the most fabulous city in the country, let's keep it that way.

Marilyn Moran: Western supports the industry.

Desiree Dante: Lucky supports the recommendation as presented by Whittlesea, Desert, and Frias.

Bob Winner for Deluxe. We support the industry recommendations. He commented to release the limitations on the handicap medallions of Deluxe, not to serve downtown or the strip, but to neighborhoods. And so when you vote, we ask that you do that just because it's easier. I don't want to encourage the word temporary because the regs are different, and you've got to make different rulings. When you make a temporary order, because a board years ago started doing all allocations temporary, and as Kelly points out, there's a property interest, that's a problem. You're going to have to follow the reg in the statute.....as to what has to be in every order. And that may mean every month you have to re up, re up, because there's limitations.

Ruthie Jones, ITPE Union: She stated that a lot has to be taken into consideration before allocating additional medallions and the major one is Deluxe's and A Cab's expansion to go countywide. The Board must deny this request. Many of these drivers are not making minimum wage. They must maintain a certain average. If they fall below that average, then they're subject to discipline, plus termination. She went on to explain why the Union does not support Agenda Item 9.

Chair Drobkin: Called back up Ms. Knapp. Are you guys doing the presentation? Well, we've decided, at least Christine and I, that this is the most convoluted one that we've had, and next time if you guys could just lay out in one sheet, like you guys usually do, that would be really helpful.

John Hickman: Madam Chair, just for clarity, and maybe I'm the only one confused. The request was made earlier for the Board to consider those requests first and maybe vote before we got into the other one. Or does the Board wish to hear them all?

Chair Drobkin: No. We're going to take--let's do it all at once. John Hickman: Okay. Great. Chair Drobkin: It wasn't written--I mean, it wasn't agendized as separate ...issues ... John Hickman: I understand. I just wanted to make sure.

Chair Drobkin: And we'll kind of--after you guys do this, we'll kind of clarify what exactly it is that you guys are asking from the full time to part time.

Cheryl Knapp clarified what they are requesting –

-10 new geographically-restricted taxis to be allocated per certificate holder. We are asking for this to provide better service to the residents of Las Vegas, Henderson, and North Las Vegas. These cabs will be permitted to pick up in the green area on the maps that you have before you. The boundaries are north of



Charleston, which will better serve the downtown area, west of Rainbow, southern border is Warm Springs, and east of Eastern, all the way to the outer boundaries of Clark County.

She went on to explain that the existing geographically-restricted medallions, which we are not addressing today, are going to be required to focus their service within the pink area that you see on your map. They are going to be restricted from picking up at the airport, strip, and downtown, as they are now. They are allowed to pick up at the Sands--hopefully, at the Sands and at the Las Vegas Convention Center.

Some of the existing problems that we have with geos serving the outlying areas, is we have customers in the Summerlin area that are waiting too long for a taxi to arrive because we are having to pull those taxis off of the Palace Station, The Palms, hotels that also need that service. So it's resulting in us having a customer waiting too long to receive that taxi. We have a customer who was at the originating area, who is not going to be able to receive service, because we're pulling from area to serve another. And we have a driver who is having to drive an inordinate distance, to pick up a ride where he knew he was already going to be guaranteed one. All three problems we can easily resolve by allocations such as this for a new medallion.

These cabs are going to be different than the existing geos and the remaining cabs in our fleet because they are going to be centralized dispatched taxis. The companies that you see on the second handout that I've given you, include the Bell Companies, Desert, Frias, Lucky, Nellis, and YCS. These companies have, prior to today's meeting, committed to being a part of the centralized dispatched cabs for this project that we're hoping you'll approve. We're hoping that we're going to receive confirmation from the remaining cab companies that they will also participate in this.

Some of the properties that you're going to see to the left include Red Rock Station, Suncoast, Green Valley Ranch, Sam's Town, Boulder Station, South Point, and Cannery. These various points encompass the Summerlin area, Henderson, east, south, and north of the outlying areas. This is not the final list of properties where we plan on stationing cabs. This is a beginning, a starting point, because we are looking to put these cabs in areas where they can serve local residents that live in those areas, as well as customers that are going to be at these major properties, with this centralized dispatch.

How it's going to work is there will be one phone number, never heard of before in our industry, that customers will call to receive a cab. Once that call is received, using GPS, we will dispatch the closest cab to the call, regardless of what cab company the cab is from, any of the cabs that you see on that participating list. Whoever the closest cab is, he's going to go for that call. When that call is completed, that driver will be forced to dead head back to either his originating area, or one of the other stationing areas that you see. We don't want to cut off our nose to spite our face, and send someone who has picked up near Red Rock and has delivered near the Cannery, making him dead head all the way back to Red Rock when he can stage at the Cannery, and other vehicles be moved to that originating property, so that we will be better able to focus on everything that is moving in these outlying areas, and being able to adjust our cabs accordingly. Something we have not previously been able to do.

Our dispatch departments will work collectively together, to make sure that we are dispatching the closest cab to the call via GPS, and ensure that we are still providing coverage in all of these areas. Once the new supply of cabs is in these areas and this new dispatch system is being used, we plan on beta testing some of the Smart phone apps. You heard from Ride Integrity this morning. We're looking at possibly beta testing two of these mobile apps with, obviously, the Board being involved to the extent that you plan on addressing this again in January.

Chair Drobkin: Obviously you're not going to create another office for the central dispatch. Cheryl Knapp: Correct. Chair Drobkin: At what place will the central dispatch be? Cheryl: It's actually going to be at all of our places because we're going to be using Smart Phones and tablets at our facilities. Chair: Okay. So the same phone number will basically be used. Cheryl: Yes. It's going to go all the way around. But if a call comes in at George's dispatch station, and it says that it is from the centralized dispatch number that people are calling, and none of George's cabs are available in that area, George's dispatch will have the ability to assign that call to one of my drivers if my driver is the next closest cab, so that we will all actually be seeing not just our own cabs, but everyone else who is participating in this centralized dispatch, giving us a much better ability to be able to respond timely for the service. Something we've never had before. Chair Drobkin: I'm impressed that you guys actually got



together and (inaudible). Cheryl: Did this all on our own. Chair Drobkin: Yeah. I'm kind of blown away. I think it's great. Continue.

Cheryl: We anticipate, as we move forward with technology, that eventually the Smart Phone app is going to be the way people are going to be hailing cabs in the outlying areas. However, we understand that there's a certain part of the population that either doesn't have a Smart Phone, or it just doesn't really want to be that tech savvy. So the phone number that we're going to be using for the centralized dispatch system will remain regardless of one app, two apps, or ten apps that might be available at that time as we move forward.

We're asking for these 10 cabs on a six month temporary basis. And we want to have the flexibility to be able to put more cabs at Red Rock if that on a Friday night the residents in that area are demanding more service, and perhaps have fewer at the Cannery or another property. By giving us the 10, you're allowing us the ability to grow this market. I can't sit before you here today and give you statistics that are going to show you that we need cabs in order to serve this need right now. What I'm asking you to do, is to give us 10 cabs so that we can go ahead and stage them and build the business, show the people that we have a supply of cabs available for them, and in doing so build that demand. And hopefully in doing so, I can come back before you again and ask for even more. By then we'll be able to show you that (inaudible).

Chair Drobkin: So just for clarification on what Deluxe was talking about, you're not asking for temporary restricted medallions. You're asking for essentially, a six month period of review for this program. Cheryl: Yes. You would actually be allocating medallions on a temporary basis. Chair Drobkin: With a review though. They're not... Cheryl: Right. I figured July 15th would give us the six months. By that point in time, if not sooner, we would have enough data from our dispatchers, you know, acquiring data, from our drivers being able to participate, and we would be able to come before you and say, these are the rides that we're providing service for, this is where we started, this is how we've grown, and be able to give you some empirical data to support either an increase, a possible change, or that we keep it status quo and just move forward.

DAG Guerri-Nyhus: You would do it as a temporary medallion, but you would review in six months to determine... Cheryl: No. What was (inaudible) by the NTA was geographic restrictions. Chair Drobkin: That's what I want everyone to understand that. I think that's what Deluxe was bringing up, so I want everyone to understand it's not that. DAG Guerri-Nyhus: That was temporary event medallions... Chair Drobkin: Right.

Cheryl: I understand that there was a challenge to that in later years. And bear in mind, you know, that we seem to have this issue with blown shifts, and I want the Board to understand that we may find that we don't need to put as many as you see on the sheet that I've given to you today, or we may have to put more. So by blowing these shifts, it doesn't necessarily mean that we're not serving the public. There just may not be a demand. It's one thing to have five cabs stationed somewhere and offer to incentivize our drivers to stay in that area and to perform accordingly. It's another to put 15 there if it's not necessary. So I just want blown shifts to be understood as to not necessarily be so negative.

Member Collins: A couple of questions. Is this in response to a potential Uber situation? Do they camp out at these properties? Do you know?

Cheryl: Well, I don't know that Uber actually camped out anywhere, Member Collins. I would like to say that we have heard the public for some time stating that they're not getting served as timely in these outlying areas as they would like. I live in the northwest side of Las Vegas. If I'm going to call a cab, I should be able to get one faster than anybody else in town except for maybe George and Brent. But the bottom line is, I don't feel like I should have to wait 40 minutes for a cab when I know I can walk right out of Caesar's and get one. I mean, it's a frustrating issue. But I also, being in this industry, know that drivers will go where the rides are. By us creating this new geo-fencing and forcing drivers to stay in these areas, because we will incentivize them to do so, we are going to be giving them the opportunity to build this business. And I truly believe that once drivers realize that there are rides out there, and these people are going to be happy to take cabs, they won't call five companies. They're only calling one number, and they know they're going to get a cab, and it's going to be timely, and the driver is going to be happy to be there. That's going to make that customer happy, that we will grow the business because word of mouth among locals goes a long way.



Chair Drobkin: These drivers are going to know what they're getting in to, right? Cheryl: Absolutely. Chair Drobkin: If you offer it them, they take it, they absolutely know what they're in for. They know the incentives versus a driver who has just said, here, this is what you're doing. Cheryl: Here's your car and go to work.

Member Collins: These are obviously all casino properties, I love the idea of centralized, goes into one number, and you've got six companies right now that can respond. My only question is, where did we come up with 10? Is 10 enough? Is 10 too many? What is the background or the intel on these type of properties? Do they have patrons who are on the strip, and all of the sudden they want to go to a local neighborhood casino type of thing? I mean, what type of traffic? Is there any information?

George Balaban: The idea of centralized dispatch, we sat down as a group and were discussing, and we didn't need to come to you for that. We were going to do that. But in that conversation, my response was is that, I'd be happy to do it, but I can't pick up anymore rides. My geographically-restricted cabs are maxed out now. So we've got to create a centralized dispatch, and that really isn't going to solve the problem because we're barely handling the business now. There are, as Kelly said, a lot of blown shifts that are geographically-restricted cabs. Well, I can almost guarantee you, that those blown shifts were not on the weekends. We weren't going to come in here and say let's create a centralized dispatch and give us different amounts of medallions on different days. We know that on the weekends we need more cars than we have. So we couldn't do it with what we had, so we thought, well, if we're going to create a centralized dispatch, we need some cars to put into that. And giving me 10 and not centralizing doesn't, obviously, solve anything. This puts 160 cars--when all of us participate, they all get into the centralized dispatch. So we have a feeling that they'll be spread pretty well. But the actual number of 10 that we came up with, was just a guess. And as we are hashing it out, we have to pick some number to start with. So if we pick 10, there is a very good chance that eight of them are sitting on everybody's desk and we don't need them, initially. And hopefully, like Cheryl said, we're back here shorter than six month going that 10 was not enough, we need more. If not, we're going to come back and go, it's slowing growing and we are blowing a lot of shifts, we're only using five of them during the week, we're using all 10 on the weekends. This is truly an experiment. We're all talking about a centralized dispatch, and maybe we're going to get into a centralized dispatch and find out that we don't like centralized dispatching.

Unidentified Male: I don't think anybody is disputing the idea. I think the idea is great. I was just kind of wondering if there was any, intel, any historical data based on these properties, the type of usage, the cab usage that they would have. But I appreciate your honesty that you picked a number and said let's run with that on a test basis.

George Balaban: Yeah. And it is--the only data we had, and I did not have these conversations, Brent had these and Jonathan had them with principals from these hotels. They have the same problems the strip has. It's not Tuesday night that they're going, where are the cabs at, it's on Friday nights and Saturday nights and Sunday mornings. They have the same experience that almost the entire city has. And again, that's why we need the flexibility, and we kind of picked the number a little bit on the high side. We're hoping it's not the high side, but on the higher side of the number to hope to make sure--because the last thing we want to do is advertise the number and provide a bad experience. Because anybody in this service industry knows that's the worst thing you can do, so we'd rather have them and not need them than the opposite.

Member Aguilera: These cabs, you say, are going to be stationed at these properties probably, right? Cheryl: Yes. Member Aguilera: But they're going to serve the community; is that right? Cheryl: In that area, yes. We have to have a place for the cabs to stay at. Member Aguilera: I wanted to make sure that's what I heard.

George Balaban: And as it works out, we might find out that it's really busy in Summerlin, and there's not even a casino close. They could be staging in the Albertson's parking lot. I mean, but there just needs a place for them. And they're usually going to like together so they can talk while they're waiting to be dispatched.

Chair Drobkin: Now, if this is approved, in six months you'll be able to have pretty good data to bring back to us, right, as what areas were busier. Balaban: Or at least trends.

Member Nolan: I was just wondering why the downtown area was left out of that. Cheryl: The downtown area is not left out of that. As far as staging, these cabs will be able to stage downtown, but because if you look, the



border is Charleston, so that we're able to provide better service to downtown. But the cabs are not going to be staging at an area downtown because they're going to be moving around. And the other question I had was, I'm assuming that any other operator who wanted to participate in this would be allowed to, so we're not being asked to... Cheryl: Yes. And we're hoping to get them all on board. I know Brent, who has been in talks with some of the other operators in trying to get them on board with this as well. Member Nolan: They would be able to participate equally. Cheryl: Yes, absolutely.

DAG Guerri-Nyhus: Every company would get their medallions, and then it would be up to them whether they participated in this centralized... Cheryl: Every company, by law, can choose to do so and purchase those medallions on a temporary basis if they want to participate in this. The whole idea behind this, is to get the cabs out there and have that supply, and hope that we create more demand. It would be in everyone's best interest if this is a huge success, and we're back before you in a few months asking for even more, because then we know that we're doing a fabulous job at serving the public.

Balaban: The ultimate goal is--in order to do this centralized dispatch, beyond the radio that we have in the car, we'll put another instrument in there that will connect these 10 cars from each company. Ultimately, we're going to add that into our other fleets to where all of our cars are on centralized dispatch, not just these 10, so that you provide good service because it's not even a geographically-restricted cab. We have complaints, and I'm sure the chairman gets them, of people that walk out to a cab stand and can't get a ride to an outlying area because the driver is pretty confident that what's the odds that somebody in Summerlin is going to get lucky enough to call my cab company so he can get a ride back. But if we're all on centralized dispatch, they won't turn those rides down to go to outlying areas because they know there's just one number that everybody calls, and odds are there's a ride out there, so he's going to be the closest, he's going to get it. And that's the ultimate goal. That won't happen in the first six months but hopefully within the year, we'll all be hooked together. That's the end game.

Interim Administrator Ely: I actually have a comment to make. The enforcement concerns, the inspection concerns, there would be some concerns related to--over the first period, six months, whatever, we would need to be looking at, from our perspective, how many more calls for service is that generating for my staff. How many more inspections are needed. Obviously, it would depend on the number of cabs being put in place. But if we also had more accidents, we would be responding to further areas out into the community possibly. So these are stats that we're going to have to look at. But if it's going to impact my staff altogether, I would need to also be looking at the numbers you're generating, to consider whether I'm going to have to ask for more inspectors or more investigators. We're going into a legislative session now. I'm not going to be able to do that for two years. So this is something I'm not saying in a negative manner. I'm just saying that we're looking at how are we going to meet the demand of increasing numbers. So whatever numbers you generate are going to impact us as well, so we would have to be working very closely together to try and justify not only the initial 10 for each of you, but how we're going to manage, basically short staffed as we are right now. So it's something to put on the table for consideration because one thing leads to another.

Chair Drobkin: I think this is an idea whose time has come. It's long overdue. I'm glad, in a sense, that Uber has forced you guys to kind of move in different directions.

Kelly Kuzik: Can I just expand briefly on what Captain Ely was saying?

Chair Drobkin: Sure. Can I finish my comment first, please. I'd really--otherwise I get off thought, and it's been a long day already. My point being is that I don't think--and I understand the constraints of this agency, as good as anybody because I've been advocating for more funding and everything since I've gotten here four years ago. But we can't, I'm really going to say is that it's not something that we can stall or hold off progress because we have issues here. We're just going to have to figure it out. It really is something that needs to be done. It's better for the community. And then with that, I'll allow you to speak what you want to speak.

Kelly Kuzik: I need to point out the logistical challenges that the agency is going to have beyond staffing inspections. If a brand new type of medallion is created, that means if it's 10, that's 160, we would have to order approximately 180 to 200 additional new types of medallion plates. And because our budget is just--I think it's closed, we would have to do--and those familiar with government budgeting, it's called a work program, and that's



how we move money around within our own budget. We have to request that through the director's office, we have to receive approval, and then we have to order the plates if they approve it, and there's no guarantee that they will. The support of the Board order certainly helps, but those are the types of things that we need to be aware of. And we don't want to run into the challenges we did when A Cab and Deluxe expanded their certificates, if you grant these additional medallions. We don't have them, and we would have to order them.

Chair Drobkin: Here's my point to that for this Board. We are tasked with doing whatever is in the best interest of the riding public, not in the best interest of the agency. I do understand our constraints. We have to look at, if this is the best thing for the riding public, and this is the best thing to make sure that everyone that comes into town or locals are being serviced, then we have to do it. That's our mandate. That's our job. Now, we can work with the problems that we have and work through them and figure that out. That can be a part of the equation, but it cannot be the reason why we don't move forward with something. That's not acceptable.

Kelly Kuzik: We're not saying to not do it. We're saying we have challenges that... Chair Drobkin: I understand the challenges, and we can put that in there. However, we need to configure it--and I ask you guys to help get our budget and do what we need to in order to keep operating at some kind of level of competency.

Unidentified Male: You would not find operators that would say, we're not going to help pay for medallions. Chair Drobkin: Right, because they understand that.

Cheryl: Right. We pay \$100.00 for every medallion as it is. We would be billed \$100.00 for each of these new medallions as well. Not to speak out of turn with the group, because I realize that it isn't just the three of us, but if getting a medallion is staff's main issue with regards to getting these on the road, all I would ask the Board to do is make that six-month mark, six months from whatever date. I had chosen July 15th as a date to, (inaudible) at the next hearing, we have to come before the Board to provide them with some information. I can't imagine any one of the companies that is willing to participate in this, is going to have an issue if we don't get a medallion tomorrow.

Balaban: We don't have centralized dispatch set up yet. We have the equipment... Cheryl: We have the equipment, but we haven't installed it.

Chair Drobkin: And so that's a moving date. We'll work with staff.

Cheryl: And we were looking at after CES (inaudible). Unidentified Male: Was there a date in mind that you had (inaudible)? Unidentified Male: Sometime in January after CES. It's probably going to be after that.

Balaban: The administrator had mentioned that any time we get a new medallion in and our fleet grows, there will be taxi cabs and new cabs that need to be put in to service. Whether it was a new geographically-restricted medallion or the 24/7 medallions or weekend medallions, we're going to be putting some cars into service. To make them centralized dispatch cars, they won't need to be dispatched, the existing car I have, we're just putting another instrument in it. I mean, the inspector would look at it when he's regularly doing his quarterlies to see if it was safe. It's not going to be on the floor where it can be caught on somebody's foot.

Cheryl: There wouldn't be a new inspection. George: It's not above and beyond the radio. We're not taking anything out. We're just adding another component in there.

Chair Drobkin: Okay. All right. Does anyone have any other questions, additions? Okay. All right. Wait, let's go--hold on. Don't move. And then I'll ask if anyone has any issues with this. Let's go step by step. What exactly are you asking for? Just walk it step by step because then we have the other issues of the handicap--or the wheelchair, we have the Sands...

Cheryl Knapp: 5 typically called 24/7 unrestricted medallions, two immediately, one each month, thereafter, until the completion of the five have been allocated.

DAG Guerri-Nyhus: Do we have enough of the medallions? Kelly Kuzik: I think we have enough. Because if every company gets--you're asking for two or five?



DAG Guerri-Nyhus: Can you do two immediate? Kelly Kuzik: Two, so it's 32.

Cheryl: You would need two per cab, two Henderson immediately. Then you would have 30 days to get one more of the regular 24/7 unrestricted. Kelly Kuzik: Yes. Cheryl: Five over time. Kelly: Right, but still that's going to be 80 total plates that we have to have. Chair Drobkin: Can you do the two per company now, though, is the question? Kelly Kuzik: I believe we would have enough to accommodate that. Chair Drobkin: Okay. And then you can order because then you'll have a month. Kelly: If we had--yes. But I do believe we can accommodate the two.

Cheryl continued: 5 time/day restricted medallions, which would operate from Thursday at 12:00 noon through Monday 2:00 p.m. And I believe this is where our presentation differs from Nellis, so you would have to get theirs. And then we would ask that the existing geographically-restricted medallions have a Board order issued that also will allow them to pick up at the Sands Convention Center via Sands Avenue, which is in addition to their ability to be able to pick up at the Las Vegas Convention Center, which they already have.

And last, that the Board order issued in 1997 requiring that one of the wheelchair medallions be attached to a vehicle equipped to handle two wheelchairs simultaneously...

DAG Guerri-Nyhus: And then I had mentioned to the chair, and I think that we need to advise the Board, on that one, I don't know that any member of the public who is handicapped would know from an Annual Review of Medallions, that we were going to change--that there was no longer going to be available a two-wheelchair car, that they're only going to be a one wheelchair car now. So I'm going to ask that the Board not consider it now, but put that on the Agenda...

Cheryl: And then 10, based on the new geo-fencing that we provided you today.

Chair Drobkin: Okay. That helps. Okay. Now, does anybody have any issues with the 10, just talking about the 10, new geo-fencing medallions? Is everybody good? Okay. Thank you.

DAG Guerri-Nyhus: Then we need to have just Jamie come and tell us the difference, what he was asking. His was slightly different. Chair Drobkin: Because he was requesting basically three additional--he was asking for five (inaudible). Unidentified Female: But he wanted 10 geos but they were the old boundaries. That's what he had (inaudible). Jamie Pino: It's the same as they are doing. The only difference is that I want to roll my 17 on Thursday morning and they don't, the 10 geos -- the same. Chair Drobkin commented that everyone is in agreement.

Chair Drobkin: Board's turn. Did you guys process all of this? Okay. I'm going to take the chair's prerogative, which I tend to do a lot. I'm really in support of this. Again, this past year has been really taxing with the various calls for, you know, panicking about service. And I do at times actually get elected officials that call and complain that people are in from out of town, get kicked out of cabs, and they can't get cabs. So I'm fielding all of that. So I really, really am in support of allowing this. As far as the 10 geo-restricted with the new outlying areas, bravo to you guys because that's exactly what's been needing to happen. And if we're trying to move the industry forward or we're trying to make things better, then we have to start somewhere. And so, that's just what we're going to have to do. We're going to have to implement things and see how they work and tweak it. And it's not like we never meet. And it's not like if there's a problem that we can't meet. We have a pretty good Board. So I'm in total, complete agreement that this is needed. So, someone else talk because I'm getting hoarse.

Member Aguilera: I agree with you. And I'm supporting it because I know the need is out there, and I know the traffic on the strip is bad. I know that our, at least my hotels are 100% full most of the time, and people want to get around town now. They don't want to just stay at one place. They go to different clubs. They go to different properties, different restaurants. In fact, we support that because they can charge comp at all the properties. So I'm supporting it.

Member Collins: I think all of the arguments all day are compelling. My only concern is when we increase permanent medallions is 80% to 85%, maybe more, at a (inaudible) statistics. But most of the business that we do from the airport to the strip, it's right there, that's where the congestion is. When you start to increase and add



more cabs on the street, that's the only issue that I get a little concerned about, is that over congestion factor. Other than that, I think all of the arguments are compelling, everybody has a good reason. We probably do, at the high peak periods, under serve the riding public. So I think there's definitely a need. I just wish, logistically, we could work out a little better system, getting from the airport to the strip. I don't think there's any question that there is an ongoing need with what's going on here in Las Vegas. So having said that, I support all these measures.

Member Nolan: I'm going to support it as well, Madam Chair. I'm not completely convinced that the--based on the numbers that we were given, that the need for the additional medallions is there right now in light of the fact that we have the ability to issue temporary medallions as needed and on event basis and that's what we do, and I think we're doing a pretty good job of that. However, I overwhelmingly support the private sector's ability to manage their own business. And they're the ones--I wasn't indifferent or didn't hear the ITPE use information, as a matter-of-fact, I think they've provided some additional information as a reminder that we had just introduced some new cabs through Deluxe and A Cab, to the equation recently. But ultimately the owners and operators of the cab companies know the costs of filling attrition is pretty significant. If they don't allocate wisely, they lose operators to other jobs, and they have to manage their business that way. So I'll be supporting the requests, and I think we just scrutinize the temporary requests going forward and into 2015 a little tighter.

Chair Drobkin: Okay. And I just kind of want to point out something. Ms. Soto, again, because I'm in constant communication with everyone, remarked that even during NFR, she said thank God for A Cab and Deluxe because they picked up the slack because they were having trouble moving people around, and that's not even our largest show. So thank you for both of you. So basically I agree, we made the right decision on that one as well. Do I have a motion?

Member Nolan: Are you looking for individual motions or we looking for a collective motion?

Chair Drobkin: Let's do a collective. Can we do a collective, Christine? DAG Christine Guerici-Nyhus: Yes, you can do a collective.

Member Nolan: Then I would ask legal staff just to go ahead and make--just to make sure, because I don't think that I could get it all right the first time.

Kelly Kuzik: I don't know. The medallion custodian isn't in the room, so I don't know the answer to that.

Member Nolan: Perhaps what we do, with regards to whether or not we have the medallions available, is pending we can have a report from staff later today. To issue what they have available immediately, or as it's allocated, and then to order those others without delay, the additional medallions that are needed... Chair Drobkin: Great idea.

Member Nolan: ...within consideration to--if there's a budgetary issue then we're going to have to address that, but the industry has already said they would step forward and cover the costs of the medallions, which they do.

Chair Drobkin: Great idea.

Motion: 5 additional 24/7 medallions, two issued immediately, one each month after that.
5 additional weekend time-restricted medallions –
Thursday, 12:00 noon to Monday 2:00 p.m., to be issued as soon as available, or
immediately. As soon as they can be made available.
The existing geographically-restricted medallions can now pick up at the Sands Convention
Center via Sands Avenue.
New allocation of 10 temporary geographically-restricted medallions to be called geo 2
medallions to be issued on a temporary basis and to be reviewed at a meeting
six months after issuance.
By: Member Nolan through DAG Christine Guerici-Nyhus
Seconded: Member Collins
Vote: Passed unanimously
Motion passes



11. Staff Report

Kelly Kuzik: I've provided the October and November stats. Trips are up for the entire year, month over month. If you have any specific questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

Interim Administrator Ely: I actually do. I wanted to give you some information that Ms. Rushton had met with us regarding VeriFone, and we had a new demo of a new style headrest type device, and we have approved that to move forward. Their staff was extremely cooperative in showing us what they had, and she has done a great job.

Kimberly Rushton for VeriFone: I just wanted to take the opportunity, Chairman Drobkin and members of the Board. I'm Kimberly Maxson-Rushton with the law firm Cooper Levenson. Consistent with what Administrator Ely has reported, we did do a demonstration in which he did approve that. One additional thing that I would like to note for your attention is the fact that, as you know, it is required--it is against the law for a passenger in a taxi to not wear their safety belt. And so consistent with the repositioning, it will be imbedded in the headrest and it will be in eye's view, and it will have a continuing message on there reminding the passenger of their obligation under Nevada law to wear a safety belt while in a taxi. So I think that that's a step forward in terms of (inaudible) and sharing the protection and the safety of the traveling public. And we thank both Administrator Ely for his commitment to safety and also for your consideration of this. Thank you very much.

12. Report of Legal Counsel

DAG Ryan Sunga said he nothing to report this month.

13. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

14. Adjournment

Motion:	To adjourn
By:	Member Aguilera
Seconded:	Member Collins
Vote:	Passed unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 2:04:44

Chair Drobkin: Thank you, everybody. Happy holidays to everyone.

NOTE: Minutes transcribed by Teleperformance Rapidtext and

Respectfully submitted by:

Barbara A. Webb 01-08-15
Barbara A. Webb, Recording Secretary Date

Approved by: Ileana Drobkin 01-29-15
Ileana Drobkin, Chairman Date

Tom Ely 1-15-15
Tom Ely, Captain, Interim Administrator Date

