

## BEFORE THE STATE OF NEVADA TAXICAB AUTHORITY

IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA  
TAXICAB AUTHORITY BOARD INITIATED  
TECHNOLOGY FEE RATE REVIEW  
PURSUANT TO NRS 706.8825(4) AND NRS  
706.8826(3)(C)

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS  
OF LAW, DECISION AND ORDER**

THIS MATTER came before the STATE OF NEVADA TAXICAB AUTHORITY BOARD (the "**Board**"), for public hearing, deliberations and action on December 17, 2025 (the "**Hearing**"), at the Nevada State Business Center, 3300 W. Sahara Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89102, upon a rate review initiated by the Board related to the technology fee authorized by Sections 706.8825(4) and 706.8826(3)(c) of the Nevada Revised Statutes (the "**NRS**").

PRESENT: Dan R. Reaser, Chair  
J.D. Decker, Member  
Alex Vazquez, Member  
Lawrence Weekly, Member  
Todd Park, Taxicab Authority Administrator  
Matthew Feeley, Deputy Attorney General

The Board makes the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and Order (the "**Order**").

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The administrative record in this matter consists of (i) the Notice of Public Hearing (the "**Notice**"); (ii) the Public Board Meeting Notice and Agenda; (iii) the presentation of written materials submitted by Todd Park, Administrator for the Nevada Taxicab Authority (the "**Administrator**"); and (iv) the presentation of information by the Administrator, each of the Nevada Taxicab Authority's (the "**Authority**"), Deputy Administrator Curtis Mell ("**Mell**"), the Authority's Chief of Enforcement Dominic Del Padre ("**Del Padre**"), and Emily Cervi, Chief Financial Officer for the Nevada Department of Business and Industry ("**Cervi**").

2. No Petition for Leave to Intervene was filed by the December 2, 2025, the date prescribed by the Notice.

////

1           3.       The Administrator reviewed with the Board written materials and made an oral  
2 presentation advocating an increase of \$0.25 in the technology fee from its current amount of  
3 \$0.05 to \$0.30. The Administrator explained:

4                   (a)     The technology fee was first imposed in 2013 and since remains  
5 unchanged.

6                   (b)     The fee authorized by NRS 706.8826(3)(b), which is commonly referred  
7 to as the "drop rate," may not exceed \$0.20 has been and remains set at the statutory  
8 ceiling and may only be modified by the Nevada Legislature. Since that fee was  
9 implemented, the rate of inflation has been 68.50 percent

10                  (c)     The Authority is an agency funded exclusively from the fees imposed on  
11 the traveling public on compensable trips of taxicabs, and the other fees and charges such  
12 as application fees and penalties authorized by statute. Among these other fees and  
13 charges, the assessments are either all set by statute or if increased would not generate  
14 significant revenues. Accordingly, the Board's authority to modify the technology fee is the  
15 only efficacious method to address an agency budget shortfall.

16                  (d)     The sources of revenue used to fund the Authority have been adversely  
17 impacted by a 50 percent reduction in annual taxicab trips since 2013 as a result of  
18 competing transportation alternatives, including notably the authorization by the Nevada  
19 Legislature of transportation network companies ("**TNCs**") such as Uber and Lyft, which are  
20 regulated by the Nevada Transportation Authority.

21                  (e)     The reduction of trip fee revenue coupled with inflationary impacts has  
22 resulted is significant reductions in the sources of revenue upon with the Authority relies for  
23 its operations and to maintain contingency funds.

24                  (f)     As a consequence of declining revenues to support its budget, the  
25 Authority has eliminated several key positions and must curtail enforcement and certificate  
26 holder auditing efforts. Among the adverse consequences of constrained fiscal and staffing  
27 resources is the inability to police transportation of the public by uncertificated purveyors that  
28 diverts business from the regulated legal certificated carriers in Clark County. This results in



1 loss income from rides for the legal carriers with a corresponding reduction in trip fees paid  
2 to the Authority.

3 (g) These funding constraints (i) eliminate or restrict the availability of funds  
4 to pay overtime to the Authority's investigation and enforcement personnel negatively  
5 impacting field coverage during large events in Las Vegas; (ii) necessitate reclassification of  
6 critical staff positions to create salary savings, for example with dispatchers; and (iii)  
7 significantly impairs recruiting, training and retention of qualified personnel to accomplish the  
8 Authority's core public service mission.

9 (h) The technology fee is imposed on a per trip basis and is recovered from  
10 the traveling public. The Board is the only public body with the statutory authority to set and  
11 modify the technology fee and this fee is the only source of funding for the Authority that  
12 does not require legislative action to implement a change.

13 4. Del Padre advised that the funding situation confronting the Authority seriously  
14 effects the ability to employ the additional enforcement officers necessary to support a  
15 reasonable force level. Without an adequate number of enforcement officers, the Authority  
16 can neither properly regulate the industry nor protect the traveling public, including the  
17 millions of annual visitors that use taxicab services in Southern Nevada. Del Padre informed  
18 the Board that the Authority is only able to fund the purchase of two-thirds of the necessary  
19 software programs needed to perform its duties or to deploy enforcement officer for all shifts  
20 in a twenty-four hour city like Las Vegas.

21 5. Cervi informed the Board that:

22 (a) The Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (the "LCB"), has  
23 opined that revenues collected through the technology fee may be applied to offset uses the  
24 reserve funding for the Authority.

25 (b) The proposed technology fee increase will generate \$3.2 million  
26 annually.

27 (c) Absent an alternative funding source, by the end of the current biennium  
28 the Authority will be insolvent if the technology fee is not increased. To address the

1 continuing revenue shortfalls, an increase in this fee must commence now to provide a new  
2 stream of funds.

3 (d) Although the \$0.25 increase in the technology fee cannot be used to  
4 fund new personnel positions, make expenditures that expand the agency or return funding  
5 for projects or programs cut or removed during the last legislative session, the fee will render  
6 the Authority solvent for the next two biennia. For example, the revenues generated by the  
7 fee increase can eliminate or reduce dependency on the Authority's reserve account which is  
8 being currently used for operating costs and existing payroll.

9 (e) The technology fee revenues may also be applied so reserve funds are  
10 available to pay expenses such LCB imposed charges associated with Nevada  
11 Administrative Code rulemaking proceedings.

12 (f) To extent that the revenues generated from the technology fee alleviate  
13 use of its reserve fund, the Authority will have the use of the reserve fund for extraordinary  
14 expenditures, for example retirement payouts, vehicle repairs, cyber attack mitigation or  
15 other unbudgeted contingencies. To accomplish that objective, the reserve balance should  
16 have funds equal to 180-days of agency funding requirements.

17 (g) Other possible funding sources for the Authority are limited and  
18 inadequate to address the full extent of the existing budget shortfall.

19 6. Mell advised that (i) the Authority's budgetary insolvency will occur in fiscal  
20 year 2028 under the existing budget based on current ridership and that the status quo is  
21 unsustainable; (ii) the \$0.25 increase in the technology fee is required to merely restore  
22 baseline operations, to meet basic compliance obligations, and to maintain solvency across  
23 the next two biennia; and (iii) the Authority has already achieved operating cost reductions  
24 through available efficiencies and position eliminations or combinations. Accordingly, those  
25 alternatives have been largely exhausted.

26 7. The uncontroverted evidence received by the Board at the Hearing  
27 demonstrates that the Authority's financial condition must be stabilized and that an increase  
28



1 in the technology fee is the only effective alternative that the agency has identified to address  
2 this situation.

3 8. If any of the foregoing findings of fact is more appropriately construed as a  
4 conclusion of law, it may be so construed.

### 5 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

6 (a) The Board may without application by a certificate holder initiate a hearing  
7 concerning rates, charges and fares. See NEV. ADMIN. CODE § 706.471(2); *cf.* NEV. REV.  
8 STAT. § 706.8824(6)(b).

9 (b) The Hearing was conducted in compliance with the provisions of NRS Chapter  
10 241, the Nevada Open Meeting Law, NRS Chapter 233B, the Nevada Administrative  
11 Procedure Act (the "NAPA"), NRS Chapter 706 and Chapter 706 of the Nevada  
12 Administrative Code (the "NAC").

13 (c) The geographic area subject to this Order is Clark County, Nevada.

14 (d) The Board is duly constituted and may regulate the conduct of the taxicab  
15 business. NEV. REV. STAT. § 706.8818.

16 (e) In performing its statutory obligations, the Board has been instructed by the  
17 Nevada Legislature, in the context of rate-making, to (i) provide for fair and impartial  
18 regulation, to promote safe, adequate, economical and efficient service and to foster sound  
19 economic conditions in motor transportation; (ii) encourage the establishment and  
20 maintenance of nondiscriminatory reasonable charges for intrastate transportation by  
21 regulated carriers without preference to any certificate holder; and (iii) discouraging practices  
22 that increase or create competition detrimental to the traveling public or to the business of  
23 the certificate holders. NEV. REV. STAT. § 706.151(1)(c)-(e).

24 (f) The Board may attach to the exercise of the rights granted by the allocation of  
25 taxicab medallions any terms and conditions that in its judgment the public interest may  
26 require. NEV. REV. STAT. § 706.8824(5).

27 (g) The Board has the authority to review and adjust, alter, or change the rates,  
28 charges, or fares for taxicab service in Clark County, Nevada, and is the only entity

1 authorized to do so for taxicab service within its jurisdiction. NEV. REV. STAT. §  
2 706.8819(1)(a); NEV. ADMIN. CODE § 706.471(1).

3 (h) The rates, charges, or fares of all certificate holders under the jurisdiction of the  
4 Board must be uniform, unless there is a showing that the public interest requires otherwise.  
5 NEV. ADMIN. CODE § 706.471(3).

6 (i) In conducting an administrative investigation, inquiry, or hearing, neither the  
7 Board nor any of its officers or employees are bound by the technical rules of evidence, and  
8 no informality in any proceeding or in the manner of taking testimony will invalidate any  
9 order, decision, rule, or regulation made or approved by the Board. NEV. ADMIN. CODE §  
10 706.948(1).

11 (j) The Nevada Legislature has authorized the Board to impose and collect a  
12 "technology fee in an amount set by the Taxicab Authority for each compensable trip" of  
13 each . . . taxicab" allocated by the Authority to a certificate holder. NEV. REV. STAT. §  
14 706.8826(3)(c). Any technology fee imposed by the Board as provided in NRS  
15 706.8826(3)(c) are "appropriated to defray the costs of regulating taxicabs in the county" and  
16 to "implement technological improvements in safety." NEV. REV. STAT. § 8825(4).

17 (k) A proceeding before the Board to adjust, alter, or change the taxicab rates,  
18 charges, or fares for taxicab service in Clark County, Nevada is a contested case under the  
19 NAPA. NEV. REV. STAT. §§ 233B.032 & 706.8819. Unless otherwise specified by law, the  
20 "preponderance of evidence" standard applies in a contested case governed by the NAPA.  
21 NEV. REV. STAT. § 233B.125. "Preponderance of the evidence" means evidence that enables  
22 a trier of fact to determine that the existence of the contested fact is more probable than the  
23 nonexistence of the contested fact. Nev. Rev. Stat. § 233B.0375.

24 (l) NRS 233B.123 states:

25 i. Irrelevant, immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence must be excluded.  
26 Evidence may be admitted, except where precluded by statute, if it is of  
27 a type commonly relied upon by reasonable and prudent persons in the  
28 conduct of their affairs.



- 1                   ii. Agencies shall give effect to the rules of privilege recognized by law.
- 2                   iii. Subject to the requirements of this subsection, when a hearing will be
- 3                         expedited and the interests of the parties will not be prejudiced
- 4                         substantially, any part of the evidence may be received in written form.
- 5                   iv. The experience, technical competence and specialized knowledge of
- 6                         the agency may be utilized in the evaluation of the evidence.

7       (m)       The reliable, probative and substantial evidence presented to the Board at the

8       Hearing established by a preponderance of such evidence that a \$0.25 increase of the

9       technology fee to the total sum of \$0.30 per trip is just and reasonable to “defray the costs of

10      regulating taxicabs in the county” and to “implement technological improvements in safety.”

11      (n)       The Board’s approval of such technology fee increase is a reasonable and

12      permissible exercise of its authority to regulate the taxicab industry and its rates, and is in the

13      public interest.

14      (o)       The Board concludes that approving the technology fee increase is in the

15      public interest, providing for fair and impartial regulation, promoting safe, adequate,

16      economical and efficient service and fostering sound economic conditions in motor

17      transportation, as well as necessary to support the regulatory mission of the Authority.

18      (p)       After discussion and deliberation, three of the four members of the Board

19      present at Hearing, having fully considered the reliable, probative and substantial evidence,

20      as well as evaluated the applicable law, and otherwise being fully advised in the premises,

21      voted in the affirmative upon a motion duly made to approve the increase in the technology

22      fee with Member Decker voting in the negative.

23      (q)       If any of the foregoing conclusions of law is more appropriately construed as a

24      finding of fact, it may be so construed.

25      ////

26      ////

27      ////

28      ////

ORDER

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. The technology fee is increased by \$0.25 for a total technology fee of \$0.30, and shall be imposed and collected as part of the rate, charge and fare imposed on the traveling public for each compensable trip of each taxicab allocated by the Authority to a certificate holder, including each such compensable trip for which a zone or other fixed rate, charge or fare is prescribed by the Authority;
2. That the revenues generated by the adjusted technology fee shall be applied as permitted by law to defray the costs of regulating taxicabs in Clark County, Nevada, and to the Authority's implementation of technological improvements in safety.
3. The Board retains jurisdiction to correct any error that may have occurred during the drafting or issuance of this Order.

DATED this 31st day of December 2025.

STATE OF NEVADA  
TAXICAB AUTHORITY BOARD

By: *Dan R. Reaser*  
Dan R. Reaser, Chair