

1 BEFORE THE STATE OF NEVADA TAXICAB AUTHORITY

2 IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA)
3 TAXICAB AUTHORITY BOARD INITIATED)
4 TECHNOLOGY FEE RATE REVIEW)
5 PURSUANT TO NRS 706.8825(4) AND NRS)
706.8826(3)(C))FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS
OF LAW, DECISION AND ORDER6 THIS MATTER came before the STATE OF NEVADA TAXICAB AUTHORITY
7 BOARD (the "Board"), for public hearing, deliberations and action on December 17, 2025
8 (the "Hearing"), at the Nevada State Business Center, 3300 W. Sahara Avenue, Las Vegas,
9 Nevada 89102, upon a rate review initiated by the Board related to the technology fee
10 authorized by Sections 706.8825(4) and 706.8826(3)(c) of the Nevada Revised Statutes (the
11 "NRS").12 PRESENT: Dan R. Reaser, Chair
13 J.D. Decker, Member
14 Alex Vazquez, Member
15 Lawrence Weekly, Member
16 Todd Park, Taxicab Authority Administrator
17 Matthew Feeley, Deputy Attorney General18 The Board makes the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, Decision and
19 Order (the "Order").

FINDINGS OF FACT

20 1. The administrative record in this matter consists of (i) the Notice of Public
21 Hearing (the "Notice"); (ii) the Public Board Meeting Notice and Agenda; (iii) the presentation
22 of written materials submitted by Todd Park, Administrator for the Nevada Taxicab Authority
23 (the "Administrator"); and (iv) the presentation of information by the Administrator, each of
24 the Nevada Taxicab Authority's (the "Authority"), Deputy Administrator Curtis Mell ("Mell"),
25 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").26 2. No Petition for Leave to Intervene was filed by the December 2, 2025, the date
27 prescribed by the Notice.

28 ////

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 in significant reductions in the sources of revenue upon which 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 uncontested 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.

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