JOE LOMBARDO
Governor

STATE OF NEVADA

DR. KRISTOPHER SANCHEZ
Director

TODD PARK
Administrator

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY
TAXICAB AUTHORITY

MINUTES OF DECEMBER 17, 2025 BOARD MEETING

1. Call to Order

Chair Reaser called the regularly scheduled monthly meeting of the Nevada Taxicab Authority Board to order at 9:31 am. The meeting was held at 3300 W. Sahara Avenue, Suite 400, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Board Members Present:

- Chair Dan Reaser
- Member Decker
- Member Vazquez
- Member Weekly
- Matthew Feeley, Deputy Attorney General

Board Members Not Present:

- Member Graf – excused due to court obligations

Taxicab Authority Members:

- Todd Park, Administrator
- Lona Webb, Attorney

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Reaser led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Compliance with Open Meeting Law

Chair confirmed that the meeting was properly posted in accordance with Nevada's Open Meeting Law, as verified by the Secretary.

2. Public Comment

Chair Reaser opened public comment.
No public comments were offered in Las Vegas or via remote connection.
Item closed.

3. **Approve Board Meeting Minutes from October 15, 2025 Board Meeting - (For Possible Action)**

The minutes of the November 19, 2025 meeting were presented for review.
Motion to approve by: Member Weekly. Second by: Member Vazquez. Motion passed. Member Decker abstained due to not being present at the meeting.

4. **Industry Discussion *(For Discussion Only)***

Chair Reaser opened industry discussion.

Mr. Balaban raised concerns regarding illegal transportation operators, particularly during large daytime events such as the Cowboy Christmas/Rodeo convention. He described individuals soliciting rides with signs and verbal offers in a manner inconsistent with lawful TNC or taxi operations and expressed concern that enforcement presence appeared insufficient during these high-traffic events. He urged the Authority to explore enforcement, regulatory, or statutory solutions.
No additional industry comments were offered.
Item closed.

5. **Public Hearing— In the matters of Application For a Pilot Program by Whittlesea Blue Cab and Henderson Taxi to examine the use by passengers of a transportation network company ("TNC") technology application to connect to a taxicab driven by a Taxicab Authority permitted driver, and similarly (i) the Applications for a Pilot Program using the Curb Mobility, LLC technology by A CAB SERIES, LLC; CAB Transport, LLC dba NewCab; Deluxe Taxicab Service; Lucky Cab Company, Western Cab Company and Nellis Cab Company; Nevada Checker Cab Corporation; Nevada Star Cab Corporation; Nevada Yellow Cab Corporation; Taxi Management, LLC; Taxi Transport, LLC; Twenty First Century Taxi, LLC dba NewCab; YCS Acquisition, LLC dba NewCab; (ii) Applications for a Pilot Program using the Kaptyn DT5 In-Vehicle Mobile Data Terminal by A CAB SERIES, LLC; CAB Transport, LLC dba NewCab; Deluxe Taxicab Service; Nevada Checker Cab Corporation; Nevada Star Cab Corporation; Nevada Yellow Cab Corporation; Taxi Management, LLC; Taxi Transport, LLC; Twenty First Century Taxi, LLC dba NewCab; YCS Acquisition, LLC dba NewCab; and (iii) Applications for a Pilot Program using the zTrip/Taxicab Authority system by Desert Cab and Virgin Valley. The pilot programs for which the applicants seek authority to conduct are similar to the zTrip pilot program applied for by Whittlesea Blue Cab and Henderson Taxi which was heard and approved on July 16, 2025, August 20, 2025, and October 15, 2025. The program proposed by the applicants will allow a passenger using either or both a technology network company's ("TNC") application and other third-party service provider software and hardware systems to connect to a taxicab driven by a Taxicab Authority permitted driver with all operational and insurance obligations mandated by NRS Chapter 706 required for those services. At the Public Hearing the Nevada Taxicab Authority Board will receive reports on and data generated by the pilot program and may consider whether, and under what terms and conditions, passenger use of the TNC technology application should receive final authorization. Applicants state their proposed pilot programs are intended to determine if this arrangement benefits passengers and drivers without jeopardizing a passenger's safety, and to provide data about the comparability between a meter rate and up-front pricing supplied through the TNC application. They seek to use technology provided by Curb Mobility, LLC, the Kaptyn DT5 In-Vehicle Mobile Data Terminal or technology identified as the zTrip/Taxicab Authority or other taxi carriers such as Deluxe system to conduct the pilot program. In accordance with action taken on October 15, 2025, by the Nevada Taxicab Authority Board, the pilot programs were approved for 184 days to end April 17, 2026. This pilot program is examining the use by passengers of a transportation network company ("TNC") technology application to connect to a taxicab driven by a Taxicab Authority permitted driver with all operational and insurance obligations mandated by NRS Chapter 706 required for those services. At the Public Hearing the Nevada Taxicab Authority Board will receive reports on and**

data generated by the pilot program and may consider whether, and under what terms and conditions, passenger use of the TNC technology application should receive final authorization. The hearing will be conducted pursuant to NRS Chapter 233B, NRS 706.8818, NRS 706.8819, NAC 706.471, NAC 706.876, and NAC 706.924. The hearing is expected to involve discussion of but is not limited to NRS Chapter 706 and NAC Chapter 706 generally, and any other relevant statutes and regulations. (For Discussion and Possible Action)

George Balaban – Desert Cab/Virgin Valley

Reported no progress since the prior meeting. Delays are due to Uber's internal legal and review processes, not Desert Cab.

Michael Bailin – Yellow Checker Star Cab

- YCS is testing both Kaptyn meters and Curb integration.
- Currently operating one Curb-integrated cab, running a few shifts.
- Early results are positive, with 10–12 rides per day from Uber referrals.
- Drivers receive additional hails immediately after Uber-originated trips

Curtis Mell – Deputy Administrator -Taxicab Authority Deputy Administrator

- Confirmed Curb started its program on December 4, 2025.
- Only one cab is currently active, but additional vehicles are possible.
- Activation remains a work in progress.

Desiree Dante – Lucky/Western and Nellis Cab

- Also launched on December 4, 2025 so stats will be submitted next month as required.

Bill George – zTrip

Provided an extensive update:

- Technology Issues: Most software issues resolved after a 90-day effort. Current focus is driver behavior and education.

Operational Adjustments:

- Some employees assigned exclusively to Uber-brokered trips to provide data and encourage driver buy-in.
- Driver earnings data is being posted to help increase program adoption.

Performance Metrics:

- 1,853 trips offered per day via Uber.
- Driver acceptance rate varies between 2% and 37%, depending on events and surcharges.
- Average fare: $20.70.
- 54% of trips occur off-Strip, supporting the Board's goal of improving neighborhood service.

Airport Coordination:

- Preliminary meeting was held with airport officials to discuss long-term staging and curb-space planning for Uber-taxi integration.
- Future meetings are expected over several months.

Overall Assessment:

- The pilot works, is beneficial to industry, and produces net-new trips that taxis would not otherwise receive.
- Zero consumer complaints reported.
- Increased supply and improved mobility benefit the public.

- Remaining challenges relate largely to driver adaptation and public communication at pickup points.
- zTrip is preparing informational flyers for drivers to present at hotels and TNC areas when confusion arises.

Online Comment – Mr. Athan Rebelos (Curb)

- Confirmed Curb began Uber referrals on December 4 with Lucky, Western, Nellis, on vehicle at YCS, and one to two vehicles at Deluxe Cab.
- Early performance is positive, and Curb will present a full report at the January meeting.

Member Decker referred to prior guidance from the Attorney General and explained that, for the current pilot program to become permanent, several additional steps would be required. These steps include reviewing contracts between taxicab companies and Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) and completing a cost-recovery audit to determine whether the Taxicab Authority is covering all of its costs for trips brokered through TNCs.

The Board discussed whether these trips could create a financial loss for the Authority. The Administrator stated that the Authority currently receives the same revenue for these trips as it does for others, and that airport fees continue to be collected.

Member Decker asked whether a rate case with the Nevada Transportation Authority would be required for TNC-brokered trips. Staff confirmed that no rate case has been started and explained that approving rates based on another agency's rate structure presents legal and regulatory challenges.

Discussion then turned to taximeter requirements. Staff confirmed that all meters in use are NTEP certified and that the Authority has relied on that certification for compliance. Counsel advised that, despite existing authority, amendments to the Nevada Administrative Code would still be recommended to ensure clarity and long-term stability.

Counsel reported that the Authority is already in an active rulemaking process with the Legislative Counsel Bureau and has recently received a revised draft for review. He recommended continuing the existing rulemaking rather than starting a new one.

Member Decker expressed concern about timing and emphasized the need to keep industry informed about next steps. He also noted that rulemaking has an estimated cost of approximately $100,000.
No additional comments. Item closed.

6. **Public Hearing--An Application by Peteglo,LLC-TPM,LLC: George Balaban (AGTB LLC) manager/member of Peteglo LLC, and Brad Balaban (BJ) and Dana Balaban, both members of Peteglo LLC-TPM LLC, for Authority to acquire the assets including the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity ("CPCN") currently held by Applicant Seller NELLIS CAB, a Nevada series LLC (CPCT 884 Sub 4---224 taxicab medallions). Peteglo seeks to acquire CPCT 884 Sub (managed by the Balaban's through DC Cab Management, LLC.) to hold and operate it. The three Balaban applicants are the sole voting members of these entities which are owned and conducted pursuant to NRS Chapter 233B, NRS 706.8818 and NAC 706.924, and is expected to involve discussion of, but is not limited to, NRS 706.8819, NAC 706.465 and NAC 706.473, NRS Chapter 706 and NAC Chapter 706 generally, and any other relevant statutes and regulations. (For Discussion and Possible Action)**

Chair Reaser noted a petition to intervene had been filed, along with an answer in opposition and a reply filed the prior day. The Chair stated the Board would address intervention before the merits of the application.

Appearances:

- Brian Hardy (Marquis Aurbach) appeared for the proposed intervenors (the Chenoweth sisters).
- Kimberly Maxson-Rushton (Cooper Levenson) appeared for the joint applicants and referenced George Balaban as an applicant representative.

Chair Reaser stated he was inclined to grant intervention, but only on a limited basis. He explained the Board would not allow proceedings to become a forum for corporate disputes outside the Authority's jurisdiction. The Chair invited Ms. Maxson-Rushton to address why intervention should be denied.

Applicants' argument against intervention
Ms. Maxson-Rushton argued intervention should be denied because the petition was tied to a District Court dispute, not regulatory issues before the Authority. She stated the petition did not identify deficiencies in the application or raise issues within the Board's jurisdiction related to suitability, financial qualifications, or operations. She also argued the intervenors had not shown their participation would advance the public interest.

Chair Reaser asked if the intervenors had a direct interest in whether the signatory to the purchase-and-sale agreement authority had to enter the agreement. Ms. Maxson-Rushton responded that the District Court TRO allowed the administrative process to proceed and did not stop the Board from reviewing the application. She stated the application seeks a suitability determination and that no transfer would occur until after compliance conditions were completed. She added that a suitability finding could assist the bankruptcy trustee and the Chapter 11 plan process.

Chair Reaser summarized the procedural background, including that the District Court declined to enjoin the Authority from proceeding and that Chapter 11 bankruptcies were filed on December 5, 2025.

Intervenors' argument for intervention
Mr. Hardy stated his clients have an ownership interest affected by the proposed transaction and sought to participate to address timing and fairness concerns related to the sale.

Board discussion
Chair Reaser stated it was difficult to conclude the intervenors lacked a direct and substantial interest given the ownership interest described on the record. The Chair reiterated intervention would be limited to matters within the Board's jurisdiction.

Motion and vote – Intervention (limited)
A motion was made and seconded to grant the petition to intervene **on a limited basis**, restricted to argument on **jurisdiction/timing** issues. The Board voted unanimously in favor (ayes heard). Intervention was granted as limited.

Jurisdiction – Bankruptcy Automatic Stay / Authority to Proceed

After granting limited intervention, Chair Reaser stated the Board would address whether bankruptcy affected the Board's authority to proceed.

Intervenors' position (Hardy)

Mr. Hardy argued that Chapter 11 filings triggered an automatic stay and that the Board should avoid action that could be seen as approving a transfer of an estate asset before the trustee's process. He stated that, at most, the Board could consider whether the applicant is a suitable potential buyer,

without implying selection of a buyer or approving a transfer. He urged the Board not to put its thumb on the scale for any bidder.

Applicants' position (Maxson-Rushton)

Ms. Maxson-Rushton argued the application met statutory and regulatory requirements and was ready for Board review. She stated the Board was not being asked to complete a transfer that day, and any approval could be conditioned on bankruptcy trustee/court approval and completion of compliance requirements. She also stated the Board has authority to impose conditions on approval.

Chair Reaser stated he did not agree that bankruptcy eliminated the Authority's regulatory jurisdiction. He discussed the government "police power" concept and stated the Authority retains regulatory authority to determine whether a privileged license may be transferred and to whom. He distinguished routine enforcement authority from actions that resemble collection activity. He cautioned against creating precedents suggesting the Board loses jurisdiction whenever bankruptcy is filed.

Member Decker stated he understood police powers support continuing enforcement authority, but he was not comfortable taking action that could interfere with the bankruptcy court's handling of an ownership/transfer issue. He expressed a preference to avoid stepping into the bankruptcy process.

Member Weekly moved that the Board has jurisdiction. The motion was seconded. The Board voted unanimously in favor (ayes heard). The Board found it has jurisdiction.

Chair Reaser stated the Board now had to decide whether to process the application at this meeting and, if so, what action to take. The Chair stated the Board had received confidential information indicating the applicants and entities were suitable; however, he expressed concern about the purchase-and-sale documentation.

Chair Reaser identified two issues:

1. The agreement appeared to fall within the 90-day period preceding bankruptcy, a matter he stated is for the bankruptcy court to address.
2. The agreement included an outside closing date of November 1, and the Chair did not see documentation extending or curing the deadline.

Applicants' response
Ms. Maxson-Rushton stated that in regulated transfers the closing cannot occur until regulatory approval, so outside closing dates are common. She suggested the November 1 date may have been an error and emphasized that the Board's role is suitability and statutory/regulatory compliance, while enforceability issues are for the bankruptcy court.

Intervenors' response
Mr. Hardy argued that curing or amending the agreement after bankruptcy may require trustee/court involvement, and that the agreement's timing and enforceability issues supported waiting for bankruptcy direction before the Board took further action. He reiterated concern about the Board taking steps that could be viewed as favoring one bidder.

Board counsel
Deputy Attorney General Feeley stated there was no need to rush. He noted that while a contract is not strictly required by statute, it is typically used to show a "meeting of the minds," and bankruptcy raised questions about whether the Board was dealing with a real transaction or a hypothetical one. He recommended continuing the matter to receive more information from key parties and the bankruptcy process.

Board Action – Suitability Finding and Continuance

Chair Reaser stated he was not prepared to approve the transfer of the CPCN and medallions at that time, but he did not want the record to reflect any doubt about the applicants' suitability. The Chair suggested continuing the matter to a certain date (February) for updates on contract status and bankruptcy developments.

Chair Reaser moved that:

1. Peteglo is fit, willing, and able, and the controlling individuals are suitable as a potential buyer; and
2. The matter be continued to the regularly scheduled February Board meeting for an update on the contract issues and the status of the bankruptcy proceedings before the Board takes final action on transfer.

Second and vote.
The motion was seconded. The Board voted unanimously in favor (ayes heard). The motion carried.

7. **Public Hearing—Taxicab Authority Board initiated rate review concerning the technology fee received by the Taxicab Authority pursuant to NRS 706.8825(4) and NRS 706.8826(3)(c) as it pertains to the existing rates, charges or fares of the certificate holders in its jurisdiction. The hearing will be conducted pursuant to NRS Chapter 233B, NRS 706.8818, NRS 706.8819, NRS 706.8824, NRS 706.8825, NRS706.8826, and NAC 706.471 and NAC 706.924, and is expected to involve discussion of, but is not limited to NRS Chapter 706 and NAC Chapter 706 generally, and any other relevant statutes and regulations. (For Discussion and Possible Action)**

The Administrator thanked the Board and noted the Authority's financial condition had been discussed previously, but Member Decker was not present at that earlier presentation. The Administrator identified staff present:

- Dominic Del Padre, Chief of Enforcement
- Curtis Mell, Deputy Administrator
- Emily Cervi, CFO (Department of Business & Industry)

The Administrator stated the issue was urgent and referenced the usual rate review considerations:

1. what the current rate is,
2. justification for an increase,
3. the public interest.

The Administrator explained, in summary:

- The drop fee has not been raised since 2003, is set by the Legislature, and can only be changed through legislative action.
- The technology fee was created in 2013 and has not been raised since then.
- Ridership declined after COVID and has averaged about 1.68% annual decline.
- Inflation has increased about 68.5% since 2003.
- The Authority has had to cut positions and has limited ability to respond to major events due to funding constraints, including reduced ability to pay overtime.
- The Administrator requested the Chief of Enforcement describe operational impacts.

Dominic Del Padre – Chief of Enforcement

Chief Del Padre stated staffing ("bodies") is the key enforcement resource and continued position reductions have left the agency under-resourced compared to regulatory demands. Key points included:

- Illegal transportation remains a major problem.
- During F1, the NTA used overtime and towed 14 illegal vehicles; the Taxicab Authority, under tighter funding, towed one during the same period despite similar enforcement tactics.
- The Authority has only about two-thirds of the software needed tools.
- Tasers are limited (enough for three officers), not sufficient for all shifts.
- The agency does not provide full 24/7 coverage, and staffing also affects phone response capability.
- He raised concerns about dispatch staffing and classification changes (dispatcher to call-taker), stating the work is effectively dispatching and that pay/classification impacts retention and recruitment.

Statutory Authority – Administrator

Administrator cited NRS 706.8825 and NRS 706.8826, stating:

- The Board has authority to set the technology fee.
- Board-approved fees are automatically added to the meter as required by statute.
- Other agency revenue fees discussed would require legislative action.

Financial Overview – CFO Emily Cervi

CFO Cervi stated the technology fee is the fee this Board can change and reported that, after consultation with legislative legal staff, technology-fee revenue may be used to support Authority operations and reserves. She explained:

- The proposed $0.25 increase is intended to keep the Authority solvent for the next two biennia, maintaining the status quo (not adding positions or expanding programs).
- It would support required essentials such as technology support, dispatch functions, and the taxi assistance program, but would not restore previously cut enforcement positions.
- Trip counts remain in a downward trend and trip-based revenue is expected to continue declining.
- The Authority is already using reserves in FY 2026–27 to cover operating expenses and payroll.
- Without an increase, the Authority is projected to become insolvent at the beginning of the next biennium.
- An incremental approach may provide temporary relief but would not rebuild reserves to a safe level.
- The targeted reserve level is 180 days (about six months) of operating expenses.
- The agency has multiple vehicles at end-of-life and unplanned costs (rulemaking, retirement payouts, emergencies, cyber events) cannot be absorbed without reserves.
- Reducing other fees (e.g., medallion fees) would materially offset the benefit and would not restore reserves to the target.

Board Clarification – Reserves and Operating Use

Board discussion clarified that reserves are used broadly to support operations (including payroll, overtime, and vehicles) subject to normal budget controls. It was also clarified that reserves can support operations but do not create permanent staffing positions by themselves.

Deputy Administrator Mell stated:

- Under the current reduced budget, the Authority projects insolvency by FY 2028 (June/early July).
- Reduced programs—especially the senior ride/taxi assistance program administered through partner services—cannot be sustained without stable funding.
- Partner agencies have had to restructure staffing due to funding uncertainty ("yo-yo effect").
- The agency has reduced costs and staff overtime and cannot make additional reductions without affecting mission requirements.
- The proposed 25-cent increase is needed to restore baseline operations and maintain solvency for the next two biennia, including required programs.

Board Discussion – Planning, "Stopgap" vs. Long-Term Fix

- Member Decker stated the Board should not be asked to keep the agency solvent for two biennia without a long-term plan. He urged immediate work with legislators ahead of the 2027 Legislative Session and asked what it would cost to remain solvent only until 2027. He suggested a sunset approach. CFO Cervi stated she would need to run numbers; a sunset could be considered but might not provide enough stability.
- The Administrator replied the proposal functions as "insurance" given declining rides and uncertainty from new transportation options and stated he cannot predict future conditions.
- Member Weekly emphasized this should be treated as a shared "we" problem (Board, staff, and industry) and encouraged coordinated legislative outreach and planning.
- Member Decker reiterated concern that the technology fee becomes a public pass-through while other legislative options were not pursued.

Staff Clarifications – Timing and Revenue

- Staff stated the increase could be implemented quickly once approved and placed on meters.
- CFO Cervi stated the increase would begin stabilizing reserves and could support limited needs such as event overtime after roughly a month, but it would not allow hiring new positions.
- Staff estimated the increase would generate about $3.2 million annually.
- The current technology fee was confirmed as $0.05 per trip.

Motion: Member Weekly moved to approve the $0.25 technology fee increase.
Second: Seconded.
Vote: Approved by voice vote (ayes heard; one nays).

Chair Reaser encouraged continued coordination and suggested exploring ongoing legislative strategy, including a possible working group/committee concept.

8. Staff Report (For Discussion Only)

A. Administrator's Report

- The industry did not reach 1,000,000 rides for the month discussed (November referenced).

C. Enforcement/Compliance Report

- The Chief reviewed enforcement statistics and noted month-to-month fluctuations without identifying one single trend.

F1 Complaints: Curtis Mell stated Dispatch received approximately 21 complaints, primarily about insufficient/unclear signage and passenger confusion; callers were frequently angry. Signage improvements were discussed with the airport, but funding and competing advertising space are challenges.

D. Stats

- Rides were reported as higher than the same month the prior year (approximately 7,600 more).
- Per-trip charge revenue was stated as:
- Employee trips: about $22.15
- Lease trips: about $20.53
- Medallion counts were reported as unchanged.

E. Legal Counsel

Nothing to report.

F. Future Agenda Items

Nothing to report.

9. Public Comment

Chair Reaser opened public comment.

LOA – Kimberly Maxson-Rushton (Cooper Levenson)

Ms. Maxson-Rushton stated LOA supports the Authority and recognizes the budget need, but raised questions/concerns including:

- Whether the fee applies to flat rates (e.g., whether flat rates increase by $0.25).
- Whether NRS 706.8826 limits the technology fee (she referenced statutory language and questioned whether the Board exceeded a cap).
- Concern about funding an agency for four years when the Legislature may consider restructuring/merger issues in 2027.
- She stated LOA may discuss whether reconsideration is needed, but reiterated support for the Authority and staff.

Chris Sanchez – Director, Department of Business and Industry

Director Sanchez advised the Board that the Department is actively engaged with legislators and interim committee activity, including the Sunset Subcommittee review involving TA and NTA. He stated the Department is working with the Governor's Finance Office on both short- and long-term approaches and intends to work collaboratively with industry and elected officials during the interim.

No further public comment was offered.

10. Adjournment

There being no further business, a motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned.

By the Authority,

Dan R. Reaser

Dan Reaser, Chair
Nevada Taxicab Authority

Dated: February 18, 2026

Las Vegas, Nevada