

**MINUTES OF THE  
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Eightieth Session  
April 2, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Yvanna D. Cancela at 1:36 p.m. on Tuesday, April 2, 2019, in Room 2135 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Senator Yvanna D. Cancela, Chair  
Senator Chris Brooks, Vice Chair  
Senator Moises Denis  
Senator Pat Spearman  
Senator Marcia Washington  
Senator Joseph P. Hardy  
Senator James A. Settelmeyer  
Senator Scott Hammond

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Marjorie Paslov Thomas, Committee Policy Analyst  
Darcy Johnson, Committee Counsel  
Tammy Lubich, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Robert Johnston, Senior Staff Attorney, Western Resource Advocates  
Dylan Sullivan, Senior Scientist, Natural Resources Defense Council  
Judy Stokey, NV Energy  
Ernie Adler, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 1245  
Katherine Lorenzo, Center for Hispanic Policy and Advocacy  
Danny Thompson, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 396 and 1245  
Marcus Conklin, Las Vegas Sands Corporation  
Andy Maggi, Executive Director, Nevada Conservation League

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure  
April 2, 2019  
Page 2

Katie Ryan, Dignity Health  
Ann Silver, CEO, Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce  
Alfredo Alonso, Ormat Technologies Inc.  
David Wise, Protect Our Winters  
Kyle Davis, Interwest Energy Alliance; Nevada Conservation League  
Katie Robbins, Nevadans for a Clean Energy Future  
Jessica Ferrato, Solar Energy Industries Association  
Richard "Hank" James, Executive Director, Nevada Rural Electric Association  
Cassandra Rivas, Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter  
Alysia Peters, Tesla  
Bill Chernock, Carson Valley Chamber of Commerce  
David Bobzien, Director, Governor's Office of Energy  
Jaina Moan, The Nature Conservancy  
Christine Saunders, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada  
Jennifer Ann Cantley, One Source Network  
James Kastens  
David Hatton  
Alondra Regalado  
Marc Ellis, Communication Workers of America  
Ralph E. Williamson, Pastor, Faith Organizing Alliance  
Chris Mixson, Vote Solar Action Fund  
Tom Dunn, Professional Firefighters of Nevada  
Patrick Donnelly, Center for Biological Diversity  
Jim Sullivan, Culinary Union  
Andy Donahue, Laborers-Employers Cooperation and Education Trust  
John Seymour, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 401  
Phil Fussell  
Lucas Foletta, Nevada Resort Association  
Fred Voltz  
Andrew Diss, Meruelo Gaming  
Erin McMullen, Boyd Gaming  
Terry Page, Enel Green Power North America  
Chris Ginac  
Angela Dykema, Southwest Energy Efficiency Project  
Tobi Tyler, Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will begin the work session with Senate Bill (S.B.) 154.

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure  
April 2, 2019  
Page 3

**SENATE BILL 154**: Requires the adoption of regulations authorizing certain renewable natural gas activities. (BDR 58-108)

MARJORIE PASLOV THOMAS (Committee Policy Analyst):  
I will read the summary of the bill and the amendment from the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).

CHAIR CANCELA:  
I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 154.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CANCELA:  
We will move to S.B. 181.

**SENATE BILL 181**: Revises provisions relating to special license plates. (BDR 43-663)

MS. PASLOV THOMAS:  
I will read the summary of the bill and the amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).

CHAIR CANCELA:  
I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 181.

SENATOR SPEARMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure  
April 2, 2019  
Page 4

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CANCELA:  
We will move to S.B. 299.

**SENATE BILL 299**: Revises provisions relating to the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Demonstration Program. (BDR 58-916)

Ms. PASLOV THOMAS:  
I will read the summary of the bill and the amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).

CHAIR CANCELA:  
I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 299.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CANCELA:  
We will move to S.B. 352.

**SENATE BILL 352**: Revises provisions relating to motor vehicle registration. (BDR 43-51)

Ms. PASLOV THOMAS:  
I will read the summary of the bill and the amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).

CHAIR CANCELA:  
I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
S.B. 352.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CANCELA:  
We will move to S.B. 356.

**SENATE BILL 356**: Authorizes the registration of certain retired military vehicles.  
(BDR 43-280)

Ms. PASLOV THOMAS:  
I will read the summary of the bill and the amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).

CHAIR CANCELA:  
I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR HARDY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED  
S.B. 356.

SENATOR DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CANCELA:  
We will move to S.B. 379

**SENATE BILL 379**: Revises provisions relating to electronic gates that provide access for vehicular traffic. (BDR 35-1047)

Ms. PASLOV THOMAS:  
I will read the bill from the work session document ([Exhibit H](#)).

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure  
April 2, 2019  
Page 6

CHAIR CANCELA:  
I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 379.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CANCELA:  
We will move to S.B. 394.

SENATE BILL 394: Revises provisions relating to rules of the road.  
(BDR 43-826)

Ms. PASLOV THOMAS:  
I will read the summary of the bill from the work session document ([Exhibit I](#)).

CHAIR CANCELA:  
I will entertain a motion.

SENATOR SETTLEMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 394.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CANCELA:  
I want put on the record that I have an extreme level of gratitude for the work the Committee did while I was gone last week in order for us to move all the bills.

I will now open the hearing on S.B. 358.

**SENATE BILL 358**: Revises provisions relating to the renewable energy portfolio standard. (BDR 58-301)

SENATOR CHRIS BROOKS (Senatorial District No. 3):  
I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit J](#)).

Robert Johnston's presentation ([Exhibit K](#)) demonstrates what S.B. 358 will do.

ROBERT JOHNSTON (Senior Staff Attorney, Western Resource Advocates):  
I am here in support of S.B. 358. Nevada was a national clean energy leader in 2009 when Nevada's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) was increased to the current 25 percent reduction by 2025. A decade later, Nevada has fallen behind. The goal of reaching 50 percent by 2030 would put Nevada back among the top ten clean energy states. Nevada's strong support for a clean energy future was demonstrated by the overwhelming vote in favor of Question No. 6 last November. Nevada is well positioned to get to the 50 percent goal by 2030 with our strong solar and geothermal resources. We can reduce our overreliance on natural gas generation and the tremendous fuel price risk along with reducing the carbon emissions that are driving climate change. Nevada can provide new clean energy jobs and stable electricity rates for Nevada customers.

[Exhibit K](#) compares S.B. 358 to the law and to Question No. 6. Slide 2 of [Exhibit K](#) shows the comparison of the state-by-state RPS requirements with a standard of 25 percent or higher. Nevada's existing and proposed RPS is shown in blue. There are 16 states, including the District of Columbia, with higher standards. Senate Bill 358 would move Nevada to the top 10.

Slide 3 of [Exhibit K](#) shows a comparison of the RPS steps under the current RPS versus the proposed RPS in S.B. 358. The current RPS is in light green, and the proposed RPS is in the darker green.

Slide 4 of [Exhibit K](#) has the same comparison except the blue line adds the renewable percentage steps from Question No. 6 and shows how S.B. 358 closely aligns with what voters approved on the initiative's first vote last November.

Slide 5 of [Exhibit K](#) has the same comparison but backs out the allowed use of energy efficiency credits for RPS compliance, which Question No. 6 does not

anticipate. Senate Bill 358 provisions will be phased out after 2024. The comparison on Slide 6 of [Exhibit K](#) shows the percentage of renewable energy credits providers will need. This is closely aligned with the RPS steps under Question No. 6.

Slide 7 of [Exhibit K](#) shows how the allowed use of energy efficiency credits for RPS compliance will be phased out. Under existing law and S.B. 358, the percentage carveout drops from a 20 percent reduction in 2019 to a 10 percent reduction for 2020 through 2024 and then disappears in 2025.

Slide 7 of [Exhibit K](#) also shows how the allowed use of energy efficiency credits for RPS compliance will only be phased out for the providers of certain *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 704B customers, whose applications to exit NV Energy were approved prior to 2019. These providers will get the 25 percent energy efficiency carveout forever under statute. Under S.B. 358, they are allowed to use the full 25 percent energy efficiency carveout through 2024.

DYLAN SULLIVAN (Senior Scientist, Natural Resources Defense Council):  
Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) is a member-based environmental advocacy group with 3 million members and activists Nationwide. There are 19,000 members and activists in Nevada, and the NRDC strongly supports the passage of S.B. 358.

I have a fact sheet on S.B. 358 put out by NRDC, Western Resource Advocates and the Sierra Club, and I will be sure members of the Committee receive it. This fact sheet summarizes the analysis commissioned by our organizations and undertaken by respected independent consultants.

Because the new solar plant in Nevada produces some of the cheapest and cleanest electricity of any new power plant in the United States, getting to a cleaner electricity mix and to 50 percent is a money saver compared to getting Nevada's electricity from out-of-state natural gas. Using Nevada renewables instead of out-of-state gas will create jobs in Nevada.

An analysis using IMPLAN, a widely used economic model, shows the robust renewable sector needed to get to 50 percent will add another 11,000 jobs to Nevada's economy in 2030. The 50 percent will also reduce greenhouse gas emissions and leave a better future for generations of Nevadans.



I want to focus on two changes in the bill. For reasons that may have been justifiable when the sections were first written, some renewable resources were given extra credits. Some things that are not renewable electricity, such as energy savings, counted toward the standard. With today's renewable energy prices and policies that support energy efficiency programs, these provisions of law are no longer necessary. Senate Bill 358 phases out the use of multipliers in energy efficiency credits so that by 2030, the 50 percent will mean 50 percent. Senate Bill 358 also treats similar electricity providers such as NV Energy and competitive electricity providers in a similar manner.

SENATOR BROOKS:

I want to make sure Committee members are looking at the amendment ([Exhibit L](#)) along with a sheet listing the amended sections ([Exhibit M](#)). I want to explain the amended bill because it is complicated, and there are many amendments.

Senate Bill 358 is amended to reflect continuing conversations with public power agencies, the Nevada Resort Association, mining and advocates for renewable energy. There are approximately 29 sections touched. I will explain the main amendments.

The bill changes the definition of renewable energy to include existing hydropower facilities. Many of our rural electric service providers, NV Energy, Southern Nevada Water Authority and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada get their energy from existing hydropower facilities and were never included in the RPS.

A change in the definition of water power as it pertains to the RPS is repeated in other chapters. This was done to be sure there is a clear delineation between existing covered water power in the RPS and the new definition for hydropower. Many of the sections amended make conforming changes in those definitions.

Senate Bill 358 has language for alternative ratemaking rules on acquiring existing renewable energy facilities and buildings. The operation and ownership of renewable energy facilities can be treated by the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada for existing utilities. Once we have defined renewable energy, S.B. 358 lays out a pathway to get from where we are now to 50 percent by 2030.

One of the key components is this bill covers all energy providers. This includes public power, the investor-owned utilities and the energy marketers that play a large role in the energy mix in the State since several large loads recently departed the investor-owned utilities. The investor-owned utilities can now receive their energy from energy marketers. This applies to the first-time energy providers, the investor-owned utility, public power, the municipal power districts, cooperatives and improvement districts as well as the Southern Nevada Water Authority and the Colorado River Commission. The energy marketers are also serving loads no longer covered by other types of utilities. The bill applies a 1 million megawatt-hour (MWh) threshold. Once the public power agencies step beyond that 1 million MWh, the amount of energy consumed is subject to the RPS.

Providing hydropower under the definition of renewable energy and the 1 million MWh cutoff protects all public power agencies in the State with their existing contracts. Should they expand beyond what their hydropower could accommodate, they would have to look at what percent of that expansion is subject to the RPS and plan accordingly. The energy marketers and their consumers, mainly large mines, casinos and resorts in the State, would meet the RPS as well.

The biggest point of conversation involves how the nonrenewable energy RPS credits are treated. As demonstrated in [Exhibit K](#), we have been using a certain percentage of non-energy renewable energy credits to comply with our RPS. We passed S.B. No. 252 of the 77th Session to phase out the renewable energy credits coming from non-energy. These are the energy efficiency credits. The energy efficiency credits would be phased out in a declining fashion by 2024. We are trying to apply the same philosophy to all energy providers in the State. Companies under NRS 704B, exiting the utility system and using energy marketers to provide their energy, were able to use non-energy portfolio credits received in their exit or purchased from another provider to meet the 25 percent reduction of their portfolio standard. This bill cuts this off at 2024 as it applies to the utility, except for the utilities that decline to 10 percent in this bill. The NRS 704B customers that would get a full 25 percent all the way to 2024 are those that have already left or have been issued an order. This does not apply to a customer that has filed an application or is thinking of filing an application. This is where the line is drawn and where an amendment ([Exhibit N](#)) has been proposed by the Nevada Resort Association.

Most of the amendments were definitions and technical conforming fixes. We have clarified the 1 million MWh exclusion for public power, the energy efficiency credit usage and how the non-energy credits are being used for portfolio compliance. We have explained how they are treated in those three different scenarios.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Every kilowatt made by hydro in Nevada should count toward our RPS. The power generated by Hoover Dam should also be counted since it is generated in Nevada. Since that power is sold to another state, we are not allowed to count it. In the past, energy efficiency was based on the simple fact that the most efficient kilowatt is the one not generated. Why are we changing the rules or that function in regard to the NRS 704B customers?

I understood the energy efficiency was taken out to increase the RPS and try to get more businesses to purchase renewal energy credits, rather than rely on the energy efficiency standard. It is unfair to do that to the NRS 704Bs. By changing the rules, I am concerned about the concept of reasonable detrimental reliance as it applies to the NRS 704Bs. Can you explain this more?

SENATOR BROOKS:

You are correct that not consuming a MWh is the best possible way to save MWhs, but energy efficiency is not renewable energy. We have an RPS defining how much renewable energy we create and consume in the State. Energy efficiency is clearly not renewable energy. Energy efficiency is important and provides a benefit in and of itself. A MWh offset by an energy efficiency MWh has a value associated with it because you did not buy that MWh. Energy efficiency measures have a financial return and energy savings for those who invest in them. Energy efficiency is not renewable energy. We are one, if not the only state, that uses energy efficiency portfolio credits to count toward being called renewable energy. The energy efficiency credits are not looked at as renewable energy credits and will complicate the issue if we want to get into a regional market.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I understand this, but the NRS 704Bs are not part of the market. They are conserving the power for their own purposes so they do not have to buy it. This is different from being part of the regular RPS. If you use the same concept, you are trying to tell me that if you conserve water by not using water, that does

not count as conservation, but it does. This same argument is why I am confused.

How do you think this will affect the ballot initiative? I am also concerned about putting the RPS into our Constitution. Will this bill help keep Question No. 6 from passing? Are there going to be any programs or discussions with the people who put it forward?

SENATOR BROOKS:

Not using water is absolutely counted as conservation of water. Not counted is the creation of water. This is the concept we are trying to address with the RPS.

The ballot initiative came from the frustration of voters when the measure was brought up in the 2017 Legislative Session. The measure passed both Houses and was then vetoed by the Governor. That created the frustration that led to the ballot initiative effort. We have tried to align the language in this bill to stand the test of that constitutional amendment in the event it were to pass. If we are to pass a clean RPS in the language of the ballot initiative, I do not believe the energy efficiency credits would survive the test.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I am interested in seeing what the voters do.

CHAIR CANCELA:

There is a legal verification, at this point, as to whether the ballot initiative could be pulled off the ballot. This would be a question for the Legal Division.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

You are correct; once it has started, it cannot come off the ballot. However, if the individuals who put it on the ballot were to advocate for its failure, that might help the failure of it at the ballot box. This is what I was referencing.

SENATOR BROOKS:

The No. 1 item that would give advocates of that ballot initiative the comfort they need is a clean RPS with 50 percent by 2030 and phasing out energy efficiency credits and multipliers.

SENATOR HARDY:

Was the proposed amendment, [Exhibit N](#), by another party not as friendly as it could have been?

SENATOR BROOKS:

The other proposed amendment, [Exhibit N](#), was sponsored by the Nevada Resort Association and would prospectively look at companies that filed but have not, as far as NRS 704B is concerned, received an order. These companies would get the same treatment as Barrick that left 15 years ago. [Senate Bill 358](#) as proposed and my proposed amendment, [Exhibit L](#), draw the line at the companies that have filed, received an order and are in the process of exiting. The proposed amendment, [Exhibit N](#), by the Nevada Resort Association would be perspective to the companies that have put in an application but have yet to receive an order. These companies are not in a long-term energy contract and have not paid exit fees or made investments in new electricity resources. This is the philosophical difference between the proposed amendment, [Exhibit N](#), and the bill as presented.

SENATOR HARDY:

Touro University Nevada put solar on their roof and found that because of the circumstances of the process, it did not meet the deadline. I suspect the companies have not been sitting back and waiting to file as they have been in the planning process. This may not be the fairest way, but that is my opinion.

The hydro portion of your bill is similar to mine. I was looking at ways to make sure hydro was counted as a renewable. Does your bill accomplish having a battery system for a pump storage process that could be used at Hoover Dam?

SENATOR BROOKS:

Pump storage can be an efficient and environmentally friendly way to store energy, but it does not produce energy. When water is pumped, a certain amount of energy is used. When you let the water fall back and you recover the energy, it is done at a loss. Not only are you not producing new renewable energy, you have a battery energy storage device with a loss. This bill does not prohibit that process. It is an important way to get to a clean, 100 percent renewable energy future. It does not treat it for the purposes of the portfolio compliance as renewable energy, except for the existing small-pump hydro systems in the system. Southern Nevada Water Authority hydro systems, which

recover energy, installed in its pipeline system are treated as renewable energy. This installation is treated as renewable energy in Senate Bill 358.

JUDY STOKEY (NV Energy):

NV Energy is in support of S.B. 358 as amended. Last year NV Energy announced support of a 50 percent RPS by 2030 and is proud of all the accomplishments Nevada has made in renewable energy.

In 1999, requirements for renewables were small and expensive. After the implementation of the RPS, we are getting solar renewable resources at record low costs, and this is benefiting our customers. We received approval last December to build over 1,000 MW of more solar resources and 100 MW of battery storage, which will help us get to the 50 percent.

ERNIE ADLER (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 1245):

We support S.B. 358, sections 6 and 7 which allow NV Energy to own and construct renewable energy plants in the State. NV Energy is at a disadvantage because it cannot utilize the 30 percent tax credit the way a private developer does. Senate Bill 358 puts NV Energy on the same level playing field as other developers of energy projects and employs local Nevadans who are members of our union to operate and construct these plants.

KATHERINE LORENZO (Center for Hispanic Policy and Advocacy):

I will read my written testimony supporting S.B. 358 ([Exhibit O](#)).

DANNY THOMPSON (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 396 and 1245):

We are in support of S.B. 358.

MARCUS CONKLIN (Las Vegas Sands Corporation):

We support S.B. 358 with the proposed amendment, [Exhibit L](#). We want to note the additional amendment, [Exhibit N](#), on behalf of the National Resort Association. If it is the will of the Committee to attach that to the bill, we would also support that amendment.

ANDY MAGGI (Executive Director, Nevada Conservation League):

The Nevada Conservation League supports S.B. 358 to increase Nevada's share of clean and cost-effective renewable energy.

Nevada has an opportunity to cement our clean energy leadership by setting a strong forward-looking RPS that will create jobs, reduce pollution and tackle the effects of climate change. A higher RPS will also allow us to tap into our State's abundant and homegrown solar, geothermal and wind energy resources, boosting our clean energy economy and saving ratepayers money. By moving to a 50 percent by 2030 standard, Nevada would show it is serious about becoming a national leader in the new clean energy economy. Nevadans have been asking for a higher RPS since 2017, and voters reiterated their preference for moving to a clean energy future by overwhelmingly supporting Question No. 6 in 2018. We urge this Committee and the Nevada Legislature to respond to the will of voters and support S.B. 358.

KATIE RYAN (Dignity Health):  
Dignity Health supports S.B. 358.

Strengthening Nevada's RPS to 50 percent by 2030 will provide significant economic benefits to the State and help create a sustainable future for the communities. Procuring clean energy helps businesses and institutions save money, hedge against volatile fuel prices and stay competitive. Dignity Health knows these benefits firsthand. Over the past year, we completed large-scale solar arrays at two of our hospital campuses. These investments will help us meet our goal to power our facilities with 35 percent renewable resources by 2020. This will benefit our bottom line and help to achieve our healing mission to advance a healthy community, economy and planet.

Our energy choices are about health, financial viability of healthcare providers, and affordability of health care for patients and air quality within Nevada communities. According to the American Lung Association's "State of the Air" report from 2017, the Las Vegas Metro area ranks tenth for worst ozone pollution. The Reno-Sparks area ranks tenth for the worst short-term particle pollution. The pollutants cause respiratory issues, particularly for vulnerable populations such as children and the elderly. Transitioning to clean renewable energy across the State will lead to immediate health benefits for our fellow citizens through fewer hospital admissions and asthma attacks, along with increased workdays and school attendance.

A strong RPS will attract new investments and accelerate the development of local clean energy projects generating cost savings and jobs in Nevada. That is why we joined a coalition of Nevada businesses and employers, including Ben &

Jerry's, Ethel M Chocolates, eBay, Unilever and Squaw Valley Alpine Meadows, to write a letter of support for this legislation ([Exhibit P](#)). Our coalition represents over \$90 billion in annual revenue, putting significant weight behind our assertion that this bill is good for business. We hope you will maintain Nevada's leadership in the clean energy economy.

ANN SILVER (CEO, Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce):

The Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce is dedicated to increasing economic success for our members in supporting key policies during this Session by protecting free enterprise, reducing regulations and ensuring a competitive business environment. Senate Bill 358 would raise the standard to 50 percent by 2030 and require utilities to use renewable energy sources such as solar, wind and geothermal power. Nevada boasts some of the best potential for solar and geothermal resources in the Nation. This is a prime time to capitalize on our existing assets.

Voters already support an RPS of 50 percent by 2030. A higher standard could bring new investments and job opportunities to our community, continuing to increase the number of Nevadans employed in clean energy. With additional investments in geothermal and wind energy, Nevada could become among the best places for tomorrow's workers. Our business members are always looking for ways to be more efficient and profitable. Deriving half of their energy from renewable resources could help reduce power bills and lower costs across the marketplace. We encourage our lawmakers to create new opportunities for economic vitality and workforce development by passing S.B. 358.

ALFREDO ALONSO (Ormat Technologies Inc.):

We support S.B. 358. Ormat is primarily a geothermal company with approximately 325 MW operated in Nevada. To give the Committee perspective, we know over 500 MW exists and could be tapped, depending on the market. The thousands of MW still undiscovered would make Nevada No. 2 in the entire Country, behind California in those resources.

This is not just about energy, it is about economic development. Every time a 25 MW facility goes into a rural county, it creates, on average, \$500,000 of new revenue not there before.



DAVID WISE (Protect Our Winters):

I am a professional skier born and raised in Reno, Nevada. In the off-season, I favor northern Nevada—living in Verdi and enjoying mountain biking, archery and fishing on the Truckee River with my kids.

As a competitive skier, I have watched the winters become more volatile and have seen glaciers get smaller and smaller. We like to say in the professional ski and snowboarding community that we are the canaries in the mine. We are the ones to see the effects of climate change firsthand. As a father, I am compelled to act. It is worth our time, effort and energy to act. I support S.B. 358 because it is positive in terms of climate and economics.

This past year, I launched a personal project called "Wise Off the Grid," where my wife and I are trying to get our house completely off the grid. We are doing this by harvesting our own meat in Nevada as well as growing our own food. I know that change on a personal level is not going to be enough. We need our lawmakers to pass systemic policy change to drive down carbon emissions on a much larger scale. We need you to help ensure that every choice made as individuals and families is good for climate. Fortunately, we have the opportunity to increase our State's RPS and affirm the clean energy future that Nevadans support.

Today, I am joined by two fellow professional skiers and snowboarders, Tim Eddy and Max Hammer. We as professional athletes represent economics in terms of winter. If winters do not go on, our outdoor economy suffers heavily. My career has suffered at the hands of climate change. When the companies that sponsor us make less money, it trickles down to us and to what they can provide to the public. The resorts cannot build the terrain parks so kids can grow up, get into the sport and learn how to live a healthy outdoor lifestyle.

KYLE DAVIS (Interwest Energy Alliance):

The Interwest Energy Alliance is a 501(c)(6) nonprofit trade association. We bring together leading renewable energy developers and manufacturers with the nongovernmental environmental community to promote renewable energy throughout Nevada and the Intermountain West.

We are in support of S.B. 358. This bill will allow Nevada to continue to tap into its exceptional solar, wind and geothermal resources to generate electricity. We also support reasonable limits on alternative ratemaking to ensure competitive

energy markets in Nevada. Renewal energy is best acquired through a competitive acquisition process, ensuring ratepayers are getting the best deal.

A stronger RPS will create thousands of good jobs, generate billions in economic activity, continue to diversify Nevada's economy and attract innovations and investments. For example, NV Energy's recent decision to acquire six new solar and battery storage purchase power agreements will stimulate over a billion dollars in capital investment in Nevada. By passage of S.B. 358, this economic process will continue to build a strong foundation supporting these business decisions into the next decade.

KATIE ROBBINS (Nevadans for a Clean Energy Future):

Last November, Nevadans voted overwhelmingly to transition from importing expensive fossil fuels to clean affordable renewable energy coming from this State. Healthcare organizations like the American Lung Association, conservation groups, businesses and organized labor were all part of the diverse coalition that supported Question No. 6. The people of Nevada have made a clear statement about the future they want and should not have to wait for it to become a reality. Many legislative leaders, as well as Governor Steve Sisolak, have recognized the need to guarantee a cleaner healthier future for our State. In addition to making our communities healthier, investing in clean energy will bring thousands of good-paying jobs and billions of dollars to our economy.

Many have asked if we are ready to go to the ballot again in 2020, and the answer is yes. We are prepared to fight and win in two years, but we should not have to. We urge you to support S.B. 358.

JESSICA FERRATO (Solar Energy Industries Association):

We are here in support of S.B. 358 and have submitted a letter of support to be put in the record ([Exhibit Q](#)). Increasing the RPS brings tremendous value to Nevada, including energy independence and improved energy security, reducing fuel transportation costs, realizing environmental benefits and workforce development.

RICHARD "HANK" JAMES (Executive Director, Nevada Rural Electric Association):  
I will read from my written testimony in support of S.B. 358 ([Exhibit R](#)).

CASSANDRA RIVAS (Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter):

On behalf of the Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter, I am here to ask for your support to pass S.B. 358. Nevada was once a policy leader driving renewable energy development, but we have fallen behind many states as they have already implemented a higher RPS. The good news is that with smart policy like S.B. 358, we can quickly catch up and become a leader. This legislation will remove harmful pollution from our air, create thousands of jobs, diversify our economy and attract innovation and investment. We need this smart policy to make sure every Nevadan benefits from the opportunities of clean energy technology.

Companies exiting the grid through the NRS 704B program must be required to comply with the RPS in an effort to be equitable, while also ensuring healthy communities and good jobs throughout the State. States with clear and consistent RPS create policies, certainty and predictability that will attract businesses and increase private investments in our local economies.

ALYSIA PETERS (Tesla):

Tesla supports the goals of S.B. 358, including the Nevada Resort Association amendment if it is acceptable to the Committee.

BILL CHERNOCK (Carson Valley Chamber of Commerce):

The Carson Valley Chamber of Commerce supports S.B. 358. The Carson Valley Chamber believes we are positioned remarkably well to use solar, wind and geothermal resources to increase the amount of electricity in this State produced by renewables. We have seen how states and counties developing renewable resources have enjoyed a greater advantage in attracting new investments and promoting economic development. Renewables have generated billions in economic output while bringing millions in revenues to local jurisdictions in school districts.

For rural Nevada, this presents an opportunity to bring businesses and jobs to our communities using our own homegrown resources. Increasing our share of renewables to 50 percent by 2030 is a sensible step given how well we have met our existing standard for the past decade. The new technologies available will provide long-term benefits in cost savings. We wish to see Nevada take on this leadership and grow business opportunities for our people. We look forward to seeing these developments take root and for renewables to strengthen local and regional economies across the State.

DAVID BOBZIEN (Director, Governor's Office of Energy):

In his State of the State Address, Governor Sisolak indicated strong support for achieving a minimum of 50 percent by 2030. I am here today to support both S.B. 358 and the amendment, Exhibit L, presented by the bill's sponsor, particularly section 22 as a revision of the RPS to mirror this goal. I want to note our support for receiving the report on RPS compliance as described in section 9.

JAINA MOAN (The Nature Conservancy):

The Nature Conservancy (TNC) supports policies that move the U.S. toward a robust clean energy economy and reduced greenhouse gas emissions from the electricity sector. The TNC supports increasing Nevada's RPS and echoes the benefits from all previous testifiers. Increasing the RPS is an important step to facilitating the deployment of renewable energy.

Equally important is how this policy is implemented and where renewable generation is sited. For over a decade, TNC has advised on the permitting and siting for utility-scale renewable energy developments in the Mojave Desert. Using TNC's published ecoregional assessments, we have identified low-impact and low-conflict solar energy zones that minimize adverse effects of energy development to ecosystems and wildlife. In the past year, we initiated a program called "Mining the Sun" to identify former mine lands and brownfields suitable for renewable energy development. These lands are already disturbed and frequently located close to existing roads and transmission. A preliminary analysis conducted by TNC and the Rocky Mountain Institute in 2018 revealed 2.8-million acres of postproduction mine lands and brownfields in Nevada suitable for renewable energy generation. Creative solutions that concentrate renewable deployment on mine lands and brownfields could also benefit rural economies.

Moving forward, TNC is interested in engaging with the Governor's Office of Energy, the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, utility companies, solar developers and other stakeholders to ensure the deployment of renewable energy resources has minimal impact to the ecosystems, wildlife and public lands. We urge the Committee to pass S.B. 358 with the proposed amendment by Senator Brooks.

CHRISTINE SAUNDERS (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada):

We support S.B. 358.

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure  
April 2, 2019  
Page 21

JENNIFER ANN CANTLEY (One Source Network):  
We support and urge the Committee to pass S.B. 358.

I am that mom from Yes, the YouTube commercials which remind families to vote for their children and kids like my son who have asthma. We are living in our children's past and must create a bright future for all children.

Senate Bill 358 will create more jobs for our economy and make Nevada a leader in a growing industry to helping to make our air, water and public lands cleaner.

JAMES KASTENS:  
I support S.B. 358 and urge the Committee to send this bill to the Floor.

DAVID HATTON:  
I will read my written testimony in support of S.B. 358 ([Exhibit S](#)).

ALONDRA REGALADO:  
I am a senior at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, studying biology and public policy. I have been researching the RPS debate since 2017. Although I was a supporter of Question No. 6, I remained critical about the key aspects of the constitutional amendment. Senate Bill 358 is needed to make sure the RPS is up to the standard and adequately reflects what is needed to create a smoother path to renewable energy. Energy efficiency credits seem to have implements to reduce compliant costs for utilities. Energy efficiency credits should never have been seen as something pertinent. As Senator Brooks said, "Although efficiency should always be the goal, it does not translate to clean energy." Phasing out energy credits is the next push to renewable energy to put Nevada at the forefront of the renewable energy market. Full transition to renewable energy is going to happen.

MARC ELLIS (Communication Workers of America):  
Communication Workers of America support S.B. 358.

RALPH E. WILLIAMSON (Pastor, Faith Organizing Alliance):  
I support the community belonging to the Faith Organizing Alliance and to the collective body that has already spoken in saying "ditto." We support S.B. 358.

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure  
April 2, 2019  
Page 22

CHRIS MIXSON (Vote Solar Action Fund):

We support the renewable energy targets outlined in S.B. 358. We have concerns with sections 6 and 7 and would suggest a reasonable cap on programs of 1 gigawatt over 5 years.

TOM DUNN (Professional Firefighters of Nevada):

We support S.B. 358.

PATRICK DONNELLY (Center for Biological Diversity):

We support S.B. 358. Climate change is having catastrophic effects on our wildlife, public lands and water supplies. This is the boldest possible action we could take.

JIM SULLIVAN (Culinary Union):

We support S.B. 358.

ANDY DONAHUE (Laborers-Employers Cooperation and Education Trust):

We support S.B. 358.

JOHN SEYMOUR (International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 401):

We support S. B. 358 and urge a fast passage.

PHIL FUSSELL:

I support S.B. 358.

LUCAS FOLETTA (Nevada Resort Association):

Our proposed amendment, [Exhibit N](#), reflects our limited opposition to the bill. We want to make it clear the Nevada Resort Association is only opposed to the language within section 23.

We are supportive of the 50 percent by 2030 of the bill. We are also not objecting to the application of the new standard to NRS 704B customers and their providers, which is a significant departure from the current state of the law. We are also not objecting to the fact that NRS 704B customers, over the long term, will not be able to use energy efficiency credits to any degree after 2024.

Our proposed amendment, [Exhibit N](#), is in respect to between now and 2024 wherein NRS 704B applicants, who have applied before January 1 and leave the electric system, will preserve the 25 percent energy efficiency compliance path through 2024. This is consistent with the proposal, [Exhibit N](#). The purpose of the amendment is to conform the proposal for customers that have received orders and to apply that to customers that have not received orders but are in the process of seeking the authority to exit the system.

It should be noted that the energy efficiency credits generated in the electric system, generally, are an attribute of the system. It is true they do not generate electricity, but they do reduce the carbon footprint of the system and have value in the sense of a policy perspective. Allowing customers to absorb those credits and use them as a compliance tool will let them realize the value of the impact fees they pay. When a customer leaves, it pays an impact fee and receives some portfolio energy credits and energy efficiency credits that it can use. Using these credits will help customers realize the value of the investment they have made. That value is not free, these are people who have paid for credits in terms of impact fees and investments in those programs.

It should also be noted that part of the NRS 704B process is that exiting customers pay back energy efficiency rebates they have received. The system is made whole in this respect. The use of these credits will allow these customers to make accommodations to reach the overall objective. If they want to build a project, it allows them to get the project up and running in time to meet the standard, where otherwise they may not be able to do so.

In 2024 the RPS of this bill will be 34 percent. That is roughly 400,000 to 500,000 MWh of customers that will have a 34 percent obligation in 2024. It is actually 15 percent of that obligation because under the bill, they would still retain the 10 percent compliance path the utility retains. All we are saying is give them the same path as everyone else on this schedule and leave the path untouched until 2024, at which time it goes away entirely.

FRED VOLTZ:

Senate Bill 358 calls for whatever it costs for renewable energy to be passed through with no metrics or benchmarks for reasonableness or affordability. The cost of service has been thrown out the window. It also circumvents the electric sector. Question No. 6 is scheduled to be voted on for a second time in

2020. As with Question No. 3, once all the implications are known, voters may not support Question No. 6 in 2020.

It seems as though the electric sector should be given the option to speak a second time. As per the U.S. Department of Energy statistics, California's all sectors electric cost in January was 95 percent more than in Nevada. In New Jersey, it is 64 percent plus more. Both states have 50 percent-plus renewable energy mandates, and it is the prime driver pushing the retail electric rates higher. In California, without stabilizing its grid, it dumps renewable power on a regular basis on Arizona and in this State for free or at below cost. That is at 35 percent renewable standards. Going to 50 percent does not help our situation at all; it may put us in the same boat as California.

Until battery storage is commercially and economically reliable, there is no viable way to store excess renewable energy overnight or on extended cloudy windless days. This is the key to having a larger source of renewable energy in this State and every other state. It is better to have renewables expand when the organic market demand and the technological evolution suggest their viability.

As for the new jobs issue, since 2015 we have had wildly fluctuating claims about the number of new jobs in renewables and the job-counting methodology. Increases in jobs are anywhere from 6,000 to 20,000 and every number in between. There are some significant environmental concerns that I do not hear any of the organizations being concerned about.

ANDREW DISS (Meruelo Gaming):

We are here to "ditto" the comments made by Mr. Foletta. We are a member of the Nevada Resort Association and endorse the proposed amendment, [Exhibit N](#). We fully support the goal of the legislation to get to the 50 percent by 2030. The problem with the bill is the energy efficiency credits. From our company's perspective, we started the NRS 704B process with the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN) back in November 2018. Taking away the energy efficiency credits we have put into our calculations, as our company has gone through the process, is going to make a difference to us. We want to make sure we have clarity for our future energy investments.



ERIN McMULLEN (Boyd Gaming):

We support S.B. 358 with the exception of limited opposition in section 23, subsection 2 where we would prefer energy efficiency credits in the pathway to compliance. It would be the same as it is for our NRS 704B industry partners that have already left.

Starting this process back in November 2018, we are within 30 days of completing our order from the PUCN, should the schedule go as planned. We put a lot of reliance on statute and have put that into our calculation. This would significantly impact us.

CHAIR CANCELA:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 358 and open the hearing on S.B. 298.

**SENATE BILL 298**: Revises provisions relating to partial tax abatements for certain renewable energy facilities. (BDR 58-908)

SENATOR CHRIS BROOKS (Senatorial District No. 3):

I will read my testimony ([Exhibit T](#)). The main difference between the bill and the amendment ([Exhibit U](#)) is instead of having the Governor's Office of Energy (GOE) share the information with the county commission in which the project took place, the bill as drafted has the GOE doing a lot of other things. The intent is that the GOE share the information with the county since it is the county's revenue.

A large part of the abatement goes to the county, and this gives the county the ability to look at those abatements to see the actual data. This is to make sure the workers actually received their wages to qualify for the abatement. In the past, some contractors and developers were applying the benefits to their actual wage to meet the statewide hourly wage. This defines clearly that the wage is to be used, not the benefits. In 2009, A.B. No. 522 of the 75th Session was passed, the abatement was defined as the wages plus the benefits. Somewhere between 2009 and now it changed. This defines that the wages on the check and the benefits are not calculated in the Statewide hourly wage.

The amendment, [Exhibit U](#), would also add the fees collected to file for an abatement as a renewable energy developer to the statutes. The amendment states the fee must include an amount that does not exceed the actual cost to the Director for processing and approving the application. I want to add an amount that sustains the GOE's work to support and expand the State's

renewable energy development for projects qualifying for partial abatements under this chapter. There are some other things the GOE does to help developers in developing their projects and for applying for these abatements. I was concerned they were not covered in the existing statutes.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I am concerned with section 4. You are indicating it was not the original intent by the Legislature to include benefits. Why not include the benefits? Are we not trying to get employers to cover health plans and provide these types of fringe benefits?

SENATOR BROOKS:

Statute states that the employer must provide benefits to its workers on the site. Nothing changes that in this bill. Instead of calculating the hourly wage of that worker, it puts it above the line and does not calculate it into the hourly wage, even though the employers must provide it. The Statewide hourly wage is based upon what people actually make.

MR. DONAHUE:

Laborers-Employers Cooperation and Education Trust is in support of S.B. 298.

MR. THOMPSON:

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers 396 and 1245 supports S.B. 298.

MR. SEYMOUR:

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 401 supports S.B. 298.

MR. ELLIS:

Communication Workers of America supports S.B. 298.

MR. DAVIS:

Interwest Energy Alliance is opposed to S.B. 298 as drafted. We are optimistic that many of our concerns can be dealt with through an amendment.

We would like to begin by acknowledging the incredible business environment for large-scale renewable energy developments that exist in Nevada. It exists

because of policy decisions made by this Body over the years, including the original energy tax abatements and the RPS.

Our concerns with the bill as drafted can be summed up in five main areas. First is the effective date. We are concerned that the bill will make projects under development subject to changing rules. A significant amount of planning and forecasting, including labor cost, goes into the development of a project before a 701A abatement application is submitted. Second is confidentiality. Wage information on a privately developed project is confidential and proprietary. This creates competitive issues if the data is a searchable part of public records. Third is the filing time frame. The bill contemplates yearly reporting but is not clear when the requirement to file ends. We are concerned about being required to file reports long after the completion of a project and having no leverage to go back to contractors in the event the project is found noncompliant. Fourth is the record detail. We want to ensure requirements of the law are no more onerous than those required for Nevada public works projects. Fifth is information for the Committee. This has to do with the cost of the projects. Based upon the industry estimates, the provision changing the definition of wage to be exclusive of comprehensive care benefits would add approximately \$4 per work hour to the total cost of a project. This estimate will vary depending on the size of the contractor and its ability to provide benefits. An estimate of the benefits on a 100 MW solar project would result in approximately an additional \$1 million added to the total project. This would increase the power purchase agreement (PPA) costs anywhere from 25 cents a MWh to 35 cents a MWh, depending on the PPA time and other assumptions. This is a meaningful cost increase as RFP bids are won and lost in this margin.

We do understand that this cost increase would apply to all developers but in all cases, the increase cost would be passed on to the ratepayers that ultimately receive the power. It is not clear what impact, if any, this would have on competitiveness. Competitiveness in a project developed with nearby states would then be trading across state lines.

MS. FERRATO:

My client, Solar Energy Industries Association, has all of the same concerns as previously stated by Mr. Davis. The specific ones we can resolve are the effective date, confidentiality, filing time frames and record details. We are willing to work with Senator Brooks to come to a compromise so we can get this bill passed.

TERRY PAGE (Enel Green Power North America):

We have four projects in Nevada worth approximately \$400 million. We have used the abatements and built projects without the abatements. We are a member of the Interwest Trade Association and echo Mr. Davis' remarks.

In the past, it was never our intent to include the \$4 as a below the line item in calculating the average wage. We always used the average wage and then above the line, after the calculation, the benefits. I caution the Committee on unintended consequences of the reporting requirements becoming too tough. It may push us to not request the tax abatements. If that occurs, then that does not put any requirement on Nevada's state labor. We are all in favor of doing Nevada state labor, but if we have to trade the economics for the tax abatements or not, the consequences of the reporting requirements could tip that scale.

MR. BOBZIEN:

The GOE is neutral on S.B. 298 and the amendments. As the Administrator of the Renewable Energy Tax Abatement program, the GOE recognizes the need for transparency and accountability for this program. If the amendment is processed, we will remove the fiscal note.

SENATOR BROOKS:

I want to make it clear that I have been in conversations with Interwest, the Solar Energy Industries Association and Enel. If time had permitted, I would have had a mocked-up amendment that addressed all but one of their issues. I agree there needs to be clarity around reporting, so it is not onerous or prohibitive. I do not necessarily agree with the proposed amendment where Nevada workers are paid less for the billions of dollars of abatement we give the industry.

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 298 and open the hearing on S.B. 428.

**[SENATE BILL 428](#)**: Revises provisions relating to transportation. (BDR 43-725)

SENATOR MARCIA WASHINGTON (Senatorial District No. 4):

I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit V](#)).

There is also a conceptual amendment ([Exhibit W](#)) to reinforce having signs created and marked for the electric vehicle charging spaces. This would make it clear not to park there unless your vehicle is electric or a hybrid.

CHRIS GINAC:

I originally reached out to Senator Julia Ratti because there were reports stating the superchargers were being blocked. There were also reports on the Tesla site of large trucks intentionally blocking superchargers and intimidating Tesla drivers. I have personally witnessed similar events occurring around town. These chargers are extremely important. Having one space blocked can make the difference between whether a person gets stuck somewhere and is able to get home in his or her electric car.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

The accelerating fines in the bill are structured similar to handicapped parking. Is a tolling fee included? It also states a person. Should it be the owner of the vehicle?

CHAIR CANCELA:

I would like to ask our Policy Analyst to work with the Research Division to get the answers.

I want to put on the record that I have heard concerns from people about making this a misdemeanor. Maybe it could be mirrored similar to handicapped parking. I will follow up with you, Senator Washington.

SENATOR DENIS:

Is this bill only for parking spots that have chargers, or would it also apply to high-efficiency parking?

MR. GINAC:

As far as I understand, the bill is written for spots that would have a charger installed only for an electric vehicle or plug-in hybrid.

SENATOR DENIS:

That is what I was asking. I do not know if this addresses the issue.

KYLE DAVIS (Nevada Conservation League):

We are in support of S.B. 428.

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure  
April 2, 2019  
Page 30

MR. SULLIVAN:

Natural Resources Defense Council is in support of S.B. 428. To the concern of the definition of vehicles, you may want to consider that a plug-in hybrid electric vehicle covers vehicles that have to be plugged in. The intent specifically applies to the plug-in vehicles.

ANGELA DYKEMA (Southwest Energy Efficiency Project):  
We are in support of S.B. 428.

TOBI TYLER (Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter):  
I will read my written testimony ([Exhibit X](#)).

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:  
I request the Research Division to look where the money from the fines goes.

CHAIR CANCELA:  
I will close the hearing on S.B. 428 and open the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution (S.J.R.) 7.

**SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 7**: Expresses support for finding innovative transportation solutions in the Lake Tahoe Basin and for the efforts of the Bi-State Working Group on Transportation. (BDR R-441)

SENATOR WASHINGTON:  
I will read my written testimony ([Exhibit Y](#)).

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure  
April 2, 2019  
Page 31

CHAIR CANCELA:

I will close the hearing on S.J.R. 7. Is there a motion?

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO DO PASS S.J.R. 7.

SENATOR HARDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED (SENATOR BROOKS WAS EXCUSED FOR THE VOTE.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIR CANCELA:

Seeing no public comment, this meeting is adjourned at 3:40 PM.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Tammy Lubich,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator Yvanna D. Cancela, Chair

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

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit / # of pages</b>		<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	2		Agenda
	B	16		Attendance Roster
S.B. 154	C	7	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
S.B. 181	D	1	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
S.B. 299	E	3	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
S.B. 352	F	1	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
S.B. 356	G	1	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
S.B. 379	H	1	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
S.B. 394	I	1	Marjorie Paslov Thomas	Work Session Document
S.B. 358	J	3	Senator Chris Brooks	Written Testimony
S.B. 358	K	8	Robert Johnston / Western Resource Advocates	Presentation
S.B. 358	L	18	Senator Chris Brooks	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 358	M	2	Senator Chris Brooks	List of Amended Sections
S.B. 358	N	1	Nevada Resort Association	Proposed Amendment
S.B. 358	O	1	Kathrine Lorenzo / Center for Hispanic Policy and Advocacy	Written Testimony
S.B. 358	P	2	Katie Ryan / Dignity Health	Letter of Support
S.B. 358	Q	1	Jessica Ferrato / Solar Energy Industries Association	Letter of Support
S.B. 358	R	1	Richard "Hank" James / Nevada Rural Electric Association	Written Testimony
S.B. 358	S	2	David Hatton	Written Testimony
S.B. 298	T	2	Senator Chris Brooks	Written Testimony
S.B. 298	U	1	Senator Chris Brooks	Proposed Amendments
S.B. 428	V	2	Senator Marcia Washington	Written Testimony



S.B. 428	W	1	Senator Marcia Washington	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 428	X	1	Tobi Tyler / Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter	Written Testimony
S.J.R. 7	Y	2	Senator Marcia Washington	Written Testimony