

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Eighty-First Session
May 11, 2021**

The Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 1:37 p.m. on Tuesday, May 11, 2021, Online and in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair
Assemblyman Howard Watts, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblyman C.H. Miller
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters
Assemblyman Tom Roberts
Assemblywoman Shondra Summers-Armstrong
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler
Assemblyman Steve Yeager

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Roberta Lange, Senate District No. 7

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst
Jessica Dummer, Committee Counsel
Devon Kajatt, Committee Manager
Lori McCleary, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Bob Johnston, Policy Advisor, Nevada Senate Democratic Caucus
Hunter Stern, Assistant Business Manager, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 1245
Will Adler, representing Silver State Government Relations; and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 1245
James Halsey, Business Manager, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 357
Ryan Bellows, Director, Labor and External Relations, NV Energy
Jimmy Lau, representing Nevada Contractors Association
Julian Boggs, State Policy Director, U.S. Energy Storage Association
Jessica Ferrato, representing Advanced Energy Economy
Nate Blouin, Policy Manager, Interwest Energy Alliance
Garrett Weir, General Counsel, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada
Misty Grimmer, representing State Contractors' Board

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] Today, we will hear one bill and we will have a work session on six measures previously heard before this Committee. As you may know, the building is open on a limited basis. This is the first day all nine of our seats have been spoken for. We still have people joining us virtually, and we welcome you to our Committee. We will have public comment at the end of our agenda.

I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 328 (1st Reprint) and welcome Senator Lange.

Senate Bill 328 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to energy storage systems. (BDR 58-658)

Senator Roberta Lange, Senate District No. 7:

Thank you for the opportunity to present Senate Bill 328 (1st Reprint). The bill addresses targets for energy storage and contractor qualifications for energy storage installations. I am pleased to be joined by Hunter Stern from International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) Local 1245, Will Adler from Silver State Government Relations, and Bob Johnston, a policy advisor for energy who will provide additional information on energy storage.

This bill addresses two issues: increasing Nevada's energy storage capacity and ensuring installation of energy storage systems is done safely and correctly. As you may recall, Senate Bill 204 of the 79th Session directed the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN) to do a cost-benefit analysis on targets for energy storage capacity, and it set biennial targets if the benefits outweighed the cost.

The analysis resulted in the PUCN setting biennial targets of 100 megawatts in 2020 and increasing up to 1,000 megawatts in 2030. Since 2018, when these targets were set, energy storage had been increasingly recognized as a critical component of efforts to reduce

greenhouse gas emissions and to facilitate the nation's migration to renewable energy. Other states have set goals as high as 3,000 megawatts by 2030, and due to advances in technology that have lowered costs and improved storage systems, I believe it is time to take another look at Nevada's energy storage targets.

The other part of the bill focuses on qualifications needed for the installation of commercial or industrial energy storage systems. As you will hear from Mr. Stern, energy storage systems can pose a fire danger and cause other problems if not properly installed. Therefore, it is important that we update the qualifications for contractors working on these projects.

With that background and your permission, Madam Chair, I would like to walk through the amendment that was posted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), dated May 10, 2021, Proposed Amendment 3352 [[Exhibit C](#)]. Starting with section 2.5, the bill sets forth legislative findings on energy storage to emphasize the importance of this issue. These findings are essentially the same criteria that were used to determine the public interest when the PUCN set the initial targets in 2018.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I just need to interrupt you for a moment. Members of the Committee, the amendment number 3352 is on NELIS if you do not have it at your desk. The amendment came out just a little while ago before this meeting started. I believe that is what the Senator will be referring to.

Senator Lange:

Sections 3 and 3.5 make conforming changes and updates to the related statutes. Shifting gears, section 5 adds a new section to Chapter 624 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), which states that a contractor must hold a valid license in the classification required for the installation of an energy storage system. In addition to the required license classifications set by the State Contractors' Board, section 5 also requires an installer of energy storage systems to have completed the Energy Storage and Microgrid Training and Certification Program (ESAMTAC), but only if the project is not—and I want to reiterate "not"—on residential property. Section 5, as amended in the mock-up, also clarifies that only one person who is supervising the work is required to have this specialized certification. Finally, section 5 defines what is considered a residential property and, therefore, not subject to additional certification requirements.

Sections 6 and 7 incorporate these new standards into the regulatory provisions of Chapter 624 of the NRS, as administered by the State Contractors' Board. Going back to the energy storage targets, section 7.5 directs the PUCN to reevaluate the current targets based on the 2021 Integrated Resource Plan recently filed by our largest electrical utility and to revise the targets as appropriate in the public interest. The PUCN must report back to the Legislative Commission no later than January 1, 2022, on whether any revisions have been or will be adopted as a result of the reevaluation.

Section 9 repeals a provision relating to the initial setting of energy storage targets, but you may notice that this very important criteria in that section are the basis for the legislative findings in section 2.5 of the bill.

In closing, I believe this bill will fill a gap in contractor qualifications for installers of commercial energy storage systems and will also speed up the reevaluation of our energy storage targets based on current technology and cost. Both are important steps toward increasing our state's energy storage capacity, complementing our efforts to fight climate change, and providing a sustainability provision of electricity to our citizens.

Madam Chair and members of the Committee, that concludes my remarks. I would like to turn the presentation over to Mr. Johnston to discuss the energy storage targets, and then to Mr. Stern to discuss the contractor provisions and the training in greater detail.

Bob Johnston, Policy Advisor, Nevada Senate Democratic Caucus:

I am here to provide a little history on energy storage and legislative and PUCN action on energy storage prior to this session. Recognizing that energy storage provides opportunities to reduce the use of fossil fuels and reduce the emission of greenhouse gases and other air pollutants, the Legislature in 2017 passed S.B. 204 of the 79th Session, which required the PUCN to first determine whether it was in the public interest to establish biennial targets for the procurement of energy storage systems by NV Energy. Second, if they determined it was in the public interest to set those biennial storage targets, the PUCN subsequently conducted a thorough investigation and rulemaking determining it was in the public interest to adopt storage targets, and then adopted a regulation setting those targets through 2030. That regulation only became final on June 8, 2020.

The target started at 100 megawatts in 2020, going to 200 megawatts in 2022, and then increases in 200-megawatt increments up to 1,000 megawatts in 2030. Those regulations also provide for the PUCN's review and modification of those biennial targets as necessary.

Since the passage of S.B. 204 of the 79th Session, the cost of battery energy storage systems has come down dramatically. According to an Environmental Impact Assessment report, the average energy capacity cost of utility-scale battery storage in the United States has decreased from \$2,152 per kilowatt-hour in 2015 to \$625 per kilowatt-hour in 2018, or about a 70 percent decrease in cost over a three- or four-year period.

The predictions are that trend in declining cost, at least for battery energy storage systems, will continue. The National Renewable Energy Laboratory recently released a report predicting a range from \$144 to \$293 per kilowatt-hour for utility-scale battery storage by 2030. If you use a base case forecast, they are saying \$208 per kilowatt-hour by 2030, so that would be another decline of 67 percent from 2018.

Energy storage systems can provide flexible, near-instantaneous capacity for the electricity grid. The clearest use case in Nevada is using this storage to capture mid-morning solar energy at a time of low demand on NV Energy's system and save that renewable energy for

use in the late afternoon and early evening when system demand is high but solar generation is declining. Many of you may have heard about this; in California they refer to this as the "duck curve" problem. The curve describing the dispatch of non-solar resources that start off high, and then as solar production comes, dips way down. Then as the sun goes down, the requirement for fossil fuel or other non-solar resources goes way up. That reliance on non-solar resources has been described as a "duck curve."

NV Energy has taken full advantage of the price declines we have seen in battery energy storage systems and has, in the last three years, brought forward nine different utility-scale, combined solar-plus storage projects, sometimes referred to as "hybrid projects," that have been approved by the PUCN and are scheduled to come online over the next three years. If those projects come into operation as planned, by 2024 NV Energy will have 1,028 megawatts of storage online, or an amount in 2024 that is already greater than the 2030 target of 1,000 megawatts set by the PUCN's regulations.

Given these events since the passage of S.B. 204 of the 79th Session, section 7.5 of the bill, as summarized by Senator Lange, requires the PUCN to reevaluate the storage targets and make any revisions determined by the PUCN to be in the public interest. Section 7.5 also requires a report back to the Legislature on the results of that reevaluation on or before November 1, 2022.

That concludes my testimony, and I am available to answer any questions.

Hunter Stern, Assistant Business Manager, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 1245:

We represent workers in northern and central Nevada working for NV Energy and contractors. I want to follow up Senator Lange's statements on the training and safety aspects of this bill. Specifically, the ESAMTAC is a national training program that educates electricians to properly install, service, and maintain energy storage systems in a safe and reliable way. It is key to the use of these systems, particularly at present—and Mr. Johnston was mentioning this indirectly—over 90 percent of the energy storage systems on the market are lithium ion batteries. Lithium ion batteries are a very effective and efficient energy storage technology, but they also come with some risk. The particular risk involved is what we call in our industry "thermal runaway." In other words, the battery itself becomes overly heated, either through a malfunction, an equipment error, or maybe improper installation, and it begins to discharge. It begins to discharge at a high temperature and the result is fire. These are particular systems that, even though they do very well, have the potential to do very badly.

We have spoken with the firefighters in some of the fire districts. Part of the assurance in installation and maintenance of this equipment is this training program, ESAMTAC. We have also put in a phased-in approach so there will be time for customers and users of the storage on the commercial side, as well as taken some amendments from the original draft, to

ensure it is clear that large-scale installation is still the purview of general engineering requirements based on the State Contractors' Board comments, and to ensure that those large projects are in no way changed or altered based on the existing projects that Mr. Johnston outlined.

There is value to requiring this training because these are relatively new pieces of equipment and they create a new electrical environment. Once the equipment is installed and up and running, it is literally part of the grid. It creates a safety hazard for any firefighters who might be responding to fire or for utility workers, our members, and members at Local 396 down south, who might be responding to some kind of outage or other problem and have a back feed from this equipment out onto the street. That is the goal and purpose of the safety rules and ESAMTAC training.

We have had lots of inquiries about the availability of training and to make sure there will be enough training to ensure that people can get out and install this without interrupting or somehow undermining the commercial activity. The only barrier at present for training, both in northern and southern Nevada, is the COVID-19 restrictions, of which we are just coming out of. Full classes can now be attended by electricians. Since the bill was drafted and released, there have been two classes in the north and one class in the south. Both training centers have assured the Senator, and I can assure you that, as needed, these classes will be increased. In other words, if there is a demand, we can meet the demand. The cost is minimal and the availability is as needed.

I also want to mention a couple other points, a little off track but also in terms of safety and reliability of the equipment. In terms of the value of energy storage in general, buttressing what Mr. Johnston said, there are a number of different technologies. Right now, as I said, lithium ion is the dominant technology. We have great benefits because there is lithium in Nevada. There is also a technology or technique to extract lithium from geothermal resources that has not been reduced to practice yet. However, there are two different planned attempts. This could also be a benefit to the state. To address the problems Mr. Johnston identified in California, there are other longer duration storage technologies that are also available. It is our interest in ensuring—whether it is lithium ion or another technology like longer duration light pump storage or hydrogen, which is also being discussed as an energy storage system—that all of these are introduced in a safe and reliable way for Nevadans and the people who visit this state.

I am available for any questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Senator Lange, do you have any other presenters?

Senator Lange:

That concludes our presentation. We are happy to answer any questions. Mr. Stern will answer questions related to the training and [unintelligible] the workers, and Mr. Johnston will answer policy questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members have before them the mock-up for the proposed amendment. Can you let us know how you got to the amendment? It came just before the Committee hearing and is quite different from the bill that I believe most members read last night or two days ago before this hearing. How did we get to this amendment instead of what was originally proposed?

Senator Lange:

As you know, bills evolve. We have been meeting with stakeholders since we first put the bill in. After talking with our stakeholders, we decided to shake out residential solar. They were at a place where we would love for them to have the training, but it was not a place where we could agree on the training or be able to implement that. At this time, we took out "residential" and concentrated on the bigger projects. We met with NV Energy and Southwest Gas Corporation. Just last night we came to agreement on some of the language, so that is why the bill has changed a bit from yesterday to today when we got the final amended version.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will continue the questioning with Assemblyman Roberts.

Assemblyman Roberts:

My question is for Mr. Stern regarding the training program. You covered a lot of it during the presentation about the program. I am curious if there is another training program in the country that is comparable, and why this one?

Hunter Stern:

At this time, there is not another national program comparable to ESAMTAC because this is still relatively new technology. Its utilization in commercial environments or commercial buildings is still very new. There has been some consternation nationally, again mostly from the firefighters. Firefighters and fire districts were part of the development of this program.

Assemblyman Roberts:

You mentioned the training and the capacity, but how long is the training and what is the cost for the course? You mentioned it is relatively inexpensive, but who controls the pricing? Is it something the national certification controls? Could you explain that?

Hunter Stern:

Starting with the pricing, it is \$125 per person per course. The training is basically eight days, typically two days a week for a four-week period. They are full days, if I remember correctly—and I think I do—there are 16 different labs, with the syllabus and the labs. The purpose is to make sure there is a standard program, and it is fully taught and understood by the students.

Assemblyman Roberts:

I think energy storage is definitely a hurdle for us to leverage solar energy in Nevada. I know there is a lot of interest in it, so I appreciate the targets. I just had some questions about the certification process. Thank you for the answers.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

The training you are doing that will be set in statute, is any of that training for nonunion workers or is it just for union workers? If it is just for union workers, is it for any other union besides your own?

Hunter Stern:

It is for all trained electricians, union and nonunion. There is no restriction and, in fact, at this point, the more the merrier. The more knowledge and expertise we can get out into the field as quickly as possible, the better for everyone.

Assemblyman Yeager:

I have a clarifying question. I want to make sure I understand the provisions of section 5 in the amendment [[Exhibit C](#)]. The way I read it, anyone who is installing an energy storage system must have a valid license in the classification required to perform the work. In section 5, subsection 1(b), there is the additional requirement that the installation has to be performed under the direct supervision of someone with the training. I want to make sure that in any case, the people doing the installing have to have the valid license and the classification, and the additional requirement then only applies to nonresidential projects. Do I have that correct?

Senator Lange:

That is correct, Assemblyman Yeager. We felt it was important that everyone on the workgroup does not need to have the training. One person needs to have the training. Initially, we wanted everyone to have the training because we thought that would be the safest thing. However, in talking with stakeholders, it was too much, so we pared it down to one person.

I would also like to add that on the training, everyone who is getting trained has until July 1, 2022, so it is not something they have to go get tomorrow. They will have some time to get that training.

Assemblyman Ellison:

My questions are for Mr. Stern. As it is currently, it is any battery storage no matter what the size. How big of kilowatt units are you going to demand people get training on? They are doing this stuff all over right now. We have never seen the fires you are talking about. I want to know what size this is going to be limited to. Is it going to be any battery storage? Because if it is, you have problems. There is lighting storage that is battery backup, generators with battery backup. You have all these battery systems that are in there, so how big of a system is this training for?

Hunter Stern:

Specifically, this was some of the discussion in which we agreed to remove the residential customers and that size. We are not specifying a size because the battery storage technologies, specifically lithium ion in commercial buildings or commercial settings, are of substantial size in a sense that they will need to support and provide energy for the building itself. There is not a set megawatt or kilowatt per hour size of storage, but it is the equipment itself.

Assemblyman Ellison:

The problem I see is you have small commercial buildings that already have storage for lighting or whatever that is used to collect solar. To do this, any commercial building—a small grocery store or anything—would have to fall under your training. This should not be a union training. If there is going to be a training, it should be through the community colleges or colleges, not just set for this group you are dealing with. The reason that is, you said the training is two days a week, eight hours a day. There are people all over the state of Nevada who might have a five-hour or ten-hour drive in one direction to get to the training. Those people will have to break up their whole work week to qualify.

Hunter Stern:

The easiest way to explain it is, any trained electrician, irrespective of whether they are union or not

Assemblyman Ellison:

Are you going to qualify a C-2 license?

Hunter Stern:

Yes.

Assemblyman Ellison:

For the record, a C-2 license is for all commercial.

Hunter Stern:

You are correct, this is a C-2 licensed electrical contractor who is a fully trained electrician. Electricians are in the habit or the practice of getting training for various kinds of equipment and work. They will take the training eagerly because it is an opportunity to do more work and make more money. If the class provides the background, experience, and training necessary to install the equipment, irrespective of whether it is this class or another class, the electricians will do it. Could it be burdensome? Yes, it could be, but it generally has not been, and people have not complained to us. That said, this is a national program. If a community college or some other education facility is interested in setting a program up, we would be more than happy to help and facilitate that. The goal is to ensure everyone is qualified to do this work.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I strongly disagree but thank you.

Assemblyman Watts:

I have a question for Mr. Stern first. My question is about the curriculum itself. Who develops the curriculum and updates it moving forward? You did mention in your testimony that while battery storage is the most used technology currently available, there are other storage technologies out there. It looks like a lot of the curriculum focuses on battery safety and elements. How does this get updated to adapt to changing technologies and who makes those decisions?

Hunter Stern:

This program was developed at Pennsylvania State University with advice and participation by a number of different entities. It has been given to an engineering firm—and I do not recall the firm's name—that is essentially serving the client, which is the ESAMTAC program. They are responsible for keeping materials up to date, for adding and/or subtracting labs, and keeping the curriculum current.

To the extent that other technologies could become, over time, more viable, either because of the application or cost, the program can adjust accordingly. Again, the goal is to get as many people trained as quickly as possible.

One of the motivations for this program nationally is there are a number of cities and counties across the country, including New York City, that require permits for the installation of this equipment. Obviously, we are not talking about that, but it is something people find, because of the potential risk, that other jurisdictions in other states have done. I hope I answered your question appropriately. I will endeavor to get the name of the firm and provide it to the Committee.

Assemblyman Watts:

Thank you, I would appreciate that. That was the only question I have for you, Mr. Stern. Mr. Johnston, I have a couple of questions about the other piece of the bill. It makes sense to me that it is pretty clear that energy storage is a benefit. We see this is the direction we are heading with some of these large projects. I understand some of the language that is essentially not a determination of whether, but essentially guaranteeing that we are going to continue this process of updating the storage targets.

We have repealed some sections of statute related to determining whether it is in the public interest. However, in the proposed amendment [[Exhibit C](#)], we have added a legislative declaration about it being in the public interest. It appears to have some of the same or similar aspects to it, but it also includes a reference to the PUCN. Could you explain why we are taking the language that was originally direction to the PUCN in statute and then putting it into the legislative declaration?

Bob Johnston:

I am not as familiar with the new section 2.5 as Senator Lange, but my understanding is you are correct. That is a legislative finding and declaration pulling some of the language from the requirement under S.B. 204 of the 79th Session for the PUCN to determine whether it

was or was not in the public interest to set biennial storage procurement targets. The PUCN having already made that determination, I believe that section is being repealed—NRS Chapter 704.795. Section 2.5 preserves some of those considerations in a new legislative declaration.

Assemblyman Watts:

I would suggest that we look at some of that language, particularly in section 2.5, subsection 2, that includes references to the PUCN. I think it makes more sense for a legislative declaration to set high-level public policy. I think subsection 1 kind of fits in that and some of these other elements may, but it would be better if the Legislature is declaring some broad guidelines under which we believe energy storage to be in the public interest or in the interest of the state rather than also referencing the PUCN. I just want to raise that as something to consider.

The other question I have is, now that we are going to require the PUCN to have these regulations and regularly go through the process—I do not see it in the particular sections that are being amended in this bill—but is there any statutory guidance to the PUCN on what they are looking for when they set these targets, or is that just determined in the regulations that the PUCN developed?

Bob Johnston:

I believe that is all in the PUCN's regulations. The PUCN's regulations provide that the utility shall include an energy storage plan in the resource plan they file. They are now filing a joint resource plan, as you are aware. The next resource plan will be filed June 1, 2021. Those regulations also provide that the PUCN can modify those storage targets. The PUCN can also have them expire. There could well be a determination based on that evaluation that targets do or do not make sense or should be extended to a longer time period. In my opinion, it is fairly right to report back to the Legislature on where things are, given the importance of storage as a resource to balance intermittent renewable resources like wind and solar.

Assemblyman Watts:

I completely agree. I think the PUCN has been doing some great work recently. Again, I want to flag that we have had issues in the past when we have not provided adequate statutory policy direction from the Legislature in how some of the results have turned out. In some of our other renewable energy policies, we have provided a lot more direction from the Legislature for aspects for the PUCN to consider when making certain decisions. While we are looking at revising the statutes related to the setting of these targets, I want to put it out there that potentially giving clear direction from the Legislature of aspects for the PUCN to consider in setting or updating those targets may result in decisions around those targets and what is submitted from the utility that align with our state public policy goals.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I believe the PUCN will be joining us on Zoom. They are generally at each of our meetings, so once we get to that point, you can also direct that question to them. The next question is from Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

My question is for Mr. Stern about the training and this emerging line of work for electricians. Assemblyman Ellison referred to the availability of this training at community colleges. It appears that is not what is happening, and I understand that. If this is a new demand of service that you see going forward with the goals the state has made for renewable energy, how are you diversifying your base of trainees? You must have one person on site who has the training, but how are you growing your teams, those under the supervisor? This appears to be an increase in opportunity for people to become electricians. I do not know how you tier all of the people who work in this area, but what are you doing to branch out and grow the number of people who are in this line of work so we can see the need across the state increased and more and more people getting involved?

Hunter Stern:

This is where we talk about opportunity because it is opportunity. First things first: The pool of people who will get the ESAMTAC training are electricians, irrespective of their background. If they are holding a C-2 license or are working under someone who is, they can do this work. In terms of creating opportunity for others in the community, we are still trying to implement a really good bill that was passed last session [Assembly Bill 465 of the 80th Session]. I believe the Chair was also the sponsor of that community solar bill. As part of the requirements to implement that bill and the regulations that were issued and approved, the IBEW is obligated to increase and create a pool of people we call pre-apprentices, which is a pool of folks to come in and be exposed to the work. These are not energy storage systems—they are rooftop or other community solar projects. It is a better opportunity because the level of skill and training involved is lower. It will give people in the community an opportunity to experience that work.

Truth be told, there are a lot of people who seem interested in our line of work specifically. However, when they get 30 or 40 feet up in the air, they find they do not work as well as they do when their feet are on the ground. That is totally understandable, but there are other requirements of the work, including the voltage—we are working with high voltage—that put some people off. In terms of the opportunity, it is the same pathway to get people into these jobs, to get them interested, and give them an opportunity so they can become trained electricians and then begin to work on this equipment. However, this equipment requires a fully trained electrician. Again, irrespective of where the trainings come from, if they are recognized by the state and if they hold a license, they can then get the ESAMTAC training.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

There was a bill last session where you were trying to increase this pre-apprenticeship. I will be as transparent as possible. There are opportunities that are needed in my community. If this bill goes forward, it will create a requirement for people who are electricians. That is

all within your purview, meaning you control the whole thing at this moment on this training. That gives you a lot of power to produce these trained people. It also implies that there are opportunities growing for storage. If you only have one person on site who is the trained person, then that gives opportunities for there to be people under them so one person can supervise multiple projects. That means you can have more people who are looking and able to work.

For me, I am looking at this thinking it is great. However, where is the thrust to bring in a diversified workforce to get people to come and do this? I do not think every electrician job is in a bucket. There are some jobs that are on the ground. Are you saying that anyone who has this C-2 commercial license also has to be able to work a bucket or be above the ground, because that was your example? Are there other places these batteries are installed that are not up in the air? Is that really a prohibition to get more people involved in being electricians, or has the effort been out there to expand the pool of people who are in this line of business, meaning from a diversity standpoint? Are you out there recruiting in neighborhoods and communities like mine so my folks can work?

Hunter Stern:

The short answer is we—the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers—are obligated by regulation to implement Assembly Bill 465 of the 80th Session to do exactly that: to provide the opportunities for people in the community where these community solar projects are being built and the communities that will be served by these projects. Again, it is different than ESAMTAC and installation of the battery storage equipment, but it is literally the regulation and, therefore, in our view, the law to create the opportunities you are talking about, and do so from the community. That is our tasked requirement. We are tasked to work with the Department of Employment, Training and Rehabilitation to do exactly that. Again, I mean the Brotherhood as a whole.

In terms of this particular work—the installation of energy storage systems—it would be the contractors and the companies doing the installation for the commercial establishments, buildings, strip malls, et cetera, who would determine their workforce. Can we do the same here voluntarily? Absolutely. You give the IBEW too much credit, although I would not mind taking it all. However, we do not quite have the authority or power that you described. We do have the ability to train people, get people up and running, and give them good middle-class jobs, and we take a lot of pride in doing that. However, it is the contractors and the people who are hired to install this equipment who actually create the workforce and establish the workforce.

In order to comply with A.B. 465 of the 80th Session, we are creating this pre-apprenticeship pathway, if you will, to get the opportunities. I, and the others engaged in this more directly, would be more than happy to sit down with you or anyone on the Committee to explain how that could work in a more transparent or obvious way.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

Is the intent of the pre-apprenticeship program to lead to fully qualified electricians? Is this a pathway to that?

Hunter Stern:

Yes, that is correct. The pre-apprenticeship is to give people an opportunity to enter the apprenticeship. It is a test. The apprenticeship is a four years-plus program, up to five years now with some of the new add-ons. Apprentices will work their way through. "Earn as you learn" is a term we like to use. They will have classroom training directly and then on-the-job training. It is that combination that allows people to progress—what we call a step—from a six-month step to the next. Some people do not progress. They either have difficulty retaining the information or lose interest. It is not entirely easy. The idea is to create that pathway in the communities that you are talking about so people can see what is possible. I think there are really good opportunities here because we are now required to provide this, and we are also eager to do so. This is from a different bill and different circumstances. I hope I answered your question.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

Sort of. I would appreciate it if you could provide some data on what your performance has been since the passage of A.B. 465 of the 80th Session to get an idea of where and who you are recruiting and how people are doing as far as sticking with it. I want to see people from my community have to take this storage class that you are talking about to be able to install these large-kilowatt projects into commercial developments. That means they have gone through an apprenticeship, learned what they need to, that they are able, and that they are at the table and able to get this training you were talking about. That means they have accomplished the ability to have a C-2 license that Assemblyman Ellison was talking about. That means they probably have an opportunity to have a business and employ other people. If they cannot get an opportunity in the apprenticeship program or a pre-apprenticeship program, if they are not on the radar to be recruited at the very bottom, they will never have a chance to get to the top.

This is an issue I have been having all along. In the last several years I have talked to you and others about availability and opportunity for people to get into this program. I hear a lot of excuses about why and why not. I would like to see some results and to see if people are really working hard at getting these things accomplished. If you have data, I would like to see it.

Hunter Stern:

We agree 100 percent. What we also find is when people come from the community, they are going to stay in that community and serve that community. That is better for us and our contractors. They are committed to the community here in Nevada. That is better than people who might jump around to the best job or best financial reward. It is better to have people coming from the community, living in the community, and benefiting the community. It also makes the IBEW, in particular, stronger. We agree 100 percent.

I will let you know. Those regulations were just approved, and I believe there is a project beginning, but I do not believe it is one that is formally on the basis of Assembly Bill 465 of the 80th Session. Unfortunately, the wheels turn slowly, but that does not mean it is not without interest or without a goal. The goal is to do exactly what you said.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I am curious about the energy storage definitions. I looked at the reference for energy storage system definitions in NRS 704.793. It is relatively broad and looks to include things which I think you mentioned in your testimony, such as reservoirs and hydrogen technologies. Reservoirs are the big one I can think of that are a national standard for energy storage that we do not really talk about as modern energy storage. We talk about batteries. I am wondering, is the intention of this bill whether you mean for those, particularly the reservoir storage, to be included as "a person shall not install an energy storage system" unless they hold an electrical license [section 5, subsection 1(a)]? That may be appropriate for a trained electrician to be on staff and installing parts of the hydroelectric structures, but I am wondering if that is the intention of the bill or if that definition may just be a little too broad for use in this section.

Bob Johnston:

You are right. It is a broad definition. I believe this picks up the definition from S.B. 204 of the 79th Session. It is looking at all types of energy storage, including battery, molten salt, flywheel, and pump hydro storage and hydrogen, as Mr. Stern referenced.

As to the relationship of ESAMTAC to those particular types of storage, I would defer to Mr. Stern on the scope of ESAMTAC with respect to other storage technologies. But you are right, it is a broad definition, and this bill uses an existing definition from Senate Bill 204 of the 79th Session.

Hunter Stern:

I mentioned these in my opening remarks, but to give them a little more clarity, there are projects based on scale and scope which essentially require a general engineering background and degree. This was advice we got from the State Contractors' Board. Those kinds of projects will not require ESAMTAC because the general engineering requirement is broader than that and actually requires more knowledge and experience. You are specifically talking about pump storage hydro, which is large-scale, long-duration energy storage. It does require trained electricians to install the equipment, but not in the way ESAMTAC and lithium ion battery energy storage systems operate.

The short answer is the Contractors' Board was very clear in pointing out that they did not want this to disable those trained or qualified folks designing these systems, and we agreed and took the amendment. I believe Senator Lange also mentioned this too, to ensure that those kinds of projects can continue to move forward because the people designing them have requisite experience and training to do so. I hope I answered that question properly.

Assemblywoman Peters:

Can you talk about where in the amendment it creates the kind of exemption you just talked about that the Contractors' Board worked toward, so I am clear as to the intent of the language?

Hunter Stern:

The amendment was designed to remove subclassifications and not to limit the people who are charged with their general engineering standards or requirements. If someone is going to design a pump storage system and it is permitted and approved, it is actually an engineering feat because of how the system works. It is that background and training of the engineers who are getting the permits and the projects certified and approved. The original draft would have potentially disabled them from doing that work. That was not our intent. That is the purpose of the amendment, to ensure that those kinds of projects can move forward without any ESAMTAC requirement.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I think I understand where this is coming from. To be clear, I want to make sure we have the intent correct on the record and that the language is reflective of that intent. In section 5, subsection 1, it states, "A person shall not install an energy storage system . . . ," which is a broad definition of what an energy storage system is, "unless he or she: (a) Holds a valid license . . . ," which could be a license from the State Contractors' Board, the State Board of Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors, or a number of other licensing boards. That classification could be in engineering, civil engineering, structural engineering, electrical engineering, or other licenses. It goes on to state, ". . . classification required to perform such work issued pursuant to this chapter . . . ," which is Chapter 624 of NRS. I do not know the entire breadth of that chapter, so if legal could weigh in—. . . and the regulations of the Board." Who is the "Board" in this particular section?

Hunter Stern:

It is the State Contractors' Board.

Assemblywoman Peters:

That is clear to me. I would just like to get on the record the breadth of classifications under NRS Chapter 624, please.

Hunter Stern:

Assemblywoman, you said that better than I could.

Jessica Dummer, Committee Counsel:

Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 624 is the chapter that deals with contracts generally. I would guess it would be anyone who is under the State Contractors' Board. It is the chapter that creates the State Contractors' Board. There are certain entities that are not included in NRS Chapter 624. For example, a utility in certain circumstances is not included in NRS Chapter 624. Those exceptions are in NRS 624.031, which are entities that would not be included. That is the purpose of that chapter.

Assemblywoman Peters:

That helps clarify for me what is included in that section.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other questions from the members for the presenters? [There were none.] Senator Lange, do you have anything to add before I open the hearing for testimony in support?

Senator Lange:

I just want to respond to a couple of things I heard. Assemblyman Watts, you were asking about the targets and why we are not more specific in the language. Initially, we were more specific, but we found that NV Energy had exceeded the goals and are far ahead. We felt it was more important to get the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) that the PUCN is going to do, and based on that document, create new goals. That is why we were not specific in our language now because we asked that those be given to the Legislative Commission in order to create new goals based on that plan so we know where Nevada is and we are not just shooting in the dark to try to figure out where we are, but we know for sure based on the IRP.

There were several questions on the training. The IBEW did not just decide they wanted to do training for everyone in our state. They knew there was a need for safety training, which equals safety. There needs to be training for them to do their job in a safe environment. They wanted to create a safe environment. They did research and found there was only one place in the nation that was doing training, at Pennsylvania State University. There were a lot of other entities involved, so they created this training and the IBEW started doing it. I have had conversations with the IBEW. I think you are all thinking—because I was watching you when they were talking about the number of people who needed to be trained to be able to do these jobs—that it could be a monumental task. It does not have to be because IBEW has already said they would do a train the trainer program. There could be someone trained for a crew or a group of people who are working on a site who are able to train other people in their business. It would not be a situation where people are driving ten hours to get to a training eight times to get eight classes, as Assemblyman Ellison mentioned. They could train one person and that person could go back and train other people. Those are models that have worked. I am a former teacher, and we did a lot of train the trainers on a variety of subjects and it works really, really well. Those are the things I will add to the conversation.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will open the hearing for testimony in support. I will invite those in the room to come up one at a time to testify before we go to our virtual platform.

Will Adler, representing Silver State Government Relations; and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 1245:

We would like to thank Senator Lange for bringing forward S.B. 328 (R1) and all the participants in this bill as it has progressed throughout the legislative session this year. There have been a lot of renditions and changes, as you can see. The most current mock-up is an

attempt to address a lot of that and get to a place where we are saying we should have energy storage in Nevada, and it should be a priority. Energy storage is what makes solar work at night. Having storage is the future of bringing the energy and the progression of it. Thank you for the hearing today.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is there anyone else in the room who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone here in the room who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone here in the room who would like to provide neutral testimony? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on Zoom or on the telephone who would like to testify in support?

James Halsey, Business Manager, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 357:

Today, I speak on behalf of 4,000 members in favor of S.B. 328 (R1) and specifically section 5, regarding ESAMTAC, which stands for Energy Storage and Microgrid Training and Certification. It is a training program and credential that prepares electrical contractors and workers for the safe and effective assembly, testing, commission, maintenance, repair, retrofitting, and decommissioning of energy storage and microgrid systems. The ESAMTAC initiative, led by the Pennsylvania State University, is a nonprofit, brand-neutral national training and certification program based on standards and codes developed and/or approved by the National Fire Protection Association, the National Electrical Installation Standards, the National Electric Code, and the American National Standards Institute.

Our local apprenticeship training center has already held two train the trainer classes and we have future ESAMTAC training classes scheduled. The ESAMTAC training is fundamental to the safety of the customers and installers of energy storage systems. This bill will make Nevada a leader in energy storage. For this and the reasons previously mentioned, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 357 supports S.B. 328 (R1).

Ryan Bellows, Director, Labor and External Relations, NV Energy:

NV Energy would like to testify in support of S.B. 328 (R1). We would like to thank the bill sponsor and the bill proponents for working with NV Energy to address the concerns we had and to address the concerns of stakeholders.

NV Energy is a leader in energy storage. We have several large-scale battery storage projects being constructed right now, and we will have over 1,000 megawatts of battery capacity by the year 2024. One of these projects, Gemini Solar, which is a 690-megawatt solar project in southern Nevada, will bring an additional 380 megawatts of storage online and is one of the country's largest storage projects under development right now.

NV Energy continues to study the benefits and impacts of all forms of energy storage on our system, including longer duration forms of storage, like that mentioned in the hearing today, pumped hydro storage and hydrogen storage. We know that as more of our renewable

projects come online, diversity in energy storage is going to be a critical piece of the puzzle to ensure we can meet the demand for our customers when these renewable projects are not producing energy.

NV Energy is committed to bringing on energy storage that makes sense for the reliability of our grid and for our customers. We also support the safe construction of these storage systems, and we know that the IBEW is uniquely qualified to build these projects safely. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Jimmy Lau, representing Nevada Contractors Association:

We would like to thank Senator Lange and the bill proponents for working with us to clarify the licensure requirements in the bill. Thank you all for your time in hearing this today.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other callers waiting to testify in support of S.B. 328 (R1)? [There was no one.] Are there any callers waiting to testify in opposition?

Julian Boggs, State Policy Director, U.S. Energy Storage Association:

The U.S. Energy Storage Association is a national trade association dedicated to energy storage. Our members work with all types of energy storage technologies, including battery and non-battery technology, like compressed air, liquid air, advanced thermal storage, and pumped hydro, among others. Our members have built or are developing hundreds of megawatts of energy storage in Nevada.

We appreciate the legislator's efforts to advance energy storage and applaud your leadership to date. We welcome this initiative by the Committee to enhance the quality and safety of energy storage installations, and we appreciate several of the changes in the legislation in response to concerns. However, we continue to be concerned that this legislation has been rushed through too quickly in the general Assembly and may needlessly constrain energy storage development.

Specifically, we have two concerns and recommendations that I will mention here. Some of these were addressed by earlier questions, but we do believe that S.B. 328 (R1) applies to all energy storage systems. That is, any device that absorbs energy, stores it for a period of time, and discharges it for later use. We do believe S.B. 328 (R1) would require installers of the compressed air storage project or a pumped hydro project to receive training and certification for a program that teaches about battery storage. There was a discussion earlier about the consulting agency that developed this. I spoke to that agency, and they did confirm that ESAMTAC is a battery storage program.

We also recommend that the legislation also allow for additional training programs and that the agencies, such as the State Contractors' Board, be given the authority to approve additional training programs and meet quality standards and access standards that keep the national codes and standards, like those mentioned previously.

I thank the Committee for the opportunity to testify, and I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

Jessica Ferrato, representing Advanced Energy Economy:

Advanced Energy Economy is an industry association composed of businesses dedicated to making the energy we use secure, clean, and affordable, including those involved in all types of energy storage and microgrid.

Advanced Energy Economy supports and encourages a well-trained workforce for all energy technologies so the energy transition can provide the most economic benefits possible to the state of Nevada. We would like to continue working with the sponsor to refine the language in this bill before it passes to ensure any battery storage training is appropriately targeted to battery storage installers.

Additionally, the energy storage industry and its technologies are undergoing some of the most significant innovations in the energy space, and we believe the state should maintain a degree of flexibility and oversight in order to revise the workforce qualifications, depending on what each old and new technology needs. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Nate Blouin, Policy Manager, Interwest Energy Alliance:

Interwest Energy Alliance is the regional trade association for developers and manufacturers of utility-scale renewable energy resources across Nevada and the nation. Our members are developing the large-scale energy storage projects that will be critical to meeting Nevada's energy and environmental policy goals. We do appreciate the sponsor and other stakeholders who provided valuable feedback on the policy that would be established by this bill, and we certainly support the intent to train members of the workforce to safely install battery energy storage systems across the state.

I would like to raise two concerns that we have with the bill as written today. First, the bill codifies a broad definition of energy storage, as Assemblywoman Peters mentioned, that expands beyond the scope of electrochemical battery energy storage, which is the primary technology addressed by the ESAMTAC training program discussed in the bill. This means that contractors working on a range of storage technologies that each have their own complexities will be required to have training that solely applies to battery energy storage.

Second, this bill codifies a training program that is largely unknown without an off branch should ESAMTAC change or cease to exist, which would leave contractors shorthanded and jeopardize Nevada's energy and emissions policy goals by potentially delaying projects that have already been permitted.

We have previously provided language to the sponsor that would alleviate our concerns, but the current draft of the bill has not incorporated all our suggestions. In closing, we support the intent of the bill to keep Nevada workers safe, but I would ask the Committee to consider the concerns that have been outlined today.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other callers wishing to testify in opposition? [There were none.] We will move to neutral testimony. I see Mr. Weir from the PUCN on Zoom. I will invite you to go first.

Garrett Weir, General Counsel, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada:

As Mr. Johnston explained earlier, the PUCN recently found that it was in the public interest to establish energy storage targets, and it established those targets via regulation. Those regulations the PUCN adopted also created a framework for reevaluating those targets and establishing new targets as necessary in future resource planning proceedings applications submitted by the electric utility.

In determining whether to establish new targets, the PUCN will, beginning this year, review an energy storage plan that the regulations require NV Energy to file. The components of that plan include how the utility plans to meet the targets within the action plan period, which is the next three years; the projects the utility is seeking approval of; and evaluation of the cost and benefits. The regulations also require NV Energy to provide annual energy storage updates beginning in 2022. The PUCN is happy to provide the report to the Legislative Commission that this bill requires.

With regard to the mock-up proposed amendment before you, the PUCN does note that in finding that storage targets were in the public interest, it previously evaluated the cost and benefits delineated under the existing law in NRS 704.795, subsection 3. To address Assemblyman Watts' observation, in reevaluating energy storage targets pursuant to our regulations, the PUCN would, again, apply these considerations were they to remain in place. We think, perhaps, it is a preferable alternative to simply amend the bill to reinstate this language rather than adding it as a legislative declaration.

Finally, if I may, and I might need to go beyond the time restrictions, address Assemblyman Watts' question regarding how the PUCN sets the energy storage targets. May I have your indulgence.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

You may have my indulgence. I was going to ask you to address the question that was asked earlier, so please, go ahead.

Garrett Weir:

Primarily, in setting those targets, the PUCN looks at need and it looks at the demands on the system and how we are going to balance the supply and demand for electricity. One consideration that is important in looking at the targets for energy storage systems is there are diminishing returns at some point. Ideally, we would be focusing our use of energy storage systems on serving peak demand for electricity. However, if we have too much storage, we may have to serve light-load periods, such as overnight, with storage instead of using zero- or near-zero cost energy.

Notably, the PUCN has directed NV Energy to study the amount of energy storage that can be interconnected before negative effects appear on the system. NV Energy will supply this information with its upcoming IRP filing this summer. That information will inform the PUCN's reevaluation of energy storage targets.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify, and I am happy to answer any further questions.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Assemblyman Watts does have a question for you, Mr. Weir.

Assemblyman Watts:

Thank you, Mr. Weir, for providing some of that additional information. I appreciate it, and I appreciate the work the PUCN has put in on this issue as well as the consideration. I always want to be careful understanding that it is the Legislature's job to set some of the public policy parameters and then the PUCN to take some of the more in-depth regulatory work to make things happen.

It seems that those sections of statute should not be repealed but clarified. Instead of determining whether or not it is in the public interest to establish those regulations and set those targets, perhaps it would be better to just modify it as items to be considered when setting or reevaluating the targets for some of those parameters that are in statute now. It sounds like you have already established a process to look at this at times but, in general, again, I think it is helpful for the Legislature to provide some guidance in aspects to consider when making those determinations, so wherever you end up generally falls within the parameters we are looking for as the Legislature.

Without trying to put you in an uncomfortable position, does my understanding line up with how this might work a little bit better?

Garrett Weir:

Your understanding is correct. We previously followed the direction of the Legislature in examining those delineated costs and benefits. If additional clarification is necessary, and frankly, I think—even just under the existing law if it were reinserted and not repealed—the PUCN would apply those same considerations of costs and benefits to its examination of whether to set new targets in reevaluating the existing targets.

Assemblyman Watts:

I think it is helpful that while the PUCN does have a process in place, when we repeal those statutes, technically there are no more guardrails for what the PUCN would consider. If we keep them in, we ensure we are keeping that same guidance in place for evaluating those targets in the future. Thank you for the clarification, Mr. Weir. Thank you, Madam Chair, for your indulgence in getting that on the record.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Is anyone else waiting to provide neutral testimony?

Misty Grimmer, representing State Contractors' Board:

I am here today to testify in neutral on S.B. 328 (R1) with the Proposed Amendment 3352. The State Contractors' Board appreciates the opportunity to work with Senator Lange on the bill's language to address concerns regarding the contractor classifications referenced as it relates to the scope of work that can be performed within respective trades. Having reviewed the amendment proposed today, the Contractors' Board agrees with the changes being sought and, again, thanks Senator Lange for her willingness to work with us on the language.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other callers waiting to provide neutral testimony? [There were none.] Senator Lange, do you have any closing comments?

Senator Lange:

Thank you for all your questions. It helps us as we move forward. I want to clarify that we took that language out of the bill because the PUCN asked us to. Now they want us to put it back in, so we will look at that and talk with them to figure out how to move forward.

For the other people who spoke in opposition, we have worked with almost everyone, and a couple of those people are brand-new people. We would be happy to reach out to them. I think all of you operate this way, as well as I do, in order to have the best bill possible that will help people in Nevada as we move forward and provide a good road map for how we do battery storage in Nevada.

If you have any further questions, please reach out to my office. I would be happy to help. [[Exhibit D](#) was submitted but not discussed.]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I appreciate the conversation by the members. The members had a number of concerns and questions. I am encouraging you to reach out to them tomorrow. We will be holding a work session on Thursday for matters that have been brought before us. I think there are a number of items that would need to be finalized, clarified, and addressed before I can put this on the work session. Please, reach out to my members.

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 328 (1st Reprint). We will move on to the next item on our agenda, which will be the work session, beginning with Senate Bill 58.

Senate Bill 58: Revises certain functions and responsibilities of the Investigation Division of the Department of Public Safety. (BDR 43-352)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 58 was first heard before the Committee on April 22, 2021, and is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure on behalf of the Investigation Division of the Department of Public Safety [[Exhibit E](#)]. The bill revises the responsibilities of the Investigation Division to include investigations relating to technological crimes and assisting other divisions within the Department. Upon request, the division may also: (1) assist

certain state agencies in carrying out criminal investigations for enforcing statutes related to cannabis; and (2) furnish services relating to the investigation of crimes to any agency, board, commission, or other unit of the Executive Branch that is authorized to conduct criminal investigations.

This measure has never been amended and there are no fiscal notes associated with S.B. 58.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 58.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 58.

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMEN PETERS AND
SUMMERS-ARMSTRONG VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Watts. The next bill on work session will be Senate Bill 60 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 60 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing vehicles. (BDR 43-307)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 60 (1st Reprint) was first heard in this Committee on April 27, 2021, and is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure on behalf of the Department of Motor Vehicles [[Exhibit F](#)]. Senate Bill 60 (1st Reprint) revises the design requirements and numbering of special license plates by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). The bill also revises the process for an applicant's participation in the design of a special plate, including deadlines for the submittal and revision of a special plate design. Senate Bill 60 (1st Reprint) clarifies that, based on a recommendation from the Commission on Special License Plates, the DMV may take disciplinary action against a charitable organization that has failed to comply with the statutes governing financial administration of special license plate fees.

The measure provides for design criteria for exempt license plates without distinguishing marks that are used in undercover investigations, expands the number of law enforcement agencies that may be issued such plates, and protects the disclosure of information related to such vehicles.

Senate Bill 60 (1st Reprint) increases the expiration date of a special permit from 15 to 30 days for the movement of a vehicle to sell out of state—or for the movement outside Nevada—of a vehicle purchased by a nonresident. A person who is not a dealer,

manufacturer, or rebuilder and who purchases an unregistered vehicle or a vehicle from a private seller, may move the vehicle without a DMV permit for three days after the date of purchase if the person carries proof of ownership or purchase and liability insurance in the vehicle.

Finally, the bill revises the formula for distribution of the money in the Pollution Control Account by removing the calculations related to funds collected from the licensure of certain classic vehicles that are exempt from emissions testing.

There are no amendments for this Committee's consideration. There have been two fiscal notes received from the DMV and the Department of Public Safety, both showing no fiscal impact.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 60 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 60 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Brown-May. The next bill on work session is Senate Bill 66 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 66 (1st Reprint): Enacts provisions relating to access to the Internet and telecommunications technology for pupils. (BDR 34-430)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 66 (1st Reprint) was first heard in this Committee on April 27, 2021, and is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Education on behalf of the Clark County School District [[Exhibit G](#)]. Senate Bill 66 (1st Reprint) requires the Office of Science, Innovation and Technology in the Office of the Governor to develop a statewide system of gathering data related to residential Internet service and telecommunications technology accessibility for pupils in Nevada. The bill also requires the office to: (1) collaborate with various entities to ensure pupils have access to telecommunications technology and the Internet; (2) recommend minimum standards for devices owned by a school or a school district; (3) conduct a gap analysis regarding the lack of pupil connectivity; (4) develop a fiscal plan to address such gaps; and (5) report on these responsibilities to the Governor, the State Board of Education, and the Legislature annually.

There are no amendments for the Committee's consideration. Following the adoption of Amendment 13, the fiscal note originally provided by the Department of Education for the measure, as introduced, is no longer applicable.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 66 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 66 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN LEAVITT SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Assemblywoman Peters:

I just want to reiterate to the proponents of the bill that there was a request to ensure we are including an analysis of parents and their ability to assist their children in accessing. I encourage that be considered as part of this project.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I have a few questions I am going to try to resolve before this goes to the floor. I will be voting no but reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Members, I will remind everyone, your vote to get the bills out of Committee is appreciated. If you do, for whatever reason, decide to change your mind, I ask that you inform me before it hits the floor for the final vote. We have a motion and a second.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Peters. The next bill on work session is Senate Bill 204.

**Senate Bill 204: Revises provisions governing the Department of Motor Vehicles.
(BDR 43-492)**

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 204 was first heard in this Committee on April 22, 2021, and is sponsored by Senator Denis [[Exhibit H](#)]. Senate Bill 204 authorizes the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to issue cards, certificates, and licenses in electronic form, provided a physical version of the document has been issued. Subject to statutory exceptions, a person must carry the physical version of the document when operating a motor vehicle.

The bill also authorizes the DMV to establish electronic branch offices to accept forms and other documentation and to conduct certain transactions electronically. The DMV is not permitted to conduct transactions electronically if state or federal law specifically requires a transaction to occur in person or for documents to be presented in their original form.

There are no amendments to the measure for the Committee's consideration. A fiscal note provided by the Office of Project Management within the DMV shows no fiscal impact.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 204.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 204.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BROWN-MAY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Roberts. The next bill on work session is Senate Bill 362.

Senate Bill 362: Revises provisions relating to public transit systems. (BDR 22-836)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 362 was first heard in this Committee on April 22, 2021, and is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure [[Exhibit I](#)]. Senate Bill 362 authorizes a regional transportation commission in a county with a population of 700,000 or more—currently Clark County—to provide microtransit services as part of its public transit system. The bill also repeals a requirement that the regional transportation commission in Clark County receive certain determinations from the Nevada Transportation Authority before it may operate an on-call public transit system.

The measure has never been amended and there are no fiscal notes associated with it.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 362.

ASSEMBLYMAN MILLER MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 362.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Leavitt. The last bill on work session is Senate Concurrent Resolution 8.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 8: Expresses support for the identification of key transportation priorities for the Lake Tahoe Basin. (BDR R-365)

Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 was heard in this Committee on April 29, 2021, and is sponsored by the Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure on behalf of the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System [[Exhibit J](#)]. Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 expresses support for the efforts of the Bi-State Working Group on Transportation and requests the Group collaborate and agree on a five-year list of transportation priorities and projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The list of transportation priorities and projects should include: (1) cost-benefit analyses for each project; (2) consistency with California and Nevada's climate change goals; and (3) the identification of potential funding sources, as well as equity issues and barriers to implementation.

The measure has never been amended and there are no fiscal notes associated with it.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will entertain a motion to adopt Senate Concurrent Resolution 8.

ASSEMBLYMAN WATTS MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT
SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SUMMERS-ARMSTRONG SECONDED THE
MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Wheeler. That brings us to the last item on our agenda for today, which is public comment. Is there anyone here or on the phone wishing to make public comment today? [There was no one.]

Our next meeting for the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure will be Thursday, May 13, 2021, at 1:30 p.m. The meeting will consist of a work session only for measures that have come before our Committee in the past few weeks. I am also trying to get our Committee photos rescheduled. As soon as I have that date, I will get it to you all. I have matching masks for all of us.

This meeting is adjourned [at 3:26 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lori McCleary
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is Proposed Amendment 3352, dated May 10, 2021, presented by Senator Roberta Lange, Senate District No. 7, regarding Senate Bill 328 (1st Reprint).

[Exhibit D](#) is a syllabus of the Energy Storage and Microgrid Training and Certification Program, submitted by Senator Roberta Lange, Senate District No. 7, in support of Senate Bill 328 (1st Reprint).

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 58, presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 60 (1st Reprint), presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 66 (1st Reprint), presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 204, presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 362, presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, presented by Katie Siemon, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.