

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

**Eighty-First Session
April 6, 2021**

The Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Daniele Monroe-Moreno at 1:42 p.m. on Tuesday, April 6, 2021, Online. 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:

Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Assembly District No. 29

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:

Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League
Dylan Sullivan, Senior Scientist, Climate and Clean Energy Program, Natural Resources Defense Council
Sarah Steinberg, Policy Principal, Advanced Energy Economy
Jaina Moan, Director, External Affairs, The Nature Conservancy
Jasmine Vazin, Organizer, Sierra Club
Mary House, President and CEO, CHR, Inc.
Tessyn Opferman, representing Service Employees International Union Local 1107
Cynthia Moore, Las Vegas Field Organizer, Moms Clean Air Force; and National Lead, EcoMadres
Matt Rubin, Energy Policy Analyst, Western Resource Advocates
Ernest Figueroa, Consumer's Advocate, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Office of the Attorney General
Barry Gold, Director, Government Affairs, AARP Nevada
Alexandra Dazlich, Director, Government Affairs, Nevada Restaurant Association
Jordan Krahenbuhl, Executive Director, Plumbing Heating Cooling Contractors of Nevada
Doug Cannon, President and CEO, NV Energy
Kerrie Kramer, representing National Association for Industrial and Office Parks
John P. Hester, President and CEO, Southwest Gas Corporation
Thomas Brill, of Counsel, Greenberg Traurig, LLP
Peter Guzman, representing Latin Chamber of Commerce
John Carlo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Kristen Averyt, State Climate Policy Coordinator, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
David Bobzien, Director, Office of Energy, Office of the Governor
Annette Kerr, Private Citizen, Spring Creek, Nevada

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 380. The bill will be presented by Assemblywoman Cohen.

Assembly Bill 380: Revises provisions relating to utilities. (BDR 58-773)

Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Assembly District No. 29:

I appreciate the opportunity to present Assembly Bill 380, which is creating a responsible energy-planning process. With me today are Kyle Davis with the Nevada Conservation League and Dylan Sullivan from the Natural Resources Defense Council.

Nevada's clean energy transformation has already begun. During the 80th Session, this body unanimously passed the 50 percent renewable portfolio standard and Governor Sisolak released the bold State Climate Strategy just a few months ago. This transition is not limited to our government. We also see it in our economy, where more than 33,000 Nevadans work

in clean energy, a sector that has seen a 40 percent employment growth since 2017. Nearly three out of five clean energy workers were employed by companies with fewer than 20 employees, highlighting the role of the industry in supporting small business.

There is even more opportunity ahead, but meeting our climate goals is a challenge that requires continuous action to move away from fossil fuels. To achieve the vision and ensure no communities are left behind, we need long-range planning for the future. In short, this bill would require Nevada's gas utilities to demonstrate that future spending on the gas system makes economic and environmental sense. That is it.

Contrary to what some have said about this bill, it has never been about banning gas or forcing anyone to replace their appliances. It is about making sure we are planning ahead for the future we want. This planning process is important for all Nevadans—all of us paying utility bills every month; all of us worried about dirty air and rising temperatures—and it is especially high-stakes for low-income families.

If there is one thing I have heard from constituents over the last year, it is a sense of uncertainty about the future. Can they keep up with rent and car payments after being furloughed? What about new job opportunities coming their way? If utility bills spike following a heatwave, what are they going to sacrifice to afford it? Just how hot is it going to get? This bill is a response to these concerns—concerns that I share. We must find a way to keep energy bills low while transitioning to renewable resources that are better for our health and climate. That is why A.B. 380 is designed to prevent wasteful or unnecessary gas spending that could lead to rate increases. The bill also includes specific provisions to protect low-income Nevadans whose choices are often limited by their economic situation, including exploring barriers these households face in upgrading to more energy-efficient appliances that could significantly reduce their bills.

In addition, we have incorporated feedback from many other stakeholders. After extensive conversations with utilities that would be involved in a new planning process, state officials who would assess those plans, industry experts with expertise in these topics, and clean energy advocates committed to meeting our climate goals, we proposed an amendment to the bill to address the varying perspectives and feedback.

These conversations are an essential part of the policymaking process, but they are also essential to how this bill works. Responsible energy planning involves putting ideas forward, having open and public debate about how those plans impact our communities, and reaching solutions that take all of the factors into consideration. I feel confident that we have made adjustments that maintain the key purpose of the bill to set Nevada up for an affordable clean-energy future, while creating opportunities for all stakeholders to weigh in, both in the policy-drafting process this year and in the responsible energy-planning process we are hoping to put in place for years to come.

I will turn the presentation over to Mr. Davis and Mr. Sullivan to walk you through the bill and the conceptual amendment [[Exhibit C](#)].

Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League:

The Nevada Conservation League convenes a coalition of over 20 environmental organizations from across the state, and this bill is a top priority for this session. Nevada has historically been a leader in investing in green energy, and last session this body passed legislation to focus on reducing our greenhouse gas emissions to get to net zero by 2050. This is an ambitious and necessary goal, and if we are serious about reaching it, we have to develop a smart plan to make progress over the coming decades.

Our electric utilities are already taking on these planning efforts, and it only makes sense that gas utilities do the same. This bill will take a hard look at future investments to ensure they make sense for ratepayers, for shareholders, and for our state's carbon reduction goals. Today, we will go through the bill, working from the conceptual amendment that was distributed to members and stakeholders in advance of this hearing, which is also available as an exhibit on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) [[Exhibit C](#)].

At a high level, this bill now does two things: it directs the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN) to launch an investigatory docket into the role of gas utilities in reducing greenhouse gas emissions in Nevada, and it puts in place a planning process for gas utilities so the state can make sure new investments in the gas system make economic and environmental sense over the next 30 years.

I would like to turn the presentation over to Mr. Sullivan, a senior scientist and technical expert with the Natural Resources Defense Council. Mr. Sullivan has worked on utility regulation for more than a decade and has a master's degree in civil and environmental engineering from Stanford University and a master's degree in public policy from Princeton University. He will walk through the provisions of the bill and amendment in greater detail.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Before Mr. Sullivan gets started, I have one question. There are two amendments on NELIS. One is 11 pages [[Exhibit D](#)] and the other is 7 pages [[Exhibit C](#)]. Which one will you be working off of, or will you be utilizing both?

Dylan Sullivan, Senior Scientist, Climate and Clean Energy Program, Natural Resources Defense Council:

I will be working off of the 7-page version or the "clean version" [[Exhibit C](#)].

I want to thank the Committee for providing us the time to present A.B. 380 and the proposed amendment for consideration today, especially given all the other bills on the Committee's plate this week. I would also like to thank the various stakeholders, whose engagement and feedback helped us develop the amendment in search of a commonsense solution to the issues that have been laid out by Assemblywoman Cohen. I will walk the Committee through the amendment section by section, working from the clean version, which was sent to Committee members and is available as an exhibit online.

I will start with sections 3, 5, and 5.1. These sections of the bill establish definitions for beneficial electrification, end-use equipment, and energy efficiency. These definitions are used in the bill in a few places. First, when gas utilities are making a load forecast for what the demand for gas might be in the future. Second, when gas utilities and the PUCN are evaluating a big, new gas project and comparing it to alternatives. Third, when the PUCN is considering how to protect low-income customers and historically underserved communities from impact on gas bills of any decline in gas sales. To be clear, there is no electrification goal or mandate in this bill. The intent of this bill is that beneficial electrification and energy efficiency are analyzed as alternatives to a big gas project.

Sections 6 and 8 of the bill define gas and greenhouse gas as they are used throughout the bill. Sections 11 and 12 define "historically underserved community" and "low-income household." We worked on the definition of historically underserved community with feedback from other advocates. The Committee will likely be seeing other legislation this session using the same or very similar definitions. The definition of historically underserved community and low-income household is based on existing federal and state definitions and data to allow for easier identification of these communities, and it is included here to assist the utility and PUCN in ensuring their decisions are equitable. These communities, of course, often see disproportionate economic, health, and environmental outcomes, and policy decisions should take those facts into account.

Section 15 establishes the policy goals of the state, which are referred to again in the investigatory docket that is articulated in section 17 of the bill. In the introduced version of the bill, section 15 generated significant concern and differing interpretations, so we have taken a different approach in the conceptual amendment—an approach that gives the PUCN and the state a general policy direction, which is to comprehensively plan the gas system in a manner that protects low-income households and historically underserved communities, takes into account workforce impacts, maintains safety and reliability, and reduces emissions.

Section 16 of the bill is about the resource planning process. I will return to that section when I talk about the resource planning process.

Section 17 directs the PUCN to launch an investigatory docket that covers the role of gas utilities in reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the state, how gas utilities can maintain safety and reliability if gas use declines from customer migration to electric alternatives, and how to best meet the policy goals in section 15. The PUCN has wide discretion to choose topics, but a few are specified due to their importance. One critical component is how low-income households and historically underserved communities can be protected from rate and bill impacts as Nevadans with the means to do so choose to go all-electric.

Because technology has changed, more and more people are going to move toward electric heating and cooking for environmental health and economic reasons. We see a similar trend toward electric vehicles instead of vehicles powered by gasoline. However, the gas system

costs are mostly fixed costs. Once pipe is laid, it is going to remain in place even if the customers it serves use less or no gas in the future. Because fixed costs are not decreasing as people choose to switch to electricity, the likely impact on gas bills is upward pressure on gas rates and fixed charges. This provision directs the PUCN to carefully consider this and carefully consider how to protect low-income customers.

A couple of options could include special income-based gas rates and specific programs that help these households switch, along with others. This ensures that these communities are not left behind bearing the burden of the fixed cost of the gas system. Section 17, subsections 2(a) and 2(b) cover this. Subsection 2(c) directs the PUCN to investigate another way to mitigate the cost of any transition. That is, there may be parts of the gas distribution system that are going to need to be replaced soon. However, it might be cheaper to serve customer needs with energy efficiency, beneficial electrification, and other alternatives instead of laying new pipe at today's construction prices. This bill just directs the PUCN to investigate under what circumstances this might make sense.

Section 19 of the bill is the planning process that I referred to earlier. Electric utilities like NV Energy go before the PUCN every three years and present their plans to build new transmission lines or bring new renewable power online. They forecast how much electricity demand they expect over the next few decades and compare their plan with alternatives. The PUCN looks at the analysis and alternatives and can approve, modify, or reject the plan. This section adopts the same basic framework for gas utilities.

In section 19, subsection 2(a), the gas utility is directed to do a demand forecast for what gas demands look like over the next 30 years. There is a base case that reflects the best guess of what might happen to demand, and a sensitivity where the gas utility examines what would happen if gas demands fell from beneficial electrification and energy efficiency. The sensitivity is important because it ensures the PUCN is considering a key risk of building large, new gas projects right now, and that is, how do they pencil out if demand for gas declines.

In section 19, subsection 2(b), the PUCN is directed to specify the types of investments and activities that the utility is required to bring forward in the plan. The intent here is for the PUCN to be able to scrutinize discretionary projects as opposed to those necessary for the day-to-day safety and management of the system. These day-to-day issues are already dealt with in the general rate case process in existing law, which we do not alter here. A couple of examples of the types of investments and activities we would like to see included in a plan would be service territory expansions or major pipe replacement projects that are not required for safety. The ultimate list of the project types that the gas utility needs to bring forward in the plan is up to the PUCN in the rulemaking process.

Section 19, subsection 2(c), requires the utility to describe, in detail, these large discretionary projects it wants to execute over the next six years. A detailed description is important because it helps the PUCN and stakeholders understand whether a project is necessary.

Section 19, subsection 2(d), requires the utility to compare what they want to do—the plan that they put together—with alternatives to that plan. Two specific alternatives that the utility has to analyze are called out, and the PUCN can say more about which alternatives need to be analyzed in the rulemaking process or potentially in the docket itself. Again, these alternatives just have to be analyzed. There is nothing that would require the PUCN to approve these alternative plans. This is something that electric utilities are required to do in resource planning, to analyze alternatives to what they want to do.

Section 19, subsection 2(e), directs the utility to evaluate the costs and benefits of its plan and the alternatives. This is where consumer cost would be taken into account, the cost of the utility infrastructure, and we also specifically mentioned climate and health impacts here.

Section 16 of the bill, which I referred to earlier, contains details on how the planning proceeding works and what the PUCN should take into account when it reviews the plan. The basic standard in section 16 that the PUCN will apply is whether the forecasts are sound and whether the plan, as filed by the gas utility, is good for Nevada's economy and environment.

The final section of the legislation that I would like to call the Committee's attention to is section 22. This section repeals statutes enacted in 2015 which, unfortunately, removed PUCN discretion over gas utility service territory expansions. Under existing law, the gas utility was able to expand to Spring Creek, a community near Elko, and put around 90 percent of the cost, \$57 million, on northern Nevada ratepayers. Under the current law, the PUCN was not able to properly evaluate the expansion. The bill and amendment in front of the Committee would put expansions through the comprehensive planning process in section 19, giving much-needed scrutiny.

That concludes my walk-through of the bill. I would also like to call the Committee's attention to the Natural Resources Defense Council's letter of support for A.B. 380, filed as an exhibit as well [[Exhibit E](#)]. I will now turn it back over to Assemblywoman Cohen.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

That concludes our presentation. We will stand for any questions from the Committee.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We do have a few members with questions. We will start with Assemblyman Watts.

Assemblyman Watts:

One of the things I really appreciate is the work in this bill to define "historically underserved communities" to make sure they are factored into these processes and planning discussions. I am excited because we have been having this conversation on a few pieces of legislation this session and I think it is overdue. Frankly, we have seen these folks left behind in a lot of policies and programs, including ones to support the deployment of solar energy, energy efficiency, and even electric vehicles. It is important to think about how we can make these decisions in an equitable way moving forward.

Could you speak about what you have heard from people in these communities so far and how the communities themselves would be involved under the provisions of this amended bill?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I have heard a lot of concerns about the bill. I think they are generally concerns that some of these climate actions are going to force people, who cannot afford to spend money, to replace appliances. As noted, we have created incentives in other programs, and they sometimes have barriers that make it harder for historically underserved communities to access them. This can be capital credit, but it can also be how to do outreach and education, languages, et cetera, letting people be in the know. The intent with the bill is to get in front of this by looking specifically at the ways targeted programs could address those impacts and make sure no one is left behind. The communities would definitely be involved; we want them at the PUCN and we want them participating.

Assemblyman Watts:

I appreciate that. Again, since a lot of times we have had to try to catch up, I think it is worth noting that this is something we are trying to build on the front end so we do not have to address greater issues moving forward. I want to express my appreciation.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

My question is a follow-up to Assemblyman Watt's question. Is the senior citizen population, those on fixed incomes, addressed in this plan? You talked about the lower-income demographic and their difficulty in converting from gas to electric, and there are certain parameters put in place to help that. Maybe you can discuss in more detail how that is done. Who picks up the tab for that? There is obviously going to be a disparity in what they can afford to do, whether they are a low-income demographic or a senior citizen on a fixed income. If they cannot afford to do what they need to do to convert to electric in their residence, who picks up the tab? How is that done? Can someone describe that in a little more detail?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Section 12 has the definition for low-income households, which is not more than 80 percent of the area's median-income population based on guidelines published by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Mr. Sullivan, would you go through those details?

Dylan Sullivan:

The first major impact of this bill is that it will give the PUCN the tools to provide needed scrutiny on the gas utilities going forward in investments. Because of the incentives of rate of return regulation, utilities are going to want to lay new pipe. This bill will just make sure that the new things the gas utility wants to do are cost-effective. The first big impact of the bill will be there on providing needed scrutiny.

What this bill calls for is really the first steps of this transition. It calls on the PUCN to do an investigatory docket about how to do this transition and how to reduce emissions from our natural gas utilities in an equitable manner. This is just the starting point. I did mention some of the things that could be good programs, such as special gas rates for low-income customers and specific programs that help customers when they are already in the market for a new appliance, when something breaks, just to make sure there is an option to switch and that it is available to all types of customers.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

Essentially, what I got out of your answer is we are going to force the gas utility to charge someone a lower rate or we are going to help someone who has to pay a certain rate, whatever it is, in some way, shape, or form, to pay that rate. What I want to know is: First, how can we dictate equitably what a gas company charges a certain demographic? Second, if we cannot get there with that and we want to ensure the lower-income level—whether it be fixed income or impoverished areas—what is the plan to supplement that? I am trying to gauge how that even works. I do not know if there is an equitable way to dictate to a certain company that they need to charge someone less by regulation. I want to know if other taxpayers are going to have to pick up the tab if we supplement their gas at some other juncture.

Dylan Sullivan:

Other states in the country have income-qualified programs for providing essential utility services. If the PUCN decided it was a good idea to mitigate the rate and bill impact, then they could pursue that as other states have done. In terms of how this would work, there is a good analogy to utility energy efficiency programs. A utility like NV Energy provides incentives for customers to buy down the cost of the more efficient models; they work with contractors to make sure contractors know about the efficient model, have it in stock, and offer a good price. In the medium term, after the investigatory docket, the PUCN could find that programs like this would be reasonable.

Again, this bill is really the starting point. The big thing it is going to do is provide added scrutiny on gas utility investments and make sure we are making the right investments for the long term.

Kyle Davis:

My colleague makes some pretty good points in programs we already have in place for electric utilities. We already have programs in place that provide assistance for lower-income ratepayers who have electric utilities. We already have programs in place that provide those efficiency programs. Those are some of the options available. I think the most important thing to consider is what we want to do is set up a process so the PUCN can consider this in an open public process where consumer groups, the state consumer advocate, and other groups can get involved so there is a way to work through these types of programs

that could be offered. We do not know right now in terms of what programs are going to work best. As my colleague said, there are a number of different programs across the country they can take into account. This bill sets up that process to consider those types of things.

Assemblyman Roberts:

I understand low-income and folks on a fixed income. Obviously, over time, the service of gas is going to reduce so there are fewer people being serviced. For those people who are stuck or cannot leave the system for whatever reason, what happens to their bills to maintain the system to still deliver gas? How does that work?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I am going to ask the other presenters to chime in. However, I think the thing to remember is what we are talking about now is planning. We know the changes are coming. We have used the example of electric cars and how more people are looking at electric cars. Just like that, more people are looking at electrification. There could be a situation where there are people who are being left behind. However, if we do not start to plan for that, in 10, 20, or 29 years from now—which is the number the state has been looking at for reducing greenhouse gases and carbonization—we cannot get there. Those people will be left behind, and the question will be, What are we going to do now?

Kyle Davis:

I do not have much more to add. I think the Assemblywoman covered it pretty well. The fact is, this is happening, based on technology and policies. This is the direction we are already moving. In fact, I remember that came up in the Legislative Committee on Energy last year. The utilities said they were planning for a future where people used less gas. We need to do that. We need to do that in a comprehensive way because this is going to continue to happen—because of technology, because of the choices consumers make, and because of policies that are put into place. Assemblyman Roberts, you are certainly right that this is something we need to be thinking about, but it is going to happen whether we think about it or not. It makes sense to plan for it on the front end. That is really what this bill is all about.

Assemblyman Roberts:

I understand that. What is your anticipation of the plan? Obviously, you are sponsoring the bill and you believe there is a need to plan for the reduced greenhouse gases. What do you think will occur? At some point, will there not be a tipping point where folks on the system cannot afford to stay on the system? Then what happens to the system?

Kyle Davis:

I think the important thing to keep in mind is that we have to actually plan for it. Mr. Sullivan talked about some of the examples that could be put into place in terms of programs that could be implemented. I think the most important part, and what this bill is trying to get at, is that we do not exacerbate the problem in the meantime. This is something we need to keep in the back of our minds, and we need to know that we may have customers

leaving the system. It does not make sense to put a lot of money into growing and enhancing that system if it is just going to be a bill that is going to come due in the future. That is really what we are talking about and thinking about on the front end—knowing that reality and making sure we do not invest a lot of money into a system that is going to have fewer people paying for it in the future so we can manage those costs.

Assembly Roberts:

As it gets reduced, the people who work on these gas lines and infrastructure, through our own planning, are probably going to be cut back over the years. What happens to those high-paying, union jobs? How do we retrain those people? Is that part of the planning process for the PUCN, or is that left to state government to shore up?

Kyle Davis:

Yes, this is about planning for the future. It is not requiring any one reality to come into play. We would anticipate that gas utility workers, such as the thousands of Southwest Gas employees, will continue to maintain the current system, including fixing leaks, for decades. In the meantime, any beneficial electrification or energy efficiency projects that are determined to be cost effective, would create new jobs on top of this existing workforce demand.

The bill establishes that it is the policy of the state to specifically consider the impact of declining gas demand on utility workers. We do not have all the answers here, but what we want to see is cross-training in other programs to ensure as the jobs change, workers are able to adjust. That is called for in the legislation.

Assemblyman Roberts:

Yes, they will be working on a lot of leaks because they probably will not be investing in any infrastructure too much.

Assemblywoman Peters:

There has been a lot of debate about banning or expanding gas and what that means for communities. I am a huge advocate for ensuring we are appropriately investing in our infrastructure and not leaving it for the last minute, as historically has been a trend for us. I also acknowledge that even in my own family, the decision to move away from gas conveniences has been a struggle. However, we have been looking at alternatives, but French-trained chefs only use gas stoves. Again, there are some alternatives out there. I also want to say that I am grateful that this bill is starting to look at the data and asking for a specific feasibility and analysis of the trends in gas and how that integrates with our advancement on climate change adaptation and planning in the future. I also know there is another proposal for comprehensive gas pipe replacement projects that are linked to the discussion of safety. Can you talk about how that proposal is currently being evaluated and how safety would be factored in their planning process of the bill, along with the other feasibility study impacts, like the financial health concerns and climate impacts?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I will start and then throw it to my fellow presenters to see if they want to add anything. I do not think I have ever been in the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure, but I am guessing this Committee is very familiar with the PUCN. There are pipeline safety regulators, and I believe they are here today to testify if necessary. We have federal laws and an existing process to ensure that projects are done for safety and carried out immediately in cases of emergency. However, our gas system is rated highly for its safety and efficiency. This bill does not change that or the process for addressing issues with leaks and other dangers. This is somewhat a follow up to the last statement Assemblyman Roberts made. It is balancing the gains from the infrastructure and doing replacement or new infrastructure against fiscal health and climate impacts of the spending. We are looking at electrification and efficiency and these alternatives, making sure we are being really targeted over the next several years as we move forward. Wherever we are going to be, we need to put thought into it.

Dylan Sullivan:

The one thing I will add is a little bit more detail about the federal pipeline safety regulations. Gas utilities are required to file a distribution integrity management plan with the federal pipeline regulator. Basically, each year they are required to identify those sections of pipe that are most at risk and replace those. Anytime there is an imminent concern about safety, gas utilities everywhere have to address that. This bill does nothing to change those existing processes for managing the day-to-day safety of the gas utility.

Southwest Gas wants to do a giant replacement project to spend \$3.7 billion ripping up 7,000 miles of streets to replace pipe that may not be necessary to replace. This bill will give the PUCN the tools to evaluate that investment to make sure it makes sense for the future direction of the state.

Assemblywoman Peters:

I appreciate the integration of financial security and safety, personal health and safety, and the health and safety of our children and other vulnerable populations, and the climate safety and health integrated into this proposal.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Mr. Sullivan, the PUCN approved all the expenditures and plans that went into Spring Creek, Nevada, did they not?

Dylan Sullivan:

The PUCN did approve the expansion to Spring Creek. However, what is important is the law that was passed in 2015 does not really give the PUCN the tools to evaluate whether expansion makes economic sense. It does not specify that expansion needs to be compared to alternatives. This bill would run expansion through a planning process where gas utilities and interveners would be able to kick the tires on these giant infrastructure proposals and make sure they make sense.

In the Spring Creek case, the gas utility did a customer-level cost benefit analysis where they looked at the impact of a customer's bill if gas was expanded to that community instead of doing some alternative, such as staying with propane or using electricity for heating. The way the company did that analysis, they did not even consider new cost-effective electric technologies, like heat pumps, that could have served those heating needs at actually lower costs than gas. With this bill, expansion could still go forward and would still go forward if it makes economic sense, but it would remove existing law that basically allows the gas utility a free hand to expand and make sure that expansion makes economic sense. That could still happen, they would just be more rigorously scrutinized.

Assemblyman Ellison:

The customers are the ones who are going to make that choice. They are on propane now and there were millions of dollars invested to get it out there. The people are so happy to get natural gas into these areas. Some of these areas will still have to be on propane for years and years to come. To me, it should be the people who decide if they want natural gas or not. They have an option to say they would rather stay on propane, take the natural gas, or go ahead and switch over to electric.

I have had more calls come into my office in Elko and at this building regarding this bill than all the other bills. People are concerned about this bill and are worried about the details. Are they going to eventually lose the gas? There is a fear factor and we are getting a lot of calls. The *Elko Daily Free Press* is going to run an article today about this bill. There is a lot of concern throughout the state about what is going to happen.

The economy in Wells, Nevada, was destroyed after that earthquake. There is no industry, there is no mining, there is nothing. They are dying. Now they have a chance to have a company move there, but the only way it will come is if there is natural gas. There is no way that company could be operated without natural gas.

In some of the areas in the winter, it is hard to get into the areas because of snow and mud. Those propane tanks better be full because there may be no delivery. One good thing about natural gas is it is running all the time. I support propane, so do not get me wrong.

I have a business that depends on natural gas. If I had to switch over from natural gas to electric, that business would not be financially feasible. All the equipment in the business is gas. It would take about one-third more to operate that business, and there is no way that could work. You are saying that gas is not going to be impacted, but we are putting regulations where we might lose expansion in the future. That is probably what scares me the most. I am a big supporter of natural gas. We converted our house as much as we could to natural gas because it runs clean, it is safe, and it is economical.

Could you tell me about Wells, Nevada? I think what happens to the future of that community will be impacted by this bill.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I will address some of those issues and then have my copresenters also provide comments. I think what you said about the calls is important because of the fear factor you are hearing. We are hearing fear, but I think that is a misunderstanding of what this means and what this bill does. I am getting emails, too, but what I am hearing is that people think we are taking away their stoves in 2023 and that this is forcing a change. That is not what this bill is doing. This bill is making a plan.

I would like to use your business as an example. If the rest of your area moves away from gas—and we are talking in the future, not next year, the year after, maybe not even 10 or 20 years from now—but people decide they want to move away from gas and are doing things to do that. Where does that leave you? If there is no plan in place, you are still there with your gas hookups in your business trying to survive, but there is no access for you because of the market changing. We know the market is changing. That is something I want you to consider.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I appreciate your talking about the fear factor. I think education is a big part of this. Many of these people think their gas is going to be turned off in the next five or six years. I tell them that is not going to happen, but I am worried about the future in some of these areas. What the gas utility had to go through to get those pipelines from Elko all the way to Spring Creek was massive because of the mountains they had to go over. The good thing about it was the City of Elko representatives, county commissioners, elected state officials, and I think Congressman Amodei, were all there for the groundbreaking. It was a big thing for people to get gas in this rural area. It was a godsend. You should have seen the community come alive and show their support. They were strongly in support of getting natural gas out there. It may have cost them a few dollars more, but in the long run, they will benefit. I just wanted to mention the fear factor.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

I appreciate the conversation and the comments from my colleagues. Thank you for bringing this bill. I do want to express my appreciation, in particular, for the consideration of low-income and older adults, many of whom will not be able to afford to retrofit, especially those in Assembly District No. 42. I have a number of mobile home parks that many times cannot be converted because of the infrastructure they possess.

With that said, I appreciate the conversation relative to the fear factor and what might be a misunderstanding, so I have a couple of questions. I hear that this is about planning and ensuring the gas utility follows a similar process as the electric utility does now. Can someone discuss the current planning process that the gas utility goes through? Does the gas utility deliver a similar plan to the PUCN now, or is that not the case? I heard Mr. Davis identify that they are looking for an open and public planning process. That leads me to believe it does not currently exist. Is that true?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Correct. My copresenters certainly have more expertise in the process in front of the PUCN than I do. They could fill in those blanks about how it works in practice.

Kyle Davis:

I can give a little bit of background, then I will turn it over to Mr. Sullivan. He can give the details on the existing process and how this would be different. Yes, in Nevada, gas utilities do not go through as much of a robust process as electric utilities. Not just energy, water utilities have to develop resource plans with long-range projections and efficiency measures. In fact, the 1987 Legislature passed a bill, Senate Bill 449 of the 64th Session, requiring gas utilities to file resource plans, although this primarily focused on the sources and availability of gas and not on the infrastructure side of things. In 1997, the Legislature dialed back the filing requirement to an informational filing, which is what it is today.

I note again from the presentation, in 2015 the process was modified to disproportionately favor the gas territory expansions if there was not any economic development impact. Essentially, what we are talking about with this bill is that all major utility projects should have their costs and benefits balanced against the long-term forecast and compared with potential alternatives. That is really what we are talking about with this bill. Mr. Sullivan can tell you a little bit more about the current process.

Dylan Sullivan:

I think the easiest way to understand this is gas utilities do not have a single comprehensive process for analyzing long-term, large infrastructure projects in the same way electric utilities do. There are one-off planning processes, a lot of after-the-fact review of projects after the utility has already made investments, which puts the PUCN in a difficult position because not allowing recovery of something that has already been incurred affects the utility's finances. It would be much better to put it all in one plan up front so interveners and the PUCN can provide needed scrutiny, and the company would have more certainty when it makes an investment that it will be able to recover those costs in the future.

It is interesting to me, in a regulatory sense, why we have not had comprehensive planning on the gas utility side. The integrated resource planning for electric utilities really developed as a result of some bad construction failures and power plant cost increases that happened in the 1970s and 1980s. People realized that maybe we should be looking at energy efficiency and other alternatives to building a huge power plant. We have not seen that same level of attention on the gas system and whether it is a good idea to lay or replace pipe.

Peoples Gas in Illinois launched a pipe replacement program to replace every pipe in the city. Program costs grew from \$1.4 billion to as much as \$11 billion between 2007 and 2015, really highlighting the need to think very carefully about gas utility expansion projects and pipe replacement. I think this is something other states are looking to do and what we will see more of in the future.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

Thank you for that information. This is a new space for me. How long does a gas line function? If we are going to lay a new gas line to a new development, how long can we expect that infrastructure to last? Is it possible for the gas utility to diversify its energy portfolio similar to the way the electric utility does now with renewable energy sources?

Dylan Sullivan:

The lifetime for which a gas pipe is depreciated from an accounting sense is about 50 years, when I looked at the IRS tables a few weeks ago. The engineering lifespan can be 70 years or longer.

To answer your second question, Can gas utilities do the same thing NV Energy is doing, basically rely more on renewable energy and other alternatives? It is more difficult. There is something called renewable natural gas available on the market. It is actually biomethane, which is a type of methane molecule, the same molecule as fossil natural gas. It is captured and collected from waste at landfills, livestock operations, and sewage treatment facilities. The analysis from the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) shows that sustainable biomethane sources can only offset around 3 percent to 7 percent of total U.S. gas use. Biomethane's claimed climate benefits really depend on some accounting assumptions. Some of the accounting assumptions are pretty dubious. I detail this more in NRDC's comment letter [[Exhibit E](#)]. Basically, because of the limited availability and the high cost of biomethane, it is unlikely it will be a transition strategy.

Hydrogen made from renewable electricity will likely be a key energy carrier in storage technology in a low-carbon world, but it is going to best be used where renewable electricity is not a great option, for things like aviation, heavy-duty trucking applications, and industrial processes. Using green hydrogen in homes and businesses to heat spaces and water, the things we use gas for in our homes currently, would be fantastically expensive and inefficient. Nevada would need to build five to six times the amount of renewable power plants to serve heating needs with green hydrogen than if it served those needs with electric heat pumps powered by renewable energy.

There are alternatives, but the availability is limited and the cost is going to be a lot higher than conventional natural gas, and it is likely to be a lot higher than using clean Nevada electricity to power new electric technologies.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I am listening to everyone saying this is not a natural gas ban. We have a stated goal of zero emissions by 2050 for this state. It seems to me this is probably the first step in a natural gas ban. More importantly, it looks to me, especially through section 19, that we are asking the gas utilities to go to the PUCN and say, "Over the next 20 years, here is how we are going to cut our own throats." Can you tell me this is not the first step to a natural gas ban, especially given the 2050 state goal of zero emissions?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

What we have to understand is that things are changing—the market, how people are choosing to bring utilities into their homes, and what utilities they are going to use. Whether we move forward, thinking that there are changes and we need to prepare for them, or we stick our heads in the sand and do not want to rock the boat and give anyone a problem, that is a big issue. The changes are coming. Again, maybe not for 10, 20 or 29 years, it is still something that is coming, and it is something this state has said needs to happen because we did make these goals. Are we just making goals so we can have a photo opportunity, or does it mean something, and are we going to do something to get there?

Kyle Davis:

What we are asking for is a process at the PUCN to consider the state's future. It is beyond any one utility or what the responsibility of the state is to continue any utility's specific business model at the time. It is asking the state, through our regulatory process, to take a look at how we are going to plan for the future. As Assemblywoman Cohen stated, yes, this is the direction the market is going, maybe not as fast right now, but it is likely to increase. Planning for the fact that people are going to electrify on their own because of improving technology is something we need to take into account.

You are quite right; we are also taking into account the state's overall carbon reduction goals. This is a part of planning for the future so we can plan to reduce our carbon emissions. We certainly took a big step forward last session with the passage of the renewable portfolio standard and increasing that to 50 percent by 2030, with the goal of getting to 100 percent carbon-free by 2050. That is the place we are trying to get to in order to stave off the worst effects of climate change. This is a planning process to figure out how to do that.

We want to set up a process that takes everything into account. All of these ideas can be brought to the table and can be considered. I expect when you hear Southwest Gas speak later in this meeting, they are going to talk about some of the "pipe alternatives" that they have. Those should certainly be evaluated by the PUCN, along with electrification options and other things we can do to reduce carbon emissions and sustainability in the future. These are all things that need to be evaluated because some may make sense, and some may not.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I hear what you are saying, but when Assemblywoman Cohen said the market is changing, what I see is that we are changing the market with this bill. We are forcing a market change. I believe we should stay out of things like that. Again, it seems to me we are sitting here saying we are going to take a viable product with very low emissions and get rid of it. I think we need a Twenty-eighth Amendment for the right to keep and bear our gas stoves.

Kyle Davis:

I hear what you are saying, Assemblyman Wheeler. The only thing I would point out is Nevada was one of the first states that adopted a renewable portfolio standard in the early 2000s. That portfolio standard was incredibly small at the time—it was less than 1 percent—all the way up to last session when this body increased it to 50 percent by 2030 with

a unanimous vote. At the time, there were certainly those who said this is forcing the market and changing the market. However, what it did was allow for that technology to develop and now we are at a point where solar is the cheapest source of energy we have in the state. We certainly see opportunities in doing things like this.

We do not want to do something that is going to put people out on the street. We want to make sure we maintain a good process to do this. However, there is advantage to investing in Nevada resources and in clean energy resources and moving in that direction for the state, both economically and environmentally.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

We talked about infrastructure for gas. Could you talk about what it costs in the lifespan of an electric power plant and transformers and what we are looking at as far as replacing those infrastructure items?

Kyle Davis:

No, I do not know the exact cost on that. Obviously, it depends on the technology and the size. Correct me if I am wrong, but just thinking about infrastructure in general—whether we are considering the costs of investing in new gas pipelines and gas distribution systems, or whether we are thinking about building new power plants, new transformers, and new electric lines—no matter what those large infrastructure projects are, our belief is that they should be subjected to a resource planning process at the PUCN. That is what happens currently with the electric utility. They do bring these types of projects forward. They come to the PUCN and detail what they would like to do with transmission planning and building new powerlines. In fact, we just saw that a few weeks ago when the PUCN approved the Greenlink Project, in part. They did that after the company made its case to the PUCN and demonstrated it was in the best interest of the ratepayers and in the best interest of bringing new renewable energy online. The company went through that process. We believe no matter what, when we are talking about expensive projects, we need to evaluate them against the benefit to the ratepayers. When talking about gas infrastructure projects, everything should be subject to such a process. That type of process is what we are trying to set up with this bill.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

We have had several conversations and I voiced my concerns to you regarding the communities I serve. I still have to be conscious of how this could affect my community. If we are going to a system where electric infrastructure is going to be more highly used, then we could also expect that the infrastructure is going to wear out faster. If it is going to wear out faster, it is also going to affect when infrastructure projects have to be requested. Would that not still affect the rates because the electric utility would have the right to be paid back for that infrastructure?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Currently, the electric utility does have to go before the PUCN, and if there is something that they are asking to have done that is not necessarily in the best interest of the ratepayers, the PUCN can say no. We have the same issue with the gas utilities. If they decided they wanted to do a whole new infrastructure program or make repairs that are not necessarily required, they do not have to go before the PUCN. Again, this is not about forcing it to happen, it is about considering that it is going to happen, and we need to start making these plans. It is going to happen. I think the market is going to get us there and we are going to see those changes. Again, maybe far in the future, but should we not start planning and thinking about it as opposed to not wanting to think about it because it is going to be difficult?

Dylan Sullivan:

It is a great question. If we are going to be adding this new electricity demand, what is going to be the cost of adding that eventually and how do we take that into account? The important thing is that solar electricity has plunged in price since I started working at NRDC in 2008. Basically, the cheapest power you can buy in America is solar power that is made in Nevada. If this market takes off, we are going to be serving these new electric appliances in Nevada homes and businesses with cheap solar electricity. Also, Nevada does not really produce any fossil fuels. We have to buy our fossil fuels from other states and other countries. Every year, we spend about \$1.4 billion, sending money to other states to buy fossil fuels, when what we have here and what can create jobs here is Nevada's world-class solar resources. When you run the numbers, what you find is it is some of the cheapest electricity you can get in the country.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong, you still look like you have a question.

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong:

It is important to ask. I think we have to realize that infrastructure is going to be taxed. Some of us live in communities that still have wires aboveground and transformers that are on poles. When we talk about increasing demand, there is going to be stress on those resources. We are being encouraged, through this legislation, to consider processes that will convert our communities. However, when I asked about the provider of that resource and whether or not it is up to snuff to provide that power in an efficient and effective manner so we do not have brown outs or blackouts and transformers that are already blowing up in our communities, I feel like I was kind of dismissed. The question is a valid question. I appreciate the comments, but I think it requires an honest answer and it requires consideration.

Dylan Sullivan:

Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong, I am sorry if I did not answer your question. I think you bring up an important point. As we add more electric vehicles to the grid, as we add electric demands, we might need more electric distribution system investment. I think the important thing is the state can compare the cost of that extra investment to the cost of continued investments in the gas system. That is what can be allowed for in this bill and the planning process that is articulated in the bill.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Along those lines, and if I am incorrect, Assemblywoman Summers-Armstrong, please correct me, but I think the biggest concern she was trying to stress is not so much the state's investment as we move forward, but the individual investment of the families that will be impacted. There has been a lot of conversation about disadvantaged communities, but I have not really heard in the presentation about how those disadvantaged communities are going to make the adjustment.

It was just a short time ago in Texas when their system went haywire. They were relying on electricity and a lot of families in that area were literally left out in the cold because of some of the failures in the infrastructure. We have given ourselves this goal, and it was voted on last session unanimously. We did not give ourselves a blueprint or plan of how we get there, but we also did not address how those underserved, lower-income, senior communities are actually going to pay for it. We look at solar and solar is great, but still, in those communities, they do not have solar access. We are working toward that. I believe what the Assemblywoman was addressing is how families in our communities are going to pay for it and what the pathway is for them, moving in the direction we have given ourselves, giving them a sense of security in the infrastructure that is in place, and how they become a part of that.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I certainly understand that concern, especially after what we saw in Texas. I can have Mr. Sullivan explain why that is not something we would be looking at here because of differences in our system. I do understand and it is certainly something we do have in the bill where there is a concern for different communities and making sure those concerns are addressed. We do not want to force anyone to make a change or to get rid of things when they are not ready for it. However, when they are ready for it, there are programs available and they can make that change. That is one of the things we want the PUCN to specifically consider. I do not necessarily have the answer as to how that change is made, but I do think we should have the PUCN—who are the experts in this field—and public hearings addressing these issues so those steps can be formulated. I truly believe the change is coming—not because of me, but because of the market.

We know change happens, we know technology is changing, and we know the preferences of communities change, so we want to make sure when those changes come, the same people we are concerned about are not left behind. Those public hearings at the PUCN will start to put the steps and the plan in place so, again, if it is 20 or 30 years from now, we are starting to figure out what we do with those homes.

We talked about providing availability for getting different appliances through different resources where there is a lower cost. All of those types of things that were mentioned are a possibility, but we have to plan to get there.

Kyle Davis:

I totally understand the points you are making. There are no easy answers we can give, which is why we want to set up a process to consider this over the next decade or two. It is important to consider, when we are talking about energy costs in a home and how that is divided between electricity or gas and how that might change. Obviously, those costs are going to be there either way. People will have bills every month. The idea is, as we make those changes, we do what we can to keep those costs the same or even bring them down as we decide where to put ratepayer dollars for infrastructure, whether we put it into new transformers or we put it into new pipes.

I am glad you brought up the issue of Texas. We watched that happen as well. I certainly share the concern about making sure we have the plans to provide critical energy during natural disasters. The lucky thing we have here is Nevada energy companies are much further ahead in planning for this. They can really speak to the preparations. In fact, I know this Committee heard presentations regarding this issue earlier this session.

It is worth noting that most natural gas appliances also require electricity to operate. The major factor for the recent Texas energy crisis was the failure of gas power plants and gas wells themselves. The PUCN places a high value on reliable service and it is one of the main things they do. Improving the planning process can just improve that oversight.

In terms of cost for customers, that is central to the planning process that is articulated in sections 16 and 19 of the bill. The gas utility needs to evaluate the utility infrastructure costs, the customer equipment costs, the environmental and health costs of its plan, and the alternatives. The PUCN is directed to take that into account when they are making these decisions.

Finally, I will certainly defer to the authors of the State Climate Strategy for specifics on what they are envisioning. I think it is important to understand that the strategy lays out a framework for policies to enable us to meet our climate goals, but it is on policymakers and regulators to enact those policies. That is what we are trying to do today by setting up a planning process to reach those goals, knowing there are a lot of decisions to be made along the way.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Before we go to our last question, I also want to say that when we think of policies and the changes, I agree with Assemblywoman Cohen. We are moving in this direction. I do not know if it is 5, 10, or how long down the road, but we are moving in this direction. Oftentimes, in our Committee meetings, we hear conversations about the underserved communities, low-income, and seniors. When we have these community conversations, we need to go into them thinking about the least of these and how it is going to affect them. I hear a number of people talking about communities of color and underserved. However, when the policies are actually put in place, those same communities are the ones left holding the bag or left out of the process. They are often the ones holding the jobs that will be disenfranchised or shut down. They are also some of the small business owners, so when we look at things we are asking them to do, it is not just changing out their homes, but also their small businesses. As we have these discussions in the future, always have the least of these in mind and make sure those communities that we say we want to protect, we are not unfairly harming and leaving out of the conversation.

Assemblyman Miller:

I agree we are moving in this direction and that proper planning is the best way to not leave people behind. This is more of a comment, but in this planning, I want to ensure that we are also considering the homes that are not able to easily make these transitions because of age or other considerations, which can be across all communities. We need to make sure that this planning takes into consideration how the older homes are going to be incorporated. I do think you addressed this earlier by having open hearings, but if you would like to add any additional context, I would appreciate it.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I am certainly open to continuing the discussion if we need to make it clearer in the bill. It has been our intent that we always have the communities in mind. With that, one of the things we are also keeping in mind is health issues. These same communities are also the ones most affected by smog and greenhouse gas emissions. In order to make sure that these communities are considered, we also have to consider those health issues.

As far as the older homes, I certainly do think it is something that needs to be considered. Everyone thinks Las Vegas is all brand new, but there are still houses from the 1940s. I know that is not as old as some of the houses in other parts of the state, but they are old, and it is something we need to consider. That is one of the reasons we do want to have this as part of the planning before the PUCN because it is public and citizens can put those issues forward to make sure they are addressed, as opposed to just going along and seeing where we are going to end up.

Dylan Sullivan:

I think you brought up a good point about older homes. Those are homes that are least likely to have good insulation and air sealing to be tightened from the elements, and they probably use the most energy in the summer and winter. These homes need to be a priority in program efforts. We have a bill in the Senate and one of the provisions is to double the low-income

program spending requirement for NV Energy so they spend 10 percent of their program budget on programs that are specifically targeted to low-income households and historically underserved communities. As you mentioned, these are households that pay a large portion of their income on energy bills and they really need to be front and center in our attention.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Seeing no further questions, I will open testimony in support of A.B. 380.

Sarah Steinberg, Policy Principal, Advanced Energy Economy:

Advanced Energy Economy (AEE) is an industry association comprised of businesses dedicated to making the energy we use secure, clean, and affordable. Today, I would like to note AEE's support for Assemblywoman Cohen's conceptual amendment to A.B. 380 [[Exhibit C](#)].

Given all the recent conversations in Nevada around the future of gas, AEE has thought hard about what we think is the best way to manage long-term infrastructure in an uncertain future. What is not uncertain is the economics and technologies of our energy resources are shifting dramatically and consumer preferences are changing in response. These trends require a reexamination of how we plan our infrastructure investments, in that we build what is necessary for safety and reliability, but avoid assets that are likely to become stranded and drive up ratepayer costs over the long term.

If we do not plan carefully today to manage the transition that is already underway, we may face rising gas bills for consumers who maintain their appliances, either by choice or because they do not have the means to renovate. A new gas utility planning process that mirrors some of the long-term planning that electric utilities undergo every three years can mitigate some of those challenges.

With that in mind, AEE believes what has been proposed in the conceptual amendment sets Nevada up for success. We see it borrowing some of the best practices from the electric utility resource planning process to ensure approved gas infrastructure projects appropriately balance a number of important priorities. Those include cost, safety, reliability, flexibility, and environmental impact in the face of uncertainty about the future as it relates to changing gas demands, economic conditions, policies, and technologies in a way that the current processes do not allow for.

I have submitted more extensive comments in writing [[Exhibit F](#)] that detail what AEE particularly likes about this proposed infrastructure, supply and alternative plans, and investigatory docket. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jaina Moan, Director, External Affairs, The Nature Conservancy:

The Nature Conservancy is a global organization conducting science-based, on-the-ground conservation work to support our mission of conserving the lands and waters on which all life depends. Climate change is the biggest threat to this mission.

As an organization, we are united in doing what we can to mitigate and adapt to climate change, and we support policies that will help us ensure global warming stays below 1.5 degrees Celsius. We support A.B. 380 with the proposed conceptual amendment [[Exhibit C](#)] because it does just that. It establishes a goal for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the building sector and a mechanism of responsible planning to ensure Nevada achieves the goal in a reasonable and equitable manner. Addressing the threat of climate change will have tradeoffs. This is a fact. We need to confront tradeoffs head on, and we believe A.B. 380 does exactly that.

In our quest as a society to combat the existential threat of climate change, there will inevitably be unalterable changes to the natural gas and other fossil fuel industries, and to the people whose lives and livelihoods depend on it. We cannot leave people behind. At the same time, we have no choice but to take urgent action. The responsible planning through A.B. 380, with the proposed conceptual amendment, seeks to ensure no one is left behind, including the workforce and the disadvantaged populations who would be affected by this climate action.

Nevada is a state like no other. We have incredible biodiversity of ecosystems in this state: sagebrush, deserts, springs, mountains, rangelands, and forests. At the Nature Conservancy, we fear we will lose it all if we do not take measured, responsible steps now to address climate change. We understand this will mean difficult tradeoffs, and we think these can be best managed with bills like A.B. 380. Thank you for bringing this bill forward. We stand ready to help. We urge Committee support. [Written testimony was also submitted, [Exhibit G](#).]

Jasmine Vazin, Organizer, Sierra Club:

On behalf of the Sierra Club and our more than 40,000 members and supporters statewide, we urge this Committee to support A.B. 380. This bill will require gas companies to submit plans for approval to the PUCN before building out expensive pipelines that will cost ratepayers money. It will ensure that future build-out of pipelines is in line with Governor Sisolak's Nevada Climate Initiative in order to protect our climate, our health, and the wealth of our communities.

Methane gas, commonly known as natural gas, is a fossil fuel that emits pollutants in our air when it is extracted, transported, and burned. Burning methane gas has been regulated for the electric sector, but for many years the gas distribution companies have not engaged in a robust planning process. This bill aims to solve that problem.

As covered in the presentation today, the electric utility has engaged in a resource planning process at the PUCN for decades. This bill would bring about a similar resource planning process for the gas utility. Assembly Bill 380 would require gas utilities to demonstrate that future spending is both economically and environmentally sound for their customers. This is critically important now because the planning decisions made by utilities today will have

a direct impact on the rates of their customers well into the future. There must be transparency as these conversations take place, which can be accomplished at the PUCN, an unbiased, public agency aimed at protecting Nevadans' best interests. They already manage a very similar regulatory process for NV Energy.

This bill calls on gas utilities to plan for how they spend ratepayers' money and account for the impacts they have on Nevada's environment. It is a commonsense solution as our state transitions to clean energy. For these reasons, the Sierra Club urges support of A.B. 380 as amended. Thank you for bringing this bill forward and considering this important piece of legislation. [Written testimony was also submitted, [Exhibit H.](#)]

Mary House, President and CEO, CHR, Inc.:

I am also the first lady of Mountaintop Faith Ministries. I am here today to support A.B. 380. There is no question that Nevada must transition away from burning methane gas, also known as natural gas, inside our homes and buildings and to power more of our appliances with clean electricity from sources like solar.

Some folks, including myself, are blessed enough to have already begun this transition. I am in the process of replacing my gas stove with an electric induction range. I am so excited about the new technology and the health, economic, and environmental benefits it is going to bring. However, not everyone is so fortunate, and it is important that no one gets left behind. That is why I support A.B. 380, which requires the Nevada gas utilities plan for the future. We simply cannot leave low-income families on the hook to pay for expensive gas system projects in a few short decades because we did not take the proper, important steps now.

To be clear, A.B. 380 is designed to protect low-income Nevadans. It will require gas utilities to look ahead and compare all the costs and benefits of business as usual with alternative options, including efficiency and electrification. Electric utilities already do this long-range planning. It is only fair that gas utilities do the same. I thank you for this opportunity in advance to consider A.B. 380.

Tessyn Opferman, representing Service Employees International Union Local 1107:

Our Service Employees International Union members support responsible energy planning and smart environmental measures to help Nevada reach our climate goal of 100 percent clean power and zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. A healthy, clean environment is important for all Nevadans. Thank you to Assemblywoman Cohen for her work bringing forward A.B. 380. This bill is an important step to help move toward Nevada's environmental goals while being conscientious of undue cost burdens on low-income and fixed-income residents. We urge your support on this measure.

Cynthia Moore, Las Vegas Field Organizer, Moms Clean Air Force; and National Lead, EcoMadres:

We are strongly in support of A.B. 380. I am calling on behalf of our over 8,000 members. Methane gas is a harmful climate pollutant, driving dangerous increases in smog and wildfires. In Nevada, we have seen the effects that wildfires have on our health and that of

our children. When burned inside homes, methane releases carbon monoxide and other air pollutants that can lead to troubling health effects, especially for the most vulnerable Nevadans such as children and seniors.

Studies show that improperly vented gas appliances can create dangerous levels of indoor air pollution and can increase the risk of children experiencing asthma symptoms by as much as 42 percent. Latino children are 40 percent more likely to die from asthma attacks than that of their white counterparts. These statistics are especially troublesome for us as parents. As the mom of a 3-year-old, I urge you to support A.B. 380. [Written testimony was also submitted, [Exhibit I](#).]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We have time for one more caller, and then we have one testimony that will be on Zoom.

Matt Rubin, Energy Policy Analyst, Western Resource Advocates:

Western Resource Advocates is a nonprofit organization that is dedicated to protecting the West's land, air, and water. Western Resource Advocates supports A.B. 380 and the conceptual amendment [\[Exhibit C\]](#). Assembly Bill 380 creates a framework similar to integrated resource plans that electric utilities submit every three years. An infrastructure, supply, and alternative plan would require gas utilities to provide a 30-year forecast on demand, descriptions and details of planned investments and activities, alternatives, and a cost-benefit analysis between the proposed alternative investments and activities. These planning activities are all included in electric utility integrated resource planning (IRP) that protect ratepayers from higher rates resulting from poor long-term planning decisions.

Assembly Bill 380 also provides the PUCN with the ability to open an investigatory docket in how to limit the impacts on historically underserved communities and low-income households as Nevada strives to achieve its policy of zero and near-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 and interim greenhouse gas emission reduction goals in 2025 and 2030. By further requiring gas utilities to demonstrate how their investments will impact greenhouse gas emissions as well as historically underserved communities, Nevadans can better determine the holistic impact this plan provides. Nevadans impacted by these plans would be able to provide their views by intervening in PUCN dockets that address the plans filed by the gas utilities, similar to what is done in an electric utility IRP.

Western Resource Advocates urges members of this Committee to pass A.B. 380 and the conceptual amendment. [Written testimony was also submitted, [Exhibit J](#).]

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

For the other callers who have waited patiently to give your testimony in support, I am so sorry, but I will encourage you to, if you have not already, send in your written testimony. The last testimony in support will be on Zoom, Mr. Figueroa.

Ernest Figueroa, Consumer's Advocate, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Office of the Attorney General:

If the policy of the state, as outlined in the Governor's Climate Initiative, is to eventually transition away from the use of natural gas by 2050, then it is imperative for economic reasons that natural gas resource planning be implemented so natural gas utility customers are not left with billions of dollars in stranded assets when that time comes. A methodic and early approach, such as resource planning as outlined in this bill, is necessary to make sure our natural gas utilities upgrade and plan accordingly, in line with the state's policy goals.

I appreciate working with the bill sponsor and for hearing our concerns on behalf of the residential ratepayers. I look forward to continuing to work with the bill sponsor as amendments are proposed and considered.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will close the testimony in support of [A.B. 380](#). [Additional exhibits in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#) include [Exhibit K](#), [Exhibit L](#), [Exhibit M](#), [Exhibit N](#), [Exhibit O](#), [Exhibit P](#), [Exhibit Q](#), and [Exhibit R](#).] I will open testimony in opposition of [A.B. 380](#).

Barry Gold, Director, Government Affairs, AARP Nevada:

AARP supports sustainable energy policies, but we also ask about the impact on energy bills and affordability as well as reliability. We have several concerns about [A.B. 380](#). While we support utility planning and robust dialogue in sustainability, we also believe the PUCN should be allowed to do its job and not be micromanaged. Accelerating depreciation of natural gas assets could raise rates, and encouraging the use of additional electricity could also raise electric rates by requiring massive new investments in electric generation, transmission, and distribution. How much would this cost? How much would rates rise? Would reliability be impacted?

Many older adults and lower-income Nevadans currently rely on natural gas to heat their homes, to cook, and to heat their hot water. It is cheaper to use natural gas to do this, and forcing them to use electricity could only increase the difficulties they may currently already have choosing between buying food and medicine or heating their homes. Many, if not most, older homes in lower-income areas have natural gas. This would create a huge burden for many of them to retrofit their homes, replace appliances, and also have to pay more for electricity. I have heard it could cost about \$9,000 for a house to do that.

These initiatives need further study before any legislative action is taken. At AARP Nevada, on behalf of our 345,000 members across the state, we oppose [A.B. 380](#) due to reliability and affordability concerns. We should not be asking grandma to rip out her hot water heater at great expense. [Written testimony was also submitted, [Exhibit S](#).]

Alexandra Dazlich, Director, Government Affairs, Nevada Restaurant Association:

The Nevada Restaurant Association is in opposition to [A.B. 380](#), which proposes to remove natural gas in commercial and residential buildings. Restaurants would suffer substantial repercussions if they were denied the ability to use natural gas in their everyday operations.

It is vital that restaurants continue to use gas to cook particular types of food over a fire, as the chef's control over the intensity of the heat directly affects the flavor of the food, whether it be flame-seared meat, charred vegetables, or using a traditional wok. Natural gas is as necessary to our restaurants as basic ingredients, such as spices that make up our favorite recipes. In addition, natural gas provides chefs and cooks optimum speed and efficiency, which affects the volume of customers a restaurant can serve. Natural gas is absolutely essential to the running of a restaurant, and our operators need our help more than ever to protect what remains of the restaurant industry as they begin to recover over the course of many years.

The Nevada Restaurant Association appreciates the intent behind the bill and is committed to taking steps to combat the effects of climate change. However, we believe A.B. 380 goes too far. It is for these reasons that we are opposed today.

Jordan Krahenbuhl, Executive Director, Plumbing Heating Cooling Contractors of Nevada:

The Plumbing Heating Cooling Contractors of Nevada (PHCC) is strongly opposed to A.B. 380 as submitted and as recently amended. Addressing the amendment starting with section 3, beneficial electrification means converting the energy source of customers' end use from a nonelectric fuel source to an effective electric source. Sections 5.1, 15, 16.4, 17, and 19 all refer to using less gas and electrification. Section 22 repeals *Nevada Revised Statutes* 271B.130 and 704.9925 for expansion.

Any legislation submitted or amended that would prohibit or limit the use of natural gas would be devastating to our industry, business owners, homeowners, and would cost many jobs across the state. Also, requiring homeowners and businesses to convert to non-gas appliances would not only be costly in regard to the equipment but also, in many cases, it would require electric service and panel upgrades. Many would simply not be able to afford this.

The question that has been asked many times today and has never been addressed is, Who is going to pay for this, including not just low-income, but middle-income families and businesses? The elimination of natural gas through A.B. 380 or any other bill is not in the best interests of the homeowners, businesses, or citizens of Nevada.

Doug Cannon, President and CEO, NV Energy:

Our company provides electric service to 1.3 million electric customers statewide and gas service to 175,000 customers in northern Nevada. The decarbonization of our energy grid is one of NV Energy's highest priorities. In fact, since 2005, NV Energy has reduced its carbon emissions by close to 55 percent. During that same time, NV Energy customers have benefited from some of the largest rate decreases that have been seen across the country. Today, in fact, our customers' rates in Nevada are at or below what they paid in 2009.

Decarbonization, when done through a deliberate and fact-driven process, can be done without increasing customer rates. NV Energy supports our state's efforts to continue decarbonization, and it is critically important that these efforts be done in a balanced and deliberate manner in order to avoid negative impacts on energy reliability and price.

NV Energy is committed to advancing Nevada's decarbonization goals and supports the state's desired clean energy and technology revolution, outlined in Governor Sisolak's Nevada Climate Initiative. As the Legislature considers additional ways to decarbonize our economy, automobile tailpipe emissions are the largest remaining emitters of carbon. We look forward to working with you to electrify our transportation sector across the state. It is an exciting opportunity.

The topic at hand today, natural gas resource planning, is yet another opportunity to benefit our environment and our economy. NV Energy has participated in the integrated resource planning process for decades for its electric business. It is this very process that has allowed our electric business to achieve significant carbon emission reductions and bring more renewable energy to Nevada. We support the philosophy that natural gas service can also benefit from resource planning. The process that exists today for electric utilities allows all stakeholders to participate in the assessment of the costs and benefits of all alternatives.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Mr. Cannon, you have reached your two-minute time limit. If you could send your comments to us in writing, that would be wonderful.

We have one more caller by phone and the next callers will be by Zoom.

Kerrie Kramer, representing National Association for Industrial and Office Parks:

We would like to thank Assemblywoman Cohen for continuing to speak with us and working toward a solution on this bill. Unfortunately, at this time, even considering the amendment, the National Association for Industrial and Office Parks is opposed. While we understand the need to look at ways to address climate change, the need for natural gas in commercial development remains necessary and will remain so long into the future. We look forward to working with the Assemblywoman in the future.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

We will now move to testifiers waiting on Zoom. I apologize, but you each only have two minutes for testimony.

John P. Hester, President and CEO, Southwest Gas Corporation:

I have been a proud resident of Nevada for over 30 years. In short, Southwest Gas opposes this legislation. The legislation creates an incremental gas utility planning process to facilitate a move away from natural gas appliances and conversion to electricity. The goal is pretty obvious if you read the third sentence in the legislation to learn the definition of beneficial electrification.

Beneficial electrification is somewhat of a misnomer in a state like Nevada, where approximately 70 percent of our electricity is generated with natural gas. Natural gas has also supported the expansion of intermittent renewable resources, such as wind and solar. That said, the most efficient use of natural gas is through direct use in natural gas appliances.

As mentioned earlier, the company has supported economic development in Nevada, as seen in the communities of Mesquite and Spring Creek, where we are currently investing approximately \$100 million, pursuant to extensive plans we filed with the PUCN. Any suggestion in this hearing today that the company is not one of the most highly regulated businesses in Nevada which is subject to the regulations of the PUCN, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission within the Department of Energy, the Department of Transportation, and others, is just not accurate. Every single dollar that is reflected in customer rates in Nevada is extensively reviewed by the PUCN. We also file annual planning reports with the PUCN to let them know what our plans for growth are for the future.

That said, the average bill for a customer in southern Nevada from Southwest Gas is \$40. I really appreciate the concern for affordability for customers. We are also working to pivot our business to new sources of energy, as was mentioned earlier, such as renewable natural gas, hydrogen, energy efficiency, and supplies that come with offsets. We are fully supportive of taking efforts in energy efficiency and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, but we are also very concerned about the needs of our customers here in Nevada.

Thomas Brill, of Counsel, Greenberg Traurig, LLP:

I am here to testify in opposition and also to provide technical expertise on A.B. 380. I have reviewed several versions of A.B. 380, including two amendments over the past five days. While the appearance of the bill has changed, each version has had one thing in common: it presumes that the best strategy for reducing emissions in the natural gas sector is through electrification. Unfortunately, the bill does not ask the PUCN to take a neutral look at the future.

The problem with the current language in A.B. 380 is that electrification would be assumed to be beneficial without considering several factors, including the up-front cost of electrification; the higher natural gas rates that would be imposed on customers who cannot afford to electrify and who would be required to pay a higher share of the utility's fixed costs as a result of electrification; the carbon intensity of natural gas and the carbon intensity of the electricity that would replace it; the potential value of natural gas infrastructure for facilitating emission reductions in other sectors; the potential need for natural gas infrastructure to ensure future electric reliability and a renewable-dominated electricity grid; and other potential ways to reduce carbon emissions in the natural gas industry that would not have adverse impacts on consumers.

I would like to amplify a few things that have not been considered in determining electrification to be beneficial. Today, when renewable natural gas or biomethane is produced from the right biogenic feed stocks, it can significantly reduce emissions in other sectors, such as agriculture, dairy, or other industries. When I say this, I am not talking about

fuel-zero emissions, like electricity from renewable generation. I mean negative lifecycle emissions. When this renewable natural gas is used in the transportation industry, it also helps reduce emissions in that sector. All of these opportunities should be considered by the PUCN without a thumb on the scale in favor of electrification.

Peter Guzman, representing Latin Chamber of Commerce:

The Latin Chamber of Commerce, with over 45 years in the community, really represents the following groups: business, community, and entrepreneurs; everyday hardworking folks that include lower-income and middle class; and our elders. I assure you, we have heard from all three regarding choice in energy. The business community, including restaurants, who employ many of the people we talk about protecting, has spoken loudly and cannot even imagine not having the choice of clean energy natural gas. They have stated it will absolutely affect jobs and their businesses. This will have a detrimental effect on these folks. We have heard from our everyday, hardworking Hispanic folks who have loudly said they are worried about losing their choice of low-cost, natural gas to heat their homes and cook their family meals. From our *abuelas y abuelos*, which are our grandmas and grandpas, many on fixed incomes, they stated loudly that they enjoy the choice of affordable, clean, natural gas for their homes.

We know that eliminating energy choice will eliminate jobs. We need more affordable energy choices. When we talk about the 7,000 miles of laying pipe that was mentioned, that is 7,000 miles worth of jobs. What we need is more innovative collaborations, and this will lead to more jobs, which we know are needed.

Lastly, to the thousands of Southwest Gas employees, many of whom I have gotten to meet through this journey—a company that has been in our community for over 90 years—we know so many people are out of work right now, but I want to address them. I feel I must point out that with good paying jobs, you have paid taxes, volunteers in all aspects of our community, and have helped make Las Vegas and Nevada a better place. Hold your heads high, knowing that your work of delivering an affordable clean energy choice is much appreciated.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I apologize to all of the other callers who are waiting. I encourage you to send your written testimony to the Committee. This is a great bill with a great discussion. The questions were necessary, but we have a hard stop for this Committee at 4 p.m. so members can get to other committees. We will roll the bills that were not heard today to Thursday and Friday. I apologize to those of you who joined us today for the other bills on our agenda. My staff will reach out to you within the next 24 hours to let you know when the bills will be rescheduled.

I will close the hearing for testimony in opposition to A.B. 380. [Additional exhibits submitted in opposition to Assembly Bill 380 include [Exhibit U](#), [Exhibit V](#), [Exhibit W](#), [Exhibit X](#), [Exhibit Y](#), [Exhibit Z](#), [Exhibit AA](#), [Exhibit BB](#), [Exhibit CC](#), [Exhibit DD](#), [Exhibit EE](#), [Exhibit FF](#), [Exhibit GG](#), [Exhibit HH](#), and [Exhibit II](#).]

I will open the hearing for testimony in neutral for A.B. 380 at this time.

John Carlo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

Thank you for your time. Some of those who are against it did a good job and they used their time very well. I only heard one person use the word "hydrogen." You should look into hydrogen vehicles as opposed to electric vehicles. Hydrogen is the wave of the future. You should look at Tesla's failure rates. I have tried contacting my Nevada state public offices about the failure rates and the highest insurance rates in America. Those cars that are failing are costing us a lot of money. It is not a good thing when NASA [National Aeronautics and Space Administration] says we are the brightest place on earth. You guys need to think about all of this electricity that is going to all of these casinos. You guys are talking about electric, electric, electric. Where is all of this power going to come from? Why do you guys want to water grass? Why do you want to use our water to make grass in Summerlin? That is not good. Look at the solar panels that are being built in China. We do not want any more from China. Look into electrical transformers that are being found with extra technology coming from China. You talk about the minority communities. You need to watch out for illegal immigrants taking our jobs.

Kristen Averyt, State Climate Policy Coordinator, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:

On behalf of the Nevada Climate Initiative, I am testifying neutral on A.B. 380. Natural gas is a fossil fuel. When it is burned, whether at power plants or directly in our homes and businesses, it releases carbon dioxide. In our state, 45 percent of our total greenhouse gas emissions come from burning natural gas. Given the significant contribution of gas to the state's greenhouse gas emissions profile, and based on what we currently know, it will be necessary to transition from natural gas across all sectors in order to achieve Nevada's net-zero emissions target.

The topic of natural gas was contemplated in the State Climate Strategy that was released last year. As it relates to natural gas and A.B. 380, the State Climate Strategy states the following:

1. In order to meet Nevada's long-term goal of zero emissions, transitioning away from natural gas is necessary.
2. Burning gas ovens can compromise indoor air quality and the health of families and those working in commercial kitchens.
3. A phased transition from gas in the residential and commercial sectors will require careful planning and engagement.

4. A potential first step in a phased transition from gas would be to allow consumers the choice between gas and electric on existing buildings.
5. Before eliminating natural gas as a fuel source, consumer choice, affordability, and equity should all be carefully considered.

The intent of A.B. 380 is consistent with the State Climate Strategy in that it addresses the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from natural gas in order to meet our state's 2050 net-zero emissions target. [Written testimony was also submitted, [Exhibit JJ](#).]

David Bobzien, Director, Office of Energy, Office of the Governor:

You will find my letter of neutral testimony on NELIS regarding this legislation, essentially connecting the bill's core concept of integrated resource planning for direct use of gas to a recommendation that is in the State Climate Strategy [[Exhibit KK](#)].

I also want to quickly note a couple of the technical issues about alternatives for natural gas that were discussed previously. There was some conversation about renewable natural gas as a possible path forward for gas distribution. I would note, that while this Legislature has been supportive and we are watching this effort, renewable natural gas was not considered in the State Climate Strategy because, according to the company's [Southwest Gas] own filings with the PUCN, the current goal for displacement of the gas supply for direct use is 3 percent by 2035.

However, we do see some opportunity with green hydrogen. Hydrogen is mentioned in the State Climate Strategy. I am proud to report that I serve as the cochair of the Western Green Hydrogen Initiative, so we are very active in the investigation of Green Hydrogen Coalition's applications for heavy industrial transportation as a storage medium, et cetera. There is some question as to the future ability to use this in the direct-use context, whether or not it can be blended. I think the point was made earlier that economically it probably will not happen. Nonetheless, we look forward to working with the company on these alternatives, and we would certainly be participating in an investigatory docket should this bill move forward directing the PUCN to open one.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Are there any other callers waiting to testify as neutral to A.B. 380? [There were none.] Are there any closing comments from the bill sponsor?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Thank you for the hearing and the good conversation. We are facing a climate crisis, one that will primarily affect those not watching or participating in this hearing. Confronting this crisis will not be easy, but our choices are harder because for decades too many of us chose to do nothing. Every day we fail to take action, we leave harder and worse decisions for the next generation. Planning for the future will help make those decisions easier, smarter, and

more predictable for everyone. The proposal does not force anyone to change anything, but it does ask us to look where we are headed, where we want to go, and for us to choose wisely. I urge your support for A.B. 380 because this is an issue we cannot ignore any longer. Please feel free to contact me with any further questions or any other information you need.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 380. That brings us to the last item on the agenda today, which will be public comment. Are there any callers waiting to speak in public comment?

Annette Kerr, Private Citizen, Spring Creek, Nevada:

As a homeowner in the underserved community of Spring Creek, Nevada, I believe it is important for Nevada lawmakers to not impede the progress we have made as an individual community to bring an additional resource like natural gas, which is affordable and energy efficient.

Spring Creek, Nevada, is a growing community with almost 15,000 residents and has a master plan for over 30,000 residents. Economic development is vital now and for our future growth. Being able to give residents in the community this infrastructure is imperative as we all move toward a sustainable future. You are known as the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure. Please do not destroy all of the hard work we have done over the past few years.

John Carlo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

My apologies for not doing it right the first time. I do want to talk to you because you need to look at hydrogen vehicles and investing in hydrogen at the gas pumps. It takes less time to refuel than electric cars and they are less combustible. Hydrogen is not harmful to your health. When you guys keep talking about electric cars, you are talking about lithium batteries. Lithium batteries are still going to be manufactured in some factory that is still going to cause pollution. There is never going to be 100 percent recycling. What I am trying to tell you guys is do not water the grass in Summerlin. Why would they try to use our water that way? I think we can use it better and recycle in the public schools. Why has no one ever thought about all the paper they have used in the past. We need to do a whole bunch of stuff. Thank you for your help and thank you to the businessmen who really are trying to fight for American jobs.

Chair Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for calling back with your name. Are there any other callers for public comment? [There were none.] As I said previously, the other bills that were supposed to be heard today will be rolled to Thursday and Friday. Our staff will reach out to the bill sponsors and presenters to let them know exactly what day they will be scheduled. I apologize but we did have an important bill with a lot of dialogue today. I did not anticipate it going this long. Thank you for joining us.

**Assembly Bill 388: Revises provisions governing access to broadband services.
(BDR 58-790)**

[Assembly Bill 388 was agendized but not heard.]

**Assembly Bill 413: Requires the Department of Transportation to establish an
Advisory Working Group to Study Certain Issues Related to Transportation
during the 2021-2022 interim. (BDR S-458)**

[Assembly Bill 413 was agendized but not heard.]

**Assembly Bill 423: Revises provisions relating to transportation network companies.
(BDR 58-948)**

[Assembly Bill 423 was agendized but not heard.]

**Assembly Bill 429: Establishes provisions governing peer-to-peer car sharing
programs. (BDR 43-861)**

[Assembly Bill 429 was agendized but not heard.]

Assembly Bill 444: Revises provisions governing limousines. (BDR 58-1020)

[Assembly Bill 444 was agendized but not heard.]

This meeting is adjourned [at 3:59 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 a proposed conceptual amendment titled "AB 380, COHEN CONCEPTUAL: CLEAN VERSION," submitted by Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Assembly District No. 29, regarding [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment titled "AB 380, COHEN CONCEPTUAL: MARKED-UP VERSION," submitted by Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Assembly District No. 29, regarding [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit E](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2021, submitted by Dylan Sullivan, Senior Scientist, Climate and Clean Energy Program, Natural Resources Defense Council, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit F](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2021, submitted by Sarah Steinberg, Policy Principal, Advanced Energy Economy, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit G](#) is a letter dated April 6, 2021, submitted by Mauricia M.M. Baca, Nevada State Director, The Nature Conservancy, and presented by Jaina Moan, Director, External Affairs, The Nature Conservancy, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2021, submitted by Elspeth Cordua DiMarzio, Senior Campaign Representative, Beyond Coal Campaign, Sierra Club, and presented by Jasmine Vazin, Organizer, Sierra Club, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit I](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2021, submitted and presented by Cinthia Moore, Las Vegas Field Organizer, Moms Clean Air Force; and National Lead, EcoMadres, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit J](#) is a written testimony submitted and presented by Matt Rubin, Energy Policy Analyst, Western Resource Advocates, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit K](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2021, submitted by Rudy Zamora, Program Director, Chispa Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit L](#) is a document dated January 15, 2021, titled "Chispa Nevada December 2020 Community Survey Results," submitted by Rudy Zamora, Program Director, Chispa Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit M](#) is a document dated December 2020, titled "Climate Change: A Policy for Latinos in Nevada," submitted by Rudy Zamora, Program Director, Chispa Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit N](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2021, submitted by Angela Dykema, representing Southwest Energy Efficiency Project, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit O](#) is a letter dated April 6, 2021, submitted by Christine Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit P](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2021, submitted by Paul Selberg, Executive Director, Nevada Conservation League, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit Q](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2021, submitted by William Pregman, representing Battle Born Progress, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit R](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2021, submitted by Susan Nedell, Mountain West Advocate, Environmental Entrepreneurs, in support of [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit S](#) is written testimony submitted by Barry Gold, Director, Government Affairs, AARP Nevada, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit T](#) is written testimony dated April 6, 2021, submitted by Doug Cannon, President and CEO, NV Energy, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit U](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2021, submitted by Bob Anderson, Chair, Board of Directors, Tahoe Chamber; and Steve Teshara, CEO, Tahoe Chamber, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit V](#) is a letter dated April 6, 2021, submitted by Jason Davidson, Director, Government Relations, Pool & Hot Tub Alliance, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit W](#) is written testimony submitted by Doug Busselman, Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit X](#) is a letter dated April 6, 2021, submitted by Nat Hodgson, CEO, Southern Nevada Home Builders Association, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit Y](#) is a letter dated April 6, 2021, submitted by Jared Luke, Director, Government Affairs, City of North Las Vegas, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit Z](#) is a letter dated April 7, 2021, submitted by Carol Kolson, President and CEO, Mesquite Chamber of Commerce, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit AA](#) is written testimony dated April 4, 2021, submitted by Amber Stidham, Vice President, Government Affairs, Henderson Chamber of Commerce, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit BB](#) is written testimony dated April 6, 2021, submitted by Susy Vasquez, Executive Director, Nevada State Apartment Association, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit CC](#) is a letter dated April 7, 2021, submitted by Sheldon Mudd, Executive Director, Northeastern Nevada Regional Development Authority, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit DD](#) is a letter dated April 6, 2021, submitted by Laura Granier, Esq., and Matt Morris, Esq., Holland & Hart, on behalf of Nevada Resort Association, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit EE](#) is a letter dated April 1, 2021, submitted by Mandi L. Wilkins, Executive Vice President, Mechanical Contractors Association of Las Vegas, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit FF](#) is a letter dated April 5, 2021, signed by Woody Miller, President, Nevada Propane Dealers Association, submitted by Neena Laxalt, representing Nevada Propane Dealers Association, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit GG](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation, submitted by Neena Laxalt, representing Nevada Propane Dealers Association, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit HH](#) is a document titled "The Economic Impact of Propane NEVADA," submitted by Neena Laxalt, representing Nevada Propane Dealers Association, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit II](#) is a collection of letters submitted by various individuals in opposition to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit JJ](#) is written testimony dated April 6, 2021, submitted by Kristen Averyt, State Climate Policy Coordinator, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, neutral to [Assembly Bill 380](#).

[Exhibit KK](#) is written testimony dated April 5, 2021, submitted by David Bobzien, Director, Office of Energy, Office of the Governor, neutral to [Assembly Bill 380](#).