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

Eighty-Third Session
February 18, 2025

The Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Howard Watts at 1:31 p.m. on Tuesday, February 18, 2025, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [Exhibit A], the Attendance Roster [Exhibit B], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/83rd2025.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Howard Watts, Chair
Assemblymember Max E. Carter II, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Shea M. Backus
Assemblymember Tracy Brown-May
Assemblymember Jill Dickman
Assemblymember Danielle Gallant
Assemblymember Bert K. Gurr
Assemblymember Venise Karris
Assemblymember Cinthia Zermeño Moore
Assemblymember Duy Nguyen
Assemblymember Toby Yurek

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Keely Latham, Committee Policy Analyst
Jessica Dummer, Committee Counsel
Cindy Glass, Committee Manager
Jeff Kirst, Committee Secretary
Lori McCleary, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Stephanie Mullen, Executive Director, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada
Garrett Weir, General Counsel, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada
Cameron Gresh, Government Affairs Liaison/Public Information Officer, City of Carson City
Lori Bagwell, Mayor, City of Carson City
Clay Mitchell, Vice Chairman, Storey County Board of Commissioners
Dwight Millard, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Thomas Gray, Owner, Virginia & Truckee Railroad Company

Chair Watts:
[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocols were explained.] We do have a quorum. We will start with our opening period of public comment. Do we have anyone wishing to provide public comment in either Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Do we have anyone wishing to provide public comment by phone? [There was no one.]

We have three items on our agenda today. We are not going to be considering Assembly Bill 46 today.

Assembly Bill 46: Revises provisions relating to privileges applicable to information obtained from records and other property of public utilities and certain other entities. (BDR 58-310)

[Assembly Bill 46 was agendized but not considered.]

We will only be having our presentation from the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada, and we will conduct our hearing on Assembly Bill 32. I do want to make one other housekeeping note. The Legislature does move fast, but I think when it comes to a courteous and respectful environment, if any person or organization has an issue with a piece of legislation, it is your responsibility to reach out to the sponsor of that legislation as soon as possible to make sure those concerns are known, so they have the opportunity to respond and work through them.

With that, we will move on to the first item on our agenda today, which is a presentation from the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada. I believe we have Stephanie Mullen and Garrett Weir joining us. Whenever you are ready, please state your name for the record and you can begin.

Stephanie Mullen, Executive Director, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada:
Good afternoon, Chair Watts, Vice Chair Carter, and members of the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to present today. I am Stephanie Mullen, executive director of the Public Utilities Commission and with me is our general counsel, Garrett Weir.

The Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN) plays a vital role in regulating Nevada's utilities, fostering a regulatory environment that supports the state's energy, telecommunications, and water sectors while encouraging sustainability, innovation, and rate stability. Addressing new load growth demands, opportunities for enhancing renewables, and finding ways to support economic development are just a few of the issues facing regulated entities across the west and here in Nevada. We recognize the responsibility entrusted to us and are dedicated to efficiently managing resources to meet the state's growing infrastructure needs while maintaining transparency and accountability. Today, we will provide a brief overview of the agency's scope and the sectors we regulate.

The PUCN is a regulatory agency overseeing a broad range of public utility services in Nevada [page 2, Exhibit C]. Key aspects of the agency's work include regulating approximately 400 investor-owned utilities across multiple sectors including electric, natural gas, telecommunications, water, and wastewater services, mobile home park utilities, and some propane systems. The agency partners with the U.S. Department of Transportation's Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) to ensure the safety of Nevada's natural gas infrastructure. This includes overseeing the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of gas pipelines, conducting inspections, and enforcing federal and state safety standards. The agency also oversees safety protocols for underground excavation activities near subsurface installation in coordination with the 811 program, or Call Before You Dig. Additionally, the PUCN Rail Safety Division monitors and inspects four key areas within the rail safety domain covering all lines within the state.

The organizational structure of the PUCN is unique and is structured around two key components: The Commission Policy/Administration (Commission) and the Regulatory Operations Staff [page 3]. Together these entities ensure the agency fulfills its regulatory responsibilities while maintaining independence and transparency.

The Commission is the quasi-judicial body that consists of a three-person panel appointed by the Governor to serve staggered four-year terms. Currently, the Commission is chaired by Hayley Williamson, with Commissioners Tammy Cordova and Randy Brown serving as the other two members. In addition to the commissioners, there is an entire team of experts who provide analysis, legal advice, and additional expertise to ensure decisions are well informed and legally sound. The Regulatory Operations Staff, or simply Staff, operate independently from the Commission. The Staff investigates and audits utility operations and participates in

every proceeding before the Commission. Although the Commission staff maintain their independence in terms of regulatory functions, they do share administrative support for non-case-related matters to be sure both components work efficiently and without compromising their distinct roles.

I would like to touch on how the agency is funded for just a moment as an important component enabling us to carry out our regulatory duties and responsibilities. The PUCN is not a State General Fund agency. We are funded through an annual regulatory fee, also known as a mill assessment, which is levied on regulated utilities' intrastate revenues. The mill assessment is capped at 3.5 mills and was set in 1980.

I will pass it over to Garrett Weir to provide an overview of the electric, natural gas, and water utilities that operate in the state.

Garrett Weir, General Counsel, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada:
I am going to walk through the types of utilities the PUCN regulates and the proceedings the Commission presides over. I am going to provide a background about the fundamental purpose of the agency.

With regard to the types of utilities we fully regulate, the PUCN is regulating all the terms and conditions of service, including the rates—the prices charged for that service. We are essentially, at our core, a substitute for competition that does not exist for some of these utilities who have a monopoly or exclusive service territory or very high barriers to entry for other participants in providing those services. For most goods and services, if it is priced too high or the quality of the good or service is not to a consumer's liking, there are other options available. They can go and buy from someone else and those market forces, consumers' choices, are ultimately what would govern the behavior of those companies providing those goods and services. That is the check. If it is too expensive, they are going to be put out of business because they will not be able to compete. If the quality is not high enough, they will not be able to compete.

For certain types of special, essential services that people depend upon because it is so crucial, there are consumer protection reasons for why we would regulate the terms and conditions of service. There are often, for utilities, the types of capital-intensive infrastructure necessary that distinguish them from other types of businesses and the type of long-term planning decisions necessary. Practically speaking, when you see power lines, when you see pipelines that require excavation, it would not be practical, cost-effective, efficient, or safe to have anybody who wants to compete going in there and putting up their own transmission lines, their own pipelines. That is where the idea of a public utility that is fully regulated, where it emerged—beginning with railroads, actually.

With that background, I will go ahead and get into some of the specific types of utilities we fully regulate at the Commission [page 4]. Beginning with electric utilities, in that sector, the Commission regulates primarily two electric utilities in the state that provide regulated retail service. Those utilities are Nevada Power Company in the south and Sierra Pacific Power

Company in the north, and they both do business under the name NV Energy. For the rural cooperative associations (co-ops) that provide electric service within the state, the Commission's regulatory jurisdiction is limited to their service territory boundaries. The policy reason for the Commission not having oversight of the terms and conditions of a co-op's electric service is that co-ops ultimately are accountable to their members. There is a political mechanism through which the leadership of a co-op can be removed from office if members are unhappy with the management decisions and the resulting service and pricing.

In the electric sector, the PUCN regularly presides over cases involving ratemaking, integrated resource planning, and permitting. There are many cases implementing numerous state policies and programs related to things like renewable energy, energy efficiency, natural disaster protection planning, and consumer protection.

Next, the natural gas sector [page 5]. The PUCN regulates two investor-owned natural gas utilities. That is Southwest Gas Corporation and Sierra Pacific Power Company which, in addition to providing electric service throughout northern Nevada, offers gas service in the Reno area. For these utilities, the PUCN holds proceedings that set rates and implement legislative policies such as the promotion of energy conservation and the use of renewable natural gas. Starting soon, the Commission will be engaging in resource planning with natural gas utilities in the state in the same way it does with electric utilities and water utilities. The PUCN also licenses alternative sellers of natural gas who provide service to large industrial and commercial users in the state.

Finally, the PUCN oversees gas pipeline safety in partnership with PHMSA, as previously mentioned, and as with electric utilities, natural gas utilities recover the cost of purchased fuel. That is the natural gas they sell to customers on just a dollar-for-dollar basis. They are not allowed to mark up the cost of the natural gas they sell. The return on investment they have made in infrastructure is where utilities get their opportunity for profit to deliver the natural gas.

In the sector of water and wastewater, the PUCN's primary regulatory activities include ensuring the delivery of clean, safe, and reliable service to customers at reasonable rates [page 6]. The PUCN monitors the quality of service, environmental compliance, and financial performance. Notably, the PUCN does not have jurisdiction over some of the largest providers of water and wastewater service in the state because the definition of public utility excludes entities subject to regulation and control by municipalities, towns or villages, and general improvement districts, unless otherwise provided by law. Similarly, there are cooperative associations over which the Commission exercises only a jurisdiction over service territory boundaries. Let us move to types of proceedings.

Stephanie Mullen:
The PUCN employs federally-certified personnel in specialized disciplines to conduct inspections and ensure compliance with safety regulations under the Code of Federal Regulations Title 49, which pertains to the U.S. Department of Transportation [page 7]. These specialized inspectors help maintain safety standards for rail operations in the state.

Finally, telecommunications [page 8]. The PUCN's key regulatory duties in the telecommunications sector include certifying competitive telecommunication suppliers, licensing wireless providers—I think it stopped. Would you like me to speak very loudly?

Chair Watts:
We are going to take a quick minute recess while we make sure all of our technical equipment is working. [The Committee recessed at 1:46 p.m. and reconvened at 1:47 p.m.]

Stephanie Mullen:
Getting back to the telecommunications sector, we regulate a few key areas: certifying competitive telecommunication suppliers, licensing wireless providers, reviewing applications from eligible telecommunication carriers, ensuring telecommunication services are available in rural areas, and regulating rates for about 320 small-scale providers, ensuring essential services are accessible in underserved areas.

However, there are certain telecommunications services the PUCN does not regulate, and that includes cellular and wireless service, long-distance telephone service, paging, Internet service, voice over IP, and other competitive telecommunication products or services.

Garrett Weir:
The PUCN performs a quasi-judicial function in presiding over contested cases [page 9]. It also performs a quasi-legislative function in adopting regulations.

Most of the contested cases at the PUCN are applications submitted by utilities, the most prominent of which are rate cases and requests related to resource planning. Resource planning is a process through which the Commission determines future needs for utility service and approves a prudent course of action for ensuring the utilities will be prepared to satisfy those needs. In a rate case, the Commission determines the cost of providing safe, reliable service to customers and sets appropriate rates for the utility to recover those prudently and reasonably incurred costs. I will speak in more detail about those types of proceedings later, but I will keep it somewhat high level, and you can ask questions if you have any. Other types of contested cases are customer complaints and proceedings in which the Commission investigates whether regulated utilities should be subject to administrative penalties for misconduct.

Rulemakings are where the Commission adopts regulations, generally following legislative sessions to implement legislation. The Commission also occasionally conducts rulemakings pursuant to its general authority to adopt regulations necessary to carry out its duties. The ability to file a petition with the PUCN provides an opportunity for people to request general relief in the form of advisory opinions or declaratory orders regarding matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission. Finally, the Commission regularly conducts investigations to examine matters related to utility service as they arise.

To address ratemaking cases, general rate applications, those are cases where we reset all of the rates for a utility that are not related to fuel and purchase power [page 10]. First, in this type of proceeding, we determine the amount of money the utility is entitled to recover. That is called the revenue requirement for utilities. The annual revenue requirement is the amount of money based on a historical test year—the 12 months preceding the filing of the case—using that as the baseline, where we determine how much it costs for a utility to provide service. Then there is an opportunity for return as part of that revenue requirement, which I will get to in a minute, but that reasonable return—that opportunity—is for capital investments, primarily physical infrastructure necessary to provide service. It would not apply to things like operations and maintenance, including employees' salaries.

The reason that utility is entitled to that return, or that the regulatory framework has evolved to provide that return, is so we can benefit from private capital paying the upfront costs of these sometimes massive capital investments on those projects that we need to provide service. That return—we engage in a phase of these cases called the cost of capital phase, where we figure out what is the cost of that capital investment. What kind of return is necessary to attract investment from the market?

Experts—expert economists primarily—come forward representing all different types of stakeholders in our proceedings. There are arguments about macroeconomic factors, but it ultimately focuses on the risk profile of the utility, how it compares to other similarly risky investments that are available. The Commission ultimately sets a return that is appropriate, given all of the factors that apply to that utility. We look at other types of utilities, proxy groups. There are multiple economic analyses, but that is a major component of the revenue requirement of a utility.

Also, in determining that annual revenue requirement, it is important for the Commission to regularly reassess the useful lives of some of these assets, because the number of years over which you amortize billions of dollars in investment makes a big difference. If we find that over time it looks like a particular generating facility or some other part of utility infrastructure is going to last longer than originally anticipated, we can push out that period over which we recover the costs. That is ultimately going to have downward pressure on rates. Conversely, if it looks like something may not last as long as intended, or if there is public policy that results in early retirement of particular assets, well then, we are going to have to recover it over a shorter period of time, and it is going to have upward pressure on rates.

The last important phase to discuss in a rate case is the rate design phase. That is where once you have that revenue requirement that has been determined, how much money the utility is entitled to. One other thing about the revenue requirement is each of those expenses has to be found to be prudently incurred. That analysis—there is all kinds of literature about this—basically did the utility go through the appropriate examination of alternatives that reflect prudent management? Once those costs are determined, the revenue requirement, you have

the pie of what the utility is entitled to recover, and then it is divvied up among different types of customers who are going to pay for it. Theoretically, the utility would be indifferent as to who is paying what. They are going to get the revenue requirement.

There are parties in the proceedings we have where they are interested in making sure they are not paying more than their fair share. In a lot of areas of government, just in a lot of the decisions that you make, there can be win-wins. This is an area where it is just by nature a zero sum. If one type of customer is paying less, another type of customer is paying more. It is hard for us to make everybody happy in these proceedings. Inevitably, you are going to hear from people who are complaining about what the PUCN does, and it is because of that. There is just no way to make everybody happy.

In determining who pays what, that is driven by something called the cost-of-service study. We look at how much it costs to provide different types of service to customers. It is driven by their profile as a customer. What does their usage look like? Do they—for example, as an electricity customer—have consistent, steady usage that is the same all hours of the day? That is predictable. There are ways to plan for that in a way that make them less expensive to serve than a customer who maybe does not require a lot of electricity for much of the day, but they are very peaky. There are big swings in what the demand is. That requires the utility and the Commission to plan for serving them in a different way that may not be as cost-effective. The default for setting rates for the Commission is cost-of-service-based, and we work backwards, unless otherwise directed through legislation, to have rates that reflect the relative costs of providing service to customers.

I will discuss fuel and purchase power costs [page 12]. Fuel and purchase power costs, that is—cost for a natural gas utility would be the cost of purchases for delivery to customers for their use, and the cost of interstate pipeline service used to obtain the natural gas. For electric utilities, fuel costs include the cost of coal and natural gas to generate electricity at power plants. Electric utilities also incur purchase power costs when they buy electricity in the wholesale market, including renewable energy.

Fuel and purchase power costs are passed on to ratepayers on a dollar-for-dollar basis without providing any profit to utilities. The return is on the infrastructure to provide that service. Fuel and purchase power rates charged to retail customers consist of two components: the Base Tariff Energy Rate (BTER), and the Deferred Energy Accounting Adjustment, the DEAA.

The BTER is set to collect from ratepayers the estimated cost of fuel and purchase power. That is set on an annual basis, and it is updated each quarter through an automatic adjustment that then is reviewed on an annual basis to reflect the average recorded costs of fuel and purchase power for the previous 12 months. We have projected what the costs of purchase power and fuel will be, but we are never going to get it exactly right. If we overestimated,

then there is going to be a credit to customers' bills, and if we underestimate it and it costs more, then we are going to have to adjust it in a way that results in those rates increasing. The DEAA rate eliminates the difference between the BTER revenues and the utility's actual costs of fuel and purchase power. In the end, ratepayers only reimburse the utility for the actual costs.

These quarterly rate adjustments are not subject to the requirements for notice and hearing as other types of rate adjustments because these costs are subject to review and adjustment in an annual filing in which they are reviewed for prudence and subject to possible disallowance. For a natural gas utility, that annual proceeding is called the annual rate adjustment, and for electric utilities, it is the Deferred Energy Accounting Adjustment.

Next, integrated resource planning [page 11]. This process is driven at the front by a load forecast, load being the demand on the system for that service. We determine the 20-year needs for the utility. We have to start making planning decisions early because some of these projects take years and years to develop. That is a process where we look at demand. There are a lot of things that drive that: population growth, new emerging industries—I think you probably heard previously from the electric utilities in the state, who maybe provided a presentation that addressed things like data centers, and how artificial intelligence is driving increased demand for electricity. Those are things that are addressed in our resource planning process. We need to account for those trends.

Once the Commission has identified a prudent course of action, what the appropriate plan is, approved something, the Commission is by law allowed to modify that plan. Then any project that is part of that plan is essentially presumed to be prudent—prudent investment entitled to cost recovery, so long as the utility carried it out in a reasonable way.

As with a few other types of proceedings we have, including rate cases, there is a statutory deadline for these cases. For a rate case, it is 210 days. For a resource planning proceeding, it is also 210 days for all but the energy supply plan component of that case, which is 135 days.

We do have additional duties of the utilities and the regulators that have emerged over the last decade or so or expanded in nature [page 13]. I will not just read the slide, you have access to it. What we are tasked with doing as part of our mandatory functions continue to grow and are very dynamic. We are available to answer any questions.

Chair Watts:
Thank you both. We will open for questions.

Assemblymember Brown-May:
It is so great to see you again. I feel like it has only been a day or two. Spending a little bit of time on energy and infrastructure, appreciating what the PUCN does, I am wondering if you could talk through the planning process that we go through. Who is arguing for the ratepayer? As we look at big projects—you talked about the demand increasing, potentially, as we have new industry and industry continues to grow. We are looking at building new

infrastructure, which costs millions and millions of dollars. If the demand for residential customers remains relatively consistent, who is arguing for the residents in their homes for 30 years—their rates? Their usage has not changed, the demand has not changed on their side. We are changing the demand with regard to corporations or businesses as we are growing industry.

Who is arguing for the ratepayer in this process to make sure they really are only absorbing their fair share of the load, which would not include, necessarily, the businesses that are growing?

Garrett Weir:
This is one of the challenges we are facing regularly. I will take it in multiple parts. As far as parties participating in the cases, representing different interests, arguing on behalf of the ratepayers, the residential customers—in each proceeding before the Commission, there is a statutory right for the Bureau of Consumer Protection, which is housed within the Office of the Attorney General, to intervene on behalf of those residential ratepayers. That is their mission. That is their exclusive focus.

The Commission, as well as the Regulatory Operations Staff of the Commission, which Ms. Mullen described earlier, both of those entities have a statutory obligation to balance interests of the utilities and their shareholders as well as customers of the utility. The Commission cannot adopt rates that are not just and reasonable. Part of that just and reasonable assessment, and that balancing of interest, would obviously be no customer should be paying more than what is just and reasonable, what is appropriate for the service being provided to them.

There are certain processes the utility is informally following. There are formal requirements for distribution system upgrades necessary to serve customers under Rule 9 of the tariffs of utilities, and in the general idea that drives what those tariffs look like. Those rules are that the cost causer pays. You are not going to see that shifting of costs on to other customers.

Those tariffs explicitly address the distribution system, those kinds of investments, but as we are seeing this growing demand that is unprecedented for electric generation, that is raising questions about those investments. Should we treat them the same as those distribution system upgrades, things like substations and transformers and that sort of stuff we currently have a tried-and-true process for? What do we do about the billions of dollars of investments in power plants? We have investigations that have been looking at that. The Commission is paying a lot of attention to this. The electric utilities—NV Energy is fully aware of these challenges and has consistently, in our proceedings and publicly, made clear they do not intend for residential customers to bear the risk of these projects potentially not moving forward, or the load, the demand, not materializing that was envisioned when investments were made.

It is a great question. It is it is a challenging one. It is something that gets debated. If you are asking within the context of resource planning, it is going to be in that load forecast that we discussed. How much demand are we planning for? That is an issue that is litigated administratively. A lot of factors go into assessing just how real a project is, and the utility does a lot of that on the front end right now. Maybe it is something we need to formalize a little bit more. Some other jurisdictions have. We are looking at it. We want to be careful not to impede economic development, but we want to be responsible and make sure nobody is paying more than they should.

Assemblymember Brown-May:
I appreciate that you brought up economic development. That would be my follow-up question. Where are you in the process of engaging the folks who are having those conversations with regard to strategic economic development? If we do not have water as a resource, we are not going to move in a bottling company.

Are you on the front lines working with, perhaps, the Governor's Office of Economic Development, or the Office of Energy? Are you involved in, as PUCN, those conversations as we are looking at the future energy demands so we are adequately researching and deliberately working with industry that is purposeful in our state?

Garrett Weir:
A timely question. In fact, I can tell you right now we are engaging in a way we have not since I have been at the agency—with the Governor's Office of Economic Development, and even stakeholders, and industry—to make sure we figure out the best way to plan that is best for everyone and is not shifting risk on to other customers.

Assemblymember Moore:
I am interested to learn a little bit more about the natural disaster protection planning, specifically in our state. We do not really have that many natural disasters. We do have a lot of wildfires up here in the north, but I am also curious to know if, in the natural disaster protection planning, you are taking into consideration extreme heat, given that Nevada is home to two of the fastest warming cities in the country, Reno and Las Vegas. In other cities and other states, they have conducted tabletop exercises specifically around extreme heat. I participated in one about a year or more ago and it just seemed like as a state, we are not prepared to deal with that.

Garrett Weir:
Extreme heat is certainly something the Commission is aware of. Within the context of planning decisions, we have to normalize things like what the weather is going to look like when we are looking at the demand, when we are planning for utilities. There is going to be more electricity used for cooling in the summers because it is getting hotter. We recognize that extreme heat and drought contributes to the risk of wildfire, those sorts of disasters we are attempting to preemptively plan for and respond to.

As far as extreme heat itself, as a natural disaster, that is something that probably should receive some attention in our natural disaster protection planning cases. I am not familiar with positions that have been taken with regard to that, but I can certainly get back to you and see if that has been a historical position taken and what our utilities can do to plan for that. I do know it has indirect effects on all types of components of what we do as an agency.

Chair Watts:
Are there any additional questions for the PUCN? [There were none.] With that, we will move on to our bill hearing, I believe our first bill hearing in this Committee for this Session. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 32, which directs the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Growth and Infrastructure to conduct a study during the 2025 to 2026 interim concerning the Nevada Commission for the Reconstruction of the V&T Railway of Carson City and Storey County. I believe we have folks from Carson City joining us today. You can begin whenever you are ready.

Assembly Bill 32: Directs the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Growth and Infrastructure to conduct a study during the 2025-2026 interim concerning the Nevada Commission for the Reconstruction of the V & T Railway of Carson City and Storey County. (BDR S-404)

Cameron Gresh, Government Affairs Liaison/Public Information Officer, City of Carson City:
I am the government affairs liaison for Carson City. I am joined here today by Carson City Mayor, Lori Bagwell, and Storey County Commissioner, Clay Mitchell. Thank you very much for this opportunity to talk to you today about Assembly Bill 32. Here we have just a brief presentation [Exhibit D] on the history of the Virginia & Truckee (V&T) Railway along with some explanations of the bill and how we think it might help improve our operations moving forward.

It is likely many of you in this room are already familiar with our local Virginia & Truckee Railway attraction. To give you a brief history of the V&T Railway, which is one of the most famous short lines in American history, it was created to serve the mines of the Comstock Lode [page 2, Exhibit D]. After 100 years of operation, the railroad ceased functioning. In the 1990s, a financial study was commissioned which indicated rebuilding the railroad as a tourism attraction was feasible, and the Nevada Commission for the Reconstruction of the V&T Railway was created through an act of legislation which would have been Assembly Bill 696 of the 67th Session of the Nevada Legislature [page 3].

Founding members, of which there were originally a few more than just the remaining two, Carson City and Storey County, contribute both staff and funding to support the railroad's operations. To do this, each founding member was given an option of a combination of four different—you could call them fundraising methods—in order to fund its commitment to the reconstruction of the V&T, which you can see broken down here [page 4]: taxes on rental

of transient lodging, imposing additional taxes upon retailers, and the like—most of which is subject to the approval of voters. Each entity is free to use any combination of the four listed here. I will now turn it over to Carson City Mayor, Lori Bagwell.

Lori Bagwell, Mayor, City of Carson City:
What did Carson City do as its contribution to the railroad project [page 5]? In 2002, Carson City implemented a 2 percent room tax fee to be used to pay capital costs and put that together and issued a $4,150,000 bond to help do that project. Then in 2005, the City itself also issued another $15 million bond to reconstruct rail to be able to have the project be successful. Our bond will be paid off in December of 2025. We also did a one-eighth cent sales tax to help support the railroad. So those are the contributions Carson City has made.

Clay Mitchell, Vice Chairman, Storey County Board of Commissioners:
Thank you for letting me be Carson City's plus one on this endeavor. Happy to be part of it. One of my assignments as a County Commissioner is on the board of the V&T Railway Commission. To be clear, the Storey County Board of County Commissioners is supportive of this bill effort.

Storey County took some similar steps to support this effort [page 6]. In 1995 we levied a quarter cent sales tax countywide, and that was used to help with the construction costs. In May of 2010, there was an agreement made between the Commission and Storey County to put it in front of the voters, to extend that sales tax for a period of 30 years. That was passed. That agreement allowed for some checks and balances, but for some sharing of costs, it was dedicated to rail-specific projects. In May of 2020, an inter-local agreement was entered into between Storey County and the Rail Commission, and that specifically provided $250,000 a year for operational support to make sure the trains could keep running. That has been the main source of support. As allowed by statute, Storey County provides financial services to the Commission like Carson City provides contract legal services to the Commission.

These two entities have been shouldering the main load, but certainly it has been a partnership with both state and federal entities as well [page 7]. In 2005, the Commission received over $2.7 million in federal grants to help with the construction and about $800,000 in Economic Development Administration funds from the federal government. Then in 2005, the Legislature provided an additional $500,000 to keep the project going. The Department of Transportation donated a railroad bridge that crosses US Highway 50. In addition, the next year the Commission received over $600,000 from the Commission on Tourism, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs. It has really been a partnership with a lot of different agencies to get the railway running. It commenced operation maybe 2008, 2009, somewhere in that range, and has been running trains with a few interruptions since then.

Lori Bagwell:
What are some of our obstacles to success [page 8]? When the original reconstruction was envisioned, it had great plans and hopes on the success, because we all want to save these valuable historic activities in our state. I think it generated from a good place. We want to save this; it is a great asset. We can come together and we can do it, and it will be a great

tourist attraction. In the end, it will pay for itself. That has not quite happened. What are some of our obstacles? We do not have a clear path on how to get there. What can we do different? What can we change? What can we do to achieve the actual goal when we set out on this endeavor?

Part of our big issue is the Railway Commission itself only owns Engine No. 18. We do not have a car to put people in. It kind of says, Oh, oh, that is it. If we are going to realize this, we need that. We have had a wonderful partner we contract with to give us that stock to be able to achieve any success at all, which is showing the public this great train ride and to do that.

We would be at a loss if all we were doing is depending upon the rider to pay a fee to sustain the project. That is why we are here today, to say we cannot just keep having Storey County and Carson City subsidize it when it has not given our residents the fruition of the project. At some point, we have to admit it just did not get there, and we have to examine it as a group. That is really what we are looking for. We do not have the resources to continue doing it. To be honest, I do not know if we have the appetite to continue to do that. Do I continue to ask the Carson City residents to subsidize this project when it is really not the priority of the people who live here—to save it, I guess one would say. I look to all of you to please help us to decide what is the right answer for this asset that I think belongs to Nevada.

We also do not have any staff. I think Mr. Mitchell's team, Storey County, has been doing a great job being the finance manager to it all. Carson City has been the legal arm to it. Most state commissions have a state employee attached to that board or commission or access into the attorney general's office or someone to support it. We have none of that. We have been shouldering this burden. When we are looking at the statute—just really asking you to help us to say, what really do we have in mind?

Cameron Gresh:
As Chair Watts mentioned earlier, A.B. 32 directs the interim counterpart of this Committee to conduct a study on the V&T Railway, that study being centered upon three basic questions or operations [page 9]. One would be reorganizing the structure of the Commission or modifying its duties or powers; improving the long-term financial viability of the Commission; or terminating the Commission and addressing related issues including route limitation, disposition of the assets of the Commission. When you think about what this bill is studying, those would be the three main items to consider.

How do we think A.B. 32 will help [page 10]? As the mayor went over already, we are unable to identify a way forward. We are now deferring to the body that created the V&T 30 years ago to assist us in maybe identifying any way we could improve our operations or perhaps if these improvements would amount to any kind of long-term financial

sustainability at all. Though we treasure this resource and absolutely do not want to see it go away or become inaccessible to Nevadans, the citizenry of Carson City and Storey County are no longer able to fund the railroad's operations in the face of—as I am sure every member of this Committee understands from their own districts—pressing infrastructure needs.

Our presentation on Assembly Bill 32 is concluded, should anyone have any questions we can answer.

Chair Watts:
I have a couple. You mentioned the other members of the Commission. Can you just give us a little bit of additional background on who else is involved in the Commission in this effort?

Clay Mitchell:
The Commission has gone through several iterations over its life. When it was first started, it was called the Tricounty Rail Commission [*sic*] because a portion of the track travels through Lyon County. They decided they did not want a whole lot to do with it.

At some point along the way, there was then a nine-member Commission that pulled in Douglas County and Washoe County. The vision was to really beef it out as a regional attraction and then it was modified back down to just the two of us. The composition was changed as well. We have a governmental representative from each of the local jurisdictions, a tourism representative from each of the local jurisdictions, and then a Governor's appointee as the fifth member. There is no provision for staff, and that creates a little bit of a structural challenge because we have to contract for everything.

When we think of an executive director to run the operations of the Commission, we need someone with a breadth of skills and knowledge to be able to handle customer service, managing contracts, dealing with all the other vendors, but then also having to do more day-to-day tasks like preparing minutes and preparing agendas. We often end up contracting at a much higher rate than we would typically do for those types of tasks. We do not have an Administrative Assistant to handle those types of tasks and as a result, the scope creeps and ends up overwhelming the people we contract with to run the Commission's business.

Chair Watts:
I might have another question, but we are going to move on. We have a question from Assemblymember Karris.

Assemblymember Karris:
I just want to clarify. Are you wanting to keep this going or are you wanting this dissolved?

Lori Bagwell:
Do we think it is a viable treasure? Not necessarily. I think that is where our concern is. Do you think it is wonderful and is it nice, and do people love one of the favorite rides on it, the Polar Express? The families love to dress in their pajamas and have hot chocolate and come out and do this ride. Is it important to remember where you have come from? The answer would be yes.

But when you look at its viability and say, Should the Carson City taxpayer contribute? Let us see, Storey's putting in $250,000 a year, should we put in that kind of money to keep it viable? Then my answer has to change a little bit when I look at everything that Carson City needs to accomplish—frankly, roads. I cannot even keep up with my day-to-day infrastructure for our community. It makes it hard for the V&T to win the day. That is as honest as I can be. It is hard for it in its scope of everything that is out there. It is hard for that to win.

Clay Mitchell:
There may be a little bit of daylight between the appetite of my electorate versus Carson City's electorate to continue to fund. The typical train ride starts on the outskirts of Carson City, comes up to Virginia City for the day, and then goes back down. Since we are the destination, we receive a more direct benefit from a sales-tax-dollar perspective. People buy lunch, they go shopping, those kinds of things. It is a little harder to track the overnight room stays and other things. We know there are some. We know it is not what was envisioned originally.

I am not feeling any sort of pressure from the Storey County end to shut it down. To put it in very real terms, last year—if I had to estimate, with the subsidies that we gave—we ended up about $140,000 in the black. Without the subsidy, that means we are losing $100,000 to $150,000 a year. It is not that far off from a perspective, and I imagine it could continue to tread water and give rides and give memories for years to come.

The question is, what is the long-term viability? Where does it go from here? Our operator is aging, and he does not really know what his plan of succession is. That is why we are looking for some guidance. That is why we are hoping the Committee can examine all of those options and look at whether this is something we all want to restructure and look at whether this is viable long term.

It is kind of half of a railway. We have a steam engine but nowhere to store it at night. We have to contract for that. We do not have cars for the steam engine to pull, and all of that are capital improvements that are a significant contribution to make those happen. That is what we are looking at. We are certainly looking at other funding sources, other opportunities. But since it is a state commission, we would like to partner with the state and expand in exploring those options.

Assemblymember Karris:
Out of curiosity, have either of you polled the people in your areas to see how they feel about it dissolving or what they would like to have happen with it? With a side note, letting them know that this is affecting infrastructure at the same time.

Lori Bagwell:
We have not actually done a poll, but when we are in the process each and every year of doing our budgets and looking at our priorities and looking at our capital improvement plan, we watch our bond repayments, and we look to the dates, and we discuss publicly.

Our bond is ending in December. We will be making our final payment. One of the discussions we had, we recently put two ballot measures out to help pay taxes for the roads. One of the questions that comes to me often is, Mayor, you have to do everything you can to not raise taxes and to find ways to fund this infrastructure. One of the things we did during many public hearings on this issue is indicate that the sales tax utilized to repay this bond was ending in December and we would repurpose it, statutorily allowed, and do a new plan of expenditure to put it to the roads. The public is well aware Carson City will be shifting its focus. Did we do an actual survey? The answer would be no.

I will tell you—you had a board many years ago that had several public discussions, and the public was not in support. You had a board that moved forward anyway. I would venture to say, I pretty much know my public.

Clay Mitchell:
I will answer as well. Our funding mechanism is going to be in place until up to 2039. It is a quarter cent sales tax countywide. Most of that comes from the business community and the business activity. It is not perceived as a heavy burden on our residents. That is where I think there is a little bit of a different perception of continued support on this, not just because of the perceived benefit, but also because we are in a little different situation from our funding source.

Assemblymember Backus:
I could not help it, because you put some numbers up in front of me, so I started pondering this. I understand Carson City is going to exhaust its repayment of its bonding authority by the end of December of 2025. Does Carson City put forth any additional cash besides repayment of its bonds at this time?

Lori Bagwell:
We have a committee that does have that room tax. It has that 2 percent that came in to a fund there, so our Culture & Tourism Authority. There was a request to repave the parking lot at the depot station. We contributed to that. That is where the operating or potential new capital comes from, that bureau, not the city general fund.

Assemblymember Backus:
To clarify, I am taking it as even though it is the 2 percent, would that have been a part of one of the—because it is repaving of a parking lot, it seems like that could have been done on a bond, or no?

Lori Bagwell:
The bond there completed itself. The bond completed—that group had to pay for in Carson, our Visitors Bureau, had to complete. That has freed that up as marketing for the railroad and any other avenues they might come to as a Commission to request operational or capital needs. They come to that bureau to ask for assistance.

Assemblymember Backus:
I have a second question. I want clarity on the first. I take it you charge when people do like the Polar Express, some of the big-ticket items. Are tickets being purchased in order for those who are deciding to ride the rail?

Lori Bagwell:
Yes. We printed this just in case somebody asked a ticket price question. In 2024, an individual passenger for the Polar Express, depending on when you buy it in the season you are riding it, is either $60 or $70 for an individual.

I want to stress that is the other mechanism. Do you raise the prices to help lower the operating losses or the potential for the railroad? I venture to indicate people are bringing their children to a Polar Express wanting to have this memory. A family lounge with 12 passengers is $840. I think it is getting to its own price point, if you want to keep it so everyone can enjoy it, not just the wealthy. We enjoy the fact everyone has an opportunity to dress in their pajamas and have hot chocolate. That is the pricing structure.

Clay Mitchell:
I want to point out two things to your first question. There are also in-kind contributions. This is an uncompensated board, and the chair of the board is currently the Director of the Tourism Authority in Carson City [*sic*]. I am guessing, on a slow week, he is putting in at least 10 hours of work and going up from there, depending. This kind of goes into development of the product we sell. The regular season for the train running is usually May through October and then November and December is when the Polar Express runs. We do have other things that are kind of peripheral and are doing what we can as a Commission to maximize. For example, we have in the past had rail bikes where people can pedal and go down into the canyon, and it has got a motor assist to bring you back up, so you do not have to work too hard. That struggled a little bit with the wildfires and the smoke because that is a summertime activity. We are looking at bringing that back for this next year.

We are certainly looking at other ways to maximize. We are looking at private rentals, renting out the whole train for a corporate retreat. The challenge is, for any of this, we either have to contract with someone who can do event planning or market development and those kinds of things, or it puts a burden on the member serving on the Commission who should be doing other jobs.

We are improving. Year over year, we are improving our performance and that could continue. I think the bigger issue that has been identified is what is the future plan for it? Where does it go? Originally, the dream was to connect it all the way down to downtown Carson City like it did in the old days. But with the development that has happened in the meantime, reconstructing that right of way would be pretty difficult at this point and incredibly expensive. The question is, with what we have, can we expand it to something that is more self-sustaining?

If the operator were no longer able to operate—who, by the way, owns the last two miles of track privately that goes from Gold Hill to Virginia City—if we were to use another operator, would people have to get off and take a shuttle into Virginia City? There are some real structural issues that I think need to be addressed.

Assemblymember Dickman:
I am just wondering—it sounds like there are an awful lot of issues. If this study is not done, if this bill is not passed, or if the study is done and it is determined it is just not feasible to continue unless there is a funding source from somewhere, how would you dispose of this asset?

Lori Bagwell:
I think that is the whole other reason for the Commission. When we looked at the enabling legislation, I do not think it assumed it would ever decommission and therefore nothing is written into the rules on what you would do if it decommissioned.

Our legal counsel said there are no rules of the game written into the legislation. Then you start to look at historic rules, and since the Commission owns the engine, do you go back and say, Sell the engine and then give the money back to whom? Because the state contributed, the city contributed, Storey County contributed, the federal government contributed. How do you dispose of the assets? That is another reason we want a study committee, that we are doing this together in writing the proper procedures, that we all agree what should happen.

Assemblymember Dickman:
You would hope that one of the results of this study would be to help you decide how to end it, if that is it.

Lori Bagwell:
I think that is something we all need to address. Even if we are able to keep this going 10 more years or 20 more years, we still should have the endgame defined. I think no matter what, that should happen.

Clay Mitchell:
I just want to add one thing to this conversation. We did have some preliminary conversations before bringing this bill here. We talked with several different state departments or divisions to see if there was capacity and maybe some economies of scale with the Nevada State Railroad Museum or with tourism assets that are in place. They indicated to us their plates were full. They had a lot of deferred maintenance on their plates, and they just did not see how they would be able to take it on.

We also approached the operator, who owns the end of the track, and said, Would you be willing to take it on? His response to me was, I am in my early seventies, the best thing I can do is keep the trains running. I do not disagree with him. Those conversations are certainly open. If those positions change, we are certainly willing to look at those. Having clarity on if the Commission were to be shut down, what the disposition of those assets would be, who owns what, I think that is important.

Because it also is important—as a member of the Railway Commission, I am trying to do whatever I can to make it successful, I feel that is my responsibility—I am looking at alternative funding sources. We are looking at federal funds that might be applicable, but I do not even know who owns the assets. I do not know what we qualify for. We are kind of this orphan commission that the state created but the locals run. Clarity around that would be extremely helpful, whether the decision is to try to wind down operations at some point, or whether it is to look at other funding sources to help bolster it and give it a future.

Chair Watts:
It has been a robust discussion. I still have a couple more questions. I hope they are quick. First, what conversations have there been with the State Railroad Museum here in Carson City?

Lori Bagwell:
We did have a meeting with them. We originally looked to move this asset underneath tourism and the Railroad Museum's control. They looked at everything and indicated to us they do not have the capacity. If it is not already super robust, they do not want to take on a problem child—another problem child might have been the correct words for that. They already have infrastructure needs of their own. That exacerbates the job they are trying to do. We did try that.

Chair Watts:
Go ahead, Assemblymember Gallant.

Assemblymember Gallant:
I know you said the ticket price for a family of 12 to be in a private car was around $800. I am also seeing there are other price points on seats—just seats. Those seem a little bit more reasonable. If I am reading this correctly, $62 to $82 for two seats; two bench seats, which would fit how many people? Two people?

Lori Bagwell:
Two passengers.

Assemblymember Gallant:
So that is like $30 or $40 per person. Have you taken a look at what you could do just across the board, increasing just a little bit of a fee to help? For a Polar Express ride, $30 or $40 for two people does not seem outlandish.

Lori Bagwell:
The first answer I would say is, it is generally not two people. If it is the Polar Express, it is a family affair. You have got young children. I have to say, the part that I was super honest about, boy it is hard to see that go potentially, because that is when I do see the little two-year-olds and five-year-olds and seven-year-olds in their pajamas, coming and learning about the V&T Railway, doing something as a family structure. I love anything that allows families to have memories together. The Polar Express meets that. I look at these prices to say, where could I go that would still let the parents bring the three-year-old, the seven-year-old. Where is that price point? Mr. Mitchell might know the last time we had a fee increase?

Clay Mitchell:
The Polar Express sells out extremely quickly. It is incredibly popular, and it is limited somewhat in supply because of the time of year. We have to quit running regular season trains in late October in time to change over and get ready for the Polar Express. This year, some of the cars used in the Polar Express were used in an unnamed historical drama set somewhere east of here. That should be coming out on TV fairly soon and may be already out. They had to load up those cars and take them and then make sure they got back in time for the Polar Express. We added a fourth car to the train, but there is an added complexity, and we are running up against our limits on staff, on hot chocolate—because that is an integral part of the Polar Express—and how quickly we can turn that. We are running three runs a night. We cannot really run earlier because people are already late to the five o'clock train. They are hustling in and then that pushes everyone else back, and if you go too late, then the kids are out too late. We are pretty close to capacity.

We certainly could raise prices. That is always a consideration. Our regular season trains, there is definitely opportunity for expansion. In our strategic planning this year, as any organization would do, we took a look at Sunday—Sundays are usually not as full as Saturdays, so there are local's discounts, which would be all of Nevada. A Nevada driver's license gets local discounts, family themed trains, wine trains in the evening on a Saturday. The train is already fired up and running, so down into the canyon. We have done two of those this year. We are going to do four this coming year It is fairly close from a perspective of breaking even. We are reinvesting anything we have left over. We are doing our work to make it as viable as possible.

The tens or hundreds of millions of dollars it would take to have it be a self-sustaining railway, to have all the rolling stock, to have places to repair and store those, to continue the tracks further, to build out the rest of it, is the bigger concern in my mind.

Chair Watts:
What is your vision for how this study would be carried out? Some of the questions you brought up are complicated. You discuss some of the staffing challenges your local governments are already dealing with. How do you see this playing out?

We do get some support, but some of these things might need additional contracted expertise to help us figure out. Could you help us understand so we are all on the same page of what you would be looking for to some extent and how this would play out? What level of expertise and detail would you like to see go into this process?

Clay Mitchell:
From my perspective, I certainly see it as a partnership, and we are willing. We have the ability, through interlocal agreements, to call on the staff within our organizations. If there is a need for preparation of documents, of research, of those kinds of things to help the Committee, we certainly are willing to commit some resources. The Commission itself has money and can budget money for that kind of thing within its accounts, and then we can call on the local jurisdictions, as needed, to help out with that. Certainly, we would be willing to consider whatever county staff can do to help out.

Lori Bagwell:
I am certainly willing to commit our staff. We have our legal staff currently working the V&T. There is not any issue with letting her know she has some other duties as assigned coming her way potentially. We have our deputy city manager who serves on this Commission. We are willing to put the needed resources to contribute to this study. We are willing to do that.

Chair Watts:
I appreciate that, because having had some experience in previous interims, we are glad to set aside the time, the space, and to help reach out and bring folks together. We generally do not have the resources to bring in additional contracted expertise. I want to make sure we are all on the same page.

Last comment, you might want to consider getting a cat or another very charismatic mascot for your railway.

Lori Bagwell:
I almost put the pin on today. You have no idea, but I did not want to be the wrong railroad.

Chair Watts:
I think that concludes the questions. Thank you so much for your time, for the presentation, for answering our questions. We will now move on to testimony. We will begin with testimony in support of Assembly Bill 32. If anyone would like to provide testimony in support here in Carson City, please go ahead and come forward.

Dwight Millard, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:
I was appointed as the Chairman of the Commission by Governor Sandoval. The people on the Commission wanted me there because I was a homebuilder and I did not follow the rules real well. When I got there, we did a lot of things that were kind of out of the ordinary. For example, there are three parts to this issue I think are really outstanding. It is the Commission to Reconstruct Nevada [*sic*]. There is a reconstruction element still available.

The jewel of this railroad is down the canyon along the Carson River and the train is currently going from Virginia City to Mound House. Mound House has a small leg down the canyon, but it needs to be continued on down to Carson City. I do not think you will ever get it into the City of Carson because of the right of ways and the issues, but that is one issue.

The second issue is the ongoing funding of operating the V&T. When I sat on the Commission, we lost about $200,000 a year from the regular operations—actually more than that. Polar Express paid for all of it except $200,000. At that time, we were looking at each of the counties to pony up about $100,000 to make it a viable railroad. I think it is still very, very viable. It needs to have a study done and continue.

I am not sure how important what the future of it is as it demises. There is not a future for the Reno airport when it demises. It just will go away, and something will happen. I think the same thing sort of happens here. The reason this railroad was built was because Marv Teixeira, then mayor, really thought it could be a real tourist attraction to the area. Ironically, I was sitting on tourism in Carson City when he said, Let us raise the room tax. That was the first thing we did, raise the room tax two percent to get across the pit. The railroad tracks are of the highest standard that was available at the time. Your asset is very, very well built, very well protected. You see that we put $25 million in it from various sources.

Chair Watts:
You are at two minutes, so I am just going to ask you to start getting close to wrapping it up.

Dwight Millard:
I will wind it down. I think a part of what is there is an asset and needs to be considered in your study. Where the property went, I have no idea. We bought property. I have no idea whose name it is in.

Chair Watts:
If you have any additional comments, feel free to prepare those in writing and provide those to our Committee staff.

Dwight Millard:
Is your Committee the one that will do the hearings in the future?

Chair Watts:
This Committee will be considering the legislation during this session.

Thomas Grey, Owner, Virginia & Truckee Railway Company:
I am with the Virginia & Truckee Railroad Company. I am that 70-year-old guy Mr. Mitchell mentioned. I agree with everything Mayor Bagwell and Mr. Mitchell said so far. I support what they say.

We have all the equipment and all the expertise. On the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada presentation, two of my young employees are now your inspectors for your railroad track and also your motive power and equipment. We are passing that knowledge around. They develop their skills up there where we are at.

I guess the main thing—this could have been a national treasure. I think it is a regional treasure and a state treasure. This is our 50th season of running the steam trains. I have collected maybe 75 pieces of equipment, the old "Reno." I still have a lot of time left, so I am still going to be building out all this stuff and it is going to go to somebody someday. The train—there will always be equipment to make this rare go back and forth, and I hope the people, the skill sets will still be there.

For the Polar Express, I charge the Railway Commission about $12 a rider to ride it, and then they aggrandize it and charge a fee. I think the Polar Express trains, the event trains, pretty much subsidize the operation of the summertime train. That is pretty good. I think that is kind of a good model, financial model, to go forward. There are additional expenses, but I think it is almost self-supporting.

The only other thing I want to say is, I have been doing this for 50 years, and I have got my schooling at University of Nevada, Reno and all that and my experience on the railroad with the track and developing the business, and I think I would like to have some input on your study. I think that would be more than helpful to you. I am an expert at it. I am only worth as much as I charge, and that is not very much. That is zero. I think that would be helpful to put that together.

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

Chair Watts:
Thank you for your comments. We have got you on the record now, and we definitely know how to get in touch. If this does move forward, expect to hear from somebody. Seeing nobody else coming forward in Carson City, seeing no one in Las Vegas, do we have anyone wishing to provide testimony in support of Assembly Bill 32 by phone? [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in opposition to Assembly Bill 32. If anyone would like to testify in opposition, please come forward. Seeing no one, has anyone joined on the line? [There was no one.] We will take testimony in the neutral position on Assembly Bill 32. Seeing no one coming forward, is there anyone on the line? [There was no one.] Would the presenters of the bill like to make any closing comments? [Bill presenters waived closing comments.] I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 32.

That brings us to the end of our agenda. We have one last item, which is public comment. Would anyone wish to provide public comment here in Carson City? Seeing nobody coming forward, seeing nobody in Las Vegas, has anyone joined us by phone? [There was no one.]

That concludes our business for today. Our next meeting will be on Thursday, February 20 at 1:30 p.m. We will have some more bill hearings. Thank you, everyone. This meeting is adjourned [at 2:59 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Jeff Kirst
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblymember Howard Watts, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Stephanie Mullen, Executive Director, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada; and Garret Weir, General Counsel, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada	PowerPoint presentation titled "Assembly Committee on Growth & Infrastructure: February 11, 2025"
A.B. 32	D	Lori Bagwell, Mayor, City of Carson City; Clay Mitchell, Vice Chairman, Storey County Board of Commissioners; and Cameron Gresh, Government Affairs Liaison/Public Information Officer, City of Carson City	PowerPoint presentation titled "AB32 Hearing Presentation"