MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Eighty-third Session
May 12, 2025

The Senate Committee on Growth and Infrastructure was called to order by Chair Rochelle T. Nguyen at 3:33 p.m. on Monday, May 12, 2025, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 5 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. Exhibit A is the agenda. Exhibit B is the attendance roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen, Chair
Senator Julie Pazina, Vice Chair
Senator Fabian Doñate
Senator Ira Hansen
Senator Carrie Ann Buck

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Tracy Brown-May, Assembly District No. 42

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Julianne King, Committee Policy Analyst
Michael Viets, Committee Counsel
Paula Peters, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Rebecca Wagner
Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League
Julia Hubbard, Solar United Neighbors
Kaylyn Kardavani, New Day Nevada
Nadine Kienhoefer, Western Resource Advocates
Jaina Moan, The Nature Conservancy
Olivia Tanager, Director, Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter
Mary House, CEO, Caring, Helping & Restoring Lives, Inc.

Clotea Smith
Frederick James Smith
Caitlin Gatchalian, Southwest Energy Efficiency Project
Shaunda Johnson, Executive Director, Faith in Action Nevada
Maria Eugenia Prentice, Chispa Nevada
Marlon Anderson, Faith Organizing Alliance
Cittaly Ayala, Chispa Nevada
Li Chen, One APIA Nevada
Hector Arreola, Nevada Environmental Justice Coalition
Audrey Peral, Program Director, Chispa Nevada
Juan Carlos Guardado, Chispa Nevada
Tom Dudas
John Michael Morales
Mathilda Miller, Native Voters Alliance Nevada
Callie McKenna, Advanced Energy United
Chauntille Roberts, Regional Director, Vote Solar
Tami Romo
Ryan Bellows, NV Energy
Danny Thompson, International Brotherhood of Electric Workers Local 396 and Local 1245
Robert Purdy, Northern Nevada Development Authority
Nick Schneider, Vegas Chamber
Wendy Colborne, Building and Construction Trades Council of Northern Nevada
Tomas Hammond, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
Carlos Hernandez, Nevada State AFL-CIO
Zoe Houghton, National Electrical Contractors Association-Northern Nevada
Tom Clark, Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce
Ronnie Young, International Brotherhood of Electric Workers Local 357
Wendi Newman, Southern Nevada Chapter, National Electrical Contractors Association
Aaron Ibarra, Southern Nevada Building Trades Union
Peter Guzman, Latin Chamber of Commerce
Thomas Bird, Nevada Alliance for Retired Americans
Emily Osterberg, Henderson Chamber of Commerce
Jacob Haas, International Brotherhood of Electric Workers Local 401
Garrett Weir, General Counsel, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada
Cyrus Hojjaty

CHAIR NGUYEN:
We are going to start with the work session and Ms. King to go over what I hope will be a consent agenda. Assembly Bill (A.B.) 20 will be removed from the work session today.

ASSEMBLY BILL 20 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the Department of Motor Vehicles. (BDR 43-305)

JULIANNE KING (Committee Policy Analyst):
I would like to note that as nonpartisan staff, I cannot advocate for or against any measure that this committee will consider.

To begin, the A.B. 46 work session document (Exhibit C) explains that the bill revises provisions relating to privileges applicable to information obtained from records and other property of public utilities and certain other entities. The bill is sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Growth and Infrastructure on behalf of the PUCN [Public Utilities Commission of Nevada] and was heard on April 30. There are no amendments.

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 55 adds the requirement that blood drawn from deceased crash victims be analyzed for the presence and concentration of commonly misused substances as determined by the coroner or other official performing similar examinations, among other provisions. The bill is sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Judiciary per the work session document (Exhibit D) on behalf of the DPS [Department of Public Safety] Office of Traffic Safety and was heard on April 28. There are no amendments.

ASSEMBLY BILL 55 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to motor vehicle crashes. (BDR 43-250)

Assembly Bill 174 allows providers of retail voice service via satellite to be included among the providers of alternative voice service for the purposes of determining whether certain telecommunication providers may be relieved of their obligations as a provider of last resort in areas where alternative voice services are provided. The bill is sponsored by Assemblymember Elaine H.

Marzola and was heard on April 28 as noted in the work session document (Exhibit E). There are no amendments.

ASSEMBLY BILL 174: Revises provisions relating to telecommunication providers. (BDR 58-128)

Assembly Bill 361 requires a regional transportation commission in a county with a population of 100,000 or more to install and maintain certain infrastructure and technology to mitigate safety risks to transit operators and to install signage informing the public about the criminal penalties for assault or battery of a transit operator. Per the work session document (Exhibit F), the bill is sponsored by Assemblymember Linda F. Hunt and was heard on May 5. There are no amendments.

ASSEMBLY BILL 361 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public mass transportation. (BDR 22-1066)

And finally, A.B. 417 requires peace officers to inspect vehicles suspected of involvement in unauthorized speed contests or trick driving displays for equipment violations or unsafe conditions among other provisions. The bill is sponsored by Assemblymember Hunt and was heard on May 7 per the work session document (Exhibit G). There are no amendments.

ASSEMBLY BILL 417 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public safety. (BDR 43-647)

CHAIR NGUYEN:
We have heard the descriptions of A.B. 46, A.B. 55, A.B. 174, A.B. 361 and A.B. 417. Seeing no questions, I would entertain a motion to do pass these bills as read by Ms. King.

SENATOR PAZINA MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 46, A.B. 55, A.B. 174, A.B. 361 AND A.B. 417.

SENATOR BUCK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR NGUYEN:
I will end the work session, and I will open the hearing on A.B. 452.

ASSEMBLY BILL 452 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to public utilities. (BDR 58-572)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER TRACY BROWN-MAY (Assembly District No. 42):
This measure that we are presenting today, A.B. 452, is important in helping to build transparency in energy costs. Why does it matter to my constituents? They continue to express their concerns with regard to affordability and transparency. Nevadans are facing high, unpredictable utility bills even when they do the right thing to conserve energy. As someone who hears from struggling families, seniors and small business owners regularly, I have seen how devastating those bills can be. This measure is about protecting customers from energy price spikes they can't control and ensuring they are treated fairly.

The problem right now [with] the way the system works is that our NV Energy utility passes 100 percent of fuel and power cost volatility on to ratepayers. Customers have no say in the cost, and they bear the entire financial burden. The utility, meanwhile, goes through the PUCN and does not have a financial stake in reducing or managing those costs. This measure is about fairness, transparency and accountability. Volatility is the enemy of affordability. We need a more balanced approach that shifts some of the risk back onto the utility so it is responsible for helping to keep costs down. In advance of and following the Assembly hearing on this measure, we worked closely with stakeholders to make meaningful adjustments to the language in the bill that address feedback and concerns from the PUCN, labor consumer advocates and the utility.

The amended version of this bill does three key things. An investigatory docket directs the PUCN to open a public docket to examine fuel and purchase power costs and evaluate a cost-sharing mechanism. With regard to overcharge protection, if NV Energy overcharges customers, then they must refund the full amount with interest, which ends the partial refund loophole that exists currently. There would be no more partial refunds like we saw in the news a few months ago. This extends the regulatory timelines for general rate cases to allow for deeper, more thorough review. For me, this consumer protection bill is about fairness, transparency and aligning the utilities incentive with good public. I am proud to bring it forward today, and I will turn it over to the experts to actually walk us through the measure.

REBECCA WAGNER:
I am here as a policy analyst in support of this measure. By way of background, you are probably wondering who is this, and why is she here? I served on the PUCN for nearly a decade, and I can't seem to escape the confines of the PUCN, as much as I loved it. This bill has taken many twists and turns, and transformed significantly since its introduction, which initially started as a very prescriptive bill. Now it is a really measured approach to exploring policies and, specifically, for fuel cost-sharing to help lower rates.

The intent of this is for the Commission to open one or more dockets [and] explore how the process is working right now. Are there tweaks? Are there things that can be done to the way it works now? Are there ways to mitigate the impact to customers from high natural gas costs and market purchase costs and, specifically, dive into a policy known as fuel cost-sharing? It is used in many states across the country, including the West. Almost all the Western States have some version of this, ranging from Hawaii to Wyoming. It is kind of universal in an approach to make sure the risk is aligned appropriately between the customers and the utility with the intent of trying to mitigate those large price spikes in natural gas.

I will not go through the super wonky parts of this. What we are asking the Commission to evaluate—the program or policy design can vary. It is best left to the Commission, interveners or participants in the investigatory docket to actually bring experts forward and spend the time looking through that.

I am sure that over time you all have heard about demand-side management, energy efficiency. What can we do to address growing load? There is a provision in this section asking the Commission to look at the integrated resource planning process. Are there things that we can do to help lessen the burden created by our growing load? And then for accountability on the Commission, just some reporting requirements.

When I was a commissioner, I always liked to maintain a good working relationship with the Legislature during the interim. I think it is a good policy and practice for the Commission to provide updates and reports throughout the process to the [Joint] Interim [Standing] Committee on Growth and Infrastructure and then after 18 months or by July 1, 2026, report on the outcomes. Did they find anything? Did they initiate a rulemaking? Did they find

anything to help lower the cost for customers? And if so, what is that? And what did they do, and what could the Legislature do about it?

Just to note here, the Commission has broad authority to initiate investigatory dockets and then begin a rulemaking process as a result, that is common practice. That is the authority you have delegated to the Commission. A subsection in here says if the Commission finds this in the public interest, they are not going to do something that is going to raise rates or harm any customer. If they find a mechanism in policy that is good for customers, they move forward with rulemaking if they see fit.

The other two pieces—the next one is just under an existing tariff. When I looked this up, it was a tariff from 1983 with refunds to customers for any overcharges by the utility. We have seen recent media coverage of customers who have been overcharged. This section says we need to revise that tariff and ensure customers get the benefit of a full refund with interest for any overcharges.

Lastly, A.B. 452 has to do with the timing of rate cases. NV Energy is on cycle to file a rate case alternating between Southern Nevada and Northern Nevada every year. On top of several other discretionary and mandatory dockets, rate cases are way more complex than back in my day. And right now, the 210 days are just not enough to ensure that you get a thorough investigation of all the moving pieces of a rate case [or] ensure due process of the participants in the rate case.

I will make a pitch for the commissioners. It takes a lot to draft what has turned out to be a 200-plus page order that needs to be delivered within a few days for other commissioners to review. Giving the Commission 90 days [of] breathing room helps with their workflow and, hopefully, gets a better pace set. The Commission has a little more flexibility on all the things they need to cover.

CHRISTI CABRERA-GEORGESON (Nevada Conservation League):
The Nevada Conservation League (NCL) has consistently supported policies that align with our core values, advancing clean energy, promoting transparency, and ensuring affordability and accountability for Nevada's utility customers. Fluctuating fossil fuel prices, particularly gas, have contributed significantly to rising energy bills, putting strain on families and businesses. Right now, customers are shouldering 100 percent of the cost impacts even when those

costs stem from global events or factors beyond their control. That imbalance deserves a closer look. That's why A.B. 452 is a top priority bill for NCL this Legislative Session.

We are not alone in believing that this is an important issue. Recent polling shows that 86 percent of Nevadans support fuel cost-sharing. Additionally, I would like to point to a letter (Exhibit H) we submitted with 23 organizations and businesses from all across the State in support of this bill. This is a bipartisan issue. People want fairness and stable bills. Families and small businesses are desperate for predictability. This bill is a step toward stability and smarter utility decisions.

Assembly Bill 452 also corrects a serious gap in existing policy. It is unacceptable that NV Energy can overcharge customers and only issue a partial refund, like in the case of a Las Vegas couple who paid more than their fair share for six years and were only reimbursed for six months. This bill ensures that never happens again by requiring full refunds plus interest when the utility is found in the wrong.

And finally, A.B. 452 includes a provision to extend the timeline for a general rate increase for general rate case reviews, a needed fix as utility activity at the PUCN continues to ramp up with NV Energy filing back-to-back general rate cases for Northern and Southern Nevada. The volume and pace of filings are making it difficult for regulators, advocates and the general public to fully review proposals and determine whether costs are fair. More time to evaluate these filings means more transparency, more accountability and better outcomes for your everyday Nevadans.

Assembly Bill 452 is a balanced, responsible step forward, ensuring any cost-sharing policy is shaped through a transparent inclusive process with the right stakeholders at the table. It gives regulators better tools to protect families and small businesses, prevents future overcharges, and promotes smarter utility planning and stronger accountability. Above all, it puts your everyday Nevadan first.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
When we are looking at section 1.7, I know there were quite a few news stories. I think it is the example you gave about the customer who had been overcharged for six years. Was it a policy decision that NV Energy only allowed

for her to recover six months of that time period, or can you elaborate on the need for this?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BROWN-MAY:
In my meetings with the PUCN, it actually was a state policy. It was not prescribed by NV Energy. That was not their policy. It was an existing statute that PUCN governed. It would require a change at the PUCN to make sure this person got the full refund.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
Would the inclusion of section 1.7 give guidance to the PUCN to come up with that determination, including what the interest would be for that full overcharge?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BROWN-MAY:
That is our intent that we would work directly with the PUCN so that they would come up with changing the language that is currently in statute that would allow for a full recovery period. In conversations with NV Energy, they have a statutory requirement that goes back a certain number of years. I do not remember exactly what that was—maybe three years, for record-keeping purposes—where they would track back what the overcharges would be at that point in time. Then we would presume customary interest based on that.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
Was part of the problem in not being able to go back six years because they did not have the corresponding records to know exactly what those overcharges were during that time?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BROWN-MAY:
No. I am going to say it was not NV Energy; and no one, to the best of my knowledge, asked for those records from them. In the requirements that the PUCN identified, [it] was only a period of months. NV Energy complied with the request from PUCN to make that payment. Could it have been done differently? Probably. But I believe that the utility acted in the interest that was prescribed by regulations the PUCN has oversight of.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
When there are overcharges—and this might be a question for NV Energy if they come up to the table; if they do not, I might ask them to come up to the table. I

am assuming this case rose to the level that we saw articles and information on the news about it. How did it get to the point where it is at the PUCN? I am assuming that sometimes when there are overcharges, customers probably just deal with it internally by calling NV Energy. [And NV Energy] says, we realize we overcharged you, and they just make those refunds, or do all of these cases come through the PUCN?

MS. WAGNER:
It can happen in a matter of ways. Customer gets an overcharge. They call NV Energy. They say this is what happened; I do not understand. NV Energy can try to resolve it. If NV Energy can't resolve it to the satisfaction of the customer, the customer always has the opportunity to take it to the PUCN Consumer Division, and they will look into it, acting on behalf of the customer to try and figure out what is going on. Then, at times, it can be elevated to an investigation, ultimately, all the way up to the commissioners. In this particular case, I think because there was either regulation or tariff on point, I do not know the details of it—actually, I am just guessing at this point—but I think they were limited by what they could do, based on the confines of what is either in regulation or in the tariff.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
Has the PUCN—I mean, obviously, at any time, they probably could have changed this regulation to have a look-back period that went back the entirety of the overcharge period for any given case. Has it just never been addressed during this period of time?

MS. WAGNER:
Unless something rises to the top and bubbles up over everything else going on, it is not likely the Commission is going to look back. They do a review of their regulations periodically. That is required by law and most often by new Governors. They could have done it. I just do not know. Mr. Weir would be the best person to question how they could address it outside of legislation or look back because I think it is really based on something outdated.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
In this situation where the PUCN decided this particular customer was owed the six months back, did that include interest, or was that just the payment for the six months? Do we know for the record?

MS. WAGNER:
I do not know.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
Okay. Is the utility ordered to repay that by the PUCN?

MS. WAGNER:
Yes. They collected the cost from the customer like any kind of business refund, right? They collected more than they should have, and then they are responsible for the refund back to the customer.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
I do not know if you know this from your previous role at the PUCN or if any of you know it from the conversations in the drafting of this bill. Are those overcharge payments ordered to be repaid using ratepayer dollars, or are they shareholder dollars?

MS. WAGNER:
It would have to be shareholder dollars.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
Okay. And is that the way it currently stands, or would we need that statutory clarification in a bill like this to make sure these were profit dollars and not ratepayer dollars?

MS. WAGNER:
I have not thought about it to that degree, and you raise a valid point. I think it is clear if there's an overcharge, the utility shareholders are responsible for that error. It would not be fair to just charge other customers to make up for that difference. I do not know if we need additional clarity in this bill, but it could put a finer point on it and make it abundantly clear.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
Okay.

JULIA HUBBARD (Solar United Neighbors Action):
We support A.B. 452 because it would mandate the Public Utilities Commission thoroughly evaluate fuel cost practices, explore options for a cost-sharing mechanism and assess whether implementing such a policy is in the public

interest. If found in the public interest and implemented, it could also shift some financial responsibility back onto the utility so these costs are shared appropriately with both ratepayers and shareholders sharing the burden. Nevadans are paying some of the highest utility bills in the nation, and this bill provides a pathway toward affordability and stabilization. This bill would also give regulators more time to review utility proposals for general rate cases, promoting greater accountability and improving oversight to protect consumers. We are also very supportive of the requirement that customers receive full refunds with interest when overcharged. This commonsense protection ensures that when billing errors occur, consumers are properly compensated, and utilities are not wrongly holding these funds. We urge your support for this important bill and thank you for your time today.

KAYLYN KARDAVANI (New Day Nevada):
New Day Nevada proudly supports this bill as it is consistent with our commitment to fairness and consumer advocacy. Assembly Bill 452 represents a meaningful step toward leveling the playing field for Nevada utility customers, ensuring they are treated fairly. This bill creates much-needed incentives for the utility to better manage energy costs and also encourages greater investment in homegrown, clean energy sources that can provide long-term cost stability for Nevadans. Thank you again, and we urge your support for A.B. 452.

NADINE KIENHOEFER (Western Resource Advocates):
Western Resource Advocates (WRA) intervenes in both general rate cases and integrated resource planning proceedings at the PUCN, representing and advocating for the interests of everyday Nevadans. The WRA strongly supports A.B. 452 as amended. Sharing the risk that comes from exposure to the volatile nature of natural gas prices can result in a more prudent investment by the utility, encouraging better long-term resource planning and preventing Nevadans from feeling the full effect of spikes in prices. The bill also authorizes the Commission to extend the timeline for certain applications by the utility. The extension could allow regulatory staff, the Bureau of Consumer Protection and interveners more time to adequately examine and analyze these applications when warranted. We urge the committee to support A.B. 452.

JAINA MOAN (The Nature Conservancy):
The Nature Conservancy supports A.B. 452. We think it will help enhance the transparency of fuel costs for utility customers and will help design a fuel cost-

sharing mechanism equitable for all. Thank you to the bill sponsors for bringing the bill forward.

OLIVIA TANAGER (Director, Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter):
I am here in strong support of this bill as well. A lot of my colleagues have echoed the sentiments that I was going to say here today. I will add for the record that the Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter also intervenes in both general rate cases and integrated resource plans; certainly, we would appreciate the extra time to deal with these cases. However, we are really passionate about making sure that everyday Nevadans are able to give input into rate cases and [see] how folks would be affected by rate hikes and impacted by integrated resource plans. For that reason, we appreciate the additional time to provide input both on behalf of advocates and community members. Generally, what we hear from community members regularly is that folks really want to see more utility accountability and more transparency as well. This is a community-backed proposal, and I urge your support.

MARY HOUSE (CEO, Caring, Helping & Restoring Lives, Inc.):
[At] CH&R [Caring, Helping & Restoring Lives], Inc., we work every day to help families in Southern Nevada overcome poverty, find stable employment and access critical resources. I am here to support A.B. 452. You see, every day I hear from families and seniors who are stretched to their breaking point by high NV Energy bills. They're cutting back on lifesaving air conditioning, skipping meals, rationing medicine, and they are still falling behind. For those living on low and fixed income, the cycle of high bills is relentless and dangerous. People are doing everything they can to survive, but they can't keep weathering prolonged periods of unstable electric bills.

Assembly Bill 452 is a much-needed step toward fixing the problem. It gives Nevada households stronger protection; ensures they are fully refunded if overcharged and opens the door to a more stable and affordable energy system. Nevadans deserve an energy system that works for us, not just a monopoly utility. So please support A.B. 452 and help bring real relief to those who need it most. I submitted a letter in support (Exhibit I).

CLOTEA SMITH:
I am just here to let you know that me and my family, we are really struggling. We have to call the utility every month, especially my utility which went from

$50 something to $108. I just got my bill yesterday. I am speaking for people who are on fixed incomes, and I am a senior. So please support this bill.

FREDERICK JAMES SMITH:
I support A.B. 452. It is important for a person like me who is a disabled veteran on a fixed income. Since my arrival here in Las Vegas in 2017, I have seen my electric bill increase over the years, minimum $20 every year. I need and want this bill to be approved on behalf of myself and other veterans who can't afford these high electric bills. I see the construction workers out there fixing the streetlights due to the fact that people have been stealing those wires. I think that we as Nevadans should not have to pay those costs. Maybe that is why the electric bills have been going up. Either way, I do not think it is fair for fixed income people, elderly people, disabled people who do not have money for other things to stretch their minds on paying an increased electric bill. I support A.B. 452, and I hope you guys do also.

CAITLIN GATCHALIAN (Southwest Energy Efficiency Project):
I am here in support of A.B. 452, and I want to echo the sentiments from our partners. I have submitted our letter of support (Exhibit J).

SHAUNDA JOHNSON (Executive Director, Faith in Action Nevada):
Faith in Action Nevada is a statewide faith-based organization, building people power to create systemic change across Nevada's most marginalized communities. At the heart of our work is a simple belief. Every Nevadan deserves to afford basic needs like electricity. But right now, our families are left to carry the full weight of fuel price spikes while NV Energy faces no consequences for poor planning or overcharging customers. When people of faith see this kind of imbalance, where monopoly power is protected and people are not, we are called to act. Assembly Bill 452 gives state regulators the tools to repair a broken system—one that puts all of the risk of high fuel cost on customers and also allows NV Energy to overcharge customers, with only partial refunds. This bill will set these issues right. Our letter (Exhibit K) submitted on behalf of Faith in Action Nevada urges you to support A.B. 452.

MARIA EUGENIA PRENTICE (Chispa Nevada):
I am a volunteer with Chispa Nevada and a resident of the State. I have seen my electric bill increase. The fuel cost is unfair. The electric companies pass 100 percent of this increase to customers. Personally, I cannot afford the payments since my husband recently passed away, and under my care, I have

guardianship of a minor. My pension barely covers my expenses on my household. Therefore, many families like you have heard here in Nevada have gone through the same situation. I strongly ask and beg you to support A.B. 452 which seeks more equivalent distribution of the cost. I consider [in] this proposal as well as being our communities, like the constitution says, we the people are speaking. Please support A.B. 452.

MARLON ANDERSON (Faith Organizing Alliance):
I serve with the clean energy community organized for Faith Organizing Alliance. I would just like to say right now it is the hardworking Nevadans who are on the hook for NV Energy's fuel and power purchase decisions. If fuel prices double or even triple, we have to pay for it, not NV Energy executives or investors. There's something morally wrong with the system that punishes hardworking Nevadans instead of holding the monopoly utility accountable for its bad decisions and mistakes. Assembly Bill 452 gives you a chance to fix that. It helps shift some of the risk of struggling families back where it belongs, which is on NV Energy. On behalf of the community I serve, I urge you to support A.B. 452. Our letter (Exhibit L) on behalf of Faith Organizing Alliance was submitted.

CITTALY AYALA (Chispa Nevada):
I am a volunteer with Chispa Nevada. As a mother, I am a caregiver worker. I strongly support A.B. 452. This law will help families like mine by ensuring the bad energy shares the cost of gas purchases, preventing energy bills from continuing to rise uncontrollably. Assembly Bill 452 will make the company assume part of the responsibility, relieve the burden of our wallet. It is not fair that only we pay the high cost with other benefits. Thank you so much for your support [of] A.B. 452.

LI CHEN (ONE APIA NEVADA):
I am a community organizer with One APIA in Nevada, a grassroots organization that empowers [the] Asian American, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander community across the State. I am here in strong support of A.B. 452. This bill ensures working families are not stuck with paying for utility overcharges and creates a better system where energy companies share responsibility for rising fuel costs. Our community already faces economic burdens, and A.B. 452 brings needed accountability. I urge you to pass the bill.

HECTOR ARREOLA (Nevada Environmental Justice Coalition):
I am the policy fellow with the Nevada Environmental Justice Coalition, and we are here in full support of A.B. 452. Nevadans have been burdened by unfair and unpredictable energy costs. With NV Energy operating as a monopoly, everyday ratepayers shoulder the financial risk while NV Energy and its shareholders remain largely isolated. In recent years, we see corporations hike prices and rake in record-breaking profits all while working families struggle to keep up. NV Energy is no exception, engaging in the same predatory practices. This bill holds NV Energy accountable, and we urge the committee to support A.B. 452. Thank you for your time and dedication to the people of our State.

AUDREY PERAL (Program director, Chispa Nevada):
Our families are already facing high-energy burdens worsened by the outdated energy systems reliant on fossil fuels. When rates go up, it hits our lower-income communities hardest. Our communities deserve a utility system that works for the people, not just for shareholders. Please refer to the letter (Exhibit M) I submitted in support. We urge the committee passage of A.B. 452.

JUAN CARLOS GUARDADO (Chispa Nevada):
I am a community organizer with Chispa Nevada. I would like to share that, like many in our community, I have seen how NV Energy's high electricity costs drain our wallets month after month. In my household, every bill increase means less money for food, medicine or basic needs. Assembly Bill 452 is a fair solution. It requires NV Energy to share the coal and gas cost rather than passing them entirely to our families. For this reason, I urge you to approve this law to relieve the economic pressure for many of us.

TOM DUDAS:
I am in approval of A.B. 452. I go back to the time when the Energy Commission was brought forward to address net metering and the experience with Berkshire Hathaway Energy and the advantages that they were trying to take in that time period against all consumers who were spending a great deal on capital for adding solar panels in the area. They are looking at some large transmission lines too, and this is where I feel the accounting that is a direct [link]. Adopting [A.B. 452] to take place is extremely important.

Berkshire Hathaway Energy was found guilty by the DOJ of overcharging all the people of Clark County and the State. It is now a question as to their transmission lines going from state to state; interstate commerce should be

looking at it in the federal sense, but I doubt that is going to happen. They are owners of ten power companies over ten states. So one little household to dispute the bill is Goliath being brought down by David and a little rock, and it is pretty hard to do.

This mention of gas power pricing to the electrical billing is also a question in accounting as they are moving to greater solar use with a battery backup to service since we do not have any gas lines producing gas in the State. It is the accounting of what is being charged on transport lines. Again, this is a look back at Enron and how they cheated their public. There are many criminal natures to a private utility company sought to be purchased at one time when it was a public utility and stocks could be purchased for individuals to own.

JOHN MICHAEL MORALES:
I proudly served in the United States Air Force, retiring after 22 years. I am here today in support of A.B. 452 because transparency is not allowed, it is a duty. When I served, we talked. We were taught that leadership and integrity meant owning every decision you make and being accountable to the people you serve. I believe that principle should apply to public utilities. Nevadans deserve to know where their money is going, especially when prices soar and families are left to shoulder the costs without explanation. Assembly Bill 452 brings long overdue transparency to the system. It demands oversight, accountability and fairness values that are the backbone of good governance and quality service. It is not about politics; it is about trust. You could not refuse overcharged customers. This bill makes sure they make it right with interest. I urge you to support A.B. 452.

MATHILDA MILLER (Native Voters Alliance Nevada):
We are in strong support of A.B. 452. Let's be honest. The current system only works if you are the utility. It does not work for elders who are forced to choose between lifesaving prescriptions and their power bill. It does not work for families who are trying to get through triple-digit summers while wondering if they can afford to run the AC. It does not work for families who suddenly have to stretch their pockets and their paycheck even further when their energy doubles overnight through no fault of their own.

The current system protects shareholder profits. Assembly Bill 452 protects the people. Right now, utilities pass 100 percent of fuel cost volatility directly on to ratepayers. That's no risk to shareholders, no accountability for poor planning,

and Nevadans are left holding the bill. This is course correction. It begins to shift the burden back to where it belongs—onto the utility that profits from our basic nonnegotiable need to keep the lights on and heat running in our home. This bill is about fairness. It is about transparency, and it is about building on an energy system that finally puts working families, not corporations, at the center of the conversation. We should be moving toward greater public accountability. We should be fighting for affordability. This bill is a step in the right direction. Where is your support?

CALLIE MCKENNA (Advanced Energy United):
Advanced Energy United is a national business trade association of advanced energy technologies and services, banning both utility scale and distribution level. We engage both in the legislative realm as well as the regulatory, intervening in integrated resource plans and other relevant proceedings with the PUCN. We are here in support of A.B. 452 and believe the investigatory docket will lead to increased transparency, ratepayer protection and future alignment of investments with ratepayer and state interests. We respectfully urge the committee to support A.B. 452.

CHAUNTILLE ROBERTS (Regional Director, Vote Solar):
I am here today in support of A.B. 452 because it is time for NV Energy systems to work for people, for ratepayers, not just utility shareholders. We submitted a letter, Exhibit H; please refer to the letter. We ask you to support A.B. 452.

TAMI ROMO:
I am touched by all the good testimony put forward for this bill. Nevada used to be a place where we can come live and not have many worries about how we were going to survive. It is not like that anymore. We're getting hit in every which way we turn with high gas prices, high utilities, high food prices. It has been unbearable at times; sometimes, we never know what it is going to bring and how high our bills are going to be. That is a scary thought, and we need to do something. We need to have truth, honesty and transparency, and find a way so that we can survive and not have to stress about how and where we are going to pay our next bill. I definitely support A.B. 452.

RYAN BELLOWS (NV Energy):
I am the vice president of government and external relations at NV Energy. I am here today in opposition to A.B. 452. While we heard from the bill proponents

that this bill is to enact a cost-sharing mechanism, I would tell you that the purpose of this bill is really to prevent us from utilizing natural gas to serve our customers and to build out Nevada's energy infrastructure for economic development. They want us to rely exclusively on renewable energy, which we simply cannot do. The technology just is not there.

While storage technology has really come a long way, solar and storage alone is not going to serve Nevada's energy needs, certainly not with the level of growth being asked of us to serve. I would tell you that we are already a leader in renewable energy, a national leader. In fact, we just reported that in the year 2024, we actually served our customers with over 47 percent renewable energy.

We will be completely out of coal by the end of 2025. We are well on our way to hitting the goal or the mandate in 2030 of serving our customers with 50 percent renewable energy. I would certainly put up our record on renewable energy with any other utility in the nation. Without the tools necessary to really meet the growth and level of request we are seeing, this bill will stifle economic development. Passing this bill would really be a signal to markets that Nevada is no longer open for business and that it cannot support new economic development. It is a misnomer to think that we can spend whatever we want to buy energy for our customers.

We heard folks say there is no stake in the game for us. Well, that is not correct. We do not mark up any of these purchases we make, but every single dollar that we spend on a market purchase is reviewed by the PUCN, the Commission's staff and also the consumer advocate. The Commission already has full authority to deny any cost recovery for any purchase made that they deem to be imprudent. Over the years, the Commission has used this power several times. We do have a stake in the game, and there are consequences to the decisions and the purchases we make. The existing system works. This bill really attempts to provide a solution for a problem that just does not exist.

I want to speak for just a second on the cost issue. Really, we heard a lot about predictability and stability. The only way to ensure perfect stability and predictability would be to go to a long-term hedging model. We know that when you pursue these hedging contracts, all it does is raise costs for our customers, so that is not a good model to go to.

Chair Nguyen, you had a few questions on the refund issue. One portion of the bill attempts to address that issue, and I just want to clarify a few of the misconceptions out there on this issue. NV Energy complies with Commission-approved rules on customer refunds. For the vast majority of billing errors that occur, Rule 5 governs refunds back to the date on which the error occurred. The utility then reimburses back to the date of the error, reimburses that to the customer.

Rule 2 has been an issue in recent cases, and that is just a specific subset or specific error. That is where a customer receives service under the wrong rate schedule. When that occurs, the rule is a six-month payment back to the customer. We are currently communicating with the Commission on this issue on how to address, improve and correct this rule going forward. We think this solution is better served to be fashioned in the regulatory side of the house, and we are certainly committed to addressing that. In sum, I would just tell you that the regulations and the process that we have in place today are really working for our customers. We would urge you to vote no on A.B. 452.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
Mr. Bellows, what do you have internally before it rises to the level of a customer who has been overcharged or suspects they have been overcharged for any period of time, whether it is one billing cycle or six years of billing cycles? What type of mechanisms do you have in place internally to address and resolve some of those? Or do you wait for them all to resolve at the PUCN?

MR. BELLOWS:
The rules are in place, and they govern how refunds work. When an error comes to our attention, either we uncover it or a customer comes to us and identifies an error. We then look to the appropriate rule and make the payment. Oftentimes, the PUCN does not have any involvement in that refund payment.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
Is there anything that stops you from—I know you referenced Rule 2 that goes back to a six-month time period. Is there anything in that rule, the PUCN rules, that prohibits you from refunding that customer who was overcharged for six years?

MR. BELLOWS:
I can look into that and see if there is any prohibition on that. I am not currently aware of any.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
I am just wondering why it would have to rise to that level. That is a pretty egregious statement if someone overpaid for six years and then only recovers six months of that because of this regulation. I am just curious if you feel like your company is limited in that recovery, you are just choosing that because that is what the PUCN already said, or if you can go above and beyond and recover, making that customer right in that situation. Does it take legislative action to make sure we are doing the right thing here?

MR. BELLOWS:
[Given] some of those errors, there was a little bit of discussion around who makes that repayment. Those rules govern that, depending on the type of error, the Commission would determine who makes that payment. We would not want to be in the practice of making any kind of overpayment over and above the rules if it is not paid by us, if it is recovered through other customers, for example.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
Do you have a way to distinguish when you are making these repayments for a customer overcharged for, let us say, the maximum right now is six months? Do you have a way of determining whether or not that is from shareholder profits or if that is from ratepayer dollars?

MR. BELLOWS:
It would depend on the type of error, and we would seek Commission input on how that error is to be paid and recovered.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
Can you describe an error that would come from ratepayers as opposed to shareholder dollars?

MR. BELLOWS:
I would have to look back and get that information. I will provide it to the committee.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
I am just really curious about that. Obviously, it is concerning that I am hearing [of] a situation where a customer was overcharged for six years and only able to recover six months of that overcharging. Then it turns out it could be a situation where ratepayer dollars are being used to pay back that person that was overcharged in the first place. If you can get that information, that would be really helpful in seeing the full picture when you respond to this. As far as some of these other issues on reporting the impact on the customer, do you have any issues with some of those requirements as far as the other portions of the bill?

MR. BELLOWS:
Could you clarify what other portions, specifically?

CHAIR NGUYEN:
I am really not sure I understand what opposition you have to this investigatory docket that just examines how the cost for purchased fuel and purchased power are currently passed through to customers. Is there something so overburdensome in that transparency piece that would lead to higher costs for you all and, ultimately, the ratepayer?

MR. BELLOWS:
Our position is that the adoption of fuel cost-sharing would lead to increased costs for customers. The investigatory dockets—it is not simply an investigatory docket being asked for in this bill. It also gives the authority for the Commission to adopt regulations and rulemaking to carry out that piece. Typically, that is not how the investigatory docket works. The investigatory docket usually occurs, and then there's a recommendation. I think the concern, as I stated at the beginning, is if fuel cost-sharing is implemented, it will simply raise costs for customers.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
I guess it is not automatic in the bill. The PUCN would still have to use that data they are collecting to determine whether or not that is the appropriate mechanism. Am I incorrect on that?

MR. BELLOWS:
That is correct.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
So, this does not mandate the PUCN to do any of these things. It just says that they should collect this stuff; if it turns out there are added costs and there could be cost savings to the customers, then they could institute some of this cost-sharing. Am I understanding that incorrectly?

MR. BELLOWS:
That is also how I understand it.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
I appreciate you taking the time to answer some of those questions.

DANNY THOMPSON (International Brotherhood of Electric Workers Local 396 and Local 1245):
Nevada moved away from these types of risky policies after the early 2000s when California had their energy crisis that had rolling blackouts, energy spikes and utility failures. We spent decades rebuilding our system here and making a better system. And it works today. Today, utilities recover fuel costs only after they've been approved by the PUCN. Our members are the men and women who keep natural gas and our power plants running and keep the lights on in Nevada. Make no mistake, A.B. 452 is the first step toward phasing out natural gas and phasing out their jobs as well.

ROBERT PURDY (Northern Nevada Development Authority):
I will keep it short and ditto Mr. Thompson's comments, but we believe it just adds unnecessary complexity without clear benefits to any of the parties.

NICK SCHNEIDER (Vegas Chamber):
I will also echo the comments made by those who testified before me and just quickly add that we do have some continued concerns over the uncertainty this creates with infrastructure updates and expansion and the negative impact that can have on our economic growth for the State.

WENDY COLBORNE (Building and Construction Trades Council of Northern Nevada):
We do applaud the sponsor’s efforts and intent. We remain concerned that A.B. 452 stretches timelines and increases uncertainty for projects which would be detrimental for our trades. When uncertainty and market conditions increase, energy investment declines, and it is not just projects that stall, it is also

livelihoods. Nevada's skilled tradespeople face fewer job opportunities, and apprenticeships get put on hold. These are not just numbers on a spreadsheet. Each job represents someone's ability to provide for their family and contribute to our community. Our concern is that this bill could significantly reduce investment in energy projects in our State, directly impacting the men and women who build, maintain and operate these critical facilities. Northern Nevada Building Trades therefore opposes A.B. 452.

TOMAS HAMMOND (Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance):
We'd echo the comments in opposition that have been made.

CARLOS HERNANDEZ (Nevada State AFL-CIO):
We like to echo the comments made by our affiliates in the IBEW [International Brotherhood of Electric Workers] and the building trades and express our opposition to A.B. 452. The Nevada State AFL-CIO sincerely appreciates Assemblymember Brown-May's commitment to engaging with labor stakeholders, and we encourage continued dialogue with the IBEW and the building trades to reach a solution that works best for all parties involved.

ZOE HOUGHTON (National Electrical Contractors Association-Northern Nevada):
Just would like to echo the comments previously, particularly related to the uncertainty with infrastructure and economic development.

TOM CLARK (Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce):
I am here in opposition to A.B. 452. And you are absolutely right, Madam Chair. It is not necessarily the study of the information that is making us nervous. It is the outcome that could come because of that. We recognize that the PUCN—and if you have ever sat through a PUCN hearing on these types of cases, they are very, very thorough on how the utility can recover those costs for the fuels they have to buy.

I think the movement that the utility has made, getting away from coal and going to more stable prices like natural gas is good. More importantly, closer to my heart is the amount of solar and renewable energy—whether it is geothermal or any of those renewable energy sources that are on the horizon. We are making progress there. It is good progress, and we support that as well. But for this particular reason, on the cost-sharing side, we are opposed to this legislation.

RONNIE YOUNG (International Brotherhood of Electric Workers Local 357):
We stand in solidarity with our outside IBEW Locals.

WENDI NEWMAN (Southern Nevada Chapter, National Electrical Contractors Association):
Assembly Bill 452 could lead to less spending on energy infrastructure, which means fewer opportunities in construction, maintenance and operations. We respectfully urge you to vote no on A.B. 452.

AARON IBARRA (Southern Nevada Building Trades Union):
We'd like to ditto our brothers and sisters at the IBEW.

PETER GUZMAN (Latin Chamber of Commerce):
We are opposed to this legislation, and we stand with our brothers and sisters at IBEW and others, including the small business members who absolutely want Nevada to be considered open for business, open for investment. That is what we want to continue to see in the future and why we are opposed to this bill which would take us backwards.

THOMAS BIRD (Nevada Alliance for Retired Americans):
I am here opposing A.B. 452 as currently amended. I am speaking on behalf of the Nevada Alliance for Retired Americans with 20,000 members statewide. Adding complexity and risk to the current system, which is already reviewed and studied, will ultimately raise bills and increase cost to our members. Low- and fixed-income customers are most affected by rate fluctuation. Any instability, no matter how moderate, creates uncertainty for seniors on fixed incomes who could already be making decisions on whether to buy lifesaving medications or food. Assembly Bill 452 just adds cumbersome process and no real value to customers. For these reasons, we urge a no vote on A.B. 452.

EMILY OSTERBERG (Henderson Chamber of Commerce):
There are over 2,000 members with the Chamber of Commerce, the majority of whom are small businesses, who express their opposition to A.B. 452. While the bill is well-intentioned, it does introduce an unnecessary risk into a utility cost-recovery system already working effectively for Nevada's residents and businesses. The risk created by this bill is particularly concerning for Nevada's business community which relies on predictable and affordable electricity to operate, invest and grow. Increased financial risk for utilities can lead to delayed infrastructure development or higher rates. It also threatens Nevada's

attractiveness to new investment, particularly for energy-intensive industries evaluating long-term commitments to the State. In short, A.B. 452 adds more regulatory process without delivering clear value to customers. For these reasons, we are opposed to A.B. 452.

JACOB HAAS (International Brotherhood of Electric Workers Local 401):
I am representing over 1,100 members, and we are in opposition to this bill for the delayed infrastructure and the risk of putting my members out of work as these delays happen. We believe the way it is working right now should not be changed.

GARRETT WEIR (General Counsel, Public Utilities Commission of Nevada):
I would just like to express our gratitude to Assemblymember Brown-May for her outreach to the PUCN and for incorporating our feedback into the revised version. Next, I would like to just briefly clarify the status of the customer refunds discussed and specifically addressed by section 1.7 of the bill. This matter is currently pending before the Commission's Consumer Complaint Resolution Division. My understanding is that the Commission will be receiving a forthcoming recommendation as to those refunds. The applicability and interpretation of some of those timelines and tariff provisions are potentially currently in dispute.

Depending on the recommendation from the Consumer Complaint Resolution Division, the Commission would then hear that matter and resolve those disputed issues. The proposed change to statute would certainly clarify what the rule would be; to the extent that the rules adopted by the Commission do not reflect that standard, they would need to be revised. But there may currently be a dispute as to whether the Commission's adopted tariffs already require full refunds under the circumstances presented.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
I think you probably know where I am going. Mr. Bellows with NV Energy had indicated how it would depend on who was at fault or the determination from the PUCN given some of those overcharges. If a customer overpaid and they were awarded that back payment for those six months currently in regulation, it would depend on the circumstances on who would pay that, whether it be ratepayer dollars or shareholder dollars. Do you know of any circumstances where there's a distinction between ratepayer dollars as opposed to shareholder dollars?

MR. WEIR:
I want to be careful because this is something that is going to likely be pending or is pending before the Commission. I guess [it would surface in] the investigatory phase with the Consumer Complaint Resolution Division and then before the Commission itself potentially.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
If that is the case, I do not want you to talk about an open pending case. But have you had other overpayment cases resolved in different ways, whether it is shareholder dollars or ratepayer dollars?

MR. WEIR:
I would have to get back to you on that. These rates are set based on the historic or expected revenues from different customer classes. In this circumstance or something similar to it where there is an overcollection from a customer, based on which customer class they are placed in, the utility would be receiving revenue in error based on what the revenue was supposed to be based on—the rates that were in effect. Under that circumstance, I am not familiar with any instances where customers would pay for that difference. Theoretically, the revenue had already been generated that was allowed pursuant to writs.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
Would you have to make a specific finding at the PUCN on a situation like that where the overpayment is required to be paid back by the utility that overcharged the customer, and those overpayment amounts could not be made using—that customer could not be made whole by using ratepayer dollars? Would you have to make that specific determination?

MR. WEIR:
It is likely that cost recovery for those sorts of things would show up in a future rate case. Those issues could be addressed at that time by the Commission and other parties. Whether there was an overcollection, the fault of the circumstances would generally be addressed pursuant to the consumer complaint process. As described in the initial testimony regarding the bill, an informal sort of mediation process initiates with the Consumer Complaint Resolution Division through which the independent investigatory arm of the Commission engages with the customer and the utility to resolve disputes. The vast majority of the time, those disputes are resolved. The customer is satisfied

with the results, and it never comes before the decision-making body. In the event those disputes are not resolved informally, then they are transmitted to the Commission for review, and there can be a hearing where further information is gathered.

CHAIR NGUYEN:
Obviously, it is not clear. I have concerns we are using ratepayer dollars to pay back overpayments by a utility. I know this is an existing regulation or rule to only go six months back. Has the PUCN ever thought about changing that, or were you there when the six months was adopted? Do you have PUCN history, as opposed to a legislative history, on how you determined that six months was appropriate? Especially in a situation where you have someone overpaying for six years, an average consumer might not even realize they are overpaying. One, I am curious about the rule development, and two, whether or not there's ever been any indication to revisit that six-month determination.

MR. WEIR:
That is the specific issue I expect to be in front of the Commission; has the Commission adopted that standard for this particular utility under those circumstances? The interpretation and application of those tariff provisions are likely contested and will come before the Commission. My expectation is that we will be seeing a recommendation soon from the Commission's independent investigatory arm, the regulatory operations staff of the Commission which houses the Consumer Complaint Resolution Division.

CYRUS HOJJATY:
I will just echo what he just pointed out, a lot of good points.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER BROWN-MAY:
You know what they say when both sides are mad—you probably have a good policy. So first, I must acknowledge the good work of our labor brothers and sisters and the importance of good and safe jobs. Our IBEW friends are really important to make sure that we have consistency in our utility. Then I must call the consistency of the lights being on in this building and many others across our great State. The utilities work to supply our energy is commendable, and I appreciate their work to address overpayments and to talk through the complexities.

We must also acknowledge the good work of the Nevada Conservation League and their work to ensure we have healthy, fair and transparent energy policy for our community. Finally, we have to trust the PUCN and their work, their process and their professional skill set to carry out their charge. On behalf of my constituents who are concerned about affordability, transparency and their energy cost, this measure simply asks for our state Commission to open an investigatory docket so we can discover the right policy. And then we are asking to address overcharges.

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

CHAIR NGUYEN:
We will close the hearing on A.B. 452. With no public comment or further business, the meeting is adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Diane Rea,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Rochelle T. Nguyen, Chair

DATE:

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	**Exhibit Letter**	**Introduced on Minute Report Page No.**	**Witness / Entity**	**Description**
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
A.B. 46	C	3	Julianne King	Work Session Document
A.B. 55	D	3	Julianne King	Work Session Document
A.B. 174	E	4	Julianne King	Work Session Document
A.B. 361	F	4	Julianne King	Work Session Document
A.B. 417	G	4	Julianne King	Work Session Document
A.B. 452	H	8	Christi Cabrera-Georgeson	Group Letter in Support
A.B. 452	I	13	Mary House / CHR, Inc.	Support Letter
A.B. 452	J	14	Caitlin Gatchalian / Southwest Energy Efficiency Project	Support Letter
A.B. 452	K	14	Shaunda Johnson / Faith in Action Nevada	Support Letter
A.B. 452	L	15	Marlon Anderson / Faith Organizing Alliance	Support Letter
A.B. 452	M	16	Audrey Peral / Chispa Nevada	Support Letter