

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW OF ADOPTED REGULATIONS--NRS 233B.066
Informational Statement
LCB File No. R055-18

1. A clear and concise explanation of the need for the adopted regulation.

The regulation implements Senate Bill 150 (2017) and Assembly Bill 223 (2017).

2. Description of how public comment was solicited, a summary of public response, and an explanation of how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

(a) Copies of the proposed regulation, notice of intent to act upon the regulation and notice of workshop and hearing were sent by U.S. mail and email to persons who were known to have an interest in the subjects of noticing and interventions. These documents were also made available on the website of the PUCN, <http://puc.nv.gov>, mailed to all county libraries in Nevada, the State library, and the Legislative Council Bureau, published in the following newspapers:

Ely Times
Las Vegas Review Journal
Reno Gazette Journal
Tonopah Times-Bonanza,

and posted at the following locations:

Public Utilities Commission 1150 East William Street Carson City, Nevada 89701	Public Utilities Commission 9075 West Diablo Drive, Suite 250 Las Vegas, Nevada 89148
--	---

(b) The Regulatory Operations Staff of the Commission (“Staff”) filed comments. Staff recommended several amendments to the proposed regulation. The Attorney General’s Bureau of Consumer Protection (“BCP”) did not submit written comments, but participated in the hearing. Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy and Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy (together, “NV Energy”) also submitted comments. NV Energy proposed two amendments to the proposed regulation that would result in separate energy savings goals for the Northern and Southern divisions.

Southwest Energy Efficiency Project, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and Western Resource Advocates (together, “Joint Commenters”) filed comments. Joint Commenters recommended adopting a goal of no less than 1.1 percent savings starting in 2020 and proposed to allow utilities with the same parent company to meet the energy savings goals for the utilities in combination.

(c) Copies of the transcripts of the proceedings are available for review at the offices of the PUCN: 1150 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada 89701 and 9075 West Diablo Drive, Suite 250, Las Vegas, Nevada 89148.

3. **The number of persons who:**
 - (a) **Attended each hearing: 5**
 - (b) **Testified at each hearing: 5**
 - (c) **Submitted written comments: 3**
4. **For each person identified in paragraphs (b) and (c) of number 3 above, the following information if provided to the agency conducting the hearing:**
 - (a) **Name;**
 - (b) **Telephone number;**
 - (c) **Business address;**
 - (d) **Business telephone number;**
 - (e) **Electronic mail address; and**
 - (f) **Name of entity or organization represented.**

Louise Uttinger
Regulatory Operations Staff of the PUCN
1150 East William Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701
(702) 686-7218
uttinger@puc.nv.gov

Michael Saunders
Attorney General Bureau of Consumer Protection
Sr. Deputy Attorney General
10791 West Twain Avenue
Suite 10
Las Vegas, Nevada 89148
(702) 486-3793
msaunders@ag.nv.gov

Douglas Brooks
Assistant General Counsel
NV Energy
6226 West Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89150
(702) 402-5697
dbrooks@nvenergy.com

Cameron Dyer
Western Resource Advocates
Staff Attorney
550 West Musser Street
Suite H

Carson City, Nevada 89703
(775) 430-4632
cameron.dyer@westernresources.org

Howard Geller
Southwest Energy Efficiency Project
Executive Director
2334 Broadway
Suite A
Boulder, Colorado 80304
hgeller@swenergy.org
(303) 447- 0078

5. A description of how comment was solicited from affected businesses, a summary of their response and an explanation of how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

Comments were solicited from affected businesses in the same manner as they were solicited from the public, as provided in response to question 2(a); the summary of comments received is reflected in response to question 2(b); and the summary may be obtained as instructed in the response to question 2(c).

6. If the regulation was adopted without changing any part of the proposed regulation, a summary of the reasons for adopting the regulation without change.

Based on discussion in the workshop conducted prior to the hearing, the proposed regulation was amended by the Commission to further reflect the intent of the legislation. Not all amendments proposed by participants were incorporated.

7. The estimated economic effect of the regulation on the business which it is to regulate and on the public. These must be stated separately, and in each case must include: both adverse and beneficial effects, and both immediate and long-term effects.

(a) Estimated economic effect on the businesses which they are to regulate.

The regulation would result in immediate beneficial effect on the businesses it is intended to regulate by increasing the Energy Efficiency Implementation Rate.

(b) Estimated economic effect on the public which they are to regulate.

The regulation would result in immediate and long term beneficial effect on the public. The proposed regulations will likely create new jobs and participants in the additional energy savings programs will see the benefit of lower bills.

8. The estimated cost to the agency for enforcement of the proposed regulation:

No additional costs are associated with the regulation.

9. A description of any regulations of other State or governmental agencies which the regulation overlaps or duplicates and a statement explaining why the duplication or overlap is necessary. If the regulation overlaps or duplicates a federal regulation, the name of the regulating federal agency.

N/A

- 10. If the regulation includes provisions that are more stringent than a federal regulation that regulates the same activity, a summary of such provisions.**

N/A

- 11. If the regulation provides a new fee or increases an existing fee, the total annual amount the agency expects to collect and the manner in which the money will be used.**

N/A

- 12. If the proposed regulation is likely to impose a direct and significant burden upon a small business or directly restrict the formation, operation or expansion of a small business, what methods did the agency use in determining the impact of the regulation on a small business?**

Staff conducted a Delphi Method exercise to determine the impact of this proposed regulation on small businesses. The Delphi Method is a systematic, interactive, forecasting method based on independent inputs of selected experts. In this instance, the participants were members of Staff. Each participant in the exercise used his background and expertise to reflect upon and analyze the impact of the proposed regulation on small businesses. Based upon Staff's analysis, Staff recommended to the Commission that the Commission find that the proposed regulation will not impose a direct and significant economic burden on small businesses or directly restrict the formation, operation or expansion of a small business. The Commission accepted Staff's recommendation and found that the proposed regulation does not impose a direct or significant economic burden upon small businesses, nor does it directly restrict the formation, operation, or expansion of a small business, and therefore a small business impact statement pursuant to NRS 233B.0608(2) is not required. This finding was memorialized in an Order issued in Docket Nos. 17-07011 and 17-08023 on August 20, 2018.