

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW OF ADOPTED REGULATIONS--NRS 233B.066
Informational Statement
LCB File No. R106-19

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

The regulation sets forth energy storage system procurement targets supported by the underlying record in Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (“PUCN”) Docket No. 17-07014, as contemplated by Senate Bill 204 (2017), codified as NRS 704.796 and 704.797.

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 at the website of the PUCN, <http://puc.nv.gov>, mailed to all county libraries in Nevada, and published in the following newspapers or at the following locations:

Ely Times
Las Vegas Review Journal
Nevada Appeal
Reno Gazette Journal
Tonopah Times-Bonanza

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) In response to the LCB-revised version of the regulation, the Attorney General’s Bureau of Consumer Protection (“BCP”) filed comments. Able Grid Energy Solutions (“Able Grid”); BCP; Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy and Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy (together “NV Energy”); Tesla, Inc. (“Tesla”); and the Regulatory Operations Staff (“Staff”) of the Commission appeared at the March 2, 2020 workshop and March 3, 2020 hearing. BCP, NV Energy, Tesla, and Staff expressed support for the regulation and Able Grid made no comment.

(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: 1

///

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.

Angela Dykema
Dykema Strategies on behalf of Able Grid
1495 Canyon Boulevard
Suite 218
Boulder, Colorado 80302
angie.dykema@gmail.com

Paul E. Stuhff
BCP
8945 West Russell Road, Suite 204
Las Vegas, Nevada 89148-1226
(702) 486-3490
pstuhff@ag.nv.gov

Douglas Brooks
NV Energy
6226 West Sahara Avenue
P.O. Box 98910
Las Vegas, Nevada
(702) 402-5697
dbrooks@nvenergy.com

Sarah Van Cleve
Tesla
6800 Dumbarton Circle
Fremont, CA 94555
svanclave@tesla.com

Shelly Cassity
Staff
9075 West Diablo Drive, Suite 250
Las Vegas, Nevada 89148
(702) 486-7218
scassity@puc.nv.gov

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.

The summary may be obtained based upon instructions in 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.**

No participant suggested any changes to the LCB-revised regulation, so no changes were made.

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 does not impose any adverse or beneficial economic effect on the businesses the regulation is to regulate.

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

The regulation does not regulate the public and is not expected to have any economic effect on the public.

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

Any costs associated with the regulation are considered incremental in nature.

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.**

The regulation does not overlap any other State, governmental agency, or federal regulations.

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 that incorporates elements of the Policy Delphi method 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 PUCN that the PUCN 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 PUCN 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 No. 17-07014 on October March 3, 2020.