

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW OF ADOPTED REGULATIONS--NRS 233B.066**  
**Informational Statement**  
**LCB File No. R031-21**

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

The regulation revises the discounted electric rates that must be charged pursuant to the Economic Development Electric Rate Rider Program as a percentage of the base tariff energy rate to reflect the revisions to the discounted electric rates enacted by Senate Bill 448 (2021).

**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 Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (“Commission”), <http://puc.nv.gov>, mailed to all county libraries in Nevada, 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) Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy (“SPPC”) and Nevada Power Company (“NPC” and together with SPPC “NV Energy”); Jeffrey Galloway; and the Regulatory Operations Staff (“Staff”) of the Commission filed comments in the matter prior to the draft regulation language being sent to the Legislative Counsel Bureau (“LCB”) for review. Following LCB review, NV Energy, filed comments. The comments generally supported the proposed regulation.<sup>1</sup>

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

//

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Galloway’s comments were critical of the Economic Development Rate Rider Program, generally, and therefore critical of the regulation, however, Mr. Galloway did not appear at either of the Workshops or the Hearing, nor did he file comments related to the draft regulation language following LCB review.

3. **The number of persons who:**
  - (a) **Attended each hearing:** 4
  - (b) **Testified at each hearing:** 4
  - (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.**

Roman Borisov  
NV Energy  
6100 Neil Road  
Reno, Nevada 89511  
(775) 834-3470  
[Roman.Borisov@nvenergy.com](mailto:Roman.Borisov@nvenergy.com)

Curt R. Ledford  
Attorney for Haas Automation, Inc.  
Davison Van Cleve PC  
300 S. 4th Street, Suite 1400.  
Las Vegas, NV 89101  
(725) 735-1718  
[crl@dvclaw.com](mailto:crl@dvclaw.com)

Baird Fogel  
Attorney for Haas Automation, Inc.  
Morgan Lewis  
One Market, Spear Street Tower, 28th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105-1596  
United States  
(415) 442-1170  
[baird.fogel@morganlewis.com](mailto:baird.fogel@morganlewis.com)

Christine Greve  
Regulatory Operations Staff of the Commission  
1150 East William Street  
Carson City, Nevada 89701  
(702) 486-7904  
[cgreve@puc.nv.gov](mailto:cgreve@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 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.**

The regulation language, as returned from LCB, was acceptable to all participants, and accomplished the purpose of the rulemaking.

- 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 economic effect on the businesses the regulation is to regulate due to the regulatory accounting allowances discussed in ¶ 7 of the December 2, 2021, Commission Order adopting the Small Business Impact Report.

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

The regulation does not regulate 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.**

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?**

The Staff of the Commission 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 No. 21-06037 on December 2, 2021.