

MINUTES
New Energy Industry Task Force (NEITF)
Subcommittee on Business Case
(Development of Key Metrics, Draft RFP and Manage Business Case)
September 19, 2012
11:00 a.m.

The meeting was held via conference call

- 1. Call to order and Roll Call.** Ian Rogoff, Co-Chairman opened the meeting at 11:00 a.m. and opened this agenda item

<u>Member Names</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Ian Rogoff, Co-Chair	X	
Ellen Allman	X	
Tom Morley		X
John Candelaria	X	
Alex Gamboa	X	
Dan Jacobsen	X	
Paul Thomsen	X	
Jason Geddes, Co-Chair	X	
Joni Eastley	X	
Kathleen Drakulich	X	
Jim Baak		X
James Settelmeyer	X	
Sue Stephens	X	
Jack McGinley	X	

- 2. Public Comment and Discussion.**

Members of the public in attendance: Wendy Ellis; Shannon Hogan, Holland and Hart; Brenda Gilbert, BEC Environmental, Inc.

Chairman Ian Rogoff noted that public comments will be permitted on agenda matters which are before the Subcommittee for consideration or action. He asked that comments be limited to three minutes. Ms. Crowley noted that a copy of the revised Synapse Report was not yet available. There being no further public comments, this agenda item was closed.

- 3. Review and Approval of Minutes from September 7, 2012 Business Case Subcommittee.**

This agenda item was opened. Jason Geddes made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded by Alex Gamboa. The motion was put to a vote and passed unanimously. The agenda item was closed.

4. Discussion and possible action regarding goals and recommendations.

Ms. Crowley commented there are a lot of questions on the report, which she noted need to be addressed by Synapse.

Chair Ian Rogoff summarized several points, which resonated from the feedback that was received. The first item discussed was that commentary should be skipped and opinions should be limited. Secondly, comparisons should have been made regarding private and public investment, and that those differences should be separated out. Next he noted that direct revenue contributions from the State of Nevada was absent from the report. Lastly, Chair Rogoff noted that the induced benefits were too general with regard to the rationale as far as developing any kind of industrial base.

John Candelaria noted an issue not addressed in the report was the mutual benefits associated with resource sharing. He also noted that due to the environmental and cost factors, it is probably cheaper to develop renewable energy in Nevada than it is in California. He would be satisfied if the report indicated what the economic effectiveness for developing renewable resources in Nevada along with the list that Chair Rogoff had already summarized. Mr. Candelaria added he would like it stated where there is not going to be any cost burden to the Nevada ratepayers.

Jason Geddes expressed a concern as to whether there was an analysis conducted to support some of the hanging opinions expressed in the report.

Ms. Crowley agreed that the commentary from Synapse was "not giving us a clear picture."

Dan Jacobsen suggested the report skip commentary. He noted there were many places in the report where opinions were expressed instead of an analysis. He requested clarification of what he termed a "bold statement" in the report with regard to taking at face value the prices California is willing to pay Nevada to serve as an energy supplier. Paul Thomsen noted his interpretation of the same paragraph as being completely different than that of Mr. Jacobsen. He stated, "We have to be careful about not cherry picking sentences," but maybe it should be reworded. Mr. Thomsen also remarked that a simple summary or bullet points should be included with the scenarios that are vague.

Chair Rogoff noted there was no real evidence to suggest that the concern with public versus private ratepayer impacts was tackled in a meaningful way.

Jack McGinley stated sometimes opinions can be helpful as long as these opinions contain conclusions. He was curious as to how the economic and jobs benefits to the state were addressed in the final report.

James Settelmeyer expressed concerns with regard to the loss of jobs in Nevada, and if the cost of energy is raised in the state, and what effect that would have on Nevada's ability to recruit businesses into the state. He suggested Synapse provide more elaboration on these points.

Ellen Allman stated all the discussions thus far addressed her concerns.

Joni Eastley admitted the report was acceptable to her, but she did express a concern with "not having any place to put all the folks coming into town" for development of renewable energy resources.

Kathleen Drakulich expressed a desire to see some support for some of the commentary. And if the commentary is not supportable, then she agreed it should come out.

Chair Rogoff explained that the question is whether there is a business case to develop renewable power for Nevada to sell to California, and does this report answer that question? He noted that Ms. Crowley has to make a final recommendation to the Governor.

Ms. Crowley commented that the mutual benefits need to be discussed further. She noted that in her opinion "this report does not solidify a business case one way or another". Mr. Candelaria added the report provides a narrow definition of a business case. He noted qualitative assessment of resource sharing options and renewable energy exchanges should be added to the report.

5. Discussion of future agenda items and announcements.

Ms. Crowley will work with Synapse to identify their plans moving forward.

6. Set time and date of next meeting.

It was noted that a meeting of the full Task Force will be held this date, September 19, at 1:00 p.m. The time and date for the next Business Case Subcommittee meeting will be announced at a later date.

7. Public Comment and Discussion.

Wendy Ellis (Las Vegas) commented that the project is not a good investment because "there's an election coming up and the country's economy is in a terrible state as is the economy of our state."

8. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.