



**GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF ENERGY**

**MINUTES**  
**Committee on Energy Choice**

May 9, 2018

The Committee on Energy Choice held a public meeting on May 9, 2018, beginning at 12:00 P.M. at the following location:

Legislative Counsel Bureau  
401 S. Carson Street, Room 1214  
Carson City, NV 89701

The meeting was also available via videoconference at:  
Grant Sawyer State Building  
555 East Washington Avenue, Room 4401  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

- 1. Call to order and Roll Call:** Chair Mark Hutchison called the meeting to order at 12:04 PM. Chair Hutchison thanked all for attending the meeting and noted that the agenda will be followed as noticed. The agenda item was opened up for roll call and a quorum was confirmed.

**Committee Members Present**

Mark Hutchison  
James Settelmeyer  
Chris Brooks  
Erik Hansen  
Dana Bennett  
Ann Silver  
Jeremy Susac  
Jennifer Taylor  
Angie Dykema  
Ernest Figueroa  
Daniel Witt  
Barry Gold  
Paul Caudill  
Paul Anderson  
Andy Abboud

Kelvin Atkinson  
Jeremy Newman  
Darren Daboda  
Joe Reynolds

**Committee Members Absent**

Adam Laxalt  
James Oscarson  
Dave Luttrell  
Adam Kramer  
Kevin Sagara

## **2. Public Comment and Discussion:**

Chair Hutchison opened Agenda Item No. 2 and asked Vice Chair Bennet to direct the efforts in Carson City noting that Vice Chair may need to step out and he asked Mr. Settlemeyer to take over in that event. Chair Hutchison asked if anyone from the public sought to make a comment on the matter in Carson City.

Vice Chair Bennett asked for public comment in Carson City. No public comment was provided.

Chair Hutchison asked for public comment in Las Vegas.

Vinny Spotleson, Program Director for the Nevada Conservation League, part of a larger coalition that supports clean energy in Nevada provided comment regarding the support of the energy choice initiative and a clean energy future. Mr. Spotleson provided some policies the coalition he represents supports and that a regional wholesale market is the only way to go forward.

Jonathan Friedrich, citizen, provided comment regarding his objection to the ballot initiative regarding energy choice. Mr. Friedrich read a statement from Massachusetts Attorney General regarding a study they conducted about a wholesale market. Mr. Friedrich read other statements from different states regarding the high rates that could be implemented based on the energy choice initiative. He discussed his support of Mr. Reynolds report and urges the voters to vote against the ballot initiative.

Blake Guinn, citizen, said he started an organization last year to represent the consumers interests in having more energy options. Mr. Guinn stated that if ECI passes again more clean energy must be part of the initiative. If ECI doesn't pass, lawmakers still have the responsibility to provide more clean energy choices to Nevadans.

George Duncan Jr, citizen representing seniors across the state, spoke about the problems that the seniors will experience if the initiative passes, as he feels the prices will be higher and seniors cannot afford more changes that result in higher prices.

Greg Ferrante, president of Nevada Solar Owners Association, provided comment. Mr. Ferrante started this organization a few years ago to help Nevada homeowners. He stated that if ECI passes, he is fearful that all of the work that was done to pass AB405 and returning solar to Nevada would be undone. He respectfully asked that the committee not focus on what can't be done but instead what can be done to make this successful.

Staff member Robin Isaacs, noted the submission of public comment for the record. Three total, a letter from White Pine County, an email from Larry at Energy Freedom and lastly a letter from Ms. Angel DeFazio which was submitted recently and will be uploaded to the website.

Chair Hutchison closed agenda item No. 2 and moved onto agenda item No. 3

**3. Approval of Minutes from March 07, 2018 meeting:**

Chair Hutchison opened agenda item No. 3, and opened the floor for any comments, additions or corrections on the draft of these minutes.

Jennifer Taylor made a motion to approve as is and Jeremy Newman seconded that motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Chair Hutchison closed agenda item No. 3 and moved onto agenda item No. 4

**4. Approval of Recommendations from Technical Working Group on Generation, Transmission, and Delivery – TWG Vice Chair Angie Dykema:**

Chair Hutchison opened agenda item No. 4 and noted that there was already a presentation previously provided at the last meeting.

Chair Hutchison asked if there were any other concerns or comments regarding the recommendations provided and asked for a motion to approve the recommendations.

Jeremy Newman made a motion to approve and Kelvin Atkinson seconded the motion. The motion was accepted unanimously and the recommendations were approved with no changes.

Chair Hutchison closed agenda item No. 4 and moved onto agenda item No. 5.

**5. Approval of Recommendations from Technical Working Group on Innovation, Technology, and Renewable Energy – TWG Chair Jennifer Taylor:**

Chair Hutchison opened agenda item No. 5

Chair Hutchison asked if there were any other concerns or comments regarding the recommendations provided and asked for a motion to approve the recommendations.

Jeremy Susac made a motion to approve and Erik Hansen seconded the motion. The motion was accepted unanimously and the recommendations were approved with no changes.

Chair Hutchison closed agenda item No. 5 and moved on to agenda item No. 6.

**6. Report and Approval of Recommendations from Technical Working Group on Consumer Protections – TWG Vice Chair Ernest Figueroa:**

Chair Hutchison opened agenda item No. 6 and asked committee member Ernest Figueroa to provide the recommendations of the technical working group he had vice chaired during this last year on Consumer Protections.

Mr. Ernest Figueroa, identified the documentation in front of the committee for review which combined the multiple presentations that the technical working group received. Mr. Figueroa identified the different presentations provided to the technical working group and who they were provided by. He stated that the goal of this technical working group was to look at what other markets have done to provide recommendations on how an open market could work. Mr. Figueroa proceeded with reading the recommendations from the technical working group. The main theme of the recommendations was a focus to educate the public on the who what when where and how about the initiative after the initiative passes to minimize consumer confusion. Mr. Figueroa read through the five recommendations provided from the technical working group. Mr. Figueroa then thanked the committee staff, Patricia Malloy and Matt Morris as well as the public and the other committee members.

Jennifer Taylor asked Mr. Figueroa to talk about the variable rate contracts and polar vortex issues that were discussed in the presentations. Mr. Figueroa and Ms. Taylor discussed what the variable rate contracts are and how they can create an unfair market in our State based on supply and demand. The presentations that were heard basically stated that people do not understand what a variable rate contract is or what the options are.

Jennifer Taylor also asked Mr. Figueroa to talk about the Massachusetts Attorney Generals presentation about retail providers. Mr. Figueroa talked about the experience of Massachusetts and that from the presentation it was apparent that there was a tremendous opportunity for retail providers to prey on the public.

Barry Gold discussed the education campaign mentioned and stated that there should be something before the vote goes through so that the public knows what they are voting on.

Chair Hutchison asked if there were any further comments and finding none he asked for a motion to approve the recommendations.

Barry Gold made a motion to approve and Jennifer Taylor seconded the motion. The motion was accepted unanimously and the recommendations were approved with no changes.

Chair Hutchison closed agenda item No. 6 and moved onto agenda item No. 7

**7. Report and Approval of Recommendations from Technical Working Group on Open Markets Design and Policy – TWG Chair Jeremy Susac:**

Chair Hutchison opened agenda item No. 7 and asked committee member Jeremy Susac to provide the recommendations of the technical working group he had chaired during this last year.

Jeremy Susac began by thanking the Governor, the staff and the Lt. Governor for the resources provided for these meetings. Mr. Susac then discussed the primary recommendation from the technical working group he chaired and asked for any questions.

Jennifer Taylor asked if there was anything presented that would inherently be in conflict with joining a wholesale market with our current renewable energy policies, energy efficiency policies or other State policies. Mr. Susac said nothing was heard that would conflict and the overall tone was positive.

Erik Hansen and Mr. Susac discussed CAISO as a suitable market for Nevada's needs. They discussed what they knew of California working on legislature to expand the role and sell outside of California and whether or not they will be able to expand. They discussed the governance structure and the options of joining a CAISO and the possibility of flexibility in California's Policies. Mr. Hansen wanted to make sure that if joining the CAISO became the path for Nevada that Nevada still has control over what happens in Nevada.

Mr. Brooks met twice with the California Energy Committee and worked on the proposed changes in governance for CAISO and believes that everyone in Nevada should be concerned with the control issues with joining the CAISO.

Mr. Susac then read his second recommendation stating that there should be a committee created between the legislature and the Governor to address specific legislative or regulatory actions. Mr. Susac provided the thought process behind this recommendation. Mr. Susac finished with reading the third recommendation.

Barry Gold asked about recommendation number two and the start of the legislative session date and how it was determined. Mr. Susac said that the committee could be created prior to the session but creating such a committee would assist in getting recommendations to the legislature by 2021.

Chris Brooks stated that the last sentence could state no later than July 31, 2020 which would meet the August deadline for submission into the 2021 BDRs. This change was discussed between Chair Hutchison, Mr. Susac and Mr. Brooks.

Chair asked for a motion to approve the recommendations as noted with the amendment.

Jennifer Taylor made a motion to approve and Jeremy Newman seconded the motion. The motion was accepted unanimously and the recommendations were approved with no changes.

Chair Hutchison closed agenda item No. 7 and moved onto agenda item No. 8

## **8. Presentation and Discussion of PUCN Energy Choice Initiative Investigatory Docket Report – PUCN Legal Staff:**

Chair Hutchison opened agenda item No. 8

Chair reminded the committee that the committee voted for the PUCN to open an investigatory docket regarding the highly technical issues on an open energy market. Chair Hutchison thanked everyone for the efforts on the report and welcomed the PUCN team to present the findings of the investigatory docket.

Joe Reynolds, PUCN Commissioner thanked his staff for their efforts on the report and introduced Garrett Weir, General Counsel along with Hailey Williamson & Roman Borisov, Assistant General Counsel and Kim Lightheart, PUCN Certified Public Accountant as members of the PUCN staff that would be providing the findings of the report.

Garrett Weir began by walking through the PUCN investigatory process. On September 23, 2017 the Committee on Energy Choice voted to request that the PUCN go through an investigatory docket proceeding. On September 27, 2017 the request letter was received by the PUCN. Before Mr. Weir proceeded with explaining the process, he provided clarification on the differences between an investigatory docket and a contested case. In the case of an investigatory docket there is no legal effect from the findings, the process is designed to be able to gather information and promote robust participation from all parties interested. The Committee did request that the PUCN go through the investigatory docket procedure which was an appropriate request in this case. Mr. Weir identified that a contested case generally has an applicant or petitioner that is asked for relief in a situation. In this case the administrative procedure act would apply as defined in NRS 233B. This would trigger a heightened due process, cross examination and also results in a higher standard of intervention in the proceedings. The investigation proceeding is to gather information which is not the same as a contested case. The report from the commission is presenting findings on what was presented to the commission during the workshops. There is no need to formally request intervention status or have extension requirements for lawyers. There were 59 distinct parties that provided comments. In a contested proceeding that would not be normal. The vast majority came from legal counsel, any licensed attorney is subject to the Nevada rules of professional conduct which includes the requirement of a Duty of Candor towards tribunals such as the PUCN. This prohibits a lawyer from knowingly providing a false statement and the PUCN could assume that all participants were not in violation of this law and the council could rely on the information provided by legal counsel. The investigative process specifically created an open forum for all interested stakeholders to participate in a transparent process over several workshops and other meetings. Mr. Weir then identified the actual process that was underwent through the PUCN. The dates were provided for these meetings, the dates for reply comments, when the draft report was issued and when the final report was approved in an open meeting of the PUCN. Mr. Weir stated that the report represents information provided to the PUCN and if there was information that was not provided where it could be scrutinized and vetted, the PUCN could not include that information. Mr. Weir stated the PUCN was very mindful of the need for transparency and fairness and for that reason the PUCN went to great lengths to ensure multiple rounds of participation. Mr. Weir wanted to respond to a comment made at the April 19, 2018 meeting on Open Design where Jon Wellinghoff specifically stated that he submitted a report during the PUCN process that would have shown that the passing of ECI would result in tens of thousands of jobs and the PUCN ignored that report. Mr. Weir stated that when Mr. Reynolds asked Mr. Wellinghoff in the proceedings about the number of jobs this could create, Mr. Wellinghoff was quoted as stating "I do not have any numbers" (2568, transcript page 983). Mr. Weir stated that

the advocates of ECI praised the proceedings and called it “one of the most worthwhile proceedings ever seen.” (776, appendix page 2334). Mr. Weir said that the concerns mentioned in the previous meetings and media only came out after the draft report was issued by Mr. Reynolds, which the ECI advocates did not like. Mr. Weir finished by reminding everyone that the PUCN conducted an investigation and provided a report which represents the information presented to the PUCN during that investigation.

Chair asked that comments are limited to the presentation on process, scope, procedure and legal considerations that the committee may have.

Jennifer Taylor thanked Mr. Weir for walking through the process and appreciated that he identified that there was a distinct difference between the two. Ms. Taylor asked if any member of the stakeholder group felt that there was something missing or needed more time to provide information past the February 9<sup>th</sup> date, what would the procedure have been in that instance?

Mr. Weir stated that it is worth acknowledging that the process was on a fairly accelerated time line as the committee was anxiously awaiting the report and also to note that implementation is on an accelerated timeline if it should pass. Mr. Weir said that the commission was seeking to stick to the procedural outline as identified, however if a party had been interested in seeking additional time, at any of the workshops or any other time that request could have been made. Even a motion that had been filed in time could have been entertained by the commission. Mr. Weir provided an example of the flexibility, the initial reply comment was extended to January 3<sup>rd</sup> from the original date. It is possible to amend the schedule but the approval of a request would have been made in such a way to allow everyone the same opportunity. Ms. Taylor thanked Mr. Weir.

Hailey Williamson then provided a summary of the key findings of the report as shown on page 6. Ms. Lightheart walked through the main cost sections of the report identifying the different participants that provided the information. Ms. Lightheart discussed what information was provided to determine the findings that were made a part of the report and what went into these calculations. Mr. Borisov went through the details of the report. Mr. Borisov read through the information that was provided in the different presentations and provided overviews of each of the outcomes and options. Ms. Williamson concluded by providing a high-level timeline of implementation if the ECI is approved. The PUCN came up with a timeline which will be highly expeditious beginning with the 2019 legislative session and continuing through the 2023 session in order to implement the energy choice initiative.

Chair Hutchison thanked the presenters and opened the floor up for questions and comments on the presentation.

Jennifer Taylor began by thanking Mr. Reynolds and the other staff of the PUCN for the report that was provided. Ms. Taylor provided her thoughts and opinions on the report provided especially about how the PUCN identified the constitutional issues with passing the initiative. Ms. Taylor asked Ms. Williamson to talk about the potential constitutional issues, specifically the difference between policies and law and how the Reno Newspaper Inc. -vs- Gibbons could impact the initiative.

Ms. Williamson stated that the commission report highlights the potential issues, the commission is not a court and ultimately this will be up to a court to determine what this means. The report does highlight potential issues with the word policy in place of law, note that the court does distinguish between these two words and they are different in meaning so they are not interchangeable.

Ms. Taylor replied that she appreciated the answer. Ms. Taylor also asked if there were there any of those costs that were assumed to be picked up by others and not the rate payers.

Ms. Lightheart responded that the costs that were identified along with the bill impacts do not make any accommodations or assumptions that anyone other than the Nevada Ratepayers would be taking those costs on. Those could be shared or allocated with the other coops and rural entities.

Barry Gold began by thanking the chairman and the PUCN for the report, which was very thorough. Mr. Gold asked what the potential impact to the low-income customers is especially the AARP customers who are on a fixed income.

Mr. Borisov responded that there was no specific analysis that would relate to low income customers, but what is known is that the low income and/or senior citizens are expected to be affected the most. Mr. Borisov said that essentially the customers that are more technologically savvy tend to get the benefits of a competitive retail market but the ones that are not technically savvy or know how to really shop for the provider generally are more negatively impacted than the others.

Mr. Gold asked if it was found that there would be an impact on low income energy assistance programs.

Ms. Williamson, added that in the report it is recognized that there is no mention of the universal energy charge that helps low income programs in the constitutional amendment and whether that law remains is unknown because that program might not continue to exist. Ms. Williamson also said that in recent news, it was reported that Texas just lost the program to help low income residents.

Chris Brooks thanked the commission and staff and chairman Reynolds for taking on the project in such a short period of time and turning out a work product that is very significant and helpful. Mr. Brooks asked if they could expand upon the relationship between Net Metering or distributed generation rates and the language in the proposed constitutional amendment which will take precedent over any current rules, policies and statutes that we have already created. Mr. Brooks asked what this new language could do to the grandfathered customers who expect a certain rate for the next 20 years if we are forced to change those polices, rules and laws to comply with the constitutional amendment and the language within it.

Mr. Borisov said that no state with significant net metering or rooftop solar has every deregulated. With a mandate for an open competitive market in the constitutional amendment, once NV Energy goes away as a bundled service provider, the whole paradigm will fall apart.



Chair Hutchison asked about the costs if Nevada had their own ISO similar to the CAISO, and would there be any material cost either saved or incurred in that direction.

Ms. Lightheart responded that there were two other options that were mentioned in the report, creating a Nevada only ISO or joining a new regional market. The Nevada only ISO cost estimate was \$100million and the cost for joining a new regional ISO was \$500million, which was significantly more than the \$250,000 for the study and the \$500,000 to join CAISO.

Chair thanked Mr. Reynolds and his staff for the work they put forth on this report.

Chair Hutchison closed agenda item No. 8 and moved onto agenda item No. 9

## **9. Public Comment on PUCN Energy Choice Initiative Investigatory Docket Report:**

Chair Hutchison opened agenda item No. 9 and reminded the public in attendance that this is public comment directly on the PUCN report, there are timing restrictions but we will be flexible to allow everyone the opportunity to be heard and asked everyone to keep this in mind.

Terry Grace, RESA, stated that RESA devoted resources and time to prepare the most comprehensive and fact-based document which was over 275 pages plus comments and it was linked to thousands of pages of statutes and policies for the commission to use as a guide book on different competitive markets during the process. Mr. Grace then said that RESA feels that the PUCN report is biased and the lead regulator ignored all of these facts submitted by RESA. RESA feels that this is an essential path forward for Nevada. Mr. Grace said he attended all of the PUCN proceedings and finished his comments saying that if the voters of Nevada choose to pass this question again, it behooves all of us to get on board with getting on board to create the best open market. Mr. Grace said that RESA's mission is to educate folks and provide information from many different resources and would like to make the market in Nevada better than the Texas market.

Chair Hutchison added that if anyone presenting or providing comment under agenda item number 9 had any written materials to provide, the committee would be glad to take that documentation. Chair Hutchison also added that the executive order that created the committee did not take a position on whether or not ECI should pass. The directive from the Governor was to embrace the mission and to identify the path in the event ECI passes.

Jon Wellinghoff, first responded to what Mr. Weir stated in the beginning of the presentation under agenda item number 8 in respect to the job numbers. Mr. Wellinghoff stated that he did not have those numbers as he was not the member of ECI that had them, they were supplied by Mr. Matt Griffin and a report was provided with these numbers. Mr. Wellinghoff introduced Mark Garrett of the Garrett Group LLC, who the ECI asked to conduct an independent analysis of the impacts of the ECI.

Mark Garrett provided a power point with his findings from the analysis. Mr. Garrett discussed what stranded costs are, the study that his company did and how they arrived at the stranded

cost numbers. Mr. Garrett went through his presentation in detail and provided a lot of information to the committee. Mr. Garrett also discussed the new tax act information, the protected ADIT and the unprotected ADIT and how this could help with the stranded assets.

Chair Hutchison and Mr. Garrett discussed whether or not the tax act would allow for amortization over the three-year period and how this could work.

Chair Hutchison asked Mr. Garrett what he wanted the committee to know about the 4 billion dollars that the PUCN report said would be incurred in stranded costs. Mr. Garrett stated that there is no way to get there with just the stranded costs, this number is just not possible. Chair Hutchison and Mr. Garrett discussed the power purchase agreements and whether or not the Nevada ratepayers would be responsible for these.

Erik Hansen asked Mr. Garrett to provide the work papers and the details that were used to create the presentation he provided.

Jennifer Taylor thanked Mr. Garrett on his presentation. Ms. Taylor and Mr. Garrett discussed the protected and unprotected benefits under the tax cut and jobs act and his estimated savings of \$11 per month and how that number was obtained and when it would no longer be a savings. Ms. Taylor and Mr. Garrett also discussed the gas plant part of his presentation and how Mr. Garrett believes that over time the gas plants would be more valuable as less and less of them are built.

Chris Brooks echoed Mr. Hansen's request to see Mr. Garrett's work as there are a lot of assumptions within this presentation that conflict with the PUCN report. Mr. Brooks also discussed the gas plant issue and why Mr. Garrett would necessarily believe that a current gas plant would have more value in the future which is in conflict in what others have stated.

Mr. Garrett stated that most of the generation is provided by gas or renewables, almost of the renewables are intermittent and it needs to be backed up by gas, he does not believe that we will be getting away from gas as a form of generation in the next several years. The fact that there are no gas plants being built, that would make the existing plants more valuable and as we add more renewables, that will take away some of the load but the capacity must be there to back up. There may be another technology that makes gas obsolete but it's not on the horizon.

Mr. Brooks said that he would like to see the backup that proves those assumptions.

Jennifer Taylor and Mr. Garrett discussed his assumptions on page 7 of his presentation and where those came from.

Paul Caudill would also like details of this presentation from Mr. Garrett and appreciates all of the work that was done. Mr. Caudill asked specifically about the IRS ruling about the normalization of the tax benefits and how they would be applied in a sale, Mr. Garrett acknowledged that there is nothing currently as a rule and there would need to be future work on how those would be applied to the customers. Mr. Caudill also asked about the assumptions of the power purchase agreements and who the counterparty is in those assumptions. Mr. Garrett

said there is no counterpart and treated these assumptions as those of the exit customers but the customers wouldn't see a difference in the bills. Mr. Caudill also asked about the assignment and consent of assignment on these agreements and wanted to know if there was any thought on who the counterpart would be. Mr. Garrett said that there was no thought put on that because he was focused on the cost factor.

Chair Hutchison wanted to make sure that all of those in attendance including the PUCN can come up and provide comments regarding what Mr. Garrett has presented. Mr. Chair asked if anyone wanted to provide questions or comments.

Members of the PUCN came up to respond and Chair Hutchison reminded them of the time constraint.

Mr. Garrett Weir with the PUCN stated that what he stated earlier in regard to Mr. Wellinghoff was not a personal attack. Mr. Weir and the staff went back through the meeting information in regard to what was said about Matt Griffin providing a report on the jobs as stated by Mr. Wellinghoff but there was only one response to this question during that meeting and Mr. Griffin provided only one sentence not a report.

Ms. Kim Lightheart with the PUCN also provided confirmation on the costs and how the \$4billion was identified in the PUCN report and responded to different parts of Mr. Garretts presentation.

Garrett Weir, with the PUCN, stated that the independent regulatory arm of the commission would like to provide comment as they were participants in the PUCN workshops.

Debra Terwillizer and Anne Marie Cuneo, with the commissions regulatory operations came forward to provide comment. Ms. Terwillizer stated that the regulatory staff is separate from the legal part of the commission. Ms. Terwillizer provided some of the reactions from them to Mr. Garretts analysis and look forward to his findings as the investigative arm of the commission. Mr. Wellinghoff did mention to Ms. Terwillizer and Ms. Cuneo separately Mr. Garretts analysis and they asked him at that time for the presentation, they are looking forward to working with Mr. Garrett on his analysis. Ms. Terwillizer then went through her comments about the assumptions in Mr. Garretts presentation.

Greg Ferrante, Nevada Solar Association, stated that as a consumer and after witnessing what he is seeing here, it is almost mortifying. Everything that is being discussed is based on assumptions and we have to keep an open mind. One of the biggest reason we are here today is because of the acts of NV Energy and the PUCN in December of 2015 and he fears the same thing is happening today.

Tom Bird, President of the Nevada Alliance for Retired Americans, shared comments made early in the meetings by AARP in which his organization agrees with. Mr. Bird also complemented the PUCN on the report and stated that it was helpful to his organization. Mr. Bird also commented on the unnecessary raises to the electric bills as most of his organization may not be around in the next ten years. Mr. Bird commented on how he feels that the current

market works and does not understand why an outside company and a local company think they can make the rates better. Mr. Bird quoted one of the ECI proponents stating that they could not say for sure that this would provide lower rates for the consumers. Mr. Bird went through multiple parts of the report and stated that he will be working diligently with his organization on educating Nevadans on what the initiative really means as he has many of his members admit to him that they did not understand the initiative to begin with and will continue to work on educating his members before the next election.

Chair Hutchison closed agenda item No. 9 and moved onto agenda item No. 10

#### **10. Public comments and discussion:**

Chair Hutchison opened Agenda Item No. 10 and asked if anyone from the public sought to make a comment on the matter in both Carson City and Las Vegas locations.

Robin Isaacs, staff member for the Energy Choice Committee, read a public comment submitted by Ms. Angel DeFazio through an ADA request.

Chris Brooks said that he won't be here for the next meeting and wanted to thank everyone on the committee as well as everyone that has presented information as it has been truly helpful.

Chair Hutchison closed agenda item No. 10 and moved onto agenda item No. 11

#### **11. Adjournment**

Chair Hutchison opened agenda item No. 11 and asked if there was a motion to adjourn. Jennifer Taylor submitted the motion to adjourn and Erik Hansen seconded that motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Hutchison thanked all for their participation and attendance and adjourned the meeting at 3:51 PM.