

**MINUTES**  
**REGIONAL TRANSMISSION COORDINATION TASK FORCE**

**November 18, 2024**  
**9:00 A.M.**

**Microsoft Teams** [Need help?](#)

[Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 214 170 103 245

Passcode: cYWQUD

**Dial in by phone**

[+1 775-321-6111,,826483193#](#) United States, Reno

[Find a local number](#)

Phone conference ID: 826 483 193#

- 1. Call to order, roll call, and establishment of quorum.** Jennifer Taylor, Chairwoman, opened the meeting at 9:02 a.m.

**Task Force Members Present**

Jennifer Taylor	Ernest Figueroa
Dwayne McClinton	John Henry Shields
Richard Perkins	Kayla Dowty
Luis Cruz	Tom Burns
Elizabeth Becker	Leslie Mujica
Eric Witkoski	Luke Papez
Asm. Daniele Monroe Moreno	
Nicole Ting	

**Task Force Members Absent**

Carolyn Turner	Alise Porto
Jeremy Drew	Sen. Dallas Harris
Asm. Melissa Hardy	Jeremy Newman
Erik Hansen	Hayley Williamson
Sen. Pete Goicoechea	

- 2. Public comments and discussion.** Chairman Taylor opened this agenda item.

**David Rubin:** I want to thank you and the committee. I know we don't have a formal representative but we were able to review the draft recommendations and the company can support them. I really do appreciate your leadership and the rest of the members of the committee for their continuing work. As I said during our update at the last meeting, clearly there is a lot to do on the market front and in the Western transmission and interconnections in general and appreciate the committee's engagement and so wanted to give you that feedback.

- 3. Opening Remarks from Chairwoman Jennifer Taylor**

Welcome everyone to the November 2024 Regional Transmission Coordination Task Force Biennial Report meeting. The October 28, 2024 minutes will be e-mailed to all task force members to review and we will vote on them when we meet to finalize the biennial report.

4. Review discussion and approval of the report required under SB-448 for possible action.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** This meeting is where proposed recommendations were being provided to the task force and were open for discussion. There was not an opportunity prior to this and that is why we are having this meeting. We still have a couple weeks to get this over to the Governor and Legislative Council Bureau, as directed in SB-448. I know that it just came out to everybody, but here's what we're going to do today. We're going to walk through it, have folks ask questions and then anybody has questions, comments, suggested changes, clarifications, catch our typos, anything like that, please e-mail the task force, Lisa and Leslie and reply all from the e-mail this morning that forwarded the draft to you and with your changes no later than close of business tomorrow. Then we can have an iterative process where we make sure that changes and concerns that are appropriate or integrated, and then we can take a vote on it. For members of the public who are on the distribution list again, I know that you've just received this draft. Thank you for being patient. With the receipt of the draft, we would welcome your comments. Same thing if you have questions, comments, concerns. We appreciate public input. If you could get those to us. I know it's a short turn around by noon tomorrow. That would be great, because then we can look at things that might need to be disseminated out to the task force for potential inclusion where appropriate. Any questions on that process from members of the task force?

**Director McClinton:** No question for me chair, but can I just make a quick statement in full transparency? Chair Taylor has been working with me and my staff at GOE to put together this draft for everyone's review. Again, we do apologize for the short notice but wanted to get it to everybody as quickly as possible. So again, we do thank you all for your participation today and look forward to your feedback and approval.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** We will now walk through the draft report. The initial piece of this is essentially just a summary. It reiterates the purpose of SB-448. What are our requirements in terms of drafting and submitting this report and then listing the current members of our task force. At the bottom of page 2 on to Page 3, we just have a high level summary of what we have done. The next paragraph just focuses on or highlights key issues that we saw repeated in different presentations, especially regarding transmission development and recent orders by FERC. It also highlights what we're seeing in terms of advancement in Western market programs like tariff filings with FERC and the continued advancement of the Pathways initiative. Again, not asking for approval, but just asking if anybody has any questions on that opening piece of this report.

Moving on, the report breaks down each of the meetings that have been held since the 2022 report was issued and provides a high-level summary of the activities of the committee as well as where there are findings or observations within the presentation. In the most recent meeting, we heard from Pam Spurburg, who provided us with an update on the West wide Governance Pathways Initiative, Step 2 Draft proposal briefing. I want to thank all of the task force members who engaged in a robust conversation with what's going on at Pathways. For presentations, you'll see that we've got a note that says link to be provided in the final draft. There will be a link to her presentation, in the report there will be a hyperlink to each of the presenters. Pam talked about updates to Pathways, its goals, some of the triggers for the next steps in the initiative including key elements highlighted, such as the fact that this new entity would have a consumer advocate body that would be able to represent the interests of consumer advocates in the region through a robust stakeholder process. One of the things that was a key element of the West of the Pathways initiative was this primary authority model so we highlighted that and then summarized some of the issues raised by Task force members during the meeting.

Ben Fitch-Fleischmann from Interwest Energy Alliance gave an overview of FERC orders 1920 including a key piece of our evaluation these past couple years related to long term regional transmission planning. Mr. Fitch-Fleischman covered one of the many parallel pathways that are going on in the West related to transmission expansion and planning, WestTEC. We talked about the importance of that voluntary effort, what the goals are, where it is in the process and how it would overlay its findings to spur ideas and action on new and needed transmission developments. He also discussed regional transmission project planning and some of the guidance that has come from FERC 1920. He discussed some of the forward-looking scenario planning issued in FERC order 1920, including seven drivers of transmission that should be considered in those long-term planning efforts, including evaluation of a minimum set of benefits over a 20-year horizon as specified by FERC order 1920.

Next up, we heard from Devin Hartman, who is the Director of Energy and Environmental Policy at R Street Institute. He provided a presentation that had some larger considerations of RTO formation given that there were questions from one of the task force members and one-on-one conversations about considerations for the development of an RTO and what we should be looking at in terms of best practices. I wanted to highlight some of those comments that Mr. Hartman made. One consideration was looking at a vertically integrated model like Nevada and then moving into some of the fragmented functions of an RTO, especially in looking at markets where there is open retail choice. He also highlighted management of seams. This was an issue that force members had asked specifically be addressed when they were not able to attend the meeting in June. We ensured we had multiple speakers address seams so that that particular task Force member could have questions about that market to market, concern and efficiency addressed and highlighted during the hearings.

Mr. Hartman talked about stakeholder protection as an important part of our development. I talked about resource adequacy as an important part and how we've had WRAP discussions come into these task force to meetings. He also talked about something that's a big issue, which is interconnection backlogs and network upgrade concerns. He talked about GETS and how GETS is one way to unlock some of those transmission concerns and transmission upgrade issues. Some of the interconnection backlogs have been caused by multiple requests for the same project as developers look for best site selection options. This issue is being addressed in part by some of the FERC order language. It is worth noting, he highlighted that being in an RTO has cost that people may not have considered, including the need to add employees and agencies to be able to interface with an RTO and the stakeholder process. Finally, he talked a little bit about deep-dive work on economic development opportunities in a markets over this next year. He mentioned the work that they are doing in terms of upgrading states on load growth readiness and highlighted that some large industrial users may prefer to be sited within an RTO, but one of the things that they are also going to look at is that transmission capacity and the interconnection queues. There were many discussions from NV Energy and other entities about transmission capacity.

Let us move on then to the update from Mr. Rubin, who is the Federal Energy Policy Director with NV Energy. He provided us with a regional coordination Task Force update on the company's entrance into the day ahead market and its work under FERC Order 2023. When we go back to the November 2023 meeting, it was a comprehensive update from NV Energy on a whole host of issues including assessments of the two proposed day ahead markets, SPP Markets+ and CAISO's EDAM. NV Energy had made the decision to seek entry into the EDAM market and part of Mr. Rubin's presentation was a discussion of the multiple bases for that decision. He highlighted that joining a day ahead market is not the same as joining an RTO but that it is an important incremental step, which is what NV Energy has been looking at in terms of moving towards an RTO and potentially joining

an RTO. He also noted that neither EDAM nor Markets+ provide a direct pathway at this time to participate in an RTO by January 2030.

Mr. Rubin addressed a question from one of the task force members from the PUCN presentation related to 704B customers in EDAM and noting that EDAM does provide large customers with a seat on the stakeholder representative committee and allows opportunities for them to participate in stakeholder processes. Mr. Rubin also covered Order 2023 interconnection issues including site control issues which are a challenge here in Nevada because of our federally controlled lands. He noted that for quarter 2023, it has already helped clear some of NV Energy's interconnection queue backlogs. Mr. Rubin scanned through those summaries so if anybody else has questions, concerns, comments on the summary of Mr. Rubin's presentation, let me know.

Finally, we had Julia Selker, who's the Executive Director with the WATT Coalition. She presented Grid Enhancing Technologies, also known as GETS, to support transmission capacity and discussed how FERC Order 1920 addresses GETS. GETS technologies can be hardware, software, or both, but essentially what they do is they increase capacity, efficiency, reliability, safety of power lines in a lower cost way than traditional infrastructure. Both FERC orders that we've discussed include some consideration of GETS for transmission enhancements. She gave us a lot of examples of how GETS have been used, some pilot programs for GETS and she also provided policies that could be adopted at the state level to support the use of these technologies. When we get down to the recommendations, the one policy recommendation that we developed was for a policy to support the use of GETS transmission lines to open up transmission capacity in a more cost effective and quicker way.

We will move on to the June 24, 2024 meeting. This meeting was essentially a repeat of what would have been provided in December, but that meeting had to be cancelled. For our June meeting, we had an overview of regional transmission organization, some updates on market advancements and we had an update from Commissioner Cordova on some of the work on one of her dockets. We had Spencer Gray, who's the Executive Director of NIPPC come in and talk a little bit about what an RTO is, what its function is, how it operates and how it does regional planning for transmission as well as some of the benefits of an RTO, especially around lowering wholesale costs to consumers by bringing both geographic diversity and resource diversity into their generation mix. He mentioned again the concept, that large consumers that may have certain commitments on their energy usage can look often to RTOs as a way to meet those needs.

Next, we had Commissioner Cordova come in and she provided some regulatory foundation which was important to hear from our Commissioner, i.e. how they view regionalization and some of the impacts that it might have. She also talked about the PUCN's docket to examine Western market activities, specifically day ahead markets, the needed characteristics for day ahead market and what that value might be for Nevada. The docket included a presentation and discussions on both the day ahead markets being developed by the Southwest Power Pool and by CAISO. She also highlighted some of the unique factors she's looking at for Nevada's potential participation in a regional market, including the day ahead market. NV Energy's choosing of EDAM is still going to have to get approval from the PUCN and this preparatory docket was an important part of that planning. She highlighted Nevada's renewable energy mandate as being unique to Nevada in considering market participation. She also highlighted that Nevada is unique in that there is only one balancing authority and we have concerns of different customers such as Nevada, Rural Electric Association members and 704B customers. She also gave us a highlight and preview of future work, including activity related to interconnection and regional transmission.

The next presentation in June was from Michael O'Brien with the Western Resource Adequacy Program. You heard about WRAP in November of 2023 during NV Energy's comprehensive program but there had been some updates in terms of their programs and we got to hear directly from WRAP, in addition to hearing from a potential participant in the program. He introduced the WRAP program and its coordination to tackle problems of resource adequacy. He noted it is not a market, but it provides advance planning to ensure resource adequacy. It's a unique setup in how it interacts with CAISO and how it is administered by SPP. Participants are very active in trying to work together to develop a common set of metrics and analyze increasingly diverse resources are.

WRAP has moved from purely voluntary to now looking at some binding participation. What that binding participation means is that those who are in that program will face financial charges if they are not able to comply with their stated resource commitments or if they are unable to cure the failure. Then he discussed some details about how the task force meets the participation requirements and talked about the fact that the WRAP region is divided into two footprints, the Northwest and Southwest, and work is being done to explore the extent to which some transmission can be allowed between the two. This concept of transmission, transmission adequacy and transmission coordination are an important piece of this discussion. When you go back to the November comprehensive presentation from NV Energy, there was an extensive discussion about regional transmission and the efforts that NV Energy is making to try to coordinate with those regional partners and other regional lines. The WestTEC discussion is another important one.

Mr. O'Brien talked about the Western Transmission Expansion Coalition (WestTEC). This WestTec effort is one that's trying to facilitate conversations on regional planning and a 10 to 20 year look ahead. The effort is also looking at how Grid Enabling Technologies (GETS) might be able to be used in the nearer term to support those transmission efficiencies. Again, we talked about how GETS are interwoven in this important transmission discussion and how FERC looks at GETS as something that is needed to ensure that we have transmission efficiency and capacity while projects are being built.

We heard from Mike Ross, Senior Vice President of External Affairs and Stakeholder Relations with the Southwest Power Pool. He covered SPP's work in the West and updated the task force on SPP's development of Markets+, its day ahead market service. A key update from him was that Markets+ had been filed as a new tariff at FERC in March of 2024. Again, there was a specific request from one of the task force members about seams and SPP discussed seams and its impact on a market-to-market coordination basis. SPP stated its intent was to negotiate favorable outcomes resulting from any seams for consumers with neighboring markets. In discussions with the task force, there were questions about current interconnection queue time frames and how SPP might be working to reduce those and shorten those times.

Next up in the June meeting, we had the California ISO present. Jeff Billington, Transmission Infrastructure and Planning and Milos Bosnak, Manager for the Regional Markets sector talk about transmission and markets activities. They discussed their current transmission planning process, the impact of load growth on that work, including growth from increased electrification and escalating renewable energy needs. The ISO has been looking at 10-to-15-year transmission planning processes to address the resulting increased transmission planning needs. From this load growth, they gave us some details on specific transmission projects, talking about regional planning and how that was fitting into the planning that they were doing specifically for the ISO. They highlighted that as with other presenters, the ISO is coordinating west-wide on multiple tracks of transmission studies and developments. They are sharing study efforts, including collaboration with the WestTEC effort.

One of the key things they talked about was that, at the time, the interest or participation from different balancing authority areas in entering into EDAM totaled about 50% of the demand in the western interconnection. They believe that percentage was a meaningful footprint in Western transmission connectivity to allow key benefits in load supply diversity across the footprint and they highlighted the parties with an interest in participating included NV Energy. At the request of a task Force member, this presentation addressed the issues of seams across multiple markets, which is a potential issue should multiple markets form in the West. While the CAISO identified that seams could introduce meaningful inefficiencies as challenges between markets, CAISO is prepared to engage from market to market to alleviate those inefficiencies. That is a high-level summary of the presentation from CAISO.

Finally, at the June meeting, we had Kathleen Stacks, who is the Executive Director for Western Freedom and the Co-Chair of the Pathways Initiative. We had her introduce the Pathways Initiative which was mentioned in November, though it only started in July of 2023, so she did not have a lot to discuss in that November meeting. She gave us some history, some of the intent and goals and talked about the current status and the next steps. The key thing with Pathways is it's an initiative to evaluate opportunities to create a separate, independently governed organization. That would be able to provide services up to and including RTO. Because of governance concerns expressed for CAISO membership and other concerns expressed for membership in an SPP RTO. Pathways is taking the initiative to see what could be done that sits somewhere in the middle and allows an independent entity for the West and for Western regional coordination. She talked about some of the current activities for the Pathways initiative including summer workshops across multiple stakeholder processes and work streams. Going back to October, we had Pam Sporburg give us an update of where Pathways was and I think that going forward, continuing to get those updates on the Pathways initiative will be an important thing for this Task Force to do as it is a very active and evolving initiative.

The third meeting for the task force was held on November 15, 2023. Senator Brooks was still chairing at that time and it was a comprehensive presentation from NV Energy with various subject matter experts discussing the Greenlink transmission project. They gave us an update on the Greenlink project and highlighted some of the economic benefits for Greenlink. They talked about the opportunities Greenlink would provide to access low-cost renewable in other states. They talked about timelines including in service dates for the two Greenlink lines in May 2027 and December 2028. They also mentioned efforts that they were undertaking to be proactive in procurement because of some supply chain challenges. The next subject they discussed was resource adequacy and they introduced NV Energy's election to be part of WRAP as a binding participant, beginning in summer of 2027. Since that time and in accordance with the PUCN's order on the 5th IRP Amendment, NV Energy's projected entry into WRAP would be no earlier than the winter of 2027 to 2028.

We will continue to get updates from NV Energy. It will be important to hear from NV Energy about its regional efforts, including this resource adequacy work and our transmission coordination and linkage challenges. As noted, WRAP models in the Northwest and the Southwest region separately, but there are ongoing efforts to unlock more transmission across the two sub regions in the future. NV Energy also updated its evaluation on the benefits of joining a day-ahead market. At that point, they were still evaluating both EDAM and Markets+. They noted that the best way to evaluate movement toward joining an RTO is an incremental staged approach that starts with joining a day ahead market. While a day-ahead market is not the same as an RTO, it is an important incremental step with its own expected benefit. They had a lengthy discussion about the two different day-ahead markets offerings as well as the timeliness for their filings, approval and anticipated go live dates.

NV Energy also differentiated the potential cost benefits of each market and the difference in their governance structures. That was the first mention of the Pathways Initiative. They highlighted that it is a coalition of Western state public utility commissioners and other officials which had started in July to provide options for independent Western regional market governance.

They went through the cost benefit assessment of each market by reviewing the report that was commissioned by a group called the Western Markets Exploratory Group or the WMEG. It was a group of 25 utility and public power executives which looked at a long-term approach to improve market efficiencies in the West and incorporated lessons learned from existing regional markets. The report's cost benefit study compared the production cost savings over footprints including both of the two day-ahead markets and identified which issues to prioritize. Including that market-to-market coordination and Seams concerns if there were to be a regional split. It also identified and drilled down a little bit into the two factors the report identified as having the largest impact on total net cost wheeling and congestion revenues, particularly where there are market Seams. These two issues along with the final market design was what was driving the energies assessment as to which day ahead market to pursue. I think it's worth highlighting that NV Energy pointed out that one of the key things that we need to look at as a State is that we need to be valued for our critical geographic location in the region because everything runs through Nevada.

NV Energy wrapped up discussing potential future transmission projects. Of note is that the Greenlink lines are already fully subscribed and they're not even in service yet in large part, NV Energy noted because of requests from 704B customers and wholesale customers, but the regional connections through other transmission projects could continue to open transmission capacity. They walked through all the transmission projects going on adjacent to Nevada and in the West, and how those might move resources around the region. One of the concerns that they highlighted, though, from a cost justification, is that they must show the business case before the load or line might be in existence. Does anyone have any questions or comments?

**Elizabeth Becker:** My only comment is that I noted that we only had one meeting in 2023 and in the law, it states we must have two but there was a meeting scheduled for December of that year that was cancelled. I just didn't know how that would affect anything.

**Director McClinton:** I can speak to that Jennifer. No, that meeting was scheduled for November last year and that's unfortunately when we had the shooting at UNLV so we had no time to reschedule that meeting.

**Elizabeth Becker:** Thank you.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Director McClinton, is it worth noting that in this report somehow?

**Director McClinton:** I think that is a great call.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** We will add that in. Anything else? So recommendations and looking ahead. This is a purpose statement for these recommendations, a summary of what we're asked to do and a high-level thought about what we really should focus on coming up this year. I think we have a good opportunity to spend some time talking about economic development opportunities in a regional transmission organization. For recommendations, Nevada policy makers, including the PUCN, should provide oversight for Nevada utilities, implementation of FERC Orders 1920 and 2023. This was developed as a recommendation because of the importance of these two orders on

transmission development and on some of the other potential implications for markets. The PUCN has primary oversight over our investor owned utility. I think it's a good way for them to continue with their substantive updates of the work being done and they've already been engaged in different ways with FERC Orders 1920 and 2023 efforts. Questions, comments, concerns about this recommendation?

The next bullet point says Nevada's relationship in collaboration with the BLM should be strengthened through relevant state and local agencies to support opportunities to streamline permitting and siting of transmission on federal lands. Anybody who's done a project in Nevada, even something as small as an EV charging station on a BLM easement knows there is no streamlining of BLM permitting and siting, even just to get a categorical exclusion. You heard Mr. Rubin talk about site control as one of the issues of concern when looking at some of these requirements in the FERC orders and how site control can be tricky when you are dealing with BLM land. I believe that Director McClinton's office is engaged in a collaboration with the BLM on some of these issues. We probably have other agencies that are doing it, but just highlighting this and making sure that those relationships can be strengthened and those discussions can continue in earnest. The PUCN and the GOE are already heavily engaged in a lot of these regional efforts. They represent the interests of the state utilities in a lot of cases in terms of just being able there to talk about issues. They represent the regulatory and the executive policy frame. We want to support that work through this recommendation and highlight for our Governor and for our policymakers in the legislature the work and the coordination being done by the GOE and PUCN.

This recommendation calls for continuing to ensure that their interests are represented and continue to be represented in regional conversations related to transmission and markets. Including the WestTEC effort, the CREPC transmission collaborative and the Pathways Initiative.

Our one specific policy recommendation is that Nevada should enact and support policies that result in greater use of GETS, such as advanced conductors as a means of increasing capacity on the existing transmission system. I am not calling out a specific policy, but certainly highlighting for those legislators on this task force that this could be an opportunity for some legislation and there were specific policy recommendations in Julia Selker's presentation. It would be interesting to get input from the PUCN, but I think that this is a good opportunity again for Nevada to lead and innovate because this doesn't exist in a lot of states. It is a good chance for us to show leadership on something that can be a lighter lift on supporting expanded transmission capacity.

Next up is a recommendation about a statewide transmission plan. Back in 2012, there was a report done by NEAC which was done under Director Crowley, who is now over at CAISO. I think this Task Force has heard from her on a few occasions. There was a statewide transmission plan and I think given the information from NV Energy, the work being done by the GOE and the PUCN, it seems that now is the time to do a comprehensive reboot on that transmission initiative routing study. If you looked at it as a 10 year look ahead, we're a couple of years out and now needing an update. It might be worth adding that NEAC study to the resources column on the tab for the task force on the website as frame of reference.

**Director McClinton:** I'm OK with that.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Thank you. In other states there are, I'm thinking of Arizona that have specific transmission citing authorities, shortcutting some of the concerns, assessments and evaluations that need to be done. This is not to say that Nevada should or could even take this path

but in the interest of learning and meeting all the requirements that are in SB 448, about our charges, this recommendation looks again at the upcoming year and how we can bring some learnings into Nevada about how other states streamline or specialize their transmission siting. Any thoughts on this one? My initial thought would be to bring somebody in from Arizona and somebody in from Oregon to talk about their transmission, siting authorities and possibly New York? There's a lot of discussion at the PUCN in terms of financing the Greenlink projects, so this recommendation highlights opportunities to explore alternative methods and opportunities for financing transmission for future projects that can enable needed transmission build out. Those could be things around federal programs, which was one of the recommendations from 2022. It could be new programs or partnerships. If this task force can bring some concepts to the table, investigate those and provide that information to its members and to the legislature, we thought that this would be a good avenue for discussion. Are there any other questions, comments, concerns, edits on this one input?

Next up, the final specific 2024 recommendation relates to our line items in SB448 that we are to advise the governor and the legislature on. One of them has to do with economic opportunities and economic diversification and benefits. We thought working on that this year was important and this recommendation looks to those opportunities, including areas where growth and demand for electricity or renewable energy generation could be accommodated by an additional transmission or RTO opportunities. This language regarding business and industries that could locate in this state as a result of our position in an RTO comes directly out of Senate Bill 448. I would request to add small customer owned resources to the distributed energy resources, as well as adding demand response, so we can just talk about demand response as an opportunity within an RTO market.

Finally, looking back at 2022, there were some recommendations that seem to still be applicable, ongoing and worth reiterating them in this report. This includes the desired governance principles for market offerings and additional opportunities for participation in regional transmission planning efforts. Additionally, continuing the load and generation conditions in forecasts in the context of different market scenarios that may move from being the day-ahead market scenarios into some discussions around the different RTO scenarios as we get later into this next two-year cycle for reporting. Again, looking to opportunities, benefits and impacts of market regionalization and transmission for ratepayers and the community including transmission customers and transmission owners, will be key. Finally, we should keep an eye on whether there are additional regulatory or legal requirements to be addressed as in pursuing the joining of an RTO.

Are there any bills that need to be done? Are there any regulatory items? I think it's worth always keeping that on as an action item, just in case something changes and something is needed. Then the task force has that as a recommendation. So, thoughts, questions, concerns. Edits on this last piece? I want to open it up to just broad questions, comments, thoughts?

**Leslie Mujica:** I'm not sure if it was WestTEC or what, but they were talking about coalitions and forming boards, paid boards and all that. I just want to make sure that Nevada is well represented and it's not California top heavy. Whenever there's either boards or coalitions, Nevadans need to be involved in key positions. I hope I made sense with that.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** That makes sense. You articulated that clearly. Director, perhaps you can just mention how representation is handled in terms of one state, one person and talk a little bit about some of the regional effort's you and chair Williamson or other Commissioners are involved in and how you make sure that Nevada is represented.

**Director McClinton:** Thank you for that and Nevada is most definitely having a seat at the table between myself and representation from the PUCN's, Chair Williamson. We have a seat at pretty much every conference, every meeting, regional, especially Western regional organizations. We will make sure we are invited and are part of those conversations.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** If we go back to the recommendations, it states PUCN and or GOE should continue to ensure Nevada's interests are represented or continue to be represented in regional conversations related to transmission in markets. Are there other entities or bodies that make sense to add in where there might be legislative representation or where legislators could loop in Nevada to make sure that the state always has a very robust and present seat at the table?

**Asm. Daniele Monroe-Moreno:** Yes, both with CSG and in CSL, there are subcommittees, and Nevada does have representation on those subcommittees when it comes to these subject matters. I would encourage Members in this conversation to reach out to their respective legislators and encourage them to get even more involved in those organizations so we have a greater influence on decision making at those organizations as well.

**Director McClinton:** We're covering all bases, but if there's an organization or anything that you see that Nevada's not getting represented at, please let my office, the PUCN know or your legislator know as well.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Is it worth mentioning those type of efforts in this Task Force and encourage legislators to be active participants in any subcommittees at CSG and CSL or similar entities?

**Asm. Daniele Monroe-Moreno:** That wouldn't be bad. Yeah, for CSG and in CSL that would be great, yes.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** We will add in the language. We'll float some language by you. Is there anything anyone else noticed, Mr. Witkoski? Mr. Figueroa, anything from your purviews that are of concern?

**Eric Witkoski:** I noticed you were mentioning the transmission authorities. I noticed that looks like New Mexico and maybe some of the other states have renewable energy transmission authorities?

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Yes, New Mexico.

**Eric Witkoski:** There are a few out there that I've heard from. They worked on that one line from New Mexico over Arizona, but it was very helpful.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Mr. Figueroa, not to put you on the spot, but anything from a consumer advocate's position that you believe should be included in this that we didn't catch?

**Ernest Figueroa:** I'm still reviewing the document, but at first glance, I don't have any edits so far, but that may change.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** I wanted to make sure in Pam Sporborg's presentation that one of the things we highlighted was that work to create a consumer advocate's body as part of the entity that will be formed as the Pathways Initiative moves forward.

**Kayla Dowty:** Thanks so much for giving us the opportunity to review the report with you this morning. I think that from our perspective, certainly the largest concern is that Greenlink is already fully allocated, which is definitely going to drive down opportunity for development here in Nevada. So looking forward to the upcoming meetings.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Kayla, please let us know if you have any thoughts on that transmission coordination or even impacts on economic development, renewable project development, the ability for your projects to be able to provide those needed baseload resources. Perhaps that's even an element of the economic development discussion that we can have going forward. I would welcome any thoughts you have on how those concerns can be translated into either additional recommendations, additional discussions in the summaries or additional presentations and discussions for next year.

**Kayla Dowty:** We're happy to provide a presentation or even a short e-mail about economic development that geothermal has here in the state in full transparency. We're prioritizing development outside of the state, which certainly hurts economic development. We think that there's a large market here in the state for firm-based load power and we're looking at ways that we can find a match there.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** I feel that's a worthwhile note on the recommendations in terms of impact of that full subscription on in state supply. Kayla, do you think possibly you could try to reduce those thoughts into a sub bullet for the economic benefits discussion because it flows into the concept of having a wider western market.

**Kayla Dowty:** Absolutely. I will draft something and get it over to you.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Thank you. Mr. Burns, can you give us insight into economic development opportunities and anything you see in GOED related to renewable energy development and if the discussion of reg even comes up in the economic development discussions?

**Thomas Burns:** Can you color in the thoughts about regionalization for me a little bit? What do you mean by that?

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** I mean energy markets. We're talking about in terms of regional transmission organizations so that our things we develop in state can get sold, we can pull in power from out of state and everything.

**Thomas Burns:** Director McClinton and I separately visited Denmark in October to go through what their renewable green energy portfolio is and obviously they are robust in that area. That being said, they only have 6 million people and geographically about double the size of Clark County, Nevada so it is a little easier to steer the ship of 6 million people versus 335,000,000 as a nation. We have some opportunities that I think will lead to some green hydrogen opportunities in rural Nevada. There are some that provide a lot of jobs and have some significant capital expenditure component to it and then there are other ones that have specifically data centers that have very large capital expenditure commitments, but smaller employment loads and having an ability to mix those in because there are some places in our state that don't want 4000 new jobs coming to their community, right? Allowing them to have a ballast in their economic environment is probably a pretty good idea and as we encounter the scarcity of electricity that it is right now, that has deferred or caused some of those opportunities to go away. Going back to what was said earlier, the thought that Greenlink is fully subscribed is a little daunting in that we were counting on that to alleviate some of the challenges we

have in that space right now and kind of felt like I was kind of led to believe that would be one of the solutions to that.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** So two thoughts from what you just shared. First being director, we need to add a recommendation related to the presentation discussion and regarding the status of subscription on the Greenlink projects. Maybe run it by NV Energy?

**Director McClinton:** Yes, let's run it by them first, but most definitely want it included because I don't know how much they're able to share right now.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Updates maybe? Maybe they can give us quarterly written updates to give us the status of subscription on Greenlink and the efforts to expand transmission opportunities to relieve that congestion.

**Eric Witkoski:** That would be very helpful because that would help us understand what the commitments of full subscription are.

**Director McClinton:** If they can share who subscribed to it and for how much, you know what type of megawatts.

**Thomas Burns:** I guess the comment that was going to a lot of wholesalers which would lead me to believe a lot of that power would be leaving our state and maybe I'm naive to that, but that would lead me to believe that is a little troubling.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** In another life of mine, I'm a planning Commissioner for the city of Las Vegas and we now have renewable projects coming to us that want entitlements on land. We at a planning level have a concern about giving land that may end up being a project developed to go out of state if there are not current commitments with NV Energy.

**Director McClinton:** Mr. Sanchez on his call. I don't know if he can speak to this right now.

**Tony Sanchez:** To the concerns in terms of the status of subscription, it's not whether we want to, or do we want to update. It's to whatever extent we're allowed to. It's not like we pick who gets to utilize Greenlink. It's regulated by FERC rules of conduct and first come first serve. We don't make the decision.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** The Director and I can try to draft some language for you guys to just make sure we're not trying to commit you to something that you can't do.

**Tony Sanchez:** Yes, we were able to review all the recommendations and everything. It's an immense amount of work that you put into those. We did not have issues with what was presented, so we appreciate all that hard work but we will gladly walk through the process and get as technical as folks want to.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Mr. Burns, the other question I was going to ask you is we've got the PUCN and GOE being engaged and representing Nevada in a meaningful way in regional conversations, since there is a specific line item in SB448 for us to advise the governor and the

legislature on economic development, is there a benefit in adding that in relative to your agency and your work? Are there regional efforts that we should be making so that our policy makers are aware that you're going to and you're intending to represent Nevada for economic development purposes at a regional level?

**Thomas Burns:** Yeah, I would think so. I will give that some additional thought.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** We'll try to draft some language. I don't know what your economic development trade groups are or the entities that you work with.

**Thomas Burns:** We have 8 regional RDA's regional that we work through.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** What about when you say regional RDA's, I know you've got LVGEA and other instate regional entities, but what about an Interstate level? Do you go to meetings with other economic development agencies from California, Arizona, Colorado?

**Thomas Burns:** There's a nationwide organization that meets twice a year.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Do they have any of the similar sort of subcommittees that Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno addressed for CSG and NCSL?

**Thomas Burns:** No

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** We'll craft something and you can say if it works.

**John Williams:** This is John Williams with the Bonneville Power Administration.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Hi, Mr. Williams, thank you for joining. Since you are with Bonneville Power and you are a big piece of this, I will give you a second if there was anything specific from a public comment perspective that you wanted to add?

**Jo**

**hn Williams:** No, not really. I think that most of the Members know that Bonneville over a year ago indicated that it is looking at joining SPP Markets+. Since then, we've had congressional members, Oregon and Washington State leadership asking Bonneville to review our analytical findings and to delay our decision. We are doing that and we're watching Pathways Initiative process very closely to see if the governance issue can be resolved.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Mr. Papez, any thoughts from a transmission operator developer perspective that we haven't covered?

**Luke Papez:** Nothing immediately comes to mind. I do appreciate the time taken to develop the recommendations. I'll take the remainder of the day and tomorrow to get back to you. If there's anything specific that we'd recommend for that inclusion in the report.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Mr. Cruz, anything from a large user perspective, from the mining industry?

**Luke Papez:** As mentioned by other Members, I'll be reviewing the document and if I have something, I'll reply back by e-mail.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Miss Becker. Miss Mujica? Anything else?

**Leslie Mujica:** No, thank you for a wonderful presentation and I want to commend you Chair for doing a great job, going through every single meeting we had. That was a tremendous help.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Alright, Director. Anything else? I think we've done a thorough walkthrough on the report and I really appreciate Members letting me put you on the spot and just have those discussions for brainstorming.

**Director McClinton:** No, I have nothing else at this time. I just want to thank everybody for making time today. I know it's last minute, but this is crucial that we get this done.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** This was the time and place to have the discussion about what was in the report. Do we have to take a specific action on this or because we set up the protocol for folks to provide input by e-mail through close of business tomorrow? Are we good Ms. Ting? What specific action must we take to be in compliance with all of our meeting rules and being able to get this approved over e-mail now that we've discussed it?

**Nicole Ting:** If everybody is agreeable with what's in the report today, we can approve. If people aren't in agreement with what's in the report, we would have to come back for a public meeting to approve it. Although someone could make a motion that you could take the comments here today and you don't need to vote so I'd say someone make a motion on that. All the comments are considered and after considering all the comments, we'll submit the report at a later time considering all those comments.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** We then are not able to integrate potential comments that come in via e-mail subsequent to this meeting?

**Nicole Ting:** Yes, you are as long as everybody's in agreement with that, that's why I do it by a motion.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Let me make sure I got my verbiage right. In relation to the biennial report, I would like to make a motion that the report be approved, subject to comments that have been discussed today and that will be integrated into the report and subject to any other e-mail comments from Task Force members that would be consistent with the report for inclusion.

**Eric Witkoski:** I second.

**Asm. Daniele Monroe-Moreno:** With those additional comments and suggestions that may come in by the end of business tomorrow, how are you going to get consensus from the members in agreement with those additions before the final report is submitted?

**Nicole Ting:** That is kind of what we're agreeing to today. The motion is that we wouldn't need another consensus to come to another consensus. We would have to come back to another public meeting so the motion right now on the floor would be that there's not going to be a consensus like a vote on the new things that are going to come in. As long as they're in accordance and in agreement with what was discussed today. For everyone to have a full vote and agreement on the new things, that would have to be a full public body meeting. We won't be able to do it through e-mail.

**Eric Witkoski:** My second was kind of based on the premise that the newcomers were within the scope of what the recommendations are. I think that's how Jennifer framed it.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** If something is missing, then that is completely new and outside of the scope. For spirit of this report, could it not be included unless we had a separate meeting?

**Nicole Ting:** Yes, I think you framed it very well. Something that we did not discuss today, something that was not in accordance with what was discussed.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** And anything that came in that was in the spirit or scope of discussions today but that was not something that say Director McClinton thought was appropriate for the report. There's not an opportunity to discuss and vote on that. It either must be included because it falls in the spirit and the scope. How do you distinguish?

**Nicole Ting:** We could frame the motion differently. It depends on what the Commission wants to do and what the Commission's comfortable with if they're comfortable with new things coming in, we can redraw. We can take back the motion and then do a new motion. If everybody is comfortable with what we discussed today going in, then we could all do that also. It just depends on what the

Commission's comfortable with, but to your point, your point of how we distinguish. I think that's something that could be done. I think it's reasonable if it's discussed today, then I think we can put it in, persuaded to that motion.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** To be clear, the folks that aren't here today, that might have a thought about something they want in the report can be included? I also understand limitations coming up to the due date for this, which is by the 30th, which is a Saturday, which means that we would have to have submission by the 27<sup>th</sup>. This does not give us a lot of options to come back together. What is your recommendation on how to accommodate that? The ability for people to provide comments that may fall outside what we discussed today, especially where they were not here and able to be part of the discussion.

**Nicole Ting:** It depends on what the Commission wants to do. If the Commission wants to accept comments and feedback from people that aren't here today, we could include that in the motion, but as long as the Commission's acceptable with that, the motion would have to be a timeline by two days from now, 48 hours from midnight or 5:00 PM tomorrow. The Commission can come together and as long as the Commission agrees, all comments that are received by this time will be considered. We can have the Commission designate someone to be that deciding factor too. They will include all the comments that they believe are reasonable or necessary. We don't have to do it by subject matter, we could do it by a certain person decides, or we can do it by subject matter, but it really is just what the Commission's comfortable with and what the Commission wants to do.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Looking for input from the rest of the task force. I am comfortable with sending in comments and input by close of business tomorrow. There may be something that's so outside of our mandate from SB448 or something that isn't within the spirit of where we're trying to go with this.

**Director McClinton:** I think the overall goal is to make sure that we have comments from every Commissioner. Will we have to reconvene as a body again?

**Eric Witkoski:** Could we?

**Richard Perkins:** I'm sure.

**Eric Witkoski:** Could we designate Director McClinton as the clearinghouse to decide whether it is the Governor's Task Force and he could decide whether the new step is way beyond the scope of what we've got here for recommendations or not?

**Nicole Ting:** I think that's just what you're about to see. I think that's a natural progression of where

we're heading. If the Director was put in charge of the Task Force report and he could in his discretion, include things that he believes are similar to the spirit and within what he understands the Commission's purpose is for what they want in their report.

**Richard Perkins:** I'm struggling with this, having spent decades in the legislative process and watching commissions like this one, I can tell you have full faith in Director McClinton voting on something like this in the dark, it makes me very uncomfortable. Spirit is very subjective and we have meetings like this for a reason, that people can't make the meeting then they can't make the meeting. I couldn't support a motion that allows some change in our report outside of the deliberations of the entire Commission.

**Director McClinton:** I have my team on here so we need to reconvene as the body of a whole. What is our best date? Can we do this on Friday or Monday?

**Lezlie Helget:** We can go ahead and try to schedule another meeting prior to the due date. I believe that we could do Friday, Monday or Tuesday of next week.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Ms. Helget, will one of those days be better for the director than others, even though I know he's saying he will make it happen and I know he will. Is there one that is better for him than other days?

**Director McClinton:** Friday anytime after 3:00p or Monday anytime after 1:30p. So I would say Monday's probably the best day for me.

**Asm. Daniele Monroe-Moreno:** That Monday, December 2nd or Monday, November 25<sup>th</sup>?

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** I could do 2:30p Director.

**Director McClinton:** We will review the final document and get everybody to vote. We want everybody's feedback and comments by closing business tomorrow. That way we can finalize this final document to include everybody's input and then we reconvene as the body of the whole on Monday, November 25<sup>th</sup>, at 2:30p. Leslie and team can you get that meeting notice out today?

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Let's also just add in minute approval, since we couldn't do it today and let's make sure everybody gets those minutes distributed by e-mail. Everybody is to get us comments by close of business tomorrow. Any members of the public who wish to comment please do so by noon tomorrow. I think the next item is public comment. Anybody from the public wishing to make comments?

**Asm. Daniele Monroe-Moreno:** I'm on the Commission, but we just ensure that all the Members of this Commission, especially the ones that we're not here today, get the information about the upcoming meeting so that they can participate.

**Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor:** Absolutely. I believe that Ms. Helget and Ms. Fredley are going to create an agenda and notice it out today.

**Director McClinton:** Correct, along with a timeline, meaning that everybody's edits are due by close of business tomorrow. We reconvene again at 2:30p on Monday, November 25th, along with October minutes for approval.

**Asm. Daniele Monroe-Moreno:** That would be great if we get the information from today to all the members and agenda for the upcoming meeting and the requirements of what's expected for them to get their ideas in by end of business in tomorrow, so that everyone can participate in this process would be ideal.

5. **Question and Answer:** None at this time.
6. **Public comments and discussion:** No public comment was made.
7. **Adjournment:** Chairwomen Jennifer Taylor: With that, I make a motion to adjourn.

This notice and agenda have been posted on or before 9:00 a.m. on the third working day before the meeting at the following locations:

- (1) Governor's Office of Energy principal office at 600 E. William St., Ste. 200, Carson City, NV
- (2) Governor's Office of Energy website: <http://energy.nv.gov>
- (3) Nevada State official website: <https://notice.nv.gov>