

The meeting was held at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 10, 2014 at the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Suite 4401, Las Vegas, Nevada.

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE

Chairman	George F. Ogilvie III
Vice Chairman	Berlyn D. Miller
Commissioner	Bob Coffin
Commissioner	J. Brin Gibson
Commissioner	Duncan R. McCoy
Commissioner	Puoy K. Premsrirut
Commissioner	Steve Sisolak

DEPUTY ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Special Counsel, Attorney General	Jennifer T. Crandell
Special Counsel, Attorney General	Ann C. Pongracz

COMMISSION STAFF IN ATTENDANCE

Executive Director	Jayne Harkins, P.E.
Deputy Executive Director	James D. Salo
Chief of Finance and Administration	Douglas N. Beatty
Assistant Director of Engineering and Operations	Robert D. Reese
Manager, Energy Services	Gail A. Bates
Manager, Hydropower Program	Craig N. Pyper
Assistant Hydropower Program Manager	Lisa M. Ray
Natural Resource Analyst	Jason Thiriot
Senior Accountant	Gail L. Benton
Senior Energy Accountant	Richard M. Sanders
Senior Energy Accountant	Kalora E. Snyder
Office Manager	Judy K. Atwood
Administrative Assistant IV	Brenda Haymore
Administrative Assistant II	Gina L. Goodman
Administrative Assistant II	Carla Miguel

OTHERS PRESENT; REPRESENTING

Bureau of Consumer Protection	David Chairez
Bureau of Consumer Protection	Paul Stuhff
Bureau of Consumer Protection	Eric Witkoski
Cameo, Kayser & Associates	Cynthia L. Gloe
City of Henderson	Suzette Wheeler
Consultant	Sandra Fairchild
Consultant	Sara A. Price, Esq.

OTHERS PRESENT; REPRESENTING (Continued)

NV Energy
Office of the Military
Overton Power District No. 5
Overton Power District No. 5
Self
Senator Reid's Office
Southern Nevada Water Authority
Southern Nevada Water Authority

Douglas Brooks
Sandor Duran
Mendis Cooper
Terry Romero
Gary Brodt
Vinny Spotleson
Jordan Bunker
Scott Krantz

**COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION
OF NEVADA
MEETING OF JUNE 10, 2014**

INDEX

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
A.	Conformance to Open Meeting Law	1
B.	Comments from the public. (No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.)	1
C.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Approval of minutes of the May 13, 2014 meeting	1
D.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Public Hearing on proposed regulations of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada (Commission) contained in Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 538, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) File No. R148-13	1
E.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to adopt new, amended and repeal of permanent regulations of the Commission contained in NAC, Chapter 538, LCB File No. R148-13, with the proposed revisions.....	6
F.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to ratify the Petition for Leave to Intervene filed in Docket No. 14-04024 on behalf of the Commission on May 21, 2014 in the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada proceeding considering the joint application of Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy and Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy for approval of amendments to energy supply plans to reflect participation in the energy imbalance market	7
G.	<i>For Possible Action:</i> Consideration of and possible action to ratify the Petition for Leave to Intervene filed in Docket No. 14-05004 on behalf of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada (Commission) on May 28, 2014 in the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUC-N) proceeding considering the application of Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy for authority to increase its annual revenue requirement for general rates charged to all classes of electric customers and for relief properly related thereto	8

**COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION
OF NEVADA
MEETING OF JUNE 10, 2014**

INDEX (Continued)

H.	<i>For Information Only:</i> Status update on Motions to Intervene in various regulatory proceedings before the PUC-N and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.....	9
I.	<i>For Information Only:</i> Status update on the hydrologic conditions, drought, and climate of the Colorado River Basin, Nevada's consumptive use of Colorado River water, and other developments on the Colorado River.....	11
J.	Comments from the public. (No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.).....	12
K.	Comments and questions from the Commission members	12
L.	Selection of the next possible meeting date	12
M.	Adjournment	13

The Colorado River Commission meeting was called to order by Chairman Ogilvie at 1:02 p.m. followed by the pledge of allegiance.

A moment of silence was observed in remembrance of Officers Alyn Beck, Igor Solbo and private citizen Joseph Robert Wilcox who were killed on June 8, 2014.

A. Conformance to Open Meeting Law.

Executive Director Jayne Harkins confirmed that the meeting was in compliance with the Open Meeting Law.

B. Comments from the public. (No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.)

Chairman Ogilvie stated that Item D was a public hearing on proposed regulations of the Commission contained in Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 538. Meeting attendees were informed that the general public would have an opportunity to comment on the proposed regulations at that time. Attendees wishing to speak during the public hearing were instructed to sign the attendance sheet and speaker form located at the back of the room at this time.

Chairman Ogilvie asked if there were any comments or questions from the public. There were none.

C. For Possible Action: Approval of minutes of the May 13, 2014 meeting.

Commissioner McCoy moved for approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Miller and approved by a unanimous vote of those present. Commissioner Premsrirut was not present for the vote.

D. For Possible Action: Public Hearing on proposed regulations of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada (Commission) contained in Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 538, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) File No. R148-13.

Ms. Harkins stated that Agenda Item D is the public hearing on proposed regulations of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada contained in NAC Chapter 538, LCB File No. R148-13. Ms. Harkins recommended the Commission conduct a hearing on the proposed regulations in conformance with the provisions for adoption or amendment of administrative regulations in Nevada's Administrative Procedures Act, Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 233B and Nevada's Open Meeting Law contained in NRS 241.

Chairman Ogilvie opened the public hearing at about 1:15 p.m. Chairman Ogilvie stated that the purpose of the hearing was to receive comments on the proposed regulations of

the Commission contained in NAC 538. He asked Ms. Harkins to confirm that the notice and intent to act upon regulation had been noticed and posted in conformance with the appropriate Nevada law.

Ms. Harkins confirmed that the notice of hearing for the adoption, amendment, and repeal of permanent regulations of the Commission contained in NAC Chapter 538, LCB File No. R148-13 had been posted in accordance with NRS 233B.060, that the public hearing agenda had been posted in accordance with Nevada's Open Meeting Law and NRS 233B.061(5), and that the public hearing was being conducted in accordance with NRS 233B and the Open Meeting Law.

Commissioner Premsrirut arrived at this time.

Chairman Ogilvie asked Ms. Harkins to explain the substance of the proposed adoption, amendment, and repeal of the regulations.

Ms. Harkins stated that there were numerous changes that were being proposed and they fell under five broad headings including: rules of practice and procedure before the Commission; how documents are to be received by the Commission; maintaining service lists; and how the Commission may appoint one or more presiding officers to conduct hearings. She stated that another broad category of the proposed regulations addressed the allocation of Schedule D power from the Boulder Canyon Project Act. These amendments address requirements of the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2011 and Assembly Bill 199 from the last legislative session.

Ms. Harkins stated further that these regulations include amendments to various provisions governing the marketing of electric power by the Commission including: defining Schedule A and Schedule C power; describing the steps the Commission will take to reallocate power; describing how the Commission will offer new Hoover power contracts to existing Schedule A and B Contractors, and describing the Post 2017 contract provisions for Schedule A, B, and D Contractors; and provisions describing the eligibility of Contractors and explaining how the power will be marketed by the Western Area Power Administration. The last broad category of other matters addressed includes metering and risk management procedures. Ms. Harkins stated that these regulations would require the Commission's end-user retail Contractors to provide the Commission with metered data for billing, require Contractors to use meter equipment that meets the standards approved by the Executive Director, require the Contractors to provide physical access to metering equipment to Commission staff, including access to Commission staff to physically disconnect power. The proposed regulations also reduce the notification period from six months to 90 days for the Commission to provide notice of a change in administrative charge, and provide the Commission the ability to review the creditworthiness of all Contractors, and in the future to implement prepayments of its bills to all Contractors and/or to establish a cash working capital fund.

Ms. Harkins added that the proposed regulations also provide the ability to reallocate hydropower on a short-term basis in the event a Contractor's allocation of hydropower has been suspended. Lastly, there are two sections being repealed.

Chairman Ogilvie said that he understood Staff held a workshop on April 21, 2014 and asked Ms. Harkins to provide the Commissioners with a report of the comments submitted at that workshop.

Ms. Harkins stated that Staff had received oral comments at the workshop and written comments from eight entities. They included Basic Power Company, the Attorney General's Bureau of Consumer Protection, the City of Henderson, the City of Mesquite, Nevada Power Company (Nevada Power), Olin Corporation, the Southern Nevada Water Authority and Valley Electric Association. Ms. Harkins said that there were specific comments related to Schedule A and B as it has been allocated to Nevada Power, and whether Schedule A should also go to residential customers, or if the benefit of Schedule A power should continue to go to all customers and the benefit of Schedule B power go to residential customers as is done currently now. Ms. Harkins added that Staff received numerous other comments, many of which were incorporated into the proposed regulations. Staff provided responses to the comments made, in the form of a Comment and Response Matrix, including whether or not changes would be incorporated in the proposed regulations.

Ms. Harkins further stated that Staff was offering two other amendments to what was included in the notice of hearing document. Those changes are to NAC Chapter 538 Section 32(4), for which Staff recommends going back to original regulation. Specifically, Staff recommends an additional change that Nevada Power shall pass through to its residential class of rate payer, only the economic benefits of power from Schedule B. And then in Section 34(5), one of the Commission's customers requested that the text "or their agents" be inserted in that section to read that "...each Contractor or their agent(s) that obtains all its electric power from the Commission must provide the Commission with the ability to physically disconnect the Contractor's power for failure to pay a power invoice from the Commission in a timely manner, without adversely impacting the delivery of power to other Contractors." It is Staff's recommendation that "or their agents" be inserted in Section 34(5).

Chairman Ogilvie requested clarification with respect to the change proposed to Section 32(4). He noted that the proposed amendment to the regulation that was originally received by the Commissioners included a pass through of the benefit of Schedule A to residential customers of Nevada Power, as well as a pass through of the benefit of Schedule B. Chairman Ogilvie asked if the proposed change would essentially leave that section of the regulation the same, so that only the Schedule B benefit would be passed through, and there would be no pass through of the Schedule A benefit.

Ms. Harkins affirmed that was correct.

Chairman Ogilvie asked if Staff had received any further comments, oral or verbal, by anyone.

Ms. Harkins stated that Staff had not received any other written comments.

Chairman Ogilvie asked if the Commissioners had questions regarding the comments or needed clarification of comments.

Commissioner Gibson asked Ms. Harkins to explain the rationale behind allowing the economic benefit pass through just for Schedule B in Section 32(4).

Ms. Harkins explained that the pass through of Schedule B to residential customers has been in place for approximately 27 years. When this pass through began, the rationale for providing the benefit to residential customers was that the Hoover power would be used primarily for load following, that residential customers caused that load following, and that therefore, residential customers should get the benefit of Schedule B.

Ms. Harkins added that Staff received data from Nevada Power which was checked with staff of the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUC-N) and provided to the Commissioners in a White Paper on Schedule A and B. Ms. Harkins explained that Staff looked at 2013 residential customer data, and based on the Schedule B benefit, on average a residential customer received a Schedule B benefit of approximately \$4.30 per year. Ms. Harkins further stated that residential customers also receive a benefit from Schedule A, when the PUC-N currently calculates the benefits to all customers.

Ms. Harkins also stated that nonresidential customers paid an average of about \$27.00 more per year than they would have if the Schedule B benefit was not limited to the residential customers, and that the rationale at the time was to benefit the residential customers. Ms. Harkins added that Staff was not recommending a change, but recommending that the regulation be kept substantially the same as it is currently.

Chairman Ogilvie asked Ms. Harkins to confirm that if Schedule A was included in the pass through with Schedule B for 2013, Nevada Power's residential customers would have realized approximately \$3.50, maybe \$4.00 more in savings on an annual basis, and that the nonresidential customers, commercial customers, would end up paying higher energy costs of approximately \$22.50 or \$23.00 on an annual basis.

Ms. Harkins agreed that was correct.

Chairman Ogilvie asked if the Commissioners had any other questions. There were none.

Chairman Ogilvie then asked if there were any members of the general public who would like to provide oral comments. There were none.

Ms. Harkins noted that Staff received comments from the Bureau of Consumer Protection which are included in the Commissioner's Briefing book; however no comments were

received from the PUC-N even though Staff had spoken with PUC-N staff and verified numbers with them.

Chairman Ogilvie asked if there were any further comments.

Vice Chairman Miller asked Ms. Harkins to clarify comments made regarding the exit fees and whether or not Nevada Power would impose exit fees, and if exit fees would be applied to those who had previously paid exit fees or to other Schedule D new allottees.

Ms. Harkins said that Nevada Power had concerns regarding Section 16(2) (e) and (f) as to how the tariff would be implemented. Ms. Harkins explained that Staff has had discussions with Nevada Power and is coming to an agreement as to what that would look like. Ms. Harkins further stated that 16(2)(f) provides that current Commission customers, such as the Southern Nevada Water Authority and its Member Agencies who have exited and paid an exit fee already, would not have to pay any further exit fees, if they would get a Schedule D allocation, because they have already exited and paid their fee. The Commission and Nevada Power have come to an agreement on the language in the proposed regulations.

Vice Chairman Miller asked that if any other entity that receives an allocation of Schedule D would be required under the NRS to pay exit fees.

Ms. Harkins said that Staff has been working with Nevada Power on how to implement the tariff and believes there is an understanding that those entities who receive Schedule D allocations would not have to pay an exit fee because those entities will not be exiting Nevada Power's services. Ms. Harkins further stated that there will be two different tariffs in place, one for those who will exit completely and one for those who do not.

Commissioner Coffin read into the record one paragraph from comments provided by the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Attorney General's office. "The Bureau of Consumer Protection (BCP) appreciates the opportunity to file comments on the proposed regulations. Specifically, for the reasons detailed below, BCP is supportive of the CRC's proposed amendment to Section 32, Paragraph 4, of NAC 538.540, to pass through the full benefits and costs of power from both Schedule A and Schedule B to Nevada Power Company's residential customers. Further, the BCP would note, there is no statutory or regulatory ratemaking prohibition that would keep the CRC from adopting a regulation that would fully allocate Schedule A to the residential class of NPC. Such an approach is consistent with what was done in 1987 with Schedule B and it causes the benefit of Schedule A to have a positive impact on the approximately 750,000 residential customers of Nevada Power Company." Commissioner Coffin stated that BCP's introductory comment is the most important and indicates support for this.

Chairman Ogilvie asked if there were other questions or comments. There were none. He closed the hearing and moved to the next agenda item which was the consideration of and possible action on the proposed regulations.

E. *For Possible Action:* Consideration of and possible action to adopt new, amended and repeal of permanent regulations of the Commission contained in Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Chapter 538, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) File No. R148-13, with the proposed revisions.

Ms. Harkins explained that Agenda Item E was consideration of and possible action to adopt new, amended, and repeal of permanent regulations of the Commission contained in NAC, Chapter 538, LCB File No. R148-13, with the proposed revisions. Ms. Harkins recommended the Commission, following the conclusion of the hearing conducted under Agenda Item D, approve the adoption of the new, amended, and repealed permanent regulations of the Commission contained in NAC, Chapter 538, Legislative Counsel Bureau File No. R148-13, with the proposed revisions attached to the briefing document.

Chairman Ogilvie asked for a motion to adopt.

Ms. Ann Pongracz asked that the Commission consider voting on the two amendments to the regulations first.

Commissioner Coffin moved for approval to incorporate the amendments set forth under Agenda Item E into the proposed regulations. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Miller and approved by unanimous vote.

Commissioner Coffin moved for the adoption of the proposed regulations outlined in the public hearing.

Commissioner Sisolak asked for clarification that the motion is for the regulation as amended.

Chairman Ogilvie affirmed it was.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Gibson and approved by unanimous vote.

Chairman Ogilvie thanked the Staff for their work on the proposed regulations.

Ms. Harkins thanked the Chairman and stated on the record that she thanked LCB staff Mr. Brian Fernley Gonzales and Ms. Debra Corp of the Carson City office for their assistance with the proposed regulations.

The proceedings were concluded at 1:29 p.m.

F. For Possible Action: Consideration of and possible action to ratify the Petition for Leave to Intervene (PLTI) filed in Docket No. 14-04024 on behalf of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada (Commission) on May 21, 2014 in the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUC-N) proceeding considering the joint application of Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy and Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy for approval of amendments to energy supply plans to reflect participation in the energy imbalance market.

Energy Services Manager Gail A. Bates explained that on April 16, 2014, Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy and Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy filed a joint application with the PUC-N requesting approval of certain amendments to their energy supply plans to reflect their participation in the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) Energy Imbalance Market (EIM). The joint applicants announced their intent to participate in the CAISO EIM in November of 2013.

The CAISO EIM is a voluntary, five-minute balancing market. In an EIM, participants are able to commit their excess generation into the EIM and, in return, acquire imbalance energy from the EIM. The Commission has a direct and substantial interest in NV Energy's participation in the CAISO EIM because NV Energy's participation in the CAISO EIM may change how Nevada Power utilizes the hydropower which it obtains from the Commission. The Commission has a statutory duty under Nevada Revised Statutes 538.161(2) to ensure that the Hoover power it provides to Nevada Power and other Hoover Contractors, is utilized "for the greatest possible benefit to this state". Therefore, the Commission has a direct and substantial interest in participating in this proceeding to obtain information regarding whether NV Energy intends to commit into the EIM any of the Hoover hydropower it receives under contract with the Commission. The Commission's interest cannot be adequately protected by any other party. The Commission staff filed the PLTI on May 21, 2014, the deadline set by the PUC-N for intervention.

Staff requested that the Commission ratify the PLTI in PUC-N Docket No. 14-04024.

Commissioner Sisolak asked what is the cost contemplated for this Intervention.

Ms. Bates responded that all legal work will be completed by in-house attorneys.

Commissioner Coffin commended Staff for providing a well-written explanation of CAISO EIM and presenting the information in layman's language making the principle concerning this docket easily understood.

Chairman Ogilvie asked if the Commission could receive notification about these PUC-N filings in advance so that ratification will not be necessary.

Ms. Bates responded that most of the time dockets and deadlines occur quite quickly leaving Staff without ample time to inform the Commission before action is required.

Staff makes every effort to get notification of filings to the Commission in advance so that ratification will not be necessary.

Commissioner McCoy motioned to ratify the PLTI filed in Docket No. 14-04024 on behalf of the Commission on May 21, 2014 in the PUC-N proceeding considering the joint application of Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy and Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy for approval of amendments to energy supply plans to reflect participation in the energy imbalance market. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Miller and approved by a unanimous vote.

G. *For Possible Action:* Consideration of and possible action to ratify the Petition for Leave to Intervene (PLTI) filed in Docket No. 14-05004 on behalf of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada (Commission) on May 28, 2014 in the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUC-N) proceeding considering the application of Nevada Power Company for authority to increase its annual revenue requirement for general rates charged to all classes of electric customers and for relief properly related thereto.

Energy Services Manager Gail A. Bates explained that on May 2, 2014, Nevada Power filed an application with the PUC-N for authority to increase its annual revenue requirement for general rates charged to all classes of electric customers and for relief properly related thereto. The Commission's interest in this docket is twofold. First, the Commission purchases Distribution Only Service (DOS) from Nevada Power and utilizes DOS in providing electric service to the Southern Nevada Water Authority and its Member Agencies. Through its participation in this docket, the Commission seeks to understand the impact of this filing on the DOS rates charged to its customers, and to ensure that any changes to DOS rates are just and reasonable. Second, Nevada Power has the contractual obligation to pass through the benefits of Hoover B power that it receives from the Commission to its residential customers through its rate filings with the PUC-N. The pass through of the Hoover B benefit has been raised as an issue by intervenors in past PUC-N general rate case proceedings. By intervening in this docket, the Commission will be ready to participate in these discussions if necessary.

The Commission has a direct and substantial interest in these proceeding which cannot be adequately protected by any other party. Accordingly, the Commission staff filed the PLTI on May 28, 2014, the deadline set by the PUC-N for intervention.

Staff requested that the Commission ratify the PLTI filed on May 28, 2014.

Commissioner Sisolak asked what is the cost contemplated for this Intervention.

Ms. Bates responded that there is zero cost.

Commissioner Sisolak commented that the Certificate of Service is quite long, four pages. He does not want to get into something that will cost a huge amount of Staff time unless it is really important and relevant. He asked if this list contain only Intervenors.

Ann Pongracz, Special Counsel, Attorney General, responded that the Certificate of Service contains Intervenor, members of Intervenor's staff as well as commenters who have not been granted full Intervenor status.

Ms. Bates stated that Staff is not anticipating being a particularly active Intervenor in Docket No. 14-05004, it is more of a defensive posture. Staff will not have to become active unless someone else raises an issue that could hurt the Commission's position in this docket.

Ms. Pongracz stated that in any event she will be the in-house attorney for the Commission.

Commissioner McCoy moved to ratify the PLTI filed in Docket No. 14-05004 on behalf of the Commission on May 28, 2014 in the PUC-N proceeding considering the application of Nevada Power Company for authority to increase its annual revenue requirement for general rates charged to all classes of electric customers and for relief properly related thereto. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Coffin and approved by a unanimous vote.

<p>H. <i>For Information Only:</i> Status update on Motions to Intervene in various regulatory proceedings before the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUC-N) and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).</p>

Energy Services Manager Gail A. Bates provided a status update on a number of PUC-N and FERC regulatory proceedings that the Commission is a party to.

FERC Docket Nos. ER13-1605-000 and ER13-1607-000: Interrelated applications made by NV Energy, Inc., on behalf of its public utility subsidiaries, Nevada Power Company (Nevada Power) and Sierra Pacific Power Company (Sierra Pacific), (collectively NV Energy) requesting authorization for: (1) the combination of the transmission and ancillary service rates of Nevada Power Company and Sierra Pacific Power Company into single-system rates (ER13-1605-000); and (2) a revision of the terms and conditions in their Open Access Transmission Tariff to reflect the consolidation of Nevada Power and Sierra Pacific, their respective transmission systems and single-system rates (ER13-1607-000). A settlement in principle has been reached and NV Energy is in the process of drafting an offer of settlement.

PUCN Docket No. 13-05056: Application of Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy (Nevada Power) and Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy (Sierra) for approval to consolidate Nevada Power and Sierra into a single jurisdictional utility, transfer and modify Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity to reflect the consolidated utility's new legal name of NV Energy Operating Company, and consolidate generation assets. On March 14, 2014, the NVE Utilities filed a motion to vacate the procedural schedule and withdraw their application in this docket. The Commission and other intervenors objected to the granting of the motion if doing so would deny the

parties access to information regarding the costs and benefits of operating the ON-LINE transmission line on a consolidated state-wide basis.

The PUC-N granted the motion to vacate and withdraw the application. However, the PUC-N also opened a separate investigation and rulemaking proceeding to determine the analyses required by the utilities and the information that must be submitted when NV Energy makes its filing in early 2015 to either operate as two separate utilities under a permanent joint dispatch agreement (two-utility model) or as a consolidated utility (one-utility model) and to address the joint dispatch agreement or accounting protocols for a one- or two-utility model. A workshop has been scheduled for July 8, 2014.

Commissioner Coffin asked if this proceeding would help in the acquisition by MidAmerican. Perhaps, to clean up some back language that might not have been finished in the consolidated earlier merger in order to then be acquired by MidAmerican.

Ms. Bates replied that the corporate merger and the operational merger are separate proceedings. The subject of this docket is operational in nature and has to do more with the accounting protocols for how the companies will operate under a consolidated system.

Commissioner Coffin asked will there be another change if MidAmerican's accounting system varies from Nevada Power and Sierra Pacific. MidAmerican is not an interested party so does this affect these two subsidiaries only.

Ms. Bates affirmed that was correct it affects Nevada Power and Sierra Pacific.

Ms. Pongracz added that at this point in time there has been an integration of MidAmerican Energy Company's and Berkshire Hathaway Inc.'s people into the operating company of Nevada Power and Sierra Pacific. Ms. Bates is talking about the merger of the northern Nevada company, Sierra Pacific and the southern Nevada company, Nevada Power.

Commissioner Coffin stated that was what he was surprised about, seeing this come up after the acquisition. How long has it been?

Ms. Bates answered this docket came up with the MidAmerican merger in 2013. It was filed almost simultaneously with that merger.

Commissioner Coffin commented that he was just curious. He asked when these two companies were operating together as corporations were they using separate accounting methods. Is that what the PUC-N was faced with?

Ms. Pongracz responded that is what the PUC-N was faced with. In addition, what has happened here is the company withdrew their application to merge the northern and southern companies so they have more time to continue to work on that. There is an attorney here from the power company if you have specific questions.

Commissioner Coffin commented that it looks like a hangover that was never completed.

Ms. Pongracz replied having worked as counsel for Sprint for over twenty-five years these things are often intricate and mysterious.

Ms. Pongracz gave Deputy Executive Director Jim Salo's comments stating one of the major factors is that the northern and southern companies are now operating a single transmission line leaving several questions that come from the single line used by the two separate entities.

I. *For Information Only: Status update on the hydrologic conditions, drought, and climate of the Colorado River Basin, Nevada's consumptive use of Colorado River water, and other developments on the Colorado River.*

Natural Resource Group Analyst, Jason Thiriot, provided a report on the following:

- Unregulated Inflow into Lake Powell
- Storage Conditions
- Lake Mead water level at Hoover Dam
- Reservoir Storage as of June 5, 2014
- Lake Powell Unregulated Inflow
- Lake Powell End of Month Elevations based on May 2014, 24-month Study
- Lake Mead End of Month Elevation Projections
- U.S. West Drought Monitor
- U.S. Seasonal Drought Outlook
- Precipitation – Colorado River Basin as of June 9, 2014
- Colorado Basin River Forecast Center
- Monthly Precipitation for May 2014
- Monthly Precipitation, Las Vegas, NV as of May 31, 2014
- Cumulative Precipitation, Las Vegas, NV as of May 31, 2014
- Water Use in Southern Nevada

Chairman Ogilvie asked if the Water Year Unregulated Inflow was complete within a couple of acre-feet for 2014.

Mr. Thiriot responded not quite yet.

Chairman Ogilvie added it is not snowing anymore; it is pretty much most probable, correct?

Ms. Harkins explained that runoff is measured from April to July. There is a little bit of forecasting remaining.

Mr. Thiriot noted that is most probable will be at 9.0 million acre-feet (maf) release from Glen Canyon Dam for next year.

Commissioner Coffin commented that many constituents have asked why Lake Powell is filling up and not Lake Mead. His response is water management basic principle is store as high as you can on any system. Is that just sort of the rule?

Ms. Harkins responded that most all the water that comes into the system is from snowpack from the Rocky Mountains; therefore Lake Powell gets it first. The current operating criteria between Lake Powell and Lake Mead are written so the Lakes increase and decrease in storage together. The scenario is reevaluated and may change each water year which begins on October 1. Currently we know that because Lake Powell has come up in elevation from a good snow year, that no matter what happens going forward this year, we are getting a 9 maf release next year from Glen Canyon Dam, which is good news. The adjustment to Glen Canyon Dam's release into Lake Mead comes about 6 months to a year later when the system is reevaluated.

Commissioner Coffin commented that he thought we relied upon keeping the levels as high as possible because it does not cost any money to move it down.

Ms. Harkins responded that evaporation losses are usually higher in the lower parts of watersheds and typically water is stored upstream to save water. The Upper Basin reservoirs above Lake Powell are each operated independently but Lake Powell and Lake Mead are operated under the current guidelines to move them up and down together.

Commissioner Coffin commented so then that is a measureable factor.

Ms. Harkins affirmed it was.

A copy of the report is attached and made a part of the minutes. (See Attachment A.)

J. Comments from the public. (No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.)

Chairman Ogilvie asked if there were any comments or questions from the public. There were none.

K. Comments and questions from the Commission members.

Chairman Ogilvie asked if there were any comments or questions from the Commission members. There were none.

L. Selection of the next possible meeting date.

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 8, 2014, at the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Suite 4401, Las Vegas, Nevada.

M. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 1:54 p.m.

Jayne Harkins, P.E., Executive Director

APPROVED:

George F. Ogilvie III, Chairman