

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF NEVADA

Petition of GismoPower LLC to open an investigation)
and rulemaking docket to adopt new regulations)
governing the interconnection of plug-in photovoltaic) Docket No. 26-09004
appliances.)
_____)

At a general session of the Public Utilities
Commission of Nevada, held at its offices
on September 29, 2026.

PRESENT: Chair Hayley Williamson
Commissioner Tammy Cordova
Commissioner Randy J. Brown
Assistant Commission Secretary Trisha Osborne

ORDER

The Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (“Commission”) makes the following
findings of fact and conclusions of law:

I. INTRODUCTION

On September 3, 2026, GismoPower LLC (“GismoPower”) filed with the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (“Commission”) a petition, designated as Docket No. 26-09004, to open an investigation and rulemaking docket to adopt new regulations governing the interconnection of plug-in photovoltaic (“PV”) appliances. On September 8, 2026, GismoPower filed an amended petition. On September 25, 2026, GismoPower filed two comments in support of the petition, the second of which submitted an interim report from the federal research project described in the petition.

II. SUMMARY

The Commission declines to initiate a rulemaking on the regulation as proposed. However, the Commission grants the alternative request to initiate an investigatory docket to examine the interconnection of plug-in PV appliances.

III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

- On September 8, 2026, GismoPower filed the petition pursuant to the Nevada Revised Statutes (“NRS”) and the Nevada Administrative Code (“NAC”) Chapters 703 and 704, including, but not limited to, NAC 703.546.
- On September 15, 2026, the Commission issued a Notice of Petition to Adopt, Amend, or

Repeal a Regulation.

- The Regulatory Operations Staff of the Commission (“Staff”) participates as a matter of right pursuant to NRS 703.301.
- On September 25, 2026, the Commission received comments from Chris Boeres (Mr. Boeres), Solar United Neighbors (“SUN”), GismoPower, and Staff.
- On September 28, 2026, the Commission’s Office of General Counsel (“General Counsel”) filed a briefing memorandum recommending the Commission decline to initiate a rulemaking and instead open an investigation regarding the interconnection of PV appliances.
- On September 29, 2026, at a regularly scheduled agenda meeting, the Commission voted to adopt the recommendations contained in General Counsel’s briefing memorandum.

IV. PETITION

GismoPower’s Position

1. GismoPower requests that the Commission adopt regulations governing the interconnection of plug-in PV appliances, or in the alternative, initiate an investigatory docket to conduct a workshop regarding the interconnection of plug-in PV appliances. (Pet. at 9.)

GismoPower states that such regulations should define equipment classes, establish a qualification pathway, determine the scope of premises inspections, and develop an interconnection procedure applicable to all future applicants that wish to utilize mobile electric generating appliances (“MEGAs”). (*Id.* at 1.)

2. GismoPower states that the need for such regulations was demonstrated in Docket No. 26-05022, a consumer complaint proceeding wherein a customer whose plug-in PV appliance had received Permission to Operate from Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy (“Nevada Power”) in December 2024 subsequently sought to expand that system and faced permitting requirements from Clark County that had not been required for the original interconnection application. (*Id.* at 2.) GismoPower explains that the customer challenged the imposition of certain permitting requirements because the non-fixed, mobile nature of the

MEGA resulted in inconsistent classification of the equipment that increased county requirements for the project. (*Id.*)

3. GismoPower explains that Nevada Power's tariffs contemplate fixed installations and final inspections from jurisdictional authorities for interconnection to its grid. (*Id.*) Meanwhile, GismoPower notes that Nevada's net metering statutes only require that equipment be located on the customer-generator's premises without consideration of whether it is located on those premises but capable of relocation. (*Id.*) GismoPower provides that the differences in Nevada Power's tariffs and the law result in the MEGA having no path to interconnection. (*Id.*)

4. GismoPower states that it is currently party to a cooperative research and development agreement with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, supported by the United States Department of Energy's Solar Energy Technology Office, to develop technical acceptance criteria and interconnection readiness guidelines for certain MEGAs to aid in consistent evaluation by utilities and jurisdictional authorities. (*Id.* at 3.) GismoPower explains that the project is evaluating a survey of utility interconnection processes, identifying National Electrical Code and Underwriters Laboratories standards barriers to plug-in appliance interconnection, jurisdictional issues, and the creation of permitting and interconnection frameworks. (*Id.*) GismoPower states that "[t]he project was expressly designed to define a credible technical and procedural framework for provisional deployment of appliance-class distributed energy resources during the period before formal product listing is complete." (*Id.* at 4.) GismoPower filed an interim report on this study in the instant docket on September 25, 2026. (*See* GismoPower's September 25, 2026, Supplemental Comment, Att. A.)

5. GismoPower states that the concept of MEGAs has existed for a decade, their feasibility has been determined with federal funding, and mature regulatory models currently

exist for them elsewhere. (*Id.* at 4.) As examples, GismoPower notes that Germany adopted a complete framework for plug-in generation, Utah passed a law recognizing such devices and exempted certain MEGAs from interconnection agreements, California is considering a bill to establish safety standards for the technology, and Minnesota is also considering a similar bill. (*Id.* at 4-5.) GismoPower distinguishes its proposed regulation as not seeking an exemption from interconnection, but rather an orderly procedure within it on a permanent, dedicated circuit utilizing technology to cap exports similar to some of the laws discussed above. (*Id.* at 5.)

6. GismoPower states that the MEGA technology is analogous to bidirectional electric vehicles, which can export electricity from vehicles to premises through a cord and plug. (*Id.*) GismoPower provides that despite the similar characteristics to its MEGA, no utility or building department treats the vehicle as a fixed structure requiring a building permit. (*Id.*) Moreover, GismoPower states that its regulation would not raise issues regarding compensation because a plug-in PV appliance would remain subject to sizing limitations imposed by NRS 704.771 and is intended predominantly for on-site consumption. (*Id.* at 7.)

Mr. Boeres' Comments

7. Mr. Boeres requests that the Commission grant the petition and open a rulemaking or convene a workshop to examine his experience with plug-in PV appliances, statements made by Clark County, and the record that would be developed in such a proceeding. (Boeres Comments at 2.)

8. Mr. Boeres explains that he owns the home at which the appliance operates and was the complainant in the consumer complaint (Docket No. 26-05022) referenced by the petition. (*Id.* at 1.) Mr. Boeres states that in June of 2025 he applied to add solar modules to a previously approved system with no changes to the inverter or interconnection. (*Id.*) Mr. Boeres

further states that Clark County characterized the MEGA differently multiple times before confirming on September 21, 2026, that no building permit or inspections were required for the appliance while it is on portable casters, unanchored, and connected only by a cord and plug.

(*Id.*) Mr. Boeres provides that Clark County's recent determination only requires an electric permit for the dedicated 240-volt outlet, which the county had already permitted, inspected, and approved in 2023. (*Id.*) Mr. Boeres states that the process took fifteen months from application to resolution and subjected his property to a code enforcement case with the risk of fines. (*Id.*)

9. Mr. Boeres states that had the proposed regulation existed when he applied to get his MEGA interconnected, he would have had the approvals necessary to proceed at that time. (*Id.*) Mr. Boeres provides that the proposed regulation would prevent the delays and problems that he experienced from occurring each time a new customer seeks to interconnect a MEGA. (*Id.*)

SUN's Position

10. SUN states that nine states have passed legislation setting safety standards and allowing consumers to utilize plug-in solar devices. (SUN Comments at 1.) SUN provides that those states recognized that plug-in solar addresses a unique market need and requires its own distinct framework from rooftop solar or other large installations. (*Id.*) SUN states that traditional interconnection, permitting, and net-metering rules were established for large, permanent rooftop solar systems requiring structural modifications and custom wiring – a framework that creates unnecessary delay and additional costs. (*Id.*) SUN provides that unlike traditional arrays, plug-in solar devices are portable appliances that plug directly into a wall outlet to supply power straight to the home, which in turn reduces grid reliance and lowers electric bills. (*Id.*) SUN states that the portable nature of MEGAs expands renewable energy

access to households that could not otherwise install or afford traditional rooftop systems, such as renters, people in multi-family homes, or those with shaded or unsuitable roofs. (*Id.*)

11. SUN recommends that the Commission establish a regulatory framework for MEGAs that defines plug-in solar devices as portable PV generation devices intended primarily to offset part or all of the customer's electric consumption, certified and listed by a nationally recognized testing laboratory, capped at 1,200 watts per service address (or per dwelling unit in multifamily housing), and fully exempts the devices from interconnection, net metering, and related tariff requirements, including any advance approval, extraordinary fees, or utility-specified hardware. (*Id.* at 2.) SUN also recommends that the regulation exempt small plug-in devices rated at 391 watts or less from product-listing or building rules that would mandate physical alterations to a customer's wiring, electrical panel, or premises solely to accommodate the device. (*Id.*) Finally, SUN recommends a provision allowing utilities to offer an optional post-installation notification form for customers to report their address and device rating, provided the form is informational only and not a condition of installation or operation. (*Id.*)

Staff's Position

12. Staff states that it believes that GismoPower's request may require a change in the NRS; however, Staff does not oppose setting this matter for further proceedings to determine if a statutory change is required. (Staff's Comments at 1.)

GismoPower's Comments

13. GismoPower states that on September 21, 2026, the Clark County Building Department issued a written determination stating that county code does not require a building permit or inspection for a mobile electricity generating appliance if it is: 1) portable; 2) not anchored to the ground; and 3) does not make a permanent connection to the building's electrical

service equipment. (GismoPower's September 25, 2026, Comments at 1.) GismoPower provides that the county also stated that while an electrical permit is required, the Building Department had previously permitted, inspected, and approved the installation of a 250V PIPV outlet with shutoff switch for Mr. Boeres' residence. (*Id.*) GismoPower contends that such determinations support adoption of its proposed regulation. (*Id.*) GismoPower states that the proposed regulation would create statewide uniformity with Clark County's determinations and avoid the time and expense of the protracted application process that GismoPower's customer experienced. (*Id.* at 2.)

14. GismoPower states that Sarasota County, Florida and Clark County, Nevada both reached similar conclusions in treating the MEGA as an appliance for permitting purposes and notes that Sarasota County requested the appliance's product listing under National Electrical Code 422.6 as the basis for permitting. (*Id.*)

Commission Discussion and Findings

15. The Commission declines to initiate a rulemaking on the regulation as proposed and instead initiates an investigatory docket to examine the interconnection of plug-in PV appliances. The Commission notes that the safety and certification questions the petition itself acknowledges remain open, the proposed text overlaps with a statute the Legislature amended in 2025, and the technical record the petition relies on is still being developed. Each of those is a reason to build a record before considering writing a rule, and every commenter, including Staff, either supports or does not oppose further proceedings.

16. The proposed regulation seeks to square a possible ambiguity of Nevada's net metering laws and the traditionally fixed nature of net metering systems contemplated by Nevada Power's tariffs. To achieve this, GismoPower proposes a regulation clarifying that a MEGA

connected by cord and plug to a permitted dedicated circuit is “located on the customer-generator’s premises” for purposes of NRS 704.771, and that a utility may not treat the appliance’s mobility or vehicle registration as disqualifying. Specifically, § 2 of the proposed regulation states, in relevant part, that “[r]egistration of the appliance as a trailer or other vehicle under the laws of this state does not render the appliance a structure and does not affect its treatment under this section.”

17. The above provision seeks to remedy a problem experienced by a residential customer whose interconnection application for a MEGA was delayed pending county determinations regarding whether the appliance was a structure for purposes of Clark County’s code (See Docket No. 26-05022). In that docket, as detailed by the instant petition and subsequent comments, a consumer faced months of delays stemming from permitting questions regarding whether the subject MEGA was, among other issues, a “structure” requiring certain county permits. Although that sentence could be read as an attempt to dictate how a county classifies a MEGA, Section 2 by its terms governs only how a utility treats the appliance when processing an interconnection application, and the petition disclaims any effect on local authority. (Pet. at 7-8.)

18. The Commission finds that it cannot, by regulation, limit a county’s authority over structures and building codes. *See* NRS 278.020, 278.580. However, a regulation directing how a utility processes an interconnection application does not do that, and the Commission’s authority over that subject is express: NRS 704.773(9) directs the Commission to adopt regulations governing interconnection under net metering tariffs and, as amended in 2025, the procedures for applying for and installing a net metering system.

19. The proposed regulation also attempts to cure a perception that utilities might arbitrarily impose requirements for interconnection applications outside of applicable laws, regulations, or codes. To do so, § 3 of the proposed regulation seeks to prevent a utility from unilaterally imposing requirements outside the scope of jurisdictional governmental entities. The Commission finds that this concern is already addressed in large part by statute. As amended by Senate Bill 440 (2025), NRS 704.774 requires a customer-generator to obtain all permits and approvals required by any governmental entity and bars a utility from imposing additional standards, tests, controls, or insurance on a customer-generator who has done so. Section 3 of the proposed regulation overlaps substantially with that statute. However, what it adds is an answer to the question this docket actually presents: how a utility should treat an appliance that the local authority has determined it does not permit or inspect, when the utility's tariff conditions interconnection on a local inspection. The Commission finds that this is a question about the utility's tariff and NAC 704.8823, not about county authority, and it is one an investigatory docket can examine with Nevada Power, Staff, and the Bureau of Consumer Protection participating.

20. Finally, the Commission notes that the MEGA discussed by this petition may not be eligible as a net metering system under Nevada law. NRS 704.774(2) provides that "[a] net metering system used by a customer-generator must meet all applicable safety and power quality standards established by: (a) The National Electrical Code; (b) Underwriters Laboratories Inc.; and (c) The Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers." The petition does not represent that the MEGA is certified to a product safety standard. It relies instead on an electrical design sealed by a Nevada-licensed professional engineer, on a UL outline of investigation published in December 2025, and on federal research that is still underway. (Pet. at 3, 6.) GismoPower's own

interim report cautions that the certification pathway for this equipment class is not yet settled. (GismoPower's Supplemental Comment, Att. A at 2-4.) Section 1 of the proposed regulation would nonetheless allow an appliance to qualify for interconnection during a transitional period without certification. That is difficult to square with NRS 704.774(2), and it is likely what Staff has in mind in suggesting that a statutory change may be required. These are sound reasons not to adopt the proposed text now. They are also the questions an investigatory docket exists to answer: the federal research deliverables are due in November 2026, and the Commission can receive them, together with the views of Nevada Power, Staff, and the Bureau of Consumer Protection, before deciding whether and how to write a rule.

21. The Commission finds that setting the matter for further proceedings is consistent with NRS 233B.100. The statute requires the Commission either to deny a petition in writing, stating its reasons, or to initiate a rulemaking; it does not require the Commission to adopt a petitioner's text, and it does not prevent the Commission from opening an investigation on its own motion. The petition itself requests an investigatory docket and workshop in the alternative. (Pet. at 9.) Mr. Boeres asks for the same, SUN urges the Commission to develop a framework, and Staff does not oppose further proceedings. An investigatory docket would allow the Commission to address in a single record the classification question it reserved in Docket No. 26-05022, the certification questions discussed above, and the broader proposals in SUN's comments, some of which may require legislation, rather than answering those questions one consumer complaint at a time. Senate Bill 440 also directed the Commission to adopt regulations addressing the application and installation process for net metering systems, and any rule that emerges from an investigatory docket can be coordinated with that work.

Therefore, it is ordered:

1. The petition filed by GismoPower LLC, designated as Docket No. 26-09004, is granted in part and denied in part.

2. The Assistant Commission Secretary shall open an investigatory docket to examine the interconnection of plug-in photovoltaic appliances.

By the Commission,



HAYLEY WILLIAMSON, Chair



TAMMY CORDOVA, Commissioner



RANDY J. BROWN, Commissioner

Attest:



TRISHA OSBORNE,
Assistant Commission Secretary

Dated: Carson City, Nevada

10/16/26
(SEAL)

