Systemic Analysis of Nevada's Energy System: NV Energy, Regulation & Reforms

Executive Summary

Nevada's electricity system is a vertically integrated, regulated monopoly centered on NV Energy (a subsidiary of Berkshire Hathaway Energy)[1]. NV Energy provides generation, transmission, and distribution service to most of the state under oversight by the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN). Unlike deregulated markets with competitive suppliers, Nevada has largely **maintained the traditional monopoly utility model** – though with a unique twist allowing large power users to "exit" utility service if they pay hefty fees[2][3]. This structure means **electric rates are set by regulators** rather than the market, with NV Energy granted an authorized rate of return (~9–10%) on investments[4][5]. Rates are adjusted via General Rate Cases every three years[6], and fuel/power costs are passed directly to consumers through quarterly adjustments[7][8], so **customers bear fuel price risk** while the utility's profits come from infrastructure investments.

Incentives in this system are mixed. NV Energy's profit motive aligns with certain public goals: it earns money by building infrastructure (power plants, transmission lines, grid improvements), which can support reliability and state renewable targets[9][10]. NV Energy has indeed invested in large-scale solar and the massive **Greenlink transmission project** (a $2+ billion "transmission triangle" to link renewable-rich areas with load centers) under legislative push[11][12]. These investments further Nevada's Renewable Portfolio Standard (50% by 2030) and long-term carbon-free goal (100% by 2050)[13]. However, other incentives conflict: NV Energy profits from selling energy, so customer-owned **rooftop solar and energy efficiency can erode its sales**. The utility has repeatedly argued that net-metered solar users don't pay their fair share of grid costs, pushing for higher fixed charges or reduced solar credits[14][15]. In 2015, the PUCN agreed, slashing net metering payments – a move **later reversed by lawmakers amid public outcry**[16][17]. This history highlights a core tension: **the more customers generate their own power, the less revenue NV Energy collects to cover fixed grid costs**, setting up battles over how to allocate costs fairly.

From a consumer perspective, outcomes have been mixed. Overall rates in Nevada have been moderate, but **fuel price volatility has caused bill spikes**. NV Energy's gas costs jumped ~70% in 2022, raising bills about $15/month for a typical household by early 2023[18]. Low-income customers and those without solar have felt these increases most, since they have few alternatives and must absorb fuel surcharges[19][20]. Rooftop solar adopters, on the other hand, insulated themselves from high grid prices and often receive bill credits for excess generation (now at **75% of retail rate** under current law)[21][22]. That dynamic raises equity concerns: policies need to balance encouraging clean energy with **protecting non-solar customers from**

undue costs, while also **avoiding disincentivizing solar adoption** that can reduce long-term system costs and emissions.

Recent reforms have aimed at threading this needle. The 2017 "Solar Bill of Rights" law (AB 405) restored net metering credits at a slight discount to retail rates and barred discriminatory fees on solar customers[23][24]. This compromise rebooted Nevada's rooftop solar market – applications jumped 11-fold in the year after the law passed[25] – while gradually lowering credits in four tiers to limit potential cost shifts. In 2019 and 2021, lawmakers passed sweeping energy laws (SB 300, SB 358, SB 448) to modernize utility regulation and ramp up renewables. These **authorized performance-based ratemaking** (to better align utility profits with policy goals)[26][27], **raised the RPS to 50%**[13], set an **80% carbon-reduction by 2030 target**[13], accelerated Greenlink, funded electric vehicle infrastructure, and even required Nevada to pursue joining a regional transmission organization by 2030[11][28]. NV Energy supported these initiatives, signaling an alignment (at least publicly) with the state's clean energy direction[29].

Still, structural conflicts remain unresolved. **Who pays for the grid if more customers produce their own power?** How can Nevada meet climate and reliability goals without burdening those least able to afford it? The **analysis below maps out the actors and incentives, the points of conflict, and realistic options for reform**, arming Nevada's citizens and decision-makers with a clear-eyed understanding of how the system works and what can be done to improve it. In short, Nevada's energy future will be determined by how well it balances innovation with fairness: leveraging abundant solar resources and new technologies to everyone's benefit, while ensuring the costs and benefits of the electric grid are shared **equitably and transparently**.

Systems Map – Actors & Incentives

Nevada's electricity landscape involves a web of players whose objectives sometimes align and often clash. Below is a mapping of the key actors and their incentives:

- **NV Energy (Utility Company):** A for-profit, monopoly utility serving ~90% of Nevada's load. *Incentives:* **Maximize its allowed return on investment** by expanding rate base (e.g. building new power plants, transmission lines)[4]. The regulatory model virtually guarantees cost recovery plus profit on prudent investments ("spend more to earn more"). NV Energy is motivated to ensure reliability (outages or disasters could spur penalties or public backlash) and to satisfy regulators/politicians on policy goals (e.g. adding renewables) – but always in ways that grow the utility's assets or rate base. Because it cannot profit on fuel/purchased power costs (those are pass-through)[8][30], NV Energy has **no direct financial incentive to minimize fuel costs** under traditional rules; its shareholders are relatively insulated from fuel price volatility (all risk is on customers). However, high bills from fuel spikes can provoke political intervention, so NV Energy has a reputational incentive to avoid extreme price swings. **Conflicts:** Customer-owned generation and energy efficiency reduce

sales, which can lead to under-recovery of fixed costs between rate cases. Rooftop solar in particular threatens the utility's long-term growth; NV Energy has lobbied to limit solar compensation and increase fixed charges to make up for lost revenue[14][15]. The utility's public messaging emphasizes reliability and "keeping rates affordable," but as a profit-driven entity, it naturally resists changes that shift spending away from its capital projects (e.g. customer-sited resources).

- **Berkshire Hathaway Energy (Utility Owner):** NV Energy's parent company, owned by Berkshire Hathaway (Warren Buffett's conglomerate). *Incentives:* Ensure NV Energy remains a steady, low-risk profit generator. Berkshire generally favors long-term investments (they often tout capital-intensive projects like renewables and grid upgrades) and opposes deregulation that could upset stable monopoly earnings. Indeed, Berkshire poured tens of millions into defeating Nevada's 2018 energy choice ballot measure that threatened to break up NV Energy's monopoly[31][32]. The parent company likely encourages NV Energy to embrace utility-owned renewable projects (to capitalize on tax credits and rate-base growth) but **push back on distributed competitors** like third-party solar providers.

- **Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN):** A three-member state commission (appointed by the Governor) that regulates NV Energy's rates, investments, and service quality[33]. *Role & Incentives:* By law, the PUCN must ensure **"just and reasonable" rates for customers while allowing the utility an opportunity to earn a fair return**[34]. Practically, the PUC balances consumer protection with maintaining a financially healthy utility (to attract capital for infrastructure)[35][7]. Commissioners and staff parse dense technical filings – general rate cases (to set base rates), integrated resource plans (long-term supply plans), and deferred energy applications (fuel cost pass-throughs) – to judge what costs are prudent and how to allocate them. The PUCN is somewhat insulated from day-to-day politics (quasi-judicial), but commissioners are sensitive to **public opinion and legislative directives**, especially after high-profile controversies. For example, after the 2015 net metering cut caused public outrage, new commissioners reversed course on some solar policies[36][37]. *Incentives:* The PUCN's institutional incentive is to **"get it right"** – i.e. avoid decisions that grossly favor one side and trigger backlash. They want to uphold their credibility as fair arbiters. They have no direct financial interest in outcomes, but they do respond to evidence from **intervenors** like the Nevada Bureau of Consumer Protection (BCP) (which represents ratepayers)[34], utility filings, and stakeholder testimony. The PUCN also has an incentive to **implement state energy laws faithfully** (e.g. expanding clean energy, alternative ratemaking mechanisms) to maintain the Commission's relevance and avoid legislative overrides.

- **Nevada Legislature & Governor:** Elected officials who set energy policy through laws and appoint regulators. *Incentives:* Respond to voter concerns (e.g. high bills, job creation, climate and air quality goals) and guide the state's economic

direction. The legislature has intervened when the PUCN's technical decisions had broad political fallout – **for instance, swiftly passing AB 405 in 2017 to restore rooftop solar credits** after regulators cut them[36][38]. Policymakers champion popular causes like **renewable energy expansion (RPS increases)**[13] and **consumer protection in utility billing**[39][40]. However, they must also consider the **financial stability of NV Energy**, since a bankrupt or struggling utility would harm constituents. Thus, laws often represent compromises: e.g. setting modest cost-sharing requirements or study committees rather than drastic rate reforms that might overly penalize the utility[41][42]. Politically powerful interests (casino resorts, big tech companies, solar industry, unions) lobby lawmakers on energy bills, influencing whose incentives get prioritized. *Recent trend:* Nevada's leaders have generally aligned with a **pro-clean-energy, pro-innovation narrative** (bipartisan support for renewables and EV infrastructure)[11][43], but with an eye to **avoiding rate shocks** or loss of utility jobs. They supported the Greenlink transmission build-out (which promises jobs and long-term rate benefits)[44][45], while also probing ideas like **fuel cost sharing** to soften bill volatility for consumers[46][47].

- **Large Casino and Mining Companies (High-Load Customers):** Nevada's casinos (e.g. MGM Resorts, Wynn Resorts) and some other major power users have been a wildcard – they **have the legal option (under NRS 704B) to leave NV Energy's bundled service** and buy power on the open market, if they pay an exit fee and show it won't hurt others[48][49]. *Incentives:* These companies seek **lower and more predictable energy costs**, often paired with greener power to meet corporate sustainability goals[50][51]. Around 2016, several casinos filed to exit, citing the ability to procure cheaper wholesale power or 100% renewables; they were willing to pay multi-million-dollar fees to do so[51][52]. MGM paid ~$87 million to leave, believing it could save money long-term and gain a cleaner supply[52][53]. For such firms, energy is a significant operating cost – any gap between NV Energy's rates and market prices is a big incentive to shop elsewhere. *Conflicts:* Their departures can leave remaining NV Energy customers to cover more of sunk infrastructure costs. The PUCN, tasked with **protecting remaining ratepayers from harm**, calculated steep exit fees to offset stranded costs[54]. Even so, some argue those fees did not fully cover long-term obligations (e.g. decommissioning of plants) – meaning a **partial cost shift to other customers**[55]. Casinos have the clout to negotiate terms (MGM even sought a credit refund in an exit fee dispute)[56]. Going forward, these large customers will push for competitive options or special tariffs. Their incentive to rejoin NV Energy is low unless the utility offers **better rates or green energy deals**; indeed, Nevada recently developed rules to let 704B "exit" customers return if it doesn't harm others[57][58]. In sum, big customers create pressure on NV Energy to remain cost-competitive and flexible in providing renewable energy – otherwise, more may attempt to leave (or at least leverage the threat to gain concessions).

- **Residential Customers (General Ratepayers):** This broad group includes homeowners and renters who rely on NV Energy for power, the majority of whom do not have rooftop solar (though solar adoption is growing). *Incentives:* Primarily **affordable and reliable electricity**. Most residential customers have little desire to delve into utility regulatory matters – until their bills surge or service falters. They benefit from NV Energy's economies of scale and resource planning, but they can be harmed by **rate increases** from fuel spikes or expensive capital projects. *Conflicts:* There is an internal split in incentives between **solar vs. non-solar homes**: solar homeowners invest upfront to lower their bills and value the credit for excess generation, while non-solar neighbors worry they might **end up paying more** if fixed grid costs are shifted onto them. This potential conflict has been highlighted by NV Energy (often **overstated, according to independent analyses** showing the cost impact of net metering has been negligible or even slightly positive for other ratepayers[59]). Low-income residential customers have a specific incentive for **rate stability and protection from disconnections**, as energy costs take a larger share of their income. They rely on programs like Nevada's Universal Energy Charge (which funds energy assistance) and would benefit if volatility in rates is reduced. Residential ratepayers as a whole have an interest in long-term cost control – e.g. **savings from renewable energy** (once built, solar/wind have no fuel costs, potentially avoiding the kind of fuel surcharges that drove bills up by ~15–20% in 2022[18]). However, they may be wary of large upfront expenditures for new infrastructure that raise rates now for future payoff. Their diffuse voice is represented by the Bureau of Consumer Protection in PUC cases and by public sentiment reaching legislators.

- **Rooftop Solar Installers & Financiers:** Companies like Sunrun, Tesla (SolarCity), and local installers comprise the rooftop solar industry in Nevada. *Incentives:* **Maximize the adoption of customer-sited solar (and now batteries)** by ensuring favorable economics for consumers. That means fighting for generous net metering credits, low fixed charges, and solar-friendly policies. After the 2015 net metering rollback, these companies saw the Nevada market collapse and many (e.g. Sunrun, Tesla) exited the state[60]. They lobbied hard and backed campaigns (even a failed 2016 ballot measure) to restore net metering. The compromise in AB 405 (2017) was a victory for them – it guaranteed a viable net metering structure and **prohibited NV Energy from levying special fees on solar owners**[23]. Now their incentive is to keep the playing field stable: they will **oppose any renewed attempts to cut export rates or add charges**. They also support policies that expand their customer base – e.g. allowing renters or low-income housing to benefit from solar (through community solar programs or expanded solar access initiatives)[58]. *Conflicts:* They are naturally at odds with NV Energy's incentive to own generation. Every kW installed on a rooftop is a kW NV Energy doesn't get to build as a utility-scale plant. The utility has responded by sometimes proposing **its own distributed solar programs** (or community solar offerings) that it can rate-base[61], and by pushing to limit net metering. Installers must counter the utility's narrative that rooftop solar shifts costs – often citing

studies (and PUC findings) that solar provides net benefits when accounting for avoided energy and capacity costs[62]. The solar industry's broader incentive aligns with environmental goals (more renewables deployed), but their immediate economic stake is ensuring customers perceive rooftop solar as a good deal in Nevada. They will continue to advocate for stable or incremental policy (e.g. gradual step-downs in credits rather than abrupt cuts) to avoid another boom-bust cycle.

- **Environmental and Clean Energy Advocates:** This includes nonprofits like Western Resource Advocates, Sierra Club, Nevada Conservation League, as well as renewable energy developers (outside of rooftop sector). *Incentives:* **Decarbonize Nevada's power sector and promote sustainable energy**. They champion higher renewable portfolio standards, retirement of coal plants, electrification of vehicles, and stronger energy efficiency programs. Many also support distributed generation and community solar as tools for cleaner air and energy justice. Their incentive is not financial but ideological/pragmatic – achieving climate targets and reducing pollution, ideally while lowering costs in the long run (since clean resources have become very cheap per kWh)[63][64]. *Alignment:* Often, these advocates find common cause with the solar industry and sometimes with large tech companies (e.g. Google) that want clean energy[65]. They also support utility investments in renewables and transmission, albeit with an eye on **ensuring those investments truly replace fossil fuels and benefit the public**. They backed laws like SB 358 and SB 448 to boost renewables and storage, and were **enthusiastic about Nevada joining a regional grid (RTO)** to better integrate renewable resources across the West[28][45]. *Conflicts:* While generally aligned with the direction of state policy, they may conflict with NV Energy if the utility drags its feet on closing fossil plants or if NV Energy's renewable project proposals seem overly expensive (they prefer competitive procurement). They also sometimes clash with pure consumer advocates on timing – e.g. a rapid coal phase-out could raise rates short-term, which consumer groups might oppose even if it yields environmental benefit. In Nevada's case, however, falling renewable costs mean advocates often argue that greener is also cheaper (citing analyses that hitting 50% RPS could **save ratepayers ~$192 million over 20 years** vs. continued gas reliance[66]). Their incentive is to produce solid evidence that clean energy is in the public interest economically, not just environmentally.

- **Nevada Bureau of Consumer Protection (BCP):** Housed in the Attorney General's office, BCP is an official intervenor in PUCN cases, representing residential and small commercial ratepayers. *Incentives:* **Minimize unjustified rate increases and ensure consumer interests are heard**. The BCP will scrutinize NV Energy's rate filings and resource plans, often pushing back on utility proposals that could raise bills without clear benefit. For example, BCP might question the size or timing of investments like Greenlink if they fear rate impacts, or advocate for more equitable rate design (e.g. opposing fixed charge hikes that disproportionately

hurt low-usage customers). They generally supported the return of net metering in 2017 *only after* ensuring non-solar customers would not be materially harmed – indeed the PUC's analysis that net metering caused virtually no rate increase likely reflected BCP input[59]. *Conflicts:* BCP can be in tension with NV Energy (they often spar in rate cases over what costs are prudent or whose burden it is to pay). They may also sometimes conflict with environmental goals if those come with short-term costs: for instance, BCP might be cautious about extremely rapid renewable build-out if it believes a slower ramp would be more affordable. But increasingly, consumer advocates and clean energy advocates work together, since **stable or lower long-term costs align with transitioning away from volatile fossil fuels**. BCP's incentive is to use data – they will bring up NV Energy's **earnings reports if the utility is "over-earning" beyond its authorized profit** (as happened in the mid-2010s, when NV Energy exceeded its allowed return by tens of millions[67][68], effectively overcharging customers). Such findings bolster the case to **reduce rates or issue refunds** in the next rate case.

These actors interact in formal proceedings and behind the scenes, constantly negotiating the balance of Nevada's energy system. The incentives map shows that many players support Nevada's clean energy trajectory (utility-scale solar, transmission, EV infrastructure) when it aligns with their benefit – **but fights erupt where costs and benefits are unevenly distributed**. Rooftop solar is a flashpoint because it challenges the utility's model; large customer departures are a flashpoint because they threaten cost allocation fairness. The PUCN sits in the middle as referee, while lawmakers set the ground rules and can shift the balance if outcomes stray from the public interest. Understanding these incentives clarifies why certain reforms are championed or resisted – as detailed in subsequent sections.

Conflict & Tradeoff Table

Key structural tensions in Nevada's electricity system manifest as **trade-offs**. These are not mere political squabbles but hard conflicts of interest or engineering/economic reality. The table below outlines the major conflicts, explaining why each is challenging to resolve:

Conflict	Dynamics & Trade-off
Climate Goals vs. Affordability	Nevada's push to decarbonize (50%+ renewable power, carbon-free by 2050) can conflict with short-term rate impacts. Replacing fossil fuel plants or building new infrastructure (solar farms, batteries, transmission lines) requires upfront capital that raises rates now, even if it lowers costs later. Regulators must decide

Conflict	Dynamics & Trade-off
	how quickly to force this transition without **rate shock**. For example, accelerating Greenlink and renewable builds is critical for climate and will reduce long-run fuel expenses, but it prompted concerns from casinos and others about **near-term rate increases**[12][44]. The trade-off: a slower transition might keep rates lower in the very short term but leave customers exposed to volatile gas prices and future carbon costs, whereas aggressive climate action yields more stable pricing long-term but needs prudent management of immediate costs (e.g. using federal subsidies, low-cost financing). The conflict is structural because **investment-heavy decarbonization and immediate affordability pull in opposite directions**, especially for low-income consumers. Crafting policies like renewable energy credits, phased project rollouts, or temporary rate offsets (using funds from federal programs or utility shareholders) are ways to reconcile the two.
Grid Resilience vs. Decentralization	A resilient grid (able to withstand wildfires, extreme heat, outages) traditionally implies **hardening and centralizing** – e.g. reinforcing transmission, building redundancy, strict control by the utility. Decentralization – rooftop solar, home batteries, microgrids – offers localized resilience (a community can keep lights on if the broader grid fails) and reduces strain on centralized infrastructure. But high decentralization also **complicates**

Conflict	Dynamics & Trade-off
	the utility's task: two-way power flows and many independent systems can make maintaining grid stability harder without new technologies. There's a tension in investment: money spent on customer-sited solutions is money not spent on utility-centric resilience (like undergrounding lines or expanding capacity). Nevada's wildfire risk (while lower than California's) and extreme heat events mean the state must bolster reliability – NV Energy might lean toward **utility-controlled solutions** (bigger transformers, etc.), whereas clean energy advocates might lean toward **distributed energy resources (DERs) + microgrids** for resilience. The structural issue: NV Energy doesn't earn profit on customer-owned DER, so its incentive is to favor utility-owned resilience measures, even if a network of solar+storage might be a more cost-effective resilience tool in some areas. A balanced approach (e.g. utility leverages private DER via incentives or NV Energy owns community storage) is needed to avoid an either/or trade-off.
Innovation vs. Stability	Novel technologies and market designs (think dynamic pricing, energy storage, third-party energy services, or an open retail market) promise **efficiency and customer choice**, but they introduce uncertainty and potential instability. For example, joining a regional transmission organization (RTO) by 2030 – mandated by SB 448 – could bring competitive wholesale

Conflict	Dynamics & Trade-off
	pricing and better integration of renewables[28], yet it means NV Energy gives up some control to a multi-state grid operator. This raises questions: Will an RTO reliably meet Nevada's needs or could it lead to California-style price swings? Similarly, encouraging **innovations like rooftop solar, smart thermostats, and electric vehicles feeding power back to the grid** can reduce costs and emissions, but they challenge the conventional grid operation. The trade-off is between **embracing change for long-term gain vs. maintaining tried-and-true methods** that offer predictability. NV Energy, as a monopoly, tends to value stability – known revenue streams, proven technologies – whereas public policy is nudging it toward innovation (performance-based rates, EV integration, etc. [26][69]). This conflict is hard because **too much change too quickly can backfire** (e.g. a poorly implemented dynamic pricing program could confuse customers and erode trust), yet clinging to old approaches could make Nevada miss out on cost savings and cleaner tech. The resolution lies in pilot programs and gradual scaling – testing innovations in controlled ways to prove reliability before full roll-out.
Consumer Choice vs. Collective Cost-sharing	In a monopoly utility model, costs of the grid are socialized across all customers – everyone pays their share in regulated rates. But what if some customers choose a

Conflict	Dynamics & Trade-off
	different path (e.g. big casinos exiting to self-procure power, or homeowners adopting rooftop solar and using less from the grid)? This raises the issue of **who pays for legacy investments and shared infrastructure**. Consumer choice – letting people buy power from alternative suppliers or generate their own – can **spur competition and empower consumers**, but if not structured carefully, those who remain fully with the utility could pay more. This was evident when MGM and others exited NV Energy: even with multi-million exit fees, there was controversy that remaining customers might shoulder certain costs (such as long-term plant decommissioning) that the departing customers would no longer help pay[55]. Similarly, every kilowatt a solar homeowner offset is revenue the utility doesn't collect to cover fixed grid maintenance – if enough people go solar, the utility may seek to raise rates on everyone else to compensate. The fundamental tension is **individual benefit vs. communal obligations**: the grid is a shared platform, and if many opt out or dramatically reduce usage, the costs don't shrink proportionally (the wires still need maintenance). Nevada wrestled with this in net metering debates – **the PUCN in 2015 felt non-solar customers were unfairly subsidizing solar users, so they approved higher fixed charges for solar customers**[70]; later analysis showed the cost shift was minimal

Conflict	Dynamics & Trade-off
	and even flipped when considering avoided costs[62], leading to a reversal. The conflict persists in new forms (e.g. how to structure community solar or partial retail choice). It's hard because both principles have merit: giving consumers freedom often drives innovation and satisfaction, but utilities argue some level of cost-sharing is essential to keep the grid financially viable for all. Solutions include **minimum bills or standby charges** for partial grid users, carefully calculated exit fees for those leaving, and new tariffs that let participants buy into shared resources (so everyone pays something for resiliency and capacity). The balance must ensure one group's choices (like casinos going solo or affluent homes adding solar+battery) don't maroon vulnerable customers with disproportionately high costs – a scenario regulators are keen to avoid[71][42].

Each of these conflicts is **structural**, not merely a matter of one side being right. They require trade-offs: e.g. setting climate policy with mechanisms to protect affordability (perhaps through phased implementation or financial assistance for low-income households), or enabling consumer innovations while devising fair ways for them to contribute to grid upkeep. Nevada's recent policies show attempts at balance – *e.g.*, the tiered net metering credit (95% → 75% of retail) was meant to acknowledge solar's benefits while curbing an unlimited subsidy[72][24]. Likewise, SB 448's requirement to join an RTO by 2030 includes **off-ramps if it would harm reliability or rates**[28][73], reflecting caution. The **tensions won't disappear**; they will need ongoing management, with stakeholders negotiating compromises as conditions evolve (like higher renewable penetration or new tech on the grid).

Consumer Impact Analysis

How do Nevada's energy policies and NV Energy's practices translate to real outcomes on the ground for different types of consumers? Below we examine several consumer

categories – residential (solar vs. non-solar, low-income vs. others), renters, and small businesses – highlighting **bill impacts, benefits, and burdens** each faces.

- **Residential Non-Solar Homeowners:** These customers simply buy all their power from NV Energy at regulated rates. They benefit from the utility's service obligation and long-term planning – for instance, NV Energy's investments in new solar farms have started to displace expensive fuel generation, which should help stabilize or lower energy prices over time[74][63]. However, non-solar homeowners are **exposed to fuel cost swings and rate increases** without any offset. Recent experience illustrates this: in 2022, natural gas prices (which fuel over half of Nevada's electricity[18]) spiked dramatically. NV Energy, by law, passed those costs dollar-for-dollar to customers, resulting in average residential bills rising roughly 15–20% (about $15 more per month for a northern Nevada household using ~765 kWh)[18]. These customers had no solar production to cushion the blow. While NV Energy doesn't profit from fuel charges[30][75], the **volatility risk falls entirely on consumers under current policy**. Non-solar homeowners also foot the bill for new infrastructure via rates – for example, the cost of the Greenlink transmission project (est. $2.5–4+ billion) will be recovered from all utility customers[76][77]. NV Energy argues such projects will enable cheaper renewable energy and improve reliability, yielding savings down the road; still, there is a **near-term rate impact** (one analysis projected Greenlink could raise rates a few percent during construction). The PUCN seeks to ensure these investments are justified so that consumers truly benefit in the long run[12][44]. For now, non-solar homeowners have seen **gradual base rate changes** (NV Energy had a rate freeze for a few years around 2018–2020 as part of commitments during the anti-deregulation campaign, which helped keep bills stable then), but are seeing higher bills lately due to fuel and new rider increases[78][79]. They do benefit from state-mandated programs like energy efficiency rebates and time-of-use rate options which can help control bills if utilized. Overall, though, this group carries the **full brunt of any utility cost increases** unless mitigated by policy.

- **Residential Solar Homeowners:** These consumers have installed rooftop solar panels (often financed or leased through solar companies) to generate their own electricity. Their experience diverges from non-solar peers. Thanks to Nevada's **net metering law**, solar homes can offset much of their consumption and even earn bill credits for excess power sent to the grid. Under current rules, new solar customers get credited at **75% of the retail rate** for their exports (for 20 years, locked in at signup)[22]. Early adopters (in mid-2017) got 95%, and intermediate ones 88% or 81%, depending on when they installed[72][80]. This means solar homeowners significantly reduce their monthly bills – essentially, NV Energy compensates them at a slightly discounted rate for their solar production. **Bill volatility is greatly reduced** for these customers: if gas prices spike or NV Energy raises rates, it affects only the net portion of energy they still buy from the grid. Many solar homeowners see minimal bills aside from fixed charges. Nevada law

also protects them from any special fees – they pay the same basic service charge as others (around ~$9–$15 a month, depending on region and rate class)[81][82], but no extra "access" fees. The outcome is that solar customers largely insulated themselves from the 2022 fuel cost spike – while neighbors' bills jumped, solar users were drawing less from NV Energy and could even bank credits from sunny months to use later. This **bill stability** is a key benefit driving solar adoption. On the other hand, solar homeowners rely on net metering staying favorable. The 2015 PUC decision would have been economically devastating: it not only slashed credit rates but raised the fixed charge for solar customers from $12.75 to ultimately $38.51 over time[83], which would have dramatically lengthened payback periods. That decision was reversed, so current solar customers are grandfathered into reasonable rates. However, they know their favorable deal exists by grace of policy – a future change could affect new installations (e.g. if Nevada ever moves to a lower "value of solar" tariff, future customers might get less credit). For now, **solar increases property value and offers long-term cost predictability** for homeowners, as NV Energy must honor the 20-year credit lock-in at the tier when they joined[84]. Solar homeowners also contribute to the grid's supply. Notably, during peak summer afternoons, their exports help NV Energy meet demand – benefiting all customers by reducing the need to buy expensive peak power. The PUC found in 2017 that restoring net metering would **slightly lower average bills (by about $0.01/month)** for all customers because of these avoided costs[59]. In effect, solar homes can confer a system benefit, though the magnitude is debated. Importantly, most solar homes still use the grid in evenings and cloudy times, so they are not fully independent. They rely on NV Energy as a backup and for net-metering credits, which is why **fair grid cost allocation** remains an open issue. But in practical terms, solar customers in Nevada today clearly *win* on monthly bills and are shielded from many rate increases, making rooftop solar a popular investment (as evidenced by thousands of applications after AB 405 passed[85]).

- **Low-Income Households:** For low-income Nevadans, energy costs can be a heavy burden. Many live in smaller apartments or older homes that aren't energy-efficient, and most cannot afford solar panels or expensive retrofits. Nevada does have assistance: a Universal Energy Charge on bills funds the Nevada Energy Assistance Program, which helps low-income families pay utility bills (this is administered through state welfare agencies). Additionally, NV Energy runs low-income weatherization programs using ratepayer funds or federal grants. Despite these, **low-income customers remain vulnerable to any rate hike or fuel spike**. The 2022 gas surge that saw bills double for some (e.g. one single mother's bill went from $91 to $245 over the year[86]) hits those on fixed incomes hardest – they may have to choose between paying the power bill and other essentials. Low-income renters (common in Nevada's urban areas) often have little control over insulation or solar options in their buildings, so they're essentially "captive" to NV Energy's pricing. The state and PUCN recognize this: there is sensitivity to **rate design impacts on low-income users**.

For example, proposals to raise flat monthly charges are criticized because a high basic charge (say $30/month) is regressive – it's a bigger portion of a small user's bill (often low-income households use less electricity than average)[87][88]. NV Energy's 2017 attempt to hike fixed charges was explicitly flagged as hurting low-income customers[87], contributing to regulators rejecting it. Low-income consumers benefit from the fact that NV Energy's residential rates are mostly volumetric, so if they conserve energy, they save money. They also benefit indirectly from Nevada's solar and renewable push: as more zero-fuel energy comes online, it reduces the risk of fuel cost spikes that can blow up their bills. However, there's a concern of **inequity in solar adoption**: wealthier homeowners enjoy solar savings (and any incentives), whereas low-income folks (especially renters) can't access those and might even see slight rate increases if costs are shifted. To address this, Nevada passed *Expanded Solar Access* legislation (AB 465 in 2019) requiring NV Energy to develop programs for low-income solar access[89][90]. Under this, NV Energy built a few small community-based solar projects for affordable housing, allowing low-income participants to get bill credits from shared solar arrays[91]. It's a start, but limited in scope. In summary, low-income consumers face **higher energy insecurity** – they are most likely to suffer from utility disconnects in summer or winter if bills are unpaid. Thus, any reform that stabilizes rates (like decoupling and modest cost-sharing of fuel risk by the utility) or that provides targeted discounts (like tiered rates or percentage-of-income payment programs) would significantly impact this group. At present, their reality is that **they pay for everyone's investments through bundled rates but have fewer alternatives**. Ensuring they aren't left behind in the transition (for instance, by directing some renewable project benefits or savings explicitly to low-income rate relief) is an ongoing policy challenge.

- **Renters and Multi-Family Residents:** Renters make up a large segment, especially in Las Vegas. Historically, renters have had little chance to benefit from rooftop solar or energy upgrades because they don't own the property. They simply pay the electric bill to NV Energy, often through individual meters. Nevada has tried to extend solar benefits here via the *Solar access* programs and recent provisions in SB 448 that **allow owners of apartments and multi-family buildings to participate in net metering** or shared solar arrangements[58]. For example, SB 448 (2021) included language to let multi-family building owners install solar and allocate credits to tenants (previously tricky under net metering rules)[58]. This could mean renters in an apartment with a rooftop solar system (or a solar carport) might see a portion of their consumption offset by that system's generation. It's early to know the impact, but it's a step toward inclusion. Still, most renters currently see the status quo: their bills reflect NV Energy's rates, and they depend on their landlord's choices for efficiency measures. Renters in older units with poor insulation or inefficient HVAC face **disproportionately high usage** (and thus high bills) relative to their income. They do benefit from overall system cost declines – e.g. as NV Energy adds cheap solar, fuel costs in rates

might drop. But near-term, like other non-solar, they experienced the fuel spike. If anything, renters can be the most **disenfranchised** class: they don't have a direct voice in PUC proceedings and have to rely on others (BCP, community groups) to represent them. Nevada's regulatory structure does protect them to a degree – NV Energy can't raise rates without PUC approval, and there are programs forbidding shutoff during extreme heat for vulnerable customers. Renters also see certain charges like the Universal Energy Charge and renewable program cost recovery on their bills – small line items that fund broader social and renewable programs. These add a bit to each bill but aim to provide collective benefits (like low-income aid and meeting RPS). A typical renter likely isn't aware of the intricacies; they care that the total bill is manageable. One notable protection: Nevada has tiered arrearage management rules and payment plans to help those behind on bills, which indirectly help many renters. **In essence, renters mostly experience whatever the general residential rate is**, with relatively few options to reduce it aside from conservation. Policies like community solar, if expanded, could change that by letting renters subscribe to off-site solar and get credits (something many states do; Nevada's current programs are limited but could grow).

- **Small Businesses:** Small commercial customers (shops, restaurants, offices) have their own rate classes with NV Energy, often including a small basic charge and energy charges, sometimes time-of-use rates. They don't have the clout of casinos but their collective impact is significant. Many small businesses lease their space (so like renters, they may not control the building's roof for solar or efficiency improvements). Those who own their premises might invest in solar if it pencils out – and net metering applies up to 25 kW systems equally for businesses[92], so many small businesses have taken advantage of that. Small businesses are very sensitive to energy costs since it affects their bottom line. A spike in summer rates (due to fuel costs or peak surcharges) can hurt, especially for businesses like restaurants that use a lot of power. Nevada does have **commercial energy efficiency programs** (rebates for efficient lighting, HVAC, etc.) which help these customers lower usage. In terms of recent reforms: the shift to more renewables should benefit small businesses via less fuel volatility, and NV Energy's stable resource planning avoids California-like price swings which is good for business planning. However, if NV Energy seeks to restructure rates – for instance, introducing **demand charges** or higher fixed fees for small commercial – that could significantly impact them. There was a mention in NV Energy filings about restructuring small commercial bills with a demand component (to better allocate costs)[93]. Demand charges (billing based on the highest 15-minute usage in a month) can be tricky for small shops that might inadvertently hit a high peak and get a big charge. The PUC would scrutinize such changes to ensure they don't unduly burden small businesses. On the flip side, small businesses stand to gain from any **distributed generation incentives or community solar** – e.g. NV Energy's "Community Based Solar" program allows businesses to host a solar project on-site (built and paid by NV Energy) and get

credits[94]. This is essentially the utility co-opting a bit of community solar idea, which could benefit businesses with suitable property by lowering their bills without upfront cost. Another aspect is reliability: small businesses suffer losses if power goes out (spoiled inventory, lost sales). NV Energy's reliability performance in city areas is generally good (few prolonged outages), but as extreme weather risks mount, small businesses have an interest in grid resilience measures (and some invest in backup generators or battery systems, sometimes with NV Energy incentives). **Overall impact:** small businesses in Nevada have enjoyed relatively competitive rates – Nevada's average commercial rates are often below the national average[74] – which has been a selling point for economic development. The state's moves to expand clean energy are projected to keep future costs in check (avoiding the need for as much natural gas generation), which bodes well for small business bills long-term[66]. In the near term, though, they too felt the pinch of fuel cost increases and are watching to see if NV Energy's new investments (like EV charging infrastructure, which they help fund) will bring them direct value or just be another line item.

In summary, consumer impacts in Nevada reflect a **mix of positive trends and remaining inequities**. Residential and small commercial customers benefit from Nevada's historically prudent regulation (no wild price spikes except those driven by external fuel markets) and the increasing supply of low-cost renewable energy. But the divide between those who can take personal action (like installing solar or efficiency upgrades) and those who cannot (renters, low-income families) is significant. Without policy intervention, there's a risk of a **two-tier consumer experience**: empowered prosumers with low bills and price protection, versus captive customers who absorb the bulk of costs. Nevada's lawmakers and PUC have shown awareness – through solar access programs, rate design caution, and investigative bills like AB 452 (fuel cost sharing) – but implementation of solutions will determine how evenly the benefits of the clean energy transition are shared. As it stands, **anyone paying an NV Energy bill feels the system's cross-currents: the investment in cleaner resources (a slight upward pressure offset by fuel savings), the fluctuations of gas prices, and the adjustments from policy reforms**. The key is that future reforms (discussed next) aim to enhance consumer outcomes across the board, not just for the most proactive customers.

Reform Options Matrix

What *realistic* reforms could Nevada pursue to address the misalignments and conflicts identified? Below is a matrix of reform options, each with a brief explanation, potential benefits, risks, and feasibility notes. The goal is not fantasy solutions but **practical levers** that legislators, regulators, or citizen advocates could actually implement or push for:

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
Decoupling Utility Revenues from Sales	Implement a *revenue decoupling* mechanism where NV Energy's allowed revenue is fixed (per PUC approval), and rates adjust automatically if sales are higher or lower than forecast[95][96]. In simple terms, NV Energy would no longer earn more by selling more electricity – any extra sales would trigger a small rate decrease to give back to customers, and lower sales would trigger a slight rate increase to make up revenue.	- **Aligns incentives for energy efficiency and rooftop solar:** NV Energy would be financially neutral if customers use less energy, removing the utility's motive to oppose distributed generation or efficiency. - **Stabilizes revenues for NV Energy**, potentially allowing smaller, steadier rate adjustments rather than big jumps in rate cases. - Used in many states, decoupling has shown to encourage utilities to support	- If poorly designed, **customers might see frequent small surcharges or credits** on bills, which can be confusing ("why did my rate go up 1% this quarter?" "Because overall sales dropped due to a cool summer"). - NV Energy might **resist** decoupling unless accompanied by other incentives, as it guarantees revenue but removes upside of sales – though performance-based mechanisms could provide alternative	**Feasibility:** Moderate. SB 300 (2019) explicitly listed decoupling as one option the PUCN can consider in alternative ratemaking[97]. The PUCN has authority now to approve a decoupling plan if NV Energy proposes it or perhaps mandate it via regulation. So far, NV Energy hasn't implemented full decoupling for electric (as of 2025), possibly due to lack of initiative. But with legislators' blessing and successful

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
		demand-side management (since profits don't suffer).	earnings opportunities. - Decoupling by itself doesn't guarantee lower rates; it's about allocation of costs. Consumers could misinterpret it as a utility profit guarantee.	decoupling in other states, it's a **realistic near-term reform**. PUCN and BCP would need to ensure the mechanism is balanced (e.g. set up periodic reviews, caps on rate adjustments to prevent large swings). Decoupling could be paired with…
Performance-Based Ratemaking (PBR)	Overhaul how NV Energy's rates are set by tying financial outcomes to achievement of specific metrics rather than solely capital investment. For example, the PUCN could set	- **Aligns utility profit with public interest outcomes:** If done well, NV Energy can make money by *doing the right things* (e.g. saving customers money, integrating more renewable	- **Complex to design**: determining the right metrics and targets is difficult. Too lenient, and it rewards NV Energy for mediocre performance; too strict or poorly chosen, and it could unintentional	**Feasibility:** Moderate. The legal authority exists now – the PUCN can approve an alternative rate plan with PBR elements[26]. In fact, the PUCN had investigatory workshops and input

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
	performance incentives/penalties for metrics like customer reliability (outage frequency), customer satisfaction, carbon reduction, or cost control. NV Energy's returns would then partially depend on meeting those goals (earnings could go up if targets exceeded, or down if missed). Nevada's SB 300 opened the door for PBR[26][98].	energy reliably) instead of simply investing more capital. - Could encourage innovation: for instance, a performance incentive for EV charging deployment or for peak reduction might push NV Energy to pilot new programs. - **Protects consumers:** By placing some earnings at risk for performance, customers won't pay full price for poor service.	ly encourage corner-cutting or gaming metrics. - NV Energy might focus on only what is measured to the detriment of other areas (the "teaching to the test" problem). - Initial implementation costs (proceedings, consultants, new tracking systems) and a learning curve. - If not paired with revenue safeguards, PBR alone doesn't ensure the utility remains financially sound (but generally some base revenue	from RMI on this[99]. Likely, a multi-year pilot PBR could be proposed in the next general rate case. NV Energy's openness will matter; their lobby supported SB 300's concept as a "framework for reform"[100]. They'll want assurances that performance incentives are achievable and the overall risk/reward is reasonable. Politically, PBR is wonky but doesn't generate opposition like a rate hike – so lawmakers

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
			assurance is kept).	are generally supportive as long as consumer advocates are on board. It's quite possible Nevada will implement PBR in the next few years, making this reform quite realistic.
Tiered or Time-of-Use (TOU) Rates by Default	Redesign residential rates to better reflect cost drivers: for instance, implementing **time-of-use pricing** for all (where electricity is more expensive during peak hours, cheaper off-peak), or inclining block tiers (higher rate per kWh after a	- **Encourages peak reduction and efficient usage:** TOU pricing, especially, signals consumers to shift usage (e.g. run appliances at night) which can lower system peak and defer the need for new power plants – saving	- **Customer acceptance:** Changing how people are charged can cause confusion and pushback. Some might see higher bills if they can't easily shift usage – e.g. someone who is at home 5–8pm will pay more under TOU. This raises equity	**Feasibility:** Moderately high. NV Energy has experience with TOU pilot programs and large customers often have TOU or demand charges already. The PUCN tends to be open to time-varying rates as long as **customer education** is provided. In

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
	certain usage threshold). NV Energy already offers TOU as opt-in; this would consider making it the standard. Similarly, a modest inclining tier could make basic needs power cheap and higher usage more expensive.	everyone money long-term. NV Energy's peak is hot summer afternoons; if smart thermostats precool homes earlier, the peak demand drops. - **Fairness:** With inclining tiers, small/basic usage (like for low-income households) is at a lower rate, while lavish consumption (mansions running 3 AC units) pay more per kWh. This can reduce cross-subsidy where frugal users currently help pay for infrastructur	issues: those who can respond (tech-savvy, maybe wealthier people with programmable devices) benefit more, while others might be penalized. - If not carefully implemented, TOU could **hurt vulnerable customers** (e.g. the elderly home during peak for health reasons). Mitigation like "baseline allowances" or bill protection for a year during transition can help, but it's a concern. - **Weather and lifestyle**	2021, NV Energy proposed optional residential TOU with some demand charge element in its rate case[93] – making it default would be a bigger leap but possibly an outcome of the alternative ratemaking docket. The legislature could also nudge this by statute (some states require utilities to offer certain rate structures). Given smart meters are universal in NV (NV Energy completed smart meter rollout years ago), the

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
		e sized for heavy users. - TOU in particular would align Nevada with modern rate trends; many states (e.g. California) have default TOU to integrate solar and reduce peak issues. NV Energy could incorporate EV-specific rates to encourage charging when power is cheap and plentiful (solar noon or overnight).	**variability:** A super hot day might force on-peak use regardless of price, potentially spiking some bills unpredictably. That said, NV Energy can structure TOU with moderate differentials and notify consumers. - Inclining block rates risk being a crude tool if not updated for household size – a large family might exceed “tier 1” usage even though they’re not wasteful. They’d argue it’s unfair.	infrastructure is there. We might see a gradual approach: e.g. default TOU for EV owners or new homes first. The key is managing the **transition carefully**. Because this is fundamentally a tariff design change within PUC’s purview, it doesn’t face the kind of political opposition a broader structural change would. Thus, it’s quite achievable in the next few years if analysis shows it benefits the grid and enough consumer

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
				protections are in place.
Minimum Bill or Grid Access Charge (for DER users)	Instead of a high monthly fixed charge for everyone (which is regressive), implement a **minimum bill** – e.g. every customer pays at least $X per month regardless of net metering credits. This ensures solar customers contribute something to grid upkeep even if their generation offsets most of their consumption. A variant is a small “grid access charge” per kW of installed solar or per connection.	- **Addresses cost-shift concerns in a targeted way:** A minimum bill might be, say, $20. Most non-solar residential bills already exceed that, so they wouldn’t be affected. But a solar home that net-credits down to $0 would still pay $20. This guarantees every customer pays a baseline amount for shared infrastructure. - Far less harmful to solar economics than completely slashing export	- If set too high, it **erodes solar savings** and could lengthen payback significantly. For example, a $30 minimum bill would total $360/year, which might wipe out a large portion of a modest solar user’s annual savings. So it must be calibrated carefully. - Doesn’t differentiate ability to pay – a minimum bill is the same for a millionaire with solar and a middle-class solar adopter. But since solar adopters	**Feasibility:** Fairly high, but depends on stakeholder consensus. The concept of a minimum bill was floated in various net metering debates nationally as a middle-ground. The PUCN currently prohibits extra fees for net metering customers[23], but a minimum bill applied to *all* customers (solar or not) could be structured to mostly affect solar users. Since AB 405 guarantees equal charges, any change

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
		credits or adding huge fixed fees. A well-designed minimum bill in the $10–$25 range has been considered in some states as a compromise. - **Simplicity:** It's easy to understand ("no matter what, there's a $X base charge"). It can be framed as akin to a cellphone basic plan fee. It avoids making non-solar folks feel solar are "freeriding," potentially easing tensions and making net metering more politically sustainable long-term.	skew higher-income on average, this may not be seen as a huge equity issue. - NV Energy might argue even a minimum bill is insufficient and push for a full fixed charge increase, but regulators so far have disallowed big fixed charge hikes[87][17]. - There is a *psychological* effect: customers who invested in solar expecting $0 bills might be disgruntled to start seeing a charge. It could cause backlash if they feel the	might need legislative tweaking or careful design. However, if down the road solar penetration grows and an equity issue appears, a minimum bill is a likely tool the PUCN or legislature would consider. It's simpler than calculating new export rates or demand charges. Given Nevada's solar tier system is now at 75% credit with no cap[101], the next question will be: is that sustainable at, say, 20% rooftop penetration? If concerns

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
			rules changed on them (would likely apply only to new solar installs to avoid breaking promises to existing ones).	arise, a modest minimum bill could be a **politically palatable adjustment**. We assess this reform as realistic especially if accompanied by consensus (some solar advocates tolerate minimum bills as alternative to worse options).
Enhanced Low-Income Protections	Policies to shield low-income consumers from rate increases and to include them in clean energy benefits. Examples: Expand funding for energy efficiency upgrades in low-income homes;	- **Equity and Energy Justice:** Ensures the most vulnerable are not left behind or hurt by reforms. For instance, if time-of-use becomes default, a PIPP or discount could neutralize any hardship	- Costs money: expanded efficiency programs and discounts mean **other ratepayers or taxpayers must fund them**. It's a cross-subsidy, though arguably a socially beneficial one. If not designed	**Feasibility:** High for some measures, moderate for others. Nevada already has the basic low-income assistance funded by the UEC charge – scaling that up or introducing a formal discount rate

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
	institute a Percentage-of-Income Payment Plan (PIPP) so qualifying households never pay more than e.g. 6% of income on energy; provide subsidized community solar subscriptions for low-income residents (so they get credits on bills); or create a special discounted rate for those on assistance (like California's CARE program giving 30% off to low-income).	for low-income folks who can't shift usage easily. - Including low-income households in solar programs (with subsidies) spreads the benefits of Nevada's sunshine to all classes, not just those who can afford rooftop systems. This can reduce energy burden and also increase public support for solar initiatives (as everyone sees a stake). - Efficiency upgrades (better insulation,	well, could slightly raise rates for others (but typically these programs have minimal impact spread across millions of MWh of sales). - NV Energy might resist if asked to administer large discount programs without guaranteed cost recovery. However, utilities often recover such program costs through a small rider on bills (shared by all). - Identifying and enrolling eligible households can be	would require legislative action or PUC approval of a new tariff. Many states have low-income rates; Nevada could implement one given the right political climate (perhaps in response to public concern over bills). Enhanced efficiency funding could come from federal funds (the infrastructure bill and IRA provide money that NV could tap for low-income weatherization). Community solar for low-income

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
		AC, etc.) can dramatically cut usage for low-income families, permanently lowering bills and improving comfort. These programs have high payoff in avoided arrearages and health/safety benefits. - PIPP, specifically, virtually eliminates shut-offs for those enrolled and ensures bills are proportional to means – a major consumer protection.	challenging (outreach needed to ensure people know and sign up). - Some political resistance to anything seen as welfare/hand outs, but utility context is often more palatable for these programs. Need to demonstrate that reducing the energy burden is linked to better overall outcomes (which many studies support).	has traction – AB 465 started down that path[90], and regulators could expand it in upcoming dockets. These reforms tend to be **incremental and additive**, making them easier to pass (few outright losers). With Governor Lombardo (as of 2025) and bipartisan interest in helping constituents with high bills, targeted low-income measures are quite feasible. One realistic path: the PUCN's investigatory report from

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
				AB 452 (if that bill passes)[41][42] could recommend a low-income fuel relief mechanism or PIPP; the 2027 legislature could then codify it.
Greater Transparency & Public Involvement	Reforms to the process itself: e.g. requiring NV Energy to produce **plain-language bill impact summaries** for any rate case or major filing (so the average person can understand what's being proposed); improving the PUCN's outreach (holding consumer sessions at convenient times/places	- **Builds trust and understanding:** Many conflicts escalate because the public doesn't have insight until after decisions are made. If NV Energy must clearly justify and communicate, "We are asking for a 5% rate increase to pay for X, which will benefit you by Y," it can either justify itself or	- NV Energy might feel this as extra burden or even a strategy to build opposition. They may resist requirements to produce simplified explanations, claiming it's hard to distill complex filings (but it's doable). - Public hearings can be hijacked by loud interest groups, not always representati	**Feasibility:** Moderate. Some steps are very feasible: the PUCN could on its own improve outreach and require summary documents – it already does consumer sessions and fact sheets, so expanding those is easy. The legislature could mandate regular performance reports from

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
	, or via Zoom, and summarizing public comments on the record); and mandating periodic **regulatory impact reviews** – like an independent audit of whether NV Energy's earnings and service quality matched what was assumed in the last rate case, with results reported to legislature.	invite pushback before approval. - Transparency can deter overcharging: for example, shining light on NV Energy's consistent over-earning in 2012–2016[67][102] helped MGM and others demand lower rates[103]. If the utility knows its earnings will be audited and publicized, it has incentive to avoid pushing forecasts that lead to big over-earnings. - More accessible public	ve input. Regulators can't base decisions purely on popularity, so they must balance anecdotal comments with evidence – too much emphasis on public comment could skew rational, technical regulation. - Auditing performance and earnings could create contentious debates over numbers (utility might downplay certain findings). And if findings show the utility consistently over-earned, there could	NV Energy (similar to how some states require report cards on utility climate compliance, etc.). Given the 2023 legislature's interest in fuel cost sharing and holding NV Energy accountable for volatility[40][104], there's momentum for "transparency" ideas. No entrenched interest is strongly against transparency (NV Energy might quietly dislike it but would be hard-pressed to lobby openly against transparency to

Reform Option	What It Entails	Pros / Potential Benefits	Cons / Risks	Feasibility & Notes
		hearings (after work hours, multiple languages, etc.) could **surface issues early**. Regulators have noted that public sentiment influenced the reversal of net metering policy[36][38]; formalizing that channel helps avoid tone-deaf decisions.	be political pressure that upends the stable regulatory regime (perhaps that's a pro, not a con, from consumers' view). - **Feasibility/cost:** These measures aren't expensive relative to big infrastructure, but they require some administrative effort and political will to possibly expose uncomfortable truths (e.g. if an audit shows a regulatory misjudgment). Politicians sometimes prefer less transparency if it avoids tough decisions.	customers). Thus, requiring plain-language disclosures or independent evaluations might garner bipartisan support. It's not a silver bullet for rates, but it empowers stakeholders (citizens, consumer advocates) with information, which in turn makes other reforms more likely. In essence, this is a low-risk, high-upside category of reform, so we deem it quite plausible that incremental measures will pass.

Each option above can be mixed and matched. In fact, a comprehensive reform package might involve **multiple measures**: e.g. moving to performance-based regulation (to change utility incentives) while instituting decoupling (to remove the sales motive), and at the same time enacting a minimum bill (to quell cost-shift fears) paired with strong low-income protections (to ensure equity). Nevada has been heading in this multi-faceted direction – **SB 448 (2021) was a great example**: it tackled transmission, EVs, future RTO participation, and access for multi-family solar all in one[11][58]. The matrix shows these reforms are mostly **evolutionary, not revolutionary**: they tweak the existing regulated structure rather than scrapping it. Notably, one reform *not* listed as realistic anymore is full retail deregulation (opening Nevada to competitive suppliers). Voters shot that down in 2018 amid concerns over risk to reliability and lack of guaranteed benefit[31][105]. Given that decisive outcome (and NV Energy's deep integration in state policy planning now), **deregulation is off the table for the foreseeable future** – stakeholders instead focus on improving the regulated model.

It's also important to consider unintended consequences: any reform should be piloted or studied. For instance, decoupling might need a cap so that if an extreme event causes huge sales drop, rates don't spike too much at once. Performance incentives need mid-course correction options. The PUCN, empowered by SB 300, is well aware of these nuances[99][106]. Feasibility-wise, many reforms might even be done via regulation without new legislation, though clear legislative directives can speed up adoption (and give cover to the PUCN to act).

In sum, Nevada has a toolkit of reforms to **better align NV Energy's profit motives with consumer and societal goals, share costs fairly, and protect vulnerable groups**. The challenge is deciding which combination yields the best balance. The next section turns to how citizens can effectively push for these changes and engage in the process, because even the best ideas need public support and savvy advocacy to be realized.

Civic Engagement Playbook

Achieving fair and forward-looking energy policy isn't just about technical fixes – it requires **informed, credible participation from the public**. Regulators and lawmakers do listen to engaged citizens, especially when they bring data and clear arguments rather than slogans. Below is a guide for Nevada citizens who want to influence energy decisions (like PUCN cases, legislative bills, or utility programs) in a productive way:

1. Know the Rules and Avenues for Input: The first step is understanding *where* decisions are made and how to get involved. In Nevada, major decisions happen at:

- **PUCN Proceedings:** These are formal dockets (for rate cases, resource plans, etc.). As a citizen, you can submit written comments on the PUCN website for a specific docket or speak at consumer sessions the PUCN holds[107][108]. For example, if NV Energy files a general rate case asking to raise fixed charges, the PUCN will schedule consumer comment hearings in Reno and Vegas. Showing up to say, with specifics, why you oppose or support something *does* get entered

into the record. While the PUCN can't base its decision purely on public comment, commissioners and their advisors read substantive comments. If 100 residents articulate concerns about, say, a proposed fee on solar, that flags to the commission that they should scrutinize it closely. **How to be effective:** reference the docket number and specific proposal. Instead of "My bills are too high, stop the greed!" say "Docket 23-xxxxx: I'm concerned the proposed $15 increase in the basic service charge will harm seniors like me on fixed incomes. It would raise my bill ~10%. NV Energy's filing doesn't justify this with any cost-of-service data showing we cause more cost. Please consider rejecting that charge as the Commission did in 2017[17]." This kind of comment, grounded in facts and personal impact, is more likely to be taken seriously.

- **Legislative Hearings & Outreach:** Nevada's Legislature meets biennially (every two years); energy bills will go through committees (e.g. Growth and Infrastructure). Citizens can testify at hearings (even via videoconference from Vegas to Carson City) or submit written testimony. Legislators particularly appreciate when constituents tie their perspective to broader data. For instance, "I urge you to support this bill requiring a study of fuel cost sharing. My NV Energy bill jumped 70% due to natural gas prices last year[18], and as a customer I had no protection. Other states use cost-sharing to motivate utilities to manage fuel risk[109]. This bill could lead to ideas that save Nevadans money and reduce volatility." That shows you're not just NIMBY complaining – you're bringing in evidence (cite stats, or mention other states' practices) and connecting it to why the bill matters. Also, **meet your legislators** or their staff outside of formal hearings. A polite, concise email or phone call to your Assembly member or Senator noting an energy issue – e.g. "I'm worried about rooftop solar availability for renters; is there a way to expand community solar?" – can put it on their radar. Be sure to **offer solutions or questions**, not just problems. Legislators hear "my bills are high" a lot; fewer people follow up with "I've read that doing X could help – could we try that here?"

- **Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) stakeholder processes:** NV Energy periodically develops a 20-year resource plan (every three years, with updates). They often hold stakeholder meetings as they draft it. This is more technical, but citizen groups or individuals can attend and voice preferences (e.g. "We want more aggressive coal retirement" or "Include more battery storage"). The **PUCN's IRP hearings** also allow public comment. If you care about the big picture (like renewable percentage or new gas plants), IRP is the forum. Use studies or examples: "California overbuilt gas, leading to stranded costs; I don't want to see NV Energy make a similar mistake." Specific references show credibility.

2. Use Data and Evidence (Be the Expert of Your Own Bill): Regulators take data-backed arguments seriously. You don't need a PhD – sometimes **your own bill history** is powerful evidence. For example, if NV Energy proposes a new time-of-use rate, you could download your smart meter data (NV Energy's website provides usage

history) and run a simple analysis: “Under the proposed TOU rates, my last July bill would have been $15 higher even if I shifted some load. Why? Because I work from home and can’t avoid using power at 5pm. I ask the Commission to consider a protection or alternative for customers like me.” Attaching numbers (even just your kWh and cost difference) gives weight. If you install solar and got an unexpected fee or delay, document it and present that story with numbers – it can inform policymakers about implementation gaps. In public workshops or legislative info requests, cite independent sources: *e.g.*, “According to the PUCN’s own findings in 2017, net metering restoration *lowered* overall bills by a cent a month on average[59], so cost shift fears did not materialize. Let’s rely on our state’s empirical evidence rather than utility scare tactics.” Bringing a printout of the source (or at least referencing it specifically) shows you’ve done homework – this commands respect.

Where to get information? The **PUCN website** posts all dockets and many “Fact Sheets” on rates[110][111]. The Nevada Legislature’s site has hearing agendas and exhibits (you can read NV Energy’s testimony or fiscal notes on bills). The Nevada Independent and other outlets we’ve cited are great for plain-language explanations and often include data points[75][13]. Use these to bolster your comments: regulators and lawmakers know these sources and will recognize them as credible if you mention them.

3. Stick to the Issue (Avoid Ideological Talking Points): It’s easy to fall into the trap of framing this as “utility vs. solar” or “corporate greed vs. people.” But you’ll be more effective focusing on **concrete impacts and feasible solutions** rather than moralizing. For instance, instead of “NV Energy is just greedy and hates competition,” say, “NV Energy as a monopoly is allowed a profit, but it’s the PUC’s job to ensure that profit isn’t excessive. I’m concerned NV Energy has been overshooting its allowed return – evidence showed $180 million in over-earnings over 2012–2016[67]. I urge regulators to scrutinize this in the next case and adjust rates so we’re not overpaying.” This appeals to the regulator’s mandate (just and reasonable rates) without a moral accusation. Similarly, rather than “rooftop solar is a right and NV Energy is killing the planet,” you’d do better with “Rooftop solar helps Nevada add clean energy quickly. Studies show it provides grid benefits near the point of use. Please ensure policies like net metering remain stable. Uncertainty or rollbacks will just slow adoption and make it harder to reach our 100% clean energy goal[13].”

Avoid personal attacks on officials or NV Energy employees. They often backfire. The people in the PUCN or legislature may actually be sympathetic, even if they disagree on approach. Keep the tone **professional and fact-focused**. You can express frustration – e.g., “I was really frustrated when the PUCN eliminated net metering in 2015 with almost no notice; it destroyed jobs and felt like a bait-and-switch on consumers” – but then pivot to solution: “I’m glad the legislature fixed it with AB 405. Going forward, let’s put in statute that existing solar customers are grandfathered under the rules they signed up with. AB 405 did that for 20 years; we should ensure any future changes respect investments people made under prior policy.” This way, you voice a grievance *and* suggest a constructive action.

4. Leverage Allies and Coalitions: It's powerful to have groups backing you. Consider joining or at least referencing the work of Nevada organizations engaged in energy issues. For example:

- **The Bureau of Consumer Protection (BCP):** While not a public membership group, know that the BCP is your taxpayer-funded consumer advocate in PUCN cases[34]. You can read their filings (they often argue for lower rate increases, or against certain NV Energy proposals). If you agree with them, echo their points in simpler terms at hearings: "The Bureau of Consumer Protection correctly noted in Docket X that NV Energy's cost of capital might be set too high given current low interest rates. I support adjusting that down, which would save ratepayers money." Commissioners hear that and realize the public is paying attention and backing the consumer advocate's technical point – that adds pressure to seriously consider it.

- **Advocacy Nonprofits:** Groups like Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA), Vote Solar, Western Resource Advocates, AARP Nevada, the Nevada Conservation League, etc., often submit comments or testify. You can coordinate with them. For instance, AARP might focus on protecting seniors from high fixed charges; if you're a senior, team up. Vote Solar might have fact sheets debunking cost shift claims[62] – use those facts in your letters. If a legislator gets both an organizational lobbyist talking in technical terms and constituents echoing the same points in personal terms, it reinforces the message.

- **Local Government and Businesses:** Sometimes city governments or large employers will also weigh in (Las Vegas city has sustainability goals, for example). Mention local resolutions or support: "Our City Council passed a resolution urging more renewable development; as a resident I concur and want the state to enable that, maybe by lifting caps on community solar or easing permitting." Businesses can be allies too; some small business coalitions might speak out if rates threaten their members. If you're a small business owner, highlight that perspective: "As a owner of a store in Henderson, I support NV Energy's Greenlink project because it will improve reliability in rural areas and unleash new clean power that could keep prices low[112]. But I ask that the costs be allocated fairly and transparently, so we know the benefit we're getting. Perhaps a slight delay to gather more bids could reduce the project cost – saving us money[44]." That shows pragmatic support, not blanket opposition or cheerleading.

5. Question Strategically in Public Meetings: When given the chance to ask questions (like at a PUC consumer session or a town hall with NV Energy reps or legislators), **ask questions that put them on record on key issues**. Examples: "NV Energy has stated that rooftop solar customers don't pay their share. Yet the PUCN found in 2017 there was no significant cost shift[59]. Does NV Energy have updated data demonstrating a cost shift under the current rates? If not, will you commit to not pursue new solar fees until such data is presented in a public forum?" This kind of question forces either an admission

(they have no strong evidence), or at least highlights the point for officials listening. Or to a legislator: “If NV Energy is over-earning beyond its authorized profit, would you support a law requiring automatic rate reductions or refunds? Why or why not?” Their answer can reveal whether they side more with the utility or consumers, and either way it educates others in the room.

6. Avoid Being Captured by Narratives – Do Your Own Math: Both the utility and the solar industry (or other interest groups) will present narratives. For example, NV Energy might claim a proposal will raise the average bill “only by $5”. Solar companies might claim adding more rooftop solar will “save everyone money”. Always ask: **how, and show me the numbers.** Dig into filings or ask pointedly for justification. If NV Energy says a $5 impact, check if that’s for an average user – your usage might be higher, so impact could be $7 for you. Call that out. If solar advocates cite a study that rooftop solar provides net benefit, check who did the study (is it independent, like a PUC staff study, or industry-commissioned?). Compare it to NV Energy’s study. Often, the truth is in the assumptions. Bring that nuance to the discussion: “There are conflicting studies on cost-shift. NV Energy’s analysis assumes every kilowatt of solar exported replaces only fuel cost, whereas other studies include avoided future capacity and environmental costs[62]. I urge the Commission to conduct its own analysis or at least examine which assumptions align with Nevada’s reality (e.g., do we avoid building a new peaker plant due to rooftop solar adoption?). Let’s base decisions on Nevada-specific data, not generic models.” This approach avoids you falling wholesale for one side’s narrative – you position yourself as **seeking the truth for Nevada**.

7. Practical Writing Tips for Comments or Testimony:

- **Be concise and organized:** Follow the headings or sections in these guidelines. For a written comment, a few focused paragraphs are far better than a ramble. Perhaps outline: *Introduction (who you are, why you care)*, *Your key point or argument with evidence*, *What you request the decision-maker to do*. In spoken testimony, lead with your conclusion (“Please vote YES on AB ___” or “Please reject NV Energy’s proposal to…”) then give your supporting reasons. Time is limited (often 2-3 minutes in hearings), so practice hitting the main points clearly.

- **Use respectful tone and acknowledge counterpoints**: “I understand NV Energy needs to maintain the grid and earn a profit, but I believe there’s a way to do that without unfairly penalizing customers who conserve energy. Decoupling, as mentioned earlier, is one such approach – it would actually encourage the utility to help us save energy[97]. I hope the Commission considers that rather than simply allowing higher fixed charges.” This kind of statement shows you’re not ignoring the utility’s perspective, which boosts credibility; you’re proposing an alternative that meets both sides’ aims.

- **End with a call to action**: explicitly state what you want them to do. “I urge the PUCN to deny this rate increase until NV Energy provides a thorough cost justification.” Or “Please support SB ___ to give community solar a chance in

Nevada – it's time renters like me can directly benefit from solar." Decision-makers have to balance many views; don't assume they know what you want unless you state it plainly.

8. Stay Informed and Involved Long-Term: Energy policy is a long game. After one issue is resolved, another will arise (e.g., today net metering, tomorrow electric vehicle rates or storage integration). **Build relationships**: attend PUCN consumer workshops periodically, join energy webinars, follow the Nevada Independent's energy reporter or utility press releases. By staying informed, you can catch early warning of proposals (like if NV Energy floats a new fee in an IRP rather than a rate case, you'll see it). Also, celebrate wins: if a reform you supported passes or a bad proposal is stopped, thank the officials ("Thank you, commissioners, for listening to public concern and rejecting that charge – it builds trust in the process"). Positive reinforcement makes them more receptive next time.

Finally, **don't get discouraged**. The system can seem technical and dominated by lawyers and economists (and indeed, NV Energy will always have many experts on their side). But history shows citizen input has made a difference: the public backlash in 2015-2017 *directly* led to policy reversals and new laws[36][38]. Lawmakers killed the 2018 deregulation attempt in large part because consumer and business voices expressed fear of the unknown, preferring to improve the system we have[31][105]. Your voice, armed with facts and delivered constructively, is a crucial piece of the puzzle. As Nevada navigates its energy future, credible civic engagement ensures that **decisions aren't just top-down, but incorporate the lived experience and values of Nevadans** – leading to outcomes that are technically sound *and* publicly accepted.

Evidence Appendix (Sources and Citations)

This section provides the referenced evidence supporting the analysis, following the citation numbers in the text:

1. **NV Energy Monopoly Structure:** *Vox explainer on NV Energy's vertically integrated status and NRS 704B exit law – Vox (2015)*[1][2]. Describes how Nevada halted deregulation and kept NV Energy as the monopoly utility owning generation, transmission, distribution, with an exception for large customers via AB 661 (NRS 704B).

2. **Regulated Rates & Return:** *Energy and Policy Institute report on NV Energy over-earning – David Pomerantz (2017)*[4][68]. Explains the deal: NV Energy gets a monopoly and an authorized return (~8–9%), but was earning above that (actual 9.24% vs allowed 8.09% in 2016).

3. **Fuel Cost Pass-Through Mechanism:** *Citizen portal summary of PUCN presentation (2025)*[7][75]. Confirms that fuel and purchased power are passed dollar-for-dollar to ratepayers (no profit) and adjusted quarterly, which places fuel price risk on customers.

4. **NRS 704B Large Customer Exits:** *Utility Dive article on casinos leaving NV Energy – Utility Dive (2016)*[51][52]. Notes MGM paid $86.9 M to exit, accounting for ~4.86% of Nevada Power's sales, seeking cheaper/greener power. Indicates large customers' ability to leave (with fees) and mentions Wynn, Sands considering exits.

5. **Exit Fee Controversy:** *Nevada Current article snippet (2024)*[55]. Suggests PUC allowed MGM, Caesars, Wynn to leave without covering certain decommissioning costs, implying remaining customers shoulder those costs ("You are [paying]").

6. **Net Metering Policy Reversal:** *Energy and Policy Institute*[17][62]. Describes NV Energy's failed argument about cost shift and notes the PUCN found no unreasonable cost shift; restoring net metering in northern NV actually led to a ~$0.01/month *decrease* for average ratepayers, per PUC findings (citing Greentech Media).

7. **Net Metering Tiers (AB 405, 2017):** *PUCN Net Metering Fact Sheet*[72][80]. Details tiered credit rates: 95% retail for first 80 MW, stepping down to 75%. Shows Tier 3 (81%) opened June 2019 and closed June 2020, Tier 4 = 75% with no cap, indicating that as of 2020+ new solar exports earn 75% retail credit locked for 20 years.

8. **Net Metering 2015 Decision:** *Wikipedia (Net metering in NV)*[70]. Outlines 2015 PUC order: raising fixed charge from $12.75 to $17.90 (eventually $38.51 over 12 years) and cutting energy rate for solar customers, applied to all (no grandfathering initially). This caused the uproar and was cited as unfair.

9. **Public Backlash & Governor Response:** *Wikipedia*[113]. Mentions Governor Sandoval was unhappy existing solar customers weren't protected, and Commissioner David Noble (who led the 2015 decision) was not reappointed. Also describes armed protest interruption of a PUC meeting, underscoring level of public anger.

10. **AB 405 Passage & Solar Industry Support:** *Nevada Independent article (2017)*[24][84]. Explains the amended AB 405 reinstated net metering at 95% retail until 6% of peak load, then 90%, 85%, 80% tiers up to 10% of peak. Solar advocates called it a compromise that revives the industry without harming other ratepayers. NV Energy officially took no position at the time (neutral)[114].

11. **Solar Market Rebound Statistics:** *Informed Infrastructure (2018)*[85]. Reports NV Energy's data: after AB 405, SolarGenerations (rooftop program) applications jumped from 287 in 2016 to 3,308 in 2017 (an 11× increase) – evidence of the rooftop solar industry's revival due to policy change.

12. **SB 300 (2019) Alternative Ratemaking:** *Nevada Independent (2019)*[26][9]. Describes SB 300's intent: allow PUCN to adopt alternative ratemaking

(decoupling, performance incentives, etc.) to better align NV Energy's business with policy goals like efficiency, storage, distributed generation. Noted that traditional cost-of-service rewards capital intensive projects and doesn't promote customer-centric innovation[9].

13. **Authorized Return Example:** *Nevada Independent*[27]. Notes NV Energy's authorized ROE was 9.7% in 2017. Shows how rates include costs + allowed return, historically set every 3 years.

14. **Net Metering Cost Study Requirement Repealed:** *Nevada Independent*[115][116]. SB 300's amendment repealed a 2017 law section that required PUCN to study net metering cost impacts by 2020, because consensus was current net metering system "worked out well" and no study was needed. Implies broad agreement that cost shift issue was resolved or minimal.

15. **SB 358 (2019) – 50% RPS & 100% Goal:** *Utility Dive (2019)* via NRDC blog[66]. Analysis commissioned by WRA and SWEEP showed a 50% RPS by 2030 could *save* ratepayers $192 M over 20 years compared to more gas – demonstrating economic benefit of higher renewables due to fuel savings. Also mentioned in Utility Dive (Jason Plautz, 2021)[13][112] that SB 448 advances the 100% carbon-free by 2050 goal set in 2019's bill.

16. **SB 448 (2021) – Greenlink, RTO, EV infrastructure:** *Utility Dive (Jason Plautz, 2021)*[11][28]. Summarizes SB 448: mandates state to join an RTO by 2030 (with task force and possible delay options), backs $2B Greenlink transmission (completion by 2029, earlier than NV Energy's plan), and increases spending on EV charging ($100 M plan). Also requires NV Energy to plan for 80% CO_2 reduction by 2030 relative to 2005[13][117].

17. **Greenlink Project Concerns:** *Utility Dive (Plautz 2021)*[12][44]. Notes PUCN approved Greenlink West line fully, but Greenlink North only for permitting, amid concerns from gaming/resort industry that project costs would raise rates. SB 448 essentially gave legislative go-ahead to build both lines, tipping balance toward construction despite cost concerns – indicating policymaker prioritization of long-term infrastructure.

18. **NV Energy Support for SB 448:** *Utility Dive (Plautz 2021)*[29]. NV Energy spokesperson applauded SB 448, saying it will transform Nevada's clean energy landscape and benefit underserved communities – showing NV Energy publicly on board with legislative clean energy efforts (likely because it also guarantees them large projects like Greenlink to build).

19. **2022 Fuel Price Spike – Bill Impact:** *Nevada Independent (April 2025)*[18]. Provides hard data: NV Energy's cost of natural gas (over half of NV's power) rose 70% in 2022, peaking Jan 2023, leading to rate increases of ~2¢/kWh. For an average northern NV household (~765 kWh/month), that meant ~$15/month higher bill. This quantifies volatility impact on consumers.

20. **Fuel Cost Sharing Proposal (AB 452, 2025):** *Nevada Independent*[41][47]. Explains Assemblywoman Brown-May's bill AB 452 that directs PUCN to investigate fuel cost sharing – where utility would bear a portion of fuel costs above forecast, and keep some savings if costs below forecast – to mitigate spikes and encourage renewables (since renewables have no fuel cost). It notes other states do this and it incentivizes utilities to manage fuel risk. Also mentions AB 452 closing a loophole on overbilling refunds (NV Energy only had to partly refund overcharges, which AB 452 seeks to change)[118].

21. **NV Energy Opposition to Cost Sharing:** *Nevada Independent*[40][119]. NV Energy's VP Janet Wells argued against AB 452, saying customers are already protected and utilities have incentive to manage costs, calling the bill a backward shift that could lead to risky changes in procurement. This shows NV Energy's stance, likely preferring status quo where customers cover fuel costs fully.

22. **NV Energy Over-earning Evidence:** *Energy and Policy Institute*[67][102]. Documents NV Energy "over-earned" by $180 M from 2012–2016 above authorized profit – roughly $144 per customer over 5 years – by overshooting allowed ROE each year (actual ~9% vs allowed ~8%). Indicates either forecasts in rate cases overshot costs or they delayed rate reductions, implying customers overpaid in those periods. MGM cited this in complaints[103].

23. **Public Opinion Impact:** *Energy and Policy Institute / Nevada Independent*[36][38]. Describes how public sentiment turned politicians against NV Energy's anti-solar stance. By 2017, NV Energy lost the battle as Sandoval signed AB 405 restoring net metering. Also highlights NV Energy's lobbyist had claimed AB 405 would cost $63 M/year (later $42 M) in purported cost shift, which the PUCN analysis refuted (finding a slight net *decrease* in bills)[38][59].

24. **Nevada Ballot Question 3 (2018) – Deregulation Defeat:** *Ballotpedia / News articles*[31][32]. Voters in 2018 rejected the Energy Choice Initiative (would amend constitution to mandate retail competition by 2023). Over $60 M was spent by opponents (NV Energy and allies) and the measure failed. The rejection indicated preference to improve the existing regulated system rather than gamble on unknown market, especially after seeing issues in other states.

25. **Legislative Clean Energy Support:** *NRDC blog (Dylan Sullivan, 2019)*[74][120]. Unanimous bipartisan support for 50% RPS bill SB 358 in Senate. Studies from NRDC/WRA/ICF showing grid can handle 50% renewables and it cuts emissions significantly by 2030 (CO_2 down 28%, NOx 13%). Demonstrates lawmakers had solid analysis that higher renewable targets are feasible and beneficial, aiding strong support.

26. **Consumer Advocacy Role:** *CitizenPortal summary (PUCN 2025 hearing)*[34]. Mentions the statutory right of the Bureau of Consumer Protection in the Attorney General's Office to intervene for residential ratepayers and that PUCN cannot

adopt rates not just and reasonable. Illustrates that consumers have an official voice (BCP) and that fairness is a legal mandate.

27. **PUCN on Large New Loads:** *CitizenPortal summary*[121][122]. Notes discussion that NV Energy publicly said it does not intend residential customers to shoulder undue risk/cost for generation or transmission built mainly for new industrial loads (like data centers). Shows the tension about who pays for expansion to serve big new customers, and NV Energy's assurance to avoid burdening households – something citizens can hold them accountable for.

28. **PUCN on Evolving Planning (Extreme Heat/Wildfire):** *CitizenPortal*[123][124]. Weir (PUC counsel) acknowledged increasing summer cooling demand, wildfire/drought risks are on their radar in planning and they'd look into how extreme heat is addressed in disaster planning dockets. This highlights new resilience challenges that affect planning and costs – context for conflicts like reliability vs. decentralization.

29. **NV Energy Rate Design Experiments:** *NV Energy GRC filing / NV Energy website*[93]. Suggests NV Energy has considered restructuring bills (the mention of "restructuring of the current bill" and adding a demand charge, though saying most won't see increase if they manage usage). This indicates NV Energy's interest in modernizing residential rate design (maybe optional TOU with demand component) – relevant for reform options like TOU or demand charges.

30. **Community Solar & Expanded Solar Access:** *Center for New Energy Economy state brief (2025)*[90]. Summarizes AB 465 (2019) requiring NV Energy to file plans to expand solar access equitably. NV Energy's Expanded Solar Access Program built 3 community-based solar projects (likely for low-income/affordable housing usage). This demonstrates an existing reform to include renters/low-income in solar, providing baseline to expand.

31. **EV Infrastructure and Low-Income EV Access:** *Utility Dive / ImpactNV summary (2021)*[125]. SB 448 invests $100 M in EV charging, with 40% in underserved communities[126]. This shows a policy tying clean infrastructure to equity by location. It doesn't directly lower rates but provides access to EV charging (and potentially EV adoption benefits like lower fuel costs for low-income drivers if they can switch to EVs).

32. **Fixed Charge Impacts on Low-Income:** *Energy and Policy Institute*[87]. Points out NV Energy's proposal to raise fixed charges would hurt low-income customers by diluting their ability to save via conservation. This argument was used in 2017 when NV Energy wanted higher basic charges, and regulators rejected that plan[14][17]. It's evidence that low-income impacts are considered.

33. **General Rate Case Frequency:** *NV Legislature PDF (2019)*[6]. Confirms NV law requires electric utilities to file a GRC at least every 3 years (NRS 704.110).

Implies if NV Energy is over-earning, a rate case should correct it, though in practice they still over-earned between cases.

34. **Consumer Session Importance:** *PUC Press Release / Pahrump Times (2020)*[127][128]. Emphasizes evolving regulatory mechanisms and mentions "senate bill sponsor said future must be embraced" – context for alternative ratemaking. Also PUC press releases mention consumer sessions scheduled (e.g., docket news releases)[129], showing when and how public can comment.

35. **NV Energy Earnings Sharing History:** *E.g., NV Energy had an earnings review docket* (implied by BCP/MGM actions). Not explicitly cited above, but likely PUCN dockets exist where NV Energy had to address earnings (the Energy and Policy piece is the source that compiled earnings from PUC filings[102]).

36. **Deregulation Attempt Outcome:** *Las Vegas Sun (2018)* or *Reno Gazette-Journal (2018)*[32]. Nevada voters rejected Question 3 in Nov 2018; about $63 M spent by opponents in the campaign and it worked – illustrating the influence of NV Energy and others in shaping public opinion to avoid deregulation.

37. **Overbilling Refund Loophole:** *Nevada Independent (2025)*[118]. AB 452 highlights NV Energy could partially refund when it overbilled (perhaps due to statute of limitations or interest not paid), and the bill closes that so full refunds must be given. Shows a consumer protection detail.

38. **Historical Context – Enron & NV Deregulation Halt:** *Vox (2015)*[130]. Explains around 2001 Nevada stopped deregulation due to the Western energy crisis, keeping the vertically integrated model (which continues now). Provides context that NV tried partial deregulation in the 1990s, reversed course, which is why NV Energy still owns generation.

Each citation above is tied to a **specific snippet** in the connected sources, ensuring traceability of facts. By scrutinizing PUCN records, independent studies, credible journalism, and legislative documents, this report's analysis is grounded in evidence rather than conjecture. In cases where sources conflicted (e.g., NV Energy's cost-shift claims vs. independent findings), we compared assumptions and leaned on official or empirical data (PUCN findings, multistakeholder studies)[62]. We clearly distinguished between **facts (from sources), inferences (our analysis bridging facts), and speculation (noting when an outcome is projected or an opinion)**. This evidence-backed approach aims to give Nevada citizens and policymakers a reliable foundation for understanding and acting on the complex issues in our electric system.

---

[1] [2] [48] [49] [50] [130] This Nevada company wanted to break up with its electric utility. The government said no. | Vox

https://www.vox.com/2015/6/12/8767927/switch-nevada-utility

[3] [51] [52] [53] Las Vegas casino set to exit Nevada utility's service with $87M fee | Utility Dive

https://www.utilitydive.com/news/las-vegas-casino-set-to-exit-nevada-utilitys-service-with-87m-fee/419644/

[4] [14] [15] [16] [17] [36] [37] [38] [59] [62] [67] [68] [87] [88] [102] [103] NV Energy claims solar raises rates while over-profiting from customers

https://energyandpolicy.org/nv-energy-earnings/

[5] [9] [26] [27] [71] [96] [98] [100] [115] [116] 'Alternative' rate-making bill would overhaul electric pricing structure for NV Energy - The Nevada Independent

https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/alternative-rate-making-bill-would-overhaul-electric-pricing-structure-for-nv-energy

[6] [8] [82] [110] [111] puc.nv.gov

https://puc.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/pucnvgov/Content/Consumers/Be_Informed/Rates/Fact_Sheet_Electric_Rates_NN.pdf

[7] [33] [34] [35] [107] [108] [121] [122] [123] [124] CitizenPortal.ai - PUCN outlines how Nevada utilities are regulated, how rates and long-range planning work

https://citizenportal.ai/articles/6665803/PUCN-outlines-how-Nevada-utilities-are-regulated-how-rates-and-long-range-planning-work

[10] [11] [12] [13] [28] [29] [43] [44] [45] [58] [65] [73] [112] [117] [126] Nevada passes clean energy bill requiring state to join RTO, accelerating $2B transmission project | Utility Dive

https://www.utilitydive.com/news/nevada-passes-clean-energy-bill-requiring-state-to-join-rto-accelerating/601106/

[18] [19] [20] [30] [39] [40] [41] [42] [46] [47] [75] [86] [104] [109] [118] [119] Should NV Energy help pay for fuel costs? Lawmakers say it’d help reduce bill spikes - The Nevada Independent

https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/should-nv-energy-help-pay-for-fuel-costs-lawmakers-say-itd-help-reduce-bill-spikes

[21] [22] [23] [72] [80] [92] [101] Net Metering

https://puc.nv.gov/Renewable_Energy/Net_Metering/

[24] [60] [84] [114] Legislators, solar advocates chart pathway forward for amended net metering bill - The Nevada Independent

https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/legislators-solar-advocates-chart-pathway-forward-for-amended-net-metering-bill

[25] [85] Renewables - Informed Infrastructure

https://www.informedinfrastructure.com/index.php/category/renewables?page=38

[31] [105] About $63 million was spent to defeat Nevada's Question 3. It worked

https://www.rgj.com/story/news/politics/2018/11/06/63-million-spent-defeat-nevadas-question-3-worked/1908835002/

[32] Nevada ballot questions: Voters reject breaking up NV Energy, pass ...

https://lasvegassun.com/news/2018/nov/07/nevada-ballot-questions-voters-reject-breaking-up/

[54] PUC says exit fees for major casino companies are fair | Energy

https://www.reviewjournal.com/business/energy/puc-says-exit-fees-for-major-casino-companies-are-fair/

[55] Pssst... exits from NV Energy are way out of control - Nevada Current

https://nevadacurrent.com/2019/03/06/pssst-exits-from-nv-energy-are-way-out-of-control/

[56] MGM seeks $16 million credit as part of amended exit agreement ...

https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/mgm-seeks-16-million-credit-as-part-of-amended-exit-agreement-from-nv-energy

[57] New rule would let casinos, businesses that left NV Energy come back

https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/new-rule-would-let-casinos-businesses-that-left-nv-energy-come-back

[61] Community Based Solar Resources (CBSR) - NV Energy

https://www.nvenergy.com/cleanenergy/solar/community-based-solar-resources

[63] [64] [66] [74] [120] 50% Renewables Bill Passes NV Senate, Unanimously

https://www.nrdc.org/bio/dylan-sullivan/50-renewables-bill-passes-nv-senate-unanimously

[69] [97] [99] [106] [127] [128] PUCN outlines plan to investigate alternative rate-making mechanisms for electric utilities | Pahrump Valley Times

https://pvtimes.com/news/pucn-outlines-plan-for-alternative-rate-plan-86527/

[70] [81] [83] [113] Net metering in Nevada - Wikipedia

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Net_metering_in_Nevada

[76] PUCN Approves NV Energy's Greenlink Nevada Transmission and ...

https://nvenergy.mediaroom.com/2021-03-22-PUCN-Approves-NV-Energys-Greenlink-Nevada-Transmission-and-Renewable-Energy-Initiative

[77] NV Energy President

https://website-0580812b.national-toxic-encephalopathy-foundation.org/

[78] Here's how Las Vegas energy, gas bills have changed over the years

https://www.fox5vegas.com/2023/04/27/heres-how-las-vegas-energy-gas-bills-have-changed-over-years/

[79] Nevada electricity and gas bills rising in 2023 | Energy | Business

https://www.reviewjournal.com/business/energy/digging-deeper-nevada-electricity-gas-bills-to-rise-in-23-2685443/

[89] [90] [91] [PDF] State Brief: Nevada - Center for the New Energy Economy

https://cnee.colostate.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/NV-State-Brief_2025_Final.pdf

[93] Southern Nevada General Rate Case | NV Energy

https://www.nvenergy.com/about-nvenergy/rates-regulatory/south-grc-2025

[94] Nevada – SEIA - Solar Energy Industries Association

https://seia.org/state-solar-policy/nevada-solar/

[95] "Decoupling mechanism" defined. :: 2024 Nevada Revised Statutes

https://law.justia.com/codes/nevada/chapter-704/statute-704-7613/

[125] Massive clean energy bill expanding transmission, electric car ...

https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/massive-clean-energy-bill-expanding-transmission-electric-car-charging-stations-gets-first-hearing-resorts-opposed

[129] Commission News Releases - pucweb1.state.nv.us

https://pucweb1.state.nv.us/puc2/PressReleaseList.aspx