STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL
Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051
Phone: (860) 827-2935 Fax: (860) 827-2950
E-Mail: siting.council@ct.gov
Web Site: portal.ct.gov/csc

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

June 25, 2021

Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
79 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106-5127
DEEP.OPPD@ct.gov

RE: STEPS for Solar Development

The Connecticut Siting Council (CSC) submits these comments in response to DEEP's June 7, 2021 Notice of Proceeding and June 16, 2021 Scoping Meeting regarding STEPS for Solar Development. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

CSC is an independent state agency with exclusive jurisdiction over the construction, operation and maintenance of energy and telecommunications facilities throughout the state, and consists of 5 per-diem members of the public appointed by the Governor and a designee from DEEP, Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA), the House Speaker and Senate President. Contrary to the comments of Mr. Comins during the Scoping Meeting, Louanne Cooley is the CSC member of the public appointed by the Governor ***with experience in ecology***.[1]

CSC appreciates DEEP's recognition of the challenges CSC confronts and the balance CSC must strike among a wide array of competing interests in the siting of generation resources throughout the state, including, but not limited to, the competing interests voiced during the Scoping Meeting. Striking a balance among the need for adequate and reliable public utility services at the lowest reasonable cost to consumers with the need to protect the environment and ecology of the state aligns with DEEP's objectives and strategies to achieve our 100% Zero Carbon Target.

A. Comments on Tentative Objectives

The first 4 Tentative Objectives, as noted by Mr. Hoffman during the Scoping Meeting, are explicitly addressed in the Public Utility Environmental Standards Act (PUESA), which created CSC in 1971. Its purposes include, but are not limited to:

- balance the need for adequate and reliable public utility services at the lowest reasonable cost to consumers with the need to protect the environment and ecology of the state;
- minimize damage to scenic, historic, and recreational values;

[1] Conn. Gen. Stat. §16-50j (2021); Connecticut Siting Council membership, *available at* https://portal.ct.gov/CSC/Membership/Membership/Council-Membership---Energy

- provide environmental quality standards and criteria for the location, design, construction and operation of facilities to assure the welfare and protection of state residents;
- encourage research to develop new and improved methods of generating, storing and transmitting electricity and fuel; and
- promote energy security.[2]

CSC achieves these purposes by employing the discretion granted to it by the legislature in a case-by-case evaluation of proposed facilities consistent with the following statutory criteria:

The nature of the probable environmental impact of the facility alone and cumulatively with other existing facilities, including a specification of every significant adverse effect, including, but not limited to, (i) electromagnetic fields that, whether alone or cumulatively with other effects, impact on, and conflict with the policies of the state concerning the natural environment, (ii) ecological balance, (iii) public health and safety, (iv) scenic, historic and recreational values, (v) agriculture, (vi) forests and parks, (vii) air and water purity, and (viii) fish, aquaculture and wildlife.[3]

CSC also achieves these purposes by consulting with and soliciting comments on every proposed facility from 12 sister state agencies as follows: DEEP, Department of Public Health, Council on Environmental Quality, Department of Agriculture, PURA, Office of Policy and Management, Department of Economic and Community Development, Department of Transportation, Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection, Department of Consumer Protection, Department of Administrative Services and Department of Labor. It also solicits comments from the host municipality and any municipality with a boundary within 2,500 feet of a proposed site.

The siting process is quasi-judicial; no one wins, but the process is predictable, efficient transparent, and most importantly, the process is fair. Consistent with CSC's purposes under PUESA, it is intended to reduce the time and cost involved in meeting the reasonable power needs of Connecticut citizens without jeopardizing our environment.[4]

Every proposed site is unique. A 1.99 MW solar project could be more controversial than a 120 MW solar project. However, the same statutory evaluation criteria is applied to each proposed site.

For proposed generation facilities of any type, CSC must find and determine a "public benefit" for the facility, the basis for it and the nature of the probable environmental impact. "Public benefit" exists when a facility is necessary for the reliability of the electric power supply of the state or for the development of a competitive market for electricity.[5]

For proposed generation facilities ***using renewable fuels with a capacity of 65 MW or less*** that are selected in a Request For Proposals (RFP), Public Act 05-1, "An Act Concerning Energy

[2] Conn. Gen. Stat. §16-50g (2021).
[3] Conn. Gen. Stat. §16-50p (2021).
[4] In 1970, the energy-environment conflicts over the proposed construction of an electric transmission line facility over 75 miles of southwest Connecticut, a nuclear electric generating facility on an island off the shores of Norwalk and an oil-fired electric generating facility at Stamford Harbor prompted the passage of PUESA.
[5] Conn. Gen. Stat. §16-50p(c) (2021).

Independence," established a rebuttable presumption of "public benefit" and permits qualifying facilities to be approved by a declaratory ruling as long as CSC does not find a substantial adverse environmental effect.[6]

In June 2011, CSC found two wind facilities, each selected in a RFP with a generating capacity of 4.8 MW (Colebrook North and Colebrook South) would not have a substantial adverse environmental effect.[7] Both decisions were unsuccessfully appealed. One month after CSC issued declaratory rulings, Public Act 11-245 imposed a moratorium on development of any wind facilities until CSC drafted wind regulations.[8] The wind regulations were adopted on Earth Day 2014. The medical marijuana regulations were approved in less time with less restrictions. This is not a recommended pathway to a zero-carbon future.

In December 2017, CSC found two solar facilities, each selected in a RFP with a generating capacity over 20 MW (Candlewood Solar and Tobacco Valley Solar) would not have a substantial adverse environmental effect. Both decisions were appealed, one of which remains undecided to date. While the petitions were pending with CSC, Public Act 17-218, "An Act Concerning the Installation of Certain Solar Facilities on Productive Farmlands," established an additional requirement specifically for solar resources with a capacity over 2 megawatts and prohibits otherwise qualifying facilities under Public Act 05-1 from being approved by a declaratory ruling.[9] This established a DEEP and Agriculture "veto" over solar facilities that are subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of CSC. It is an impediment to the pathway to a zero-carbon future.

In February 2021, Bill No. 6498, "An Act Concerning the Siting of Certain Solar Facilities on Farmlands and Core Forests," proposed "increased review of proposals to site solar facilities on certain farmlands and land that is core forest." It sought to expand the scope of Public Act 17-218 to solar facilities with a generating capacity of one or more megawatts and to solar facilities proposed on farmland of state-wide importance. Testimony on the bill echoes comments from the Scoping Session seeking to impose similar vetoes for watershed lands and protected species. In response to Mr. LaFrance's reference to testimony on the bill, CSC's testimony is attached.

Other comments on the Tentative Objectives are as follows:

Tentative Objective #2 – In addition to soliciting comments from the host municipalities on every proposed facility, under Conn. Gen. Stat. §16-50x, when rendering decisions on applications for certificates and petitions for declaratory rulings, CSC "shall give such consideration to other state laws and municipal regulations ***as it shall deem appropriate***."

---

[6] Conn. Gen. Stat. §16-50k(a) (2021).

[7] Wind Colebrook North's declaratory ruling expired in September 2018. Two of the three approved wind turbines at Wind Colebrook South were upgraded and achieved commercial operation in 2015. The third wind turbine was upgraded and selected in the Small Scale Clean Energy RFP. CSC approved the upgrade of the third wind turbine in March 2020. It is exempt from the wind regulations and currently subject to litigation.

[8] Public Act 11-245, *available at* https://www.cga.ct.gov/2011/ACT/Pa/pdf/2011PA-00245-R00HB-06249-PA.pdf

[9] Bill No. 6498, *available at* https://www.cga.ct.gov/2021/TOB/H/PDF/2021HB-06498-R00-HB.PDF; Conn. Gen. Stat. §16-50k(a) (2021).

Tentative Objective #4 - With respect to environmental justice, under Conn. Gen. Stat. §22a-20a, "Affecting facility" shall not include the portion of an electric generating facility that uses nonemitting and nonpolluting renewable resources such as wind, solar and hydro power or that uses fuel cells.

Tentative Objective #5 – Under PUESA, the purpose of the presumption of public benefit for a project selected in a RFP is to advance energy policy goals, meet energy demand and promote fuel diversity.[10] Projects submitted into RFPs are essentially concepts until they are selected. Once selected, CSC's statutory obligation to evaluate the nature of the environmental impacts of the projects remains intact. Selection in a RFP does not and should not result in a rubber stamp.

Guided by DEEP's Integrated Resources Plan and evidenced in the list below, energy resource procurements solicit proposals that are consistent with the state's environmental goals and standards.[11] These procurements include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Conn. Gen. Stat. §16a-3f - Class I renewable energy sources
- Conn. Gen. Stat. §16a-3g - Class I renewable energy sources or large scale hydropower
- Conn. Gen. Stat. §16a-3h - Run of river hydropower, landfill methane, biomass, fuel cells, off shore wind, anaerobic digestion or energy storage systems
- Conn. Gen. Stat. §16a-3i - Class I renewable energy sources
- Conn. Gen. Stat. §16a-3j - Regional and independent solicitations
- Conn. Gen. Stat. §16a-3*l* - ***Solicitations shall consider environmental impacts of any proposal received consistent with Public Act 17-218***
- Conn. Gen. Stat. §16a-3m - Zero Carbon electric generating resources
- Conn. Gen. Stat. §16a-3n - Solicitation for off shore wind facilities
- Conn. Gen. Stat. §16a-3p - Solicitation for anaerobic digestion

State and/or ratepayer procurements that promote solar development on sites other than greenspace, such as parking canopies and previously disturbed lands, would be consistent with the STEPS objectives and comments received during the Scoping Meeting.

B. Tentative Facility Scope

As proposed, the Tentative Facility Scope may be both too broad and too narrow. It could be more manageable if it is divided into subparts and/or limited to projects selected in DEEP or public utility procurements. Based on CSC's experience with the wind facilities, the tentative facility scope should either be expanded to include other renewable and non-renewable facility types or narrowed to solar facilities on sites other than greenspace, such as parking canopies and previously disturbed lands. Otherwise, similar to Public Act 11-245 and Public Act 17-218, utility-scale ground-mounted solar facilities will be singled out among similarly situated facilities and subject

[10] Public Act 05-1, *available at* https://www.cga.ct.gov/2005/ACT/Pa/pdf/2005PA-00001-R00HB-07501SS1-PA.pdf
[11] Conn. Gen. Stat. §16a-3a (2021).

to different requirements. Public Act 11-245 called for development of wind regulations with "different requirements for projects of different sizes." This requirement was eliminated from Public Act 11-245 due to existing CSC requirements for projects with a generating capacity of more or less than 65 MW. Similarly, Public Act 17-218 applies to solar facilities with a generating capacity of more than 2 MW. It singles out solar, placing it at a disadvantage in comparison to other renewable energy sources, and causes delays and costs that do not apply to other fuel types. This contradicts the objectives of PUESA, Public Act 05-1, the IRP and the procurement statutes.

C. Proposed Topics

Like the Tentative Facility Scope, the Proposed Topics may be both too broad and too narrow. However, they could be matched with respective subparts of the Tentative Facility Scope.

CSC offers the following bulleted comments on the Proposed Topics:

1. Preferential solar siting criteria which will take into consideration factors including but not limited to natural resources and habitats, water quality and quantity, topography, equity, and degree of development;
    - consult with municipalities regarding "locational preferences" (Mr. Vidich)
    - examine impacts to property rights, economy, environment, other state policies, and electric system reliability
    - solicit written comments from developers, sister state agencies and ratepayers
    - apply CSC balancing factors under Conn. Gen. Stat. §16-50p

2. Benefits and potential challenges associated with the location of the solar facility, including but not limited to core forest, prime agricultural land, wetlands, and environmental justice communities;
    - renewables are exempt from the Environmental Justice statute
    - **conflicting interests** (ex. agriculture is exempt from environmental laws)[12]
    - solicit written comments from developers, sister state agencies and ratepayers
    - apply CSC balancing factors under Conn. Gen. Stat. §16-50p

3. Types of design and construction practices available to both maximize the energy efficiency of solar projects and minimize detrimental impact to natural resources, community resources and the environment and implementation challenges such as the timing of the in-service date;
    - incorporate battery storage into RFPs and existing solar facilities (upgrades)
    - install higher wattage solar panels (decrease footprint, increase efficiency)
    - opposition delays before, during and after siting proceedings (litigation, etc.)
    - solicit written comments from developers, sister state agencies and ratepayers
    - apply CSC balancing factors under Conn. Gen. Stat. §16-50p

[12] Conn. Gen. Stat. §22a-40 (2021); Conn. Gen. Stat. §19a-341 (2021).

4. Opportunities to optimize regulatory and permitting requirements and processes depending upon the size of the solar project and siting considerations including sequential steps and opportunities to streamline the process;
    - each proposed site is unique and requires a case-by-case evaluation
    - a form or check the box scenario will not be applicable to most proposed sites
    - different requirements for projects of different sizes is not advisable (PA 11-245)
    - pre-application meetings with DEEP and CSC for guidance through the process
    - concurrent or coordinated submission to CSC and DEEP (ex. Stormwater Permit)

5. Siting and permitting challenges specific to developing previously disturbed land such as brownfields and landfills;
    - remediation, transaction and construction costs
    - multiple permitting issues

6. Types of incentives, selection weighting factors, and timing of commitments relating to siting that may increase the effectiveness of a solicitation, including but not limited to DEEP-run procurements, LREC/ZREC, and shared clean energy facilities (SCEF).
    - solicit proposals for solar development on sites other than greenspace and existing structures, such as rooftop, parking canopy, light pole and utility pole installations
    - incentivize solar in new construction (Mr. Vidich)[13]
    - examine costs to ratepayers[14]
    - consider technical and visual impacts of interconnections[15]

---

[13] The Hotel Marcel is located at 500 Sargent Drive in New Haven (formerly Pirelli Building). Construction began in summer of 2020 and it is slated to open in September 2021. The hotel is designed as a net-zero energy building, generating 100% of its own electricity, heat and hot water with a rooftop solar array and solar parking canopies. This energy platform will also allow occupants to charge their electric vehicles. In the event of a solar grid outage, the hotel has battery backups to ensure continuity.

[14] For VNM, ratepayers are subsidizing municipal and agricultural facilities by offsetting the usage with solar output at commercial or industrial rates, including distribution charges, which are two to three times higher than the wholesale market rates. As a result, remaining customers across the customer class are absorbed in the revenue requirements. CSC has reviewed several solar projects that have claimed they are financially viable without VNM and therefore the projects should not be subsidized. In theory, the economy of scale is that larger solar projects should provide the revenue stream necessary to support project development. Larger projects are usually a result of a RFP from the EDC providing the long term contractual and financial support necessary to finance a project.

[15] Since ZREC contracts are limited to 1 MW, and LREC contracts are limited to 2 MW, several contracts can be proposed for a single site. As an example, when several LREC/ZREC contracts are proposed for the same site, depending on the total MW output, the project could have several separate revenue meters to support each LREC/ZREC contract. This requirement is in accordance with the LREC/ZREC program which requires no more than one LREC/ZREC contract at a given revenue meter in any given solicitation. Therefore, separate 40-50-foot distribution poles with revenue metering equipment, which are typically in proximity to the entrance of the facility, connect to the EDC's distribution facilities. Distribution poles are also necessary for other distribution equipment, including a utility-owned recloser and a gang operated air switch. The result is an unsightly view of a cluster of 5-6 distribution poles that are in close proximity to each other. Distribution is under the jurisdiction of PURA, not CSC.

D. Stakeholder Engagement Process

Consistent with the suggestion to either broaden or narrow the Tentative Facility Scope, the stakeholder engagement process could be organized according to the respective subparts for manageability. In addition to the 12 sister state agencies consulted by CSC for written comments on every proposed solar project, CSC suggests other stakeholders be consulted to submit written comments on the proposed topics, including, but not limited to, Office of Consumer Counsel, Green Bank, State Historic Preservation Office, CBIA, Home Builders Association, COST, CCM and public utility companies. CSC also strongly suggests polling the ratepayers relative to preferences for renewable energy development and associated costs.

In response to comments from the Scoping Meeting to follow up on existing solar installations and operations suggested by Ms. Moshier-Dunn, attached please find a record of the status of solar facilities subject to CSC jurisdiction. To date, CSC has evaluated **61** solar facilities.

Also, here are links to the CSC Filing Guides referenced by Mr. Hoffman:

Petition for a Declaratory Ruling for a Renewable Energy Facility: https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/CSC/Guides/2019_guides/RenewableEnergyFacilityPetitionGuide082619pdf.pdf

Application for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need for a Renewable Energy Facility: https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/CSC/Guides/2020_guides/RenewableEnergyFacilityApplicationGuide_052620.pdf

In response to Deputy Commissioner Hackett's request for suggestions related to short-term and long-term approaches, for both, CSC suggests issuance of RFPs that promote solar development on sites other than greenspace and existing structures, such as parking canopies and previously disturbed lands. Any moratoria, solar-specific regulations and/or legislative changes that result in the erosion of CSC's discretion in striking a balance among competing interests in the evaluation of facilities or that result in the consideration of solar facilities any differently than similarly situated renewable energy source facilities would be an impediment to the state's energy policy and goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Melanie A. Bachman

Attachments: CSC Testimony on Proposed Bill No. 6498, March 19, 2021
CSC Jurisdictional Solar Facilities Spreadsheet, June 2021

Written Testimony of the Connecticut Siting Council
Submitted to the Environment Committee

In Reference to House Bill No. 6498
An Act Concerning the Siting of Certain Solar Facilities on Farmlands and Core Forests
March 19, 2021

Good morning Senator Cohen, Representative Gresko, Senator Slap, Representative Palm, ranking and distinguished members of the Environment Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony in connection with Bill No. 6498. The Connecticut Siting Council opposes this bill for the same reasons it opposed Public Act 17-218, "An Act Concerning the Installation of Certain Solar Facilities on Productive Farmlands."[16]

CSC has exclusive jurisdiction over the siting of energy facilities throughout the state with a generating capacity of more than 1 megawatt. Its purpose is to ***balance*** the need for reliable public utility services at the lowest reasonable cost to consumers with the need to protect the environment of the state.

Striking a balance includes evaluation of state policies concerning: (i) the natural environment, (ii) ecological balance, (iii) public health and safety, (iv) scenic, historic and recreational values, (v) ***agriculture***, (vi) ***forests*** and parks, (vii) air and ***water purity***, and (viii) fish, aquaculture and wildlife.[17]

In rendering decisions, CSC exercises the ***discretion*** it was granted by the legislature 50 years ago.

The bill's stated purpose is "to provide for increased review of proposals to site solar facilities on certain farmlands and land that is core forest." It seeks to expand the scope of Public Act 17-218 to solar facilities with a generating capacity of one or more megawatts and to solar facilities proposed on farmland of state-wide importance. This proposed expansion of the scope of Public Act 17-218 continues to single out solar and would erode CSC discretion, increase solar project costs, thwart state policy goals, and impact private property rights.

Review of proposals to site solar facilities is the same wherever they are located and at whatever generating capacity they are rated. When any solar facility is proposed, CSC must consult with and solicit comments from 12 state agencies, including Agriculture, DEEP and

[16] Public Act No. 17-218: https://www.cga.ct.gov/2017/ACT/pa/2017PA-00218-R00SB-00943-PA.htm; CSC Written Testimony in Reference to Bill No. 943, March 6, 2017: https://www.cga.ct.gov/2017/ENVdata/Tmy/2017SB-00943-R000306-Stein,%20Robin%20,%20Chairman-Connecticut%20Siting%20Council-TMY.PDF
[17] Conn. Gen. Stat. §16-50p (2021).

DPH.[18] Naturally, competing interests exist among the state agency policies.[19] CSC must strike a balance among these competing interests. The effect of this bill would tip the scale.

The bill also seeks to require a decommissioning bond for solar facilities approved on prime farmland, farmland of state-wide importance or core forest. It does not apply equally to all solar facilities, and it does not specify the holder of the bond. Most solar facilities are sited on private property that is leased by the developer. The owner of the property rather than the developer or the state possesses the legal rights to control how the solar facility is to be decommissioned and the amount of any bond for costs associated with the decommissioning.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide testimony on Bill No. 6498. Should there be any questions or requests for additional information, please feel free to contact me at 860-827-2951 or Melanie.Bachman@ct.gov.

Melanie A. Bachman
Executive Director

[18] Conn. Gen. Stat. §16-50j(g) (2021); Regs. Conn. State Agencies §16-50j-39 (2021).
[19] Conn. Gen. Stat. §22a-40 (2021); Conn. Gen. Stat. §19a-341 (2021) (Farm exemptions from wetland and nuisance laws).

CT Siting Council - Solar Projects

June 2021

Petition	Application	Output MW AC	Date Filed	Procurement	Hearing	Decision	Developer	Location	Project Site Acreage	Host Property Acreage	Prime Farmland Soils on Project Site	Core Forest on Project Site	Project Status
1042		5MW	10/31/2012	DEEP Class I RFP	Yes	3/21/2013	Somers Solar Center LLC	Somers	95	two parcels=106	Yes	No	Operational
1056		5MW	12/17/2012	DEEP Class I RFP	Yes	4/23/2013	GRE 314 East Lyme LLC	East Lyme	35	five parcels=75.6	Yes	No	Operational
1104		2.2MW	5/27/2014	DEEP EDC RFP	Yes	4/2/2015	UI	Seaside Landfill, Bridgeport	22	one parcel = 46	No	No	Operational
1137		6.1MW	1/26/2015		No	3/5/2015	Windham Solar LLC	Lebanon	39.02	one parcel = 44.5	Yes	No	Operational
1150		3.1MW	4/6/2015	Community Shared Solar	No	5/28/2015	Tesla Energy Operations Inc.	Bozrah	15.8	one parcel = 25.2	No	Yes	Operational
1159		2MW	5/21/2015		No	6/25/2015	Lodestar Energy LLC	Suffield	26.47	one parcel = 51.3	Yes	No	Operational
1178		20MW	7/29/2015	2013 DEEP RFP	No	9/17/2015	Fusion Solar Center LLC	Sprague	144	five parcels = 362	Yes	Yes	Operational
1181		4.93MW	8/25/2015	Community Shared Solar	No	11/12/2015	Tesla Energy Operations Inc.	Norwich Transfer Station, Norwich	22.8	two parcels = 27.41	Yes	No	Operational
1192		2.74MW	9/18/2015	Community Shared Solar	No	11/12/2015	Tesla Energy Operations Inc.	Norwich	10.8	two parcels = 98.3	Yes	Yes	Operational
1195		4.05MW	10/9/2015	Community Shared Solar	No	1/7/2016	Tesla Energy Operations Inc.	Groton	19.1	one parcel = 290.5	Yes	No	WITHDRAWN
1215		1.2MW	2/16/2016		No	3/3/2016	RER CT 57 LLC	East Haddam	10.5	one parcel = 124	Yes	No	Operational
1220		7MW	3/21/2016	LREC/ZREC	No	6/23/2016	Windham Solar LLC	Griswold	29.1	two parcels = 50.1	Yes	No	D&M Plan approved
1221		3.7MW	3/21/2016		No	7/21/2016	Windham Solar LLC	Plainfield	16.9	one parcel = 67.2	Yes	No	DENIED
1222/1222A		8.0MW	3/22/2016 & 10/26/2020	LREC/ZREC	No	7/21/2016 & 4/23/2021	Windham Solar LLC	Hampton	39.7	one parcel = 99.3	Yes	Yes	Decision conditions pending
1223		3.0MW	3/24/2016	VNM - Town of Rocky Hill	No	5/12/2016	Tesla Energy Operations Inc.	Rocky Hill	24	one parcel = 61.4	No	No	Operational
1224		20.0MW	5/13/2016	DEEP Small Scale RFP	No	5/12/2016	Woods Hill Solar LLC	Pomfret	102	two parcels = 228	Yes	No	Operational
1234		2.2MW	6/15/2016		No	7/21/2016	DG Connecticut Solar LLC	North Canaan	9.4	one parcel = 77.1	No	Yes	Operational
1247		2.7 MW	7/19/2016	Agricultural-VNM	No	9/1/2016	C-TEC Solar LLC	Thompson	14	one parcel = 49.3	Yes	No	Operational
1294		2.0MW	3/27/2017	Agricultural-VNM	No	5/25/2017	Lodestar Energy LLC	NORCAP Landfill, East Windsor	12	one parcel = 14.6	No	No	Operational
1295		2.0MW	3/27/2017	Agricultural-VNM	No	5/25/2017	Lodestar Energy LLC	NORCAP Landfill, East Windsor	11.2	one parcel = 42	No	No	Operational
1310/1310A		50MW	6/15/2017 & 11/12/2019	Tri-State RFP	Yes	12/7/2017 & 4/23/2020	NextEra Resources	Brooklyn and Canterbury	270/227	29 parcels = 561	Yes	No	DENIED/D&M Plan approved
1312		20MW	6/28/2017	Tri-State RFP - PPAs w/ MA	Yes	12/21/2017	Candlewood Solar LLC	New Milford	78.2	one parcel = 163	No	Yes	Decision conditions pending
1313		24.6MW	6/29/2017	Tri-State RFP - PPAs with MA/RI	Yes	12/21/2017	DWW Solar II LLC	Simsbury	156	five parcels = 289	Yes	No	Operational
1323		6.9MW	8/30/2017	LREC/ZREC	No	1/22/2018	Windham Solar LLC	Somers	27.3	1 parcel = 43.3 acres in CT	Yes	Yes	Decision conditions pending
1324		3.0MW	8/31/2017		No	Withdrawn 10/4/2017	Windham Solar LLC	Plainfield	16	two parcels = 67.2	Yes	No	WITHDRAWN
1328		1.99MW	9/27/2017	LREC/ZREC	No	1/22/2018	Windham Solar LLC	Pomfret	7.9	one parcel = 25.1	Yes	No	EXPIRED
1339		19.99MW	1/10/2018	DEEP Small Scale RFP	No	3/29/2018	Wallingford Renewable Energy	Wallingford Landfill	49	three parcels = 158	No	No	D&M Plan approved
1341		1.21MW	3/16/2018		No	6/7/2018	Durham Manufacturing Co.	Durham	4.7	one parcel = 18	Yes	No	Operational
1342		4.98MW	4/10/2018	DEEP Small Scale RFP	No	6/7/2018	GRE GACRUX LLC	North Haven	22	two parcels = 42	No	No	Operational
1345/1345A		15MW	5/23/2018 & 6/18/2020	DEEP Small Scale RFP	No	10/26/2018 & 8/27/2020	North Stonington Solar	North Stonington	120	four parcels = 353	Yes	Yes	D&M Plan denied/under construction
1347/1347A		16.78MW	6/20/2018 & 1/23/2020	DEEP Small Scale RFP	No/Yes	10/25/2018 & 11/5/2020	Greenskies	Waterford	100	one parcel = 152.2	No	Yes	DENIED/Partial D&M Plan approved
1348		2.0MW	8/8/2018	LREC/ZREC	No	10/1/2018	Safari Energy LLC	West Farms Mall, New Britain and Farmington	10.4 ground/roof	seven parcels = 75.4	No	No	Operational
1352		19.6MW	10/19/2018	Tri-state RFP/Small scale RFP	Yes	4/25/2019	NextEra Resources	Enfield	131	nine parcels = 162	Yes	Yes	Operational
1354		1.92MW	10/23/2018	LREC/ZREC	Yes	5/9/2019	Chatfield Solar LLC	Killingworth	16	one parcel = 25	No	Yes	DENIED
1367		1.986MW	4/16/2019	LREC/ZREC	No	5/23/2019	CP Middletown Solar	Middlefield and Middletown	8.7	six parcels = 30	Yes	No	Operational
1378		5MW	8/20/2019	VNM	No	10/10/2019	Greenskies Renewable Energy	Stonington	22.6	one parcel = 86.8	Yes	Yes	Under construction
1380		1.9MW	9/12/2019	VNM	No	11/21/2019	Lodestar Energy LLC	Enfield	9.9	one parcel = 24.2	No	No	Operational
1385		1.95MW	10/7/2019	LREC/ZREC	No	1/6/2020	Cobb Road LLC (GRE)	Old Lyme	11.2	one parcel = 120.2	No	No	Partial D&M Plan approved
1395/1395A		3.99MW/1.99MW	2/26/2020 & 3/26/21	LREC/ZREC	No	4/17/2020 & 6/17/2021	Windham Solar LLC	Ansonia	11.38/9.9	one parcel = 12.72	No	No	INCOMPLETE/Decision conditions pending
1396		1.975MW	3/6/2020	LREC/ZREC	No	5/21/2020	NJR Clean Energy Ventures	East Hampton	14.93	one parcel = 27.42	No	Yes	Operational
1397		20MW	3/27/2020	DEEP Small Scale RFP	No	7/16/2020	NextEra Resources	Plainfield	80	four parcels = 149	Yes	Yes	Decision conditions pending
1398/1398A		1.99MW/1.99MW	3/27/2020 & 1/15/21	LREC/ZREC and VNM	No	9/28/2020	Lodestar Energy, LLC	Winchester	20.64/14.3	one parcel = 104	No	No	DENIED/Decision conditions pending
1401		12.25MW	4/17/2020		No	7/16/2020	Revity Energy, LLC	Plainfield and Sterling	58.5	one parcel = 79	No	Yes	Decision conditions pending
1407		1.975MW	5/29/2020	LREC/ZREC	No	8/13/2020	DG Connecticut Solar II, LLC	Torrington	11.5	one parccel = 66.4	Yes	No	Decision conditions pending
1410		3.0MW	6/4/2020	LREC/ZREC	Yes	2/11/2021	Greenskies Clean Energy, LLC	Stonington	15	two parcels = 113.5	Yes	No	Decision conditions pending
1412		1.99MW	6/11/2020	LREC/ZREC and VNM	No	8/28/2020	Lodestar Energy, LLC	North Canaan	8.7	one parcel = 23	Yes	No	Decision conditions pending

CT Siting Council - Solar Projects

June 2021

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
1	**Petition**	**Application**	**Output MW AC**	**Date Filed**	**Procurement**	**Hearing**	**Decision**	**Developer**	**Location**	**Project Site Acreage**	**Host Property Acreage**	**Prime Farmland Soils on Project Site**	**Core Forest on Project Site**	**Project Status**
48	1415		5MW	6/23/2020	LREC/ZREC & VNM with CSCU	No	10/8/2020	CF Boombridge, LLC	North Stonington	27	three parcels = 133	No	No	Under construction
49	1417		1.975MW	7/6/2020	LREC/ZREC	No	12/3/2020	NextEra Resources	Watertown	16.6	one parcel = 154	Yes	No	Decision conditions pending
50	1421		3.25MW	7/20/2020	LREC/ZREC	No	11/5/2020	Verogy	Bristol	18.9	one parcel = 26.9	Yes	No	Under construction
51	1422		4.99MW	7/20/2020	LREC/ZREC and VNM	Yes	4/22/2021	Greenskies Clean Energy, LLC	East Windsor	39	one parcel = 104	Yes	No	Decision conditions pending
52	1424		4.725MW	7/29/2020	LREC/ZREC and VNM	No	5/21/2021	Verogy	Southington	37.45	one parcel = 102.4	Yes	No	Decision conditions pending
53		492	120MW	7/31/2020	DEEP Zero Carbon RFP	Yes	2/25/2021	Gravel Pit Solar	East Windsor	485	eight parcels = 636	Yes	No	Under construction
54	1425		1.9MW	8/7/2020	LREC/ZREC	Yes	3/25/2021	Gaylord Mountain Solar	Hamden	12.3	one parcel = 33.64	No	No	DENIED
55	1426		4.9MW	8/10/2020	LREC/ZREC	Yes	5/6/2021	Verogy	East Windsor	29.1	one parcel = 147.8	Yes	No	Decision conditions pending
56	1427		1.0MW	8/12/2020	LREC/ZREC &VNM with Bristol	No	1/14/2021	TRITEC Americas, LLC	Bristol	6	one parcel = 11.94	No	No	Decision conditions pending
57	1431		1.99MW	9/15/2020	LREC/ZREC	No	4/8/2021	TRITEC Americas, LLC	Bethlehem	11.84	three parcels = 77.37	Yes	No	Decision conditions pending
58	1437	497	3.5MW	11/3/2020 & 1/22/2021	LREC/ZREC	No/Yes	pending	Verogy	Burlington	16.9/14	one parcel = 62.98	No	Yes	Petition Withdrawn/Docket in review
59	1442		19.8MW	2/5/2021	DEEP Small Scale RFP	No	pending	SR Litchfield, LLC	Litchfield and Torrington	80	six parcels = 212	Yes	No	In review
60	1443		9.9MW	2/25/2021	DEEP Small Scale RFP	Yes	pending	SR North Stonington, LLC	North Stonington	47	five parcels = 157	Yes	No	In review
61	1444		1.97MW	3/8/2021	LREC/ZREC and VNM	No	6/4/2021	CP NB Solar	North Branford	10	one parcel = 19.86	Yes	No	Decision conditions pending
62	1451		6.0MW	4/13/2021	LREC/ZREC	No	pending	C-Tec Solar, LLC	Ellington	32.13	two parcels = 157.3	Yes	Yes	In review