

CONNECTICUT DISTRIBUTED GENERATION POLICY WORKING GROUP

MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, January 31, 2023

9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

Location: Microsoft Teams

**Introduction**

* The meeting began with Zak summarizing the tasks delegated to the Working Group in Docket No. 22-08-02

**Cancellation Period/Duplicate Applications**

* Zak described the request from PURA for the WG to examine the establishment of a cancellation period of 15 days for projects that are not progressing and asked whether the group should consider a single definition for residential and non-residential projects or only residential
* Carl Nowiszewski stated that the group should focus on residential projects
* Mike Farrell expressed concern regarding a 15-day cancellation period and stated that there can be many reasons for delays outside of the control of the developer including, supply chain issues affecting meter sockets and electric services, or customer-side issues such as the need to replace a roof
* Carl asked whether a longer timeframe, such as a year, would be more acceptable
* Mike thought that a year-long period before a project would be deemed “not progressing” would be appropriate
* Evan Dube of Sunrun agreed that projects that have been inactive for over a year are unlikely to proceed
* Zak then asked the group to better define the problem we’re trying to solve
* Sara Pyne described the process utilized by the Green Bank during the RSIP process, which included features to remind installers of existing projects that had not been moving forward and allowed the installers to request additional time
	+ Sara noted that ensuring projects move forward was more important in the RSIP program because it had up-front incentives and time-limited funds
	+ Sara also noted that about 20% of RSIP projects went stale
* Brian Rice explained that from an RRES administration standpoint, a stale project itself is not a problem but that it becomes an issue when it causes a duplicate application. In Massachusetts, customers are unable to submit a duplicate application.
* Chris Fullarton asked about the impact of preventing duplicate applications
* Noel Lafayette stated that for commercial projects, the developer must submit a bid certification form along with the application and that process has worked effectively
* Mike Farrell described how duplicate applications usually come up when a customer has already selected an installer but changes their mind after the application has been submitted. Trinity Solar at one point had a form for customers to submit informing the EDC that to cancel any other applications
* Brian Rice stated that Eversource would be able to follow the MA process without any issue but wants to hear from installers before making that change
* Evan stated that there is a big difference between an auto-cancellation process for projects that have not progressed and duplicate applications. Evan stated that he would be ok with following the MA process with respect to duplicates
* Brian stated that the MA process is informal and doesn’t require a customer to fill out a specific form to indicate which installer they will work with. The communication can be by phone, email, or other means.
	+ Sara indicated that RSIP was handled in a similar way
* Cornelius then described the process for dealing with stale application in Maine, which applies to all interconnection applications. If, during the application review, a project has not provided any written updates for three months, the application will be removed, with a 10-day period to cure. After a project has been approved, it has 12 months to energize unless the delay is caused by utility failure or if the utility has agreed to a longer time period
* Cornelius also stated that the Maine process is likely not needed for Connecticut residential projects at this time
* Sara agreed that because the RRES program doesn’t need to manage time-sensitive incentives, the group could table the issue and look at it again in the future
* Joe Marranca stated that he would like the EDC to have the flexibility to push a delayed project to commit if it is causing a subsequent project to need an upgrade to interconnect. They would look at projects without communications or other activities.
* Zak asked about how big an issue duplicate applications currently are
	+ Mike F. stated that he was only aware of a single instance where a single location had two applications but he spoke with the Trinity Solar team in Massachusetts and they confirmed that the MA process worked well. In MA the company will reach out to the homeowner and the homeowner will be the one who contacts the EDC to cancel.
	+ Joe M. agreed that the homeowner or service account holder should be the one to inform the EDC which of the duplicate applications is correct
* Brian asked about implementing the change to prevent duplicate applications and whether that needs to go through PURA or can be done by the EDCs
* Zak stated that the Working Group has to submit a report to PURA by July 1, 2023 regarding the definition of a “project that has not progressed” and that this revision could be included in the report. He also asked whether the EDCs would prepare a communication regarding the change to be sent directly to the installers

**Fast Pass Updates**

* Carl provided an update on the Fast Pass process
	+ The process is going well and remains an opt-in process
	+ Applicants can now see transformer capacity at the start of the process, which should help installers
	+ It has also been implemented in New Hampshire
* Mike F. described that at Trinity, the more experienced employees use the fast pass process while newer employees tend to use the standard process
* Cornelius stated that UI is currently looking into adding the Fast Pass process