



Connecticut Distributed Generated Interconnection Working Group Meeting Summary

State of Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority Office of Education, Outreach & Enforcement

August 11, 2026 Meeting Summary

NOTE: On Friday, August 21st, GPI sent IX WG members a draft version of the August 11th IX WG meeting summary for review. IX WG members who attended the August 11th IX WG meeting were permitted to suggest revisions to the summary for GPI and EOE consideration. Suggested revisions must pertain to whether the summary accurately reflects meeting facts. The summary review period is not an opportunity for participants to add new items or details to the points discussed during the meeting. Suggested revisions were due no later Friday, August 28th. GPI reviewed all suggested revisions to determine whether incorporating them into the revised meeting summary would be appropriate.

Substantive suggested revisions found to be appropriate for incorporation are reflected in this final version in red for clarity and transparency purposes. Minor revisions such as grammar and punctuation corrections are not indicated in red text but have been incorporated to improve clarity.

Introduction

The August 11, 2026 Interconnection Working Group (IX WG) meeting focused on the following items:

1. Continued discussion on cost allocation directives from [PURA's December 20, 2023 Decision](#) in Docket No. 22-06-29 (See Orders 3, 4, and 5)
2. Implementation status updates on IX WG decisions, including:
 - a. IX WG 100-Day Sprint items:
 - Chess clock (Proposal #5 in Sprint Report, Order 10 in PURA's August 2025 Decision)
 - Communications improvements with single point of contact (Proposals #15, 17, 19 in Sprint Report, Order 1 in PURA's March 2025 Interim Decision)
 - For reference see [IX WG sprint report](#) and PURA's [March 2025 Interim Decision](#) and [August 2025 Final Decision](#) on Sprint-related items
 - Non-Sprint items:
 - b. Non-binding cost estimate report
 - c. Witness testing and permission-to-operate timeline
3. Review study process timelines and discuss interconnection process
4. Prepare for ISO-NE presentation and discussion topics

5. Next steps:
 - a. Review IX WG-suggested topics for future discussion
 - b. Next IX WG meeting: September 8

The IX WG meeting began with a continued discussion on cost allocation directives from PURA's December 20, 2023 Decision in Docket No. 22-06-29. And then continued with discussions on Sprint implementation, other IX topics IX WG members proposed for IX WG discussions, and preparation for the upcoming September meeting with ISO-NE.

The following pages provide an overview of IX WG discussion on these items.

RRES Cost Allocation Policy Discussion

Context

- From PURA's December 20, 2023 RRES [*Decision*](#) (**Docket No. 22-06-29**)
- Order 3 states that by August 1, 2024 and annually thereafter, EDCs must submit a proposed application fee adder to be charged to interconnection applications received the following calendar year consistent with Section II.D., Policy Design.
 - o The application fee adder is currently \$25.
 - o The application fee is waived for applicants meeting EJ requirements.
- Order 4 requires companies to submit motions for review and approval for proposed fees.
- Order 5 is directed at the IX WG: *No later than July 22, 2026, the Working Group shall submit as compliance an assessment of the interconnection cost allocation policy for residential DERs authorized in this Decision through Docket No. 26-08-02, Annual Residential Renewable Energy Solutions Program Review – Year 6. The assessment shall include:*
 - o *Suggestions for refining or improving the cost allocation model;*
 - o *Identification of any issues with the current model;*
 - o *Suggestions for alternative methods of cost allocation if appropriate; and*
 - o *Methods for refining the application fee adder.*
- At the previous IX WG meeting on July 17th, the IX WG determined that it would like to first see the EDC's compliance filings prior to making a determination on the adequacy of the fee adder. Therefore, EOE requested a Motion for Extension; PURA granted the extension and the compliance filing is now due **August 19, 2026**.

Overview of EDCs' Compliance Filings

GPI provided an overview began with a summary of their filings and asked the EDCs to provide further context.

Data	UI Data Summary	Eversource Data Summary
Upgrade types	All upgrade costs were associated with transformer upgrades (i.e., no “other” costs)	~53% of upgrade costs were associated with transformer upgrades ~47% of upgrade costs were associated with “other” upgrades
Timelines	- Estimated timeline for upgrade completion: ~30 BDs - Actual upgrade completion timeline: 6 BDs	Actual upgrade completion timeline: 27 days
# of projects that triggered upgrade need	89 total, 14 of which met EJ requirements	942, 48 of which met EJ requirements
Project decisions	74 / 89 projects moved forward with upgrade 15 / 89 projects reduced size to avoid upgrade	499 / 942 projects moved forward with upgrade 443 / 942 projects reduced size to avoid upgrade
Rate impacts	\$236,756.50 (total value of DER-triggered transformer upgrade costs) - 41,025.00 (application fee adder revenue) \$195,688.00 (total cost recovered across ratebase) Monthly bill impact for average residential customer: \$0.0006	\$1,435,045 (total value of DER-triggered transformer upgrade costs) - 157,991 (application fee adder revenue) \$1,277,054 (total cost recovered across ratebase) Monthly bill impact for average residential customer: \$0.003
EJ	- Non-EJ upgrade costs: \$127,953 - EJ upgrade costs: \$67,735	- Non-EJ upgrade costs: \$1,096,771 - EJ upgrade costs: \$338,274

- Brian Rice (Eversource) noted that the overall bill impact of \$1.5M in upgrades is fairly small. When looking at the total cost impact of residential projects, the cost of upgrading transformers is a small piece of that.
 - o The reporting requirements for this compliance require a lot of company time and effort. The decisions on how much to credit these projects has an overwhelmingly larger impact on ratepayer costs.

- Maritza Estremera Jimenez, UI expressed agreement with Eversource and noted that the material presented in the table provided an accurate overview of UI's compliance filing
 - o Clarifying questions from Jamie Spannhake, EOE:
 - Q: What was the total number of projects that required upgrades?
 - A: 2560 customers, 3.5% of projects that required transformer upgrades.
 - Q: Why were some projects not energized yet?
 - A: Only reported projects mature enough to trigger the transformer upgrade.
 - Q: Are there other costs associated with upgrades but you did not report on them?
 - A: Yes, UI interpretation of Order 3 was to provide info about transformer upgrades only. In Order 4, we included both costs.

Discussion

GPI posed the following questions to the IX WG for discussion.

- 1. Is \$25 still an appropriate RRES application fee adder for transformer upgrade costs?**
- 2. Is this still the IX WG's preferred interconnection cost policy for residential DERs(Order 5)? If not...**
 - 1. What are the issues with the current model?**
 - 2. How could/should the cost allocation model be refined or improved?**
 - 3. Do you have any suggestions for alternative cost allocation methods?**
 - 4. How (if at all) should the application fee adder be refined/modified?**

- The EDCs have maintained while the \$25 fee does not cover all transformer costs, they are not advocating to adjust it.
- Eversource: the recommendation to maintain the fee is specific to the next year of the RRES program. Encourage PURA to consider reevaluating the fee within the design of the successor RRES program. For now, in the final year of the program, stability has value.
 - Jamie, EOE: If there is a long wait for the successor program, would you want the adder fee changed sooner?
 - A: Probably not. However, if upgrade costs become more significant, that could impact things.
 - Eversource reiterated that managing the accounting for this fee adder is somewhat burdensome: Each individual upgrade has its own work order. Accountants spread the revenue from the fees across hundreds of work orders. Recording and reporting these costs is time consuming.
 - UI: Agrees that the accounting is burdensome.
 - o Dominic Gatti, Tesla: Support keeping the structure the same for the final years of the RRES program. The fee could be revisited for the successor program.
- Summary:

- Keep the \$25 as is. Revisit under the successor program.
- EDCs raised some concerns about the administration of the program, such as the burdensome reporting requirements.
- **Next steps:** EOE will draft the compliance filing by August 14th. EDCs and IX WG will review the draft before EOE files the document on August 19th

Sprint and IX WG implementation status updates

Context

GPI has asked IX WG to send in any topics for discussion within the WG. One theme that has emerged is compliance with the Sprint orders ([Sprint Report](#), [PURA's 3/27/25 Interim Decision](#), [PURA's 8/20/25 Decision](#)), as well as other items of recent IX WG meeting discussion. Topics of interest from the Sprint process and recent IX WG meetings are summarized in the table below.

<i>Item & Description</i>	<i>Order(s)</i>
Chess clock (Sprint Proposal 5): Add a “chess clock” functionality to PowerClerk so that for the duration of the interconnection application it tracks whether it is either the EDC's or the Customer's turn to provide a deliverable in order to progress the application to the next step.	Order 10 (8/20 Decision): No later than January 1, 2026, Eversource shall adopt the approved version of Proposal 5 and shall file compliance with the Authority upon completion. Order 15 (8/20 Decision): No later than April 1, 2026, UI shall adopt the approved versions of Proposals 5, 7, 8, 11, and 12 and shall file compliance with the Authority upon completion.
Communications improvements with single-point-of-contact: - Sprint proposal 15: Establish an improved communication process for the Single Point of Contact for all projects >25kW - Sprint proposal 17: Establish redundant method of communication (have PC automatically generate a text when it generates an email) - Sprint proposal 19: Establish that the DG Group project manager assigned by the EDC will be the single point of contact for all Rate 980 (for ES) and SG2 (for UI) and NRES projects whether they be Buy-All or Netting. (<1MW, NRES)	Order 1 (3/27 Decision): No later than June 1, 2025, the EDCs shall implement the approved versions of Proposals 1, 4, 15, 17, 18, 19, 23, and 44, and file compliance with the Authority upon completion. Additionally, the EDCs shall update the Interconnection Guidelines, filing both clean and redlined versions, to reflect the approved versions of Proposals 1, 4, 15, 17, 18, 19, 23, and 44.

Non-binding cost estimate report: In 2025, IX WG members requested that the EDCs provide a non-binding cost estimate report – high-level estimates regarding estimated study costs and timelines, etc.	As of late 2025/early 2026, EDCs had a template for the non-binding cost/timeline estimate reports, and provided them to developers. - Are these reports still being provided in a timely fashion? - Are they automatically provided to all developers, or are they provided upon request?
--	--

Discussion on the “chess clock” feature

Discussion began around the implementation of the “Chess clock” feature to PowerClerk to track who is responsible for the next action.

- Toni Berlandy, Eversource: The chess clock allows the installer to check the status of a project and how long the project has been in that status. The status will also show what action is needed and by whom.
 - o Does it have a timeframe? (E.g., it’s been X days since the previous action)? That was an original intent of this.
 - Eversource will check on this.
- James Cerkanowicz, Verogy: James logged into PowerClerk to check the feature and reported that the display gives a status update but it requires diligent work by the EDCs and developers to make sure the correct status is displayed. If a developer does not realize it’s in their court, they could miss a deadline because they weren’t alerted there was a change. There are also times when a developer completes a step and the status does not change. There is some potential functionality but it’s not apparent or not being done properly by all parties. No notifications/follow-ups.
- Alan Chubbuck, Michaud Law Group: Has had similar experiences to James. In addition, it takes multiple attempts to get a response from the EDC point of contact. The page may say customer action is required, and it is not changed when the customer completes something.
- Kayte Morales, Earthlight: Raises another issue that things are getting put back into “customer action required” but the customer often has no ability to make that happen.
- Joe Marranca, UI: UI implemented the chess clock feature in Q1. Developers should reach out to their POC and bring further technical issues to UI’s attention.
- James Schwartz, Independence Solar: The intent of the chess clock was that it would improve visibility into whose turn it was to take an action and for their to be accountability among the developers and EDCs.
- Aileen Cole, GPI: Notes that her understanding of the chess clock was that it would include timing for each step. Is this still something that developers would find useful?
 - o Yes, this would provide accountability for items that have specific turnaround times.
 - o A goal of the chess clock was to memorialize timelines for individual projects and to help understand where bottlenecks occur and to make the process more efficient.

- Brett Jacobson (Eversource): PowerClerk has the capability to provide notifications. In MA, PowerClerk sends notifications of status changes via email. One thing that has been trickier to navigate via automation is large project changes. Those are harder to capture.
- Sara Pyne, CT Green Bank: Who can see the chess clock—only the person who submitted the application?
 - o Brett Jacobson (Eversource): Yes, only the individual who submitted the application.
- Is there accountability for enforcing the Jan 1 deadline for Eversource to implement the chess clock? This has not changed at all this year.
 - o One developer noted they have not seen the chess clock in PowerClerk. What have others' experiences been?
 - Alan Chubbuck: there have been some updates to PowerClerk, though the chess clock features are not what developers were expecting.
 - Jamie Spannhake: Regarding accountability, EOE can file a motion to compel action, if needed.
 - Joe Marranca: we will reach out to our vendor to see what we do have implemented and discuss options. It appears that whatever is implemented is not exactly what was the initial expectation. If the current system isn't working or can be improved, let's set up another subgroup meeting and discuss what can be improved.
 - Would WG members be interested in a follow-up meeting on this?
 - IX WG agreement that this would be helpful.
 - **Next Step:** GPI will schedule a subgroup meeting for sometime in the next few weeks.

Discussion on nonbinding cost estimate reports

- In late 2025, IX WG members requested that the EDCs provide a non-binding cost estimate report, a high-level estimate regarding study costs and timelines. Are these reports being provided and in a timely manner? Are they automatically provided, or on request?
 - o Alan Chubbuck – No. it has been difficult to get access to the reports. In one instance, developer was denied access to the report until ISO can review it. There have been at least 4 cases where developers have tried to, and have not received, a non-binding cost estimate.
 - o James Cerkowicz: Developers are experiencing difficulty with the single points of contact assigned at Eversource.
 - Study deadlines are largely not being met and require repeated requests for results.
 - o EDCs generally won't be able to provide a cost estimate until some level of study or review has been done. In some cases, a cost estimate can be provided earlier, but in some instances not until after a facility study has been done.
 - o **Next steps:** EDCs to present communication improvement options. GPI will keep track of this topic and circle back within a few months to see if there has been any improvement.

Study timelines and IX challenges

- Note: Joe Debs was unavailable for this IX WG call, so this topic will be moved to a future meeting.
- Alan Chubbuck notes that there are not issues with study timelines across all projects, but there are instances of issues, including with witness tests. Usually, a witness test can be completed within a month, but experienced a push back to 6 months without an explanation. Often revisions will take time between multiple parties (3-4 back and forths; may take a couple of weeks for each). The timeline also depends on what additional steps are needed prior to scheduling.

Prepare for ISO-NE presentation at September IX WG meeting

Based on IX WG discussions earlier this spring, ISO-NE will be coming to the September meeting to discuss their study process and communication protocols with the EDCs. GPI asked IX WG members to identify topics of interest for ISO to present in advance of the September IX WG meeting.

Members expressed interest in learning more about the cluster study process and clarify when DG projects may or may not need to undergo cluster studies or when they may be deemed ready to move forward without additional analysis?

- Joe M would like the ISO to discuss what criteria that they use to determine when a Level 3 study is required and whether different circumstances apply to that criteria. This would help EDCs communicate timelines and process steps to developers.
- James Cerkanowicz: Agrees that this would be helpful for planning and meeting timelines.
- Alan Chubbuck: Would be good to understand how long it takes to get study results.
- **Next Steps:** IX WG should reach out to GPI staff over the next few days with any additional ideas. We will communicate these requests to ISO-NE.

Participant-suggested topics for future IX WG discussions

IX WG participants have reached out to GPI and expressed interest in the following topics of discussion. Several of these items (designated in **bold**) were discussed today, but may still warrant further IX WG discussion.

- A. Flexible interconnection:
 - Affordable Dynamic Flexible Interconnection (DFI) without DERMS and no rate case
- B. Compliance tracking:

- **Review 40ish EDC Sprint decisions to determine whether any compliance issues exist**
 - **Single point of contact**
 - **Utility coordination and communication, especially regarding infrastructure work**
 - **Job or work order numbers for Fast Track Preliminary Utility Applications (UI territory)**
 - **PowerClerk issues (Eversource)**
 - Review UI and Eversource NRES annual compliance filings, specifically related to BESS
- C. Bidirectional EVs
- Continued discussion regarding need for second AC disconnect
 - External disconnect switch – barrier to interconnection
- A. RRES Cost Allocation
- **Project execution with regard to the residential transformer cost-sharing and replacement policy in Docket No. 22-06-29**
- A. Other
- **Timeline and cost estimates for infrastructure upgrades**

Next steps and action items

- EOE will draft the Order 5 compliance filing by August 14th. EDCs and IX WG will review the draft before EOE files the document on August 19th.
- GPI will schedule a subgroup meeting on continued “chess clock functionality” sometime in the next few weeks.
- EDCs to present communication improvement options regarding non-binding cost estimates and timelines. GPI will keep track of this topic and circle back within a few months to see if there has been any improvement.
- Circle back to study timelines and communication at a future meeting.
- IX WG members should reach out to GPI staff over the next few days with any additional ideas regarding ISO-NE’s presentation topics.
- **Next IX WG meeting:** September 8, 2026