



Connecticut Distributed Generation Interconnection Subgroup Meeting Summary

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

Subgroup Meeting—June 26, 2025

Introduction

On June 26, 2025 the Interconnection Working Group (IX WG) Subgroup met to discuss combining Proposals 2 and 3 from the [100-Day Sprint Working Group Report](#), which were approved in PURA's March 2025 [Interim Decision](#). GPI provided the following overview of Proposals 2 and 3 to frame the discussion:

The background:

- IX timelines identified as primary area of concern. All NRES projects get a comprehensive review resulting in full approval to construct as designed, with coordinated internal discussion.
- Proposal introduced to create a separate category for small C&I projects (e.g., 50–500kW); this would allow smaller projects to move through screening/approval process more quickly than larger projects, which may require more extensive studies.

Resulting in:

- Proposal 2: Requires the EDCs to review the current interconnection processes and explore the creation of new or more specific process tracks for projects with varying needs or specifications, such as a dedicated track for smaller commercial projects with onsite load.
- Proposal 3 requires the EDCs to establish new, separate, and expedited interconnection processes for commercial projects <500 kW range that are either co-located with on-site load or served by on-site infrastructure.

PURA encouraged the EDCs to consider aligning Proposal 3 with Proposal 2, as both proposals address similar issues and goals.

Group Discussion

This meeting was an informal subgroup meeting of the full IX WG to discuss whether the group felt that it made the most sense to address Sprint Proposals 2 and 3 separately, or via one comprehensive proposal.

Joe Marranca (United Illuminating): Joe provided background on Proposal 2 from the Sprint—UI proposed Proposal 2, attempting to put a threshold relative to export (e.g., >200kW) and have a requirement around controls. This may be an opportunity to reduce screening criteria and the number of screens based on exporting criteria.

Joe Debs (Eversource): Asks whether there is any equipment that can meet this exporting criteria for small projects?

General comment made that small projects <200kW are easier to interconnect in CT than in MA.

General agreement that Proposal 3 is a subset of Proposal 2.

Mike Trahan (ConnSSA): re proposal 3—can there be a separate lane to move unique projects through the IX process?

James Schwartz (Independence Solar): re Proposal 3—Asks whether projects that don't cause grid issues can be expedited. Maybe automated screens could do the trick? This is just about high-level hosting capacity; can there be a track for these kinds of projects?

Joe Marranca: Notes that automated screens process projects faster only if the project passes the screen. Perhaps another screen is needed, like an automated hosting capacity screen? This could lead to a problem at the point of interconnection.

James Schwartz: Notes that it may be helpful for a developer to know and have it well documented that they've only received approval for a fast-track hosting capacity screen. Developers have previously mistaken contingency approval as full approval.

Carl Nowiszewski (Eversource): The utility is trying to achieve two things: 1) clarity on approvals and 2) opportunity for developers to have the option to do a localized study. Carl also notes that having on-site load doesn't eliminate potential issues--load can change or disappear entirely.

General comment that the Flexible Interconnection Working Group will not addressing export controls for small C&I projects (as in proposal 2)

Next Steps

- EDCs to present straw proposal to the full IX WG that combines Proposals 2, 3, 14, and 25 at the July 8th meeting.