



Connecticut Distributed Generated Interconnection Working Group Meeting Summary

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

December 9, 2025

NOTE: On Monday, December 15th GPI sent IX WG members a **draft** version of the December 9th IX WG meeting summary for review. IX WG members who attended the December 9th 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. This 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 than **Monday, December 29th**. GPI and EOE will determine whether a suggested revision is appropriate for incorporation into the revised meeting summary, which will be posted on the IX WG webpage.

IX WG member-suggested revisions that GPI and EOE felt were appropriate to incorporate into the final meeting summary have been incorporated into this revised meeting summary as appropriate. Substantive revisions are reflected 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 December 9, 2025 Interconnection Working Group (IX WG) meeting included discussion on the following items.

- Administrative items pertaining to potential updates to several IX WG procedures
 - Voting process
 - Meeting summaries
 - Governance framework
- Continued discussion regarding implementing Proposal 33, as adopted with modification in PURA's [August 20, 2025 decision](#) following the 100-Day Sprint Process (Docket No. 25-01-27)
- Eversource presentation and IX WG discussion on Eversource's approach to line-side taps, as well as associated line-side tap safety concerns
- Flexible interconnection (Flex IX) working group update from Eversource
- Other interconnection-related items: Dispatch Limiting Schedules

Administrative Items

Voting Process

Several IX WG members recently expressed interest in re-instating IX WG voting procedures. In response to this request, GPI and EOE developed a draft proposed approach to doing so and presented it to IX WG participants during the meeting for review and feedback. The GPI- and EOE-developed draft proposed approach is provided below.

- Items subject to voting:
 - Voting would only be done on items directed to the IX WG via PURA orders
 - Limited to orders that identify specific IX WG directives
 - Example of a specific IX WG directive: “The IX WG shall approve X,” “The IX WG must...”
 - Example of non-specific IX WG directives: “The EDCs shall collaborate with the IX WG,” “The IX WG should have the opportunity to provide feedback on,” etc.
- Voting representative composition
 - Eligible voters (same as from IX WG Sprint Process)
 - 2 votes from EDCs (one from Eversource, one from UI)
 - 2 votes from developers/developer associations
 - 1 vote from CIEC
 - 1 vote from OCC
 - 1 vote from DEEP BETP
 - Alternates would be allowed, so long as established in advance

GPI and EOE invited IX WG discussion and reactions to this proposed approach, as well as suggestions regarding whether the proposal should be revised.

Several members sought clarification regarding the situations in which voting be considered. No IX WG members in attendance at the meeting expressed concern regarding voting on specific PURA directives to the IX WG. However, several participants (including both developers and EDCs) expressed that voting may be valuable in some circumstances in which the IX WG is providing something to PURA. Several members noted that this was done frequently by the IX WG in the past, and that it was helpful to have a formal record of votes and any dissents, even if it is not about a specific IX WG directive. This would help maintain a formal record of IX WG voting member perspectives regarding items of discussion.

GPI also asked participants if they felt that any parties were missing from the list of eligible voters. One participant noted that BETP was not listed as a voting member in the original Governance Framework but is included on this list. GPI clarified that their inclusion was intended to be reflective of the list of eligible voting members from the 100-Day Sprint Process that occurred in late 2024. In that process, BETP was an eligible voting party, but elected to waive their right to vote.

Meeting Summaries

GPI prepares IX WG meeting summaries, which are posted publicly on PURA’s webpage. GPI proposed two potential new processes for sharing meeting summaries with the IX WG. This included one potential process in which meeting summaries are posted within 10 days of the

meeting (currently there is not an established timeline on which meeting minutes are posted), and a separate potential process that would provide IX WG members with an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the minutes. This second potential process, as presented by GPI during the IX WG meeting, is provided below:

- GPI will send draft meeting summary to IX WG within 10 days following each IX WG meeting
- IX WG members will have one week after GPI sends the draft meeting summary to identify any concerns regarding accuracy. Examples include:
 - Failure to capture major themes and topics of discussion
 - Factual inaccuracies (inaccurately described topic, perspective, etc.)
 - The 10 day/7 day timeframes can be slightly adjusted on case-by-case circumstances due to holidays
- If participants feel that there are accuracy issues in a summary, please reach out to GPI and EOE directly within one week of **receiving** the notes **being sent out**.
 - If a participant identifies accuracy issues for GPI and EOE review, GPI and EOE will consider whether these concerns have merit and warrant revision of the notes
 - You must have attended the relevant IX WG meeting to be able to identify whether or not you feel that there are factual inaccuracies in the summaries.
- After the 7-day review period, GPI and EOE will post the meeting summary on the IX WG webpage (within 4 business days). Any changes to the notes based on participant-identified accuracy issues will be clearly marked.

GPI sought IX WG participant feedback regarding whether participants simply wanted the summaries posted within 10 days of each meeting, or whether they wanted an opportunity to review a draft summary first. Several IX WG participants expressed support for the review period approach. One participant expressed that this approach would provide an opportunity for participants to think about and absorb discussions from the previous meeting, then revisit the summaries to confirm.

Based on a lack of expressed opposition to this approach, some expression of support, GPI will move forward with this method for future meeting summaries.

Governance Framework

The IX WG created the [Governance Framework](#) in January 2021. The framework can be updated so long as it remains consistent with PURA's directive to EOE to establish IX WG bylaws (see [November 25, 2020 Order](#) in Docket 17-12-03-RE06).

The Governance Framework contains several IX WG processes and procedures, some of which have no longer been in practice since before GPI began facilitating the IX WG in Fall 2023. The Governance Framework includes processes and procedures related to voting and meeting minutes. Accordingly, GPI proposed that GPI and EOE could develop a draft revised/redlined Governance Framework document, for IX WG review. GPI would send the document out at least a week before the next IX WG meeting to ensure that participants had sufficient time to review it, as it will be a topic at the January IX WG meeting, during which IX WG participants will discuss whether they wish to move forward with some or all of the revisions.

No developers, EDCs, or other IX WG members expressed opposition to revisiting the Governance Framework, or to GPI and EOE developing and distributing a draft Governance Framework document for IX WG review and discussion at the January meeting. GPI and EOE will therefore move forward with this item.

Administrative Action Items

- **Voting Process:** GPI and EOE will revise the proposed approach to voting in response to participant feedback. This will include broadening the scope of items on which the IX WG may vote and further refining a high-level document describing voting procedures. This updated approach will be revisited during the January IX WG meeting.
- **Meeting Summaries:** GPI to send draft summary of 12/9/25 IX WG meeting within 10 days. IX WG participants will have 7 days after GPI sends the draft meeting summary to identify factual accuracy issues. IX WG participants should inform GPI and EOE of any such issues as soon as possible.
- **Governance Framework:** GPI and EOE to develop a draft redlined/revised version of the existing Governance Framework document for IX WG review. Document to be sent out to IX WG members at least one week before the January IX WG meeting. This will be a topic of discussion at the January IX WG meeting.

Technical Discussions

Proposal 33

The IX WG began discussions on Proposal 33 at its November 18, 2025 meeting. Based on that discussion, the EDCs were to present a plan for addressing developer concerns regarding outreach and transparency on meter payments, orders, and installation in alignment with Proposal 33.

A full plan was not presented by the EDCs; questions and discussions continued on the subject to inform the plans that the EDCs will be filing with PURA by January 1st, 2026.

The EDCs shared the following clarifying information:

- In Eversource territory, a process has been set in place so that developers may make Level 2 meter payments by credit card. This process was initiated in November.
- In UI territory, the payment system is heavily reliant on manual inputs. The company is adjusting its system to accommodate on-line meter payments, but there are necessary reconfigurations with the CRM that need to be completed first for it to be able to communicate with Power Clerk. In addition, UI has different post-payment processes that have led to some bottlenecks. UI has identified internal communications issues between departments to resolve this issue and to get information that normally comes late to be available earlier on in the process. They want to hear from developers about the troubles they're encountering so that UI can develop a plan to address concerns.
- UI also noted that sometimes compliance issues on the developer side lead to longer timelines and higher costs. For example, a meter may be sent out several times because of configuration issues. Approximately 30-40% of projects in UI territory run into this issue. Eversource also encounters compliance issues that cause delays.
 - Next steps: EV and UI will try to get actual numbers of how many projects face compliance issues from their metering departments.

- In addition, Mike Trahan will connect with Cornelius Stevenson (UI) offline.
- UI plans to implement its meter plan by October 1.

Developers shared their experiences and perspectives on changes and improvements they would like to see in meter processing:

- Legacy projects are still lacking transparency in the process for paying for and installing incentive meters. Without transparency, developers are repeatedly emailing the EDCs to check on the status of the meters.
- In addition, there is some confusion on where the EDCs stand regarding NRES incentive meters with netting projects.
- Lastly, at least one project was unable to access the new Eversource system to be able to pay by credit card. Kayte and Curtis Fahnstock (Eversource) will follow up on this separately.

Action Items: Proposal 33

- Mike Trahan to follow-up with UI regarding metering compliance issues.
- EDCs to file plan with PURA by 1/1/26.

Line-Side Taps for Buy-All Installations

Patrick Fam and Scott Miller presented on Eversource guidelines regarding line-side taps and safety protocols. For the purposes of the presentation, a line-side tap is defined as a connection made to the "line" or unmetered side of a service. A line-side tap would be a connection on the service conductors or supply-side of an existing disconnect/breaker.

The Eversource Information & Requirements booklet outlines the requirements for adding a new service. These guidelines are intended to provide guidance for developers when estimating projects costs at a conceptual level. Eversource views the installation of a buy-all service to follow the same design process as a new service.

The NEC has provision for granting the following items to be under direct control of the utility. See article 90.2(B)(5) in the 2020 NEC which states:

- Installations under the exclusive control of an electric utility where such installations:
 - Consist of service drops or service laterals, and associated metering...

The EDCs will no longer allow line-side taps for Buy-Alls. The standard practice for commercial Buy-All installations would require interconnection at the pad mount transformer feeding the existing service.

Exceptions where a line-side tap may be permitted include:

- If an existing transformer secondary is physically full but has the electrical capacity to support the DER
- If the transformer is greater than 200' away from a building
 - Eversource standard service is 200' or less and offered to the customer for services less than 400A
- If 200' or more of asphalt/concrete separates the building from the transformer
- Transformers that have public roads/sidewalks needing to be crossed underground to reach the transformer

- Trenching to the transformer would cause significant risk to damaging other utilities as determined by Eversource
 - A standard gas, water, or telecom line would not be considered a significant risk
 - A gas transmission line going city to city, for example, would be a significant risk

All exceptions must be reviewed and approved by Eversource. If Eversource deems a line-side/tap acceptable, it is installer's responsibility to ensure that the line side tap is within the state's applicable version of the National Electric code, CT State Building Code, manufacturer's specification, recertified by the manufacturer and approved by the municipal inspector.

Following the presentation on the new line-side taps guidelines and safety risks rationale, the working group discussed the proposed guidelines. Developers made the following comments and raised the following questions:

- If exceptions may be granted by the EDCs, then is there really a safety issue?
 - Eversource responded that these guidelines are intended to provide guidance for developers when estimating project costs at conceptual level—background information for initial site visit, determining whether a trench would need to be done, etc.
- Have arc flashes occurred and if so, how often?
 - Eversource responded that they have been proactive in regards to safety. They are not waiting for an incident to occur to make safety decisions.
- If a line-side tap were to be installed, the NEC requirement would be to install a disconnect within a few feet of the tap. Assuming that Eversource wouldn't be sending in a technician to work on live gear; but is there an example of when an Eversource technician would be working on live gear?
 - Eversource responded that technicians do work on live switches and sockets with proper personal protection equipment. It's usually not a risk when installed properly, but line-side taps introduce additional risk. A lot of line-side taps are not installed properly and they come with a lot of hazards. There are situations that do receive municipal approval but are still not to code. And the work is done and now needs to be undone at risk to the employee.
- Currently under the I&R, anything under 400 Amps would be installed by the utility on the provider side and is developer owned. Would this be a change in which Eversource employees install equipment owned by developers for buy-alls?
 - Under 400A, the practice would remain the same for new service. For example, a developer would install an underground trench and the service equipment. Eversource would schedule the shut-off and complete the final procedures.
- UI comments that, in general, it is in agreement with Eversource on this proposal and that stricter requirements than NRES are already in place. The EDCs are trying to create standards because too much variance in practice creates safety risks. Technicians may not fully understand the many different ways that interconnection set ups have been made.
- Developers noted that line-side taps have been installed safely. Distance does not make an installation safe or unsafe. Incorrect practices do. For this reason, the trenching distances seem arbitrary and add undue cost for small Buy-all projects. Could "percent of project cost" be a better measure than distance?

- EDCs respond that safety cannot be risked for the sake of ease and lower costs. It is their goal to allow exceptions and ensure safer installations.
- Developers are feeling squeezed. Netting is severely penalized from an economic point of view and, on the technical side, it is very difficult to do a Buy-all project. If line-side taps are going to be so limited, then developers need more support getting netting projects to be more economically viable.
- General agreement that there may be financial solution/s and incentives to be discussed outside of this IX WG conversation.

Flex IX WG Update

Joe Debs (Eversource) shared that the Flex IX WG plans to meet before the end of the year and notes it may be difficult due to personal holidays and time off.

Next Steps and Action Items

- **EDC action items**
 - Proposal 33 filing due January 1. EDCs to take developer input on meter payments and processing as they prepare their plan.
 - Schedule and host next Flex IX WG meetings
- **Developer action items:**
 - Discuss metering compliance issues with UI
- **GPI/EOE action items:**
 - Revise voting guidelines based on IX WG conversation
 - Develop draft revised governance framework, to be distributed before next IX WG meetings
 - Send draft meeting summary within next 10 days, for IX WG review
- **Other items**
 - Keep eye out for RRES and NRES decisions
 - Next meeting: January 13, 2026. Items to be discussed:
 - Updated voting guidelines and governance framework
 - Dispatch limiting schedules and projects enrolled in the Connected Solutions Program
 - EDCs to present on non-binding report on distribution study timelines and costs
 - Aligning Sprint straw proposal (specifically, section 3.4) with redlines to IX Guidelines