



Connecticut Distributed Generated Interconnection Working Group Meeting Summary

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

November 18, 2025

Introduction

During the November 18, 2025 Interconnection Working Group (IX WG) meeting, the IX WG discussed paths to 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).

In advance of the November IX WG meeting, participants expressed interest in understanding opportunities for innovation in distribution studies that could help improve timelines and costs, such as through automating aspects of the process. The EDCs provided an update on what has contributed to shifting study completion timelines over time, and ways that they are exploring innovative pathways to addressing this.

Additionally, Joe Debs (Eversource) provided an update on the Flexible Interconnection Working Group (Flex IX WG), and participants had an opportunity to bring up other interconnection-related topics of interest for future discussion.

Discussion

Proposal 33

GPI reviewed Proposal 33 (as provided below) with participants.

The Authority directs the EDCs to collaborate with the Interconnection Working Group to develop a plan aimed at streamlining meter payment, processing, and communication of status updates to developers.

No later than January 1, 2026, the EDCs shall file a plan for the Authority's review and approval that must, at a minimum, address the following:

- 1. identify opportunities to streamline and improve meter payment processes;*
- 2. improve the communication of meter order status updates to developers; and*
- 3. evaluate and eliminate unnecessary steps in the meter procurement process.*

In developing this plan, the EDCs must carefully balance developer concerns with the cost implications for ratepayers.

To provide level-setting prior to group discussion, the EDCs shared their current process on handling REC meter payment, processing, and communication of status updates to developers. Developers then identified the following points of concern with the current REC meter payment:

- Developers currently need to mail in a physical check. Currently there is no way to track when that check is received by the utility and processed.
- Overall would prefer increased transparency regarding the meter's status in PowerClerk (payment, meter ordered, technician visit/installation date, rescheduled date if technician is unable to visit on the planned date, etc.)
- Approximately 30% of Level 2 projects take more than the 2-week timeline for meter installation

EDCs have been in the process of making updates that would address several of these items. This includes establishing online meter payment capabilities (fully implemented for Level 1 projects, soon to be implemented for Level 2 projects). Eversource also stated that they will explore incorporating additional status categories into PowerClerk to enable improved transparency. EDCs clarified that meters are shipped prior to municipal approval, but the work order cannot be entered until after the town inspection is approved—do not want to create a situation in which work is done prior to municipal approval.

Action Items: Proposal 33

EDCs will prepare a plan including the following, for alignment with Proposal 33:

1. Processes that the EDCs have implemented since Proposal 33 was discussed during the 100-Day Sprint Process that address some of the concerns that led to developers suggesting the proposal.
2. Additional strategies that the EDCs could implement to further address outstanding developer concerns.

The EDCs will present this plan at the December meeting for IX WG feedback and discussion.

Distribution System Studies

Representatives from Eversource and UI shared challenges that EDCs are facing that are increasing distribution study timelines and complexity, as well as solutions the EDCs are pursuing. Major points from this portion of the discussion are summarized below:

- Distribution studies have started to take longer over the last two years (previously 30 business days, now 45-60 business days). Factors contributing to this include:
 - Increased volume of interconnection applications, and, accordingly studies. EDCs used to conduct 1-2 studies per month, and now conduct 5+.
 - As DER penetration increases, studies have become more complex. Previously, few studies failed, but now studies are failing due to increased generation and demand and timelines are increasing due to the need to search for solutions.
- Dynamic studies are becoming more common and are more lengthy.
- ISO-NE has also created its first cluster study process last year, which has been challenging. Developers must have signed study agreements by certain deadlines, otherwise they will not be included in the cluster study and will need to wait until the following year. ISO-NE has done this due to the volume of interconnection being submitted in New England. ISO-NE's next cluster study will begin in January 2026.
- Eversource's new hosting capacity maps, as well as some process automation strategies, are potential areas of innovation and opportunity.

- Eversource's Connecticut hosting capacity maps will be identical to those launched in Massachusetts.
- The ability to automate screening would reduce some aspects of the study timelines, as it will enable engineers to focus their time on other aspects of the study process. Eversource would like to automate load flow in the future.
- UI is facing many of the same challenges as Eversource and is also focusing on improving efficiency via the hosting capacity maps and automation. Additionally, UI is always trying to identify trends in what is causing failed studies to be able to communicate this earlier in the process.

Next, IX WG participants provided feedback on this issue, as summarized below.

- Developers emphasized that commercial solar developers are under significant pressure to reduce costs, and studies are a major component of overall project costs.
- Developers appreciate that the EDCs are seeking opportunities to streamline the distribution study process by identifying innovative solutions and pathways, including the use of automation where appropriate.
- Developers wanted to know how many studies are conducted internally vs. externally. Concerned about unnecessarily high costs, if being conducted by external consultants.
 - All Eversource distribution studies are conducted internally. Some transmission studies are conducted by subcontractors. While Eversource has used external contractors to conduct distribution studies in the past, it was much more expensive.
- Eversource noted that interim non-binding documents have started to go out to developers once impact studies are complete. These non-binding documents include cost estimates. EDCs suggest that these non-binding documents can become standard practice to distribute to all developers once impact studies are complete. The EDCs will present a draft framework document for the IX WG to review that would include ballpark costs and timelines.
- Technical documentation regarding system impact studies includes language about modifying time blocks based on developers' operational schedules. Would Eversource be open to making more time windows at 1-2 hour increments. What would be the challenges associated with doing that.
 - Eversource identified that one challenge is that it creates many different battery schedule permutations, which makes studies difficult. It's not necessarily an issue in the short term, but with lots of generation, each with a different timeframe, studies become difficult. This could make the studies so complex that they might last 3-4 months.
 - Eversource will check with teams exploring this in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, to explore this as a follow-up item.
 - Something for the EDCs to explore in the Flex IX proposal, being developed in the Flex IX Workgroup.

Action Items: Distribution System Studies

In advance of the December IX WG meeting, EDCs will prepare a high-level framework of what a non-binding document could include (e.g., non-binding cost estimates and timelines). EDCs will share this with the IX WG at the December meeting. This is intended to be solely a

demonstration of what a *non-binding* distribution system study cost estimate could look like. It is not intended to be interpreted as a guaranteed cost estimate.

Other Interconnection-Related Items

Next, IX WG members had an opportunity to discuss other interconnection-related items. This portion of the meeting is summarized below.

- Dominic Gatti (Tesla) identified that he would like group to take up interconnection pathways for vehicle-to-grid operation. Consider looking to Maryland as an example where precedent was quickly adopted, and could serve as a baseline for Connecticut.
 - Eversource noted that from a technical point of view, so long as the vehicle-to-grid project meets necessary certifications, it should not be a major issue—it would be treated like any other battery during a screen. However, there are likely some other issues and details to work through.
- Mike Trahan (ConnSSA) identified that the EDCs made references in their recent filing to the IX WG making formal determinations, but there had not been a formal vote. Expressed that he would like the group to return to formal voting.
 - GPI and EOE noted that there is precedent for a formal voting process, and that precedent was used in the Sprint Process. The IX WG has not continued pursuing that process since the Sprint Process concluded, but could revisit it. However, all voting members should be available to contribute to that discussion, and not all voting members are present today.
- Mike Trahan (ConnSSA) also expressed that he would like AI notetakers to be permitted in IX WG meetings.
 - GPI and EOE affirmed that at this time, AI notetakers are not allowed. Meeting notes are available on the IX WG webpage.

Flex IX WG Update

The Flex IX Workgroup has met several times, though not recently. Recently, UI and Eversource have met and are working on the Flex IX proposal. The EDCs asked the IX WG to share their expectations for how Flex IX will work and, including system operational expectations, and size considerations. With the Flex IX, one of the intentions is having a lower buffer than what is currently allowed. If that margin is removed, then there is a greater risk to having to curtail at times.

UI provided an example, noting that if generators propose a 2 MW solar facility, are developers going to be ok with signing an interconnection agreement (from a financial perspective with respect to their investment) that could require 10% curtailment at any point in time. Developers expressed that they do need to know specific curtailment percentages. A project can only be financed for the worst-case scenario; for example, if the curtailment is 5%, then the revenues would be forecasted at 95%. Developers also suggested that the EDCs learn from other jurisdictions in which they work, such as NY.

Not all developers were aware that there is a Flex IX Working Group. Joe Debs (Eversource) will add these developers to the distribution list for future invites and will develop a series of future Flex IX Workgroup meeting dates. Developers would also like to dive deeper into flexible interconnection at the next IX WG meeting.

Action items: Flexible interconnection

Joe Debs (Eversource) will add Matt Shortsleeve to the Flex IX Workgroup distribution list. He will also identify dates for upcoming Flex IX Workgroup meetings.

Next Steps and Action Items

- Keeping eye out for RRES and NRES decisions
- Next meeting: December 9, 2025 (1:30–3:30pm EST)
 - Continued discussion on EDCs' metering plan (Proposal 33)
 - Non-binding distribution study document framework overview (e.g., non-binding cost estimates and timelines) from EDCs
 - Line-side taps
 - Flex IX Working Group Update
 - Additional topic(s) TBD
- **Action Items**
 - **EDCs to develop plan to address Proposal 33, incorporating feedback from today's IX WG meeting. EDCs will present this plan at the December IX WG meeting in advance of the January 1, 2026 filing deadline.**
 - **EDCs to develop a proposal for what a preliminary, non-binding distribution study report could look like, and what information it could contain. Will present this proposal at the December IX WG meeting.**
 - **EDCs to present on line-side tap proposal at December IX WG meeting.**
 - **Eversource to add developers to Flex IX Workgroup invite list, and will establish a series of upcoming Flex IX Workgroup meetings**