



# STATE OF CONNECTICUT

## PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

### CONNECTICUT DISTRIBUTED GENERATION WORKING GROUP

#### INTERCONNECTION GUIDELINES SUBCOMMITTEE - MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, July 28, 2022

9:00 AM – 10:30 AM

Location: Microsoft Teams

#### **9:00 AM – 10:30 AM - Residential Interconnection Guidelines Discussion**

- Mike Trahan stated that his members are excited about the Eversource Fast Pass program but interconnection ("IC") approval issues still persist
  - The delays in the combined RRES/IC process has led some developers to withdraw from UI service territory for fear of reputation damage among customers
- Mike T. mentioned that other states such as OR, HI, and VT have put up backstops against approval delays, essentially allowing projects to move forward after a certain amount of time has passed. In MN, EDCs can be fined after a certain amount of customer complaints.
- Mike T. stated that he believed compliance with the guidelines should be reported to PURA on a monthly basis
- Carl N. stated that Eversource surveys all residential customers at the end of process and that the company is looking to increase customer satisfaction
  - Need to first define what is a good customer experience and what is a reasonable customer expectation as to timeframes
- Carl stated that it is worth examining whether there is a benefit to decoupling the tariff review and the IC process
- Carl stated that there are currently challenges with workflow and changing PURA requirements regarding production meters
- Carl believes that there is currently an annual report regarding timeline compliance
- Mike T. believes that more regular reporting is required to meet PURA expectations and goals and installers are worried about completing projects in time to receive the ITC
- UI reported that it did experience delays and that it is filing a report regarding application review metrics on the following Monday. UI reported that it also provides PURA with monthly data regarding applications. The tariff review portion of the application is now caught up with applications processed within a few days
- UI's IC review is improving but still not where it needs to be
- Mike T expressed the need for regular reporting of hard numbers and that annual reporting is insufficient

- Mike Ferrell stated that UI deployments are problematic; only 11 of 257 applications have made it to PTO. They're also having issues getting HES audits scheduled
- Mike F also stated that UI is requesting that a truck return to take a photo to send back to UI after UI's technician replaces the meter, which Mike said was unacceptable
- Mike F. also raised continuing issues with acquiring job numbers and issues with getting HES audits scheduled; requiring audit prior to installation would be devastating
- Mike F stated that he has to give customers significantly different estimations regarding timeframes – 3 months for Eversource and an undefined amount of time in UI territory; a two-month start to finish timeframe would be ideal for both service areas
- Carl stated that current timeframes in Eversource territory are between 2-3 months
- Mike F. agreed that projects there are sometimes completed within 30 days but that town inspections can take a while
- Carl stated that they will look at decoupling the application process but that he understands that work order/job numbers can be the sticking point and decoupling may not solve that problem
- Mike F stated that if the job number could be granted after technical/design review, with the tariff review to follow, that would solve most of the issues
- UI stated that it would like to work on potential decoupling with Eversource
- Earthlight asked whether there was available data on the number of buy-all vs netting tariffs and whether the bifurcated process is causing a lot of issues
- UI and Eversource representatives were unsure of the current rates of buy-all vs netting
- Mike T stated that developers were not receiving their 3-, 10- or 15-day notifications
- Carl stated that PowerClerk gives instant notification of submission and the RRES team leads the review; the IC guidelines which were developed as a standalone are now coupled to the RRES process
- Mike T asked whether there was any opposition to his suggested revisions to the guidelines requiring regular compliance reporting
- Carl stated that he does not oppose reporting metrics but wants to ensure that the proper metrics are collected
- Curtis says that the reporting should take into account the time an application is in RRES review as to not skew the IC timeframes
- The group discussed whether the interconnection guideline timeframes should be changed to reflect the dual tariff and IC review but ultimately decided that the guidelines should remain technology and program agnostic
- Carl is going to review the guidelines to see if the Fast Pass language can be added to the guidelines, the Fast Pass questions have recently been added to the standard application for Eversource but are not mandatory for installers

- A developer who opts into the fast pass program would bear the risk of any upgrades needed but an experienced developer should be able to tell whether a proposed project would need an upgrade
- Eversource recently met with UI to discuss the Fast Pass program and UI is looking at how it could be implemented in its territory
- Mike T requested that the EDCs have a standing call to address developer questions/issues with the application process; Eversource said it would hold one weekly and UI said it would do it monthly
- Currently the bottleneck with Fast Pass is the generating of the work order. Eversource has a goal of automating the work order process so that it is provided at the time of submission. The IC team has a goal of being one week behind the RRES review
- UI allows the job number to be requested after the tariff review is complete but expressed that it was unlikely to be able to provide a job number at the time of submission because the process is integrated with all of the UI jobs

#### Action Items

- Zak asked for members to provide feedback on the following
  - Mike T's proposed changes to the guidelines
  - Adding Fast Pass language to the guidelines
  - Whether guideline timeframes should be adjusted