

**CONNECTICUT DISTRIBUTED GENERATION POLICY WORKING GROUP**  
**[DRAFT] MINUTES FROM MAY 25, 2021 MEETING**

PURA facilitator Zachary Alexander called the Microsoft Teams call meeting to order at 9:03 am. Attending were Noel Lafayette, SHR Energy; Mike Trahan, SolarConnecticut; Mike Farrell Trinity Solar; Tim Schneider, Earthlight Technologies; Ray Furse, Litchfield Hills Solar; Alex Marroquin, CED; Kyle Wallace, Sunrun; Carl Nowiszewski, Eversource; Dave Ferrante, Eversource; Joe Marranca, UI; Mark Kirschbaum, UI; JR Viglione, OCC;

---

The primary purpose of the meeting was to determine support for the five interconnection issues described in an August 2020 report commissioned by SolarConnecticut and prepared by Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger, a national expert in interconnection proceedings across the United States. The report compares Connecticut's distributed energy resource (DER) interconnection guidelines to national best practices in the areas of hosting capacity analyses, sharing distribution upgrade costs, interconnection ombudsperson, public interconnection queues, and permanent interconnection working groups.

**HOSTING CAPACITY ANALYSES MAPS** – Noel L. pointed to the report findings that Southern California Edison's (SCE) HCA map is a national best practice and that the EDCs (Eversource updating maps now apparently) should strive to replicate the SCE best practice. The report states that the Connecticut maps to not include more basic distribution system data to help customers determine where to site and how to design DERs and that the Connecticut maps do not meet the level these maps have achieved.

**NEXT STEPS** – EDCs to review [SCE map](#) and comment on whether their planned upgrades would contain the same/similar information and functionality

**INTERCONNECTION OMBUDSPERSON** – There was significant discussion on dispute resolution regarding who would hear disputes and how disputes might escalate up the chain. Carl N. said it's likely most problems can be resolved at the lowest level rather than proceeding quickly to most costly options. Mark K. opposed having the Ombudsperson be regarded as a workaround DER department staff and that developers should abide by a prescribed hierarchy. Mike T. agreed that the first step for disputes should be DER teams. Noel felt there needs to be a strict deadline for EDCs to respond to developer disputes and the group should adopt the report's central feature of the process that a ombudsperson be a regulatory agency staffer.

**NEXT STEPS** – Zack A. to circulate IREC/MASS dispute timelines for discussion at the next meeting.

**SHARING DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM UPGRADE COSTS** – The members first discussed the report findings on rate basing distribution system upgrades for small (residential) systems. Zack A. reviewed current rules in New York that cap residential upgrades on systems up to 25kW at \$350. Carl N. proposed that

interconnection fees could be raised with a portion of fees collected be pooled to cover upgrades. Kyle Wallace said a similar arrangement is in place in Mass/RI and that average upgrade is \$3k-\$5k; Tim Schneider and Mike Farrell described some customer experiences with overwhelmed transformers. Dave A. felt we may want to consider put caveats where solar installs don't contribute much or when underground services will be especially expensive;

Mike T. suggested NYS and CA offer reduced interconnection costs or waive costs because officials there feel the net benefits new solar offers to all ratepayers including non-solar users outweigh upgrades costs that would be socialized;

On larger systems, NYS allows first one in to pay full cost then reimbursed when others tap in; Noel says MA is a best practice but their DOER is freshening up their policy and we may want to monitor the MASS docket rather than make a decision on larger system cost sharing; Mike T. suggests reviewing the MA DOER proposal to determine if that docket is trying to solve just a MA problem that doesn't apply to CT; Carl N. says developers are free to make cost sharing deals now.

NEXT STEPS – Zack A. to chart top two options for both small and large DER systems based on what other states doing and circulate to the group for action at the next meeting.

**PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM INTERCONNECTION QUEUES** – Data security and privacy were discussed. Developers said they don't know who to contact get a better read on how costs might be shared. Carl N/ has been matching up developers willing to swap information; important to developers to know the number projects and capacity in front of them; Noel says take CA queue approach then figure out privacy issues; Eversource is planning a capacity hosting map that would include some info that might be helpful; Zack A. disagreed that EDC's can't continue to serve as entity connecting developers who might want to share information. CA best practice still doesn't answer all issues developers have.

NEXT STEPS – Follow up at next meeting to discuss (1) whether separate public interconnection queue is necessary, and if so, whether it should contain all information contained in the Report; and (2) whether information identifying owners of projects should be included in that queue (with consent of developers).

**PERMANENT INTERCONNECTION WORKING GROUPS** – Report findings already taken into consideration of WG formation.

-END-