



STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

CONNECTICUT DISTRIBUTED GENERATION JOINT TECHNICAL AND POLICY WORKING GROUP MEETING

MEETING MINUTES

Friday, December 17, 2021

9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

9:00 AM – 9:05 AM Introduction and Adoption of Meeting Minutes

Schedule for Future Working Group Meetings

- Mike Trahan supports continuing the monthly meetings on the policy side
- Eversource and Jean-Paul LaMarche agreed that every other month was sufficient for technical meetings
- Noel Lafayette would prefer the monthly technical meetings but would be ok with meeting every other month so long as the group remains flexible in holding monthly meetings as needed
- The group decided that the frequency of technical meetings would depend on whether there were enough topics to support monthly meetings

Schedule for Future Educational Meetings

- Members supported continuing the public educational meetings and even increasing them to up to 3 times a year
- We will continue to separate the meetings into one geared towards residential developers and the other toward larger project developers
- Carl recommended forming an education subcommittee to help set meeting topics and agendas; Raagan and Noel volunteered to join that committee

Outstanding Issues

- Residential Cost-Sharing Proposal
 - Plan is to send a summary of working group discussions and request PURA open a docket to explore cost sharing proposals
 - Mike Trahan to draft language for proposal supporting \$350 cap for residential upgrades
- Large project cost-sharing
 - There is not currently a proposal for larger projects but group will review Massachusetts Order 20-75-B and discuss applicability to CT in future meeting
 - Discussions surrounding long-term targeted build out of facilities to support DER deployments are happening at DEEP but some participants are concerned about the focus of these discussions

10 Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

An Equal Opportunity Employer

www.ct.gov/pura

- The DEEP discussions are currently focused on land use; Jean Paul suggested that a holistic view that also takes interconnection costs into account and Noel agreed
- Carl asked whether developers have weighed in on what would be acceptable interconnection costs
- Jean-Paul replied that the level of costs a project can support depends on numerous factors and that setting a number for all projects is not possible
- Hosting Capacity Maps
 - Eversource will be ready to demo the upgraded HCMs by January; the TWG will meet in January to review the prototypes of the upgraded HCMs (No UI representatives were present at the meeting so it is unknown whether they will be ready to demo their HCM at the January meeting)
 - Jean-Paul mentioned that he was seeing substantial changes in the HCMs over a short period of time; e.g., seeing a circuit going from an availability of 5MW to 200kW; and wanted to check whether it was due to new projects entering the queue or some other issue
 - Per Eversource, the best way to hold a spot in the queue is to file an application because the HCM cannot provide a perfect representation of circuit capacity

Topics for Discussion in 2022

- Discuss creation of regional or tri-state (e.g. New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut) TWG
- Examine ways to improve the transmission study notification process
- Potentially revisit the topic of the public interconnection queue, depending on how the features in the updated HCMs
- Continue discussion of IEEE implementation
- Revising the proposed ombudsperson guidelines in response to PURA's request for additional information
- Comprehensive review of the interconnection guidelines document
- Review and discuss large scale project cost-sharing options such as whether MA Order 20-75-B and whether such order is relevant to Connecticut (i.e. should be explored by PURA in its current or modified form)
- Monitor new tariff and storage programs for developing issues
 - The Green Bank raised concerns about the additional \$129 fee associated with the new tariff
 - Dave Thompson responded that although the customer pays \$129, the actual cost of a new tariff application is closer to \$300
 - Andy Mayshar also raised concerns about the costs of the additional meter and changes to the electrical service
 - Carl N. stated that Eversource is looking into ways to make the process easier
- Consider whether separate application should be created for EV charger interconnections, as is currently done in New York

- Speeding up interconnection review process for residential applications, primarily an issue in UI territory
 - No UI members were on the call but other members stated that UI had agreed in principle to move to PowerClerk and begin taking online payments
 - Carl N. stated that even a small number of inconsistent or changing applications can disrupt the whole review process
 - Mike Trahan stated that he would be ok with kicking out incomplete applications or putting them into a “slow lane”

Additional Discussion Topics Submitted via e-mail after the Meeting

- Net zero interconnections – two projects sharing a single interconnection and each one pushing more electrons throughout certain hours of the day (without exceeding the interconnection rating); e.g. adding storage to existing solar in order to supplement during low solar production times
- Whether developers should have financial rights in network upgrades; e.g., if a developer pays for upgrades that create more capacity than what is needed to support that project, should the developer have the right to be reimbursed by a subsequent user of that capacity including earning a rate of return?
- Creating a plan for an enhanced backbone set of distribution lines across the state