



# STATE OF CONNECTICUT

## PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

### CONNECTICUT DISTRIBUTED GENERATION TECHNICAL AND POLICY JOINT WORKING GROUP

#### JOINT MEETING AGENDA

Monday, September 20, 2021  
9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Location: Microsoft Teams [Click here to join the meeting](#)

Dial in Number: +1 860-840-2075,,747176115#

Phone Conference ID: 747 176 115

#### **9:00 AM – 9:05 AM      Introduction**

PURA to take meeting minutes

#### **9:05 AM – 12:00 PM      *Discussion and Voting on Fast Track Proposals***

- **Mike Trahan asks for members to be able to vote later today if they are not here, no objections**

#### *General Approach for Each Issue*

- Proponent of action item will give a brief summary of the issue and proposed resolution
- Other members may ask clarifying questions of proponent
- Open discussion on proposal
- Vote
- Next steps, e.g., send to PURA as unanimous proposal, send to PURA with objections, revisit at future date, etc.

#### *1. Dispute Resolution Process*

- **This would be a process that is less formal than PURA's complaint process. The draft process is based on the IREC rules. This is not the first step, this is after you have tried to resolve things informally through the EDC; which works for almost all issues in the past**
- **Discussion regarding scenario of a party using dispute resolution process to "buy more time" in the queue if they are otherwise not ready to proceed**
  - **Issue raised that if one developer needs more time for whatever reason, other developers in the queue will probably want more time for the same reason. Therefore, the scenario would not be problematic**
    - **Some disagreement on this discussion. One solution would be to let the two parties in the queue to be in**

10 Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051

An Equal Opportunity Employer

[www.ct.gov/pura](http://www.ct.gov/pura)

contact with one another in case party 1's delay would affect party 2

- Dispute Resolution process is a good faith process, it will become clear is a party is trying to abuse the process and the ombudsperson will not entertain bad faith claims.
- For issues related to timeframe compliance, 8 days for dispute resolution between parties until escalated to ombudsperson, ~2 week dispute resolution process with ombudsperson
- Vote on submitting draft of dispute resolution process, based on IREC procedures, to PURA
- Vote Total: 10 for; 2 against; 1 abstention

Policy Group	Technical Group
<b>FOR</b>	<b>FOR</b>
Developer – N. Lafayette	Developer – J.P. LaMarche (voted after meeting)
Developer – M. Farrell	Developer – A. Mayshar
Eversource	Eversource
UI	UI
CIEC	CIEC
<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>
OCC	OCC
<b>ABSTAIN</b>	
BETP (voted after meeting)	

- OCC opposed because of possibility of gamesmanship. All you could be doing with this process is buying time, if you don't like what the ombudsperson is saying then you can just go to PURA after filing with the ombudsperson. OCC would prefer PURA to be the adjudicator.

## 2. Increasing Level 1 Screen to 25kW

- Proposal to change the system size threshold from 20 to 25 kW. This is in line with the new state statute which caps the residential tariff at 25 kW. Included in this are some technical screening changes that the EDCs feel are going to be beneficial to the process moving forward and minimize the amount of projects that are getting flagged. Also includes
- Draft to be sent out by Joe Marranca (UI). Other changes were discussed to be included in the draft(nameplate rating, inverter frequency ride-thru capability). Voting members given opportunity to change their vote based on this draft, with their indicated reason.
- Vote Total: 13 for; 0 against; 0 abstention

Policy Group	Technical Group
<b>FOR</b>	<b>FOR</b>
Developer – N. Lafayette	Developer – J.P. LaMarche (voted after meeting)
Developer – M. Farrell	Developer – A. Mayshar
Eversource	Eversource

UI	UI
CIEC	CIEC
OCC	OCC
BETP	

### 3. *Hosting Capacity Maps*

- **Eversource is on target for hosting capacity upgrades by approximate end of 4<sup>th</sup> quarter**
  - **Downloading capacity and load may not be available at that time**
- **UI on schedule to have available hosting capacity maps by year end, with additional features to be added at a later time**
- **Developers would like to be able to download GIS files**
- **Vote to continue informal process of HC upgrade topic (as opposed to submitting to PURA)**
  - **No objections**
- **Working group plans to review upgrades in subsequent meeting in Q1 2022, once EDCs have had a chance to deploy their solutions.**

### 4. *Public Interconnection Queues*

- **Developers in favor of IREC recommendations of releasing additional information on public interconnection queues**
- **Discussion on funding/management of this database**
  - **Massachusetts public interconnection queue is managed by a third party, updated monthly which leads to questions on accuracy**
  - **California public interconnection queue also a spreadsheet updated monthly**
  - **HC Maps maintained by EDCs and updated monthly. Currently have “concierge” service in place of public interconnection queue**
  - **Eversource’s HC upgrades will include # of projects by circuit, but will not list the individual projects**
  - **UI’s HC maps will not initially have this functionality; UI reviewing potential Excel file public queue document similar to those used in California**
- **Discussion on specific granularity of data sought from public interconnection queue – topic for further discussion**

### 5. *Distribution System Upgrade Cost Sharing*

- **Developers are in favor of a similar fee cap (\$350 per project under 25kW in NY) for residential projects**
  - **Any cost beyond \$350 would be rate based**
- **NY and CA have fee caps for projects under 25kW, based on state statute. CT does not have statute at this time**
- **OCC reiterates that any recommendation from this group needs to address the cost allocation of these costs**

- A cost-benefit-analysis of CA and NY residential project caps would be beneficial
- Vote on recommendation to PURA: for residential service installation only, customer would pay up to \$350 and any amount in excess of that would be rate based:
- Vote Total: 3 for; 6 against; 4 abstention

Policy Group	Technical Group
<b>FOR</b>	<b>FOR</b>
Developer – N. Lafayette	Developer – A. Mayshar
Developer – M. Farrell	
<b>AGAINST</b>	<b>AGAINST</b>
Eversource	Eversource
UI	UI
OCC	OCC
<b>ABSTAIN</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
BETP	Developer – J.P. LaMarche (voted after meeting)
CIEC	CIEC

- Members who voted against or abstained largely were concerned about lack of specifics on cost allocation beyond \$350 but were open to further discussion on the issue.
- Assignment for those opposed: put forward into writing (email Zak Alexander) what more information we should be looking at, i.e. some bullet points about specific areas this group should discuss.