

Energy and Technology Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5245 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC AGGREGATION

Title: PROGRAMS.

Vote Date: 3/17/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 2/24/2026

File No.:

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Energy and Technology Committee

CO-SPONSORS OF BILL:

[Rep. Mark W. Anderson, 62nd Dist.](#)

[Rep. Nick Gauthier, 38th Dist.](#)

REASONS FOR BILL:

Municipal electric aggregation programs (MEAP) allow local governments to leverage their electricity demand from their residents and local businesses when negotiating electric rates with suppliers. This bill allows municipalities to create such programs for electric supply, along with specifying qualifications to get approved for MEAP programs, to address rising costs of energy for consumers and municipalities.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Connecticut House Republicans:

Connecticut House Republicans support this bill, citing that it gives consumers a wider range of choice among their electric providers, including renewable energy. They also mention that it grants consumers access diverse energy sources and meaningful rate relief. They support the accommodating nature of the program. They note that many other states offer similar programs, and that Connecticut needs to follow their example.

Katie S. Dykes, Commissioner, Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP):

DEEP expresses concerns that the current iteration of this bill would have unintended consequences. They explain that auto-enrolling customers would provide the public aggregator information about customers without their consent. In addition, they believe that this will likely lead the municipal aggregator to charge prices higher than the standard service rate. Due to these circumstances, they suggest making the participation voluntary.

They point out that customers should be able to opt out anytime, as is the case with existing alternative electricity supply programs, stating that the 180-day opt-out period is inconsistent. The bill also does not provide protections for customers in the case of a significant price increase in wholesale energy market process, making it more difficult for the public aggregator to continue serving participants. They also insist on clarifying the intent and potential effect of carve-outs for hardship customers. They maintain that consumer protections would be more critical if the hardship customers are not carved out, and if this bill were to be created, it can potentially lead to customers staying on standard service to experience a cost increase.

Furthermore, DEEP advocates that the committee clarify that participation in such program can replace generation services from a standard service or other electric supplier but cannot be used to avoid non-bypassable portions of the bill, arguing that these programs are non-negotiable and benefit all customers. They add that participation would not reduce local transmission and delivery of electric bills.

DEEP is also advocating for greater transparency around oversight and enforcement, allowing for the removal of a public aggregator from the program if they are not properly executing their approved municipal aggregation plan.

Claire E. Coleman, Consumer Counsel, Office of Consumer Counsel (OCC):

The Office of Consumer Counsel states that it wants to ensure that this legislation does not negatively impact residential customers. They believe that HB-5245 excludes critical customer protections that are essential for the program to function, therefore, they oppose the bill as currently drafted. They express that the committee should not allow a CCA to undo residential protections for customers and instead should expand customer benefits.

The OCC also stresses the importance of imposing time limitations, requiring residential approval for the programs' creation, prohibiting CCA rates from exceeding standard service, making CCAs ineligible to transfer their receivables to EDCs, ensure necessary EDC billing changes would be paid for by CCAs, and allow hardship customers to participate while maintaining their current protections.

They also bring attention to the fact that the state's Standard Service procurement process is currently undergoing changes, which can potentially negatively impact full requirement contracts when introducing such a program, causing an increase in risk premiums.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

James Derardino, Legislative Director, Connecticut Council of Small Towns (COST):

COST expresses support of this bill due to many of their constituents in their small towns expressing concern over rising energy rates. This bill will allow their constituents to negotiate

cheaper rates. They also cite the success other states have achieved adopting similar systems.

Daryush M. Donyavi, Manager of Electric Energy Supplier Services, Eversource Energy:

Eversource supports offering help to consumers that need to save on their energy bill. They explain that they already offer Standard Service and Last Resort services to customers who don't purchase their energy from competitive retail electric suppliers, which makes them no profit. As a result, they do not compete with aggregators or retail electric suppliers.

They declare that the State of Connecticut ultimately needs to decide on this policy with careful examination and is willing to share their experiences with active municipal aggregation programs in other states to assist. They suggest the committee use a model that utilizes more state regulatory oversight over municipal aggregation if they decide to advance this bill, with the goal of lowering costs for customers.

Lori Brown, Executive Director, Connecticut League of Conservation Voters:

The CT League of Conservation Voters believe that HB-5245 will increase customer choice, reduce, electricity costs, and promote sustainable energy. They point to the success of other Community Choice Aggregation programs present in other states to ensure that Connecticut must also advance with their own, at risk of falling behind.

They support a more advanced model that allows municipalities to form Joint Action Agencies, which has the potential to improve the local economy and enhance energy resilience without requiring taxpayer funding.

They go on to list the main benefits of HB-5245, including lower energy supply costs, increased renewable energy options, enhanced energy resilience, economic growth, empowerment of Environmental Justice committees, no additional burdens and taxpayers, improved public health, and stronger advocacy for clean energy.

Justin Kearney, Managing Director, Titan Energy:

Titan Energy believes HB-5245 can deliver tangible savings, provide customer protection and cleaner energy options for communities without impacting non-participants. They elaborate that HB-5245 is an enabling bill for both municipalities and customers. It allows municipalities the choice to develop an aggregation program to benefit their community by first developing a plan and holding a public process, ensuring transparent community engagement. The bill values freedom of choice, providing an opt-out structure and voluntary participation.

They also list that they've seen the success of municipal energy programs in other states first-hand and list the benefits they've spotted. These benefits include lower supply prices and bill savings, price stability and risk management, transparent alternative to door-to-door retail marketing, improved consumer protections, equity tools and targeted benefits, cleaner and more accessible energy options for customers, and municipal collaboration and economies of scale. They go into detail about HB-5245's safeguards to eliminate potential harm to customers that remain on standard service. They state that Standard service remains fully available and visible, program costs are limited to participants, and ensure the effectiveness of this structure by referencing the success of other states' municipal aggregation programs.

Charles J. Rothenberger, Director of Government Relations, Save the Sound:

Save the Sound states that Community Choice Aggregation programs simultaneously lower costs for customers and gain environmental benefits. They go on to cite examples of other CCA programs achieving these benefits. They recommend that the program HB-5245 proposes comply with the requirements of Public Act 22-5, also requiring all electricity purchased by a CCA be zero-carbon by January 1, 2040.

Patrick Roche, Director of Innovation, Good Energy:

Good Energy believes that Municipal Aggregation is a well-tested strategy that addresses electricity affordability, expands customer choice, sustains consumer protections, and supports environmental goals. They cite their part in Massachusetts' program as proof of its effectiveness, pointing out that the program saved residential customers \$240 million since 2016. They also bring attention specifically to the City of Somerville, and its residential savings of over \$15 million with a default offering that includes 40% more Class I renewables, with the prices being below the current Eversource residential rate.

Even though participations in Good Energy's programs are optional, they mention that most of their programs maintain and increase participation over time in some cases. They also note Eversource's history of coordination making programs like this successful.

Good Energy goes on to suggest two alterations to the bill: access to historical data usage, and flexible launch timing, both currently being utilized in the state of Massachusetts.

Claire Depit-Stromback, Director of Public Policy, Lean Energy:

Lean Energy claims that CCA programs enables competitive procurement, expanded energy choice, price stability, procurement innovation, and pursuit of local energy goals. They go on to state that Connecticut can learn from previous states' programs and implement their own in a way that suits the state's needs. They also emphasize the popularity of such programs, citing that customer participation rates in such programs typically range from 85-95%.

Additionally, they point out that the benefits of these programs are achieved without compromising grid reliability and customers continue to receive a single unified utility bill. It achieves all its benefits without requiring participation.

Lean energy then lists the key consumer and regulatory protections under such programs: local control, transparency and oversight, consumer choice, protection for low-income and assistance program customers, competitive procurement and market innovation, and economic development.

Samantha Dynowski, State Director, Sierra Club:

The Sierra Club supports this bill, stating that CCAs are a proven regulatory practice that has seen success in our neighboring states. They state that CCAs can lower costs and increase access to clean renewable energy. They recommend that any CCA implemented comply with Connecticut climate and clean energy standards, including Public Act 22-5 and Connecticut's 100% zero-carbon electricity supply by 2040.

Mark Sassi, President, Bridge Energy Services:

Bridge Energy states that CCAs leverages collective buying power so communities can secure more stable pricing, expand access to renewable energy, and increase participation in competitive supply markets while sustaining strong consumer protections and customer choice.

Bridge Energy highlights the success of CCAs in neighboring states to promote them in Connecticut. They continue that CCAs promote renewable energy and can reduce greenhouse gas emissions to advance Connecticut's energy objectives. CCAs also can be tailored to local communities' specific needs. They go into more depth about customer autonomy, elaborating that customers would receive advance notice, the ability to opt-out without penalty, maintaining full control over their electricity supplier. They proceed that HB-05245 is structured in a way that avoids adverse impacts on standard service customers and benefits all customers. They reference the success of CCAs of nearby states to argue for CCAs to come to Connecticut. Bridge Energy also states that HB-05245 strengthens customer protections, requiring Municipalities to hold public hearings and develop transparency to ensure that customers remain informed and protected.

They also recommend revisions to strengthen the bill. This includes changing the definition of "Consultant" in lines 28-31 to "Electric Aggregator", requiring the participation of a licensed Connecticut Electric Aggregator and expand the customer data provided by utilities to public aggregators (lines 188-213). They continue that utilities should be required to provide date fields (1), (2), (3), (6), (7), (8) and (9), while also identifying customers not eligible for auto-enrollment. Data fields (4) and (5) should remain restricted.

[Tom Swan, Executive Director, Connecticut Citizen Action Group \(CCAG\):](#)

This organization supports HB-05245 but advocates for stronger consumer protections, especially for low income and fixed income consumers.

[Sharon Huttner, Member, Branford Planning & Zoning:](#)

Sharon Huttner claims that CCAs would allow local governments to procure energy at a lower cost with the savings transferring to the ratepayers as well. They continue that Branford has seen how local control over electricity creates more opportunities for renewable energy as well and would like to see that continue.

[Richard Landau, Ash Creek Conservation Association:](#)

They claim that CCAs would allow local governments to procure energy at a lower cost with the savings transferring to the ratepayers as well. They continue that Branford has seen how local control over electricity creates more opportunities for renewable energy as well and would like to see that continue.

Thirty testimonies were expressed, four anonymously, in support for the bill. These individuals include:

[Anonymous 4](#), [Anonymous 5](#), [Anonymous 18](#), [Anonymous 19](#), [Guy Wanegar](#), [Madison Mulqueen](#), [Jamie Coss](#), [Kevin Banach](#), [Margaret Sipple](#), [Stephen Sawch](#), [Robert Perry](#), [Shirley McCathy](#), [Elizabeth Frew](#), [Christina Duncan](#), [Timothy Deschenes Desmond](#), [Alison Zyla](#), [Raina Volovski](#), [Philip Steinborn](#), [Elizabeth Pezzi](#), [Elizabeth Maliniak](#), [Jennifer Kleindienst](#), [Lisa & Tom Finnegan](#), [Irene Skrybailo](#), [Lee Schacter](#), [Irwin Krieger](#), [Robert Pavlick](#), [Susan Eastwood](#), [Pau Connolly](#), [Lynne Bonnett](#), [Peter Festa](#)

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

[John Elingheuser, Senior Director of Advocacy, American Association of Retired Persons \(AARP\):](#)

AARP is opposed opt-out CCAs but does not oppose voluntary opt-in participation into such programs. They believe that what this bill is trying to achieve can be accomplished through means less harmful to ratepayers in Connecticut.

They state that CCAs will increase electric rates for most ratepayers in Connecticut by destabilizing the scale of the standard service pool, negatively impacting price stability. They suggest that CCAs will increase the risk premiums associated with the standard offer, raising rates and granting the municipality the right to switch the electric supplier of everyone in the jurisdiction without their consent.

The AARP rebuts the success other states have experienced upon implementing CCAs, stating that all these states' deregulated electric markets are different. They continue that almost every state had to change the way their CCAs functioned because the results upon implementation were never as promised.

AARP conducted polls of voters in Connecticut age 50+ on the notion of implementing CCAs and found that voters overwhelmingly opposed allowing towns to automatically enroll town residents into these programs. They believe that this proposed bill can compound problems in the long run.

They reference a study conducted by PURA that concluded that the electric suppliers' prices are frequently higher than standard service, causing residents to overpay for electricity, recommending Connecticut to eliminate the supplier market. The AARP recommends that PURA and the committee instead study ways to improve the procurement of standard service and examine the necessity of the residential third-party electric supplier market, meeting the goals of the proposed bill.

One testimony was expressed anonymously, opposing the bill.

[Anonymous 11](#)

GENERAL COMMENTS:

[Christie Prescott, Vice President, The United Illuminating Company \(UI\):](#)

UI states that CCAs introduce significant operational, regulatory, and consumer protection challenges. New York's experience demonstrates that poor coordination can increase uncertainty in power procurement and raise Standard Service costs for remaining customers.

They advocate for Municipalities providing EDCs with at least 180-day notice before filing an aggregation plan so that program timelines align with Standard Service procurement cycles. They also support terminating an CCA to require a 90-day advance notice and for Aggregators be required to follow the same Electronic Data Interchange enrollment rules that govern retail suppliers.

They propose changing the bill's proposed requirement for a fifteen-minute interval; data to sixty-minute interval data to be compatible with UI's current settlement system. They go on to discuss that the bill as currently written excludes hardship customers from CCAs, preventing them from accessing potential savings. They also believe that the bill needs more detail to ensure compatibility for the existing regulatory design as ISONE finalizes new FERC Order 2222 rules by late 2026.

They encourage a data-driven review of CCAs to ensure its success and preservation of the Standard Service market. They go on to describe examples of CCA programs in other states failing, to justify the need for strong consumer protections, efficient program oversight, effective enrollment and termination protocols, stable supplier qualification standards, and robust contingency planning.

**Reported by: Tatyana Massa and Abigail
Lockwood**

Date: March 20th, 2026