

Energy and Technology Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5340 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

Title: AN ACT CONCERNING RENEWABLE POWER GENERATION.

Vote Date: 3/19/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 3/5/2026

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 & Technology Committee](#)

CO-SPONSORS OF BILL:

Rep. Aundre Bumgardner, 41st Dist.
Rep. Mary M. Mushinsky, 85th Dist.
Rep. Joseph P. Gresko, 121st Dist.
Rep. Michael "MJ" Shannon, 117th Dist.
Rep. Josh Elliott, 88th Dist.
Rep. Nick Gauthier, 38th Dist.
Rep. Kate Farrar, 20th Dist.
Rep. Patricia A. Dillon, 92nd Dist.
Rep. Fred Gee, 126th Dist.
Rep. Kerry S. Wood, 29th Dist.

Rep. Michael D. Quinn, 82nd Dist.
Sen. Julie Kushner, 24th Dist.
Sen. Martha Marx, 20th Dist.
Rep. Stephen R. Meskers, 150th Dist.
Rep. Savet Constantine, 42nd Dist.
Rep. Melissa Osborne, 16th Dist.
Sen. Derek Slap, 5th Dist.
Rep. Jane M. Garibay, 60th Dist.
Rep. Hector Arzeno, 151st Dist.
Rep. Geraldo C. Reyes, 75th Dist.

REASONS FOR BILL:

As solar energy develops, there have not been incentives created for low-income residents, which makes solar inaccessible for them. Additionally, solar energy is virtually inaccessible for individuals that are unable to install solar panels on their rooftops. Solar is becoming more popular in the state, and with that comes a need to expand solar energy while also preserving and supporting farmers.

This bill makes changes to improve the Residential Renewable Energy Solutions (RRES) program, the Nonresidential Renewable Energy Solutions (NRES) program, and the Statewide Shared Clean Energy Facility (SCEF) program, requiring the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA) to initiate multiple proceedings. Additionally, it requires electric distribution companies in the state to offer tariffs for residential customers to purchase excess energy, and to offer a buy-all tariff to low-income residents. Such tariffs would then be

examined by PURA, require PURA to develop an application program for each tariff, and established for each electric distribution company. This bill also exempts portable solar generation devices from interconnection agreement requirements imposed by PURA. Lastly, it requires the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) to develop a program that would support agrivoltaics projects (projects that combine both solar energy generation with agricultural production).

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Michelle Gilman, Commissioner, Connecticut Department of Administrative Services:

The DAS offers 2 items with focus on Section 5 for the committee's consideration. First, they request that compliance with the State Fire Safety Codes be included as a requirement for portable solar generation devices to protect the public health and safety of residents of the state. Secondly, they suggest that the language clarifies that a building permit is required when portable solar generation devices are installed or connected to a building's electrical system. They argue that permitting and inspection for these installations are essential to prevent fire and life-safety hazards.

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

DEEP supports establishing programs to replace the RRES, NRES, and SCEF programs to continue providing incentives for new distributed generation to work towards our state's energy and climate policy goals. They believe that the tariff rates established by PURA under Sections 1, 2, and 3 should be set based on their relative value to the electric system, not the cost of installation.

They express concern on relying on administratively set pricing for these alternative programs instead of competition. They state that competition forces developers to lower prices through innovation and protects ratepayers from excessive costs. They recommend competition be integrated while also setting administrative price caps based on ratepayer value.

DEEP advocates encouraging these programs increase all ratepayer benefits. They also endorse creating a combined annual budget for them, including a target total dollar annual budget that PURA can provide for programs that support renewable energy. They believe this will enhance the value of solar as opposed to separate annual budgets for each individual program. They state that it will also help provide rate certainty and set a maximum impact on non-participating ratepayers and highly unpredictable deployment rates. Isolated programs decrease the ability and incentive to distribute resources to the most cost-effective programs for ratepayers. They suggest programs within the budget should be required to prove their value to ratepayers to provide more cost discipline on incentive programs supporting distributed generation. They propose that PURA should provide money to programs that have justified their value.

They recommend the RRES successor program should include an annual budget, corresponding to the budgets proposed for the other successor programs in Sections 2 and 3. They advise the bill should allow tariff terms of up to twenty years for each program, giving PURA the flexibility to alter the term of years based on project costs and funding as technology changes.

They suggest the bill should explain what happens with projects at the end of the tariff term, believing it should introduce programs with tariff terms that change after 20 years. Due to the lasting ratepayer impact these projects have and the expected lifespan of solar photovoltaic technology, they assert that projects should not be given incentives past their original tariff term or the related costs of continued payments must be regarded in setting program budgets.

They propose the bill should also illustrate how the annual budget for the programs are created, stating that it should include all incentives received by participants and beneficiary accounts, securing a comprehensive and accurate accounting of the budgets. They also state that if unused budget money is rolled over to the next program year, the bill should contain a system that prevents unpredictable bill impacts due to the changing in program spending each year.

DEEP expresses that the bill should elaborate on the project size requirements in section 2 for the NRES replacement program and allow projects up to and including five megawatts. They also believe subscriptions in the SCEF replacement program should go to low-income residential customers only, which was recommended in PURA's Legislative Report on the Renewable Energy Tariff Programs Successor Study. The current iteration of the bill does not reflect this.

They support multifamily properties participating in the RRES replacement program. They highlight their history and ongoing collaboration with a multifamily housing working group focused on affordable multifamily participation in the RRES comprised of state agencies and private companies. They wish to continue aligning the RRES replacement program with multifamily property rules created in the current RRES program that was the product of years of coordination with the Working Group.

They advocate for the solar consumer protection force in Section 4 and embrace the opportunity to participate when assembled.

While they are open to working with the committee on portable solar generation devices in Section 5, they feel a study is required to facilitate understanding of how these devices interact with our electric system before excluding them from regulatory requirements, as well as studying the need for consumer protections. Furthermore, they elaborate that consumers may not receive the value they desire from investing in portable solar generation equipment. For Section 6, they point out that if DEEP had to review annual reports, create regulations, and program enforcement, it would require more staffing than is currently possible for them.

They express concern that the program set to be established in Section 7 is too similar to the SCEF successor program in Section 3 and offer to work with the committee to make more distinctions between the two. They also state Section 7 should require clear specifications for how pilot communities/participants are selected/eligible and support a requirement for all pilot participants to be low-to-moderate income customers. Furthermore, they encourage including energy storage systems and allowing upgrades. Finally, they note that Section 7 does not specify a funding source and that they do not have any funding in their budget to support the program.

[Claire Coleman, Consumer Counsel, Office of Consumer Counsel \(OCC\):](#)

Overall, the OCC supports the framework of this bill. They encourage cost efficiencies and cost containment to be prioritized the most to lower overall program costs and securing ratepayers benefit from these programs.

In regard to Section 1, they support the authority's suggestions for lowering and adjusting compensation levels for solar exports and for pairing solar and storage systems. They suggest setting a target program budget for evaluation purposes. They also prefer budget-based caps as opposed to megawatt caps because they provide more effective cost controls than fixed megawatt limits, giving the program the flexibility to adjust to changing market conditions.

For Section 2, they prefer to preserve a competitive solicitation instead so transitioning to a walkup or first-ready procurement model. They believe taxpayer projections could be increased by guaranteeing the proposed NRES standard offer, first-ready project selection framework with guardrails preventing cost-ineffective projects. They also endorse creating compensation rates so PURA continues prioritizing lower cost bids to diminish overall program costs.

They agree with Section 3's focus on low-income customers and that fuel cells should not be included in future community solar programs, as they do not need ratepayer funded incentives.

They endorse Section 4, and assert that customer disclosures and accurate marketing are essential for protecting customers from bad financial arrangements and advocate for more protections for low-income customers to discover how they can benefit economically from a successor tariff.

While they support Section 5, they believe more analysis would be beneficial to determine financial accounting, metering technology requirements and any interconnection rules and safety certification process.

Bryan Garcia, President, Connecticut Green Bank:

The Green Bank believes PURA's process assumed through the Docket delivered a study that advanced climate goals, energy accessibility, affordability and provided great benefits to customers and non-participating ratepayers for the successor programs.

In regard to Section 1, Green Bank supports it, agreeing with PURA's priority for a successor RRES program to complement the ESS program. They also believe the committee should entertain the role of the Green Bank within the RRES successor programs as it did under CGS 16-244dd. They go on to state that there should be more clarity to the multifamily affordable housing aspects under the bill and go on to highlight the issues with the existing framework within the bill. They continue that the committee should explore allowing all multifamily properties to participate in the successor to the RRES program. Furthermore, they encourage the committee to contemplate a study evaluating the net metering policy since its inception, including the costs that are incorporated onto electric ratepayer bills. Additionally, they believe the committee should indicate the importance of managing the solid waste from end-of-life renewable resource materials utilized under proposed successor programs as well as prior programs. Finally, they take some time to highlight the troubles that current RRES and interconnection projects are experiencing as well.

They support Section 2, and suggest the Committee consider multiple legislative approaches related to refining and improve EDC incentive structures regarding interconnection planning and administration including:

1. Performance based regulatory framework
2. Prioritizing Ratepayers

They support the proposed standard offer and budget framework but suggest longer-term visibility into the standard offer rate with each declining incentive block spanning 2-3 years and a least two blocks visible in advance.

In addition, Green Bank advocates for fuel cells within the successor programs and list the potential benefits they can provide. They would also like clarification on low-emission programs in the bill as well.

Concerning Section 3, Green Bank support it, but recommend a change in the bills language so that environmental justice communities must be prioritized in the successor of the SCEF program. Furthermore, they suggest SCEF subscribers that receive credits from the Conservation and Load Management Plan (C&LMP) be required to participate in the Home Energy Solutions – Income Eligible (HES-IE) and in EDC administered programs.

Finally, they advise the committee to adjust the timeline for the implementation of the successor programs to secure a smooth and orderly transition between the current programs and the successor tariff structures.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Paul Aresta, Executive Director, State of Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality:

The Council supports the concepts in Raised Bill 5340. According to their annual report, solar installations have helped Connecticut improve air quality and energy reliability.

They express concerns for the provisions of Section 6, requiring the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) to create a program that supports the development of agrivoltaics projects in Connecticut. bringing attention to Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) Section 16-50k(a), highlighting the requirements established by the Department of Agriculture (DOAG). They go on to list the benefits that Connecticut's farmlands provide and state that although they support that development of renewable energy facilities on appropriate sites, they are opposed to the conversion of productive agricultural land to energy generation facilities.

They then propose that the Section include the following revisions:

1. Provide examples of agrivoltaics activities that can be approved for such a project.
2. Require that DEEP coordinate with DOAG to study the best ways of deploying renewable energy systems while supporting state agriculture.
3. Revise the capacity of solar projects requiring review and determination by the DOAG under CGS Section 16-50k(a) from two megawatts to wone, consistent with the provisions of Section 6 (1) of this bill.

Jason Bowsza, First Selectman, Town of East Windsor:

Jason Bowsza requests the following two suggestions for Section 1 of bill HB-05340:

1. Require Reporting of Installed Wattage
2. Provide Fair Compensation for Residential Oversupply

In regard to the first revision, he states that Connecticut doesn't have complete accounting of residential rooftop generation to measure progress towards statewide renewable goals. He continues that it is difficult to evaluate overall progress and program effectiveness without accurate data.

For the second revision, he says that requiring annual cash reconciliation for overproduction would strengthen the financial incentive for rooftop solar installation, provide transparency to homeowners, and reduce pressure to meet renewable targets.

Bowsza suggests that Section 2 subsection (e) raises serious municipal concerns. He argues that this section may further state energy policy objectives at the expense of municipal taxpayers and weakens long-term municipal fiscal stability. He continues that financial incentives should be provided at the state level, not the municipal level where it can diminish municipal revenue streams.

He proposes that Section 3 should only be implemented after reforming the siting process to include municipalities in a substantive role. Failing to do so will increase land use conflicts and erode local planning authority.

He believes that if Section 6 were to be implemented, the term "agrivoltaics" will be applied loosely. Therefore, the bill should require that at least fifty percent of total project acreage be devoted exclusively to genuine agricultural production to qualify as such a project. He also adds that legislative directive similar to lines 435-436 have not produced meaningful safeguards, being routinely ignored by the Siting Council. He affirms that Certification language without measurable standards and enforcement mechanisms offers no real protection.

Duncan Broatch, Chairperson, Connecticut Small Power Producers Association (CSPPA):

CSPPA supports this bill with a modification. They have been advocating for the creation of a program that provides fair energy purchase rates for hydropower for many years. They point out that DEEP missed the procurement deadline (12/31/2025) proposed in PA 24 38. They suggest that this bill be revised to amend PA 24 38 by extending the deadline by one year. This is a suggestion which they believe is supported by DEEP as well.

Brian Carmody, Director of Finance, ReNew Developers:

ReNew Developers is suggesting a competitive, limited program to deploy up to 50 MW of new, locally generated Class I renewable power into the state's grid in 2 MW increments on distressed municipal properties and brownfields across the state. They then go into more detail about the key program parameters.

In particular, they are advocating for fuel cells due to its efficiency and its ability to provide reliable, consistent baseload power that strengthens grid resilience. They then go on to list the benefits of such a program.

Firstly, they state that it directly addresses upward pressure on electricity rates caused by supply constraints at a reasonable price. Secondly, it provides food security by requiring every project to produce a minimum of 7 tons of fresh produce annually. Thirdly, it sparks economic redevelopment by bringing Brownfields and distressed municipalities back to productivity.

They then provide an estimated cost for such a project-- to be between \$25 and \$30 million. Finally, they request the Committee to advance legislation that makes their pilot RFP program possible, which they describe in further detail.

Michael DellaGalla, Founder, Solar Collective Agrivoltaics:

Solar Collective Agrivoltaics is in strong support of this bill. They state that it will preserve the state's farmland and improve our agricultural industry and benefit the community. With that being said, they have their own suggestions.

Firstly, they advocate for the project size to be limited to one MW, AC, and a robust ag-first definition of Agrivoltaics. They then provide a revised version of line 419 that they wish to be implemented.

They believe that agrivoltaics project owners should be required to provide farm plans drafted by state-approved, 3rd party consultants and submit it to DoAg at the beginning of project terms and every year on the anniversary of project commencement. They then reference Massachusetts success with similar legislation.

They also go on to defend administratively set pricing, arguing that auction systems would increase uncertainty and would work against the intent of the program.

Finally, they suggest that agrivoltaics projects that are less than 500kW AC be accelerated through the impact study process.

Ruthie DeWit, Director of State Affairs, Northeast Region, Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA), Natalie Treat, Senior Director of Public Policy, Alliance for Climate Transition (ACT):

SEIA and ACT support this bill and advocate for the following changes:

1. Change start date for successor program to January 1, 2028.
2. Create a standard offer walk up/open access structure for NRES and SCEF successor programs.
3. Keep a netting and buy all option for NRES customers.
4. Continue utilizing the Assurance deposit in relation to the standard offer NRES program framework.
5. Allow broader eligibility rules to allow more participants in the SCEF program.
6. Provide PURA discretion when setting budgetary caps and allow specific projects to be exempt from said cap.
7. Enable successor programs to be permanent.
8. Create a non-residential front of the meter (FTM) storage program.
9. Establish a designated stakeholder to reinstate the Consumer Protection Taskforce (CPTF) previously authorized by statute.
10. Allow systems to be sized beyond the load at the individual customer's electric meter.
11. Set the export rate floor at the supply rate for the RRES Program
12. Eliminate the "size to load" project limitation.

Finally, they ask that the committee specify a process and timing for establishing the Benefits Cost Analysis / VDER in time to decide program values.

Samantha Dynowski, State Director, Sierra Club:

The Sierra Club supports this bill. They support sections 1, 2, and 3, but believe reauthorization of these programs should be done in a way that meets the state's renewable energy goals. They also bring attention to their belief that despite the state's vast opportunities and capacity for solar energy, they haven't been making enough progress implementing it. They also advocate for the committee removing the non-bypassable charge this year.

They go on to express concern that MW and budget caps are limiting solar growth in the state. They instead suggest price caps that regulate overall cost but don't limit the amount of solar.

They endorse section 5 of this bill, citing that it reduces electricity bills and lowers pollution. They advocate for section 6, stating that it provides supplies dual-use land efficiency, refines water-use efficiency, boosts panel efficiency, improves farm income, and cultivates sustainable, climate-resilient farming.

Finally, they express support for section 7, believing it will secure investment and increased access to solar in Environmental Justice Communities throughout the state.

Chelsea Farrell, Legislative and Regulatory Affairs Manager, Trinity Solar:

Trinity raises some concerns regarding this bill. First, they address the proposed timeline in Section 1. They believe that this timeline poses a major risk of a program gap between the expiration of the current RRES program and the implementation of the successor program, which would have a disastrous impact on the industry. They continue that it would stall residential installations and disrupt workforce stability across multiple professions across the industry. They also suggest the legislation align the successor program's effective date with the expiration date of the RRES program or prolong the existing program until successor tariffs are functioning.

Secondly, they address rate setting in Section 1. They recommend that the bill include guardrails to support program viability, requesting PURA create a tariff floor no lower than the electric supply rate when setting export compensation. They assert their approach would provide baseline confidence for costumers considering solar power while allowing PURA to design rate structure compatible with wider policy objectives.

Nathan Frohling, Director of External Affairs, The Nature Conservancy (TNC):

TNC supports this bill. They approve of Sections 1-3 and stress the importance of utilizing the full potential of BTM energy sources. They endorse the intent of Sections 2 and 4, stating that a study of consumer protections for solar photovoltaic systems would help guide the evolution of solar programs and would benefit ratepayers, developers, and owners of solar systems. They advocate for Section 5, praising Plug-in solar systems' affordability, accessibility, and those who unable to install permanent solar systems. They also highlight its potential to reduce reliance on the electric grid and lower energy bills.

Regarding Section 6, they claim that despite the higher costs of agrivoltaics in comparison to traditional solar development, it has the potential to enhance the siting of solar installations, improve solar PV panel performance, and decrease operations and maintenance costs. In addition, it helps keep farmland in production. They continue that it will help farmers and the communities in which they are built. In particular, they believe that it will serve to benefit the state's dairy farms the most.

They express support of Section 7, insisting it will increase access to clean energy, in particular to individuals that would be unable to access it otherwise. They also maintain that it will contribute to economic stability, improve public health, and provide job and economic opportunities.

Will Herchel, CEO, Verogy:

Regarding Sections 1-3, Verogy supports the Value of Distributed Resources Study, and believes more clarity is needed that EDCs should only be used to recover the parts of the electricity component of purchased products that is above the standard offer or general service charge in use.

For Section 2, they request that section 2(d) be amended to allow a front-of-the-meter option for the NRES successor program and remove the requirement to be constrained to onsite load. They also believe Section 2(i) to be arbitrary and will discourage development in the state.

They then go into detail about what new language they'd like to see implemented. They believe the bill should require cost sharing between interconnection applicants in a given study area and the EDCs be permitted to earn a rate of return on interconnection upgrade work. They also advocate to accelerate existing programs and eliminate the misapplied monetary cap. In addition, they support Net Metering for Commercial DERs that do not participate in SCEF or NRES Programs. Finally, they believe federal tax credits should be applied to fuel cell technologies or create a new program specifically for fuel cells.

Kendall Keelen, Staff Attorney, Conservation Law Foundation (CLF):

The CLF supports Sections 2, 4, 5, and 7 of this bill. They oppose sections 1 and 3. They oppose section 1, believing it would lead successor programs to slow and limit the installation of renewable energy sources in the state. In addition, they suggest extending RRES instead of executing the Authority's proposal, stating that the successor program would fail to maintain the state's renewable deployment rate.

They support Section 2, asserting it would be economically benefitting customers, reduce project timelines, and exclude polluting technologies from being eligible. The CLF doesn't believe that Section 3 would benefit ratepayer values or advance the state's environmental justice objectives and instead advocate to expand the current program's subscriber eligibility to low-income customers and service organizations. They support Section 4, as they support consumer protections. They endorse Section 5 and 7, stating it will make clean energy more accessible and affordable.

Jake Marley, Manager, Hyperion Systems:

Hyperion Systems lists their perceived four greatest beneficial results of agrivoltaics:

1. Farmland Conservation
2. Farm Viability
3. In State Energy Generation
4. Renewable Power

They advocate for the bill in respect to agrivoltaics.

Bernard Pelletier, Vice President, People's Action for Clean Energy (PACE):

People's Action for Clean Energy (PACE) supports this bill, stating that it will enhance the state's electric grid, stabilize long-term energy costs for residents and businesses, and reduce exposure to unstable fossil fuel markets.

Regarding Section 4, they assert that the Consumer Protection Task Force delivers a viable system that ensures residents partake in a transparent, well-regulated market. For Section 5, they believe it will reduce energy costs and address practical safety and electrical interconnection issues.

They advocate for Section 6, expressing that Agrivoltaics can further the financial stability of farms while working towards the state's energy goals.

They endorse Section 7, justifying the Solar Pilot as a valuable way of assessing program design, installation models, and overall benefits.

Finally, they ensure that Section 8 provides consumer protection to vulnerable households, guaranteeing that they are not exposed to higher-prices electricity contracts.

Sean Riel, Director of Sales Operations, Earthlight:

Earthlight suggests the committee authorize PURA to initiate proceedings for successor programs in 2026-2027 with a January 2028 launch date or authorize them to continue accepting projects under legacy programs until successor programs are ready. They also would like the successor program to have both "netting" and "buy-all" options and allow systems to be sized beyond load. In addition, they object requiring developers to secure approved permits and interconnection before applying for the successor program, believing it to be too restrictive and burdensome. Finally, they are supportive of giving PURA the power to set dynamic tariff rates under the netting structure and allowing PURA to analyze installation costs, and benefits of the program.

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

Save the Sound supports this bill with suggested modifications. For Sections 1-3, they believe the legislature should adjust the timeline of the successor programs to align with the expiration of the existing programs, allow solar capacity to match existing site load as well as anticipated future load. Furthermore, they are against limiting the SCEF program to low-income customers only and wish to maintain the current eligibility classes.

They are highly in favor of Section 6, believing it to be beneficial and very compatible with farmers.

Anne Schmidt, Legislative Specialist, League of Women Voters of Connecticut (LWVCT):

LWVCT has been supporting programs which promote the conservation of environmental resources over the course of decades, which naturally leads them to support this bill. They claim that the state has been insufficient in meeting its greenhouse emission goals, which are essential in maintaining solar programs, a huge contributor in making energy more affordable. They continue that legalizing plug in solar will allow residents to enjoy clean affordable energy that wouldn't be possible otherwise.

Mark Scully, President, People's Action for Clean Energy (PACE):

PACE supports this bill but proposes the following suggestions:

1. Ensure continuity of solar during transition to successor programs
2. Provide a Buy-All option to the NRES program
3. Require PURA to provide a public accounting of the costs and benefits of solar

Regarding item 1, they believe this should be achieved by either prolonging the current programs until successor programs are initiated, or by moving the start dates for successor programs to December 31st, 2027.

For item 2, they state that prohibiting a Buy-All tariff will eliminate an option that has provided benefits to Connecticut businesses and will impede the growth of the solar industry in the state.

Concerning item 3, they state that quickly deploying solar is a must, and limiting deployment is unnecessary and constrains the industry. They also would like to note that NRES is already bound to a 5 megawatt project cap, nulling the risk that any business can deploy solar unreasonably.

With respect to item 4, they express concern over the lack of transparency on monetary program caps, as this can lead to the public viewing this as just a burden on taxpayers. Providing no distinctions between the components of program spending can also leave the industry vulnerable to shifting political narratives. They also bring attention to pre-purchase of future electricity generation and assert that accounting for these purchases up-front will benefit ratepayers through increased supply and lower wholesale market clearing prices.

Kyle Wallace, Senior Director of Public Policy, Sunrun:

Sunrun supports this bill with the following changes:

1. Alter the start date for the successor program to be January 1, 2028.
2. Allow PURA to extend RRES until the start of the successor program.
3. Set the export rate floor at the supply rate.
4. Consider both the solar market and policy considerations in the rate setting.
5. Set the tariff term to 25 years.
6. Permit current solar customers to opt into the successor.
7. Set the program end date to December 31st, 2036.

Connor Yakaitis, Deputy Director, Connecticut League of Conservation Voters (CTLCV):

The CTLCV is supportive of this bill. They believe that Sections 1, 2, and 3 will be beneficial to the electricity grid and environment while providing efficiency. Additionally, they praise Sections 3,4, and 7 for making solar energy more accessible and affordable to people from all walks of life while also maintaining consumer safety. They also highlight its capability of reducing demand on the electricity grid. They assert Section 6 encourages solar development while simultaneously protecting local environments. Finally, they praise Section 8 for protecting consumers from excessive electricity costs.

Jake Assael, Senior Manager of Policy, GoodLeap:

GoodLeap supports this bill but has a few recommendations. They would like the gap between the current RRES program and the successor program get eliminated, believing that a gap would cause the electricity market to suffer unnecessarily.

They also suggest keeping the export rates above the supply rate to maintain affordability, the benefits of solar energy, and customer confidence in the program. They assert that a failure to do so can lead to the economy of solar systems to quickly collapse and lead to a drop of solar installations, shrinking the future market for storage attachments and retrofits. In addition, they advocate for the 20-year successor program be extended to 25 years, stating that it better aligns with average residential solar financing and equipment warranty periods while also making consumer conversations simpler and more transparent. Furthermore, they express support for continuing exploration of time varying rates to encourage the system to integrate more distributed resources while simultaneously rewarding customers that support the grid's needs. They want the successor RREs program to remain compatible with ESS participation as well.

Finally, they endorse the immediate convening of the consumer protection task force to enforce against bad actors and ensure customers have positive experiences with their energy investment.

Teresa Eickel, Executive Director, Interreligious Eco-Justice Network (IREJN):

The IREJN expresses support for this bill. They believe this bill is crucial in the rapid deployment of solar energy, which they deem to be incredibly important.

They also approve of plug-in solar, stating that it makes solar energy more accessible, and references Utah as a state that has utilized this energy with great success.

They endorse DEEP's plan to develop agrivoltaics and cite a report by Yale that claims that farmers were supportive of agrivoltaics due to the benefits it provides economically, energy-wise, and productivity-wise.

Finally, they advocate for the implementation of solar systems in built environments and for DEEP's two-year pilot program to provide access to solar energy to communities struggling with economic costs.

John Erlingheuser, AARP Connecticut:

AARP advocates for section 4 of the bill but does not hold any particular stances on any other section. They advise that the task force's charge should expand to provide protections for all consumers. They also encourage the committee to consider providing additional enforcement authority to secure compliance with consumer protections. They claim that the marketing for solar panels can be misleading, and support greater oversight to assist consumers in making informed decisions.

Maryette Haggerty Perrault, Senior Policy Manager, Bloom Energy:

Bloom energy advocates for this bill with changes pertaining to fuel cells, believing it can play a significant role in the state achieving their energy objectives. They assert that fuel cells are efficient, non-pollutive and requires no water usage. They add that they are fuel-flexible, capable of transitioning to various renewable energies.

In addition, they state that fuel cells are well suited for high density areas and can minimize costs for customers in these areas. It can be used as a microgrid, which can allow buildings to still maintain power during grid outages. It can also complement solar and storage as opposed to replacing them. Furthermore, it has the capability to be effective in combined heat and power applications. They then detail how fuel cells can benefit electric systems economically, allowing them to avoid expensive transmission and distribution upgrades and may also be owned by electric distribution companies.

They then conclude by advocating that the state to maintain a pathway for fuel cells within their successor programs.

Jeff Hintzke, Vice President of Policy and Marketing, Greenskies Clean Focus:

Greenskies testifies in support of this bill with some concerns. They would like to see the timeline for developing the new programs be accelerated, stating that the current timeline prevents projects from being initiated until 2028. They express that the timeline should be accelerated by at least 6 months.

They advocate for mandated interconnection timelines or a wider overhaul of the interconnection process to be comfortable with the project maturity requirements. They also believe the Buy-all structure should be retained, believing that removing it will remove incentives from building owners to add solar.

Kaleigh Mitchell, Director of Operations, Efficiency for All (EFA):

The EFA supports this bill, especially Section 7. They state that despite the widespread adaptation of solar energy, marginalized communities have been unable to experience the benefits of solar. They say that Section 7 directly advances their "Power Our People" (POP!) Environmental Justice Solar Equity Pilot, a two-year program that targets Environmental Justice communities and minority-owned businesses, providing low to no-cost solar installations to low- and moderate-income households. They go on to claim that POP! Also

directly advances to goals of the Connecticut Governor’s Council on Climate Change (GC3). They go on to praise Section 7 for advancing solar energy as a right, not a privilege.

Chris Phelps, State Director, Environment Connecticut:

Environment Connecticut supports this bill and the intent of Sections 1-3. In regard to Section 1, they are concerned that it may stifle the economic benefit of behind-the-meter residential solar installations for customers that install solar on their property and dissuade property owners from going solar. Instead, they encourage the committee to extend the existing residential solar program.

They go into detail about their support of Section 5 and its ability to grant customers the opportunity to partake in solar energy who do not want to or are unable to install residential solar systems. With that being said, they suggest that the committee make the following changes:

1. Add the sentence, “A portable solar generation device shall not be eligible for net metering credit” to subsection (b) of Section 5.
2. For Section 5, subsection (b), explain that multiple plug-in installations are possible, but their aggregate capacity cannot exceed 1,200 watts.

Mike Trahan, Executive Director, Connecticut Solar & Storage Association (CONNSSA):

CONNSSA requests the Value of DER Study (VDER) directed by PURA and/or DEEP return to an updated version of the 2020 draft. They also suggest language of the bill be altered to grant PURA the ability to extend the current RRES program until successor tariffs are fully implemented. In addition, they request that the bill specify the export rate should be no less than the supply rate and add a provision that allows existing RRES solar-plus-storage customers to opt into the new successor program.

Furthermore, they encourage the committee to keep the “Buy-All” option for commercial rooftops. Regarding the “Walk-Up” Maturity Requirements, they advocate for maturity requirements to enter the program be reduced to showing site control and a submitted interconnection application.

Concerning the consumer pro task force, they request appointments to the task force be maintained and that a task force chairman be named responsible for convening the task force. Moreover, they advocate to restore the Front-of-the-Meter (FTM) storage programming to PURA.

Additionally, they support establishing a 15% state income tax credit for residential solar installations, inspired by similar successful legislation in Massachusetts, but they acknowledge that this may be out of the committee’s jurisdiction.

Finally, they support proposals made by solar developer Verogy to increase the development of various sustainable energy storage systems within the state.

Bob Wall, Chair, Sustainable Fairfield:

Sustainable Fairfield strongly supports this bill. They believe that advocating for renewable energy is more important than ever before. They claim that expanding consumer protections will encourage adoption of solar energy.

Brenda Watson, Executive Director, North Hartford Partnership:

North Hartford Partnership expresses strong support for this bill. They express the importance of making solar energy more accessible to families in environmental justice

communities like North Hartford. They continue that legalizing plug in solar systems will grant people unable to install rooftop solar to partake in clean energy. They also claim that it will decrease emissions and improve public health across the state.

[Anonymous 24, Peter Auster, Anonymous 20, Anonymous 22, Sharon Huttner, Richard Landau, Krieger Irwin, Elizabeth Maliniak, Abbie Winter, Alison Zyla, Cheryl Cappiali, Jamie Coss, Bradford Czepiel, Thomas Denzler, Kathleen Ruby, James Salkind, Chris Schweitzer, Laura Seaberg, Philip Steinborn, Allison Su, Susan Miller, Royal Graves, Jennifer Kleindienst, Roger Kuhns, Cheryl Cappiali, Brian Wnek, Mary Tremblay](#)

These individuals support this bill, believing it will support and increase solar energy use, therefore reducing emissions and improving public health across the state.

[Jennifer Chu, Alison Correia, Priscilla Dannies, Pete Govert, David Joyce, Emma Kenyon, Leslie Lee, Andrew Lopez, Clayton Mansfield, Meagan Moore, Joel Reich, Patricia Sabosik, Susan Sokoloski, Katherine Stapp, Mary Stevens, Ellen Thomson, Stephen Ullman, Deborah Wolff, Catherine Bates, Kelly Siranko, Jeff Becker, Douglas Clark, Kenny Foscue, Tracey Hammer, John Kevin Huelster, Mari Jackson, Carolyn Johnston, Russell Kaplan, William Kirwin, Shauna Lake, Sasha Lovell, James Malley, Tom Mariconda, Marian Nangle, Roberta Paro, George Penniman, Kevin Walsh, Georgann Witte, Marcella Trowbridge:](#)

These individuals are in support of this bill, believing it to improve accessibility to solar energy at an affordable price while also improving public health. In addition, they cite plug in solar's success in other states to justify their position.

Forty-three testimonies were expressed in support for the bill. These individuals include:

[Dwayne Escola, Laura Lynch, Shirley McCarthy, Margaret McDonnell, Peggy Strickler, Anonymous 21, Mark Farmer, Eileen Kopec, Cyril May, Rick McNerney, Chris Sillman, Kathleen Van Der Aue, Pippa Bell Ader, Susan Van Kleef, Grace Damio, Laura Cahn, Tom Cameron, Karen Evans, Jim Cheryl Fillman, Bettina Hall, Jack Potter, Irene Skrybalio, Nancy Urban, Joseph Wasserman, Claudia Allen, Peggy Carpenter, Jesse Friedman, Geraldine Kuenkler, Mary Lee, Benjamin Oko, Jon Olson, James Reilly, Hanna Soucie, Anne Aurand, Mary Lhowe, John Stoddard, Peter Festa, David Englert, William Horne, Alexander Branforff, Vincent Giordano, Rusty Lansford, Reginald Windsor](#)

Sharon Baldwin:

Sharon Baldwin supports this bill, believing it will lessen the utilization of fossil fuels and improve the environment. She describes how her solar panels have saved her a substantial amount of money and would like to personally implement plug in solar devices into her home.

Kathrine Bennett:

Katherine Bennett supports this bill, pointing to solar energy's worldwide implementation, continuing that plug in solar will make it accessible to residents that wouldn't have been able to use otherwise. In addition, she believes it will save costs, provide relieve to electricity providers and improve public health across the state.

Joy Bonitz:

Joy Bonitz supports this bill and in particular is enthusiastic about plug in solar systems, agrivoltaics, and the pilot program.

Gary Caisse:

Gary Caisse details his personal solar use and how its benefited in reducing his energy costs and reducing his pollution output. He advocates for making solar energy more affordable and for the installation of Fast Capacity Charging stations across all rest stops in Connecticut.

Susan Chapin:

Susan Chapin expresses that she wishes that a study be conducted on the entire grid, not just transmission. She advocates to diversify the power supply and emphasizes the low cost of solar energy. She would like to see solar power more accessible to people and communities that currently don't have access it and believes that plug in solar and large solar power projects is the way to do it.

David Foy Crabtree:

David Foy Crabtree believes this bill will make solar power more accessible and build the compatibility of agriculture and solar farms, overall reducing reliance on fuels and systems that are increasing in cost.

Jeffrey Crothers:

Jeffrey Crothers supports this bill, stating it will make solar installations easier, allowing apartment and small homeowners to increase the resale value of their property.

Lisa Dahill:

Lisa Dahill cites her satisfaction with her personal investment in solar energy and supports this bill so that eventually every Connecticut property owner is able to install these systems.

Sheila Dravis-Cosgrove:

Sheila Dravis Cosgrove is supportive of this bill and is advocating that the committee expand eligibility of the Agrivoltaics Programs to owners of undeveloped private open space property. They believe this bill will help preserve the health of both humans and natural habitats as well as supporting the growth of solar energy jobs.

Kristen Foster:

Kristen Foster discusses how solar price reductions, including those done by the government has made it possible for them to install a solar system in their home and hopes for this bill to help others achieve what they have done. They would like to see solar house batteries be incentivized by the state as well.

Kelly Kennedy:

Kelly Kennedy details her personal satisfaction with her solar energy system. They go on that as a climate action advocate; they support plug in solar and solar installations in environmental justice communities. They conclude with emphasizing that the state needs to focus on environmental conservation, energy efficiency, and energy conservation as opposed to solar farms and data centers that work against these goals.

Nancy Meyers:

Nancy Meyers supports this bill, believing it will make solar energy accessible to more people, including renters. They state this bill will help Connecticut move towards a safer, cleaner environment.

Mark Mitchell:

Mark Mitchell supports this bill. He claims that black and brown residents are more likely to live near polluting power plants and we must push towards a future where these polluting power plants will be forced to close due to the wide adoption of solar energy. He believes this future will lead to the improved health and safety of black and brown residents. He is also in support of providing solar energy access to low-income residents and communities.

Andrew Nunno:

Andrew Nunno is a doctor in New Haven that regularly sees patients for asthma or COPD exacerbations. He attributes some of these issues to pollutants in the air, which he claims is often concentrated in areas of people of color and low-income residents. He advocates for this bill to improve the health of the people around us.

Elsa Obuchowski:

Elsa Obuchowski would like solar energy to be more accessible to people. Due to the age of her house, she is unable to install solar panels and would like to take advantage of a Plug In Solar system. In addition, she advocates for the continuation of the state's solar programs. She believes it will also reduce fossil fuel emissions and improve public health across the state.

Marisa Olavarria:

Marisa Olavarria brings attention to the coal plant and natural gas plant impacting residents' health in Bridgeport due to their contributions to air pollution. She believes furthering the implementation of solar energy will help improve both the financial and environmental health of the city. She also states that plug in solar would help her and many other Bridgeport residents financially. She would like to see Connecticut rely less on the burning of fossil fuels.

Susan Olson:

Susan Olson supports this bill, stating that their solar panels have reduced her electricity bills and would like to see the widespread adoption of plug-in solar to support the future of the state both economically and environmentally.

Annie Perkins:

Annie Perkins states that that despite their investment in solar energy, they have been unable to expand their investment without the support of the state's incentives and loans from CT Green Bank. They stress the importance of renewable energy and continue that the state needs to step up to make transitioning to it as easy as possible.

Daniel Rabin:

Daniel Rabin supports solar energy, believing it saves costs for residents and reduces the load on the electric grid. They also endorse plug-in solar.

John Sievel:

John Sievel supports this bill, believing it will lower the costs of electricity and improve air quality. He also endorses plug-in solar systems for making solar energy more accessible and approves of the integration of solar and agriculture.

Malaine Trecoske:

Malaine Trecoske brings attention to her own positive experience with her solar energy system and wants to make it more accessible for others so they can share the same experience. They express a desire to install plug-in solar in their home and state that federal and state subsidies are what made transitioning to solar energy more feasible for her.

Nicholas Weaver:

Nicholas Weaver supports this bill, stating they would love to utilize a portable solar setup since they are unable to install solar panels on their roof.

Susan Weldon:

Susan Weldon states that this bill will improve the environment and help state citizens save money. They talk about how their previous solar energy system improved their quality of life as well as their finances. They are currently unable to install and solar energy system in their condominium and would love to utilize plug-in solar to utilize solar energy in their current situation.

Adam Grady:

Adam Grady is a regenerative farmer advocating for the importance of agrivoltaics. He claims it to have agricultural, economic, and environmental benefits, applauding its efficiency. He continues that despite its vast benefits; he stresses the importance of the technology being used to serve and advance agriculture first and foremost and should never be used to displace it.

Anonymous 23:

This individual believes the state should continue supporting the state's commercial and residential shared solar programs and shouldn't expire in 2028. They state it will increase access to solar and improve public health.

Anonymous 25:

This individual supports this bill, believing it will reduce reliance on non-renewable energy, increase energy affordability and accessibility, and decrease air pollution, improving public health across the state.

Benjamin Baker:

Benjamin Baker supports this bill, highlighting the lower costs, health benefits, economic benefits, and accessibility. In addition, they believe agrivoltaics is an efficient way to maintain both agriculture and solar energy in the state.

Kathleen Barrett:

Kathleen Barret supports this bill in the interest of fairness, granting access to solar to those previously unable to with the legalization of plug-in solar. They conclude emphasizing the importance of granting citizens the freedom of choice when it comes to solar energy.

Janet Bellamy:

Janet Bellamy brings attention to the financial benefits both herself and her neighbors experienced upon using solar energy and would like to help other citizens have that same opportunity, which plug-in solar helps achieve. They also emphasize the importance of supporting the state's farmers and agricultural land while supporting solar energy.

Clara Biesel:

Clara Biesel supports this bill, advocating for the affordability of renewable energy and supports the implementation of plug-in solar.

Lynne Bonnett:

Lynne Bonnett states that residents of New Haven have been left out of all solar incentives to help them save money on electric bills. She expresses excitement at the prospect of plug-in solar, and advocates for even more incentives to help urban residents across the state.

Lourdes Brown:

Lourdes Brown supports the adaptation of plug-in solar, stating it is cheap, clean, and accessible.

Yaniv Chen:

Yaniv Chen discusses how integrating solar energy has saved their family money and reduce their carbon footprint.

Kristen Colombo:

Kristen Colombo states that they have utilized solar incentives, which has lowered their energy costs. They support this bill because it expands access to solar energy, lowers costs, and improves public health.

Kim Craven:

Kim Craven believes this bill will lower expenses and pollution across the state, creates jobs, and benefits farmers economically. They talk about how their solar system has cut electricity costs for them.

Jean de Smet:

Jean de Smet believes solar lowers electricity bills and improves both air quality and public health and believes that plug-in solar will help advance us towards these goals. They also support making solar energy accessible for lower-income people and communities.

Kate Donnelly:

Kate Donnelly highlights the positive impact solar energy has had on her life and the town of Hampton. They state this bill will lower the cost of electricity and help the state reach its climate goals.

Alma Elder:

Alma Elder brings attention to the health issues caused by pollution from non-renewable energy. They support this goal to help improve public health.

Robert Essman:

Robert Essman would like to see the solar energy industry improve, believing it to have a lot of problems, possibly due to changing regulations. They advocate for this bill, wanting other residents to have the same opportunities he's had with utilizing solar energy.

Charles Kenyon:

Charles Kenyon supports this bill, believing it will lower electricity costs, emissions, and assist the state in transitioning to green energy. They state this bill will bring economic relief to many residents.

Diana Kolaj:

Diana Kolaj supports the utilization of plug-in solar, stating it will make it more accessible and allow lower income residents to take advantage of renewable energy generation. They also state that it will help accelerate the solar industry and help support the working class.

Hibo Makena:

Hibo Makena believes this bill helps serve their faith, asserting that it will improve the lives of our neighbors, and help move society away from selfishness and heal the world.

William Nygren:

William Nygren supports this bill, and puts emphasis on the implementation of plug-in solar, believing it will make solar energy more accessible to a wider range of people.

David Schneider and Marge Schneider:

David & Marge Schneider advocate for this bill, believing it to lower energy costs and improve the environment and hope this legislation will help them participate in the benefits of solar energy.

Ellen Smith:

Ellen Smith discusses how the burning of fossil fuels harms the health of the public and disproportionately affects people of color due to them being more likely to live in close proximity to fossil fuel infrastructure. They state that this bill will help the state invest in the health of its residents and reduce the harm fossil fuels imposes on residents.

Priscilla Dannies:

Priscilla Dannies cites how this bill will benefit New Haven residents in particular who did not have access to solar energy previously. They believe it will make solar more accessible and improve public health.

Andy Bauer:

Andy Bauer highlights his savings that he's achieved through utilizing solar energy and would like to see this be repeated everywhere.

Jennifer Weber:

Jennifer Weber supports the establishment of successor programs and advocates for making solar energy more accessible to people through the Plug-In Solar programs.

Mary Woolsey:

Mary Woolsey comments on how solar energy has benefitted her life and believes it should be made available to more people. They also support reducing gas emissions and supports the development of agrivoltaics while ensuring that prime farmland is not lost.

Mary Sherwin:

Mary Sherwin advocates moving away from fossil fuel consumption to further the state's climate goals while providing equitable access to renewables. They highlight their enthusiasm for plug-in solar and bringing solar energy to environmental justice communities. Lastly, they express their support for agrivoltaics.

Scott Redfern:

Scott Redfern expresses his support for plug-in solar, increasing accessibility to solar energy, and reducing dependence on fossil fuels. They also emphasize that these programs need to continue to ensure future investment by solar panel owners. Finally, he expresses support for agrivoltaics and solar generation in environmental justice communities.

Deborah Roe:

Deborah Roe states that solar energy is not as accessible as it should be but is excited about the implementation of plug-in solar systems, claiming it will grant thousands of residents the ability to participate in solar energy for the first time. Overall, they believes this bill improves the health of the state's energy system.

Wesley Schrock:

Recommends that the bill language be adjusted to explicitly exempt systems from net metering and create a maximum aggregate AC power output of 1,200 watts per meter or service address. They express support for plug-in solar, claiming it is both beneficial for consumers and the electrical grid.

Jason Zandri:

Jason Zandri brings attention to the economic benefits he's experienced after installing a solar system in his home and would like to see this opportunity be extended to others while also reducing emissions and improve public health.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Kip Kolesinskas, Chair, Working Lands Alliance (WLA):

The Working Land Alliance (WLA) strongly opposes Section 6 of this bill. They claim that the state's agricultural and food system is being negatively impacted by utility scale solar, particularly, the northern CT Valley. They continue that the preferred siting for utility grade solar projects are prime farmland soils, which causes the land to lose its prime farmland status, negatively impacting the agricultural community and supporting businesses. They cite the American Farmland Trust (AFT)'s recommendation to avoid prime farmland conversion first.

They oppose the beneficial tariffs to increase agrivoltaics projects, stating it will accelerate the negative impacts as stated above, asserting that local and regional food systems are also essential to our climate resiliency and sustainability goals.

They also bring attention to the fact that the bill charges DEEP with implementing a pilot program for agrivoltaics, and state that the agency does not have the capability to do so. They assert that utility scale agrivoltaics supply less renewable energy, disrupts habitats, ground water recharge, water quality, economic development, recreation, and scenic beauty.

They want to make clear that although they do support solar and agrivoltaics projects, they do not wish for these projects to be located on prime farmland soils.

[Anonymous 27, Anonymous 29, Anonymous 28, Anonymous 30:](#)

Submitted testimony unrelated to contents of the bill.

Two testimonies were expressed, opposing the bill. These individuals include:

[Robert Brown, Robert Keen](#)

GENERAL COMMENTS:

[Andy Belden, Vice President of Renewable Programs and Strategy, Eversource Energy:](#)

Eversource has two comments on Section 6 of this bill. First, they suggest the bill have a limit on the aggregate procurement of energy products from agrivoltaics at less than \$16 million annual limit for Shared Clean Energy Facilities included in Section 3(f) or fund the program through state bonding or taxpayer funds. Secondly, they request the cost recovery language in Lines 462-466 be altered so they are consistent with the other cost recover text present in this bill.

They explain that excess electricity generated by solar may be registered as customer energy consumption. They state that without the installation of a utility meter that records excess generation and a PURA approved excess generation compensation tariff, customers may not see the benefits of portable solar devices or even be at a disadvantage. For these reasons, they believe that customer protection requirements that ensure customers are making informed purchasing decisions is essential. In addition, they cite Advanced Metering Infrastructure as a potentially better solution than installing new utility meters.

Regarding Sections 1-3, Eversource would like to note the excessive costs of clean energy programs, which they claim impact the affordability of electric utility service to Connecticut customers. Therefore, they suggest the General Assembly lower the costs of successor clean energy programs through amending the bill to control costs and encourage competition. Additionally, they advocate for the bill to be updated to give more direction to PURA to decrease compensation rates and use competitive process to generate prices for the largest clean energy sources.

For Section 1 specifically, they assert that the General Assembly remove Sec.1(b)(3) and update Sec. 1(b)(2) so the rate of successor program tariffs should be less than the total of all center-per-kilowatt-hour charges applicable to a customer's rate class and that the rate be equal to the applicable cost of Standard Service provided by the utility. They advocate for these changes to guarantee the costs of successor residential tariffs will decline ensure that future distributed generation customers will continue to be responsible for the cost of the energy they consume from the electric power system.

In respect to Section 2, they warn that the proposed departure from competitive solicitations for a "walk-up" program where projects are compensated at pre-determined rates set by

PURA is likely to lead to higher costs of clean energy in the state. They state that a similar approach in Massachusetts led to their Department of Energy Resources to set compensation rates for solar energy projects that cost as much as double the cost of similar projects recent bid into competitive solicitations of our state's NRES and SCEF programs. They go on to address concerns with competitive solicitations, stating that concerns typically raised have mixed evidence in practice. They advocate for the modifications of Sec. 2(c) of HB 5340 to remove the direction for PURA to develop and implement an application process and suggest it be replaced with a direction for PURA to create a procurement plan for each EDC similar to that in the C.G.S. 16-244Z(a)(1)(A). Finally, they believe Sec. 2(b) should be changed to direct the rates for successor program tariffs to be based on the results of competitive solicitations conducted pursuant to procurement plans established by PURA to guarantee the state benefits from lowest costing commercial clean energy resources available.

Kirsten Ek, Fellow, Connecticut Chapter of the American College of Physicians (ACP):

The ACP strongly stresses the significance of clean energy solutions to manage climate change and its health impacts and believes this needs to be immediately addressed. They state that this bill will increase access to solar and allow people to utilize power for life saving medical equipment during grid failures without requiring roof top solar access.

Michael Shea, Executive Director, Connecticut Airport Authority (CAA):

The CAA brings attention to their pursuit of solar canopies for Bradley International Airport's parking lots through the shared clean energy facility program for the last several years and their struggle with obtaining approval. They request the JFS language in lines 298 to 310 provide more incentives for transportation facilities, including airports so they can provide more clean energy projects for their airport system.

Christie Prescott, Vice President, United Illuminating (UI):

UI begins with bringing attention to their history of engagement with Connecticut's renewable energy programs, including their participation in PURA Docket 25 02 14. They express their desire to continue supporting the state's transition to cleaner energy. They emphasize the importance of aligning legislation with PURA's structured analytical review instead of predetermined outcomes. They voice their concern that if the current bill were approved as drafted, it would veer away from the current analyses in Docket 25 02 14. They claim the bill in its current form would increase customer costs and stress the necessity of program scale, procurement volumes, and tariff design being informed by detailed cost impact and rate impact modeling. They urge the legislator to allow PURA's successor program process to run to completion so final decisions about program size and structure are informed and done tactfully.

Adam Wooda, Director, Dispatch Energy:

Dispatch Energy highlights that fuel cells installed under the NRES program have a waiver (DG Rider) of specific natural gas delivery charges for the duration of the project, while fuel cells constructed under SCEF are ineligible for it. While in 2024, the state extended DG Rider to SCEF fuel cells approved in 2023 for earlier, they have not approved DG Rider for any projects since. Dispatch Energy asks for the time limitation in Section 16 243hh be removed to allow any SCEF fuel cell to receive the DG Rider. They emphasize the importance of fuel cells to address energy unaffordability and grid instability and assert that adding financial barriers to fuel cells serving low-income customers as opposed to their private corporate customers is completely unjust and needs to be changed.

They also bring attention to the Lamont Administration eliminating fuel cells from existing NRES and SCEF programs at the end of the 2025 legislative session. They state that this action had negative consequences on fuel cell developers and insist that an act such as this one being carried out without any public hearing or comment is not an appropriate way to implement renewable energy policy in Connecticut. They declare the importance of fuel cells in the state's energy future and wish for it to remain. In response, they are requesting the committee reverse last year's decision to remove fuel cells from these programs and allow them to be eligible through the end of their current authorization (2027). In addition, they ask the committee to provide an additional directive to PURA to create a separate docket for the future of non-zero emission technologies, including fuel cells and anaerobic digestion.

[Farn James](#) submitted testimony unrelated to the contents of the bill.

[Ian McDonald:](#)

Ian McDonald states it is critical to look at various supply chain costs of other forms of energy generation to accurately assess Solar's value to the state's residents. He goes on to reference a recent study to justify his concerns.

[Michael Ungaro:](#)

Michael Ungaro supports the general concept of this bill but does not support reducing export compensation in the Residential Program, instead advocating to continue compensating energy exports in the residential program at the full retail rate. He is also against limiting the Community Renewable Energy Program to low-income subscribers, believing that it should be in addition a program that serve all income levels. In addition, they disagree with including a cap on the Non-Residential Program but do support adopting PURA's proposals on "first-ready" selection and standard-offer compensation rates. Finally, they support the implementation of plug-in solar.

Reported by: Tatyana Massa, Abigail Lockwood Date: March 31st, 2026