

General Law Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: SB-233 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING SOLAR CONTRACTORS AND CONSUMER PROTECTIONS REGARDING SOLAR ENERGY.

Vote Date: 3/11/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 2/23/2026

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

General Law Committee

REASONS FOR BILL

This raised bill combines two proposals the committee considered in the 2025 session.

- [2025 SB 1236](#) would have eliminated a licensing exemption for certain solar installation work.
- [2025 HB 6052](#) would have created certain protections for home solicitation sales.

The current year's raised bill combined the provisions of 1236 with selected protections regarding the door-to-door sale of residential solar systems. Notably, 2026's raised bill does *not* include the "no-knock list" that was part of 2025 HB 6052.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE

During the committee process, it was determined that it was best to remove the provisions that would have eliminated certain solar licensing exemptions. That decision is reflected in the substitute language (LCO 2927).

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY

[Claire Coleman, Consumer Counsel, Office of Consumer Counsel](#) submitted general written commentary on the bill. The testimony notes that the bill tasks OCC in consultation with DCP and PURA with developing a handbook defining consumer's rights. OCC agrees with the importance in making this resource available to consumers but notes that the issue this spans several agencies, including DCP, DEEP, PURA and the Office of the Attorney

General. The testimony suggests that the Solar Consumer Protection Task Force that is currently underway is the appropriate interagency body to develop the handbook.

Bryan Cafferelli, Commissioner of the Department of Consumer Protection submitted comments requesting clarification regarding:

- The need to provide the consumer with a consumer's rights handbook – must it be provided in print or electronically? Must DCP print a hardcopy?
- The meaning of the term "business relationship".
- Line 442 requires the imposition of a civil penalty of \$500 per violation but does not specify whether the DCP is to enforce and collect or whether it is a private right of action. The enforcement provisions will require additional resources not allocated for in the Governor's budget.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Kyle Wallace, Sr. Director, Public Policy, Sunrun, Inc. submitted written testimony in support of S.B. 233 because it will provide consumer education and protection. Director Wallace addressed solar licensing. Licensing changes have been addressed in the substitute language of the bill. She recommends adding a definition for "door-to-door" sales vs. home solicitation sales and revising the definition of the solar photovoltaic system to include energy storage to keep up with the growing energy storage market. Last, Sunrun recommends amending the allowable soliciting hours to include language that would not restrict the consumer's ability to schedule an appointment outside of those hours.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Bill Finch, The Connecticut Labor Management Cooperation Committee submitted written testimony on behalf of his committee and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Locals 90, 488 and 35, and National Electrical Contractors Association, CT Chapter. He could not support the section of the bill regarding licensure for solar photovoltaic installation work with the intent of improving an existing licensing exemption and requested that it be removed. Licensing language has been addressed in the substitute language of the bill.

Ruthie DeWit, Director State Affairs, Northeast Region-SEIA (Solar Energy Industries Association) submitted testimony that supports the intent of SB 233 but recommends changes to strengthen the bill.

- Clarify which sections are meant for door-to-door sales and home solicitation sales.
- The State is directed to publish the handbook/brochure by a specific date and require all contractors to use the brochure by the same specified date providing no time for contractors to incorporate the handbook/brochure into their sales processes.
- Clarification is needed for the section referencing what information contractors need to provide to DCP. Is it the names of businesses providing financing and installation services or a list of all individuals who provide financing and installation?

[John Erlingheuser, Sr. Director of Advocacy-AARP CT](#) submitted testimony in support as the bill serves to broaden and clarify the scope of the CT Home Solicitation Sales Act and adds protections related to solar sales and loans. However, the bill separates the definition of consumer goods from the definition of consumer services presenting a problem with the solar definition. It is not clear of the purpose for the change beyond adding solar. The bill adds the phrase lease or rental, which would be better accomplished by adding a definition of sale to include sale, lease or rental.

The advocate for AARP suggests defining the term consumer to mean any individual who enters or is solicited to enter a contract for a consumer good or service through a home solicitation sale. It is also recommended a change of the language in the following sections:

- Section (a)(4) from loan to lease and lender to lessor.
- Section (a)(7) limits solar loans to purchase money loans; i.e., loans used to buy the system. The problem with payoff and transfer docs presumably would apply to any solar financing.
- Section (c) references a \$250 credit to consumer's account for violations, but the account may no longer be in that person's name and a general reference to a \$250 payment may make more sense.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

[Jeff Hintzke, VP of Policy, Greenskies Clean Energy](#) testified in opposition to Section 1 of the bill, which referenced the elimination licensure exemption. This section has been removed from the substitute language of the bill.

[Mike Trahan, Executive Director-CT Solar-Storage Association](#) submitted testimony opposing Section 1 of the bill that suggests safety concerns and speaks to licensure exemption. Licensing concerns have been addressed in the substitute language of the bill. Mr. Trahan also suggests defining door-to-door and home solicitation sales and defining hours of solicitation. Last, clarification of the reporting requirement needs to be addressed and should be limited to relevant partnerships involving financing, installation and consumer facing interactions.

[Michael Maiscalco, CFO, Earthlight Technologies](#) and 23 additional employees submitted similar testimony in opposition to S.B. 233 because in its current form it would impose unnecessary new licensing requirements on installers, increase project costs for consumers and businesses due to added labor and compliance; extend project timelines, constrain the qualified workforce and hinder Connecticut's clean energy goals to achieve a zero-carbon electric grid by 2040. The bill adds bureaucracy without increasing safety. Solar installations are already subject to inspections by multiple entities before they are allowed to be energized. The section of concern was removed from the substitute language.

Reported by: Jacqueline Olsen

Date: March 18, 2026