

# Energy and Technology Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No:** SB-421 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

**Title:** AN ACT CONCERNING REPORTING OF DOUBLE UTILITY POLES.

**Vote Date:** 03/19/2026

**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable Substitute

**PH Date:** 3/12/2026

**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:

The Energy and Technology Committee

## CO-SPONSORS:

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

[Sen. Jorge Cabrera, 17th Dist.](#)

[Sen. Ceci Maher, 26th Dist.](#)

[Sen. MD Rahman, 4th Dist.](#)

[Rep. Kara Rochelle, 104th Dist.](#)

[Rep. Mary M. Mushinsky, 85th Dist.](#)

[Rep. Geoff Luxenberg, 12th Dist.](#)

[Sen. Rick Lopes, 6th Dist.](#)

## REASONS FOR BILL:

The reasoning for the bill is to make sure that the removal of double utility poles occurs in a timely manner and the creation of a system for the public to have a way of reporting them. This is to prevent the dangers that double utility poles poses.

## SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:

The substitute language (LCO # 3365) entirely replaces the underlying raised bill language, and establishes times and procedures concerning the removal of double utility poles, including enforcement by the Public Utilities Authority (PURA) in the form of fines up to \$100 per violation per day.

## RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

### [Katie S. Dykes, Commissioner, CT Department of Energy & Environmental Protection](#)

DEEP supports the idea of addressing double utility poles and agrees that a centralized reporting system could improve transparency and coordination. However, they caution that the bill would make DEEP mainly a pass-through for reports without authority to fix the problem and suggests that regulators like PURA or utility stakeholders lead a more effective, coordinated solution.

[Claire E. Coleman, Consumer Counsel \(OCC\)](#)

Coleman on behalf of the Office of Consumer Counsel supports SB 421, noting that double utility poles pose safety risks, and that better reporting could improve coordination among utilities and attachers. However, continued improvements to coordination and enforcement, not just reporting, are key to effectively resolving the issue.

**NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:**

[Jim Case, Member and Lobbyist, Communications Workers of America Local 1298](#)

Jim Case, a member of CWA, Local 1298 states his support of SB 421, emphasizing that double utility poles are widespread, hazardous, and increasingly common due to delays by third-party attachers. While he supports creating a reporting system, he argues the bill is not strong enough and should include enforceable timelines and accountability to ensure poles are fixed and removed.

[Senator Bob Duff, State of Connecticut, 25th District](#)

Senator Bob Duff states his support for SB 421. He states his years in fighting to remove double poles, mentioning that many of these double poles are damaged in some way (i.e., rotting, decaying, damaged by motor vehicles), increasing the risk of structural failure during storms, creating traffic hazards, and delaying emergency responses. He expresses that this issue of double poles got so bad that in 2019, he convened a working group of local utilities and City of Norwalk officials to help address this problem. There was slow progress at first with the working group, especially during Covid, but it led to the removal of 147 poles in 2022, and another 226 in 2023. Then, in 2024, Norwalk began to participate in the state pilot program designed to significantly accelerate the removal of "double poles." This pilot program has resulted in the removal of hundreds of additional double poles. Yet there still are double poles, about 222 in Norwalk. Senator Duff argues that Senate Bill 421 would create a reporting system for these double poles; respectfully asking the Committee to consider amending this bill to shorten the statutory timeframe attachers must move their wires from an old to a new utility pole from 45 days to 15 days. With failure to abide by this expedited timeframe would result in the owner of the old utility pole moving the wires and then charging the attachers at the prevailing rate. This would allow for the expedited removal of these double poles, speeding up the transfer of wires and more swiftly removing the danger from the sides of our roads.

[Michael Treadwell, Business Manager/Financial Secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers \(IBEW\) Local 42](#)

Treadwell, a business manager/financial secretary of IBEW Local 42 supports SB 421, emphasizing that double utility poles are a serious and growing safety risk for both workers and the public due to delayed equipment transfers by multiple attachers. While they support creating a reporting system, they argue the bill should be strengthened with the following:  
**Enforceable Transfer Deadlines:** Attachers should be required to transfer their equipment from an old pole to a new pole within 15 days of installation of the replacement pole. **PURA as Lead Enforcement Agency:** directing enforcement through PURA ensures accountability sits with the agency that has the jurisdiction and tools to act. **Legacy Pole Remediation Timeline:** A framework requiring custodians to catalog legacy poles within six months of enactment and remove them within eighteen months thereafter would set a clear path to eliminating the backlog.

The following individual also expressed support for the bill for similar reasons stated above.

[David Weidlich Jr, President, Communications Workers of America, Local 1298](#)

**NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:**

1 individual expressed opposition to the bill.

**Reported by: Luna Romani**

**Date: 03/30/2026**