

Paula Panzarella  
344 Norton Street  
New Haven, CT 06511  
paulapanzarella@yahoo.com  
(203) 562-2798  
Sept. 8, 2020

To the Energy and Technology Committee:

I'm a New Haven resident and a founding member of the group Fight the Hike that has given testimony before this committee for well over a decade. I am also a member of the New Haven Energy Task Force.

First off, I commend the Energy and Technology Committee for its work on LCO 3920. In the past so many issues on such a wide scope were separated into separate bills. I hope nothing falls through the cracks.

I'm impressed by many of the proposals in LCO 3920. I'll mention them, and then focus on items that should have been included.

Regarding the IRP, A note of caution, based on our past experience. The IRP should never be written by, or have its final editing by, the utility companies, or their representatives or lawyers or anyone in their employ. The IRP needs to protect the public.

I commend the Energy and Technology Committee for consumer protection regarding the business practices of 3rd party electricity suppliers.

I also agree with expanding energy storage, expanding the Residential Solar Investment Program, and keeping solar net metering until 2022.

The attention to microgrid development and the resilience grant and loan pilot programs is encouraging, as are the numerous calls for public hearings and the consideration for implementation of low-income rates, and reimbursement for customers who have to throw out food due to extended power outages. As I mentioned earlier, I see a lot of really good thinking went into this bill.

I am ecstatic reading Sec. 21, starting on line 953, which called for "an Independent Consumer Advocate to act as an independent advocate for ratepayer interests in all matters that may affect the ratepayers of each electric distribution company, as defined in section 16-1 of the general statutes. Such Independent Consumer Advocate shall be instituted on the board of directors for each electric distribution company." As someone who has approached the Energy and Technology Committee and various legislators on energy issues since 2006, I welcome Sec. 21 as it offers the possibility of public oversight, direct involvement and the ability to be taken seriously by the State Legislature.

Performance-based regulation is also a great point, as is reviewing the decoupling mechanism. This charge to consumers further unjustly enriches the electric companies.

I'm glad this bill calls for more transparency and a review of gas and electrical companies' financial and operating funds and calls for public hearings for rate increases.

Please consider under operating expenses, what the dividends to stockholders are, the rate of return, and the actual earnings of the CEOs and other officers, e.g., salary, compensation, stock awarded, etc. For instance, [Eversource Energy CEO James Judge's 2019 pay](https://www.execpay.org/news/eversource-energy-2019-compensation-970) included \$3M in non-equity incentive plan, \$1.3M in salary, \$6.7M in stock awards, as well as \$26.6K in other compensation.

<https://www.execpay.org/news/eversource-energy-2019-compensation-970>

As Chief Executive Officer at Avangrid, Inc., in 2018, James P. Torgerson made \$5,709,436 in total compensation. Of this total \$1,096,162 was received as a salary, \$1,347,660 was received as a bonus, \$0 was received in stock options, \$3,080,264 was awarded as stock and \$185,350 came from other types of compensation.

<https://www1.salary.com/James-P-Torgerson-Salary-Bonus-Stock-Options-for-AVANGRID-INC.html>

Line 1071 mentions the Clean Energy Fund. In LCO 3920, you need to make sure what happened to the Clean Energy Fund in April 2018 **never** can happen again. The Legislature agreed to seize \$155 million from the “Combined Public Benefits Charge” to put into the General Fund.

On the back of our electric bills, the charge is explained:

Combined Public Benefits Charge is the combination of the following three charges:

Conservation and Land Management Program - This is the charge to fund programs that promote energy conservation and efficiency.

Renewable Energy Investment -To fund programs that promote the use of renewable (or environmentally friendly) fuel sources, such as solar power, wind, fuel cells, methane gas from landfills, biomass, trash-to-energy, and water.

Systems Benefit Charge - For funding public costs such as public education, hardship protection, and nuclear plant decommissioning.

I, representing the group Fight the Hike, was a participant in the lawsuit against the State to have the money returned. The court, and the following appeal, upheld the State's seizure of these funds. CT residents depended on these funds for their jobs in the renewable energy sector. Efficiency and clean energy save the state money, and people's health is at stake because fossil fuels are increasing asthma rates and respiratory illnesses.

By crippling these programs, it was estimated over 6,600 jobs would be lost in two years, \$21 million in state tax revenue will be lost, tens of thousands of people will not be able to receive energy assessments, weatherization upgrades, energy efficiency programs, and financial assistance for low-income ratepayers. How the legislators and the judges continued to act against the public good then is beyond me.

These funds could still be restored by the Legislature, and there needs to be a safeguard that they can never be raided again.

Now we have to talk about Millstone. Reported in the New Haven Register ("Report: Millstone power plant viable through 2035") on March 1, 2018:

"The assessment recommends the state allow Millstone to sell its power on the open market through competitive bidding, and notes that any resulting contracts would have to be advantageous to ratepayers.

"We think this is the right path forward and we are finding a way to do a procurement that is most protective to ratepayers," said Robert Klee, commissioner of the state Department of Energy and Environmental Protection."

And currently the New Haven Register on-line has the headline:

"Why are CT ratepayers paying entire cost of keeping the Millstone nuclear plant open?" Alexander Soule, Sept. 7, 2020.

As fingers get pointed back and forth from ISO to Gov. Lamont to legislators to Millstone, it is the consumer who will be footing the bill. And, for the record, nuclear energy is not a renewable source. Uranium doesn't grow on trees. Massive CO2 is created by the heavy machinery necessary to dredge uranium from the ground and transport it. Also, as Joel Gordes said in testimony years ago, "To treat nuclear power as it were a renewable resource is completely inappropriate...Real renewable resources don't produce a deadly byproduct that has to be guarded for an eternity" (New Haven Register, Nov. 17, 2018). March 11, 2011 was the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant disaster in Japan. That alone should have given legislators pause to reconsider relying on Millstone.

Connecticut residents are still dealing with the debacle of former Gov Malloy's decision to spend Connecticut's money of creating more gas lines. In addition there is the plan to continue building the Killingly plant. One more article of note is the Sep. 10, 2019 Hartford Courant by Stephen Singer: "Environmentalists clash with Lamont as natural gas plant set for Killingly tests Connecticut's promise to address climate change." The first paragraph concisely states the situation that the Energy and Technology Committee has the power now to address in LCO 3920.

"As Gov. Ned Lamont seeks to dramatically scale back carbon emissions over the next two decades, Connecticut has the distinction of being the only state in New England where a natural gas plant is set to be built."

In conclusion, thank you for your work in a bill that encompasses so much, yet it behooves you to correct some very important energy issues that were not included, e.g., the seizure of funds from the Combined Public Benefits Charge, Millstone and Killingly.

Sincerely,

Paula Panzarella