

Connecticut Distributed Generated Interconnection Working Group Meeting Summary

State of Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority Office of Education, Outreach & Enforcement

June 10, 2025

Introduction

The June 10, 2025, IX WG meeting focused on addressing PURA's Interim Decision on the 100-day Sprint report, specifically proposals 2 and 3.

- [Link](#) to Interim Decision
- [Link](#) to Sprint Report

Presentations and discussion focused on Proposals 2 and 3 and approaches other jurisdictions have taken to develop parallel but separate interconnection tracks for unique projects such as small commercial projects with on-site load. The working group sought to answer whether separate tracks should be defined based on system size, on-site load match, location, and/or on-site storage.

Proposal 2: requires the EDCs to review the current interconnection processes and explore the creation of new or more specific process tracks for projects with varying needs or specifications, such as a dedicated track for smaller commercial projects with on-site load.

Proposal 2: requires the EDCs to establish new, separate, and expedited interconnection processes for commercial projects, 500 kW that are either co-located w/ on-site load or served by on-site infrastructure.

PURA suggested aligning proposals 2 and 3 as both address similar issues and goals. The working group agrees that proposal 3 is a subset of proposal 2 and that both can be approached together.

Order 5 directs the EDCs implement the approved versions of Proposals 2, 3, 14, 22, 25, and 30 by October 1, 2025, and file both clean and redlined versions of the Interconnection Guidelines for the Authority's review and approval, incorporating these proposals. For exact language and directives, please refer directly to Order 5 on page 29 of PURA's Interim Decision.

Order 5 Compliance Discussion: Addressing Proposal 2 and 3

The Working group began with a review of interconnection tracks in other states for unique projects such as small non-exporting systems, battery-only installations, and limited export systems. The group reviewed tracks from Illinois, Maryland, and California.

Illinois information can be found here:

<https://www.lrl.mn.gov/docs/2024/mandated/241703.pdf>

Maryland information can be found here:

<https://www.lrl.mn.gov/docs/2024/mandated/241703.pdf>

California information can be found here: https://www.sce.com/sites/default/files/custom-files/Web%20files/Rule21_FAQ.pdf

- The group discussed Rule 21.
- Non-export projects are theoretically simple to process, but the non-export condition must be guaranteed (for life of project equipment). Eversource expressed concern that developers have been unwilling to make interconnection agreements contingent on a site's load always being present.
- General agreement that there is a lack of equipment for small generators to be able to reliably control or guarantee non-export.
- However, reverse power relays can detect site load drops and prevent export. The following example was shared: a 300 kW commercial system can be physically blocked from exporting if the load disappears.

Next, CONN SSA members Mike Trahan (CONN SSA) + Andrew Hickock (Solect Energy) presented on the Massachusetts' Interconnection Implementation Review Group (IIRG) approach to a group study opt-out:

- Five members of MA industry group sent letter to EDCs proposing group study opt-out to give smaller behind-the-meter projects that wouldn't otherwise require infrastructure upgrade to pull out of group and be studied independently if needed. Specifically for projects not requiring supplemental review or requiring additional engineering study. MA also working on some changes to supplemental review. In practice, the opt-out would be a 250 kw threshold. [MA docket 25-48](#).
- Rather than a hard size threshold, MA determined that if the interconnecting project doesn't require supplemental review and the group study hasn't yet commenced, the project should have option to be exempt, at the discretion of the EDCs. There will be a hearing on the 17th ([link](#)). MA seems to be the first state to be attempting something like this.

- Potential impact: smaller projects bypass the queue when they opt out of group study. Projects can get an IA ahead of the group study being completed. This proposed track is a parallel/separate lane—it is not jumping to the front of the queue.
- CT EDCs comment that CT has not implemented a group study process. But there is an exemption clause for projects meeting certain criteria and for projects <1 MW that do not export, which is similar to MA’s approach, but also in some ways different. EDCs suggest looking at the MA group study dockets; final order issued few months ago.

Discussion

Aligning Proposals 2 and 3

- General agreement that these can be aligned into a single solution (with one or multiple tracks)

Defining system tracks

- Intent was to address small commercial projects that would not need studies by putting them on a parallel path to get an IA more quickly.
- Looking to qualify certain subsets of projects that could move through the upfront part of the process in a more efficient manner. (Note that UI doesn’t consider a site to be non-export unless there’s a control mechanism in place to ensure non-export.)
- CONSSA members suggest using MA approach
- Joe Debs, Eversource: Proposes considering pathways based on different criteria such as size. Joe offers to reach out to MA coworkers to see what’s going on.
 - Brett Jacobson is co-chair with Kate Tohme (New Leaf); Tim Snyder participates as advisory member
- MA has been tackling defining export capacity as part of this effort
- Next steps:
 - Invite MA IIRG to come talk to IX WG
 - CT IX WG subgroup forms to meet over the next month with the MA IIRG participants to do some research and bring straw proposal to the full WG
 - Subgroup will consist of EDCs, Mike Trahan, James Schwartz, Joe Debs, Cornelius from UI, Kayte Morales. Val will see if Kate Tohme (New Leaf), who participates in MA IIRG, would like to participate.
 - GPI will convene the subgroup and facilitate discussion

- Subgroup will present suggestions/proposed tracks at full WG meeting on July 10th

Next Steps

- At the next full WG meeting on June 24th, we'll tackle Proposals 14 and 25.