

S.B. 9 2018 Written Testimony
From Bernard Pelletier, 21 Northcliff Drive, West Hartford CT 06117

Dear Legislators,

I am writing AGAINST SB 9 as now configured. While there are some areas that I would support – the radical and retrograde treatment of Net Metering is so offensive that I would oppose the bill in its entirety if this does not change.

Net Metering has been a successful means of increasing residential solar here in Connecticut and generally around the United States. While it results in lower transmission and distribution revenue to the utilities it also provides concomitant benefits to the utility and the rate paying public:

- Reduced peak demand – which lowers cost for everyone
- Reduced use of fossil fuel with attendant health benefits
- Progress towards lowering greenhouse gas emissions
- Support for the local solar and energy efficiency industries

As I read Section 4 I note:

- It would not allow solar customers to consume their own solar power
- That restriction on consumption precludes the widespread adoption of energy storage
- The effect of the impacts above is to paralyze our electrical grid in its current antiquated central power mode thereby foregoing local resiliency and local economic benefits
- Substantial investment in new metering would add insult to injury – by increasing cost to prevent solar adoption
- The solar industry generally – would be radically scaled back
- The new tariff structure envisioned in lieu of net metering is not specified in any understandable fashion – so- we are passing a law with the key element – the tariff for solar – being unspecified. This is reckless and potentially malicious.
- The proposal is a RADICAL – RETROGRADE – and DESTRUCTIVE proposal that ignores common sense and more incremental steps:
 - Before any step such as the current proposal were to be made a VALUE OF SOLAR study must occur.
 - A forward-looking adjustment to the rate at which solar in excess of that being consumed in a given day could be devised.
 - Smart reforms to net metering are possible – that maintain customer rights and benefits and improve grid financial and electrical stability.

In closing – I am shocked at how awful this new proposal is – and disappointed that my legislators drafted such a bill. On the heels of the raids on RGGI funds, the Green Bank, and Energy Efficiency funds this makes me wonder about the motivation of these bills. The impacts of climate change are ever more apparent – and this proposal would impair the power of individuals to invest their own money – on their own home – to reduce environmental degradation. We can – and we must do better. Up until now I have taken pride in not being a single-issue voter – but – this issue is so egregious – that it would amount to a permanent stain on the record of anyone voting for it.

With hopeful expectation of better legislation,


Bernard Pelletier