

Dear Energy and Technology Committee member,

I am writing to voice my support for three bills: SB 882, SB 952, and HB 6523 in hopes of an affordable and healthy future.

SB 882 codifies into statute the goal of a zero-carbon electric supply for Connecticut by 2040, as set out in Gov. Lamont's Executive Order No. 3. This allows DEEP to procure up to 300,000 MWh of electricity from demand response and energy efficiency measures to save ratepayers money and provide stability and reliability to the electric grid in all hours of the day as we increase the deployment of intermittent resources such as wind and solar; and requires the disclosure of residential energy performance to renters and buyers.

While I support codifying the Governor's 100% by 2040 zero-carbon target within the Global Warming Solutions Act, the GWSA must also be strengthened to ensure accountability and enforceability. As our critical environmental and clean energy goals become ever more important, we must ensure that the statutory and regulatory framework has sufficient "teeth" to ensure success. Accordingly, I recommend amending the bill to include specific language that requires state agency compliance with the GWSA and that provides for citizen enforcement of the GWSA pursuant to the Connecticut Environmental Protection act.

SB 952 creates solar energy storage goals, increases the virtual net metering cap, and permits ownership of solar generation facilities by electric distribution companies, up to a maximum of 150 MW. In addition, SB 952 directs DEEP and PURA to investigate solar energy development programs, as well as holds municipal utilities accountable to reporting their progress in reducing carbon emissions. This is key to protecting public health and improving energy efficiency.

On increasing the net metering cap, HB 6523 serves a similar purpose through extension of credits to manufacturers in distressed municipalities. Both HB 6523 and SB 952 increase the virtual net metering cap to \$30 million, however, would dedicate the additional funds to slightly different priorities - manufacturers in distressed municipalities (HB 6523) or municipalities in an alliance school district (SB 952).

I recommend that the additional funding not be restricted. If funding is restricted, I would recommend making it available to all eligible entities within the current program and prioritizing those projects that are located in either an Environmental Justice Community or are a municipality within an Alliance School District provided that schools within such Alliance School District are designated as beneficial accounts.

Together these bills will help ensure a healthy climate, affordable energy rates, and clean energy future for us all.

Sincerely,

Ms Alanna Fagan

73 Housatonic Dr Milford, CT 06460-5033 alaleo@snet.net