

WEC is a great organisation with dedicated staff and capable board leadership. WEC is one of many entities that push power onto the grid, and receive power from it. WEC's subsidiary, CCEC (Coventry Clean Energy Corporation) produces $\approx 70\%$ of WEC members' electricity; the rest is purchased from other renewable sources. WEC is proud of being "100 percent renewable," a hard-earned achievement, resulting from excellent leadership. However, there seems to be a lack of interest in moving WEC's climate action needle further. You might ask, if WEC is already 100 percent renewable, what else can be done?

Not an island unto itself, WEC is connected to the ISO-NE grid. ISO-NE's "resource mix" varies, but at the moment I checked for this writing: 43% was natural gas, 21% nuclear, 5% hydro, 2% coal, 19% net imports, and 10% "renewables." Ergo, WEC members may be purchasing power that is 100% renewable, but the energy WEC members received at that moment was only 10% renewable, because that's the way the grid works.

What can WEC do about that? Not much. WEC's grid load represents about 0.1% of ISO-NE's total, i.e., a "drop in a bucket." However, WEC often "punches above its weight," when it comes to influencing energy policy.

One way to make more of the grid's energy renewable is to build more renewable generation. Another way is to remove load. Any utility customer who generates most or all of his own power is reducing demand on the grid. With 1,200 miles of distribution line serving nearly 3000 square miles of service area in 41 towns, and more intense weather systems constantly threatening WEC's infrastructure, WEC seems an ideal laboratory in which to experiment with shifting a portion of its membership to generating power at the point of use.

One method is already quite popular: Net Metering. Unfortunately, while netting one's consumption and generation, paying only for the difference, is a great incentive, someone needs to pay for the utility's infrastructure fixed costs, now increasingly born by everyone who does not net meter - not a fair or sustainable situation. This is to say nothing

of the lop-sided night time and winter demands net metering places on the utility.

So why do I continue to support net metering? In its current form, I do not. The legislature needs to identify other funding sources to incentivise it, and these incentives need to be sunsetted after a solar array has been fully amortised. There is no reason folks using infrastructure should get a free ride on it in perpetuity. Second, there needs to be a storage requirement to prevent wild oscillations in load to the utility.

At present, per KWH, “home grown” electricity (with storage) costs roughly double WEC’s retail price. This means generating your own power at home is a luxury. I would like to see incentives that make power generated at home justifiable and affordable to all members - not only those with reserves of disposable income.

WEC policy appears to be aimed at discouraging further development of net metering, as opposed to modifying it, and as far as I can tell, apart from quietly assenting it is a member’s right, WEC is silent on any other form of home power generation. I would like to see a policy shift toward one that encourages development of “home-grown” electricity, and I’d like to see WEC publicly advocate for that more strongly.

I have been honoured for the opportunity to serve WEC, and with your vote, will continue to advocate sound environmental policy. Thank you for your support.