

Good morning Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

My name is Jason Nisly and I am representing our company, King Solar, who is a member of the Climate and Energy Business Council. We are a solar retailer located in Reno County.

Our industry group has worked diligently alongside Jessica for the past two years, spending hours and hours in negotiations. We're proud to bring to you all the bill you have before you.

There is a lot of nuance to the language of this bill, but the main goals are to:

- Create a baseline of consistency across all utilities in the state
- Give our industry certainty in how distributed generation will be handled moving forward
- Provide clarity in what has proven to be by and large an ambiguous set of expectations outlined in existing legislation

Approximately 15 years ago when our company, King Solar, transitioned into the solar electric market, our industry was in its infancy. We've now had over 10 years to prove that this distributed energy technology can be implemented safely and without catastrophic effects to our shared utility infrastructure. It's time for our legislation to catch up to where we are today.

For example, our existing legislation neither allows nor prohibits energy storage batteries, which continue to offer robust options for energy management and resiliency to Kansas homes and businesses. The proposed legislation sets the utility billing meter as the point of delineation between a distributed energy system and the grid. This in turn gives homeowners and businesses the freedom and flexibility to generate, store, and manage their energy use while offering robust protections to the utility as to how those systems interact with or "export" energy to the grid.

I would like to share a few items that we're proud of in this legislation.

- Disclosures (protecting residential customers from bad actors)
 - Our service team has repaired multiple inoperable systems where the original sales company or installer would not return their calls or emails, leaving them with a loan payment and a non-functional system.
- Defining export capacity as AC or alternating current, which is important because the current legislation simply requires an "appropriate size" but does not establish how that size is effectively implemented or how it affects real-world performance.
 - We had a customer install a smaller portion of a system that they could afford at the time. When they wanted to add panels in the future it was unclear to us and the utility whether that was allowable.
- Clarifying how an existing system can be repaired without triggering lengthy re-application paperwork and fees
 - Allows for "repowering" an older system so long as the inverter output export capacity remains the same.

Here are a couple of examples where we compromised in this bill for mutual benefit:

- Providing the “right to repair” an existing system in exchange for offering the utilities a “right to disconnect” a system should there be questions of foul play or a customer who intentionally skirts the rules.
- Offering a clear definition of “appropriately sized” in exchange for lowering the value of energy from 150% of avoided cost to 100%.

We’ve had a customer who did not like the “appropriate size” given by the utility, so they called in a favor and got a larger size approved. The inconsistency in this situation is something that this bill seeks to address.

While this legislation doesn't give us everything we want - as is expected of a compromise - it does provide the stability Kansas needs and we ask you to vote in support of the legislation presented to you today.

I'm happy to stand for questions at the appropriate time.