**Chair Lively, Vice Chairs Levy and Gamba, members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of HB4080.**

**This bill is about affordability. It offers a way to let individual Oregonian families make their own direct investments towards meeting our HB2021 targets without any fiscal impact to the state or placing additional strain on the grid. With this bill, families can opt in to saving 10 to 20% on their electricity bills, which is a not insignificant amount.**

**Allow me to address some of the points made in opposition to this bill.**

**The European empirical record.** Germany has over 4 million of these systems installed. The Netherlands, Austria, and other EU states have similar programs. The catastrophic failure scenarios described in this testimony - breaker masking fires, GFCI-disabling backfeed, mass electrocution - should be empirically observable at scale if they're real risks. Where are the bodies? The opposition needs to explain why millions of European installations haven't produced the harms they predict, or concede the risks are manageable.

**The licensed contractor exclusion paradox cuts both ways.** They argue the bill ensures unlicensed installation. But flip it: if plugging a cord into a receptacle requires a licensed electrician, you've effectively made solar access contingent on the ability to pay for professional installation, which is the exact equity barrier the bill addresses. What *other* 1,200W plug-in devices require licensed electrician involvement - space heaters, window AC units, multiple kitchen appliances on one circuit. The answer is none.

**The "unknown wiring in old buildings" argument proves too much.** The point about 100-year-old wiring is real, but it's an argument against *all high-draw plug-in devices in old buildings*, not specifically against plug-in solar. If the concern is that old branch circuits can't handle the load, that's an existing code enforcement problem that the legislature could address separately (inspection programs, retrofit mandates). Using it to block one specific technology is *ad hoc*.

**The egress/balcony obstruction argument applies to everything else already on balconies.** Grills, furniture, storage, bicycles, potted plants - none of these require legislative authorization and all of them obstruct egress and firefighter access. A 25-pound solar panel is not categorically different from a 40-pound Weber grill. Fire codes already regulate balcony obstruction and egress clearance.

**Anti-islanding technology is not speculative, but mature and field-proven.** The opposition consistently treats microinverter anti-islanding as an untested hope. In reality, anti-islanding has been a mandatory feature of grid-tied inverters under IEEE 1547 for over two decades. The microinverters in plug-in solar devices use the same semiconductor technology.

**The interest alignment is worth naming.** The opposing organizations all have direct institutional interests in maintaining the regulatory status quo: electricians and contractors get

work from permitting and installation requirements; fire marshals retain jurisdictional authority over code adoption. This means the legislature should weigh them as interested testimony, not disinterested expert opinion. Just as a legislature would discount pharmaceutical company testimony about drug regulation, it should apply appropriate skepticism to trade organizations testifying about trade licensing requirements.

**Energy equity has a time dimension the opposition ignores.** Every year of delay is a year that renters, apartment dwellers, and low-income homeowners without rooftop access continue paying full retail electricity rates while homeowners with rooftop solar reduce theirs. The opposition acknowledges energy costs are rising and frames affordability as "problematic but not a reason" to proceed. However the *cost of delay* is borne entirely by the people least able to bear it, while the *cost of proceeding* (speculative risk mitigated by multiple safeguards) is distributed and insurable.

**The "Washington rejected it" argument is a non sequitur without knowing why.** The opposition cites Washington declining to advance a similar bill as persuasive precedent, but legislative inaction can reflect lobbying pressure, session timing, committee composition, or any number of procedural contingencies — not necessarily a considered safety judgment. Meanwhile, Utah *did* pass legislation, and multiple other states are moving forward. Cherry-picking one state's inaction while dismissing another state's action is selective use of precedent.

Please pass HB4080 for energy affordability.

Juno Suarez
Systems Engineer
February 7, 2026