STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY
TEN FRANKLIN SQUARE
NEW BRITAIN, CT 06051

DOCKET NO. 26-05-01 ANNUAL REVIEW OF AFFORDABILITY PROGRAMS AND OFFERINGS

October 21, 2026

Thomas H. Wiehl

David Arconti, Jr.

Janice A. Beecher

Holly H. Cheeseman

Everett Smith, III

DECISION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

A. SUMMARY 1
B. BACKGROUND AND CONDUCT OF THE PROCEEDING 1
C. PARTICIPANTS 3
D. PUBLIC COMMENT 3

II. ARREARAGE FORGIVENESS PROGRAM PLAN 4

A. OVERVIEW 4
B. JOINT AFP PROPOSED CHANGES 6
1. MPP Metrics 6
2. Payment Plan Removal 7
3. Service Reconnection Fee 9
4. BBP Reporting 11
5. Improvements to DSS Data Matching 12
6. Household Size Verification 13
7. LIDR Reporting 15

III. OTHER AFFORDABILITY ISSUES 16

A. MOTION NO. 3, CNG AND SCG HOT WEATHER CUSTOMER PROTOCOLS 16
1. CNG and SCG Proposal 16
2. Stakeholder Comments 18
3. Authority Analysis 19
B. MOTION NO. 6, YANKEE GAS BBP CESSATION 19
1. Yankee Gas Proposal 19
2. Stakeholder Comments 20
3. Authority Analysis 21

IV. CONCLUSION AND ORDERS 22

A. CONCLUSION 22
B. ORDERS 22

DECISION

I. INTRODUCTION

A. SUMMARY

The Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (Authority or PURA) approves the 2026-2027 Joint Arrearage Forgiveness Program Plan (Joint AFP) submitted by The Connecticut Light and Power Company and Yankee Gas Services Company, each individually d/b/a Eversource Energy (CL&P and Yankee Gas, respectively; jointly, Eversource), and The United Illuminating Company, Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation, and The Southern Connecticut Gas Company (UI, CNG, and SCG, respectively; collectively, Avangrid; together with Eversource, Companies), subject to the modifications and additions discussed herein. Additionally, the Authority makes determinations on CNG and SCG's customer service proposals for gas service disconnections during hot weather and on Yankee Gas's Below Budget Payment (BBP) program cessation proposal.

B. BACKGROUND AND CONDUCT OF THE PROCEEDING

On April 20, 2022, the Authority issued a decision in Docket No. 21-07-01, Application of The Connecticut Light and Power Company and Yankee Gas Services Company, each individually d/b/a Eversource Energy, The United Illuminating Company, Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation, and The Southern Connecticut Gas Company for Approval of Arrearage Forgiveness Program 2021–2022 (21-07-01 Decision), establishing a consolidated, comprehensive annual review proceeding to examine energy affordability matters of electric and gas utility customers in Connecticut (Annual Review).

The Annual Review process provides the Authority with an opportunity to assess the new and ongoing residential hardship and non-hardship and non-residential energy affordability programs and offerings in a single annual proceeding, including the implementation of a Low-Income Discount Rate (LIDR) for certain residential customers of Eversource and UI (jointly, electric distribution companies or EDCs) established in the Authority's October 19, 2022 Decision in Docket No. 17-12-03RE11, PURA Investigation into Distribution System Planning of the Electric Distribution Companies – New Rate Designs and Rates Review, and subsequently modified in the Authority's November 20, 2024 (17-12-03RE11 2024 Decision), and March 20, 2025 Decisions in Docket No. 17-12-03RE11.

On June 29, 2023, the governor of Connecticut signed Public Act 23-102, An Act Strengthening Protections for Connecticut's Consumers of Energy (Public Act 23-102) into law, which, *inter alia*, modified the matching payment program (MPP) in § 30 of Public Act 23-102 (Section 30). Section 30 is effective from passage. See Motion No. 22 Ruling, July 18, 2023, Docket No. 23-05-01, Annual Review of Affordability Programs and Offerings (Energy Affordability Annual Review), p. 2 ("The Companies are under a legal obligation to comply with current law."). In July 2023, the Companies informed the Authority that they could not timely implement the MPP modifications as required. See Decision, Oct. 11, 2023, Docket No. 23-05-01 (23-05-01 Decision), p. 5 (citations omitted).

Consequently, the Authority directed the Companies to make the IT changes necessary to implement the MPP modifications no later than November 1, 2024. 23-05-01 Decision, p. 5.

By Notice of Proceeding dated January 7, 2026 (Notice), the Authority established the instant docket. In the Notice, the Authority stated it would use the docket to review: (1) matters related to energy affordability offerings and programs, including, but not limited to, reasonable amortization agreements, MPP, and the residential LIDR, and the impact these offerings and programs have on uncollectible account balances; and (2) the proposed Joint AFP and associated AFP metrics. Notice, p. 1.[1]

On January 16, 2026, CNG and SCG filed a joint motion (Motion No. 3) requesting that the Authority reconsider and modify Order No. 2 of the Authority's December 6, 2018 Decision in Docket No. 18-05-16, Application of Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation to Increase its Rates and Charges, and Order No. 2 of the Authority's January 3, 2018 Decision in Docket No. 17-05-42, Application of The Southern Connecticut Gas Company to Increase its Rates and Charges.[2] Specifically, CNG and SCG request approval to revise their customer service policies by eliminating the suspension of gas service disconnections on hot weather days. Motion No. 3, p. 1. Subsequently, the Authority issued a response to Motion No. 3, stating that it required input from participants in this proceeding before it can issue a ruling. Motion No. 3 Ruling, May 14, 2026, p. 2.

On May 26, 2026, Yankee Gas filed a motion (Motion No. 6) with the Authority, requesting approval of Yankee Gas's compliance with Order No. 11 of the Authority's March 11, 2026 Decision in Docket No. 24-12-01, Application of Yankee Gas Services Company d/b/a Eversource Energy to Amend its Rate Schedules (24-12-01 Decision). Specifically, Yankee Gas requests that the Authority review and approve its proposal to cease offering the $50 BBP for gas customers when Yankee Gas's LIDR is implemented. Motion No. 6, p. 3.

On June 1, 2026, the Companies filed a joint motion (Motion No. 7) requesting that the Authority review and approve the Companies' Joint AFP.

The Authority solicited written comments on May 14, 2026, and June 24, 2026, regarding Motion No. 3, Motion No. 6, and the Companies' Joint AFP.

The Authority issued interrogatories on May 14, June 15, June 30, and August 10, 2026.

---

[1] The Authority subsequently issued a Revised Notice of Proceeding notifying the Companies that the Authority is extending the period for review and modification or approval of the Companies' Joint AFP by up to 30 days. See Revised Notice of Proceeding, June 4, 2026, p. 1; General Statutes § 16-262c(b)(4)(E).

[2] CNG and SCG cross-posted the filing in Docket Nos. 18-05-16 and 17-05-42 as Motion Nos. 55 and 59, respectively. The Authority subsequently posted the filing in Docket No. 26-05-01 as Motion No. 3. For the purposes of this decision, the Authority refers to the filing as Motion No. 3.

The Authority held a noticed technical meeting on August 6, 2026, via teleconference, to discuss the Companies' Joint AFP and proposals provided in Motion No. 3 and Motion No. 6, and any other energy affordability items.

On August 7, 2026, the Authority issued a Notice of Briefs, inviting participants to submit briefs summarizing their respect positions on the various topics discussed in the proceeding. Avangrid, Eversource, the Office of Consumer Counsel (OCC), PURA's Office of Education, Outreach, and Enforcement (EOE), and Connecticut Veterans Legal Center (CVLC) each filed briefs.[3]

The Authority determined that a proposed final decision was not required or necessary in this proceeding, accordingly no proposed final decision was issued.

C. PARTICIPANTS

The Authority recognized the following as participants to the proceeding: CL&P, P.O. Box 270, Hartford, CT 06141-0270; Yankee Gas, P.O. Box 270, Hartford, CT, 06141-0270; UI, 180 Marsh Hill Road, Orange, CT 06477; CNG, 180 Marsh Hill Road, Orange, CT 06477; SCG, 180 Marsh Hill Road, Orange, CT 06477; OCC, Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051; the Commissioner of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP), 79 Elm Street, Hartford, CT 06106; EOE, Ten Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051; CCA, 65 Elizabeth Street, Hartford, CT 06105; Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers, 540 Broadway, P.O. Box 22222, Albany, NY 12201-2222; Connecticut Local Administrators of Social Services, 14 Park Place, Vernon, CT 06066; Connecticut Veterans Legal Center (CVLC), 114 Boston Post Road, Ground Floor, West Haven, CT 06516; EnergyCom Network, Inc. d/b/a Exceleron, 8144 Walnut Hill Lane, Suite 907, Dallas, TX 75231; Nonprofit Accountability Group (NAG), 12 Chatterton Woods, Hamden, CT 06514; and Generation Power, 75 Charter Oak Avenue, Suite 2-240, Hartford, CT 06106.

D. PUBLIC COMMENT

The Authority received correspondence from residents Linda DiBella, Ashley Jamison, and Andrew Messore (collectively, Residents), and from Disability Rights Connecticut (DRCT). Residents expressed concern with the 12-month stay out period under the current MPP guidelines once customer completed a MPP. Linda DiBella Corresp., May 25, 2026 (DiBella Corresp.); Andrew Messore Corresp., Aug. 13, 2025 (Messore Corresp.). Residents also opined that the amounts required to be paid by customers on a payment arrangement outside of MPP are far too high and defeat the purpose of an affordability program. DiBella Corresp.; Ashley Jamison Corresp., June 13, 2026. DRCT found the Companies' proposed changes to financial hardship programs "deeply troubling", stating that the Companies' proposals "would make utility Hardship

[3] On October 13, 2026, the Companies and the Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA) filed a motion (Motion No. 15) with the Authority, requesting that PURA modify the procedural schedule to include issuance of a proposed final decision and an opportunity for participants to file written exceptions. Motion No. 15, p. 1. Subsequently, Operation Fuel, Inc. d/b/a Generation Power CT (Generation Power) filed a response to Motion No. 15 on October 14, 2026, expressing its support for the request. The Authority determines a proposed final decision is neither required nor necessary.

protections more difficult for people with disabilities to obtain and maintain while doing nothing to address affordability concerns." DRCT Corresp., August 28, 2026.

II. ARREARAGE FORGIVENESS PROGRAM PLAN

The Authority approves the Companies' Joint AFP, subject to the modifications and additions discussed herein. Accordingly, Motion No. 7 is granted with modification.

A. OVERVIEW

The Companies' Joint AFP proposed the following three goals for the 2026–2027 program year:

1. Help customers with a past due balance reduce their past due balance by offering options, including matching payment plan forgiveness for eligible customers with timely payments;
2. Help customers maintain service by offering payment options to help them resolve their past due balance and make timely payments; and
3. Provide insight into arrears and the impact of collections practices in reducing Connecticut's cost of unpaid bills which are ultimately paid for by all customers.

Joint AFP, Att. "Joint 01_The Plan" (Joint 01), p. 4.

The Companies proposed several changes to the affordability programs vis-à-vis the Joint AFP for the 2026–2027 program year. Table 1, below, summarizes the proposals in the Joint AFP.

Table 1: 2026-2027 Joint AFP Summary

Joint AFP Section	Joint AFP Topic	Proposals	Description
III and Joint AFP, Joint 09	Arrearages	Payment Plan Removal	Remove customers from payment plan after a single missed payment
		Service Reconnection Fee	Require a % payment of past due bills to reconnect service
IV	MPP	BBP Reporting	Cease reporting on BBPs since it will no longer be offered when Gas LIDR is implemented
V	Payment Plans	N/A	N/A
VI	Financial Hardship Verification	Improve Data-Matching	Implement changes to data-matching process with the Connecticut Department of Social Services (DSS) to account for address label mismatches and customers moving

Joint AFP Section	Joint AFP Topic	Proposals	Description
		Household Size Verification	Rely only on Community Action Agencies (CAAS) to perform household income and size verification
VII	Customer Communications and Outreach	N/A	N/A
VIII	Other Reporting	LIDR Reporting	Shift reporting on LIDR from the Joint AFP to the annual LIDR dockets
IX	Accounting Treatment and Expense Recovery	N/A	N/A

Joint AFP, Joint 01, pp. 5–17; Joint AFP, Att. Joint 09 Proposals to Reduce Arrears (Joint 9), pp. 5–6.

The Authority hereby approves the Joint AFP generally; however, of the seven proposals included therein, PURA approves only the proposed MPP metrics, the household size verification proposal, and the reconnection fee proposal with respect to only non-hardship customers. The Companies' affordability programs continue in a period of transition as LIDR has been implemented and modified for the EDCs, as the gas LIDR is being refined and implemented through recent local distribution company (LDC) rate amendment application decisions and the proceeding in Docket No. 26-02-06, PURA Investigation into the Implementation of a Multi-Tiered Low-Income Discount Rate for Natural Gas Companies, and as other affordability program changes take hold. As discussed further below, the Authority declines to make significant new changes in the affordability programs for the 2026–2027 program year as the recent and impending modifications are effectuated and results can be observed.

A current area of interest to PURA and stakeholders is in reducing arrearages for each of the Companies, as noted in Section II.B.1, MPP Metrics. This indicator should continue to be monitored to determine whether the policies governed under the annual affordability review are achieving desirable outcomes for all customers.

Several stakeholders provided feedback that more time and data are needed to determine if past affordability program modifications are having their intended impact. The Authority agrees and therefore avoids further program modifications for now. Moreover, several changes proposed by the Companies are nearly identical to those brought forth in previous annual affordability reviews and on which the Authority has already ruled. In response to these renewed proposals, many stakeholders note that their positions on the proposals have not wavered.

B. JOINT AFP PROPOSED CHANGES

1. MPP Metrics

a. Proposal

In 2024, the Authority directed the Companies to provide initial MPP impact metrics with a proposal for new metrics to measure "success" under the new MPP program structure. Decision, Nov. 6, 2024, Docket No. 24-05-01, Annual Review of Affordability Programs and Offerings (ENERGY AFFORDABILITY ANNUAL REVIEW) (24-05-01 Decision, pp. 37–38 (Order No. 14). Subsequently, the Companies proposed new MPP impact metrics but recommended that the Authority allow for an entire MPP program year to complete prior to establishing MPP success metrics. See Decision, Oct. 22, 2025, Docket No. 25-05-01, Annual Review of Affordability Programs and Offerings (Energy Affordability Annual Review) (25-05-01 Decision), p. 5. Consequently, the Companies requested that "the Authority review success metrics in the next energy affordability annual review proceeding, i.e., Docket No. 26-05-01." Id. However, the Companies did not propose any additional metrics to measure "success" in MPP in the Joint AFP. See Joint AFP, Att. Joint 05, p. 3.

In response to Authority discovery requests, the Companies proposed adopting two metrics as MPP success goals. Eversource Interrog. Resp. CAE-12, pp. 1–2; Avangrid Interrog. Resp. CAE-12, p. 1. Specifically, both Companies proposed adopting one existing MPP metric and creating a new metric to help measure MPP success: (1) MPP customer successful completion rates; and (2) overall reduction of arrears in MPP. Id.

The Companies' first proposed MPP metric provides data on the total number and percentage of customers who completely eliminate their individual arrears by successfully completing the program. Eversource Interrog. Resp. CAE-12, p. 1; Avangrid Interrog. Resp. CAE-12, p. 1. The second metric, which the Companies propose adopting for future evaluation, would "measure the overall reduction of arrearages for all customers enrolled in MPP, expressed as a percentage of the total arrearage enrolled in MPP." Id. For the 2024–2025 MPP program year, Eversource reported that arrears were reduced through the program by 17% and 13% for CL&P and Yankee Gas, respectively. Eversource Interrog. Resp. CAE-57. Avangrid reported that arrears were reduced through the program by 24%, 29% and 11% for CNG, SCG, and UI, respectively. Avangrid Interrog. Resp. CAE-57. For all five companies, this equates to about $62.7 million in arrears reduction during the 2024–2025 MPP program year. Id.

b. Stakeholder Comments

EOE did not support or oppose any proposed MPP metrics but stated that it is still too early in MPP to make any reliable, evidence-based conclusions about the program's success. EOE Written Comments, July 22, 2026 (EOE July Comments), p. 2.

Generation Power states that additional metrics for MPP are unnecessary at this time. Generation Power Written Comments, July 22, 2026 (Generation Power July

Comments), p. 2. However, Generation Power expressed concern in the data provided by the Companies, stating MPP completion rates were far below the 65% success rate goal. Id. Generation Power opined that the proposals provided by the Companies in the Joint AFP were not designed to improve those success rates. Id.

c. Authority Analysis

The proposed MPP metrics provide important reference points for the overall direction of the program by focusing on both the individual participating customer impact of successful completion, and the overall ratepayer impact of arrearages. Both perspectives are valuable when tracking MPP performance and can provide a starting point for further investigation to understand the trends and program design behind these high-level metrics. Stakeholders did not oppose any of the proposed metrics and believe that additional metrics would be unnecessary at this juncture. The Authority finds the data showing a consistent reduction in arrearages across all companies is encouraging and should be the goal of all involved for that trend to continue. Accordingly, the Authority directs the Companies to add to their list of reporting metrics: (1) a metric that collects the total number and percentage of customers who completely eliminate their individual arrears by successfully completing the MPP; and (2) a metric that collects the overall reduction of arrearages for all customers enrolled in MPP, expressed as a percentage of the total arrearage enrolled in MPP. The Companies shall begin tracking the two new MPP success metrics no later than November 1, 2026.

2. Payment Plan Removal

a. Proposal

The Companies propose that the requirement for removing customers, in all customer segments (i.e., residential and non-residential), enrolled in a payment plan be reduced from two missed payments down to a single missed payment. Joint AFP, Att. Joint 09, p. 5. The Companies explain:

> While a customer is enrolled in a payment plan their service is protected. Customers are currently required to remain protected by a payment plan unless they miss two consecutive monthly required payments. Instead, the Companies propose that when a customer misses one payment, they should be removed from the payment plan.

Id.

Eversource reports that approximately 62,000 customers missed one or both of their first two required monthly payments after enrolling in a payment plan. Id. Of those customers who missed payments, 79% (i.e., 49,000 customers) made one payment while 21% (i.e., 13,000 customers) made zero payments. Id.

Avangrid reports that approximately 12,000 customers missed one or both of their first two required monthly payments after enrolling in a payment plan. Joint AFP, Joint 9,

p. 5. Of those customers who missed payments, 91.7% (i.e., 11,000 customers) made one payment while 6.7% (i.e., 800 customers) made zero payments.[4] Id.

b. Stakeholder Comments

EOE noted that the Authority denied a similar proposal in the 25-05-01 Decision and stated that EOE's concerns about the proposal have not changed. EOE July Comments, p. 5. Specifically, EOE has concerns about the lack of a grace period for late payments, as well as the idea that if an eligible customer is auto enrolled in MPP during the winter moratorium and never makes a payment, that customer would only be required to make up one missed payment to re-enroll in May. Id.

Generation Power stated that removing customers from their payment plan harms all utility ratepayers by increasing a customer's monthly charges, thereby increasing their arrearages, adding to the total that a customer would be required to pay back to avoid service termination. Generation Power July Comments, p. 7. To even consider this change, Generation Power believes that the Companies should show how this proposal would improve affordability for a customer or for the entire rate class, which has not been demonstrated in this proposal. Id.

OCC argued that no changes should be made to MPP at this time, stating that recent changes to MPP and LIDR would benefit from some level of sustained consistency to allow participants to properly evaluate the effects of those changes. OCC Written Comments, July 22, 2026 (OCC July Comments), p. 7. OCC opined that a flexible payment arrangement (FPA) is essentially an 18-month interest free loan since an FPA requires a customer pays 1/18th of the customer's arrearage each month. Id. As such, OCC states that it may be reasonable to remove a non-hardship or non-residential customer from the FPA when the customer misses a payment. Id.

CCA and CVLC oppose the Companies' missed payment proposal, contending that customers who experience an extreme hardship (e.g., illness, loss of employment, or personal or household emergencies) in one month should not automatically lose their payment plan. CCA & CVLC Written Comments, July 22, 2026 (CCA & CVLC July Comments), p. 4.

c. Authority Analysis

The Companies' rationale for the proposal is unsupported by evidence showing that changing from two missed payments to one missed payment would improve program outcomes. Similarly, however, the proposition that the single missed payment threshold would necessarily produce net negative program outcomes, a concern raised by some stakeholders, is also unsupported. Without further evidence and analysis, and in light of the OCC's assertion that further adjustments to the MPP will further delay any data-driven analysis of the effectiveness of the program, the Authority is not inclined to change the current missed payment standard. Therefore, the Authority denies the proposal to reduce the requirement for removal from a payment plan down to a single missed payment.

[4] The Authority identified a minor discrepancy of 200 customers in Avangrid's reporting (i.e., 12,000 – 11,000 – 800 = 200).

However, the Authority invites all stakeholders to offer evidence and analysis to support their positions on this issue in next year's annual review (i.e., Docket No. 27-05-01) with consideration of both participant and program impacts.

3. Service Reconnection Fee

a. Proposal

After a customer has been disconnected for non-payment, the Companies' policy currently requires the lower of 50% of the arrearage due or $1,000 for non-financial hardship customers, and the lower of 20% of the arrearage due or $400 for financial hardship customers. Joint AFP, Joint 09, p. 6. The Companies propose eliminating the "lower of" option and retain simply the 50/20% requirement for all customers." Id. The Companies explain that the "lower of" flat minimum payment option allows customers with large balances to reconnect while significant past due balances remain without a path to resolution. Id.

b. Stakeholder Comments

EOE argued that the $1,000 and $400 caps were included by the Authority as an affordability measure. EOE July Comments, p. 5. EOE contended that more information, including an evaluation of other state practices, is required before such a change is made. Id.

Generation Power argued the proposal does not account for the customer's ability to pay the proposed higher amounts. Generation Power July Comments, p. 7. Generation Power approved 439 emergency energy assistance applications for households with incomes between 60–75% State Median Income in Fiscal Year 2026. Id. Generation Power stated that these customers do not qualify for financial hardship protections and therefore would be at risk of shutoff and required to pay an unmanageable debt for most limited-income residents under the Companies' proposal. Id.

OCC expressed concern over the proposed increased costs to reconnect service, noting that customers who are unable to afford monthly payments cannot afford to pay a percentage of their past due balance and therefore may take steps, such as putting service in another individual's name, in order to reconnect their utility service. OCC July Comments, pp. 7–8. OCC recommended that the goal of the reconnection fee should be that customers must pay a higher amount, on average, to reconnect utility service than it would be to restart that customer's respective payment arrangement. Id. p. 8.

CCA and CVLC argued that the proposed reconnection fee is unaffordable and would represent an insurmountable payment challenge for many customers. CCA & CVLC July Comments, p. 4. CCA and CVLC expressed great concern that the proposed changes could return Connecticut to a time when customers live for many months of a year without service because they simply cannot afford to have their service reinstated. Id. CCA and CVLC stated that even the $400 reconnection fee is unaffordable for many of their clients, though some are able to make that payment through a combination of personal savings and donations from charitable organizations. Id. As such, requiring a

customer to pay 20% of an arrearage as the only option for reconnection would likely be unattainable and cause many to simply live without service. Id.

c. Authority Analysis

The Authority accepts the EDCs' proposal to apply the 50% of arrearage standard only to customers who do not qualify for financial hardship or medical protection status. The Authority understands and respects the stakeholder view that non-hardship customers struggle to afford utility bills and already face substantial barriers to reconnection, but the Authority must balance these real concerns against the increasing pressure on utility bills imposed by the cost of uncollectible debt; the availability of flexible payment arrangements to assist customers with managing outstanding balances; and the data presented by the EDCs demonstrating that 2025 reconnection fee activity allowed customers to continue to receive service after termination despite maintaining substantial unpaid account balances.

Specifically, the current "lesser of" standard allowed Eversource and Avangrid customers to reconnect despite an average of 89% and 91% of their outstanding balances remaining unpaid, respectively. Joint 09, p. 6. The Authority notes that prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, non-hardship customers were required to pay 100% of their outstanding balance in order to reconnect. Id., p. 4. The Companies' proposal to apply a 50% of balance standard to non-hardship customers appropriately balances the Authority's concerns while maintaining a policy that remains twice as flexible as the standard in place prior to the pandemic.

However, the Authority does not accept the Companies' proposal to remove the "lesser of" option for financial hardship and medical protection customers. The Authority concurs with the concerns of stakeholders and specifically notes a particular comment provided by CCA and CVLC:

> Given the low-income customer total household income, the proposed adjustments to payment plan parameters are unaffordable. When customers are struggling to pay their bills and are at the point of shut off, requesting 20% of the total arrears presents an insurmountable challenge. It is of great concern that the proposed changes could return . . . the State to a time when customers live for many months of a year without service because they simply cannot afford to have their service reinstated.

CCA & CVLC July Comments, p. 4.

The arrearages of financial hardship and medical protection customers also ultimately impose costs upon all ratepayers. However, the Authority is concerned that accepting the Companies' proposal for financial hardship and medical protection customers may leave many customers with no feasible option to continue to receive service, which would impose health and safety risks.

4. BBP Reporting

a. Proposal

The Companies proposed that Yankee Gas, CNG, and SCG cease reporting on their BBP offerings, as required by Order No. 22 of the Authority's October 12, 2022 Decision in Docket No. 22-05-01, 2022 Energy Affordability Annual Review (22-05-01 Decision), effective November 1, 2026, because Yankee Gas, CNG, and SCG will no longer offer BBPs to gas customers upon implementation of the gas LIDR.[5] Joint AFP, p. 10; 25-05-01 Decision, p. 15; Motion No. 6, May 26, 2026, pp. 1–2.[6] The Companies additionally proposed that Yankee Gas, CNG, and SCG cease reporting on Orders Nos. 1 and 3 of the Authority's September 30, 2020 Decision in Docket No. 20-07-04, Application of The Connecticut Light and Power Company and Yankee Gas Services Company, each individually d/b/a Eversource Energy, The United Illuminating Company, Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation, and The Southern Connecticut Gas Company for Approval of Arrearage Forgiveness Program 2020-2021 (20-07-04 Decision), as modified by the April 23, 2025 Interim Decision in Docket No. 25-05-01 (25-05-01 Interim Decision), related to the processing of Below Budget Worksheets. Joint AFP, p. 10.

b. Stakeholder Comments

EOE supported the Companies' proposal to cease reporting BBP metrics as all the Companies have already, or will soon have, cease offering this program. EOE July Comments, p. 2.

Generation Power agrees that once there are no longer any customers enrolled in BBP, reporting on its metrics will no longer be useful. Generation Power July Comments, p. 4. However, given that customers are still enrolled in BBP, that reporting on it should continue until it ceases to be utilized. Id.

OCC finds no value in a compliance filing with no data and therefore agrees that when the Companies cease offering BBP, the Companies should be allowed to cease reporting on BBP. OCC July Comments, p. 4.

CCA and CVLC do not believe that the Companies should be allowed to cease reporting on BBP metrics, as it will be important to compare monthly payments obligations under BBP and LIDR, including payment amounts and success rates of the two programs. CCA & CVLC July Comments, p. 3.

---

[5] CNG and SCG implemented LIDR in August 2026. Tech Mt'g Tr., Aug. 6, 2026, 32:10–11. Yankee Gas will not implement LIDR until mid-January 2027 at the earliest. Eversource Brief, Aug. 28, 2026 (Eversource Brief), p. 3.

[6] The Authority approved CNG and SCG's proposal to cease offering the BBP to eligible customers when they each implemented LIDR and ordered CNG and SCG to cease offering BBP no later than November 1, 2026. 25-05-01 Decision, pp. 15, 39. The Authority directed Yankee Gas to submit a proposal to cease offering the BBP once LIDR is implemented. 24-12-01 Decision, pp. 205–206, 223 (Order 11).

c. Authority Analysis

The Authority concurs that BBP reporting will be unnecessary once no customers remain on BBP. However, customers do remain on BBP to this day and so it is premature to cease reporting on BBP metrics. Accordingly, the Authority denies the Companies' proposal to cease BBP reporting; therefore, the Companies are required to continue reporting in the annual affordability review dockets, as required by Order No. 22 of the 25-05-01 Decision and Order Nos. 1 and 3 of the 20-07-04 Decision, as modified by the 25-05-01 Interim Decision.

5. Improvements to DSS Data Matching

a. Proposal

The Companies signed an opt-out customer data sharing agreement with DSS in January 2024. Motion No. 85 Ruling, Apr. 8, 2024, Docket No. 17-12-03RE11, pp. 2, 4. In accordance with this agreement, the Companies send DSS a data file every month that consists of all active residential accounts. 24-05-01 Decision, p. 12. DSS then analyzes whether the customers currently receive public assistance and indicates to the Companies whether each account is eligible for financial hardship, and for EDC customers, whether the customers are eligible for the various LIDR tiers. Id., pp. 12–13; 17-12-03RE11 2024 Decision, p. 23.

The Authority directed the Companies to submit a proposal in the 2026–2027 AFP to address mismatches with the DSS data-sharing. 25-05-01 Decision, p. 39 (Order No. 12). In response, the Companies provided two potential solutions. First, Eversource, with DSS, identified customer scenarios in which DSS had a street address prefix which was not included in the utility customer's address (i.e., "10 Main St" vs "10. E. Main St") that resulted in mismatches between the two systems. Joint AFP, Joint 01, pp. 11–12. Eversource proposed a test for June 2026 to include prefixes for all street addresses provided to DSS. Id. Eversource states that in the test sample, the street address matching rate decreased when including the prefixes. Id., p. 12. Based on a sample review of accounts on the DSS file with address mismatches for Avangrid, Avangrid determined that the most common discrepancies were attributable to the differences in address formatting. Id. Specifically, cases where records listed an address as Street instead of St. or Place instead of Pl., or where some records included an apartment number following the street name. Joint AFP, Joint 01, p. 12.

Second, the Companies worked on scenarios where addresses for a benefit recipient between DSS and the utility do not match, possibly because the benefit recipient has moved. Id. The Companies continue to work with DSS to understand how public benefit recipient addresses are updated when they move and the impact this would have on the overall data-matching. Id. Recommendations from DSS include a data-matching process modification to indicate when a utility customer is identified as a public benefit recipient, absent an address match, by instead matching the last five digits of a social security number, matching the last name, and matching the first name. Id.

The Companies indicated that while these potential solutions may be viable, the number of additional customers that may be identified through the proposed matching improvements is unknown and additional time is needed for DSS to analyze the data. Eversource Interrog. Resp. OCC-17; Avangrid Interrog. Resp. OCC-17.

b. Stakeholder Comments

EOE stated that more information, including how many customers will be added or excluded as a result of these changes, would likely be beneficial before making a determination whether these changes should be implemented. EOE July Comments, p. 3. EOE suggested that the Companies be directed to file this proposal as a motion so that it might be resolved prior to next year's annual review. Id. OCC echoed EOE's comments, expressing concern over the potential number of customers that might be added after implementing these changes and similarly considered filing this proposal as a motion to avoid any unnecessary delays. OCC July Comments, pp. 4–5.

c. Authority Analysis

The Companies and stakeholders recognize that while these solutions may improve the DSS data matching process, the size of the impact is still unknown. The Authority appreciates the efforts the Companies have taken in working with DSS to improve the data-matching process but finds it premature to implement until the effects of the proposed changes can be understood. Therefore, the Authority denies the proposed data matching changes, but directs the Companies to each submit by June 1, 2027, an updated proposal, with an impact study, as part of the 2027–2028 Joint Arrearage Forgiveness Plan (2027–2028 Joint AFP).

6. Household Size Verification

a. Proposal

The Companies proposed to have the CAAs perform all eligibility verification that requires proof of household size and income. Joint AFP, Joint 01, pp. 13–15. The Companies would, however, continue accepting proof of other qualifying benefits as eligibility for financial hardship designation and LIDR. Id. p. 15.

Pursuant to Order No. 12(c) of the 25-05-01 Decision, and again in Interrogatory CAE-9, the Authority requested a comparison of the Companies' process for identifying customers eligibility for financial hardship designation, specifically household size verification, with the processes of other jurisdictions and other entities in Connecticut.

Eversource stated that in all three of its jurisdictions (i.e., Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts), CAAs perform household size and income verification. Eversource Interrog. Resp. CAE-9. Eversource also noted that Connecticut's state data-matching was designed after its Massachusetts affiliate. Id. However, its New Hampshire affiliate "does not support (and has intentionally decided not to pursue) automated state data-matching with utilities to identify and verify low-income customers who are benefits program recipients." Id. Similarly, Eversource's Massachusetts affiliate offers self-attestation to provide temporary service protection during the winter protection period and

temporary and reversible 60-day LIDR, pending proof of income eligibility. Id. Eversource's New Hampshire affiliate does not provide the same self-attestation opportunities. Id.

Avangrid stated that its gas affiliates (i.e., Central Maine Power and Berkshire Gas Company) do not verify household income or size and instead rely on CAAs and other third parties for verification. Avangrid Interrog. Resp. CAE-9. Conversely, its electric affiliates (i.e., Rochester Gas and Electric and New York State Electric and Gas) accept verbal income verification from a customer to determine the customer's inability to pay and qualify for a minimum payment agreement and medical emergency renewals. Id.

Additionally, the Companies contacted more than 10 utility companies across New Hampshire, Maryland, New York, and Pennsylvania and none of the companies have a way to verify household size. Joint AFP, Joint 01, p. 14.

In calendar years 2024 and 2025, Eversource's annual costs to conduct financial hardship income verification in Connecticut were $546,348 and $565,615, respectively. Eversource Interrog. Resp. CAE-8. Avangrid provided similar costs, which totaled $524,486 and $633,830 for calendar years 2024 and 2025, respectively. Avangrid Interrog. Resp. CAE-8.

b. Stakeholder Comments

EOE stated that it is not an opportune time to make any changes to the household verification process. EOE July Comments, p. 3. While EOE understands the Companies' desire to transfer responsibility of household verification to CAAs, as the Companies are not social service organizations, EOE remains concerned that CAAs will be overwhelmed by the number of customers in need of income verification, which will result in a greater risk of under inclusion. Id.

Generation Power opposed this proposal for similar reasons to EOE, noting that while this proposal may save time and money for the Companies, shifting that responsibility entirely on to non-profit organizations will result in delays that will increase customer costs and customer risk of losing service. Generation Power July Comments, p. 4.

OCC is hesitant to take steps, such as this proposed change, that may hinder customers' ability to receive assistance. OCC July Comments, p. 6. While OCC recognized that having the Companies continue providing household verification presents a risk of over-inclusion, something taken very seriously as that benefit is paid for by all ratepayers, the Companies have not quantified that risk. Id. At this moment when federal assistance is becoming more difficult to obtain, OCC believed the risk of under-inclusion outweighs the risk of over inclusion. Id.

CCA and CVLC do not think that CAAs should be the sole way customers verify their income and household size. CCA & CLVC July Comments, p. 4. CAAs are limited in location, staff, and appointment availability, while customers have limited time to find an appointment and may require time off of work to do so. Id., pp. 3–4. Moreover,

customers may have difficulty physically getting to a CAA location even when they do have an appointment. Id., p. 4. When a customer can simply provide the required documentation to the Companies themselves, the program should not put undue burden on customers and CAAs. Id.

c. Authority Analysis

The Authority recognizes stakeholders' considerable concerns with transferring household income and verification responsibility to CAAs only. However, the Authority also recognizes that the Companies are not qualified or ideally suited to evaluate eligibility criteria for individual customers. The Authority also finds that the money and time saved by removing the Companies from this process should ultimately benefit the customers who are currently funding the operational expenses necessary to perform this function through utility rates. Accordingly, the Authority accepts the Companies' proposal to cease their eligibility verification responsibilities. The Authority also notes that other state and local agencies and resources may be available to provide services directly or share data that could facilitate program administration and encourages the utilities and stakeholders to explore collaborative opportunities and legislative or other public policies that could improve program implementation to the benefit of all utility customers.

7. LIDR Reporting

a. Proposal

The Companies proposed that the reporting on LIDR be removed from the annual energy affordability proceedings and instead be reported in the respective LIDR dockets. Joint AFP, Joint 01, p. 16. Specifically, the Companies propose the following modifications:

- Docket 17-12-03RE11, October 2022 Decision at pages 38-40. Stating at page 40, "Notwithstanding the biennial LIDR review, the EDCs shall report at least annually on or before June 15 on the items enumerated above in the current year's energy affordability proceeding"
    - The Companies propose the following modified language "Notwithstanding the biennial LIDR review, the EDCs shall report at least annually on or before June 15 on the items enumerated above in **Docket 17-12-03RE11** ~~the current year's energy affordability proceeding~~"
- Docket 17-12-03RE11, November 2024 Decision at Order No. 12.
    - The Companies propose the following modified language "No later than June 15, 2025, and annually thereafter, the EDCs shall submit in Docket No. 17-12- 03RE11 ~~and in the current year's applicable energy affordability review proceeding, i.e., Docket No. XX-05-01, as part of each EDC's annual LIDR reporting~~…"

Id.

b. Stakeholder Comments

EOE agreed that all decisions relating to LIDR should be made in the relevant LIDR dockets. EOE July Comments, p. 5. While continuing to cross file LIDR reporting in the annual energy affordability dockets may not be reasonable in perpetuity, EOE does appreciate the current system as it eases the review of LIDR compliance filings due to the substantial size of the LIDR dockets. Id.

Generation Power is also concerned with the size of the LIDR dockets, noting an extensive documentary history going back years, believing that only publishing content there would be challenging and time-consuming for stakeholders and other interested parties. Generation Power July Comments, p. 5. Generation Power highlighted that one possible solution would be to present the data in both the LIDR and annual nergy affordability dockets. Id. Generation Power believes that LIDR should continue to be discussed in the annual affordability review as LIDR rates, payments, costs, and impacts directly affect energy affordability issues. Id.

CCA and CVLC believe that LIDR should remain as part of the annual energy affordability dockets, noting that it adds simplification and therefore transparency to the Authority's dockets. CCA & CLVC July Comments, p. 4.

c. Authority Analysis

The Authority finds that stakeholders' concerns about removing LIDR reporting from the annual energy affordability docket are valid. The extensive LIDR dockets can be difficult to navigate due to the many filings over years of proceedings. The LIDR programs are also directly tied to any discussion around affordability and should remain a part of that discussion in future proceedings so that all interested stakeholders can receive a wholistic view of the affordability landscape in Connecticut. Therefore, the Authority denies the Companies' proposal to cease reporting on LIDR in the annual energy affordability proceedings.

III. OTHER AFFORDABILITY ISSUES

A. MOTION NO. 3, CNG AND SCG HOT WEATHER CUSTOMER PROTOCOLS

1. CNG and SCG Proposal

On October 2, 2025, CNG and SCG jointly filed Motion No. 3 requesting to modify their customer service policy by removing service protection for gas customers during severe heat days in the summer. Motion No. 3, pp. 1–2. CNG and SCG stated that they currently suspend gas service disconnections on days with high heat indexes and/or when the governor of Connecticut activates the State's hot weather protocols. Id., p. 1. Originally, CNG and SCG explained, they implemented this practice in alignment with UI's procedures. Id. CNG and SCG argued the loss of gas service does not interfere with the cooling needs of homes or businesses because gas service is rarely used for air conditioning and customers also typically have electric service for cooling. Id. CNG and

SCG made clear that this proposal would not modify in any way CNG and SCG's Cold Weather Policy. Motion No. 3, p. 1.

Additionally, CNG and SGC reported suspending gas terminations for 5 days in 2023, 7 days in 2024, and 15 days in 2025 due to severe heat days. CNG-SGC Interrog. Resp. OCC-1. The longest continuous period of time that terminations were suspended due to severe heat was four days, and the number of CNG and SCG customers affected annually ranged from approximately 800 to nearly 5,000. CNG and SCG Interrog. Resp. OCC-1. Table 2, below, provides the number of CNG and SCG customers affected by gas service terminations due to severe heat days and Table 3, below, provides the number of severe heat and severe cold days per month reported by Avangrid.

Table 2: Number of Customers Affected by Suspension of Gas Service Terminations Due to Heat Days

Company	2023	2024	2025
CNG	1,083	3,806	4,842
SCG	803	4,797	4,729

CNG and SCG Interrog. Resp. OCC-1, p. 1.

Table 3: Number of Severe Weather Days per Month, Nov. 2024 – May 2026

Month	No. of Days
Nov. 2024	-
Dec. 2024	-
Jan. 2025	7
Feb. 2025	7
Mar. 2025	-
Apr. 2025	-
May 2025	-
Jun. 2025	3
Jul. 2025	8
Aug. 2025	4
Sep. 2025	-
Oct. 2025	-
Nov. 2025	-
Dec. 2025	5
Jan. 2026	8
Feb. 2026	10
Mar. 2026	1
Apr. 2026	-
May 2026	-

Avangrid Interrog. Resp. CAE-2.

CNG and SCG reported that in July 2024, it was required to restart the dunning process for approximately 2,500 accounts because the billing cycle for those accounts had closed. CNG and SCG Interrog. Resp. OCC-1, p. 1. CNG and SCG noted that such disruptions in the dunning process have a negative impact on their ability to perform disconnections because those disconnections are then rolled into the following days and further compound their ability to complete the number of disconnections required due to staffing levels. Id. However, CNG and SCG do not currently have a reporting mechanism to track the impact of this effect. Id., p. 2. Finally, CNG and SCG reported that no IT or billing system reprogramming is required to implement the proposed change and therefore they would incur no cost. Id.

Yankee Gas' customer service policy regarding shut off protections for severe weather days does not provide shut off protection for severe heat days. Yankee Gas Interrog. Resp. CAE-1, Att.1.

2. Stakeholder Comments

NAG requested that the Authority "not permit gas service disconnections during hot-weather protocols without additional safeguards, notice requirements, medical screening, hardship review, and consistency across all gas utilities." NAG Written Comments, May 29, 2026, p. 2. NAG stated that while gas service may not be a direct source of cooling, it is an essential household utility used for hot water, cooking, medical hygiene, sanitation, laundry, and safe household functioning. Id. Notwithstanding, NAG recommended that if the Authority allows gas shutoffs during severe heat days, the Authority should exclude shutoffs for customers coded as financial hardship, medical protection, elderly, disabled, infant household, or payment-assistance eligible. Id.

EOE expressed concern over the proposal and its effect on customers' ability to cook and heat water. EOE Written Comments, June 4, 2026, p. 2. Also, EOE is unclear how the overall effect of this proposed change will impact the CNG and SCG's collection practices and believed it beneficial for the Authority to incorporate this issue into the broader discussion of the Joint AFP. Id. EOE asserted that further discussion on this topic may assist the Authority when ultimately making a decision. Id.

OCC recognized that most customers do not use natural gas for cooling; therefore, disconnection of gas service on a hot day should impact only gas fueled cooking equipment and water heating for customers with gas water heaters. OCC Written Comments, June 4, 2026, p. 1. However, OCC asserted that clear public health and safety reasons should be considered when making a determination on this subject, as it is concerned that the delays in disconnections caused by this policy may incur costs in the form of mailed disconnect letters as well as the accumulation of additional arrearages. Id., pp. 1–2. OCC expressed interest in better understanding whether any specific health and safety protections are needed for gas customers on severe heat days. Id., p. 2.

Generation Power is concerned that CNG and SCG's request, if approved, would create "harmful and potential life-threatening impacts on vulnerable households." Generation Power Written Comments, June 4, 2026, p. 1. Generation Power stated that changing this policy would affect an unknown number of gas customers across

Connecticut who rely on the service for heating water for showers, laundry, and hand washing in the summer months, as well as gas service for cooking. Id. Generation Power believes that maintenance of both electric and gas companies' hot weather service protections will become even more important as climate hazards such as extreme heat and poor air quality become more frequent to protect households from unnecessary tragedies. Id.

3. Authority Analysis

The Authority accepts CNG and SCG's proposal to remove the extreme-heat disconnection moratoriums in their customer service policies. While the concerns advanced by stakeholders are understandable, they apply to the adverse impacts of disconnection generally, as opposed to any particular concern related to disconnecting gas service during extreme-heat periods. The Authority acknowledges that aside from the loss of heating, the termination of gas service can adversely impact customers' ability to comfortably maintain hygiene (i.e., gas water heating) or prepare food (i.e., gas stoves), but this is true at all times of the year and does not clearly justify a termination moratorium specific to extreme-heat events. Moreover, the policy incongruity between Yankee and CNG and SCG is unjustified and unfair, as customers of one of the state's LDC should not enjoy heightened disconnection protections as compared to customers of another. Accordingly, the Authority grants Motion No. 3.

B. MOTION NO. 6, YANKEE GAS BBP CESSATION

1. Yankee Gas Proposal

In accordance with Order No. 11 from the 24-12-01 Decision, Yankee Gas requests approval to cease offering the BBP for gas customers when Yankee Gas implements LIDR.[7] Motion No. 6, p. 2. In addition, Yankee Gas requests approval of its customer communication materials, which it plans to distribute to all currently enrolled MPP customers, including those with a BBP. Id.; see Motion No. 6, Att. Yankee Gas's proposed transition plan for BBP cessation includes notifying customers via email and letter approximately 45 days in advance of LIDR implementation; ceasing the BBP offering at the time of LIDR implementation and transitioning all gas MPP customers to the new MPP required monthly payment amount, reduced by a new 10% LIDR discount. Motion No. 6, p. 3. Yankee Gas shared its BBP cessation communications plan and materials during the March 2026 Energy Affordability Customer Communications Working Group. Id., p. 2.

---

[7] Order No. 11 states:

> No later than June 1, 2026, the Company shall submit for review and approval in Docket No. 26-05-01, a proposal to cease offering the BBP once LIDR is implemented that includes a proposed transition plan and customer communication materials, as discussed in Section X.F.9.c, Below Budget Plan. The Company shall share the proposed customer communications with the Energy Affordability Customer Communications Working Group for review and comment at least 10 business days ahead of the Company's motion filing and the motion shall incorporate any feedback received.

24-12-01 Decision, p. 223.

Subsequently, Yankee Gas submitted supplements to update its motion with changes to the draft customer communications plan and materials based on feedback from the Energy Affordability Customer Communications Working Group. See Motion No. 6 Resp. July 21, 2026 (Supplement 1); Motion No. 6 Resp., July 29, 2026 (Supplement 2). Specifically, Supplement 1 added an additional letter for MPP BBP customers that do not heat with gas. Supplement 1, Att. 1. The new additional letter informs those non-heating MPP BBP customers that the only change for them is the end of the BBP as LIDR is only available to gas heating customers. Id. Supplement 2 makes minor changes to the letter and email to be sent to gas heating customers on MPP, including those with a BBP. Supplement 2, Att. 1. Subsequently, Yankee Gas stated that it will not implement LIDR until mid-January 2027 at the earliest. Eversource Brief, p. 3.

Yankee Gas estimates that with implementation of the 10% flat LIDR, the current MPP and BBP monthly required payment of $50 would increase to $149 for those customers receiving a Connecticut Energy Assistance Program (CEAP) award and $166 for those not receiving CEAP. Eversource Interrog. Resp. CAE 60. Yankee Gas opines that ceasing the BBP upon LIDR implementation was only intended to be used in combination with a tiered LIDR. Id. In addition, Yankee Gas states that until the Authority approves a tiered LIDR, the MPP monthly required payment amount for customers with a BBP is more affordable than it would otherwise be with a 10% LIDR discount. Id. Finally, Yankee Gas proposed "that the MPP BBP should be retained until a Tiered Gas LIDR is approved by PURA and implemented so the lowest income customers will continue to receive what has been deemed an affordable bill." Id.

2. Stakeholder Comments

OCC opined that the BBP "does not work well in conjunction with a LIDR or an energy burden" and affirms its understanding that, per the 24-12-01 Decision, Yankee Gas's BBP will cease upon implementation of its LIDR. OCC July Comments, pp. 2–3. With respect to the sufficiency of Yankee Gas's proposed BBP cessation customer communications, OCC suggested bolding the section which indicates that the change will increase their monthly payment. Id. Additionally, OCC suggested better highlighting the bullet which encourages customers to apply for CEAP. Id.

EOE stated that it is appropriate to have BBP consistency among the local distribution companies (LDCs), noting that the CNG and SCG BBP cessation proposals were approved in the 25-05-01 Decision. EOE Written Comments, Jul. 22, 2026 (EOE July Comments), p. 2. CNG and SCG provided an update to the Authority in which they stated the LIDR framework would be implemented on August 3, 2026, and subsequently would cease offering BBP, effective November 1, 2026. CNG and SCG Compliance, July 29, 2026.

Generation Power observed that, per its review of Yankee Gas's communication materials in July, 2026, customers do not need to take action as a result of the change. Generation Power July Comments, p. 1. Nonetheless, Generation Power recommended that Yankee Gas provide a "contact channel" for customers who may be confused about the change or who may seek more information about payment options. Id. Generation

Power further recommended that Yankee Gas track data associated with the transition of customers from BBP to LIDR and conduct a customer survey of customers who change from BBP participation to LIDR. Id.

CCA and CVLC argued that BBP is the one existing payment program that is truly affordable due to past data showing its high payment success rate. CCA & CVLC July Comments, p. 2. CCA and CVLC further argued against BBP cessation, stating that the goal should be to expand affordability program offerings to improve customer payments rather than removing an existing program. Id.

3. Authority Analysis

The Authority agrees with EOE that consistency among the LDCs in affordability offerings is generally appropriate. The Authority ordered Yankee Gas to cease offering BBP when it implemented LIDR. 24-12-01 Decision, pp. 205, 223. In addition, the Authority ordered CNG and SCG to cease offering the BBP no later than November 1, 2026, and approved CNG's and SCG's proposal to cease offering BBP, including their customer communication materials. 25-05-01 Decision, pp. 15, 39; Motion No. 15 Ruling, Oct. 22, 2025, Docket No. 25-05-01.

Accordingly, the Authority grants Motion No. 6 with modification. Specifically, the Authority approves Yankee Gas's proposal to cease offering the BBP to all customers once it implements the 10% LIDR. Additionally, the Authority approves Yankee Gas's transition plan to: (1) send a BBP cessation notice to all heating customers on MPP via email and letter approximately 45 days prior to 10% LIDR implementation, stating that the customers will be transitioned to the new 10% LIDR; (2) send a BBP cessation notice to all non-heating customers on MPP that receive the BBP option via email and letter approximately 45 days prior to 10% LIDR implementation, stating that the BBP option is ending; (3) cease offering the BBP to all gas heating and non-heating customers once 10% LIDR is available; and (4) remove all gas non-heating MPP customers receiving BBP from BBP once Yankee Gas implements 10% LIDR.

In addition, the Authority approves Yankee Gas's BBP cessation customer communication materials, with modification. First, the Authority agrees with OCC's suggestion to bold the text indicating the customer's monthly payment will increase as a result of the cessation of the BBP. This change will help draw attention to the critical information impacting customer budgets. Second, the Authority agrees with OCC's suggestion to draw attention to the text encouraging customers to apply for CEAP. This information can help customers further mitigate their energy costs and should also be emphasized visually with either text bolding or underlining, as determined by Yankee Gas. Third, the Authority agrees with Generation Power's suggestion that the customer communication materials include a contact channel for customers who seek more information about the BBP change. It is conceivable that several customers may have questions about the change or seek to understand other payment options in light of the BBP cessation. Therefore, no later than 45 days prior to implementation of the 10% LIDR, the Authority directs Yankee Gas to modify the BBP cessation customer communication materials by: (1) bolding the text indicating the customer's monthly payment will increase as a result of the BBP cessation; (2) either bolding or underlining the text encouraging

customers to apply for CEAP; and (3) including the appropriate customer service phone number, so that customers may readily contact Yankee Gas with questions as necessary.

IV. CONCLUSION AND ORDERS

A. CONCLUSION

The Authority approves the Companies' Joint AFP, subject to the modifications and additions discussed herein.

B. ORDERS

For orders requiring a filing, the Companies shall file an electronic version through the Authority's website at www.ct.gov/pura. Submissions filed in compliance with the Authority's orders must be identified by: Docket Number, Title, and Order Number. Compliance with orders shall commence and continue as indicated in each specific order or until the Company requests and the Authority approves that the Company's compliance is no longer required after a certain date. Unless otherwise provided or determined by the Authority, filings submitted in compliance with an order shall constitute satisfaction of the order. Filings requiring Authority approval must be filed as a motion.

1. No later than 30 days after the issuance of this decision, all stakeholder groups, including those who received advance payments, must submit a completed (1) Evidence of Substantial Contribution form and (2) Stakeholder Group Compensation Itemized Expenditures form in Docket No. 23-09-34, PURA Implementation of the Stakeholder Group Compensation Provisions of Section 15 of Public Act 23-102. Both forms must be submitted as a comment to the motion representing the stakeholder group's Application.

2. No later than 30 days after the Authority's order to pay stakeholder compensation, each of the Companies shall pay that compensation in the following proportion:

Company	Portion
CL&P	54.94%
UI	15.61%
Yankee	11.50%
CNG	9.53%
SCG	8.42%
Total	**100%**

3. No later than 30 days after the Authority's order to return stakeholder compensation, the relevant stakeholder groups shall return the compensation to the Authority, for return to each of the Companies.

4. No later than December 4, 2026, the Companies shall incorporate the modifications and additions discussed herein and submit the revised Joint AFP as compliance.

5. No later than June 1, 2027, as a part of the 2027–2028 Joint AFP, and annually thereafter, the Companies shall add to their list of reporting metrics the two new MPP success metrics, as discussed in Section II.B.1, MPP Metrics, which they shall each begin tracking no later than November 1, 2026;

6. No later than June 1, 2027, as a part of the 2027–2028 Joint AFP, the Companies shall provide an updated DSS data matching proposal, with an impact study, as discussed in Section II.B.5, Improvements to DSS Data Matching.

7. No later than 45 days prior to implementation of the 10% LIDR, Yankee Gas shall modify its BBP cessation customer communication materials by: (1) bolding the text indicating the customer's monthly payment will increase as a result of the BBP cessation; (2) either bold or underline the text encouraging customers to apply for CEAP; and (3) include the appropriate customer service phone number, so that customers may readily contact Yankee Gas with questions as necessary, as discussed in Section III.B, Motion No. 6, Yankee Gas BBP Cessation.

DOCKET NO. 26-05-01 ANNUAL REVIEW OF AFFORDABILITY PROGRAMS AND OFFERINGS

This decision is adopted by the following commissioners:



Thomas H. Wiehl



David Arconti, Jr.



Janice A. Beecher



Holly H. Cheeseman



Everett Smith, III

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of the decision issued by the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority, State of Connecticut, and was forwarded by Certified Mail to all parties of record in this proceeding on the date indicated.



Jeffrey R. Gaudiosi, Esq.
Executive Secretary
Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

October 21, 2026
Date