STATE OF CONNECTICUT

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

DOCKET NO. 26-08-04 **ANNUAL SHARED CLEAN ENERGY FACILITY PROGRAM REVIEW – YEAR 8**

October 19, 2026

PROPOSED DECISION

This proposed Decision is being distributed to the participants in this proceeding for comment. The proposed Decision is not final. The Authority will consider the participants' arguments and exceptions before reaching a final Decision, which may differ from the proposed Decision. Therefore, this proposed Decision does not establish any precedent and does not necessarily represent the Authority's final conclusion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1
A. SUMMARY 1
B. BACKGROUND OF THE PROCEEDING 1
C. CONDUCT OF THE PROCEEDING 2
D. PARTIES AND INTERVENORS OR PARTICIPANTS 3

II. LEGAL AUTHORITY 3

III. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES 3

IV. AUTHORITY ANALYSIS 4
A. PROGRAM OVERVIEW 4
B. PRICE CAP 5
1. Stakeholder Comments 5
2. Authority Analysis 7
C. BUDGET REALLOCATION 8
1. Background 8
2. Stakeholder Comments 9
3. Authority Analysis 11
D. BID PREFERENCES 13
1. Stakeholder Comments 13
2. Authority Analysis 14
E. PROGRAM DOCUMENTS 15
1. EDC Proposed Changes 15
2. DEEP Proposed Changes 16
3. Development Period Security 17
4. Updated Documents 19

V. CONCLUSION AND ORDERS 19
A. CONCLUSION 19
B. ORDERS 19
1. Standing Orders 19
2. New Orders 23

PROPOSED DECISION

I. INTRODUCTION

A. SUMMARY

The Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (Authority or PURA) approves updates to the Shared Clean Energy Facility Program (SCEF Program or Program), administered by The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy (Eversource) and The United Illuminating Company (UI; collectively, with Eversource, the electric distribution companies or EDCs). The approved changes better align the SCEF Program with the Program Objectives. The Decision also sets the SCEF price caps and bid preferences for project applications to be received in the Year 8 procurement.

B. BACKGROUND OF THE PROCEEDING

Through the SCEF Program, the state seeks to deploy eligible Class I renewable generation projects selected through a competitive procurement process each year for eight years.[1] In 2019, the Authority approved, with modification, the SCEF Program requirements developed by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP). Decision, Dec. 18, 2019, Docket No. 19-07-01, Review of Statewide Shared Clean Energy Facility Program Requirements (SCEF Decision). The first SCEF procurement (Year 1) occurred in 2020.

After the Year 1 SCEF procurement, the Authority conducted a proceeding to review the Year 2 SCEF procurement to determine whether any adjustments were necessary. Based on this review, the Authority approved certain modifications to the SCEF Program requirements. Decision, April 28, 2021, Docket No. 19-07-01RE02, Review of Statewide Shared Clean Energy Facility Program Requirements – Year 2 Procurement (Year 2 Decision). The Year 2 SCEF procurement was conducted in 2021.

Concurrently, the Authority opened a docket to review compliance filings related to Order Nos. 5, 6, and 7 of the SCEF Decision, and to serve as the administrative record for the working groups established under that decision to support the development of the compliance orders. At the conclusion of that proceeding, the Authority approved the process for the EDCs to identify, verify, and enroll customers into the SCEF Program, including contracting with Operation Fuel to identify eligible low- and moderate-income (LMI) customers. See Decision, Sept. 15, 2021, Docket No. 19-07-01RE01, Review of Statewide Shared Clean Energy Facility Program Requirements – Customer Enrollment, p. 21 (SCEF Enrollment Decision).

[1] The SCEF Program was first implemented pursuant to Section 7(a)(1)(C) of Public Act No. 18-50, An Act Concerning Connecticut's Energy Future, codified as General Statutes § 16-244z(a)(1)(C). Public Act No. 24-31, An Act Concerning Solar Projects Throughout the State, extended the SCEF Program from six to eight years.

Following the Year 2 SCEF procurement, the Authority again performed a review of the SCEF Program and approved changes. Decision, Nov. 17, 2021, Docket No. 21-08-04, Annual Review of Statewide Shared Clean Energy Facility Program Requirements – Year 3 (Year 3 Decision). The Year 3 SCEF procurement was completed in 2022.

Similarly, the Authority performed its annual review of the SCEF Program and approved changes for the Year 4 SCEF procurement. Decision, Dec. 7, 2022, Docket No. 22-08-04, Annual Shared Clean Energy Facility Program Review – Year 4 (Year 4 Decision). The Year 4 Decision also addressed certain changes to the Program in relation to Public Act No. 22-14, An Act Concerning Clean Energy Tariff Programs (Public Act No. 22-14), and renamed the Modified Program Requirements to the SCEF Program Manual. Id., pp. 3–6. The Year 4 SCEF procurement was completed in 2023.

Following the Year 4 SCEF procurement, the Authority issued a final decision on December 6, 2023, in Docket No. 23-08-04, Annual Shared Clean Energy Facility Program Review – Year 5 (Year 5 Decision). This decision approved, with modifications, the SCEF Program Manual, the accompanying Appendix B, and DEEP's proposed bid preferences and procurement price cap for the Year 5 procurement. Year 5 Decision, pp. 7–23. The Year 5 SCEF procurement was completed in 2024.

The Authority next issued a final decision on December 11, 2024, in Docket No. 24-08-04, Annual Shared Clean Energy Facility Program Review – Year 6 (Year 6 Decision), approving with modifications the SCEF Program Manual, the accompanying Appendix B, and DEEP's proposed bid preferences and procurement price cap for the Year 6 procurement. Year 6 Decision, pp. 8–16. The Year 6 SCEF procurement was completed in 2025.

Thereafter, on December 17, 2025, the Authority issued a final decision in Docket No. 25-08-04, Annual Shared Clean Energy Facility Program Review – Year 7 (Year 7 Decision), approving with modifications the SCEF Program Manual, the accompanying Appendix B, and DEEP's proposed bid preferences and procurement price cap for the Year 7 procurement. Year 7 Decision, pp. 7–15. The Year 7 SCEF procurement was completed in 2026.

By September 1 of each year, the EDCs are required to jointly file the current SCEF Program rules and all Request for Proposal (RFP) documents and to propose modifications "that will allow the SCEF Program to better meet the Program Objectives." Year 7 Decision, p. 19. By the same September 1 deadline, DEEP submits its proposed procurement price cap and bid preferences to the Authority. Id., p. 19.

C. CONDUCT OF THE PROCEEDING

On April 8, 2026, the Authority issued a Notice of Proceeding in the above-captioned docket.

On August 25, 2026, the Authority issued a Notice of Request for Written Comments on the following topics: (1) procurement price caps; (2) budget reallocation; (3) bid preferences; and (4) proposed programmatic changes. The Authority received seven sets of written comments from interested stakeholders.

On August 31, 2026, the EDCs filed a joint motion (Motion No. 2), addressing the Year 8 SCEF Program Manual and RFP documents, including associated redlined changes. On September 1, 2026, DEEP submitted a compliance filing containing its recommended bid preferences and procurement price cap, along with proposed revisions to Appendix B – Submittal to DEEP.

On September 17, 2026, the Authority held a Technical Meeting to discuss the topics outlined in the August 25, 2026 Notice of Request for Written Comments.

D. PARTIES AND INTERVENORS OR PARTICIPANTS

A listing of all Participants to this proceeding is appended hereto as Appendix A.

II. LEGAL AUTHORITY

The SCEF Program was established pursuant to Public Act No. 19-35, An Act Concerning a Green Economy and Environmental Protection, as codified in General Statutes § 16-244z. General Statutes § 16-244z(a) required that the Authority establish tariffs and a procurement plan for each EDC and requires that the EDCs conduct annual solicitation(s), as determined by the Authority, that would allow for a diversity of selected projects. Pursuant to Public Act No. 22-14, certain changes to the SCEF Program were directed by the General Assembly, including an increase in the maximum allowed project size, changes to the definitions of LMI customers, and an increase in the aggregate megawatt (MW) capacity available to SCEF projects in Program Years 4 through 6. Public Act No. 22-14, §§ 1-3. Public Act No. 23-102, An Act Strengthening Protections for Connecticut's Consumers of Energy, further amended the definitions of LMI customers. Public Act No. 23-102, § 25. Additionally, Public Act No. 25-173, An Act Concerning Energy Affordability, Access and Accountability, provides that, beginning January 1, 2026, all new SCEF projects shall emit no pollutants. Public Act No. 25-173, § 9.

In this proceeding, the Authority reviews the SCEF Program documents and SCEF Program Manual, relevant compliance filings, current tariff rates, and relevant Program metrics to determine whether the SCEF Program should be modified to better align with the direction provided in the SCEF Decision, the Program Objectives as modified in the Year 4 Decision, and General Statutes § 16-244z, as modified by Public Act Nos. 22-14, 23-102, and 25-173.

III. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

As part of its annual review, the Authority evaluates the SCEF Program Objectives to ensure the objectives remain current. Previously, the Authority identified the following objectives for the SCEF Program:

1) Cost-effectively allocate up to 25 MW annually to SCEFs, as defined in General Statutes § 16-244x;
2) Provide savings to specific categories of customers, particularly customers with LMI, low-income service organizations, and customers who reside in environmental justice communities; and
3) Lower or eliminate barriers to entry for Subscriber Organizations.

Year 2 SCEF Decision, p. 6.

The Authority then altered these objectives to account for the required revision codified in Public Act No. 22-14, which became effective October 1, 2022. The objectives were modified as follows:

1) Cost-effectively procure up to 50 MW annually of SCEFs, as defined in General Statutes § 16-244z;
2) Provide savings to specific categories of customers, particularly customers with LMI, low-income service organizations, and customers who reside in environmental justice communities; and
3) Lower or eliminate barriers to entry for Subscriber Organizations.

Year 4 SCEF Decision, p. 7.

Consistent with past SCEF Program reviews, the Authority used the above objectives when evaluating the modifications and comments submitted by docket Participants in the instant proceeding, and in developing the direction and orders herein. See Year 2 SCEF Decision, p. 6; see also Year 3 SCEF Decision, p. 2. Further, the Authority reiterates that the EDCs shall administer the SCEF Program in accordance with the three objectives identified above (i.e., the annual cost-effective allocation of 50 MW, programmatic focus on LMI customers and customers in environmental justice communities, and lowering barriers to entry), consistent with past direction. Id.

IV. AUTHORITY ANALYSIS

A. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The SCEF Program is an eight-year Class I community generation program that launched in 2020. It is administered by the state's EDCs, in coordination with DEEP. Each year, 50 MW of new capacity may be selected; 40 MW allocated to Eversource and 10 MW to UI. Eligible projects must range in size from 100 kilowatts (kW) to 5,000 kW (AC). Motion No. 4, Dec. 31, 2024, Docket No. 24-08-04 (Motion No. 4), Att. 1, p. 13.

Projects are awarded contracts through a competitive, reverse auction solicitation process. Selected projects are compensated by the EDCs at their bid price for both energy and renewable energy credits (RECs). Id., p. 6.

In Year 7 of the Program, two bid preferences were in place; solar canopy projects received a 40% bid preference, while projects located on landfills or brownfields received a 20% preference. Year 7 Decision, p. 13. The procurement price cap for Year 7 projects was $182.94/MWh, and the total budget caps were set at $9,864,750.81 for Eversource and $5,709,894.63 for UI. Id., pp. 10–11.

Subscribers to in-service projects receive monthly bill credits of $0.025/kWh at no cost to them. Motion No. 4, Att. 1, p. 21. The EDCs are required to enroll subscribers for at least 90% of each project's expected electricity output. Id., pp. 19–20. For projects entering service after December 6, 2023, 50% of the expected output must be subscribed

by low-income customers with household incomes at or below 60% of the state median income. Id., pp. 4, 20. An additional 20% must be subscribed by LMI customers with incomes at or below 100% of the state median income; customers who are landlords or entities responsible for an affordable housing facility, with subscriptions applicable only to that facility; and/or customers that qualify as low-income service organizations. Id., pp. 5, 20. Another 20% must be subscribed by small businesses. Motion No. 4, Att. 1, p. 20. The remaining 10% of a project's output may be subscribed on a voluntary basis by any eligible customer; however, the EDCs are not required to secure subscriptions for this portion. Id. Customers who are not income-eligible may still subscribe to a SCEF project if their home is not suitable for solar or if they are renters who do not control their rooftop. Id., p. 18.

B. PRICE CAP

The Authority conducts an annual evaluation of the price cap for the SCEF Program. The maximum purchase price for energy and RECs in a given SCEF procurement cannot exceed the "maximum selected purchase price for the same resources in the prior year's solicitation," unless the Authority determines that "changed circumstances" warrant a different approach. General Statutes § 16-244z(a)(5)

The Authority solicited stakeholder input on the appropriate Year 8 procurement price cap. Notice, Aug. 25, 2026, pp. 1–2. Stakeholders were encouraged to support their recommendations with Program trends, project data, or other relevant analyses. Id., p. 2.

1. Stakeholder Comments

In joint comments, the EDCs recommended a Year 8 SCEF price cap of $182.93/MWh, which is one cent lower than the Year 7 price cap. EDC Comments, Sept. 11, 2026, p. 3. The EDCs asserted that this price cap would provide an appropriate balance between encouraging project development and protecting ratepayers from unnecessarily high procurement costs. Id. The EDCs stated that, despite evolving market conditions, including equipment costs and federal trade policy, the Year 7 price cap has provided sufficient support for robust Program participation, as demonstrated by the significant oversubscription of Eversource's Year 8 solicitation. Id. The EDCs acknowledged that UI's solicitation was comparatively undersubscribed, but argued that this result should not be viewed as evidence that the price cap is insufficient. Id. Rather, the EDCs attributed the lower level of participation in UI's service territory to the more limited availability of developable land resulting from its more urban characteristics. EDC Comments, Sept. 11, 2026, p. 3. The EDCs further argued that maintaining the existing price cap would maximize the amount of renewable energy procured while avoiding unnecessary increases in ratepayer costs. Id., pp. 3–4.

Like the EDCs, DEEP recommended a Year 8 price cap of $182.93/MWh, which represents the highest selected bid price from the first round of the prior SCEF procurement. DEEP Compliance, Sept. 1, 2026, p. 2. DEEP noted that UI was conducting a second SCEF procurement round but stated that its recommendation would not change because the highest selected bid price from the first round was only one cent below the existing price cap. Id., p. 2, fn. 8. DEEP asserted that a $182.93/MWh price cap would accommodate continued changes associated with the federal investment tax

credit (ITC) while maintaining a competitive and cost-effective Program and allowing the EDCs to maximize the capacity deployed within the annual SCEF budget. Id., p. 2. DEEP acknowledged that recent federal tariffs and increased interconnection costs may affect solar project costs but stated that further investigation would be necessary before determining whether those factors constitute "changed circumstances" warranting a higher price cap. Id., p. 3.

Save the Sound supported the EDCs' and DEEP's recommendation of a $182.93/MWh price cap, arguing that the recommendation is consistent with General Statutes § 16-244z(a)(5) because it does not exceed the maximum purchase price of selected resources in the prior procurement. Save the Sound Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, pp. 1–2. Save the Sound also stated that the increase from $133/MWh to $182.94/MWh adopted last year has, at least for the time being, maintained Program participation. Id., p. 2. Save the Sound nevertheless deferred to project developers regarding whether new challenges, including ongoing federal trade actions, warrant a higher price cap. Id.

The Office of Consumer Counsel (OCC) stated that, absent changed circumstances, General Statutes § 16-244z(a)(5) requires the price cap to be no greater than the highest selected purchase price from the prior year's procurement. OCC Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 1. OCC argued that no new changed circumstances warrant a higher price cap because the federal changes affecting the ITC and other federal actions were accounted for when the Authority increased the price cap from $133/MWh to $182.94/MWh last year. Id., p. 2. OCC reiterated its position from last year that Connecticut ratepayers should not be expected to absorb the full cost of federal actions. Id. OCC further stated that, if the Authority maintains harmonization between the SCEF and Non-Residential Renewable Energy Solutions (NRES) large buy-all price caps, the Authority should continue to couple that approach with the same annual Program budget cap adopted last year to protect non-participating ratepayers. Id.

Allco Renewable Energy Limited (Allco) recommended establishing a separate, higher price cap for UI, arguing that the availability of sites suitable for SCEF development in UI's service territory is insufficient to support development at the existing price cap. Allco Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 1. Allco emphasized that any unused capacity in Year 8 would be permanently lost because this is the final year of the SCEF Program. Id. Accordingly, Allco recommended eliminating the UI price cap. Id. In the alternative, Allco recommended establishing a UI-specific price cap of $261.34/MWh, which Allco stated would be more comparable to the medium and small NRES buy-all price caps of $236.74/MWh and $250.42/MWh, respectively, and would better reflect the smaller and more urban sites available for SCEF development in UI's service territory. Id., pp. 1–2. Allco further argued that an increased price cap would not increase ratepayer costs because the SCEF budget is fixed. Allco Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 2.

Verogy argued that significant changed circumstances warrant an increase in the SCEF price cap. Verogy Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 1. Specifically, Verogy identified new tariffs that it asserted will increase module prices by approximately 5–7.5%, as well as increased interconnection costs, constrained supply chains, and economy-wide inflation. Id., pp. 1–2. Verogy asserted that the impact of the new tariffs alone would support a Year 8 price cap between $192.09/MWh and $196.66/MWh. Id., p. 2. Verogy further argued that, notwithstanding the annual Program budget cap, which limits the

ratepayer impact of a price cap increase, the identified changes in project costs justify an increase to the price cap. Id.

2. Authority Analysis

The Year 8 SCEF price cap shall be $179.00/MWh, consistent with the NRES large buy-all price cap recommended for the 2027 NRES procurement. See Motion No. 4, July 29, 2026, Docket No. 26-08-03, Annual Non-Residential Renewable Energy Solutions Program Review – Year 6, p. 2.

Maintaining a price cap equal to the NRES large buy-all price cap is consistent with the approach adopted by the Authority in the Year 7 SCEF annual review. Year 7 Decision, p. 10. In that proceeding, the Authority established equal price caps for the SCEF Program and the NRES large buy-all category because of the potential for inter-program competition. Id. The project sizes and market participants in the two programs are sufficiently similar to warrant continued consideration of this potential competition. Maintaining aligned price caps also provides a consistent framework for developers evaluating the two procurement opportunities.

The SCEF and NRES Programs are not identical, and developers may consider a variety of factors when determining which program to pursue. Nevertheless, certain characteristics of the SCEF Program may provide economic advantages relative to NRES large buy-all projects. Unlike NRES projects, SCEF projects do not require a host customer with an electric bill or a beneficial account. See Motion No. 5, July 30, 2026, Docket No. 26-08-03, Att. 2a, pp. 4, 8. As a result, SCEF developers do not face the same customer acquisition and engagement requirements or the expectation to share tariff-related benefits with a host customer or beneficial account. These differences may lower the costs of developing a SCEF project relative to a comparable NRES large buy-all project. Accordingly, a higher price cap for SCEF projects, relative to comparable NRES large buy-all projects, is not justified.

A $179.00/MWh price cap is below the highest selected SCEF bid price from the prior procurement, which was $182.93/MWh. See DEEP Compliance, Sept. 1, 2026, p. A2. The $182.93/MWh bid was one cent below the Year 7 price cap of $182.94/MWh. Year 7 Decision, p. 11. Therefore, establishing a $179.00/MWh price cap would exclude bids between $179.00/MWh and $182.93/MWh that otherwise could have been eligible for selection. However, the Year 7 selection results demonstrate that most selected projects — specifically, nine[2] out of 13, or approximately 69% — were bid below $179.00/MWh. In Eversource's service territory, the median selected bid price was $161.30/MWh and the average selected bid price was $171.09/MWh, with the lowest selected bid at $143.95/MWh. See Motion No. 6, May 15, 2026, Docket No. 25-08-04, Att. B. In addition, two qualified but unselected bids were below $179.00/MWh, at $172.80/MWh and $177.80/MWh, respectively. Id. Thus, a $179.00/MWh price cap remains above both the median and average selected bid prices in Eversource's Year 7 procurement and above two qualified bids that were not selected. By setting the price

[2] Including the solar canopy project, which is eligible to bid above the price cap provided that its evaluated bid price is below the cap. Specifically, one Eversource solar canopy project submitted a bid of $274.15/MWh, but its evaluated bid price of $164.49/MWh was below $179.00/MWh. See Motion No. 6, May 15, 2026, Docket No. 25-08-04, Att. B

cap below the Year 7 level but above the evaluated bid prices of most projects selected in that procurement, the Authority can limit payments for higher-cost projects while preserving opportunities for lower-cost projects to participate. Given the Program's fixed budget, lowering the average price paid per unit of capacity could also enable the Program to procure more MW within the available budget.

The Year 7 results in UI's service territory warrant additional consideration because selected bid prices were substantially closer to the existing price cap. In the first Year 7 solicitation round, the median selected bid price was $182.93/MWh and the average selected bid price was $182.58/MWh. See Motion No. 7, June 18, 2026, Docket No. 25-08-04, Att. B. Nevertheless, these results do not establish a need to maintain the higher $182.94/MWh price cap. Unlike Eversource's solicitation, in which eight qualified bids were not selected or withdrawn, all three qualified UI bids were selected. Id.; Motion No. 6, May 15, 2026, Docket No. 25-08-04, Att. B. In addition, only two companies participated in the UI solicitation, compared with nine companies participating in the Eversource solicitation. Id. The limited number of bids and bidders in UI's solicitation reduced the competitive pressure on bid prices. Accordingly, the Authority cannot conclude from the Year 7 UI results that a price cap of $179.00/MWh would have resulted in insufficient participation or materially different procurement outcomes.

The Authority also considered the potential effects of federal actions, including tariffs, on solar project costs. Such actions may increase development costs and, in turn, affect future SCEF bid prices. However, the Authority accounted for significant federal policy uncertainty in last year's price cap determination, when it increased the SCEF price cap from $133.00/MWh to $182.94/MWh, an increase of approximately 37.55% in a single year. Year 7 Decision, pp. 7–11. The record in this proceeding does not establish that subsequent federal actions have increased costs to a level that would render either the current price cap of $182.94/MWh, or a modestly reduced price cap of $179.00/MWh, economically unviable for project development. Rather, the record establishes only that costs may increase. Moreover, the magnitude and duration of the effects of federal trade and tax policies remain uncertain. The Authority is also concerned that, given the Program's fixed budget, increasing the price cap without a corresponding increase in funding could reduce the amount of capacity ultimately selected if developers respond by submitting bids closer to the higher cap. The Authority therefore declines to increase the price cap based on potential future cost impacts that remain speculative or are not sufficiently supported by quantitative analysis.

The Year 8 SCEF price cap shall be set at $179.00/MWh, consistent with the recommended NRES large buy-all price cap. This price cap appropriately balances the objectives of facilitating continued SCEF participation, maintaining consistency between the SCEF and NRES large buy-all procurements, and limiting unnecessary procurement costs to ratepayers.

C. BUDGET REALLOCATION

1. Background

For the Year 7 procurement, the Authority adopted separate budget caps for each EDC, pursuant to General Statutes §§ 16-244z(c)(1)(A) and 16-244z(c)(1)(B). Year 7

Decision, pp. 8–9. Specifically, the approved 2026 SCEF budget caps were $9,864,750.81 for Eversource and $5,709,894.63 for UI. Id., p. 10.

However, these allocations do not reflect the typical 80/20 allocation between the EDCs based on their respective shares of statewide electric revenues. Rather, the approved values reflected the projected payment obligations associated with projects selected during the Year 5 procurement. Unlike Eversource, UI selected a fuel cell project during the Year 5 procurement. Year 7 Decision, p. 9, fn. 5. Because fuel cell projects generally operate at higher capacity factors than conventional solar projects, UI's resulting SCEF budget allocation exceeded the amount that would have resulted under the standard 80/20 revenue-based allocation methodology. Id. Importantly, following the enactment of Public Act 25-173, fuel cells that emit pollutants are no longer eligible for participation in the SCEF Program.[3]

Therefore, the Authority requested stakeholder comment on whether the combined SCEF budget of $15,574,645.44 should be reallocated between the EDCs using the standard 80/20 revenue-based allocation methodology. Id. Under such an approach, the resulting allocations would be $12,459,716.35 for Eversource and $3,114,929.09 for UI. Id.

2. Stakeholder Comments

The EDCs opposed reallocating the Year 8 SCEF budget using the standard 80/20 revenue-based allocation methodology. EDC Comments, Sept. 11, 2026, p. 4. The EDCs argued that the methodology adopted last year better controls SCEF Program costs because it reflects the EDCs' actual payment obligations. Id., p. 5. The EDCs noted that increasing Eversource's allocation under an 80/20 methodology would increase Eversource's available budget by approximately $2.6 million without a corresponding change in the underlying project compensation obligations used to establish the current budget. Id. The EDCs therefore asserted that reallocating the budget would be inconsistent with the cost-control methodology used to establish the existing EDC-specific allocations. Id.

DEEP, in contrast, supported reallocating the SCEF budget using the standard 80/20 revenue-based allocation methodology. DEEP Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 1. DEEP noted that UI received sufficient bids to utilize less than half of its available budget, resulting in UI initiating a second procurement round. Id., pp. 1–2. In contrast, DEEP stated that Eversource received substantially more eligible bids than it could accept, even after increasing its original $9,864,750.81 budget by $3,082,758.17 to account for previously selected projects that were terminated. Id., p. 2. Accordingly, DEEP argued that allocating $12,459,716.35 to Eversource and $3,114,929.09 to UI for Year 8 would produce a procurement outcome similar to that of the Year 7 Round 1 solicitation. Id.

OCC supported reallocating the total 2027 SCEF budget of $15,574,645.44 between the EDCs using the standard 80/20 revenue-based methodology. OCC Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 2. OCC noted that UI's elevated Year 7 budget allocation

[3] The Authority clarifies that not all fuel cells are ineligible for the Program; rather, only fuel cells that emit pollutants are ineligible. See DEEP Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p 2.

resulted from the selection of a single fuel cell project, which would no longer be eligible for the Program following changes to fuel cell eligibility. Id. OCC argued that, given UI's comparatively urban service territory, maintaining the current allocation creates a risk that a meaningful portion of the final-year budget will remain unutilized. Id. OCC further stated that General Statutes § 16-244z(c)(1)(A) provides the Authority with discretion to adjust procurement parameters to maintain a competitive and efficient Program, including for purposes of reallocating the Year 8 budget. Id. If the Authority reallocates the budget, OCC emphasized that the combined budget cap should remain unchanged because that cap provides the operative protection for nonparticipating ratepayers. OCC Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 3.

Andover Energy supported changing the Year 8 SCEF budget to the standard 80/20 allocation between Eversource and UI. Andover Energy Corresp., Sept. 14, 2026, p. 1. Andover Energy noted the change in fuel cell eligibility and argued that an 80/20 allocation would provide the Year 8 solicitation with a greater opportunity to procure renewable energy capacity at cost-effective rates while reducing the risk that budget capacity remains unutilized during the final Program year. Id.

Verogy likewise supported reallocating the SCEF budget to an 80/20 Eversource/UI split. Verogy Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 2. Verogy argued that an 80/20 allocation would provide additional funding for viable SCEF projects in Eversource's geographically larger service territory without adversely affecting the viability of SCEF projects in UI's service territory, which Verogy noted was undersubscribed in the Year 7 spring procurement. Id., pp. 2–3. Verogy also recommended that any unused Program budget or capacity following the Year 7 procurement be allocated using an 80/20 methodology rather than allowing unused UI capacity from Year 7 to roll forward exclusively into UI's Year 8 allocation. Id., p. 3.

Allco supported a hybrid approach to the Year 8 budget allocation. Allco Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 2. Allco argued that the Authority should initially maintain the existing budget allocation methodology rather than reset the allocation to 80/20. Id. Allco asserted that maintaining the existing allocation would preserve UI customers' opportunity to participate in the SCEF Program. Id. However, Allco recommended that, after UI's Year 8 awards are finalized, any remaining unused UI budget be transferred to Eversource. Id.

Save the Sound similarly supported maintaining the current EDC-specific budget allocations rather than immediately reallocating the budget to an 80/20 split. Save the Sound Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 3. Save the Sound based its position on historical data indicating that project bids in UI's service territory have generally been higher on a $/MWh basis than bids in Eversource's service territory. Id. Save the Sound argued that, to the extent the Authority seeks to maintain an 80/20 allocation of Program capacity between the EDC service territories, a proportionately larger budget for UI may be necessary because of those higher bid prices. Id. Save the Sound nevertheless recognized the difference in bid volume between the EDCs, noting that UI has historically received fewer bids than Eversource. Id., pp. 3–4.

To address the potential for unused Program capacity or budget, Save the Sound recommended a "blended" or hybrid approach. Save the Sound Comments, Sept. 14,

2026, p. 4. Specifically, Save the Sound recommended that, following the initial Year 8 awards, any unused UI budget or capacity be made available to the next eligible projects in the Eversource bid queue. Id. Save the Sound argued that this approach would preserve sufficient budget for UI to meet its allocated procurement commitments while reducing the risk that unused UI budget or capacity remains stranded in the final Program year. Id.

3. Authority Analysis

Consistent with the recommendations of OCC, DEEP, Andover Energy, and Verogy, the 2027 SCEF budget shall be reallocated using the standard 80/20 split based on the EDCs' respective shares of statewide electric revenues. The aggregate 2027 SCEF budget will not increase as a result of this reallocation.

The 63/37 Eversource/UI allocation established for the prior program year was based on circumstances that are not representative of current SCEF procurements. As discussed earlier, UI selected a fuel cell project during the Year 5 procurement. Year 7 Decision, p. 9, fn. 5. That fuel cell project, which had a higher capacity factor than typical solar projects, accounted for approximately $4.32 million, or 76%, of the annual subscriber organization payments associated with UI's 2024 procurement, which was the solicitation year used to establish the EDC-specific budgets for the prior Program year. See Motion No. 9, May 13, 2024, Docket No. 23-08-04, Att. B; Year 7 Decision, pp. 8–9. Thus, the higher UI budget allocation was driven primarily by the payment obligations associated with a single fuel cell project, rather than by greater demand for SCEF projects in UI's service territory. Because fuel cells that emit pollutants are no longer eligible for the SCEF Program, the circumstances underlying that allocation are unlikely to recur in future SCEF procurements.

An 80/20 allocation more appropriately aligns responsibility for SCEF Program costs with the EDCs' respective shares of statewide electric revenues. The Authority finds this approach preferable to continuing to base the EDC-specific allocations on a historical procurement containing an atypical project. Maintaining a budget allocation that materially differs from the EDCs' respective shares of statewide electric revenues without a corresponding current-year basis could result in one EDC's customers bearing a greater or lesser share of Program costs than would otherwise be reflected by that EDC's share of statewide electric revenues. Reallocating the budget to 80/20 therefore provides a more consistent and equitable basis for allocating the aggregate Program budget between the EDCs.

The 80/20 allocation is also consistent with the existing allocation of SCEF procurement capacity between the EDCs. The Program currently provides for 40 MW of capacity in Eversource's service territory and 10 MW in UI's service territory, representing an 80/20 allocation. Decision, Docket No. 25-08-01, 2025 Clean and Renewable Energy Program Data and Report, Att. 1, p. 36. Reallocating the budget to the same proportion therefore does not alter the existing relative allocation of Program capacity between the EDCs. Rather, it aligns the available budget associated with that capacity with the existing 80/20 Program structure.

Finally, maintaining the existing 63/37 budget allocation could result in a meaningful portion of the final-year SCEF budget remaining underutilized. UI's comparatively urban service territory may limit the availability of developable sites for SCEF projects and, as a result, may contribute to lower solicitation interest than in Eversource's service territory. The first Year 7 solicitation round illustrates this difference. Only 7.49 MW of the 10 MW allocated to UI was selected, leaving approximately 2.51 MW unallocated. Motion No. 6, May 15, 2026, Docket No. 25-08-04, Att. B. In contrast, Eversource received substantially more bid interest than its available budget could accommodate. Eversource received approximately $23 million in eligible bids compared with approximately $13 million in available budget after accounting for terminated projects. EDC Corresp., Sept. 14, 2026, p. 3; Motion No. 6, May 15, 2026, Docket No. 25-08-04, Att. B.

The difference in solicitation interest is particularly significant because Year 8 is the final year of the SCEF Program. If the existing EDC-specific budget allocations are maintained, unused UI budget capacity may remain unavailable for projects in Eversource's service territory despite substantially greater demonstrated demand there. This creates a risk that available Program funds will not be fully utilized and that the final-year procurement will result in fewer projects being selected than could otherwise be supported within the aggregate Program budget. The Authority therefore finds that the Year 8 solicitation results provide an additional basis for aligning the EDC-specific budgets with the 80/20 allocation.

The Authority also considered the alternative proposal advanced by Allco and Save the Sound, under which the Authority would initially retain the existing 63/37 allocation and subsequently make any unused UI budget available to Eversource following completion of the UI solicitation. This approach could preserve the existing level of funding available to UI while reducing the risk that any unused UI budget remains stranded at the conclusion of the final procurement. However, the Authority declines to adopt this approach. First, depending on the level of UI participation, transferring all unused UI budget to Eversource could result in Eversource ultimately receiving more than 80% of the aggregate Program budget. Such an outcome would depart from the standard 80/20 allocation that the Authority finds appropriate for Year 8. Second, a subsequent transfer would require an additional allocation process following completion of the UI solicitation and could create administrative and implementation issues for the EDCs. The Authority finds it preferable to establish the appropriate EDC-specific allocations at the outset of the final procurement rather than rely on a subsequent transfer mechanism.

The Authority emphasizes, however, that reallocating the EDC-specific budgets does not increase the aggregate SCEF budget; rather, it changes only the allocation of the existing budget among the EDCs. Accordingly, the reallocation will not increase total ratepayer costs for the Program on a statewide basis.

Finally, the Authority reiterates that the EDC-specific budget allocations are hard caps. The EDCs shall not exceed their respective allocations under any circumstances, after accounting for unused, terminated, withdrawn, or reduced-size projects. During the Year 7 solicitation, Eversource exceeded its budget by $6,195.97, which resulted in the Authority directing Eversource to subtract that amount from its Year 8 budget. Motion No. 6 Ruling, May 26, 2026, Docket No. 25-08-04, pp. 2–3. That determination remains

unchanged. To maximize utilization of the available budget without exceeding the applicable cap, the EDCs should consider making partial awards as an EDC approaches its full budget allocation, provided the applicant agrees to accept a partial award.

Accordingly, the Authority reallocates the $15,574,645.44 SCEF budget to an 80/20 Eversource/UI split. This results in an initial allocation of $12,459,716.35 for Eversource and $3,114,929.09 for UI. After accounting for the $6,195.97 amount by which Eversource exceeded its Year 7 budget, Eversource's Year 8 allocation is reduced to $12,453,520.38. The resulting Year 8 SCEF budget allocations are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: SCEF Program Annual Budget Caps

Year	Eversource	UI	Total
2026	$9,864,750.81	$5,709,894.63	$15,574,645.44
2027	$12,453,520.38	$3,114,929.09	$15,568,449.47

D. BID PREFERENCES

The Authority also conducts an annual review of the SCEF Program's bid preferences. As part of its Year 8 review, the Authority solicited stakeholder input on the appropriate bid preferences for the Year 8 procurement. Notice, Aug. 25, 2026, p. 3. Stakeholders were encouraged to support any proposed changes with analyses of potential ratepayer impacts, effects on stakeholder participation and project diversity, and consistency with the Program Objectives. Id.

1. Stakeholder Comments

The EDCs supported maintaining the existing bid preferences for Year 8: 40% for solar canopies and 20% for landfills or brownfields. EDC Comments, Sept. 11, 2026, p. 5. The EDCs argued that the existing preferences appropriately balance the policy objectives of encouraging development on preferred sites with maintaining cost-effective and competitive procurement outcomes. Id., p. 6. The EDCs further asserted that the existing preference levels have demonstrated their ability to support participation from preferred site types, noting that six solar canopy projects were selected in the prior two procurements. Id.

DEEP recommended maintaining the bid preference categories and levels used in Year 7 for Year 8. DEEP Compliance, Sept. 1, 2026, pp 3–4. DEEP stated that maintaining the existing bid preferences would balance the cost-effectiveness of the Program with the environmental and ratepayer benefits associated with developing projects on preferred sites. Id., p. 4.

OCC supported maintaining the existing bid preference categories and levels for Year 8. OCC Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 3. OCC stated that bid preferences are appropriate to the extent they are necessary for the Program to achieve its objectives. Id. OCC also opposed establishing new bid preference categories in the final Program year, arguing that introducing new bid preferences at this stage would provide neither bidders nor the Authority with a sufficient basis to evaluate their effects. Id.

Andover Energy recommended retaining the bid preferences adopted for Years 6 and 7. Andover Energy Corresp., Sept. 14, 2026, p. 1. Andover Energy argued that the existing bid preference levels provide preferred site types with an opportunity to participate in the SCEF Program while maintaining rates that are reasonable for ratepayers. Id.

Save the Sound supported maintaining the Year 7 bid preference levels for Year 8. Save the Sound Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 4. Save the Sound noted that one landfill project was selected in the Year 8 procurement and that the project also represented the second-lowest evaluated bid in Eversource's service territory. Id. Save the Sound argued that this result indicates that the existing 20% landfill/brownfield preference is sufficient to facilitate participation by landfill projects and that the limited number of other landfill or brownfield projects may be attributable to factors other than the bid preference amount. Id. Save the Sound also noted that two solar canopy bids were submitted in the Year 8 procurement, one of which was selected, and argued that this result supports maintaining the existing 40% solar canopy preference. Id., p. 5.

Verogy likewise supported maintaining the existing bid preference levels for Year 8. Verogy Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 3. Verogy additionally recommended permitting landfill and brownfield projects to bid above the price cap, similar to the treatment of solar canopy projects. Id., pp. 3–4. Verogy argued that this change would streamline the SCEF Program's design and asserted that the existing general price cap has become prohibitive for development of projects on landfill and brownfield sites. Id.

2. Authority Analysis

Consistent with the broad stakeholder support for maintaining the existing bid preferences, the SCEF bid preference categories and amounts shall remain unchanged for Year 8. Maintaining the existing 20% bid preference for landfill and brownfield projects and the 40% bid preference for solar canopy projects appropriately balances the objectives of encouraging development on preferred sites with the need to maintain a competitive and cost-effective procurement, particularly as the SCEF Program enters its final year.

The Year 7 procurement results provide evidence that the existing bid preference amounts can support the development of preferred-site projects. In Eversource's Year 7 procurement, one landfill project and one solar canopy project were selected. See Motion No. 6, May 15, 2026, Docket No. 25-08-04, Att. B. Moreover, the selected solar canopy project ranked seventh among the 10 selected projects based on evaluated bid price, while the selected landfill project had the second-lowest evaluated bid price. Id. Thus, the results demonstrate that projects receiving the existing bid preferences can remain competitive with other SCEF projects under the current procurement structure.

Only one landfill project and one solar canopy project were selected; no additional brownfield, landfill, or solar canopy projects were selected in the Year 7 procurements. However, the limited number of selected preferred-site projects does not, by itself, establish that the existing bid preference amounts are insufficient to support development of those project types. The number of projects available for selection may also be affected

by the availability of suitable sites, the development characteristics and costs associated with individual sites, the number of developers pursuing such projects, and developers' relative preference for developing preferred-site projects versus less complex standard projects. The Authority therefore does not find sufficient evidence in the Year 7 results to conclude that a change in the existing bid preferences is warranted.

Maintaining the existing bid preferences also promotes stability and predictability as the SCEF Program enters its final year. The existing preferences have been in place for multiple years, and the Year 7 procurement provides recent evidence regarding their operation. Introducing new bid preference categories or materially changing existing preference amounts in the final Program year could create additional uncertainty for developers and make it more difficult to assess the effects of those changes within the remaining procurement period.

The Authority considered Verogy's proposal to permit landfill and brownfield projects to bid above the price cap in a manner similar to solar canopy projects. There is potential merit in evaluating whether the treatment of the various bid preference categories should be more consistent. However, the Authority does not believe that such a substantive change to the bid preferences is appropriate in the final year of the SCEF Program. Instead, the issue may be more appropriately considered in Docket No. 26-06-04, Implementation of Clean Energy Successor Programs, as the Authority develops the successor NRES and SCEF Programs.

Accordingly, the Authority determines that the SCEF bid preference categories and amounts for Year 8 shall remain unchanged from Year 7. The applicable bid preference categories and amounts are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: SCEF Program Bid Preferences

Preference Type	Preference Amount
Solar Canopy[4]	40%
Landfills or Brownfield	20%

E. PROGRAM DOCUMENTS

1. EDC Proposed Changes

Order No. 13 of the Year 7 Decision requires the EDCs to file, by September 1 each year, the current SCEF Program Requirements and all RFP documents "proposing modifications, as necessary and appropriate." Year 7 Decision, p. 19. In compliance with this directive, the EDCs filed Motion No. 2 on August 31, 2026, which includes updated

[4] As determined by the Year 5 Decision, solar canopies may submit bids above the price cap, provided that the final bid price, inclusive of the bid preference, does not exceed the price cap. See Year 5 Decision, pp. 12–13.

SCEF Program documents, including a revised Program Manual. See Motion No. 2, Aug. 31, 2026.

The EDCs did not propose substantive changes to the SCEF Program documents, citing the maturity of the SCEF Program and its entry into its final year. Motion No. 2, Aug. 31, 2026, p. 1; EDC Comments, Sept. 11, 2026, p. 7. The EDCs stated that the revisions proposed in Motion No. 2 are limited to addressing instances of inconsistency and ambiguity in the existing Program documents and are not intended to modify the underlying Program structure or requirements. EDC Comments, Sept. 11, 2026, p. 7.

When commenting on the proposed changes, OCC requested, among other things, that the Authority clarify how unused budget or MW allocations will be treated at the conclusion of the Program's final year, including whether such funds will lapse or be addressed through successor programs. OCC Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 3.

The Authority finds that the EDCs' proposed revisions are limited in scope and are primarily intended to improve consistency among the Program documents and clarify existing requirements. Accordingly, except as otherwise addressed in this Decision, the Authority approves the redline changes proposed by the EDCs, thereby granting Motion No. 2 with modification.

The Authority also notes that the revised Program documents provide that any unallocated Program budget will expire and will not roll over into a subsequent Program year. Motion No. 2, Aug. 31, 2026, Att. 1, p. 11. This provision addresses OCC's request for clarification regarding the treatment of unused Program budget following the final SCEF procurement.

2. DEEP Proposed Changes

Order No. 15 of the Year 7 Decision requires DEEP to file, annually by September 1, proposed changes to Appendix B of the SCEF Program Manual. Year 7 Decision, p. 19. In compliance with this directive, DEEP submitted proposed revisions to Appendix B. See DEEP Compliance, Sept. 1, 2026.

DEEP characterized its proposed modifications as minimal and stated that none of the proposed changes impose additional burdens on bidders. Id., p. 4. DEEP indicated that most of the proposed revisions are intended to clarify existing requirements. Id. For example, DEEP proposed revisions specifying that bidders must provide the full 11-digit census tract number; confirming that Appendix B submissions are due to DEEP by the date and time established by the EDCs in their SCEF RFP; adding a new section addressing Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) exemptions; and revising the Veracity of Statement Affidavit to clarify that the affiant refers to an individual bid rather than a batch of bids submitted by the same developer. Id., pp. 4–5.

The Authority finds that DEEP's proposed changes are limited in scope, primarily clarify existing requirements, and do not introduce new barriers to participation. Accordingly, the Authority approves the redlined changes proposed by DEEP that are not otherwise impacted by other sections of this Decision.

3. Development Period Security

Section 3.5 of the SCEF Program Manual currently requires bidders to post Development Period Security of $25/kW of the nameplate capacity of the bid at the time of bid submission. Motion No. 2, Aug. 31, 2026, Att. 1, p. 12. The EDCs are required to return the Development Period Security if at least one of the following conditions is met: (1) the selected project enters commercial operation in a timely fashion and begins producing energy consistent with the Program's requirements; (2) the project is terminated for failure to receive regulatory approval satisfactory in substance to the EDC; (3) the project is terminated due to a force majeure event; or (4) the bid is not selected under the procurement for which the bid was submitted. Id. Development Period Security is forfeited if the project is terminated by the EDC for an event of default, including, but not limited to, the failure of a SCEF project to enter commercial operation within the required timeframe, or the bidder's decision not to move forward with the bid after submission. Id. The Program Manual does not currently establish a specific deadline by which the EDCs must return Development Period Security following a refund request. See id.

Allco argued that the Authority should require the EDCs to return Development Period Security to unselected bidders without requiring an action or request from the bidder within 30 days of the issuance of bid selection results. Allco Comments, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 4. Allco further argued that, if the EDCs fail to return the Development Period Security within that timeframe, the unreturned amount should accrue interest at the prevailing prime rate. Id. Allco cited its experience in Year 6 in support of its proposal, stating that $225,000 in Development Period Security associated with three non-selected bids remained unreturned for more than 15 months following the issuance of project selection results and were released only after repeated inquiries and the EDCs' imposition of a "company letterhead" request requirement that Allco contended is not contained in the Program documents. Id. Allco argued that the return of Development Period Security should not depend on the bidder's persistence in requesting a refund. Id.

At the September 17, 2026 Technical Meeting, the Authority asked the EDCs to respond to Allco's claims regarding the return of Development Period Security. Tech Mt'g Tr., Sept. 17, 2026, 24:1-8. The EDCs stated that they were not prepared to respond to project-specific questions. Tr., 24:9-14. Eversource nevertheless explained that, following the close of a solicitation, it contacts bidders regarding the return of Development Period Security and requires certain information, including banking information provided on company-specific letterhead, to protect against fraudulent payments. Tr., 24:20-25. Eversource stated that refunds can be issued within four to six weeks, assuming the bidder provides all required information in a timely manner. Tr., 26:1-15. UI similarly stated that the timing of refunds depends on how promptly the bidder provides the required documentation. Tr., 25:13-19.

The Authority cannot determine from the record whether Allco's claimed delay in receiving its Development Period Security was attributable to the EDCs, Allco, or a combination of circumstances. Nevertheless, the current Program documents do not provide sufficient clarity regarding the Development Period Security refund process. Specifically, the Program Manual establishes the circumstances under which Development Period Security must be returned but does not establish a deadline for the

EDCs to issue a refund or identify the documentation that a bidder must provide to facilitate the refund. See Motion No. 2, Aug. 31, 2026, Att. 1, p. 12. The absence of these requirements creates unnecessary uncertainty for bidders and may result in avoidable delays or repeated communications regarding the information necessary to process a refund.

Accordingly, the Authority establishes the following requirements for the Year 8 Development Period Security refund process, which shall be reflected in the Year 8 Program Manual. First, an EDC shall return a bidder's Development Period Security within 45 days after the bidder has submitted all documentation required by that EDC to process the refund. The Authority finds that 45 days provides a reasonable period for the EDCs to complete the necessary administrative and payment-processing activities. The timeframe is also consistent with, and slightly longer than, the four-to-six-week timeframe identified by Eversource at the Technical Meeting. Importantly, the 45-day period will not begin until the bidder has provided all information required by the applicable EDC, thereby ensuring that the EDC is not held responsible for delays resulting from an incomplete submission. The Year 8 Program Manual shall clearly state this requirement.

Second, each EDC shall identify in the Year 8 Program Manual the specific documentation and information that a bidder must provide to receive a Development Period Security refund. The EDCs may reasonably require certain information to verify the identity of the recipient and prevent fraudulent payments. However, those requirements should be clearly communicated to bidders in the Program Manual rather than established through ad hoc or otherwise undocumented communications following a solicitation. Providing these requirements in advance will allow bidders to submit complete refund requests and reduce unnecessary back-and-forth communications that could delay the return of funds.

Third, if an EDC fails to return Development Period Security within 45 days after the bidder has submitted all required documentation, the outstanding amount shall accrue interest at the Federal Funds Effective Rate, at the expense of the EDC and not ratepayers, until the Development Period Security is returned. This is the same interest rate that applies when an EDC retains a bidder's Operating Period Security. See Motion No. 2, Aug. 31, 2026, Att. 4, pp. 4–6. Applying the interest obligation to the EDCs provides an appropriate incentive to timely process refunds while ensuring that any cost associated with an avoidable delay is not borne by ratepayers.

These requirements appropriately balance the EDCs' need to conduct reasonable verification and payment-processing procedures with bidders' need for a clear and timely process for recovering their Development Period Security. The requirements also establish a consistent process across EDCs while allowing each EDC to specify reasonable documentation necessary to process a refund. Timely return of Development Period Security is particularly important because the funds represent capital that bidders may otherwise use to advance other projects. Establishing clear documentation requirements, a defined refund deadline, and an EDC-funded interest obligation will provide greater transparency and reduce the potential for unnecessary delays in the return of bidder funds.

Accordingly, the Year 8 Program Manual shall be revised to incorporate the Development Period Security refund requirements established above.

4. Updated Documents

No later than December 31, 2026, the EDCs, in coordination with DEEP, shall jointly file for Authority review and approval clean and redlined versions of the Year 8 SCEF Program documents, including the Program Manual, Appendix B, and the RFP documents, incorporating all changes approved in this Decision.

V. CONCLUSION AND ORDERS

A. CONCLUSION

In this Decision, the Authority approves changes to the SCEF Program to better serve the Program Objectives. The Decision also approves, with modification, the procurement price cap for applications submitted in the 2027 calendar year. Additionally, the Decision includes the Authority's ruling on Motion No. 2.

B. ORDERS

For Orders requiring a filing, the Company 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.

The below standing orders are a summation of prior orders related to the SCEF Program that continue to apply. In certain instances, the Authority has amended those standing orders through the redline edits reflected below. Because next year is expected to be the final year of the SCEF Program, the Authority has also added language sunsetting orders that will no longer be applicable following the conclusion of the Program. The orders below apply on a prospective basis.

1. Standing Orders

1. Reference Docket No. 19-07-01 Final Decision, Dec. 18, 2019, Order No. 3, p. 22: No later than ninety (90) days after the issuance of this Decision [19-07-01 Final Decision], and ~~semi-~~annually thereafter until the SCEF Program stops accepting new bid submissions, the EDCs shall provide a detailed cost estimate for the SCEF implementation costs in the most recent annual review proceeding, and updates to the forecasted implementation costs and ongoing program administration.

2. Reference Docket No. 19-07-01 Final Decision, Dec. 18, 2019, Order No. 9, pp. 23-24: No later than November 30, 2022, and annually thereafter until January 1 2031, each EDC shall review SCEF subscriptions in the aggregate for the preceding year and report to the Authority in the most recent annual review

proceeding on the status of the aggregate SCEF subscriptions by Customer type, specifically providing:

a. Annual aggregate SCEF production;
b. Annual aggregate SCEF Subscribed Energy by Customer eligibility type, including opt-in Subscribers;
c. Information on each Subscriber who was a Subscriber in the preceding year, including the Subscriber's meter address, customer class, date of entry and exit, and Subscription kWhs, as applicable;
d. The number of residential Subscribers and corresponding Subscription kWhs in the preceding year that were subscribed by way of physical written documentation from a rooftop solar installer that demonstrates they are unable to have solar panels installed on their roof, including any associated documentation;
e. The number of Subscribers and corresponding Subscription kWhs in the preceding year that are in excess of the load covered by net metering, virtual net metering, LREC/ZREC contracts, or PA 18-50 tariffs other than those in this Program, for such Subscriber;
f. All marketing materials used to recruit opt-in Subscribers in the preceding year, including, but not limited to, the website used by the EDC; and
g. The number of Subscriptions, and kWhs associated with any such Subscriptions, which were: (1) transferred to another location when a Subscriber moved; (2) terminated; or (3) resized in the preceding year.

3. Reference Docket No. 19-07-01 Final Decision, Dec. 18, 2019, Order No. 10, p. 24: No later than November 30, 2022, and annually thereafter until the SCEF Program stops accepting new bid submissions, each EDC shall provide in the most recent annual review proceeding an aggregate list of eligible LMI customers readily identifiable in the EDC's billing system, by number of customers and annual electricity consumption, not currently subscribed through the SCEF program.

4. Reference Docket No. 19-07-01 Final Decision, Dec. 18, 2019, Order No. 11, p. 24: The EDCs shall seek recovery of the costs and revenues of the Modified SCEF Program Requirements in their annual RAM proceeding through the NBFMCC charge, in accordance with the requirements in Section Q., Cost Recovery for the EDCs, unless and until recovery of such costs is authorized by the Authority in an alternative manner pursuant to the requirements of General Statutes § 16a-3m.

5. Reference Docket No. 19-07-01RE01 Final Decision, Sept. 15, 2021, Order No. 9, p. 22: No later than August 1, 2022, and annually thereafter until the SCEF Program stops accepting new bid submissions, the EDCs shall provide an annual summary of their SCEF engagement activities in the most recent Annual Review proceeding, including a description of any training sessions held with organizations regarding the SCEF Program and any lessons learned and recommended improvements.

6. Reference Docket No. 19-07-01RE01 Final Decision, Sept. 15, 2021, Order No. 10, p. 22: No later than November 30, 2022, and annually thereafter until the SCEF Program stops accepting new bid submissions, each EDC shall review SCEF

subscriptions in the aggregate for the preceding year and report to the Authority in the most recent annual review proceeding on the status of the aggregate SCEF energy and subscriptions allocated to customers in EJ communities and in municipalities with SCEFs sited on landfills or brownfields with its filing provided in compliance with Order No. 9 of the SCEF Decision.

7. Reference Docket No. 19-07-01RE01 Final Decision, Sept. 15, 2021, Order No. 11, p. 23: The EDCs shall provide as compliance in ~~this docket [19-07-01RE01] and~~ the most recent annual SCEF review docket information on any webinars and public presentations or trainings on the SCEF program two weeks before the day of the event. The EDCs may provide such information closer to the event, if two weeks is impossible or impractical. This order shall sunset when the SCEF Program stops accepting new bid submissions.

8. Reference Docket No. 19-07-01RE02 Final Decision, April 28, 2021, Order No. 3, pp. 17-18: For program Year 2, and all subsequent program years, each EDC shall inform the Authority, on the first day of issuance, that disqualified bidders and winning bidders have been notified. The EDCs shall inform the Authority via a sample notification provided to disqualified bidders (e.g., an anonymized email sent to disqualified bidders) and winning bidders (e.g., an anonymized email sent to winning bidders) as a compliance filing in the most recent annual review proceeding. For clarity, the EDCs shall provide one notification on the first day disqualified bidders are notified and another notification on the day that winning bidders are notified. This order shall sunset when the SCEF Program stops accepting new bid submissions.

9. Reference Docket No. 19-07-01RE02 Final Decision, April 28, 2021, Order No. 4, p. 18: For program Year 2, and all subsequent program years, each EDC shall continue the practice of submitting the selected SCEF bids as a motion in the relevant annual review proceeding (i.e., for Year 6 selected projects, in Docket No. 24-08-04) for the Authority's review and approval. The public summary shall be sorted by evaluated Bid price(s), and shall include for each Bid: the Bid/Project ID, address; Subscriber Organization name; Bid status (disqualified, selected, withdrawn, etc.); as-Bid project size in MW; expected annual production in kWh; Y/N for each Bid Preference considered during the solicitation(s); Bid price(s); evaluated Bid price(s) if Bid preferences are applied; projected annual amount to be paid to Subscriber Organization; the projected annual amount to be paid to Subscribers; estimated in-service date; fuel type (e.g., solar, fuel cell, etc.); and customer class/tariff (e.g., rate 27, rate 30, etc.). If an EDC adjusts its annual SCEF budget cap to reflect projects from prior solicitation years that were terminated, withdrawn, or installed at capacities different from those originally proposed, the EDC shall provide a detailed breakdown of the methodology and calculations used to determine the budget adjustment.

10. Reference Docket No. 19-07-01RE02 Final Decision, April 28, 2021, Order No. 5, p. 18: For program Year 2, and all subsequent program years, each EDC shall provide a narrative summary of the SCEF program solicitation in its motion filed in accordance with Order No. 4 seeking approval of the selected SCEF bids (Summary Report), providing an overview of the key data and metrics. The

Summary Report shall be similar in form to the LREC/ZREC Procurement Plan submitted for the LREC/ZREC program.[5] The Summary Report shall also include a section in the narrative summary that clearly articulates how any disqualified bids met the following criteria: 1) there is a violation of clear program rules; 2) disqualification is not in conflict with the objectives of the program; and 3) disqualification does not represent an unnecessary barrier to entry. Both companies shall use the same format and include the same type of information and data in their Summary Report. Both companies shall also post both the Summary Report and public summary data, in Excel, to their respective websites.

11. Reference Docket No. 19-07-01RE02 Final Decision, April 28, 2021, Order No. 6, p. 18: For program Year 2, and all subsequent program years, each EDC shall file in the most recent annual review proceeding a composite list of the most up-to-date information and data for the most recent and all previous SCEF program solicitations (Annual SCEF Summary Data), no later than 60 days after the Authority's approval of the selected bids. Such report shall include all of the information included in the public summary data filing listed above for each SCEF bid received to-date, as well as an accounting of all unallocated megawatts; all allocated, but unused megawatts; ~~and~~ total in-service megawatts; and the percentage of each in-service project's anticipated electricity output allocated to each customer eligibility type (e.g., the portion subscribed by low-income customers, etc.). The EDCs shall use the same format in providing the Annual SCEF Summary Data, which shall be submitted in an unlocked Excel spreadsheet and concurrently posted to the company's website.

12. Reference Docket No. 19-07-01RE02 Final Decision, April 28, 2021, Order No. 7, p. 18: On a going forward basis, all SCEF bid documents shall be sent to the relevant EDC and DEEP as outlined in Section III.B.1 of the 19-07-01RE02 Final Decision to ensure that both the EDCs and DEEP have all the requisite information to complete their respective reviews. In conducting such reviews, both DEEP and the EDCs shall consider a bid complete if either DEEP or an EDC is in possession of the required documentation.

13. Reference Docket No. 21-08-04 Final Decision, November 17, 2021, Order No. 2, p. 19: No later than September 1, 2022, and annually thereafter until the SCEF Program stops accepting new bid submissions, the EDCs shall jointly file the current SCEF Program Requirements and all RFP documents in the applicable Annual Review proceeding (i.e., Docket No. 22-08-04, 23-08-04, etc.), and proposing modifications, as necessary and appropriate, that will allow the SCEF Program to better meet the Program Objectives.

14. Reference Docket No. 24-08-04 Final Decision, December 11, 2024, Order No. 14, p. 19: No later than January 5, 2025, and annually thereafter until the SCEF Program stops accepting new bid submissions, the EDCs shall file in the most recent annual review proceeding an updated Frequently Asked Question

[5] See, e.g., Docket No. 11-12-06, UI Compliance Filing Order No. 5, Year 9 Final Procurement Plan, Dec. 31, 2020, Compliance Filings for 11-12-06 (state.ct.us).

document and Fact Sheet for the SCEF Program that reflects the Program modifications as directed in the most recent final Decision issued through the SCEF Program Annual Review proceeding, Docket No. XX-08-04.

15. Reference Docket No. 24-08-04 Final Decision, December 11, 2024, Order No. 15, p. 19: No later than September 1, 2025, and annually thereafter until the SCEF Program stops accepting new bid submissions, the Authority requests that DEEP file in the most recent annual review proceeding its recommended Bid Preferences and Procurement Price Cap consistent with § 3.3 of the SCEF Program Manual and proposed changes to Appendix B – Submittal to DEEP.

16. Reference Docket No. 24-08-04 Final Decision, December 11, 2024, Order No. 2, p. 16: As soon as practicable after approval, the ombudsman shall file as compliance any approved extension requests, including whether each request was granted or denied, in the SCEF annual review docket related to the solicitation year in which the project was selected (e.g., Docket No. 22-08-04 if the project was selected in Year 4 of the Program, i.e., calendar year 2022). The ombudsman shall also annually file a summary of any extension request denials in the relevant SCEF proceeding by August 1.

2. New Orders

17. No later than December 31, 2026, the EDCs, in coordination with DEEP, shall jointly file in the present proceeding, for Authority review and approval, clean and redlined versions of the Year 8 SCEF Program documents, including the Program Manual, Appendix B, and the RFP documents, incorporating all changes approved in this Decision. The EDCs shall conduct the Year 8 SCEF procurement in accordance with the final, approved documents and the Program Objectives.

APPENDIX A: List of Docket Participants

Participant	Representing
Ross Abbey United States Solar Corporation 100 N. 6th Street, Suite 410B Minneapolis, MN 55403	US Solar Corp.
Bernadette Antaki Michaud Law Group, LLC 101 Centerpoint Drive, Suite 230 Middletown, CT 06457	Solar Alliance for Virtual Energy
Emily Basham Connecticut Green Bank 75 Charter Oak Avenue, Suite 1-103 Hartford, CT 06106	CT Green Bank
David M. Bodendorf Senior Environmental Engineer Materials Innovation and Recycling Authority 200 Corporate Place, Suite 202 Rocky Hill, CT 06067	Materials Innovation & Recycling Authority
Michael Borkowski Community Power Group	Community Power Group
Carole Briggs, Esq. Department of Agriculture/Office of the Commissioner 450 Columbus Boulevard, Suite 701 Hartford, CT 06103	Dept. of Agriculture/Office of the Commissioner
Ed Brolin Vice President, Policy & Regulatory Affairs Clean Energy Collective 27B Midstate Drive, Suite 106 Auburn, MA 01501	Clean Energy Collective
Cal Brown Sustainable Energy Advantage, LLC	SEA, LLC
Richard W. Caperton Senior Director, Regulatory Affairs and Market Development Arcadia Power 1121 14th Street NW, Suite 300 Washington, DC 20005	Arcadia Power
Michelle Carpenter Turning Point Energy 999 18th Street, Suite 3000 Denver, CO 80202	Turning Point

Participant	Representing
Samantha Chasalow Glenvale, LLC 3190 Washington Street Boston, MA 02130	Glenvale, LLC
Mateo Chaskel Director/Development UGE USA, Inc. 330 W 38th Street, Suite 1103 New York, NY 10018	UGE USA, Inc.
Emma Cimino Acting Commissioner Department of Energy and Environmental Protection 79 Elm Street Hartford, CT 06106-5127	DEEP
Claire E. Coleman Consumer Counsel Office of Consumer Counsel 10 Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051	OCC
Jarryd Commerford Summit Ridge Energy 1401 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 800 Arlington, VA 22209	Summit Ridge Energy
Amanda De Vito Trinsey, Esq. Couch White, LLP 540 Broadway P.O. Box 22222 Albany, NY 12201-2222	CIEC
Samantha Dynowski State Director Sierra Club Connecticut P.O. Box 270595 West Hartford, CT 06127	Sierra Club
Ryan Fahey Ameresco 111 Speen Street Framingham, MA 01701	Ameresco
Jordan Garfinkle Sr. Policy Manager, NE Bloom Energy Corporation 4353 N 1st Street San Jose, CA 95134	Bloom Energy Corp.
William Gary National Fuel Cell Research Center University of California, Irvine Irvine, CA 92697	National Fuel Cell Research Center

Participant	Representing
Dylan J. Gillis Michaud Law Group 101 Centerpoint Drive, Suite 230 Middletown, CT 06457	TRITEC Americas, LLC; Solar Alliance for Virtual Energy
David Giordano Federal & State Government Relations Doosan Fuel Cell America, Inc. 195 Governor's Highway South Windsor, CT 06074	Doosan Fuel Cell America, Inc.
S. Jay Goodman, Esq. Partner Couch White, LLP 540 Broadway P.O. Box 22222 Albany, NY 12201	CIEC
Joel Gordes Environmental Energy Solutions 38 Brookmoor Road West Hartford, CT 06107	Environmental Energy Solutions
Lindsay Griffin Vote Solar 13 Symphony Road Boston, MA 02110	Vote Solar
William Herchel CEO Verogy Holdings, LLC 124 LaSalle Road, 2nd Floor West Hartford, CT 06107	Verogy Holdings, LLC
Tom Hunt Clean Energy Collective 361 Centennial Parkway, Suite 301 Louisville, CO 80027	Clean Energy Collective
Alexandrea Isaac, Esq. Senior Legal Counsel FuelCell Energy, Inc. 3 Great Pasture Road Danbury, CT 06810	FuelCell Energy, Inc.
Morgan Kennedy Energy Resources	Energy Resources
Joel M. Kopylec Director, Regulatory Services & Policy UIL Holdings Corporation 180 Marsh Hill Road Orange, CT 06477	UI
Anubhav Kumaria Office of Consumer Counsel	OCC

Participant	Representing
10 Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051	
Michael Licamele MSL Group, Inc. 18 Wells Hill Road Easton, CT 06612	MSL Group, Inc.
Michael Licamele MSL Group, Inc. - Residential Finance Network 185 Plains Road, Suite 100E Milford, CT 06461	CHIP Fund 5
Gannon Long Policy & Public Affairs Director Operation Fuel, Inc. 75 Charter Oak Avenue, Suite 2-240 Hartford, CT 06106	Operation Fuel
Jeff Lord Clean Energy Collective LLC 361 Centennial Parkway, Suite 301 Louisville, CO 80027	Clean Energy Collective
Matt Macunas Sr. Marketing Mgr. Connecticut Green Bank 75 Charter Oak Avenue, Suite 1-103 Hartford, CT 06106	CT Green Bank
Bruce McDermott Murtha Cullina LLP One Century Tower 265 Church Street New Haven, CT 06510	FuelCell Energy, Inc.
Michael Melone, Esq. Allco Renewable Energy, Ltd. 157 Church Street, 19th Floor New Haven, CT 06510	Jefferson Solar, LLC
Thomas Melone Allco Renewable Energy Limited 157 Church Street, 19th Floor New Haven, CT 06510	Allco Renewable Energy Limited
Paul R. Michaud Michaud Law Group, LLC 101 Centerpoint Drive, Suite 230 Middletown, CT 06457	Solar Alliance for Virtual Energy
Paul Michaud Michaud Law Group, LLC 175 Capital Boulevard, Suite 432 Rocky Hill, CT 06067	TRITEC Americas, LLC

Participant	Representing
Jonathan Miller Gravity Renewables, Inc. 1401 Walnut Street, Suite 420 Boulder, CO 80302	Gravity Renewables, Inc.
Suzannah Nigro, Esq. Staff Attorney Department of Energy and Environmental Protection 10 Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051 DEEP	DEEP/BETP
Vincent Pace Assistant General Counsel Eversource Energy Service Company P. O. Box 270 Hartford, CT 06141-0270	CL&P
James Patenaude 64Solar, LLC	64Solar, LLC
Paschaline Poku Staff Attorney Office of Consumer Counsel 10 Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06050	OCC
Deb Poulin CT Association for Community Action (CAFCA) 203 Main Street 300 Plaza Middlesex Middletown, CT 06457	CAFCA
Christie Prescott UIL Holdings Corporation 180 Marsh Hill Road Orange, CT 06477	UI
Lisa Riffin Glenvale, LLC 3190 Washington Street Boston, MA 02130	Glenvale, LLC
Charles J. Rothenberger Climate & Energy Attorney CT Fund for the Environment/Save the Sound 900 Chapel Street, Suite 2202 New Haven, CT 06511	CFE/STS
Shannon Scheiwiller Sr. Vice President, Marketing Clean Energy Collective 27B Midstate Drive, Suite 106 Auburn, MA 01501	Clean Energy Collective

Participant	Representing
Peter Schmitt US SOLAR	US Solar
James Schwartz Independence Solar 9 Novelty Lane, Unit 9B Essex, CT 06426	Independence Solar
J. Brandon Sharkey, Esq. AmeriZone Consulting, LLC 508 West Lake Avenue Guilford, CT 06437	Lodestar Energy, LLC
Miguel Silva Senior C&I Business Analyst Centrica Business Solutions 7484 Candlewood Road Suite T-W Hanover, MD 21076	Centrica Business Solutions
Megan J. Sullo Office of Consumer Counsel Ten Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051	OCC
Mike Trahan Connecticut Solar and Storage Association P.O. Box 515 Higganum, CT 06441	ConnSSA
Brendan P. Vaughan Keegan Werlin LLP 1 Liberty Square, Suite 208 New Britain, CT 06051	UI
John R. Viglione Office of Consumer Counsel Ten Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051	OCC
Wendy Wanchak, Esq. Connecticut Legal Services, Inc. 1125 Main Street Willimantic, CT 06226	CT Legal Services, Inc.
Amberli Young Project Manager Community Power Group	Community Power Group