November 10, 2026

Via Electronic Filing and Service

Jeffrey R. Gaudiosi
Public Utilities Regulatory Authority
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, Connecticut 06051

RE: Docket 26-08-05 Annual Energy Storage Solutions Program Review - Year 6 – Written Exceptions

Dear Mr. Gaudiosi,

Earthlight Technologies, LLC respectfully submits these written exceptions for filing in Docket 26-08-05. Please contact me with any questions regarding this filing.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Sean Riel
Sean Riel
Director of Sales Operations
Earthlight Technologies, LLC
128 West Road
Ellington, CT 06029
T: (413) 544-4292
E: sean@earthlighttech.com

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

Annual Energy Storage Solutions Program	**:**	**Docket No. 26-08-05**
Review – Year 6	**:**	**November 10, 2026**

EARTHLIGHT TECHNOLOGIES, LLC WRITTEN EXCEPTIONS IN RESPONSE TO NOTICE

Earthlight Technologies, LLC ("Earthlight") submits these written exceptions to the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority ("Authority") in response to the Proposed Final Decision issued in this docket on October 29, 2026 ("PFD"). Earthlight supports much of the PFD, including the move to seasonal performance payments only. It takes exception to two determinations: adoption of the enrollment incentive clawback and the undefined effective date of the clawback.

I. Enrollment Incentive Clawback

Earthlight asks the Authority to reconsider the enrollment incentive clawback. The PFD finds it necessary because an owner could leave shortly after receiving the incentive and keep the full payment The record does not show that this risk justifies a new repayment obligation.

Construct 5 already ties compensation to continued participation. The PFD recognizes that Construct 5 has substantially reduced ratepayer risk. An owner that leaves forfeits all future performance payments, and losing a single year of those payments typically exceeds the enrollment incentive for most battery systems.

Early disenrollment is rare and usually outside the owner's control. Earthlight, Eversource, and CPower each identified causes such as OEM bankruptcy, home sale, and battery failure.[1] In Year 5, the Authority waived clawback fees for SunPower customers because

[1] Earthlight Comments, July 9, 2026, p. 2; PFD, pp. 25, 27-28.

pursuing them "would be inequitable and likely impractical."[2] The PFD's principle that a clawback applies when a participant cannot continue for any reason is difficult to reconcile with that approach.

Administration will cost close to what is recovered. The Program Administrators estimate $707 to $1,414 per project before legal costs.[3] Because the clawback is prorated over ten years, an owner leaving after eight years of a $3,900 incentive would owe about $780, which is close to the low end of the Program Administrators' cost estimate. Eversource, UI, and the Connecticut Green Bank opposed the clawback or sought cost-effectiveness limits.

II. Effective Date of the Clawback

The PFD applies the clawback to "all new system owners enrolling in the ESS Program, effective when the revised Program Manual is approved," and grandfathers owners that "enrolled in the ESS Program before the effective date."[4] It does not specify when an owner "enrolls." A project passes through several steps, including the initial incentive reservation application in the Green Bank portal, approval, installation, approval to energize, and incentive payment. These milestones will be months apart.

Without clarification, similarly situated customers could be treated differently depending on which step the Program Administrators treat as enrollment. A customer who reserved an incentive in 2026, before any clawback existed, could be told after installation that the clawback applies. Installers cannot disclose, and financiers cannot price an obligation that does not yet exist.

---

[2] Docket No. 25-08-05, Decision (Dec. 17, 2025), p. 31.
[3] PFD, p. 30 n. 6
[4] PFD, Order No. 19.

If the clawback is retained, Earthlight asks that the Final Decision provide that (1) the clawback applies only to projects whose initial incentive reservation application in the Green Bank portal is dated after the Authorityapproves the revised Program Manual; (2) earlier projects are grandfatherred regardless of installation, energization, or payment dates; and (3) the Manual states this rule. The reservation application is the earliest dated record in the portal and gives the Program Administrators one objective date. The rule also mirrors the PFD's treatment of legacy tranches, where approved projects keep legacy terms, and its rationale that owners should be held to the requirements in effect when they enrolled.

III. Conclusion

Earthlight appreciates the opportunity to provide these written comments to the Authority for the 26-08-05 Annual Review.

Respectfully submitted,
Earthlight Technologies, LLC

/s/ Sean Riel
Sean Riel
Director of Sales Operations
Earthlight Technologies, LLC
128 West Road
Ellington, CT 06029
T: (413) 544-4292
E: sean@earthlighttech.com