STATE OF CONNECTICUT
PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

ANNUAL EV CHARGING PROGRAM REVIEW – YEAR 6	**:**	**DOCKET NO. 26-08-06**
	:	**JULY 30, 2026**

WRITTEN COMMENTS OF THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY D/B/A EVERSOURCE ENERGY AND THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY

I. INTRODUCTION

The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy ("Eversource") and The United Illuminating Company ("UI" and collectively with Eversource, the "Companies" or the "EDCs") submit to the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority ("PURA" or the "Authority") the following comments in response to the July 9, 2026 Notice of Request For Written Comments (the "Notice") on the Electric Vehicle Charging Program (the "Program" or the "EV Program") established by PURA in the July 14, 2021 Final Decision in Docket No. 17-12-03RE04, PURA Investigation into Distribution System Planning of the Electric Distribution Companies – Zero Emission Vehicles.

II. WRITTEN COMMENTS

The Companies appreciate this opportunity to submit comments to PURA and respectfully request that PURA consider the Companies' comments as it reviews Year 6 of the Program in this proceeding.

A. Written Comments on Topics Identified in the Notice

In the Notice, the Authority invited comments on its proposed framework for a DC Fast Charger ("DCFC") Uptime Requirement and Enforcement Structure, including, but not limited to, the following areas:

- The Authority's proposed DCFC uptime requirement;

- The Authority's proposed DCFC uptime reporting requirements and prerequisite in order to apply for Program incentives;
- The Authority's proposed DCFC uptime requirement enforcement mechanism; and
- The appropriate percentage of incentive withholding for enforcement that incorporates the above Authority-stated considerations.

The Companies will limit their comments to the topics outlined above.

1. The EDCs Concur with the Authority's Reporting Requirements and Prerequisites

The Companies appreciate the Authority's proposal to incorporate the recommendations made in Motion 1[1] to align with the 97% uptime requirement, as defined and required as part of NEVI at 23 C.F.R. § 680.116(b), and to require uptime reporting capability as prerequisite in order to apply for Program incentives for DCFC stations awarded after January 1, 2027.

2. The EDCs Reiterate the Administrative Costs and Burdens of the Authority's Proposed Enforcement Mechanism

The Authority's proposed DCFC uptime requirement enforcement mechanism – that the EDCs enforce the uptime requirement by withholding a to-be-determined percentage of the upfront incentive, fails to address the administrative burdens and costs for utilities, which were previously outlined in Motion No. 003[2].

As the EDCs stated on page 5 of Motion No. 003,

"The enforcement mechanism creates administrative burdens and costs for utilities:

- *Each DCFC site enabled by the CT EV Program could have up to five additional payments to process.*

[1] Joint Motion for Review and Approval of Order No. 14, filed February 2, 2026 in Docket No. 26-08-06.
[2] Joint Motion for Review and Approval of Order No. 12, filed May 1, 2025 in Docket No. 25-08-06.

- *Calculation of requirements and payments based on the site's in-service date would make tracking individual site due dates for data and compliance more difficult.*
- *Data verification and calculation would require resources and costs not currently contemplated as part of the CT EV Program.*
- *Exception management and the outage adjudication process could be burdensome, difficult to verify, and likely require resources and costs not currently contemplated as part of the CT EV Program.*
- *Extends the responsibilities and funding requirements of the overall EV Program past the defined term end date of 2030. Projects awarded in the third DCFC cycle, whose incentive timelines continue five years beyond their in-service date, would incur extended implementation costs potentially borne by the EV Program."*

The Companies further note that, similar to the structure employed in the Non-Residential Energy Solutions ("NRES")[3] and Residential Retrofits for Energy Solutions ("RRES") programs, compliance and enforcement determinations should be made by the Authority's designated Ombudsperson or other Authority-appointed entity rather than the EDCs. The EDCs should not be responsible for determining whether a participant has failed to satisfy the uptime requirement, whether an outage qualifies for an exception, or what enforcement action is warranted.

Rather, the EDCs should receive a determination from PURA or its designee identifying any non-compliance and directing any required withholding, payment adjustment, or other enforcement measure. This approach appropriately separates program administration from compliance adjudication and avoids placing the EDCs in the role of regulator or factfinder.

[3] Decision in Annual Non-Residential Renewable Energy Solutions Program Review – Year 3, issued November 8, 2023 in Docket No. 23-08-03.

Further, to the extent the Authority adopts an uptime enforcement framework that assigns implementation responsibilities to the EDCs, all incremental costs associated with administering and supporting that framework should be fully recoverable in a timely manner. Any compliance tracking, reporting review, enforcement implementation, dispute support, customer communications, data management, information technology modifications, or other activities undertaken to satisfy the Authority's enforcement requirements would represent costs not currently contemplated within the EV Program and should be eligible for full recovery.

3. *Deficiencies with the Withholding Amount Methodology*

Beyond the enforcement burdens addressed in Motion No. 003, the Authority's inquiry regarding determination of the withholding amount itself has some unresolved deficiencies. The proposal "seeks a withholding percentage that is closer to the actual O&M and compliance costs but is not so large as to exacerbate the upfront deployment barrier for DCFC installations." However, this fails to address the disparate incentive amounts for baseline and underserved customers, by not considering that a withholding amount based on a simple percentage of incentive might have a very different economic impact on a customer receiving up to $150,000 versus a customer receiving up to $250,000. Actual O&M and compliance costs are more likely a function of the number of ports any particular customer has installed, and not a function of the incentive award they have received or whether the project is located within a baseline or underserved community. In its Notice, the Authority cited the EDCs' example of a typical four port site budgeting $5,000 to $15,000 per year and the total withholding amounts resulting from various withholding percentages of a baseline incentive. This was only an example, however. Each

customer's O&M and compliance costs will be a function of the number and type of ports at the site.

4. Limited Application of the Requirement

Finally, it may be worth noting that applying this requirement to the ports that receive EV program funding after 2027, while well intended, is not likely to have a significant impact on uptime of the DCFC ports generally in the state. The requirement would apply to the current port deployment goals remaining for the DCFC program area (138 if left unchanged), which (given the current DCFC ports deployed, DCFC ports planned to be built, and DCFC market growth at current rates) by 2030 are only likely to comprise approximately 10 percent of the total DCFC ports in the state.

In conclusion, the Companies appreciate the requirement to report uptime in the manner they proposed in Motion 1 but reiterate their strong opposition to the incentive withholding enforcement mechanism.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY d/b/a EVERSOURCE ENERGY

By: *Daniel T. Crisp*
Daniel T. Crisp
Senior Counsel
Eversource Energy
P.O. Box 270
Hartford, CT 06410-0270
Its Attorney

THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY

By: *Alex E. Soter*
Alex E. Soter
Counsel
UIL Holdings Corporation
180 Marsh Hill Rd.
Orange, CT 06477
Its Attorney

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that on this 30th day of July 2026, the foregoing document was filed with the Authority, and copies of the foregoing document were served upon each person designated on the Authority's official service list in this proceeding in accordance with R.C.S.A. § 16-1-15.

By: *Alex E. Soter*
Alex E. Soter
Counsel