



December 23, 2011

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

DETERMINATION OF PROPOSALS AND FINAL PROJECT SELECTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 127 OF PUBLIC ACT 11-80

SUMMARY

The Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (Department or DEEP) is pleased to announce its selection of 2 commercial renewable energy projects pursuant to section 127 of Public Act 11-80, An Act Concerning the Establishment of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection and Planning for Connecticut's Energy Future (Act). DEEP received and evaluated a total of 21 proposed projects. Out of 21 proposed projects, DEEP conditionally awards East Lyme Solar Park and Somers Solar Center the right to enter into long-term power purchase agreements pursuant to the Act, representing the addition of approximately 10 megawatts of renewable generation to the state's renewable energy portfolio. This represents one-third of the 30 megawatts of renewable generation procurement mandated by the Act.

LEGAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Pursuant to Section 127 of the Act, proposals by electric distribution companies (EDC) and private developers may be submitted to the Department to build, own or operate up to thirty megawatts of zero emission Class I renewable energy sources. Section 127 allows such proposals to be submitted by EDCs and private developers. By Notice of Acceptance of Proposals from Private Developers (Notice of Acceptance of Proposals) dated December 9, 2011, the Department announced it would review and approve proposals by private developers to build, own or operate up to 10 megawatts of zero emission Class I renewable energy sources, but specifically reserved the right not to approve any proposals if the number or quality of proposals received were determined to be insufficient to meet the goal of obtaining cheaper and cleaner energy.

In the Notice, DEEP indicated it would evaluate proposals on an expedited basis to enable projects to leverage federal incentives that are set to expire December 31, 2011. DEEP required the applicants to demonstrate how the proposed project met various project eligibility and threshold requirements and minimum contract terms cited in the Notice. The projects that met the requirements were then evaluated against each other

based on factors such as price, economic development, reliability and use of existing sites. The stated goal of the process was to evaluate projects on a competitive basis with an aim to provide the lowest necessary public subsidy for clean energy generation. The Office of Consumer Counsel (OCC) and the Clean Energy Finance Investment Authority (CEFIA) observed and participated in the evaluation process with DEEP (Evaluation Committee).

The process followed by the Department consisted of the following steps:

1. On December 9, 2011, the Department distributed the Notice to a broad list of potential project developers and trade associations. The list is appended hereto as Attachment A.
2. Questions were received by the Department up to and including December 13, 2011.
3. On December 13, 2011, the Department distributed to the mailing list answers to the questions posed.
4. Projects were accepted by the Department through 12:00 noon on December 16, 2011.
5. After receipt of the proposals on December 16, 2011, the Department, OCC, and representatives of CEFIA conducted analyses of proposals received.
6. On December 19 and December 20, 2011, the Department, OCC and CEFIA discussed and compared their analyses.
7. On December 23, 2011, the Department issued the instant approval.

I. PROPOSED PROJECTS

On December 16, 2011, DEEP received a total of 21 proposed projects, totaling approximately 70 megawatts.¹ DEEP is pleased with the number of proposals received, especially the number of projects proposed to be built in Connecticut (see Attachment B). While not specifically a requirement in the Notice of Acceptance of Proposals, DEEP is very encouraged by the level of interest evidenced by the number of viable projects proposed.

II. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Upon receiving the proposals, the Department assigned a project number to each; if a proposal included more than one pricing option, each pricing option was given a

¹ Note: some of the proposals listed the maximum capacity amount (DC) in their proposals instead of the delivered capacity amount (AC). DEEP indicated it would accept proposals up to a maximum value of 5 MW AC. See, DEEP Implementation of Section 127, Questions and Answers.

separate project number.

Project 1	Project 12B
Project 2	Project 13
Project 3	Project 14
Project 4	Project 15
Project 5	Project 15B
Project 6	Project 16
Project 7	Project 17A
Project 8	Project 17B
Project 9	Project 17C
Project 9B	Project 18
Project 10	Project 18B
Project 11	Project 19
Project 11B	Project 20
Project 12	Project 21

In the RFP notice, DEEP indicated that applicants must demonstrate they meet a number of basic requirements, threshold requirements and their acceptance of certain minimum contract terms in order to be eligible to have the project awarded. In addition to the basic requirements of the Notice of Acceptance of Proposals, all proposers on the service list were informed that the Department would provide eligibility clarifications and updates via a "Question and Answers" section on the DEEP website. DEEP will first discuss which proposals the Evaluation Committee determined did not meet the basic requirements and minimum contract terms, followed by an analysis of which projects did not meet the threshold requirements of managerial capability, technical and financial viability. Lastly, the remaining eligible projects were evaluated on the price and non-price criteria set forth in the Notice of Acceptance of Proposals.

Upon initial review of the twenty-one submittals, the Evaluation Committee found that two proposals did not meet one or more of the basic requirements. A review follows:

1. Project 20

The proposal designated as Project 20 was deemed incomplete, based on a lack of relevant content. The proponent submitted three proposals, one each for three sites. The project documents submitted by the proponent for Project 20 contained errors which made evaluation of the proposal impossible. Financial documents filed with this proposal were mislabeled and/or cross-filed, apparently based on the proponent's decision to submit multiple proposals. Several documents within the proposal were misidentified as being related to another proposal submitted by the proponent, Project 19. This included the statement of financial structure and cash flow analysis as well as the contract terms acceptance and pricing proposals. Since these documents refer to Project 19 and not Project 20, these documents are not acceptable for review.

2. Project 21

The proposal designated as Project 21 was deemed incomplete, based on a lack of relevant content. The proponent stated it makes the proposal under “other arrangements” and seeks no funds at this time. Further the proposer submitted a narrative which outlined the positive attributes of solar energy, but did not, in any relevant way, describe the project proposal in a manner that directly relates to the Notice of Acceptance of Proposals. The proposal did not identify the specific technology to be used. The proposal did not specify a nameplate capacity of the technology as between 1 MW and 5 MW, but instead cited “2.5 Mgws (sic) or much more”. The proposer did not indicate its acceptance that the EDCs will own all project energy, capacity & environmental attributes. The proposal made no reference to the requirement regarding commercial operation date or Federal Production Tax credit eligibility. Other than the vaguely worded reference to “a 97 acre level hilltop”, the proposer did not identify the proposed site.

A. BASIC REQUIREMENTS AND MANDATORY CONTRACT TERMS

- Emit no pollutants.
- Have a nameplate capacity of between 1 and 5 MW.
- The EDC will own all energy, capacity and environmental attributes associated with the project.
- The Project must not already be operational or eligible for federal production tax credits as of December 15, 2011.
- Project must be operational by July 15, 2014.
- All power must be delivered to Connecticut.
- The contract will be for a maximum of 20 years.
- Seller shall be paid on a cents/kWh basis only for kWh delivered to the buyer.
- Projects must be operational by July 1, 2014. If the project is not operational by July 1, 2014 the project will be required to pay delay damages as outlined in Section 3.2 of the model PPA (attached).
- In addition, if the project is not operational by July 1, 2016, the buyer may terminate the contract.

The Evaluation Committee found that the following seven proposals did not meet one or more of the basic requirements. A review follows:

1. Project 8 and Project 14

Two applicants indicated in their proposals that they would retain the energy, capacity and environmental attributes. Therefore the proposals did not meet the basic requirements set forth in the Notice of Acceptance of Proposals, which states that the EDC will own all energy, capacity and environmental attributes associated with the project. In addition, the Project 8 proposal did not demonstrate adequate site control and therefore does not meet the technical viability threshold requirement. Therefore, Project 8 and Project 14 were eliminated from further consideration.

2. Project 5, Project 10, Project 16, Project 17

Some proposals reflected a rejection of minimum contract requirements that were expressly stated in the Notice of Acceptance of Proposals, and included proposed alternate PPAs that omitted the requirements. These proposals were eliminated from further consideration.

3. Project 3

The proponent for Project 3 indicated in the “Proposed Structure / Outline” section of their proposal, that “the annual payments [proposed] shall be conditioned upon the generation of not less than 5,000,000 KWh of power per year. If less is produced, the annual payments will be adjusted.” This phrase and other aspects of the proposal designated as Project 3 led the Evaluation Committee to conclude that a proposal in which the price can vary inversely with production is not aligned with the minimum contract term in the Notice of Acceptance of Proposals that the Seller shall be paid a cents/kWh basis only for kWh delivered to the buyer. Therefore, Project 3 was eliminated from further consideration.

B. THRESHOLD CRITERIA

In the Notice of Acceptance of Proposals, DEEP identified three threshold criteria in which the proposals must demonstrate they meet:

- Technical viability of the project including the type of technology utilized and status (maturation), technical specifications, estimated capital and operating and maintenance costs. Applicants were required to submit a projected timeline for project construction completion, including major milestones, with a projected commercial operation date(s) target of July 1, 2014 or earlier. Site control, such as location, ownership structure and anticipated issues obtaining Connecticut Siting Council approval, if any, must be included.
- Management Capability: Experience of the developers, including the technical, administrative and managerial capability to develop and maintain desired

operation over the life of the project. Ability of developers to leverage financial resources should be of strong consideration;

- Financial viability of the project, including a proposed financing plan, financial structure, cash-flow analysis, and general ability to finance said project given current economic conditions and given the availability of long-term fixed-price contracts. The application should have included proforma income statements that indicate projected costs and revenues annually to show that the project is cost based and provides a reasonable rate of return.

DEEP reviewed the remaining eligible projects and determined that all met the threshold criteria with the exception of one project, Project 2. DEEP finds that it does not demonstrate adequate site control. The proponent indicated that it will own the site on which the project would be built without any further supporting documentation, such as a purchase or lease agreement or even a letter of intent. Further, it was not clear from the proposal where the site was located.

C. PRICING EVALUATION

The project evaluation criteria in the Notice of Acceptance of Proposals indicates that projects that meet the Eligibility Requirements will be evaluated on price and non-price criteria. Price criteria will account for 85% of the total score and non-price criteria account for the other 15%. Applicants were asked to provide contract prices expressed on a fixed cents/kWh basis annually and an estimate of annual production and costs annually over the 20 year contract life. The Notice of Acceptance of Proposals further states that projects will be evaluated on the cost impact over 5 and 10 years as well as over the contract life.

DEEP developed a financial model (Model) to evaluate the pricing proposals. The model provides a number of matrices to evaluate the projects both on a nominal and present value basis over 5 year, 10 year and 20 year periods.

Using bid prices and production values provided by the applicants the model calculates annual costs, total costs and present value costs for the first 5 years, 10 years and over the 20 year life of the contracts. The Model provides similar information regarding the over market costs of the proposals. The Model also calculated average prices and over market costs on a cents/kWh basis, in both nominal and net present value (NPV) basis for 5, 10 and 20 year periods. A 7% discount rate was used in the DEEP NPV model to approximate the cost of capital for electric distribution companies.

Over market costs were estimated by comparing the contract costs to avoided costs for energy, capacity and Class I renewable energy credits. The avoided costs were provided by Brattle Group, as calculated for the 2012 Integrated Resource Plan. Since all but one project were solar, DEEP used the same avoided costs each year for all projects.

Each member of the Evaluation Committee conducted their own independent analysis of pricing proposals. DEEP primarily considered the NPV over/under market rankings on a 20 year basis. DEEP also considered the impact on the first 5 and 10 year periods as well as rankings that alternatively used a 3% discount rate and average prices on a nominal basis. OCC primarily evaluated projects based on their nominal prices over the 20 year contract period. CEFIA chose to evaluate projects based on a 3% discount rate.

All members of the Evaluation Committee chose Project 4 as the number 1 selection. This project is the clear winner in all regards. The project has the lowest prices in all years except the first 5 years where it was surpassed by only one other project. It ranks 2nd for 5 years, 1st for 10 years and 1st for 20 years on a NPV basis. Its ranking is also 1st using a 3% discount rate and in nominal terms.

Both DEEP and the OCC chose Project 11A as the second selection. CEFIA did not select a second project. The proponent for Project 11 proposed two pricing options: a base rate that escalated during the contract term Project 11A and a flat rate for all twenty years, Project 11B. Although Project 11A ranks 3rd over 20 years on an NPV basis it was chosen over Project 11B because it ranks higher in the 5 and 10 year periods.

Projects 4 and 11A are both 5 MW projects. Therefore, they fill the procurement goal of 10 MW of renewable generation by private developers. The Evaluation Committee agreed not to select any additional projects.

During the evaluation process the Evaluation Committee did actively discuss two additional projects because of their high position in the price ranking. One project was the only non-solar project submitted. This project ranked highly under the Department's analysis when evaluated over the 20 year contract period on a NPV basis. The project, however, did not rank as highly on a 5 and 10 year basis when compared to Project 11A for those time frames. While the evaluation criterion does include non-price variables, technology diversity was not one of the criteria. When non-price variables were considered it did not alter the project's ranking.

The non-solar proposal presented challenges in evaluation. The proposal included a first year price that would be adjusted each year based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI). The proponent provided price estimates based on a 2% annual escalation rate as an estimate of CPI. This created uncertainty, making it more difficult to compare the project to others since most did propose fixed prices. DEEP believes that a 2% inflation rate over the next twenty years is on the low end of reasonableness but went forward using the provided estimates. In evaluating the results using a 2% escalation factor for the CPI, the project was not considered as attractively priced as the two projects selected. As the 2% inflation rate represented the low end of reasonableness, the proposal was also tested using a 3% inflation rate. Under this assumption, the project ranking declined considerably. Therefore, neither DEEP nor OCC selected the non-solar project.

Another project that was considered but rejected was Project 1. The pricing for this project was the most extreme in terms of escalation. The prices were very low in the early years and very high in the final years of the contract. The project ranked 1st over the first 5 years, 2nd over first 10 years but then dropped significantly when compared to other projects over the life of the contract. Due to the high prices in the later years of the contract, the discount rate has the greatest impact on the ranking of this project. At a discount rate of 7% the project ranks 6th overall. However, when the discount rate is reduced to 3% the project's ranking drops to 9th overall. Project 1 ranked 11th over 20 years when the nominal prices are evaluated. Based on the Evaluation Committee's analysis that weighted the 20-year impact more heavily than shorter time periods, the Project 1 was not selected by the Evaluation Team due to the impact on ratepayers in the future.

Summary of the Primary Price Rankings Used by DEEP						
		NPV 7%*	NPV 7%*	NPV 7%*	NPV 3%**	Nominal**
Project No.		5 Yrs.	10 Yrs.	20Yrs.	20 Yrs.	20 Years
4		2	1	1	1	1
11B		7	6	2	2	2
11A		3	3	3	4	5
6		6	6	4	6	5
12B		8	7	5	3	3
1		1	2	6	9	11
12A		4	4	7	7	7
18A		9	8	8	5	4
18B		5	5	9	8	8
7		13	11	10	9	10
9B		12	10	10	9	9
9A		7	9	12	11	11
13		10	12	13	12	12
19		11	13	14	13	13
15A		15	15	15	14	14
15B		14	14	15	15	15

*Analysis performed on estimated over market costs in \$/MWH.

**Analysis performed on average contract payments in \$/MWH.

D. NON-PRICE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Notice of Acceptance of Proposals indicated that certain non-price criteria would account for 15% of the project selection scoring. The non-price criteria were identified as: impact on overall economic growth; increasing competitiveness of local businesses; job creation in the state; contribution to system reliability; risks of variation in output; moderation of peak load; committing qualifying capacity to ISO-NE; and making efficient use of existing sites and supply infrastructure.

VALUE ASSIGNMENT FOR NON-PRICE CRITERIA

In order to quantify the non-price criteria, the Evaluation Committee evaluated the ten qualified proposals for non-price criteria, and rank-ordered the projects on this basis.

DEEP assigned point values to criteria inputs. The point scale allowed for a maximum of 15 points for each project. Points were assigned for job creation potential, with DEEP determining that all of the qualified proposals scored equally on this criterion. For system reliability criteria, 3 points were awarded for projects which generate power concurrent with peak demand, 1 point was awarded for capacity enhancement and 1 point was awarded for site location in SW Connecticut (an area of congested transmission). For the siting / infrastructure criteria, 5 points were assigned for re-use of a brownfield site, 4 points for use of an existing structure (such as a rooftop on an existing building), 3 points for siting on otherwise reclaimed space, 2 points if the site was on previously usable open space, and 0 points if the siting required clear-cutting of a forested area. An additional point could be added or subtracted to/from the score for proximity to a population / load center.

DEEP's determination on the projects ranking on the non-price criteria in Notice of Acceptance of Proposals is as follows:

<u>Bid</u>	<u>Economic Benefits</u>	<u>System Reliability</u>	<u>Use of Site</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rank</u>
4	3	3	3	9	4 (tied)
11	3	3	3	9	4 (tied)
12	3	4	2	9	4 (tied)
18	3	3	3	9	4 (tied)
9	3	5	5	13	1
6	3	2	2	7	5
7	3	5	4	12	2
1	3	4	4	11	3 (tied)
13	3	3	3	9	4 (tied)
15	3	3	5	11	3 (tied)

OCC also evaluated the projects for the criteria in Notice of Acceptance of Proposals with 15 points being the highest score, and made a determination as follows. OCC focused on jobs benefits, use of existing generation or industrial sites, proximity to major

Connecticut loads, and other factors.

<u>Bid #</u>	<u>Score</u>
4	7
11	7
6	15
12	8
18	7
9	15
7	10
19	7
1	7
13	7
15	12

Based on the aforementioned, the Evaluation Committee concluded that the non-price criteria did not change the rankings for the top 5 projects based on price.

III. FINAL PROJECT SELECTION

Based on the above analysis, the Evaluation Committee selected Project 4, the East Lyme Solar Park proposed by GRE 314 East Lyme LLC and Project 11A, the Somers Solar Center proposed by HelioSage Energy. The two proposed projects were the best priced projects, met DEEP's eligibility requirements, and demonstrated other non-price benefits to the state. Once built, the projects will contribute approximately 10 MW of cheaper, cleaner renewable energy to the State of Connecticut. DEEP find the selected projects will serve the long term interests of ratepayers. DEEP notes that the East Lyme Solar Park proposal contained what may be one of the most competitive prices for a commercial solar project in the country.

The selected bidders will negotiate and execute fixed-price contracts with its respective EDC and will submit the final contract to PURA, who makes final approval of the contract and determines cost recovery. DEEP expects that the final negotiating process will result in non-material changes to the PPA set forth in the proposals. Under no circumstance may any of the minimum contract requirements and/or price be changed. If PURA approval results in an order that is unacceptable in form or substance, either party may terminate the agreement. Failure to execute a contract with the EDC within 180 days of this approval may result in loss of the contract award.

Attachment A

December 9, 2011

NOTICE OF ACCEPTANCE OF PROPOSALS

NOTIFICATION LIST

Daniel Allegretti Vice President, Energy Policy Constellation Energy Commodities Group E-mail: Daniel.allegretti@constellation.com	Robert Babcock, President Elemental Power E-mail: rbabcock@elemental-power.com
David Bogan, Esq. Robinson & Cole LLP E-mail: dbogan@rc.com	Michael A. Coretto The United Illuminating Company E-mail: uiregulatory@uinet.com
John A. DeTore, Esq. Rubin and Rudman, LLP E-mail: jdetore@rubinrudman.com	Daniel Donovan Vice President Plainfield Renewable Energy LLC E-mail: ddonovan@prellc.net
Deborah A. Donovan Sr. Consultant Sustainable Energy Advantage, LLC E-mail: ddonovan@seadvantage.com	EMCOR Energy Services, Inc. E-mail: emcor_info@emcorgroup.com <u>Undeliverable to:</u> jrisley@emcor.net sent to address above on Monday, December 12, 2011
Julie Friedberg Senior Counsel – Northeast Region NRG Energy, Inc. E-mail: julie.friedberg@nrgenergy.com	Bryan Garcia Clean Energy Finance & Investment Auth. E-mail: bryan.garcia@ctcleanenergy.com
Robert C. Grace President Sustainable Energy Advantage, LLC E-mail: bgrace@seadvantage.com	John Harranty, Director GrowJobsCT E-mail: iamjh@sbcglobal.net
Sandi Hennequin Vice President NE Power Generators Association, Inc. E-mail: shennequin@nepga.org	John M. Hiscock General Manager & CEO Norwalk Second Taxing District E-mail: jhiscock@snew.org

<p>Lee D. Hoffman, Esq. Pullman & Comley, LLC E-mail: lhoffman@pullcom.com</p>	<p>Timothy Honan Northeast Utilities Services Company E-mail: honantj@nu.com</p>
<p>Paul Horowitz PAH Associates E-mail: pahorowitz@eathlink.net</p>	<p>Mitchell H. Jacobs Cape Wind Associates, LLC E-mail: jacobs@emienergy.com</p>
<p>Elin Swanson Katz Office of Consumer Counsel E-mail: elin.katz@ct.gov Undeliverable to: Swanson.elin@ct.gov sent to above address on Monday, December 12, 2011</p>	<p>James S. King, Esq. Couch White LLP E-mail: jking@couchwhite.com</p>
<p>Frederic L. Klein, Esq. Pullman & Comley, LLC E-mail: fklein@pullcom.com</p>	<p>Joyce E. Kung Environment Northeast E-mail: ene.ct.docket@env-ne.org</p>
<p>Josh Lieberman General Manager Renewable Energy Markets Association E-mail: jlieberman@tcorp.com</p>	<p>Kevin McCarthy Legislative Research E-mail: kevin.mccarthy@cga.ct.gov</p>
<p>Paul McCary, Esq. Murtha Cullina LLP E-mail: pmccary@murthalaw.com</p>	<p>Paul Michaud Murtha Cullina LLP E-mail: pmichaud@murthalaw.com</p>
<p>Mark Mininberg, President Hospital Energy Development E-mail: mark@hospitalenergy.com</p>	<p>Joey Lee Miranda, Esq. Robinson & Cole LLP E-mail: jmiranda@rc.com</p>
<p>James J. Murkette Executive Director Bridgeport Fuel Cell Park, LLC E-mail: jmurkette@purepowerllc.com</p>	<p>Northeast Energy & Commerce Assoc. E-mail: lois@necanews.org</p>
<p>Janet Palmer Manager Regulatory Policy Northeast Utilities Service Company E-mail: palmejr@nu.com</p>	<p>James S. Potter, President Clearview Power, LLC E-mail: clearviewpower@comcast.net</p>

Homer Purcell Vice President, Sales UTC Power, LLC E-mail: homer.purcell@utcpower.com	Joseph A. Rosenthal, Esq. Office of Consumer Counsel E-mail: joseph.rosenthal@ct.gov
Derek K. Rudd TEN Companies, Inc. E-mail: derekrudd@hartfordsteam.com	Donna C. Sharkey, Esq. Rubin and Rudman LLP E-mail: dsharkey@rubinrudman.com
Mark Sigal Canaccord Adams E-mail: mark.sigal@canaccordadams.com	Andrew Skok DFC ERG CT, LLC E-mail: askok@fce.com
Philip L. Sussler, Esq. E-mail: pls56@aol.com	Michael C. Wertheimer Assistant Attorney General E-mail: michael.wertheimer@po.state.ct.us
Frank Wolak FuelCell Energy, Inc. E-mail: fwolak@fce.com	John Wright Assistant Attorney General E-mail: john.wright@po.state.ct.us

December 12, 2011

NOTICE OF ACCEPTANCE OF PROPOSALS

NOTIFICATION LIST OF ADDITIONAL CONTACTS
NOTICE E-MAILED ON DECEMBER 12, 2011

Eric Brown CBIA E-mail: browne@cbia.com	Gretchen Deans CERC E-mail: gdeans@cerc.com
EMCOR Energy Services, Inc. E-mail: emcor_info@emcorgroup.com	David Fischer E-mail: terra5136@aol.com
Heather Hunt, Esq. Law Office of Heather Hunt E-mail: heatherhuntlawoffice@gmail.com	Elin Swanson Katz Office of Consumer Counsel E-mail: elin.katz@ct.gov
Mike Trahan Solar Connecticut E-mail: mtrahan@solarconnecticut.org	

Attachment B

Project Name: Nexamp Ellington
Developer Name: Nexamp, Inc.
Location: Ellington, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 2.63 MW (AC)
Proposed Operation Date: 5/18/2013

Project Name: Solar Renewable Energy
Developer Name: Solar Renewable Energy LLC
Location: East Granby, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 1.72 MW (DC)
Proposed Operation Date: 7/31/2013

Project Name: East Lyme Solar Park
Developer Name: GRE 314 East Lyme LLC
Location: East Lyme, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 5 MW (DC)
Proposed Operation Date: 6/1/2014

Project Name: Connecticut Studios
Developer Name: Southern Sky Renewable Energy, LLC
Location: South Windsor, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 5 MW
Proposed Operation Date: 11/1/2012

Project Name: Borrego Salem Site
Developer Name: Borrego Solar
Location: Salem, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 2.61 MW
Proposed Operation Date: 9/18/2013

Project Name: Dual Rooftop Solar
Developer Name: Mercury Solar Systems /Altus Power Management
Location: Greenwich, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 4.5 MW
Proposed Operation Date: 11/15/2012

Project Name: Brightfields Solar
Developer Name: Brightfields Development, LLC
Location: West Hartford, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 2 MW (DC)
Proposed Operation Date: Q1, 2013

Project Name: Norwalk Solar Generating Site
Developer Name: NRG Energy, Inc.
Location: Norwalk, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 5 MW
Proposed Operation Date: September 2013

Project Name: BNE Colebrook
Developer Name: BNE Energy, Inc.
Location: Colebrook, CT
Type: Wind
Size: 4.8 MW
Proposed Operation Date: 9/28/2012

Project Name: Connecticut Solar Park
Developer Name: Southport Power, LLC
Location: Lebanon, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 5 MW (AC)
Proposed Operation Date: 7/4/13

Project Name: Borrego Groton Site
Developer Name: Borrego Solar
Location: Groton, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 3.5 MW
Proposed Operation Date: 9/18/2013

Project Name: Goshen Solar Center
Developer Name: HelioSage
Location: Goshen, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 5 MW (AC)
Proposed Operation Date: 11/16/2013

Project Name: BeFree Solar System
Developer Name: BeFree Green Energy, LLC
Location: Hartford, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 1.68 MW (AC)
Proposed Operation Date: 11/1/2012

Project Name: Borrego Thompson Site
Developer Name: Borrego Solar
Location: Thompson, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 2.13 MW (AC)
Proposed Operation Date: 9/18/2013

Project Name: Clinton Solar
Developer Name: Town of Clinton/Sunpower
Location: Did not indicate
Type: Did not indicate
Size: Did not indicate
Proposed Operation Date: Did not indicate

Project Name: Somers Solar Center
Developer Name: HelioSage Energy
Location: Somers, CT
Type: Solar
Size: up to 5 MW (AC)
Proposed Operation Date: 11/16/2013

Project Name: Nexamp Naugatuck
Developer Name: Nexamp, Inc.
Location: Naugatuck, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 2 MW (AC)
Proposed Operation Date: 3/21/2013

Project Name: Pratt & Whitney Solar Center
Developer Name: HelioSage, LLC
Location: East Hartford, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 2.5 MW (AC)
Proposed Operation Date: 11/16/2014

Project Name: Montville Solar Generating Site
Developer Name: NRG Energy, Inc.
Location: Montville, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 2.5 MW (DC)
Proposed Operation Date: 6/30/2013

Project Name: Borrego Pomfret Site
Developer Name: Borrego Solar
Location: Pomfret, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 2.61 MW (AC)
Proposed Operation Date: 9/18/2013

Project Name: Nexamp Putnam
Developer Name: Nexamp, Inc.
Location: Putnam, CT
Type: Solar
Size: 5 MW (AC)
Proposed Operation Date: 5/23/2013