The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

D.P.U. 24-195 October 17, 2025

Petition of NSTAR Electric Company d/b/a Eversource Energy for Approval of a Mid-Term Modification to its Phase II Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program.

D.P.U. 24-196

Petition of Massachusetts Electric Company and Nantucket Electric Company, each d/b/a National Grid, for Approval of a Mid-Term Modification to its Phase III Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program.

D.P.U. 24-197

Petition of Fitchburg Gas and Electric Light Company d/b/a Unitil for Approval of a Mid-Term Modification to its Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program.

APPEARANCES: John Habib, Esq.
Michael Hershberg, Esq.
Keegan Werlin LLP
1 Cranberry Hill, Suite 304
Lexington, Massachusetts 02421
FOR: NSTAR ELECTRIC COMPANY
Petitioner, D.P.U. 24-195

Bonnie Raffetto, Esq.
National Grid
170 Data Drive
Waltham, Massachusetts 02451

-and-

John Habib, Esq.
Michael Hershberg, Esq.
Keegan Werlin LLP
1 Cranberry Hill, Suite 304
Lexington, Massachusetts 02421
FOR: MASSACHUSETTS ELECTRIC COMPANY AND NANTUCKET ELECTRIC COMPANY
Petitioner, D.P.U. 24-196

Alice Davey, Esq.
Unitil Service Corp.
6 Liberty Lane
West Hampton, New Hampshire 03842
FOR: FITCHBURG GAS AND ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY
Petitioner, D.P.U. 24-197

Andrea Joy Campbell, Attorney General
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
By: Jessica Freedman
Benjamin Meshoulam
Assistant Attorneys General
Office of Ratepayer Advocacy
One Ashburton Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02108
Intervenor, D.P.U. 24-195; D.P.U. 24-196; D.P.U. 24-197

Department of Energy Resources
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
By: Colin Carroll, Legal Counsel
Joshua Williams, Legal Counsel
100 Cambridge Street, 9th Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02114
Intervenor, D.P.U. 24-195; D.P.U. 24-196; D.P.U. 24-197

Katherine Lee Goyette, Esq.
B. Seth Gadbois, Esq.
62 Summer Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
FOR: CONSERVATION LAW FOUNDATION
Intervenor, D.P.U. 24-195; D.P.U. 24-196; D.P.U. 24-197

Sarah Krame, Esq.
50 F St. NW, Eighth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001
FOR: SIERRA CLUB
Intervenor, D.P.U. 24-195; D.P.U. 24-196; D.P.U. 24-197

Scott Dunbar, Esq.
Keyes & Fox LLP
1580 Lincoln Street, Suite 1105
Denver, Colorado 80203
FOR: EV.ENERGY CORP.
Intervenor, D.P.U. 24-195

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department of Public Utilities ("Department") approved NSTAR Electric's electric vehicle ("EV") charging infrastructure program for deployment from 2023 to 2026, National Grid's EV charging infrastructure program for deployment from 2023 to 2026, and Unitil's EV charging infrastructure program for deployment from 2023 to 2027 in prior proceedings docketed as D.P.U. 21-90, D.P.U. 21-91, and D.P.U. 21-92. In the instant proceedings, the Companies propose modifications that they claim will improve their respective EV charging infrastructure programs and further increase EV charging infrastructure deployment, particularly for Level 2 chargers. The Department approves, in part, and denies, in part, the Companies' proposed modifications. The approved modifications are in the public interest and will support the Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals.

The Companies propose to modify the current third-party funding requirements. The record shows that customers' inability to combine external funding for Level 2 electric vehicle supply equipment ("EVSE") with EVSE rebates through the Companies' EV programs has led to project cancellations or delays. To incentivize and accelerate more robust Level 2 EVSE deployment while maximizing the Companies' available EV program budgets during the remaining 14 to 26 months of the current program terms, the Department approves the Companies' proposed modifications to the third-party funding requirements for publicly accessible projects only, including projects that receive MassEVIP funding, and eliminates the requirement to deduct the third-party funding customers receive for publicly accessible projects from the combined make-ready and EVSE incentives they are eligible to receive through the EV program. The original third-party funding requirements will continue to apply to private projects. The Department eliminates the requirement for applicants to the Companies' EV programs to apply for MassEVIP funding.

NSTAR Electric and National Grid propose to modify the rebate incentive structure for their public and workplace segments, reducing rebate levels for direct current fast charger ("DCFC") ports in environmental justice ("EJ") populations and eliminating rebates entirely in non-EJ populations. The Department accepts the Attorney General's recommendations to cap public and workplace segment DCFC EVSE rebates at 25 percent of current levels in EJ populations, to eliminate them entirely in non-EJ populations, and to implement a DCFC EVSE cost cap of $100,000 per site in EJ populations.

National Grid has not demonstrated a clear need for flexibility to increase public and workplace DCFC rebate levels during the remainder of the term. Accordingly, the Department denies National Grid's request for flexibility to adjust public and workplace segment DCFC rebate levels during the current EV program term in response to market conditions.

NSTAR Electric requests an additional $5 million in ratepayer support or, in the alternative, to shift $5 million from its residential segment budget to expand its fleet segment to include a medium- and heavy-duty ("MDHD") fleet pilot that would support approximately six MDHD fleets. The Department approves NSTAR Electric's proposed MDHD fleet pilot and the reallocation of $5 million from the Company's residential segment budget to fund its implementation. The Department also approves NSTAR Electric's proposal to offer enhanced make-ready incentives of up to 150 percent of the average installation cost for customer-side infrastructure, on a case-by-case basis. NSTAR Electric proposes to shift $500,000 from its residential segment budget to its fleet segment budget to implement a pilot program to support approximately 25 bidirectional chargers for MDHD fleet customers, primarily at school bus sites, which the Department denies because NSTAR Electric has not adequately demonstrated that the proposed bidirectional charger incentive pilot is sufficiently unique or does not duplicate other current vehicle-to-grid pilots. NSTAR Electric proposes to shift $3 million within its residential segment budget to implement a residential managed charging program with passive and active managed charging components. The Department approves NSTAR Electric's proposed residential managed charging program and the reallocation of $3 million from the Company's residential segment budget to fund its implementation, as described herein.

National Grid proposes to extend its off-peak charging period (i.e., 9:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) to include weekends and holidays, which the Department approves. The Department approves National Grid's proposal to extend the off-peak charging rebate program through 2026 and to eliminate the participation caps for residential and fleet customers during this period. The Department approves National Grid's request for a waiver of the 15 percent cap on budget shifting between program segments to help support the off-peak charging rebate program and public and workplace segment to the greatest extent possible within its existing Phase III EV program budget because it will benefit ratepayers by using existing EV program funds to extend through 2026 a program that can help facilitate the deferral of, or avoid entirely, costly future distribution system upgrades that can ultimately save ratepayers money. For consistency, the Department finds it reasonable, appropriate, and in the public interest to extend the same waiver to both NSTAR Electric and Unitil. The Department denies National Grid's request to collect an additional $31,948,763 from ratepayers for its public and workplace segment.

Unitil proposes to temporarily suspend the requirement for residential and income-eligible customers in its EV program to participate in its EV time-of-use rate until it can address the high upfront costs associated with purchasing and installing the additional meter socket needed for a second meter that is required to enroll in the EV time-of-use rate, which the Department approves. The Department directs Unitil to provide updates in its EV program annual reports on its efforts to address the costs associated with the second meter socket. The Department approves Unitil's Customer Choice Pathway for its public segment to provide customers with the option of retaining a contractor of their own choosing, which has the potential to attract customers to participate in the Company's public segment offerings and accelerate EV charging infrastructure deployment in its service territory. Our approval of the Customer Choice Pathway will help align Unitil's public segment offering with those of NSTAR Electric and National Grid, thereby promoting greater consistency and uniformity across the Companies' EV programs. The Department approves Unitil's proposed residential managed charging program to be funded by the reallocation of $101,000 from the Company's residential segment budget and directs the Company to eliminate the $50 enrollment incentive for customers who receive residential segment rebates.

The Department declines to dictate the details and requirements of forthcoming EV program proposals because our focus in the current proceedings is to review potential modifications to the Companies' EV charging infrastructure programs to implement during the remainder of the current program terms.

I. INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On December 19, 2024, NSTAR Electric Company d/b/a Eversource Energy ("NSTAR Electric") and Massachusetts Electric Company and Nantucket Electric Company, each d/b/a National Grid ("National Grid"), each filed with the Department a petition for approval of a mid-term modification to its 2023-2026 Phase II and Phase III EV charging infrastructure program, respectively. On December 20, 2024, Fitchburg Gas and Electric Light Company d/b/a Unitil ("Unitil") filed with the Department a petition for approval of a mid-term modification to its 2023-2027 EV charging infrastructure program. The Department approved each company's (individually "Company," collectively, "Companies") current EV charging infrastructure program, with modifications, in Electric Vehicles, D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92 (2022); D.P.U. 21-90-A/ D.P.U. 21-91-A/D.P.U. 21-92-A (2023). The Department docketed these matters as D.P.U. 24-195, D.P.U. 24-196, and D.P.U. 24-197, respectively.[1]

The Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts ("Attorney General") filed a notice of intervention pursuant to G.L. c. 12, § 11E(a) in D.P.U. 24-195 and D.P.U. 24-196 on December 20, 2024 and in D.P.U. 24-197 on January 2, 2025. Additionally, the Department granted full intervenor status to the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources ("DOER"), the Conservation Law Foundation ("CLF"), and the Sierra Club in each proceeding. The Department also granted full intervenor status to EV.Energy Corp. ("EV.Energy") in D.P.U. 24-195.

1 For administrative efficiency, the Department adjudicated the three dockets simultaneously and issues a single Order. These cases have not been consolidated, however, and remain separate proceedings.

Pursuant to notices duly issued on January 8, 2025, the Department received written comments from: (1) the Massachusetts Department of Transportation ("DOT"); (2) the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection ("DEP"); (3) Green Energy Consumers Alliance; (4) Electrify America; (5) EVgo; (6) East Coast Renewable Energy; (7) Firefly Energy Efficiency Services; (8) Highland Electric Fleets; (9) It's Electric; (10) New Leaf Energy; (11) PowerOptions; (12) ReVision Energy; (13) the Alliance for Climate Transition; (14) WeaveGrid; (15) 15 members of the public in D.P.U. 24-195; and (16) eleven members of the public in D.P.U. 24-196.[2]

In support of its filing in D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric sponsored the testimony of the following Eversource Energy Service Company[3] employees: (1) Sean Tully, manager of electric mobility; (2) Kevin Boughan, manager of research and business development; (3) John G. Griffin, director of budgets and financial analysis; and (4) Brandy Chambers, director of customer decarbonization planning.

---

[2] Most commenters recommend that the Department approve the Companies' mid-term modification proposals as proposed or with modifications. Other commenters expressed concern about the rising cost of electricity and urged the Department to reject any budget increases for NSTAR Electric's and National Grid's EV charging infrastructure programs (Amy Bartley Comments at 1; Dolores Rock Comments at 1; Laurie Novak Comments at 1; Michelle Sicard Comments at 1).

[3] Eversource Energy Service Company provides accounting, auditing, communications, rates, legal, regulatory affairs, information technology, human resources, and other services for NSTAR Electric and other Eversource Energy subsidiaries. NSTAR Electric Company, D.P.U. 22-22, at 5 n.8 (2022).

In support of its filing in D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid sponsored the testimony of the following witnesses, all of whom are employed by National Grid USA Service Company, Inc.:[4] (1) Julia Gold, principal policy and strategy analyst for clean transportation; (2) Jenna Gould, manager of clean transportation; and (3) Christopher Coy, manager of clean transportation.

In support of its filing in D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil sponsored the testimony of the following Unitil Service Corporation[5] employees: (1) Cindy Carroll, vice president of customer energy solutions; and (2) Thomas Palma, manager of distributed energy resources, planning and design.

The Attorney General sponsored the testimony of the following witnesses: (1) Caroline Palmer, principal associate at Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. ("Synapse"); and (2) Thanh Nguyen, senior associate at Synapse. In D.P.U. 24-195, EV.Energy sponsored the testimony of Jared Ballew, United States policy director.

The Department determined that it did not require an evidentiary hearing in these proceedings, and no party requested an evidentiary hearing.[6] On June 18, 2025, the Attorney

---

4 National Grid USA Service Company, Inc. provides management, administrative, accounting, legal, engineering, information systems, and other services to National Grid USA subsidiaries, including Massachusetts Electric Company and Nantucket Electric Company. Massachusetts Electric Company and Nantucket Electric Company, D.P.U. 18-150, at 2 (2019).

5 Unitil Service Corporation performs administrative and professional services for Unitil and its utility affiliates. Fitchburg Gas and Electric Light Company, D.P.U. 23-80/D.P.U. 23-81, at 219 (June 28, 2024).

6 The Department finds that the evidentiary records in these proceedings provide an adequate basis to address the Companies' filings without the need for an evidentiary hearing.

General, DOER, CLF, and the Sierra Club each submitted an initial brief in each proceeding[7] and EV.Energy submitted an initial brief in D.P.U. 24-195. On July 3, 2025, NSTAR Electric, National Grid, and Unitil each submitted an initial brief. The Attorney General and DOER filed letters in lieu of reply briefs on July 25, 2025. On August 7, 2025, NSTAR Electric, National Grid, and Unitil each filed letters in lieu of reply briefs.

The evidentiary record for each docket consists of the respective Company's initial filing exhibits and corresponding revisions and corrections to those exhibits, the intervenors' pre-filed testimony, and that Company's responses to information requests. The record in D.P.U. 24-195 includes NSTAR Electric's responses to 94 information requests.[8] The record in D.P.U. 24-196 includes National Grid's responses to 64 information requests.[9] The record in D.P.U. 24-197 includes Unitil's responses to 23 information requests.[10]

---

7 For the reader's ease, the Department omits individual docket numbers when citing to the briefs submitted by the Attorney General, DOER, CLF, and the Sierra Club.

8 The Department, on its own motion, moves the following exhibits into the record of D.P.U. 24-195: DPU 1-1 through DPU 1-21; DPU 2-1 through DPU 2-7; DPU 3-1 through DPU 3-17; DPU 4-1 through DPU 4-4; AG 1-1 through AG 1-7; AG 2-1 through AG 2-5; AG 3-1 through AG 3-2; AG 4-1; DOER 1-1 through DOER 1-5; DOER 2-1 through DOER 2-4; CLF 1-1 through CLF 1-4; CLF 2-1 through CLF 2-4; SC 1-1 through SC 1-12; and ES-EV-MTM-1 through ES-EV-MTM-4.

9 The Department, on its own motion, moves the following exhibits into the record of D.P.U. 24-196: DPU 1-1 through DPU 1-9; DPU 2-1 through DPU 2-8; DPU 3-1 through DPU 3-4; DPU 4-1; AG 1-1 through AG 1-10; AG 2-1 through AG 2-7; AG 3-1 through AG 3-3; DOER 1-1 through DOER 1-4; DOER 2-1 through DOER 2-3; CLF 1-1 through CLF 1-4; CLF 2-1 through CLF 2-4; SC 1-1 through SC 1-7; NG-EV-MTM-1 through ES-EV-MTM-10; and NG-EV-MTM-1 (Rev.) through NG-EV-MTM-8 (Rev.).

10 The Department, on its own motion, moves the following exhibits into the record of D.P.U. 24-197: DPU 1-1 through DPU 1-7; DPU 2-1; DPU 3-1 through DPU 3-3;

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSALS

A. Joint Proposals

1. Third-Party Funding Directives

The Companies jointly propose to eliminate the Department's requirement in D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 127, to deduct third-party funding that customers receive from state or federal programs from the combined EV program incentives for which customers are eligible, including both make-ready infrastructure ("make-ready") and EVSE incentives (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 15-16; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 18-19; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 10). The Companies assert that this requirement has led to project cancellations, especially for municipalities, state agencies, and other customers reliant on grant funding, and has added unnecessary complexity to the EV programs and increased customer dissatisfaction (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 13-15; DPU 1-5; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 15-17; AG 1-3; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 8-9). Additionally, the Companies state that this requirement has hindered Level 2 charger deployment in the Commonwealth by requiring that funding from the Massachusetts Electric Vehicle Incentive Program ("MassEVIP"),[11] administered by DEP, be deducted from customers' eligible EVSE incentives, thereby increasing out-of-pocket costs for

DPU 4-1 through DPU 4-4; AG 1-1 through AG 1-4; AG 2-1; DOER 1-1 through DOER 1-2; CLF 1-1; and FGE-CCTP-1.

[11] Available at https://www.mass.gov/how-to/apply-for-massevip-public-access-charging-incentives (last visited October 17, 2025).

Level 2 projects (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 14-15; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 17; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 9-10).[12]

The Companies propose instead that third-party funding designated for a specific purpose (e.g., EVSE) be deducted from only the corresponding eligible EV program incentives (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 15-16; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 18; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 10). This deduction would apply only if the combined total of third-party funding and EV program incentives for make-ready, EVSE, or networking,[13] respectively, exceeds 100 percent of the program participant's actual, eligible costs for those components (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 15-16, 19; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 18-19; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 10). The Companies state that final rebates issued to customers will not exceed the maximum make-ready, EVSE, and networking incentive levels established for the EV programs (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 19; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 22; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 11).

The Companies maintain that this modification will improve their EV charging infrastructure programs by enabling customers to combine third-party funding with EV program

---

12 NSTAR Electric and National Grid state that the Department's third-party funding requirements have not affected direct current fast charger ("DCFC") deployment due to the unavailability of third-party funding for DCFC projects (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 15, 37; DPU 1-17; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 17, 30; DPU 1-8).

13 Networking enables customers to find and access EV chargers through mapping and queuing features in charging applications. It also facilitates the collection and sharing of charging data. D.P.U. 21-91, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 11 n.6.

incentives, which will help bridge the existing funding gap, reduce customer confusion, and accelerate the deployment of Level 2 chargers (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 17, 19-20; DPU 1-17; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 22-23; DPU 1-8; DPU 2-8; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 11-12). The Companies do not seek an increase to their EV program budgets associated with this proposed program modification (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 19; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 22; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 12).

2. Public and Workplace Segment DCFC Rebate Incentive Structure

NSTAR Electric and National Grid propose to adjust the rebate incentive structure for their public and workplace segments to reduce the rebate levels for DCFC ports in both EJ neighborhoods[14] and non-EJ neighborhoods (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 39;

14 EJ populations are defined in G.L. c. 30, § 62 and the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs Environmental Justice Policy. Environmental Justice Policy of the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, (2021), available at https://www.mass.gov/doc/environmental-justice-policy6242021-update/download (last visited October 17, 2025). A census block group is designated as an EJ population if it meets one or more of the following criteria: (1) the annual median household income is not more than 65 percent of the statewide annual median household income; (2) minorities comprise 40 percent or more of the population; (3) 25 percent or more of households lack English language proficiency; or (4) minorities comprise 25 percent or more of the population and the annual median household income of the municipality in which the neighborhood is located does not exceed 150 percent of the statewide annual median household income. NSTAR Electric and National Grid use the terms "environmental justice neighborhoods" and "environmental justice communities" interchangeably. Other parties also use the term "environmental justice populations" in their filings.

D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 34; DOER 1-2).[15] The Companies propose a 50 percent rebate reduction for DCFC ports in EJ neighborhoods (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 39; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 34). Specifically, for DCFC ports with capacities between 50 kilowatts ("kW") and 149 kW, the rebate would decrease from a maximum of $40,000 per port to a maximum of $20,000 per port, and for 150 kW or higher DCFC ports, the rebate would decrease from a maximum of $80,000 per port to a maximum of $40,000 per port (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 39-40, 42; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 34-35, 37). Rebates for DCFC ports in non-EJ neighborhoods would be eliminated (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 39-42; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 34-35, 37). Additionally, both Companies propose corresponding reductions to the per-site cost cap for EVSE to reflect the modified DCFC rebate structure (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DPU 3-10; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. DPU 3-1).

NSTAR Electric and National Grid maintain that reducing the DCFC rebate levels for their public and workplace segments will prevent exhausting their remaining public and workplace segment budgets at the expense of Level 2 projects and allow them to stretch their remaining public and workplace segment budgets across a greater number of projects (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 40, 42-43; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 34-39). They further assert that this modification will enable them to support a greater number of total chargers, as Level 2 charging ports cost approximately ten times less than DCFC ports

15 NSTAR Electric does not propose to adjust the DCFC rebate levels for its existing EJ communities charging hub pilot program (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 40, 44).

and can be installed in a variety of locations (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 40-41; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 34-39; DPU 1-6; DPU 1-7; DPU 3-3).

NSTAR Electric proposes to implement the modified DCFC rebate structure as a cap on incentive levels for DCFC projects contracted after November 30, 2024 (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 39, 42; DPU 4-1). NSTAR Electric states that it will suspend approval of new DCFC applications until the Department issues a decision on the proposed program modification (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 43-44; DPU 4-1; DOER 1-3).[16] NSTAR Electric maintains that the fast-charging needs of EV drivers in its service area will be adequately met by the 633 DCFC ports already approved through its EV program, along with any additional DCFC ports supported by the remaining public and workplace segment budget (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 43-44; DPU 1-20; DPU 3-1). NSTAR Electric does not seek an increase to its EV program budget for this proposal (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 44).

National Grid proposes to implement the modified DCFC rebate structure as an initial cap on incentive levels for DCFC projects contracted after the date of this Order (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 34; DPU 4-1; AG 2-1). National Grid states that it will adjust its DCFC rebate levels as necessary through the remainder of the EV program term, which runs

[16] NSTAR Electric does not expect to approve any new DCFC applications under its public and workplace segment for the remainder of the EV program term, which runs through 2026, regardless of whether the Department approves its proposed modifications to the DCFC rebate structure (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. DPU 3-1; DOER 1-3). NSTAR Electric states that its proposal is intended to align its program incentives with National Grid's and to ensure optimal use of incentives if DCFC awards continue (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. DPU 3-1; DOER 1-3).

through 2026, in response to market conditions (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. DPU 3-3; AG 2-2). National Grid also states that it will publish any changes to the DCFC rebate levels in advance and that all customers receiving a commitment letter after the publication date will be eligible for the updated incentive levels (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. DPU 3-3; AG 2-2).

B. Company-Specific Proposals

1. NSTAR Electric

a. Medium- and Heavy-Duty Fleet Pilot

NSTAR Electric seeks approval to recover an additional $5 million from ratepayers or to shift $5 million from its residential segment budget to its fleet segment budget[17] to expand its fleet segment to include support for approximately six MDHD fleets (referred to by NSTAR Electric as the "MDHD fleet pilot") (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 26-28).[18] NSTAR

---

[17] In its rebuttal testimony, the Company states that, based on its most recent analysis of its residential segment budget, NSTAR Electric could fully fund the MDHD fleet pilot by shifting $5 million from its residential segment budget to its fleet segment budget within the existing Phase II EV program budget (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 14-15). NSTAR Electric projects a residential segment budget surplus of approximately $30.2 million, approximately $7.91 million of which could be shifted to other program segments under the current 15 percent cap on budget shifting (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 15). Therefore, NSTAR Electric states that the MDHD fleet pilot could be fully funded from this surplus without requiring additional ratepayer contributions (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 15).

[18] To develop the budget for the MDHD fleet pilot, NSTAR Electric based its estimates on a standard site configuration of ten 60 kW DCFC ports using data from its EJ community fleet pilot (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 26-27; ES-EV-MTM-2; AG 1-5). The Company assumed a customer distribution of 50 percent public fleets in EJ neighborhoods, 35 percent public fleets in non-EJ neighborhoods, and 15 percent private fleets (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 26-27; ES-EV-MTM-2). Additionally, the Company included a $140,000 allocation for marketing and program administration to support customer outreach and implementation (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1,

Electric proposes to offer make-ready rebates to private and publicly owned fleets that operate in its service territory and tiered EVSE rebates of up to 100 percent for eligible government-owned fleets based on the EJ criteria that they meet (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 20-21). Specifically, NSTAR Electric proposes to provide rebates of up to: (1) 100 percent of the make-ready costs on the utility side of the meter; (2) 100 percent of the average installation costs of the infrastructure on the customer side of the meter,[19] not to exceed actual installation costs; (3) 100 percent of the EVSE costs for public fleets that (i) are registered in an EJ neighborhood that meets the EJ criterion based on income or (ii) operate more than 50 percent of the time within census block groups that meet the EJ criterion based on income; (4) 75 percent of the EVSE costs for public fleets that (i) are registered in an EJ neighborhood that meets any of the other EJ criteria or (ii) operate more than 50 percent of the time within census block groups that meet any of the other EJ criteria; and (5) 50 percent of the EVSE costs for public fleets in non-EJ neighborhoods (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 21-22).[20]

---

at 27; DPU 3-3). The proposed budget does not account for any potential third-party funding for customers, as the Company maintains that such funding is too uncertain to estimate reliably (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 27).

[19] To account for certain site-specific characteristics and potential cost-shifts in the industry, the Company proposes to provide make-ready incentives for up to 150 percent of the average installation costs of the infrastructure on the customer side of the meter on a case-by-case basis (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 22). NSTAR Electric also proposes to periodically recalculate the average customer-side infrastructure costs for each installation type to reflect current market dynamics (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 22).

[20] The Department acknowledges that the Companies' reference to EJ criteria pertain to the four criteria in the 2021 Environmental Justice Policy. See n.14, above.

NSTAR Electric proposes to implement cost-containment caps for customer-side make-ready and EVSE rebate incentives (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 22-23). For Level 2 EVSE, NSTAR Electric proposes a customer-side make-ready rebate cost-containment cap of $9,600 per port for private and public fleets and the following EVSE rebate cost-containment caps: (1) $3,900 per port for public fleets that (i) are registered in an EJ neighborhood that meets the EJ criterion based on income or (ii) operate more than 50 percent of the time within census block groups that meet the EJ criterion based on income; (2) $2,925 per port for public fleets that (i) are registered in an EJ neighborhood that meets any of the other EJ criteria or (ii) operate more than 50 percent of the time within census block groups that meet any of the other EJ criteria; and (3) $1,950 per port for public fleets in non-EJ neighborhoods (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 22; ES-EV-MTM-2). For DCFC EVSE, NSTAR Electric proposes rebate cost-containment caps of: (1) $9,600 per port for customer-side make-ready and $3,900 per port for EVSE for public fleets in EJ neighborhoods for ports 50 kW or below; (2) $30,000 per port for customer-side make-ready and $40,000 per port for EVSE for public fleets in EJ neighborhoods for ports between 50 kW and 149 kW; (3) $60,000 per port for customer-side make-ready and $80,000 per port for EVSE for public fleets in EJ neighborhoods for ports 150 kW or greater; (4) $9,600 per port for customer-side make-ready and $1,950 per port for EVSE for public fleets in non-EJ neighborhoods for ports 50 kW or below; (5) $30,000 per port for customer-side make-ready and $20,000 per port for EVSE for public fleets in non-EJ neighborhoods for ports between 50 kW and 149 kW; (6) $60,000 per port for customer-side make-ready and $40,000 per port for EVSE for public fleets in non-EJ neighborhoods for ports 150 kW or greater; (7) $9,600 per port for customer-side make-ready for private fleets for ports

50 kW or below; (8) $30,000 per port for customer-side make-ready for private fleets for ports between 50 kW and 149 kW; and (9) $60,000 per port for customer-side make-ready for private fleets for ports 150 kW or greater (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 22-23; ES-EV-MTM-2). NSTAR Electric proposes to implement a cost-containment cap of $400,000 on DCFC EVSE rebates per site (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 23; ES-EV-MTM-2). NSTAR Electric states that the proposed cost-containment caps align with those in National Grid's MDHD fleet segment offering (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 23).

The Company maintains that expanding its fleet segment to include additional MDHD fleets is appropriate because of the demonstrated success of its EJ community fleet pilot, which reached full subscription within eleven months of its launch (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 23-24). NSTAR Electric further asserts that its proposal aligns with the Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals and will support the deployment of charging infrastructure for zero-emission school buses funded by the United States Environmental Protection Agency's ("EPA") Clean School Bus Program (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 24-25, 28).[21]

b. Bidirectional Charger Incentive Pilot

NSTAR Electric proposes to shift $500,000 from its residential segment budget to its fleet segment budget to implement a pilot program to support the purchase of approximately

21 NSTAR Electric notes that airport and ferry operators have expressed interest in installing DCFC stations to support electric aircraft and boats (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 28). The Company states that it is willing to support these MDHD segments if the Department determines that such funding is an appropriate use of ratepayer resources (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 28).

25 bidirectional chargers for MDHD fleet customers and to provide EVSE rebates to offset the incremental costs to upgrade to bidirectional charging equipment, primarily at school bus sites (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 31-32; DPU 1-8; AG 4-1; DOER 1-1).[22] The Company states that the pilot will allow it to start evaluating the bidirectional charging equipment's dispatch capabilities for potential future use (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 32; DOER 1-1; DOER 2-4). The Company anticipates that power dispatch from the bidirectional chargers to the electric grid will not begin until sometime between 2027 and 2030 due to current interconnection timelines for distributed energy resources (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 32; DPU 2-6).

c. Residential Managed Charging Program

NSTAR Electric proposes to shift $3 million within its residential segment budget to implement a residential managed charging program with passive and active managed charging components (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 33-34; ES-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 15).[23] The Company proposes to provide customers with a one-time $50 enrollment incentive and $10 monthly rebates when 90 percent of their EV charging occurs outside the peak hours of

22 To develop the budget for the bidirectional charger incentive pilot, NSTAR Electric based its cost estimates on data from another utility's vehicle-to-grid ("V2G") school bus pilot (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 32; DPU 3-4). The Company estimates that the incremental cost per bidirectional charger port is approximately $20,000 (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 32; DPU 3-4; DOER 1-1).

23 To develop the budget for the residential managed charging program, NSTAR Electric used cost estimates based on data from its residential managed charging program in Connecticut (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 34; DPU 1-16, Att.). The Company projected enrollment of up to 9,000 customers in the program by the end of 2026 (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 34; AG 1-7).

1:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., including weekends and holidays (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 33; DPU 1-13; AG 1-7). NSTAR Electric also proposes to offer a "scheduled charging" service to its managed charging customers who routinely charge their vehicles during peak hours (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 33; DPU 3-6; DPU 3-7; AG 1-7). Customers who receive wiring upgrades or EVSE rebates from the Company will be required to enroll in the residential managed charging program (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. DPU 3-14; DPU 3-15; SC 1-1).[24] The Company proposes to leverage the same internal employees and external vendor partners currently supporting its residential managed charging program in Connecticut to implement the new program (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 34; DPU 3-8). NSTAR Electric estimates that it will take approximately four months from the date of this Order to set up and roll out the program (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DPU 3-8).

NSTAR Electric maintains that implementation of the proposed residential managed charging program is essential because it will help reduce peak demand from EV charging by encouraging off-peak charging, provide valuable insights into EV drivers' charging behavior and responsiveness to time-based pricing to help inform the design of future time-varying rate ("TVR") structures, facilitate the evaluation of technologies and partnerships for monitoring and reporting charging data to support future program expansion, help familiarize customers with utility-managed EV charging, expand the Company's portfolio of demand flexibility assets, and address growing customer interest in participating in a managed charging program (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 34-35; DOER 2-1). The Company also notes that it

[24] Customers who receive wiring upgrades or EVSE rebates from the Company will be ineligible to receive the $50 enrollment incentive (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DPU 3-15).

will use lessons learned from its existing managed charging program in Connecticut to inform the design of future managed charging program offerings in Massachusetts, including offerings for non-residential customers (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 35).

2. National Grid

a. Off-Peak Charging Rebate Program

National Grid proposes to shift $4,966,500 from its residential segment budget to extend its existing off-peak charging rebate program through 2026 (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 26; NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2)). The Company also proposes to eliminate the current program participation caps of 11,000 residential customers and 1,000 fleet vehicles to increase enrollment in the program (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 23; AG 2-5; DOER 2-1).[25] Additionally, National Grid proposes to extend the off-peak period (i.e., 9:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) to include weekends and holidays to align with the design of its EV time-of-use ("TOU") rates proposal in Massachusetts Electric Company and Nantucket Electric Company, D.P.U. 23-85, as well as the design of NSTAR Electric's residential managed charging program proposal in these proceedings (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 24-25).

---

25 National Grid states that approximately 15 percent of registered EVs in the Company's service territory are currently enrolled in its off-peak charging rebate program (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 24). If residential enrollment rates remain the same, National Grid estimates that it could enroll approximately 16,500 residential customers, with approximately 18,000 vehicles, by the end of 2026 (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 24). Regarding the fleet off-peak charging rebate program, National Grid states that while the program has not yet launched, the Company anticipates that careful management of enrollment within the available budget will support increased participation and greater off-peak charging through the end of 2026 (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 24).

National Grid maintains that these programmatic changes will promote continued growth of its off-peak charging rebate program, support program continuity, reduce customer confusion, and incentivize customers to shift more of their EV charging to off-peak hours (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 25-27). The Company states that it will likely need to pause or discontinue the residential off-peak charging rebate program at the end of 2025 unless the Department approves its proposal to eliminate the current 11,000-customer cap because enrollment is expected to reach the cap before year-end based on current trends (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 27, 51).[26]

b. Budget-Shifting Cap and Additional Public and Workplace Segment Funding

National Grid requests a waiver of the 15 percent cap on shifting budget amounts between program segments to help support the off-peak charging rebate program and public and workplace segment through the remainder of the current EV program term (i.e., 2026) to the greatest extent possible within its existing Phase III EV program budget (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 41, 61). For the off-peak charging rebate program, National Grid forecasts a budget deficit of $4,966,500 by the end of 2026 based on projected enrollment of up to 21,000 residential customers (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 42, 47;

26 After the residential customer enrollment cap of 11,000 is reached, National Grid states that it would need to waive the requirement that customers who receive rebates for wiring upgrades through the residential segment also enroll in the off-peak charging rebate program (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 27).

NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2)).[27] As described in Section II.B.2.a, above, National Grid proposes to shift funds from its residential segment budget to fund its off-peak charging rebate program through 2026 (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 26; NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2)). This budget reallocation includes $4,391,250 that would exceed the 15 percent cap on shifting budget between program segments (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 26, 47, 50; NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2)).

For the public and workplace segment, National Grid forecasts a budget deficit of $55,457,106 (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 44-45; NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2)). To address this deficit, the Company proposes to shift a total of $23,508,344 from its residential segment and company staffing budgets to its public and workplace segment budget (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2); AG 3-2). Of this amount, $13,096,418 would exceed the 15 percent cap on budget shifting between program segments (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2)). The Company also seeks approval to collect an additional $31,948,763[28] from ratepayers to address the remaining budget shortfall (D.P.U. 24-196,

---

27 The projected budget shortfall for the residential component of the off-peak charging rebate program includes costs associated with rebates, incentives, and program administration (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 42; NG-EV-MTM-8 (Rev. 1)).

28 In its initial filing, National Grid projected a budget deficit of $2.2 million for IT and back-office system costs, including costs associated with its Clean Energy 2.0 platform, the Company's online application portal for its Phase III EV program (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 43-44). Based on its most recent budget analysis, National Grid now states that its current budget is sufficient to meet the IT and back-office system needs of the EV program for the remainder of the term (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. AG 3-2). As a result, rather than shifting $2.2 million from the company staffing budget to cover IT and back-office system costs, the Company proposes to reallocate those funds to its public and workplace segment (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. AG 3-2). This budget reallocation reduces the Company's incremental budget request for the public and workplace segment

Exh. NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2)).[29] The Company states that this additional funding is needed even if the Department approves a waiver of the 15 percent cap on budget shifting between program segments and its proposal to reduce the public and workplace segment DCFC rebate incentive levels (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 57). National Grid maintains that additional funding for its public and workplace segment is essential to continue progress toward the Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals and ensure continuity of the program (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 52-53, 57-58). National Grid proposes to recover the $31,948,763 in additional public and workplace segment costs, as well as any budget reallocations exceeding the 15 percent cap, from ratepayers through its existing EV program factor (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 59-60).

3. Unitil

a. EV TOU Rate Requirement

Unitil proposes to temporarily suspend the requirement for residential and low-income discount customers enrolled in its EV program to participate in its EV TOU rate until it can address the high upfront costs of purchasing and installing the additional meter socket needed for a second meter, required for enrollment in the EV TOU rate (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 12-13). The Company states that a local electrician estimated the cost of purchasing and installing the additional meter socket at $2,000 and that this expense has deterred interested customers from participating in the residential program (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. FGE-CCTP-1,

---

from $34,148,763 to $31,948,763 (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-4; NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2); AG 3-2).

[29] Minor discrepancies in any of the amounts appearing in this Order are due to rounding.

at 13; DPU 3-1). Unitil also notes that no residential customers have enrolled in its residential segment or EV TOU rate to date (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 13). The Company maintains that suspending this requirement will accelerate participation in its EV program, which will, in turn, help the Commonwealth achieve its EV adoption goals (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. FGE-CCTP-1, at 14; DOER 1-2).

b. Residential Managed Charging Program

Unitil proposes to shift $101,000 from its residential segment budget to implement a residential managed charging program (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. FGE-CCTP-1, at 15; DPU 1-7; DOER 1-1).[30] The Company proposes to provide customers with a one-time $50 enrollment incentive and $10 monthly rebates when 90 percent of their EV charging occurs outside the peak hours of 1:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., including weekends and holidays (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 14). Unitil plans to issue a request for proposals to select a vendor to implement the program (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. FGE-CCTP-1, at 15; DPU 3-2). Customers who receive residential segment rebates from the Company will be encouraged to enroll in the residential managed charging program if they own an EV or EV charger compatible with the selected vendor's software platform (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. DPU 4-2).[31]

[30] To develop the budget for the residential managed charging program, Unitil used cost estimates developed in partnership with the vendor currently managing the Company's ConnectedSolutions program (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. FGE-CCTP-1, at 15; DPU 1-7). The program is designed to accommodate enrollment of up to 100 residential customers (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. FGE-CCTP-1, at 15; DPU 4-4; AG 1-3).

[31] Customers who receive residential segment rebates from the Company will be ineligible to receive the $50 enrollment incentive (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. DPU 4-3).

Unitil maintains that implementation of the proposed residential managed charging program is critical because it will help customers become accustomed to utility-managed EV charging, facilitate the evaluation of technologies and partnerships for monitoring and reporting charging data to support future program expansion, expand the Company's portfolio of demand flexibility assets, provide valuable insights into EV drivers' charging behavior, and reduce peak demand by promoting off-peak charging (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. FGE-CCTP-1, at 15-16; DPU 3-3). The Company also states that it will draw insights from NSTAR Electric's and National Grid's fleet programs to evaluate the feasibility of expanding its managed charging program to include non-residential customers in the future (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 17).

c. Customer Choice Pathway

Unitil proposes to introduce a Customer Choice pathway to its public segment to provide customers with the option to hire their own contractors to install the infrastructure on the customer side of the meter (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 17-18). For Level 2 EVSE installations, Unitil proposes to offer rebates of up to $77,000 to cover both utility-side and customer-side make-ready costs (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG 1-4). For DCFC EVSE installations, Unitil proposes to offer rebates of up to $143,000 to cover both utility-side and customer-side make-ready costs (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG 1-4). Unitil states that its proposal is intended to align its public segment offering with those of NSTAR Electric and National Grid, and to respond to growing interest from customers and developers who prefer to manage their own customer-side infrastructure installations (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 17-18).

Unitil also proposes to create a good cause exemption to the current requirement that program participants in the public segment install at least two EVSE per project site (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 17-18). Unitil notes that this requirement may disqualify smaller commercial and municipal customers who are interested in developing charging stations but face budgetary or other limitations that prevent them from meeting the two EVSE per project site minimum (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 18). The Company states that examples of good cause exemptions may include, but are not limited to, space constraints at a project site or financial constraints that prevent the immediate installation of more than one EVSE (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 18).

III. POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

A. Introduction

Intervenors generally support the Companies' proposed modifications to their EV charging infrastructure programs. However, many intervenors also recommend additional modifications, as detailed below.

B. Third-Party Funding Directives

1. Attorney General

The Attorney General encourages the Department to approve the Companies' proposed modifications to the third-party funding requirements because the existing requirements have led to project cancellations and hindered Level 2 charger deployment (Attorney General Brief at 2, 5). The Attorney General contends that the proposed modifications are reasonable and would likely accelerate Level 2 charger deployment (Attorney General Brief at 5). Therefore, the

Attorney General recommends approval of the Companies' proposed modifications to the existing third-party funding requirements (Attorney General Brief at 5).

2. DOER

DOER supports the Companies' proposed modifications to the third-party funding requirements (DOER Brief at 25). DOER argues that the proposed modifications appropriately balance the need to ensure third-party funds are used to offset EV program funding with the practical challenges of implementing the current directives (DOER Brief at 25). DOER also contends that the proposed third-party funding modifications will help customers better access, understand, and leverage multiple funding sources to cover their EV charging infrastructure project costs, thereby accelerating EV charging infrastructure deployment and advancing the Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals (DOER Brief at 25).

Additionally, DOER urges the Department to eliminate the requirement for applicants of the Companies' EV programs to apply for MassEVIP funding (DOER Brief at 3, 26, 28). DOER notes that the MassEVIP's non-ratepayer funds through the Volkswagen Environmental Mitigation Trust Agreement for State Beneficiaries ("Volkswagen Settlement") are nearly exhausted and, without new funding sources, MassEVIP will be funded exclusively through the sale of allowances and alternative compliance payments under the Climate Protection and Mitigation Expendable Trust, which are funded by ratepayers (DOER Brief at 26). Therefore, DOER contends that the requirement for applicants of the Companies' EV programs to apply for MassEVIP funding no longer serves its intended purposes because both programs are funded by ratepayers (DOER Brief at 28).

To address the Department's concern about applicants receiving duplicative rebates through MassEVIP and the Companies' EV programs, DOER argues that the Department could direct the Companies to prohibit projects that receive MassEVIP funding designated for a specific purpose (e.g., EVSE) from receiving corresponding EV program incentives (DOER Brief at 28). Under this option, DOER recommends that the Department direct the Companies, in coordination with DEP, to ensure that applicants receiving MassEVIP funding designated for a specific purpose are not also receiving EV program incentives for the same purpose (DOER Brief at 28-29).

3. CLF

CLF recommends that the Department approve the Companies' proposed modifications to the third-party funding requirements, which would allow customers to combine incentives from outside sources with those from the EV program, provided that the total funding does not exceed 100 percent of the customer's actual installation costs (CLF Brief at 14). CLF argues that the current third-party funding requirements are impeding Level 2 charger deployment, particularly for public and multi-unit dwelling projects (CLF Brief at 14). CLF contends that this has resulted in significantly higher DCFC deployment and lower Level 2 charger deployment than the Companies' initially projected (CLF Brief at 14-15). CLF contends that adopting the proposed modifications will likely encourage greater deployment of Level 2 chargers (CLF Brief at 15). Accordingly, CLF urges the Department to approve the proposed modifications to the third-party funding requirements (CLF Brief at 15).

4. Companies

The Companies argue that the current third-party funding requirements have led to project cancellations, particularly for municipalities, state agencies, and other customers reliant on grant funding, and have added unnecessary complexity to the EV programs, resulting in customer dissatisfaction (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 7, 10-11; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 10-11; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 8-9). The Companies contend that their proposed modifications will improve their EV charging infrastructure programs by allowing customers to combine third-party funding with EV program incentives, which will help close existing funding gaps, reduce customer confusion, and accelerate Level 2 charger deployment (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 13-14; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 12-14; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 10-12).

NSTAR Electric and National Grid agree with DOER's recommendation to eliminate the requirement that applicants to the Companies' EV programs must also apply for MassEVIP funding because MassEVIP funding from non-ratepayers sources (i.e., Volkswagen Settlement funding) is nearly exhausted (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 13; NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 5; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 13; National Grid Reply Brief at 5). NSTAR Electric and National Grid argue that maintaining this requirement imposes unnecessary administrative burdens on both applicants and program administrators (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 13; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 13). Nonetheless, the Companies argue that customers should continue to have the option to pursue and combine incentives from both MassEVIP and the Companies' EV programs (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 13; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 13). Accordingly, NSTAR Electric and National Grid urge the Department to approve the proposed modifications to the third-party funding requirements, including DOER's recommendation to eliminate the requirement for applicants of the Companies' EV programs to apply for MassEVIP funding (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 14-15; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 14).

C. Public and Workplace Segment DCFC Rebate Incentive Structure

1. Attorney General

The Attorney General supports NSTAR Electric's and National Grid's proposal to adjust the rebate incentive structure for their public and workplace segments to reduce the rebate levels for DCFC ports in EJ neighborhoods and non-EJ neighborhoods because both Companies are on track to significantly exceed their initial DCFC port deployment targets for the current EV program term while falling behind on their Level 2 port deployment targets (Attorney General Brief at 7-8).[32] The Attorney General notes that while the Companies initially projected a deployment ratio of Level 2 to DCFC ports at approximately 30:1, the actual current project pipeline shows a ratio closer to 1:2 (Attorney General Brief at 7). To address this imbalance, the Attorney General recommends further reductions to the Companies' public and workplace segment DCFC rebate levels (Attorney General Brief at 8). Specifically, the Attorney General recommends capping DCFC EVSE rebates at 25 percent of current levels in EJ neighborhoods and eliminating them entirely in non-EJ neighborhoods (Attorney General Brief at 8). The Attorney General argues that these additional adjustments would help level the playing field

---

32 The Attorney General states that NSTAR Electric and National Grid have installed DCFC ports at rates 4.2 and 5.7 times higher than their original targets, respectively (Attorney General Brief at 7).

between Level 2 and DCFC projects and allow remaining public and workplace segment funds to support a greater number of projects (Attorney General Brief at 8).

In addition, the Attorney General recommends a proportional reduction to the per-site DCFC EVSE cost cap, i.e., a DCFC EVSE cost cap of $100,000 per site in EJ neighborhoods (Attorney General Brief at 8-9). The Attorney General notes that NSTAR Electric did not oppose this recommendation and National Grid stated that it will align its per-site EVSE cost targets proportionally with the reduced rebate levels (Attorney General Brief at 9). The Attorney General encourages the Department to approve these recommendations because: (1) the Companies do not oppose them; and (2) the Companies have significantly exceeded their DCFC port deployment targets for the current EV program term (Attorney General Brief at 9-10).

Finally, the Attorney General opposes National Grid's request for flexibility to adjust public and workplace segment DCFC rebate levels during the current EV program term based on market conditions (Attorney General Brief at 10). The Attorney General contends that National Grid has already exceeded its DCFC port deployment targets and, therefore, increasing DCFC rebates above the modified levels is unnecessary to meet the program's objectives for the current term (Attorney General Brief at 10). Furthermore, the Attorney General argues that denying National Grid's request would maintain greater consistency and uniformity between NSTAR Electric's and National Grid's EV programs (Attorney General Brief at 10). Accordingly, the Attorney General recommends that the Department reject National Grid's request for flexibility to adjust DCFC rebate incentive levels during the remainder of the current Phase III EV program term (Attorney General Brief at 10).

2. DOER

DOER supports NSTAR Electric's and National Grid's proposal to modify the DCFC rebate structure for their public and workplace segments because it would promote a balanced approach to program flexibility, efficiency, and equity (DOER Brief at 31). However, DOER argues that DCFC projects located at DOT service plazas should qualify for a 50 percent rebate incentive because these chargers play a critical role in addressing range anxiety, fulfill a critical need that private entities have not met, and are essential infrastructure at highway rest stops owned by the DOT (DOER Brief at 3, 29-30). DOER contends that offering a 50 percent rebate for DCFC EVSE costs at these locations through the Companies' EV programs is consistent with the public interest (DOER Brief at 30).

DOER disputes the Companies' contention that the recommendation is beyond the scope of these proceedings (DOER Reply Brief at 2). DOER argues that its recommendation relates to the public interest standard that governs the Companies' EV programs and that the Department has discretion to adopt this recommendation if the Department finds it to be consistent with the public interest (DOER Reply Brief at 2-3). Even if the recommendation is deemed outside the scope of these proceedings, DOER contends that the Department can still direct the Companies to include it in their next EV program proposals, which are expected to be filed later this year (DOER Reply Brief at 3).

3. CLF

CLF urges the Department to reject NSTAR Electric's and National Grid's proposed modifications to the public and workplace segment DCFC rebate incentives because they could hinder the Commonwealth's progress toward its transportation electrification goals (CLF Brief at 23-24). CLF recommends instead that the Department establish caps on the percentage of total reimbursable project costs (CLF Brief at 23). CLF contends that these project-level caps will ensure that program participants meaningfully contribute to their project expenses (CLF Brief at 23). Additionally, CLF recommends that the Department require more frequent reporting, either quarterly or semi-annually, from the Companies on DCFC and Level 2 charger deployments through their EV programs and the effectiveness of their current rebate incentives (CLF Brief at 24).

4. NSTAR Electric and National Grid

NSTAR Electric and National Grid encourage the Department to approve their proposed modifications to the DCFC rebate incentives for their public and workplace segments because these modifications: (1) are needed to prevent depleting their remaining public and workplace segment budgets at the expense of Level 2 charging projects; (2) will enable them to stretch their remaining public and workplace segment budgets across a greater number of projects; and (3) will support a greater number of total chargers because Level 2 charging ports cost approximately ten times less than DCFC ports (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 35-37; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 20-24).

NSTAR Electric and National Grid oppose CLF's recommendation for more frequent reporting on DCFC and Level 2 charger deployments through their EV programs because this additional reporting would impose an undue burden on the Companies without yielding meaningful results (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 38; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 24-25). NSTAR Electric and National Grid contend that their existing annual reports to the Department on their EV programs adequately capture the relevant information

(D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 38; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 25). National Grid also argues that its proposal for flexibility to adjust DCFC rebate levels based on market conditions is a more effective way to manage deployment imbalances between DCFC and Level 2 ports than increasing the frequency of reporting (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 25). Therefore, NSTAR Electric and National Grid urge the Department to reject CLF's recommendation (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 38; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 25).

National Grid does not oppose the Attorney General's recommendation to reduce DCFC EVSE rebates in the public and workplace segment to 25 percent of the current cost cap for EJ neighborhoods and to eliminate them for non-EJ neighborhoods (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 25). However, National Grid objects to the Attorney General's recommendation to deny its proposal for flexibility to adjust DCFC rebate levels based on market conditions because this flexibility is needed to support the program through the remainder of the current term (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 26). Accordingly, National Grid requests that the Department reject the Attorney General's recommendation to eliminate this flexibility (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 26).

The Companies argue that the Department should reject DOER's recommendation related to rebate levels for DOT service projects because: (1) DOER introduced this recommendation for the first time in its brief and cannot be implemented without a full adjudication;[33] (2) DOER

[33] The Companies note that DOER's recommendation could be adjudicated in a separate proceeding, which would allow for public comment, witness testimony, discovery, evidentiary hearings, and briefing on the recommendations (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 39; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 41).

deliberately raised this issue at the end of these proceedings, depriving the Companies of the opportunity to respond through testimony or discovery; and (3) DOER provided no evidentiary support for its recommendation, nor has it justified why the recommendation is warranted or appropriate at this stage in the proceedings (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 38-39; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 41).

Regarding DOER's argument that the Department has discretion to consider its DOT service plaza recommendation under the public interest standard applicable to the Companies' EV programs, the Companies contend that DOER's legal analysis is flawed and not supported by Department precedent (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 3-4; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 4). Nonetheless, the Companies state that they welcome discussions with DOER and other stakeholders on this recommendation later this year (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 4; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 4).

D. National Grid's Off-Peak Charging Rebate Program

a. Extension of Off-Peak Period

i. Attorney General

The Attorney General does not object to National Grid's proposal to extend the off-peak period (i.e., 9:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) to include weekends and holidays (Attorney General Brief at 11-12). While the Attorney General maintains that a shorter peak period would be preferable to the one currently in place, she recognizes that National Grid does not yet offer TVR or other managed charging programs (Attorney General Brief at 12). The Attorney General also acknowledges that the existing off-peak period aligns with timeframes that would likely be classified as shoulder or mid-peak periods under a TVR structure (Attorney General Brief at 12). As a result, the Attorney General contends that extending the off-peak window may help incentivize EV drivers to charge during lower demand periods in the short term while National Grid deploys the necessary advanced metering infrastructure ("AMI") to support TVR offerings (Attorney General Brief at 12). The Attorney General also acknowledges that a daily off-peak period may reduce customer confusion (Attorney General Brief at 12).

ii. CLF

CLF supports National Grid's proposal to extend the off-peak period to include weekends and holidays (CLF Brief at 21). CLF contends that this proposal aligns with stakeholder feedback, will reduce customer confusion, and encourages more off-peak EV charging (CLF Brief at 21).

iii. National Grid

National Grid urges the Department to approve its proposal to extend the off-peak period to include weekends and holidays because this change will reduce customer confusion, encourage off-peak EV charging, and align the program's design with the Company's proposed EV TOU rates in D.P.U. 23-85 and NSTAR Electric's proposed residential managed charging program in this proceeding (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 16).

b. Residential and Fleet Customer Participation Caps

i. Attorney General

The Attorney General supports increasing the participation caps and the associated budget for National Grid's off-peak charging rebate program but expresses concern with National Grid's proposal to entirely eliminate the participation caps for residential and fleet customers (Attorney General Brief at 12). The Attorney General recommends instead that the Department approve: (1) an increase to the residential participation cap from 11,000 to 16,500; and (2) a corresponding budget increase to support this expanded enrollment (Attorney General Brief at 13). The Attorney General argues that her recommendation aligns with National Grid's own projection of enrolling 16,500 residential customers in the program by the end of 2026, assuming current enrollment trends continue (Attorney General Brief at 13-14).[34] The Attorney General further argues that eliminating participation caps would remove an important cost-control mechanism, which should remain in place until National Grid conducts a benefit-cost analysis ("BCA") demonstrating the costs and benefits of any future expansion, extension, or modification of the program (Attorney General Brief at 15). By limiting the residential participation cap to 16,500 customers, the Attorney General argues that her recommendation will help contain costs and reduce the incremental budget required to support the program (Attorney General Brief at 16).

ii. DOER

DOER urges the Department to approve National Grid's proposal to remove participation caps for residential and fleet customers in the off-peak charging rebate program (DOER Brief at 8). DOER argues that expanding customer enrollment will benefit EV drivers, encourage charging during off-peak hours, and has the potential to defer or avoid costly future distribution system upgrades, thereby helping to mitigate rate impacts for ratepayers (DOER Brief at 8).

---

34 The Attorney General notes that National Grid projects enrollment of up to 21,000 residential customers by the end of 2026 if the residential participation cap is eliminated (Attorney General Brief at 14).

Therefore, DOER recommends that the Department approve the removal of these participation caps (DOER Brief at 8).

iii. CLF

CLF supports the Attorney General's recommendation to cap participation in the off-peak charging rebate program at 16,500 residential customers and to increase the program's budget proportionally (CLF Brief at 22). CLF notes that this cap aligns with National Grid's projected enrollment in the program by the end of 2026 (CLF Brief at 22). However, if National Grid is on track to exceed 16,500 residential participants before the end of 2026, CLF urges the Department to require the Company to submit a report detailing current enrollment figures and a request to increase the participation cap and corresponding budget through the end of 2026 (CLF Brief at 22).

iv. National Grid

National Grid requests that the Department approve its proposal to eliminate the participation caps for its off-peak charging rebate program because, without this change, the Company will likely need to pause or discontinue the residential off-peak charging rebate program at the end of 2025 based on current trends (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 17). National Grid also argues that removing the cap will increase participation in its off-peak charging rebate program and shift more EV charging off-peak (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 17-18).

Regarding the Attorney General's recommendation to limit participation to 16,500 residential customers, National Grid argues that such a cap would force the Company to turn away otherwise eligible participants (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 18). National

Grid also contends that, if participation falls below expectations, the Company will not incur additional administrative or incentive costs (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 18).

With respect to CLF's recommendation to require National Grid to submit a report with enrollment data and a request for a cap and budget increase if participation is on track to exceed 16,500 residential customers before the end of 2026, National Grid contends that this recommendation would impose an undue burden on the Company and create unnecessary barriers to customer participation in the program (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 19).

E. Budget-Shifting Cap and Additional Public and Workplace Segment Funding

1. Attorney General

The Attorney General urges the Department to reject National Grid's request to increase funding for its public and workplace segment by collecting an additional $32 million from ratepayers and shifting funds from the residential segment and company staffing budgets beyond the 15 percent cap on budget shifting for six reasons (Attorney General Brief at 17; Attorney General Reply Brief at 4). First, the Attorney General argues that additional public and workplace segment funding is unnecessary because National Grid has already exceeded its DCFC port deployment target by a factor of 5.7 (Attorney General Brief at 17). Second, the Attorney General contends that National Grid should have managed its existing public and workplace segment budget more effectively to ensure adequate funding for Level 2 projects, and ratepayers should not be responsible for additional costs to deploy Level 2 chargers (Attorney General Brief at 17-18). Third, the Attorney General argues that National Grid has not committed to restricting the use of additional funds exclusively for Level 2 projects (Attorney General Brief at 17-18). Fourth, the Attorney General contends that National Grid has provided no indication that it plans to revise its demand-based approach to awarding DCFC EVSE rebates (Attorney General Brief at 18). Fifth, the Attorney General argues that National Grid's mid-term reassessment of public and workplace charging needs and its determination of ratepayers' share of those costs is inappropriate and that these issues should be reserved for consideration when National Grid files a proposal for the next iteration of its EV program, supported by testimony and a customer bill impact analysis (Attorney General Brief at 18). Finally, the Attorney General contends that the Commonwealth can achieve its transportation electrification goals through other programs and initiatives without requiring an increase to National Grid's public and workplace segment budget (Attorney General Reply Brief at 4). For these reasons, the Attorney General recommends that the Department deny National Grid's proposal to increase public and workplace segment funding through additional ratepayer contributions and budget shifting beyond the 15 percent cap (Attorney General Brief at 18; Attorney General Reply Brief at 4).

2. CLF

CLF recommends that the Department approve National Grid's proposal to shift funding from its residential segment to its off-peak charging rebate program but only to the extent necessary to support the participation of 16,500 residential customers (CLF Brief at 28). CLF also supports National Grid's proposal to shift funding from other program segments to the public and workplace segment, provided that the additional funding is allocated fairly and does not prioritize DCFC projects over Level 2 projects (CLF Brief at 28). Additionally, CLF recommends that the Department require National Grid to provide regular reports comparing projected versus actual deployment figures for both DCFC and Level 2 ports (CLF Brief at 29).

3. National Grid

Due to the near depletion of its public and workplace segment budget, National Grid urges the Department to grant its request for a waiver of the 15 percent budget shifting cap and to approve its proposal to collect an additional $32 million from ratepayers (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 31-32, 36; National Grid Reply Brief at 4). Without this additional funding, the Company states that it will be forced to pause approval of new Level 2 and DCFC project applications, which would impede progress toward the Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 32-33; National Grid Reply Brief at 4). Therefore, National Grid contends that additional public and workplace segment funding is essential to ensure that there is no funding gap between its Phase III and Phase IV EV programs (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 33, 37). National Grid argues that maintaining the EV program's momentum is critical for both customers and for achieving the Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 33, 37).

Regarding CLF's conditional support for the Company's proposal to shift funds beyond the 15 percent cap on budget shifting, National Grid argues that CLF misconstrues the proposal's primary purpose, which is to support Level 2 charger deployment, and that CLF's recommendation for more frequent reporting on DCFC and Level 2 charger deployment levels would create administrative hurdles and slow program implementation (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 36). Accordingly, National Grid requests that the Department reject CLF's recommendation (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 36).

Finally, National Grid urges the Department to reject the Attorney General's recommendation to deny its request for additional public and workplace segment funding because the primary purpose of the additional funding is to support progress toward the Commonwealth's Level 2 charger needs and to prevent a funding gap between its Phase III and Phase IV EV programs (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 40). National Grid acknowledges the Attorney General's argument that the Company's EV program is not the sole source of EV funding in the Commonwealth but contends that increased funding for its public and workplace segment is still critical to support the achievement of the Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 4). Therefore, National Grid requests that the Department reject the Attorney General's recommendation (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 40).

F. NSTAR Electric's Bidirectional Charger Incentive Pilot

1. Attorney General

The Attorney General encourages the Department to deny NSTAR Electric's proposed bidirectional charger incentive pilot for three primary reasons. First, the Attorney General contends that the pilot would not provide meaningful benefits to the electric grid or participating fleets because it does not require participants to enroll in a grid dispatch compensation program, such as ConnectedSolutions (Attorney General Brief at 19-20). Second, the Attorney General argues that NSTAR Electric has not committed to testing V2G capabilities or tracking key metrics, such as V2G's impacts on fleet operations, potential revenues from V2G exports, or broader grid benefits, which undermines the pilot's value (Attorney General Brief at 20). Third, the Attorney General contends that the insights NSTAR Electric hopes to achieve through the pilot can already be obtained through its existing fleet assessment services program, its MDHD EJ communities fleet pilot, and its proposed MDHD fleet electrification pilot (Attorney General Brief at 20-21). Additionally, the Attorney General argues that Massachusetts Clean Energy Center's ("MassCEC") vehicle-to-everything ("V2X") demonstration projects, which will fund V2X initiatives, collect data, and publish a V2X guidebook, will likely yield similar data and lessons that NSTAR Electric can use for the same purpose (Attorney General Brief at 21). The Attorney General also contends that NSTAR Electric's proposed pilot overlaps with MassCEC's program and offers no incremental benefit to ratepayers (Attorney General Brief at 21). Accordingly, the Attorney General recommends that the Department deny NSTAR Electric's proposed bidirectional charger incentive pilot (Attorney General Brief at 21).

2. DOER

DOER encourages the Department to deny NSTAR Electric's proposed bidirectional charger incentive pilot because it focuses primarily on a well-understood use case (school buses) and overlaps with existing programs in Massachusetts and other states (DOER brief at 11-13; DOER Reply Brief at 2). DOER argues that NSTAR Electric has not demonstrated that the pilot will yield any new or meaningful insights (DOER brief at 11-14). Moreover, DOER contends that the proposed pilot is unlikely to deliver significant benefits to the electric grid because it does not require customers to participate in a grid dispatch compensation program, such as ConnectedSolutions (DOER brief at 11, 14-15). Therefore, DOER recommends that the Department reject NSTAR Electric's proposed bidirectional charger incentive pilot (DOER brief at 11).

Despite opposing the approval of the current proposal, DOER recognizes the potential of bidirectional charging as an effective load management strategy for EVs (DOER Brief at 15). Accordingly, DOER recommends that the Department direct NSTAR Electric to file a revised V2X pilot as part of its next EV program proposal that evaluates use cases beyond school buses and those addressed by MassCEC's V2X demonstration projects and that mandates customer participation in a grid dispatch program (DOER brief at 16; DOER Reply Brief at 2).

3. CLF

CLF recommends that the Department deny NSTAR Electric's proposed bidirectional charger incentive pilot because it overlaps with other programs in Massachusetts, including MassCEC's V2X demonstration projects, and would divert funding away from the residential segment, where funding is still needed (CLF Brief at 26-27). CLF also contends that NSTAR Electric has not adequately demonstrated how its proposed pilot would yield substantially different results from MassCEC's program (CLF Brief at 27). Therefore, CLF recommends denial of NSTAR Electric's proposed bidirectional charger incentive pilot and further requests that the Department direct NSTAR Electric to evaluate its residential segment incentive offerings and file a report explaining how they can be improved to better support the program (CLF Brief at 27).

4. NSTAR Electric

NSTAR Electric contends that the bidirectional charger incentive pilot will help ensure that bidirectional charging equipment is ready to support power flow to the electric grid when V2G capabilities become available sometime between 2027 and 2030 based on current interconnection timelines for distributed energy resources (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 27). NSTAR Electric opposes the recommendation from the Attorney General and CLF to deny the pilot on the basis that it does not mandate customer participation in a grid dispatch compensation mechanism, such as ConnectedSolutions (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 27). NSTAR Electric states that ConnectedSolutions is currently the only available program for battery storage dispatch, and it is designed to reduce behind-the-meter load rather than enable energy exports to the grid (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 27). Because the Company is not proposing to make the bidirectional charger incentive pilot a permanent program at this time, NSTAR Electric contends that the Attorney General's recommendation to mandate customer participation in a grid dispatch program is premature and procedurally inappropriate (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 27).

NSTAR Electric also disputes DOER's contention that the pilot will not yield novel insights due to its focus on school buses (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 27). NSTAR Electric argues that rejecting the pilot would result in a lost opportunity to advance V2G technology for fleets, potentially leading to costly future retrofits or significant delays in enabling future fleets to benefit from V2G capabilities (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 27-28).

Additionally, NSTAR Electric contends that the proposed pilot is in the public interest because it seeks to develop new EV technology using existing EV program funds (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 4). NSTAR Electric also argues that the proposal will not hinder the EV charging market or impose additional costs on ratepayers (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 4). Finally, NSTAR Electric contends that approving the pilot will meaningfully advance bidirectional charging because the Company is well-positioned to gather insights and lessons learned from the bidirectional charger incentive pilot (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 4). For these reasons, NSTAR Electric urges the Department to approve the proposed pilot (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 4).

G. NSTAR Electric's Residential Managed Charging Program

1. Attorney General

The Attorney General supports the approval of NSTAR Electric's proposed residential managed charging program, subject to two modifications (Attorney General Brief at 21). First, the Attorney General recommends that customers who receive wiring upgrades or EVSE rebates through NSTAR Electric's residential segment be required to enroll in the managed charging program and be ineligible for the $50 enrollment incentive (Attorney General Brief at 22-23). The Attorney General notes that NSTAR Electric has agreed to adopt this recommendation (Attorney General Brief at 23). Second, the Attorney General contends that any extension of the program beyond 2026 should be conditioned on NSTAR Electric conducting a BCA beforehand (Attorney General Brief at 22).

Regarding the program's benefits, the Attorney General argues that it will help reduce peak demand without increasing costs for ratepayers (Attorney General Brief at 22). The Attorney General also contends that the program's design aligns with National Grid's off-peak charging rebate program, which will help promote a consistent charging experience across the Commonwealth and create uniformity between the Companies' EV programs (Attorney General Brief at 22). Therefore, the Attorney General recommends approval of NSTAR Electric's proposed residential managed charging program, with the inclusion of these two modifications (Attorney General Brief at 23).

2. DOER

DOER supports the approval of NSTAR Electric's proposed residential managed charging program because it would likely reduce peak demand, mitigate stress on the electric grid, and help defer the need for costly distribution system upgrades (DOER Brief at 6-7, 10). While acknowledging some differences between NSTAR Electric's proposed program and National Grid's off-peak charging rebate program, DOER notes that the overall program designs and incentive structures are generally aligned (DOER Brief at 10). DOER argues that this alignment will support a consistent charging experience across the Companies' service territories and make it easier for EV drivers to understand and compare offerings (DOER Brief at 10). DOER also contends that NSTAR Electric's proposed program is likely to deliver comparable benefits to National Grid's off-peak charging rebate program given the substantial similarities between the two programs (DOER Brief at 10). Accordingly, DOER recommends that the Department approve NSTAR Electric's proposed residential managed charging program (DOER Brief at 7, 10).

3. CLF

CLF notes that NSTAR Electric's proposed residential managed charging program incentives are modeled after National Grid's off-peak charging rebate program, which fails to account for several important benefits, including avoided transmission and distribution costs, reliability improvements, capacity-related price reductions, emissions reductions and associated costs, and other non-energy benefits (CLF Brief at 18). CLF encourages the Department to direct NSTAR Electric, National Grid, and Unitil to recalculate their EV managed charging program incentives to more accurately reflect the full value EV drivers provide by participating in these programs (CLF Brief at 18-19).

4. EV.Energy

EV.Energy urges the Department to approve NSTAR Electric's proposed residential managed charging program because it would likely provide many benefits to EV drivers and the electric grid (D.P.U. 24-195, EV.Energy Brief at 1-3). EV.Energy also supports the Attorney General's recommendation to require residential customers who receive wiring upgrades or EVSE rebates to enroll in the managed charging program and to eliminate the $50 enrollment incentive for these customers (D.P.U. 24-195, EV.Energy Brief at 2-3).

While EV.Energy considers NSTAR Electric's proposal to be a strong initial step toward managing EV charging loads in its service territory, EV.Energy encourages the Department to direct NSTAR Electric to expand the active managed charging component of the program in its next EV program proposal because active managed charging programs offer numerous advantages over passive ones (D.P.U. 24-195, EV.Energy Brief at 3). Therefore, EV.Energy recommends that the Department approve NSTAR Electric's current proposal but direct the Company to further develop and expand active managed charging options in its next EV program proposal (D.P.U. 24-195, EV.Energy Brief at 4).

5. NSTAR Electric

NSTAR Electric encourages the Department to approve its proposed residential managed charging program because it will help reduce peak demand by encouraging off-peak EV charging, provide valuable insights on EV drivers' behavior and responsiveness to time-based pricing to help inform future TVR designs, facilitate the evaluation of technologies and partnerships for monitoring and reporting charging data to support future program expansion, help familiarize customers with utility-managed EV charging, expand the Company's demand flexibility resources, and address increasing customer interest in participating in a managed charging program (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 29-30). NSTAR Electric states that it intends to adopt the Attorney General's recommendation to require customers who receive wiring upgrades or EVSE rebates through its residential segment to participate in the managed charging program (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 30).

H. NSTAR Electric's MDHD Fleet Pilot

1. Attorney General

The Attorney General supports the approval of NSTAR Electric's proposed MDHD fleet pilot because its design is consistent with National Grid's fleet program and fleet electrification can help reduce carbon emissions and other air pollutants (Attorney General Brief at 24). However, if the Department approves the pilot, the Attorney General recommends requiring NSTAR Electric to include a fleet managed charging program in its future Phase III EV program proposal (Attorney General Brief at 24-25).

2. CLF

CLF recommends that the Department approve NSTAR Electric's proposed MDHD fleet pilot, with modifications (CLF Brief at 24-25). Specifically, CLF recommends that eligibility for private fleet participation be limited to those operating primarily in EJ neighborhoods (CLF Brief at 25). CLF argues that EJ populations bear a disproportionate burden of transportation-related emissions and that targeting MDHD fleet electrification in these areas will help reduce this impact (CLF Brief at 25). CLF contends that limiting funding for private fleets to those serving EJ neighborhoods will help ensure the program's benefits are distributed more equitably (CLF Brief at 25). Therefore, CLF supports approval of the proposed MDHD fleet pilot, contingent upon the approval of this additional modification for private fleets (CLF Brief at 25).

3. NSTAR Electric

NSTAR Electric argues that expanding its fleet segment to include additional MDHD fleets is appropriate because of the demonstrated success of its EJ community fleet pilot, which reached full subscription within eleven months of its launch, and because the proposed expansion would facilitate the deployment of charging infrastructure for zero-emission school buses funded by the EPA's Clean School Bus Program (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 19-20). The Company contends that the Department should approve the proposed MDHD fleet pilot because it targets a key transportation segment that currently lacks adequate support for EVSE installation (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 22). Without this support, NSTAR Electric contends that entities like school districts, often operating under financial constraints, may be unable to install EV charging infrastructure and may be forced to forgo federal funding for electric buses (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 22). For these reasons, NSTAR Electric contends that the pilot is in the public interest and should be approved (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 24).

Regarding the Attorney General's recommendation that the Department require NSTAR Electric to include a fleet managed charging program in its future Phase III EV program proposal, NSTAR Electric argues that this recommendation is outside the scope of this proceeding (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 23). Therefore, NSTAR Electric requests that the Department reject the recommendation (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 23). Nevertheless, the Company states that it will consider fleet managed charging options in the future and acknowledges that the Attorney General may raise this issue again in the proceeding on its future Phase III EV program proposal (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 23).

NSTAR Electric also opposes CLF's recommendation to restrict funding under the pilot for private fleets to only those that operate primarily in EJ neighborhoods because it would undermine the purpose of the proposed expansion and hinder the Commonwealth's ability to achieve its transportation electrification goals (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 23). Accordingly, NSTAR Electric urges the Department to deny CLF's recommendation (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 23).

I. BCAs for Managed Charging Programs

1. Attorney General

The Attorney General asserts that the Companies should proactively plan for load management ahead of AMI deployment to mitigate the impacts of EV charging and heat pumps on their distribution systems (Attorney General Brief at 26). To support this forward-looking, data-driven approach, the Attorney General recommends that the Department require NSTAR Electric and National Grid to conduct a BCA before seeking approval to extend, expand, or modify their managed charging programs beyond 2026 (Attorney General Brief at 26, 28; Attorney General Reply Brief at 3).

The Attorney General argues that a BCA will help the Companies, the Department, and stakeholders assess the effectiveness of the proposed program design beyond 2026 and increase transparency regarding their benefits and costs (Attorney General Brief at 26). The Attorney

General contends that the BCA should compare both quantifiable and non-quantifiable benefits and costs and serve as one of several factors in determining whether the program's benefits outweigh its costs (Attorney General Brief at 27; Attorney General Reply Brief at 4).

The Attorney General notes that utility companies in other states, such as Maryland, have filed similar BCAs for their managed charging programs and EV TOU rates (Attorney General Brief at 28). Additionally, the Attorney General contends that the Companies have experience conducting BCAs for EV managed charging programs under the 2022-2024 Energy Efficiency Plan (Attorney General Brief at 28). For these reasons, the Attorney General urges the Department to require NSTAR Electric and National Grid to conduct BCAs before requesting any extension of their managed charging programs beyond 2026 (Attorney General Brief at 28-29).

The Attorney General supports NSTAR Electric's recommendation to collaborate with stakeholders to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of different BCA methodologies (Attorney General Reply Brief at 4). The Attorney General further recommends that the Department facilitate this process by convening a technical conference within 90 days of this Order (Attorney General Reply Brief at 4).

2. CLF

CLF supports the Attorney General's recommendation that the Companies conduct BCAs of their EV managed charging programs before extending them beyond 2026 (CLF Brief at 20). CLF contends that, without such analyses, it will be uncertain whether the benefits of these programs outweigh their costs, which is a significant concern because the programs are funded by ratepayers (CLF Brief at 19-20). CLF argues that the Attorney General's request is reasonable because the Companies already conduct BCAs for other programs and file annual reports on their EV programs, and the BCAs would serve as an essential safeguard to ensure value for ratepayers (CLF Brief at 20).

3. Companies

The Companies argue that conducting a forward-looking BCA would be challenging because it would require assumptions about numerous hypothetical and hard-to-quantify future grid benefits, potentially underestimating their programs' total long-term value and making them appear less cost-effective than they actually are (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 31; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 31-32; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 14). NSTAR Electric recommends collaboration between the Department, the distribution companies, and stakeholders to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of different BCA methodologies before the Department reaches a determination on whether the Companies should be required to conduct BCAs for their managed charging programs (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 31).

Regarding the Attorney General's recommendation that the Department convene a technical conference within 90 days of this Order to evaluate different BCA methodologies, NSTAR Electric and Unitil argue that this recommendation is arbitrary and outside the scope of these proceedings (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 3; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 3).[35] Therefore, NSTAR Electric and Unitil request that the Department reject the

[35] National Grid does not specifically address this recommendation on brief.

Attorney General's recommendation (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 3; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 3).

J. Unitil's EV Time-of-Use Rate Requirement

1. Attorney General

The Attorney General supports Unitil's proposal to temporarily suspend the requirement for residential program participants to enroll in its EV TOU rate because the cost of installing a second meter socket presents a significant barrier to participation in Unitil's EV program (Attorney General Brief at 29). The Attorney General notes that no customers have enrolled in Unitil's residential program or EV TOU rate to date, primarily due to the costs associated with the additional meter socket installation (Attorney General Brief at 29-30). Accordingly, the Attorney General recommends approving the temporary suspension of this enrollment requirement for residential customers (Attorney General Brief at 30).

2. CLF

CLF supports the approval of Unitil's proposal to temporarily suspend the requirement for residential program participants to enroll in its EV TOU rate because the cost of purchasing and installing a separate meter socket has deterred customers from participating in Unitil's EV program (CLF Brief at 29-30).

3. Unitil

Unitil urges the Department to approve its proposal to temporarily suspend the requirement for residential program participants to enroll in its EV TOU rate because this requirement has deterred residential customers from enrolling in its EV program (D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 15). Unitil notes that both the Attorney General and CLF support this proposal

(D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 15). Accordingly, Unitil requests that the Department approve its proposal (D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 15).

K. Unitil's Customer Choice Pathway

1. Attorney General

The Attorney General supports Unitil's proposal to implement a Customer Choice pathway for its public segment because it would likely increase customer participation in Unitil's EV program and promote the deployment of more EV charging infrastructure in Unitil's service territory (Attorney General Brief at 30-31). Therefore, the Attorney General recommends that the Department approve Unitil's proposed Customer Choice pathway (Attorney General Brief at 30-31).

2. CLF

CLF recommends that the Department approve Unitil's proposal to introduce a Customer Choice pathway to its public segment because it would likely increase customer participation in Unitil's EV program and help accelerate EV charging infrastructure deployment in Unitil's service territory (CLF Brief at 30).

3. Unitil

Unitil requests that the Department approve its proposal to introduce a Customer Choice Pathway to its residential segment because it will align its public segment offering with those of NSTAR Electric and National Grid, help increase customer participation in its EV program, and accelerate EV charging infrastructure deployment in its service territory (D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 15-16). Unitil notes that both the Attorney General and CLF support this proposal

(D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 16). Therefore, Unitil requests approval of its proposed Customer Choice Pathway (D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 16).

L. Unitil's Residential Managed Charging Program

1. Attorney General

The Attorney General urges the Department to deny Unitil's proposed residential managed charging program due to its substantially higher cost per participant compared to NSTAR Electric's similar proposal (Attorney General Brief at 31). Specifically, the Attorney General observes that Unitil's program would cost $337 annually per customer whereas NSTAR Electric's program would cost $167 annually per customer (Attorney General Brief at 31). The Attorney General argues that Unitil has not adequately demonstrated that the benefits of its proposed program outweigh the costs (Attorney General Brief at 31-32). Accordingly, the Attorney General recommends that the Department deny Unitil's proposed residential managed charging program (Attorney General Brief at 31-32).

2. DOER

DOER supports the approval of Unitil's proposed residential managed charging program because it is likely to reduce peak demand, alleviate stress on the electric grid, and help defer the need for costly distribution system upgrades (DOER Brief at 6-7, 10). DOER acknowledges certain differences between Unitil's proposed program and National Grid's off-peak charging rebate program but notes that the overall program designs and incentive structures are generally aligned (DOER Brief at 10). DOER contends that the general alignment between the two programs will promote a uniform charging experience across the Companies' service territories and simplify customer understanding and comparison of available offerings (DOER Brief at 10).

Additionally, DOER contends that, due to the substantial similarities between the two programs, Unitil's proposed program is likely to yield benefits comparable to those of National Grid's off-peak charging rebate program (DOER Brief at 10). Therefore, DOER recommends that the Department approve Unitil's proposed residential managed charging program (DOER Brief at 7, 10).

3. <u>CLF</u>

CLF notes that Unitil's proposed residential managed charging program incentives are modeled after National Grid's off-peak charging rebate program, which fails to account for several important benefits, including avoided transmission and distribution costs, reliability improvements, capacity-related price reductions, emissions reductions and associated costs, and other non-energy benefits (CLF Brief at 18). CLF encourages the Department to direct Unitil, NSTAR Electric, and National Grid to recalculate their EV managed charging program incentives to more accurately reflect the full value EV drivers provide by participating in these programs (CLF Brief at 18-19).

4. <u>Unitil</u>

Unitil encourages the Department to approve its proposed residential managed charging program because it would help customers become accustomed to utility-managed EV charging, facilitate the evaluation of technologies and partnerships for monitoring and reporting charging data to support future program expansion, expand the Company's demand flexibility assets, provide important insights into EV drivers' charging behavior, and reduce peak demand by promoting off-peak charging (D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 13-15).

M. Other Issues

1. EV Load Management Roadmaps

a. DOER

DOER urges the Department to direct the Companies to submit an EV load management roadmap as part of their next EV program proposals (DOER Brief at 3, 20). DOER maintains that the roadmaps should outline a clear and strategic approach to EV charging infrastructure investments that support the Commonwealth's clean energy and affordability goals (DOER Brief at 3, 20-21). DOER recommends that the Department provide guidance on the required components of these roadmaps (DOER Brief at 3, 20-21, 24).

At a minimum, DOER argues that each roadmap should include: (1) information on future load management plans and offerings; (2) consolidated performance data related to EV load management; (3) a comprehensive summary of past, current, and planned EV load management and demand response programs as well as EV-related rate designs; (4) forecasts of peak load reductions attributable to current and future[36] managed charging programs; (5) annual updates on the Companies' EV load management activities and progress; (6) metrics to track peak demand and load reduction; and (7) analyses of the cumulative impact of all of the Companies' EV-related offerings on peak load reductions (DOER Brief at 21-23). DOER contends that these roadmaps will improve transparency into the Companies' EV load management strategies and help evaluate the reasonableness of their EV program investments (DOER Brief at 22-23).

---

[36] DOER defines future managed charging programs as those the Companies anticipate implementing within the next ten years (DOER Brief at 21-22).

Finally, DOER urges the Department to reject the Companies' request to dismiss its recommendation related to the development of EV load management roadmaps for the same reasons it articulated in opposition to the Companies' contention that its recommendations regarding both rebate levels for DCFC projects located at DOT service plazas and the use of the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs' ("EEA") Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide,[37] are beyond the scope of these proceedings (DOER Reply Brief at 2-3).

b. Attorney General

The Attorney General supports DOER's recommendation that the Companies include an EV load management roadmap in their next EV program proposals (Attorney General Reply Brief at 1). The Attorney General contends that these roadmaps will help the Department assess the adequacy of the Companies' load management strategies, guide necessary adjustments, and ensure proactive planning to avoid unnecessary increases in system peak load and associated costs (Attorney General Reply Brief at 1-2). The Attorney General argues that this is especially important as the Commonwealth pursues strategies to achieve its transportation electrification goals in a cost-effective manner (Attorney General Reply Brief at 1-2). Additionally, the Attorney General argues that the EV load management plans should incorporate stakeholder feedback, ensuring that stakeholders, including those from the EV industry, have the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed roadmaps (Attorney General Reply Brief at 2).

---

37 EEA's Office of Environmental Justice and Equity developed for the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordinating Council "A Guide to the Equitable Siting of Electric Vehicle Charging Stations in EJ Populations" ("EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide") published in June 2025, available at https://www.mass.gov/doc/a-guide-to-the-equitable-siting-of-electric-vehicle-charging-stations-in-ej-populations/download (last visited October 17, 2025).

c. Companies

Consistent with its arguments about DOER's recommendations regarding rebate levels for DCFC projects located at DOT service plazas and the use of EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide, the Companies argue that DOER's recommendation regarding EV load management roadmaps is beyond the scope of these proceedings, procedurally deficient, and should be dismissed (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 38-39; NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 1-4; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 41; National Grid Reply Brief at 1-2, 4; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 16-17; Unitil Reply Brief at 1-4). However, the Companies state that they welcome a discussion on this topic with DOER, the Attorney General, and other stakeholders during the upcoming proceedings related to their next EV program proposals later this year (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 1-2).

2. Notice of Remaining Budget

a. DOER

DOER argues that timely and transparent communication from the Companies regarding available EV program funding is critical to maintain developer confidence in programs (DOER Brief at 17-18). If the Department approves National Grid's request for additional public and workplace segment funding, DOER encourages the Department to direct National Grid to notify the Department and the public when 75 percent of its public and workplace segment budget is committed to improve transparency and support effective planning (DOER Brief at 18, 20). DOER argues that all Companies should be required to provide similar notice in the next phase of their EV programs when 75 percent of their public and workplace segment budgets are committed (DOER Brief at 3, 18, 20). Additionally, DOER urges the Department to direct the Companies to develop clear strategies for regularly communicating the status of their available EV program funds to the public, such as through a public-facing status portal or other accessible method (DOER Brief at 18, 20).

DOER contends that implementing these recommendations would allow developers to plan for potential funding pauses, strengthen trust between developers and the Companies, and reduce uncertainty as EV charging infrastructure deployment accelerates across the Commonwealth (DOER Brief at 18-20). DOER also argues that these measures would help keep the Department informed of potential budget shortfalls and allow for timely action to address any funding gaps (DOER Brief at 19). DOER notes that the Department has approved similar notification requirements in other programs (DOER Brief at 19-20).

b. Attorney General

The Attorney General supports DOER's recommendation that the Companies should be required in the next phase of their EV programs to notify the Department and the public when 75 percent of their public and workplace segment budgets are committed (Attorney General Reply Brief at 2). The Attorney General also recommends that the Department consider convening a technical conference to provide stakeholders with an opportunity to discuss necessary adjustments to the Companies' EV program spending practices (Attorney General Reply Brief at 2).

c. Companies

The Companies argue that, although there are currently no formal notification requirements regarding the status of their public and workplace segment budgets, they provided adequate notice to developers and the Department that these budgets were nearly fully committed (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 2). The Companies also contend that introducing budget notification requirements at this stage of the current EV program term would not deliver the intended value (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 2). Additionally, the Companies argue that this recommendation is outside the scope of these proceedings, which are limited to a review of their mid-term modification proposals (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 2). Nonetheless, the Companies state that they welcome a discussion on future budget notification requirements with DOER, the Attorney General, and other stakeholders during the forthcoming proceedings on their next EV program proposals later this year (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 2).

3. Application Process

CLF observes that the Companies use eligibility criteria that differ from those of DEP's MassEVIP program (CLF Brief at 15). As a result, applicants must navigate separate application processes with inconsistent and sometimes conflicting requirements, creating confusion and added complexity (CLF Brief at 15-16). To address this issue, CLF urges the Department to take steps to streamline the eligibility and application processes between MassEVIP and the Companies' EV programs (CLF Brief at 17).

4. EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide

a. DOER

DOER recommends that the Companies voluntarily provide developers planning to install DCFC stations in EJ neighborhoods with a copy of EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide (DOER Brief at 31-32). DOER notes that EJ populations can experience adverse impacts from DCFC station installations, such as increased traffic and congestion, and that the primary users of these stations may come from outside the community (DOER Brief at 31). DOER contends that EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide offers useful strategies to help mitigate these impacts (DOER Brief at 31). DOER acknowledges that EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide was published after the close of the record in these proceedings and, therefore, is not recommending that the Department direct the Companies to adopt this recommendation at this time (DOER Brief at 32). Nonetheless, DOER encourages the Companies to adopt this recommendation voluntarily (DOER Brief at 32; DOER Reply Brief at 3). Additionally, DOER argues that the Department should reject the Companies' request to dismiss its recommendation regarding the use of EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide as beyond the scope of these proceedings for the same reasons it articulated in opposition to the Companies' claims regarding rebate levels for DCFC projects located at DOT service plazas (DOER Reply Brief at 2-3).

b. Attorney General

The Attorney General supports DOER's recommendation that the Companies provide developers planning DCFC installations in EJ neighborhoods with a copy of EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide (Attorney General Reply Brief at 3). The Attorney General argues that this requirement would impose minimal administrative burden on the Companies while helping developers avoid potential unintended impacts in these communities (Attorney General Reply Brief at 3).

c. Companies

Consistent with its arguments in opposition to DOER's recommendations on the EV load management roadmaps and rebate levels for DCFC projects located at DOT service plazas, the Companies contend that DOER's recommendation regarding the use of EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide is beyond the scope of these proceedings, procedurally flawed, and should be dismissed (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 38-39; NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2-4; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 41; National Grid Reply Brief at 2, 4; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 16-17; Unitil Reply Brief at 2-4). Notwithstanding, the Companies acknowledge that providing developers planning DCFC installations in EJ neighborhoods with a copy of EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide would not be administratively burdensome (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 2). However, NSTAR Electric and National Grid maintain that their approval of additional DCFC projects in their program pipeline is contingent upon a favorable outcome on their proposals in these proceedings (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 2). Nonetheless, the Companies state that they are open to discussing EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide with stakeholders before they file their next EV program proposals later this year (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 2).

5. Collaboration and Strategic Planning on EV Program Design

a. DOER

DOER states that it intends to engage in discussions with the Companies and relevant state agencies to develop more strategic approaches for using ratepayer funds for EV charging infrastructure programs in the future (DOER Brief at 32). DOER contends that this collaboration will help ensure that ratepayer funds are directed toward the most impactful EV charging infrastructure, such as DCFC charging stations within one mile of primary and secondary transit corridors throughout the Commonwealth (DOER Brief at 32).

b. Attorney General

The Attorney General commends NSTAR Electric and National Grid for their willingness to collaborate with state agencies to evaluate the design of future EV programs (Attorney General Reply Brief at 3). The Attorney General argues that this collaboration is important to ensure that customer offerings are distinct and non-overlapping with other state EV programs (Attorney General Reply Brief at 3). The Attorney General recommends that the Companies coordinate with DOER, EEA, DOT, and other relevant state agencies to achieve this objective (Attorney General Reply Brief at 3).

Additionally, the Attorney General supports DOER's recommendation to take a more strategic approach to the use of ratepayer funds for EV charging infrastructure in the future (Attorney General Reply Brief at 3). The Attorney General urges the Department to direct the Companies to describe their collaboration efforts with state agencies and strategies for more efficient use of ratepayer funds in their next EV program proposal filings (Attorney General Reply Brief at 3).

c. Companies

The Companies oppose the Attorney General's recommendation to implement new reporting requirements related to their collaboration with state agencies because such a mandate would create an undue burden on them while offering limited value (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 3; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 3; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 3). The Companies argue that they should have flexibility to engage with state agencies on future program proposals independently, without a directive from the Department (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 3; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 3; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 3). The Companies note that they voluntarily consulted with the Attorney General, DOER, and EEA about the proposed modifications in these proceedings prior to filing them (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 3; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 3; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 3). The Companies also note that they are already proactively engaging key stakeholders in discussions on proposals for the next phase of their EV programs (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 3; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 3; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 3).

Additionally, the Companies argue that the Attorney General's recommendation is outside the scope of these proceedings (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 3; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 3). Nonetheless, NSTAR Electric and National Grid state that they welcome continued collaboration with state agencies to develop future programs that provide distinct, non-overlapping offerings for customers (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 13; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 13).

6. Strategic Planning for MDHD EV Charging and DCFC Applications

The Sierra Club argues that MDHD vehicles and DCFC stations place significantly greater demands on the electric grid than Level 2 chargers (Sierra Club Brief at 1). The Sierra Club contends that these higher loads frequently require distribution system upgrades, which can involve lengthy installation timelines (Sierra Club Brief at 1). Accordingly, the Sierra Club argues that the Companies must proactively plan for these distribution system upgrades to meet forecasted MDHD vehicle load growth (Sierra Club Brief at 1). The Sierra Club contends that this planning is essential to ensure the grid is prepared to support EV charging infrastructure in a timely and cost-effective manner (Sierra Club Brief at 1).

To address these challenges, the Sierra Club recommends that the Department establish implementation timelines for the distribution system upgrades needed to support MDHD EV charging and DCFC projects (Sierra Club Brief at 2). The Sierra Club also contends that it may be necessary for the Department to approve certain distribution system upgrades prospectively because ongoing equipment supply constraints can create lengthy delays (Sierra Club Brief at 2). The Sierra Club notes that other states, including New Jersey, Colorado, and California, have adopted similar regulatory approaches to mitigate distribution system upgrade delays and ensure grid readiness to support MDHD EV charging and DCFC projects (Sierra Club Brief at 2-3).

IV. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

A. Introduction

In Electric Vehicles and Electric Vehicle Charging, D.P.U. 13-182-A at 13 (2014), the Department established three criteria that an electric distribution company's EV charging infrastructure proposal must meet to receive Department approval. Specifically, the proposal must: (1) be in the public interest; (2) meet a need regarding the advancement of EVs in the Commonwealth that is not likely to be met by the competitive EV charging market; and (3) not hinder the development of the competitive EV charging market. D.P.U. 13-182-A at 13.

In D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 93-97, the Department approved the Companies' EV charging infrastructure program proposals, finding that they were in the public interest, met a need regarding the advancement of EVs in the Commonwealth that was not likely to be met by the competitive EV charging market, and would not hinder the development of the competitive EV charging market. Specifically, the Department found that the Companies' EV programs would: (1) help accelerate the deployment of EV charging infrastructure to support the Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals and transition to a clean transportation future; (2) promote equitable deployment of EV charging infrastructure; (3) reduce cost barriers for site hosts; and (4) support EV adoption, which would, in turn, improve EV charging station utilization and strengthen the business case for further private investment in EV charging infrastructure. D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 94-95. The Department approved NSTAR Electric's EV charging infrastructure program for deployment from 2023 to 2026, National Grid's EV charging infrastructure program for deployment from 2023 to 2026, and

Unitil's EV charging infrastructure program for deployment from 2023 to 2027. D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 168-169.

In the instant proceedings, the Companies propose modifications that they claim will improve their respective EV charging infrastructure programs and further increase EV charging infrastructure deployment, particularly for Level 2 chargers. The parties to these proceedings generally support approval of the Companies' proposed modifications to their EV programs, provided certain modifications are incorporated. Below, the Department addresses the Companies' proposed modifications and the intervenors' recommendations. For proposed modifications to existing EV program requirements, the Department will evaluate whether such modifications are consistent with the public interest. For newly proposed programs and pilots, including the residential managed charging programs proposed by NSTAR Electric and Unitil, the Department applies the criteria outlined above, i.e., whether the proposals are in the public interest, address a need regarding the advancement of EVs in the Commonwealth that is not currently being met by the Company's EV program or the competitive EV charging market, and does not hinder the development of the competitive EV charging market.

B. Third-Party Funding Requirements

1. Third-Party Funding Offset

The Companies propose to modify the current third-party funding requirements so that third-party funding designated for a specific purpose (e.g., EVSE) is deducted from only the corresponding eligible EV program incentives and only when the combined total of third-party funding and EV program incentives for make-ready, EVSE, or networking exceeds 100 percent of the program participant's actual, eligible costs for those components (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 15-16, 19; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 18-19; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 10). Additionally, NSTAR Electric and National Grid argue that customers should be allowed to pursue and combine incentives from both MassEVIP and the Companies' EV programs (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 13; NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 5; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 13; National Grid Reply Brief at 5). The Attorney General, DOER, and CLF support these proposed modifications (Attorney General Brief at 5; DOER Brief at 25; CLF Brief at 14).

The Department established the third-party funding requirements to ensure that ratepayer-funded incentives do not result in a potential windfall for program participants at the expense of ratepayers and, in affirming its decision, explained that the third-party funding requirements: (1) seek to balance providing incentives to encourage EV charging infrastructure deployment and the economic burden on ratepayers funding these programs; (2) serve to limit the use of ratepayer funds in situations where funding from other sources is available to provide the same incentive for EV charging infrastructure deployment; and (3) prevent program participants from overbuilding charging sites at ratepayers' expense. D.P.U. 21-90/ D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 127; D.P.U. 21-90-A/D.P.U. 21-91-A/D.P.U. 21-92-A at 16-17.

In the instant proceedings, the Companies argue that implementing the third-party funding requirements has: (1) led to project cancellations and delays, particularly for Level 2 chargers; (2) added unnecessary complexity, resulting in customer confusion; and (3) hindered the overall effectiveness of the EV programs (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 13-15; DPU 1-5; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 15-17; AG 1-3; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 8-10). Additionally, the Companies argue that their proposed modifications will improve their EV charging infrastructure programs by allowing customers to combine third-party funding with EV program incentives, which will help close existing funding gaps, reduce customer confusion, and accelerate Level 2 charger deployment (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 13-14; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 12-14; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 10-12). The Attorney General contends that the proposed modifications are reasonable and would likely accelerate Level 2 charger deployment while DOER maintains that they appropriately balance the need to ensure third-party funds are used to offset EV program funding with the practical challenges of implementing the current directives (Attorney General Brief at 5; DOER Brief at 25).

Notwithstanding these arguments, the Department notes that NSTAR Electric and National Grid have maintained a robust project pipeline (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 36; DPU 1-21; DOER 1-3; SC 1-8; SC 1-9; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. DPU 2-8; SC 1-5). In fact, both Companies have nearly depleted their public and workplace segment budgets of $109.1 million and $94.7 million, respectively, and National Grid's project pipeline remains sufficiently robust that it seeks an additional $31,948,763 in ratepayer support to implement its public and workplace segment through the end of the current term (i.e., through 2026) (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DPU 1-4; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 34; NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2); DPU 2-8; SC 1-5). D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 168-196. Additionally, the Department notes that in 2023 to 2024, the third-party funding requirements resulted in ratepayer savings totaling $3,605,671, or savings of $20,603 per project, without derailing the success of the Companies' EV programs. NSTAR Electric Company, D.P.U. 25-51, Exh. ES-ST-3, at 15 (2024); Massachusetts Electric Company and Nantucket Electric Company, D.P.U. 25-68, Exh. NG-MMJG-1, App. E at 27 (2024).

Nonetheless, based on the specific facts presented in these proceedings, the Department finds that the Companies have provided compelling reasons to warrant a modification to the third-party funding requirements for the remainder of the Companies' current program terms, which expire in 2026 for NSTAR Electric and National Grid and in 2027 for Unitil. The Department recognizes the important role Level 2 chargers play in supporting the Commonwealth's transportation electrification and climate goals. Their versatility and suitability for deployment across a variety of locations with long-term parking access make them a vital component of the Commonwealth's effort to encourage widespread EV adoption (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 40-41; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 34-39). Additionally, because Level 2 chargers cost substantially less to install than DCFC stations, the Companies can use their remaining EV program funds to support more projects (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 40-41; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 34-39). We note that the Companies' approved EV charging infrastructure programs set deployment targets for Level 2 and DCFC ports to ensure a balanced mix of charging options. D.P.U. 21-90, Exh. ES-KB-1, at 41-42; D.P.U. 21-91, Exh. NG-EVPP-1, at 41-42; D.P.U. 21-92, Exh. CSVG-1, at 38-39. However, all three Companies have fallen short of their Level 2 port deployment targets: NSTAR Electric has completed only 24 percent of its planned Level 2 public and workplace segment port deployments, National Grid has completed only 6 percent of its planned Level 2 public and workplace segment port deployments, and Unitil has yet to deploy any Level 2 ports (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DPU 2-5, Att.; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. AG 1-1, Att.;

D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG 1-1). Because third-party funding is more readily available for Level 2 chargers than for DCFC stations, the third-party funding requirements have disproportionately impacted potential Level 2 projects (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 14-15, 37; DPU 1-17; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 17, 30; DPU 1-8; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 9-10). The record shows that customers' inability to combine external funding for Level 2 EVSE with EVSE rebates through the Companies' EV programs has led to project cancellations or delays (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 14-15, 36; DPU 1-5; DPU 1-8; DPU 1-21; AG 1-3; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 17; DPU 1-4; DPU 2-8; AG 1-3; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 9-10; DPU 1-3; DPU 1-4; AG 1-2). The Department is persuaded that continuing to apply these requirements to Level 2 projects for the remainder of the EV program term risks prolonging the slow pace of Level 2 port deployment that the Companies have achieved to date. Therefore, to incentivize and accelerate more robust Level 2 EVSE deployment while maximizing the Companies' available EV program budgets during the remaining 14 to 26 months of the current program terms, the Department finds that certain modifications to the third-party funding requirements are appropriate.

In D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 111, the Department established parameters for the Companies' public and workplace offerings to minimize the potential for an inequitable distribution of EV charging infrastructure in higher-income areas by limiting the availability of EVSE rebates to publicly accessible sites, which serve the general public and provide access to the greatest number of customers. Similarly, the Department finds it appropriate and in the public interest to establish analogous parameters for the revised third-party funding requirements. Specifically, the Department approves the Companies' proposed modifications to the third-party funding requirements for publicly accessible projects only,[38] including projects that receive MassEVIP funding, and eliminates the requirement to deduct the third-party funding customers receive for publicly accessible projects from the combined make-ready and EVSE incentives they are eligible to receive through the EV program. The original third-party funding requirements will continue to apply to private projects.

The Department acknowledges that private multi-unit dwelling and fleet projects also often face unique and challenging barriers to EVSE installation (see D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/ D.P.U. 21-92, at 119, 121, 165, 182), and clarify that the revised third-party funding requirements we direct today apply to EV chargers that are intended to primarily serve private multi-unit dwellings and fleets, as long as they are also accessible to the general public. Our revised third-party funding requirements recognize the necessity of applying the Companies' limited remaining EV program budgets to support public charging infrastructure that benefits the greatest number of customers in a manner that also helps to address the unique barriers encountered by multi-unit dwellings and fleets. We note that a commercial entity opting to restrict public access to a project qualifies for reduced EV program incentives but may have access to other resources to complete the project.

The Department acknowledges the potential that applying different third-party funding requirements for private and public projects may introduce additional complexity to the

38 As stated in D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 113, the Department defines "publicly accessible" projects as those that provide the general public practical access to, and use of, the parking space and charging station for seven days per week, 24 hours per day. Program participants are permitted to charge a parking fee and, if the location has access restrictions, may reduce the hours of public access to no less than twelve hours per day, seven days per week. D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 113.

Companies' EV programs (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DPU 1-6; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. DPU 1-5). Nevertheless, the Department is still concerned that without some guiding parameters, EV charging infrastructure deployment could be concentrated in higher-income locations. D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 111. Additionally, the Department notes that the Companies' EV programs already apply different EVSE eligibility criteria based on the public's ability to access the project and that clear education materials and communication can mitigate customer confusion. The Department requires the Companies to clearly explain the modified third-party funding requirements in customer-facing materials. The Companies must also establish mechanisms to ensure that final rebates issued to customers do not exceed the maximum make-ready, EVSE, and networking incentive levels established for the EV programs (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 19; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 22; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 11). In sum, the Department finds the modified requirements approved herein are appropriate to encourage Level 2 charger deployment while maximizing the benefits of that increased deployment and optimizing the Companies' remaining EV program budgets.

Notwithstanding, the Department remains convinced that project applicants should contribute to their project's costs. NSTAR Electric and National Grid indicated they will be filing proposals for the next phase of their EV programs later this year (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DOER 1-5; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. DOER 1-4). As part of those proceedings, the Department must consider the best approach to balance the Commonwealth's goals of transportation electrification and greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions reductions with the critically important goal of ratepayer affordability, which will necessarily include consideration of the appropriate third-party funding framework for the next iteration of the Companies' EV charging infrastructure programs. The Department expects the Companies to consider and include a range of funding approaches, such as CLF's recommendation to establish caps on the percentage of total reimbursable project costs, to help ensure that program participants meaningfully contribute to the costs of their projects (CLF Brief at 23; see also D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DPU 2-1; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. DPU 2-1).

2. MassEVIP Application

DOER recommends, and NSTAR Electric and National Grid support, eliminating the requirement for applicants to the Companies' EV programs to also apply for MassEVIP funding because MassEVIP's Volkswagen Settlement funding is nearly exhausted (DOER Brief at 26, 28; D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 13; NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 5; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 13; National Grid Reply Brief at 5).

The original intent of the MassEVIP application requirement was to limit the use of ratepayer funds by leveraging external funds from other sources for the same purpose. D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 126. MassEVIP is funded through both ratepayer and non-ratepayer sources but its available non-ratepayer funds are fully committed.[39] Thus, the future availability of non-ratepayer funding for MassEVIP is uncertain.[40] As a result, continuing

39 See Mass.Gov, Volkswagon Diesel Settlements & Environmental Mitigation, available at https://www.mass.gov/guides/volkswagen-diesel-settlements-environmental-mitigation (last visited October 17, 2025).

40 See MassDEP VW Settlement Semiannual Report (August 5, 2025), available at: https://www.mass.gov/doc/massdep-vw-settlement-semiannual-report-1st-half-of-2025/download (last visited October 17, 2025).

the MassEVIP application requirement could impose regulatory burdens that no longer fulfill their intended purpose.[41] Therefore, the Department concludes that this requirement is not currently in the public interest and accordingly eliminates the requirement for applicants to the Companies' EV programs to apply for MassEVIP funding. Nevertheless, applicants who do apply for and receive MassEVIP incentives may, consistent with our findings above, combine MassEVIP and EV programs incentives for make-ready, EVSE, and networking up to 100 percent of the program participant's actual, eligible costs for those components for publicly accessible projects.

Further, the Department notes that MassEVIP and the Companies' EV programs provide incentives for similar EV charging infrastructure projects on a first-come, first-served basis.[42] The Department strongly encourages the Companies to coordinate with DEP and other relevant state agencies to develop new program offerings or modify existing program offerings to reduce or eliminate duplicative incentives for the same purpose and, to the extent that overlap exists, to collaborate on streamlining application processes to the greatest extent possible.

Finally, the Department acknowledges that MassEVIP may receive non-ratepayer funding in the future. The Companies must continue to pursue external, non-ratepayer funding sources, consistent with their previous commitments. D.P.U. 21-90-A/D.P.U. 21-91-A/

---

41 In public comments, DEP noted that requiring EV program applicants to also apply for MassEVIP funding creates unnecessary administrative burdens for applicants and program administrators (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/D.P.U. 24-197, DEP Comments at 3).

42 Applications for MassEVIP funding are considered on a first-come, first-served basis. Available at www.mass.gov/doc/massevip-public-access-charging-requirements/download (last visited October 17, 2025).

D.P.U. 21-92-A at 18. As part of this effort, the Department expects the Companies to monitor changes to MassEVIP and other state and federal programs and, where appropriate, coordinate with program administrators to use non-ratepayer funding to offset EV program costs.

C. Public and Workplace Segment DCFC

1. Rebate Incentive Structure

NSTAR Electric and National Grid propose to modify the rebate incentive structure for their public and workplace segments, reducing rebate levels for DCFC ports in EJ neighborhoods from up to 100 percent of the cost cap to up to 50 percent, and eliminating rebates entirely in non-EJ neighborhoods by reducing them from up to 50 percent of the cost cap to 0 percent (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 39; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 34; DOER 1-2). NSTAR Electric and National Grid argue that their proposed modifications to the public and workplace segment DCFC rebate levels are necessary to: (1) prevent depleting their remaining public and workplace segment budgets at the expense of Level 2 charging projects; (2) enable them to stretch their remaining public and workplace segment budgets across a greater number of projects; and (3) support a greater number of total chargers because Level 2 charging ports cost approximately ten times less than DCFC ports (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 35-37; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 20-24).

DOER supports these proposed modifications, while CLF opposes them (DOER Brief at 31; CLF Brief at 23-24). The Attorney General supports eliminating public and workplace segment DCFC rebate incentives for non-EJ neighborhoods but recommends a greater reduction for non-EJ neighborhoods to 25 percent of the current cost cap as well as a proportional reduction to the per-site DCFC EVSE cost cap for NSTAR Electric's and National Grid's public and workplace segments, i.e., a DCFC EVSE cost cap of $100,000 per site in EJ neighborhoods, neither of which NSTAR Electric and National Grid opposes (Attorney General Brief at 8; D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 5-7; DPU 3-10; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-Rebuttal-1, at 5-7; DPU 3-1; National Grid Brief at 25).

After review and consideration, the Department accepts the Attorney General's recommendations to cap public and workplace segment DCFC EVSE rebates at 25 percent of current levels in EJ populations, to eliminate them entirely in non-EJ populations, and to implement a proportional reduction to the per-site DCFC EVSE cost cap for NSTAR Electric's and National Grid's public and workplace segments, i.e., a DCFC EVSE cost cap of $100,000 per site in EJ populations. The Department is persuaded that accepting these recommendations is in the public interest and will help create a more level playing field between Level 2 and DCFC projects (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 6-7; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-Rebuttal-1, at 6-7).

NSTAR Electric and National Grid have installed DCFC ports at rates 4.2 and 5.7 times higher than their original targets, respectively (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DPU 1-20; D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196; Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 9). Further, the record reflects that the fast-charging needs of EV drivers in NSTAR Electric's service territory can be adequately met by the 633 DCFC ports that have already been approved, along with any additional chargers that may be approved through the end of the program term (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 43-44; DPU 1-20; DPU 3-1). As such, the Department concludes that reducing incentives for public and workplace segment DCFC projects, combined with the approved modifications to the third-party funding requirements above, will encourage more Level 2 charger projects

(D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. DPU 1-21; SC 1-5; SC 1-7; SC 1-10; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. DPU 1-6; DPU 4-1; SC 1-5). These modifications will assist NSTAR Electric and National Grid to regain momentum towards achieving their Level 2 port deployment targets and help to rebalance the mix of deployed charger types (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 14-15, 36; DPU 1-8; DPU 1-21; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 17; DPU 2-8). Additionally, the Department recognizes that approving these modifications should enable NSTAR Electric and National Grid to more efficiently utilize their limited remaining EV program funds given the substantially lower costs of Level 2 chargers relative to DCFC stations, thereby allowing the Companies to support a greater number of projects within their existing budgets (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 40-41; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 34-39). Last, we note that NSTAR Electric and National Grid do not oppose these recommendations (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 5-7; DPU 3-10; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-Rebuttal-1, at 5-7; DPU 3-1). Therefore, to maximize the remaining EV program funds for NSTAR Electric and National Grid for the current term, the Department establishes a cap on public and workplace DCFC EVSE rebates at 25 percent of current levels in EJ populations, eliminates them entirely in non-EJ populations, and proportionally reduces the DCFC EVSE cost cap of $100,000 per site in EJ populations.

The Department emphasizes that these changes are not an indication of diminishing support for DCFC projects, which remain essential to achieving the Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals.[43] Rather, this is a necessary, short-term adjustment aimed at

[43] Nor are these changes an adjustment to the Department's support for—and commitment to—equitable program design and serving EJ populations. G.L. c. 25, § 1A.

accelerating Level 2 charger deployment during the current EV program term. The Department fully anticipates that the Companies' next EV program proposals will include DCFC offerings (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DOER 1-5; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. DOER 1-4).

The Department acknowledges there is some merit to CLF's recommendation to establish caps on the percentage of total reimbursable costs for DCFC projects as an alternative approach to encourage DCFC deployment while limiting ratepayer contributions (CLF Brief at 23). However, the record does not clearly establish the potential impacts that such caps might have on the deployment of DCFC and Level 2 chargers over the remainder of the current program term. The Department is also mindful of the importance of bringing NSTAR Electric and National Grid back on track to meet their Level 2 port deployment targets. Accordingly, the Department declines to adopt CLF's recommendation at this time. As stated in Section IV.B.1, above, the Department nonetheless encourages the Companies to consider a broad range of funding approaches as part of filing their next EV program proposals (D.P.U. 24-195, DPU 2-1; D.P.U. 24-196, DPU 2-1).

The Department also declines to approve CLF's recommendation that the Companies provide more frequent reporting, either quarterly or semi-annually, regarding the deployment of DCFC and Level 2 chargers through their EV programs as well as the effectiveness of the associated rebate incentives (CLF Brief at 24). The Department is not convinced that more frequent reporting would produce meaningful benefits and recognizes the additional burden that this would place on the Companies.

2. Flexibility to Adjust Rebate Incentive Structure

National Grid seeks the flexibility to adjust public and workplace segment DCFC rebate levels during the current EV program term in response to market conditions (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. DPU 3-3; AG 2-2). National Grid argues that this flexibility is needed to support the program through the remainder of the current term (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 26). The Attorney General opposes such flexibility because the Company has already exceeded its DCFC port deployment target (Attorney General Brief at 10).

National Grid's argument that it requires flexibility to adjust public and workplace segment DCFC rebate levels because market developments may emerge during the current Phase III EV program term that could render the DCFC rebate levels insufficient is purely speculative (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 8; AG 2-2). Notably, National Grid failed to (1) detail the circumstances under which it would exercise such flexibility; (2) justify its concerns regarding the potential insufficiency of DCFC rebate levels despite DCFC port deployment exceeding the term target; or (3) describe how it would allocate its limited remaining public and workplace segment funds between DCFC and Level 2 projects (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 9). In contrast to its DCFC deployment, National Grid has fallen significantly behind in meeting its Level 2 port deployment target with approximately one year left in the Phase III EV program term (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 9, 22; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. DPU 2-8). Therefore, National Grid has not demonstrated a clear need for flexibility to adjust public and workplace DCFC rebate levels during the remainder of the term. Accordingly, the Department denies National Grid's request.

3. DOT Service Plaza Projects

DOER proposes modifying the Companies' EV programs to allow a 50 percent EVSE rebate for DCFC projects located at DOT service plazas to address the unique and important charging needs at highway rest stops (DOER Brief at 3, 29-30). The Companies argue that the proposed modification is not supported by the record and must be adjudicated on its merits (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 38-39; NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2, 4; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 41; National Grid Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 16-17; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 1, 3).

The Department recognizes that EVSE at DOT service plazas plays a critical role in addressing range anxiety, fulfills an important need that private entities have not met, and are essential infrastructure at highway rest stops owned by the DOT (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/ D.P.U. 24-197, DOT Comments at 12). However, DOER's recommended EV program modification was first proposed on brief. Nothing in the record addresses the potential impacts of DOER's proposal on the Companies' EV program as whole, or on the remaining EV program budgets. Thus, there is an insufficient record in these proceedings to appropriately evaluate the modification proposed by DOER on brief. The Department emphasizes the importance of introducing substantive proposals as early as possible in the adjudicatory process to ensure that sufficient evidence is on the record to support Department action. Electric Sector Modernization Plans, D.P.U. 24-10-A/D.P.U. 24-11-A/D.P.U. 24-12-A at 201-202 (June 13, 2025). Accordingly, the Department declines to further consider DOER's recommendation at this time. Nevertheless, the Department notes that the Companies committed to assessing funding options for EV charging infrastructure at DOT service plazas in advance of filing their next EV program proposals (see D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DPU 2-2; D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. DPU 2-2), and the Department encourages the Companies to collaborate with DOT, DOER, and other relevant state agencies in evaluating these options for inclusion in the next iteration of their EV charging infrastructure programs.

D. NSTAR Electric

1. MDHD Fleet Pilot

NSTAR Electric requests an additional $5 million in ratepayer support or, in the alternative, to shift $5 million from its residential segment budget to expand its fleet segment to include an MDHD fleet pilot that would support approximately six MDHD fleets (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 26-28; ES-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 15). NSTAR Electric contends that the proposed pilot will facilitate the adoption of electric school buses and other MDHD fleets that currently lack sufficient support and would not proceed otherwise (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 22). NSTAR Electric modeled its proposed MDHD fleet pilot on National Grid's MDHD fleet offering (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 23; AG 1-5).

The Attorney General and CLF support the proposed MDHD fleet pilot, subject to certain modifications (Attorney General Brief at 24-25; CLF Brief at 25). The Attorney General recommends that the Department direct NSTAR Electric to include a fleet managed charging program in its forthcoming Phase III EV program proposal (Attorney General Brief at 24-25). CLF recommends limiting private fleet eligibility under the pilot to those operating primarily in EJ neighborhoods (CLF Brief at 25).

The Department has previously recognized that fleet customers, particularly public fleets, face some of the greatest barriers to EVSE installation, including funding constraints and unique charging needs. D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 121. Under the pilot, NSTAR Electric would offer make-ready rebates to both public and private fleets and EVSE rebates to public fleets, such as school buses and mass transit vehicles, that often experience greater barriers to EVSE installation than other fleet types (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. DPU 1-9; AG 1-5). The Department expects that funding from this pilot will likely help accelerate MDHD fleet electrification, thereby supporting the Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 31). Additionally, by supporting mass transit vehicles, the pilot will help expand clean transportation options for individuals without personal vehicles and help lower GHG emissions by replacing diesel-powered MDHD vehicles (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 31). Further, the Department approved National Grid's MDHD fleet offering in D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 121, on which NSTAR Electric modeled its offering (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 23; AG 1-5). The Department finds that approving NSTAR Electric's MDHD fleet pilot would promote consistency and alignment between NSTAR Electric's and National Grid's EV programs. For these reasons, the Department concludes that NSTAR Electric's proposed MDHD fleet pilot is in the public interest, addresses a need regarding the advancement of EVs in the Commonwealth that is not currently being met by the Company's EV program or the competitive EV charging market, and does not hinder the development of the competitive EV charging market. The Department, however, is not persuaded to commit additional ratepayer funds for the pilot when reprioritizing its program and shifting the necessary budget from its residential program will suffice. Accordingly, the Department approves NSTAR Electric's proposed MDHD fleet pilot and the reallocation of $5 million from the Company's residential segment budget to fund its implementation.

The Department also approves NSTAR Electric's proposal to offer enhanced make-ready incentives of up to 150 percent of the average installation cost for customer-side infrastructure, on a case-by-case basis (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 22; DPU 1-11). The Department finds that this proposal will help address unique project challenges and unforeseen circumstances that may otherwise impede EVSE deployment (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DPU 1-11). The Department, however, cautions the Company that any enhanced make-ready incentives provided to customers without adequate justification may be subject to cost disallowance.

Regarding NSTAR Electric's willingness to support installation of DCFC EVSE for electric aircraft and boats through its EV program (see D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 28), NSTAR Electric has not presented a developed proposal for us to consider and, until such time, we decline to opine on the need for, or appropriateness of, ratepayer funding to incentivize such installations.

The Department also declines to adopt CLF's recommendation to restrict private fleet eligibility to those operating primarily in EJ populations (CLF Brief at 25). The Department recognizes that EJ populations have historically borne a disproportionate burden of transportation-related emissions and, to help address these concerns, approved a separate EJ Community Charging Hub pilot for NSTAR Electric's Phase II EV program. D.P.U. 21-90/ D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 95, 144-145. The MDHD fleet pilot approved here would be available not only to MDHD fleet vehicles operating in EJ populations, but also to other fleets with resource constraints that merit support (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 28).

Finally, we decline in this proceeding to dictate the specific proposals that must be included in the next iteration of the Companies' EV programs. These proceedings are focused on the Companies' existing EV programs and potential modifications to improve implementation of those programs before these programs expire. However, the Department recognizes that fleet managed charging programs can help reduce fleet operating costs and ease pressure on the electric grid by encouraging off-peak charging and welcomes fleet managed charging proposals in NSTAR Electric's forthcoming Phase III EV program filing (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/ D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 32).

2. Bidirectional Charger Incentive Pilot

NSTAR Electric proposes to shift $500,000 from its residential segment budget to its fleet segment budget to implement a pilot program to support approximately 25 bidirectional chargers for MDHD fleet customers, primarily at school bus sites (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 31-32; DPU 1-8; AG 4-1; DOER 1-1). The Attorney General, DOER, and CLF oppose the proposed pilot (Attorney General Brief at 19-21; DOER Brief at 11, 14-15; CLF Brief at 26-27). Instead, CLF recommends that NSTAR Electric evaluate its residential segment incentive offerings and report on how it can increase residential customer participation in its Phase II EV program, using the funds the Company proposed to reallocate to the bidirectional charger incentive pilot (CLF Brief at 27). NSTAR Electric argues that the proposed pilot would support the development of emerging EV technology using existing EV program funds and that rejecting the proposal would forgo a valuable opportunity to advance V2G technology for fleets (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 27-28; NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 4).

The Attorney General notes that similar V2G pilots already exist in the Commonwealth, such as MassCEC's demonstration projects and Highland Electric Fleets' partnership with Beverly Public Schools (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. AG-CTPN-1, at 24-25; AG-CTPN-SURREBUTTAL-1, at 7-8). Nothing in the record clearly distinguishes NSTAR Electric's proposed bidirectional charger incentive pilot from these existing pilots. Moreover, given these existing pilots, we are not convinced that a denial of NSTAR Electric's proposed pilot would delay progress on V2G technology for fleets as a general matter. Further, we note that due to current interconnection timelines for distributed energy resources, the Company does not anticipate power dispatch from the bidirectional chargers to the grid until sometime between 2027 and 2030 (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 27-28). Accordingly, there remains sufficient opportunity to support V2G development, for instance, in the next phase of the Company's EV program, without jeopardizing near-term progress. To facilitate timely implementation of V2G or V2X pilot programs, the Department encourages each Company to include an innovative V2G or V2X pilot in its forthcoming proposal, focusing on MDHD vehicle types not currently addressed by other V2G or V2X pilots in the Commonwealth. In sum, the Department concludes that NSTAR Electric has not adequately demonstrated that the proposed bidirectional charger incentive pilot is sufficiently unique or does not duplicate other current V2G pilots and therefore denies the proposal.

Finally, the Department declines to direct NSTAR Electric to report on strategies for improving its residential segment incentives to increase residential customer participation in its

Phase II EV program (CLF Brief at 27). The Department notes that NSTAR Electric's Phase II EV program concludes in 2026 and the Company expects to file a proposal for the next phase of its EV program later this year (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DOER 1-5). While such a reporting requirement could provide useful insights for shaping the next iteration of the Company's residential program offering, the timing of the forthcoming EV program proposal limits the report's usefulness, and the potential benefits may not outweigh the additional burden.

3. Residential Managed Charging Program

NSTAR Electric proposes to shift $3 million within its residential segment budget to implement a residential managed charging program with passive and active managed charging components (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. ES-EV-MTM-1, at 33-34; ES-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 15). NSTAR Electric contends that the proposed residential managed charging program will provide several important benefits, including reducing peak demand by incentivizing off-peak EV charging and helping to familiarize customers with utility-managed EV charging (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 29-30). The Attorney General, DOER, and EV.Energy support the proposal (Attorney General Brief at 21-23; DOER Brief at 6-7, 10; D.P.U. 24-195, EV.Energy Brief at 1-3). CLF also supports the proposal but recommends that NSTAR Electric revise its incentive structure to better reflect the full value provided by participating EV drivers (CLF Brief at 17-18).

In Electric Sector Modernization Plans, D.P.U. 24-10/D.P.U. 24-11/D.P.U. 24-12, at 267 (2024), the Department encouraged NSTAR Electric to submit an EV managed charging program proposal for the Department's review in the near term. We note that NSTAR Electric's proposed residential managed charging program is largely modeled on National Grid's approved off-peak charging rebate program albeit with some notable differences (e.g., fixed monthly incentives versus volumetric ones) (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. DPU 1-13; DPU 1-14; AG 1-7). We also note the similarities between NSTAR Electric's and Unitil's proposed residential managed charging programs in the instant proceedings. This overarching program design alignment will provide ratepayers with a more unform experience throughout the Companies' service territories (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. DPU 1-13; DPU 1-14; AG 1-7; D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/ D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 28). This, in turn, could increase customer satisfaction with the programs and lead to higher retention rates (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. AG 2-1).

The Department also finds that implementation of NSTAR Electric's proposed program is likely to deliver meaningful benefits to both customers and the Company's distribution system, including lowering operating costs for EV drivers, placing downward pressure on rates for all customers, reducing peak demand, and helping to avoid the curtailment of renewable generation (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 14-15; D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. EV.Energy-1, at 8-11; DOER 2-1). Additionally, the Department expects the Scheduled Charging component to enhance the program's effectiveness by enabling NSTAR Electric to directly assist customers who consistently charge during peak periods to shift their charging to off-peak hours (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. DPU 1-15; AG 1-7; EV.Energy-1, at 12-13). For these reasons, the Department concludes that NSTAR Electric's proposed residential managed charging program is in the public interest, addresses a need regarding the advancement of EVs in the Commonwealth that is not currently being met by the Company's EV program or the competitive EV charging market, and does not hinder the development of the competitive EV charging market. Accordingly, the Department approves NSTAR Electric's proposed residential managed charging program and the reallocation of $3 million from the Company's residential segment budget to fund its implementation, subject to the following.

Consistent with the Attorney General's recommendation, NSTAR Electric agreed to require customers who receive wiring upgrades or EVSE rebates to enroll in its residential managed charging program without any additional enrollment incentive (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. DPU 3-14; DPU 3-16). This modification will help to minimize the costs of the EV program for ratepayers while still providing the significant benefits of managed charging to participating customers, the Company, and the distribution system as a whole. The Department, therefore, approves its implementation.

The Department acknowledges that certain customers may be unable to participate in the residential managed charging program due to the specific combination of their EV charger and vehicle (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. DPU 4-3). As EV and EV charger technology and standards evolve, continued collaboration among the Companies and EV equipment manufacturers and aggregators to support the widest range of eligible EV chargers and vehicle types will help to expand compatibility and extend the benefits of the Company's managed charging program to additional customers.

The Department declines to direct NSTAR Electric to expand the active managed charging component of the program in its forthcoming Phase III EV program proposal, as recommended by EV.Energy (EV.Energy Brief at 34). We reiterate that the current proceedings are focused on proposed modifications to the Companies' existing EV charging infrastructure programs, not NSTAR Electric's future managed charging plans. However, the Department recognizes the considerable benefits of enabling utility companies to take direct control over customers' charging behavior through managed charging programs and welcomes proposals to expand the active managed charging component of the program in future program filings (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. EV.Energy-1, at 12-13).

The Department also declines at this time to direct NSTAR Electric to recalculate its residential managed charging program incentives to more accurately reflect the value of EV drivers' participation in the program (CLF Brief at 18-19). The Department finds that a simple incentive structure to encourage customer participation and build customer trust while also supporting year-round off-peak charging is a reasonable approach as NSTAR Electric begins to gather data on customers' EV charging behavior and builds experience with the program (D.P.U. 24-195, Exh. CLF 1-1). We do not intend for the incentive structure we approve today to remain in place in the long term. Rather, in future proceedings and as customers' understanding of managed charging programs increases, the Department expects to explore how future incentive structures might better capture the full value of EV drivers' participation in the program.

E. National Grid

1. Off-Peak Charging Rebate Program

a. Extension of Off-Peak Period

National Grid proposes to extend the off-peak period (i.e., 9:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.) to include weekends and holidays (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 24-25). National Grid contends that its proposal will reduce customer confusion, encourage off-peak EV charging during weekends and holidays, and align the program's design with its proposed EV TOU rates in D.P.U. 23-85 and NSTAR Electric's proposed residential managed charging program in this proceeding (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 16). The Attorney General does not object to the extension (Attorney General Brief at 11-12). CLF supports the proposal but recommends that National Grid revise the program's incentive structure to better reflect the full value of EV drivers' participation (CLF Brief at 17-18, 21).

The Department finds National Grid's proposal to extend the off-peak period to weekends and holidays to be reasonable, appropriate, and in the public interest because it will likely reduce customer confusion by providing a consistent, daily off-peak period as well as shift electricity demand away from peak hours (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 25; AG 2-5). In addition, extending the off-peak period to weekends and holidays will promote greater consistency between National Grid's and NSTAR Electric's EV programs (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 25). Accordingly, the Department approves National Grid's proposal to extend the off-peak period to weekends and holidays.

Consistent with the Department's decision above to reject CLF's recommendation that NSTAR Electric revise its residential managed charging program incentive structure, we similarly decline to revise the incentive structure of National Grid's off-peak charging rebate program at this time (see CLF Brief at 18-19). The current incentive structure may remain in place through the end of the EV program term, i.e., through 2026. However, the Department reminds National Grid of its stated commitment to assess potential modifications to the off-peak charging rebate program's incentive structure prior to filing its proposal for the next phase of its EV program (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. AG 2-5; CLF 1-1).

b. Participation Caps for Residential and Fleet Customers

National Grid proposes to shift $4,966,500 from its residential segment budget to extend its existing off-peak charging rebate program through 2026 (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 26; NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2)). The Company also proposes to eliminate the current program participation limits of 11,000 residential customers and 1,000 fleet vehicles to encourage greater enrollment in the program (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 23; AG 2-5; DOER 2-1). National Grid argues that eliminating the participation caps will increase enrollment in its off-peak charging rebate program and shift more EV charging to off-peak hours (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 17-18). DOER supports this proposal (DOER Brief at 8). The Attorney General and CLF recommend increasing the residential participation cap to 16,500 customers, along with a proportional increase in the program's budget (Attorney General Brief at 13-14; CLF Brief at 22). CLF further recommends that, if residential enrollment approaches 16,500 before 2026, National Grid should be required to submit a report detailing current enrollment figures and a request to increase the participation cap and corresponding budget (CLF Brief at 22).

The Department finds National Grid's proposal to remove the participation caps for residential and fleet customers for the remainder of the Phase II EV program to be appropriate, reasonable, and in the public interest. The record demonstrates that the implementation of a cap of 16,500 on residential customer participation could force National Grid to turn away eligible participants, limiting the program's effectiveness (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 9). This limitation could potentially hinder progress toward broader adoption of EVs and delay the achievement of Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 9). Therefore, the Department approves National Grid's proposal to extend the off-peak charging rebate program through 2026 and to eliminate the participation caps for residential and fleet customers during this period.[44] Based on these findings, the Department declines to require National Grid to submit an enrollment report along with a request for an increase to the participation caps should participation approach 16,500 residential customers before 2026 (see CLF Brief at 22).

2. Budget-Shifting Cap and Additional Public and Workplace Segment Funding

a. Budget-Shifting Cap

National Grid requests a waiver of the 15 percent cap on budget shifting between program segments to help support the off-peak charging rebate program and public and workplace segment to the greatest extent possible within its existing Phase III EV program budget for the remainder of the term (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 41, 61). National Grid argues that eliminating the cap will help address projected budget deficits for its off-peak charging rebate program and public and workplace segment during the current EV program term and help prevent a funding gap between its Phase III and Phase IV EV programs (D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 30). CLF supports this request while the Attorney General opposes it (CLF Brief at 28-29; Attorney General Brief at 17-18; Attorney General Reply Brief at 4).

For the following reasons, the Department finds that a waiver of the 15 percent cap on budget shifting is reasonable, appropriate, and in the public interest. By allowing National Grid

---

44 The Department addresses the off-peak charging rebate program's funding through 2026 in Section IV.E.2.a, below.

to reallocate existing EV program funds beyond the 15 percent cap, the Company can more effectively use its remaining Phase III EV program funds to address its projected budget deficits for its off-peak charging rebate program and public and workplace segment during the current term. The Department expects that National Grid's proposal to shift $4,966,500 from its residential segment budget to its off-peak charging rebate program, including $4,391,250 above the 15 percent cap on budget shifting, will benefit ratepayers by using existing EV program funds to extend through 2026 a program that can help facilitate the deferral of, or avoid entirely, costly future distribution system upgrades that can ultimately save ratepayers money (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 26, 47, 50; NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2); (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 14-15). Additionally, the Department expects that National Grid's proposal to shift a total of $23,508,344 from its residential segment and company staffing budgets to its public and workplace segment budget, including $13,096,418 from the residential segment budget above the 15 percent cap, will allow the Company to maximize its limited remaining EV program funding to support Level 2 charger deployment during the current term and help bring the Company back on track to meet its original Level 2 port deployment target (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2); AG 3-2).

Notwithstanding our approval, the Department acknowledges the Attorney General's concern that National Grid did not explicitly commit to using the additional public and workplace segment funds primarily to support Level 2 charger deployment nor has it proposed modifications to its demand-based approach to awarding DCFC EVSE rebates (Attorney General Brief at 17-18). However, the modified third-party funding requirements coupled with the reduced public and workplace segment DCFC rebates approved in Sections IV.B.1 and IV.C.1, above, and resulting favorable financial incentives afforded to Level 2 projects will likely shift customer demand towards Level 2 projects (D.P.U. 24-195, Exhs. DPU 1-21; SC 1-5; SC 1-7; SC 1-10; D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. DPU 1-6; DPU 4-1; SC 1-5).

In sum, to ensure efficient use of the Company's remaining EV program funds, the Department grants the requested waiver of the 15 percent cap on budget shifting between program segments for the remainder of the Phase III EV program term. The Department also approves National Grid's proposal to shift $4,966,500 from its residential segment budget to its off-peak charging rebate program[45] and to shift a total of $23,508,344 from its residential segment and company staffing budgets to its public and workplace segment budget.

Finally, for consistency, the Department finds it reasonable, appropriate, and in the public interest to extend the same waiver to both NSTAR Electric and Unitil. This will allow all three Companies to maximize their limited remaining EV program funds during the remainder of the current term. Costs incurred associated with reallocated budgets, including those beyond the 15 percent threshold, are eligible for recovery through each Company's approved EV program factor.

b. Additional Public and Workplace Segment Funding

National Grid requests an additional $31,948,763 beyond its approved budget to support its public and workplace segment through the remainder of the current term, sustain the

[45] The Company will fund the off-peak charging rebate program through 2026 using a combination of its existing off-peak charging rebate program budget and the $4,966,500 reallocated from the residential segment budget (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2)).

momentum of the Phase III EV program during the current term by deploying additional DCFC and Level 2 chargers, and facilitate a seamless transition from the Phase III to the future Phase IV EV program without any gap in funding between the current and next program phases (D.P.U. 24-196, Exhs. NG-EV-MTM-1, at 57; NG-EV-MTM-4 (Rev. 2); NG-EV-MTM-REBUTTAL-1, at 14-15; National Grid Brief at 33, 37). CLF supports this request, while the Attorney General opposes it (CLF Brief at 28-29; Attorney General Brief at 17-18; Attorney General Reply Brief at 4).

The Department has emphasized the importance of program continuity to prevent delays in EV charging infrastructure deployment, support the Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals, and reduce customer confusion and developer frustration. See, e.g., NSTAR Electric Company, D.P.U. 23-49, at 30-31 (2023). The Department, however, is not convinced of the need for nearly $32 million in additional ratepayer support given our approval, above, of reductions to the public and workplace segment DCFC rebates and elimination of the 15 percent cap on budget shifting. Nor has National Grid clearly demonstrated that these two modifications are insufficient, on their own, to sustain the public and workplace segment budget through the remainder of the current term (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-SURREBUTTAL-1, at 5). Additionally, given that National Grid has already exceeded its DCFC port deployment target by a factor of 5.7, we find no evident need for additional funding for DCFC deployment during the current term that would justify the additional financial burden on ratepayers (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/ D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 9). While continuity of the EV program is a worthwhile goal, the Department will not commit additional funding based on the record before us given our responsibility to prioritize affordability at this time. G.L. c. 25, § 1A. For these reasons, the Department denies National Grid's request to collect an additional $31,948,763 from ratepayers for its public and workplace segment.

The Companies are well aware of the importance of managing their EV program budgets carefully to prevent early budget depletion. Proactive budget oversight is critical to the continued success of the EV programs and helps maintain steady progress toward the Commonwealth's transportation electrification goals.

F. Unitil

1. EV TOU Rate Requirement

Unitil proposes to temporarily suspend the requirement for residential and income-eligible customers in its EV program to participate in its EV TOU rate until it can address the high upfront costs associated with purchasing and installing the additional meter socket needed for a second meter that is required to enroll in the EV TOU rate (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 12-13). Unitil contends that the current EV TOU rate enrollment requirement has deterred residential customers from participating in its EV program (D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 15). The Attorney General and CLF support this proposed modification (Attorney General Brief at 29-30; CLF Brief at 30).

The Department finds Unitil's proposal to temporarily suspend the enrollment requirement for residential customers in the Company's EV TOU rate is appropriate because the cost of the additional equipment needed to enroll in the EV TOU rate has been a significant barrier to customer participation in the Company's EV program (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/ D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 33; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. DOER 1-2). Notably, no residential customer has enrolled in either Unitil's residential segment or its EV TOU rate to date due, presumably, to this requirement (D.P.U. 24197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 13). In an effort to increase enrollment in Unitil's EV program, the Department is persuaded that suspension of this requirement is necessary and in the public interest (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 33; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. DOER 1-2). Therefore, the Department approves a temporary suspension of the EV TOU rate enrollment requirement for residential customers. The Department directs Unitil to provide updates in its EV program annual reports on its efforts to address the costs associated with the second meter socket.

2. Customer Choice Pathway

Unitil proposes to introduce a Customer Choice Pathway to its public segment, which would allow customers to hire their own contractors to install the infrastructure on the customer side of the meter (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 17-18). Unitil also proposes to create a good cause exemption to the requirement that program participants in the public segment install at least two EVSE per project site (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 17-18). Unitil argues that its proposed Customer Choice Pathway will align its public segment offering with those of NSTAR Electric and National Grid, help increase customer participation in its EV program, and accelerate EV charging infrastructure deployment in its service territory (D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 15-16). The Attorney General and CLF support these proposals (Attorney General Brief at 30-31; CLF Brief at 30).

To date, no customers have enrolled in Unitil's public segment (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. DPU 1-2; DPU 1-3). Providing customers with the option of retaining a contractor of their own choosing has the potential to attract customers to participate in the Company's public segment offerings and accelerate EV charging infrastructure deployment in its service territory (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 36; D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. DOER 1-2). Similarly, given the lack of enrollment to date, a good cause exemption to the required number of EVSE deployed per site is a reasonable modification to increase participation and deployment. Additionally, the Department finds that approval of the Customer Choice Pathway will help align Unitil's public segment offering with those of NSTAR Electric and National Grid, thereby promoting greater consistency and uniformity across the Companies' EV programs (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 17). Accordingly, the Department concludes that these modifications are in the public interest and, therefore, approves Unitil's proposed Customer Choice Pathway and the good cause exemption to the two EVSE minimum per-site requirement.

3. Residential Managed Charging Program

Unitil proposes to shift $101,000 from its residential segment budget to implement a residential managed charging program (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. FGE-CCTP-1, at 15; DPU 1-7; DOER 1-1). DOER supports this proposal (DOER Brief at 6-7, 10). CLF also supports the proposed program but recommends that the Department direct Unitil to revise its incentive structure to better reflect the full value of EV drivers' participation in the program (CLF Brief at 17-18). The Attorney General opposes the proposed program due to its substantially higher cost per participant compared to NSTAR Electric's similar proposal (Attorney General Brief at 31).

The Department, in D.P.U. 24-10/D.P.U. 24-11/D.P.U. 24-12, at 267, invited the Company to submit a managed charging program for the Department's review (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-REBUTTAL-1, at 5). As stated in Section IV.D.3, above, Unitil and NSTAR Electric propose substantially similar residential managed charging programs in the instant proceedings and both are modeled on National Grid's approved off-peak charging rebate program (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. DPU 1-6; AG 1-3; AG 2-1). This alignment promotes greater consistency and uniformity across the Companies' EV programs (D.P.U. 24-195/D.P.U. 24-196/ D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. AG-CPTN-1, at 28). Additionally, for the same reasons set forth in Section IV.D.3, above, the Department concludes that Unitil's program is likely to provide significant benefits to both its customers and its distribution system (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. FGE-CCTP-1, at 15-16; FGE-CCTP-REBUTTAL-1, at 6; DPU 3-3; DOER 1-1). For these reasons, the Department concludes that Unitil's proposed residential managed charging program is in the public interest, addresses a need regarding the advancement of EVs in the Commonwealth that is not currently being met by the Company's EV program or the competitive EV charging market, and does not hinder the development of the competitive EV charging market. Accordingly, the Department approves Unitil's proposed residential managed charging program to be funded by the reallocation of $101,000 from the Company's residential segment budget and, as part of our approval, directs the Company to eliminate the $50 enrollment incentive for customers who receive residential segment rebates to which the Company agreed during the course of this proceeding (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. DPU 4-3).

As previously stated in Section IV.D.3, above, the Department acknowledges that certain customers may be unable to participate in the residential managed charging program due to the specific combination of their EV charger and vehicle (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. DPU 4-1). As EV and EV charger technology and standards evolve, continued collaboration among the Companies and EV equipment manufacturers and aggregators to support the widest range of eligible EV chargers and vehicle types will help to expand compatibility and extend the benefits of the Company's managed charging program to additional customers.

The Department acknowledges the higher cost per participant of Unitil's program compared to NSTAR Electric's similar proposed program (Attorney General Brief at 31). However, we find that this disparity is largely due to Unitil's smaller service territory, which limits its ability to spread program costs over a larger customer base (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. DPU 3-2; DPU 4-4). Currently, the record does not provide evidence of viable alternatives at this time to further reduce the program's costs and we are reluctant to delay the program's implementation when it could impede early opportunities for Unitil to influence customers' EV charging behavior and reduce peak demand (D.P.U. 24-197, Exhs. DPU 3-2; DPU 3-3). Finally, the Department notes that Unitil's residential managed charging program will be funded using existing EV program funds, ensuring that its implementation will not result in any additional costs to ratepayers (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. FGE-CCTP-1, at 15). Nonetheless, the Department directs Unitil to explore cost-saving opportunities and report on them in its EV program annual reports.

Regarding CLF's recommendation for Unitil to revise the incentive structure of its proposed residential managed charging program, the Department declines to require such changes at this time (CLF Brief at 18-19). Unitil selected a simple incentive design to encourage customer participation, which the Department finds reasonable and appropriate for the early stages of the program's implementation (D.P.U. 24-197, Exh. CLF 1-1). As stated in Section IV.D.3, we do not intend for the incentive structure we approve today to remain in place in the long term. Rather, in future proceedings and as customers understanding of managed charging programs increases, the Department may need to explore how future incentive structures might better capture the full value of EV drivers' participation in the program.

G. Other Issues

1. BCAs for Managed Charging Programs

The Attorney General recommends that the Department direct NSTAR Electric and National Grid to conduct a BCA prior to requesting approval for any extension, expansion, or modification of their EV managed charging programs beyond 2026 (Attorney General Brief at 26, 28; Attorney General Reply Brief at 3). CLF supports this recommendation (CLF Brief at 20). The Companies oppose this recommendation because it would rely on numerous hypothetical and difficult-to-quantify future grid benefits, which could underestimate the programs' long-term value and make them appear less cost-effective than they truly are (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 31; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 31-32; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Brief at 14).

Once again, we decline to dictate the details and requirements of forthcoming EV program proposals. Our focus in the current proceedings is to review potential modifications to the Companies' EV charging infrastructure programs to implement during the remainder of the current program term. We emphasize that nothing in this Order precludes the Companies from collaborating with the Attorney General and other relevant stakeholders in advance of the next EV program proposal filings on an appropriate methodology for demonstrating the costs and benefits of their EV managed charging programs to ratepayers. Indeed, collaboration can reduce the time and resources devoted to adjudications, and the Department fully endorses such endeavors. The Department, however, declines to expand the scope of these proceedings, as requested by the Attorney General, to mandate that the Companies conduct a BCA before proposing to implement in the future a managed charging program that deviates from the current programs. The Department will fully adjudicate any future managed charging program proposal presented to us, and the Companies will be required to support those proposals at that time.

2. EV Load Management Roadmaps

DOER recommends that the Department direct the Companies to include an EV load management roadmap in their next EV program proposals that provide a clear and strategic approach to EV charging infrastructure investments that align with the Commonwealth's clean energy and affordability goals (DOER Brief at 3, 20-21). The Attorney General supports this recommendation while the Companies oppose it, arguing that it falls outside the scope of the current proceedings (Attorney General Reply Brief at 1; D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 1-2). The Department notes the similarities between DOER's recommendation in the current proceedings and the Attorney General's recommendation in D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/ D.P.U. 21-92, at 165-166, for the Companies to develop comprehensive load management plans. As stated in D.P.U. 21-90/D.P.U. 21-91/D.P.U. 21-92, at 168, Section 81 of Chapter 179 of the Acts of 2022, An Act Driving Clean Energy and Offshore Wind, St. 2022, c. 179 ("2022 Clean Energy Act") establishes a coordinated, statewide framework to address transportation electrification, including load management planning. Given this statutory framework and the existing demand reduction program requirements under G.L. c. 25, § 21, the Department finds that it is unnecessary to direct the Companies to develop EV load management roadmaps in the current proceedings. Moreover, the Department agrees with the Companies that DOER's recommendation is beyond the scope of the current proceedings. In sum, the Department declines to further consider DOER's recommendation in these proceedings.

3. Notice of Remaining Budget

If the Department approves National Grid's proposal for additional public and workplace segment funding in the current proceedings, DOER recommends that the Department direct the Company to notify both the Department and the public when 75 percent of its public and workplace segment budget has been committed (DOER Brief at 18, 20). DOER also recommends that this notification requirement apply to all Companies in the next phase of their EV programs (DOER Brief at 3, 18, 20). The Attorney General supports this recommendation, while the Companies oppose it, contending that it falls outside the scope of the current proceedings (Attorney General Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 2).

The Department understands that transparency into the Companies' EV program budgets is critical to foster market certainty and enable developers to plan for potential funding pauses. National Grid has committed to notifying potential site hosts of its remaining public and workplace segment budget for new projects through banner updates on its website and email communications to charging station installers (D.P.U. 24-196, Exh. DPU 2-3). The Department finds this approach to be reasonable and appropriate for the current EV program term but determines that future budget notification requirements for the EV programs are beyond the scope of the current proceedings.

4. EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide

DOER acknowledges that EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide was released after the close of the record in the current proceedings but recommends that the Companies voluntarily provide developers planning to install DCFC stations in EJ neighborhoods with a copy of the Guide (DOER Brief at 31-32). The Attorney General supports this recommendation (Attorney General Reply Brief at 3). The Companies do not address the merits of DOER's recommendation but express a willingness to discuss EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide with stakeholders ahead of filing their next EV program proposals later this year (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Reply Brief at 2; D.P.U. 24-197, Unitil Reply Brief at 2).

The Department understands that DOER's recommendation aims to ensure that EJ populations benefit from DCFC deployment in their communities (DOER Brief at 31). The Department agrees that developers should engage with communities prior to installing DCFC infrastructure in EJ populations to ensure those communities receive meaningful benefits from the installations. The Department commends the Companies for their openness to discuss EEA's Equitable EV Infrastructure Siting Guide with stakeholders and encourages them to follow through on these discussions before submitting their next EV program proposals.

5. Collaboration and Strategic Planning on EV Program Design

DOER recommends increased collaboration between the Companies and relevant state agencies to develop more strategic uses of ratepayer funds for future EV charging infrastructure programs (DOER Brief at 32). The Attorney General supports this recommendation and further urges the Companies to detail such collaboration in their next EV program filings (Attorney

General Reply Brief at 3). The Companies oppose a formal requirement to collaborate with state agencies on their EV programs but are open to working collaboratively on future initiatives that offer distinct, non-overlapping offerings for customers (D.P.U. 24-195, NSTAR Electric Brief at 13; D.P.U. 24-196, National Grid Brief at 13).

As we have stated previously in this Order, the Department encourages the Companies to collaborate with relevant state agencies in developing future programs that offer distinct, non-overlapping offerings for customers. Such collaboration can reduce the time and resources devoted to the subsequent adjudication. But we decline to impose a formal requirement for such collaboration. We emphasize, however, that the burden lies with the Companies to fully support any and all program proposals, the use of ratepayer funds to support those proposals, and the basis for Department approval of those proposals, including whether such proposals align with other programs, including those offered by state agencies.

6. Strategic Planning for MDHD EV Charging and DCFC Applications

The Sierra Club recommends that the Department establish implementation timelines for the distribution system upgrades needed to support MDHD EV charging and DCFC projects (Sierra Club Brief at 2). No party addressed this issue on brief.

On November 14, 2024, the Legislature enacted An Act Promoting a Clean Energy Grid, Advancing Equity, and Protecting Ratepayers, St. 2024, c. 239 ("2024 Climate Act"). Section 103 of the 2024 Climate Act establishes a new grid planning process for EV charging infrastructure and tasks the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Coordinating Council[46] ("EVICC")

[46] EVICC is an intergovernmental coordinating council established pursuant to Section 81 of the 2022 Clean Energy Act to implement a statewide, coordinated approach to EV

with forecasting the charging needs and identifying potential grid constraints over the next ten years. As part of this Section 103 process, the Companies will be required to plan for the distribution system upgrades needed to support MDHD EV charging and DCFC projects during that timeframe. In light of these statutory requirements and the forthcoming planning efforts under the 2024 Climate Act, the Department declines to accept the Sierra Club's recommendation.

H. Conclusion

Above, the Department approved, in part, and denied, in part, the Companies proposed modifications to their respective EV programs. The Department concludes that each of the proposed modifications we approve here are in the public interest, and for new program and pilot proposals, that they also address a need regarding the advancement of EVs in the Commonwealth that is not currently being met by the Company's EV program or the competitive EV charging market and does not hinder the development of the competitive EV charging market. The approved modifications shall apply to the Companies' EV programs through the remainder of the current EV program term.

Specifically, the Department approved the Companies' proposed modifications to the current third-party funding requirements, with the exception of private projects, which will remain subject to the existing third-party funding requirements. Additionally, the Department approved NSTAR Electric's and National Grid's proposal to reduce the DCFC EVSE rebate

---

charging infrastructure deployment. Available at: https://www.mass.gov/info-details/electric-vehicle-infrastructure-coordinating-council-evicc (last visited October 17, 2025).

levels for DCFC projects installed through their public and workplace segments, with a further reduction of the DCFC EVSE rebates to 25 percent of current levels in EJ neighborhoods. The Department also approved National Grid's proposed modifications to its off-peak charging rebate program.

Additionally, the Department approved National Grid's proposal to eliminate the 15 percent cap on budget shifting between program segments for the remainder of the current EV program term and extended this flexibility to NSTAR Electric and Unitil. Furthermore, the Department approved: (1) NSTAR Electric's proposed MDHD fleet pilot; (2) NSTAR Electric's and Unitil's proposed residential managed charging programs; and (3) Unitil's proposal to temporarily suspend the requirement for residential customers to enroll in its EV TOU rate, to introduce a Customer Choice Pathway to its public segment, and to create a good cause exemption to its public segment's requirement that developers install at least two EVSE per site. The Department expects that these approved modifications will improve the Companies' current EV programs for the remainder of the term and help accelerate EV charging infrastructure deployment, particularly for Level 2 chargers.

Above, the Department also denied National Grid's proposal to collect an additional $31,948,763 from ratepayers to support its public and workplace segment through the current term. Additionally, the Department denied NSTAR Electric's proposed bidirectional charger incentive pilot.

The Department anticipates that NSTAR Electric and National Grid will file proposals for the next phase of their EV programs later this year. In those filings, the Department encourages the Companies to include proposals that will help accelerate DCFC port deployment in the Commonwealth as well as innovative proposals for V2G or V2X pilots or programs. The Department also encourages NSTAR Electric to evaluate options for expanding the active managed charging component of its residential managed charging program, as well as options for fleet managed charging.

Finally, the Department acknowledges and appreciates intervenors' concerns and recommendations related to BCAs, EV load management plans, and budget notification requirements, among other concerns. The Department will continue to evaluate whether and how these recommendations can be incorporated into the Companies' EV programs during our review of the Companies' next EV program proposals.

V. ORDER

Accordingly, after due notice, opportunity for hearing, and consideration, it is

ORDERED: That the electric vehicle charging infrastructure program mid-term modification proposals filed by NSTAR Electric Company, Massachusetts Electric Company and Nantucket Electric Company, and Fitchburg Gas and Electric Light Company are APPROVED in part and DENIED in part, consistent with the directives contained herein; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED: That NSTAR Electric Company, Massachusetts Electric Company and Nantucket Electric Company, and Fitchburg Gas and Electric Light Company shall comply with all directives contained in this Order.

By Order of the Department,

James M. Van Nostrand, Chair

Staci Rubin, Commissioner

Jeremy C. McDiarmid, Commissioner

An appeal as to matters of law from any final decision, order or ruling of the Commission may be taken to the Supreme Judicial Court by an aggrieved party in interest by the filing of a written petition praying that the Order of the Commission be modified or set aside in whole or in part. Such petition for appeal shall be filed with the Secretary of the Commission within twenty days after the date of service of the decision, order or ruling of the Commission, or within such further time as the Commission may allow upon request filed prior to the expiration of the twenty days after the date of service of said decision, order or ruling. Within ten days after such petition has been filed, the appealing party shall enter the appeal in the Supreme Judicial Court sitting in Suffolk County by filing a copy thereof with the Clerk of said Court. G.L. c. 25, § 5.