May 21, 2020

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

RFP PURSUANT TO SECTION 1 OF PUBLIC ACT 19-71, *PROCUREMENT OF OFFSHORE WIND FACILITIES*

NOTICE OF FINAL DETERMINATION

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On August 16, 2019, the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to solicit offers from providers of energy derived from offshore wind facilities that are Class I renewable energy sources, for up to two thousand megawatts (2,000 MW_{AC}) in the aggregate.

Pursuant to the authorizing statute, Public Act 19-71, *An Act Concerning the Procurement of Energy Derived from Offshore Wind* (the "Act"), any selected offshore wind resource selection must be in the best interest of ratepayers, help electric distribution system reliability, help to meet the state's greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets under Connecticut General Statutes section 22a-200a (hereinafter the Global Warming Solutions Act or GWSA), promote economic development, further other energy policy goals set forth in the Comprehensive Energy Strategy (CES) and Integrated Resources Plan (IRP), be consistent with the policies established in sections 22a-92 and 25- 157t of the general statutes, and use practices to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to wildlife, natural resources, ecosystems and traditional or existing water-dependent uses.

DEEP received proposals from three bidders: Vineyard Wind (Park City Wind project), Bay State Wind (Constitution Wind project), and Mayflower Wind Energy (Mayflower Wind project); each of whom submitted multiple offers with varying capacities and pricing options. DEEP received 46 total bids from the three bidders, 23 of which were either positively contingent upon selection in Massachusetts (i.e. available only if Massachusetts made a certain selection) or negatively contingent upon selection in Massachusetts (i.e. no longer available if Massachusetts made a certain selection). After an extensive analysis, DEEP selected the 804 MW Park City Wind project developed by Vineyard Wind.

The subsequent narrative explains the selection process in greater detail.

II. OVERVIEW AND EVALUATION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS

A. Solicitation Development

Public Act 19-71 was signed by Governor Lamont on June 7, 2018. The Act authorized DEEP to procure up to 2,000 MW of offshore wind energy. The Act included a number of requirements of bidders:

- Contract commitments in selected bids that require payment of not less than the

prevailing wage, as described in section 31-53 of the general statutes, for laborers, workmen and mechanics performing construction activities within the United States with respect to the project;
- Engage in a good faith negotiation of a project labor agreement;
- Specify the minimum terms that such project labor agreements shall address;
- Include an environmental and fisheries mitigation plan for the construction and operation of such offshore wind facilities, provided such plan shall include, but not be limited to, an explicit description of the best management practices the bidder will employ that are informed by the latest science at the time the proposal is made that will avoid, minimize, and mitigate any impacts to wildlife, natural resources, ecosystems and traditional or existing water-dependent uses, including, but not limited to, commercial fishing; and
- Include at least one proposal for resources eligible pursuant to this section with a nameplate capacity rating of four hundred megawatts

The Act also required DEEP to establish a commission on environmental standards to provide input on best practices for avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating any impacts to wildlife, natural resources, ecosystems, and traditional or existing water-dependent uses, including, but not limited to, commercial fishing, during the construction and operation of facilities eligible pursuant to this section.

On the same day that Governor Lamont signed the Act, DEEP released a Notice of Scope of Proceeding and Request for Written Comment to begin the process of soliciting proposals for offshore wind resources. Comments on the scope were due on June 14, 2019 and DEEP received 5 comments. On July 1, 2019, DEEP released its draft RFP and requested comments from stakeholders by July 15, 2019. DEEP received almost thirty comments from industry, environmental organizations, state representatives, commercial fishermen, and transmission developers.

In compliance with the statute, DEEP convened a Commission on Environmental Standards (Commission) on June 14, 2019 to provide input on best practices for avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating any impacts to wildlife, natural resources, ecosystems, and water-dependent uses like commercial fishing. The Commission comprised of scientists, environmental organizations, and members of regional working groups. The Commission released its draft recommendations on July 18, 2019 and sought written comments from stakeholders by July 25, 2019. After receiving comments from nearly fifteen stakeholders, the Commission released its final recommendations on August 7, 2019. DEEP incorporated many of the Commission's recommendations into the final RFP.

B. Evaluation and Selection Process

The Evaluation Team included DEEP, the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA) Procurement Manager, the Office of Consumer Counsel (OCC), the Office of the Attorney General (AGO), The United Illuminating Company (UI), and Eversource Energy (Eversource). DEEP retained Levitan and Associates, Inc. (Levitan) to assist with the evaluation. In addition, DEEP consulted with the Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) to determine whether a proposal had any positive impacts on the state's economic development.

The Evaluation Team conducted a two-stage evaluation and selection process. As part of the Stage One process, proposals were evaluated to ensure they satisfied specified eligibility, threshold, and

other minimum requirements set forth in Section 2.2 of the RFP. Proposals advancing to Stage Two were evaluated through quantitative and qualitative measures.

The Selection Team—consisting of DEEP, the PURA Procurement Manager, and OCC—evaluated and ranked the projects based upon this two-stage evaluation and selection process. Ultimately, the DEEP Commissioner made the final selection.

i. Stage One – Minimum Threshold Requirements

Under Section 2.2 of the RFP, the proposals must comply with the threshold requirements, satisfy any relevant statutory criteria under the Procurement Statute, and meet minimum standards demonstrating project viability. The minimum threshold requirements are as follows:

a. Bid Requirements

Under Section 2.2.1 of the RFP, eligible projects could be combined to form one bid, and positive contingent bids were allowed. Positive contingent bids included projects purchased by another state or bids offered with lower pricing options if two or more bids were selected.

If an eligible bidder submitted a proposal to the Massachusetts Section 83C of Chapter 169 of the Act of 2008, they were required to submit a copy of the complete and unredacted proposal to DEEP.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

b. Eligible Projects

Under Section 2.2.2 of the RFP, projects must be new or incremental offshore wind facilities that qualify as Class I renewable energy resources. The delivery of energy under any agreement must begin no earlier than July 1, 2020 and no later than December 31, 2026, and must not begin construction earlier than the effective date of the Purchase Power Agreement (PPA).

In addition, projects must comply with state regulatory and land use requirements. Bidders were encouraged to include an environmental pre-application meeting with DEEP, separate from the DEEP Evaluation and Selection Teams.

Eligible Projects were not allowed to receive Connecticut ratepayer-funded incentives or subsidies, including but not limited to net metering, pursuant to C.G.S. § 16-243h, virtual net metering, pursuant to C.G.S. § 16-244u, LREC/ZREC, pursuant to C.G.S. §§ 16-244r and 16-244t, or any successor programs. Eligible Projects receiving loans from the Connecticut Green Bank are eligible.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

c. Quantities and Contract Term Lengths

Under Section 2.2.3 of the RFP, the maximum authorized procurement level for energy and RECs for this RFP was 2,000 megawatts AC (MW_{AC}) in the aggregate. Bidders were required to submit at least one non-contingent proposal from an offshore wind facility with a nameplate capacity rating of 400

MW_{AC}, including bids for multiple sizing options greater than and less than 400 $MW_{AC,}$ to provide the Selection Team with greater optionality. The contract term is twenty years.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

d. Eligible Bidder

Under Section 2.2.4 of the RFP, the bidder must hold a lease from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) for the project.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

e. Qualified Energy and RECs via PPA

Under Section 2.2.5 of the RFP, bidders must sell energy and RECs through a PPA. The energy price is on a dollar per megawatt-hour ($ / MWh) basis and the RECs are on a dollar per REC ($ / REC) basis for GIS certificates.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

f. Capacity and Other ISO New England Markets

Section 2.2.6 of the RFP requires bidders to qualify and participate in the ISO-NE Forward Capacity Market (FCM), and make commercially reasonable efforts to be selected and compensated in the capacity market, which includes the use of the Renewable Technology Resource exemption. The bidders were required to describe their plan to obtain a capacity supply obligation.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

g. Interconnection Requirements

Projects are required to interconnect within the ISO-NE control area or adjoining control areas as outlined in Section 2.2.7 of the RFP. The delivery of energy from the project must occur throughout the term of the contract. The bidder must identify the delivery point. The delivery point must be located so that EDCs are not responsible for wheeling charges or scheduling to move energy to the ISO-NE Pool Transmission Facilities (PTF), nor any costs associated with delivery other than the payment of the bid prices.

Bidders were obligated to demonstrate how the project's energy can be delivered without material constraint or curtailment (i.e., that the project will be fully dispatched without displacing other clean energy generation). Bidders were required to demonstrate that their proposed point of delivery into ISO-NE, along with their proposed interconnection and transmission upgrades, is sufficient to ensure full dispatch of the proposal's output.

The project had to comply with all applicable ISO-NE and state interconnection requirements for generation facilities and interregional ties, as applicable, including but not limited to The Connecticut Light and Power Company and The United Illuminating Company Generator Interconnection Technical

Requirements. Bidders had to describe the status of the planned interconnection to the grid and submit a plan that clearly demonstrated how the energy was delivered from or by the delivery point that is a PTF node. Additionally, the RFP required details of interconnection applications, studies, and their status by filing interconnection requests with ISO-NE or other applicable system operator as necessary. Proposals had to include all interconnection and transmission upgrade costs required to ensure full dispatch, including transmission upgrades that may occur beyond the point of interconnection.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

h. Generation Site / Interconnection Route Control

Under Section 2.2.8 of the RFP, a proposal was required to demonstrate that it has a BOEM lease. A proposal had to demonstrate that it has property rights for a substantial portion of the property necessary for interconnection with a plan for obtaining control over any portion that is not under control.

Proposals that included activities within Long Island Sound (LIS) had to include a detailed description of how the project was consistent with the goals and policies set forth in the Long Island Sound Blue Plan, as required by Sections 22a-92 and 25-157t(b) of the General Statutes, and consistency with the New York Long Island Sound Coastal Management Program.[1]

In addition, any proposal that included in-water activities outside of Connecticut waters in LIS had to include a detailed description of how the project was consistent with all applicable marine spatial plans, including but not limited to the New York Ocean Action Plan, the Rhode Island Ocean SAMP, the Massachusetts Ocean Plan, and the Northeast Regional Ocean Plan.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

i. Technical Viability; Ability to Finance the Proposed Eligible Project

The bidders had to demonstrate that the proposed equipment was technically viable. Technical viability was demonstrated by showing the commercial availability of the technology and its use as outlined in Section 6 of Appendix B. In addition, the operational parameters were required to be consistent with Section 7 of Appendix B. An energy resource plan consistent with Section 8 of Appendix B, and a reasonable and complete critical path schedule for development as described in Section 9 of Appendix B were required.

The bidder had to demonstrate technical, financial, and managerial capabilities to develop the proposed project, including: the funding of development costs; the required development period security; reasonable estimated interconnection costs; capability to fund any required decommissioning of the project; and the ability to acquire the required equipment in the time frame proposed.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

[1] https://www.dos.ny.gov/opd/programs/WFRevitalization/longisland.html

j. Environmental Viability; Environmental and Fisheries Mitigation Plan

The bidder had to include an assessment of environmental impacts based on the information provided in Section 11 of Appendix B with a clear outline of the plan to mitigate such impacts or impediments.

The Environmental and Fisheries Mitigation Plan for the construction and operation of such offshore wind facilities had to include the following elements:

1. Per Section 11.7 of Appendix B – An Adaptive Plan with clearly identified stakeholders, a stakeholder engagement process, a plan for pre-construction and risk assessment, a process to avoid, minimize, and mitigate risks to stakeholders throughout the project phases, and a reporting schedule on such plan;

2. Per Section 11.8 of Appendix B – The plan to inventory, avoid, minimize, and mitigate the following specific hazards: risk to commercial fisheries; risk to marine mammals and sea turtles with specific reference of underwater sound and collision; risk to birds and bats; and risk to other species;

3. Per Section 11.10 of Appendix B – A Data Reference and Sharing Plan that addressed coordination with relevant Regional Working Groups and a plan to store and share inventory and monitoring data; and

4. Per Section 11 of Appendix B – A decommissioning plan for the entire project, including but not limited to project components located in non-federal waters.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

k. Experience

Bidders were required to demonstrate a sufficient amount of relevant experience and expertise to successfully develop, finance, construct, operate, and maintain its proposed project. Development, financing, and construction experience was established by demonstrating that key member(s) of the development team have previously undertaken project management responsibilities, including:

1. Successful development and construction of a similar type of project per Section 12.2 of Appendix B; or

2. Successful development and construction of one or more projects of similar size or complexity or requiring similar skill sets per Section 12.3 of Appendix B;

3. Experience successfully financing power generation or demonstrating the financial means to finance as shown on balance sheet per Section 12.3 of Appendix B; and

4. Experience in complex permitting processes and / or stakeholder engagement processes.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

l. Project Labor

The bidder was required to commit to paying not less than the prevailing wage, as described in section 31-53 of the Connecticut general statutes, for laborers, workmen, and mechanics performing construction activities within the United States, including federal waters. The bidder was also required to commit to engage in a good faith negotiation of a project labor agreement.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

m. Proposal Certification

Bidders were required to sign the Proposal Certification and Authorization Form in the Master Offer Form and / or Certification, Project and Pricing Data form (CPPD) verifying that the price(s), terms and conditions of the proposal are valid for at least 270 days following submission. Only an officer or other duly authorized representative was allowed to sign the Proposal Certification Form.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

n. PPA Pricing

Proposals for energy and RECs were required to be sold under a PPA and conform to the following requirements:

1. Proposals were required to provide fixed prices (in $ / MWh and $ / REC) annually for the term of the contract, and prices may be the same each year or increase over time.
2. Proposals were required to include prices that must be paid on a $ / MWh and $ / REC basis for actual production, following delivery on a monthly basis over the life of the contract. No fixed payments, pre-payments or fees shall be included in the proposal or paid.
3. Proposals were required to provide separate prices for energy and environmental attributes.
4. Payment for RECs would be made after receipt of the appropriate GIS Certificate in the applicable EDC's NEPOOL GIS account.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

o. Other Required Pricing Parameters

Proposals were required to satisfy the following requirements:

1. Proposed prices could not be conditioned upon or subject to adjustment based upon the availability of the Federal Production Tax Credit or the Federal Investment Tax Credit, or the availability or receipt or continuation for any period of any other tax treatment or government grant or subsidy.
2. Bidders were required to provide at least one bid for 400 MW_{AC}.

3. Bidders were required to indicate if their project or contract size (MW_{AC}) is scalable, the size of each increment, and the minimum and maximum size of the project, based upon the pricing submitted.
4. The bidders were required to indicate the delivery point for energy.
5. If the Locational Marginal Price (LMP) for the energy is less than $0.00 per MWh in any hour, then the buyer purchases energy at the contract rate and the seller credits, on the same monthly invoice, an amount equal to the product of (i) the energy delivered at that hour and (ii) the absolute value of the hourly LMP at that delivery point.

All projects passed this threshold requirement.

ii. Stage Two: Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis

In Stage Two of the evaluation, all proposals were evaluated based upon the evaluation criteria detailed in the RFP. Stage Two scoring was divided into two parts, with up to 75 points for quantitative factors and 25 points for qualitative factors for a total of 100 points.

1) Quantitative Evaluation Metrics

The quantitative evaluation used a multi-year net present value analysis to preliminarily score all projects. For purposes of computing the net present value, a nominal discount factor of 7% was used (4.9% real discount factor). The metric used for scoring bids was the ratio of the net present value of direct and indirect benefits to net present value costs of the projects.

The energy production profile provided by the bidder was evaluated for reasonableness. The bidder had to support the basis for all estimates and underlying assumptions. The Evaluation Team had the option of modifying the production profile (i.e., use a different profile from that provided by the bidder) or any other estimate in order to produce a reasonable and appropriate evaluation.

a) Model Overview

Levitan performed the quantitative analysis using an electric market simulation model known as AURORA, licensed by Energy Exemplar®. The AURORA model produces hourly zonal energy prices over the forecast period, emissions of CO_2, NOx, and SO_2 from fossil units in the model, as well as other data on the generation resources and transmission system across the modeled footprint. To perform the analysis, a model run with the proposed project in service was compared to a reference case without the proposed project. The Evaluation Team worked with Levitan on the key assumptions in the model, such as transmission transfer limits, fuel prices, resource buildout, plant retirements, and CO_2 allowance prices over the forecast period, 2020 through 2046. Key input data regarding load and resources were based on the ISO New England Capacity, Energy, Load and Transmission (CELT) report, the NYISO 'Gold Book', and the PJM Load Forecast.

A spreadsheet template was used to create a cost and benefit model for each proposal, drawing on information from the proposals and from their respective project case simulation runs. The spreadsheet model provided monthly and annual tabulations of project generation, payments to the project under the proposed pricing structure, market value of the generated energy, changes in energy cost to Connecticut load (aggregated hourly products of load and the change in energy price relative to the reference case), changes in the market value of pre-existing Connecticut EDC contracts due to energy market price

changes, and changes in New England greenhouse gas emissions. The model also assigned a value to the emissions changes and determined the present values of all relevant cash flows and quantities.

i) Direct Contract Costs

Direct contract costs were evaluated as the monthly products of the proposed prices for energy and RECs applicable in the relevant contract year and the corresponding monthly generation quantities for each month. Monthly payments were aggregated to the calendar year level and discounted to present value over the proposed PPA term.

ii) Direct Contract Benefits

Direct contract price benefits were evaluated using the products of project energy generation and the projected market price for the delivered energy in each hour over the PPA term. Hourly products were aggregated by month and then by calendar year. The calendar year benefits were discounted to present value over the proposed PPA term. The present value of net direct benefits was determined as the present value of direct contract benefits less the present value of direct contract costs.

iii) Indirect Economic Benefits

The quantitative evaluation process included an evaluation of the indirect economic benefits to the electric system to customers using the outputs from an electric market simulation model. The indirect economic benefits for Connecticut customers were measured by comparing the cost to load (hourly load multiplied by hourly energy price for each Connecticut load zone) with and without the project, over the forecast period. The indirect economic benefits also took into account the impact on the Connecticut EDCs' existing long-term contracts for clean energy resources. This was measured by comparing the change in contract revenues from existing PPAs, with and without the project, over the forecast period. The hourly benefits were aggregated first by month and then by calendar year. The calendar year benefits were discounted to present value over the proposed PPA term.

iv) Avoided Carbon Value

Annual CO_2 emissions from fossil resources across New England with the project in service were compared to annual CO_2 emissions across New England in the reference case. The difference between the CO_2 emissions with the project in service and the reference case in each calendar year was multiplied by the social cost of carbon (SCC),[2] less the embedded value of CO_2. The embedded value is the forecasted value of RGGI emission allowances, since the allowance cost was already included in the direct energy benefit. During the proposed PPA term, the benefit of all the avoided emissions is ascribable to the project. Beyond the PPA term, through 2046, the project is assumed to continue to operate and displace fossil emissions, but only the benefits from Connecticut's load share (assumed to be 25%) of the avoided emissions are counted.

v) Benefit to Cost Ratio

The primary quantitative evaluation metric was Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR), calculated as the ratio of the present value of the sum of direct contract benefits, indirect economic benefits, and avoided carbon value, divided by the present value of direct contract costs. Each proposal was given a numerical score based on its BCR.

[2] Source: Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government. (2016). *Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866.*

2) Qualitative Analysis

The Evaluation Team assessed proposals based on the following qualitative factors:

- Consistency with the policy goals outlined in the Connecticut Comprehensive Energy Strategy (CES) and Integrated Resources Plan (IRP)
- Plans for the use of skilled labor
- Impact on Connecticut's economic development
- Plans and practices to avoid, minimize, and mitigate current known and future discovered impacts to wildlife, natural resources, ecosystems, and traditional or existing water-dependent uses, including, but not limited to, commercial fishing

Proposals were evaluated for consistency with the CES and IRP based on project viability and likelihood of the project to be developed in order to continue the State's progress in meeting its greenhouse gas emission reduction targets. The Evaluation Team considered the robustness of the proposals with regards to descriptive permitting plans, interconnection paths, and the project's position in the ISO-NE interconnection queue. Two of the three projects received full points because they had a clear permitting plan and a more favorable ISO-NE interconnection queue position. One developer received no points because the Evaluation Team had concerns with the interconnection path, and the permitting and interconnection plan was not as well developed as other proposals.

DEEP relied upon the expertise of the Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) to evaluate proposals for their plans for the use of skilled labor and impact on Connecticut's economic development. Developers offered different economic development contributions based on the size of the project selected. DECD evaluated the projects in comparison to one another based upon project size and the value of economic development commitments made when compared to other similarly sized proposals.

Finally, proposals were evaluated for their environmental and fisheries mitigation plan based on the following factors: (1) adaptive operational and decommissioning plan; (2) specific hazards for collision and sound with marine mammals and turtles, and birds and bats, (3) specific hazards for commercial fisheries and (4) data reference and sharing plan. More specifically, proposals were evaluated based upon the following: identification of affected stakeholders, development of a plan to engage stakeholders; preconstruction inventory and assessment plan related to fisheries and environmental concerns; a commitment to site assessment based upon standards developed by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); turbine spacing and installation; specific hazard avoidance and mitigation ; mitigation funding sources; and monitoring and reporting throughout all phases of the project. One developer presented the least robust plan with a heavy emphasis on fisheries, and an inadequate discussion of natural resources. Two developers had a more robust environmental and fisheries mitigation plan, including a greater willingness to address mitigation funding and stakeholder engagement. Of those two developers, the one that scored the highest had the most detailed identification of specific hazards and a clear plan to address them, and expressed the highest level of commitment to mitigating funding.

III. PROJECT SELECTION

All eligible projects were given a total score based on the quantitative and qualitative points awarded. Some contingent proposals were no longer available for selection after Massachusetts announced the results of its offshore wind procurement issued pursuant to Section 83C of the Massachusetts Green Communities Act, as added by Chapter 188 of the Acts of 2016, An Act to Promote Energy Diversity.

On December 5, 2019, DEEP announced the selection of the 804 MW Park City Wind project developed by Vineyard Wind. This project had the third highest score of all proposal variations. The first and second ranked proposals were larger versions of the Park City Wind project, but the Commissioner selected the 804 MW Park City Wind project to balance the need to deploy significant zero carbon resources to meet our state climate goals, anchor economic development benefits from a sizeable offshore wind project, secure the use of a favorable interconnection point, and also spread out the ratepayer impact by reserving additional offshore wind purchases for later years. DEEP expects that as the experience with development of offshore wind projects grows, the supply chain hardens, and technology improves, the real price of offshore wind will likely decrease. Purchase of offshore wind over time also allows for the development of a sustained offshore wind workforce providing long-lasting economic development.

The Park City Wind project is expected to generate 3,710,916 MWh per year, which is the equivalent of approximately 14% of the state's two investor-owned electric distribution company load. The Park City Wind project included an estimated $890 million in direct economic development in Connecticut, including Bridgeport Harbor and the local supply chain. The developer committed to investments into Bridgeport Harbor to facilitate local outfitting and assembly of the turbines, create a local operations and maintenance base in Bridgeport, and bring nearly $900 million in economic development directly related to the project. In addition, the project presented the state with the opportunity to establish itself as a Tier 1 offshore wind manufacturer with the Kerite cable manufacturing company in Seymour, Connecticut. The project committed to pay no less than the prevailing wage and to negotiate in good faith for a mutually agreeable project labor agreement. Vineyard Wind estimates 2,800 direct full-time employment years created in Connecticut through the project.

The proposal included a commitment to many of the recommendations developed by the Commission such as:

- a thorough environmental and fisheries mitigation plan, including an assessment of identified wildlife and fisheries specific hazards from developing and operating the offshore wind turbines;
- a willingness to provide mitigation funding for hazards that are not avoided;
- a comprehensive stakeholder engagement process;
- a commitment to one nautical-mile by one nautical-mile spacing between turbines and multiple designated transit lanes; and
- a robust decommissioning plan.

The Park City Wind project will provide significant environmental benefits and help Connecticut advance toward meeting the carbon emission reduction targets established in the GWSA and Executive Order No. 3. The project enables Connecticut to avoid emitting more than one million short

tons of carbon dioxide per year, or more than 25 million short tons over the 20-year contract period. Additionally, the project will help Connecticut avoid more than 5,400 metric tons of NO_X and 380 metric tons of SO_2.

The Park City Wind project will also provide significant winter reliability benefits. The project will avoid an average of approximately 6,500 million cubic feet of gas during the winter months (December – February) and 21,000 million cubic feet annually.

IV. CONCLUSION:

The Commissioner found the Park City Wind project, totaling 3,710,916 MWh per year, to be in the best interest of ratepayers. It more than doubles the amount of new zero-carbon renewable energy from offshore wind resources procured by DEEP to date. The selection is a significant step toward the state's statutory target to reduce economy-wide greenhouse gas emissions by at least 45% by 2030 and at least 80% by 2050. In addition, Park City Wind improves electric grid reliability in cold winter periods, a critical feature to advance Connecticut's transition away from reliance on natural gas power plants. The project will also provide significant economic benefits to Connecticut during the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project as well as position Connecticut as a hub for offshore wind for years to come.