

In chronological order:

- Docket No. 14-07-19RE05
 - Decision dated December 19, 2018
 - Commissioner panel: John W. Betkoski, III; Michael A. Caron; Katherine S. Dykes
 - This is the implementation decision, which, among other things, stated, “The Authority instructs the EDCs, upon completion of all IT redesigns, and development of compliance reporting and communications, to submit a compliance filing indicating the total costs to be billed to suppliers. After suppliers have been given the opportunity to review the costs, these costs will be allocated to each supplier licensed to serve residential customers, and serving one or more residential customers, as of the date of the reopened docket to address cost reimbursement to the EDCs.” Page 2.

- Docket No. 17-11-25
 - Correspondence to Wattifi dated November 27, 2019
 - Commissioner panel: Michael A. Caron; John W. Betkoski, III
 - Correspondence stated, in part, “Based on the number of concerns cited herein, the Authority instructs Wattifi to cease enrolling new customers until it has resolved the items noted herein to the satisfaction of the Authority.”
 - Correspondence to Wattifi dated December 23, 2019
 - Commissioner panel: Michael A. Caron; John W. Betkoski, III
 - Correspondence lifted the stay imposed by the November 27, 2019 letter.

- Docket No. 19-06-01RE01
 - Decision dated May 19, 2021
 - Commissioner panel: Marissa P. Gillett; John W. Betkoski, III; Michael A. Caron
 - Decision addressed Wattifi’s deficiencies in RPS compliance for calendar year 2018, directing payments of \$559 to Eversource; \$28 to UI; and \$171 to the Green Bank.

- Docket No. 20-06-01
 - Decision dated May 19, 2021
 - Commissioner panel: Marissa P. Gillett; John W. Betkoski, III; Michael A. Caron
 - Decision addressed Wattifi’s deficiencies in RPS compliance for calendar year 2019, directing payments of \$8,684 to Eversource and \$966 to UI.

- Docket No. 14-07-19RE07
 - Decision dated July 26, 2023
 - Commissioner panel: Marissa P. Gillett; John W. Betkoski, III; Michael A. Caron
 - Decision allocated to third-party suppliers, including Wattifi, the final project costs first approved in Docket No. 14-07-19RE05 decision, directing payment to be made no later than October 19, 2023, including a directive to Wattifi to make payments of \$41,142.37 to Eversource and \$16,026.05 to UI, for a total of \$57,168.42.
 - Notice of Violation issued on December 7, 2023, for failure to comply with the Decision dated July 26, 2023

- The NOV stated, in part, “The civil penalty will be waived if the Company complies with [\$57,168.42 payment] within 20 days of receipt of this Notice. Failure to comply with Order No. 3 within 20 days of receipt of this Notice may result in suspension of the Company’s electric supplier license.”
 - Pursuant to General Statutes § 16-41, since the company did not request a hearing within 20 days of receipt of the notice, “then this Notice shall, on the first day after the expiration of the 20-day period, become a final order of the Authority, and the matters asserted or charged in the Notice shall be deemed admitted by the Company.”
- Docket No. 17-11-25
 - Decision dated May 29, 2024
 - Commissioner panel: Marissa P. Gillett; John W. Betkoski, III; Michael A. Caron
 - The decision revoked Wattifi’s electric supplier license “due to the Company’s failure to maintain financial and managerial capability, failure to maintain a security, failure to notify the Authority of the Company’s dissolution, and violations of law as documented in the Notice of Violation and Civil Penalty issued on December 7, 2023 (NOV).”
- Docket No. 24-06-01
 - Decision dated March 12, 2025
 - Commissioner panel: Marissa P. Gillett; Michael A. Caron; David A. Arconti, Jr.
 - This decision addresses RPS compliance for calendar year 2023.
 - Ordering clause states, “No later than April 9, 2025, Wattifi shall submit to the Authority receipts showing payments of \$4,800 to Eversource, \$220 to UI, and \$23 to Green Bank.”

Additional Background Information:

- With respect to notices (i.e., Notices of Proceeding, Notices of Hearings, Notices of Violations, etc.), these documents are not actions or decisions of the Authority. Rather, these documents simply notify parties and participants by providing information about the proceeding or specific events in a docket, such as providing information about how and by when an interested party must file to request participant status. Apart from Notices of Violation, which are a prerequisite for civil penalties, notices issued by the Authority are discretionary and have no legal effect. As such, voting is not required for notices.
- The Notice of Violation (NOV) issued on 12/7/2023 was an enforcement action resulting from a decision voted on by the three commissioners on July 26, 2023. The NOV notifies a party that the Authority has reason to believe a violation has occurred. The NOV does not make any findings of fact or conclusions of law. Rather, it provides the receiving party the opportunity to request a hearing and have the Authority adjudicate the matter. If a hearing is requested, the Authority will initiate a proceeding and issue a decision voted on by the commissioners. Alternatively, the receiving party can waive this statutory right for an adjudication, admit the violation, and pay the assessed civil penalties. In those cases, the Authority does not conduct a proceeding or take a further vote on the matter. With respect

to the referenced NOV, Wattifi, elected to waive its right to adjudicate the NOV, and the NOV became a final order of the Authority on the twenty-first day, in accordance with General Statutes § 16-41. For a recent example of this process in other matters where a party *did* request a hearing on a notice of violation, which in turn resulted in a hearing and vote by a panel of commissioners, please refer to Docket Nos. 20-08-03RE01, 23-01-32RE01, 23-01-39RE01, and more available upon request.

- As to motion rulings, the UAPA and PURA regulations expressly authorize a presiding officer to issue motion rulings on behalf of the agency. For decades, the Authority has issued procedural, evidentiary, and intermediary rulings without holding a public meeting and voting as a full panel since voting on these motion rulings is not a legal requirement. Even the utilities concede (correctly) that this is permissible. Ultimately though, every final decision in a proceeding is voted on by the panel of commissioners. Consequently, if a party is aggrieved by a motion ruling (e.g., a ruling striking evidence), such party may raise the issue during an administrative appeal of the final decision. This is long-standing administrative law practice because it avoids unnecessary appeals of intermediate rulings until a matter is fully adjudicated. Final Decisions are voted on by the panel of commissioners every Wednesday at PURA's publicly-accessible regular meeting. Votes of all decisions rendered by PURA at Regular Meetings, noticed pursuant to General Statutes § 1-225, are available on the PURA website by navigating to the appropriate docket, or by accessing the minutes for the Regular Meeting.