

In Re: Ecogy Energy, Inc., Docket No. 22-14-REG
Ecogy Responses to RI Energy First Set of Data Requests

EXHIBIT 1-4

Phone call between Brittany Friese and Tom Kender

Date: Jun 28, 2022

Time: 9:40AM

The call lasted for about 45 minutes.

In summary, Tom Kender mentioned that a ton of developers also rebid in the Open Enrollment. They re-applied with existing COE's in an effort to capitalize on the higher ceiling price. He further said that upon application, there were discussions around this that included RI Energy, OER, DG Board, the Commission, and Renewable Contracts.

According to Tom, during these conversations, they decided to not award developers with existing COEs a new COE because "you cannot hold two COEs".

I pushed back strongly and underlined that we (Ecogy) had intent to terminate the existing COE, as this was allowed last year, and that the Tariff has no explicit language around this. I also made plenty of references to emails by Tom himself.

Additionally, Tom mentioned that covid issues were more impactful during 2020 and 2021. In reply to this, I gave several examples of EPC pricing almost doubling, module issues, lead times on specific equipment because plants in China are shut down, etc.

I mentioned that these projects are not financially viable without higher incentives. On seeking redress at the Public Utilities Commission ("PUC"), Tom mentioned that "we would not be viewed favorably should we decide to bring this to the PUC. Higher incentives means higher costs passed down to ratepayers and it looks bad when a developer jumps around from Enrollment to Enrollment".

Tom essentially alluded to the fact that RI Energy will not consent if we still have a year left to build.

Tom mentioned that the PUC believes developers should be able to complete a small solar project in 24 months. We would need to show a bunch of proof of delays.