

with the written approval of the Commission, is being relocated to N.J.A.C. 13:71-27.56(n).

N.J.A.C. 13:71-27.56(l) is proposed for amendment to require permit holders to submit a written request for permission to distribute the Pick (N) carry-over on a specific performance for a specified date no greater than one year from the date the request is submitted. Further, the request must contain justification for the distribution and an explanation of the benefit to be derived.

The existing language at N.J.A.C. 13:71-27.56(m), which allows unforeseen circumstances to be resolved with general pari-mutuel practice and decisions regarding distribution to be determined final, is being relocated to N.J.A.C. 13:71-27.56(o).

N.J.A.C. 13:71-27.56(m) is proposed for amendment to require that if the Pick (N) carry-over is designated for distribution on a specified date and performance in which there are no wagers selecting the first place finisher in each of the Pick (N) contests, the entire pool shall be distributed as a single price pool to those whose selections finished first in the greatest number of Pick (N) contests. The Pick (N) carry-over shall be designated for distribution on a specified date and performance only upon written approval from the Commission as provided at subsection (l) of this rule or upon the closing performance of the meet.

Notably, N.J.A.C. 13:71-29.56(j), which allows permit holders to distribute carry-over on the last day of the meet, is not being proposed for amendment.

As the Commission has provided a 60-day comment period for this notice of proposal, this notice is excepted from the rulemaking calendar requirements pursuant to N.J.A.C. 1:30-3.3(a)5.

#### Social Impact

The Commission believes that the proposed amendments will have a positive social impact. The rulemaking will ensure consistency within the horse racing rules. Further, it is anticipated that enabling the permit holders to request to pay out the Pick (N) carry-over on a selected day will enable them to remain competitive with racetracks in the states that currently allow this flexibility. In addition, the amendments may enable permit holders to attract more bettors, increase wagering, maximize handle and profits, and generate more excitement for New Jersey racing.

#### Economic Impact

The Commission has evaluated this rulemaking and determined that no costs will be incurred due to this rulemaking. It is possible, but purely speculative, that the proposed amendments will have a positive economic impact if the wagering handle increases which will generate more purse money and breeders' awards for the racing industry.

#### Federal Standards Statement

A Federal standards analysis is not required as there are no Federal standards or requirements applicable to the proposed amendments. The Commission proposes these amendments pursuant to the rulemaking authority set forth at N.J.S.A. 5:5-30.

#### Jobs Impact

The Commission has evaluated the proposed rulemaking and determined that it will not generate or eliminate any jobs in the State.

#### Agriculture Industry Impact

The Commission has evaluated the proposed amendments, which concern the Pick (N) carry-over distribution, and determined that they will not have an impact on the agricultural industry in the State. Accordingly, no further analysis is required. It is possible, but purely speculative, that a positive impact on the agricultural industry could result if the wagering handle increases which may assist New Jersey's breeding industry by resulting in additional revenue for breeders' awards.

#### Regulatory Flexibility Statement

A regulatory flexibility analysis is not required as the proposed amendments will have no impact on the reporting, recordkeeping, or compliance requirements on small businesses as defined in the Regulatory Flexibility Act, N.J.S.A. 52:14B-16 et seq.

#### Housing Affordability Impact Analysis

The Commission has evaluated the proposed amendments, which concern the distribution of the Pick (N) carry-over, and determined that

they will not have an impact on housing affordability or evoke a change in the average costs associated with housing in the State. Accordingly, no further analysis is required.

#### Smart Growth Development Impact Analysis

The Commission has evaluated the proposed rulemaking, which concerns the distribution of the Pick (N) carry-over, and determined that it will not have an impact on housing production in Planning Areas 1 or 2, or within designated centers, pursuant to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. Accordingly, no further analysis is required.

#### Racial and Ethnic Community Criminal Justice and Public Safety Impact

The Commission has evaluated the proposed amendments and determined that they will not have an impact on pretrial detention, sentencing, probation, or parole policies concerning adults and juveniles in the State. Accordingly, no further analysis is required.

Full text of the proposal follows (additions indicated in boldface **thus**):

#### SUBCHAPTER 27. MUTUELS

13:71-27.56 The Pick (N)

(a)-(k) (No change.)

**(l) A written request for permission to distribute the Pick (N) carry-over on a specific performance may be submitted to the Commission. The request must be for a specified date no greater than one year from the date the request is submitted and contain justification for the distribution, an explanation of the benefit to be derived, and the intended date and performance for the distribution.**

**(m) The Pick (N) carry-over shall be designated for distribution on a specified date and performance only upon written approval from the Commission granted in response to a written request submitted pursuant to (l) above or upon the closing performance of the meet.**

**1. Should the Pick (N) carry-over be designated for distribution on a specified date and performance in which there are no wagers selecting the first place finisher in each of the Pick (N) contests, the entire pool shall be distributed as a single price pool to those whose selections finished first in the greatest number of Pick (N) contests.**

Recodify existing (l)-(m) as **(n)-(o)** (No change in text.)

## PUBLIC UTILITIES

### (a)

#### BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

#### Community Solar Energy Program

#### Notice of Proposed Substantial Changes Upon Adoption to Proposed Amendments

#### Proposed Changes: N.J.A.C. 14:8-9.2, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7, 9.9, 11.2, 11.4, and 11.5

Proposed: September 18, 2023, at 55 N.J.R. 1985(a) (See also at 55 N.J.R. 2048(a)).

Authorized By: The New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Christine Guhl-Sadovy, President, Dr. Zenon Christodoulou, Ph.D., and Michael Bange, Commissioners.

Authority: N.J.S.A. 48:3-87.11, 48:3-115, and 48:3-116.

BPU Docket Number: QX23070434.

The deadline for comments on this notice of proposed substantial changes upon adoption is 5:00 P.M., on December 6, 2024.

Please submit comments directly by using the Board of Public Utilities' (Board) Public Document Search tool, search for the specific docket listed above, and post by utilizing the "Post Comments" button. Written comments may also be submitted. Please include subject matter and docket number and submit to:

Secretary of the Board  
44 South Clinton Ave., 1st Floor  
PO Box 350

Trenton, NJ 08625-0350  
 Attn: BPU Docket Number: QX23070434  
 Email: [board.secretary@bpu.nj.gov](mailto:board.secretary@bpu.nj.gov)  
 Phone: 609-292-1599

All comments are considered “public documents” for purposes of the State’s Open Public Records Act. Commenters may identify information that they seek to keep confidential by submitting it in accordance with the confidentiality procedures set forth at N.J.A.C. 14:1-12.3.

**Take notice** that the Board proposed amendments at N.J.A.C. 14:8-9 and 11 on September 18, 2023, at 55 N.J.R. 1985(a), and made administrative corrections on October 2, 2023, at 55 N.J.R. 2048(a). The current rules established the Community Solar Energy Pilot Program (Pilot Program) and the Successor Solar Incentive (SuSI) Program. The proposed amendments established the Community Solar Energy Program (CSEP) and integrated it with the larger SuSI Program. Specifically, the amendments:

- 1) established the specifics of the CSEP design, which includes registration of eligible facilities, through conversion of the Pilot Program to the CSEP;
- 2) established the CSEP structure so that it allows eligible projects to provide solar energy to participating subscribers through the community solar mechanism; and
- 3) provided standards for subscriptions and low- to moderate-income (LMI) subscribers, billing procedures, consumer protection, and reporting requirements.

The public comment period closed on December 1, 2023.

The Board is proposing substantial changes to the amendments in response to comments received from Arcadia Power; Coalition for Community Solar Access and Solar Energy Industries Association (CCSA-SEIA); CS Energy; Gabel Associates; NAIOP New Jersey; the New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel (RC); Prologis; and Solar Landscape pertaining to N.J.A.C. 14:8-9.2, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7, 9.9, 11.2, 11.4, and 11.5. Summaries of the comments that prompted the changes, and the agency responses, are provided below. This notice of proposed substantial changes is published pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:14B-4.10.

#### Summary of Public Comments and Agency Responses:

Comments on the original proposal were received from Arcadia Power; Atlantic City Electric Company; Modern Renewables/Bromley Community Solar; CCSA-SEIA; CS Energy; Gabel Associates; Good Energy; the NAACP NJ State Conference; NAIOP New Jersey; RC; Prologis; Public Service Electric and Gas Company, and Solar Landscape.

#### N.J.A.C. 14:8-9.5 Community Solar Energy Program Eligibility

1. COMMENT: The commenter recommends including “a sand and gravel pit that has no critical wildlife habitat” as a permitted siting type in the CSEP, stating that sand and gravel pits were considered preferred siting in the Pilot Program and should continue to be able to participate in community solar. The commenter says such sites may require remediation and add value to their communities. (CS Energy)

RESPONSE: The Board agrees with the commenter’s implication that mining sites are disturbed and degraded areas where installation of solar facilities would have a relatively minor environmental impact. While not considered impervious surfaces or part of the built environment, these sites are in some ways analogous to contaminated sites and landfills. The Pilot Program also considered these sites as preferred siting. The Board has consulted with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and believes mining sites would be appropriate to include in the CSEP, and it proposes a definition of “mining site” at N.J.A.C. 14:8-9.2 and including these sites as permitted site types in the CSEP.

2. COMMENT: The commenters suggest that the Board’s prohibition on co-located projects on adjacent buildings with the same beneficial owner will limit effective deployment of warehouse and distribution space and handicap long-term rooftop community solar development. The commenters note that within industrial properties, building rooftops are often separated by access roads, parking lots, or other physical means of separation, and are leased by distinct tenants. The commenters suggest removing “with different beneficial owners” from the co-location exemption at proposed N.J.A.C. 14:8-9.5(g). (Prologis and NAIOP New Jersey)

3. COMMENT: The commenter proposes, as an alternative, extending the exemption to projects that are registered in the CSEP during different energy years. (Prologis)

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS 2 AND 3: The Board agrees with the commenters that buildings on separate properties may have projects on their rooftops developed and installed separately. The Board believes that distinguishing adjacent buildings with the same beneficial owner and with different beneficial owners is unnecessary and is proposing to remove this provision (N.J.A.C. 14:8-9.2(f)). However, the Board disagrees with the suggestion to distinguish co-located projects that are registered during different energy years, which would diminish the differences in eligibility for the ADI and CSI programs. The Board is also proposing to rephrase the definition of and restrictions on co-location at N.J.A.C. 14:8-11.2 and 11.4, respectively, for greater clarity.

4. COMMENT: The commenters object to the provision at N.J.A.C. 14:8-9.5(h) excluding EDCs from developing, owning, and operating community solar projects and urge the Board to strike any such language in its entirety. The commenters state that the rule contradicts the language in the Clean Energy Act, which permits EDCs to participate in the permanent program and imperils the State’s ability to achieve its clean energy goals. (ACE and PSE&G)

RESPONSE: The Board agrees with the commenters that the EDCs may be able to participate in the CSEP. The Board proposes to delete originally proposed N.J.A.C. 14:8-9.5(h) and instead proposes that the standard for community solar projects owned by EDCs be that such projects may register in the CSEP in any capacity that is not subscribed by the end of an energy year. Such remaining capacity would be carried over to the subsequent energy year in addition to newly allocated capacity, and the EDC may register pursuant to standard procedures projects that total up to the capacity that was carried over. The Board continues to believe that there is strong interest in developing community solar projects by non-EDC entities and that risks and costs associated with developing a community solar project should not be transferred to ratepayers. However, the Board also believes that in addition to their roles in the administration of the community solar program, the EDCs can contribute to meeting the State’s clean energy goals when the capacity targets allocated by the Board are not met. Each service territory is planned to have a certain capacity of projects to serve residents, and when these areas have not generated the intended private investment interest, it may be appropriate for EDCs to fill the gap for additional competitive presence. The Board further proposes that an EDC that registers a project in the CSEP shall submit a rate filing for how it intends to recover any costs associated with its community solar projects.

#### N.J.A.C. 14:8-9.6 Subscription Requirements

5. COMMENT: The commenters request that the Board confirm that a municipality can adopt an automatic enrollment community solar project through the procurement of an existing community solar project, whether it be a project that was awarded community solar participation in the Pilot Program or previous rounds of the CSEP, or one that has not yet applied or been selected to participate. (Gabel Associates and Solar Landscape)

RESPONSE: The Board intends for existing community solar projects to be able to serve as municipal automatic enrollment projects and is proposing to clarify the rule to specify that municipalities may use a public procurement process to do so.

6. COMMENT: The commenter suggests that it is possible for a small number of municipalities to take up a large portion of the program’s capacity with municipal automatic enrollment projects and thereby limit other municipalities’ access to such an enrollment option. The commenter recommends that automatic enrollment should be capped at 20 percent of annual program capacity to level the playing field and ensure opt-in projects can operate. The commenter also expresses concern that individual customers may see negligible bill savings if one of many automatically enrolled in a municipality. (Arcadia Power)

RESPONSE: The Board appreciates the commenter’s concerns and believes that municipalities and potential subscribers across the State should have access to both automatic enrollment projects and traditional opt-in subscriptions. The Board, therefore, proposes to update the rule to allow the Board to set, by Board Order, an annual limit on the number or

capacity of projects that convert to municipal automatic enrollment projects as well as a limit on the number or capacity of projects that contract with a single municipality. The Board also agrees that automatically enrolled subscribers should receive substantial bill savings and proposes that it be required to set a minimum guaranteed bill credit discount for automatically enrolled subscribers.

7. COMMENT: The commenter believes that the 15-mile geographic restriction on automatic enrollment communities is arbitrary and hinders project owners from forming strategic partnerships with municipalities that might have a more significant LMI population. The commenter claims the rule change is harmful because: 1) the restriction on area deprives municipalities the opportunity to benefit fully from the CSEP; 2) it will inhibit competition by reducing the number of bidders eligible to participate in competitive bids; 3) the 15-mile limit hinders rural communities with fewer, less dense rooftops and canopies to which solar projects are limited; and 4) the requirement that solar developers must provide a letter of support from the municipality renders the 15-mile limitation moot and over-reaching. (Gabel Associates)

8. COMMENT: The commenter states that the 15-mile geographic restriction is unnecessary and proposes that automatic enrollment for a project be expanded to the entire utility territory in which the project resides to allow for a more diverse pool of subscribers and encourage participation from more diverse regions, thus expanding project viability. (Good Energy)

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS 7 AND 8: The Board agrees with the commenters' recommendation to expand the geographic restriction on automatic enrollment projects. The Board is proposing to amend N.J.A.C. 14:8-9.6(1)4 to permit a local government to associate with a municipal automatic enrollment community solar project located anywhere in the same EDC service territory as the local government.

**N.J.A.C. 14:8-9.9 EDC Responsibilities and Cost Recovery**

9. COMMENT: The commenter disagrees with the deletion of three original subsections (d), (e), and (h) regarding telemetry of production data to the EDC, measuring the metered production of energy, and compliance with applicable laws and regulations, respectively. (RC)

RESPONSE: The Board agrees that the deletion of subsections (d) and (e) was not necessary and is proposing to restore those subsections to the rule. With respect to subsection (h), the Board believes it unnecessary to specify in these rules that Federal and State securities laws, rules, and regulations apply.

**N.J.A.C. 14:8-11.4 Administratively Determined Incentive Program Eligibility**

10. COMMENT: The commenter recommends providing, in the proposed rules, examples of specific scenarios in which a co-location waiver would be granted, specifically for a co-located project on an unclosed, municipally owned landfill that meets certain requirements. The commenter notes that contaminated sites and landfills are a critical component of the State's clean energy future and failing to optimize this segment through co-location will hinder their performance as clean energy sites and clear guidance and relaxed co-location rules would aid in their otherwise stagnant development. (CS Energy)

RESPONSE: The Board agrees that siting solar projects on municipally owned landfills that have not yet been properly closed is a preferred site type due to the benefits to the public and the public entity site owner. The Board also recognizes that municipally owned landfills may be able to host more than one community solar project and that, due to the requirements of the closure process, these should be able to be co-located. Therefore, the Board is proposing that community and/or remote net metered facilities sited on a landfill that is owned by a public entity and is not properly closed at the time of registration may be co-located, provided the total capacity of all co-located projects is no more than 10 megawatt (MW). The Board also proposes rephrasing the definition of and restrictions on co-location at N.J.A.C. 14:8-11.2 and 11.4, respectively, for greater clarity.

**N.J.A.C. 14:8-11.5 Successor Solar Incentive Program Registration Process**

11. COMMENT: The commenters support the requirement for projects greater than one MW in size to provide conditional approval to construct

from the EDC when registering for the CSEP and further recommend that this also be required for projects smaller than one MW to have similar requirements for all applicants in a competitive program. They indicate that this exemption for smaller projects allows for speculative projects that may still be rejected for interconnection by the EDC or face high upgrade costs. (CCSA-SEIA, NAIOP New Jersey, and Solar Landscape)

RESPONSE: The Board agrees with the commenters and proposes to apply the registration requirement of conditional approval to construct from the EDC for all community solar projects.

**Effect of Proposed Changes on Impact Statements Included in Original Proposal**

The changes to the proposed amendments will not affect the impact statements included in the original notice of proposal. The changes modify the site types permitted in the CSEP; remove a restriction on co-location of community solar projects; allow the conversion of projects to municipal automatic enrollment projects; restore provisions regarding telemetry of production data and measuring metered production of energy; and require all projects to submit conditional approval to construct from the EDC in their registration packages. These changes will not affect the Social, Economic, Jobs, Agriculture Industry, or Racial and Ethnic Community Criminal Justice and Public Safety Impacts; the Federal Standards Statement; the Regulatory Flexibility Statement; or the Housing Affordability or Smart Growth Development Impact Analyses, as published in the original notice of proposal.

Full text of the proposed substantial changes to the proposed amendments follows (additions to proposal indicated in italicized boldface *thus*; deletions from proposal indicated in italicized cursive brackets {thus/}):

SUBCHAPTER 9. COMMUNITY SOLAR ENERGY PROGRAM

14:8-9.2 Definitions

For the purposes of this subchapter, the following words and terms shall have the following meanings, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

...  
*"Mining site" means a sand mine, gravel pit, or mine on land classified as "Extractive mining" in Level II of the modified Anderson classification system within the most recent Land Use/Land Cover GIS data layer produced by the NJDEP. A mining site shall exclude forested land as defined at N.J.A.C. 14:8-12.2.*  
 ...

14:8-9.5 Community Solar Energy Program (CSEP) eligibility

(a)-(c) (No change from proposal.)  
 (d) Unless modified by Board Order or by a waiver granted by the Board, a community solar project may be located on:

- 1.-2. (No change from proposal.)
- 3. **A contaminated site or landfill, where associated disturbed areas constitute a maximum of 10 percent of the total area dedicated to solar development, and that excludes farmland; {or}**
- 4. **A body of water that has little to no established floral and faunal resources, such as a water treatment reservoir or dredge pond{./}; or**
- 5. **A mining site.**

(e) **Regarding projects located on a contaminated site, {or} landfill, or mining site:**

- 1.-5. (No change from proposal.)
- (f) *{(Reserved)} If, at the end of an energy year, there is remaining unsubscribed capacity allocated in a megawatt block for an EDC service territory, such capacity shall roll over into the allocation for the subsequent energy year. In the subsequent energy year, the EDC is eligible to register community solar projects in the CSEP up to the amount of the rolled over capacity in the EDC's service territory. The EDC shall submit a rate filing for how it intends to recover any costs associated with its community solar projects.*

*{(g) Community solar facilities are not considered co-located if they are located on rooftops of separate buildings on different properties with different beneficial owners.*

**(h) EDCs are not allowed to develop, own, or operate community solar projects beyond the billing and other responsibilities set forth in this subchapter.**

14:8-9.6 Subscription requirements

(a)-(k) (No change.)

(l) Beginning April 1, 2025, a local government may submit a registration for a municipal community solar automatic enrollment project that requests an exemption from the provisions at N.J.A.C. 14:8-9.10(b)1i, which mandate subscriber enrollment through affirmative consent of the subscriber. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, an automatic enrollment project shall be subject to all other rules of the CSEP, as well as to the following provisions:

1. (No change.)

2. **A local government {that developed a project in the CSEP or Pilot Program and wishes to convert it to a municipal community solar automatic enrollment project may provide} may contract with an existing community solar project to become a municipal community solar automatic enrollment project by means of a public procurement process and by providing, to the Board, a resolution or ordinance stating its intention to convert the project as a municipal community solar automatic enrollment project and the mechanism by which it intends to enroll new customers {by no later than December 31, 2025;}. The Board may, by Board Order, set annual limits on the number or capacity of projects that convert to municipal community solar automatic enrollment projects or contract with a single municipality;**

3. (No change.)

4. **The automatic enrollment project shall be located within {15 miles of the boundaries of} the same EDC service territory as the associated local government;**

5.-13. (No change.)

14:8-9.7 Community solar billing

(a) (No change.)

**(b) Subscribers shall receive at least the project’s guaranteed bill credit discount, as identified in the project’s registration, respective to the capacity to which they are subscribed. The Board shall set, by Board Order, a minimum guaranteed bill credit discount applicable to all projects and a minimum guaranteed bill credit discount applicable to subscribers automatically enrolled to an automatic enrollment project, and projects may establish a higher discount in their registration.**

(c)-(s) (No change.)

14:8-9.9 EDC responsibilities and cost recovery

(a)-(c) (No change.)

**(d) Each community solar project shall telemeter its production data to the EDC in accordance with EDC Electronic Data Interchange procedures.**

**(e) The EDCs shall be responsible for measuring the metered production of energy by community solar projects and for verifying that the community solar projects are producing an amount of energy that is greater than or equal to the amount of energy that is being credited to subscribers’ bills.**

SUBCHAPTER 11. SUCCESSOR SOLAR INCENTIVE PROGRAM

14:8-11.2 Definitions

For the purposes of this subchapter, the following words and terms shall have the following meanings, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

“Co-location” means siting two or more SuSI-eligible solar facilities on the same property or on contiguous properties, such that the individual facilities are eligible for a higher incentive value or different program than they would be if they were combined into one single facility. In the case of net metered projects, SuSI-eligible solar facilities shall [be] not be deemed co-located if they serve separate net metering customers as defined at N.J.A.C. 14:8-4. **A community solar facility and a net metered facility are not deemed co-located if they serve separate customers.**

14:8-11.4 Successor Solar Incentive Program eligibility

(a)-(e) (No change.)

(f) {Co-location is not permitted in the ADI Program, unless the Board grants a waiver in response to a petition.} **The following restrictions on co-location in the ADI Program apply:**

**1. Co-located net metered facilities that serve the same net metering customer as defined at N.J.A.C. 14:8-4 may sum to a capacity of no more than five MW in the ADI Program;**

**2. Co-located community solar and/or remote net metered facilities may sum to a capacity of no more than five MW unless sited on:**

**i. Rooftops of separate buildings on different properties; or**

**ii. A landfill that is owned by a public entity and is not properly closed at the time of registration, in which case, the total capacity of all the co-located community solar and/or remote net metered facilities may sum to no more than 10 MW; and**

**3. Co-located net metered facilities shall receive the lowest incentive value available to any of the facilities as if registered either individually or aggregated. The registration packages of such co-located facilities shall include an affidavit accepting the lowest incentive.**

(g)-(k) (No change.)

14:8-11.5 Successor Solar Incentive Program registration process

(a)-(c) (No change.)

(d) The registrant shall meet minimum facility maturity standards according to the ADI or CSI Program conditions and provide all required documentation as part of its initial registration package.

1.-2. (No change.)

3. For community solar projects in the ADI Program and the CSEP, the registrant shall supply the following, and any other information the Board, or its designee, may deem necessary to confirm eligibility for the Program:

i. (No change.)

**ii. For facilities sized up to one MW, evidence of having submitted to the relevant EDC an Attachment A to an Interconnection Application and Agreement signed by the installer;**

**iii. For facilities sized one MW or greater, written authorization from the EDC providing conditional approval to construct and a Milestone Reporting Form;**

**iv. Evidence of applications for all discretionary land use approvals and entitlements applicable to the project, such as municipal zoning permit or municipal site plan approval, county site plan approval, soil conservation district approval, and Pinelands Commission or Highlands Commission approval, with a signed list of all permits to be applied for;**

**v. A community engagement and subscriber acquisition plan;**

**vi. A guaranteed bill credit discount to be offered to subscribers, given as a percentage to two decimal places; and**

**vii. For projects on a contaminated site or landfill, an estimated size of the area designated as a “contaminated site” or “properly closed sanitary landfill,” a completed New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection permit readiness checklist, and a completed Contaminated Sites and Landfills Eligibility Verification Form.**

(e)-(l) (No change from proposal.)

**(a)**

**BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES**

**Competitive Solar Incentive Program**

**Reproposed Amendments: N.J.A.C. 14:8-11.5 and 11.10**

Authorized By: New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, Christine Guhl Sadovy, President, Dr. Zenon Christodoulou, Ph.D., Marian Abdou and Michael Bange, Commissioners.

Authority: N.J.S.A. 48:2-12, 48:3-49 et seq., 48:3-87, 48:3-115(c), and 48:3-116 through 118.