Date Filed: November 02, 2026

**Witness: Counsel**
**Request from: ALLCO**

**Question:**

(Treatment of behind-the-meter solar generation that is exported.) For the same four cases, describe step by step, with the same citations, how energy generated by the facility and exported to the distribution system is treated in the Company's Load Settlement Process, and state: (a) whether the exported kilowatt-hours are metered as a separate channel and, if so, whether they are reported to ISO-NE as generation, as negative load on the host customer's Load Asset, as a reduction of the Metering Domain total that is allocated among all Load Assets, or otherwise; (b) the precise mechanism — section of Manual M-28 or other authority — by which, as the Company stated in ALLCO-095(a), "[t]he excess wholesale generation is distributed amongst all LSEs in the load zone," including whether the distribution is made in proportion to each LSE's share of load in the Company's Metering Domain, in the Connecticut load zone, or otherwise, and whether it is made hourly or monthly; (c) whether the exported energy is reflected in any Load Asset's coincident-peak contribution used to set capacity load obligations and regional network service charges, and for whose benefit; (d) whether the same treatment applies to the entire output of a facility that exports all of its generation — including facilities compensated under the buy-all option of the Non-Residential Renewable Energy Solutions, Shared Clean Energy Facility, and Residential Renewable Energy Solutions tariffs, LREC/ZREC facilities, and qualifying facilities selling under power purchase agreements — and if not, how the output of each such category is treated; and (e) a worked example for a 2 MW facility exporting 300 MWh in a month, showing the kilowatt-hours by which each Load Asset in the Company's Metering Domain is reduced, assuming Standard Service and Last Resort Service represent the percentage of Metering Domain load that they represented in the Test Year (state that percentage).

**Response:**

Eversource objects to this request. The requested information regarding load settlement for behind-the-meter solar generation is not probative of any material or disputed issue relevant to the Company's application in this proceeding, which PURA is conducting as a general distribution rate proceeding pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. § 16-19, to amend the Company's base-rate schedules. Absent such a connection, the requested information is not reasonably calculated to advance the evidentiary record upon which PURA must base its decision.

The purpose of discovery is to provide PURA, the parties, and intervenors with access to relevant, probative information necessary to develop a complete and accurate record -- not to allow

repetitive or irrelevant requests that divert time and resources from that objective. By statute, administrative agencies must exclude "irrelevant, immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence." Conn. Gen. Stat. § 4-178(1); see also Conn. Agencies Regs. § 16-1-38(a). Connecticut judicial precedent explains that evidence is relevant only if it has a tendency to establish the existence of a material fact. United Technologies Corp. v Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities, 72 Conn. App. 212, 229 (2002). Discovery must advance the efficiency of the proceeding and provide the factual foundation upon which an agency decision may rely. Therefore, a party is required to produce discovery documents only if they are "material and necessary to [an] action." Dotson v. Hartford Roman Catholic Diocesan Corp., No. CV106012742S, 2011 WL 1021745, (Conn. Super. Ct. Feb. 17, 2011) (citing, Berger v. Cuomo, 230 Conn. 1, 7 (1994)); see also Conn. Gen. Stat. § 4-177c(a)(1) (permitting discovery of "relevant and material records, papers and documents[.]").

Additionally, discovery "does not afford an open invitation to delve into [CL&P's] affairs". J. Pub. Co. v. Hartford Courant Co., 261 Conn. 673, 681 (2002). Allco "must be able to demonstrate good faith as well as probable cause that the information sought is both material and necessary" to this rate case. Id. Practice Book § 13-2, which defines the scope of discovery, provides in relevant part that a party may only seek discovery of nonprivileged information that is "material to the subject matter involved in the pending action . . . ." "It is axiomatic that [e]vidence is admissible only to prove material facts, that is to say, those facts directly in issue or those probative of matters in issue; ***evidence offered to prove other facts is immaterial***." Salmon v. Dept. of Public Health & Addiction Services, 259 Conn. 288, 316 (2002) (internal quotation marks omitted; emphasis added.)

Further, discovery may not be used to conduct an unrestricted search for information. As the Connecticut Supreme Court has explained, a party "should not be allowed to indulge a hope that a thorough ransacking of any information and material which . . . [CL&P] may possess would turn up evidence helpful to [his] case". J. Pub. Co. v. Hartford Courant Co., 261 Conn. at 681. Simiarly, "[i]nterrogatories should not be used to . . . permit a party to go on a fishing expedition." Mfr.'s Advert., Inc. v. Pancoast, 4 Conn. Cir. Ct. 668, 670 (1967) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Here, Allco's request pertains to load settlement for behind-the-meter solar generation, which is not relevant to PURA's evaluation of either the Company's application as a whole or its proposed revenue requirement. Thus, the information requested in this interrogatory is not relevant or material to the Company's rate application as it does not advance the factual foundation upon which PURA's decision will rely. Office of Consumer Counsel v. Department of Public Utility Control, 44 Conn. Supp. 21, 26-27 (1994). As the information is irrelevant and immaterial, this discovery must be excluded. See General Statutes § 4-178(1); see also Conn. Agencies Regs. § 16-1-38(a).

In addition, the statutory 350-day timeframe for issuing a final decision on the Company's application, coupled with the volume of interrogatories issued, strongly weighs against devoting the time and resources of the parties and PURA to discovery that does not advance the resolution of this proceeding. Requiring the Company to collect, review, and produce information that has not been shown to be material or relevant would impose unnecessary administrative burdens and divert resources from the important issues PURA must evaluate and resolve within the statutory timeframe. Accordingly, in the interest of the orderly and efficient conduct of this proceeding, Eversource respectfully requests that this objection be sustained.