STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

August 3, 2026
In reply, please refer to:
Docket No. 26-05-10
Motion No. 10

Vincent P. Pace, Esq.
The Connecticut Light and Power Company
d/b/a Eversource Energy
101 Selden Street
Berlin, CT 06037

Tiffany N. Tisler, Esq.
Keegan Werlin LLP
1 Liberty Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket No. 26-05-10 – Application of CL&P d/b/a Eversource Energy to Amend its Rate Schedules

Dear Attorneys Pace and Tisler:

On July 16, 2026, The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy (Company) submitted a motion (Motion No. 10) and supporting affidavits requesting that the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (Authority) provide protective treatment of certain exhibits (Exhibits) in the Company's rate amendment application submitted on July 14, 2026. The Company asserts that the Exhibits shown in Table 1, below, are exempt from public disclosure under Connecticut's Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), General Statutes § 1-210(b)(5).[1] In addition, the Company provided a protective order that contains the Company's proposal "governing the relationship between Confidential Information and [Artificial Intelligence (AI) models." Motion No. 10, p. 15; See Motion No. 10, Att. A, pp. 2–3.

On July 17, 2026, the Office of Consumer Counsel (OCC) submitted a comment (OCC Comment) on Motion No. 10, stating that it appears the Company may have "inadvertently omitted" Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS-12 from Motion No. 10, despite having publicly filed the exhibit with redactions. OCC Comment, p. 1. In addition, OCC states that it reserves comment on the Exhibits for which the Company has not yet filed a redacted version until redacted versions are filed. Id. Subsequently, the Company submitted a response to the OCC Comment (Company Response) on July 22, 2026, stating that it does not seek protective treatment for an unredacted version of Exhibit CLP-

[1] The Authority is only ruling on protective treatment of the information redacted in the Company's publicly filed versions of Exhibits CLP-PBR-2(A), CLP-PBR-3(A), CLP-PBR-3(B), CLP-ACOS-2, CLP-MCOS-2, CLP-REVREQ-6(A), CLP-REVREQ-8(A), CLP-REVREQ-10(A), CLP-REVREQ-11(A), CLP-STORM-ACCT-2 (CLP-01) through (CLP-14), CLP-ADDITIONS-6, and CLP-ADDITIONS-11 herein. The Authority will issue a ruling on the protective treatment of Exhibits CLP-REVREQ-4(A-1) through (A-61), CLP-ENV-3(A-1)–(A-19), CLP-STORM-ACCT-2 (CLP-01-A) through (CLP-14-A), and CLP-REVREQ-6(A) when the Company publicly files redacted versions of those exhibits.

ADDITIONS-12. Company Response, p. 1. The Company redacted the information in Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS-12 because the information is not relevant to this proceeding (i.e., it does not relate to the Company) and the Company does not seek to enter the nonrelevant information into this proceeding. Id.

Table 1: Confidential Attachments

Application Exhibit	Date Redacted Version Filed	Date Confidential Version Submitted
CLP-PBR-2(A); CLP-PBR-3(A); CLP-PBR-3(B)	N/A	7/14/2026
CLP-ACOS-2; CLP-MCOS-2	N/A	7/14/2026
CLP-REVREQ-4(A-1)–(A-61)	Anticipated 8/31/2026	7/14/2026
CLP-REVREQ-6(A)	7/14/2026	7/14/2026
CLP-REVREQ-8(A)	7/14/2026	7/14/2026
CLP-REVREQ-10(A)	7/14/2026	7/14/2026
CLP-REVREQ-11(A)	7/14/2026	7/14/2026
CLP-ENV-3(A-1)–(A-19)	Anticipated 8/14/2026	7/14/2026
CLP-STORM-ACCT-2 (CLP-01)–(CLP-14)	7/14/2026	7/14/2026
CLP-STORM-ACCT-2 (CLP-01-A)–(CLP-14-A)	Anticipated 9/15/2026	7/14/2026
CLP-ADDITIONS-6	Anticipated 10/1/2026	7/14/2026
CLP-ADDITIONS-11	7/14/2026	7/14/2026

Under FOIA, the general rule is that "all records maintained or kept on file by any public agency, whether or not such records are required by any law or by any rule or regulation," are public records. General Statutes § 1-210(a). Certain records are exempt from mandatory public disclosure by FOIA, however.[2] General Statutes § 1-210(b). The burden of establishing an exemption from disclosure under FOIA rests on the party claiming the exemption. New Haven v. Freedom of Information Commission, 205 Conn. 767, 775 (1988). A claimant must "provide more than conclusory language, generalized allegations or mere arguments of counsel. Rather, a sufficiently detailed record must reflect the reasons why an exemption applies to the materials requested." Id. at 776.

Trade secrets and confidential commercial or financial information may be exempt from disclosure under FOIA. General Statutes § 1-210(b)(5). Trade secrets are defined as "information, including formulas, patterns, compilations, programs, devices, methods, techniques, processes, drawings, cost data, customer lists, film or television scripts or detailed production budgets that (i) derive independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable by

[2] FOIA exemptions are permissive, not mandatory, and agencies may elect to disclose information that is subject to an exemption. See Opinions, Conn. Atty. Gen. No. 2005-026 (October 14, 2005), pp. 1, 3; Massachusetts Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. State, No. CV054014549, 2005 WL 2277264 at *4 (Conn. Super. Ct. Aug. 25, 2005) ("exemptions listed at General Statutes § 1-210(b) . . . are permissive"); State Office of the Attorney General v. Freedom of Information Commission, Superior Court, No. CV094021768S, 2011 WL 522872 at *6 (Conn. Super. Ct. Jan. 20, 2011) (discretion exists for disclosures of information "controlled by the permissive language 'nothing . . . shall be construed to require disclosure of'").

proper means by, other persons who can obtain economic value from their disclosure or use, and (ii) are the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain secrecy." General Statutes § 1-210(b)(5)(A). "Commercial or financial information given in confidence, not required by statute" is not required to be disclosed under FOIA. General Statutes § 1-210(b)(5)(B).

Disclosure is also not required under FOIA for personnel, medical, and similar files, "the disclosure of which would constitute an invasion of personal privacy." General Statutes § 1-210(b)(2). "When a claim for exemption is based upon § 1-210(b)(2), the person claiming the exemption must meet a twofold burden of proof. First, the person claiming the exemption must establish that the files are personnel, medical or similar files. . . Second, the person claiming the exemption under § 1-210(b)(2) must also prove that disclosure of the files would constitute an invasion of personal privacy." Rocque v. Freedom of Information Commission, 255 Conn. 651, 661 (2001). In addition, the exemption for personal privacy applies "only when the information sought does not pertain to legitimate matters of public concern, and [disclosure] is highly offensive to a reasonable person." Dept. of Children & Families v. Freedom of Information Commission, 48 Conn. App. 467, 472 (1998).

A. Exhibits

1. Exhibits CLP-PBR-2(A), CLP-PBR-3(A), and CLP-PBR-3(B)

Exhibits CLP-PBR-2(A), CLP-PBR-3(A), and CLP-PBR-3(B) are "[London Economics International LLC's (LEI)] workpapers containing the datasets and analytics to develop the Industry Total Factor Productivity, Unit Cost Benchmarking, and Econometric Cost Benchmarking models for U.S. electric distribution companies." Motion No. 10, p. 3. The Company argues that the datasets and formulae used to generate these models were created utilizing LEI's proprietary knowledge and are protected as LEI's intellectual property. Id. Further, LEI has invested time and resources in developing these datasets and formulae for consultation services and therefore has substantial commercial value. Id. Public disclosure of the datasets and formulae to other consultants competing with LEI for consulting services will reduce the commercial value of the information. Id. Therefore, LEI requires the Company to treat these models and all data contained in Exhibits CLP-PBR-2(A), CLP-PBR-3(A), and CLP-PBR-3(B) as confidential-only and protected from public disclosure. Id.

The Authority finds that the data and formulae in Exhibits CLP-PBR-2(A), CLP-PBR-3(A), and CLP-PBR-3(B) constitute trade secrets. Consequently, Exhibits CLP-PBR-2(A), CLP-PBR-3(A), and CLP-PBR-3(B) are exempt from disclosure. See General Statutes § 1-210(b)(5)(A).

2. Exhibits CLP-ACOS-2 and CLP-MCOS-2

Exhibits CLP-ACOS-2 and CLP-MCOS-2 are Ms. Amparo Nieto's "working models in Excel format identified as the Allocated Cost of Service Study ('ACOS') and the Marginal Cost of Service Study ('MCOS')." Motion No. 10, p. 3. The Company argues that the models were created utilizing Ms. Nieto's proprietary knowledge and are

protected as her intellectual property. Id. Further, Ms. Nieto's "know-how" to perform the studies is highly proprietary and confidential and her models have substantial commercial value. Id. Public disclosure of the models to other parties, including consultants competing with Ms. Nieto for consulting services, will reduce the commercial value of the models. Id. Therefore, Ms. Nieto requires the Company to treat these models in Exhibits CLP-ACOS-2 and CLP-MCOS-2 as confidential-only and protected from public disclosure. Id.

The Authority finds that the models in Exhibits CLP-ACOS-2 and CLP-MCOS-2 constitute trade secrets. Consequently, Exhibits CLP-ACOS-2 and CLP-MCOS-2 are exempt from disclosure. See General Statutes § 1-210(b)(5)(A).

3. Exhibits CLP-REVREQ-6(A), CLP-REVREQ-8(A), CLP-REVREQ-10(A), CLP-REVREQ-11(A), and CLP-STORM-ACCT-2(CLP-01)–(CLP-14)

Exhibits CLP-REVREQ-6(A),[3] CLP-REVREQ-8(A), CLP-REVREQ-10(A), CLP-REVREQ-11(A),[4] and CLP-STORM-ACCT-2 (CLP-01) through (CLP-14)[5] are invoices and cost documentation that contain "terms, fees, rates, negotiated agreements, and unit quantities and price terms . . . including hourly rate information for third party contractors and consultants, hours billed on specific tasks, vendor's bids for services, unit cost information, and bid quantity information that is competitive to the vendor." Motion No. 10, Att. B, p. 4. Eversource argues the information in these invoices and cost documentation is propriety, competitive and commercially sensitive and public disclosure would cause substantial harm to the Company and its vendors. Id. Further, the negotiated contract terms, pricing, and unit cost terms from the vendors are provided to the Company with the expectation of privacy to maintain competitive market pricing. Id.

In addition, Exhibits CLP-REVREQ-6(A), CLP-REVREQ-8(A), CLP-REVREQ-10(A), CLP-REVREQ-11(A), and CLP-STORM-ACCT-2(CLP-01) through (CLP-14) contain bank account and tax identification numbers of the Company's vendors. Id., pp. 4–5. The Company argues this information must remain confidential in order to protect the Company, its vendors, and its banking partners from potential fraud and abuse. Motion No. 10, Att. B, p. 5.

---

[3] The Company only redacted employee names, signatures, and contact information in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-6(A). It did not redact any other information in the exhibit.

[4] The Company redacted customer-specific information in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-11(A), for which the Company did not seek protection of this information in Motion No. 10. See Motion No. 10, pp. 5–6. In addition, the Company redacted information related to the Company's affiliate (i.e., affiliate's name and the affiliate's monthly authorization amount and invoice totals); however, the Company did not mention the redaction of this information in Motion No. 10. See id. It did not redact any other information in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-11(A).

[5] The Company only redacted employee numbers in Exhibits CLP-STORM-ACCT-2 (CLP-01) through (CLP-14), for which the Company did not specifically seek protection (i.e., the Company requests protection of employee names, signatures, and contact information, but not employee numbers). See Motion No. 10, pp. 5–6. The Company did not redact any other information in the exhibit.

Finally, Exhibits CLP-REVREQ-6(A), CLP-REVREQ-8(A), CLP-REVREQ-10(A), CLP-REVREQ-11(A), and CLP-STORM-ACCT-2(CLP-01) through (CLP-14) contain employee names, signatures, and contact information. Id. The Company argues that public disclosure of this information could heighten security risks by increasing opportunities for online fraud. Id.

The Authority finds that the information the Company seeks to protect in Exhibits CLP-REVREQ-8(A) and CLP-REVREQ-11(A), other than the employee names, signatures, and contact information, is confidential commercial or financial information. Consequently, that information in Exhibits CLP-REVREQ-8(A) and CLP-REVREQ-11(A) is exempt from disclosure. See General Statutes § 1-210(b)(5)(B). The Authority also finds that the customer individually identifiable information in Exhibits CLP-REVREQ-10(A) and CLP-REVREQ-11(A) is exempt from disclosure.[6] See General Statutes § 1-210(b)(2). In addition, based on the Company's representation that disclosure of the employee names, signatures, and contact information in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-6(A) could heighten security risks by increasing opportunities for online fraud, the Authority determines that the Company is not required to publicly file this information. The Authority also finds that the disclosure of the employee numbers in Exhibits CLP-STORM-ACCT-2 (CLP-01) through (CLP-14) could heighten security risks by increasing opportunities for online fraud.[7] Consequently, the Company is not required to publicly file the employee numbers in Exhibits CLP-REVREQ-10(A) and CLP-REVREQ-11(A).

The Authority denies protective treatment of the percentage and amount of professional services expenses allocated to the Company information redacted in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-11(A) as that is not confidential commercial or financial information. Further, the Company publicly disclosed the information in other parts of the exhibit. See, e.g., Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-11(A), p. 7. Consequently, the Authority directs the Company to publicly refile Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-11(A) with the percentage and amount of professional services expenses allocated to the Company information unredacted no later than August 17, 2026, by 4:00 p.m.

The Authority is unable to make a determination regarding the affiliate information (i.e., affiliate's name and the affiliate's monthly authorization amount and invoice totals) the Company redacted in the public version of Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-11(A) as the Company did not state in either Motion No. 10 or Attachment B of Motion No. 10 why this information requires protective treatment; the Company did not reference this information at all. Consequently, unless the Company files a motion for protective treatment of the affiliate information sufficiently explaining why this information is exempt from disclosure,

---

[6] As stated above, the Company did not request protection of the customer information in Exhibits CLP-REVREQ-10(A) and CLP-REVREQ-11(A). The Company only requested protection of customer-specific information in Exhibit Exhibits CLP-ADDITIONS-6, for which the Company has not yet filed a redacted version. Motion No. 10, p. 9.

[7] As stated above, the Company did not request protective treatment of or permission not to publicly file employee numbers in Motion No. 10 or Attachment B of Motion No. 10; the Company only requested protective treatment of employee names, signatures, and contact information.

the Company shall publicly refile Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-11(A) the affiliate information unredacted no later than August 17, 2026, by 4:00 p.m.

4. Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS-11

Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS-11 contain "names and contact information for individual Eversource and contractor employees." Motion No. 10, Att. B, p. 5. The Company states it keeps this information confidential due to security and financial risks, specifically related to targeted scams involving fraudulent activity. Id., pp. 5–6.

Based on the Company's representation that disclosure of the employee names, signatures, and contact information in Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS-11 could heighten security risks by increasing opportunities for online fraud, the Authority determines that the Company is not required to publicly file this information.

5. Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS-12

OCC contends that the Company may have inadvertently omitted Exhibit CLP-Additions-12 from Motion No. 10, despite having publicly filed the exhibit with redactions. OCC Comment, p. 1. In response, the Company states it only filed a redacted version of Exhibit CLP-Additions-12 because it does not seek protective treatment for an unredacted, confidential version of the exhibit. Company Response, p. 1. The Company asserts the information redacted in Exhibit CLP-Additions-12 is not relevant to this proceeding (i.e., it pertains to other Eversource affiliates or jurisdictions outside of Connecticut, not the Company) and the Company does not seek to enter irrelevant evidence in this proceeding. Id. As such, the Authority does not need to make a determination regarding the protective treatment of the redacted information. Id.

The Authority notes that the Company voluntarily submitted Exhibit CLP-Additions-12 as a supplement to its rate amendment application, rather than in a response to an interrogatory request. The Company is free to choose the information it wishes to provide to meet its burden in this proceeding. Based on the Company's representation that the redacted information in Exhibit CLP-Additions-12 is not relevant to this proceeding, the Authority declines to require the Company to publicly file the exhibit unredacted or to file a confidential version of the exhibit unredacted and a motion for a protective order sufficiently explaining why all or parts of the redacted information is exempt from disclosure.

B. Draft Protective Order, Non-Disclosure Agreement, and Artificial Intelligence

The Company provided as an attachment to Motion No. 10 a draft protective order that contains the Company's proposal governing the relationship between the information granted protective treatment and artificial Intelligence (AI) models. Motion No. 10, p. 15; see Motion No. 10, Att. A, pp. 2–3.

Although the Authority grants protective treatment of certain information in the Exhibits, the Authority declines to issue the Company's proposed protective order. PURA consultants, admitted parties, admitted intervenors, and the consultants of admitted

parties and intervenors' use of the protected information is subject to the non-disclosure agreement to be negotiated by these entities with the Company, including any provisions related to the use of artificial intelligence.

C. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, the Authority grants Motion No. 10 in part and denies it in part.[8]

By the following commissioner,



Thomas H. Wiehl
Chairman

cc: Service List

[8] This ruling is being issued by the commissioner indicated. A motion for full panel review of this ruling by the commissioners assigned to this docket may be filed within 14 days of this ruling.

As stated above, the Authority is only ruling on protective treatment of the information redacted in the Company's publicly filed versions of Exhibits CLP-PBR-2(A), CLP-PBR-3(A), CLP-PBR-3(B), CLP-ACOS-2, CLP-MCOS-2, CLP-REVREQ-6(A), CLP-REVREQ-8(A), CLP-REVREQ-10(A), CLP-REVREQ-11(A), CLP-STORM-ACCT-2(CLP-01) through (CLP-14), CLP-ADDITIONS-6, and CLP-ADDITIONS-11.