STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

September 17, 2026
In reply, please refer to:
Docket No. 26-05-10
Motion No. 43

Andrew Minikowski, Esq.
Agency Legal Director
Office of Consumer Counsel
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket No. 26-05-10 – Application of The Connecticut Light & Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy to Amend its Rate Schedules

Dear Attorney Minikowski:

On September 3, 2026, the Office of Consumer Counsel (OCC) submitted a motion (Motion No. 43) to the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (Authority or PURA). In Motion No. 43, OCC requests that the Authority provide clarification regarding the scope of the above-referenced proceeding with respect to The Connecticut Light and Power Company dba Eversource Energy's (Company) performance-based ratemaking (PBR) proposal, which includes the Company's multi-year rate plan (MRP) and total factor productivity (TFP) study. Motion No. 43, pp. 1–2. OCC asserts that parties, including OCC, lack the necessary guidance to meaningfully evaluate the Company's PBR proposal because the Authority has not issued final decisions in the three PBR dockets (i.e., Docket Nos. 21-05-15RE01, 21-05-15RE02, and 21-05-15RE03). Id., p. 1. OCC contends that the Company's PBR proposal significantly diverges from PURA's earlier draft PBR decisions in the PBR dockets (e.g., the "X Factor" in the Company's PBR proposal escalates authorized revenues based only on operations and maintenance (O&M), whereas the Authority's earlier draft PBR decisions applied revenue caps to both capital and O&M spending), which compounds OCC's concerns surrounding the procedural posture of the proceeding. Id. Lastly, if the Authority intends to evaluate the Company's MRP and TFP study in this proceeding, OCC requests that the Authority clarify whether it will retain a consultant to review and test the TFP model, as contemplated in prior draft PBR decisions. Id., p. 2.

On September 8, 2026, Allco Finance Limited (Allco) submitted a response (Allco Response) in support of Motion No. 43, stating that the Authority should not evaluate the Company's PBR proposal in the above-referenced proceeding unless more time is allocated. Allco Response, pp. 1–2. If the Authority intends to evaluate the Company's PBR plan, Allco contends that the Authority should retain a consultant to evaluate the TFP study, require the Company to produce the complete TFP model, underlying data, and

workpapers, and adjust the procedural schedule to permit meaningful analysis. Id., pp. 4–5.

Subsequently, the Company submitted a response (Company Response) to Motion No. 43, stating that it does not oppose Motion No. 43. Company Response, Sept. 9, 2026, p. 1. However, the Company states that no statutes, regulations, or PURA decisions prohibit it from proposing PBR in the above-referenced proceeding, nor is the Authority required to issue final decisions in the PBR dockets before evaluating the Company's PBR proposal. Id., pp. 1–2.

Lastly, on September 14, 2026, Acadia Center and Conservation Law Foundation (Acadia and CLF, respectively) jointly submitted a response (Acadia and CLF Response) in support of Motion No. 43, stating they share OCC's concern regarding the lack the necessary guidance available to parties and intervenors without the Authority's final decisions in the three PBR dockets. Acadia and CLF Response, Sept. 14, 2026, p. 1. Acadia and CLF assert that "[m]any years of effort went into the PBR [] dockets [and] to replicate that scrutiny here without final guidance from PURA, on the timeline of a rate case, would be a significantly difficult exercise for parties and intervenors." Id. According to Acadia and CLF, the issuance of final decisions in the three PBR dockets would "promote administrative efficiency and conserve parties' and intervenors' limited resources and ability to respond meaningfully to the Company's proposal." Id.

The Authority grants Motion No. 43.[1] The Authority finds that nothing precludes CL&P from proposing PBR in the above-referenced proceeding and nothing precludes PURA from considering it. Further, the Authority is required, in any rate hearing under General Statutes § 16-19, to "consider the implementation of financial performance-based incentives and penalties and performance-based metrics." General Statutes s. § 16-19a(b). Consequently, the Authority will consider the Company's PBR plan in this proceeding.

By the following commissioner,



Thomas H. Wiehl
Chairman

cc: Service List

[1] 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.