Date Filed: October 21, 2026

Witness: Edward A. Davis and Kimberly R. Parsons
Request from: UCONN

Question:

(Rate Class Distribution) Please list the number of active customer accounts that Eversource has in each of the following rate classes as of 10/1/2026.

Rate Schedule	Customer Class	Number of Active Customer Accounts
Rate 41	Large Church and School Electric Service	
Rate 55	Intermediate Time-of-Day Electric Service, Manufacturers	
Rate 56	Intermediate Time-of-Day Electric Service, Non-Manufacturers	
Rate 57	Large Time-of-Day Electric Service, Manufacturers	
Rate 58	Large Time-of-Day Electric Service, Non-Manufacturers	
Rate 7	Residential Time-of-Day Service	
Rate 27	Small Time-of-Day General Electric Service	
Rate 27A	Small Time-of-Day General Electric Service Alternative	
Rate 37	Intermediate Time-of-Day General Electric Service	
Rate 39	Large Interruptible Service	

Rate EV-M	Medium Electric Vehicle Charging Service	
Rate EV-L	Large Electric Vehicle Charging Service	
Rate EV-MHD	Medium Heavy Duty Electric Vehicle Charging Service	

Response:

Please refer to the table below for the requested customer counts as of 9/30/2026:

Rate Schedule	Customer Class	Number of Active Customer Accounts
Rate 41	Large Church and School Electric Service	10
Rate 55	Intermediate Time-of-Day Electric Service, Manufacturers	287
Rate 56	Intermediate Time-of-Day Electric Service, Non-Manufacturers	675
Rate 57	Large Time-of-Day Electric Service, Manufacturers	74
Rate 58	Large Time-of-Day Electric Service, Non-Manufacturers	82
Rate 7	Residential Time-of-Day Service	627
Rate 27	Small Time-of-Day General Electric Service	396
Rate 27A	Small Time-of-Day General Electric Service Alternative	47
Rate 37	Intermediate Time-of-Day General Electric Service	1,514
Rate 39	Large Interruptible Service	3
Rate EV-M	Medium Electric Vehicle Charging Service	37
Rate EV-L	Large Electric Vehicle Charging Service	36
Rate EV-MHD	Medium Heavy Duty Electric Vehicle Charging Service	4

Date Filed: October 21, 2026

Witness: Douglas P. Horton, Jared A. Lawrence, Megan Bernardini, Edward A. Davis, Shamus O'Brien and Kimberly Parsons
Request from: UCONN

Question:

(Affordability and Customer Engagement) Refer to Exhibit CLP-RATES 8 at p.3 which states that "engagement strategies are tailored by customer segment, including residential customers, small and medium commercial customers, larger commercial and industrial customers, and customers with separately metered EV charging load." Please describe in detail what engagement strategies have been or are being utilized for larger commercial and industrial customers.

Response:

The Company's customer engagement efforts for large commercial and industrial customers are generally conducted through the Company's Account Executive organization. Account Executives provide ongoing support to business customers and serve as a primary point of contact regarding electric service, including discussions related to rate options, bill impacts, energy efficiency programs, distributed energy resources, reliability and rate comparisons. As part of these interactions, Account Executives may provide information regarding available time-varying rate ("TVR")/time-of-use ("TOU") rate offerings and assist customers in evaluating whether such rates align with their operational needs and usage profiles.

In addition to direct customer engagement, the Company provides communications tailored to larger commercial and industrial customers, including periodic newsletters covering topics of interest to this customer segment. The Company also conducts large meetings/forums, and similar outreach activities from time to time that may include information regarding rate options, electrification initiatives, load management, and other energy-related topics relevant to commercial and industrial operations.

Larger commercial and industrial customers may also obtain information regarding available rates and through the Company's website, eversource.com. Future TVR offerings may also be highlighted through press releases, and other broad communications, as applicable.

These engagement strategies are consistent with the objectives described in Exhibit CLP-RATES 8, including increasing awareness of available rate options, improving customer understanding of potential bill impacts, and supporting informed customer decision-making regarding participation in TVR/TOU offerings.

Date Filed: October 21, 2026

Witness: Edward A. Davis and Kimberly R. Parsons
Request from: UCONN

Question:

(Distribution Demand Ratchets) For each of Rates 55-58, please state the precise distribution-demand billing formula, look-back period, ratchet percentage, and power-factor measurement used in the existing and proposed tariffs.

Response:

For Rates 55-58, the Distribution Demand is determined via the following, pulled directly from the tariff:

> DETERMINATION OF DISTRIBUTION DEMAND: The distribution demand shall be the highest average 30-minute kilovolt-ampere (kVA) demand in the current month or the preceding eleven (11) months.

This provision is the same in proposed rate schedules. Please refer to UCONN-009, Attachment 1, for the nominal power factors used for Rates 55-58 in converting from kW to kVA if the customer does not have a meter capable of measuring kVA demand.

Date Filed: October 28, 2026

Witness: Edward A. Davis, Joseph D. Rubino and Kimberly R. Parsons
Request from: UCONN

Question:

(Distribution Demand Ratchets) For each of Rates 55-58 in calendar year 2025, please provide by class:

a. the number and percentage of accounts and billed months in which a ratchet, rather than current-month measured demand, set billed demand; and
b. the aggregate billed kVA and distribution revenue attributable to ratchet above current-month measured demand.

Response:

Please refer to Table 1, for the information requested.

Table 1

	Rate Class	Rate 55	Rate 56	Rate 57	Rate 58
a.	Estimated approximate number of customer accounts with a ratchet	300	740	83	100
	Estimated percentage of customer accounts with a ratchet	100%	95%	100%	99%
	Estimated number of monthly bills with ratchet	3,197	7,107	864	952
	Estimated percentage of monthly bills with ratchet	95%	92%	95%	95%
b.	Estimated approximate Aggregate billed kVA attributable to ratchet above current-month measured demand	388,000	1,136,800	357,400	478,300
	Estimated approximate Distribution revenue attributable to ratchet above current-month measured demand	$2,580,200	$8,992,000	$1,947,700	$3,601,800

These revenue differences would need to be reconciled through rate redesign. A change in the design of rates, particularly a conversion to actual monthly metered demand would be expected to reduce the quantity of demand billing units and therefore result in a rate increase to make up for these revenue shortfalls (i.e., such rate increase would be necessary to achieve a revenue neutral

rate design). This higher rate would also introduce an element of bill instability and cause a reshuffling and shifting of charges among customers, where some customers would pay more and others would pay less depending on their monthly demand compared with their demand ratchet.

The data attained is from the C2 billing system.

Date Filed: October 21, 2026

Witness: Edward A. Davis, Kimberly R. Parsons and Amparo Nieto
Request from: UCONN

Question:

(Drivers of Proposed Class Rate Increases) For each of Rates 55-58, please quantify rate changes attributable to:

a. the allocated cost of service;
b. forecast billing determinants;
c. the class return or revenue allocation target;
d. any limits on increases relative to system average; and
e. the allocation between customer and distribution-demand charges.

Furthermore, please explain what alternative allocation, if any, was considered to moderate increases in distribution-demand unit prices while recovering the same class revenue target.

Response:

The Company has not performed such analyses but provides the following that provides information that can be used as a basis for evaluating these rate change drivers.

a. The allocated cost-of-service study provides summary and detailed allocations of costs associated with proposed Distribution revenue requirements along with current revenues, earned rate of return, and excesses or deficiencies relative to proposed revenue requirements, for each rate class. Please refer to Exhibit CLP-ACOS-2.

b. Forecast billing determinants are provided for each rate class in Exhibit CLP-RATES-2.4.

c. A discussion and references to relevant information that can be used for a comparative analysis is provided in Exhibit CLP-RATES-1, pages 13-15. Table 1 of Exhibit CLP-RATES-1, at page 15, provides a summary of the current vs. proposed rates of return, by class compared with the system average. Further detail along with the proposed revenue targets is provided in Exhibit CLP-RATES-2.1.

d. Please refer to subpart (c).

e. A comparison of the allocation of revenue between customer and distribution demand charges for these classes under current vs. proposed rates can be made using the data provided in Exhibit CLP-RATES-2.4.

Date Filed: October 20, 2026

Witness: Andrew C. Belden, Warren R. Boutin, Lavelle A. Freeman and David L. Gladey
Request from: UCONN

Question:

(Distributed Energy Resources and Firm Service) Refer to the response to UCONN-010 and UCONN-011 in which Eversource states that adoption of DER does not benefit the distribution system unless it entirely eliminates an obligation to provide firm peak backup.

a. Please identify any study or workpaper that supports this assertion.
b. Please explain whether a customer's contractual reduction in reserved firm capacity, a dispatchable curtailment obligation, a lower net coincident load at a constrained feeder or substation, or a non-wires alternative could defer a specified distribution investment and/or reduce grid demand even while some backup service remains necessary.

Response:

a. When the Company discussed the benefit to the distribution system, the Company is specifically referring to factors that impact a customer's utility bill impact. Given that distribution infrastructure already exists to serve the customer, the most effective way to avoid incremental costs to customers is to avoid or defer additional capacity upgrades to the system that are required to serve the customer. Therefore, if there are no planned capacity upgrades, no value can be attributed to DER from the distribution system perspective. The examples below illustrate this point:

    1. Adding a distribution battery to a system that has abundant load-serving and DER hosting capacity provides no incremental capacity value while there is no constraint to the system. In this scenario, if a load constraint were to be identified in the future, the Company can contract with said DER to operate in a manner that helps to offset the need. At that point, there would be a value which would be considered in an agreement with the DER

    2. Adding a distribution battery at a constrained substation could avoid capacity projects if the battery is operated by the Company in a manner that ensures discharge occurs during peak or constrained hours.

b. On a constrained system that has an identified capacity need, planning solutions or measures to resolve the violation in a safe, reliable manner will be considered by the Company and can defer an infrastructure investment. This happens in a variety of ways in the Company's planning cycle:

    1. The Company updates its forecasts annually. If, for example, customers on a station have significant participation in the Company's Demand Response (DR) or Energy Efficiency (EE) programs, the impact on the station recorded peak directly impact the Company's econometric (trend) forecast model, reducing the forecasted need.

    2. The Company forecasts the impact of EE, DR, and DER deployment on lowering system peaks. As a result, the forecasted Company need over the next decade is adjusted for all load-reducing impacts before the need for any project is assessed.

    3. Under the NWA program the Company will review solution measures to reduce the need for infrastructure projects that are identified after consideration of the reduced net load forecast (as discussed above). These can also include DR efforts or deployment of DER to resolve capacity violations.

    When customers, both DER and load, seek interconnection, these customers can avoid system costs associated with their interconnection by voluntarily limiting their interconnection capacity demand. A practical example of this is a DER developer that co-sites an energy storage system (ESS) with a 5 MW solar site, for example, and requests only 3 MW of export capacity while using the ESS to manage solar overproduction. Another example is an EV fast-charging site that adds ESS to request only half the installed charging demand as load during a constrained period. This allows customers to optimize their operations and reduce interconnection costs.

Date Filed: October 21, 2026

Witness: Mark P. Baldwin, Christopher Colorio, Lavelle A. Freeman and Elli Ntakou
Request from: UCONN

Question:

(Critical Facility Reliability and Performance Incentive Mechanisms) Refer to the response to UCONN-020 and Exhibit CLP-ELP-1 at pp. 103-117.

a. Please state how Eversource designates a hospital or other essential facility as a Critical Facility;
b. Please state the number of accounts designated as Critical Facilities;
c. On an anonymized aggregate basis, provide the frequency and duration of outages for these designated accounts between 2023-2025 compared with systemwide frequency and duration of outages; and
d. Please explain how the proposed Performance Incentive Mechanisms will help prevent service interruptions at Critical Facilities and what restoration data will be reported to PURA during the proposed plan.

Response:

a. Critical facilities are defined in the Connecticut ESF-12 Annex, as follows:
Critical Facility – a building or structure where loss of utility services may interrupt functions considered essential for the delivery of vital services and the life safety of the community. They usually include emergency response facilities (fire, police, rescue, emergency operations centers), hospitals, licensed convalescent homes, facilities designated as emergency shelters, water supply and waste water treatment as provided by the CT Department of Health (DPH) and Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP), communications facilities (E911 and Public Safety Answering Points), and any other assets pre-identified or identified at the time of the emergency as needed to be of critical importance for the protection of the health and safety of the population.

b. There are currently 1,491 accounts designated as “Town Critical Facilities”.

c. The table below provides a comparison of SAIDI, SAIFI, and CAIDI system-wide versus performance for the Town Critical Facility (TCF) population. To calculate the TCF metrics, the total customers impacted and total customer minutes were calculated for TCF accounts and divided by the total TCF population. Performance is on par with or better than statewide performance.

		IEEE Non-Storm			**IEEE All In**		
Population	YEAR	SAIDI	SAIFI	CAIDI	SAIDI	SAIFI	CAIDI
System	2023	76	0.67	114	182	0.82	222
	2024	77	0.65	119	152	0.83	182
	2025	85	0.69	125	208	0.92	227
TCF	2023	59	0.57	103	182	0.85	215
	2024	64	0.55	117	142	0.78	183
	2025	65	0.60	108	184	0.95	194

d. As noted in several prior responses, PIMs are intended to provide performance incentives and accountability; however, PIMs alone do not directly cause reductions in service interruptions, whether in frequency or duration, nor do they impact any particular customer group independently of the Company's broader operational and investment activities. As the Company continues to invest in the system to improve reliability and resiliency for all customers, service quality for Critical Facilities in impacted areas will also improve. During the PBR term, if accepted, the Company will continue to provide previously required outage and restoration reporting. Reporting of PIMs will depend on acceptance of the PBR proposal and requirements from PURA.