Date Filed: September 29, 2026

Witness: David L. Gladey, Steven Lamontagne, Leanne M. Landry and Jeffrey D. Turano
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(PLANT ADDITIONS) Application, Ex. CLP-ADDITIONS-1, p. 17. Explain why the Company no longer includes system resiliency as a capital investment category.

Response:

As stated by the Company in Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS-1, at p. 17, "For CL&P, capital projects and programs are broken out into the following investment categories: Basic Business, New Customer, Peak Load/Capacity, Regulatory Commitments, Reliability, Facilities, Information Technology ("IT"), and Other Investments"

This level of category breakdown is for the high-level presentation for this Exhibit. The Company does continue to include resiliency as a capital investment category, however, it is summarized and included in the Reliability category noted here.

Please refer to Exhibit TSP-3, at 42, to see specific resiliency investment category amounts.

Date Filed: September 29, 2026

Witness: Leanne M. Landry and Jeffrey D. Turano
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(PLANT ADDITIONS) Application, Ex. CLP-ADDITIONS-1, p. 17. Explain which capital investment categories are considered "core" capital projects and whether these categories are consistent with the definition used in the settlement agreement approved in the decision dated April 18, 2018, in Docket No. 17-10-46, Application of The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy to Amend its Rate Schedules (Settlement Agreement).

Response:

The capital investment categories that are considered core capital include New Customer, Peak/Load Capacity, Basic Business, Regulatory Commitments, and Reliability. The core capital categories are consistent with the categories from Docket No. 17-10-46.

Included below is Chart KBB-3, from page 17, of the November 22, 2017 Pre-Filed Testimony of Kenneth B. Bowes under Docket No. 17-10-46, which identified core capital programs.

Chart KBB-3

CL&P Distribution Capital Expenditures 2018 – 2022
($ in millions)

Major Programs ($'s in Millions)	2018 Forecast	2019 Forecast	2020 Forecast	2021 Forecast	2022 Forecast
New Customer	37.6	39.9	41.3	42.5	43.7
Peak Load / Capacity	21.5	18.7	17.5	17.9	18.2
Basic Business					
Capital Tool Purchases/Other	8.5	9.7	8.0	8.0	8.1
Capitalized Vehicles	10.8	9.8	9.9	10.0	9.8
Emergent Equipment Failures	47.3	49.5	50.9	52.2	53.4
Environmental	16.9	16.1	16.1	0.6	0.6
Facilities	7.1	6.5	10.9	16.2	7.6
Information Technology	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
Lighting	13.8	10.6	9.8	9.9	3.7
Line Relocations/Act of Public Authority	10.6	11.0	11.3	11.6	11.8
Meters - Electric	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4
Pre-Cap Line Transformers	26.0	27.0	28.0	29.1	30.2
Regulatory Commitments-Other	15.2	17.7	17.7	17.8	14.6
Reliability					
Distribution Line Reliability	27.7	26.6	29.4	30.4	31.0
Network Reliability	10.2	10.4	10.4	10.6	10.8
Substation Reliability	43.0	32.3	31.7	29.8	28.7
URD/DB Cable Improvements	14.3	14.3	14.6	14.9	15.2
Total for Core Capital Program	**325.6**	**315.4**	**322.6**	**316.6**	**302.5**
System Resiliency Program ("SRP")	80.7	73.0	73.0	49.4	49.8
Total for Core Capital + SRP	**406.3**	**388.5**	**395.6**	**366.0**	**352.4**

Date Filed: September 29, 2026

Witness: Leanne M. Landry and Jeffrey D. Turano
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(PLANT ADDITIONS) Application, Ex. CLP-ADDITIONS-4. Provide an exhibit showing only the specific project-related and program-related plant additions for all additions that were considered "system resiliency" additions pursuant to section 3(a)(ii)(2), of the Settlement Agreement.

Response:

Please refer to RSR-010, Attachment 1, for listing of project specific and program related plant additions classified as "system resiliency". Please also note that the following project types are classified as "system resiliency":

- Customer Focused Trimming
- DSCADA – Radio Expansion
- Enhanced Tree Removal
- Enhanced Tree Trimming
- Island Substation Program
- Line Sensors Program
- Pole Integrity Program
- Recloser Control Program
- Right Of Way Lines
- Smart Switches Program
- SR Double Pole Removals
- SS Circuit Breaker Automation
- Structural and Electrical
- Substation Flood Mitigation
- Substation Security
- Tower Replacements
- UCONN Resilient Energy Center

Date Filed: October 13, 2026

Witness: Leanne M. Landry and Jeffrey D. Turano
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(PLANT ADDITIONS) Application, Ex. CLP-ADDITIONS-4. Provide an unlocked spreadsheet with the same level of detail as Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS-4 but including only those plant additions that have been reviewed and approved for prudency and approved for inclusion in rate base by the Authority as part of the electric system improvements (ESI) charge. Include an additional column in the exhibit referencing which PURA decision authorized each addition for recovery following a prudence determination.

Response:

Please refer to RSR-011, Attachment 1, identifying the capital plant additions that have been reviewed and approved for prudence by PURA since the last rate case. As explained in greater detail below, the capital plant additions that PURA has already evaluated for prudence include: (a) all plant additions recovered in base rates and through the electric system improvements (ESI) charge for 2018, 2019 and 2020; and (b) $300 million of capital plant additions recovered through the ESI charge for 2021 through 2025.

By way of background, the January 11, 2018, Settlement Agreement approved in the Company's last rate case in Docket No. 17-10-46, as amended by Amendment One (collectively, the "Settlement") contained the following relevant provisions that explain which plant additions were recovered in base distribution rates and the ESI since the last rate case:

- **For the period 2017:**

The Settlement states that "[g]ross plant additions . . . of $400 million for calendar year 2017 shall be recovered in base distribution rates." (Settlement Agreement at Section 3(a)(i).) PURA has not evaluated the prudence of the 2017 plant additions. Therefore, these 2017 plant additions are not included in RSR-011, Attachment 1.

- **For the period 2018, 2019 and 2020**:
    - The first $270 million of core capital plant additions for 2018, 2019 and 2020 was authorized to be recovered in base distribution rates. (Settlement at Section 3(a)(ii)(1)(a).)

- All "reliability" plant additions (which are a subset of core capital projects) for 2018, 2019 and 2020 were authorized to be recovered in the ESI rate. (Id.)
- System resiliency plant additions for 2018, 2019 and 2020 were authorized to be recovered through the ESI rate. (Id., Section 3(a)(ii)(2).)

- **For the period 2021 through present**:
  - $300 million of core capital plant additions per year are recovered in the ESI. (Id., Section 3(a)(ii)(1)(b).)
  - Core capital plant additions in excess of $300 million per year are deferred for recovery to the next rate case. (Id.)
  - System resiliency plant additions for 2021 and thereafter are deferred for recovery to the next rate case. (Id., Section 3(a)(ii)(2)(b); see also Docket No. 17-10-46, Nov. 25, 2020, ruling on Motion No. 53.)

The following analysis identifies the portion of the above-described plant additions that have already been subjected to a prudence review by PURA.

In PURA's September 15, 2021 decision in the revenue adjustment mechanism ("RAM") proceeding in Docket No. 21-01-03 (the "2021 RAM Decision"), PURA stated that its prudence review in that docket encompassed *all* capital plant additions recovered in base distribution rates and in the ESI for the period 2018, 2019 and 2020. See Doc. 21-01-03 and 20-03-01RE01, Sept. 15, 2021, Decision at 26 (stating "[t]he Authority also noted that this prudency review [in 2021] would take place not just for plant additions that are recovered through ESI, but for all plant additions made and recovered by the Company in either base distribution rates or ESI.")

In the RAM proceeding in Docket No. 21-01-03, PURA confirmed that its prudence analysis extended to both capital plant additions recovered in base rates and the ESI for the period 2018, 2019 and 2020, when PURA concluded that $17.2 million of storm capital plant additions was improperly included in base rates in 2019 and 2020, and therefore, PURA ordered CL&P to reduce the ESI rate by the $17.2 million to achieve that functional result because PURA could not adjust base rates in a RAM proceeding. See id. at 30 (stating that "[b]ased on the provisions of the . . . Rate Case Decision Settlement Agreement, the Authority concludes that Eversource inappropriately included certain storm-related capital plant additions in base distribution rates.")

As a result, the 2021 RAM decision evaluated the prudence of all capital plant additions for 2018, 2019 and 2020 in base rates and the ESI, concluding that only $17.2 million of storm capital plant additions should be removed from rates. As a result, RSR-011, Attachment 1, hereto reflects all capital plant additions recovered in base distribution rates and the ESI for the period 2018, 2019 and 2020 because those costs were subject to a prudence review in the 2021 RAM Decision, except for the $17.2 million of storm capital plant additions that were removed from rates and are pending a court remand in Docket No. 21-01-03RE01.

Thereafter, for the period 2021 through 2025, each annual RAM proceeding evaluated the prudence of $300 million of core capital plant additions that were recovered in the ESI. In the RAM proceedings in 2021 and 2022, the Company identified the first $300 million of core capital plant additions that went into service for each of those years; and those plant additions for 2021 and 2022 are provided in RSR-011, Attachments 2, and RSR-011, Attachment 3. Those plant additions were subject to a prudence review in the applicable RAM proceedings in Docket No. 22-01-03 (for 2021 plant additions) and Docket No. 23-01-03 (for 2022 plant additions). During this time period, PURA's RAM decisions in Docket Nos. 22-01-03 and 23-01-03 did not find any of these plant additions that were recovered through the ESI to be imprudent. RSR-011, Attachment 1, also contains all capital plant additions recovered in the ESI for the period 2021 and 2022 because they were subject to prudence reviews in Docket Nos. 22-01-03 and 23-01-03.

For the period 2023, 2024 and 2025, each final decision issued by PURA in its annual RAM proceeding in Docket Nos. 24-01-03, 25-01-03 and 26-01-03 contained an appendix to the final decision that identified the first $300 million of core capital plant additions recovered in the ESI rate and subject to a prudence review in the RAM docket. Copies of those appendices to PURA decisions are provided in RSR-011, Attachments 4 through Attachment 6. During this time period, PURA's RAM decisions in Docket Nos. 24-01-03, 25-01-03 and 26-01-03 did not find any of these plant additions that were recovered through the ESI to be imprudent. RSR-011, Attachment 1, also contains all capital plant additions recovered in the ESI for the period 2023, 2024 and 2025 because they were subject to prudence reviews by PURA.

Date Filed: October 09, 2026

Witness: Leanne M. Landry and Jeffrey D. Turano
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(PLANT ADDITIONS) Application, Ex. CLP-ADDITIONS-4. Provide an unlocked spreadsheet with the same level of detail as Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS-4 but including only those plant additions that have not been reviewed and approved for prudency and not approved for inclusion in rate base by the Authority as part of the electric system improvements (ESI) charge.

Response:

Please refer to RSR-012, Attachment 1.

This exhibit excludes all projects and programs with additions in 2018-2020 that were reviewed for prudency as summarized in RSR-011[i].

PURA has not evaluated the prudence of the 2017 plant additions. Therefore, these 2017 plant additions are included in RSR-012, Attachment 1, hereto.

For projects and programs with plant additions in 2021 through 2025, those projects that were part of the $300M reviewed for prudency that had additional charges following the $300M cut-off have been included in RSR-011 since those projects were reviewed in totality as part of the annual prudence review. Please refer to RSR-011, Attachment 1, columns P and R for the total project or program additions in a given year compared to what portion of that addition was included in the $300M prudency review.

The projects and programs reflected in RSR-012, Attachment 1, are those projects that did not have any additions included in the $300M prudency review.

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] RSR-011 Question:

(PLANT ADDITIONS) Application, Ex. CLP-ADDITIONS-4. Provide an unlocked spreadsheet with the same level of detail as Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS-4 but including only those plant additions that have been reviewed and approved for prudency and approved for inclusion in rate base by the Authority as part of the electric system improvements (ESI) charge. Include an additional column in the exhibit referencing which PURA decision authorized each addition for recovery following a prudence determination.

RSR-011 Response:

Please refer to RSR-011, Attachment 1, identifying the capital plant additions that have been reviewed and approved for prudence by PURA since the last rate case. As explained in greater detail below, the capital plant additions that PURA has already evaluated for prudence include: (a) all plant additions recovered in base rates and through the electric system improvements (ESI) charge for 2018, 2019 and 2020; and (b) $300 million of capital plant additions recovered through the ESI charge for 2021 through 2025.

By way of background, the January 11, 2018, Settlement Agreement approved in the Company's last rate case in Docket No. 17-10-46, as amended by Amendment One (collectively, the "Settlement") contained the following relevant provisions that explain which plant additions were recovered in base distribution rates and the ESI since the last rate case:

- **For the period 2017:**

The Settlement states that "[g]ross plant additions . . . of $400 million for calendar year 2017 shall be recovered in base distribution rates." (Settlement Agreement at Section 3(a)(i).) PURA has not evaluated the prudence of the 2017 plant additions. Therefore, these 2017 plant additions are not included in RSR-011, Attachment 1.

- **For the period 2018, 2019 and 2020**:
    - The first $270 million of core capital plant additions for 2018, 2019 and 2020 was authorized to be recovered in base distribution rates. (Settlement at Section 3(a)(ii)(1)(a).)
    - All "reliability" plant additions (which are a subset of core capital projects) for 2018, 2019 and 2020 were authorized to be recovered in the ESI rate. (Id.)
    - System resiliency plant additions for 2018, 2019 and 2020 were authorized to be recovered through the ESI rate. (Id., Section 3(a)(ii)(2).)
- **For the period 2021 through present**:
    - $300 million of core capital plant additions per year are recovered in the ESI. (Id., Section 3(a)(ii)(1)(b).)
    - Core capital plant additions in excess of $300 million per year are deferred for recovery to the next rate case. (Id.)
    - System resiliency plant additions for 2021 and thereafter are deferred for recovery to the next rate case. (Id., Section 3(a)(ii)(2)(b); see also Docket No. 17-10-46, Nov. 25, 2020, ruling on Motion No. 53.)

The following analysis identifies the portion of the above-described plant additions that have already been subjected to a prudence review by PURA.

In PURA's September 15, 2021 decision in the revenue adjustment mechanism ("RAM") proceeding in Docket No. 21-01-03 (the "2021 RAM Decision"), PURA stated that its prudence review in that docket encompassed all capital plant additions recovered in base distribution rates *and* in the ESI for the period 2018, 2019 and 2020. See Doc. 21-01-03 and 20-03-01RE01, Sept. 15, 2021, Decision at 26 (stating "[t]he Authority also noted that this prudency review [in 2021] would take place not just for plant additions that are recovered through ESI, but for all plant additions made and recovered by the Company in either base distribution rates or ESI.") In the RAM proceeding in Docket No. 21-01-03, PURA confirmed that its prudence analysis extended to both capital plant additions recovered in base rates and

the ESI for the period 2018, 2019 and 2020, when PURA concluded that $17.2 million of storm capital plant additions was improperly included in base rates in 2019 and 2020, and therefore, PURA ordered CL&P to reduce the ESI rate by the $17.2 million to achieve that functional result because PURA could not adjust base rates in a RAM proceeding. See id. at 30 (stating that "[b]ased on the provisions of the . . . Rate Case Decision Settlement Agreement, the Authority concludes that Eversource inappropriately included certain storm-related capital plant additions in base distribution rates.") As a result, the 2021 RAM decision evaluated the prudence of all capital plant additions for 2018, 2019 and 2020 in base rates and the ESI; and it concluded that only $17.2 million of storm capital plant additions should be removed from rates. As a result, RSR-011, Attachment 1, hereto reflects all capital plant additions recovered in base distribution rates and the ESI for the period 2018, 2019 and 2020 because they were subject to a prudence review in the 2021 RAM Decision, except for the $17.2 million of storm capital plant additions that were removed from rates and are pending a court remand in Docket No. 21-01-03RE01.

Thereafter, for the period 2021 through 2025, each annual RAM proceeding evaluated the prudence of $300 million of core capital plant additions that were recovered in the ESI. In the RAM proceedings in 2021 and 2022, the Company identified the first $300 million of core capital plant additions that went into service for each of those years; and those plant additions for 2021 and 2022 are provided in RSR-011, Attachments 2, and RSR-011, Attachment 3. Those plant additions were subject to a prudence review in the applicable RAM proceedings in Docket No. 22-01-03 (for 2021 plant additions) and Docket No. 23-01-03 (for 2022 plant additions). During this time period, PURA's RAM decisions in Docket Nos. 22-01-03 and 23-01-03 did not find any of these plant additions that were recovered through the ESI to be imprudent. RSR-011, Attachment 1, also contains all capital plant additions recovered in the ESI for the period 2021 and 2022 because they were subject to prudence reviews in Docket Nos. 22-01-03 and 23-01-03.

For the period 2023, 2024 and 2025, each final decision issued by PURA in its annual RAM proceeding in Docket Nos. 24-01-03, 25-01-03 and 26-01-03 contained an appendix to the final decision that identified the first $300 million of core capital plant additions recovered in the ESI rate and subject to a prudence review in the RAM docket. Copies of those appendices to PURA decisions are provided in RSR-011, Attachments 4, through RSR-011, Attachment 6. During this time period, PURA's RAM decisions in Docket Nos. 24-01-03, 25-01-03 and 26-01-03 did not find any of these plant additions that were recovered through the ESI to be imprudent. RSR-011, Attachment 1, also contains all capital plant additions recovered in the ESI for the period 2023, 2024 and 2025 because they were subject to prudence reviews by PURA.

Date Filed: October 14, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—RECIPIENT-LEVEL DATA) Application, Schs. C-3.5, C-3.6, and C-3.7. Provide an unlocked Excel workbook, with formulas intact, containing separate tabs for (i) non-officer employees included in Schedule C-3.6 and (ii) officers/executives included in Schedule C-3.7. For each anonymized individual included in the Test Year or used to develop the amount included in the Rate Year:

a. job title or position category;
b. employing entity;
c. business unit/department and cost center;
d. base salary or wage compensation;
e. target short-term variable-pay percentage and target dollar amount;
f. actual 2025 short-term variable-pay amount;
g. long-term variable-compensation expense, if any;
h. total variable compensation;
i. amount expensed;
j. amount capitalized;
k. amount directly charged or allocated to CL&P;
l. applicable allocation factor and basis; and
m. amount included in the Rate Year revenue requirement.

If the amount included in the Rate Year is not maintained at the individual level, provide the corresponding job amount in the Rate Year and explain the methodology used to derive it.

Response:

The Company did not construct Schedule C-3.6 to present Employee Variable Compensation at the individual employee level.

The Test Year Employee Variable Compensation in Schedule C-3.6 represents the amount of variable compensation accrued during the test year. The actual variable compensation payments are made in the first quarter of the following year, and the accrued liability is reviewed and trued up as necessary at that time to reflect the final, approved pay-out amounts. True-up adjustments are recorded and allocated proportionally as the original accrual was charged, ensuring the final

costs are accurately reflected and consistently assigned. The final actual variable compensation payments made in the first quarter of 2026 account for the Test Year Pro Forma amounts.

To derive the Rate Year adjustment, the Test Year Pro Forma amounts are then escalated by the three-percent merit increases, as known and measurable changes for the period January 1, 2026 through June 30, 2028. The Test Year Pro Forma amount plus the Rate Year Adjustment derives the Rate Year level of variable compensation. Because these amounts were originally developed as described above, at the company level, the Company does not have an individual-by-individual itemization of variable compensation in the form contemplated by the question.

Upon review, the Company is preparing an updated Schedule C-3.6 that will provide the target level of variable compensation on an individual-employee basis, as requested in this question. Target-level variable compensation in 2025 was lower than the amount actually funded and paid out for 2025, which was above target. Target-level variable compensation is most representative of what the Company expects to pay out year-to-year over the longer term, as funding above target will vary year to year. Therefore, the Company plans to update the cost of service to incorporate the variable compensation pay-out at target, rather than as originally proposed in the Company's application, which will lower the cost of service.

Please refer to the Company's response to UPA-015,[i] for the Officers' variable compensation methodology that derives the Rate Year amounts.

Prior Referenced Response:

---

[i] UPA-015 Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—RESIDUAL LONG-TERM OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION) Application, Sch. WP C-3.7. After the exclusions described in Schedule WP C-3.7, the Rate Year still includes long-term officer variable compensation. For each anonymized recipient of the remaining long-term compensation, provide:

a. title and employing entity;
b. award type or instrument;
c. grant date;
d. performance and vesting period;
e. target and actual award;
f. performance or vesting metrics and weights;
g. accounting expense recognized in the Test Year, pro forma, and Rate Year;
h. amount allocated or charged to CL&P; and
i. an explanation of how the award and its performance metrics benefit CL&P customers. Identify whether any metric is based on total shareholder return, stock price, EPS, dividend growth, net income, return measures, relative market performance, regulatory outcomes, or another financial measure.

UPA-015 Response:

a. The population in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Schedule C-3.7 represents the officer at the Vice President level and above as of December 31, 2025 for whom a portion of their compensation is charged to the Company. Please see UPA-015, Attachment 1, which provides a reconciliation by officer for the Test Year, Test Year Pro-Forma and Rate Year. As shown in Attachment 1 columns (D) and (E) the Test Year expense consists of the accounting accrual of short-term and long-term variable compensation (see rows 11 through 79). The Company made pro-forma adjustments to (1) remove both the short-term and long-term variable compensation associated with the CEO, CFO and CL&P President (see row 82); (2) remove the long-term variable compensation associated with other named executive officers (see row 83); and (3) remove the 2024 true-up recorded in 2025 and add the 2025 true-up recorded in 2026 (see rows 84 and 85). Lastly, the Company made Rate Year adjustments to reflect the known merit increases of 3 percent for the period January 1, 2026 through June 30, 2028.

   In summary, after these adjustments, the Company's proposed cost of service in this proceeding includes executive (i.e., those at the level of Vice President and above, excluding those components referenced above and removed on lines 82 and 83) variable compensation charged to CL&P as earned in the Test Year, 2025, based on the payouts associated with that performance year, as adjusted to Rate Year levels.

   The Company recognizes that the variable compensation accruals and payouts vary from year to year and may be more (or less) than target levels. For instance, as shown in UPA 15, Attachment 1, the amount of cash variable compensation accrued in the Test Year, and which serves as the basis for Rate Year amounts is above target levels (see, e.g., Column D as compared to Column F). Conversely, the Test Year accrual for LTI variable compensation is below target (see, e.g., Column H as compared to Column E). The Company's experience in Massachusetts is to reflect the amount of variable cash incentive at target levels, rather than at accrued amounts. As shown in Attachment 1, using the target short-term and long-term variable compensation, the Company's Rate Year amounts would be $1.571 million and $1.913 million respectively as compared to $2.438 million and $1.331 million.

b. Long-term officer variable compensation awards is recognized over a three-year vesting period in the form of two vehicles:

   1. Restricted Share Units ("RSUs") vest by one-third typically on the 1st of February in each of the three years following the calendar year of the grant.

   2. Performance Shares ("PSUs") vest at the end of the three-year performance period (December 31st).

   3. The Company recognizes compensation expense in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP"), specifically Accounting Standards Codification 718, *Compensation - Stock Compensation*

c. Please refer to the table below for the long-term officer variable compensation grant date and payment dates for the last three plan years:

Long-Term Variable Compensation Awards

Officer RSUs:	Award - Grant Date	Payment - Distribution Date
2023-2025 Plan	2/1/2023	Year 1: 2/12/2024
		Year 2: 2/18/2025
		Year 3: 2/12/2026
2024-2026 Plan	1/31/2024	Year 1: 2/18/2025
		Year 2: 2/12/2026
		Year 3: 2/18/2027
2025-2027 Plan	1/29/2025	Year 1: 2/12/2026
		Year 2: 2/18/2027
		Year 3: 2/17/2028
Officer PSUs:	Award - Grant Date	Payment - Distribution Date
2023-2025 Plan	2/1/2023	2/12/2026
2024-2026 Plan	1/31/2024	2/18/2027
2025-2027 Plan	1/29/2025	2/17/2028

d. Please refer to subpart (c) for payment dates.

e. Please refer to UPA-015, Attachment 1, for the CL&P-related component for target and actual awards.

f. Long-term officer variable compensation is awarded with the following weights:

   1. 75% of the grant in the form of PSUs
   2. 25% of the grant in the form of RSUs.

g. Please refer to UPA-015, Attachment 1.

h. Please refer to UPA-015, Attachment 1.

i. Variable compensation is comprised of short-term and long-term incentives that pay out based on the performance of the individual employee. Long-term incentives are based on the metrics shown below, which are appropriate given that customers benefit from lower operating costs, lower capital costs and other areas of good fiscal management, which are the outcomes that are promoted through this compensation.

Long-Term Incentive Program Performance Share Potential Payout

Three-Year Average EPS Growth	Three-Year Relative Total Shareholder Return Percentiles									
	Below 10th	20th	30th	40th	50th	60th	70th	80th	90th	Above 90th
10.0%	100%	110%	130%	140%	150%	160%	170%	180%	190%	200%
9.0%	90%	100%	120%	130%	140%	150%	160%	170%	180%	190%
8.0%	80%	90%	110%	120%	130%	140%	150%	160%	170%	180%
7.0%	70%	80%	100%	110%	120%	130%	140%	150%	160%	170%
6.0%	60%	70%	90%	100%	110%	120%	130%	140%	150%	160%
5.0%	40%	60%	80%	90%	100%	110%	120%	130%	140%	150%
4.0%	30%	40%	60%	80%	90%	100%	110%	120%	130%	140%
3.0%	—	20%	40%	70%	80%	90%	100%	110%	120%	130%
2.0%	—	—	20%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	110%	120%
1.0%	—	—	—	30%	50%	60%	70%	80%	100%	110%
0.0%	—	—	—	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
Below 0%	—	—	—	—	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%

Date Filed: September 29, 2026

Witness: Sasha P. Lazor, Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—RECONCILIATION) Application, Schs. WP C-3.7 and G-2.12. Provide a reconciliation of the officer-variable-compensation amounts in Schedule WP C-3.7 to Schedule G-2.12 and to the underlying payroll/general-ledger source data. In the reconciliation:

a. identify the population included in each schedule;
b. separately identify all named-executive, CEO, CFO, and CL&P President exclusions;
c. identify timing differences between award, payment, and expense recognition;
d. identify amounts charged to CL&P versus other Eversource Energy companies;
e. identify any stock-based or other long-term amounts included in Schedule G-2.12 but excluded from Schedule C-3.7;
f. explain the "920000" reference shown in WP C-3.7, including the account, report, ledger source, and other supporting record to which that reference refers.

Response:

a. The population in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Schedule C-3.7 and Schedule G-2.12 represents officers at the Vice President level and above, as of December 31, 2025, for whom a portion of their compensation is charged to the Company.

b. The named executive officers are identified in Schedule G-2.12. The named executive officers are: Joseph R. Nolan, Jr, Chairman, President & Chief Executive Officer ("CEO"); John M. Moreira, Executive Vice President & Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") & Treasurer; Paul W. Chodak III, Executive Vice President & Chief Operating Officer ("COO"); Gregory B. Butler, Executive Vice President & General Counsel; and James W. Hunt III, Executive Vice President-Corporate Relations & Sustainability & Secretary.

   The Company has excluded the CEO, CFO and CL&P President Short-Term Variable Compensation as a pro forma adjustment in Schedule C-3.7 to decrease the Test Year by ($737,000). In addition, the Company is proposing to exclude the Named Executive Officers and CL&P President's Long-term Variable Compensation as a pro forma adjustment in Schedule C-3.7 as a reduction totaling ($2.587) million.

c. The expense for the long-term officer variable compensation awards is recognized over a three-year vesting period. Restricted Share Units ("RSUs") vest by one-third typically on the 1st of February in each of the three years following the calendar year of the grant. Performance Shares ("PSUs") vest at the end of the three-year performance period (December 31st). The Company recognizes compensation expense in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP"), specifically Accounting Standards Codification 718, *Compensation - Stock Compensation*. Please refer to the table below for the long-term officer variable compensation award and payment dates for the last three plan years:

Long-Term Variable Compensation Awards

Officer RSUs:	Award - Grant Date	Payment - Distribution Date
2023-2025 Plan	2/1/2023	Year 1: 2/12/2024 Year 2: 2/18/2025 Year 3: 2/12/2026
2024-2026 Plan	1/31/2024	Year 1: 2/18/2025 Year 2: 2/12/2026 Year 3: 2/18/2027
2025-2027 Plan	1/29/2025	Year 1: 2/12/2026 Year 2: 2/18/2027 Year 3: 2/17/2028

Officer PSUs:	Award - Grant Date	Payment - Distribution Date
2023-2025 Plan	2/1/2023	2/12/2026
2024-2026 Plan	1/31/2024	2/18/2027
2025-2027 Plan	1/29/2025	2/17/2028

d. Officer variable compensation is allocated from the Service Company ("ESC") and charged to CL&P, following how labor was charged. The ESC labor charges are both direct charged or allocated based on direct, causal-based, and common allocators to ensure any services rendered by the officers are appropriately charged to the benefiting operating companies. The assignment of officer variable compensation to the operating companies, including CL&P, is performed through an automatic system-generated incentive labor loader, whereby the variable compensation expense is charged to CL&P through a payroll labor charge only when an officer is providing services to CL&P.

e. Please refer to the response in subpart (b) for the long-term variable compensation that is included in Schedule G-2.12, while excluded from the Company's cost of service in Schedule C-3.7.

f. The reference to "920000" is denoting the specific FERC Account. As outlined in Title 18, Chapter I, Subchapter C, Part 101 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") Account No. 920 Administrative and General Salaries "shall include the compensation (salaries, bonuses, and other compensation for services, but not including director fees) of officers, executives, and other employees of the utility properly chargeable to utility operations and not chargeable directly to a particular operating function."

Date Filed: October 06, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien, Garrett J. Murray, Sasha P. Lazor and Marianne H. Eichler
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE PAY—ELIGIBILITY AND PARTICIPATION) Application, Schs.C-3.6 and C-3.7; Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-3. For the Test Year, provide the number and percentage of CL&P and ESC employees supporting CL&P who were eligible for variable compensation and the number and percentage who actually received variable compensation. Provide the response separately for:

a. officers/executives;
b. management employees;
c. non-management employees;
d. union employees, if applicable; and
e. non-union employees.

For the Rate Year, provide the number and percentage assumed eligible in each category and explain any change from the Test Year. Reconcile the Test Year counts to the populations shown in Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-3 and to the employee/officer populations underlying Schedules C-3.6 and C-3.7.

Response:

Please refer to UPA-004, Attachment 1, for the response to subparts (a) through (e). Please note that a critical datapoint is excluded from this question, which is the percent of total variable pay realized by the employee based on their performance. The competitive nature of the variable pay program is reflected not in the number of employees that received variable pay, but rather in the percent of the total possible payment that the employee could have received. The Company provided this information in response to OCC-201, Attachment 1.

With respect to the Rate Year, the number of CL&P employees, and the number of service company employees supporting CL&P in each category was assumed to remain the same with the exception that the Rate Year also proposes 41 new FTEs, as noted in the Company's response to OCC-333[i]. Each of the proposed 41 new FTEs would be eligible for variable pay, thereby increasing the proposed total eligible ESC Non-Union employees to 2974 from 2954 and proposed eligible CL&P Non-Union employees to 329 from 308.

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] OCC-333 Question:

Payroll. For each of the new positions that the Company is requesting recovery of in the rate year, state whether the hiring of the positions are conditioned on their approval in this case.

OCC-333 Response:

The Company is providing an update for the Full Time Equivalent ("FTE") counts included in the request for recovery in the rate year in this response as OCC-333, Attachment 1 (note that this is an update of Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Work Paper C-3.5, page 3). The Company will update the payroll expense and other affected costs as part of its next cost of service update.

The number of FTEs included in the original filing was fifty-eight (58). This number was a preliminary number and included FTEs contemplated in the Advancing the Grid plan that is above and beyond the Targeted System Plan ("TSP") requested for review and approval in this application. The updated number of incremental FTEs to be included in the rate year of the Company's cost of service is forty-one (41).

Included in the forty-one (41) full-time positions are twenty-one (21) in Vegetation Management, five (5) Power Quality positions, two (2) in Distribution Planning & Forecasting and one (1) Asset Health, these are contingent on PURA's approval in this case. In addition, for Grid Modernization there are seven (7) for Control Room Operations, three (3) for Data Innovation, and two (2) for Field Communications that the Company will consider hiring based on business needs and changing requirements as necessary, but most likely not all requested.

The Vegetation Management positions allow the Company the opportunity to improve the system's reliability and improve cost-efficiency by transitioning more work in-house to restructure vegetation management performance for the benefit of our customers. While the twenty-one (21) Vegetation Management positions appear to be incremental, in reality there is only 1 incremental resource. Of the twenty-one (21), eight (8) of the FTEs are the result of 16 employees who currently split their time 50%/50% between O&M and capital work shifting to solely working on the proposed combined O&M program, if approved, results in the equivalent of 8 incremental employees working on the O&M program; twelve (12) resources would be converted from contracted resources to internal resources of which the Company's proposed vegetation management expenses in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Work Paper C-3.31 reflect the reduction in outside contractor services; and one (1) resource would be truly incremental.

The Grid Modernization positions are needed to support large-scale distributed energy resource ("DER") integration and clean-energy advancement; develop and deploy advanced tools and analytics for integrated distribution system planning and grid modernization; and drive increased innovation and application of GenAI, LLM and machine learning capabilities.

The Company is also providing as OCC-333, Attachment 2, which is a corrected Exhibit CLP-TSP-3, page 43 of 149 that has been updated with the corrected number of FTEs in the parenthesis in the text boxes on the right.

Date Filed: October 09, 2026

Witness: Sasha P. Lazor and Marianne H. Eichler
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE PAY—FUNDING POOL) Application, Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, pp. 30–35. The referenced exhibit states that the enterprise variable-pay pool is funded based on corporate financial and operational performance and provides the applicable metrics and weights. Without repeating those descriptions, provide the complete 2025 calculation showing:

a. the threshold, target, and maximum scoring or payout curve for each metric;
b. actual 2025 performance;
c. the score or performance factor assigned to each metric;
d. the resulting financial score and operational score;
e. the resulting overall pool funding percentage/factor;
f. the dollar amount of the pool at target and the actual amount funded;
g. whether the funded pool was fully distributed;
h. any amount retained, returned, forfeited, or otherwise not distributed;
i. how the funded amount was allocated among business units; and
j. how amounts available to each business unit or manager were translated into individual awards.

Response:

This question continues to improperly intermingle the two <u>independent</u> processes applicable to the Company's variable pay compensation framework, which are (1) the process to determine the annual funding pool and the Board of Trustee's determination of variable pay for the CEO; and (2) the process to determine how each individual's actual payout percentage is determined <u>for every other employee</u> in the business aside from the named officers. Below are data points and references to better explain and detail the process with each subsection denoted as to whether it applies to the first or second process.

(a) <u>The threshold, target, and maximum scoring or payout curve for each metric</u>. Each year, the Eversource Energy Board of Trustee's evaluates the corporation's performance in the prior calendar year against a set of pre-designated performance metrics and assigned ratings. Based on that evaluation, the Board of Trustee's makes a determination that variable pay compensation will be funded for the year. In addition, the Board of Trustees determines the variable pay compensation for the CEO, which is also granted on the basis of the corporation's achievement of those same pre-designated performance goals. Thus,

the threshold, target and maximum ranges for each performance goal in CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, at pages 30-35, pertain exclusively to the ***funding process*** and to the determination of variable pay for the CEO. These performance metrics and assigned ratings ***do not apply*** to any other individual employees, except for the CEO, whose compensation is determined by the Board of Trustee's Compensation Committee.

Metric	Threshold	Target	Maximum
Financial Performance (70%)			
Non-GAAP Earnings Per Share	$4.59	$4.71	$4.80
Dividend Growth	$2.97	$3.00	$3.03
Strategic Growth Initiatives			
Strategic Growth Initiatives	Regulatory filings, storm cost recovery, and strategic positioning		
Operational Performance (30%)			
Reliability Average Months Between Service Interruptions (MBI)	15 Months	21.3 Months	22 Months
Restoration System Average Restoration Duration (SAIDI)	70 Minutes	63.7 Minutes	62 Minutes
Safety Rate	1.25 Rate	0.85 Rate	0.75 Rate
Gas Emergency Response	93.0%	98.2%	99.2%
% Candidate Slate	50.0%	59.5%	65.0%

Sustainability Ranking	65.0%	87.0%	107.0%
Key Strategic Customer and Clean Energy Operational Results			
Enhance the Customer Experience	Advanced Metering Infrastructure rollout, Energy Efficiency programs, stakeholder and community engagement and data security programs		
Clean Energy Execution	Non-pipe alternatives, execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization, geothermal and decarbonization projects		

(b) through (e)

For 2025, the Board of Trustees Compensation Committee approved corporate performance at 145% of target based on the following computation:

Table 1
Targeted and Actual Performance

Threshold	**Target**	**Maximum**	**Financial**	**Payout**	**Approved**
Metric 50%	100%	200%	Results	Factor	Weighting
Financial Performance					
2025 Non-GAAP Earnings Per Share $4.59	$4.71	$4.80	$4.76	155%	60%
Dividend Growth $2.97	$3.00	$3.03	$3.01	131%	10%
3.85%	5.00%	5.94%			

Table 2

Key Strategic Financial and Regulatory Results

Strategic Financial Initiatives and Regulatory Outcomes	Regulatory filings, storm cost recovery and strategic positioning				175%	30%
Operational Performance						
Reliability Average Months Between Service Interruptions (MBI)	15 Months	21.3 Months	22 Months	21.0 Months	95%	25%
Restoration System Average Restoration Duration (SAIDI)	70 Mins.	63.7 Mins.	62 Mins.	66 Mins.	63%	25%
Safety Rate	1.25 Rate	0.85 Rate	0.75 Rate	0.87 Rate	95%	8.33%
Gas Emergency Response	95%	98.2%	99.2%	98.0%	94%	8.33%
% Candidate Slate	50.0%	59.5%	65.0%	64.3%	187%	8.33%
Sustainability Index	65.0%	87.0%	107.0%	102.6%	178%	8.33%
	Key Strategic Customer and Clean Energy Operational Results					
Enhance the Customer Experience	Advanced Metering Infrastructure rollout, Energy Efficiency programs, stakeholder and community engagement and data security programs				165%	8.33%
Clean Energy Execution	Non-pipe alternatives, execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization, geothermal and decarbonization projects				160%	8.33%
Financial Performance (weighted 70%)	at 159%	111%				
Operational Performance (weighted 30%)	at 113%	34%				
Overall Performance	**145%**					

Subpart (b) asks for "actual 2025 performance." Table 1 provides the "actual 2025 performance" for the corporation, for the purposes of the Funding Pool decision. Table 1 does not pertain to any individual employee in the enterprise other than the CEO.

Subpart (c) asks for the "score or performance factor assigned to each metric." Table 2 provides the "score or performance factor assigned to each metric," for the corporation, for purposes of the Funding Pool decision. Table 1 does not pertain to any individual employee in the enterprise other than the CEO.

Subpart (d) asks for the "resulting financial score and operational score." Table 1 provides the "resulting financial score and operational score" for the corporation, for the purposes of the Funding Pool decision. Table 1 does not pertain to any individual employee in the enterprise other than the CEO.

Subpart (e) asks for the "resulting overall pool funding percentage/factor." Table 2 provides the "resulting overall pool funding percentage/factor" for the corporation, for the purposes of the Funding Pool decision. Table 2 does not pertain to any individual employee in the enterprise other than the CEO.

As noted in Table 2, the "overall pool funding percentage/factor" is 145%.

f. Subpart (f) of the question asks about "the dollar amount of the pool at target and the actual amount funded. Based on the overall results of the corporation against the pre-established goals, the corporation's performance was calculated as 145% of target for 2025, reflecting the Company's strong performance and the executive team's execution of the Company's Operating Plan.

The 2025 overall funding pool percentage is used to set the variable pay compensation of the CEO. The CEO's variable pay component was based on the 145% of target factor. For the other Named Executive Officers, their variable pay compensation was paid out at 145% of target, *in the aggregate,* for the group of five officers, although individuals in the group received different percentages depending on their individual performance.

Similarly, for the vice presidents, their variable pay compensation was paid out at 145% of target, *in the aggregate,* for the entire group, although individuals in the group received different percentages depending on their individual performance. The 145% performance achievement does not apply at any other level of the organization for establishing pay-outs to individual contributors.

For performance in 2025, the Chief Financial Officer established the funding pool shown below, which was above target:

2025 Variable Compensation Target	**2025 Actual Variable Compensation Paid Out to Employees**
$80,308,863	$101,113,911

g. Subpart (g) of the question asks whether the funded pool was fully distributed. Once the funding pool is established (at $101,113,911), all amounts were paid out across the organization because variable pay compensation is part of total employee compensation and is not used or diverted for other purposes once the pool is established. Once funded, the dollars are distributed to employees or "individual contributors" across the organization in accordance with the allocation process that is handled by the Eversource Energy Human Resource Department.

h. Subpart (h) asks whether any amount (of the funding pool) is retained, returned, forfeited, or otherwise not distributed. As answered in subpart (g), none of the variable compensation funded pool was retained, returned, forfeited or otherwise not distributed. To the contrary, each year, variable pay compensation is accrued in the operating budget for every business unit, reflecting the expectation that variable pay compensation will be paid out to employees. Generally, variable compensation is budgeted at target levels as this is the level of total compensation that the Company would expect to pay if every employee met the expectations of their job positions exactly as anticipated for the individual job position. In this case, the Company is requesting to include the target level in rates as representative of the amount of variable pay compensation that the Company will pay to employees on a year-to-year basis, although in the Test Year 2025, Eversource paid out greater than the target level to employees and may do so again in the future.

i. With respect to how the funded amount is allocated among business units, the process starts with a bottom-up assessment of target funding levels. For each eligible employee, Eversource multiplies the employee's base salary times the employee's variable compensation target (i.e. $100,000 times 10% = $10,000) to define the eligible variable compensation dollar target. This calculation is conducted for each eligible department of the Company to define the target dollar amount for each department.

   Once the funding pool is set, the eligible funding pool is distributed to each department on the basis of the department's employee count and the identified pay-out level associated with the funding pool approved by the CFO, correlating to the target amounts for that department.

j. With respect to how amounts available to each business unit or manager are translated into individual awards, funding pools are allocated to each department/manager through the

Company's Workday Human Resources Information System (HRIS). Through this system, managers enter recommendations for grants to eligible employees in their departments, in conjunction with their performance assessments of those employees (only up to the amount of the funding pool for that department). Through the Workday system, these recommendations are rolled up to the Executive Vice President of each respective organization for review, consultation and final approval. This process was described in the Company's response to UPA-010[i].

k. All eligible individual employees or "contributors" below the six Named Executive Officers, have individual scorecards delineating the individual's performance goals for the calendar year. These individual performance goals are not designed to correlate directly or tie to the corporation's performance goals, nor are there any weightings that apply to individual employee goals. All of the corporation's goals, whether financial or operational, are part of the corporation's service mission to customers and are furthered by the efforts of our employees across the organizations. Therefore, individual goals are designed to support corporate objectives to provide safe and reliable service to customers with rigorous cost control and responsible management. The performance of each employee is reviewed by the respective manager and decisions are made within the various levels of management as to how the funding pool for that department will be allocated among its own contributors. Employees are ranked by their level of contribution and the variable pay is paid out to employees on the basis of the contribution level assigned by management. The Company's response to OCC-201, Attachment 1, shows the allocation of variable pay compensation across the base of employee contributors.

Prior Referenced Response:

---

[i] UPA-010 Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—PAYOUT DISCRETION) Application, Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, pp. 37–38. Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1 states that an individual variable-pay award may range from 0% to 200% of target and that supervisors exercise discretion based on individual performance. Explain the criteria, documentation, calibration process, approval hierarchy, and internal controls governing that discretion. In the response, identify:

a. who can increase or decrease an officer/executive award;
b. any limits on discretion;
c. whether ratings or awards are calibrated across managers/business units;
d. the role of senior management and the Compensation Committee;
e. required supporting documentation;
f. circumstances in which an employee can receive an award despite missing one or more stated goals; and
g. the process used to ensure consistency among similarly situated employees.

UPA-010 Response:

Eversource's variable pay program provides leaders with the ability to differentiate awards based on individual performance within established performance rating categories. To support the annual variable, pay process, the HR Consulting and Compensation teams develop, communicate, and administer the program, providing employees and leaders with a regular cadence of communications throughout the cycle (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 1). A comprehensive suite of resources is available on the company intranet, and training sessions are offered throughout the process: Performance Management Training (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 2), HRBP Information Sessions (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 3), and Information Sessions for Leaders. (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 4).

Annual performance reviews serve as the foundation for the calibration process and ultimately support variable pay recommendations and approvals. The calibration process is designed to promote consistency in the evaluation of similarly situated employees across each department. HR partners with department leaders to prepare for and facilitate calibration sessions, helping to ensure they are productive, effective, and aligned with established guidelines. The following resources are used: Calibration Guidelines (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 5) and Unconscious Bias (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 6).

During these discussions, leaders present information supporting their recommendations, and ratings are reviewed in detail. Where appropriate, adjustments are made to ensure consistency and fairness. Once consensus is reached, final ratings are submitted to executive leadership for review.

Each year, the Compensation department establishes and communicates variable pay award guidelines (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 7: Compensation Cycle Guidelines). Leaders are responsible for submitting variable pay award recommendations through the HRIS system. These recommendations are subject to approval at each level of the management chain, with final approval provided by the Executive Vice President. Throughout the recommendation and approval process, HR Consulting and Compensation monitor proposed awards to ensure recommendations are within established guidelines.

Officer awards are administered through a separate process. Recommendations for officer awards are made by the Senior Vice President or Executive Vice President to whom they report. The Senior Team reviews and approves award recommendations for those officers in their overall organizations. The Board of Trustees Compensation Committee approves award recommendations for the CEO's direct reports, while the CEO's compensation is recommended by the Compensation Committee and approved by the full Board of Trustees.

Employees are evaluated annually against established performance goals as well as broader measures of overall performance and behavior. While a Successful Contributor rating generally reflects achievement of all established goals, there may be circumstances in which an employee does not fully achieve a specific goal but is nevertheless determined to have met overall performance expectations based on the totality of their contributions and performance during the evaluation period. As shown in OCC-201, Attachment 1, employees are rated along a curve, with the general expectation that the majority of employees fall into the Successful Contributor category. The variable compensation payout ranges are defined by employee performance rating, and the manager’s assessment of the individual’s performance informs the individual’s payout generally within the range. Employees who fall below Successful Contributor are expected to demonstrate improved performance over the next and subsequent review periods. Failure to demonstrate improved and sustained performance generally results in the employee being exited from the Company.

Date Filed: October 09, 2026

Witness: Sasha P. Lazor and Marianne H. Eichler
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—PERFORMANCE WEIGHTINGS) Refer to Application, Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, p. 35; Schs. C-3.6, and C-3.7. Confirm whether the Table 9 enterprise funding weights in Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1 apply uniformly to all CL&P and ESC employees and all officers/executives whose compensation is included in Schedule C-3.6, or C-3.7. If the funding, business-unit, or individual-performance weighting structure differs by employee group, executive level, business unit, state/geography, employing entity, incentive plan, or some other factor, identify each variation and provide the applicable weighting structure.

Response:

As stated in the referenced testimony, at page 35, line 5, Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, at page 35, the weights in Table 9 are applicable to **only** the funding decision (stating, "[s]olely for the purpose of determining the funding pool….").

More specifically, these are weightings that are applied to make the decision as to whether the corporation has met is goals for funding the annual variable pay component. These weightings do **not** "apply uniformly to all CL&P employees and all officers/executives whose compensation is included in Schedule C-3.6, or C-3.7," nor do these weightings apply to determine the variable pay compensation of any individual except for the Chief Executive Officer. The reason these weightings do **not** apply to employees is because these are not weightings that apply to the performance of any individual in the entire enterprise. These are weightings that apply to the corporation in order to determine whether the corporation has met the performance goals set by the Board of Trustees for payment of variable compensation across the entire enterprise. Investors expect the corporation to have performance goals and these goals are intended to capture the essence of the utility's business functions and therefore are prominently discussed and analyzed in the annual proxy statement. However, these goals do **not** serve as the basis for measuring performance or compensating individuals employed by the corporation, other than the CEO.

The question asks: [i]f the ***funding, business-unit, or individual-performance*** weighting structure differs by employee group, executive level, business unit, state/geography, employing entity, incentive plan, or some other factor, identify each variation and provide the applicable weighting structure."

These three terms "funding," "business-unit" and "individual performance" are completely disparate terms in relation to the Company's variable pay program. There is nothing common between these terms.

→ "Funding" is the decision that is made in February each year for the past performance year and relates to the Board of Trustee's determination that the corporation has met its goals and the corporation will pay out its variable compensation obligations to employees. "Funding" decisions do not pertain to any individual employee whether officer or other employees. With the exception of the CEO, all employees from top to bottom are treated ***exactly the same*** in relation to the funding decision, meaning that the plan is either funded or not funded based on the corporation's performance and the weightings that apply therein. Once authorized by the Board of Trustees, the Chief Financial Officer makes the final decision on the actual amount of the variable pay funding available to allocate across the organization.

→ The term "business unit" is not a term that has a discrete role within the variable pay program, nor is applicable to the allocation of pay. There is no difference between "business units" in terms of the funding decision or how the program works to allocate the variable pay compensation among employee groups and employees. All business units are treated the same.

→ "Individual performance" is the basis on which each individual from top to bottom is paid out a portion of the variable pay compensation funded for each respective year. Because each employee is treated as an individual contributor within the variable pay structure, each individual is held accountable for their individual goals, tailored to their job position. In this structure, there are no "weightings" applied.

Thus, as described in the Company's response to OCC-196[i], and OCC-197[ii], after variable compensation is funded, actual awards are determined based on individual performance and there is no weighting system that applies across individuals comprising the employee base.

Prior Referenced Responses:

[i] OCC-196 Question:

(VARIABLE PAY) Please refer to Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, p. 32, Table 8. Please explain in detail each of the metrics, including the components of the "Enhance the Customer Experience" and "Clean Energy Execution" metrics, and how each was met to earn variable pay.

OCC-196 Response:

Please refer to the response to CIEC-015[i]. There are two stages to the Company's variable pay program. In the first stage, there is an annual ***determination to fund variable pay compensation and at what level.*** This is a determination made by the Board of Trustees, which views the determination on a holistic, enterprise-wide basis because – when the decision is made to fund the variable pay compensation component – it is a decision that will apply across the entire Eversource Energy enterprise for all employees of every division and operating unit. This determination is made by the Board of Trustees based on a pre-determined mix of financial and service-based objectives. This stage is described in detail in CIEC-015, Attachment 1 (2026 Proxy Statement), at pages 48-52, reflecting a weighting of approximately 70% financial objectives and 30% service-related objectives.

The second stage of the Eversource Energy variable pay program is the determination of ***what individual employees have earned in the prior performance year*** in relation to their specific performance goals.

Table 8 in Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, correlates to the first stage of the annual variable pay procedure. Specifically, Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, at 31, at lines 15-18, explains that Table 8 "provides the target goals set by Eversource in 2024 and 2025 applicable to the decision as to whether the variable pay pool should be funded. These goals are solely for the purpose of determining whether the variable pay pool should be funded."

Thus, the referenced metrics of "Enhance the Customer Experience" and "Clean Energy Execution" are metrics evaluated at the enterprise-wide level, not metrics that generally determine what individual employees "earn" for a given performance year.

With respect to the metric "Enhance the Customer Experience," the proxy statement discusses the five separate initiatives that comprise the goal. See, CIEC-015, Attachment 1 (2026 Proxy Statement), at page 51-52, excerpted in relevant part, below:

ENHANCE THE CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE:

Goal	Outcome
Efficiently execute the Massachusetts Advanced Metering Infrastructure project.	• We made significant progress on our Massachusetts AMI throughout 2025. The Company completed construction of the enhanced AMI field network required to utilize all of the meter data in western Massachusetts and the eastern Massachusetts scope is advancing as planned. Meter installations began in western Massachusetts in July of 2025, with the completion of meter installations expected across the state for all 1.4 million customers at the end of 2027. • Our OMNI project implemented an industry leading SAP Customer Relations and Billing and Cloud for Customer software for some of our Massachusetts gas customers. Phase II is in progress for our electric and remaining gas customers in Massachusetts. • We constructed and launched the Grid Edge Modernization lab to enable the Company to provide community stakeholders, the media and our employees with a firsthand look at the technology the Company has in place for our customers.
Enhance strategies to improve the execution of the Emergency, Storm and Business Continuity Response and Stakeholder Communication Plans.	• At Eversource, customer and operational security is of critical importance, and we have completed the following enhancements to safeguard this data: ◦ Commenced the transition to a third-party co-location for data centers to reduce operational risk and support future growth; ◦ Hardened physical access to our existing Connecticut data centers to enhance protection of confidential information.
Educate customers regarding energy costs and impacts of decarbonization.	• We developed ratepayer affordability campaigns to promote education of customer bills and the impact of usage to our electric and gas customers. A new customer bill design, based on surveys of gas customers, was rolled out in Massachusetts in November 2025. We also focused on budget billing and energy efficiency options for our customers.

COMPENSATION DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Goal	Outcome
Advance the Company's commitment to equity with customers, communities and key stakeholders.	• We engaged community partners with support and information on our business and programs, and the Company purchased approximately $47 million in historic and affordable housing tax credits which support important projects in key communities across Connecticut. The Company received the United Way Pioneer Valley Champions Award for its development of an Environmental Justice mapping tool.
Execute the approximately $900 million Energy Efficiency Plan budget for Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Hampshire.	• To support increased energy efficiency goals in Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, we executed the $900 million Energy Efficiency Plan with increased focus on equity and customer centric electrification. We implemented other initiatives including electric vehicle charging, innovation pilots, battery storage, and federal projects.
• The Committee determined this goal to have attained a 165 percent performance result.	

The extent to which this 2025 goal was achieved, and this goal's "weighting" in CIEC-015, Attachment 1 (2026 Proxy Statement), at page 48, excerpted in relevant part, below:

Enhance the Customer Experience	Advanced Metering Infrastructure rollout, Energy Efficiency programs, stakeholder and community engagement and data security programs	165%	8.33%

With respect to the metric "Clean Energy Execution," the proxy statement discusses the extent to which the 2025 goal was achieved and the goal's "weighting." See, CIEC-015, Attachment 1 (2026 Proxy Statement), at page 40, excerpted in relevant part, below:

	• **Clean Energy Execution:** We successfully advanced our initiatives in supporting clean-energy projects: ◦ Successfully completed the final year of the 2022-2025 Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities authorized grid modernization plan, including the deployment of over 3,000 monitoring and control devices in Massachusetts substations and distribution lines. Placed into service over $68 million of capital for Grid Modernization. ◦ In 2025, Eversource broke ground on the $1.8 billion Greater Cambridge Energy Program, an innovative package of transmission and distribution upgrades to meet expected increases in electric demand, support key industries driving Massachusetts' economy, and enable electrification and decarbonization. ◦ Reported strong performance on our Networked Geothermal Pilot in Framingham, Massachusetts through the winter and summer seasons, and received a commitment for U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) funding to support an Expansion Loop with the potential for an additional 180 customers of all types.

The extent to which this 2025 goal was achieved, and this goal's "weighting" in the Annual Program appears in the table on page 48:

Clean Energy Execution	Non-pipe alternatives, execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization, geothermal and decarbonization projects	160%	8.33%

The detailed discussion of this goal, and the five separate initiatives that comprise the goal, appears on page 52:

- **CLEAN ENERGY EXECUTION:**

Goal	Outcome
Integrate gas and electric systems planning to promote the ability to assess reliable non-pipe alternatives (NPA) enabling electrification.	• During 2025, Eversource implemented a formal structure and framework to assess the viability of NPA to electrify customer heating needs without compromising reliability of the underlying gas infrastructure and increasing ratepayer burden. The NPA framework, a model tariff and cost recovery proposal were filed with the Climate Compliance Plan.
Execute the recently approved Massachusetts Electric Sector Modernization Plan to enable a clean energy future in support of state policies.	• Eversource successfully completed the final year of the 2022-2025 Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities authorized grid modernization plan. We deployed over 3,000 monitoring and control devices in Massachusetts substations and distribution lines which increased the visibility and control of the grid to improve reliability and integrate distributed energy resources to meet or exceed regulatory commitment.
Plan, develop and build transmission infrastructure to facilitate the interconnection of clean, renewable energy projects.	• In 2025, Eversource broke ground on the $1.8 billion Greater Cambridge Energy Program, an innovative package of transmission and distribution upgrades to meet expected increases in electric demand, support key industries driving Massachusetts' economy, and enable electrification and decarbonization. The project, which includes a first-of-its-kind underground substation, required ongoing close partnership with the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority, the real estate owner, and other public and private partners to achieve siting approval.
Expand the development of utility-owned solar and geothermal technology.	• In 2025, the Company advanced its Control Room of the Future initiative by deploying the first distribution management system (DMS) into service in Massachusetts. The DMS will provide control room operators visibility reflecting the impact of solar generation, electric vehicles and other factors impacting power flow across the grid and enable self-healing automation to dynamically restore customers by re-routing power flows within one minute of the start of an outage. • Our geothermal pilot demonstrated strong geothermal system performance through the winter and summer seasons. We received a grant for the expansion loop in Framingham, Massachusetts on the geothermal project from the DOE.
Execute Distributed Energy Resource (DER) initiatives in Massachusetts.	• We advanced our DER Initiatives in line with the Massachusetts DPU four-year mandate by continuing project planning for future construction of approved major clean energy interconnection hubs to enable renewable energy projects.

- The Committee determined this goal to have attained a 160 percent performance result.

[ii] OCC-197 Question:

(VARIABLE PAY) Please refer to Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, p. 32, Table 8. One of the metrics includes "execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization." Please explain how this assisted Connecticut customers.

OCC-197 Response:

As discussed in response to OCC-196, Table 8, in Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1 correlates to the first stage of the annual variable pay procedure. Specifically, Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, at 31, at lines 15-18, explains that Table 8 "provides the target goals set by Eversource in 2024 and 2025 applicable to the decision as to whether the variable pay pool should be funded. These goals are solely for the purpose of determining whether the variable pay pool should be funded."

As a multi-state, multi-line of business organization, the corporate and customer-based metrics applicable to the enterprise-wide funding determination appropriately include "execution of the Massachusetts Grid Modernization" because execution of the Massachusetts Grid Modernization program is important to the overall goals of the Eversource Energy enterprise.

At the second stage where individual performance and the associated earned variable pay is determined, individual performance is assessed only on the aspects of the business in which employees are specifically involved. For example, the performance of a Connecticut field employee would not be based on the "execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization." However, an employee that provides regulatory support across all three jurisdictions may have an individual performance goal pertaining to the "execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization," although this portion of the employee's variable pay would be charged to the Massachusetts electric company, not CL&P. Work performed by employees on a shared basis among operating companies is appropriately allocated among those entities for financial reporting and rate recovery purposes.

Date Filed: October 09, 2026

Witness: Sasha P. Lazor and Marianne H. Eichler
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—FINANCIAL AND STRATEGIC METRICS) Application, Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, Tables 8 and 9. For the 2025 performance year, provide:

a. the scoring curve, threshold, target, maximum, and actual score for Non-GAAP earnings per share (EPS) and dividend growth;
b. the individual initiatives comprising "Strategic Financial Initiatives and Regulatory Outcomes";
c. the target, actual result, weight, and score assigned to each such initiative;
d. the resulting contribution of each financial subcomponent to the overall 2025 funding-pool factor; and
e. any pre-existing analysis quantifying the asserted CL&P customer benefit from the financial component, including any effect on borrowing costs, credit metrics, cost of capital, customer bills, or capital-investment costs.

Response:

This question continues to improperly intermingle the two independent processes applicable to the Company's variable pay compensation framework, which are (1) the process to determine the annual funding pool and the Board of Trustee's determination of variable pay for the CEO; and (2) the process to determine how each individual's actual payout percentage is determined for every other employee in the business. Below are data points and references to better explain and detail the process with each subsection denoted as to whether it applies to the first or second process.

a. The scoring curve for Non-GAAP earnings ***as it pertains to establishment of the Funding Pool and variable pay compensation for the CEO*** is included in the Company's response to UPA-005[i].

Metric	Threshold	Target	Maximum
Non-GAAP Earnings Per Share	$4.59	$4.71	$4.80

(b) through (d)

The initiatives and outcomes comprising "Strategic Financial Initiatives and Regulatory Outcomes," and their actual results, are discussed in the Company's annual proxy statement provided as Attachment CIEC-015, Attachment 1, at pages 56, through 57, excerpted below for ease of reference. The referenced "Strategic Financial Incentives and Regulatory Outcomes ***pertain only to establishment of the Funding Pool and the CEO***. These goals do not pertain to individual contributors, unless specifically identified for a particular employee.

• STRATEGIC INITIATIVES AND REGULATORY OUTCOMES:

Goal	Outcome
Effectively manage onshore construction for Revolution Wind.	• Eversource completed the onshore substation construction of the Revolution Wind project ahead of schedule. We expect this milestone to accelerate the commencement of commercial operations for the wind farm and reduce the Company's financial exposure. The project successfully challenged the stop-work order issued by the U.S. Department of the Interior's Bureau of Ocean Energy Management in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, permitting construction to resume in October. The project also prevailed when a second stop-work order was issued. A second stop-work order was also overturned by the court on January 12, 2026, and the project team is working on final construction and commissioning of the project.
Execute regulatory initiatives across three states, including the Yankee Gas Service Company and Public Service Company of New Hampshire rate cases and various capital tracker and performance mechanisms.	• We have filed to recover and/or received regulatory approval for nearly 98 percent of deferred storm costs, an effort that is expected to result in nearly $2.0 billion of deferred storm cost recovery, another major milestone in improving our balance sheet condition. The Company played an active role in support of Connecticut passing legislation to securitize storm costs for The Connecticut Light and Power Company. The Company filed to recover nearly $1 billion of deferred storm costs in Connecticut in 2024-2025 to catch up on nearly all previous storms. The Company also filed for storm cost recovery in Massachusetts and New Hampshire and is awaiting approval. The Company implemented significant enhancements to streamline our storm response efforts, cost efficiencies, reporting capabilities, and oversight that will accelerate future regulatory prudence filings. • The Company received a final decision on the Yankee Gas Services Company rate case that resulted in an approved revenue increase of approximately $100 million, a return on equity of 9.32 percent, and enabled timely recovery of critical safety and regulatory capital investment programs. The Public Service Company of New Hampshire rate case yielded a rate increase of approximately $100 million with annual inflationary performance-based regulation rate mechanism that provides for an annual rate adjustment through July of 2029 and a return on equity of 9.50 percent. Each of these rate cases was a successful effort supporting continued earnings growth and providing the framework for future investment. In addition, the Company has been diligently engaging with stakeholders on timely recovery of capital investment outside of the full rate cases cycle, mitigating the need for more frequent rate cases while minimizing cost increases for customers. • We successfully negotiated a settlement agreement for NSTAR Gas Company with the Massachusetts Attorney General's office (MA AGO) that resulted in a $10 million rate adjustment and Gas System Enhancement Program in base rates. • The Company reached a settlement with the MA AGO for Eversource Gas Company of Massachusetts to allow for future recovery of approximately $65 million, net of acquisition and integration costs, while resolving the long-standing pension and Resiliency Tree Work cost recovery items.
Advance strategies to improve the Connecticut political and regulatory environment, while strengthening Massachusetts and New Hampshire stakeholder relations.	• Our ongoing effort to engage key Connecticut stakeholders and share how utilities operate and finance their business contributed to the development of Connecticut Senate Bill 4 addressing energy bill affordability. Changes in the Connecticut regulatory structure, including the appointment of new commissioners and increasing the committee membership to five commissioners, signaled a more balanced and constructive regulatory environment and led to further investor confidence in the financial condition of the Company. We have significantly increased our stakeholder engagement, including bringing stakeholders to Eversource facilities for tours. All of these interactions offer the unique opportunity to educate stakeholders on our business, and how we conduct our operations, allowing settlement and rate case procedures to be more tangible for intervenors, as well as public communication.
Grow the transmission business through competitive solicitations.	• Evaluation of competitive transmission offers is being embedded into our transmission strategy, including ISO-New England (ISO-NE) and NE-NY processes for further growth investment. The Company submitted a bid in response to ISO-NE's request for transmission infrastructure to be constructed enabling generation from Maine to be delivered into southern New England. We are streamlining project development processes to ensure efficient coordination for timely siting, permitting, procurement, engineering and construction which allows for a more flexible and robust annual capital planning process.

Goal	Outcome
Improve corporate-wide cost structure and financial condition.	• We have executed a supply chain management effectiveness initiative which has reduced inventory and improved processes, tools and training, resulting in lower cost supply operation while sustaining optimal performance. • The Company implemented a $1.2 billion At-the-Market share issuance program and issued approximately seven million shares resulting in net proceeds of $465 million.
Complete the divestiture of Aquarion Water Company.	• The Company received an unfavorable regulatory decision from the Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA) on the sale of Aquarion Water Company. The Company appealed the PURA decision and, on January 14, 2026, a Connecticut court held that PURA acted illegally and remanded the matter back to PURA for further proceedings. On March 6, 2026, PURA issued a proposed final decision approving the sale of Aquarion. PURA has scheduled release of its final decision for March 25, 2026. There can be no assurance that PURA's final decision will be consistent with the proposed final decision. The Company is evaluating the conditions of that approval as well as other strategic opportunities to avoid further debt and equity issuances. Eversource's FFO to debt ratio is currently approximately 14 percent and in excess of the 13 percent Moody's threshold.
• The Committee determined this goal to have attained a 175 percent performance result.	

e. As discussed in the Company's response to OCC-196,[ii] and OCC-197[iii], Table 8, in Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, correlates to the ***first stage*** of the annual variable pay procedure. Specifically, Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, at 31, at lines 15-18, explains that Table 8 "provides the target goals set by Eversource in 2024 and 2025 applicable to the decision as to whether the variable pay pool should be funded. These goals are solely for the purpose of determining whether the variable pay pool should be funded."

Accordingly, all of the referenced "Strategic Financial Incentives and Regulatory Outcomes ***pertain only to establishment of the Funding Pool and variable pay compensation for the CEO***. These goals do not pertain to individual contributors, except as modified or applied to distribution operations for the work distribution employees perform for customers.

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] UPA-005 Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE PAY—FUNDING POOL) Application, Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, pp. 30–35. The referenced exhibit states that the enterprise variable-pay pool is funded based on corporate financial and operational performance and provides the applicable metrics and weights. Without repeating those descriptions, provide the complete 2025 calculation showing:

a. the threshold, target, and maximum scoring or payout curve for each metric;
b. actual 2025 performance;
c. the score or performance factor assigned to each metric;
d. the resulting financial score and operational score;
e. the resulting overall pool funding percentage/factor;
f. the dollar amount of the pool at target and the actual amount funded;
g. whether the funded pool was fully distributed;

h. any amount retained, returned, forfeited, or otherwise not distributed;
i. how the funded amount was allocated among business units; and
j. how amounts available to each business unit or manager were translated into individual awards.

UPA-005 Response:

This question continues to improperly intermingle the two independent processes applicable to the Company's variable pay compensation framework, which are (1) the process to determine the annual funding pool and the Board of Trustee's determination of variable pay for the CEO; and (2) the process to determine how each individual's actual payout percentage is determined for every other employee in the business aside from the named officers. Below are data points and references to better explain and detail the process with each subsection denoted as to whether it applies to the first or second process.

(a) The threshold, target, and maximum scoring or payout curve for each metric. Each year, the Eversource Energy Board of Trustee's evaluates the corporation's performance in the prior calendar year against a set of pre-designated performance metrics and assigned ratings. Based on that evaluation, the Board of Trustee's makes a determination that variable pay compensation will be funded for the year. In addition, the Board of Trustees determines the variable pay compensation for the CEO, which is also granted on the basis of the corporation's achievement of those same pre-designated performance goals. Thus, the threshold, target and maximum ranges for each performance goal in CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, at pages 30-35, pertain exclusively to the ***funding process*** and to the determination of variable pay for the CEO. These performance metrics and assigned ratings ***do not apply*** to any other individual employees, except for the CEO, whose compensation is determined by the Board of Trustee's Compensation Committee.

Metric	Threshold	Target	Maximum
Financial Performance (70%)			
Non-GAAP Earnings Per Share	$4.59	$4.71	$4.80
Dividend Growth	$2.97	$3.00	$3.03
Strategic Growth Initiatives			
Strategic Growth Initiatives	Regulatory filings, storm cost recovery, and strategic positioning		
Operational Performance (30%)			
Reliability Average Months Between Service Interruptions (MBI)	15 Months	21.3 Months	22 Months
Restoration System Average	70 Minutes	63.7 Minutes	62 Minutes

Restoration Duration (SAIDI)			
Safety Rate	1.25 Rate	0.85 Rate	0.75 Rate
Gas Emergency Response	93.0%	98.2%	99.2%
% Candidate Slate	50.0%	59.5%	65.0%
Sustainability Ranking	65.0%	87.0%	107.0%
Key Strategic Customer and Clean Energy Operational Results			
Enhance the Customer Experience	Advanced Metering Infrastructure rollout, Energy Efficiency programs, stakeholder and community engagement and data security programs		
Clean Energy Execution	Non-pipe alternatives, execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization, geothermal and decarbonization projects		

(b) through (e)

For 2025, the Board of Trustees Compensation Committee approved corporate performance at 145% of target based on the following computation:

Table 1
Targeted and Actual Performance

Threshold	**Target**	**Maximum**	**Financial**	**Payout**	**Approved**
Metric 50%	100%	200%	Results	Factor	Weighting
Financial Performance					
2025 Non-GAAP Earnings Per Share $4.59	$4.71	$4.80	$4.76	155%	60%
Dividend Growth $2.97	$3.00	$3.03	$3.01	131%	10%
3.85%	5.00%	5.94%			

Key Strategic Financial and Regulatory Results

Strategic Financial Initiatives and Regulatory Outcomes	Regulatory filings, storm cost recovery and strategic positioning				175%	30%
Operational Performance						
Reliability Average Months Between Service Interruptions	15 Months	21.3 Months	22 Months	21.0 Months	95%	25%

(MBI)						
Restoration System Average Restoration Duration (SAIDI)	70 Mins.	63.7 Mins.	62 Mins.	66 Mins.	63%	25%
Safety Rate	1.25 Rate	0.85 Rate	0.75 Rate	0.87 Rate	95%	8.33%
Gas Emergency Response	95%	98.2%	99.2%	98.0%	94%	8.33%
% Candidate Slate	50.0%	59.5%	65.0%	64.3%	187%	8.33%
Sustainability Index	65.0%	87.0%	107.0%	102.6%	178%	8.33%
	Key Strategic Customer and Clean Energy Operational Results					
Enhance the Customer Experience	Advanced Metering Infrastructure rollout, Energy Efficiency programs, stakeholder and community engagement and data security programs				165%	8.33%
Clean Energy Execution	Non-pipe alternatives, execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization, geothermal and decarbonization projects				160%	8.33%
Financial Performance at 159% (weighted 70%)						
Operational Performance at 113% (weighted 30%)						34%
Overall Performance						**145%**

Subpart (b) asks for "actual 2025 performance." Table 1 provides the "actual 2025 performance" for the corporation, for the purposes of the Funding Pool decision. Table 1 does not pertain to any individual employee in the enterprise other than the CEO.

Subpart (c) asks for the "score or performance factor assigned to each metric." Table 2 provides the "score or performance factor assigned to each metric," for the corporation, for purposes of the Funding Pool decision. Table 1 does not pertain to any individual employee in the enterprise other than the CEO.

Subpart (d) asks for the "resulting financial score and operational score." Table 1 provides the "resulting financial score and operational score" for the corporation, for the purposes of the Funding Pool decision. Table 1 does not pertain to any individual employee in the enterprise other than the CEO.

Subpart (e) asks for the "resulting overall pool funding percentage/factor." Table 2 provides the "resulting overall pool funding percentage/factor" for the corporation, for the purposes of the Funding Pool decision. Table 2 does not pertain to any individual employee in the enterprise other than the CEO.

As noted in Table 2, the "overall pool funding percentage/factor" is 145%.

f. Subpart (f) of the question asks about "the dollar amount of the pool at target and the actual amount funded. Based on the overall results of the corporation against the pre-established goals, the corporation's performance was calculated as 145% of target for 2025, reflecting the Company's strong performance and the executive team's execution of the Company's Operating Plan.

The 2025 overall funding pool percentage is used to set the variable pay compensation of the CEO. The CEO's variable pay component was based on the 145% of target factor. For the other Named Executive Officers, their variable pay compensation was paid out at 145% of target, *in the aggregate,* for the group of five officers, although individuals in the group received different percentages depending on their individual performance.

Similarly, for the vice presidents, their variable pay compensation was paid out at 145% of target, *in the aggregate,* for the entire group, although individuals in the group received different percentages depending on their individual performance. The 145% performance achievement does not apply at any other level of the organization for establishing pay-outs to individual contributors.

For performance in 2025, the Chief Financial Officer established the funding pool shown below, which was above target:

2025 Variable Compensation Target	**2025 Actual Variable Compensation Paid Out to Employees**
$80,308,863	$101,113,911

g. Subpart (g) of the question asks whether the funded pool was fully distributed. Once the funding pool is established (at $101,113,911), all amounts were paid out across the organization because variable pay compensation is part of total employee compensation and is not used or diverted for other purposes once the pool is established. Once funded, the dollars are distributed to employees or "individual contributors" across the organization in accordance with the allocation process that is handled by the Eversource Energy Human Resource Department.

h. Subpart (h) asks whether any amount (of the funding pool) is retained, returned, forfeited, or otherwise not distributed. As answered in subpart (g), none of the variable compensation funded pool was retained, returned, forfeited or otherwise not distributed. To the contrary, each year, variable pay compensation is accrued in the operating budget for every business unit, reflecting the expectation that variable pay compensation will be paid out to employees. Generally, variable compensation is budgeted at target levels as this is the level of total compensation that the Company would expect to pay if every employee met the expectations of their job positions exactly as anticipated for the individual job position. In this case, the Company is requesting to include the target level in rates as representative of the amount of variable pay compensation that the Company will pay to employees on a year-to-year basis, although in the test year 2025, Eversource paid out greater than the target level to employees and may do so again in the future.

i. With respect to how the funded amount is allocated among business units, the process starts with a bottom-up assessment of target funding levels. For each eligible employee, Eversource multiplies the employee's base salary times the employee's variable compensation target (i.e. $100,000 times 10% = $10,000) to define the eligible variable compensation dollar target. This calculation is conducted for each eligible department of the Company to define the target dollar amount for each department.

Once the funding pool is set, the eligible funding pool is distributed to each department on the basis of the department's employee count and the identified pay-out level associated with the funding pool approved by the CFO, correlating to the target amounts for that department.

j. With respect to how amounts available to each business unit or manager are translated into individual awards, funding pools are allocated to each department/manager through the Company's Workday Human Resources Information System (HRIS). Through this system, managers enter recommendations for grants to eligible employees in their departments, in conjunction with their performance assessments of those employees (only up to the amount of the funding pool for that department). Through the Workday system, these recommendations are rolled up to the Executive Vice President of each respective organization for review, consultation and final approval. This process was described in the Company's response to UPA-010[i].

k. All eligible individual employees or "contributors" below the six Named Executive Officers, have individual scorecards delineating the individual's performance goals for the calendar year. These individual performance goals are not designed to correlate directly or tie to the corporation's performance goals, nor are there any weightings that apply to individual employee goals. All of the corporation's goals, whether financial or operational, are part of the corporation's service mission to customers and are furthered by the efforts of our employees across the organizations. Therefore, individual goals are designed to support corporate objectives to provide safe and reliable service to customers with rigorous cost control and responsible management. The performance of each employee is reviewed by the respective manager and decisions are made within the various levels of management as to how the funding pool for that department will be allocated among its own contributors. Employees are ranked by their level of contribution and the variable pay is paid out to employees on the basis of the contribution level assigned by management. The Company's response to OCC-201, Attachment 1, shows the allocation of variable pay compensation across the base of employee contributors.

[ii] OCC-196 Question:

(VARIABLE PAY) Please refer to Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, p. 32, Table 8. Please explain in detail each of the metrics, including the components of the "Enhance the Customer Experience" and "Clean Energy Execution" metrics, and how each was met to earn variable pay.

OCC-196 Response:

Please refer to the response to CIEC-015i. There are two stages to the Company's variable pay program. In the first stage, there is an annual determination ***to fund variable pay compensation and at what level***. This is a determination made by the Board of Trustees, which views the determination on a holistic, enterprise-wide basis because – when the decision is made to fund the variable pay compensation component – it is a decision that will apply across the entire Eversource Energy enterprise for all employees of every division and operating unit. This determination is made by the Board of Trustees based on a pre-determined mix of financial and service-based objectives. This stage is described in detail in CIEC-015, Attachment 1 (2026 Proxy Statement), at pages 48-52, reflecting a weighting of approximately 70% financial objectives and 30% service-related objectives.

The second stage of the Eversource Energy variable pay program is the determination of ***what individual employees have earned in the prior performance year*** in relation to their specific performance goals.

Table 8 in Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, correlates to the first stage of the annual variable pay procedure. Specifically, Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, at 31, at lines 15-18, explains that Table 8 "provides the target goals set by Eversource

in 2024 and 2025 applicable to the decision as to whether the variable pay pool should be funded. These goals are solely for the purpose of determining whether the variable pay pool should be funded."

Thus, the referenced metrics of "Enhance the Customer Experience" and "Clean Energy Execution" are metrics evaluated at the enterprise-wide level, not metrics that generally determine what individual employees "earn" for a given performance year.

With respect to the metric "Enhance the Customer Experience," the proxy statement discusses the five separate initiatives that comprise the goal. See, CIEC-015, Attachment 1 (2026 Proxy Statement), at page 51-52, excerpted in relevant part, below:

• ENHANCE THE CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE:

Goal	Outcome
Efficiently execute the Massachusetts Advanced Metering Infrastructure project.	• We made significant progress on our Massachusetts AMI throughout 2025. The Company completed construction of the enhanced AMI field network required to utilize all of the meter data in western Massachusetts and the eastern Massachusetts scope is advancing as planned. Meter installations began in western Massachusetts in July of 2025, with the completion of meter installations expected across the state for all 1.4 million customers at the end of 2027. • Our OMNI project implemented an industry leading SAP Customer Relations and Billing and Cloud for Customer software for some of our Massachusetts gas customers. Phase II is in progress for our electric and remaining gas customers in Massachusetts. • We constructed and launched the Grid Edge Modernization lab to enable the Company to provide community stakeholders, the media and our employees with a firsthand look at the technology the Company has in place for our customers.
Enhance strategies to improve the execution of the Emergency, Storm and Business Continuity Response and Stakeholder Communication Plans.	• At Eversource, customer and operational security is of critical importance, and we have completed the following enhancements to safeguard this data: ◦ Commenced the transition to a third-party co-location for data centers to reduce operational risk and support future growth; ◦ Hardened physical access to our existing Connecticut data centers to enhance protection of confidential information.
Educate customers regarding energy costs and impacts of decarbonization.	• We developed ratepayer affordability campaigns to promote education of customer bills and the impact of usage to our electric and gas customers. A new customer bill design, based on surveys of gas customers, was rolled out in Massachusetts in November 2025. We also focused on budget billing and energy efficiency options for our customers.

2026 Proxy Statement 51

CONTENTS

COMPENSATION DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Goal	Outcome
Advance the Company's commitment to equity with customers, communities and key stakeholders.	• We engaged community partners with support and information on our business and programs, and the Company purchased approximately $47 million in historic and affordable housing tax credits which support important projects in key communities across Connecticut. The Company received the United Way Pioneer Valley Champions Award for its development of an Environmental Justice mapping tool.
Execute the approximately $900 million Energy Efficiency Plan budget for Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Hampshire.	• To support increased energy efficiency goals in Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, we executed the $900 million Energy Efficiency Plan with increased focus on equity and customer centric electrification. We implemented other initiatives including electric vehicle charging, innovation pilots, battery storage, and federal projects.
• The Committee determined this goal to have attained a 165 percent performance result.	

The extent to which this 2025 goal was achieved, and this goal's "weighting" in CIEC-015, Attachment 1 (2026 Proxy Statement), at page 48, excerpted in relevant part, below:

Enhance the Customer Experience	Advanced Metering Infrastructure rollout, Energy Efficiency programs, stakeholder and community engagement and data security programs	165%	8.33%

With respect to the metric "Clean Energy Execution," the proxy statement discusses the extent to which the 2025 goal was achieved and the goal's "weighting." See, CIEC-015, Attachment 1 (2026 Proxy Statement), at page 40, excerpted in relevant part, below:

- **Clean Energy Execution:** We successfully advanced our initiatives in supporting clean-energy projects:
  - Successfully completed the final year of the 2022-2025 Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities authorized grid modernization plan, including the deployment of over 3,000 monitoring and control devices in Massachusetts substations and distribution lines. Placed into service over $68 million of capital for Grid Modernization.
  - In 2025, Eversource broke ground on the $1.8 billion Greater Cambridge Energy Program, an innovative package of transmission and distribution upgrades to meet expected increases in electric demand, support key industries driving Massachusetts' economy, and enable electrification and decarbonization.
  - Reported strong performance on our Networked Geothermal Pilot in Framingham, Massachusetts through the winter and summer seasons, and received a commitment for U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) funding to support an Expansion Loop with the potential for an additional 180 customers of all types.

The extent to which this 2025 goal was achieved, and this goal's "weighting" in the Annual Program appears in the table on page 48:

Clean Energy Execution	Non-pipe alternatives, execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization, geothermal and decarbonization projects	160%	8.33%

The detailed discussion of this goal, and the five separate initiatives that comprise the goal, appears on page 52:

• **CLEAN ENERGY EXECUTION:**

Goal	Outcome
Integrate gas and electric systems planning to promote the ability to assess reliable non-pipe alternatives (NPA) enabling electrification.	• During 2025, Eversource implemented a formal structure and framework to assess the viability of NPA to electrify customer heating needs without compromising reliability of the underlying gas infrastructure and increasing ratepayer burden. The NPA framework, a model tariff and cost recovery proposal were filed with the Climate Compliance Plan.
Execute the recently approved Massachusetts Electric Sector Modernization Plan to enable a clean energy future in support of state policies.	• Eversource successfully completed the final year of the 2022-2025 Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities authorized grid modernization plan. We deployed over 3,000 monitoring and control devices in Massachusetts substations and distribution lines which increased the visibility and control of the grid to improve reliability and integrate distributed energy resources to meet or exceed regulatory commitment.
Plan, develop and build transmission infrastructure to facilitate the interconnection of clean, renewable energy projects.	• In 2025, Eversource broke ground on the $1.8 billion Greater Cambridge Energy Program, an innovative package of transmission and distribution upgrades to meet expected increases in electric demand, support key industries driving Massachusetts' economy, and enable electrification and decarbonization. The project, which includes a first-of-its-kind underground substation, required ongoing close partnership with the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority, the real estate owner, and other public and private partners to achieve siting approval.
Expand the development of utility-owned solar and geothermal technology.	• In 2025, the Company advanced its Control Room of the Future initiative by deploying the first distribution management system (DMS) into service in Massachusetts. The DMS will provide control room operators visibility reflecting the impact of solar generation, electric vehicles and other factors impacting power flow across the grid and enable self-healing automation to dynamically restore customers by re-routing power flows within one minute of the start of an outage. • Our geothermal pilot demonstrated strong geothermal system performance through the winter and summer seasons. We received a grant for the expansion loop in Framingham, Massachusetts on the geothermal project from the DOE.
Execute Distributed Energy Resource (DER) initiatives in Massachusetts.	• We advanced our DER Initiatives in line with the Massachusetts DPU four-year mandate by continuing project planning for future construction of approved major clean energy interconnection hubs to enable renewable energy projects.
• The Committee determined this goal to have attained a 160 percent performance result.	

[iii] OCC-197 Question:

(VARIABLE PAY) Please refer to Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, p. 32, Table 8. One of the metrics includes "execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization." Please explain how this assisted Connecticut customers.

OCC-197 Response:

As discussed in response to OCC-196, in Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, correlates to the first stage of the annual variable pay procedure. Specifically, Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, at 31, at lines 15-18, explains that Table 8 "provides the target goals set by Eversource in 2024 and 2025 applicable to the decision as to whether the variable pay pool should be funded. These goals are solely for the purpose of determining whether the variable pay pool should be funded."

As a multi-state, multi-line of business organization, the corporate and customer-based metrics applicable to the enterprise-wide *funding determination* appropriately include "execution of the Massachusetts Grid Modernization" because execution of the Massachusetts Grid Modernization program is important to the overall goals of the Eversource Energy enterprise.

At the second stage where *individual performance* and the associated *earned variable pay* is determined, individual performance is assessed only on the aspects of the business in which employees are specifically involved. For example, the performance of a Connecticut field employee would *not* be based on the "execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization." However, an employee that provides regulatory support across all three jurisdictions may have an individual performance goal pertaining to the "execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization," although this portion of the employee's variable pay would be charged to the Massachusetts electric company, not CL&P. Work performed by employees on a shared basis among operating companies is appropriately allocated among those entities for financial reporting and rate recovery purposes.

Date Filed: October 09, 2026

Witness: Sasha P. Lazor and Marianne H. Eichler
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—OPERATIONAL METRICS) Identify each operational metric or strategic operational result used in the 2025 enterprise variable-pay funding calculation that is not directly attributable to CL&P's Connecticut electric operations, including, as applicable, gas emergency response, non-pipe alternatives, Massachusetts grid-modernization activity, geothermal projects, and other non-Connecticut activities. For each such item:

a. state its effective weight in the overall funding calculation;
b. explain why it is appropriate for that item to affect variable-compensation costs recovered from CL&P customers; and
c. provide any pre-existing analysis quantifying the benefit to CL&P customers, including cost savings, service-quality, reliability, safety, affordability, or other measurable benefits.

Response:

This question continues to improperly intermingle the two independent processes applicable to the Company's variable pay compensation framework, which are (1) the process to determine the annual funding pool and the Board of Trustee's determination of variable pay for the CEO; and (2) the process to determine how each individual's actual payout percentage is determined for every other employee in the business.

In terms of the "2025 enterprise variable-pay funding calculation," please refer to UPA-005[i], presenting the funding calculation.

(a) In terms of the "effective weight" of each of the listed "operational metrics," these metrics do not generally apply to individual employees, except for the CEO, referenced in the Company's response to UPA-005. Individual employees at the distribution level may have specific goals that pertain to "gas emergency response," or "non-pipe alternatives," or other listed functions, but they are not weighted in relation to other performance goals that the employee may have. Weighting only occurs at the corporate level for corporate performance for the purposes of the funding pool and the variable pay determination for the CEO.

(b) Funding is not collected from CL&P customers. Instead, the Company is seeking to recover the amount of variable pay compensation collected from CL&P customers paid to

individual employees that serve in functions needed by the utility operations to provide safe and reliable service to customers – and only for those functions and activities that provide a benefit to customers.

(c) The referenced performance goals pertain to the corporation and the CEO. They do not directly or generally apply across the employee base. Individual performance is guided by goals specific to a business area, which may include goals that further financial and operating functions. For example, a CL&P officer will not have individual goals from the Gas business unit.

Prior Referenced Response:

---

[i] UPA-005 Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE PAY—FUNDING POOL) Application, Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, pp. 30–35. The referenced exhibit states that the enterprise variable-pay pool is funded based on corporate financial and operational performance and provides the applicable metrics and weights. Without repeating those descriptions, provide the complete 2025 calculation showing:

a. the threshold, target, and maximum scoring or payout curve for each metric;
b. actual 2025 performance;
c. the score or performance factor assigned to each metric;
d. the resulting financial score and operational score;
e. the resulting overall pool funding percentage/factor;
f. the dollar amount of the pool at target and the actual amount funded;
g. whether the funded pool was fully distributed;
h. any amount retained, returned, forfeited, or otherwise not distributed;
i. how the funded amount was allocated among business units; and
j. how amounts available to each business unit or manager were translated into individual awards.

UPA-005 Response:

This question continues to improperly intermingle the two independent processes applicable to the Company's variable pay compensation framework, which are (1) the process to determine the annual funding pool and the Board of Trustee's determination of variable pay for the CEO; and (2) the process to determine how each individual's actual payout percentage is determined for every other employee in the business aside from the named officers. Below are data points and references to better explain and detail the process with each subsection denoted as to whether it applies to the first or second process.

(a) The threshold, target, and maximum scoring or payout curve for each metric. Each year, the Eversource Energy Board of Trustee's evaluates the corporation's performance in the prior calendar year against a set of pre-designated performance metrics and assigned ratings. Based on that evaluation, the Board of Trustee's makes a determination that variable pay compensation will be funded for the year. In addition, the Board of Trustees determines the variable pay compensation for the CEO, which is also granted on the basis of the corporation's achievement of those same pre-designated performance goals. Thus, the threshold, target and maximum ranges for each performance goal in CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, at pages 30-35, pertain exclusively to

the ***funding process*** and to the determination of variable pay for the CEO. These performance metrics and assigned ratings ***do not apply*** to any other individual employees, except for the CEO, whose compensation is determined by the Board of Trustee's Compensation Committee.

Metric	Threshold	Target	Maximum
Financial Performance (70%)			
Non-GAAP Earnings Per Share	$4.59	$4.71	$4.80
Dividend Growth	$2.97	$3.00	$3.03
Strategic Growth Initiatives			
Strategic Growth Initiatives	Regulatory filings, storm cost recovery, and strategic positioning		
Operational Performance (30%)			
Reliability Average Months Between Service Interruptions (MBI)	15 Months	21.3 Months	22 Months
Restoration System Average Restoration Duration (SAIDI)	70 Minutes	63.7 Minutes	62 Minutes
Safety Rate	1.25 Rate	0.85 Rate	0.75 Rate
Gas Emergency Response	93.0%	98.2%	99.2%
% Candidate Slate	50.0%	59.5%	65.0%
Sustainability Ranking	65.0%	87.0%	107.0%
Key Strategic Customer and Clean Energy Operational Results			
Enhance the Customer Experience	Advanced Metering Infrastructure rollout, Energy Efficiency programs, stakeholder and community engagement and data security programs		
Clean Energy Execution	Non-pipe alternatives, execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization, geothermal and decarbonization projects		

(b) through (e)

For 2025, the Board of Trustees Compensation Committee approved corporate performance at 145% of target based on the following computation:

Table 1
Targeted and Actual Performance

Threshold	**Target**	**Maximum**	**Financial**	**Payout**	**Approved**
Metric 50%	100%	200%	Results	Factor	Weighting
Financial Performance					
2025 Non-GAAP Earnings Per Share $4.59	$4.71	$4.80	$4.76	155%	60%
Dividend Growth $2.97	$3.00	$3.03	$3.01	131%	10%
3.85%	5.00%	5.94%			

Key Strategic Financial and Regulatory Results

Strategic Financial Initiatives and Regulatory Outcomes	Regulatory filings, storm cost recovery and strategic positioning				175%	30%
Operational Performance						
Reliability Average Months Between Service Interruptions (MBI)	15 Months	21.3 Months	22 Months	21.0 Months	95%	25%
Restoration System Average Restoration Duration (SAIDI)	70 Mins.	63.7 Mins.	62 Mins.	66 Mins.	63%	25%
Safety Rate	1.25 Rate	0.85 Rate	0.75 Rate	0.87 Rate	95%	8.33%
Gas Emergency Response	95%	98.2%	99.2%	98.0%	94%	8.33%
% Candidate Slate	50.0%	59.5%	65.0%	64.3%	187%	8.33%
Sustainability Index	65.0%	87.0%	107.0%	102.6%	178%	8.33%
	Key Strategic Customer and Clean Energy Operational Results					
Enhance the Customer Experience	Advanced Metering Infrastructure rollout, Energy Efficiency programs, stakeholder and community engagement and data security				165%	8.33%

	programs		
Clean Energy Execution	Non-pipe alternatives, execution of Massachusetts Grid Modernization, geothermal and decarbonization projects	160%	8.33%
Financial Performance at 159% (weighted 70%)		111%	
Operational Performance at 113% (weighted 30%)		34%	
Overall Performance	**145%**		

Subpart (b) asks for "actual 2025 performance." Table 1 provides the "actual 2025 performance" for the corporation, for the purposes of the Funding Pool decision. Table 1 does not pertain to any individual employee in the enterprise other than the CEO.

Subpart (c) asks for the "score or performance factor assigned to each metric." Table 2 provides the "score or performance factor assigned to each metric," for the corporation, for purposes of the Funding Pool decision. Table 1 does not pertain to any individual employee in the enterprise other than the CEO.

Subpart (d) asks for the "resulting financial score and operational score." Table 1 provides the "resulting financial score and operational score" for the corporation, for the purposes of the Funding Pool decision. Table 1 does not pertain to any individual employee in the enterprise other than the CEO.

Subpart (e) asks for the "resulting overall pool funding percentage/factor." Table 2 provides the "resulting overall pool funding percentage/factor" for the corporation, for the purposes of the Funding Pool decision. Table 2 does not pertain to any individual employee in the enterprise other than the CEO.

As noted in Table 2, the "overall pool funding percentage/factor" is 145%.

f. Subpart (f) of the question asks about "the dollar amount of the pool at target and the actual amount funded. Based on the overall results of the corporation against the pre-established goals, the corporation's performance was calculated as 145% of target for 2025, reflecting the Company's strong performance and the executive team's execution of the Company's Operating Plan.

The 2025 overall funding pool percentage is used to set the variable pay compensation of the CEO. The CEO's variable pay component was based on the 145% of target factor. For the other Named Executive Officers, their variable pay compensation was paid out at 145% of target, *in the aggregate,* for the group of five officers, although individuals in the group received different percentages depending on their individual performance.

Similarly, for the vice presidents, their variable pay compensation was paid out at 145% of target, *in the aggregate,* for the entire group, although individuals in the group received different percentages depending on their individual performance. The 145% performance achievement does not apply at any other level of the organization for establishing pay-outs to individual contributors.

For performance in 2025, the Chief Financial Officer established the funding pool shown below, which was above target:

2025 Variable Compensation Target	2025 Actual Variable Compensation Paid Out to Employees
$80,308,863	$101,113,911

g. Subpart (g) of the question asks whether the funded pool was fully distributed. Once the funding pool is established (at $101,113,911), all amounts were paid out across the organization because variable pay compensation is part of total employee compensation and is not used or diverted for other purposes once the pool is established. Once funded, the dollars are distributed to employees or "individual contributors" across the organization in accordance with the allocation process that is handled by the Eversource Energy Human Resource Department.

h. Subpart (h) asks whether any amount (of the funding pool) is retained, returned, forfeited, or otherwise not distributed. As answered in subpart (g), none of the variable compensation funded pool was retained, returned, forfeited or otherwise not distributed. To the contrary, each year, variable pay compensation is accrued in the operating budget for every business unit, reflecting the expectation that variable pay compensation will be paid out to employees. Generally, variable compensation is budgeted at target levels as this is the level of total compensation that the Company would expect to pay if every employee met the expectations of their job positions exactly as anticipated for the individual job position. In this case, the Company is requesting to include the target level in rates as representative of the amount of variable pay compensation that the Company will pay to employees on a year-to-year basis, although in the test year 2025, Eversource paid out greater than the target level to employees and may do so again in the future.

i. With respect to how the funded amount is allocated among business units, the process starts with a bottom-up assessment of target funding levels. For each eligible employee, Eversource multiplies the employee's base salary times the employee's variable compensation target (i.e. $100,000 times 10% = $10,000) to define the eligible variable compensation dollar target. This calculation is conducted for each eligible department of the Company to define the target dollar amount for each department.

   Once the funding pool is set, the eligible funding pool is distributed to each department on the basis of the department's employee count and the identified pay-out level associated with the funding pool approved by the CFO, correlating to the target amounts for that department.

j. With respect to how amounts available to each business unit or manager are translated into individual awards, funding pools are allocated to each department/manager through the Company's Workday Human Resources Information System (HRIS). Through this system, managers enter recommendations for grants to eligible employees in their departments, in conjunction with their performance assessments of those employees (only up to the amount of the funding pool for that department). Through the Workday system, these recommendations are rolled up to the Executive Vice President of each respective organization for review, consultation and final approval. This process was described in the Company's response to UPA-010[i].

k. All eligible individual employees or "contributors" below the six Named Executive Officers, have individual scorecards delineating the individual's performance goals for the calendar year. These individual performance goals are not designed to correlate directly or tie to the corporation's performance goals, nor are there any weightings that apply to individual employee goals. All of the corporation's goals, whether financial or operational, are part of the corporation's service mission to customers and are furthered by the efforts of our employees across the organizations. Therefore, individual goals are designed to support corporate objectives to provide safe and reliable service to customers with rigorous cost control and responsible management. The performance of each employee is reviewed by the respective manager and decisions are made within the various levels of management as to how the funding pool for that department

will be allocated among its own contributors. Employees are ranked by their level of contribution and the variable pay is paid out to employees on the basis of the contribution level assigned by management. The Company's response to OCC-201, Attachment 1, shows the allocation of variable pay compensation across the base of employee contributors.

Date Filed: October 14, 2026

Witness: Sasha P. Lazor and Marianne H. Eichler
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS) Application, Sch. C-3.7; Exs. CLP-EMPLOYEE-4A–4C. The referenced exhibits provide representative employee goal reports, executive key-initiative reports, and employee-to-executive linkages. Do not reproduce those materials. Instead, for each anonymized officer/executive whose short-term or long-term variable compensation remains included in Schedule C-3.7, after the Company's stated exclusions, provide the completed 2025 year-end performance assessment or scorecard. For each individual, identify:

a. each goal or key initiative;
b. its weight, if any;
c. target and actual performance;
d. final assessment or rating;
e. target incentive opportunity;
f. any manager, senior-management, or Compensation Committee adjustment; and
g. a calculation methodology from the completed assessment to the actual short-term and/or long-term variable-compensation amount included in Schedule C-3.7

Response:

a. Please refer to UPA-009, Attachment 1, containing the 2025 year-end performance scorecards for each anonymized officer/executive (less those previously excluded and those previously provided in Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-4B) whose variable compensation is included in Schedule C-3.7.

   Goals included on executive scorecards are tied to specific initiatives used to measure the performance of officers, executives, and departments. These scorecards do not represent a comprehensive view of an individual officer's or executive's full set of goals and responsibilities. Most goals are shared by two or more executives and/or officers, both within departments and across the organization.

c. The performance target for each milestone and goal is "C" (Complete), as indicated in Column I (milestones) and Column V (goals) of each scorecard. The final rating for each goal is indicated in Column V of each scorecard. Performance is measured using the following indicators:

- R (Red): Not Met
- Y (Yellow): Partially Met
- G (Green): On Track / Met

d. through e. Please refer to UPA-015, Attachment 1, for details both the target and actual variable compensation payout for each officer in Schedule C-3.7.

f. There is no manager, senior management, or Compensation Committee adjustment to these awards.

g. The actual variable compensation payouts are included in UPA-015, Attachment 1.

Date Filed: September 29, 2026

Witness: Sasha P. Lazor and Marianne H. Eichler
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—PAYOUT DISCRETION) Application, Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, pp. 37–38. Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-1 states that an individual variable-pay award may range from 0% to 200% of target and that supervisors exercise discretion based on individual performance. Explain the criteria, documentation, calibration process, approval hierarchy, and internal controls governing that discretion. In the response, identify:

a. who can increase or decrease an officer/executive award;
b. any limits on discretion;
c. whether ratings or awards are calibrated across managers/business units;
d. the role of senior management and the Compensation Committee;
e. required supporting documentation;
f. circumstances in which an employee can receive an award despite missing one or more stated goals; and
g. the process used to ensure consistency among similarly situated employees.

Response:

Eversource's variable pay program provides leaders with the ability to differentiate awards based on individual performance within established performance rating categories. To support the annual variable, pay process, the HR Consulting and Compensation teams develop, communicate, and administer the program, providing employees and leaders with a regular cadence of communications throughout the cycle (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 1). A comprehensive suite of resources is available on the company intranet, and training sessions are offered throughout the process: Performance Management Training (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 2), HRBP Information Sessions (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 3), and Information Sessions for Leaders. (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 4).

Annual performance reviews serve as the foundation for the calibration process and ultimately support variable pay recommendations and approvals. The calibration process is designed to promote consistency in the evaluation of similarly situated employees across each department. HR partners with department leaders to prepare for and facilitate calibration sessions, helping to ensure they are productive, effective, and aligned with established guidelines. The following resources are used: Calibration Guidelines (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 5) and Unconscious Bias (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 6).

During these discussions, leaders present information supporting their recommendations, and ratings are reviewed in detail. Where appropriate, adjustments are made to ensure consistency and fairness. Once consensus is reached, final ratings are submitted to executive leadership for review.

Each year, the Compensation department establishes and communicates variable pay award guidelines (please refer to UPA-010, Attachment 7: Compensation Cycle Guidelines). Leaders are responsible for submitting variable pay award recommendations through the HRIS system. These recommendations are subject to approval at each level of the management chain, with final approval provided by the Executive Vice President. Throughout the recommendation and approval process, HR Consulting and Compensation monitor proposed awards to ensure recommendations are within established guidelines.

Officer awards are administered through a separate process. Recommendations for officer awards are made by the Senior Vice President or Executive Vice President to whom they report. The Senior Team reviews and approves award recommendations for those officers in their overall organizations. The Board of Trustees Compensation Committee approves award recommendations for the CEO's direct reports, while the CEO's compensation is recommended by the Compensation Committee and approved by the full Board of Trustees.

Employees are evaluated annually against established performance goals as well as broader measures of overall performance and behavior. While a Successful Contributor rating generally reflects achievement of all established goals, there may be circumstances in which an employee does not fully achieve a specific goal but is nevertheless determined to have met overall performance expectations based on the totality of their contributions and performance during the evaluation period. As shown in OCC-201, Attachment 1, employees are rated along a curve, with the general expectation that the majority of employees fall into the Successful Contributor category. The variable compensation payout ranges are defined by employee performance rating, and the manager’s assessment of the individual’s performance informs the individual’s payout generally within the range. Employees who fall below Successful Contributor are expected to demonstrate improved performance over the next and subsequent review periods. Failure to demonstrate improved and sustained performance generally results in the employee being exited from the Company.

Date Filed: September 29, 2026

Witness: Sasha P. Lazor and Marianne H. Eichler
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—MARKET BENCHMARKING) Application, Schedule C-3.7; Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, pp. 7–11. The referenced exhibit provides aggregate CL&P and ESC market-median comparisons, variable-pay prevalence data, and an illustrative Accounting Supervisor market-pricing example. Provide the market study or studies, survey results, benchmarking analyses, or other materials relied upon to establish or assess the compensation for each officer/executive job or job-scope level included in Schedule C-3.7. For each such position or job-scope level, explain how the Company used the results of those materials to determine or support the Rate Year compensation reflected in Schedule C-3.7, including the compensation components benchmarked, the relevant market positioning or comparison relied upon, and any adjustments or other judgment applied in translating the benchmarking results into the Rate Year amounts. Provide the underlying survey output, analysis, or workpapers sufficient to verify the benchmarking and its application, subject to appropriate confidentiality protections.

Response:

Please refer to OCC-193, Attachments 1 through 8 CONFIDENTIAL, for the studies and/or research conducted by Willis Towers Watson on behalf of the Company from 2018 to present in the energy/utility and general industry sectors.

As described in CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, Eversource tests the competitiveness of its base pay and total compensation levels against the external market on an ongoing basis. Eversource annually reviews salary adjustments and total compensation, both current and projected, against external market trends within the energy/utility and general industry sectors to confirm that compensation levels are reasonable and competitive to the market for energy/utility and general industry roles. In addition to Eversource's substantial internal expertise on compensation matters, Eversource utilizes Willis Towers Watson and the surveys it produces based on its proprietary databases. The results of these analyses show that the Company's non-union salary adjustments and total compensation levels are closely aligned with the relevant markets. This close alignment is consistent with the Eversource compensation philosophy and the goal of offering competitive compensation to attract and retain highly skilled employees to work in concert across the entire organization to provide customers with continued safe and reliable service.

Date Filed: October 02, 2026

Witness: Sasha P. Lazor and Marianne H. Eichler
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—RECRUITMENT, RETENTION) Application, Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, pp. 7–13. The Company states that variable pay is necessary to remain competitive and that, without variable pay, base salaries would have to be higher. Without repeating the Towers Watson prevalence statistics, competitor job postings, or aggregate market-median comparisons already filed, provide Company-specific evidence supporting those assertions for the CL&P workforce and, separately, for officers/executives included in Schedule C-3.7. Include, for 2021-2025 where available:

a. voluntary turnover;
b. officer/executive turnover;
c. vacancy duration;
d. offer acceptance rates;
e. declined offers attributed to compensation;
f. exit-interview or other evidence identifying compensation as a factor; and
g. any analysis quantifying the increase in base salary or other compensation that the Company estimates would be required if short-term or long-term variable compensation were reduced or not recovered in rates.

Response:

Eversource operates in an increasingly competitive labor market where attracting, retaining and motivating qualified employees is critical to fulfilling the Company's mission of delivering safe and reliable service to its customers. The recruitment and workforce data shared in this response demonstrates that maintaining a market-competitive total compensation program, including variable pay opportunities, is essential to securing the talent needed to meet operational and customer demands.

The need for a competitive total rewards package is important for many reasons, particularly given the relatively high cost of living across Connecticut and throughout Eversource's service territory. To attract talent from outside the region and retain employees within it, Eversource must offer compensation that not only compares favorably to the cost of living but also compares favorably with alternative employment opportunities. Variable compensation is an important component of this strategy, reinforcing the overall value proposition and helping the Company remain competitive in the labor market.

Eversource fills a substantial number of positions each year through both external hiring and internal movement, reflecting the importance of attracting new talent while also retaining and developing existing employees. Despite sustained recruiting efforts, positions currently take approximately three months to fill, on average. Certain critical roles, particularly those requiring specialized technical expertise, are very difficult to staff and often remain vacant for six months to a year due to a limited supply of qualified candidates and increasing competition from utility employers both within and outside the region, as well as general industry employers.

Employee turnover has normalized following the elevated levels experienced during the "Great Resignation" in 2021 and 2022, however, retention remains a critical workforce priority due to the cost and delay of having to fill open positions. The combination of prolonged hiring timelines, a constrained talent market, and ongoing competition for skilled workers increases the importance of maintaining a competitive compensation program.

Compensation remains a key factor in employment decisions. Company recruiting data show that, on average, compensation is the leading reason candidates decline employment offers, accounting for approximately 18% to 26% of declined offers, depending on the year. In addition, when candidates accept an offer, and later withdraw or choose a competing opportunity, compensation is frequently a contributing factor. Similarly, inadequate compensation – most notably related to the requirement to work on storm duty -- is frequently cited in employee exit interviews as a reason for voluntary separation**.** Although Eversource maintains relatively strong offer acceptance rates**,** the data demonstrates that total compensation, including variable pay, plays a vital role in both candidate decision-making and employee retention.

Compensation studies indicate that absent annual incentive and long-term incentive opportunities, Eversource would need to increase base salaries by approximately the value of target variable pay awards simply to maintain market competitiveness. Even then, replacing performance-based compensation with guaranteed salary would not provide comparable alignment between employee rewards, Company performance and customer outcomes. Employees respond to financial incentives, and financial incentives that are tied to performance have a direct benefit for the Company’s customers.

In that regard, variable pay is a standard and widely used market practice that reinforces accountability, encourages high performance and motivates employees to achieve operational, financial, safety, and customer service objectives. As such, it serves not only as a compensation mechanism but also as a tool for driving workforce performance and supporting the Company's goals in these areas.

Eliminating variable pay would diminish the competitiveness of Eversource's total rewards package relative to other employers competing for the same talent. Prospective and current employees evaluate employment opportunities based on total compensation, not base salary alone. As a result, removing variable pay opportunities would make recruiting more difficult,

significantly increasing compensation-related offer declines, and reduce employee retention, unless and until the variable pay that is removed is replaced by other compensation; namely, higher base salaries.

These impacts would present meaningful operational risks. Longer vacancies in critical positions and increased voluntary turnover among experienced employees would negatively impact business operations, increase training and replacement costs, and reduce institutional knowledge. For functions that directly support electric operations and customer service, workforce shortages could impair the Company's ability to execute work efficiently, respond to customer needs, and maintain the level of service expected by customers and regulators.

For these reasons, variable pay is clearly a fundamental component of a market-competitive total rewards program rather than a discretionary or supplemental benefit. The Company's ability to attract, retain, and motivate qualified employees depends on maintaining a compensation package that is competitive with the broader labor market. Eliminating variable pay would weaken Eversource's competitive position, increase turnover and recruitment challenges, and ultimately impair the Company's ability to deliver safe, reliable, and responsive service to customers.

a. Refer to UPA-012, Attachment 1, Tables 1 and 2, for voluntary turnover, excluding turnover due to retirement, for both CL&P and the Service Company.

b. Refer to UPA-012, Attachment 1, Table 3, for Officer/executive voluntary turnover, excluding turnover due to retirement. Please note that there was no voluntary officer/executive turnover in CL&P for the same time period.

c. Refer to UPA-012, Attachment 1, Table 4, for average vacancy duration since the Company began tracking this metric in 2023. Please note, vacancy duration is expressed as “time to fill”.

d. Refer to UPA-012, Attachment 1, Table 5, for offer acceptance rates. It should be noted that the Company’s overall average of 85% is aligned with industry best practices.

e. Refer to UPA-012, Attachment 2, which summarizes the reasons candidates declined employment offers. Beginning in 2023, Eversource enhanced its procedures to capture more specific reasons for offer declines. The percentages reflected in the chart represent the four most frequently cited reasons and, therefore, do not total 100% of all declined offers. It is also important to note that compensation may have been a contributing factor in candidates' decisions across each category. However, the reason identified in the chart reflects the primary factor cited by the candidate when declining the offer.

   Refer to UPA-012, Attachment 3, for exit survey data by reported reason, by year. Please note that, in 2024, Eversource revised and expanded the exit interview questions to better

understand employees' reasons for leaving. UPA-012, Attachment 4, provides a sampling of narrative comments from exit surveys.

f. Please see introductory statements above.

g. As noted above, the Company views the elimination of the variable pay component to essentially require a $1 for $1 increase in base salaries by approximately the value of target variable pay awards simply to maintain market competitiveness, if short-term or long-term variable compensation were reduced or not recovered in rates.

The issue is that the Company must pay employees at a level that is comparable to the market based on total compensation, which includes variable pay. Historically, PURA consistently allowed a sufficient portion of variable pay into rates to enable continuation of the program. However, PURA's recent decisions have *zeroed out* recovery of variable pay compensation. If PURA's firm policy is going to be that variable pay cannot be recovered in any proportion in customer rates, then the Company will need to change its compensation policy to better comport with PURA's ratemaking policies for employee compensation.

Date Filed: October 16, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien, Garrett J. Murray and Danielle Munson
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—ACCOUNTING, CAPITALIZATION AND ACCOUNTS) Application, Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-1, p. 36. The referenced exhibit explains that non-executive variable compensation is capitalized using a ratio derived from capitalized non-executive base pay, and Schedule WP C-3.6 separately identifies capitalized employee variable compensation. Explain the accounting treatment for officer short-term and long-term variable compensation in Schedule C-3.7. Specifically:

a. identify all FERC Uniform System of Accounts and general-ledger accounts charged;
b. state whether officer base salary is ever capitalized;
c. state whether any officer short-term or long-term variable compensation is capitalized;
d. if not, explain why the treatment differs from non-executive variable compensation;
e. identify the amount expensed and capitalized in the Test Year, pro forma, and Rate Year; and
f. provide the accounting policy, workpaper, or other support for the treatment.

Response:

a. With respect to the accounting treatment for officer short-term and long-term variable compensation in Schedule C-3.7, CL&P follows the FERC Uniform System of Accounts ("USofA") and charges FERC Account 920 (Administrative and General Salaries) and general-ledger account 920000.

b. With respect to an officer's base salary, the only portion that is capitalized is when it relates to certain Vice Presidents ("VPs") whose timesheets charge Engineering & Supervision ("E&S") work orders. The E&S work orders are selected by certain VPs who actively support construction activities directly related to capital projects, which are not readily identified to a specific capital project work order. Having these VPs direct charge specific capital project work orders on a daily basis becomes impracticable to decipher for timesheet reporting purposes because of the extensive number of capital projects they support. Therefore, the E&S work order allows for a more practical, effective, and expedient timesheet reporting mechanism for certain VP's to capture their time appropriately. E&S is not ascribed to individual capital projects on a discrete, quantifiable basis for individual projects or programs. The labor and labor-related costs associated with the E&S function are ascribable to all eligible capital projects and are pooled into closing accounts that are then applied on an aggregated basis to active workorders on a month-to-month basis as a "clearing rate."

The E&S overhead "pool" captures costs incurred in support of the Company's construction activities that are not readily identified to a specific capital project work order. The nature of these costs includes labor costs/payroll and associated overheads. Such classification is required under the FERC Uniform System of Accounts ("USoA"), which states: "Engineering and supervision includes the portion of the pay and expenses of engineers, surveyors, draftsmen, inspectors, superintendents and their assistants applicable to construction work." Thus, the types of charges included in FERC Account 107ES0 (Construction Work in Progress) are employee labor and external vendor labor costs that support capital project construction activities through engineering and supervisory functions.

Once a capital project is placed in service in FERC Account 101 (Electric Plant in Service), the E&S costs are classified to property units in the same manner as all other capital charges on the project work orders. With the assistance of project managers and engineers, Plant Accounting determines what percentage of the total project each property unit represents. All capital charges to the project work orders, including E&S charges, are ascribed to the installed property units based on these percentages. An officer's base salary is not discernible as a line item through this process.

c. With respect to an officer's short-term or long-term variable compensation, all officer short-term and long-term variable compensation is charged to FERC Account 920 and general-ledger account 920000.

d. Under Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and the FERC USofA, the Company is allowed to capitalize all payroll costs, including cash or stock-based incentive compensation paid to employees who are directly associated with, or who devote their time to, capital projects and construction activities. Therefore, variable compensation is capitalizable when it meets the capitalization criteria, similar to base salary. Saying that, the Company does not directly capitalize officer short-term and long-term variable compensation in the normal course of business. Please refer to part e. below for additional information regarding the Administrative, Support and Engineering (AS&E) loader.

e. Please refer to Schedule WP C-3.6 (Employee Variable Compensation) for the amounts expensed and capitalized in the Test Year, pro forma, and Rate Year. Please note the amounts in Schedule WP C-3.7 (Officer Variable Compensation) are directly charged to expense as the Company does not directly capitalize officer variable compensation as noted in part d. of this response. The only portion of officer variable compensation that is capitalized is reflected in Schedule WP C-3.7 as the Administrative, Support and Engineering (AS&E) loader, which is an indirect cost allocation factor that provides for the capitalization of essential centralized back-office and support services that are recorded to and appropriately includible in FERC Account 920 (Administrative and General Salaries).

f. Please refer to EOE-060, Attachment 3, for the Company's Accounting Policy Statement on Capital vs. Expense Criteria.

Date Filed: September 29, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—ADJUSTMENTS AND RECONCILIATION) Application, Sch. WP C-3.7, rows 21–27, and notes (a) and (b). Provide the detailed calculation supporting each pro forma adjustment, including:

a. the $(737,000) CL&P short-term adjustment, separately identifying amounts removed for the CEO, CFO, and CL&P President and any other component;
b. the $367,000 ESC short-term adjustment, including the calculation methodology used for the $1.157 million Test Year amount, removal of the 2024 true-up paid in 2025, inclusion of the 2025 payout paid in 2026, and the resulting $1.524 million pro forma amount; and
c. the $(2.587) million ESC long-term adjustment, separately identifying the amount removed for each of the five named executive officers and the CL&P President. Provide the underlying source data and formulas.

Response:

For subpart a. and c., please refer to the table below for the detailed calculation supporting the short-term and long-term variable adjustments.

ESC and CL&P Officer Variable Compensation Pro Forma Adjustments

Officers	Short-Term Variable	Long-Term Variable
Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer	$ (437,717)	$ (1,204,360)
Executive Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer	(135,953)	(479,870)
Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer	-	(291,888)
Executive Vice President and General Counsel	-	(189,570)
Executive Vice President, Corporate Relations and Sustainability, and Corporate Secretary	-	(133,163)
President, CL&P	(163,271)	(287,740)
Pro Forma Adjustments	**$ (736,941)**	**$ (2,586,591)**

For subpart b., please see the table below for the detail calculation showing the corrected roll-forward from the Test Year to the Pro Forma Test Year ESC Short-Term Variable Compensation. The Company notes the costs were inadvertently presented incorrectly between the ESC and CL&P, however there is no change to the total Officer Variable Compensation Test Year Pro Forma or Rate Year amounts. Please refer to UPA-014, Attachment ,1 for a revised Exhibit CLP-

REVREQ-2, WP C-3.7, showcasing the correct Short-Term and Long-Term Variable components for ESC and CL&P.

ESC Short-Term Officer Variable Compensation

	Description	Short-Term Variable
1	Test Year ESC Short-Term Variable Cost	$ 2,387,703
2		
3	Removal of 2024 Payout True-up	1,663,961
4	Inclusion of 2025 Payout True-up	1,292,465
5	Pro Forma Adjustment (Line 3 - Line 4)	371,496
6		
7	Removal of CEO, CFO, & CL&P President	(736,941)
8		
9	Test Year Pro Forma Short-Term Variable Cost (Line 1 + Line 5 + Line 7)	$ 2,022,258

Date Filed: October 02, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien, Garrett J. Murray and Sasha P. Lazor
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—RESIDUAL LONG-TERM OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION) Application, Sch. WP C-3.7. After the exclusions described in Schedule WP C-3.7, the Rate Year still includes long-term officer variable compensation. For each anonymized recipient of the remaining long-term compensation, provide:

a. title and employing entity;
b. award type or instrument;
c. grant date;
d. performance and vesting period;
e. target and actual award;
f. performance or vesting metrics and weights;
g. accounting expense recognized in the Test Year, pro forma, and Rate Year;
h. amount allocated or charged to CL&P; and
i. an explanation of how the award and its performance metrics benefit CL&P customers. Identify whether any metric is based on total shareholder return, stock price, EPS, dividend growth, net income, return measures, relative market performance, regulatory outcomes, or another financial measure.

Response:

a. The population in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Schedule C-3.7 represents the officer at the Vice President level and above as of December 31, 2025 for whom a portion of their compensation is charged to the Company. Please see UPA-015, Attachment 1, which provides a reconciliation by officer for the Test Year, Test Year Pro-Forma and Rate Year. As shown in Attachment 1 columns (D) and (E) the Test Year expense consists of the accounting accrual of short-term and long-term variable compensation (see rows 11 through 79). The Company made pro-forma adjustments to (1) remove both the short-term and long-term variable compensation associated with the CEO, CFO and CL&P President (see row 82); (2) remove the long-term variable compensation associated with other named executive officers (see row 83); and (3) remove the 2024 true-up recorded in 2025 and add the 2025 true-up recorded in 2026 (see rows 84 and 85). Lastly, the Company made Rate Year adjustments to reflect the known merit increases of 3 percent for the period January 1, 2026 through June 30, 2028.

In summary, after these adjustments, the Company's proposed cost of service in this proceeding includes executive (i.e., those at the level of Vice President and above, excluding those components referenced above and removed on lines 82 and 83) variable compensation charged to CL&P as earned in the Test Year, 2025, based on the payouts associated with that performance year, as adjusted to Rate Year levels.

The Company recognizes that the variable compensation accruals and payouts vary from year to year and may be more (or less) than target levels. For instance, as shown in UPA 15, Attachment 1, the amount of cash variable compensation accrued in the Test Year, and which serves as the basis for Rate Year amounts is above target levels (see, e.g., Column D as compared to Column F). Conversely, the Test Year accrual for LTI variable compensation is below target (see, e.g., Column H as compared to Column E). The Company's experience in Massachusetts is to reflect the amount of variable cash incentive at target levels, rather than at accrued amounts. As shown in Attachment 1, using the target short-term and long-term variable compensation, the Company's Rate Year amounts would be $1.571 million and $1.913 million respectively as compared to $2.438 million and $1.331 million.

b. Long-term officer variable compensation awards is recognized over a three-year vesting period in the form of two vehicles:

    1. Restricted Share Units ("RSUs") vest by one-third typically on the 1st of February in each of the three years following the calendar year of the grant.

    2. Performance Shares ("PSUs") vest at the end of the three-year performance period (December 31st).

    3. The Company recognizes compensation expense in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP"), specifically Accounting Standards Codification 718, *Compensation - Stock Compensation*

c. Please refer to the table below for the long-term officer variable compensation grant date and payment dates for the last three plan years:

Long-Term Variable Compensation Awards

Officer RSUs:	Award - Grant Date	Payment - Distribution Date
2023-2025 Plan	2/1/2023	Year 1: 2/12/2024 Year 2: 2/18/2025 Year 3: 2/12/2026
2024-2026 Plan	1/31/2024	Year 1: 2/18/2025 Year 2: 2/12/2026 Year 3: 2/18/2027
2025-2027 Plan	1/29/2025	Year 1: 2/12/2026 Year 2: 2/18/2027 Year 3: 2/17/2028

Officer PSUs:	Award - Grant Date	Payment - Distribution Date
2023-2025 Plan	2/1/2023	2/12/2026
2024-2026 Plan	1/31/2024	2/18/2027
2025-2027 Plan	1/29/2025	2/17/2028

d. Please refer to subpart (c) for payment dates.

e. Please refer to UPA-015, Attachment 1, for the CL&P-related component for target and actual awards.

f. Long-term officer variable compensation is awarded with the following weights:

   1. 75% of the grant in the form of PSUs

   2. 25% of the grant in the form of RSUs.

g. Please refer to UPA-015, Attachment 1.

h. Please refer to UPA-015, Attachment 1.

i. Variable compensation is comprised of short-term and long-term incentives that pay out based on the performance of the individual employee. Long-term incentives are based on the metrics shown below, which are appropriate given that customers benefit from lower operating costs, lower capital costs and other areas of good fiscal management, which are the outcomes that are promoted through this compensation.

Long-Term Incentive Program Performance Share Potential Payout

Three-Year Average EPS Growth	Three-Year Relative Total Shareholder Return Percentiles									
	Below 10th	20th	30th	40th	50th	60th	70th	80th	90th	Above 90th
10.0%	100%	110%	130%	140%	150%	160%	170%	180%	190%	200%
9.0%	90%	100%	120%	130%	140%	150%	160%	170%	180%	190%
8.0%	80%	90%	110%	120%	130%	140%	150%	160%	170%	180%
7.0%	70%	80%	100%	110%	120%	130%	140%	150%	160%	170%
6.0%	60%	70%	90%	100%	110%	120%	130%	140%	150%	160%
5.0%	40%	60%	80%	90%	100%	110%	120%	130%	140%	150%
4.0%	30%	40%	60%	80%	90%	100%	110%	120%	130%	140%
3.0%	—	20%	40%	70%	80%	90%	100%	110%	120%	130%
2.0%	—	—	20%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%	110%	120%
1.0%	—	—	—	30%	50%	60%	70%	80%	100%	110%
0.0%	—	—	—	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
Below 0%	—	—	—	—	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%

Date Filed: September 29, 2026

Witness: Sasha P. Lazor, Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—RATE YEAR ESCALATION OF VARIABLE COMPENSATION) Application, Schs.C-3.6, and C-3.7. Provide the formula, dates, assumptions, and source data used to calculate the Rate Year adjustments in Schedules C-3.6, and C-3.7. For Schedule C-3.7, specifically, explain the increase from the $3.501 million Test Year Pro Forma amount to the $3.769 million Rate Year amount, including the separate calculations for CL&P short-term, ESC short-term, CL&P long-term, and ESC long-term compensation. Confirm whether the calculation applies the Company's 3% annual compensation escalation for approximately 2.5 years; if not, provide the actual methodology. Explain why an escalation based on base-pay merit assumptions is appropriate for variable compensation that also depends on pool funding and individual performance.

Response:

Please refer to UPA-016, Attachment 1, for the excel file with formulas to calculate the Officer Variable Compensation Rate Year Adjustments showing the increase from the $3.501 million to the $3.769 million. The Company's notes this response is based on updated Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, WP C-3.7, showing the corrected short-term and long-term variable compensation provided in UPA-014.

The Company confirms the use of the 3% annual merit escalation from the Test Year through to the Rate Year. There are two separate and distinct issue to address in this answer. First, target variable compensation is calculated as a multiple of base salary. A 3% merit increase, for example, carries to target variable compensation. Secondly, the payout of variable compensation is a separate calculation that is aligned with both the pool funding and individual performance. This approach aligns compensation with performance and ensures that variable pay targets reflect current base salary levels.

Date Filed: October 13, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien, Garrett J. Murray and Danielle Munson
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—ESC OFFICER COMPENSATION ALLOCATED OR CHARGED TO CL&P) Application, Sch. C-3.7. Provide the complete support for the ESC officer variable compensation included in Schedule C-3.7 and charged or allocated to CL&P. For each anonymized officer, executive, or cost center, identify:

a. the Test Year, pro forma, and Rate Year amount;
b. whether the charge is direct or allocated;
c. the allocation factor;
d. the numerator and denominator used to calculate the factor;
e. the percentage and amount charged to CL&P;
f. the percentage and amount allocated or charged to each Eversource Energy operating company or other affiliate receiving a portion of the officer's variable compensation, such that the allocations identified in response to parts e. and f. reconcile to 100% of the applicable compensation amount; and
g. the justification for the allocation methodology

Response:

a. Please refer to UPA-017, Attachment 1, for the anonymized Test Year and Test Year pro forma amount of variable compensation by cost center. The Rate Year amount is not calculated by individual cost center or officer. In an effort to be responsive the Rate Year in Attachment 1, is presented by applying the Rate Year adjustment pro rata to the Test Year pro forma amount by cost center.

b. Please refer to UPA-017, Attachment 1, for the amount charged directly and amount allocated by cost center.

c. Please refer to UPA-017, Attachment 1, for the amount charged to each EESCO rate code for allocated costs.

d. The Company will supplement this response with the information requested as soon as practicable.

e. Please refer to UPA-017, Attachment 2.

f. Please refer to UPA-017, Attachment 2.

g. Officer incentives are charged to each Eversource subsidiary in proportion to the amount of labor charged to the subsidiaries by the officers.

Date Filed: October 08, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien, Garrett J. Murray and Sasha P. Lazor
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION) Application, Schs. C-3.5, C-3.6, and C-3.7. Provide a crosswalk showing how the employee population and payroll dollars in Schedule C-3.5 map to Schedules C-3.6 and C-3.7 for the Test Year, pro forma, and Rate Year. Identify:

a. which employees in Schedule C-3.5 are eligible for variable compensation;
b. which are included in Schedule C-3.6;
c. which are included in Schedule C-3.7;
d. any employees or costs included in more than one schedule;
e. the effect of the incremental full-time employees (FTEs) included in Schedule WP C-3.5 on the amount included in the Rate Year in Schedules C-3.6 and C-3.7; and
f. the portion of each Rate Year variable-compensation adjustment attributable to payroll growth, incremental FTEs, changes in target incentive opportunity, expected pool funding, capitalization, or other factors.

Response:

a. As noted in the Company's response to UPA-004[i], for the Service Company 100% of Non-Union employees and 100% of Windsor Call Center Union employees are eligible; and, for CL&P 100% of Non-Union employees and certain Union employees are eligible for variable compensation.

b. All eligible employees, Director-level and below, that received variable payment in March 2026 are included in Schedule C-3.6 Employee Variable Compensation.

c. All officers of the Service Company and CL&P, Vice-President and above, are included in Schedule C-3.7 Officer Variable Compensation. The Company removed the CEO, CFO and CL&P President Short-Term Variable Compensation and Long-Term Variable compensation and the named executive officers and CL&P President's Long-term Variable Compensation from Schedule C-3.7.

d. For an employee's total cash compensation (base salary and annual variable compensation) for Director-level and below the employee's base salary is reflected in Schedule C-3.5 (Payroll Expense) and the variable compensation is in Schedule C-3.6 (Employee Variable Compensation). For Officers' base salary and variable compensation (Short-Term and

Long-Term), it is reflected in Schedule C-3.5 (Payroll Expense) and Schedule C-3.7 (Officer Variable Compensation), respectively. The Company notes the base salary for the CEO, CFO, and CL&P President was removed from Schedule C-3.5 and the Officer variable compensation has been adjusted as discussed in the Company's response to UPA-014[ii].

e. Incremental full-time employees (FTEs) base salaries are included in Schedule C-3.5 as a Rate Year adjustment for six months of 2028. To account for the incremental FTEs shown in Schedule C-3.6, a prorated change in payroll between the Rate Year and the Test Year Pro Forma amounts is used to determine the percentage increase for 2028 that is incorporated in the Rate Year adjustment in Schedule C-3.6. No incremental FTEs are included in Schedule C-3.7.

f. The Company interprets "payroll growth" to mean merit increases through the Rate Year. Please refer to the table below for the attributes that relate to the Rate Year Adjustments for Schedule C-3.6 and Schedule C-3.7 for employee and officer variable compensation, respectively.

(Dollars in Thousands)	Payroll Growth	Incremental FTEs	Capitalization	Rate Year Adjustments
Schedule C-3.6 Employee Variable	$2,184	$33	($601)	$1,616
Schedule C-3.7 Officer Variable	268	0	0	268

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] UPA-004 Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE PAY—ELIGIBILITY AND PARTICIPATION) Application, Schs.C-3.6 and C-3.7; Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-3. For the Test Year, provide the number and percentage of CL&P and ESC employees supporting CL&P who were eligible for variable compensation and the number and percentage who actually received variable compensation. Provide the response separately for:

a. officers/executives;
b. management employees;
c. non-management employees;
d. union employees, if applicable; and
e. non-union employees.

For the Rate Year, provide the number and percentage assumed eligible in each category and explain any change from the Test Year. Reconcile the Test Year counts to the populations shown in Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-3 and to the employee/officer populations underlying Schedules C-3.6 and C-3.7.

UPA-004 Response:

Please refer to UPA-004, Attachment 1, for the response to subparts (a) through (e). Please note that a critical datapoint is excluded from this question, which is the percent of total variable pay realized by the employee based on their performance. The competitive nature of the variable pay program is reflected not in the number of employees that received variable pay, but rather in the percent of the total possible payment that the employee could have received. The Company provided this information in response to OCC-201, Attachment 1.

With respect to the Rate Year, the number of CL&P employees, and the number of service company employees supporting CL&P in each category was assumed to remain the same with the exception that the Rate Year also proposes 41 new FTEs, as noted in the Company's response to OCC-333i. Each of the proposed 41 new FTEs would be eligible for variable pay, thereby increasing the proposed total eligible ESC Non-Union employees to 2974 from 2954 and proposed eligible CL&P Non-Union employees to 329 from 308.

[ii] UPA-014 Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—ADJUSTMENTS AND RECONCILIATION) Application, Sch. WP C-3.7, rows 21–27, and notes (a) and (b). Provide the detailed calculation supporting each pro forma adjustment, including:

a. the $(737,000) CL&P short-term adjustment, separately identifying amounts removed for the CEO, CFO, and CL&P President and any other component;
b. the $367,000 ESC short-term adjustment, including the calculation methodology used for the $1.157 million Test Year amount, removal of the 2024 true-up paid in 2025, inclusion of the 2025 payout paid in 2026, and the resulting $1.524 million pro forma amount; and
c. the $(2.587) million ESC long-term adjustment, separately identifying the amount removed for each of the five named executive officers and the CL&P President. Provide the underlying source data and formulas.

UPA-014 Response:

For subpart a. and c., please refer to the table below for the detailed calculation supporting the short-term and long-term variable adjustments.

ESC and CL&P Officer Variable Compensation Pro Forma Adjustments

Officers	Short-Term Variable	Long-Term Variable
Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer	$ (437,717)	$ (1,204,360)
Executive Vice President, Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer	(135,953)	(479,870)
Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer	-	(291,888)
Executive Vice President and General Counsel	-	(189,570)
Executive Vice President, Corporate Relations and Sustainability, and Corporate Secretary	-	(133,163)
President, CL&P	(163,271)	(287,740)
Pro Forma Adjustments	**$ (736,941)**	**$ (2,586,591)**

For subpart b., please see the table below for the detail calculation showing the corrected roll-forward from the Test Year to the Pro Forma Test Year ESC Short-Term Variable Compensation. The Company notes the costs were inadvertently presented incorrectly between the ESC and CL&P, however there is no change to the total Officer

Variable Compensation Test Year Pro Forma or Rate Year amounts. Please refer to UPA-014, Attachment 1, for a revised Exhibit CLP- REVREQ-2, WP C-3.7, showcasing the correct Short-Term and Long-Term Variable components for ESC and CL&P.

ESC Short-Term Officer Variable Compensation

	Description	Short-Term Variable
1	Test Year ESC Short-Term Variable Cost	$ 2,387,703
2		
3	Removal of 2024 Payout True-up	1,663,961
4	Inclusion of 2025 Payout True-up	1,292,465
5	Pro Forma Adjustment (Line 3 - Line 4)	371,496
6		
7	Removal of CEO, CFO, & CL&P President	(736,941)
8		
9	Test Year Pro Forma Short-Term Variable Cost (Line 1 + Line 5 + Line 7)	$ 2,022,258

Date Filed: October 02, 2026

Witness: Sasha P. Lazor
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

(OFFICER VARIABLE COMPENSATION—REGULATORY-OUTCOME AND RATE-RECOVERY GOALSIN EXECUTIVE INCENTIVES) Application, Ex. CLP-EMPLOYEE-4B. The referenced exhibit includes executive initiatives involving, among other matters, preparation and support of rate cases to achieve a "positive regulatory outcome," storm-cost recovery, rate recovery, and a Connecticut "Regulatory Balance Tour" to re-establish a "balanced regulatory environment." Identify each officer/executive whose compensation is included in Schedule C-3.7 and whose 2025 performance assessment or variable-compensation award was affected by any initiative involving regulatory outcomes, rate recovery, storm-cost recovery, or similar objectives. For each such individual:

a. identify the initiative;
b. state its weight or significance in the performance assessment;
c. state the actual assessment/result;
d. quantify its effect, if any, on the performance rating or payout; and
e. explain why recovery from CL&P ratepayers of compensation tied to that objective is reasonable and necessary and how the objective provides a benefit to those ratepayers.

Response:

(a) Please note that the relevant officer titles are listed in Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-4B, designated as "Responsible." The vice president designated in each sample is responsible for setting staff in that functional area on a course to achieve the identified outcomes, all of which are beneficial to customers. CL&P is a pervasively regulated utility and every "outcome" that the Company achieves is tied to the customer interest within the context of a regulatory policy, initiative, or requirement designed to serve the interests of customers. It is hard to conceive how the Company would establish a performance-based framework for internal operations that *did not include* numerous initiatives to comply with, or further, regulatory objectives.

For example, a performance objective that is to "support [a] rate process to achieve a successful outcome," a group of employees will have the role of participating in a rate case filing with a "successful" outcome including preparing and filing discovery in a manner that is timely and informative to the other parties representing customers and promoting goodwill among the parties and the regulator and managing the case in a manner that

demonstrates that the Company is a responsible contributor in the context of that proceeding. A "successful" outcome would also include obtaining a revenue increase that sufficiently covers the cost of service to potentially obviate the need for a second, sequential filing, while enabling needed investment on the system for the benefit of customers. In fact, the interests of customers and the Company are ***not*** diametrically opposed when it comes to regulatory proceedings, outcomes or initiatives, as the question appears to suggest. The Company rejects the proposition that any successful outcome for the Company is bad for customers. The Company is fully committed to meeting the expectations of customers and state leadership in relation to the level of service that customers expect and require. However, for the Company to fulfill that role efficiently and effectively, a fair and reasonable regulatory process must exist and regulatory outcomes must support those objectives. This should be a system that all works together to serve the common interest that regulators and the Company have providing essential services to customers in an efficient and affordable manner.

(b) At the individual employee level, there is no "weighting" attached to individual performance goals.

(c) The performance objectives are used to evaluate the employee's overall effort, commitment and personal contribution to objectives, rather than the specific achievement of the objective. In most cases, no one individual would be able to produce the results implied by the applicable performance objectives without contributions from other employees. Therefore, it is the employee's contribution to the objective that is evaluated for purposes of variable pay compensation.

(d) There is no "quantification" that applies to each of the stated objectives, nor that is tied to the employee's pay-out. The employee's pay-out is based on a holistic assessment of the level of contribution to the team's objectives and the relative merits of that assessment compared to other employees in the business unit.

(e) Each and every performance objective listed in Exhibit CLP-EMPLOYEE-4B has a direct benefit for customers because each objective is designed to promote the efficient, effective and productive performance of a regulated public utility that has a core obligation to provide safe, reliable and affordable service to customers. The Company spends a significant amount of time in a year to the development of meaningful performance parameters that will produce benefits for customers, particularly when accomplished as a whole across the employee base.