STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

July 28, 2026
In reply, please refer to:
Docket No. 26-05-10
Motion No. 9

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

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

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

Dear Attorneys Pace, Crisp, Bidra, and Tisler:

On July 14, 2026, The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy (Company) submitted a motion (Motion No. 9) to the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (Authority or PURA). In Motion No. 9, the Company requests that the Authority approve a "reasonable timeframe" to comply with the Authority's July 10, 2026 Procedural Order Regarding Protected Materials (Procedural Order), which prohibits the submission of bulk filings confidentially without a redacted version submitted publicly. Motion No. 9, p. 1; Procedural Order, p. 2. Specifically, the Company requests that the Authority approve the Company's proposed schedule (Proposed Redaction Schedule) shown in Table 1, below, for submission of the redacted versions of the Company's confidential bulk filings. Motion No. 9, p. 4. On July 15, 2026, the Office of Consumer Counsel (OCC) and PURA's Office of Education, Outreach, and Enforcement (EOE) jointly submitted a comment (State Parties Comment) on Motion No. 9.

Table 1: Company Proposed Redaction Schedule

Document Type	Company Proposed Deadline
Ex. CLP-ENV-3(A) (Environ. Remed. Invoices)	August 14, 2026
Ex. CLP-REVREQ-4(A) (Make Ready Invoices)	August 30, 2026
Ex. CLP-ACCT-2(A) (Storm Invoices)	September 15, 2026
Ex. CLP-ADDITIONS-6 (Capital Project Documentation)	October 1, 2026

Motion No. 9, p. 4.

The Company contends it did not timely redact its confidential bulk filings because it reasonably relied on prior PURA rulings that held it did not need to file publicly redacted

versions. Id., p. 5. The Company requests additional time to submit redacted versions of its confidential bulk filings because it cannot use an automated redaction service to complete the redactions due to the nature of the documents and information that is subject to redaction. Id., p. 2. As such, the Company needs to manually redact the filings, which it asserts is a "very significant effort to undertake at this late date." Id.

The Company contends its Proposed Redaction Schedule is reasonable to comply with the Procedural Order. First, the Authority and OCC have access to the confidential bulk filings as the Company submitted the filings when it submitted its rate amendment application on July 14, 2026. Motion No. 9, p. 4. Second, the Company's proposed redaction deadlines will occur "well before" the expected date for the evidentiary hearings. Id. Third, if a party or an intervenor requires a redacted version of a confidential filing earlier, the Company will "attempt to reasonably accommodate their needs." Id., p. 5. As such, the Company requests that the Authority approve the Company's Proposed Redaction Schedule. Id.

OCC and EOE assert that the Company's "lack of clarity regarding what specific information Eversource is requesting to be protected" impacts not only the evidentiary hearings, but discovery too. State Parties Comment, p. 1. Specifically, until the Company submits redacted versions of the confidential bulk filings, OCC and EOE contend that parties and intervenors propounding interrogatories are required to use their best judgment regarding what information they may include in the public version of interrogatories. Id. As such, if the Authority approves the Company's Proposed Redaction Schedule, OCC and EOE will redact only the rates charged by outside and third-party vendors; they will not redact any other information. Id.

The Authority is not convinced the Company's Proposed Redaction Schedule is reasonable. As such, the Authority declines to approve the Proposed Redaction Schedule. Instead, the Authority will establish a filing deadline for the redacted versions of the Company's confidential bulk filings after hearing from the Company, non-Company parties, and intervenors at the scheduling conference.

By the following commissioner,[1]



Thomas H. Wiehl
Chairman

cc: Service List

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