Date Filed: October 01, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-022.) The response provided only the proposed Rate Year legal-function compensation of $4.940 million and a confidential attachment limited to 2025. Provide the information the interrogatory called for: for each calendar year 2018 through 2025 and the Test Year, (a) the total annual cost of the internal legal function — stated separately for compensation, benefits, occupancy, technology, library/research services, and allocated overheads— and (b) the amount of that cost charged or allocated to the Company each year; (c) the FERC account(s) in which the allocated amounts are recorded; and (d) for the Rate Year, the non-compensation components of the legal-function cost included in the revenue requirement, with the schedule and line for each.

Response:

The Company's response to ALLCO-022[i] provided the legal function compensation for each year 2021 through 2025, filed as confidentially in ALLCO-022, Attachment 1, and adequately addressed subparts (b) and (c), and the FERC accounts are referenced in each schedule in the cost of service. For each year 2018 through 2020, the information is not readily retrievable, nor pertains to the Company's request for recovery in this rate proceeding based on a Test Year ending December 31, 2025.

For subpart (d), please refer to Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Schedule C-3.20 for the non-compensation components for the Legal department included in the Company's cost of service.

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] ALLCO-022 Question:

State, for each year 2018 through 2025, the Test Year, and the proposed Rate Year, the total annual cost of the internal legal function (including compensation, benefits, occupancy, technology, library/research services, and allocated overheads), and the amount of that cost charged or allocated to the Company; identify the allocation methodology and allocation factor(s) used (referencing, as applicable, the cost allocation methodologies produced in response to EOE-066); and identify the FERC account(s) and the specific revenue requirement schedules and workpapers in this docket in which the amounts allocated to the Company appear.

ALLCO-022 Response:

Please refer to ALLCO-022, Attachment 1 CONFIDENTIAL. The Company's Legal function proposed total compensation in the Rate Year is $4.940 million reflected in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Schedules C-3.5 Payroll Expense, C-3.6 Employee Variable Compensation, C-3.7 Officer Variable Compensation and C-3.12 Employee Benefits. Please refer to the Company's response to OCC-332 for the allocation methodology and factors used in the cost of service.

Date Filed: October 08, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-020.) The public version of ALLCO-020, Attachment 1, is redacted to a handful of boxes. Because the interrogatory sought "positions by title and reporting lines" — not names — produce a public version of the organizational chart of the legal function showing every position by title and its reporting line, with individual names redacted; state the number of attorneys and non-attorney staff in each practice area identified in the response, as of December 31, 2025 and as of the date of the response; and state, for each practice area, the portion of its 2025 compensation allocated to the Company (which may be provided by cross-reference to ALLCO-022, Attachment 1 CONFIDENTIAL, with practice-area subtotals).

Response:

Please refer to ALLCO-075, Attachment 1, for an updated public version of the organizational chart of the legal function showing every position by title and reporting line as of September 21, 2026; this version also indicates practice areas. It should be noted that the titles indicated on this organizational chart are the actual titles for these specific roles.

ALLCO-075, Attachment 2, provides the numbers of attorneys and non-attorney staff in each practice area as of December 31, 2025, and as of September 21, 2026.

Please see the Company's response to ALLCO-022[i] for the portion of the Legal organization's 2025 compensation allocated to CL&P by position.

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] ALLCO-022 Question:

State, for each year 2018 through 2025, the Test Year, and the proposed Rate Year, the total annual cost of the internal legal function (including compensation, benefits, occupancy, technology, library/research services, and allocated overheads), and the amount of that cost charged or allocated to the Company; identify the allocation methodology and allocation factor(s) used (referencing, as applicable, the cost allocation methodologies produced in response to EOE-066); and identify the FERC account(s) and the specific revenue requirement schedules and workpapers in this docket in which the amounts allocated to the Company appear.

ALLCO-022 Response:

Please refer to ALLCO-022, Attachment 1 CONFIDENTIAL. The Company's Legal function proposed total compensation in the Rate Year is $4.940 million reflected in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Schedules C-3.5 Payroll Expense, C-3.6 Employee Variable Compensation, C-3.7 Officer Variable Compensation and C-3.12 Employee Benefits. Please refer to the Company's response to OCC-332i for the allocation methodology and factors used in the cost of service.

Date Filed: October 01, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-023.) The response omitted 2018 through 2020 entirely and provided no breakdown by vendor category. State, for each calendar year 2018 through 2025 and the Test Year: (a) the Company's total outside counsel fees (direct and allocated), by firm for the ten highest-billing firms each year; (b) total other legal-related vendor costs, stated separately for e-discovery and litigation-support vendors, court reporters, expert witnesses and consultants engaged through counsel, and claims administrators; and (c) the amounts of (a) and (b) allocated to the Company, with the FERC accounts used; and reconcile the 2021-2025 amounts to Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-3, identifying page and line.

Response:

(a) Please refer to ALLCO-076, Attachment 1, for a list of outside legal expenses by vendor for each years 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025 (Test Year). ALLCO-076, Attachment 1, shows the outside legal expenses identified by: (1) legal service category consistent with the categories included in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-3.20; (2) whether it is a direct or allocated charge; and (3) the applicable FERC account(s). For each year 2018 through 2020, the information is not readily retrievable.

The Company notes ALLCO-023[i] did not ask for a "breakdown by vendor category" or "for total outside counsel fees (direct and allocated), by firm for the ten highest-billing firms each year." ALLCO-023 asked for the Company's total legal spend "separated into (a) internal/ESC legal function costs, (b) outside counsel fees, and (c) other legal-related vendors (e.g., e-discovery, court reports, expert witness, claims administrators)."

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] ALLCO-023 Question:

State, for each year 2018 through 2025, the Test Year, and the proposed Rate Year, the Company's total legal spend (direct and allocated), separated into (a) internal/ESC legal function costs, (b) outside counsel fees, and (c) other legal-related vendors (e.g., e-discovery, court reporters, expert witnesses, claims administrators); and state the total legal expense included in the proposed Rate Year revenue requirement, identifying the schedule and line.

ALLCO-023 Response:

(a) Please refer to the Company's response to ALLCO-022[i] for internal legal costs.

(b) – (c) Refer to the Company's Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-3 for 2021 through 2025 outside legal costs. Also, refer to the Company's Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Schedule C-3.20 for the outside legal expenses proposed in the Rate Year.

Date Filed: October 01, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-028.) The response did not answer the second half of the interrogatory. State whether the costs of (a) litigation or other proceedings in which the Company or any affiliate is the plaintiff or claimant, and (b) proceedings in which the Company defends the prudence or lawfulness of its own conduct, are included anywhere in the Test Year or proposed Rate Year revenue requirement; if so, identify the amounts, the matters (by category if privilege is asserted as to specific matters), and the schedule and line where each amount appears; and if not, identify where and how such costs are excluded.

Response:

As referenced in the Company's response to ALLCO-028[i], Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Schedule C-3.20 separates legal costs into the following five categories: Claims & Litigation; Corporate; Employment; Federal Regulatory; and State Regulatory. The Company confirms that such costs include litigation or other proceedings in which the Company is a plaintiff or defendant. However, the Company does not track legal costs that would allow the Company to identify the portion of costs that relate to litigation or other proceedings and then separate that portion by specific matters. Please also refer to the Company's response to ALLCO-076[ii].

Prior Referenced Response:

---

[i] ALLCO-028 Question:

Describe the Company's policies and practices for determining whether legal costs (internal and outside) are (a) charged to the Company or to another Eversource affiliate, (b) recorded above or below the line for ratemaking purposes, and (c) charged to expense, capitalized, or charged to a deferred or storm-related account; state whether the costs of litigation in which the Company or its affiliates is the plaintiff or claimant, and of proceedings in which the Company defends the prudence or lawfulness of its own conduct, are included in the Test Year or Rate Year revenue requirement, and if so, identify the amounts and matters (by category if privilege is asserted as to specific matters).

ALLCO-028 Response:

(a) Please refer to EOE-066, Attachment 1, for the Eversource Energy Service Company Cost Allocation Manual that includes cost allocation approaches and methodologies.

(b) For all accounting policies and procedures the Company follows and adheres to the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") Uniform System of

Accounts ("USoA"). Additionally, the Company is subject to rate regulation that is based on cost recovery and that meets the criteria for application of accounting guidance for rate-regulated operations, which considers the effect of regulation on the timing of the recognition of certain expenses.

(c) Please refer to EOE-060, Attachment 3, for the Company's Accounting Policy Statement ("APS") No. 8 – Capital vs Expense Criteria, which explains how the Company determines how costs are classified as capital versus expense. As noted above, this policy is in compliance with GAAP and FERC accounting rules.
Refer to the Company's Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Schedule C-3.20 for the Test Year and Rate Year legal costs included in our cost of service.

[ii] ALLCO-076 Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-023.) The response omitted 2018 through 2020 entirely and provided no breakdown by vendor category. State, for each calendar year 2018 through 2025 and the Test Year: (a) the Company's total outside counsel fees (direct and allocated), by firm for the ten highest-billing firms each year; (b) total other legal-related vendor costs, stated separately for e-discovery and litigation-support vendors, court reporters, expert witnesses and consultants engaged through counsel, and claims administrators; and (c) the amounts of (a) and (b) allocated to the Company, with the FERC accounts used; and reconcile the 2021-2025 amounts to Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-3, identifying page and line.

ALLCO-076 Response:

(a) Please refer to ALLCO-076, Attachment 1, for a list of outside legal expenses by vendor for each years 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024 and 2025 (Test Year). ALLCO-076, Attachment 1, has the outside legal expenses identified by: legal area category which is consistent with the legal service categories included in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-3.20; if it is a direct or allocated charge; and the FERC account(s). For each year 2018 through 2020, the information is not readily retrievable and outside the scope of any reasonable trend analysis relevant to demonstrating that the Company's costs are reasonable and prudently incurred in this rate proceeding.

The Company notes ALLCO-023[ii] did not ask for a "breakdown by vendor category" or "for total outside counsel fees (direct and allocated), by firm for the ten highest-billing firms each year." ALLCO-023 asked for the Company's total legal spend "separated into (a) internal/ESC legal function costs, (b) outside counsel fees, and (c) other legal-related vendors (e.g., e-discovery, court reports, expert witness, claims administrators)."

Date Filed: October 01, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-030.) The response cross-referenced OCC-438, which contains no itemization. Itemize the approximately $3.1 million of rate case expense in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-9 by vendor or firm, matter or workstream, and amount; identify each Company or ESC position (by title) whose Test Year or Rate Year payroll, incentive compensation, or benefits include time associated with attendance in, participation in, or preparation for rate proceedings, and the amounts included; state whether any rate-proceeding-associated costs are recorded outside Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-9 — including in payroll, A&G, service-company charges, or any deferral — and identify the amounts and locations; and state the total of all costs associated with rate proceedings initiated on or after January 1, 2024 that are included anywhere in the proposed revenue requirement.

Response:

The rate case expense in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-9 in the amount of $3.1 million is itemized by vendor and Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, WP C-3.36, at page 10, shows the annual amortized rate case expense proposed in the revenue requirement. Additionally, please refer to ALLCO-027 Attachment 9, for a summary of billed rate-case expenses by vendor through June 30, 2026.

As outlined within Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-9, all rate case expenses requested for recovery are from external vendors/contractors. There are no internal payroll, labor or benefits costs included within the $3.1 million rate case expense outlined in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-9.

Please note that the Company does not incur incremental payroll, labor or benefits costs when preparing, filing or adjudicating a rate case. All internal labor associated with this proceeding is staffed with current employees that work for the Company on a permanent basis, which means that there is no additional internal cost caused by the rate case. The Company's departments handling the rate case is the Connecticut revenue requirements Group; the Connecticut rates group; and the internal legal department. The test year for this case is fiscal year ending December 31, 2025, and the internal work on the rate case is exclusively contained in fiscal year 2026, and the Company has confirmed that there is less than $10,000 recorded in 2025 in relation to the rate case. Please refer to the Company's response to OCC-332,[i] for a detailed explanation as to how the Company calculates its test year pro-forma and rate year payroll expense. Applying the Company's calculation of payroll expense, there are no payroll, labor or benefit costs pertaining to the rate case in the proposed revenue requirement.

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] OCC-332 Question:

Payroll. State whether the Company used the same forecasting methodology used in the prior rate case. If not, explain in detail all changes.

OCC-332 Response:

Yes. The Company utilized a similar methodology that was used in the prior CL&P rate case in Docket No. 17-10-46 which was also the methodology used in the last Yankee Gas rate case in Docket No. 24-12-01 to calculate the Test Year Pro-Forma ("TYPF") payroll expense as well as the Rate Year payroll expense.

The Company's Test Year payroll data consists of hundreds of thousands of lines of individual transactions that are unique each and every year. Those transactions can vary based on a number of different conditions throughout the year such as weather events, supply chain issues, personnel availability, capital budgets and much more. To determine the normalized Test Year level of payroll expense, the Company performs an independent evaluation of the payroll expense utilizing actual employee salary information as of the end of the Test Year as described in greater detail below and supported by detailed calculations provided as attachments to this response.

(1) In order to calculate the TYPF level of payroll expense, the Company first begins with a listing of actual CL&P and Eversource Energy Service Company ("Service Company") salaries for each employee position that is **filled and active** as of December 31, 2025. It is important to begin with only those positions that are filled and active as those are the positions the Company is experiencing actual expenses for. This also ensures that an imputed vacancy rate is accounted for as the Company typically does not have 100% filled and active positions at any single point in time and therefore it would be inappropriate to include all positions (inclusive of unfilled and inactive positions) in the TYPF calculation. Please refer to OCC-332, Attachment 1, for the full listing of CL&P and Service Company employee salaries as of December 31, 2025.

(2) In a normal year it is expected that CL&P employees will charge 100% of their time to CL&P and therefore the amounts shown on OCC-332, Attachment 1, page 1, lines 6 through 10, support the TYPF amounts shown on Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Work Paper C-3.5, page 1, lines 15 through 19. In a normal year it is typical for Service Company employees to charge their time to multiple operating companies throughout the year, and therefore the Company takes the total Service Company salaries shown in OCC-332, Attachment 1, page 38, lines 6 through 16, and allocates those costs to CL&P. In order to do so, the Company utilized the actual labor charged to CL&P by each Source Cost Center ("SCC") and compared that to the total actual labor charges for each of the same SCCs. Please see OCC-332, Attachment 2, for the calculation of the amount of Service Company salaries allocated to CL&P and OCC-332, Attachment 3, for the actual 2025 allocation of labor by SCC utilized in the calculation in OCC-332 Attachment 2. The allocated amounts shown in OCC-332, Attachment 2, page 1, lines 8 through 18, support the amounts shown in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Work Paper C-3.5, page 1, lines 33 through 42.

(3) The base salaries calculated in items (1) and (2) above are total salaries prior to the split between capital and O&M; therefore, the final necessary adjustment to those CL&P allocated salary amounts is to account for the portion that will be capitalized, which is then removed from the payroll expense schedule. In order to do so, the Company utilized the actual Test Year capitalization ratios. Please see OCC-332, Attachment 4, for the calculation of the Test Year capitalization percentages.

In summary, the Company starts by taking actual salaries of active / filled positions as of December 31, 2025, and allocates those to CL&P and further assigns a portion to expense and capital all based on actual Test Year information. That resulting TYPF payroll expense becomes the basis for payroll expense increases utilizing annual merit adjustments. The difference between the TYPF amount above and the actual Test Year expense results in the $2.778 million pro-forma increase (or approximately 2%).

In addition, the Company is proposing incremental Full Time Equivalents ("FTEs") in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, page 3 of 3. Page 3 of 3 shows the number of employees the Company expects to hire in each business area (i.e. Vegetation Management, Grid Modernization, Engineering Capital, Distribution System Planning, Asset Health and Field Engineering). It also shows the expected salary, hiring date, and resulting O&M payroll expense included in the Company's COS. This treatment is consistent with the Company's incremental FTE request in Docket No. 17-10-46.

Date Filed: October 01, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-034.) Supplement the response as the Company committed: produce the Keegan Werlin LLP invoices for redaction and confidentiality-designation services as they are rendered, and state the amounts billed to date; provide the Company's best estimate of the internal Company and ESC personnel time (by title, with hours and loaded cost) devoted to redaction and confidentiality-designation work in this proceeding, notwithstanding that such time is not separately tracked; identify the account(s) to which all such costs have been charged; and state the amount included in, or to be sought through, the Test Year or Rate Year revenue requirement, rate case expense, or any deferral, with the schedule and line.

Response:

Please refer to the Company's response to ALLCO-034,[i] wherein the Company stated that it "will supplement this response with the requested information for Keegan Werlin LLP *once it becomes available*" (emphasis added). The Company's response to this interrogatory was recently submitted on September 16, 2026, and to-date, the Company has not received an invoice from Keegan Werlin for these services. Eversource will supplement ALLCO-034 once this information becomes available. Also as stated in the Company's response to ALLCO-034, Eversource does not separately track time for redaction and confidentiality designation work performed by internal resources.

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] ALLCO-027 Question:

Question: With respect to the approximately $3.1 million of rate case expense included in the proposed revenue requirement (Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-1; response to REVREQ-9), including the approximately $1.875 million estimate for Keegan Werlin LLP: (a) produce the engagement letter(s), fee agreement(s), rate schedules, and any budget or estimate for each outside firm and consultant included in rate case expense; (b) state the amounts billed and paid to date, by firm; (c) state whether the Company considered performing any of the rate case legal work with its internal legal function or solicited proposals from any other firm, and if not, why not; and (d) explain how the Company determined that the estimated amounts are reasonable for recovery from ratepayers.

ALLCO-027 Response:

(a) Refer to the following attachments for the engagement letter for rate case services:

- ALLCO-027, Attachment 1 CONFIDENTIAL, for Keegan Werlin LLP bid proposal.
- ALLCO-027, Attachment 2 CONFIDENTIAL, for Keegan Werlin LLP engagement letter notifying KW its bid was accepted.
- ALLCO-027, Attachment 3, for a listing of contracts with outside firms and consultants included in rate case expense.
- ALLCO-027, Attachment 4 CONFIDENTIAL, for contracts listed in Attachment 3.
- ALLCO-027, Attachment 5 CONFIDENTIAL, for contracts listed in Attachment 3.

(b) Refer to ALLCO-027, Attachment 9, for the summary billed by vendor through June 2026.
- See also ALLCO-27, Attachment 10 CONFIDENTIAL, for Keegan Werlin invoices through May 31, 2026.

(c) The Company considered the capabilities of its internal staff to perform the rate case legal work when making decisions whether to seek outside service providers. The decision was made to utilize internal staff for a portion of rate case work and to solicit proposals for an outside vendor to assist with the other portion of rate case legal work.1. The Company does not maintain sufficient internal legal resources to fulfill the substantial work requirements of the ongoing typical workload of both CL&P and Yankee Gas Services Company d/b/a Eversource Energy, while also tending to high demand, unusual proceedings like a base rate because these types of proceedings occur at irregular intervals.

Therefore, the Company's legal staff contacted law firms that either had experience with utility rate matters or have attorneys on staff with rate making or rate case experience. The Company issued a request for proposal ("RFP") to three law firms for assistance with legal services for the rate case, presented in ALLCO-27, Attachment 6.

The responses to this RFP are provided in ALLCO-27, Attachment 7 CONFIDENTIAL, and ALLCO-027, Attachment 8 CONFIDENTIAL. See also ALLCO-27, Attachment 1 CONFIDENTIAL.

The Company selected Keegan Werlin because of its specialized expertise and resources in handling base-rate proceedings, its prior experience working with the Company, the large volume of legal work associated with a rate-case proceeding and Keegan Werlin's staffing to handle that work; the existing workload of in-house legal staff; and the firm's competitive pricing.

(d) The Company is aware of the requirement to contain costs for outside services providers and has taken steps to ensure costs are negotiated to the lowest levels possible while still receiving the highest quality of service. Initially, when the decision was made to use an outside service provider, the Company competitively bid these services as described above. Once an outside service provider is selected, the Company limits the total contract costs through mechanisms such as blended hourly fees, discounts and not-to-exceed levels.

Additionally, as discussed above, the rate case requires a large volume of legal work from highly experienced and specialized legal staff. All of this work is relevant and necessary to the preparation and presentation of the Company's rate case proceeding.

Date Filed: October 01, 2026

Witness: Laura E. Perbeck
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-035.) The referenced annual RAM filings do not contain the requested year-by-year presentation. Provide, in a single native-format table for each calendar year 2019 through 2025 and year-to-date 2026: (a) the MWh of energy and quantities of other products purchased under the Millstone PPA; (b) the average price per MWh paid; (c) the disposition of those products by category and quantity; (d) the revenues realized from each disposition category, including the Company's buyer's percentage entitlement of ISO-NE settlement proceeds and CES-E sales proceeds; and (e) the resulting net cost or net revenue charged or credited to customers through the NBFMCC, by year. If any component appears in an existing filing, cite the docket, filing, exhibit, and page where the specific annual figure appears.

Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.[1]

Without waiving said objection, the requested data is provided in Eversource's annual RAM filings for 2019-2025, and will be provided for 2026 on or around March 1, 2027, as applicable. For 2019-2025 data, the following applies:

(a) As stated in response to ALLCO-035[i], Eversource provides this information in its annual RAM filings in compliance with Order No. 5 of PURA's November 22, 2019, 3rd Interim Decision in Docket No. 18-05-04. Below is a list of each docket, filing, exhibit, and page of the annual RAM filings where the information is located:

[1] Allco previously litigated the Millstone PPA in the Company's Docket No. 24-01-03 Revenue Adjustment Mechanism proceeding. See, Docket No. 24-01-03, Eversource responses to ALLCO-02, ALLCO-03, ALLCO-05, ALLCO-06, ALLCO-07, and ALLCO-21. Eversource objected to each of these questions.

Year	RAM Docket No.	Filing Location	Date Filed
2019	20-03-01	Exhibit 3 pg. 18	4/8/20
2020	21-01-03	Exhibit 3 pg. 18	3/1/21
2021	22-01-03	Exhibit 3 pg. 17	3/1/22
2022	23-01-03	Exhibit F pg. 17	3/1/23
2023	24-01-03	Exhibit F pg. 17	3/1/24
2024	25-01-03	Exhibit F pg. 17	3/3/25
2025	26-01-03	Exhibit F pg. 17	3/2/26

(b) Eversource's response to ALLCO-038[ii] directly quoted the public Millstone PPA regarding pricing.

(c) Eversource previously provided this information in response to Allco-037[iii], and has provided further information in response to ALLCO-082.

(d) As stated in response to ALLCO-035, Eversource provides this information in its annual RAM filings in compliance with Order No. 5 of PURA's November 22, 2019, 3rd Interim Decision in Docket No. 18-05-04. See part (a) for a list of each docket, filing, exhibit, and page of the annual RAM filings where the information is located.

(e) As stated in response to Allco-035, Eversource provides this information in its annual RAM filings in compliance with Order No. 5 of PURA's November 22, 2019, 3rd Interim Decision in Docket No. 18-05-04. See part (a) for a list of each docket, filing, exhibit, and page of the annual RAM filings where the information is located:

Prior Referenced Response:

[ii] ALLCO-035 Question:

For each year 2019 through 2025 and year-to-date 2026, state: (a) the quantity (MWh) of energy and other products the Company purchased under the Millstone PPA; (b) the average price per MWh paid; (c) the manner of disposition of those products (e.g., resale into the ISO-New England day-ahead or real-time markets, bilateral sales, or use to serve the Company's standard service or supplier of last resort service load), with quantities for each; (d) the revenues realized from each manner of disposition; and (e) the resulting net cost or net revenue charged or credited to customers through the NBFMCC (or any other rate mechanism), by year. Produce the supporting workpapers in native format.

ALLCO-035 Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside

the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.[1]

Without waiving said objection, Eversource provides this information in its March 1st annual RAM filings[2] in compliance with Order No. 5 of PURA's November 22, 2019, 3rd Interim Decision in Docket No. 18-05-04. The Millstone PPA, inclusive of pricing per MWh for Products purchased under that agreement, is publicly available on PURA's Docketed Database Filings website under Docket No. 18-05-04.[3] Regarding the sale of Millstone products, please refer to Eversource's response to ALLCO-037.

[ii] ALLCO-038 Question:

For each year 2019 through 2025: state (a) the Company's total standard service and supplier of last resort service load (MWh) and the average all-in supply cost per kWh the Company paid to wholesale suppliers for that load; (b) the average cost per kWh of energy purchased under the Millstone PPA; and (c) the net amount charged to customers through the NBFMCC in respect of the Millstone PPA for that year; and produce data sufficient to calculate, for each such year, the net impact on customers had the Company used Millstone PPA energy to serve standard service and supplier of last resort service load up to the lesser of the Millstone PPA quantities or that load (accounting for the residual quantities that would still have been resold into the market), including hourly standard service load data and hourly Millstone PPA delivery quantities in native format.

ALLCO-038 Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.

Without waiving said objection, the Company's Standard Service loads can be found on the following website: https://www.eversource.com/residential/about/doing-business-with-us/energy-suppliers/connecticut-wholesale-supply. The supply costs paid to suppliers can be found in the following dockets: 2019-01-01; 2020-01-01; 2021-01-01; 2022-01-01; 2023-01-01; 2024-01-01; 2025-01-01. As noted in the Millstone PPA, "The Price for the Buyer's Percentage Entitlement of Delivered Products up to the Contract Maximum Amount shall be USD $49.99/MWh," which is equivalent to $0.0499/kWh. Eversource provides the net amount charged to customers through the NBFMCC for the Millstone PPA in its March 1st annual RAM filings.

[iii] ALLCO-037 Question:

In its September 18, 2019, Interim Decision in Docket No. 18-05-04, the Authority stated that "the manner in which these Products are resold can impact the value of the Agreements to ratepayers" and directed the EDCs "to thoughtfully consider their options in this area and to pursue those options that maximize such value." Describe each action the Company has taken in response to that directive from 2019 to the present; state whether the Company has ever changed its method of reselling Millstone PPA products; and state whether the disposition of Millstone PPA products is addressed in the Company's current procurement plan or any pending or planned procurement-plan update.

ALLCO-037 Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.

Without waiving said objection, Eversource does not resell the energy from the Millstone PPA; instead, the facility bids the energy into the ISO-NE wholesale market, and it is settled via ISO-NE. Eversource receives its buyer's percentage entitlement of that settlement. Eversource sells qualified Clean Energy Standard for Existing resources ("CES-E's") from the Millstone facility, and the net benefit of those sales is credited to ratepayers via the NBFMCC.

Date Filed: October 01, 2026

Witness: Justin Pelkowski
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-036.) The response identified two dockets but did not answer the question. State, yes or no, whether the Company has at any time since 2019 analyzed, evaluated, or considered using the energy purchased under the Millstone PPA to serve its standard service or supplier of last resort load in whole or in part; if yes, identify and produce each analysis, evaluation, memorandum, presentation, or communication, and identify by title each person who participated in the decision regarding disposition; if the presentations in Docket Nos. 17-12-03RE10 and 12-06-02RE04 are the only responsive materials, produce them in this docket and confirm that no analysis has been performed since.

Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.[1]

Without waiving said objection, as stated in ALLCO-036[i], yes, the Company has presented information regarding the use of energy from the Millstone PPA to serve Standard Service load, the results of which are captured in presentations filed in Docket Nos. 17-12-03RE10, 12-06-02RE04, and in an exhibit in 18-05-04. The presentations filed in Docket Nos. 17-12-03RE10 and 12-06-02RE04 are attached as ALLCO-081, Attachment 1, and ALLCO-081, Attachment 2, respectively to this response while the exhibit from Docket No. 18-05-04 is not as it was filed confidentially. No subsequent analysis has been performed.

[1] Allco previously litigated the Millstone PPA in the Company's Docket No. 24-01-03 Revenue Adjustment Mechanism proceeding. See, Docket No. 24-01-03, Eversource responses to Q-ALLCO-02, Q-ALLCO-03, Q-ALLCO-05, Q-ALLCO-06, Q-ALLCO-07, and Q-ALLCO-21. Eversource objected to each of these questions.

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] ALLCO-036 Question:

State whether the Company has at any time since 2019 analyzed, evaluated, or considered using the energy purchased under the Millstone PPA to serve its standard service and/or supplier of last resort service load, in whole or in part, rather than reselling that energy into the ISO-New England markets; produce every such analysis, evaluation, memorandum, presentation, or communication; identify, by title, each person who participated in the decision regarding the manner of resale; and state each reason for the disposition method chosen. If no such analysis exists, so state.

ALLCO-036 Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.

Without waiving said objection, the Company has previously presented information related to utilizing PPAs for Standard Service in Docket Nos. 17-12-03RE10 and 12-06-02RE04.

Date Filed: October 01, 2026

Witness: Laura E. Perbeck
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-037.) The response described the current arrangement but not the actions the interrogatory asked about. Describe each action the Company has taken from 2019 to the present in response to the Authority's September 18, 2019 directive in Docket No. 18-05-04 to "thoughtfully consider their options in this area and to pursue those options that maximize such value"; state whether the Company has ever changed the manner of disposition of Millstone PPA products, and if not, whether any change was ever evaluated; and state whether the disposition of Millstone PPA products is addressed in the Company's current procurement plan or any pending or planned update, identifying the relevant section or stating that it is not addressed.

Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.[1]

Without waiving said objection, each year since the PPA term began in 2019, Eversource has not resold the energy from the Millstone PPA; instead, the facility bids the energy into the ISO-NE wholesale market, and it is settled via ISO-NE. Eversource receives its buyer's percentage entitlement of that settlement. Since 2021 Eversource has also sold qualified Clean Energy Standard for Existing resources ("CES-E's") from the Millstone facility, and the net benefit of those sales is credited to ratepayers via the NBFMCC.[2] In July 2019, in Docket No. 18-05-04, CT DEEP requested a late file (LFE No. 15) titled:

---

[1] Allco previously litigated the Millstone PPA in the Company's Docket No. 24-01-03 Revenue Adjustment Mechanism proceeding. See, Docket No. 24-01-03, Eversource responses to ALLCO-02, ALLCO-03, ALLCO-05, ALLCO-06, ALLCO-07, and ALLCO-21. Eversource objected to each of these questions.

[2] As noted in the April 8, 2020, annual RAM filing in Docket No. 20-03-01, Exhibit 3 page 18, Eversource did not purchase nor sell any CES-E's in 2019; As noted in the March 1, 2021, annual RAM filing in Docket No. 21-01-03, Exhibit 3 page 17, Eversource did not sell any CES-E's in 2020.

Quantification and examples of the impact to the market and the procurement process of using the output from the Millstone PPA as the basis for a full services standard service product in CT (EDC's- Mr. Levitan)

In its confidential July 11, 2019, response to LFE No. 15 in Docket No. 18-05-04, Eversource explained the impact on the Standard Service marketplace and price as a result of taking the output under the Millstone PPA and using it for Standard Service.

The Company does not maintain a procurement plan; rather, the State's Procurement Plan is maintained by PURA. PURA is currently reviewing recommendations made by the PURA Procurement Manager's in Docket No. 12-06-02RE05. PURA posted a draft decision in Docket No. 12-06-02RE05 on September 11, 2026. As part of their draft decision, PURA addressed the use of PPAs for Standard Service.

Date Filed: October 01, 2026

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

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-043.) The response described the calculation of net metering amounts but did not answer subparts (b) and (c). State, yes or no, whether the amounts charged to customers through the NBFMCC for net metering and virtual net metering are reduced or offset by the corresponding reductions in regional transmission charges (RNS, LNS, TAC), capacity obligations, and standard service procurement quantities attributable to the same behind-the-meter generation; if no such offset is made, explain why not; and state the annual amount charged to customers through the NBFMCC for net metering and virtual net metering for each calendar year 2020 through 2025, in native format.

Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to ALLCO's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.[1]

Without waiving said objection, the Company's response to ALLCO-043[i] is responsive to the question. The amounts charged to the NBFMCC for net metering and virtual net metering for each calendar year 2020 through 2025 are part of the public record in the respective Revenue Adjustment Mechanism proceedings in which they are included. Net metering affects wholesale loads, which could impact peak loads. Please refer to the Company's response to ALLCO-095 which requests information on how behind the meter generation impacts wholesale settlements. Please note that ALLCO-095 will be filed on October 5, 2026.

[1] Allco previously litigated renewable energy projects as load reducers in the Company's Docket No. 24-01-03 Revenue Adjustment Mechanism proceeding. See, Docket No. 24-01-03, Eversource responses to ALLCO-04 and ALLCO-027. Eversource objected to both of these questions.

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] ALLCO-043 Question:

Describe how amounts associated with net metering and virtual net metering are calculated and recovered from other customers through the NBFMCC (including the "avoided bill" methodology described by Company witnesses in Docket No. 20-01-01), and state whether the amounts so charged to customers are reduced or offset by the corresponding reductions in regional transmission charges (RNS, LNS, TAC), capacity obligations, and standard service procurement quantities attributable to the same behind-the-meter generation; if no such offset is made, explain why not, and quantify the annual amount charged to customers through the NBFMCC for net metering for each year 2020 through 2025 without any such offset.

ALLCO-043 Question:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to ALLCO's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding

Without waiving said objection, net metering and virtual net metering amounts included in the NBFMCC are calculated and recorded for inclusion in the NBFMCC, as part of each customer's monthly bill, in accordance with the tariff rider under which each customer is enrolled. Monthly net metering amounts for the net metering rider involving banked kWh (e.g., Rider N) are calculated by multiplying the portion of a customer's net metering facility's energy produced and not used, but that is netted against the energy delivered to that customer from the distribution system by the customer's prevailing per kWh rates. Any excess monthly energy production not so netted over the course of 12 months is multiplied by the annual average LMP rate to determine a residual amount included in the NBFMCC. For net metering facilities that do not involve kWh banking (e.g., RRES), the amount included in the NBFMCC for each month is calculated by multiplying total energy produced and not used by the customer by the rate set forth pursuant to the net metering tariff rider under which they are enrolled. For virtual net metering ("VNM"), net metering amounts included in the NBFMCC are determined by multiplying the monthly energy production by the prevailing general service rates under which the customer receives electric service, calculated on a per kWh basis, pursuant to the VNM rider.

Date Filed: October 08, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-032.) The table provided as ALLCO-032, Attachment 1, addresses subpart (c) only as to "Customer Deposits." Complete the response as to the remaining categories the interrogatory identified: for (a) deposits, prepayments, and security provided by developers and interconnection customers (including amounts paid for interconnection studies, system modifications, and upgrades held pending final accounting), (b) unpaid or unrefunded interconnection final-accounting balances, and (c) over-recovered rate adjustment mechanism balances held prior to return to customers — state, for each: the amounts held as of December 31, 2025 and as of the most recent date available; the interest rate the Company pays or credits on each (or confirm that the rate is zero); the accrual and compounding convention; and the FERC account(s) in which each is recorded. If the Company pays or credits no interest on any category, state the basis for accruing carrying charges at its pre-tax WACC, compounded monthly, on balances customers owe the Company while paying nothing on balances the Company holds for customers.

Response:

CL&P objects to this request on the ground that it is an improper effort by Allco to use this rate case proceeding to obtain discovery for purposes of a lawsuit that it filed against the Company on August 10, 2026, in the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut (Civil Action No. 3:26-cv-1277), outside of and in contravention of the rules of procedure that govern discovery in that lawsuit.

Without waiving said objection, the Company notes that interconnection-related funds are not held in customer deposits. Please refer to the Company's responses to ALLCO-002[i] and ALLCO-044[ii]. Further, the Company does not and has not requested deposits, prepayments or security from developers and distribution generation interconnection customers.

Prior Referenced Response:

---

[i] ALLCO-002 Question:

State the total dollar amount of CIAC and interconnection-related payments collected from DER and QF interconnection customers in each year 2018 through 2025, and explain precisely how those amounts are reflected in

(a) rate base, (b) the Test Year revenue requirement, and (c) the Rate Year revenue requirement proposed in this docket, identifying the specific schedules and workpapers.

ALLCO-002 Response:

CL&P objects to this request on the ground that it is an improper effort by Allco to use this rate case proceeding to obtain discovery for purposes of a lawsuit that it filed against the Company on August 10, 2026, in the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut (Civil Action No. 3:26-cv-1277), outside of and in contravention of the rules of procedure that govern discovery in that lawsuit.

Without waiving said objection, please refer to the Company's response to ALLCO-001i for CIAC year-end balances from 2018 through 2025. CIAC and interconnection-related payments received by the Company reduce the cost of construction or plant placed in service. CIAC is recognized as an offset to the underlying capital project. CIAC would not be considered a component of rate base until the underlying capital project is placed in service. At that time, the underlying capital project costs in rate base would be wholly offset by CIAC at the time of final project billing and reconciliation. In the Company's next cost of service update, the rate base and the Rate Year revenue requirement will reflect the CIAC and the underlying capital project cost for projects placed in service.

[ii] ALLCO-044 Question:

With respect to each cost category included in the percentage overhead or "CIAC" rates applied to interconnection upgrade, study, and construction costs charged to distributed generation, qualifying facility, and other interconnection customers (including, without limitation, project management, engineering and supervision, administrative and general expense, employee benefits or compensation loaders, insurance, and Eversource Energy Service Company charges): (a) identify each such cost category and its share of the overhead rate in effect in each year 2018 through 2025; (b) state whether the costs in each such category were included, in whole or in part, in the test-year cost of service and revenue requirement approved in the Company's most recent prior general distribution rate proceeding, Docket No. 17-10-46, and therefore recovered from all ratepayers through base distribution rates during 2018 through the present; (c) if the answer to any part of subpart (b) is affirmative, explain why applying overhead rates that include the same cost categories to amounts charged to interconnection customers does not result in the Company recovering the same costs twice — once from ratepayers generally and again from interconnection customers; (d) quantify, for each year 2018 through 2025, the total dollar amount of overheads collected from interconnection customers in cost categories that were also reflected in base rates; and (e) state whether amounts collected from interconnection customers through overhead rates are recorded as a credit or offset to the corresponding expense or plant accounts recovered in base rates and, if not, where those amounts are recorded, consistent with the Company's description of its netting treatment of third-party attacher billings in its response to RRU-002.

ALLCO-044 Response:

CL&P objects to this request on the ground that it is an improper effort by ALLCO to use this rate case proceeding to obtain discovery for purposes of a lawsuit that it filed against the Company on August 10, 2026, in the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut (Civil Action No. 3:26-cv-1277), outside of and in contravention of the rules of procedure that govern discovery in that lawsuit.

Without waiving said objection, please note that capital expenditures (direct costs and overheads applied to those amounts) are entirely billed to the interconnection customer and reimbursed through the CIAC process; therefore, these asset additions are not included in rate base. Please refer to ALLCO-064i for additional discussion on the CIAC rate and ALLCO-003ii where the Company goes into more detail on the CIAC Tax Adder.

Date Filed: October 08, 2026

Witness: Douglas P. Horton, Brendan J. O' Brien, Garrett J. Murray, Leanne M. Landry, and Jeffrey D. Turano
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-032 and ALLCO-001.) For customer deposits and for each category of interconnection-related funds the Company holds — deposits and security provided by developers and interconnection customers, amounts paid for interconnection studies, amounts paid for system modifications and upgrades held pending final accounting, and unpaid or unrefunded final-accounting balances — identify exactly where the funds sit: (a) each bank, depository, escrow, trust, money-market, or investment account in which such funds are held or through which they pass, stating the financial institution, account title, account number (which may be provided under the protective order in this docket), account type, and the entity in whose name the account is maintained (the Company, Eversource Energy Service Company, Eversource Energy, or another affiliate); (b) whether the funds are segregated from the Company's general corporate funds or commingled with them, including whether they participate in or fund the Eversource system money pool; (c) the interest or investment return earned on each such account or on the commingled funds, and to whom that return is credited; (d) if the funds are commingled, how the Company uses them — working capital, money-pool lending to affiliates, or otherwise — and the return realized on that use; and (e) a reconciliation of the amounts so held to the FERC accounts and balances identified in the Company's responses to ALLCO-001 and ALLCO-032, including FERC Account No. 252500.

Response:

CL&P objects to this request on the ground that it is an improper effort by Allco to use this rate case proceeding to obtain discovery for purposes of a lawsuit that it filed against the Company on August 10, 2026, in the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut (Civil Action No. 3:26-cv-1277), outside of and in contravention of the rules of procedure that govern discovery in that lawsuit.

Without waiving said objection, the Company states as follows:

a. – d. Any cash provided to CL&P would be deposited into its primary operating account at Bank of America (Account number ending 9048) with those funds coming led with all other funds in that account for working capital needs. CL&P is no longer a party to a money pool arrangement with other affiliates. Interest is not earned on this primary operating account, but an earnings credit is netted against our monthly account transaction fees. Additionally, as noted in the Company's

response to ALLCO-084[i], the Company does not hold any interconnection-related funds associated with deposits and/or securities by developers and interconnection customers.

e. The responses to ALLCO-001[ii] and ALLCO-032[iii] are referencing two different accounts. The response to ALLCO-001 refers to the CIAC balances in FERC account 252500, whereas the response to ALLCO-032 refers to the Customer Deposit balances in FERC account 235010.

Prior Referenced Responses:

---

[i] ALLCO-084 Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-032.) The table provided as ALLCO-032, Attachment 1, addresses subpart (c) only as to "Customer Deposits." Complete the response as to the remaining categories the interrogatory identified: for (a) deposits, prepayments, and security provided by developers and interconnection customers (including amounts paid for interconnection studies, system modifications, and upgrades held pending final accounting), (b) unpaid or unrefunded interconnection final-accounting balances, and (c) over-recovered rate adjustment mechanism balances held prior to return to customers — state, for each: the amounts held as of December 31, 2025 and as of the most recent date available; the interest rate the Company pays or credits on each (or confirm that the rate is zero); the accrual and compounding convention; and the FERC account(s) in which each is recorded. If the Company pays or credits no interest on any category, state the basis for accruing carrying charges at its pre-tax WACC, compounded monthly, on balances customers owe the Company while paying nothing on balances the Company holds for customers.

ALLCO-084 Response:

CL&P objects to this request on the ground that it is an improper effort by Allco to use this rate case proceeding to obtain discovery for purposes of a lawsuit that it filed against the Company on August 10, 2026, in the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut (Civil Action No. 3:26-cv-1277), outside of and in contravention of the rules of procedure that govern discovery in that lawsuit.

Without waiving said objection, the Company notes that interconnection-related funds are not held in customer deposits. Please refer to the Company's responses to ALLCO-002[i] and ALLCO-044[i]. Further, the Company does not and has not requested deposits, prepayments or security from developers and distribution generation interconnection customers.

[ii] ALLCO-001 Question:

Identify each FERC account in which the Company records CIAC and other amounts collected from interconnection customers for interconnection studies, upgrades, and overheads, and state the balance in each such account at the end of each year 2018 through 2025 and as of the most recent month available.

ALLCO-001 Response:

CL&P objects to this request on the ground that it is an improper effort by Allco to use this rate case proceeding to obtain discovery for purposes of a lawsuit that it filed against the Company on August 10, 2026, in the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut (Civil Action No. 3:26-cv-1277), outside of and in contravention of the rules of procedure that govern discovery in that lawsuit.

Without waiving said objection, the Company records CIAC activity from interconnection customers to FERC Account No. 252500. The table below summarizes the end of year balance in FERC Account No. 252500 from 2018 through June 2026.

Year	**Balance**
December 2018	($5,569,769)
December 2019	($5,038,280)
December 2020	($9,076,090)
December 2021	($25,399,399)
December 2022	($11,263,859)
December 2023	($7,796,182)
December 2024	($10,334,276)
December 2025	($23,605,408)
June 2026	($28,277,769)

[iii] ALLCO-032 Question:

With respect to every carrying charge, return on unamortized balance, or similar time-value amount the Company proposes to collect from customers in this docket — including the approximately $396.7 million of carrying charges on 2018-2023 storm costs and $27.6 million on 2024-March 2025 storm costs (Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2 (Storms A) and (Storms B)), carrying charges on deferred assets, and carrying charges proposed on RAM, decoupling, and SCRAF over/under-recoveries: (a) state the rate applied, whether it is pre-tax or after-tax, the compounding convention, the date from which carrying charges accrue, and the balance to which the rate is applied (including whether the balance is net of customer contributions, insurance recoveries, and amounts disallowed in any docket); (b) identify the statute, regulation, or PURA decision authorizing each (Allco does not repeat OCC-522, which addresses the choice of index for SCRAF carrying charges); and (c) separately identify every context in which the Company holds funds of customers or third parties — including customer deposits, developer and interconnection-customer deposits and security, unpaid interconnection refunds, and over-recovered rate adjustment mechanism balances — and state the interest rate the Company pays (or credits) on each, so that the rates the Company charges when it is owed money can be compared with the rates it pays when it owes money.

ALLCO-032 Response:

Please refer to ALLCO-032, Attachment 1, for the requested information. Please refer to the Company's response to OCC-522.

Date Filed: October 01, 2026

Witness: Laura E. Perbeck
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-038.) A referral to a public webpage and seven annual dockets is not an answer, and the remaining components are not public. Provide, in a single native-format table for each calendar year 2019 through 2025: (a) the Company's standard service and supplier of last resort load in MWh and the average all-in supply cost per kWh paid to wholesale suppliers for that load (the figures the Company's referral sources contain, compiled); (b) the MWh of the Company's Buyer's Percentage Entitlement of Millstone PPA products actually delivered or settled, by month; (c) the effective all-in price per MWh actually paid under the Millstone PPA, identifying any component other than the $49.99/MWh contract price; and (d) the net amount charged or credited to customers through the NBFMCC in respect of the Millstone PPA, by year. Produce the hourly (or most granular available) Millstone delivery quantities and standard service load data in native format.

Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.[1]

Without waiving said objection, while Eversource's response to ALLCO-038 was responsive to the question asked,[2] Eversource provides the following additional information as requested:

---

[1] Allco previously litigated the Millstone PPA in the Company's Docket No. 24-01-03 Rate Adjustment Mechanism proceeding. See, Docket No. 24-01-03, Eversource responses to ALLCO-02, ALLCO-03, ALLCO-05, ALLCO-06, ALLCO-07, and ALLCO-21. Eversource objected to each of these questions.

[2] As stated in ALLCO-038, historical load data can be found on the following website: https://www.eversource.com/residential/about/doing-business-with-us/energy-suppliers/connecticut-wholesale-supply. This website is utilized by Standard Service suppliers who are interested in historical data so that they can develop bids in Standard Service solicitations. Less than halfway down the page, there is a section labeled, "Historical Resources (2023-Present)." There files can be downloaded by year with the 8760 load data. All approved rates that were paid to Standard Service and Last Resort Service Providers are already a part of the public record, and each of the docket numbers listed in ALLCO-038 contain those final PURA approved rates for each rate class for the applicable period.

(a) Please refer to ALLCO-86, Attachment 1.

(b) Eversource provides the annual MWh purchased under the Millstone PPA in its annual RAM filings in compliance with Order No. 5 of PURA's November 22, 2019, 3rd Interim Decision in Docket No. 18-05-04. Below is a list of each docket, filing, exhibit, and page of the annual RAM filings where the information is located:

Year	RAM Docket No.	Filing Location	Date Filed
2019	20-03-01	Exhibit 3 pg. 18	4/8/20
2020	21-01-03	Exhibit 3 pg. 18	3/1/21
2021	22-01-03	Exhibit 3 pg. 17	3/1/22
2022	23-01-03	Exhibit F pg. 17	3/1/23
2023	24-01-03	Exhibit F pg. 17	3/1/24
2024	25-01-03	Exhibit F pg. 17	3/3/25
2025	26-01-03	Exhibit F pg. 17	3/2/26

The Company cannot provide Millstone's monthly/hourly generation information publicly as this is considered non-public, market-sensitive third-party data per the FERC-approved ISO-NE tariff.

(c) Eversource provided this information in response to ALLCO-038[i] and directly quoted the PPA that identifies the price for all Products as $49.99/MWh.

(d) Eversource provides the monthly and annual net amount charged or credited to customers through the NBFMCC in respect of the Millstone PPA in its annual RAM filings. Below is a list of each docket, filing, exhibit, and page of the annual RAM filings where the information is located:

Year	RAM Docket No.	Filing Location	Date Filed
2019	20-03-01	Exhibit 3 pg. 3	4/8/20
2020	21-01-03	Exhibit 3 pg. 3	3/1/21
2021	22-01-03	Exhibit 3 pg. 3	3/1/22
2022	23-01-03	Exhibit F pg. 3	3/1/23
2023	24-01-03	Exhibit F pg. 3	3/1/24
2024	25-01-03	Exhibit F pg. 3	3/3/25
2025	26-01-03	Exhibit F pg. 3	3/2/26

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] ALLCO-038 Question:

For each year 2019 through 2025: state (a) the Company's total standard service and supplier of last resort service load (MWh) and the average all-in supply cost per kWh the Company paid to wholesale suppliers for that load; (b) the average cost per kWh of energy purchased under the Millstone PPA; and (c) the net amount charged to customers through the NBFMCC in respect of the Millstone PPA for that year; and produce data sufficient to calculate, for each such year, the net impact on customers had the Company used Millstone PPA energy to serve standard service and supplier of last resort service load up to the lesser of the Millstone PPA quantities or that load (accounting for the residual quantities that would still have been resold into the market), including hourly standard service load data and hourly Millstone PPA delivery quantities in native format.

ALLCO-038 Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.

Without waiving said objection, the Company's Standard Service loads can be found on the following website: https://www.eversource.com/residential/about/doing-business-with-us/energy-suppliers/connecticut-wholesale-supply. The supply costs paid to suppliers can be found in the following dockets: 2019-01-01; 2020-01-01; 2021-01-01; 2022-01-01; 2023-01-01; 2024-01-01; 2025-01-01. As noted in the Millstone PPA, "The Price for the Buyer's Percentage Entitlement of Delivered Products up to the Contract Maximum Amount shall be USD $49.99/MWh," which is equivalent to $0.0499/kWh. Eversource provides the net amount charged to customers through the NBFMCC for the Millstone PPA in its March 1st annual RAM filings.

Date Filed: October 01, 2026

Witness: Andrew C. Belden
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-040.) The response omitted the decision-making the interrogatory asked about. Identify, by title, each person or group who determines whether a distribution-connected resource under five megawatts is registered in ISO-New England or treated as an unregistered load reducer, and state the criteria applied; identify and produce every analysis, evaluation, or quantification the Company has performed of the customer-cost consequences of registering versus not registering such resources — including any analysis underlying the position PURA approved in Docket No. 20-07-01 and any quantification of the "benefits for customers" the response describes — or state that no such analysis exists; and identify each exception to the Company's "general practice," i.e., each distribution-connected resource under five megawatts that is or has been registered in the ISO-New England markets since 2020, stating its size, program, and the reason for registration.

Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.[1]

Without waiving said objection, there is not an individual or group that determines whether a distribution-connected resource under five megawatts is registered in ISO-NE or treated as an unregistered load reducer. It has been general Company practice to not register resources under 5 MW, and this approach has been acknowledged and accepted by PURA.

Registering versus not registering distributed generation does not change the underlying operation of a distributed generation resource or its physical impact to the electric power system. The reduction to wholesale load obligations described as a customer benefit in the Company's response to ALLCO-040 is equal to the excess generation from unregistered resources. If a distributed

[1] Allco previously litigated renewable energy projects as load reducers in the Company's Docket No. 24-01 03 Revenue Adjustment Mechanism proceeding. See, Docket No. 24-01-03, Eversource responses to ALLCO-04 and ALLCO-027. Eversource objected to both of these questions.

generation resource was registered, the same amount of energy would be sold within the wholesale market and resulting revenues credited to customers through operation of the Rate Adjustment Mechanism.

Please refer to the Company's response to ALLCO-089[i] for the single example of a registered distributed generation facility.

Prior Referenced Response:

---

[i] ALLCO-089 Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-042.) Identify each resource constituting an exception to "substantially all" — that is, each eligible resource under five megawatts that was registered in ISO-New England rather than treated as an unregistered load reducer at any time during 2020 through 2025 — stating for each its nameplate capacity, program or contract, the period of registration, and the reason; and state whether the Company has ever evaluated, or been requested by any customer, developer, or agency to evaluate, changing the registration status of any category of such resources, identifying each evaluation or request and its disposition.

ALLCO-089 Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.[1]

Without waiving said objection, 750 kW solar photovoltaic (PV) facility enrolled in the Virtual Net Metering Rider is registered as a settlement only generator at the request of the customer. The Company receives 100% of the energy revenue from the facility through the ISO-NE Market Settlement System, and these proceeds are credited to customers through the Rate Adjustment Mechanism.

Date Filed: October 08, 2026

Witness: Andrew C. Belden and Justin Pelkowski
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-041.) The components below require no counterfactual and are in the Company's possession. Provide, for each calendar year 2020 through 2025, in native format: (a) the Company's reported Real-Time Load Obligation, by month; (b) the Company's monthly coincident-peak (12-CP) values used for RNS, LNS, and TAC billing; (c) the Company's capacity load obligation and installed capacity requirement values; (d) the estimated or metered aggregate output of distribution-connected resources under five megawatts at each monthly system peak hour — including any behind-the-meter generation estimates or profiles the Company or its affiliates use in load forecasting, standard service procurement, or ISO-NE load reporting (including any ISO-NE behind-the-meter photovoltaic estimates the Company relies on); and (e) each document in which the Company or any affiliate has estimated the effect of behind-the-meter or load-reducing generation on peaks, load obligations, or transmission billing determinants. If the Company contends it possesses no data responsive to subpart (d), state whether output at peak could be derived from its PowerClerk records, production meters, or forecasting models, and why it has not done so.

Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.[1]

Without waiving said objection,

(a) Please refer to the Company's response to ALLCO-063[i].

(b) Please refer to CIEC-020, Attachment 1.

[1] Allco previously litigated the Millstone PPA in the Company's Docket No. 24-01-03 Revenue Adjustment Mechanism proceeding. See, Docket No. 24-01-03, Eversource responses to ALLCO-02, ALLCO-03, ALLCO-05, ALLCO-06, ALLCO-07, and ALLCO-21. Eversource objected to each of these questions.

(c) Because the Company does not serve load it does not have capacity obligations.

(d) Refer to ALLCO-088, Attachment 1, for estimated output of distribution-connected resources under five megawatts at each monthly ISO-NE peak hour.

(e) The Company has not expressly estimated the effect of behind-the-meter or load-reducing generation on peaks, load obligations, or transmission billing determinants.

Prior Referenced Response:

---

[i] ALLCO-063 Question:

For each month of the Test Year, produce the ISO New England settlement statements (including any resettlements) for the Company's load asset(s), showing the kilowatt-hours of Real-Time Load Obligation charged or settled to the Company, and state the monthly and annual settled kilowatt-hour totals. Reconcile the annual ISO-NE settled kilowatt-hours to

a) the total retail kilowatt-hours billed to all customers (Q-ALLCO-061) and

b) the kilowatt-hours billed to standard-service customers (Q-ALLCO-062),

separately itemizing and quantifying each reconciling item — including distribution losses, transmission losses, unaccounted-for energy, company use, station service, unbilled or estimated usage, and any other category — and stating the loss factor(s) applied at each stage and their source. Identify the system(s) and process by which the Company performs retail load settlement, and identify (by title, date, and custodian) every internal load-settlement, unaccounted-for-energy, or loss-study report prepared or updated for any period including the Test Year.

ALLCO-063 Response:

The Company does not serve load and therefore does not receive settlement statements for any load assets. In addition, wholesale loads for Standard Service, Last Resort Service and retail supply are not relevant to the adjudication of the Company's proposed retail distribution revenue requirement in this rate case or retail customer loads. Nevertheless, for informational purposes please refer to ALLCO-063, Attachment 1, for the 2025 ISO-NE wholesale loads for Standard Service, Last Resort Service, and competitive supply.

In addition to the fact that the above-described wholesale loads are not relevant to the adjudication of the Company's proposed retail distribution revenue requirement in this rate case or retail sales, the Company also notes that it cannot readily reconcile wholesale load data with Test Year data due to rate class level data being based on monthly billing cycles at the customer meter, which vary for every customer, and wholesale load data being calendar month, summed by hour, and aggregated by competitive supplier at the wholesale level.

Date Filed: October 01, 2026

Witness: Andrew C. Belden and Justin Pelkowski
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

(Follow-up to ALLCO-042.) Identify each resource constituting an exception to "substantially all" — that is, each eligible resource under five megawatts that was registered in ISO-New England rather than treated as an unregistered load reducer at any time during 2020 through 2025 — stating for each its nameplate capacity, program or contract, the period of registration, and the reason; and state whether the Company has ever evaluated, or been requested by any customer, developer, or agency to evaluate, changing the registration status of any category of such resources, identifying each evaluation or request and its disposition.

Response:

PURA's June 2, 2026, Notice of Proceeding in Docket No. 26-05-10 states that, upon a receipt of a completed application from Eversource to amend the Company's existing rate schedules, PURA will conduct a contested proceeding to review Eversource's application. Eversource objects to Allco's effort to litigate an issue that is outside the scope of this rate case proceeding. Considering the statutory 350-day timeframe to issue a final decision on the Company's application and the number of interrogatories issued in this proceeding to-date, the litigation of issues irrelevant to the Company's application threatens to adversely impact the orderly conduct of this proceeding.[1]

Without waiving said objection, 750 kW solar photovoltaic (PV) facility enrolled in the Virtual Net Metering Rider is registered as a settlement only generator at the request of the customer. The Company receives 100% of the energy revenue from the facility through the ISO-NE Market Settlement System, and these proceeds are credited to customers through the Rate Adjustment Mechanism.

[1] Allco previously litigated renewable energy projects as load reducers in the Company's Docket No. 24-01 03 Revenue Adjustment Mechanism proceeding. See, Docket No. 24-01-03, Eversource responses to ALLCO-04 and ALLCO-027. Eversource objected to both of these questions.