Date Filed: September 23, 2026

Witness: Craig Dikeman and Matthew J. Correia
Request from: ALLCO

Question:

In addition to, and without repeating, the competitive-bidding information requested in EOE-051 through EOE-053: for each law firm engaged by or on behalf of the Company from 2018 through the present without competitive bidding — including Keegan Werlin LLP and Rowthorn Law — state the reason competitive bidding was not used, identify by title who approved the engagement, and produce the sole-source or single-source justification for the engagement; if no such justification document exists for a firm, so state.

Response:

Per the Eversource Procurement Manual, strategic legal services are not subject to the competitive bid requirements, nor requirements for "sole-source or single-source justification" for engagement. Please refer to EOE-046, Attachment 1 through EOE-046, Attachment 21, for copies of the Eversource Procurement Manual.

The legal department will periodically use competitive bidding, such as to retain counsel for large-scale legal matters. For example, the rate case work performed by Keegan Werlin LLP in Connecticut was subject to competitive bidding. The legal department also periodically evaluates its law firms' fees and rates and uses benchmarking resources like its eBilling system (Thomson Reuters Legal Tracker) and other public reports to negotiate rates and ensure its firms' fees and rates are competitive. Law firm engagements are approved by legal department management on the basis of strategic and tactical considerations, suitability and capability for the issue(s) or subject matter involved, logistical considerations, and availability, among other factors, and cost, rates, and overall value are a significant consideration.