107 Selden Street, Berlin, CT 06037
P.O. Box 270, Hartford, CT 06141-0270

Vincent P. Pace
Associate General Counsel

(860) 665-5426
vincent.pace@eversource.com

October 30, 2026

Jeffrey R. Gaudiosi, Esq.
Executive Secretary
Public Utilities Regulatory Authority
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Docket No. 26-05-10, Application of The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy to Amend its Rate Schedules

Dear Secretary Gaudiosi:

The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy ("CL&P" or the "Company") respectfully submits this response to the following Motion, submitted to PURA on October 23, 2026 (the "Redundant Motion"), by Allco Finance Limited ("Allco"):

> **MOTION OF ALLCO FINANCE LIMITED TO COMPEL COMPLETE RESPONSES TO ALLCO-121, -133, -134, -142, -143, -145, -147, -148, -149, -151, -152, -153, AND -154 AND TO SUBPART (d) OF ALLCO-150 (RESPONSES TO ALLCO'S ELEVENTH SET FILED OCTOBER 15–21, 2026), TO OVERRULE THE COMPANY'S "OUTSIDE THE SCOPE" OBJECTION, AND SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION NO. 084.**

This 13-page document is titled a "supplemental statement in support of Motion No. 084." Motion No. 084 was filed on October 13, 2026, requesting that PURA compel additional responses to Allco discovery Sets One, Five, Six, Eight, Nine and Eleven and to overrule the Company's objections to Allco discovery on the basis of ongoing federal litigation and interrogatories posed by Allco for its own purposes with no relation to the Company's filing or the purposes of this proceeding. The Company responded to Motion No. 084 on October 20, 2026, and Allco replied to that pleading on October 22, 2026. In addition, on October 27, 2026, the Company submitted a Supplemental Response to Motion No. 084, fully addressing the reasons that PURA should prevent Allco from continuing its disruption of this administrative proceeding. Consequently, the dispute is fully briefed and pending before PURA, as Allco expressly concedes in its new Redundant Motion, at page 1 (stating, "the motion is fully briefed and pending").

Now, Allco requests that PURA grant the following relief: (1) extend the ruling sought in Motion No. 084 to also overrule the Company's objection to discovery as "outside the scope" of the proceeding, as asserted in ALLCO-088 and ALLCO-152; (2) order "complete responses" to the 13 identified interrogatories and to subpart (d) of ALLCO-150; and (3) grant Allco leave to supplement the pre-filed testimony. Eversource objects to all three of these requests for relief.

Under Conn. Gen. Stat. § 4-178, PURA "shall, as a matter of policy, provide for the exclusion of irrelevant, immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence." Allco's requested relief is simply proof positive that Allco has exceeded all reasonable parameters for the conduct of an administrative proceeding, and therefore now is an appropriate time for PURA to issue guidance preventing Allco from continuing to conduct unnecessary and burdensome discovery on issues that are irrelevant, immaterial and outside the scope of this proceeding.

For example, the Redundant Motion seeks to have PURA compel a response to the following questions, referenced in the Redundant Motion as ALLCO-088 and ALLCO-152.

ALLCO-088:

> (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.
>
> (emphasis added).

ALLCO-152:

> (Follow-up to ALLCO-063 — ***load settlement and losses***.) The response states that "[t]he Company does not serve load and therefore does not receive settlement statements for any load assets." (a) Identify the entity that is the ***ISO-NE load-asset owner and settlement counterparty for Standard Service and Last Resort Service load*** in the Company's service territory, and the contractual or regulatory basis on which that entity, rather than the Company, holds the load asset. (b) State the distribution loss factor(s) the Company applies in converting metered retail sales to wholesale load for settlement, the source and date of the loss study supporting each, and produce the study. (c) State the annual 2025 total of the ***hourly wholesale loads*** in ALLCO-063, Attachment 1, for ***Standard Service, Last Resort Service, and***

> ***competitive supply***, and the annual 2025 total retail kWh billed (CIEC-020, Attachment 2), and state the difference and the Company's explanation of it, including ***losses, unaccounted-for energy, company use, and unbilled usage***, in whatever level of detail the Company's records permit.
>
> (emphasis added).

As is patently apparent, neither one of these questions has any bearing on the Company's rate request and Allco has repeatedly sought to have the Company expend its resources on questions of this type that have no bearing on any decision that PURA will make in this proceeding.

As stated in the Company's supplemental opposition to Motion No. 084, the purpose of discovery is to provide PURA, the parties, and intervenors with access to relevant, probative information necessary to develop a complete and accurate record -- not to allow repetitive or irrelevant requests that divert time and resources from that objective. Connecticut law requires administrative agencies to exclude "irrelevant, immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence."[1] The Connecticut Supreme Court has cautioned that parties seeking discovery "should not be allowed to indulge a hope that a thorough ransacking of any information and material which the defendant may possess would turn up evidence helpful to the petitioner's case."[2]

Discovery requests must also comply with requirements of relevance, permissible scope and proportionality.[3] In line with the statutory requirement that parties have access to "***relevant and material*** records, papers and documents," a request is not permissible merely because it is made; it must bear a reasonable relationship to the issues before PURA, fall within the scope of the proceeding, and avoid burdens disproportionate to any legitimate evidentiary purpose.[4] Put simply, "effective discovery serves to advance the efficiency of administrative hearings and provides the important fact-finding base upon which administrative decisions may rely."[5]

No statute, regulation, PURA precedent, or judicial authority supports this proposition that Allco's discovery and associated motions are proper. To the contrary, the Company is required to

---

1 Conn. Gen. Stat. § 4-178(1); see, also Conn. Agencies Regs. § 16-1-38(a).

2 Pottetti v. Clifford, 146 Conn. 252, 263 (1959).

3 Conn. Practice Book § 13-2 (A party may obtain "discovery of information . . . material to the subject matter involved in the pending action, which are not privileged"); Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(2) (discoverable information includes any nonprivileged matter relevant to any party's claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case, considering factors such as importance, burden, and expense).

4 Conn. Gen. Stat. § 4-177c(a)(1) (emphasis added).

5 Off. of Consumer Couns. v. Dep't of Pub. Util. Control, 44 Conn. Supp. 21, 26–27 (Super. Ct. 1994).

produce discovery documents only if they are "***material and necessary*** to [an] action," which these questions fail to achieve.[6]

Even under a reasonable standard of relevance,[7] the relevance of a subject does not, by itself, automatically render every discovery request proper. Particular requests may be unduly repetitive or cumulative, overbroad, protected by privilege, or directed primarily toward developing evidence for use in another lawsuit. Many of Allco's requests disregard these limits, seeking information that is objectionable on these independent grounds. Moreover, Allco has also repeatedly sought information that is plainly immaterial to any issue properly before PURA in this proceeding, as do the questions referenced above, ALLCO-088 and ALLCO-152.[8] For example, although PURA may properly examine the reasonableness of the Company's overhead-allocation methodology in this proceeding, that inquiry does not render discoverable every interconnecting-customer complaint, every historical refund payment, or the name of every employee ever connected to the calculation of interconnection costs. Allco's repeated failure to observe these limits and submission of discovery requests lacking relevance or materiality underscores the need for clear direction from PURA.

PURA should note that Allco's conduct in an administrative proceeding is no different in other jurisdictions. On November 29, 2024, Allco filed a petition with the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities ("MDPU") requesting an adjudicatory proceeding pursuant to Section 9.3 of Massachusetts Electric Company d/b/a National Grid Standards for Interconnection of Distributed Generation, M.D.P.U. No. 1632. The MDPU granted that request and docketed the matter as D.P.U. 24-186.

On October 26, 2026, the MDPU Hearing Officer issued a ruling on a Motion to Compel filed by Allco on virtually the same basis that Allco asserts here in Motion No. 084. The MDPU

---

[6] Dotson v. Hartford Roman Catholic Diocesan Corp., No. CV106012742S, 2011 WL 1021745, (Conn. Super. Ct. Feb. 17, 2011) (citing, Berger v. Cuomo, 230 Conn. 1, 7 (1994)) (emphasis added); see also Conn. Gen. Stat. § 4-177c(a)(1) (permitting discovery of "relevant and material records, papers and documents[.]"); see, also Office of Consumer Counsel v. Department of Public Utility Control, 44 Conn. Supp. 21, 26-27 (1994) (explaining that information sought through discovery must be material and must advance the factual foundation upon which PURA's decision will rely); Cf. Berger v. Cuomo, 230 Conn. 1, 7 (1994) ("A plaintiff must be able to demonstrate good faith as well as probable cause that the information sought is both material and necessary to his action.")

[7] Evidence is relevant if it "has a logical tendency to aid the trier of fact in the determination of an issue. Evidence is relevant only if it has a tendency to establish the existence of a material fact." State v. Pagan, 158 Conn. App. 620, 634 (2015). Evidence is material when it is offered to prove a fact directly in issue or a fact probative of a matter in issue. State v. Estrella, 277 Conn. 458 n. 17 (2006).

[8] Evidence is relevant only if it has a tendency to establish the existence of a material fact. United Technologies Corp. v Commission on Human Rights & Opportunities, 72 Conn. App. 212, 229 (2002); Relevant evidence is defined in § 4–1 of the Connecticut Code of Evidence as "evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is material to the determination of the proceeding more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence."

Hearing Officer ruled against the Motion to Compel – in a proceeding that was initiated on Allco's own petition – describing Allco's Motion to Compel as almost identical to this proceeding:

> Allco's Motion is the first of three Motions to Compel it has filed in this case, which together cover more than 165 information requests across nine sets of discovery. Many of these requests either overlap or simply restate earlier requests with different wording. Discussion of the relevance and importance of the requested information (the key components of the Department's legal standard) in Allco's Motion and in National Grid's responses and objections is limited or non-existent.

(MDPU Hearing Officer Ruling, dated October 26, 2026, provided herewith).

The law is no different in Connecticut. A party is not entitled to all information it requests, nor is a party necessarily entitled to information that simply passes the threshold relevance inquiry. Pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. §4-178, PURA "shall, as a matter of policy, provide for the exclusion of irrelevant, immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence." In this case, such an order is necessary to relieve the Company from the undue burden of responding to irrelevant and repetitive information requests. In addition, pursuant to Connecticut law and practice, PURA may deny a request for relevant information if the level of detail sought would not further the analysis of the issues or if the impact of the response on the case is expected to be minimal.

Accordingly, Eversource respectfully requests that PURA issue an order denying Allco's Motion No. 084, in its entirety, along with this new Redundant Motion, and further require Allco to comply with the terms of the in-force 2021 Settlement Agreement (which is described in the Company's responses to Motion No. 084). Even if PURA declines to issue an order directing Allco to comply with the terms of the 2021 Settlement Agreement, PURA should still deny Allco's Motion No. 084 for the reasons set forth herein and in Eversource's Responses submitted to PURA on October 20, 2026 and October 27, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent P. Pace

Vincent P. Pace
Associate General Counsel
On behalf of The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy

cc: Service list

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

D.P.U. 24-186 October 26, 2026

Petition of Allco Renewable Energy Limited and Allco Finance Limited for an Adjudicatory Proceeding Regarding Interconnection Disputes with Massachusetts Electric Company d/b/a National Grid.

HEARING OFFICER RULING ON ALLCO'S FIRST MOTION TO COMPEL

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND[1]

On November 29, 2024, Allco Renewable Energy Limited and Allco Finance Limited ("Allco") filed with the Department of Public Utilities ("Department") a petition requesting an adjudicatory proceeding pursuant to Section 9.3 of Massachusetts Electric Company's d/b/a National Grid ("Company" or "National Grid") Standards for Interconnection of Distributed Generation, M.D.P.U. No. 1632 ("Interconnection Tariff")[2] ("Petition"). The Department has docketed this matter as D.P.U. 24-186.

This Ruling addresses the discovery issues raised in Allco's June 3, 2026 Motion to Compel Production of Documents and Complete Answers to Information Requests ("Allco's Motion"). Allco's Motion is the first of three Motions to Compel it has filed in this case, which together cover more than 165 information requests across nine sets of discovery. Many of these requests either overlap or simply restate earlier requests with different wording. Discussion of the relevance and importance of the requested information (the key components of the

---

1 For a detailed summary of the relevant procedural history in this case, please refer to the relevant discussion in the Department's recent Interlocutory Order in this docket, Allco Renewable Energy Limited and Allco Finance Limited, D.P.U. 24-186-A at 2-7 (September 15, 2026).

2 National Grid's currently effective Interconnection Tariff is M.D.P.U. No. 1632. At the time of Allco's filing the Petition, National Grid's effective Interconnection Tariff was D.P.U. No. 1468. Section 9.3 of National Grid's Interconnection Tariff has not changed from M.D.P.U. No, 1468 to M.D.P.U. No. 1632. Changes in M.D.P.U. No. 1632 do not materially affect this proceeding.

Department's legal standard) in Allco's Motion and in National Grid's responses and objections is limited or non-existent.[3]

Consequently, managing discovery in this proceeding and analyzing this sweeping discovery dispute has been extraordinarily time-intensive. The Department has repeatedly expressed concern with the delays in the proceedings to date and requested that the parties manage their case strategies as efficiently as possible. Regardless of the merits of the parties' positions, the magnitude and disorganization of the underlying discovery process and motion practice exemplify the unnecessary strain on the parties' and the Department's time and resources that has plagued this proceeding from the start. Once the procedural schedule in this docket resumes, I reiterate the expectation that the parties make every effort to facilitate the expeditious conclusion of this matter.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

With respect to discovery (e.g., information requests), the Department's regulation 220 CMR 1.06(5)(c)1 provides:

> The purpose for discovery is to facilitate the hearing process by permitting the parties and the Department to gain access to all relevant information in an efficient and timely manner. Discovery is intended to reduce hearing time, narrow the scope of issues, protect the rights of the parties, and ensure that a complete and accurate record is compiled.

Hearing officers have discretion in establishing discovery procedures and are guided in this regard, but not bound, by the principles and procedures underlying the Massachusetts Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 26 et seq. 220 CMR 1.06(5)(c)2; see Cambridge Electric Light Company, D.P.U. 94-101/95-36, at 11 n.5 (1995) (Department has not adopted Massachusetts Rules of Civil Procedure, but these rules sometimes provide useful dispositive models); see also Attorney General v. Department of Public Utilities, 390 Mass. 208, 212-213 (1983) (rules of court do not govern procedures in executive department). Rule 26(b)(1) provides in pertinent part:

> Parties may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, which is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action . . . . It is not ground for objection that the information sought will be inadmissible at the trial if the information sought appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Mass. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1).

---

[3] National Grid declined to file an opposition to Allco's Motion, deferring to the arguments in its Opposition to Allco's May 27, 2026 Motion for Extension of the Procedural Schedule.

In ruling on a motion to compel discovery, the Department finds it appropriate to adopt the Rule 26(b)(1) standard regarding the production of information. In re Olmstead, D.P.U. 06-AD-1, Second Interlocutory Order at 21-22 (September 2, 2010); NSTAR Gas Company, D.P.U. 14-64, Hearing Officer Ruling on Motion to Compel at 4 (July 25, 2014).

III. SCOPE OF DISCOVERY IN THIS PROCEEDING

A. Introduction

Because of the significant number of discovery requests addressed in this Ruling, the explanations of my decisions on individual requests in Section IV are necessarily brief. Accordingly, I first provide an overview of the discovery standards that guided the analysis and explain how I have applied them in the context of this proceeding to resolve the issues raised in Allco's Motion. Though presented in summary form, the explanations of my reasoning for each request reflect careful analysis using this framework.

B. Relevance and Burden

Regarding motions to compel discovery, the Department's regulations provide that an Order compelling compliance with a discovery request requires a finding that a party failed to comply in a reasonable manner with a legitimate discovery request without good cause. 220 CMR 1.06(5)(c)4.

The threshold issue to obtaining discovery is that the information sought must be relevant, that is, it must relate or pertain to legal or factual issues in the case or be reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Fiber Technologies Networks, LLC, D.T.E. 01-70, Interlocutory Order at 36 (December 24, 2002) (citing Mass. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1)). The Department has broad discretion in considering the relevance of and admitting evidence. Choice One Communications of Mass. Inc., D.T.C. 07-9, D.T.C. 10-2, Hearing Officer Ruling on Motion to Compel at 2 (December 30, 2010). Although discovery is a useful tool for narrowing and refining issues for adjudication, the Department is careful to guard against the use of discovery as a fishing expedition for unnecessary information. New England Telephone & Telegraph Company, D.P.U. 91-63-A at 11 (1991).

A party is not entitled to all requested information that passes the threshold relevance inquiry. The Department may take steps to protect a party against the undue burden of responding to information that is only marginally relevant. Verizon New England, D.T.E. 01-20, Interlocutory Order at 20 (October 18, 2001). The Department may deny a request for relevant information if the level of detail sought would not further the analysis of the issues or if the impact of the response on the case is expected to be minimal. D.T.E. 01-20, Interlocutory Order at 20. The Department may determine that producing relevant information would be unduly burdensome relative to its probative value, taking into account the context of the case, including the procedural schedule and the importance of the information sought to the issues being litigated. D.T.E. 01-20, Interlocutory Order at 20, 22.

The 90-day adjudication timeframe provided in Section 9.3(e) of the Interconnection Tariff is core to the context of this case and informs the assessment of reasonable discovery.[4] Section 9.3(e) contemplates filing testimony, completing pre-hearing discovery, and conducting an evidentiary hearing all within that 90-day period. Such an expedited timeline necessarily bounds the scope of discovery compared to other Department proceedings or adjudications in other forums. I have also considered the acceptable scope of discovery and burden of response in the context of the already significant delays to this proceeding.

Accordingly, I have carefully considered whether the information would meaningfully assist the progression of the case, whether the Company's previous responses provided sufficient information, and whether the burden of requiring further details or documents is justified under the circumstances. In certain instances, I have limited or modified Allco's requests where a less burdensome version would suffice. See D.T.E. 01-20, Interlocutory Order (modifying certain compelled responses to reduce the burden to the appropriate level in relation to the probative value).

C. Scope of Proceeding

Clarification of the scope of the proceeding is a procedural matter that is within the hearing officer's discretion. D.P.U. 06-AD-1, First Interlocutory Order at 7 (February 4, 2008). Determination of the scope of a proceeding is a threshold issue before ruling on what matters are relevant for purposes of discovery. If a claim is beyond the Department's jurisdiction or outside the scope of a proceeding, then discovery is not allowed on matters relevant to that claim. D.P.U. 14-10 through D.P.U. 14-47, Interlocutory Order at 13 (July 24, 2014);[5] D.P.U. 06-AD-1, First Interlocutory Order at 7.

The Company challenges whether Allco's claims are properly within the scope of the dispute resolution process contemplated by Section 9.3 of the Interconnection Tariff several times, including in its Answer to Allco's Petition, its Opposition to Allco's May 27, 2026 Motion to Revise the Procedural Schedule, its Opposition to Allco's August 10, 2026 Motion for Summary Judgment, and in response to several of the information requests at issue in Allco's Motion to Compel.

---

4 The context and purpose of the accelerated timeline guide the scope of discovery even though the Department waived the Section 9.3 procedural deadlines when establishing the initial 142-day Procedural Schedule for the proceeding. See D.P.U. 24-186, Procedural Notice Regarding Procedural Schedule (March 26, 2026).

5 This consolidated proceeding involved municipal aggregation plans submitted for approval by 38 municipalities pursuant to G.L. c. 164, § 134.

In its Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, Allco argues that four legal issues raised in its Petition are within the scope of the proceeding such that the Department can adjudicate them without the need for further discovery. These issues are:

(1) Whether the consent from the Ashburnham Municipal Light Plant ("AMLP") was required for interconnection;

(2) Whether the Company can impose a Contribution in Aid of Construction ("CIAC") tax adder to pay federal income tax;

(3) Whether Federal regulations 18 CFR §§ 292.303 and 292.101(b)(7) apply as limitations on interconnection costs that the Company may recovery from Allco; and

(4) Whether state law limits the recovery of certain interconnection costs that do not result "solely from" system modifications required to interconnect Allco's projects.

As communicated to the parties during the August 20, 2026 procedural conference, the Department intends to resolve this sweeping discovery dispute prior to ruling on Allco's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment for reasons of procedural efficiency. D.P.U. 24-186, Hearing Officer Memorandum Regarding Procedural Conference (August 21, 2026). Accordingly, the Department has not yet ruled on the dispute regarding the scope of the proceeding.

Several of the discovery requests included in Allco's Motion to Compel address topics that the parties do not agree are within the proceeding's scope. For requests to which National Grid objected as outside the scope of the proceeding but still provided a response, I have assessed the sufficiency of the response relative to the requested information without making a finding on the overall relevance of the request. For requests to which National Grid declined to respond, a decision would require analyzing the relevance of the requests and a resolution to the scope dispute. For requests in the latter category, I have deferred ruling until the Department's forthcoming decision on the scope of the proceeding.

IV. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

A. Communications

Information request ALLCO-NG-1-2 seeks communications concerning or mentioning Allco, Thomas Melone, or any of the four case numbers of the Allco projects. The Company objects to the breadth and scope of the request and states that it has already provided relevant information in response to other requests.

The request for all communications in the Company's possession or control concerning or mentioning Allco or Thomas Melone is overly broad, as it would capture materials unrelated

to the issues in this proceeding. The request for all communications concerning the Allco project case numbers is overly broad because it is not limited to any specific items or issues in dispute.

Denied.

B. Documents Identified by Reference in Attachment 3-1

Information requests ALLCO-NG-1-3 and ALLCO-NG-1-4 seek documents that form the basis for the Winchendon and Ware Final Accounting Reports ("FARs"). Allco seeks a set of documents (enumerated as items (1) through (6) on page 7 of Allco's Motion) referenced in or attached to emails that the Company produced in Attachment 3-1. The Company states that these documents were prepared in connection with the FARs but were not produced. The Company objects to the scope and relevance of the request and states that it has already provided relevant information in response to other requests.

I find that the documents specifically referenced in or attached to emails that the Company produced as response to information requests ALLCO-NG-1-3 and ALLCO-NG-1-4 are relevant and would not be overly burdensome for the Company to provide. However, Allco's request for notes from meetings referenced in the emails is overly broad. Information concerning the meetings is available in the emails themselves, and there is no indication that written notes exist or would be readily accessible. Further, meeting notes may be informal summaries of such matters as outcomes and next steps with no official recognition.

Granted with respect to items (1) through (5) and **denied** with respect to item (6).

C. Third-Party Vendor Invoices

Information request ALLCO-NG-3-31 seeks contracts, master service agreements, statements of work, and purchase orders charged to the Allco projects. On June 3, 2026, the Company objected to the breadth and relevance of the request but provided third-party invoices for the Ware distribution-line and substation work and for the Winchendon project. Allco had not received National Grid's June 3, 2026 production at the time its Motion to Compel was filed and requested the Company's response to this request. In its June 11, 2026 Status Update on its Motion to Compel, Allco withdrew the portion of its request that was mooted by the Company's June 3, 2026 production but maintained its request for additional contracts, master service agreements, statements of work, and purchase orders.

I find that the Company's June 3, 2026 production of third-party invoices for the Ware and Winchendon projects provides sufficient information to allow for Allco's assessment of those charges. The additional documentation Allco requests would not further the analysis of the dispute sufficiently to justify requiring its production.

Denied.

D. Marlowe Distribution WO 10025542900

Information request ALLCO-NG-1-5 seeks the general ledger for MA-00178729 (Winchendon). In the Motion to Compel, Allco request line-level transaction detail for the ledger the Company produced as Attachment Allco No. 5-1. The Company states that Attachment No. 5-1 provided the requested "general ledger."

I find that National Grid's response to Allco's request for a "general ledger" is complete. Allco's separate request for further detail regarding the Marlowe Distribution WO (information request ALLCO-NG-2-16) is discussed below.

Denied.

E. Vendor Invoices and Supporting Documentation

Information requests ALLCO-NG-2-32 and ALLCO-NG-2-33 seek vendor invoices and supporting documentation for vegetation management and management labor charges the Marlowe and Ware FARs. The Company objects to the breadth and relevance of the request and notes that it provided explanations of the vegetation management and management labor cost allocation methodologies and provided invoices in response to ALLCO-NG-3-31.[6]

National Grid's narrative explanations provide sufficient explanation of the necessity of the non-routine vegetation management work and of the assignment of specific management labor charges. National Grid also provided the requested invoices in response to ALLCO-NG-3-31. The additional detail Allco requests would not further the analysis of the dispute sufficiently to justify requiring its production.

Denied.

F. Cost Allocation-Methodology

Information requests ALLCO-NG-3-1 through ALLCO-NG-3-7 request documentation underlying the cost allocation methodologies the Company described in its responses to information requests ALLCO-NG-2-5 through ALLCO-NG-2-10. The Company objects to the breadth and relevance of the requests and refers to its prior responses explaining the various cost allocation methodologies.

As a general matter, I find that National Grid's narrative explanations of its cost allocation methodologies sufficiently address Allco's requests. Allco has not articulated concerns with the costs or cost allocation methodologies that would justify requiring National

---

[6] Allco had not received the third-party invoices the Company provided in response to ALLCO-NG-3-31 at the time it filed the Motion to Compel.

Grid to undertake the burden of providing further documentation that would facilitate Allco's scrutiny of the application of those methodologies.

Denied.

G. Service Company Billing Documents

Information requests ALLCO-NG-2-8, ALLCO-NG-3-8, and ALLCO-NG-3-9 seek documents and information regarding billing for services performed by National Grid USA Service Company.[7] The Company objects to the breadth and relevance of the requests and states that it described the relevant changes in response to ALLCO-NG-2-8 and provided a copy of the Order issued in Massachusetts Electric Company and Nantucket Electric Company, D.P.U. 23-150 (2024), which reviewed the Company's costs in its base distribution rate proceeding.

National Grid has provided extensive detail supporting the NGSC charges in Attachment Allco Information Request No. 6-1 and has explained its cost allocation methodology. Allco has not shown any irregularities or other cause for concern with the NGSC charges. I find that further detail and documentation would not further the analysis of the dispute sufficiently to justify requiring its production.

Denied.

H. Tax Gross-Up Methodology and Workpapers

Information requests ALLCO-NG-3-10 through ALLCO-NG-3-13 request information and supporting documentation regarding the Company's tax gross-up policy and its application to the Marlowe and Ware projects and to other customers seeking interconnection.[8] The Company objects to the breadth and relevance of the requests, and whether an interconnection applicant should be charged a CIAC Interconnection Tax is a policy issue that is outside of the scope of the Interconnection Tariff dispute process.

The Department has not yet ruled on the issue of whether an interconnecting customer should be charged a CIAC interconnection tax is within the scope of an interconnection dispute arising under Section 9.3 of the DG Interconnecting Tariff. While the tax advisers' analysis that

---

[7] National Grid USA Service Company ("NGSC") provides management, administrative, accounting, legal, engineering, information systems, and other services to affiliates within the National Grid USA holding company system including the Company. Massachusetts Electric Company and Nantucket Electric Company, D.P.U. 18-150, at 2 (2019).

[8] Due to what was presumably a clerical error, Allco's third set of information requests did not include ALLCO-NG-3-12. Because that request was not issued to the Company, it is not addressed in this Ruling.

National Grid included with its Answer to Allco's Petition provides some detail as to the decision to apply the tax gross-up to the Allco projects, I find that a ruling on information requests ALLCO-NG-3-10 through ALLCO-NG-3-13 requires analysis of the relevance of the requested information to the issues in dispute. Accordingly, I defer ruling on these requests pending the Department's decision on the scope of the proceedings.

Ruling deferred.

I. Purportedly Partial and Non-Responsive Answers

Allco states in the Motion that the Company provided partial or non-responsive answers to the following information requests:

ALLCO-NG-2-15 (ARC 242 transfers);

ALLCO-NG-2-16 (Marlowe WO 10025542900 journal entries)

ALLCO-NG-2-18 (699/850/As-Built status);

ALLCO-NG-2-19 (BSC and Pontoon charges);

ALLCO-NG-2-20 (Marlowe FAR drafts);

ALLCO-NG-2-23 (update analysis); and

ALLCO-NG-3-9 (Service Company cost-of-service review).

The Company objects to the breadth and relevance of each request, in addition to request-specific objections. I address each request in turn below.

ALLCO-NG-2-15: The Company's response explained "ARC 242 Error" as an administrative designation for transfers between work orders during project accounting. Absent a demonstration of any irregularities or other concerns with the charges included in the Final Accounting Reports, I find that more details would not further the analysis of the dispute.

Denied.

ALLCO-NG-2-16: I find that Allco should be provided with basic information about the value of the manual journal entries and the justification for billing those charges to the customer to assess whether further detail is warranted.

I deny Allco's requests for the identity of the personnel who determined that the manual journal entries were billable to the customer and for documentation supporting the determinations. The evidentiary record at this stage of the proceeding does not support requiring the Company to provide further detail absent an indication of irregularity or other concern with the charges it was assessed.

Granted in part. National Grid shall provide the total dollar value of the charges placed on WO 10025542900 by manual journal entry and the basis for the determination that such charges were billable to the customer.

ALLCO-NG-2-18: The Company's response confirmed that the FAR is final notwithstanding the current status of the 699 and 850 requirements on the associated Work Orders and that all necessary work has been completed and invoices collected. In view of this confirmation, I find that further detail on a per-work order level detail is unnecessary.

Denied.

ALLCO-NG-2-19: The Company's response provided the requested confirmation that the charges were identified and retained on the project, the basis for that resolution, and that the charges were included in the FAR. I find that the identity of the project manager who made the determination is not relevant.

Denied.

ALLCO-NG-2-20: The Company's response identified and explained the corrections made to the October 6, 2025 draft of the FAR, confirmed that the corrected version was provided to Allco and when, and confirmed that there were no further revisions to the final FAR. I find the Company's response sufficient and that requiring the Company to supplement its response with the underlying drafts is not warranted.

Denied.

ALLCO-NG-2-23: This request is moot, as the Company provided a response to subsequently issued information request ALLCO-NG-4-23, which requests the same information using different terminology.

Denied.

ALLCO-NG-3-9: As discussed above, the Company provides a detailed explanation of its Service Company charges and cost allocation methodology, and Allco has not identified irregularities or other concerns that warrant further scrutiny or supplemental information. Further explanation would not further the analysis of the dispute to justify requiring its production.

Denied.

J. Local System Plan, Grid Modernization Plan, and Shared-Upgrade Documents

Information requests ALLCO-NG-3-25 through ALLCO-NG-3-27 seek information and documentation regarding the Company's Local System Plan ("LSP"), Grid Modernization Plan ("GMP"), and cost-allocation framework and supporting documents for shared system upgrades.

The Company objects to the breadth and relevance of the requests, states that the LSP post-dates the execution of the Interconnection Service Agreement ("ISA"), and objects to the request for cost-allocation framework and documentation as seeking a legal conclusion.

I find that the Company's explanation in its responses and in its Answer to the Petition of its LSP and GMP work is sufficient and that further detail or supplementation is not necessary at this stage of the proceeding. Additionally, as Allco acknowledges, the October 2019 LSPs and GMPs Allco are both publicly available documents, and Allco can access them independently from discovery in this proceeding. Finally, although the Department has not yet ruled on whether the federal cost allocation framework applies to this proceeding, I find that Allco's request for the Company's understanding of how that framework applied the Allco projects seeks the Company's legal conclusions and analysis and is improper as a discovery request.

Denied.

K. Vegetation Management, Management Labor, and Ancillary Distribution Documents

Information requests ALLCO-NG-3-28 through ALLCO-NG-30 seek information and documentation regarding the Company's vegetation management and management labor charges. The Company objects to the relevance and breadth of the requests and notes that it provided additional information regarding vegetation management in response to subsequently issued information requests.

As noted above with respect to information request ALLCO-NG-2-23, I find that the Company provided sufficient explanation of its non-routine vegetation management work and its assignment of specific management labor charges and that the requested invoices have been provided in response to information request ALLCO-NG-3-31. Further detail and documentation would not further the analysis of the issues to justify requiring its production.

Denied.

L. ISA Contingency and Indirect-Cost Loading

Information requests ALLCO-NG-2-21, ALLCO-NG-2-22, ALLCO-NG-3-14, and ALLCO-NG-3-15 seek information and documentation regarding contingency, indirect and overhead costs and the Company's cost estimation methodology. The Company objects to the relevance and breadth of the requests, notes that the contingency adder and cost estimates were agreed upon terms in the ISA, and states that the contingency amount is moot because the project is complete and that the Company issued the Final Accounting Report.

I find that Allco's request for further information regarding costs that were included in the cost estimate after the execution of the ISA and completion of the project is unreasonable and would not further the analysis of the issues to justify requiring its production. The same applies to the request for further explanation of the cost estimation methodology.

Denied.

M. Engineering Alternatives

Information requests ALLCO-NG-2-23 through ALLCO-NG-2-25 and ALLCO-NG-3-16 through ALLCO-NG-3-18 seek information and documentation regarding the Company's consideration of alternative engineering solutions for interconnecting the Allco projects. The Company objects to the relevance and breadth of the requests, in addition to further objections to the individual requests.

As noted above, Allco's request with respect to ALLCO-NG-2-23 (information regarding an Uprate Study) is denied, as Allco issued a subsequent request for the same information using different terminology.

The Company explains the basis for its rejection of an express-feeder solution in response to ALLCO-NG-2-24 and its basis for rejecting lower-line voltage modifications in response to ALLCO-NG-2-25. I find that the Company's narrative responses sufficiently respond to Allco's requests and that providing further detail or documentation (as requested in information requests ALLCO-NG-3-16 through ALLCO-NG-3-18) would not further the analysis of the issues to justify requiring its production.

Denied.

N. Winchendon #1 ISA Processing Timeline

Information request ALLCO-NG-2-27 seeks detailed information regarding the processing timeline for the Winchendon #1 application. The Company objects to the relevance and breadth of this request, states that it improperly seeks a legal conclusion regarding whether consent by AMLP was required to construct the Winchendon #1 project, and refers to its Answer to Allco's Petition.

I find that Allco's request for the steps in the application processing timeline, the date each step was completed, and an explanation of any delays is reasonable and would not be overly burdensome for the Company to provide. The remaining details sought in Allco's request would be unreasonably burdensome for the Company to provide.

Granted in part. The Company shall provide an explanation of (a) each step in processing the Winchendon #1 application from December 20, 2017 through November 29, 2018; (b) the date each step was completed; (c) any delay encountered at each step; and (d) a brief explanation of the delay, if any.

O. AMLP Consent

Information requests ALLCO-NG-2-28 and ALLCO-NG-3-23 seek information and documents regarding the Company's conclusion that the Winchendon #1 project required the

AMLP's consent. The Company objects to the relevance and breadth of this request, states that it improperly seeks a legal conclusion regarding whether consent by AMLP was required to construct the Winchendon #1 project, and refers to its Answer to Allco's Petition.

I find that the Company's explanation in its Answer to Allco's Petition is sufficiently responsive to these requests and that additional information is not warranted. Further detail and documentation would not further the analysis of the issues to justify requiring its production. Allco's request for an explanation of the Company's conclusion that AMLP's consent was required seeks a legal conclusion and is improper as a discovery request.

Denied.

P. Winchendon #2/#3 Queue Removal and Group-Study Determination

Information requests ALLCO-NG-2-29 and ALLCO-NG-3-21 seek information and documentation regarding the removal of the Winchendon #2 and Winchendon #3 projects from the interconnection queue and requirement that they participate in the group study. Information request ALLCO-NG-3-22 seeks documents regarding other instances of the Company's requiring interconnecting customers to participate in a group study. The Company objects to the breadth and relevance of the requests, states that they seek a legal conclusion regarding the Company's decision to study the projects in a group study, and refers to the information provided in its Answer to Allco's Petition.

I find that the Company's explanation of the queue removals and group study requirement for the Winchendon #2 and Winchendon #3 projects in its Answer to Allco's Petition is sufficient. Further detail and documentation substantiating those decisions would not further the analysis of the issues to justify requiring its production and would be unreasonably burdensome for the Company to provide. I also find that the request for documents regarding other instances in which the Company required an interconnection application to participate in a group study and the basis for those determinations is not relevant to the issues concerning the Allco projects in this proceeding.

Denied.

Q. 4.98-MW Project Records

Information request ALLCO-NG-3-24 seeks documentation regarding to the 4.98-megawatt ("MW") project listed ahead of the Allco Ware projects in the Company's interconnection queue. The Company objects to the relevance and breadth of this request and refers to its explanation in response to ALLCO-NG-2-30.

I find that the Company's narrative response to ALLCO-NG-2-30 sufficiently explains the status of the 4.98-MW project ahead of the Ware Projects in the queue and that its interconnection to a different substation is the reason that the Ware system modifications are still

required. Further detail and documentation concerning the 4.98-MW project would not further the analysis of the issues to justify requiring its production.

Denied.

R. Shared Upgrade Cost Allocation Framework

Information request ALLCO-NG-2-34 seeks information regarding the Company's determinations that each charge in the Marlowe and Ware FARs was a "necessary cost" under 18 CFR §§ 292.303 and 292.101(b)(7)). Information request ALLCO-NG-3-27 seeks documents describing the Company's shared upgrade cost allocation framework. The Company objects to the breadth and relevance of these requests and states that they seek the Company's legal analysis of the applicability of Federal regulations to the Allco projects.

I decline to rule on this request in this Ruling. The relevance of the requested information depends on whether the cost allocation framework under the referenced Federal regulations is applicable to an interconnection dispute under Section 9.3 of the Company's Interconnection Tariff. Accordingly, I defer deciding this request pending the Department's determination of the scope of the proceeding.

Ruling deferred.

S. Substation Construction History

Information requests ALLCO-NG-2-26, ALLCO-NG-3-19, and ALLCO-NG-3-20 seek information and documents concerning the construction of and modifications to substations associated with the Allco projects. The Company objects to the breadth and relevance of the requests.

The Company's response to ALLCO-NG-3-20 states that the Company did not combine any system modifications with other modifications to its electric power system to service other distribution or interconnecting customers, and that it did not charge Allco for any pre-existing substation modifications. Further explanation and documents (particularly the extensive historical construction records requested) to substantiate these statements would not further the analysis of the issues to justify requiring its production.

Denied.

T. Witness and Personnel Identification

Information requests ALLCO-NG-2-1 and ALLCO-NG-2-2 seek identification of the Company personnel involved in preparing the Ware and Marlowe FARs. Information request ALLCO-NG-3-32 requests identification of the Company's witnesses, and information request ALLCO-NG-3-33 requests the documents the Company's witnesses will rely on. The Company objects to the relevance and breadth of the request, states that its discovery responses name the

relevant supporting witnesses, and states that further witnesses would be named in its rebuttal testimony. The Company further states that it is not required to provide further witness identification and documentation information at this stage in the proceeding.

I find that Allco's request for witness identification and documents is premature, as the Company is not required to provide such information at this stage in the proceedings.

Denied.

U. Privilege Objection

Information request ALLCO-NG-2-3 seeks the information regarding a meeting "with Will, Kevin, and legal" referenced in a September 5, 2025 email that the Company provided in Attachment Allco Information Request No. 3-1. The Company objects to the request as protected by the attorney-client privilege and provides a privilege log as Attachment ALLCO-NG-3-34.

Much of the information Allco requests, including the attendees, the meeting date, and the topic of discussion, is apparent from the face of the September 5, 2025 email. I find that requiring the Company to provide the further detail that Allco requests would be unreasonably burdensome relative to its probative value. I deny Allco's request without deciding on the merits of the Company's assertion of the attorney-client privilege. See D.T.E. 01-70, Interlocutory Order at 37 (upholding hearing officer's denial of motion to compel for lack of relevance without reaching the attorney-client privilege assertion).

Denied.

V. Privilege Log

Information request ALLCO-NG-3-34 seeks "all communications (whether or not produced in response to the First Set or in Attachment 3-1) within, to, or from National Grid… concerning Allco's November 29, 2024 Petition, this Proceeding, or any of the Allco Projects, from January 1, 2024 through the date of response."

The Company objects to the request as seeking information protected by the attorney-client privilege and provides a privilege log of communications concerning (a) Allco and this proceeding Petition and (b) "other communications protected by attorney-client privilege that relate to the development of the Final Accounting Reports that are the subject of this proceeding" (Company's Response to information request ALLCO-NG-3-34).

In Allco's Motion, Allco argues that the Company's privilege claims are waived because its privilege assertions are overbroad and because its privilege log is not sufficiently detailed (Allco's Motion at 18). Allco requests that the Department require the Company to supplement the privilege log to identify: (i) communications that copy in-house counsel without seeking legal advice; (ii) communications that post-date issuance of the FARs that relate to litigation

strategy rather than the substance of the FARs; (iii) the non-legal portions of the September 9, 2025 meeting concerning the Marlowe FAR, and (iv) the participants in that meeting (Allco's Motion at 18).

The Department does not require the routine filings of privilege logs as a general matter of practice. New England Gas Company, D.P.U. 09-GAFC-P6 / D.P.U. 11-54, First Interlocutory Order at 26, n.25 (June 24, 2013). Typically, parties file a motion for protective treatment of the purportedly privileged information pursuant to 220 CMR 1.04(5)(e) and do not file privilege logs with the motions. D.P.U. 09-GAFC-P6 / D.P.U. 11-54, First Interlocutory Order at 26. However, the Department may require a privilege log if there is otherwise insufficient information to evaluate a claim of privilege. D.P.U. 09-GAFC-P6 / D.P.U. 11-54, First Interlocutory Order at 26, n. 25.

Given the nature of Allco's request for communications regarding this proceeding and Allco's Petition, I agree that a privilege log is the appropriate means to evaluate the Company's privilege assertions. I find that the Company's privilege log is insufficient to assess its privilege assertions.

The stated basis for the assertions of privilege over each communication in the privilege log is: "Communications regarding litigation strategy and case preparation." Communications concerning Allco's Petition and this proceeding would naturally implicate litigation strategy and case preparation. However, the Company states in its response to ALLCO-NG-3-34 that the log also includes "other communications… that relate to the development of the Final Accounting Reports that are the subject of this proceeding," which, presumably, does not relate to the Allco Petition or the proceeding (or it would not be necessary to distinguish them). If so, it is not clear why this category of communications would relate to "litigation strategy and case preparation." Accordingly, the Company's privilege log does not provide sufficient detail regarding its privilege assertions to allow Allco or the Department to assess those claims.[9]

Granted as to items (i) and (ii) in Allco's request. National Grid shall supplement its privilege log to (i) identify any communications that copy in-house counsel without giving or obtaining legal advice and (ii) state whether each withheld communication included in the privilege log relates to either: (a) litigation strategy and case preparation; (b) preparation of the one or both of the FARs that are the subject of this proceeding; or (c) another issue that the Company claims gives rise to the attorney-client privilege.

---

[9] At this stage, I decline to find that the lack of detail in the privilege log constitutes a waiver of the privilege, as Allco argues (Allco's Motion at 18). I will assess the Company's privilege claims should Allco challenge them upon receiving the Company's supplemental privilege log.

Denied as to the items (iii) and (iv) in Allco's request. As noted above, I find that the request for information regarding the substantive discussion and participants in the September 9, 2025 meeting is overly broad (items (iii) and (iv)).

V. RULING

Accordingly, after due consideration and opportunity for response, the Motion to Compel Responses to Information Requests is GRANTED in part, DEFERRED in part, and DENIED in part, as provided herein. By no later than **Monday, November 9, 2026**, National Grid shall provide supplemental responses to information requests:

i. ALLCO-NG-1-3 and ALLCO-NG-1-4, as described in Section IV.B;

ii. ALLCO-NG-2-16, as described in Section IV.I;

iii. ALLCO-NG-2-27, as described in Section IV.N; and

iv. ALLCO-NG-3-34, as described in Section IV.V.

Under the provisions of 220 CMR 1.06(5)(d)(3), any party may appeal this Ruling to the Commission by filing a written appeal with supporting documentation within seven business days of this Ruling. A copy of this Ruling must accompany any appeal. A written response to any appeal must be filed within five business days of the appeal. The Ruling remains in full force and effect unless and until set aside or modified by the Commission.
220 CMR 1.06(5)(d)(2).

/s/
Ian Bollag-Miller
Hearing Officer