Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: Donald J. Scacco Jr., Digaunto Chatterjee and Douglas P. Horton
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Executive Leadership Panel) With reference to page 21 of the Executive Leadership Panel's Direct Testimony, state whether the Company is advancing any proposal in this proceeding that would promote, allow, or otherwise enable utility ownership of generation. If the Company is advancing any such proposal in this proceeding, provide a reference to the testimony where the proposal(s) may be found.

Response:

No, the Company is not advancing any specific proposal in this proceeding to promote, allow, or enable utility ownership of generation. The Company's point is that it is time to consider all alternatives to solving the energy affordability conundrum in Connecticut (and the broader New England region). This should start with development of a comprehensive independent integrated resource planning assessment that projects the state of resource adequacy under a range of scenarios – ten years out. This is the type of study completed with robust stakeholder participation and input – including EDCs, LDCs, the legislature, and advocates for all customer segments (residential, commercial, and industrial) – that is essential to formulate an informed view of the comprehensive solution set necessary to meet the future resource adequacy needs within Connecticut. The Company is open to consideration of what would essentially be *customer-owned* generation through the utility operating model, if it would be the most cost-effective solution to meet reliability needs of Connecticut customers.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: Donald J. Scacco Jr., Digaunto Chatterjee, Douglas P. Horton, Edward A. Davis and Kimberly R. Parsons
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Executive Leadership Panel) With reference to page 29 of the Executive Leadership Panel's Direct Testimony, provide the approximate percentage of the average Rate 39 bill in 2025 represented by public benefit programs.

Response:

The approximate percentage of the average Rate 39 bill in 2025 represented by public benefit programs is 15.4%. Please refer to CIEC-002, Attachment 1, for additional detail.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: Donald J. Scacco Jr., Digaunto Chatterjee, Douglas P. Horton, Edward A. Davis and Kimberly R. Parsons
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Executive Leadership Panel) With reference to page 29 of the Executive Leadership Panel's Direct Testimony, provide the approximate percentage of the average Rate 57 bill in 2025 represented by public benefit programs.

Response:

The approximate percentage of the average Rate 57 bill in 2025 represented by public benefit programs is 19.2%. Please refer to CIEC-003, Attachment 1, for additional detail.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: Amparo Nieto
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Amparo Nieto (ACOSS)) With reference to page 6 of Nieto's Direct Testimony, confirm that meter reading costs were allocated within each class, such that no class is assigned responsibility for costs to read the meters of customers in a different class.

Response:

Yes. The Company provided the test year meter reading expenses by class. The class shares relative to total meter reading expenses were used to calculate the class allocation factors.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: Amparo Nieto
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Amparo Nieto (ACOSS)) Explain the rationale behind the decision to allocate meter plant as described on page 6, lines 21 through 25, of Nieto's Direct Testimony. Include in your response workpapers in their native format with all cells and formulae unlocked (if applicable) that demonstrate how the meter plant allocators were determined.

Response:

The Company calculated the total loaded meter plant cost for each rate class, using as the basis for this calculation the meter types that are currently used to provide meter services for each class, the number of meters of each type, and the unit installed loaded cost per meter type. The loaded meter plant costs include loaded labor costs, and any use of vehicle and IT-related costs involved in installation. Once these costs are calculated for the range of meter types used in a class, the costs were summed for each customer class. The resulting class-based allocated costs form the basis for the ACOS allocation factors.

The explanation at page 6, lines 21-25, in Ms. Nieto's Direct Testimony is meant only to reflect that the meter plant allocation factors are not merely based on the number of meters by class, rather the factors also reflect the relative unit cost differentials among the meter types used for different customer classes. The class weighting factors were computed for informational purposes. The workpaper associated with the class allocation factor for meter plant is provided as CIEC-005, Attachment 1.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: Amparo Nieto
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Amparo Nieto (ACOSS)) Provide an electronic copy of the allocated cost-of-service study with all formulas and links intact.

Response:

Please refer to Exhibit CLP-ACOS-2-CONFIDENTIAL from the Application for the excel copy of the allocated cost-of-service study with all formulas and links intact.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: Amparo Nieto
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Amparo Nieto (MCOSS)) Provide an electronic copy of the marginal cost-of-service study with all formulas and links intact.

Response:

Please refer to Exhibit CLP-MCOS-2-CONFIDENTIAL from the Application for the excel copy of the marginal cost-of-service study with all formulas and links intact.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: David L. Gladey, John P. Dipaola-Tromba, Leanne M. Landry and Jeffrey D. Turano
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Capital Additions Panel) For each of the past 10 calendar years, specify:

a. the capital expenditure budget broken down by investment in the transmission, sub-transmission, primary, and secondary systems; and
b. the amount of actual capital expenditures, broken down by investment in the transmission, sub-transmission, primary, and secondary systems.

Response:

For purposes of the capital expenditure budget in this distribution rate proceeding, the Company does not track investment by the categories of "transmission, sub-transmission, primary, and secondary systems."

a. Please refer to CIEC-008, Attachment 1, for a summary of actual and forecast distribution capital expenditures for the years 2018-2025 as filed in compliance with Docket No. 17-10-46 each year.

b. Please refer to subpart a. Please also refer to Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS-4 which summarizes the cumulative capital spending to date for each project put in service from 2017-2025 greater than $100K and Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS 6 which includes the associated capital project documentation. Also for reference, although not capital spending, Exhibit CLP-ADDITIONS-2 and 3 provide a summary of plant additions (both distribution and transmission) by year and is reconciled to the Company's FERC Form 1.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: David L. Gladey, Lavelle Freeman, John P. Dipaola-Tromba, Jennifer A. Schilling and Elli Ntakou
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Capital Additions Panel) For each year of Eversource's current five-year capital plan, specify the proposed capital expenditure budget broken down by investment in the transmission, sub-transmission, primary, and secondary systems.

Response:

For purposes of the capital expenditure budget in this distribution rate proceeding, the Company does not track investment by the categories of "transmission, sub-transmission, primary, and secondary systems."

To be responsive to this request, please refer to Exhibit CLP-TSP-3, page 41, for a summary of Eversource's current five-year distribution capital plan broken down by the Company's investment categories of basic business, new customer, peak load/capacity, reliability, regulatory commitments, facilities, information technology and all other.

CL&P's transmission investment is out of scope for this distribution rate proceeding, however, for informational purposes to assist in CEIC's inquiry, please refer to CIEC-009, Attachment 1, for a summary of the Company's forecasted transmission capital spending for the years 2026-2030 from Eversource Energy's Year End 2025 Earnings Report. This publicly available chart summarizes the forecasted transmission capital expenditures for each Eversource Energy electric operating company.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: David L. Gladey, Lavelle Freeman, John P. Dipaola-Tromba, Jennifer A. Schilling and Elli Ntakou
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Capital Additions Panel) Specify the total number of customers served by Eversource during each of the last ten years.

Response:

The table below reports the total number of customer accounts served by CL&P in the years 2015 through 2025.

Year	Number of Customers
2025	1,309,940
2024	1,290,879
2023	1,281,654
2022	1,276,313
2021	1,272,110
2020	1,264,653
2019	1,256,150
2018	1,251,053
2017	1,245,042
2016	1,238,337
2015	1,230,278

Source: FERC Form 1, at page 304.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Revenue Requirements Panel) Specify Eversource's total 2026 revenue requirement broken down by revenues recovered through distribution rates, Rate Adjustment Mechanisms ("RAM"), and any other category designation utilized by the Company.

Response:

Please refer to CIEC-011, Attachment 1, for the Company's 2026 total revenue requirement broken down by revenues recovered through distribution rates, Rate Adjustment Mechanisms ("RAM"), and other categories. Please note the distribution rate amount reflects the Company's current allowed revenue target and does not include the revenue deficiency presented as part of the current rate case. Additionally, please note the Company does not calculate a revenue requirement for its generation service charge rates (Standard Service, Last Resort Service, and Bypassable Federally Mandated Congestion Charge), as these rates result from a competitive bid process and are only charged to customers who take generation service from the Company.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Revenue Requirements Panel) Specify:

a. Each currently-approved deferral mechanism; and
b. Each new deferral mechanism proposed in the rate filing.

Response:

a. The reconciliation mechanisms that the Company has identified in subpart (a) of its response to interrogatory CIEC-013[i] are the currently approved deferral mechanisms.

b. As part of its filing, the Company proposed a new reconciliation mechanism for storm costs referred to as the Storm Cost Recovery Adjustment Factor ("SCRAF"). Additionally, the Company follows long-standing regulatory practice whereby if it incurs a significant new cost that is not included in its cost of service, it will defer such cost if it deems the recovery of the cost to be probable. In that case, the Company will ultimately make a request to PURA for cost-recovery treatment, as appropriate.

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] CIEC-013 Question:

(Revenue Requirements Panel) Specify:
a. Each currently-approved reconciliation mechanism; and
b. Each new reconciliation mechanism proposed in the rate filing.

CIEC-013 Response:

a. The Company currently has the following reconciliation mechanisms, primarily necessary to accommodate electric supply and public-benefit costs:

1) Generation Service Charge ("GSC")
2) Bypassable Federally Mandated Congestion Charge ("BFMCC")
3) Revenue Decoupling Mechanism ("RDM")
4) Electric System Improvements charge ("ESI")
5) Competitive Transition Assessment ("CTA")

6) Transmission Adjustment Clause ("TAC")
7) Nonbypassable Federally Mandated Congestion Charge ("NBFMCC")
8) System Benefits Charge ("SBC"), and
9) Conservation Adjustment Mechanism ("CAM")

b. As part of this current rate case, the Company is requesting one new annual reconciliation mechanism for storm costs referred to as the Storm Cost Recovery Adjustment Factor ("SCRAF"). Additionally, the Company has proposed a Performance Based Multi-year Rate Plan ("PBMRP"), which does not function as a reconciliation mechanism. Rather, the PBMRP would function in lieu of sequential distribution rate petitions to provide incremental revenue support to operate the business following the initial rate year. Without a multi-year rate plan in place, the Company plans to file requests for distribution rate amendments as close to annually as possible in order to support the capital investment levels needed on the system.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Revenue Requirements Panel) Specify:

a. Each currently-approved reconciliation mechanism; and
b. Each new reconciliation mechanism proposed in the rate filing.

Response:

a. The Company currently has the following reconciliation mechanisms, primarily necessary to accommodate electric supply and public-benefit costs:

1) Generation Service Charge ("GSC")
2) Bypassable Federally Mandated Congestion Charge ("BFMCC")
3) Revenue Decoupling Mechanism ("RDM")
4) Electric System Improvements charge ("ESI")
5) Competitive Transition Assessment ("CTA")
6) Transmission Adjustment Clause ("TAC")
7) Nonbypassable Federally Mandated Congestion Charge ("NBFMCC")
8) System Benefits Charge ("SBC"), and
9) Conservation Adjustment Mechanism ("CAM")

b. As part of this current rate case, the Company is requesting one new annual reconciliation mechanism for storm costs referred to as the Storm Cost Recovery Adjustment Factor ("SCRAF"). Additionally, the Company has proposed a Performance Based Multi-year Rate Plan ("PBMRP"), which does not function as a reconciliation mechanism. Rather, the PBMRP would function in lieu of sequential distribution rate petitions to provide incremental revenue support to operate the business following the initial rate year. Without a multi-year rate plan in place, the Company plans to file requests for distribution rate amendments as close to annually as possible in order to support the capital investment levels needed on the system.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: Rima Hyder, Matthew Fallon and Jonathan Kallen
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Anne E. Bulkley) Provide the following for Eversource and all parent, holding, and service companies:

a. The most recent shareholder's report;
b. The latest credit reports from all credit reporting agencies;
c. The latest presentations made to credit rating agencies;
d. The latest investor presentation; and
e. Equity analyst reports issued within the last three months.

Please update this response during this proceeding if relevant reports, presentations, or analyses are available after the date of your initial response.

Response:

a. Please refer to CIEC-014, Attachment 1, for the most recent shareholder's report (United States Securities and Exchange Commission Form 10-Q for the quarterly period ended June 30, 2026).

b. Please refer to the following attachments for the latest credit reports from the credit-rating agencies:
   - CIEC-014, Attachment 2, for the S&P Global Ratings reports
   - CIEC-014, Attachment 3, for the Moody's Ratings reports
   - CIEC-014, Attachment 4, for the Fitch Ratings reports

c. Please refer to the CIEC-014, Attachment 5 CONFIDENTIAL AND REDACTED FOR RELEVANCE, for the Eversource Energy 2026 presentation to the rating agencies.

d. Please refer to CIEC-014, Attachment 6, for the latest investor presentation.

e. Please refer to CIEC-014, Attachment 7 CONFIDENTIAL, for the equity analyst reports issued within the last three months. The attachment includes reports from Mizuho Securities USA LLC, Morningstar Equity Research, TD Cowen, UBS Global Research,

and Wolfe Research. These reports are confidential analyst reports that are not within the proprietary control of Eversource Energy and no public version is available.

Eversource also received reports from Bank of America Securities/Global Research, Citi Research, Goldman Sachs Research, J.P. Morgan Equity Research, and Wells Fargo Equity Research in this time period. However, these five entities denied permission to reproduce their research.

The UBS Global Research report is provided subject to the disclaimer provided below.

Disclaimer from UBS Global Research:

Pursuant to this email, UBS AG or its relevant affiliate that published the UBS research report(s) referenced below ("**UBS")** grants Eversource Energy (**"User**") a royalty-free, non-exclusive and non-transferable licence to use the UBS research reports referenced below (the "**UBS Material")** solely for the purpose of submitting the UBS Material, in its entirety, to the Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority ("**CT PURA**") in connection with User's regulatory filing, on a confidential, non-public basis, for CT PURA's internal regulatory use only (the **"Purpose"**). For the avoidance of doubt, UBS has no involvement in, responsibility for, or opinion on the Purpose, the regulatory filing, or any matters submitted to or considered by CT PURA, and UBS does not endorse or express any view on any positions, arguments, or conclusions advanced by User. User acknowledges that UBS retains all right, title, and interest in and to the UBS Material, including all intellectual property and proprietary rights, whether registered or unregistered, legal or beneficial. User agrees to reproduce the following copyright notice prominently on the UBS Material:

Source: 2Q'26 EPS a Bit Light; Potential Transmission Cap-ex Upside dated July 30, 2026 © UBS. All rights reserved. Reproduced with permission. May not be forwarded or otherwise distributed.
Source: CT PURA approved $668 mln net storm costs eligible for recovery and $872 mln prudently incurred. dated July 30, 2026 © UBS. All rights reserved. Reproduced with permission. May not be forwarded or otherwise distributed.
Source: CT PURA draft decision approves $742 mln storm securitization and prospective carrying charges. dated June 30, 2026 © UBS. All rights reserved. Reproduced with permission. May not be forwarded or otherwise distributed

Source: CT Governor Regulatory Proposals Could Hamper Rate Case; Similar to Others dated June 10, 2026 © UBS. All rights reserved. Reproduced with permission. May not be forwarded or otherwise distributed.
Source: Positive 1Q'26 Result; Focus is on CT Regulatory Calendar dated May 6, 2026 © UBS. All rights reserved. Reproduced with permission. May not be forwarded or otherwise distributed.

UBS EXPRESSLY EXCLUDES ANY AND ALL WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND WITH RESPECT TO THE UBS MATERIAL. THE UBS MATERIAL IS LICENSED "AS IS" AND "AS AVAILABLE" WITHOUT REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND (INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF TITLE, ACCURACY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE) AND USER ASSUMES THE ENTIRE AND SOLE RISK OF ITS USE AND RELIANCE THEREON. USER WILL HOLD UBS HARMLESS ON DEMAND FROM ANY ACTUAL OR THREATENED LIABILITY WHICH MAY ARISE FROM USER'S OR PURA'S USE OF THE UBS MATERIAL. User may not assign, sublicense, transfer, or otherwise dispose of any of its rights or obligations under this email. User further agrees that, when providing the UBS Material to CT PURA, it will clearly state that CT PURA is deemed to acknowledge and agree, by accessing the UBS Material, that (i) the UBS Material is provided for information purposes only; (ii) the UBS Material is subject to the disclaimers and limitations included therein and in this email; (iii) CT PURA is not, and shall not be treated as, a "client" of UBS for any legal or regulatory purpose; (iv) the UBS Material must not be relied upon or acted upon for any purpose; (v) the UBS Material is confidential and for internal regulatory use only.

Date Filed: August 18, 2026

Witness: Sasha P. Lazor and Marianne H. Eichler
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

(Employee Compensation and Benefits Panel) Does the Company's variable pay program include any employee incentive tied to capital additions? If the answer is in the affirmative, identify and explain in detail each such incentive.

Response:

There are two stages to the Company's variable pay program. In the first stage, there is an annual determination ***to fund variable pay compensation and at what level***. This is a determination made by the Board of Trustees, which views the determination on a holistic, enterprise-wide basis because – when the decision is made to fund the variable pay compensation component – it is a decision that will apply across the entire Eversource Energy enterprise for all employees of every division and operating unit. From a corporate financial perspective, this is a determination in the range of $80 million on an enterprise-wide basis, which is therefore made by the Board of Trustees based on a pre-determined mix of financial and service-based objectives. This stage is described in detail in CIEC-015, Attachment 1 (2026 Proxy Statement), at pages 48-52, reflecting a weighting of approximately 70% financial objectives and 30% service-related objectives. At this level, there is no metric tied to capital additions or achievement of the capital expenditure forecast.

The second stage of the Eversource Energy variable pay program is the determination of ***what individual employees have earned in the prior performance year*** in relation to their specific performance goals. The determination of what each individual employee has earned is derived through an annual "top-to-bottom" process within each operating unit whereby the performance of each employee is evaluated and rated as compared to a designated slate of goals that are tailored to the employee's specific work function and role within the organization. Within an operating affiliate, such as CL&P, the employee-specific performance goals are 100% tied to customer-beneficial functions and activities.

Depending on the function and role of the employee, the employee's specific performance goals may include "financial" objectives such as budget control and efficiency innovation. These types of financial objectives benefit customers directly by helping to control costs and assure efficiency in the cost of providing service to customers in day-to-day operations. In this regard, there is no employee that is incentivized to find capital additions for the purpose of achieving earnings or growing rate base. However, employees may have a performance goal that seeks to incentivize good budget practices, such as budget accuracy or bringing the work plan in on budget. Good

performance on these types of goals works to the direct benefit of customers by assuring rational and efficient business operations.