Date Filed: November 12, 2026

Witness: Edward A. Davis and Kimberly R. Parsons
Request from: Connecticut Industrial Energy Consumers

Question:

Please refer to the Rates Panel Testimony at page 22, lines 14-21.

a. Please confirm that any shortfall in actual distribution revenue relative to the authorized revenue target, regardless of its cause, would be reconciled through the RDM.
b. Please confirm that, as proposed, the RDM rate would be a single per-kWh rate applied to all rate classes, including Rate 39, Rate 57 and Rate 58.
c. For each of the Company's last three RDM reconciliation filings, please provide the total RDM amount and the amount recovered from or credited to each rate class, including Rate 39, Rate 57 and Rate 58.
d. Please explain how a reduction in distribution revenue resulting from a heat pump rate, such as Rate 6 or Rate HP, would be recovered between rate cases, and identify the share that would be recovered from non-residential rate classes.

Response:

a. Differences in revenue between actual and target, and flow through of such differences for charges or credits through the RDM are subject to a prudence review and authorization by PURA.

b. Yes, as proposed and as is currently designed, the RDM rate would be a single per-kWh rate applied to all rate classes, including Rate 39, Rate 57 and Rate 58.

c. Please refer to Table 1 for the requested information, which has been provided in previous RAM filings:

Table 1

	2024 (DN 24-01-03)	2025 (DN 25-01-03)	2026 (DN 26-01-03)
Rate 1	$15,426,873	$7,990,329	$870,234
Rate 5	$3,256,347	$1,686,621	$183,691
Rate 7	$10,701	$5,543	$604
Rate 18	$1,443	$748	$81
Rate 27	$165,744	$85,847	$9,350

Rate 29	$5,296	$2,743	$299
Rate 30	$6,662,626	$3,450,898	$375,840
Rate 35	$1,188,616	$615,642	$67,050
Rate 37	$2,299,083	$1,190,807	$129,692
Rate 40	$196,280	$101,663	$11,072
Rate 41	$29,925	$15,500	$1,688
Rate 55	$1,211,754	$627,627	$68,355
Rate 56	$3,534,218	$1,830,544	$199,366
Rate 57	$1,638,061	$848,431	$92,403
Rate 58	$3,291,659	$1,704,911	$185,683
Rate 115	$105,636	$54,714	$5,959
Rate 116	$150,310	$77,853	$8,479
Rate 117	$60,300	$31,232	$3,402
Rate 39	$534,357	$276,770	$30,143
Rate 119	$13,940	$7,220	$786
Total	**$39,783,171**	**$20,605,642**	**$2,244,179**

d. Please refer to the Company's response to OCC-473[i]. The Company has not proposed a Rate HP. Please refer to Table 2 below for the allocation percentage of the RDM rate based on billing determinants currently in effect.

Table 2

Rate	Allocation %
1	38.8%
5	8.2%
7	0.03%
18	0.0%
27	0.4%
29	0.01%
30	16.7%
35	3.0%
37	5.8%
40	0.5%
41	0.1%
55	3.0%
56	8.9%
57	4.1%
58	8.3%

115	0.3%
116	0.4%
117	0.2%
39	1.3%
119	0.04%
Total	100.0%

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] OCC-473 Question:

(Rate 6 – Residential Space Heating Rate) Refer to Exhibit CLP-RATES-1, at 23-24. Please state whether the Revenue Decoupling Mechanism is designed to capture any revenue shortfall arising from Rate 6 enrollment diluting Rate 1 revenues. If so, explain how Rate 6-driven revenue loss will be treated under the RDM and which customer classes ultimately bear that cost.

OCC-473 Response:

The Revenue Decoupling mechanism is designed to reconcile differences in aggregated (i.e.,. total) actual vs. targeted revenues, and not specifically to capture such revenue shortfall that may occur. While the question does not define or explain what is meant by diluted revenues, if the context of an assumed difference in revenue is due to the migration of Rate 1 customers to Rate 6, such migration may in a given month result in higher revenue for first block kWh sales, and lower revenue for second block kWh sales, which potentially include both kWh sales that would otherwise have been charged under Rate 1 and kWh sales associated with incremental, new heat pump load. The Company does not agree that Rate 6 enrollment which reflects increased kWh sales would reduce overall revenue compared with revenue under Rate 1 which would exclude such increased kWh sales.