STATE OF CONNECTICUT
PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

September 21, 2026
In reply, please refer to:
Docket No. 26-08-03

Vincent P. Pace, Esq.
Assistant General Counsel
Eversource Energy Services Company
107 Selden Street
Berlin, CT 06037

Christie Prescott
UIL Holdings Corporation
180 Marsh Hill Road
Orange, CT 06477

Re: Docket No. 26-08-03 – Annual Non-Residential Renewable Energy Solutions Program Review – Year 6

Dear Attorney Pace and Ms. Prescott:

Enclosed are interrogatories numbered **CAE-01 through CAE-04**, directed individually to The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy (Eversource), and The United Illuminating Company (UI; together with Eversource, the electric distribution companies, or EDCs); and **CAE-05 through CAE-07**, directed jointly to the EDCs.

The responses to these questions have been deemed necessary by the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (Authority) in connection with the above-referenced docket and will become a part of the record in this proceeding. Please note that persons responsible for responses must be available for cross-examination during a hearing, if held, and must attest to the truth and accuracy of their responses.

Please submit the responses to the Authority's Executive Secretary no later than **October 5, 2026, at 4:00 p.m.** The Authority encourages the submission of responses as soon as they are available rather than delaying until all answers are completed. **Please list each question and answer on the same sheet of paper using a separate sheet for each interrogatory number, and sequentially number the pages of each response (e.g., p. 1 of 5, etc.). At the top of each page, clearly identify the Docket Number, the interrogatory number (including the prefix), the name of the company and the person responsible for the response, and the date of submission.**

Similarly, each Late Filed Exhibit that may be submitted after hearing in this docket shall be sequentially numbered and identified with the Docket Number, Late Filed Exhibit Number, page number, the name of the company and the person responsible for the exhibit, and the date of submission.

If a response to any of the requested information has already been filed in response to another Parties' interrogatory(ies) in this proceeding, please reference the interrogatory which provides the information. It is the respondent's responsibility to ensure that any such information is on file with the Executive Secretary of the Authority.

ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF FILINGS

IMPORTANT NOTE: The Authority has indefinitely suspended the paper copy filing requirement. Anyone filing material with the Authority should file only an electronic copy through the PURA Web Filing System. Please refer to the Electronic Filing webpage for more information, including on confidential materials: Make An Electronic Filing

CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

No confidential material may be filed publicly through the web filing system. Confidential material can be filed electronically by emailing the material to Jeff.Gaudiosi@ct.gov with a subject line labeled in all capital letters "CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL - NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE." Each page of any electronic confidential information shall also contain a header "CONFIDENTIAL – NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE." The motion for a protective order shall be filed electronically.

The Authority operates with the strong presumption that all documents filed with it are public records subject to the right of public inspection and copying in accordance with the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act, Conn. Gen. Stat. §1-200 et. seq. In those exceptional circumstances where a participant believes that information it intends to file is confidential under law, it may file a Motion for a Protective Order requesting an exemption from public disclosure. The Motion must provide specific legal arguments with reference to state or federal law describing with supporting facts why the information should be kept confidential. A certified affidavit supplied by a competent witness in support of the Motion must be appended to the Motion. The Authority will rule on the Motion forthwith, and it will give further direction as necessary.

The current service list for this docket is available on the Authority's website located at http://www.dpuc.state.ct.us/DPUCPublicList.NSF.

By the Direction of the Authority,

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY



Jeffrey R. Gaudiosi, Esq.
Executive Secretary

Enclosure
cc: Service List

Docket No. 26-08-03
Annual Non-Residential Renewable Energy Solutions Program Review – Year 6

Interrogatories CAE-01 through CAE-04 are directed individually to The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy (Eversource) and The United Illuminating Company (UI; together with Eversource, the electric distribution companies or EDCs).

CAE-1. Motion No. 12, June 5, 2026, Docket No. 25-08-03, Ex. B1; Motion No. 16, July 1, 2026, Docket No. 25-08-03, Ex. B. Describe the methodology used to calculate expected annual production for each project bid, including the capacity factor and any other assumptions used. Justify the methodology and explain whether it continues to provide a reasonable estimate of actual annual production.

CAE-2. Order No. 19 Compliance, July 30, 2026. Discuss the extent to which a lower number of NRES bids received decreases the staff time required for bid review, tariff agreement award and processing activities.

CAE-3. Order No. 19 Compliance, July 30, 2026. In calculating a proposed nonrefundable application fee, the EDCs assumed that NRES bid review and tariff agreement processing takes six months of each staff member's time. Is this assumption based on actual recorded staff time dedicated to NRES Program administration? If not, explain how the six-month assumption was determined and provide the actual amount of staff time spent on NRES bid review and tariff agreement processing in 2025.

CAE-4. Order No. 19 Compliance, July 30, 2026, Att. 1. Provide the portion of the EDCs' proposed application fee increase, as a percentage and dollar value, that is driven by increased salaries compared to 2024.

Interrogatories CAE-05 through CAE-07 are directed jointly to the EDCs.

CAE-5. Motion No. 32 Ruling, Aug. 13, 2026, Docket No. 24-08-03; Motion No. 5, Att. 2b, p. 36. Section 8.1.1 of the Program Manual states that, for Buy-All projects, the production meter and revenue meter may be the same meter. Would the EDCs recommend editing or removing this section to avoid future disputes like that discussed in Motion No. 32 in Docket No. 24-08-03?

CAE-6. Decision, Nov. 8, 2023, Docket No. 23-08-03, pp. 60-61. Discuss the rationale behind the EDCs' proposed modification to the definition of "Rooftop Project." Specifically, explain why the EDCs proposed that Rooftop Projects located on a set of rooftops must be served by the same revenue meter, rather than located on the same project site, as recommended by several stakeholders.

CAE-7. Motion No. 32 Ruling, Aug. 13, 2026, Docket No. 24-08-03, p. 3. Confirm that, under the current program rules, there may be cases where a Rooftop Buy-All project consisting of a single rooftop is on a building served by multiple revenue meters. If so, does this create an inconsistent result where a project on a single rooftop may include multiple revenue meters in the underlying building, but a project across multiple rooftops must be behind a single revenue meter? Explain why or why not and discuss whether the EDCs would support an adjustment to the definition of "Rooftop Project" to allow projects to be installed on a set of rooftops located on the same project site.