Date Filed: August 28, 2026

Witness: RUNYON, JENNIFER M
Request from: Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Question:

Decision, Dec. 17, 2025, Annual Energy Storage Solutions Program Review – Year 5, p. 10. Explain why the EDCs did not raise technical concerns regarding the annual payment option during the previous annual review cycle, particularly given that the EDCs supported levelized performance payments at that time.

Response:

The EDCs expressed support for a single payment for administration efficiency for Front-of-the-Meter ("FTM") projects in their response to CAE-005 in Docket No. 25-01-15, *Front-of-the-Meter Storage Program*[1] under the assumption that an FTM project would be participating in a different program, other than ESS. The EDCs did not raise an objection when PURA issued the Proposed Final Decision in Docket No. 25-08-05 on November 24, 2025 because it was not clear to the Company based on the language in the Proposed Final Decision that PURA was contemplating allowing customers to choose between seasonal or annual payments. The choice is what introduces the complexity.

In addition, Eversource was unaware of its DERMS' vendor platform limitations because every other program the DERMS supports only issues one annual payment to customers since there is only one demand response season (summer) in every other demand response program Eversource implements. Since ESS is the only program that has a summer and a winter demand response season, Eversource was unaware that combining two seasons of demand response performance into one payment file for some, but not all, customers would be outside of its DERMS' functionality.

[1] Docket No. 25-01-15, Front-of-the-Meter Storage Program, Q-CAE-005 (filed Feb. 14, 2025).