STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

October 16, 2025
In reply, please refer to:
Docket No. 26-08-06

Christie Prescott
Joel M. Kopylec
UIL Holdings Corporation
180 Marsh Hill Road
Orange, CT 06477

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

Re: Docket No. 26-08-06 - Annual EV Charging Program Review - Year 6

Dear Ms. Prescott and Messrs. Kopylec, and Pace:

Enclosed are interrogatories numbered **CAE-1 through CAE-7.** Interrogatories numbered CAE-1 through CAE-5 are directed jointly to The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy (Eversource) and The United Illuminating Company (UI; collectively, EDCs). Interrogatories numbered CAE-6 through CAE-7 are directed individually to Eversource.

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 30, 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.**

If a response to any of the requested information has already been filed in response to another Participant's 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.**

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, a proposed protective order and nondisclosure agreement must be appended to the Motion.

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

By Direction of the Authority,

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY



Jeffrey R. Gaudiosi, Esq.
Executive Secretary

Enclosure
cc: Service List

Interrogatories CAE-1 through CAE-5 are directed jointly to The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy (Eversource) and The United Illuminating Company (UI; collectively, EDCs).

CAE-1 EDC Compliance, Aug. 3, 2026, Att. 10b. Provide an updated copy of Attachment 10b of the Annual Report that breaks out the funds committed by award year.

CAE-2 Avangrid Corresp. Oct. 9, 2026, Joint EDC Presentation, p. 12. Provide an updated DCFC map that includes the pipeline of 413 DCFC projects in the queue. The updated map should clearly identify the projects that have not yet been built. Further, the map should be accompanied by the projects' projected completion date.

CAE-3 Avangrid Corresp. Oct. 9, 2026, Joint EDC Presentation, p. 6; EDC Compliance, Aug. 3, 2026, Att. 7, Att. 8. The Companies have recommended adjusting incentives and port deployment targets to reduce the required annual budget from $59,143,629 to $19,970,139 in order to meet the budget cap imposed by Public Act No. 25-173. However, Eversource and UI's budget filings as submitted on August 3, 2026 (Attachments 7 and 8) appear to project a total 2026 budget of $26,539,576 for Eversource and $11,057,689 for UI, indicating a total combined budget of $37,597,265, which is inclusive of all costs including those not subject to the statutory cap. How was the $59,143,629 projected total for upfront incentives derived?

CAE-4 EDC Compliance, Aug. 3, 2026, Annual Report, p. 36. Companies' recommended program adjustments include either reducing port deployment targets while maintaining per-port rebate levels (Scenario 1) or reducing per-port rebate levels while maintaining port deployment targets (Scenario 2). Specifically, Scenario 1 proposes the wholesale discontinuation of DCFC port targets. During the Technical Meeting on October 13, 2026, a representative of UI noted that there would be no immediate reduction to the Companies' administrative costs if the Authority were to proceed under the Companies' proposal. Please explain how the Companies' Education and Outreach; EMV; IT & Vendor Solutions; and Labor costs would not be reduced if the DCFC deployment component of the program were eliminated as proposed.

CAE-5 During the Technical Meeting on October 13, 2026, the geographic prioritization of DCFCs was discussed. Describe the pros and cons of modifying the existing prioritization to 1) remove towns from prioritization which have been sufficiently built with DCFCs; 2) develop a new prioritization which values proximity to major roadways. Include a description of how new prioritization rules might be implemented to accomplish the latter.

Interrogatories CAE-6 through CAE-7 are directed individually to The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy (Eversource).

CAE-6 Annual Report, p. 68. Eversource reports having exceeded budgeted amounts for IT & Vendor Solutions in Program Year 4 by over 400% ($233,096 budgeted; $1,335,763 spent), with the same cost continuing to exceed budgeted amounts in Program Cycle II. Please explain these exceedances and provide supporting documentation.

CAE-7 Annual Report, p. 65. Table 24 shows Eversource sent five direct email campaigns during the program period. Provide the costs associated with these email communications and explain why the program budget reduction necessitated a reduction in consumer outreach.