STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

May 27, 2026
In reply, please refer to:
Docket No. 26-08-08
Motion No. 7

Vincent P. Pace, Esq.
Eric Eggleston, Esq.
Eversource Energy
P.O. Box 270
Hartford, CT 06410

Re: Docket No. 26-08-08 – Non-Wires Solutions Process Cycle 2

Dear Attorneys Pace and Eggleston:

On May 8, 2025, The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy (Company) filed a motion (Motion No. 7) requesting that the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (Authority) conduct a full panel review regarding the requirement to provide certain information publicly pursuant to the Authority's April 16, 2026 Motion No. 5 Ruling in the above-referenced proceeding (Ruling).[1] While the full panel of commissioners affirms the Motion No. 5 Ruling, the Authority clarifies that its intent was to permit the Company to redact various other types of CEII besides those enumerated in the Motion No. 5 Ruling.

The Ruling granted in part and denied in part the Company's request to provide protective treatment for certain attachments (Attachments).[2] Specifically, the Ruling determined that while the Attachments contained certain information that constitutes critical energy infrastructure information (CEII), the Company's request to designate the entirety of the documents as CEII and exempt them from public disclosure was overly broad. Ruling, p. 3. The Ruling indicated that certain information, such as generic descriptions of the identified projects, a statement of need for the projects, the project objectives, a scope of work, various alternative projects considered and the advantages and disadvantages of each, and a proposed schedule that includes projected or suggested in-service dates, could not be reasonably construed as CEII. Id. As such, the Ruling directed the Company to file no later than May 8, 2026, public versions of the Attachments that redacted only information constituting CEII, "such as circuit diagrams, the specific location of certain infrastructure, and the number of critical customers served

[1] On May 13, 2026, the Office of Consumer Counsel filed comments to Motion No. 7 but did not take a position on the Company's request.

[2] Specifically, Attachments 1 and 2 to Interrogatory Response RSR-004; Attachment 1 to Interrogatory Response RSR-005; Attachment 1 to RSR-011; Attachments 1, 2A, 2B, and 3 to Interrogatory Responses RSR-012 and RSR-013; and Attachment 1 to RSR-003. Motion No. 5 Ruling, pp. 1-2.

by a circuit." Ruling, p. 3. The Ruling also indicated that the Company could renew its motion for protective order upon resubmittal of the redacted Attachments. Id.

In the present motion, the crux of Eversource's argument is that the Ruling renders the Company unable to redact confidential and sensitive electric system information that constitutes CEII because the ruling only permits redactions for circuit diagrams, the specific location of certain infrastructure, and the number of critical customers served by a circuit. Motion No. 7, pp. 4-5. The Authority clarifies that it did not intend to create an exhaustive list of information that the Company could redact as CEII; to the contrary, the Attachments were voluminous documents that could contain various other types of CEII, which the Company was permitted to redact so long as it explained its reasoning for doing so in a renewed motion for protective order.

For administrative efficiency and to ensure the Authority and Company are generally aligned with what information constitutes CEII the Authority will permit the Company to file a sample of documents from the Attachments that show the additional information the Company proposes to redact. The Authority directs the Company to submit its sample of documents and an accompanying motion for protective order on or before June 17, 2026. The Authority will subsequently rule on the protective order and either direct the Company to file the remaining redacted Attachments in full or engage further with the Company to reach a consensus that balances both the Company's security concerns and the Authority's disclosure obligations under Connecticut Freedom of Information Act.

By the following commissioners,

Thomas H. Wiehl
Chairman

David Arconti, Jr.
Vice Chairman

Janice A. Beecher
Commissioner

Everett Smith
Commissioner

Holly H. Cheeseman
Commissioner

cc: Service List