STATE OF CONNECTICUT

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

NON-WIRES SOLUTIONS PROCESS CYCLE 2	**:**	**DOCKET NO. 26-08-08**
	:	
	:	**MAY 8, 2026**

MOTION OF THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY d/b/a EVERSOURCE ENERGY FOR FULL PANEL REVIEW

I. INTRODUCTION

The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy ("Eversource" or the "Company") respectfully submits this Motion for Full Panel Review to the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority ("PURA") regarding certain directives in its April 16, 2026 Ruling on Motion No. 5 (the "Motion Ruling"). Specifically, the Company seeks full panel review regarding the requirement to provide certain information publicly.

Motion No. 5 was denied in part as to several attachments (the "Confidential Attachments"),[1] which contain critical energy infrastructure information ("CEII") that the company claimed is confidential in Motion No. 5, based on its risk of harm to the electric distribution system. PURA concluded that "while the Attachments do contain certain information that constitutes CEII, such as circuit diagrams and the specific location of certain infrastructure, the Company's request to designate the entirety of the documents as CEII and exempt them from public disclosure is overly broad." Motion Ruling at 3 (footnote omitted). As part of that analysis, PURA determined that information such as generic descriptions of the identified projects, need statements, objectives, and scope of work cannot reasonably be construed as CEII. Id. PURA directed the company to file "public versions of the Attachments that specifically redact only

[1] These attachments are: RSR-003 Attachment 1, RSR-004 Attachments 1 and 2, RSR-012 Attachments 1, 2a, 2b, and 3, and RSR-013 Attachments 1, 2a, 2b, and 3.

information constituting CEII, such as circuit diagrams, the specific location of certain infrastructure, and the number of critical customers served by a circuit. Id. The Motion Ruling was signed by a Commissioner.

The Company does not object to filing redacted documents generally and it respects PURA's obligation under the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act (FOIA") to publicly disclose non-confidential information filed with the agency, but it is the Company's obligation to ensure its system remains safe and reliable, while complying with PURA's orders and directives. The Company appreciates PURA's conclusion that CEII should be protected; however, with all due respect, certain information that an individual PURA Commissioner initially determined is not reasonably construed as CEII (specifically, project information contained in descriptions, need statements, objectives, and scope of work) actually does contain information that constitutes CEII, and should be likewise protected from public disclosure. For these reasons, the Company is filing this Motion for full panel review to respectfully request the opportunity to describe the risks associated with this information to the entire panel of Commissioners prior to filing the redacted documents.

II. DISCUSSION

The Company understands the directives in the Motion Ruling as confirming the basis for protection of confidential information within the Confidential Attachments, but at the same time denying the form of submission of the Confidential Attachments. Based on PURA's Motion Ruling specifying that "while the Attachments do contain certain information that constitutes CEII…the Company's request to designate the entirety of the documents as CEII and exempt them from public disclosure is overly broad," it is apparent that PURA understands the CEII in the

Confidential Attachments qualify for protective treatment. As a result, PURA's order in the Motion Ruling rests on the premise that CEII can be protected through redaction, enabling non-confidential information to be released. The Company appreciates the premise that, if information is not confidential, it is appropriate to release it to the public record. But the next question is whether the information in the Confidential Attachments determined by a Commissioner to be CEII contains the entire population of information that needs to be protected to avoid public disclosure of system vulnerabilities that could be used by potential bad actors. As a result, the Company seeks in this Motion full panel review of the determination of the population of protectable CEII in the Confidential Attachments.

As a preliminary matter, neither the FOIA found at Conn. Gen. Stat. § 1-200 *et seq.* nor PURA's Rules of Practice found at Conn. Agencies Regs. § 16-1-1 *et seq.* include provisions requiring the proponent of confidential information to provide redacted versions of confidential documents. Indeed, FOIA focuses on public agencies' maintenance of records and release or disclosure of records. PURA instead "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 [FOIA]." Notice of Proceeding dated January 23, 2026. Thus, PURA presumes that documents filed with it by utilities or other entities become public records once filed.

Taken a step further, PURA is bound by FOIA to comply with the release of public records if they are not exempted or excepted from public disclosure under FOIA. PURA's long-standing practice through motions for protective treatment is to essentially pre-determine during a proceeding what information is confidential and what is not, so that if a FOIA request is made, PURA may simply review the relevant motion ruling and determine if the information is deemed confidential under FOIA, or not. The result, and any subsequent analysis of what is subject to

disclosure under FOIA, is facilitated by the practice where the utility or entity filing the document subject to protective treatment also files a redacted version of the document. Eversource generally agrees with this practice and utilities and other entities appearing before PURA generally oblige in providing such redactions, as they have already determined that they consider certain information within such documents confidential, and that it should not be accessible as a public record. This is a mutually beneficial practice for both PURA and the proponents of confidential information. Because this is a beneficial practice, Eversource always strives to provide redacted documents that limit those redactions to the information that qualifies as "confidential" data under FOIA.

In this case, the Company's concern is with certain information that it classifies as confidential in accordance with FOIA, but to which the Motion Ruling denied protection. Specifically, after the Company's counsel consulted with our engineers, our engineers determined that the limited definition of CEII provided in the Motion Ruling ("such as, circuit diagrams, the specific location of certain infrastructure and the number of critical customers served by a circuit") poses a serious threat to the electric system from bad actors that can use other substation electric system information in the Confidential Attachments to cause harm to the electric system. Based on the current Motion Ruling, the Company is unable to redact confidential and sensitive electric system information such as: capacity of specific parts of the electric system, parts of the system that have been identified as having limited capacity, or parts of the system operating above their rated capacity; information about system forecasting and loading on specific parts of the electric system; the way the electric system is configured to restore customers following a failure; how certain parts of the electric system back up other parts (e.g., what bulk substations are used to

restore power from other bulk substations); parts of the system that supply critical infrastructure; and the outcome of system failures.

When looked at individually, each discrete piece of information does not, by itself, represent system vulnerability; however, when combined and analyzed in the context of the Confidential Attachments and this docket which focuses on grid needs, the above-mentioned information can be used by a bad actor to understand the vulnerabilities of the electric system in Connecticut and significantly target vulnerable parts of the system, thereby affecting our customers. For example, the fact that project descriptions and need statements contain information such as which towns or geographic areas are impacted by substation outages, what types of single elements could be targeted to result in a loss of supply of an entire substation, and which systems provide support for certain substations, means that based on the Motion Ruling finding that these sections of the Confidential Information are not CEII, this information would be made public as a result of the Motion Ruling. This information becoming public puts the Company's system at risk.

The Company notes that this is not simply a theoretical argument about bad actors; there have been several recent examples of electric substations being targets:

- In November of 2022 unknown suspects fired multiple shots at a Carteret-Craven Electric Cooperative Substation in Maysville, North Carolina;[2]
- Also in November or 2022, individuals were responsible for shooting an energy facility substation in Oregon City, Oregon;[3]
- In January of 2023, unknown suspects fired multiple shots at an Energy United substation in Randolph County, North Carolina;[4] and

[2] https://www.fbi.gov/wanted/seeking-info/shooting-of-electrical-substation2.
[3] https://www.fbi.gov/wanted/seeking-info/shooting-of-energy-facility-substation.
[4] https://www.fbi.gov/wanted/seeking-info/electrical-substation-shooting.

- In December of 2022, unknown suspects fired multiple shots at two Duke Energy substations in Moore County, North Carolina.[5]

As noted above, the practice of providing redactions is mutually beneficial to PURA, the Company, other parties and the public, provided those redacted documents protect all confidential information. However, based on the information provided herein, the Motion Ruling does not permit the Company to adequately protect its confidential information from public disclosure.

Finally, incorporating the process for a full panel review to clarify this important point now offers a significant positive outcome for the security of information provided under the Non-Wires Solutions ("NWS") programs, and has zero negative impact on this Docket. PURA issued a Notice of Docket Closing for Docket No. 26-08-08 on April 17, 2026 ("Closing Notice"), "closing this docket without a Screening Decision, pausing further process cycles, and initiating an NWS process redesign docket to consider program reforms." Closing Notice at 2. While PURA advised in the Closing Notice that the Electric Distribution Companies ("EDCs") "should continue to submit compliance filings set forth in the NWS and 24-08-08 Decision, respectively" and "the Authority may choose to issue interrogatories to the EDCs from time to time regarding such compliance filings," using the time now for a full panel review does not impact any future process in this closed docket and potentially informs program reforms to be discussed in Docket No. 26-04-27, PURA Investigation and Implementation of Non-Wires Solutions Process Reforms.

Given the real threats to the electrical grid today and our collective responsibility to maintain a safe and reliable grid, it's critical that we continue to discuss the appropriate balance between public and confidential information. Eversource appreciates the Motion Ruling, which was clearly intended to protect the grid and in fact did provide certain protection. Through this

[5] https://www.fbi.gov/wanted/seeking-info/shooting-of-electrical-substations.

motion, the Company seeks to build on the Motion Ruling and continue the discussion to best ensure that all information that could pose a threat to the operation of the electric system is sufficiently protected from use by bad actors. To that end, the Company is willing to meet with PURA in an appropriate, confidential setting to discuss how we can collectively strike the appropriate balance between the need for public disclosure and the necessity of protecting information that could cause significant public harm.

Accordingly, for all these reasons, the Company respectfully requests that the full PURA panel assigned to this docket review the Confidential Attachments to consider permitting additional redactions to those contained in the Motion Ruling. The Company appreciates the full panel's consideration of this request, and the Company would be pleased to provide any additional information or clarification that will facilitate the panel's adjudication of this Motion.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated in this Motion, the Company respectfully requests PURA convene a full panel review of the Confidential Attachments and Motion No. 5 to review the information contained in the parts of the Confidential Attachments previously determined by a Commissioner to not reasonably be construed as CEII (generic descriptions of the identified projects, need statements for the projects, objectives, scope of work, alternatives, and schedules) in the context of the information provided in this Motion for a final ruling on the Confidential Information. In order to facilitate PURA's review of this request and in order to enable the Commissioners to better understand what type of additional information in the Confidential Attachments constitutes CEII that must be protected from public disclosure, the Company proposes that either (1) PURA convene a technical meeting where Company engineers can explain in more detail the type of

information in the Confidential Attachments that constitutes CEII or (2) the Company can file with PURA sample documents from the Confidential Attachments that show the additional information the Company proposes to redact. The Company recognizes that either or both of these options are necessary to help the panel of Commissioners render a decision on this Motion.

Respectfully submitted,

THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY d/b/a EVERSOUREC ENERGY

By: *Eric Eggleston*

Eric Eggleston
Vincent P. Pace
Eversource Energy
107 Selden Street
Berlin, CT 06037
(860) 665-3242

Its Attorneys

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that on this day a copy of the above referenced documents were sent to the official service list in this proceeding.

Eric Eggleston
Commissioner of the Superior Court