

I sent the following letter to pura.information@ct.gov for the Eversource Rate Hearings, Docket Number 20-01-01, Public Comment. Please include these for your Energy and Technology Committee's Virtual Information Forum. Thank you.

To whom it may concern:

I'm not sure if the public hearing is specifically about the requested rate change, the storm performance, or both. While this email will focus on the rate change, I just want to say that the amount of money we are paying to Eversource should have been sufficient to ensure that the health and welfare of those in my community were protected. Having wires laying on a major secondary road for 4 days, 1/2 mile from the center of the Newtown Borough, extending the response time for emergency services to get to our citizens is unconscionable.

Now for questions about the rate change.

1) Focusing only on delivery cost per kWh...

From 2017 to 7/2020, we've, personally, seen a near 66% increase in delivery cost per kWh - again, in 3 years! We've seen an increase of almost 300% (3X) in ten years.

Year (every ~3 years); delivery cost/kWh (rounded); increase from prior 3 yrs

2011*	\$0.059	
2014	\$0.069	17%
2017	\$0.091	32%
2020**	\$0.151	66%

* I believe this was the rate prior to the 3 storms in 2011/2012.

**The 2020 rate is documented - with some simple math required - at:

<https://www.eversource.com/content/docs/default-source/rates-tariffs/ct-electric/ct-electric-rates.pdf>.

The US CPIs from 2011 to 2020 have been quite low - overall increasing about 18%, according to https://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm.

300% vs 18%? From what I've experienced, my delivery service has not improved much, if at all, so why am I paying SO MUCH MORE for energy delivery relative to everything else? And this while (I read that) non-management employees were being cut?

2) Now for the energy generation side of the bill. The cost per kWh on our July bill decreased from \$0.09414 in the prior bill to \$0.07375, about a 22% reduction.

Eversource's explanation about the state's requirement to purchase energy from Millstone was one reason for the exceptional increase in rates. Was this cost for energy produced by Millstone included in the energy generation rates or was it added to the delivery rate? If the latter, I do not understand why. Isn't the provision of energy from other sources, like hydro, natural gas, trash incineration, etc. accounted for in the energy generation rates?

Millstone said their wholesale rate for Eversource was \$0.0499, meaning that there was an upcharge of 48%, assuming the new \$0.07375 rate. Was the wholesale energy prices paid by Eversource for other sources different enough to justify treating the cost of nuclear energy generation differently? If the

added cost for millstone has been included in the delivery rate then, from what I understand, that means we are paying for the generated kWh we use twice - once for non-nuclear energy sources (in the energy production charge) and once again for Millstone (in the delivery charge). If so, what is the portion of the delivery rate increase attributed to Millstone? And, what was the difference in overall wholesale rate for Eversource?

If the delivery rate increase includes energy generation from Millstone, wouldn't it make more sense - and be more transparent - to add the differential in wholesale cost (and Eversource profit) as a separate generation rate surcharge?

Sincerely,
Deborra Zukowski
4 Cornfield Ridge Rd
Newtown, CT
203-270-0002