Date Filed: September 25, 2026

Witness: Christopher E. Colorio, Mark P. Baldwin, John G. Griffin and Leanne M. Landry
Request from: Office of Education, Outreach, and Enforcement

Question:

(MS24A-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-1 and Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-1A-16, pp. 193-212. The Company reported two incremental charges in the combined amount of $153,711 for the M J Electric LLC vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Explain why the equipment was charged at 50% for standby. If applicable, cite the applicable contract provisions. Additionally, identify the remaining amount ($) of equipment that was charged for standby.
b. Referring to p. 207, confirm that the Company included a charge applicable to "car vs pole". If confirmed, identify the total impact of this activity and explain why this amount was not eliminated from the storm recovery request. As part of the response, please provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet supporting applicable calculations.

Response:

Please refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-1)(MS24A), Outside Line Contractors, Lines 443-444, MJ Electric LLC, in the combined amount of $153,711.

a. Per the COC contract provisions in Exhibit B "Pricing Schedule" and within Appendix PS-5, the contractor is required to charge 50% of the equipment rates while on standby. Additionally, the remaining amount of equipment charged for standby was $4,896.75.

b. During the internal review process, it was determined that the work associated with Event 5234191 was related to storm-induced tree damage to equipment and not a car vs pole incident as indicated on the timesheet. Therefore, the associated charges were retained as storm-related costs and were not removed. The incorrect work description appears to have been a documentation error. During storm restoration activities, personnel are often managing multiple work orders simultaneously and recording information in the field, including handwritten notes when necessary. Based on the review of the supporting documentation, the Company determined that the work performed was storm-related and that the discrepancy was limited to the description recorded on the timesheet. In addition, please refer to EOE-234, Attachment 1, for the OMS details related to Event 5234191 to validate repairs were due to tree damage.