Date Filed: October 06, 2026

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

Question:

(MS24F-VENDOR-TRAFFIC) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-6, and Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-6A-3, pp. 218-230. The Company reported an incremental charge of $10,253 for the Certified Utility Services Inc vendor. Explain how the Company verified the alignment of costs to the MS24F event when most of the supporting Job assignment documents referred to different workorder numbers, including MN23AK011 (pp. 221, 224, 228, and 230) and MN23J011 (pp. 222, 223, 226, and 227). As part of the response, identify if these costs were incorrectly charged to MS24F or explain why the Company didn't have the vendor correct the workorder number.

Response:

Referring to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-6 (MS24F), Outside Contractors- Vendors, line 135, vendor Certified Utility Services Inc, total invoice amount of $10,253.

With respect to slips referencing work orders MN23AK or MN23J, the associated services were procured by contractors performing restoration work on behalf of the Company. It is common during storm restoration activities for contractors to engage subcontractors, including flagging services, to support the completion of assigned work. While the specific work order information provided to the vendor may not always reflect the final Company work order at the time services were performed, the Company's invoice review process includes validation of the service dates, locations, and work performed to ensure the charges are appropriately associated with event-related restoration activities. Following this review, management verifies that the costs are reasonable, properly supported, and correctly allocated to the applicable storm event prior to approval for payment.