Question:

(AMI) Application, Lawerence and Horton PFT, p. 7. The Company states that it must secure a decision from the Authority by November 2026 to leverage extended pricing from its regional vendor agreements into early 2027.

a. Provide the exact calendar expiration dates for each vendor LOI and pricing proposal.

b. Explain what specific contractual barriers will prevent the Company from using this favorable pricing if the Authority issues its final decision according to the schedule of the rate case, i.e., Docket No. 26-05-10.

c. Explain the Company's basis for favoring extended pricing already obtained from a vendor several years ago, as opposed to seeking updated competitive pricing options.

Response:

(a) [redacted]. Thus, it would be to the benefit of Connecticut customers, if the Company could receive approval of its AMI Implementation Plan and proceed to contracting before the end of 2026.

(b) [redacted], so the Company views that there will be lost opportunity cost if the Company can only obtain PURA's decision on the AMI implementation on the rate case timeline (versus in November 2026).

(c) [redacted]

[redacted].

"Economies of scale" in the context of the MA and CT AMI deployments references the ability to manage uniform systems and networks across the two states with the same personnel. The MA AMI network operations team, MDMS support resources and CIS support resources will be able to extend their support to CT with resources additions ultimately tied only to the increase in exception volume from adding CT. If CT does not leverage the MA technologies, then completely new AMI network operations, MDMS support and CIS support groups will have to be built and staffed. Additionally, if MA technologies are not leveraged in CT, CT will not benefit from the many lessons learned and technical fixes/upgrades that were implemented as a result of the experience with the MA technology; instead, CT-dedicated resources will be learning the systems 'from scratch' and will experience low initial efficiency and only a gradual improvement in efficiency as technical challenges are encountered for the first time. Finally, future equipment and licensing purchases can be made in greater quantities if MA technology is leveraged in CT; if not, CT purchases will be separate and in smaller volumes, very likely leading to higher future costs.

In any event, if a new competitive solicitation process is deemed necessary, it cannot be launched until the business requirements are confirmed as part of the approval of the AMI Implementation Plan, which the Company estimates would further delay the program launch by roughly one year, while opening up the entire program to completely new pricing. [redacted] Moreover, if the subsequent bidding process reveals that the favorable extended pricing would have been preferred, it will not be possible to revert to the Massachusetts extended pricing proposals as those arrangements will be lost.