STATE OF CONNECTICUT
PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY
OFFICE OF EDUCATION, OUTREACH, & ENFORCEMENT

November 13, 2026
Docket No. 26-05-10

Re: Docket No. 26-05-10 - Application of CL&P dba Eversource Energy to Amend its Rate Schedules

Enclosed are interrogatories **EOE-481 through EOE-580** directed to The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy ("Eversource," or "Company"). The responses to these questions have been deemed necessary by the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (Authority) Office of Education, Outreach, and Enforcement (EOE) in connection with the above referenced docket, and will become a part of the record in this proceeding. Please note that persons responsible for responses must be available for cross-examination during a hearing, if held, and must attest to the truth and accuracy of their responses.

Please submit the responses to the Authority's Executive Secretary no later than **4pm on November 30, 2026**. If a response to any of the requested information has already been filed in response to another interrogatory response in this proceeding, please reference the interrogatory which provides the information. It is the respondent's responsibility to ensure that any such information is on file with the Executive Secretary of the Authority.

EOE requests that all interrogatory responses be included in the same document, rather than responses to each interrogatory being filed as individual documents.

Anyone filing material with the Authority should file only an electronic copy through the PURA Web Filing System. Please refer to Electronic Filing on the Authority's website for more information. **Paper filings will be accepted only if a person is unable to file electronically. The Authority reserves the right to request paper copies of certain filings at a later date.** No confidential material may be filed publicly through the web filing system. Confidential material can be filed electronically by email using the following directions: confidential material must be emailed directly to **Jeff.Gaudiosi@ct.gov** in an email with a subject line labeled in all capital letters "CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL - NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE." Each page of any electronic confidential information shall also contain a header "CONFIDENTIAL – NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE." The motion for a protective order shall be filed publicly.

The Authority 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 Connecticut Freedom of Information Act, Conn. Gen. Stat. § 1-200 et. seq. In those exceptional circumstances where a participant believes that information it intends to file is confidential under law, it may file a Motion for a Protective Order requesting an exemption from public disclosure. The Motion must provide specific legal arguments with reference to state or federal law describing with supporting facts why the information should be kept confidential. A certified affidavit supplied by a competent witness in support of the Motion, a proposed protective order and nondisclosure agreement must be appended to the Motion. The Authority will rule on the Motion forthwith, and give further direction as necessary. Contact the Authority's Executive Secretary at (860) 827-1553 with questions regarding making a confidential filing.

The current service list for this docket is available on the Authority's website located at www.dpuc.state.ct.us/DPUCservlist.html.

Sincerely,

By: /s/*Brittany Wyman*
Brittany Wyman
Attorney
PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY
Office of Education, Outreach and Enforcement

Enclosure
cc: Service List

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day the foregoing document was filed with the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority, and copies thereof were served upon each person designated on the official service list in this proceeding in accordance with R.C.S.A. § 16-1-15.

Sincerely,

By: /s/ Jamie Spannhake

Jamie Spannhake
Attorney
PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY
Office of Education, Outreach and Enforcement

The following Interrogatories, designated as EOE-481 through EOE-580, are directed to The Connecticut Light and Power Company d/b/a Eversource Energy ("Eversource" or "Company").

EOE-481. (EVERSOURCE WINDSOR OPERATIONS CENTER) Regarding the Company's property located at 1985 Blue Hills Avenue Extension, Windsor, Connecticut, provide the following information:

a. Describe the Company's acquisition of the property, including the acquisition date, purchase price, and original intended use. Additionally, discuss the historical and current uses of the property, including any expansion or changes in operations conducted at the location, as well as the timing.

b. Identify, by year, all capital investments associated with the property, including acquisition costs, improvements, expansions, and other capital expenditures. For each year, identify the amount of capital investment included in the Company's rate case filing and provide the corresponding references (e.g., schedules, exhibits, testimony, or supplemental filings).

c. Identify the annual O&M expenses associated with the property that are included in the Company's Rate Year request, broken down by major expense category. As part of the response, provide the corresponding references to where these expenses are reflected within the rate case filing (i.e., SFR schedules).

d. Indicate whether the Company's use of the property has resulted in any cost allocations or chargebacks from its Connecticut operations to Eversource affiliates. If applicable, identify the allocation amounts by affiliate and year from 2020 through the Rate Year and discuss the nature of the allocations.

EOE-482. (STORM REMEDIATION – BLOCKED ROADS) Refer to Responses to EOE-383 and OCC-906. The Company's response to EOE-383 appears to focus on the removal of damaged vegetation that could still result in damage to the electrical grid versus the removal of downed vegetation that would not impair electrical service. Provide copies of all policies, procedures, guidance, statutes, or regulations, that detail the Company's obligations for the removal of vegetation that is blocking a road or right of way, which is unrelated to an issue with electrical service or exists after the vegetation has been cut free from the electrical apparatus (i.e., wires, poles, transformers, etc). To clarify, this inquiry attempts to understand if the Company is required to incur costs to remove the downed vegetation in lieu of deferring the remediation to the property owner or municipality.

EOE-483. (MS24A-VENDOR-FOOD/LODGING) Refer to Responses to EOE-219 and EOE-386, and Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-1 and Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-1A-10, pp. 158-162. The Company's response to EOE-219 identified

that "[t]he cancellation notification was sent via email on Wednesday, January 10, 2024, at 2:19pm." Additionally, the response stated that "[d]ue to a guarantee on the rooms and the ordered food, the Company incurred charges for the cancelled rooms and the cost of the ordered food." The Company's response to EOE-386 identified that "[t]he notice required that would have prevented a cancellation charge would have been any time prior to 6pm on the same day" and "there is no notice requirement for meals." Respond to the following:

a. Reconcile these two conflicting responses within EOE-219 and EOE-386. Specifically, explain why the Company was unable to cancel all unused rooms and meals given that the cancellation was provided prior to the notice requirement.
b. Identify the specific meals and rooms by day that were paid and not used, along with the total cost of the unused services (i.e., rooms and meals). Specifically, EOE requests confirmation that none of the January 10-12 charges were applicable to services actually utilized. If not confirmed, explain.

EOE-484. (MS24A-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Responses to EOE-417, EOE-243, Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-1, and Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-1A-17, pp. 238-301. The Company's response to EOE-243 (subsection 'd') deduced that there was a clerical error with the hours reported on pp. 274-275 but asserted that there was no duplicate billing. The Company's response to EOE-417 confirmed that the response to EOE-243 cited a document in error and referenced reliance on the Arcos system to support the vendor crews' arrival time of 6:00 p.m. Respond to the following:

a. Provide a copy of the Arcos records that were referenced in EOE-417, as used to confirm the crew's arrival time of 6:00 p.m.
b. Provide the "incremental impact of two hours billed" as was originally requested in EOE-417.
c. Clarify the Company's final sentence within its response to EOE-417 where the response states "… notwithstanding the absence of a signed Eversource Contractor Storm Mobilization & Demobilization Time Report." Specifically, please confirm that there was a signed Eversource Contractor Storm Mobilization & Demobilization Time Report provided at pp. 274-275 and explain what the Company meant in its response.

EOE-485. (EMERGENCY RESPONSE SPECIALIST) Refer to Response to EOE-418. Identify if the Company performed any type of analysis to determine the largest number of Emergency Response Specialists that could be employed while maintaining the same, or less, annual fully loaded costs. If an analysis has occurred, please provide. If an analysis has not occurred, explain why.

EOE-486. (FUEL REIMBURSEMENT) Refer to Responses to EOE-401 and EOE-290, Att. 2. The Company's response to EOE-401 identified that "*the Company has not separated and removed these* [fuel] *costs to obtain contractor reimbursements because it is not cost-efficient to do so.*" Respond to the following:

a. Explain how the Company determined that it is not cost-effective to obtain reimbursement for vendor fuel costs during storm events. Additionally, provide an estimate for the unreimbursed fuel costs included in the storm recovery request, along with corresponding calculations, or explain why an estimate cannot be provided.
b. Referring to EOE-290, Att. 2 CONFIDENTIAL, identify both the number of external vendor crews and number of Eversource crews located at each location (i.e., hotel) that would have received Fuel. Additionally, using the respective crew counts, provide a percentage of costs that would be applicable to external vendors versus Company employees.
c. Referring to response to subsection 'b', discuss if the percentage derived would be representative of other major storm events.

EOE-487. (CAR VS. POLE) Refer to Response to EOE-406. Respond to the following:

a. Discuss any review procedures performed by the Company to ensure that all Car vs. Pole activity identified within OMS has been eliminated from the storm recovery balance. If a dedicated review of OMS vehicle accidents has not occurred, explain why.
b. Referring to EOE-406, Att. 1, identify if the report can be expanded to include additional details (i.e., fields) to include work order number and assigned crews (i.e., vendors). If the additional fields can be provided, please provide along with a data dictionary. If the fields cannot be provided, please provide a detailed listing of all fields that could be extracted for analysis purposes, along with a data dictionary.

EOE-488. (3RD PARTY CLAIMS/CAR VS. POLE) Refer to Responses to EOE-406 and RRU-087. Respond to the following:

a. Discuss how 3rd party claims are identified, who handles the processing, where the activity is logged, how the activity is monitored, and how the activity is reported (i.e., internally within the Company).
b. Identify how the accounting of 3rd party claims is administered to include both the recording of the recoverable balance and the reserve (i.e., referenced in RRU-087).
c. Identify if the Company performs or is capable of performing a reconciliation between the Car vs. Pole activity reported in OMS to the activity discussed in subsections 'a' and 'b'. If a reconciliation is possible, please provide a representative sample for 2024. If a reconciliation is not possible, explain why.

d. Identify all 3rd party claim scenarios that are logged in OMS (i.e., other than car vs. pole) and provide a comprehensive OMS extract detailing each scenario's activity for the period 2024 through 2025.

EOE-489. (MS24H-CAR VS. POLE) Refer to Response to EOE-406. Comparing EOE-406, Att. 1, Excel Row 490 to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-9A-1) CONFIDENTIAL, p. 497, confirm that the OMS Event No. 5440073 was repaired by the Conexus Energy Group vendor and the costs were incorrectly charged to the MS24H event. If confirmed, provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet calculating the amount applicable to the "car vs pole" repair and confirm that it will be eliminated from the recovery request. Additionally, identify any other vendor charges that would be applicable to the OMS Event. If not confirmed, explain how the Company determined that the OMS information was inaccurate.

EOE-490. (MS24A-VENDOR-LINE-TRAVEL) Refer to Responses to EOE-408, EOE-246, Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP 1, and Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-1A-17, pp. 329-333. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to EOE-408 subsection 'b', please clarify the Company's response where it responded that the Correct number of hours attributed to Travel was 16 and the Correct number of hours attributed to Standby was 3. Specifically, is it the Company's position that time spent to "Shape up at shop, onboard/safety train new hires, prepare fleet, tooling fleet, tailboard, travel, safety training of Eversource videos" (i.e., EOE-246, subsection 'a') are all attributed to Travel or are several of these activities attributed to Standby? Provide details.

b. If response to subsection 'a' is that all onboarding hours are attributed to Travel (i.e., billed at the corresponding rates), identify where this treatment is defined within the vendor contract or Company procedures. Additionally, explain why it took 6 hours (i.e., 11 hours on ACCT-2 CLP-1A-17, pp. 331-332 less the 5 hours of travel estimated in EOE-246, subsections 'a' and 'b') to perform the onboarding tasks.

c. If response to subsection 'a' is that onboarding hours are attributed to Standby, provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet detailing the equipment billed during standby and calculate the total amount of equipment billed during the revised (increased) number of standby hours.

EOE-491. (STORM EVENT DOCUMENTATION) Refer to Response to EOE-030-SP01, Att. 1. Provide a reconciliation between the line crew costs reported within EOE-030-SP01, Att. 1 to the respective line crew costs reported within each storm's Excel spreadsheet. To the extent that the amounts differ, please supplement EOE-030-SP01, Att. 1. As an example, EOE observed that Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-01 (MS24A Excel spreadsheet) identified $14,059,070 of line crew costs compared to $8,355,703 within

EOE-030-SP01, Att. 1. Similarly, EOE observed that Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-02 (MS24B Excel spreadsheet) identified $3,490,465 of line crew costs compared to $2,036,801 within EOE-030-SP01, Att. 1. EOE's observations were not limited to these two examples.

EOE-492. (STORM FLEET) Refer to Response to EOE-393. EOE-393 attempted to obtain a breakdown of the Storm Fleet costs split between Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire. Instead, the Company provided an allocation of the total Annual Storm Fleet costs allocated to each state based on usage. Identify if the Company is capable of providing the underlying costs for each state to include costs relevant to the individual vehicles (i.e., maintenance, depreciation, etc) and the individual locations (i.e., storage costs, plowing, etc). If the Company is capable of providing costs applicable to each state's fleet, please provide. If the Company is incapable of providing the costs applicable to each state's fleet, explain why.

EOE-493. (STORM FLEET-EXPENSES) Refer to Responses to EOE-396 and EOE-178, Att.1. The Company was requested to provide documentation supporting various sampled Fleet expenses and provide explanations detailing the nature of the expenses. Respond to the following:

- **a.** Referring to sample selection 'b', the Company referenced that the monthly charge for storage of storm vehicles was approved without an invoice. Provide additional details regarding the nature of this monthly charge (i.e., why do the vehicles require storage in lieu of using Company owned property, where is the storage located, etc.) and provide the omitted documentation. If documentation cannot be provided, explain how this cost can be assessed for prudence.
- **b.** Referring to sample selection 'c', explain how an upgrade to an MRC command vehicle is treated as an expense versus a capitalized asset in accordance with Capital Versus Expense Criteria (i.e., EOE-060, Att.3).
- **c.** Referring to sample selection 'c', explain how the supporting invoice aligns to the selection. Specifically, the invoice references an International HV607 (i.e., a dump truck) supporting a different amount than included in EOE-178, Att. 1. Also, explain how a dump truck is included in the storm fleet.
- **d.** Referring to sample selection 'c', explain how the plowing of the Shrewsbury Massachusetts lot is relevant to the Connecticut storm fleet. As part of the response, identify if any of the Connecticut storm fleet vehicles are located in the lot.
- **e.** Referring to sample selection 'd', explain why a third-party vendor is necessary to drive the trucks "to keep them from forming issues from sitting for long periods" in lieu of Company employees. Additionally, identify the preceding date in which the storm fleet vehicles were used to have warranted the need for the vendor to drive the fleet vehicles.

f. Referring to sample selection 'g', the Company explained that the sampled expense "are journal entries and UVL transactions to account for charges in the proper account" but failed to provide any supporting documentation for the $232,106.98 expense. Provide additional details and supporting documentation for the underlying amount. If supporting documentation cannot be provided, explain why.

g. Referring to sample selection 'h', explain how the rental of a specialty "cutter truck" is relevant to the storm fleet. As part of the response, identify if the equipment is mounted on a Connecticut fleet vehicle.

EOE-494. (STORM FLEET-INVENTORY) Refer to Responses to EOE-031, Att.1 and EOE-395. Provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet detailing each fleet vehicle included within the Company's inventory by year (2024-present). As part of the response, please identify the type of vehicle, the vehicle ID number, the assigned state, the cost basis, the net carrying value, and other pertinent details that reconcile with EOE-395.

EOE-495. (STORM FLEET-DEPRECIATION/RATE OF RETURN) Refer to Responses to EOE-395 and EOE-178, Att. 1. The Company's response to EOE-395 identified several "revisions" to the storm fleet costs and referenced EOE-178RV01 (which has yet to be provided). Provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet detailing the impact (i.e., allocation reduction) to each Major and Minor storm event to account for the revisions.

EOE-496. (NON-STORM FLEET ADDITIONS– CONNECTICUT) Provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet detailing the Company's non-storm fleet additions and disposals by year (i.e., 2021-present) and provide details regarding the types of vehicles. Additionally, identify the projected number of non-storm fleet additions by type through the rate year.

EOE-497. (MS24A-VENDOR-LINE/FLEET) Refer to Responses to EOE-407 and EOE-251. The Company's responses to the two interrogatories provided conflicting information. Specifically, EOE-251 confirmed billing errors of $24,653 and discussed that "*[c]ertain Eversource Storm Fleet assets, including bucket trucks utilized by line crews, were staged in Massachusetts.*" The Company's response to EOE-407 asserts that "*[t]he SOS contractor mobilized directly to Connecticut. The reference to Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, as the ending location on the timesheet was most likely an inadvertent documentation error."* Respond to the following:

a. Identify whether the vendor was staged in Massachusetts, as asserted within EOE-251, or if they were mobilized directly to Connecticut, as asserted within EOE-407. If mobilized (i.e., staged) to Massachusetts, provide responses to subsections 'b' and 'c' as requested within EOE-407. If mobilized directly to Connecticut, explain how the response aligns to the description of work included on pp. 822-824 (i.e., "crew was

ordered to leave hotel in Marlborough, MA where self-lodging was established and sent to Norwalk Inn in Norwalk, CT where customer supplied hotel and dinner.")

b. Referring to EOE-251 subsection 'e', provide the Excel spreadsheet that was originally requested, along with the corresponding cites.

c. Provide a redacted version of the various invoices provided at CLP-1A-19, pp. 790-915, along with notations identifying any errors confirmed within EOE-251 or the Company's analysis to be provided in response to subsection 'b'.

d. Provide all emails or other correspondence detailing the mobilization instructions for the SOS vendor for the MS24A event.

e. Referring to EOE-407, subsection 'a', please clarify the specific location or locations of where the Connecticut storm fleet (i.e., 68 vehicles) was located when not in use. If the vehicles were located in different locations, identify the locations, and counts of vehicles.

EOE-498. (STORM COST OF REMOVAL-PBR) Identify if the Company has allocated any storm costs to capital to account for the cost of removal that occurs during storm events. To the extent that removal costs are eliminated from the storm balance, please explain how the accounting is administered, identify how the costs were derived, and provide a detailed listing of removal costs that were eliminated per storm event. If removal costs are not eliminated, explain why.

EOE-499. (MS24H-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-1, pp. 1-184. The Company reported 60 invoices in the combined incremental charge of $164,956 for the Asplundh Tree Expert vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to Rows 37, 53-59, 68, 83-84, and 88, explain why the vendor was permitted to bill until 10PM on July 1, 2024 when EOE-019, Att.1 identified that crews were released at 6:00PM (i.e., 1800).

b. Referring to Rows 39, 61, 66, 74, 77, 81, 86, and 89, the Company included various charges for Disc Chippers and a Power Blower. Explain why the equipment was necessary for storm remediation purposes and identify if the equipment was actually used. Furthermore, provide documentation to support the Company's pre-authorization of the additional charges and identify the total amount charged for this equipment.

c. Referring to Rows 77, 80-82, and 89-90, the Company allocated incremental charges for each crew for nine hours on July 3, 2024 (i.e., several days after the storm event). Explain if all of the activity included within these July 3, 2024 invoices were applicable to the MS24H storm and, if applicable, provide supporting documentation. To the extent that

any hours were not associated with the MS24H event, identify the amounts.

EOE-500. (MS24H-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-1, pp. 98-101. The Company reported an incremental charge of $6,979 for the Asplundh Tree Expert vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Comparing the storm details referenced within Ex. CLP-STORM-IMT-3 (Event 9) and EOE-019, Att.1, to the vendor's timesheet (i.e., p. 99), explain how the 1:30AM service call could be attributed to the MS24H event. Specifically, the MS24H documentation characterizes the initial impact of the thunderstorms as occurring at 11:40AM (see Ex. CLP-STORM-IMT-3, p. 8), approximately ten hours after the referenced vegetation charge.

b. Provide documentation supporting both the necessity and pre-approval of the referenced crane in support of the MS24H remediation. Additionally, please explain who owned the property where it was necessary for the Company to "hoist and remove trees" (i.e., p. 101) and explain why this activity was necessary for storm remediation purposes.

c. Identify the total incremental charges associated with the 1:30am service call.

d. Provide a redacted version of the referenced invoice documentation.

EOE-501. (MS24H-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-1, pp. 129-131. The Company reported an incremental charge of $4,491 for the Asplundh Tree Expert vendor and appears to have omitted an Eversource Connecticut Emergency Restoration Tree Contractor Work Location report for activity billed on July 3, 2024 (i.e., several days after the storm event). Provide documentation demonstrating that the (9) hours billed on July 3, 2024 was applicable to the MS24H event and explain why it was necessary for the vendor to bill for a chipper. Additionally, identify the location of the remediation activity.

EOE-502. (MS24H-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-1, pp. 132-135. The Company reported an incremental charge of $4,647 for the Asplundh Tree Expert vendor which includes billing for hours (9) on July 3, 2024 (i.e., several days after the storm event). Provide documentation demonstrating that the (9) hours billed on July 3, 2024 was applicable to the MS24H event and explain why it was necessary for the vendor to bill for both a crane service and a chipper. Furthermore, please explain who owned the property where it was necessary for the Company to "hoist and remove trees" (i.e., p. 134).

EOE-503. (MS24H-VENDOR-TRAFFIC) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-1, pp. 204-362. The Company reported 17 invoices in the combined incremental charge of $44,454 for the Certified Utility Services Inc vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Cite the contract or corresponding pricing schedule that defines the Hourly Work Zone Setup rate charged. EOE reviewed the contract at EOE-014, Att.2 (CONFIDENTIAL), starting at p. 164 and was unable to locate the specific rate.

b. Explain how the Company derived the correct amounts to allocate to the MS24H event when the various invoices and job assignment documents failed to include the MS24H011 work order number. As an example, the Company allocated the entire amount invoiced on p. 266 but the job assignment document on p. 269 referenced MS24G and the job assignment document on p. 270 referenced MS24R.

c. Referring to pp. 293-296, explain why the job assignment forms identified multiple different work order numbers (i.e., none of which were MS24H) for July 5, 2024 (several days after the MS24H event), yet all of the activity was charged to the MS24H event. Provide documentation supporting the Company's position.

d. Referring to pp. 320-339, explain why the job assignment forms identified multiple different work order numbers (i.e., none of which were MS24H), including activity through July 5, 2024 (several days after the MS24H event), yet all of the activity was charged to the MS24H event. Provide documentation supporting the Company's position.

e. Referring to p. 362, provide documentation supporting the applicability of the services performed on August 13, 2024 to the MS24H event.

EOE-504. (MS24H-VENDOR-ENVIRONMENTAL) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-1, pp. 404-414. The Company reported two invoices in the combined incremental charge of $2,123 for the Clean Harbors Env Services Inc vendor. Explain how the two invoices which supported "emergency response" activity on August 8, 2024 and August 6, 2024, respectively, applied to the MS24H event (i.e., which occurred over a month prior). Furthermore, provide documentation supporting the applicability of the charges and explain why the remediation did not occur for over a month.

EOE-505. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-1, pp. 419-421, 426-428. The Company reported an incremental charge of $107,707 for the Conexus Energy Group Inc vendor. Explain if the Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Reports were fully completed as required by the Eversource Contractor

Storm Daily Time & Work Report Procedure provided at EOE-022, Att.5. If not fully completed, explain why the Eversource reviewer did not require the information (i.e., notably boxes 24 and 25) to be completed prior to approval.

EOE-506. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-1, pp. 436-499. The Company reported five incremental charges in the combined amount of $876,040 for the Conexus Energy Group Inc vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to OCC-044, Att.2 (CONFIDENTIAL), p. 874-892, confirm that the vendor's Exhibit A Pricing Schedule contains the Company's standard provisions, including "Standby Rates apply to labor resources only" (i.e., p. 880). If not confirmed, cite the revised Exhibit A Pricing Schedule that was executed (signed) for 2024 and 2025 that revised the standard provisions.

b. Refer to pp. 442-444, identify the total amount of incremental billing of equipment during the hours reported when the crews were not provided with assignments (i.e., in accordance with the ERSG-Contractor Obligations-Instructions provided at EOE-173, Att.1, p. 27).

c. Referring to pp. 454-456, identify the total amount of incremental billing of equipment during the hours reported when the crews were not provided with assignments.

d. Referring to pp. 461-462, identify the total amount of incremental billing of equipment during the hours reported when the crews were not provided with assignments.

e. Referring to pp. 469-473, identify the total amount of incremental billing of equipment during the hours between the start time (i.e., 7:00AM) and the first assignment (i.e., 10:00AM).

f. Referring to pp. 497-499, identify the total amount of incremental billing of equipment during the hours between the start time (i.e., 6:00AM) and the first assignment (i.e., 7:59AM).

g. Referring to pp. 497-499, the Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Report identified "Crews Released at 7:00PM – Dinner and acquire lodging" (i.e., p. 497) and then permitted each crew member to bill for an additional three hours to 10:00PM. Explain how the Company determined it was appropriate for the vendor to bill for three hours for dinner/lodging. Furthermore, please identify the total incremental billing for the three hours referenced (i.e., including labor and equipment).

EOE-507. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-2, pp. 1-10. The Company reported an

incremental charge of $96,562 for the Conexus Energy Group Inc vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to pp. 4-10, it appears that the Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Reports were corrupt, please provide legible documents.

b. If the documents provided in response to subsection 'a' identifies a delay between the Start Time (Box 6) and the first assignment commencement (i.e., Box 24. Event Start Time), please identify the total amount of incremental billing of equipment during the hours reported when the crews were not provided with assignments.

EOE-508. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-2, pp. 11-32. The Company reported an incremental charge of $106,794 for the E-J Electric T&D LLC vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to pp. 17-21, explain what the "Damaged house service" related to and identify how the charges were applicable to the MS24H event. Furthermore, identify if the homeowner is responsible for the incurred charges. If the charges should not have been applied to the MS24H event, provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet calculating the impact of the remediation.

b. Referring to p. 25, explain why the vendor billed for hotel charges for the evening of June 30, 2024, when the vendor had not been mobilized until the morning of July 1, 2024 (see pp. 14-16).

c. Referring to p. 25, explain why the vendor billed for hotel charges for the evening of July 1, 2024, when the vendor had completed its demobilization by 7PM on July 1, 2024 (see pp. 22-24).

d. If the Company's response to subsection 'b' and 'c' is due to the vendor's contract, please cite the contract provisions that would permit the billing of lodging for two nights when only supporting the Company for a single day.

EOE-509. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-2, pp. 43-55. The Company reported an incremental charge of $106,679 for the Elecnor Energy Services LLC vendor. Referring to pp. 48-52, the Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Reports identify 30 individuals who supported the MS24H event and each billed for Work Time on July 1, 2024. The vendor identified a total of two assignments for the duration of the billing. Please identify the number of vendor employees who supported each assignment and confirm

that both assignments took ten hours to complete. If the hours are not confirmed, identify the number of hours for each assignment.

EOE-510. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-2, pp. 124-141. The Company reported an incremental charge of $106,081 for the Haugland Energy Group LLC vendor.

a. Provide a discussion explaining the timing and nature of services performed by the vendor. As part of the discussion, explain how each crew was able to bill for four hours of travel time (i.e., Box 10 within pp. 127-141) without an Eversource Contractor Storm Mobilization & Demobilization Time Report or details regarding actual travel. Additionally, identify the actual travel including the starting and ending locations.

b. Comparing p. 125 with pp. 134-141, confirm that the vendor did not bill for equipment during standby for applicable crews.

c. Referring to pp. 127-133, explain why the vendor did not bill for standby when the various timesheets supported work assignments started between 8AM and 10AM. Specifically, comparing the billable hours from pp. 134-141 (see response to subsection 'b') with pp. 127-133 would suggest that the vendor should have billed for standby between 1 and 3 hours per crew (assuming a 2-hour travel from 5AM to 7AM). Furthermore, provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet deriving the incremental billing of equipment for any hours that should have been recorded as standby.

EOE-511. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-2, pp. 156-162. The Company reported an incremental charge of $190,954 for the I B Abel Inc vendor. Referring to p. 161, the Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Reports identify 26 individuals who supported the MS24H event and each billed for Work Time on July 1, 2024. The vendor identified a total of two assignments for the duration of the billing. Please identify the number of vendor employees who supported each assignment and confirm that both assignments took ten hours to complete. If the hours are not confirmed, identify the number of hours for each assignment.

EOE-512. (MS24H-VENDOR-CIVIL) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-3, pp. 31-33. The Company reported an incremental charge of $24,932 for the KTI Utility Construction & Maintenance LLC vendor. Explain why the Company allocated the entire invoice to the MS24H event when several individual charges were

referenced to the MS24G011 work order number. As part of the response, identify the total amount attributed to the MS24G011 work order.

EOE-513. (MS24H-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9 (Outside Contractors tab), Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-3 through CLP-9A-4. The Company reported 97 incremental charges (Excel Rows 155-251) for the combined amount of $322,466 for the Lewis Tree Service Inc. vendor. Explain why almost every Weekly Operations Summary report (e.g., pp. 35, 38, 41, etc.) included a 'Time Start' and a 'Time Finish' of 7:00AM and 4:00PM, respectively, which does not agree with the hours billed. As part of the response, explain how the Company was able to validate the accuracy of the hours billed and provide supporting documentation available to the reviewer at the time verifying that the hours were correctly billed for each invoice (i.e., crew). Additionally, provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet listing each invoice, detailing the crew's actual start and end times, identifying the billable amounts, and identifying if supporting documentation (i.e., available to the arborist at the time of the review) is being provided.

EOE-514. (MS24H-VENDOR-TREE-EQUIPMENT) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9 (Outside Contractors tab), Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-3 through CLP-9A-4. The Company reported 97 incremental charges (Excel Rows 155-251) for the combined amount of $322,466 for the Lewis Tree Service Inc. vendor. The Company was billed for atypical equipment including extra chainsaws, chipper disks, chip trucks, and log trucks. Provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet listing each applicable invoice, the referenced equipment, the amounts billed for the applicable equipment, and the justification for why the equipment was necessary for storm remediation purposes. Additionally, please provide documentation of prior authorization for each charge.

EOE-515. (MS24H-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9 (Outside Contractors tab), Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-3 through CLP-9A-4. The Company reported 97 incremental charges (Excel Rows 155-251) for the combined amount of $322,466 for the Lewis Tree Service Inc. vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to Rows 218-225 and 247-251, the Company was billed for remediation and/or police activity passthroughs between the dates of July 8, 2024 and August 22, 2024, when the storm event was demobilized on July 1, 2024. Provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet listing each applicable invoice, the referenced dates, the amounts billed for each date, and, as applicable, provide documentation demonstrating that the remediation was both necessary and directly applicable to the MS24H event. To the extent that errors are identified, please reference each error in the Excel spreadsheet.

b. Referring to Rows 168, 187, 197, 227, 233-234, and 236, the Company was billed by multiple different crews for remediation on July 5, 2024, with many of the invoices billing at OT rates for apparent after-hours activity. Identify how this remediation was both necessary and directly applicable to the MS24H event and unrelated to the MN24S minor storm event. To the extent that errors are identified, please identify each instance and the impact.

c. Referring to pp. 93, 103, 107, and 114 (supporting Rows 173, 176-177, and 179), explain why each invoice was supported by a "2024 Vine Survey" document that detailed activity, unrelated to MS24H, performed on July 1, 2024. As part of the response, explain why these costs were included in the MS24H storm recovery request and separately identify the specific hours and costs attributed to the survey activity.

EOE-516. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE-TRAVEL) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-5, pp. 31-44. The Company reported an incremental charge of $184,438 for the MTV Solutions vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to pp. 32-34 and 42-44, explain why four employees were billed for eight hours of travel (mobilization and demobilization) in lieu of the 12.5 hours billed by the majority of the crew members.

b. Referring to pp. 32-34 and 42-44, explain why most of the vendor crew members were permitted to bill for 12.5 hours for both mobilization and demobilization when the distance between the two locations was less than 400 miles, which using the criteria outlined in response to EOE-130 would result in billable travel of less than nine hours. As part of the response, provide emails or other correspondence obtained during the initial review to support the hours billed. Additionally, provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet demonstrating the calculation of the total incremental costs for the hours billed in excess of the estimated travel.

EOE-517. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-5, pp. 118-140. The Company reported an incremental charge of $213,481 for the MTV Solutions vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to pp. 119-121, confirm that the mobilization references to Manchester, New Hampshire was a typo. If not confirmed, explain why the charges apply to Connecticut.

b. Referring to pp. 119-121 and 132-134, explain why the vendor crew members were permitted to bill for four hours of travel for both mobilization and demobilization when the distance between the two

locations was approximately 100 miles, which using the criteria outlined in response to EOE-130 would result in billable travel of less than 2.5 hours. As part of the response, provide emails or other correspondence obtained during the initial review to support the hours billed. Additionally, identify the total incremental costs for the hours billed in excess of the estimated travel.

c. Comparing p. 140 with OCC-044, Att.2, p. 4622, explain why the Company permitted the vendor to bill for the Digger at a higher rate than reflected within the contractual rate included with the contract. As part of the response, please identify the total incremental impact of allowing the use of the higher rate for all of the MTV invoices provided for MS24H.

EOE-518. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-5, pp. 153-167. The Company reported an incremental charge of $158,024 for the MTV Solutions vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to pp. 155-158, explain why the vendor was permitted to bill for two hours of mobilization from Windsor Locks CT to East Hampton CT when that commute would typically take minutes, or less than 1 hour after applying a 1.3 factor increase. As part of the response, provide any communication between the Company and the vendor that occurred prior to the approval of the invoice substantiating the travel hours billed and separately identify the incremental impact of the 1 hour of excess travel billed.

b. Referring to pp. 160-166, explain why the vendor was permitted to bill for Work Time, including the billing of equipment, when the Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Reports failed to identify any assignments. As part of the response, identify the incremental impact of allowing the vendor to bill for the equipment that would otherwise not be billed during standby (i.e., see p. 167).

c. Referring to pp. 167 and OCC-044, Att.2 (Confidential), p. 4621, explain why the Company permitted the vendor to establish and bill a higher “Standby Rate” versus a lower “Work Rate” for labor. As part of the response, identify if the higher Standby rate was established to account for the equipment that was not billable during standby.

d. Cite the location of the vendor’s contractual Pricing Schedule Exhibit that supports the Travel rates charged. The pricing schedule provided at OCC-044, Att.2 (Confidential), p. 4621 does not identify a rate for travel. If not specifically included within a pricing schedule, explain why the higher rate was charged along with the corresponding billing for the

equipment. As part of the response, identify the incremental impact of billing at the higher standby rate versus the lower work rate.

EOE-519. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-5, pp. 168-171. The Company reported an incremental charge of $14,771 for the Nooter Construction LLC vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to OCC-044, Att. 2 (Confidential), p. 4624-4638, confirm that the vendor's Exhibit A Pricing Schedule contains the Company's standard provisions, including "Standby Rates apply to labor resources only" (i.e., p. 4630). If not confirmed, cite the revised Exhibit A Pricing Schedule that was executed (signed) for 2024 and 2025 that revised the standard provisions.

b. Referring to pp. 170-171, explain why the vendor was permitted to submit Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Reports that lacked any details regarding actual work performed (i.e., boxes 20-25). As part of the response, identify if the vendor was assigned any actual remediation and, if applicable, provide documentation to support the assignments and corresponding timing.

c. Identify the incremental billing of both labor and equipment for allowing the vendor to bill at DT rates and bill for equipment prior to the first assignment referenced in subsection 'b' above.

EOE-520. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-6, pp. 1-24. The Company reported two incremental charges in the combined amount of $275,721 for the One Source Power LLC vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to pp. 7-10, explain why the vendor was permitted to submit Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Reports that lacked any details regarding actual work performed (i.e., boxes 20-25).

b. Referring to pp. 7-10, provide documentation demonstrating when the vendor received its first assignment. If the first assignment did not occur at 6:00AM, identify the incremental impact of allowing the vendor to bill for equipment at the higher rates until the first assignment.

c. Comparing pp. 21-22 with p. 16, explain why the vendor billed equipment at the full rates during standby when the Company's response to EOE-399, Att. 1 identified the vendor as being subject to Exhibit B (i.e., equipment should only be billed at 50% during standby). As part of the response, identify the incorrect amount billed.

EOE-521. (MS24H-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-6, pp. 44-61. The Company reported two incremental charges in the total amount of $33,548 for the Riggs Distler & Company Inc vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Explain why the vendor was permitted to submit Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Reports that lacked details regarding hours worked for each assignment (i.e., boxes 24-26 within pp. 46-47, 50-51, and 54-57). EOE acknowledges that several of the referenced pages were for charges that were allocated to the MS24G event.

b. For the two MS24H charges, identify when the vendor crews were provided their first assignments in relation to its commencement of billing and identify the incremental billing of both labor and equipment for allowing the vendor to bill at DT rates and to bill for equipment prior to the first assignments.

EOE-522. (MS24H-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-6, pp. 65-67, 74-76. The Company reported two incremental charges in the total amount of $6,555 for the Stanley Tree Service Inc vendor which included charges for chip trucks and chippers. Provide documentation demonstrating the arborist's pre-approval of these charges. Additionally, identify the incremental amounts charged for the chip truck and chipper.

EOE-523. (MS24H-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-6, pp. 68-70. The Company reported an incremental charge of $959 for the Stanley Tree Service Inc vendor. The charges related to "wood pick up" (i.e., p. 70), which billed for a log truck and labor (i.e., p. 69) several days after the storm event. Explain why it was the Company's responsibility to remove the wood from the broken maple (i.e., p. 67) in lieu of allowing the property owner or town to perform these services. Additionally, explain why it was necessary for this charge to be allocated to the MS24H event.

EOE-524. (MS24H-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-6, pp. 80-84. The Company reported two incremental charges in the combined amount of $4,544 for the Stanley Tree Service Inc vendor. The two charges related to the same location on July 8, 2024 and included individual charges for a crane and a log truck. Additionally, the supporting documentation included references to "PURA" (i.e., pp. 81 and 84). Respond to the following:

a. Provide all correspondence between the Company and either PURA or the property owner that is associated with the remediation included

within the two referenced invoices. Additionally, cite where the correspondence demonstrates the applicability of the remediation to the MS24H storm event or any associated storm event.

b. If the Company's review of subsection 'a' identifies an error, identify how the arborist had initially determined that the charges would be applicable to the storm event.

c. If the Company's review of subsection 'a' identifies an error, explain why the Company was responsible for removing the tree in lieu of the property owner.

EOE-525. (MS24H-VENDOR-EQUIPMENT) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-6, pp. 90-108. The Company reported ten incremental charges in the combined amount of $88,648 for the Sunbelt Rentals vendor. (Note: The page numbers per the Excel file appear to be misaligned for 9 of the 10 selections but are all included at pp. 90-108.) Respond to the following:

a. Provide redacted copies of the referenced documents to include copies of all Oracle Analytics Interactive Dashboards-Events where this document was omitted. Specifically, it appears this document was omitted for Event No. 13273242 (p. 99); and 5439369 (p. 100).

b. Referring to pp. 91 and 93 (i.e., supporting charges for $13,246 and $24,416), explain how these charges apply to the MS24H event when both Oracle Analytics Interactive Dashboards–Events reports detail outages that occurred prior to the onset of the MS24H event and specify Weather of "Norm-Normal Weather". If determined to be a valid MS24H expense, provide documentation supporting the Company's response.

c. Referring to pp. 106 and 108 (i.e., supporting charges for $8,170 and $6,252), explain how both of these charges apply to the MS24H event when both outages commenced on July 2, 2024 (several days after the event) and neither outage was included within the Company's outage data reported within EOE-020, Att.1. If determined to be a valid MS24H expense, provide documentation supporting the Company's response.

EOE-526. (MS24H-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-6, pp. 109-117. The Company reported three incremental charges in the total amount of $8,421 for the Tennett Tree Service Inc vendor which included charges for chip trucks, chippers, and extra saws. Provide documentation demonstrating the arborist's pre-approval of these charges. Additionally, identify the incremental amounts charged for the chip trucks, chippers, and extra saws.

EOE-527. (MS24H-VENDOR-TRAFFIC) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-6, pp. 183-280. The Company reported an incremental charge in the amount of $2,109 for the Town of Greenwich which was supported by an invoice detailing dozens of jobs between July 26, 2024 and July 31, 2024 (i.e., approximately a month after the MS24H event). Please identify which jobs applied to the MS24H event and provide supporting documentation.

EOE-528. (MS24H-VENDOR-TRAFFIC) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-6, pp. 281-365. The Company reported an incremental charge in the amount of $2,811 for the Town of Greenwich which was supported by an invoice detailing dozens of jobs between August 1, 2024 and August 18, 2024 (i.e., over a month after the MS24H event). Please identify which jobs applied to the MS24H event and provide supporting documentation.

EOE-529. (MS24H-VENDOR-ACCRUAL) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9. The Company reported an incremental charge of $32,077 for a Tree Accrual (Row 321). Explain why the Company is reporting an accrual for Tree costs that occurred over two years ago and provide documentation supporting the amount.

EOE-530. (MS24H-VENDOR-FOOD) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-2, pp. 148-149. The Company reported an incremental charge of $7,701 for the Heritage Hotel for a buffet dinner. Provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet detailing the total all-in costs for the associated meal and provide a comparison of the cost to the maximum meal cap outlined within Eversource's restaurant meal policy. As part of the response, identify the aggregate amount that exceeds the policy.

EOE-531. (MS24H-VENDOR-FOOD) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-2, pp. 154-155. The Company reported an incremental charge of $6,537 for the HT-Exit 88 Hotel TRS LLC (i.e., Mystic Marriott) for a buffet dinner. Provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet detailing the total all-in costs for the associated meal and provide a comparison of the cost to the maximum meal cap outlined within Eversource's restaurant meal policy. As part of the response, identify the aggregate amount that exceeds the policy.

EOE-532. (MS24H-VENDOR-FOOD) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-6, pp. 35-36. The Company reported an incremental charge of $10,862 for the Paul Gregorys vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Specific to the MS24H charges, provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet detailing the total all-in costs for the associated meal (i.e., lunch on 7/1/24) and provide a comparison of the cost to the maximum meal cap outlined within Eversource's restaurant meal policy. As part of the response, identify the aggregate amount that exceeds the policy.

b. Specific to the additional invoice charges not allocated to the MS24H event, provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet detailing the total all-in costs for each meal (i.e., breakfast, lunch, and dinner) and provide a comparison of the cost to the maximum meal caps outlined within Eversource's restaurant meal policy. As part of the response, identify the aggregate amount that exceeds the policy.

EOE-533. (MS24H-LABOR OVERTIME) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Labor by Empl. Title tab. Provide documentation to support the validity of the following Overtime hours specific to the MS24H event. As part of the response, please provide relevant timesheets, calculations, or other supporting documents.

a. Row 110, Response Specialist-Line, 31.5 hours
b. Row 471, Response Specialist-Line, 36 hours
c. Row 694, Lead Line Mechanic, 43.5 hours
d. Row 743, Chief/Top Line Mechanic, 44.5 hours
e. Row 851, Lead Line Mechanic, 38.5 hours
f. Row 927, Lead Line Mechanic, 41.5 hours
g. Row 1707, Response Specialist- Line, 31.5 hours
h. Row 2094, Principal Counsel, 10 hours

EOE-534. (MS24H- MEALS) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Labor by Empl. Title tab. Provide documentation to support the validity of the following Meal reimbursements (stipends). As part of the response, please provide relevant calculations, union agreement citations, invoices, or other supporting documents and identify whether the employee received any Company provided meals or not.

a. Row 693, Lead Line Mechanic, $110
b. Row 742, Chief/Top Line Mechanic, $130
c. Row 819, Response Specialist- Line, $200
d. Row 1148, Line Helper, $120

EOE-535. (MS24H-P-CARDS-MEALS) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, P-Card tab. The Company included five references to supporting documents provided within Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9A-6 and cited various pages (see rows 19, 56, 58, 62, and 81). Explain how each of the five charges (totaling

$89,406) are applicable to the MS24H event when every invoice pre-dates the event (pp. 398-412).

EOE-536. (MS24H-P-CARDS-MEALS) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, P-Card tab. Provide documentation to support the validity of the following sampled P-Card Meal expenses. As part of the response, please provide the relevant invoices and other supporting documents demonstrating the necessity and applicability of each charge to the MS24H event. Additionally, provide documentation to support the charges complying with Eversource's restaurant meal policy and if the charges exceed the policy, identify the amounts in excess of the policy.

a. Row 39, HARTFORD RESTAURANT, $402
b. Row 46, MAGGIE MCFLYS, $168
c. Row 59, PARKWAY DINER, $8,309
d. Row 64, SPARTAN II RESTAURANT, $505
e. Row 69, NEWTOWN DELI LLC, $43,263

EOE-537. (MS24H-EMPLOYEE EXPENSE REIMB) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Empl. Expense&Other tab. Provide documentation to support the validity of the following sampled employee expenses. As part of the response, please provide a description of the purchase, relevant invoices, applicable calculations, and other supporting documents demonstrating the necessity and applicability of each cost to the MS24H event.

a. Row 24, Employee Reimbursements, $360
b. Row 64, Employee Reimbursements, $598
c. Row 182, Employee Reimbursements, $936
d. Row 204, Employee Reimbursements, $932
e. Row 232, Employee Reimbursements, $678

EOE-538. (MS24H-EMPLOYEE EXPENSE MILEAGE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-9, Empl. Expense&Other tab. Provide documentation to support the validity of the following sampled mileage expenses. As part of the response, please provide the mileage logs and other supporting documents that were available to the Eversource reviewer at the time of approval demonstrating the applicability of each cost to the MS24H event, as well as the netting of the employee's normal commute.

a. Row 31, $161
b. Row 51, $110
c. Row 63, $352
d. Row 143, $166
e. Row 171, $110

EOE-539. (MS24K-NONSTORM DAMAGE) Refer to Exhibit CLP-STORM-IMT-3 (Event 12-MS24K), p. 85. The Emergency Briefing document referenced a Hartford Electric Outage that related to "customer-owned underground electric equipment on Elm Street in Hartford that damaged our equipment and caused an underground fire". Respond to the following:

a. Identify if the Company has included any costs associated with the non-storm Elm Street fire within the storm recovery request. If included, identify all amounts.
b. Provide a complete extract of OMS activity associated with the non-storm Elm Street fire, inclusive of details on assigned crews.
c. Identify the total costs associated with the underground fire, including both O&M and Capital costs, and identify if the Company has obtained reimbursement for those costs.
d. Identify if the Company included the outages from the Elm Street fire within its storm outage activity reported within Exh. CLP-STORM-IMT-3 or EOE-020, Att. 1. If included, explain why.

EOE-540. (MS24K-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-1, pp. 144-146. The Company reported an incremental charge of $2,787 for the Asplundh Tree Expert Co vendor. The Eversource Connecticut Weekly Operations Report (p. 145) billed for hours from 12/9/24 (two days prior to the event) through 12/13/24 (two days after the event) and included an Emergency Restoration Tree Contractor Work Location report that solely referenced "Misc" (p. 146). The Company appears to have allocated approximately four of the five days of the invoiced amount to the MS24K event.

a. Identify which days were allocated to the MS24K event and provide documentation to support the applicability of the charges. To the extent that the Company cannot provide documentation, explain why documentation could not be provided and explain what specific services were performed.
b. Explain how the invoice reviewer was able to verify the accuracy of the billed hours when the Eversource Connecticut Weekly Operations Report (p. 145) failed to identify any start or end times for the entire week.

EOE-541. (MS24K-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-1, pp. 42-44, 81-83, 87-89, 209-214, and 229-231. The Company reported six incremental charges in the total amount of $10,758 for the Asplundh Tree Expert Co vendor that included activity from December 13, 2024 (after the storm event). Respond to the following:

a. Referring to pp. 42-44, provide documentation to demonstrate that the remediation was caused by the MS24K event and that the remediation required the use of a Disc Chipper.

b. Referring to pp. 81-83, provide documentation to demonstrate that the remediation was caused by the MS24K event and that the remediation required the use of a Disc Chipper.

c. Referring to pp. 87-89, provide documentation to demonstrate that the remediation was caused by the MS24K event and that the remediation required the use of a Disc Chipper. Additionally, explain how the invoice reviewer was able to validate the accuracy of the hours billed given the lack of start and end times on the Eversource Connecticut Weekly Operations Report (p. 88).

d. Referring to pp. 209-211, explain why the Company permitted the vendor to bill for standby on December 13, 2024.

e. Referring to pp. 212-214, provide documentation to demonstrate that the remediation was caused by the MS24K event and explain how the invoice reviewer was able to validate the accuracy of the hours billed given the lack of start and end times on the Eversource Connecticut Weekly Operations Report (p. 213).

f. Referring to pp. 229-231, provide the omitted Emergency Restoration Tree Contractor Work Location Report, along with documentation to demonstrate that the remediation was caused by the MS24K event. Additionally, explain how the invoice reviewer was able to validate the accuracy of the hours billed given the lack of start and end times on the Eversource Connecticut Weekly Operations Report (p. 230).

EOE-542. (MS24K-VENDOR-SERVICE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-2, pp. 25-48. The Company reported an incremental charge in the total amount of $18,069 for the Central Connecticut Cable vendor. The charge solely related to the billing of four hours on December 12, 2024 and included an email from the Company stating “Crews released this morning as of 0600 will be able to bill 4 hours of demob” (p. 36). Explain why vendor crews that were released immediately upon the commencement of their shift were permitted to bill for four hours. As part of the response, identify where this billing treatment is defined within the vendor contract. If not included within the vendor contract, explain why this additional billing was authorized by the Company.

EOE-543. (MS24K-VENDOR-TRAFFIC) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-2, pp. 68-93. The Company reported an incremental charge of $5,756 for the Certified Utility Services Inc vendor.

Explain how the Company derived the correct amount to allocate to the MS24K event when the various job assignment documents failed to include the MS24K011 work order number and the amounts associated with December 11, 2024 are significantly less than the amount allocated.

EOE-544. (MS24K-VENDOR-TRAFFIC) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-2, pp. 114-122. The Company reported an incremental charge of $10,628 for the Certified Utility Services Inc vendor. Explain why multiple flaggers were permitted to commence billing as of 0700 when the storm was not expected to impact the state until later in the day and why the flaggers were permitted to bill for 24 hours straight (i.e., see e.g., p. 115, 116, 118, and 120-122).

EOE-545. (MS24K-VENDOR-TRAFFIC) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-2, pp. 123-137. The Company reported an incremental charge of $8,492 for the Certified Utility Services Inc vendor. Explain why the Company permitted multiple flaggers to remain on standby on December 12, 2024, after the Company had demobilized from the MS24K event. As part of the response, identify the incremental impact of all Traffic crews (i.e., including those within other CUS invoices) who were permitted to remain on standby after the Company resumed normal operations (i.e., 8AM on December 12, 2024). To clarify, this request looks to understand the impact of standby billing for all CUS invoices post normal operations.

EOE-546. (MS24K-VENDOR-TRAFFIC) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-2, pp. 157-171. The Company reported an incremental charge of $9,457 for the Certified Utility Services Inc vendor. Explain how the Company could have incurred two charges on December 10, 2024, commencing at 7AM, that were referenced as Storm repair (p. 159) and Storm clean-up (p. 160) when the MS24K event did not impact the state until the next day.

EOE-547. (MS24K-VENDOR-TRAFFIC) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-2, pp. 172-179. The Company reported three incremental charges in the total amount of $2,512 for the Certified Utility Services Inc vendor. All of the charges related to activity on either December 16, 2024 or December 20, 2024, several days after the MS24K event. Please provide documentation (i.e., OMS reports) demonstrating the applicability of these charges to the MS24K event.

EOE-548. (MS24K-VENDOR-CIVIL) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-2, pp. 236-238. The Company reported three incremental charges in the combined amount of $25,673 for the Coleman Drilling & Blasting Inc vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Explain how each of the three invoices were dated December 3, 2024, but applicable to Jobs on December 11 or 12, 2024, over a week later.
b. Identify if the vendor actually performed remediation or if they billed for standby.
c. The Company did not provide timesheets or other documents to support the hours worked. Provide any omitted signed timesheets. If timesheets do not exist, explain how the invoice reviewer was able to validate the accuracy of the hours billed and provide any relevant documentation.

EOE-549. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-2, pp. 239-282. The Company reported two incremental charges in the total amount of $178,102 for the D&D Power LLC vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to OCC-044, Att. 2 (Confidential), p. 908-946, confirm that the vendor's Exhibit A Pricing Schedule contains the Company's standard provisions, including "Standby Rates apply to labor resources only" (i.e., p. 914). If not confirmed, cite the revised Exhibit A Pricing Schedule that was executed (signed) for 2024 and 2025 that revised the standard provisions.
b. Comparing pp. 241-242 with pp. 244-249, confirm that the vendor did not bill for equipment during standby. If not confirmed, identify where the vendor billed for equipment during standby.
c. Referring to pp. 274-275, the charge solely related to the billing of four hours on December 12, 2024 and included an email from the Company stating "Crews released this morning as of 0600 will be able to bill 4 hours of demob to the storm" (p. 277). Explain why vendor crews that were released immediately upon the commencement of their shift were permitted to bill for four hours. As part of the response, identify where this billing treatment is defined within the vendor contract. If not included within the vendor contract, explain why this additional billing was authorized by the Company.

EOE-550. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-2, pp. 317-326. The Company reported an incremental charge of $88,762 for the E-J Electric T&D LLC vendor. The charges related to activity on December 11 - 12, 2024. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to p. 322, the Description of Work for December 12, 2024 characterized the sole OMS assignment as "*Replace 3ph primary riser dead end pole due to fire. Rebuild pole, pull in and terminate new 3ph*

urd cable to pad 2811. Complete switching and energize." Additionally, the OMS Event No. (i.e., 55556308) was not included within EOE-020, Att. 1. Explain how the work assignment (i.e., an event that was "due to fire" and after return to normal operations) was applicable to the MS24K storm event.

b. Referring to p. 323, the Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Report included a note in the top right-hand corner that provided a different WO# (i.e., 19648810). Additionally, the OMS Event Nos. (i.e., 55556372/5556291) were not included within EOE-020, Att. 1. Explain how the December 12, 2024 work assignment was applicable to the MS24K storm event.

c. Referring to p. 324, the OMS Event No. (i.e., 5556190) was not included within EOE-020, Att. 1. Explain how the work assignment was applicable to the MS24K storm event.

d. To the extent that subsections 'a' – 'c' above identify errors with the allocation of costs to MS24K, provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet demonstrating the calculation of all costs that should be eliminated, including costs associated with flagging or other related activity (i.e., see e.g., CUS charges at pp. 103-107, meal charges, hotel charges, etc.).

e. To the extent that subsections 'a' – 'c' above do not confirm errors with the allocation of costs to MS24K, provide copies of the OMS reports and all correspondence between the Company and the vendor pertaining to the reference Event Nos.

EOE-551. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-3, pp. 1-15. The Company reported an incremental charge of $25,515 for the E-J Electric T&D LLC vendor. The charges related to activity solely on December 12, 2024. Respond to the following:

a. Explain why the vendor was permitted to bill for hotel charges the evening of December 11, 2024 when they were both mobilized and released on December 12, 2024, and each hotel receipt (i.e., pp. 11-15) referenced an unrelated "NY Job".

b. Referring to p. 2, explain why the vendor billed for one hour of standby (labor) and also billed for the equipment at the full equipment rate in lieu of the 50% rate identified by the Company within the Exhibit B referenced in EOE-399, Att.1.

EOE-552. (MS24K-VENDOR-TRAFFIC) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-3, pp. 39-57. The Company reported an incremental charge in the amount of $5,225 for the Elite Flaggers LLC

vendor. Identify the specific charges (i.e., flagging services) that were allocated to the MS24K event. Specifically, EOE reviewed each of the timesheet equivalents (i.e., pp. 41-57) and was unable to derive the reported charge based on the reported Job # (i.e., work order numbers).

EOE-553. (MS24K-VENDOR-ENVIRONMENTAL) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-3, pp. 58-249. The Company reported an incremental charge in the amount of $5,350 for the Environmental Consultants Inc vendor and appears to have provided unrelated documents. Please provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet demonstrating how the Company derived the reported charge based on the documentation provided. Please cite the relevant pages and separately identify the vendor's billing at Regular Time versus Overtime.

EOE-554. (MS24K-VENDOR-CIVIL) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-3, pp. 273-284. The Company reported two incremental charges in the combined amount of $24,232 for the KTI Utility Construction & Maintenance LLC vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to p. 273, the Company did not provide timesheets or other documents to support the hours worked. Provide any omitted signed timesheets. If timesheets do not exist, explain how the invoice reviewer was able to validate the accuracy of the hours billed and provide any relevant documentation.

b. Referring to p. 274, explain how the activity performed on December 23-24, 2024 were applicable to the MS24K event. Specifically, the dates align with the MN24AN minor storm event as reported within EOE-013-RV01, Att. 1.

EOE-555. (MS24K-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-3 through CLP-12A-4. The Company reported 130 incremental charges (Excel Rows 185-314) for the combined amount of $264,881 for the Lewis Tree Service Inc. vendor. Explain why almost every Weekly Operations Summary report (e.g., pp. 278, 281, 287, etc.) included a 'Time Start' and a 'Time Finish' of 7:00AM and 4:00PM, respectively, which does not agree with the hours billed. As part of the response, explain how the Company was able to validate the accuracy of the hours billed and provide supporting documentation available to the reviewer at the time verifying that the hours were correctly billed for each invoice (i.e., crew). Additionally, provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet listing each invoice, detailing the crew's start and end times, identifying the billable amounts, and identifying if supporting documentation (i.e., available to the arborist at the time of the review) is being provided.

EOE-556. (MS24K-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-4, pp. 112-115, 237-238. The Company reported three incremental charges (Excel Rows 275-276, 314) for the combined amount of $38,365 for the Lewis Tree Service Inc. vendor. Respond to the following:

a. The invoices reference different job descriptions (see e.g., "Operator of 70' Bucket"), types of equipment, and rates. Please cite the executed contract and pricing schedule that supports each of the billed employees and types of equipment.

b. The Company failed to provide Eversource Connecticut Emergency Restoration Tree Contractor Work Location reports for each of the referenced invoices, please provide.

c. Referring to pp. 237-238, explain why the Company utilized the reference crews on December 13, 2024, when the Company resumed normal operations as of 8AM on December 12, 2024. Additionally, explain why the Company required the use of the various atypical equipment (i.e., Albach Felling Crane, Bobcat, Log Truck, and Whole Tree Chipper) and provide documentation to support both the applicability and necessity of these charges to the MS24K event.

EOE-557. (MS24K-VENDOR-TREE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-4, pp. 10-33, 122-157. The Company reported 17 incremental charges (Excel Rows 241-248, 279-287) for the combined amount of $38,365 for the Lewis Tree Service Inc. vendor. Each of the charges were for remediation between December 16, 2024 and December 20, 2024, when the Company resumed normal operations as of 8AM on December 12, 2024. Respond to the following:

a. Provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet listing each applicable invoice, the referenced dates, the amounts billed for each date, and, as applicable, provide documentation demonstrating that the remediation was both necessary and directly applicable to the MS24K event. To the extent that errors are identified, please reference each error in the Excel spreadsheet.

b. Comparing pp. 124-129 with p. 132-137, explain why duplicate Eversource Connecticut Emergency Restoration Tree Contractor Work Location reports (encompassing a week's activity) were provided in support of two different invoices.

c. Explain why the remediation of "dead" trees (see e.g., pp. 124, 125, 128, etc) was directly attributed to the MS24K event. As part of the response,

identify if the Company's existing vegetation management program includes revenue to remediate dead vegetation.

EOE-558. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-4, pp. 304-307. The Company reported an incremental charge in the amount of $11,726 for the M J Electric vendor. Respond to the following:

a. The vendor appears to have provided a non-standard version of the Eversource Contractor Daily Work Report (pp. 305-306) that fails to identify billing for 'travel', 'standby', and 'work'. Explain why the Company permitted the use of the form and identify what specific billing activity was performed. If billing for travel or work, provide details on the actual travel and work assignments.

b. Comparing p. 307 with OCC-044, Att. 2, p. 3662, confirm that the vendor billed for its equipment at 100% for each hour worked. If confirmed, explain why this was permitted when the Company's response to EOE-399, Att.1 would require billing of equipment at 50% (i.e., during standby) and identify the total incorrect amount billed.

EOE-559. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-5, pp. 12-42. The Company reported an incremental charge in the amount of $138,549 for the McPhee Electric LTD LLC vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Explain why the Company identified an incremental recoverable amount of $138,549 when the invoice was for $134,077.

b. Referring to p. 13, confirm that the vendor did not bill for equipment during standby (i.e., for the OT Hours). If confirmed, explain why.

c. Referring the vendor's Exhibit B provided at EOE-237, Att. 2 (Confidential) and the vendor's Pricing Schedule provided at OCC-044, Att. 2, p. 4246, explain why the Company allowed for conflicting provisions and identify which provision applies. Specifically, Exhibit B at Section 4.4 [Emergency Response Work], subsection e (p. 10) defines that fuel is included in Equipment rates; however, the Pricing Schedule provides a notation that "Fuel will be billed at cost – No Markup."

EOE-560. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-5, pp. 44-67. The Company reported an incremental charge in the amount of $100,821 for the Michels Power Inc vendor. The charge solely related to the billing of four hours on December

12, 2024, and included an email from the Company stating, "Crews released this morning as of 0600 will be able to bill 4 hours of demob to the storm" (p. 52). Respond to the following:

a. Explain why vendor crews that were released immediately upon the commencement of their shift were permitted to bill for four hours. As part of the response, identify where this billing treatment is defined within the vendor contract. If not included within the vendor contract, explain why this additional billing was authorized by the Company.

b. Explain why the billed rates included on pp. 56-63 are different (higher) than the rates included within the vendor's pricing schedule provided within OCC-044, Att. 2 (Confidential), pp. 4420-4427 for the same period. As part of the response, please provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet that compares the billing at the two different rate schedules.

c. Explain why the Company permitted the vendor to bill the entire four hours as Travel in lieu of Standby, which would be subject to a lower billing rate for equipment (see EOE-399, Att.1). As part of the response, please identify the incremental impact on the equipment charge for permitting the vendor to bill travel in lieu of standby.

EOE-561. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-5, pp. 68-75. The Company reported an incremental charge in the amount of $138,549 for the Michels Power Inc vendor. Confirm that the vendor solely performed standby and did not bill for any equipment for the duration of its assignment. If confirmed, explain why.

EOE-562. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-5, pp. 76-109. The Company reported three incremental charges in the combined amount of $296,439 for the MTV Solutions Inc vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to pp. 77-83 and 86-90, each of the Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Reports include a discussion within Section 23 [Description of Work] that references coordination for December 11, 2024, but the billing applied to December 12, 2024. Confirm that this was a typo. If not confirmed, explain.

b. Referring to pp. 77-83 and 86-90, explain how the Company validated the accuracy of the vendor's billing of six hours of travel. As part of the explanation, identify if any portion of the billing should have been attributed to standby and, if applicable, how much of the equipment costs were attributed to standby in error.

c. Referring to pp. 77-83 and 86-90, explain how a vendor can arrive at a location "ready to work" and then incur billable time to eat breakfast 30 minutes later. Additionally, identify if breakfast was provided by the Company and, if so, explain why the vendor was also permitted to separately bill the Company for the meal (see pp. 84, 91).

d. Referring to the 3rd Invoice, specifically pp. 93-100, confirm that the portion of billing associated with standby did not include any billing for equipment. If confirmed explain why.

e. Referring to the 3rd Invoice, specifically pp. 101-107, explain how the Company validated the accuracy of the four hours of billing for travel when the Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Reports failed to provide any details. As part of the response, provide details on the travel.

EOE-563. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-5, pp. 130-153. The Company reported three incremental charges in the combined amount of $81,440 for the One Source Power LLC vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Explain why each of the invoices billed for four hours of demobilization on December 12, 2024, with the starting and ending locations being the same location (see e.g., p. 136). To the extent that the billing of four hours was permitted by contract, identify where this billing treatment is defined within the vendor contract. If not included within the vendor contract, explain why this billing was permitted.

b. Explain why the Company permitted the vendor to bill the entire four hours as Travel in lieu of Standby, which would be subject to a lower billing rate for equipment (see EOE-399, Att.1). As part of the response, please identify the incremental impact on the equipment charge for permitting the vendor to bill travel in lieu of standby.

EOE-564. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-5, pp. 154-160. The Company reported an incremental charge of $87,834 for the OneSource Restoration LLC vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to OCC-044, Att. 2 (Confidential), p. 5048-5064, confirm that the vendor's Exhibit A Pricing Schedule contains the Company's standard provisions, including "Standby Rates apply to labor resources only" (i.e., p. 5054). If not confirmed, cite the revised Exhibit A Pricing Schedule that was executed (signed) for 2024 and 2025 that revised the standard provisions.

b. Referring to OCC-044, Att. 2 (Confidential), p. 5048-5064, the vendor's Exhibit A Pricing Schedule appears to include outdated rates. Provide or cite the signed 2024 Pricing Schedule that aligns to the rates charged.

c. Explain why the vendor was permitted to bill for four hours of demobilization on December 12, 2024, with the starting and ending locations being the same location. To the extent that the billing of four hours was permitted by contract, identify where this billing treatment is defined within the vendor contract. If not included within the vendor contract, explain why this billing was permitted.

d. Explain why the Company permitted the vendor to bill the entire four hours as Travel in lieu of Standby, which would be subject to the provisions of Exhibit A (see EOE-389, Att.2). As part of the response, please identify the incremental impact of the equipment charge.

EOE-565. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-5, pp. 161-167. The Company reported an incremental charge of $94,616 for the Orion Utility Contractors LLC vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Confirm that the portion of billing associated with standby did not include any billing for equipment. If confirmed explain why.

b. Comparing pp. 164-165 with EOE-406, Att. 1, Excel Row 907, confirm that the OMS Event No. 5554682 (i.e., car vs pole) was repaired by the Orion Utility Contractors LLC vendor and the costs were incorrectly charged to the MS24K event. If confirmed, provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet calculating the amount applicable to the "car vs pole" repair and confirm that it will be eliminated from the recovery request. Additionally, identify any other vendor charges that would be applicable to the OMS Event (i.e., flagging, environmental, etc). If not confirmed, explain how the Company determined that the OMS information was inaccurate.

EOE-566. (MS24K-VENDOR-SERVICE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-5, pp. 168-189. The Company reported an incremental charge of $22,240 for the Pasquariello Electric Corp vendor. Most of the supporting exhibits (i.e., Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Reports at pp. 170-179 and Eversource Contractor Storm Mobilization & Demobilization Time Reports at pp. 180-189) are either illegible or inconsistent. For example, it appears that Crew #1 reported 8 hours of standby on December 12, 2024 from 6AM to 2PM (p. 170) and then reported 4 hours of demobilization on December 12, 2024 from 7AM to 11AM (p.180). Please provide a narrative detailing the specific support efforts performed by the vendor, including timing, and explain why the vendor wasn't released as of the Company's 8AM return to normal

operations. If the vendor did not support a full 8 hours as billed on p. 168, identify the incremental impact of the overbilling.

EOE-567. (MS24K-VENDOR-SERVICE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-5, pp. 190-193. The Company reported three incremental charges in the combined amount of $44,703 for the Paul Gregorys LLC and Perk on Main LLC vendors. Provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet detailing the total all-in costs for each meal (i.e., breakfast, lunch, and dinner) and provide a comparison of the cost to the maximum meal caps outlined within Eversource's restaurant meal policy. Additionally, explain why each of the requested recovery amounts exceed the amounts reported on the invoices.

EOE-568. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-5, pp. 130-153. The Company reported two incremental charges in the combined rounded amount of $53,439 for the Premium Utility Contractor Inc vendor. Respond to the following:

- **a.** Explain how the two invoices, both in the amount of $26,719 for the same crew members on the same December 12, 2024, date, are not duplicated charges. If duplicates, explain this was not identified during management's review and confirm the amount that will be removed from the recovery request.
- **b.** Identify if the vendor was mobilized or if they were immediately released and permitted to bill for four hours of demobilization on December 12, 2024.
- **c.** If response to subsection 'b' is that the crews were actually mobilized, explain why they were permitted to bill for four hours to travel between East Hampton and Monroe CT.
- **d.** If response to subsection 'b' is that they were not mobilized but were permitted to bill for a minimum of four hours, identify where this billing treatment is defined within the vendor contract. If not included within the vendor contract, explain why this billing was permitted.
- **e.** Explain why the Company permitted the vendor to bill the entire four hours as Travel in lieu of Standby, which would be subject to the provisions of Exhibit A (see EOE-389, Att.2). As part of the response, please identify the incremental impact of the equipment charge.

EOE-569. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-5, pp. 212-219. The Company reported an incremental charge of $55,133 for the Riggs Distler & Company Inc vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to p. 213, explain why the vendor billed for 13 hours of equipment on December 11, 2024 when they billed for 10 hours of standby and 8 hours of work.
b. Explain why the vendor was permitted to submit Eversource Contractor Storm Daily Time & Work Reports that lacked details regarding hours worked for each assignment (i.e., boxes 24-26 within pp. 214-215).
c. Referring to p. 215, please provide a complete copy of the OMS report for event number 5556582. If not included in OMS, identify when the event was completed.

EOE-570. (MS24K-VENDOR-LINE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-6, pp. 1-9. The Company reported an incremental charge of $30,769 for the Siebert and Sons Enterprises LLC vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Identify if the vendor was mobilized or if they were immediately released and permitted to bill for the four hours of demobilization on December 12, 2024.
b. If response to subsection 'a' is that the crews were actually mobilized, provide details on the mobilization/demobilization to include the missing "End Location" on pp. 6-9.
c. If response to subsection 'a' is that they were not mobilized but were permitted to bill for a minimum of four hours, identify where this billing treatment is defined within the vendor contract. If not included within the vendor contract, explain why this billing was permitted.
d. Explain why the Company permitted the vendor to bill the entire four hours as Travel in lieu of Standby, which would be subject to the provisions of Exhibit A (see EOE-389, Att.2). As part of the response, please identify the incremental impact of the equipment charge.

EOE-571. (MS24K-VENDOR-EQUIPMENT) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-6, pp. 24-36. The Company reported 12 incremental charges in the combined amount of $143,353 for the Sunbelt Rentals Inc. vendor. Respond to the following:

a. Referring to p. 24 (supporting charge of $10,001), explain how the charge could be applicable to the MS24K event when the outage was reported as December 9-10, 2024, commencing several days prior to the MS24K event, associated with an unrelated workorder number, and was not included within the Company's outage data reported within EOE-020, Att. 1.
b. Referring to pp. 30-34 (supporting charges of $51,033), explain how each of the charges could be applicable to the MS24K event when the outages all commenced on December 12, 2024, after the MS24K event

and none of the outages were included within the Company's outage data reported within EOE-020, Att. 1. If determined applicable to the MS24K event, please provide both copies of the applicable OMS reports and copies of the Oracle Analytics Interactive Dashboards-Events reports.

c. Referring to pp. 35-36 (supporting charges of $54,714), identify if any of the charges were applicable to generators that were actually used or if the generators were solely staged. If the generators were not used, provide all documentation that was contemporaneously available to support the necessity of the generators for the MS24K event.

EOE-572. (MS24K-VENDOR-POLICE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-6, pp. 100-131. The Company reported an incremental charge of $2,430 for the Town of Stonington. The invoice included multiple individual charges, including charges that occurred both prior to and after the MS24K event. Please identify how the Company derived the amount applicable to the MS24K event. Additionally, provide additional documentation to include OMS reports substantiating the billing for any allocated charges that did not occur on either December 11 or 12, 2024.

EOE-573. (MS24K-VENDOR-REPS) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-6, pp. 137-146. The Company reported an incremental charge of $4,484 for the United Utility Services Holdings LP vendor. Explain the specific services performed by the vendor employee, explain why these services were necessary, and explain why the individual was necessary to commence billing at 6AM on December 11, 2024. As part of the response, identify if this vendor employee was engaged for non-storm activities where those services would be funded by existing base rates.

EOE-574. (MS24K-VENDOR-FOOD) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12 (P-Card tab), Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12A-6, pp. 158-177. The Company reported seven incremental charges in the combined amount of $95,635 for various restaurants and provided supporting documents (i.e., P-Card tab, rows 20, 33, 56, 58, 61, 62, and 77). EOE was unable to reconcile each of the recovery amounts to the corresponding invoices provided. Respond to the following:

a. Provide a reconciliation between each of the charges and the corresponding invoices provided and identify any adjustments required to the recovery amounts. As an initial example, row 33 identified a recovery amount of $15,121 and supported the charge by two invoices in the amounts of $5,872.80 each (i.e., $11,745.60), leaving a difference of approximately $3,375.

b. Provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet detailing the total all-in costs for each associated meal/vendor and provide a comparison of the cost to the maximum meal cap outlined within Eversource's restaurant meal policy. As part of the response, identify the aggregate amount that exceeds the policy.

c. Referring to p. 177 (i.e., row 77), the Company provided a receipt for December 10, 2024, prior to the MS24K event and prior to any apparent vendor mobilization. Explain how the charges apply to the MS24K event and identify both where the food was delivered and who the food was for.

EOE-575. (MS24K-LABOR OVERTIME) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Labor by Empl. Title tab. Explain why most of the overtime billing was identified as being applicable to the week ending December 21, 2024 when the MS24K storm event occurred on December 11, 2024. Specifically, it appears that the Company's submission details approximately $3,500 of incremental costs for the week ending December 14, 2024 (column G) and approximately $2 million for the week ending December 21, 2024 (i.e., overlapping with minor storm MN24AP).

EOE-576. (MS24K-LABOR OVERTIME) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Labor by Empl. Title tab. Provide documentation to support the validity of the following Overtime hours specific to the MS24K event. As part of the response, please provide relevant timesheets, calculations, or other supporting documents.

a. Row 442, Distribution System Operator, 28.25 hours
b. Row 1893, Line Helper, 32 hours
c. Row 2658, Response Specialist-Line, 42 hours
d. Row 2758, Line Mechanic, 30 hours
e. Row 3357, Response Specialist-Line, 44 hours
f. Row 3404, Distribution System Operator, 28.25 hours

EOE-577. (MS24K- MEALS) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Labor by Empl. Title tab. Provide documentation to support the validity of the following Meal reimbursements (stipends). As part of the response, please provide relevant calculations, union agreement citations, invoices, or other supporting documents and identify whether the employee received any Company provided meals or not.

a. Row 553, Response Specialist- Line, $220
b. Row 1127, Senior Supervisor, Electric Field Operations, $736
c. Row 1467, Supervisor, Electric Field Operations, $843
d. Row 1892, Line Helper, $130
e. Row 2717, Response Specialist- Line, $220

f. Row 3323, Senior Supervisor, Electric Field Operations, $880

EOE-578. (MS24K-P-CARDS-MEALS) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, P-Card tab. Provide documentation to support the validity of the following sampled P-Card Meal expenses. As part of the response, please provide the relevant invoices and other supporting documents demonstrating the necessity and applicability of each charge to the MS24K event. Additionally, provide documentation to support the charges complying with Eversource's restaurant meal policy and if the charges exceed the policy, identify the amounts in excess of the policy.

a. Row 19, ANGELO S MARKET, $3,485
b. Row 30, CASA MIA AT THE HAWTHO, $2,763
c. Row 40, GRAND APIZZA MADISON, $7,735
d. Row 47, HILLTOP RESTAURANT & B, $3,911
e. Row 60, PARKWAY DINER, $9,698
f. Row 76, SQ *NEWTOWN DELI LLC, $8,234

EOE-579. (MS24K-EMPLOYEE EXPENSE REIMB) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Empl. Expense&Other tab. Provide documentation to support the validity of the following sampled employee expenses. As part of the response, please provide a description of the purchase, relevant invoices, applicable calculations, and other supporting documents demonstrating the necessity and applicability of each cost to the MS24K event.

a. Row 25, Employee Reimbursements, $714.00
b. Row 184, Employee Reimbursements, $465.00
c. Row 185, Employee Reimbursements, $344.00

EOE-580. (MS24K-EMPLOYEE EXPENSE MILEAGE) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-12, Empl. Expense&Other tab. Provide documentation to support the validity of the following sampled mileage expenses. As part of the response, please provide the mileage logs and other supporting documents that were available to the Eversource reviewer at the time of approval demonstrating the applicability of each cost to the MS24K event, as well as the netting of the employee's normal commute.

a. Row 81, $178
b. Row 88, $126
c. Row 90, $126
d. Row 116, $110
e. Row 136, $126
f. Row 176, $126