Date Filed: September 28, 2026

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

Question:

(Storm MN25K – Civil Crews) Refer to Exhibits ACCT-2 (CLP-13A-6) (MN25K), and ACCT-2 (CLP-13A-7) (MN25K). The following pertains to invoices from Charter Oak Utility Constructors Inc.:

a. Several invoices and Excavation Job Forms documents work performed under work order #RPEU0011 (ex. Invoice #39513). Provide additional context and explain how this work order relates to storm MN25K. If this work order number does not relate to the storm event, why was this included within the storm recovery costs?

b. Per review of invoice #39459, the Excavation Job Form was submitted on 2/18/25, however, the work was performed on 1/23/25. Explain how the work performed within this form relates to storm MN25K given the work was performed prior to the start of the storm event.

c. Per review of invoice #39677 and #39990, the work performed was after the storm event. Explain and provide additional support to indicate that the work performed per these invoices related to storm MN25K given the dates documented per the Excavation Job Forms.

d. Per review of invoice #40098, the Excavation Job Form indicated this work was performed under work order #RPEU0011 and was performed on 6/13/25. Provide additional context and explain how this work order relates to storm MN25K.

e. Per review of invoice #40260, the Excavation Job Form has handwritten notes indicating the work performed was related to storm MN25K. Provide additional context and explain how the Eversource approver verified that the work performed related to storm MN25K. Is there any additional information logged that noted the delay by Cox and Frontier as to why this crew was deployed in June to fix the pole?

Response:

Referring to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-13)(MN25K), Outside Line Contractors, lines 206-228, Charter Oak Utility Constructors Inc, in the total amount of $67,314.

a. If the vendor isn't given a specific work order to charge their costs to, they will use one of the generic expense work orders the Company has provided in the past. When the vendor submits their invoice, the Administration Group that processes them assigns the correct accounting to the invoices, which would be MN25K in this case.

b. While preparing this response, it was determined that this charge under invoice #39459 is not related to the storm event. The Company will supplement Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-13)(MN25K), to remove line 217 in the amount of $2036.

c. Invoice #39990 relates to post-storm follow-up work performed to re-seed a property on Adna Road, Bristol, CT, associated with outage Event 5604323, which originated during the MN25K event on February 17, 2025. Please refer to OCC-644, Attachment 1 CONFIDENTIAL, for the OMS details supporting these charges. Invoice #39677 relates to restoration of a work area following restoration activities performed on March 6, 2025, during the MN25M event. Please refer to OCC-644, Attachment 2 CONFIDENTIAL, for the OMS details associated with the MN25M event. Upon further review, the Company determined that the $4,146 charge currently included on line 225 of Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-13)(MN25K), is attributable to the MN25M event. Accordingly, the Company will supplement Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-13)(MN25K), to remove the $4,146 charge and will supplement Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-14)(MN25M), to include the $4,146 charge under the appropriate storm event.

d. While preparing this response, it was determined that this charge under invoice #40098 is not related to the storm event. The Company will supplement Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-13)(MN25K), to remove line 227, in the amount of $293.

e. The customer at 133 School St., is fed from a pole line coming from another street behind the property into the backyard of house 133. The pole with the transformer feeding the house broke during the storm, requiring the Company to drive across the customer's lawn to access the location and replace the pole. While all electric repairs were completed at that time, as the custodian of the pole, the Company is required to access the property again to remove the remnants of the old pole. In accessing the property, the lawn suffered damage (ruts) that required remediation. Due to the amount of restoration that would be needed after each utility accessed the location, it was determined that the best course of action was to wait until all work was completed to make repairs. The Company at several points reached out to Cox and Frontier between the storm date and June to shift their facilities to the new pole.