Date Filed: November 19, 2026

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

Question:

(MS24F-VENDOR-TRAFFIC) Refer to Response to EOE-281, Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-6, and Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-6A-3, pp. 136-161. The Company's response confirmed an error between MS24F and MS24E but claimed that "[t]he remaining job slips are all related to the MS24E storm." Respond to the following:

a. Identify if the Company's response included a typo where it referenced MS24E but intended to reference MS24F (i.e., the current event).

b. If subsection 'a' acknowledges a typo, provide documentation to support pp. 140-141 as being applicable to the MS24F event.

c. If subsection 'a' does not acknowledge a typo, explain why the Company is only removing $432 from the current event.

d. Referring to p. 139 and the Company's explanation that this charge applied to MS24E, provide documentation to support this response. Additionally, provide documentation for any other expenses allocated to MS24E based on the Company's responses to subsection 'b'.

Response:

a. The Company confirms that the response to EOE-281[i] contains a typo. The response incorrectly references MS24E. The remaining charges are associated with MS24F. The Company confirms that MS24F is the correct storm designation for the remaining charges.

b. Please refer to EOE-432, Attachment 1 CONFIDENTIAL, which contains the timesheet from Central Connecticut Cable supporting the charges documented on pages 140-141. This attachment serves as the supporting documentation for the referenced charges.

c. Please refer to the Company's response to subpart (a).

d. Please refer to EOE-432, Attachment 2 CONFIDENTIAL, which contains the timesheet for the employee and confirms both the work location and the charges associated with storm number MS24E. This attachment serves as supporting documentation for the referenced charges.

Prior Referenced Response

[i] EOE-281 Question:

(MS24F-VENDOR-TRAFFIC) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-6, and Confidential Exhibit ACCT-2 CLP-6A-3, pp. 136-161. The Company reported an incremental charge of $16,693 for the Certified Utility Services Inc vendor. The invoice details activity from April 2, 2024 (i.e., prior to the mobilization at 6 p.m. on April 3, 2024) to April 5, 2024, and references several unrelated workorder numbers. For each Job assignment document that details a different workorder number (i.e., pp. 139-141), please provide documentation to support the applicability of the charges to the MS24F event. Identify the amount of charges included which are unrelated to the MS24F event.

EOE-281 Response:

Referring to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-6) (MS24F), Outside Line Contractors, at Line 131, Certified Utility Services Inc, in the amount of $16,693.

Upon further review of the charges in support of this response, the Company determined that a portion of the costs recorded under the MS24F event are attributable to post-storm work associated with MS24E. Specifically, the charges associated with the job slip referenced on page 139 will be reallocated from MS24F to MS24E. Accordingly, the Company will supplement Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-6) (MS24F), to revise line 131, to an adjusted total of $16,261. Additionally, the Company will supplement Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-5) (MS24E), to include the reallocated charge of $432.

The remaining job slips are all related to the MS24E storm. The supporting job slips either identify the work as storm-related or reference a storm work order. While there may be instances where a vendor records an incorrect work order number or does not have the appropriate work order available when documenting the work performed, the Company's invoice review process includes additional validation procedures to verify the appropriateness of charges. These procedures may include review of supporting documentation and consultation with field personnel. Based on the storm designation noted on the job slips and the results of the validation review, the invoice reviewer determined that the charges were appropriately associated with storm-related work and approved the invoice.