Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Edward A. Davis and Kimberly R. Parsons
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(ELECTRIC HEATING CUSTOMERS)

a. How does the Company currently identify customers who heat using electricity (e.g., electric resistance heating, heat pump, etc...)?
b. How many customers does the Company have who heat with electricity? (please clarify in this response how the Company determined the number of customers and if the response relies solely on the answer to subpart a).

Response:

a. Currently, the Company identifies those who heat using electricity as those enrolled on Rate 5 – Residential Electric Space Heating. While there may be customers serviced under Rates 1 or 7 who heat with electric resistance, the customer count of Rate 5 provides a definitive measure of those customers with electric space heating. Records of customers who have received an Energy Efficiency Program Rebate for heat pump installations may provide another indicator of customers who heat using electricity.

b. Please refer to the Company's responses to CLF-SC-004[i] specifically subpart (a) and CLF-SC-003[ii] for the requested information.

Prior Referenced Response

[i] CLF-SC-004 Question:

For the same Test Year specified in the preceding request, please provide the number of residential electric customers, total electricity consumption (kWh), and total electric delivery revenue, broken out separately for the residential customer groups whose primary heating is:

a. electric resistance
b. natural gas
c. delivered fuels (e.g., fuel oil, propane)
d. other/unknown heating sources

Please provide this information in the same format requested in the preceding request. If the Company does not possess the information necessary to produce any of the three items requested (customer count, consumption, or delivery

revenue) for any of the residential customer categories listed above, please state specifically which items and/or categories the Company is unable to provide, and explain in detail why not for each item and category identified. If the Company is not able to produce all three items requested for each category for the test year, but is able to do so for a different time period, please provide these figures for the same time period as is used in CLF-SC-3.

CLF-SC-004 Response:

Since the Company does not track the heating sources of its customers, the following response used best available data collected from multiple sources to approximate the following amounts for this request.

a. For the Test Year 2025, the Company provided electric service to 135,073 customers on Rate 5 Residential Electric Heating Service. While there may be customers serviced under Rates 1 or 7 who heat with electric resistance, the customer count of Rate 5 provides a definitive measure of those customers with electric space heating.

   For the Test Year 2025, the total electricity consumption of these customers was approximately 1,594,819,665 kWh.

   For the Test Year 2025, the Company calculated an estimated total delivery revenue, using average Rate 5 delivery rate1 for 2025, of approximately $289,698,992.

b. The Company estimates that for the Test Year, 2025, there are approximately 31,548 CL&P Residential customers received service under either the Yankee Gas Rate 2 Residential Heating rate or the Yankee Gas Rate 3 Residential Multi-Dwelling rate, and who therefore may be assumed to heat using natural gas. The Company cannot account for any customers who may receive natural gas from any company other than Yankee Gas Company.

   For the Test Year 2025, the total electricity consumption of these customers was approximately 177,787,876 kWh.

   For the Test Year 2025, the Company calculated an estimated total delivery revenue, using an average Residential delivery rate2 for 2025, of approximately $34,721,972.

c. For the Test Year 2025, the Company estimates there are approximately 2,089 CL&P Residential customers who receive service under the Yankee Gas Rate 1 Residential Non-Heating rate that are not on CL&P Rate 5 Residential Electric Heating Service. Therefore, it may be assumed that these customers are heating with delivered fuels (e.g. fuel oil, propane). The Company cannot predict the heating source of any other customers.

   For the Test Year 2025, the total electricity consumption of these customers was approximately 10,915,087 kWh.

   For the Test Year 2025, the Company calculated an estimated total delivery revenue, using an average Residential delivery rate3 for 2025, of approximately $2,131,716.

d. This information is not available.

[ii] CLF-SC-003 Question:

For the Test Year in this proceeding, please provide:

a. the number of residential electric customers with a heat pump as their primary heating source;
b. the total electricity consumption (kWh) of these customers;
c. the total electric delivery revenue attributable to these customers, in the aggregate.

The Company may provide this information either as a summary table or as the underlying billing and customer data necessary to derive it (e.g., anonymized billing-quality data identifying each customer's heating source, together with that customer's kWh consumption and delivery revenue for the period). Please provide this information in CSV format or in live Microsoft Excel format (with all formulae intact). If the Company does not possess the information necessary to produce any of the three items requested (heat pump customer count, consumption, or delivery revenue), please state specifically which item(s) the Company is unable to provide, and explain in detail why not for each. If the Company is not able to produce all three items requested for the Test Year, but is able to do so for a different time period, please provide these figures for the most recent time period available.

CLF-SC-003 Response:

Since the Company does not track the heating sources of its customers, the Company has evaluated data collected from Energy Efficiency rebates issued to customers who (1) installed a qualifying heat pump at their residence and (2) submitted for a rebate. This information does not represent all customers who may have heat pumps.

a. Evaluation of data from rebate program which began in 2023 indicates there have been approximately 4,400 customers who have received heat pump rebates that indicate full displacement of other heat sources and use heat pumps as their primary heating source.

b. The Company does not know the total number of residential electric customers utilizing heat pumps as their primary heating source during the Test Year and accordingly is unable to query those customers' total kWh consumption or determine or estimate total delivery revenue.

c. Refer to the Company's response to subpart (b), above.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: John G. Griffin and Leanne M. Landry
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(STORM OVERTIME) Please refer to the Response to OCC-945, Attachment 1. Please complete the same for all storms in 2024.

Response:

Please refer to OCC-985, Attachment 1, for an unlocked excel file which includes employee's job title and storm role for all 2024 storms. Please refer to EOE-040, Attachment 3, for description of storm roles.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Jessica B. Cain and Daniel M. Traynor
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(AFFORDABILTY) Please refer to the Response to OCC-957, Attachment 1.

a. Please indicate the all-in rate used in each assumed monthly bill.

b. Please provide the same calculation assuming 1200 kWh/month usage for Rate 5.

Response:

a. The all-in rates used for each assumed monthly bill are:

- Rate 1: $0.28976 per kWh, plus Customer Charge ($12.36)
- Rate 5: $0.26412 per kWh, plus Customer Charge ($30.00)
- Rate 7[1]:
  i. On Peak Usage: $0.35510 per kWh
  ii. Off-Peak Usage: $0.26282 per kWh
  iii. Customer Charge: $12.36

b. Please refer to OCC-986, Attachment 1, for the requested information.

[1] Rate 7 monthly bill amount based off 26.5% On-Peak Usage, and 73.5% Off-Peak Usage.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Edward A. Davis and Kimberly R. Parsons
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(USAGE) Please provide the average residential customer (separated by Rate 1 and Rate 5, excluding Rate 7) usage for each month of the calendar years 2021-to present.

Response:

Please refer to OCC-987, Attachment 1, for the Rate 1 and Rate 5 average residential customer usage (kWh) for each month of the calendar years 2021 to present.

Date Filed: November 09, 2026

Witness: Christopher Leigh
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(CYBERSECURITY) Please refer to the Response to OCC-768. There the Company indicated "Yes" to the question of if it had ever determined, through its vendor security review process, that a prospective or existing vendor's security controls or practices were insufficient; however, the Company answered the remaining of the question regarding only what "may" occur in such circumstances, not what did occur. Please indicate from 2018 to the present:

a. each incident in which the Company determined through its vendor security review process that a vendor's security controls or practices were insufficient;
b. what services that vendor provided;
c. what specific security deficiencies were identified;
d. whether the vendor was permitted to proceed or continue providing services; and
e. what specific action(s) the Company took in response.

Response:

The Company reviewed its Vendor Risk Management records for the period January 1, 2018 through the present to identify instances in which a prospective or existing vendor was determined through the vendor security review process to have security controls or practices that did not meet the Company's requirements. Please refer to OCC-988, Attachment 1 CONFIDENITAL, for the results of the Company's vendor assessments.

In each of the instances, the Company's Vendor Risk Management process identified the relevant concern through the due diligence review and resulted in the vendor either not proceeding with the contemplated engagement or being subject to additional requirements or conditions before the engagement could proceed.

The Company also identified vendor reviews during this period that were closed or classified as rejected for reasons other than a determination of inadequate cybersecurity controls, including vendor non-responsiveness and instances where the vendor was not ultimately selected. Those records have not been included in OCC-988, Attachment 1 CONFIDENIAL.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien and Garrett J. Murray
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(BOARD OF DIRECTORS) Please refer to the Response to OCC-263. Is the Company stating that there are no costs or compensation associated with the Board of Directors paid for by CL&P ratepayers? If there are any costs, please provide for the years 2021-2025 and describe.

Response:

The Company clarifies that there were two separate asks in the interrogatory request OCC-263[i] relevant to the current interrogatory. First the Company addressed the "total expenses associated with... CL&P... board of directors that are direct charged and allocated to the Company" in which the Company replied in the first paragraph of the response that "The Board of Directors of the Connecticut Light and Power Company have never, nor do they now receive any meeting fees, reimbursable expenses, benefits, stock options, or meeting costs as it relates to the Company's meetings or for their service on its Board." Therefore, there are no costs included within the Company's cost of service related to the CL&P board of directors.

The second portion of interrogatory request OCC-263 asked the Company to "[p]rovide the total expenses associated with Eversource...and any other board of directors that are direct charged and allocated to the Company". That portion of the interrogatory was responded to in the second paragraph of the response, in which the Company details costs incurred for the Board of Trustees for Eversource Energy in the Test Year. Further, OCC-263, Attachment 1, displays costs from years 2021-2025.

Eversource Energy Board of Trustee costs sought for approval are shown in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-1, at page 70 as "Trustee Retainer Fees of $290,000, and Restricted Stock Units of $225,000." These costs can also be found in Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-2, Schedule C-3.4.

To reiterate, costs other than Trustee retainer fees and trustee restricted stock units have been excluded from the Company's cost of service.

Prior Referenced Response

[i] OCC-263 Question:

(Board of Director Expenses) Provide the total expenses associated with Eversource, CL&P and any other boards of directors that are direct charged and allocated to the Company including but not limited to fees, retainers, reimbursements, benefits, stock options, travel, meeting costs, etc. for each of the years 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025 and the amount included in the rate year.

OCC-263 Response:

The Board of Directors of the Connecticut Light and Power Company have never, nor do they receive any meeting fees, reimbursable expenses, benefits, stock options, or meeting costs as it relates to the Company's meetings or for their service on its Board.

For costs related to the Eversource Energy Board of Trustees from 2021 through the Rate Year, please see OCC-263, Attachment 1. Note the Company incurred expenses of $515,000 in the Test Year and in the Rate Year associated with Board of Trustees expenses. Please see CLP-REVREQ-2, Schedule C-3.4, and the Prefiled Testimony at Exhibit CLP-REVREQ-1, at page 70, for additional information on Board of Trustees expenses.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Jason Tharp
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(BRIDGE METERS) Please list and explain all functions of the bridge meter(s) the Company uses (i.e., not functions that the meter is capable of, but functions that the Company uses) that differ from an AMR meter.

Response:

Please refer to the Company's response to information request OCC-995[i].

Referenced Response

[i] OCC-995 Question:

(BRIDGE METERS) Please provide the Authority decision and/or ruling approving the Company installing the 467,145 bridge meters it has installed.

OCC-995 Response:

The Company does not require PURA's approval for installation of bridge meters. The installation of meters is a basic function of utility service, falling into the category of capital investment that PURA reviews on the basis of prudence at the time that recovery of the investment is requested in rate base. On the CL&P system, implementation of bridge meters proceeded on the basis of a business case contemplating the obsolescence of automated meter reading ("AMR") technology and the opportunity to obtain enhanced functionality on the distribution system, as the evaluation of implementation of Advanced Metering Infrastructure ("AMI") took place in Docket No. 17-12-03RE02 over an extended time frame (2019-2024). The installation of bridge meters does not involve the need for a comprehensive implementation plan involving the integration of new back-office information systems and accelerated installation across the entire customer base, which are the circumstances that drive the need for an associated cost-recovery mechanism and other approvals of PURA to support that type of implementation.

Specifically, beginning in 2017, the Company began to evaluate the installation of "bridge" meters to replace a portion of its hard-to-reach AMR meters with a goal of increasing operational efficiencies for service disconnects and reconnects; decreasing the amount of customer write-offs and bad debts through more and faster remote disconnects; and addressing the "failure curve" for meters at or approaching end of life. Bridge meters are AMR meters with remote turn-on and turn-off capability through the Company's existing meter reading system. Bridge meters can also be used for specialty applications, including net and demand readings. An AMR meter with specialty applications added to it – like the capability to measure demand – is more expensive than purchasing a bridge meter and programming it to perform specialty applications. This is due to the fact that AMR technology is antiquated and requires more expensive components than the more flexible bridge meter. Because the Company's existing metering

infrastructure was at its end-of-life and therefore prone to error or failure, replacement was necessary in order to avoid billing inaccuracies or estimates.

With the success of the bridge-meter project in meeting operational and bad-debt reduction goals, the Company increased the level of meter-related capital expenditures in 2018, 2019 and 2020, and migrated to remote-disconnect capable meters as its meter of choice for all replacement installations. To this day, bridge meters continue to offer significant safety and operational benefits with their ability to remotely read and operate when access is an issue, which is common in metro areas. The Company expects to continue to utilized both bridge-meter technology and AMR meter technology pending full implementation of AMI.

Specific benefits of bridge-metering technology include the following:

Remote disconnect/reconnect switch:

- Many of the residential meter types include a remote disconnect/reconnect switch. That switch can be operated by agents of Eversource without the need to physically access the meter. The agents must still visit the premises to get close to the meter for the signal to reach.

- The disconnect feature is primarily used to decrease the amount of customer write-offs and bad debt. Allowing employees to disconnect the meter without physical access helps in situations where access is prevented or unsafe conditions.

- The primary benefit of the remote reconnect feature is the ability to restore power to the customer without requiring the customer to be home to grant access when the meter is located inside.

Automatic demand reset:

- Legacy meter types require the Meter Reader to perform manual demand resets monthly so the meter can correctly record demand values for applicable customers/rates. The bridge meter can automatically reset the demand value when the meter is read each month. This cuts down the time and effort involved with reading these meter configurations.

Polyphase phase angles:

- Polyphase bridge meters have the added benefit of providing phase angle data when meter data is extracted. Phase angle data is used to troubleshoot metering or service issues. There have been examples of equipment errors being detected with phase angle data.

Meter feature standardization:

- Prior to bridge meters, the Company used different meter types for demand customers, net customers, net demand customers and production meters. Multiplying each of these needs across the various service configurations results in dozens of different meter types. The bridge meter is able to handle all these billing requirements with the same meter which greatly simplifies inventory and reduces meter inventory shortages.

Annual installations are summarized as follows:

Year	Installed Bridge Meters	Installed AMR Meters
2015		39,086
2016	5,161	28,224
2017	50,292	17,958
2018	85,581	3,798
2019	105,285	1
2020	54,345	
2021	21,291	20,476
2022	16,426	35,157
2023	29,710	14,852
2024	69,896	3,784
2025	18,237	1,432
2026	13,222	173
Total	**469,446**	**164,941**

The table above provides a breakdown of all bridge and AMR meters that are currently physically installed in Connecticut. The different rows separate meters into the year they were purchased. The total quantities differ from the 467,145 figure referenced due to minor fluctuations in reporting of installed and removed meters which occur on a daily basis.

Additionally, it is necessary to highlight that the methodology of categorizing physically installed meters broken out by purchase year, matches previously filed meter breakdowns. Since there are natural delays between purchasing and installing meters in the field, it may appear as if past stated vintages are increasing (i.e. there is an increase in 2025 meters than previously stated). This variance is due to reporting on meters that were purchased in 2025 were physically installed in the field in 2026. This is true for all years resulting in older vintage volumes decreasing, and newer vintage meter volumes increasing each time this analysis is performed.

Going forward – with the implementation of AMI - advances in the industry throughout the previous decade have enabled additional capabilities in AMI meters at comparable cost, increasing the relative cost-effectiveness of an AMI system. Modern AMI meters now leverage advancements in mesh network technology and 4G LTE and 5G communication technologies, enabling near real-time data sharing through device-to-device communication. This facilitates greater situational awareness for the utility. Equipped with more powerful processors and expanded storage, these meters can download applications and run analytical algorithms to address various use cases, such as mapping meters to transformers and providing customers with detailed insights into their energy usage. Additionally, modern AMI meters are capable of grid-edge computation, processing vast amounts of data to produce actionable insights for both the customers and the grid. The meters can autonomously decide which data to send back to the utility, optimizing network utilization and reducing the amount of time needed to process, analyze, and make decisions based on that data. Advanced AMI use cases now include neutral monitoring, connectivity model verification, and advanced load disaggregation, alongside traditional capabilities such as remote connect/disconnect, internal metering, tamper detection, and power loss and restoration notifications. The Company's meter replacement strategy aims to provide all customers in the territory with equal access to the benefits the AMI deployment.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Jason Tharp
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(BRIDGE METERS) Please provide an unlocked Excel file indicating: the date the Company installed each of the 467,145 bridge meters; if the account associated with the meter is commercial or residential; and the bridge meters' manufacturer and model number. Please additionally provide all manufacturer's guides and/or specifications for the meters/model numbers listed.

Response:

Please refer to OCC-991, Attachment 1, for the requested information. Additionally, please refer to OCC-99,1 Attachment 2, and OCC-991, Attachment 3, for additional manufacturer details on the installed meter types.

OCC-991, Attachment 1, provides a breakdown of all bridge meters that are currently physically installed in Connecticut. The different rows separate meters into the year they were purchased, the customer rate class, manufacturer meter type, and if the meter is used as a solar production meter. The total quantities differ from the 467,145 figure referenced due to minor fluctuations in reporting of installed and removed meters which occurs on a daily basis.

Additionally, it is necessary to highlight that the methodology of categorizing physically installed meters broken out by purchase year, matches previously filed meter breakdowns. Since there are natural delays between purchasing and installing meters in the field, it may appear as if past stated vintages are increasing (i.e. there is an increase in 2025 meters than previously stated). This variance is due to reporting on meters that were purchased in 2025 were physically installed in the field in 2026. This is true for all years resulting in older vintage volumes decreasing, and newer vintage meter volumes increasing each time this analysis is performed.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Jason Tharp
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(BRIDGE METERS) Please refer to the Response to OCC-943, where the Company states that bridge meters can facilitate time of use rates. Please clarify that the singular barrier to a current customer on a bridge meter being on a time of use rate is the Company's "supporting billing system and interval data management system." If this is not the singular barrier, please describe all other barriers.

Response:

TOU rates require meters that record interval data, which bridge meters can record. The interval data management system (MV-90) is responsible for calling and validating interval data information, including for TOU customers. The MV-90 system normally communicates with meters via analog phone lines or cellular modems. It is technically possible for bridge meters to communicate interval data via the AMR ERT module to a meter reader vehicle. But transmitting interval data opposed to simple register reads takes much longer. Adding interval data collection to meter reading routes would reduce the number of meters a route can handle, resulting in additional AMR drive-by meter readers collecting the interval data. Eversource decided that the added cost for system upgrades to support collecting interval data from drive-by meter reading along with the increasing meter readers to support more time intensive interval read collection were not prudent and ran counter to moving to an eventual AMI solution.

The traditional method for obtaining interval data from bridge meters is to set up the AMI 1.0 network and collect the interval data wirelessly without the need for meter reader collection. But multiple intermediary systems are required between bridge meters (or AMI meters) and the billing system. One intermediary system is typically referred to as meter data management system (MDMS) and is responsible for housing the interval data for the billing system to retrieve and render bills. Another intermediary system is the head-end system responsible for calling the bridge meters (or AMI meters) to obtain the interval data. It is a significant effort to set up both the head-end system and an MDMS and integrate them with the billing system.

In short, there are significant investments required for either method of collecting interval data from bridge meters. If the Company collected the interval data from AMR drive-by meter readers, Eversource would need to upgrade the meter reading collection system, the MV-90 system, and add more meter readers. If the Company stood up the AMI 1.0 network to collect the interval data, Eversource would need to implement a head end system, MDMS, and make changes to the billing system and MV-90 system. This represents the bare minimum for enabling TOU billing with

bridge meters, but an AMI infrastructure offers many other benefits that would entail many more system integrations to realize those benefits.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Sean P. Noonan
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(METER BILLING SYSTEM) Please indicate the month and year the Company's current billing system was installed and the month and year of any updates.

Response:

The Company has two billing systems for Connecticut electric accounts C2, and CT Large Power Billing.

The main application is a system called C2 which was built in-house by Eversource in 2008. This system is used to bill most of the Company's commercial and residential customer accounts. The C2 system cannot accommodate working with AMI meters, making the overall upgrade to a cohesive singular CIS application necessary.

The Company's other system is called CT Large Power Billing and was implemented around 2008. This system manually bills a very small number of complex and mostly commercial accounts through a mostly manual process. CT Large Power Billing will be retired in Q2 of 2027, and the customers will begin billing through C2 via an add-on tool to calculate the billing determinates.

Over the years, numerous enhancements, upgrades and fixes have been implemented to each of these systems to keep the systems running and to meet the Company's service obligations.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Sean P. Noonan
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(INTERVAL DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM) Please indicate the month and year the Company's current interval data management system was installed and the month and year of any updates.

Response:

The Company uses a combination of field collection applications and a meter data management system to collect and store CT Electric meter data.

There are two field collection applications, FCS, which was implemented in July 2015 and MV90, which was implemented in October 2006. FCS collects AMR and bridge meter data but does not function as a Meter Data Management System (MDMS) within the program's capabilities. MV90 supports TOU meters and is a MDMS, however it is not compatible with AMI meters and lacks the technological advancements to accommodate working with AMI meters.

Field Collection Applications:

- FCS: implemented July 2015
- MV90: implemented October 2006

Meter Data Management:

- MDMS: implemented April 2014

Over the years, numerous enhancements, upgrades and fixes have been implemented to each of these systems to keep the systems running and to meet the Company's service obligations.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Jason Tharp
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(BRIDGE METERS) Please provide the Authority decision and/or ruling approving the Company installing the 467,145 bridge meters it has installed.

Response:

The Company does not require PURA's approval for installation of bridge meters. The installation of meters is a basic function of utility service, falling into the category of capital investment that PURA reviews on the basis of prudence at the time that recovery of the investment is requested in rate base. On the CL&P system, implementation of bridge meters proceeded on the basis of a business case contemplating the obsolescence of automated meter reading ("AMR") technology and the opportunity to obtain enhanced functionality on the distribution system, as the evaluation of implementation of Advanced Metering Infrastructure ("AMI") took place in Docket No. 17-12-03RE02 over an extended time frame (2019-2024). The installation of bridge meters does not involve the need for a comprehensive implementation plan involving the integration of new back-office information systems and accelerated installation across the entire customer base, which are the circumstances that drive the need for an associated cost-recovery mechanism and other approvals of PURA to support that type of implementation.

Specifically, beginning in 2017, the Company began to evaluate the installation of "bridge" meters to replace a portion of its hard-to-reach AMR meters with a goal of increasing operational efficiencies for service disconnects and reconnects; decreasing the amount of customer write-offs and bad debts through more and faster remote disconnects; and addressing the "failure curve" for meters at or approaching end of life. Bridge meters are AMR meters with remote turn-on and turn-off capability through the Company's existing meter reading system. Bridge meters can also be used for specialty applications, including net and demand readings. An AMR meter with specialty applications added to it – like the capability to measure demand – is more expensive than purchasing a bridge meter and programming it to perform specialty applications. This is due to the fact that AMR technology is antiquated and requires more expensive components than the more flexible bridge meter. Because the Company's existing metering infrastructure was at its end-of-life and therefore prone to error or failure, replacement was necessary in order to avoid billing inaccuracies or estimates.

With the success of the bridge-meter project in meeting operational and bad-debt reduction goals, the Company increased the level of meter-related capital expenditures in 2018, 2019 and 2020,

and migrated to remote-disconnect capable meters as its meter of choice for all replacement installations. To this day, bridge meters continue to offer significant safety and operational benefits with their ability to remotely read and operate when access is an issue, which is common in metro areas. The Company expects to continue to utilize both bridge-meter technology and AMR meter technology pending full implementation of AMI.

Specific benefits of bridge-metering technology include the following:

Remote disconnect/reconnect switch:

- Many of the residential meter types include a remote disconnect/reconnect switch. That switch can be operated by agents of Eversource without the need to physically access the meter. The agents must still visit the premises to get close to the meter for the signal to reach.
- The disconnect feature is primarily used to decrease the amount of customer write-offs and bad debt. Allowing employees to disconnect the meter without physical access helps in situations where access is prevented or unsafe conditions.
- The primary benefit of the remote reconnect feature is the ability to restore power to the customer without requiring the customer to be home to grant access when the meter is located inside.

Automatic demand reset:

- Legacy meter types require the Meter Reader to perform manual demand resets monthly so the meter can correctly record demand values for applicable customers/rates. The bridge meter can automatically reset the demand value when the meter is read each month. This cuts down the time and effort involved with reading these meter configurations.

Polyphase phase angles:

- Polyphase bridge meters have the added benefit of providing phase angle data when meter data is extracted. Phase angle data is used to troubleshoot metering or service issues. There have been examples of equipment errors being detected with phase angle data.

Meter feature standardization:

- Prior to bridge meters, the Company used different meter types for demand customers, net customers, net demand customers and production meters. Multiplying each of these needs across the various service configurations results in dozens of different meter types. The

bridge meter is able to handle all these billing requirements with the same meter which greatly simplifies inventory and reduces meter inventory shortages.

Annual installations are summarized as follows:

Year	Installed Bridge Meters	Installed AMR Meters
2015		39,086
2016	5,161	28,224
2017	50,292	17,958
2018	85,581	3,798
2019	105,285	1
2020	54,345	
2021	21,291	20,476
2022	16,426	35,157
2023	29,710	14,852
2024	69,896	3,784
2025	18,237	1,432
2026	13,222	173
Total	**469,446**	**164,941**

The table above provides a breakdown of all bridge and AMR meters that are currently physically installed in Connecticut. The different rows separate meters into the year they were purchased. The total quantities differ from the 467,145 figure referenced due to minor fluctuations in reporting of installed and removed meters which occur on a daily basis.

Additionally, it is necessary to highlight that the methodology of categorizing physically installed meters broken out by purchase year, matches previously filed meter breakdowns. Since there are natural delays between purchasing and installing meters in the field, it may appear as if past stated vintages are increasing (i.e. there is an increase in 2025 meters than previously stated). This variance is due to reporting on meters that were purchased in 2025 were physically installed in the field in 2026. This is true for all years resulting in older vintage volumes decreasing, and newer vintage meter volumes increasing each time this analysis is performed.

Going forward - with the implementation of AMI - advances in the industry throughout the previous decade have enabled additional capabilities in AMI meters at comparable cost, increasing the relative cost-effectiveness of an AMI system. Modern AMI meters now leverage advancements in mesh network technology and 4G LTE and 5G communication technologies, enabling near real-time data sharing through device-to-device communication. This facilitates greater situational awareness for the utility. Equipped with more powerful processors and expanded storage, these meters can download applications and run analytical algorithms to address various use cases, such as mapping meters to transformers and providing customers with detailed

insights into their energy usage. Additionally, modern AMI meters are capable of grid-edge computation, processing vast amounts of data to produce actionable insights for both the customers and the grid. The meters can autonomously decide which data to send back to the utility, optimizing network utilization and reducing the amount of time needed to process, analyze, and make decisions based on that data. Advanced AMI use cases now include neutral monitoring, connectivity model verification, and advanced load disaggregation, alongside traditional capabilities such as remote connect/disconnect, internal metering, tamper detection, and power loss and restoration notifications. The Company's meter replacement strategy aims to provide all customers in the territory with equal access to the benefits the AMI deployment.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Jason Tharp
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(METERS) Please provide for each year from 2018 through the present the average unit cost of each type: of AMR meter(s) the Company installed; each type of bridge meter(s) the Company installed; and each type of AMI meter(s) the Company installed.

Response:

Please refer to Table 1 below for the requested information:

Table 1: Average Unit Cost of Installed Meter by Type

Meter Type	Service	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Legacy AMR	Self-Contained	$138	$200	$180	$38	$37	$41	$35	$38
Legacy AMR	Transformer Rated	$97	$121	$0	$145	$72	$75	$77	$90
Bridge AMR	Self-Contained	$127	$115	$118	$107	$115	$143	$139	$125
Bridge AMR	Transformer Rated	$176	$161	$188	$187	$187	$186	$197	$199
AMI	Self-Contained	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
AMI	Transformer Rated	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Mark P. Baldwin, Clifford G. Williams, Leanne M. Landry, John G. Griffin, Craig Dikeman and Matthew J. Correia
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(MS24E) Please refer to the Response to OCC-955.

a. Please cite to the contractual provision contained in the contract with E-J Electric provided in response to OCC-44 that permits the vendor to begin billing at double time while traveling to a job work site.
b. Where was this crew housed/staying on the night of March 11, 2024?

Response:

a. Please refer to OCC-044, Attachment, at 2 page 1153 which includes the list of exhibits referenced within the contract with E-J Electric. The Exhibit B Pricing Schedule was not included with the E-J Electric MSA provided in OCC-044[i]. Please refer to EOE-206, Attachment 1, for a copy of the Exhibit B Pricing Schedule applicable to the E-J Electric contract cited above.

   Please refer to Exhibit B Pricing Schedule, Section 4.4 Emergency Response Work, section (a); "Owner shall compensate Contractor for Emergency Response Work assigned to Contractor based on Contractor's applicable Emergency Response rates from the commencement of such Emergency Response Work at the Site through the termination of Emergency Response Work at the Site, excluding rest time during that period. Emergency Response rates for labor shall be rates equal to the Double Time Rates set forth in Appendix PS-6 PRICING SCHEDULE - T&M."

b. Per Exhibit ACC-2(CLPI-5A-2)(MS24E), at page 157, the crews self-lodged at the Holiday Inn Express in Rocky Hill.

Prior Referenced Response

[i] OCC-044 Question:

(Contracts) For all external line crews and vegetation contractors whose costs are reflected in the storms in this docket and for all current external line crews, please provide all contracts and addendums thereto in effect from January 1, 2024, to the present.

OCC-044 Response:

Please refer to OCC-044, Attachment 1, for a listing of external line crew and vegetation contractors whose services were utilized in the storms under review in this docket and all current external line crews. Attachment 1 includes page number references to the associated contracts, which are provided as OCC-044, Attachment 2 CONFIDENTIAL.

Date Filed: November 09, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Timothy W. McGrath
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(ACCOUNT NUMBERS) Referring to OCC-915, and OCC-916, Interrogatory Responses. Why does the Company state that it "may transfer the payment" instead of "will"?

Response:

If a customer has multiple billing account numbers and a payment is applied to another billing account associated with them, the customer may elect to leave the payment on that account rather than have it transferred.

If a customer provides proof of payment and the payment is located on a billing account with which they have no association, the Company will transfer the payment balance to the correct billing account.

Date Filed: November 09, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Timothy W. McGrath
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(ACCOUNT NUMBERS) Referring to OCC-915, and OCC-916, Interrogatory Responses. For years 2021 –2026 in an Excel spreadsheet provide a list of customer accounts that had a customer incorrectly pay into a wrong account. Include the total which was paid to the wrong account. Include the total number of instances and instances per account impacted.

Response:

Misapplied payment and payment transfer requests are sent by Customer Service Representatives to the Payments and Bill Print team through payment inquiry requests submitted in the Customer Information system or through email requests.

There is no reporting available for email requests, and no way to isolate the misapplied payment or payment transfer requests from other payment inquiry requests submitted through the Customer Information System.

Date Filed: November 09, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Timothy W. McGrath
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(ACCOUNT NUMBERS) Referring to OCC-915, and OCC-916, Interrogatory Responses and OCC-992, interrogatory. For each customer account which had this customer account error provide the amount of payments/funds/money which was transferred to the correct account and amount of payments/funds/money which was NOT transferred to the correct account.

Response:

The Company interprets this question to reference OCC-999, instead of OCC-992. Please refer to the Company's response to OCC-999[i].

Prior Referenced Response

---

[i] OCC-999 Question:

(ACCOUNT NUMBERS) Referring to OCC-915, and OCC-916, Interrogatory Responses. For years 2021 –2026 in an Excel spreadsheet provide a list of customer accounts that had a customer incorrectly pay into a wrong account. Include the total which was paid to the wrong account. Include the total number of instances and instances per account impacted.

OCC-999 Response:

Misapplied payment and payment transfer requests are sent by Customer Service Representatives to the Payments and Bill Print team through payment inquiry requests submitted in the Customer Information system or through email requests.

There is no reporting available for email requests, and no way to isolate the misapplied payment or payment transfer requests from other payment inquiry requests submitted through the Customer Information System.

Date Filed: November 09, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Timothy W. McGrath
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(ACCOUNT NUMBERS) Referring to OCC-915, and OCC-916, Interrogatory Responses. Has the Company refused to transfer the payments/funds/money customers made to incorrect accounts to correct accounts after payment verification is completed?

Response:

The Company will not refuse to transfer payments, funds, or monies that have been applied to an incorrect account with which the customer has no association, provided the customer supplies acceptable proof of payment.

Date Filed: November 09, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Timothy W. McGrath
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(ACCOUNT NUMBERS) Referring to OCC-915, and OCC-916, Interrogatory Responses. Has the Company required customers to make additional payments in excess of the customer's bills because of an incorrect account error? Meaning the payments to the wrong account are not credited to the correct account.

Response:

If a payment is made to a billing account with which the customer has no association, the customer remains responsible for all charges incurred for electric service at the location where they are the customer of record.

In this instance, if the customer provides proof of payment for the payment on a billing account with which they have no association, the Company will transfer the payment balance to the correct billing account.

Date Filed: November 09, 2026

Witness: Jared A. Lawrence and Timothy W. McGrath
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(ACCOUNT NUMBERS) Referring to OCC-916, Interrogatory Response. Why is it the customer's responsibility to verify proof of payment into the Company's own payment system?

Response:

Company payment systems can confirm receipt of payments. The Company cannot confirm ownership of such payments and thus requires customers to provide documentation verifying payment ownership before any payment, funds, or monies are transferred to an account associated with the customer.

Date Filed: November 19, 2026

Witness: Craig Dikeman and Matthew J. Correia
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(VENDORS) For years 2021 – 2025 in an Excel spreadsheet provide the list of CL&P's largest 25 outside vendors/contractors/third-party business-related expenses and explanation how the Company tries to keep these vendors/contractors/third-party related business expenses under competitive bidding and or Company's active relationship and process management to keep costs similar to a market competition cost level.

Response:

Please refer to OCC-1004, Attachment 1, which provides, by year for 2021 through 2025, the requested expense information for CL&P's 25 largest outside vendors, contractors, and other third-party businesses, based on the expenses presented in this Rate Case and identified in EOE-051[i].

In preparing the attachment, the Company excluded the following four entities from the ranking:

- Northeast Utilities
- MTV Solutions Inc.
- Elecnor Energy Services LLC
- Tempest Energy LLC
- Midcon Energy Services Inc.
- Sparks Energy Inc.

Northeast Utilities was excluded because the amounts represent intercompany expenses rather than expenses paid to an outside vendor, contractor, or third-party business. The other five suppliers identified above were excluded because the associated expenditure primarily relates to emergency response and restoration services, which are addressed separately in the Company's responses to interrogatory requests concerning storm and emergency restoration costs.

The Company manages vendor and contractor expenses in accordance with its Procurement Policy and Procurement Manual. The Company's procurement practices are designed to encourage competition and obtain the best evaluated cost consistent with reliability, quality, safety, service, and availability. Purchases exceeding $50,000 generally must be supported by a competitive bid, an approved sole-source justification, or another documented exception permitted under the Procurement Manual.

It is worth noting that for these 25 Vendors over 98% of the costs were supported by Ariba Contracts.

For competitively sourced goods and services, Procurement works with the applicable business organization to define requirements, identify qualified suppliers, solicit and evaluate proposals, negotiate pricing and commercial terms, and document the basis for the award. Competitive evaluations consider price and overall value, as well as applicable technical and operational factors such as supplier qualifications, safety, quality, reliability, service, and resource availability. The supplier offering the lowest price is not necessarily selected if another proposal provides the best evaluated overall value.

When competitive bidding is not practicable or appropriate, the Company requires an approved and documented sole-source justification or other applicable procurement exception. The supporting documentation must explain the basis for the selected procurement method and how the Company's commercial and operational interests are protected.

The Company also manages costs after contract award through practices that may include negotiated rate schedules, defined contractual terms, invoice review, supplier performance monitoring, periodic business reviews, and sourcing or renegotiation activities, as appropriate. For key suppliers, the Company's Supplier Relationship Management process may include scorecards, formal performance reviews, continuous improvement initiatives, and monitoring of cost, safety, quality, service, and supplier risk.

This procurement, contracting, and supplier-management practices are intended to promote cost-effective outcomes, maintain competitive market discipline where practicable, and preserve access to qualified suppliers necessary to support safe and reliable utility operations.

Prior Referenced Response:

[i] EOE-051 Question:

(COMPETITIVE BID ASSESSMENTS) Provide an unlocked Excel spreadsheet detailing each external vendor utilized between 2018 and 2025, and separately identify the total spend by year broken down between O&M, Capital, Storm, and Other (if applicable). Additionally, identify the most recent contract effective date, identify if the vendor is subject to a competitive bid process or a sole source justification, and identify when the last competitive bid/sole source justification occurred. To assist with this request, EOE offers the following visual but is not opposed to separate spreadsheets for each year:

						A	B	C
Vendor Name	Spend by Year				Most Recent Contract Effective Date	Competitive Bid or Sole Source	If Comp Bid, most recent completion date.	If Sole Source, most recent approval date.
	O&M	Capital	Storm	Total				
Entity #1	2022	$$	$$	$$	$$			
	2023	$$	$$	$$	$$			
	2024	$$	$$	$$	$$			
	2025	$$	$$	$$	$$			
Entity #2	2022	$$	$$	$$	$$			
	2023	$$	$$	$$	$$			
	2024	$$	$$	$$	$$			
	2025	$$	$$	$$	$$			

EOE-051 Response:

Please refer to EOE-051, Attachment 1, for an unlocked spreadsheet providing the requested details for vendor spend and bidding information.

Please note that the scope of information requested is substantial, extending well beyond the confines of this rate proceeding. Accordingly, to align the Company's preparation of the requested information with the scope of this proceeding, the Company is providing information for the following time periods:

1. For capitalized costs, the Company has compiled and is providing the requested information for the time period 2018-2025, which is in alignment with the plant additions that are requested for inclusion in rate base.
2. For operating and maintenance expense, the Company has compiled and is providing the requested information for the time period 2023-2025, which is in alignment with the Company's test year (calendar year 2025), plus two additional historical years.
3. For storm-restoration expense associated with the deferred storm costs requested for recovery in this docket, the Company has compiled and is providing the requested information for the time period 2024-2025.

Please note that supporting procurement records are maintained at the Purchase Order or Contract level rather than the Supplier level. Consequently, certain suppliers may have competitively bid transactions, as well as transactions supported by Sole Source Justification.

For each contract, the Company has provided the most recent contract effective date. The Company's systems do not track records based on the most recent bid completion date. This is a detail that the Company can research and provide on a sample basis, upon request.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: Brendan J. O'Brien, Garrett J. Murray, Jeffrey M. Pugliese and Mark P. Baldwin
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FEES) Please refer to the Response to OCC-70, where the Company states, "The purpose of the Company's membership with these organizations is to facilitate a mutual assistance network among member utilities, which enables companies to mobilize personnel and equipment to support major restoration efforts."

a. Is the Company stating in this Response that membership in these organizations is necessary for mutual aid?
b. Do these organizations contribute to storm restoration in any manner other than mutual aid from other utilities? If so, please describe.
c. For the test year, please indicate for each storm if the Company relied on these organizations in its storm response and describe how.

Response:

a. No. The Company is not stating that membership in these organizations is required in order to receive mutual assistance. Rather, the Company's participation in organizations such as the Edison Electric Institute (EEI) and the associated regional mutual assistance networks provide an established framework and coordination process through which electric utilities can efficiently request, offer, and deploy restoration resources during major outage events.

   The mutual assistance program is a voluntary partnership among electric companies that facilitates the sharing of skilled personnel, contractors, and specialized equipment when significant restoration efforts are required.

b. Yes. In addition to facilitating the exchange of mutual assistance resources, organizations such as EEI support storm restoration preparedness and response by:

   - Developing and managing mutual assistance procedures, applications, and agreements that enable rapid resource requests and deployment.
   - Coordinating communication between affected and assisting utilities before, during, and after major events, including situational awareness and information sharing regarding storm impacts, resource availability, and travel restrictions.

- Maintaining regional networks that allow utilities to identify available crews, equipment, and contractor resources.
- Conducting industry emergency management forums, preparedness activities, exercises, and post response assessment efforts that help improve future restoration operations.

c. For the 14 storm events that occurred during the test year, the Company did not secure restoration resources through the mutual assistance process facilitated by the Edison Electric Institute (EEI) or its affiliated regional network, the North Atlantic Mutual Assistance Group (NAMAG.)

The Company actively participated in NAMAG coordination and situational awareness activities before, during, and after significant weather events. Specifically, the Company participated in mutual assistance and situational awareness conference calls associated with the January 9th storm, the April 3rd – 4th storm, and the August 9th severe weather event. The Company also participated in industry calls related to Hurricane Helene and Hurricane Milton, which created significant restoration demands across multiple regions of the United States and affected the nationwide availability of utility and contractor resources.

Date Filed: November 12, 2026

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

Question:

(Storm MS24J – Civil Crews) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11A-2) (MS24J) and ACCT-2 (CLP-11A-3) (MS24J). The following pertains to invoices from Charter Oak Utility Constructors Inc.:

a. Per review of invoices #38621 & #38705 and associated Excavation Job Forms, the work performed under work orders #RPEX0011 and #82780347. Provide additional context and explain how this work order relates to storm MS24J. 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 #38649, the work was performed on 8/19/24. Explain how the work performed within this form relates to storm MS24J given the work was performed during the timing of a minor storm event according to the data provided from EOE-0 Attachment 1.
c. Per review of invoice #38921, the work was performed on 9/6/24. Explain how the work performed within this form relates to storm MS24J given the work was performed after the storm event. How did the Company know this related to MS24J with other minor storms occurring after MS24J that could have caused the damage?

Response:

Referring to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11) (MS24J), Outside Line Contractors, lines 176, 181, 182, 183, Charter Oak Utility Constructors LLC, in the total amount of $35,029.

a. The work charges shown on lines 176 and 181 occurred during the timeframe of storm preparation activities immediately prior to the declaration of the ERP for MS24J. Without additional context to tie it more directly to MS24J, the Company has elected to remove the charges totaling $30,339 and will supplement Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11) (MS24J), accordingly.

b. Please reference OCC-1006, Attachment 1 CONFIDENTIAL, for the OMS details related to this event. During the storm event, repairs were made at the impacted location. The Company hired Charter Oak Utility Constructors LLC to return and perform the needed repair. Please note that the OMS details reference the Town of Manchester, as this particular location is right on the Manchester and South Windsor town lines.

c. Please refer to OCC-1006, Attachment 2 CONFIDENTIAL, for the OMS details related to this event. During the storm event, repairs were made at the impacted location. The Company hired Charter Oak Utility Constructors LLC to return to the property and repair the property impacted by the equipment.

Date Filed: November 12, 2026

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

Question:

(Storm MS24J – Civil Crews) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11A-3) (MS24J). The following pertains to invoice #N0817224B from HI Stone & Son, Inc. Per review of the Excavation Job Form, there is no submission date, work completion date, signature by the contractor, or signature by the Eversource approver and the form has work order #RMOU0011. Explain how the Company verified the invoices and work performed by these crews without reviewing the work or having a reference date. If additional support or information is to be considered regarding this work, please provide and explain why it was not originally included.

Response:

Referring to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11) (MS24J), Outside Line Contractors, at Line 211, HI Stone & Son, Inc, in the amount $3,632. The work charges are for the repair of damages resulting from a lightning strike on August 8, 2026, shortly prior to the declaration of the ERP for MS24J. Without additional context to tie this damage to MS24J, the Company has elected to remove the charges totaling $3,632, and will supplement Exhibit CLP-7 (MS24J), to remove line 211, accordingly.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

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

Question:

(Storm MS24J – Civil Crews) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11A-4) (MS24J). The following pertains to KTI Utility Construction & Maintenance LLC. The description within the invoice notes work performed on 10/16/2024 and the invoice date of 10/19/24. Explain how the work performed within this invoice relates to storm MS24J given the work was performed two months after the event and other minor storm events occurred after MS24J that could have caused that damage. If additional information was utilized to determine the applicability to MS24J, please provide.

Response:

On 8/10/2024 during the MS24J storm, the damage occurred at 10 Spring House Rd in Greenwich. This is shown in event #5483661. There was damage to the off-road pole which was sent to KTI to hand dig and set a new pole. This was not the priority in the heat of the storm as the customer had power when this was sent to KTI. Other work was prioritized over this damage related to restoring power, therefore it was scheduled and completed at a later date.

Date Filed: November 09, 2026

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

Question:

(Storm MS24J – Civil Crews) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11A-7) (MS24J). The following pertains to McAllen Construction Inc. Per review of invoice #642024, only one event had a work order related to MS24J. Explain how the Company determined $6,525 of the cost related to MS24J per ACCT-2 (CLP-11) (MS24J) CONFIDENTIAL, when the invoice recorded only $3,019.92.

Response:

Referring to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11)(MS24J), Outside Line Contractors, at Line 398, McAllen Construction Inc, in the amount of $6,525. At the time the work was performed, the vendor did not have the applicable storm work order number and therefore billed the work using the OMS event number provided by the Company. During the Company's internal review process, the OMS event number identified on the invoice was cross-referenced to Company records and confirmed to be associated with MS24J. Please refer to OCC-1009, Attachment 1, for the OMS details related to Event# 5481707. Based on this review and validation of the charges, the Company determined that $6,525 of the invoiced costs were attributable to MS24J.

Date Filed: November 09, 2026

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

Question:

(Storm MS24J – Police & Traffic Control) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11A-1) (MS24J) and ACCT-2 (CLP-11A-2) (MS24J). The following pertains to C C Security Corp:

a. Per review of invoice #60622, the work performed relates to multiple events and it is unclear which field work orders relate to MS24J. Identify which work orders apply to MS24J within the invoice, if any.
b. Per review of invoice #60625, the work performed relates to multiple events and it is unclear which field work orders relate to MS24J. Considering only the work orders labeled MS24J011, explain how the Company determined $4,395 of the cost related to MS24J per ACCT-2 (CLP-11) (MS24J) CONFIDENTIAL. Provide a breakout of the total costs to be considered related to MS24J for this invoice.

Response:

Referring to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11)(MS24J), Outside Line Contractors, at Lines 154-155, C C Security Corp, in the combined amount of $4,930.

a. In reference to invoice #60622, the vendor utilized work order RMOX0011 for two separate jobs performed on 8/9/24 because the applicable storm work order had not yet been provided at the time the work was performed. Through the Company's internal review process, the charges were verified and updated to reflect the correct storm event of MS24J.

b. In reference to invoice #60625, while preparing a response, it was determined that a portion of these charges are not part of the MS24J event. Please refer to Table 1, for the breakdown that reflects the correct total amount of $1,635 that is related to MS24J. The Company will supplement Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11)(MS24J) line 155 to reflect the corrected amount of $1,635.

Table 1

Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11) Page #	Cost
15	$337.50
15	$150.00
21	$300.00
26	$412.50
34	$300.00
34	$135.00

Date Filed: November 12, 2026

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

Question:

(Storm MS24J – Police & Traffic Control) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11A-2) (MS24J). The following pertains to Certified Utility Services Inc invoice #22531, p. 128. Explain how the flagger work recorded as part of this invoice related to MS24J given it occurred after the storm (8/15/2024).

Response:

Referring to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11) (MS24J), Outside Line Contractors, at Line 165, Certified Utility Services Inc, in the amount of $864. The OMS event started on August 13th (August 15th is the date of the final repair). Based on this information, the Company is electing to remove the amount of $864 and will supplement Exhibit CLP-11 (MS24J), accordingly.

Date Filed: November 12, 2026

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

Question:

(Storm MS24J – Police & Traffic Control) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11A-3) (MS24J). The following pertains to Elite Flaggers LLC invoice #576, p. 102. Explain how the flagger work recorded as part of this invoice related to MS24J given it occurred two weeks after the storm (8/23/2024) and no work order is recorded identifying it as work related to MS24J.

Response:

Referring to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11) (MS24J), Outside Line Contractors, at Line 201, Elite Flaggers LLC, in the amount of $1,600. Without additional context, the Company has elected to supplement Exhibit CLP-11 (MS24J) to remove line 201 in the amount of $1,600.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: John G. Griffin and Leanne M. Landry
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(Storm MS24J - P-CARDS) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11) (MS24J) CONFIDENTIAL, P-Card tab. Provide documentation to support the following P-Card expenses. As part of the response, please provide a description of the purchase, relevant invoices, and other supporting documents demonstrating the necessity and applicability of each charge to the MS24J event.

a. Row 39, Dave & Charles Homet, $169
b. Row 95, Portofinos, $129
c. Row 129, Newtown Deli LLC, $6,389
d. Row 144, Texas Roadhouse, $160
e. Row 164, The Village Table, $1,854
f. Row 171, WM Supercenter, $217

Response:

Referring to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11) (MS24J) CONFIDENTIAL, P-Card tab, please refer to the following for the requested information:

- Please refer to OCC-1013, Attachment 1, for a summary, description and location for the documentation supporting each cost.

- Please refer to OCC-1013, Attachment 2, for all receipts supporting each charge for MS24J.

Upon responding to this question there was an error found within this question for Row 95, Portofino's, $129. The correct total amount is $201.

Date Filed: November 10, 2026

Witness: John G. Griffin and Leanne M. Landry
Request from: Office of Consumer Counsel

Question:

(Storm MS24J – Employee Expense Reimbursement) Refer to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11) (MS24J) CONFIDENTIAL, Empl. Expense&Other tab. Provide documentation to support the following employee expenses. As part of the response, please provide a description of the purchase, relevant invoices, and other supporting documents demonstrating the necessity and applicability of each cost to the MS24J event.

a. Row 40, Employee Reimbursement, $182
b. Row 87, Employee Reimbursements, $1,142
c. Row 139, Employee Reimbursement, $586
d. Row 181, Meals - Employee Reimbursement, $35
e. Row 235, Meals – Employee Reimbursement, $50

Response:

Referring to Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11) (MS24J) CONFIDENTIAL, Empl. Expense&Other.

Please refer to OCC-1014, Attachment 1, for a summary of purchases and descriptions of transactions. In addition, please refer to OCC-1014, Attachment 2, for all receipts directly associated with this event MS24J and OCC-1014, Attachment 3, for expenses under $25.00.

Please note that lines 139, 181 and 235 include expenses under the amount of $25.00. Pursuant to the Company's Employee Expense Policy, receipts are not required for individual expenses below $25.00. This threshold reflects the Company's determination that the administrative burden associated with collecting, reviewing, and retaining receipts for nominal-value transactions exceeds the corresponding control benefit.

To mitigate the risk of circumvention through multiple small-dollar submissions, all de minimis expenses must be submitted through the Workforce system rather than Workday. The Workforce system provides centralized tracking, requires supervisory review and approval contemporaneous with the expense submission, and facilitates monitoring for unusual or potentially duplicative expense patterns.

The expenses identified above were submitted in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Employee Expense Policy and were reviewed and approved by the employees' supervisors through

the Workforce system. As part of that approval process, the supervisors confirmed that the expenses were incurred in connection with storm restoration activities. Accordingly, these expenses represent properly incurred storm-related costs and are eligible for recovery

Although properly attributed to the storm event and incurred for work associated with the storm event, the Company has elected to remove the following cost totaling $1,142 from this event.

- The Company will supplement Exhibit ACCT-2 (CLP-11) (MS24J) to remove line 87 in the amount of $1,142.