

**STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

IN RE: THE NARRAGANSETT ELECTRIC COMPANY :
d/b/a RHODE ISLAND ENERGY APPLICATION FOR : **DOCKET NO. 25-45-GE**
APPROVAL OF A CHANGE IN ELECTRIC AND GAS :
BASE DISTRIBUTION RATES :

DIVISION’S 37th SET OF DATA REQUESTS
DIRECTED TO RHODE ISLAND ENERGY

Issued: May 12, 2026
Due- No later than May 26th

DIV. 37-1 ACCOUNT CREDIT ERROR

On April 30, 2026, the Division received a complaint from a customer as follows:

I am filing a formal complaint regarding a \$34,571.31 repayment demand from Rhode Island Energy resulting from an admitted internal billing error.

Rhode Island Energy has confirmed that an incorrect meter reading was entered by their agent, which led to a substantial overpayment being issued to me. At the time, I contacted the company and was explicitly instructed by their representative to cash the check. I relied on this instruction in good faith and had no reason to believe the payment was made in error.

More than six months later, the company identified the issue during an internal audit and is now demanding full repayment of \$34,571.31. They have stated that no portion of the balance will be waived or reduced and that the only repayment option available is a six-month payment plan.

The dispute centers on the company’s attempt to recover a large payment after explicitly directing me to accept it and after a significant delay.

This situation creates an extreme and unreasonable financial burden and stems entirely from the utility’s internal error and failure to timely identify the issue.

I am requesting regulatory review of:

- * The fairness of requiring full repayment under these circumstances
- * The impact of the company instructing me to cash the check
- * The reasonableness of a six-month repayment term for such a large amount
- * Whether a reduction, waiver, or extended repayment arrangement is appropriate

I am seeking a fair resolution that reflects the utility’s responsibility for the error and the reliance created by their actions.

During the Division's review of the Complaint, the Division was informed by one of the Company's employees as follows:

"I have been working with this customer for an extended period regarding an issue with the generation meter read for the billing period 9/5/25–10/6/25. During that period, the truck did not obtain a read from the generation meter. We contacted the customer to request a manual meter read; however, the customer declined to provide one. As a result, an estimated read was issued. An agent subsequently applied a proration to calculate the generation, but the proration was calculated incorrectly. This error resulted in the issuance of a Regrowth PBI payment totaling \$34,571.31. After receiving the payment, the customer contacted the Contact Center and spoke with a newer agent. When the customer asked whether the check could be cashed, the agent incorrectly advised that it could. I reviewed the call, and the agent was coached accordingly. The customer later contacted us to request his annual 1099 form, and an internal PBI payment audit was conducted. During this audit, it was identified that the Regrowth PBI payment had been issued in error. We explained to the customer the cause of the error and informed him that the payment would need to be returned. I requested to speak with the customer by phone to discuss the matter further; however, he declined to do so. The customer was recently invoiced for the full amount of the erroneous payment and was offered a six-month repayment plan. The customer has stated that this repayment option is not acceptable. We will not waive or reduce the repayment that is due back to us."

The Division is aware of another instance of a large PBI check being mailed out to a different customer in December of 2025. For reference purposes, the Company's check number was 078301. The amount of the check was \$35,198.63. This customer inquired of a Division employee who interfaced with company representatives to learn that this check was erroneously issued and the check was not cashed. As such, customer repayment did not become an issue.

- a) Please explain in detail how/why both of these large PBI checks were issued to customers.
- b) What internal measures, if any, exist to prevent these types of errors? If there are no internal measures, please explain why there are not.
- c) How many other erroneous PBI checks have been issued to customers? Please provide a chart of such customers that includes the date, amount, whether the check was cashed and if cashed, the status of recoupment. Please total the amount of erroneously issued checks, if any others besides the two referenced in this data request.
- d) For the customers in (c), please also explain in detail how/why such checks were issued.

Response can be found at Book 1, Bates page 1-4.

DIV. 37-2 DEPRECIATION

Regarding the hypothetical on RIE-101 page 11, line 1 – page 12, line 5 of Rebuttal Testimony of John J. Spanos. When setting up that hypothetical, page 11, lines 10-12 states: "In each year of the service line's life, the recorded amount of net salvage would be \$0. When the asset is eventually retired in year 48, the recorded net salvage would be \$1,000."

- (a) Does this hypothetical assume no retirements during the years 1 through 47? If not, please provide the retirements per year that are assumed in this hypothetical.

- (b) Does Mr. Spanos agree that the historic net salvage ratio would be 0 percent for the years 1 through 47 since the hypothetical assumes no retirements or related net salvage amounts for the years 1 through 47?
- (c) If the answer to part (b) is anything other than an unqualified yes, please provide a corrected statement regarding the historic ratio based on the hypothetical on page 11, line 1 – page 12, line 5 of Rebuttal Testimony of John J. Spanos (RIE-101).
- (d) Please provide support for the response to part (c) of this request including any additional assumptions added to the hypothetical that are not included on page 11, line 1 – page 12, line 5 of Rebuttal Testimony of John J. Spanos (RIE-101).

Response can be found at Book 1, Bates page 5.

DIV. 37-3

Please provide the workpapers that support Figure JJS-1 on RIE-101 page 13 of Rebuttal Testimony of John J. Spanos. Please provide the workpaper in Excel with formulas intact.

Response can be found at Book 1, Bates page 6-9.

DIV. 37-4

Please provide the workpapers that support Figure JJS-2 on RIE-101 page 15 of Rebuttal Testimony of John J. Spanos. Please provide the workpaper in Excel with formulas intact.

Response can be found at Book 1, Bates page 10-12.

DIV. 37-5

Regarding the hypothetical on RIE-101 page 18, line 13 – page 18, line 7 of Rebuttal Testimony of John J. Spanos. When setting up that hypothetical, page 19, Table JJS-1, Line 4, shows the “Net Salvage Per Service” amount of \$5,000.

- (a) Does this hypothetical assume that the “Net Salvage Per Service” will be \$5,000 in year 1?
- (b) Does this hypothetical assume that the “Net Salvage Per Service” will be \$5,000 in year 48?
- (c) If the hypothetical assumes that the “Net Salvage Per Service” will be different for the years 1 through 48, please provide the assumed “Net Salvage Per Service” by year.

Response can be found at Book 1, Bates page 13.