

**ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD**

**IN THE MATTER OF** the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998, S.O. 1998, c.15, Schedule B, as amended (the “OEB Act”);

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** an Application by InnPower Corporation to the Ontario Energy Board for an Order or Orders approving or fixing just and reasonable rates and other service charges for the distribution of electricity as of January 1, 2017.

**INTERROGATORIES**

**OF THE**

**SCHOOL ENERGY COALITION**

[The numbering of the interrogatories is not intended to limit the scope of the questions as contained therein. In addition, numbering starts at 2. On April 5, 2017, SEC filed a comprehensive interrogatory with respect to the building.]

1-SEC-2

[Ex. 1, p. 8] Please provide a side by side capital and operating budget, with items sufficiently disaggregated to show:

- A) The original budgeted amounts before the reductions of \$676,897 and \$3,811,161 noted in the evidence.
- B) The amounts included in the Application.
- C) The amounts included in the Supplementary evidence.

1-SEC-3

[Ex. 1, p. 9] Please confirm that the Applicant has not prepared an asset condition assessment, and has not undergone an independent assessment of the condition and needs of its system. If confirmed, please explain why. If not confirmed, please provide the independent asset condition assessment.

1-SEC-4

[Ex. 1, p. 15] Please explain why the Application does not include the commitments and Board orders contained in the Settlement Agreement in EB-2014-0086. Please provide a list of the directives arising out of that Board order.

1-SEC-5

[Ex. 1, p. 18] Please provide a full description of the business and activities of Innservices Utilities Inc., including without limitation all relationships, direct and indirect, with the Applicant. Please include all agreements between the Applicant and this Affiliate, or between the Applicant and any other party that include services to or from the affiliate.

1-SEC-6

[Ex. 1, p. 21] Please provide a full timeline to show the Applicant's diligence in filing and pursuing the Applicant in sufficient time to obtain an order for new rates effective July 1, 2017. Please include all steps taken prior to filing, and the reasons for any delays.

1-SEC-7

[Ex. 1, p. 21] Please confirm that the request for interim rates is intended to now be as of July 1, 2017.

1-SEC-8

[Ex. 1, p. 22] Please provide full details of the "operational synergies" arising out of the "operational hub", and please quantify how they benefit "both taxpayers and power users", including a breakdown between the two groups.

1-SEC-9

[Ex. 1, p. 25] Why have the three sites approved in 1990, 1991, and 1993 been developed, more than 25 years later? What is the current forecast for developments on those sites?

1-SEC-10

[Ex. 1, p. 28 and others] Please update each of the tables in Exhibit 1 to reflect the update filed May 8, 2017. For each of the tables that include 2016 data, please include 2016 actuals in the update.

1-SEC-11

[Ex. 1, p. 29-30] Please explain how the Applicant took into account, in its budgeting:

- a) Rate impacts
- b) Willingness to pay by the customers
- c) The results of customer engagement
- d) Outcomes for customers

1-SEC-12

[Ex. 1, p. 32] Please provide details on the status of the PWU contract and, if it has been completed, the terms. If the rate increases are not the same as in the Application, please provide details of amendments that should be made to the Application.

1-SEC-13

[Ex. 1, p. 39] Please provide quantitative details of the benefits – including operational savings and customer response outcomes – from the SCADA system. Please provide any cost benefit analyses prepared at any time before or after the implementation.

1-SEC-14

[Ex. 1, p. 40] For each of the line items in the Maintenance table, please provide the reasons that item required an increase in maintenance spending.

1-SEC-15

[Ex. 1, 47-48] Please explain why the Applicant got such a strong negative response from its customers at the two Community Day functions organized by the OEB.

1-SEC-16

[Ex. 1, p. 49-54] Please provide a similar set of tables for engagement and educational activities not relation to CDM.

1-SEC-17

[Ex. 1, 56] Please provide details of the 2016 UtilityPULSE bi-annual customer survey.

1-SEC-18

[Ex. 1, p. 61] Please provide copies of correspondence to and from the Board with respect to the compliance audit.

1-SEC-19

[Ex. 1, p. 71] Please provide a copy of the UR document.

1-SEC-20

[Ex. 1, p. 75] Please provide copies of all costs and savings forecast for the document management software.

1-SEC-21

[Ex. 1, p. 80]

Please provide the cost benchmarking calculations for 2018-2020.

1-SEC-22

[Ex. 1, p. 81] Please provide the 2016 audited financial statements.

1-SEC-23

[Ex. 1, p. 83] Please provide details of the discussions with EPCOR and with Powerstream, the result of those discussions, and the reasons why no consolidation or co-operation activities were ultimately pursued.

1-SEC-24

[Ex. 1, App., F, p. 30] Please explain the jump in directors' fees. Please explain what controls, if any, are put in place to limit compensation to directors or officers who are also employees or receiving compensation from the Town or from other affiliates. For any person receiving compensation from the Applicant and either the Town or any of the affiliates, please provide the actual amounts of compensation from each, the total, and the reasons the arrangements are fair and reasonable to the ratepayers.

1-SEC-25

[Ex. 1, App. J, throughout] The Applicant appears to be the worst performer on most or all of the metrics reported by the CHEC group, and appears to be below the provincial average on many of those metrics. Please describe in detail the Applicant's plan to reverse that result. Please describe the extent, if any, to which the CHEC group is expected to provide support or assistance in the Applicant's turnaround plans.

1-SEC-26

[Ex. 1, App. K] With respect to the Business Plan:

- a) Please provide the date this was approved by the Board of Directors.
- b) Please provide the 2017-2021 Business Plan. If it has not yet been completed, please explain why.

1-SEC-27

[Ex. 1, App. K, p.4] Please provide the report from FMR, any updates to the report, and any written responses from the Town or the Applicant with respect to the conclusions or recommendations in that report.

1-SEC-28

[Ex. 1, App. K, p. 8] Please provide an update on the status of the Friday Harbour development, including customers already connected and the schedule for additional connections.

1-SEC-29

[Ex. 1, App. K, p. 13] Please explain the arrangements that will result in the Business Analyst's "costs will be absorbed through the CFO's budgeted salary".

1-SEC-30

[Ex. 1, App. K, p. 13] Please explain how a strategy in which "new staff resources correlate to the cost of service rate applications that occur every five years" is consistent with the RRFE.

1-SEC-31

Attached to these interrogatories is a table of typical bills for customers of LDCs in Ontario for 2016. InnPower is above average in bill amount, and for residential and small business is well above average. With respect to this comparison:

- a) Please confirm that, with the proposed rate increases in the Application, InnPower would become one of the five highest cost LDCs in Ontario.
- b) Please explain the primary factors that have challenged the Applicant in keeping its costs under control, and explain how those factors apply differently to the Applicant than to other similar LDCs with lower rates.
- c) Please explain why, in light of the Applicant's poor performance on rates, the Board should allow a large increase in this Application.

1-SEC-32

Attached to these interrogatories is a table of annual benchmarking results for Ontario LDCs using the Board's model.

- a) Please confirm that the Applicant's results have been showing an annual decline in performance, and that the Applicant proposes to continue that decline in performance in the Test Year.
- b) Please explain the reasons the Board and the Applicant's customers should consider this declining performance acceptable.

2-SEC-33

Please update each of the tables in Exhibit 2 to reflect the update filed May 8, 2017. For each of the tables that include 2016 data, please include 2016 actuals in the update.

4-SEC-34

Please update each of the tables in Exhibit 4 to reflect the update filed May 8, 2017. For each of the tables that include 2016 data, please include 2016 actuals in the update.

5-SEC-35

[Ex. 5, p. 3] Please confirm that, but for the declines in the cost of capital parameters from the last rebasing until now, the deficiency in this Application would be \$381,524 higher.

5-SEC-36

Please update each of the tables in Exhibit 5 to reflect the update filed May 8, 2017. For each of the tables that include 2016 data, please include 2016 actuals in the update.

6-SEC-37

Please update each of the tables in Exhibit 6 to reflect the update filed May 8, 2017. For each of the tables that include 2016 data, please include 2016 actuals in the update.

6-SEC-38

Please confirm that, but for the decline in the working capital allowance percentage from 12% to 7.5%, the deficiency in this Application would be \$104,000 higher.

7-SEC-39

Please update each of the tables in Exhibit 7 to reflect the update filed May 8, 2017. For each of the tables that include 2016 data, please include 2016 actuals in the update.

7-SEC-40

[Ex. 7, p. 5] Please provide full details on the calculation of the services weighting factors, including the analysis of the “actual layouts”, and the methods by which the average cost of connection was determined. Please confirm that, for GS>50, that “average cost” was determined with reference to only four customers, and please explain the period of selection, and the reason why a longer time period was not used. Please provide the total increase in allocations to GS>50 for all categories as a result of the increase in the Services Weighting Factor.

7-SEC-41

[Ex. 7, p. 5-6] Please provide full details on the calculation of the billing and collecting weighting factors, including full details of the derivation of \$3.93 per bill for GS>50.

7-SEC-42

[Ex. 7, p. 11] Please provide all reasons of the Applicant justifying the increase in the fixed charge for GS>50 when the current charge, \$151.60, is already above the Minimum System with PLCC adjustment. Please calculate the GS>50 variable charge if the fixed charge is limited to \$151.60.

8-SEC-43

[Ex. 8, p. 12] Please justify the management time included in each of the proposed new charges.

8-SEC-44

[Ex. 8, p. 17] Please add 2016 to Table 8-16.

Submitted on behalf of the School Energy Coalition this June 4, 2017.

---

Jay Shepherd  
Counsel for the School Energy  
Coalition

<i>Distributor</i>	<i>Benchmarking Results</i>						
	<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>2012</i>	<i>2013</i>	<i>2014</i>	<i>2015</i>	<i>3 Year</i>
Algoma Power	62.0%	68.1%	66.4%	69.1%	68.1%	70.6%	69.3%
Toronto Hydro	41.7%	47.7%	45.1%	48.4%	49.9%	51.5%	49.9%
West Coast Huron Energy	14.4%	16.0%	34.8%	41.4%	32.8%	33.5%	35.9%
Hydro One Networks	58.6%	57.3%	58.7%	27.6%	30.0%	20.3%	26.0%
Chapleau Public Utilities	17.5%	14.8%	24.0%	20.5%	27.7%	23.9%	24.0%
Woodstock Hydro	33.5%	32.9%	29.0%	25.9%	23.0%	19.5%	22.8%
PUC Distribution	-8.5%	-5.2%	13.4%	22.7%	14.6%	16.2%	17.8%
Festival Hydro	20.5%	18.0%	20.2%	19.6%	16.6%	14.0%	16.8%
Midland Power	16.4%	17.0%	19.6%	18.7%	15.2%	13.8%	15.9%
Wellington North Power	7.4%	18.0%	12.8%	17.7%	14.2%	11.8%	14.6%
Peterborough Distribution	14.0%	15.6%	13.2%	14.5%	14.5%	11.0%	13.3%
Canadian Niagara Power	16.4%	15.6%	10.0%	11.0%	12.9%	13.0%	12.3%
Renfrew Hydro	15.3%	18.3%	18.3%	15.7%	10.4%	10.6%	12.2%
Hydro Ottawa	-0.1%	-2.6%	7.8%	8.5%	12.7%	15.2%	12.1%
EnWin Utilities	17.8%	16.8%	23.9%	10.3%	10.9%	9.9%	10.3%
Waterloo North Hydro	-3.1%	6.4%	4.3%	10.6%	11.0%	8.2%	9.9%
Oakville Hydro	7.6%	12.4%	10.6%	13.8%	8.7%	6.9%	9.8%
Greater Sudbury Hydro	-2.4%	14.1%	16.7%	4.8%	14.9%	8.0%	9.3%
Thunder Bay Hydro	9.6%	8.0%	-2.8%	8.1%	7.4%	8.6%	8.0%
Tillsonburg Hydro	13.5%	10.7%	12.2%	19.5%	4.4%	-0.5%	7.8%
Erie Thames Powerlines	14.9%	14.4%	3.9%	7.9%	7.0%	7.0%	7.3%
North Bay Hydro	3.6%	5.5%	5.8%	5.4%	8.2%	7.0%	6.9%
Fort Frances Power	14.8%	10.5%	11.7%	6.4%	5.6%	5.1%	5.7%
PowerStream	-7.4%	-6.4%	1.2%	3.0%	5.6%	8.1%	5.6%
Atikokan Hydro	14.9%	7.7%	32.9%	10.3%	-4.9%	9.7%	5.0%
Niagara Peninsula Energy	5.4%	5.2%	10.2%	1.1%	7.7%	4.5%	4.5%
Norfolk Power	-1.8%	-2.6%	6.0%	1.2%	6.5%	NA	3.9%
Bluewater Power	-3.2%	1.7%	6.4%	5.9%	0.3%	0.8%	2.3%
Sioux Lookout Hydro	0.6%	-1.4%	7.2%	2.9%	6.2%	-4.3%	1.6%
Innpower	-7.1%	-6.2%	-2.4%	-2.8%	-2.8%	8.5%	1.0%
Kingston Hydro	0.1%	2.2%	2.4%	3.7%	-3.6%	-3.1%	-1.0%
Cambridge and North Dumfries	-10.1%	-7.8%	-3.3%	0.5%	-1.9%	-3.6%	-1.7%
Milton Hydro	-4.1%	-3.0%	-37.6%	-4.6%	-4.0%	2.7%	-2.0%
Veridian Connections	-4.7%	-4.5%	2.4%	-1.3%	-3.0%	-2.7%	-2.3%
Centre Wellington Hydro	-8.7%	-4.9%	0.4%	-3.2%	-3.1%	-1.2%	-2.5%
Guelph Hydro	12.4%	14.7%	-2.0%	0.8%	-4.8%	-3.8%	-2.6%
Westario Power	-3.1%	-0.2%	-1.4%	2.2%	-4.2%	-6.0%	-2.6%
Brantford Power	3.8%	-2.5%	4.7%	0.7%	-3.6%	-6.1%	-3.0%
Lakeland Power	na	na	-6.4%	-0.9%	-1.9%	-7.6%	-3.5%
Niagara-on-the-Lake Hydro	7.6%	6.5%	2.7%	-1.1%	-2.8%	-6.6%	-3.5%
Orangeville Hydro	-2.7%	1.6%	0.8%	0.1%	-4.0%	-7.6%	-3.8%
Brant County	15.6%	22.4%	11.5%	5.5%	-3.6%	-13.6%	-3.9%
Ottawa River Power	-2.9%	2.7%	0.0%	4.3%	-6.9%	-9.3%	-4.0%
Hydro One Brampton	-5.8%	-7.4%	-9.2%	-5.7%	-3.3%	-2.9%	-4.0%



Horizon Utilities	-13.0%	-13.7%	-6.9%	-5.5%	-5.3%	-2.1%	-4.3%
Whitby Hydro	0.4%	-3.0%	-7.0%	-5.7%	-6.8%	-2.6%	-5.0%
Orillia Power	-3.5%	-1.9%	-3.7%	-4.7%	-5.3%	-8.0%	-6.0%
Rideau St. Lawrence Distribution	-10.6%	-13.8%	-6.7%	-7.2%	-8.1%	-4.8%	-6.7%
St. Thomas Energy	-6.4%	-4.5%	6.8%	-4.6%	-6.3%	-10.3%	-7.1%
Hydro 2000	-14.8%	-12.2%	-0.8%	-1.0%	-15.3%	-6.2%	-7.5%
Kenora Hydro	-11.5%	-4.6%	-5.2%	-11.2%	-11.0%	-3.9%	-8.7%
Burlington Hydro	-7.6%	-7.1%	-9.0%	-7.5%	-9.4%	-10.3%	-9.0%
Enersource Hydro Mississauga	-9.5%	-16.1%	-9.5%	-10.7%	-13.9%	-8.2%	-11.0%
London Hydro	-16.8%	-10.1%	-11.1%	-11.0%	-12.8%	-9.9%	-11.3%
COLLUS PowerStream	-8.2%	-9.5%	-1.2%	-12.3%	-14.2%	-14.2%	-13.6%
Essex Powerlines	-17.0%	-17.1%	-12.6%	-17.2%	-12.7%	-13.5%	-14.5%
Lakefront Utilities	-14.7%	-12.5%	-18.7%	-7.4%	-16.0%	-22.1%	-15.2%
Entegrus Powerlines	-13.1%	-13.4%	-10.9%	-14.7%	-16.7%	-17.3%	-16.3%
Oshawa PUC	-21.7%	-18.0%	-14.5%	-17.4%	-18.1%	-14.9%	-16.8%
Grimsby Power	-23.1%	-18.6%	-9.6%	-16.9%	-17.3%	-17.0%	-17.0%
Welland Hydro	-19.6%	-16.2%	-10.4%	-15.2%	-17.3%	-18.7%	-17.0%
Newmarket-Tay Power	-14.6%	-21.0%	-19.5%	-19.5%	-18.6%	-19.3%	-19.1%
Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro	-22.9%	-22.8%	-20.7%	-19.3%	-19.0%	-22.3%	-20.2%
Hearst Power	-26.3%	-30.1%	-28.4%	-33.1%	-22.4%	-7.4%	-21.0%
Espanola Regional Hydro	-22.6%	-21.8%	-15.5%	-19.3%	-25.4%	-20.4%	-21.7%
Haldimand County Hydro	-27.6%	-24.1%	-18.7%	-23.7%	-23.6%	-21.4%	-22.9%
Cooperative Hydro Embrun	-19.3%	-16.9%	-26.4%	-18.7%	-29.7%	-33.2%	-27.2%
Halton Hills Hydro	-27.2%	-24.9%	-27.5%	-35.7%	-31.3%	-28.2%	-31.7%
Northern Ontario Wires	-38.5%	-35.7%	-25.8%	-25.1%	-32.6%	-42.2%	-33.3%
E.L.K. Energy	-28.2%	-26.2%	-25.4%	-33.2%	-44.9%	-34.7%	-37.6%
Wasaga Distribution	-46.8%	-46.3%	-37.8%	-41.6%	-41.6%	-45.6%	-42.9%
Hydro Hawkesbury	-61.8%	-59.4%	-55.8%	-51.1%	-64.3%	-68.1%	-61.2%

**Annual Distribution Bill Comparison - All LDCs 2016 Rates**  
(monthly charge and volumetric rate)

Utility	Residential		GS<50		GS>50		Large		Overall Ranking
	800 kwh	% of Avg	2000 kwh	% of Avg	250 KW	% of Avg	10 MW	% of Avg	
Toronto Hydro	\$461.87	135.8%	\$1,052.70	221.4%	\$21,534.03	181.2%	\$754,349.06	200.6%	169.0%
Algoma	\$605.76	178.1%			\$16,876.98	142.0%			160.0%
Canadian Niagara	\$427.20	125.6%	\$891.12	187.4%	\$21,888.06	184.1%			148.0%
Norfolk	\$455.64	133.9%	\$974.16	204.9%	\$14,827.20	124.7%			135.1%
Waterloo North	\$384.36	113.0%	\$765.12	160.9%	\$16,627.26	139.9%	\$566,060.64	150.5%	129.7%
Bluewater	\$397.80	116.9%	\$799.32	168.1%	\$14,722.08	123.9%	\$536,714.88	142.7%	126.0%
Hydro Ottawa	\$340.80	100.2%	\$725.16	152.5%	\$14,611.80	122.9%	\$599,679.84	159.5%	123.0%
Wellington North	\$434.52	127.7%	\$930.12	195.6%	\$11,205.30	94.3%			120.7%
Haldimand County	\$438.96	129.0%	\$779.28	163.9%	\$12,805.02	107.7%			118.1%
Newmarket-Tay	\$323.28	95.0%	\$834.72	175.6%	\$15,794.52	132.9%			117.9%
Oakville (interim)	\$334.80	98.4%	\$807.48	169.8%	\$15,749.28	132.5%			117.5%
Grimsby (proposed)	\$387.48	113.9%	\$858.36	180.5%	\$12,982.86	109.2%			117.5%
Orillia	\$334.08	98.2%	\$845.04	177.7%	\$14,834.70	124.8%			116.8%
Whitby	\$362.88	106.7%	\$749.40	157.6%	\$14,935.92	125.7%			115.1%
Enersource	\$286.92	84.3%	\$788.04	165.7%	\$14,064.18	118.3%	\$494,292.84	131.4%	113.2%
PUC Distribution	\$290.28	85.3%	\$687.24	144.5%	\$17,432.34	146.7%			111.8%
Lakeland	\$392.40	115.4%	\$753.72	158.5%	\$12,245.22	103.0%			110.6%
Niagara Peninsula	\$396.72	116.6%	\$790.20	166.2%	\$11,383.86	95.8%			110.5%
EnWin	\$329.28	96.8%	\$727.68	153.0%	\$15,800.34	132.9%	\$370,506.96	98.5%	109.5%
Horizon	\$341.76	100.5%	\$748.92	157.5%	\$12,147.66	102.2%	\$452,270.40	120.3%	108.9%
Greater Sudbury	\$312.84	92.0%	\$708.48	149.0%	\$14,822.28	124.7%			107.8%
Sioux Lookout	\$460.20	135.3%	\$708.72	149.1%	\$8,557.26	72.0%			104.7%
Innpower	\$431.64	126.9%	\$611.16	128.5%	\$11,158.80	93.9%			104.3%
Kitchener-Wilmot	\$283.32	83.3%	\$626.88	131.8%	\$15,819.06	133.1%	\$379,151.52	100.8%	102.9%
Centre Wellington	\$325.20	95.6%	\$671.40	141.2%	\$12,968.82	109.1%			102.0%
Brant County	\$338.76	99.6%	\$640.32	134.7%	\$12,952.86	109.0%			101.7%
London	\$313.20	92.1%	\$636.60	133.9%	\$9,780.00	82.3%	\$507,475.68	134.9%	101.3%
Festival	\$350.52	103.0%	\$746.04	156.9%	\$10,267.44	86.4%	\$270,881.64	72.0%	100.6%
Midland	\$382.92	112.6%	\$663.60	139.6%	\$10,390.74	87.4%			100.0%
North Bay	\$330.48	97.1%	\$721.08	151.7%	\$11,086.02	93.3%			99.7%
Wasaga	\$292.20	85.9%	\$534.72	112.5%	\$15,692.16	132.0%			99.5%
Kenora	\$371.52	109.2%	\$611.04	128.5%	\$11,550.00	97.2%			99.5%
Veridian	\$313.68	92.2%	\$600.36	126.3%	\$11,112.06	93.5%	\$451,744.56	120.1%	99.1%
Niagara-on-the-Lake	\$346.80	101.9%	\$737.28	155.1%	\$9,801.18	82.5%			98.5%
St.Thomas	\$330.60	97.2%	\$669.84	140.9%	\$11,455.02	96.4%			98.2%
Cambridge North Dumfries	\$305.76	89.9%	\$506.52	106.5%	\$13,666.32	115.0%	\$396,850.92	105.5%	96.7%
Embrun	\$320.76	94.3%	\$558.84	117.5%	\$13,229.16	111.3%			96.6%
Erie Thames	\$366.00	107.6%	\$606.48	127.6%	\$10,671.30	89.8%	\$347,225.64	92.3%	95.3%

Woodstock	\$367.44	108.0%	\$650.28	136.8%	\$9,412.62	79.2%			95.1%
Tillsonburg	\$354.72	104.3%	\$749.04	157.5%	\$7,764.18	65.3%			94.1%
Oshawa	\$270.84	79.6%	\$569.04	119.7%	\$14,048.40	118.2%	\$348,161.04	92.6%	94.0%
Renfrew (2015)	\$306.84	90.2%	\$703.80	148.0%	\$9,870.54	83.0%			93.1%
Halton Hills	\$300.48	88.3%	\$567.72	119.4%	\$12,231.00	102.9%			92.3%
Essex	\$310.32	91.2%	\$697.56	146.7%	\$9,260.58	77.9%			91.4%
Hydro One Brampton	\$285.12	83.8%	\$690.84	145.3%	\$9,862.32	83.0%	\$350,250.72	93.1%	91.0%
Guelph	\$365.40	107.4%	\$524.76	110.4%	\$10,215.66	85.9%	\$335,730.36	89.3%	90.4%
Northern Ontario Wires	\$409.08	120.3%	\$718.44	151.1%	\$5,052.30	42.5%			90.3%
COLLUS	\$311.88	91.7%	\$576.60	121.3%	\$10,861.38	91.4%			90.0%
Entegrus	\$301.68	88.7%	\$597.60	125.7%	\$10,832.64	91.1%			89.9%
Thunder Bay	\$276.00	81.1%	\$661.68	139.2%	\$10,248.78	86.2%			89.0%
Burlington	\$305.52	89.8%	\$635.28	133.6%	\$9,559.32	80.4%			88.6%
Ottawa River	\$292.08	85.9%	\$564.24	118.7%	\$11,289.00	95.0%			88.6%
Powerstream (DRO)	\$292.08	85.9%	\$659.40	138.7%	\$11,854.74	99.7%	\$245,852.16	65.4%	87.6%
Orangeville	\$316.20	93.0%	\$621.48	130.7%	\$8,625.90	72.6%			86.4%
Brantford	\$281.28	82.7%	\$483.12	101.6%	\$11,965.86	100.7%			85.4%
Rideau St. Lawr. (2015)	\$302.28	88.9%	\$587.04	123.5%	\$9,351.60	78.7%			85.3%
Westario	\$311.88	91.7%	\$563.28	118.5%	\$9,177.84	77.2%			84.6%
WestCoast Huron	\$425.28	125.0%	\$642.72	135.2%	\$8,964.00	75.4%	\$152,306.88	40.5%	84.4%
Lakefront	\$266.16	78.2%	\$493.92	103.9%	\$11,315.46	95.2%			82.6%
Welland	\$325.92	95.8%	\$557.16	117.2%	\$10,761.24	90.5%	\$196,922.76	52.4%	80.7%
Milton (DRO)	\$329.76	96.9%	\$616.20	129.6%	\$10,612.26	89.3%	\$150,130.92	39.9%	79.7%
Kingston	\$301.20	88.5%	\$521.64	109.7%	\$10,222.14	86.0%	\$200,544.00	53.3%	76.6%
Peterborough	\$272.64	80.1%	\$584.76	123.0%	\$10,045.44	84.5%	\$166,332.24	44.2%	74.2%
Hydro 2000	\$334.92	98.5%	\$495.84	104.3%	\$5,247.90	44.2%			72.4%
Hearst (2015)	\$264.12	77.6%	\$368.40	77.5%	\$5,923.44	49.8%			61.0%
E.L.K.	\$219.48	64.5%	\$309.24	65.0%	\$6,994.14	58.8%			56.6%
Hydro Hawkesbury	\$188.16	55.3%	\$332.04	69.8%	\$7,352.88	61.9%			55.7%
<b>AVERAGE</b>	\$340.18		\$475.47		\$8,719.43		\$178,482.48		