

**Ontario Energy
Board**
P.O. Box 2319
27th. Floor
2300 Yonge Street
Toronto ON M4P 1E4
Telephone: 416- 481-1967
Facsimile: 416- 440-7656
Toll free: 1-888-632-6273

**Commission de l'énergie
de l'Ontario**
C.P. 2319
27e étage
2300, rue Yonge
Toronto ON M4P 1E4
Téléphone; 416- 481-1967
Télécopieur: 416- 440-7656
Numéro sans frais: 1-888-632-6273



BY E-MAIL

October 20, 2009

Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

**Re: Oakville Hydro Electricity Distribution Inc.
2010 Distribution Rate Application
Board Staff Interrogatories
Board File No. EB-2009-0271**

In accordance with Procedural Order No. 1, please find attached Board Staff Interrogatories in the above proceeding. Please forward the following to Oakville Hydro Electricity Distribution Inc. and to all other registered parties to this proceeding.

Yours truly,

Original Signed By

Silvan Cheung
Advisor – Applications & Regulatory Audit

Encl.

Board Staff Interrogatories

2010 Electricity Distribution Rates Oakville Hydro Electricity Distribution Inc. (“Oakville Hydro”) EB-2009-0271

Rate Base

1. Ref: Exhibit 2 / Tab 1/ Sch. 1/ Page 1 – Rate Base

In Table 1 – Summary of Rate Base, the Rate Base amount for Test Year 2010 is \$132,448,078. At Exhibit 2 / Tab 1/ Sch. 1/ Page 1 / line 14 the rate base for the Test Year is indicated as \$19,311,062. Please reconcile these two amounts and explain the reason for the differences.

Capital Expenditures

2. Ref: Exhibit 2/ Tab 4/ Sch. 3/ Appendix A Pg. 28 – Rebuild Overhead Distribution System

- a) Please clarify whether the Pre-2009 amount of \$1,238,572 for Replace/Rebuild Back Lot Overhead is included in the Rate Base prior to 2009.
- b) Please explain the difference, if any, between the nature of the expenditure listed in (a) and the expenditures in Exhibit 2/ Tab 4/ Sch. 2/ page 32/ line 9 -16 which are also classified as “Replace/Rebuild Back Lot Overhead”.

3. Ref: Exhibit 2/ Tab 4 – Capital Expenditures

Table 1

Year	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 Bridge	2010 Test
Rebuild Overhead Distribution System	\$488,541	\$1,677,737	\$1,569,725	\$1,549,168	\$4,595,708	\$8,077,230	\$5,429,000

- a) To review Oakville Hydro’s expenditures on “Rebuild Overhead Distribution System”, using the information provided in Exhibit 2/ Tab 4, Board staff prepared the above table. Please confirm that Oakville Hydro agrees with the figures presented in Table 1. If Oakville Hydro does not agree with any figures in the table, please explain why not and provide amended tables with a full explanation of all changes.

- b) The annual average expenditures on “Rebuild Overhead Distribution System” is approximately \$1.3 million for the period 2004 to 2007. Please explain the reasons for the increase in 2008, 2009 and 2010.
- c) Does Oakville Hydro have a plan that will ensure that all the projects identified under “Rebuild Overhead Distribution System” will be completed on time in 2009 and 2010?
- d) Please provide the percentage of the completed expenditures as compared to total 2009 bridge year budget of \$8,077,230 as of September 30, 2009 or the latest information that is available.

4. Ref: Exhibit 2/ Tab 4 – Capital Expenditures

Table 2

Year	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009 Bridge	2010 Test
New Development & Services	\$1,535,092	\$1,769,189	\$100,518	(\$598,589)	\$2,582,084	\$4,869,748	\$1,587,700

- a) To review Oakville Hydro’s expenditures on “New Development & Services” using the information provided Exhibit 2 / Tab 4, Board staff prepared the above table. Please confirm that Oakville Hydro agrees with the figures presented in Table 2. If Oakville Hydro does not agree with any figures in the table, please explain why not and provide amended tables with a full explanation of all changes.
- b) On Exhibit 2/ Tab 4/ Sch. 2/ page 24 – 25, under the 2007 capital summary, Oakville Hydro states: “Due to timing differences, Oakville Hydro invoiced developers for capital projects designed to enhance services and equipment for these subdivisions \$3,738,638, an amount that was \$598,589 more in 2007 than was capitalized in the year.” Please explain whether this Contributed Capital (Invoiced amount to developers) is for the projects completed in 2007 or projects for other years.
- c) The annual average expenditures on “New Development & Services” is approximately \$0.7 million for the period 2004 to 2007. Please explain the reasons for the increase in 2008, 2009 and 2010.
- d) Does Oakville Hydro have a plan to ensure that all the projects under “New Development & Services” will have been completed on time in 2009 and 2010?
- e) Please provide the percentage of the completed expenditures as compared to total 2009 bridge year budget of \$4,869,748 as of September 30, 2009 or the latest information that is available.

5. Ref: Exhibit 2 / Tab 4/ Sch. 3/ Page 11/ Appendix 2-B – 2009 Capital Projects Table

Oakville Hydro provided the totals for “Rebuild for Road Widening / Railway Work” and “New Development & Services” as \$421,888 and \$8,117,597 respectively. But based on the amounts provided in the appendix, staff has calculated that the total amount for “Rebuild for Road Widening / Railway Work” should be \$251,889 and the total amount for “New Development & Services” should be \$4,869,748. Please reconcile the numbers provided in Exhibit 2 with those provided in the appendix.

6. Ref: Exhibit 2 / Tab 4/ Sch. 4/ Page 9/ Appendix 2-B – 2010 Capital Projects Table

In Appendix 2-B, Oakville Hydro filed a table that listed the expenditures of 2010 capital projects by accounts. Please add a column in the same table which identifies the total amounts for each project.

7. Ref: Exhibit 2 / Tab 4/ Sch. 4/ Page 2 – 2010 Capital Summary

On page 2, line 10-11, it states: “it is estimated that after the conversion of these two stations maintenance costs will be reduced by approximately \$13,000 per year. “

- a) Please confirm whether Oakville Hydro has included this reduction in its 2010 Maintenance costs.
- b) If the answer to (a) is affirmative, please provide the details in 2010 maintenance costs which reflects this reduction.

Service Quality and Reliability

8. Ref: Exhibit 2 / Tab 4/ Schedule 7/ page 6 / Table 25 – Service Reliability Indices

For any annual result where performance is outside (higher than) the range of the previous three years’ performance, please provide an explanation for the reason(s) for deteriorated performance, Oakville Hydro’s efforts to address the matter and, if available, the impacts of service improvement efforts.

Load and Customer Forecasting

9. Ref: Exhibit 3 / Tab 2/ Sch. 1/ page 14 – Load Forecasting Model

Various data points are used in the regression model and Oakville Hydro stated that one of the data sources is “Report- Administrative Services Committee – Best Planning Estimates of Population, Occupied Dwelling Units and Employment for the Period of 2007-2021 – Town of Oakville (issued on April 10, 2007) for population growth.”

Please provide the material issued by the Town of Oakville on April 10, 2007 related to Best Planning Estimates of Population, Occupied Dwelling Units and Employment for the Period of 2007-2021.

10. Ref: Exhibit 3 / Tab 2/ Sch. 1/ page 4 – Load Forecasting Model

In the above reference, Oakville Hydro states: “In November of 2008, Oakville Hydro experienced a significant loss of load resulting from its only Large Use customer (Customer A) shutting down operations. The customer chose to cease production in Oakville due to the current economic recession. This customer’s demand dropped from 10 MW to less than 0.4 MW, demonstrating a steep decline in usage. This significant drop in demand drove Oakville Hydro’s decision to include Customer A’s consumption as an independent variable in the multifactor regression model.”

In Exhibit 3/ Tab 2/ Sch. 1/ page 32-46, Oakville Hydro made adjustments to the modeled forecast for 2009 and 2010 to reflect the impact of business closures for customer B, C, D, and E.

- a) Oakville Hydro has chosen to include customer A as an independent variable. Please explain why the independent variable of Ontario Real GDP Monthly % would not be sufficient to represent the economic situation.
- b) Oakville Hydro has chosen to make adjustments to the modeled forecasted for customers B, C, D, and E. Please explain why the independent variable of Ontario Real GDP Monthly % would not be sufficient to represent the economic situation. .
- c) Please explain why Oakville Hydro did not include customers B, C, D and E as an independent variable in the multifactor regression model.
- d) Please provide the regression statistics and forecasted weather normalized load for 2009 and 2010 by including customers B, C, D, and E in the multifactor regression model.

11. Ref: Exhibit 3 / Tab 2/ Sch. 1/ page 32-35 – Customer B

On page 32 line 23, Oakville Hydro stated that: “No replacement customer consumption data, if any, is known at present.” What would be Oakville Hydro’s proposal if the replacement load is obtained?

12. Ref: Exhibit 3 / Tab 2/ Sch. 1/ page 36-38 – Customer C

- a) Please identify the class that customer C currently resides?
- b) Please identify the class that customer C would be placed in 2010?
- c) On page 36 line 9, Oakville Hydro stated that: “No replacement customer data, if any, is known at present.” What would be Oakville Hydro’s proposal if the replacement load is obtained?

13. Ref: Exhibit 3 / Tab 2/ Sch. 1/ page 39-41 – Customer D

- a) Please identify the class that customer D currently resides?
- b) Please confirm whether customer D would still be Oakville Hydro’s customer in 2010 or not.
- c) If the answer to (b) is affirmative, what class would customer D be placed in 2010?
- d) What would be Oakville Hydro’s proposal if the replacement load is obtained?

14. Ref: Exhibit 3 / Tab 2 / Sch. 1 / Page 26 / Table 8 – Customer/Connection Forecast

Under Table 8, the customer forecast for General Service > 1000 kW for 2009 and 2010 are 17 which maintains the same level as 2008 actual.

- a) Please confirm whether the customer forecast for General Service > 1000kW has taken into account the loss that Oakville Hydro had.
- b) Please confirm whether Oakville Hydro is expecting that any lost customers would be replaced by new ones added in 2010.

15. Ref: Exhibit 3 / Tab 2 / Sch. 1 / Page 31- kW Load Forecasting

On line 6, it states: “Note: the predicated 2009 and 2010 kW for Large Use class was added to GS 50 to 999 kW”

Please identify the amount for the Large Use class.

Other Revenues**16. Ref: Exhibit 3 / Tab 3 / Sch. 1 / Page 6 – Interest and Dividend Income**

Please provide a breakdown of the interest income for 2008, 2009 and 2010 that is related to:

- I. Monthly interest earned in the bank account
- II. Interest on Regulatory assets/ Liabilities
- III. Interest earned on loans Oakville Hydro has made to its affiliate businesses
- IV. All other sources.

Operating Expenses

17. Ref: Exhibit 4 / Tab 2 / Sch. 3 / Page 6 – Collections

On line 11, it states that “Oakville Hydro has purchased credit receivable insurance which covers approximately 30 non-MUSH, non-residential companies on a named basis, plus an additional \$50,000 coverage on a unnamed basis.”

In the above reference, Oakville Hydro stated that it has purchased the credit receivable insurance, please discuss why its 2010 forecasted bad debt expense increased to \$276,587 from the 2009 bad debt expense of \$200,000.

18. Ref: Exhibit 4 / Tab 2 / Sch. 5 / Page 2 / Appendix 2-G – OM&A Expense Table

In Appendix 2-G, the total OM&A expense for 2006 & 2007 Actual are \$9,994,397 and \$8,913,036 respectively. In reference to the Board's 2006 and 2007 Yearbook of Electricity Distributors, the sum of the Operation, Maintenance, and Administration for Oakville Hydro were \$11,235,887 and \$10,460,615 respectively. Please reconcile these amounts and explain the reason(s) for the differences.

19. Ref: Exhibit 4 / Tab 2 / Sch. 5 / Page 6-7 – Pandemic and Emergency Planning

Please provide an itemized cost breakdown of the Pandemic and Emergency Plan and the timeline of this plan.

20. Ref: Exhibit 4 / Tab 2 / Sch. 5 / Page 11 - LEAP

In the above reference, Oakville Hydro stated that the amount of \$30,000 is included in the 2010 Test Year for Low Income Energy Assistance Program. Please identify whether these amounts relate to existing or new program(s).

21. Ref: Exhibit 4 / Tab 2 / Sch. 5 / Page 15 - OM&A Cost per FTEE

Please provide an update of both Appendix 2-J tables by using the **total** FTEE instead of only FTEE under Management / Executive / Directors category.

22. Ref: Exhibit 4 / Tab 2 / Sch. 7 / Page 1 – Employee Compensation Breakdown

At the above reference, the applicant states that: “Oakville Hydro records stipend and meeting fees paid to the Board of Directors in OEB account 5605. The inclusion of these costs in this account along with the 2008 increase in the number of paid Board of Directors from 3 to 10 has resulted in a reduction in the average yearly compensation. Prior to 2008, the Oakville Hydro Board consisted of one independent director and two directors from the parent company Board. Oakville Hydro paid the independent director and was allocated a percentage of the costs of the two parent company directors.”

- a) Please confirm that Oakville Hydro has 10 Board of Directors in 2009 and 2010.
- b) Please provide the number of Board of Directors in 2008, 2009 and 2010 that are independent and the number of Board of Directors that are from the Board of the parent company.

23. Ref: Exhibit 4 / Tab 2 / Sch. 7 / Page 3 / Appendix 2-L – Wages and Benefits

- a) Oakville Hydro indicates that three additional employees were added in the “Management / Executive/ Directors” category in 2009. Please confirm whether Human Resource Supervisor, Billing Supervisor, and Vice-President of Engineering represented these three additional employees. If not, please provide the correct details.
- b) Oakville Hydro indicates that two additional employees are to be added under “Union” category in 2010 (from 67 to 69). On Exhibit 4/ Tab 2/ Sch. 2 / Page 9, under 2010 Cost Drivers, Oakville Hydro did not indicate an increase in Number of Union staff. Please provide the job title for these two additions. Please also confirm whether the cost increase of \$50,736 includes these two staff positions.

24. Ref: Exhibit 4 / Tab 2 / Sch. 8 / Page 5 – Total Cost of Services

- a) In Table 5, Oakville Hydro indicates that the total costs for Executive Services for 2010 is \$1,233,721 which represents a 59% increase as compared to 2008 actual (\$776,214). Please explain the reason(s) for this increase.
- b) In Table 5, Oakville Hydro indicates that the total costs for Human Resource Services for 2010 is \$748,168 which represent a 112% increase as compared to 2008 actual (\$352,330). Please explain the reason(s) for this increase.

PILs**25. Ref: Exhibit 4 / Tab 3/ Sch. 1/ Page 3 – Tax Rates**

Ontario Income Tax rate will change effective July 1, 2010 from 14% to 12%. This change in tax rate will change the combined tax rate from 32% to 30%. Please explain the rationale for using a 32% tax rate instead of the weighted average tax rate of 31%.

26. Ref: Exhibit 4 / Tab 3/ Sch. 3/ Appendix B/ page 27 – 2008 T2 Corporation Income Tax Return

Under Schedule 8, Capital Cost Allowance (CCA) table, it listed an item under class 95 with the description of "NAFU".

- a) Please identify what NAFU represents and provide a detailed description..
- b) Please explain why this class has 0% for its CCA rate.
- c) Please explain why this class was not included in the 2009 Bridge Year Capital Cost Allowance listed under Exhibit 4 / Tab 3/ Sch. 2/ Page 2/ Table 17.

Cost Allocation**27. Ref: Exhibit 7 / Tab 1/ Sch. 2 / Page 3 – 2006 Cost Allocation information filing**

In Table 2, the Revenue to Cost Ratio for Unmetered Scattered Load is 137.75%. But the Revenue to Cost ratio for Unmetered Scattered Load filed under Exhibit 7/ Tab 1 / Sch. 2 / Page 6 indicated that the ratio is 135.75%. Please reconcile these two percentages.

28. Ref: Exhibit 7 / Tab 1/ Sch. 2 / Page 1 – 2006 Cost Allocation information filing

On page 1, line 8 – 13, it states: "Hydro One correctly shifted consumption from the Large Use class to the General Service Greater than 1,000 kW customer class but did not reduce consumption levels. Oakville Hydro has corrected the Model by reducing the total normalized kWh for the General Service Greater than 1,000 kW customer class from 414,270,457 to 201,579,847, the kWh from approved 2006 EDR model."

- a) Please provide the data that Oakville Hydro had indicating the shifted consumption from the Large Use class to the General Service Greater than 1,000 kW customer class.
- b) Please explain on what basis Oakville Hydro reduced the General Service Greater than 1,000 kW customer class from 414,270,457 to 201,579,847 kWh.

29. Ref: Exhibit 7 / Tab 1/ Sch. 2 / Page 7 – 2006 Corrected Cost Allocation information filing

Please provide sheet I6 and I8 of the 2006 Corrected Cost Allocation Information filing to reflect the original filing but with the Load and Transformer Allowance corrections.

30. Ref: Exhibit 7 / Tab 1/ Sch. 3 / Appendix A / Page 2-3 – 2010 Cost Allocation Information Filing - Sheet I4 Break out worksheet

- a) Please confirm whether Oakville Hydro has changed any Break out (%) in Sheet I4 or not.
- b) If the answer to (a) is affirmative, please provide the details of the changes and explanations.

31. Ref: Exhibit 7 / Tab 1/ Sch. 3 / Appendix A / Page 4 – 2010 Cost Allocation Information Filing - Sheet O1 Revenue to Cost summary Worksheet

Please explain what methodology Oakville Hydro used to calculate the Distribution Revenue and Miscellaneous Revenue for each class.

Rate Design

32. Ref: Exhibit 8 / Tab 1/ Sch. 2/ Page 8 – Monthly Fixed Charges (MFC)

Please explain why the proposed monthly 2010 Fixed Charges for General Service Less than 50 kW, General Service 50 to 999 kW, and General Service Greater than 1,000 kW classes exceed the ceiling as set out in the cost allocation information filing and also exceed their own 2009 IRM approved MFC.

33. Ref: Exhibit 8 / Tab 2/ Sch. 6/ Page 1 – Schedule of Proposed Rates & Charges (2010)

Please explain why the proposed Wholesale Market Service Rate for all the classes has been changed to \$0.0065/kWh as compared to \$0.0052/kWh listed in the existing rate schedule.

Loss Factors

- 34. Ref: Exhibit 1, Tab 1, Schedule 12, Page 1 /
Exhibit 8, Tab 1, Schedule 6, Page 1 – 5 /
Exhibit 8, Tab 1, Schedule 6, Appendix 2Q, Page 1**
- a) Please confirm whether Oakville Hydro is partially embedded within the Hydro One distribution system
 - b) If the answer to part (a) is affirmative, please re-calculate the weighted average SFLF by factoring in a SFLF of 1.0340 (3.4% losses) to account for supply losses in the component of Oakville Hydro's distribution system that is embedded within Hydro One's distribution system, i.e. the component of Oakville Hydro's distribution system that is not connected to Palermo TS, Trafalgar TS, Bronte TS and Oakville TS.
 - c) Given that Oakville Hydro has used a weighted average SFLF of 1.0047 in the calculations for the years 2002 to 2008 shown in the table in the 3rd reference, please explain the reason why the A1/A2 calculation for the year 2008 yields 1.0046 rather than 1.0047. (for all other years A1/A2 yields 1.0047).
 - d) Please provide an explanation or rationale for proposing an average DLF of 1.0347 (years 2002 to 2008) as provided in the 3rd reference rather than a lower factor such as the actual DLF for 2004 of 1.0290.

Distribution Revenue Loss Recovery**35. Ref: Exhibit 8 / Tab 2 / Sch. 1 – Loss Revenue**

In the above reference, Oakville Hydro states: “Due to economic recession, Oakville Hydro has been facing a loss of customers and load. Oakville Hydro analyzed and calculated the distribution revenue loss. The results show a distribution revenue loss in the amount of \$1,313,544.”

Table 3

Customer	The Loss of revenue started	Revenue Loss in 2008	Revenue Loss in 2009	Revenue Loss in 2010
A	December 2008	\$45,796	\$646,421	\$247,208
B	July 2008	\$40,517	\$93,739	\$31,108
C	February 2008	\$35,515	\$48,203	\$16,060
D	April 2008	\$39,222	\$52,312	\$17,440
Annual Total		\$161,050	\$840,675	\$311,816

- a) To review Oakville Hydro’s distribution revenue loss, using the information provided in Exhibit 8 / Tab 2 / Sch. 1, Board staff prepared the above Table 3. Please confirm that Oakville Hydro agrees with the figures presented in Table 3. If Oakville Hydro does not agree with any figures in the table, please explain why not and provide amended tables with explanations of all changes.
- b) Please advise whether Oakville Hydro had notified the Board regarding the loss of customers or load prior to the filing of this application.
- c) If the answer to (c) is affirmative, please provide copy of the notification(s).

36. Ref: Exhibit 8 / Tab 2 / Sch. 1 – Customer A

On page 5, Table 24 listed a column titled “December 2008 to April 2010 Demand”.

- a) Please confirm whether the demands for the period from December 2008 to June 2009 are actual or forecast.
- b) Please explain on what basis Oakville Hydro forecasted 456 kW for each month for the period from July 2009 to April 2010.
- c) Please provide the actual monthly consumption for customer A in kW from July 2009 to September 2009.

37. Ref: Exhibit 8 / Tab 2 / Sch. 1 – Customer B

On page 8, Table 28 listed a column titled “July 2008 to April 2010 Demand”.

- a) Please confirm whether the demands for the period from July 2008 to February 2009 are actual or forecast.
- b) Please explain on what basis Oakville Hydro forecasted 397 kW for each month for the period from March 2009 to April 2010.

- c) Please provide the actual monthly consumption for customer B in kW from March 2009 to September 2009.

38. Ref: Exhibit 8 / Tab 2 / Sch. 1 – Customer C

On page 11, Table 30 listed a column titled “July 2008 to April 2010 Demand”.

- a) Please confirm whether the demands for the period from February 2008 to June 2009 are actual or forecast.
- b) Please explain on what basis Oakville Hydro forecasted 105 kW for each month for the period from July 2009 to April 2010.
- c) Please provide the actual monthly consumption for customer C in kW up to September 2009.

Deferral and Variance Accounts

39. Ref: Exhibit 9 / Tab 1 / Sch. 1 / Page 1 – Manager’s Summary

In the above reference, Oakville Hydro states: “The total amount of the variance requested for disposition, including the interest, is \$(5,718,842). Oakville Hydro proposes a 4-year recovery period with an annual recovery amount of \$(1,429,710). However in Exhibit 9 / Tab 2 / Sch. 2 / Page 1 / Table 9, the total disposition balance is \$(7,386,841) and the annual amount is \$(1,846,710). Please clarify what amount Oakville Hydro is requesting for disposition.

40. Ref: Exhibit 9 / Tab 1 / Sch. 6 / Page 5 – Accounts 1588

On October 15, 2009, the Board’s Regulatory Audit & Accounting group issued a bulletin related to Regulatory Accounting & Reporting of Account 1588 RSVAPower and Account 1588 RSVAPower Sub-account Global Adjustment. Please confirm whether or not Oakville Hydro plans on making any changes to its filing with respect to Account 1588.

41. Ref: Exhibit 9 / Tab 2 / Sch. 1 / Page 7 – Accounts requested for Disposition

Oakville Hydro has requested disposition of account 1590. The balance as of December 31, 2008 is:

Principal:	\$(1,752,927)
Interest:	\$ 1,551,378

- a) Please explain why the principal is a credit number, and the interest is a debit number, and why is there such a large variation.
- b) Please provide the monthly breakdown to show the balance in both principal and interest from 2006 to 2008.

Smart Meters**42. Ref: Exhibit 9 / Tab 3 / Sch. 1 – Smart Meter Implementation Plan**

On page 3, Oakville Hydro states: “Oakville Hydro anticipates beginning installation of smart meters in September 2009. The target for installation during 2009 is 58,551 (actual on June 30, 2009) meters for residential and small commercial customers. Oakville Hydro states that the number of customers varies and it will be different by the time the implementation of smart meters is completed.”

- a) Please clarify whether the number of 58,551 is based on the actual number of meters for residential and small commercial customers as of June 30, 2009.
- b) Please clarify whether Oakville Hydro plans to install all 58,551 smart meters in 2009.

LRAM & SSM**43. Ref: Exhibit 10, Tab 1, Schedule 5, Page 1**

Oakville Hydro is seeking approval for recovery of \$669,349 related to the Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanism (“LRAM”) and \$141,170 related to the Shared Savings Mechanism (“SSM”) for Conservation and Demand Management (“CDM”) programs it undertook between 2005 - 2008.

Please provide a complete list of the input assumptions used for all prescriptive measures within Oakville Hydro’s total LRAM and SSM claim.

- a) When supplying the list of input assumptions, include the source of the input assumption and the rationale for their use.
- b) Please confirm that Oakville Hydro has used the best available input assumptions at the time of the third party assessment when calculating its LRAM amount.