December 24, 2009

Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
PO Box 2319
2300 Yonge St
26th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4

Re: Orangeville Hydro Limited ED-2002-0500
Cost of Service Rate Application EB-2009-0272

Dear Ms. Walli:

Please find enclosed Orangeville Hydro Limited's responses to the Board Staff Interrogatories (Round 2) due in your office December 30, 2009. Please find enclosed 2 paper copies.

We hope that you find every in order but if you do require further assistance or have any questions, please contact Jan Howard at jhoward@orangevillehydro.on.ca or by phoning 519-942-8000.

Yours truly,

ORANGEVILLE HYDRO LIMITED

Jan Howard
Manger of Finance & Rates

Orangeville Hydro Limited
Response to
Board Staff Supplemental Interrogatories
2010 Electricity Distribution Rates
EB-2009-0272

Low Voltage Cost Forecast

54. Ref: IRR Board staff # 9 and # 38

OHL has provided details on two components of its forecast of LV cost, ST lines and LVDS, totalling $274, 135, in the response to # 9. In the response to # 38, the total cost of $314,695 is mentioned.

a. Please show a calculation of the third component of LV cost, the fixed charge per delivery point, and if this component does not reconcile the two amounts $274,135 and $314,695 please provide a reconciliation of the amounts.

Response

The detail of the two components of the forecast of LV cost, ST lines and LVDS that total $274,135 is the correct amount using the Hydro One rates noted in the chart in IR #9 that were provided by Hydro One. At the time of submission of the interrogatories, the liaison at Hydro One believed that these rates did not include Rate Rider #4.

The amount of $314,695 was the calculation of the current Hydro One rates minus Rate Rider #4. During the 1st round of interrogatories we changed the calculation of the LV charges from $314,695 to $274,135 as we received the 2010 proposed rates from Hydro One. The response should have read "OHL has revised the LV Cost of Power calculations from $200,513 to **$274,135**."

Orangeville would now submit that we should use the 2010 proposed Hydro One rates without the inclusion of the rate rider to calculate the cost of power and the rate to be charged to customers.

b. Please update the response to # 38 with 'Proposed LV Charges Revenue' to each class that add to the correct total amount from part (a).

Response

Please find an updated table below noting the calculation of the revised LV Revenue Requirement in response to #38 as requested .

Rate Classification	Proposed Distribution Revenue	Proposed LV Charges Revenue	Total
Residential	$3,239,709	$103,011	$3,342,719
General Service Less Than 50 kW	$834,494	$42,676	$877,170
General Service Greater Than 50 kW	$861,026	$126,379	$987,405
Street Lights	$49,159	$1,687	$50,845
Sentinel Lights	$6,558	$121	$6,679
Unmetered Scattered Load	$15,018	$410	$15,428
Total	**$5,005,962**	**$274,285**	**$5,280,247**

55. Ref: IRR Board staff # 9

It appears that the ST rates assumed in the first table in the response to # 9 are based on Hydro One's application EB-2009-0096 as follows:

- Fixed charge as proposed, less Rate Rider # 4
- ST Line close but not precisely as proposed, less Rate Rider # 4
- LVDS as proposed, but without Rate Rider # 4

a. If this explanation of the rates assumed in # 9 is inaccurate please provide the right explanation.

Response

- Fixed charge as proposed, less Rate Rider # 4 is based on Hydro One's application as $277.46 minus 65.78 = $211.68
- ST Line proposed,for Rate Rider # 4 is also based on Hydro One's application as $.639 minus .195 = .444
- Yes, you are correct that the LVDS is as proposed, but without Rate Rider # 4, namely 1.859.

b. Using the format of the latter two tables in the response, please provide a calculation of total LV cost assuming no Rate Rider # 4 on any component, and a calculation with Rate Rider # 4 on all components of OHL's cost.

Response

For the purpose of clarity we have provided the table below that was submitted with IR #9 where OHL assumed the fixed charge is less Rate Rider # 4,ST Line less Rate Rider # 4 and LVDS without Rate Rider # 4 that totalled $274,135;

Meter Points	2008 Data	2009 Forecast	2010 Forecast	Rate	Serv Chg 211.68 4	LV charges
Jan	40,767	43,705	44,579	0.4440	847	20,640
Feb	48,411	42,504	43,354	0.4440	847	20,096
Mar	37,294	39,967	40,766	0.4440	847	18,947
Apr	33,998	34,510	35,200	0.4440	847	16,475
May	39,714	40,438	41,247	0.4440	847	19,160
Jun	41,333	41,949	42,787	0.4440	847	19,844
Jul	51,565	52,865	53,922	0.4440	847	24,788
Aug	45,607	46,857	47,794	0.4440	847	22,067
Sep	36,310	37,602	38,354	0.4440	847	17,876
Oct	36,384	37,882	38,640	0.4440	847	18,003
Nov	40,057	41,867	42,704	0.4440	847	19,807
Dec	41,247	43,372	44,239	0.4440	847	20,489
Total						238,193

LVDS						
Jan	1985	2025	2045	1.859		3,802
Feb	1940	1979	1999	1.859		3,715
Mar	1784	1820	1838	1.859		3,417
Apr	1290	1316	1329	1.859		2,471
May	1226	1251	1263	1.859		2,348
Jun	1267	1292	1305	1.859		2,426
Jul	1300	1326	1339	1.859		2,490
Aug	1250	1275	1288	1.859		2,394
Sep	1292	1318	1331	1.859		2,474
Oct	1498	1528	1543	1.859		2,869
Nov	1810	1846	1865	1.859		3,466
Dec	2125	2168	2189	1.859		4,070
Total						35,941

Total LV Charges	**274,135**

Please see below tables that calculate the LV charges with no rate rider and with the rate rider as requested..

NO RATE RIDER						
	2008	2009	2010	LV Rate	Serv Chg	LV charges
	Data	Forecast	Forecast	0.639	277.46	
Meter Points					4	
Jan	40,767	43,705	44,579	0.6390	1,110	29,596
Feb	48,411	42,504	43,354	0.6390	1,110	28,813
Mar	37,294	39,967	40,766	0.6390	1,110	27,160
Apr	33,998	34,510	35,200	0.6390	1,110	23,603
May	39,714	40,438	41,247	0.6390	1,110	27,466
Jun	41,333	41,949	42,787	0.6390	1,110	28,451
Jul	51,565	52,865	53,922	0.6390	1,110	35,566
Aug	45,607	46,857	47,794	0.6390	1,110	31,650
Sep	36,310	37,602	38,354	0.6390	1,110	25,618
Oct	36,384	37,882	38,640	0.6390	1,110	25,801
Nov	40,057	41,867	42,704	0.6390	1,110	28,398
Dec	41,247	43,372	44,239	0.6390	1,110	29,379
Total						341,500

LVDS				Rate		
				1.859		
Jan	1985	2025	2045	1.859		3,802
Feb	1940	1979	1999	1.859		3,715
Mar	1784	1820	1838	1.859		3,417
Apr	1290	1316	1329	1.859		2,471
May	1226	1251	1263	1.859		2,348
Jun	1267	1292	1305	1.859		2,426
Jul	1300	1326	1339	1.859		2,490
Aug	1250	1275	1288	1.859		2,394
Sep	1292	1318	1331	1.859		2,474
Oct	1498	1528	1543	1.859		2,869
Nov	1810	1846	1865	1.859		3,466
Dec	2125	2168	2189	1.859		4,070
Total						35,941

Total LV Charges	**377,442**

WITH RATE RIDER						
	2008	2009	2010	LV Rate	Serv Chg	LV charges
				0.639	277.46	
				(0.195)	(65.78)	
	Data	Forecast	Forecast	0.444	211.68	
Meter Points					4	
Jan	40,767	43,705	44,579	0.4440	847	20,640
Feb	48,411	42,504	43,354	0.4440	847	20,096
Mar	37,294	39,967	40,766	0.4440	847	18,947
Apr	33,998	34,510	35,200	0.4440	847	16,475
May	39,714	40,438	41,247	0.4440	847	19,160
Jun	41,333	41,949	42,787	0.4440	847	19,844
Jul	51,565	52,865	53,922	0.4440	847	24,788
Aug	45,607	46,857	47,794	0.4440	847	22,067
Sep	36,310	37,602	38,354	0.4440	847	17,876
Oct	36,384	37,882	38,640	0.4440	847	18,003
Nov	40,057	41,867	42,704	0.4440	847	19,807
Dec	41,247	43,372	44,239	0.4440	847	20,489
Total						238,193

LVDS				Rate		
				1.859		
				(0.430)		
				1.429		
Jan	1985	2025	2045	1.429		2,922
Feb	1940	1979	1999	1.429		2,856
Mar	1784	1820	1838	1.429		2,626
Apr	1290	1316	1329	1.429		1,899
May	1226	1251	1263	1.429		1,805
Jun	1267	1292	1305	1.429		1,865
Jul	1300	1326	1339	1.429		1,914
Aug	1250	1275	1288	1.429		1,840
Sep	1292	1318	1331	1.429		1,902
Oct	1498	1528	1543	1.429		2,205
Nov	1810	1846	1865	1.429		2,665
Dec	2125	2168	2189	1.429		3,128
Total						27,628

Total LV Charges	**265,821**

c. Please calculate a weighted average of the forecasts from part (b), with weights ¼ with Rate Rider # 4 and ¾ without. These weights are based

on the assumption that Rate Rider # 4 will be in place for one year after the proposed effective date of OHL's application, and that OHL will apply for re-based rates after three years after that. If other weights would be more reasonable, please provide that calculation instead, with an explanation.)

Please see below table that calculates the weighted average as specified above. It is OHL's view that the weighted average value amount of $349,537 is a reasonable amount for the 2010 rates.

WEIGHTED AVERAGE RATE RIDER						
	2008 Data	2009 Forecast	2010 Forecast	LV Rate Weighted Average	Serv Chg Weighted Average	LV charges
Meter Points					4	
Jan	40,767	43,705	44,579	0.590	1,044	27,357
Feb	48,411	42,504	43,354	0.590	1,044	26,634
Mar	37,294	39,967	40,766	0.590	1,044	25,106
Apr	33,998	34,510	35,200	0.590	1,044	21,821
May	39,714	40,438	41,247	0.590	1,044	25,390
Jun	41,333	41,949	42,787	0.590	1,044	26,299
Jul	51,565	52,865	53,922	0.590	1,044	32,872
Aug	45,607	46,857	47,794	0.590	1,044	29,255
Sep	36,310	37,602	38,354	0.590	1,044	23,683
Oct	36,384	37,882	38,640	0.590	1,044	23,851
Nov	40,057	41,867	42,704	0.590	1,044	26,250
Dec	41,247	43,372	44,239	0.590	1,044	27,156
Total						315,674

LVDS				Rate Weighted Average		
Jan	1985	2025	2045	1.752		3,582
Feb	1940	1979	1999	1.752		3,501
Mar	1784	1820	1838	1.752		3,219
Apr	1290	1316	1329	1.752		2,328
May	1226	1251	1263	1.752		2,212
Jun	1267	1292	1305	1.752		2,286
Jul	1300	1326	1339	1.752		2,346
Aug	1250	1275	1288	1.752		2,255
Sep	1292	1318	1331	1.752		2,331
Oct	1498	1528	1543	1.752		2,703
Nov	1810	1846	1865	1.752		3,266
Dec	2125	2168	2189	1.752		3,834
Total						33,863

t

Total LV Charges	**349,537**

Load Forecast

56. Ref: IRR Board staff # 13(b), and Exh 3 / 2 / 1 / p. 7

a. Please explain the use of trended HDD and CDD data, distinguishing between "trended" data on the one hand, and average HDD or CDD calculated as the mean of either 20 years of data or 10 (or 11) years of data.

Response

The information provided for the 20 year data is on a trended basis, even though it is titled as average on the referenced response. Please see the table below with the corrected titles.

Average of 10 year HDD	Trended value of 20 year HDD	Average of 10 year CDD	Trended value of 20 year CDD
4259	4113	180	180

The trend of HDD and CDD, by month, over a 20 year time period was determined using the TREND function in Excel. For example, OHL entered the January HDD numbers from January 1998 to January 2008 into the Excel TREND function and determined the trend number for January.

b. OHL has provided its data for the 10-year and 20-year averages of HDD. The difference in average heating degree days is 146 between the 10-year and 20-year scenarios, and there is no difference in average cooling degree days. Multiplying the difference of 146 times the coefficient of HDD in the econometric equation in Exhibit 3 yields a difference of 750,887 kWh, a little more than half as much as the difference cited in the Application which is 1,297,165 kWh.

c. To help parties in understanding how the forecasting model works, please explain why there is this apparent inconsistency in the alternative fitted amounts in the equation.

Response b & c

In the process of preparing the response for this interrogatory, it has come to OHL's attention that the process used to determine the 20 year trended HDD numbers used in the application was incorrect. The incorrect numbers produced an average of 4004, as shown in the table below. In addition, the average of the weather normalized HDD was based on an 11 year average, which came to a total of 4,256. The difference between the 11 year average of 4,256 minus the incorrect 20 year trended number of 4,004 is -252. When this number is applied to the HDD coefficient, it results in a difference of -1,297,166. However, the correct 20 year trend number should have been 4,113, which creates a difference of -143. When multiplied by the HDD coefficient, it results in a difference of -734,004. This is the updated difference between the 20 year trend number and the amount in the

application, which means the 20 year trended forecast should be 263,316,067 minus 734,004, which equals 262,582,063.

Average 11 year HDD	20 year Trend used in rate application	Difference	Revised 20 year trend values	Difference
748	738	-10	738	-10
696	648	-48	692	-4
610	574	-36	613	3
378	364	-14	374	-4
212	209	-3	223	10
57	44	-13	48	-9
18	17	-1	17	-1
30	27	-3	27	-3
98	78	-20	78	-20
297	276	-21	276	-21
448	436	-12	436	-12
664	592	-72	592	-72
4,256	4,004	-252	4,113	-143
	HDD coefficient	**5,143**		**5,143**
Difference multiplied by coefficient		**-1,297,166**		**-734,004**

Please note that the numbering is incorrect, there are no questions 57 and 58.

59. Ref: IRR Board staff # 16(b), and Exh 3 / 2 / 1 / Tables 4 and 9

OHL has provided population data for 2010 from the Town of Orangeville and a consultant referred to as the Hemson report.

a. Please indicate which 2010 population forecast was used to arrive at the 2010 load forecast found in Table 4, and provide the 2010 forecast of kWh using the one that was not used in Table 4.

Response

The population data from the Town of Orangeville was used to arrive at the 2010 load forecast.

The 2010 forecast amount using the Hemson report population data is 266,182,517.

b. Please confirm that OHL's forecast of the increased number of Residential customers in Table 9 is more consistent with the population forecast from Hemson than with the forecast provided by the Town of Orangeville.

Response

Yes, we do confirm that OHL's forecast of the increased number of Residential customers in Table 9 is more consistent with the population

forecast from Hemson than with the forecast provided by the Town of Orangeville. The population increase in the Hemson Report from 2008 to 2010 is 906 divided by the 2.8 factor per household would be an increase in connections of 323 where we forecasted the connections at 428 over the two year period. OHL considered the upcoming subdivisions in the connection forecast however the connections seem to be slower than in previous years due to the economy.

c. Please provide more information on how the consultant incorporated the changes in provincial legislation, as mentioned in the response to 16(b).

Response

OHL was not involved in the preparation of this report, and is not able to comment on the relevance on the report. However, we have provided the relevant pages from their report that address how the legislation changes were incorporated. We have included the relevant pages from the report in Appendix A.

60. Ref: IRR Board staff # 16(b), and Exhibit 3 / 2 / 1 / Appendix A

The growth rate provided by the Town of Orangeville is described in the interrogatory response as being based on Census data, most recently in 2006. However, in the Appendix the projected growth of approximately 30 per year is only 1/3 of the growth in the period actually covered by the Census which was over 100 per year.

Does OHL consider this to be a reason to consider the projections attributed to the Town of Orangeville in the response to 16(b) to be pessimistic, perhaps overly so?

Response

At the time of preparing the application, we used the town of Orangeville information which was the best information we were provided at the time. OHL consulted with the Town of Orangeville who provided the population data and their response was **"The population is calculated by multiplying the total number of households by 2.8 (which is the average household size shown on the 2006 Census data). The total number of households is provided to the Town from MPAC. It does appear low but that is the data the Town of Orangeville received."**

62. Ref: IRR VECC # 22(i)

OHL has indicated in the response to #22(i) that the participation of commercial customers in CDM programs is now included in the load forecast, but that the effect is not yet reflected in the proposed rates.

a. Will there be updated information from the OPA showing final participation rates and load impacts for 2009? If so, when will this information be available?

Response

No, there will not be updated information from the OPA as there is no report available at this time. The report with information on 2008 and prior years was not made available until July 2009.

b. If updated information is going to be available, will it be available soon enough to enable a more accurate forecast of the impact of CDM in 2010?

Response

Due to the response in 62 a, the report will not be available to enable a more accurate forecast of the impact of CDM in 2010.

c. If there will not be updated information on CDM to enable a better 2010 forecast, please provide the best forecast that is currently available, as described in the response to 22(i) -- rather than waiting until the final rates as suggested.

Response

Please see below for the forecast as described in the response to 22(i). The forecast has also been changed due to the manual adjustments to reflect a loss factor of 1.0343 as per VECC IR #51 (a) and (b)

Orangeville Hydro Weather Normal Load Forecast for 2010 Rate Application

	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Weather Normal	2010 Weather Normal
Actual kWh Purchases	259,662,833	265,059,732	257,950,545		
Predicted kWh Purchases	258,167,939	262,611,965	260,954,481	262,826,600	263,316,067
Manual Adjustments				-1,881,409	-5,380,453
				260,945,191	257,935,614
% Difference	-0.6%	-0.9%	1.2%		
Billed kWh	250,897,683	256,622,372	249,716,485	252,663,200	249,637,408
By Class					
Residential					
Customers	9,483	9,547	9,619	9,813	10,045
kWh	85,059,823	85,922,369	85,459,087	85,817,915	85,724,945
Consumption % Difference	-2.98%	1.00%	-0.54%	0.42%	-0.11%
General Service < 50 kW					
Customers	994	1,030	1,061	1,081	1,081
kWh	35,198,596	37,055,213	37,433,972	38,411,338	38,621,229
Consumption % Difference	2.29%	5.01%	1.01%	2.54%	0.54%
General Service > 50					
Customers	130	131	132	133	133
kWh	128,541,421	131,518,571	124,560,248	126,163,636	123,000,460
kW	304,914	313,687	297,642	301,099	293,560
Consumption % Difference	2.31%	2.80%	-5.39%	1.15%	-2.57%
Streetlights					
Customers	2,506	2,519	2,643	2,683	2,724
kWh	1,594,469	1,615,441	1,734,012	1,771,737	1,787,196
kW	4,452	4,445	4,842	5,025	5,069
Consumption % Difference	0.48%	-0.16%	8.18%	3.66%	0.86%
Sentinel Lights					
Connections	175	179	177	168	170
kWh	130,122	133,476	136,892	129,720	129,066
kW	370	373	379	359	357
Consumption % Difference	1.79%	0.86%	1.40%	-5.41%	-0.51%
Unmetered Loads					
Connections	35	35	35	32	32
kWh	373,252	377,302	392,274	368,855	374,511
Consumption % Difference	100.00%	1.07%	3.82%	-6.35%	1.51%
Total					
Customer/Connections	13,322	13,439	13,665	13,909	14,184
kWh	250,897,683	256,622,372	249,716,485	252,663,200	249,637,408
kW from applicable classes	309,736	318,505	302,862	306,484	298,986
	13,322	13,439	13,665	13,909	14,184
	250,897,683	256,622,372	249,716,485	252,663,200	249,637,408
	309,736	318,505	302,862	306,484	298,986

63. Ref: IRR Board staff # 18(a), and IRR VECC # 22(e)

The response to # 18(a) indicates that a mistake in the impact of CDM programs has been corrected by OHL. The response to # 22(e) shows impacts of 783,114 kWh in 2009 and 787,775 kWh in 2010, which differ from 962,000 in both years in the original version of Table 6 (Exh 3 / 2 / 1 / p. 10).

a. Is the change in Table 6 in the response to 22(e) the correction that is referred to? If not, please explain the correction and indicate where it is available in the record of this application.

Response

Yes, the change in Table 6 in the response to 22(e) is the correction that OHL referred to.

b. Please provide a brief explanation of the current forecast of the impact of CDM, and in particular please indicate why the impact is expected to increase so little in 2010 over 2009.

Response

There was a large difference in the consumption decrease from 2008 to 2009 due to a new program being introduced by the OPA, which was extremely successful. We failed to include in our forecast the new customers that we expect to participate in the 2010 year for the program. We did not consider that the consumption decrease for any new customers participating in the programs in 2009 to be continued into 2010 consumption. Please see question #62c for the updated load forecast.

64. Ref: IRR Board staff # 18(c), and IRR VECC # 21(f)

The response includes an offer to update the impact of CDM program participation when new reports are available similar to the 2008 report provided with the response.

a. Please indicate the approximate date at which the updated reports will be available to OHL, and explain whether the report(s) will be for 2009 only or whether an updated forecast of 2010 effects will also be available at that time.

Response

Due to the response in 62 a, the report will not be available to enable a more accurate forecast of the impact of CDM in 2010.

b. Please explain how the expected update for 2009 will differ from the information provided in response to VECC interrogatory # 21(f) – including any explanation that would assist in converting from the units in # 21(f) – MW – compared to the manual adjustment made to the load forecast – thousands of kWh.

Response

The headings in the table provided in VECC interrogatory #21(f) should have been shown as MWh, not MW.

The table from VECC IR #1, Q21 (f) took into account the actual number of participants, which is why it varied slightly with the forecast of 342 mWh that was provided from the OPA. We have continued to use the 2008 forecasted numbers as there is not a significant difference. However, we did not have any information on the commercial savings because the programs did not commence until 2009 thus updated the load forecast to include the commercial class.

65. Ref: IRR VECC # 20(f), and Exhibit 3 / 2 / 1 / Appendix A

The response indicates that there has been an update of the financial outlook for the province since the Appendix was prepared.

a. Does OHL consider that the local economy in its service territory will likely experience as much of a decrease in percentage terms as is projected in the report cited in the response?

Response

OHL is not aware of any information related to the local economic condition in its service area. However, for the purposes of the load forecast we expect the results cited in the report to be the best estimate of economic conditions in the OHL service territory.

b. If OHL has calculated an updated 2010 load forecast, fitted on an updated "Ontario Real GDP Monthly %" and any other updates that may have become available, please provide the updated load forecast.

Response

Using the table from 62 (c) as a starting point, we have changed the "Ontario Real GDP Monthly %" to reflect updated values and have provided below the updated load forecast. Please note that we have also changed the table to reflect the response for VECC question #50a and removed the loss factor of 1.0343 from the predicted purchases.

Orangeville Hydro Weather Normal Load Forecast for 2010 Rate Application

Updated Fall GDP Values

	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Weather Normal	2010 Weather Normal
Actual kWh Purchases	259,662,833	265,059,732	257,950,545		
Predicted kWh Purchases	258,167,939	262,611,965	260,954,481	262,443,451	262,497,407
Manual Adjustments				-1,812,560	-5,148,920
				260,630,891	257,348,487
% Difference	-0.6%	-0.9%	1.2%		
Billed kWh	250,897,683	256,622,372	249,716,485	252,299,421	248,900,793

By Class

Residential					
Customers	9,483	9,547	9,619	9,813	10,045
kWh	85,059,823	85,922,369	85,459,087	85,692,084	85,453,313
Consumption % Difference	-2.98%	1.00%	-0.54%	0.27%	-0.28%
General Service < 50 kW					
Customers	994	1,030	1,061	1,081	1,081
kWh	35,198,596	37,055,213	37,433,972	38,355,017	38,498,852
Consumption % Difference	2.29%	5.01%	1.01%	2.40%	0.37%
General Service > 50					
Customers	130	131	132	133	133
kWh	128,541,421	131,518,571	124,560,248	125,985,338	122,665,114
kW	304,914	313,687	297,642	300,674	292,764
Consumption % Difference	2.31%	2.80%	-5.39%	1.01%	-2.70%
Streetlights					
Customers	2,506	2,519	2,643	2,683	2,724
kWh	1,594,469	1,615,441	1,734,012	1,769,139	1,781,533
kW	4,452	4,445	4,842	5,018	5,053
Consumption % Difference	0.48%	-0.16%	8.18%	3.52%	0.70%
Sentinel Lights					
Connections	175	179	177	168	170
kWh	130,122	133,476	136,892	129,529	128,657
kW	370	373	379	359	356
Consumption % Difference	1.79%	0.86%	1.40%	-5.56%	-0.68%
Unmetered Loads					
Connections	35	35	35	32	32
kWh	373,252	377,302	392,274	368,314	373,324
Consumption % Difference	100.00%	1.07%	3.82%	-6.51%	1.34%
Total					
Customer/Connections	13,322	13,439	13,665	13,909	14,184
kWh	250,897,683	256,622,372	249,716,485	252,299,421	248,900,793
kW from applicable classes	309,736	318,505	302,862	306,051	298,173
	13,322	13,439	13,665	13,909	14,184
	250,897,683	256,622,372	249,716,485	252,299,421	248,900,793
	309,736	318,505	302,862	306,051	298,173

Cost Allocation

66. Ref: IRR VECC 34(b), and Exh 7 / 1 / 2 / p. 6

OHL has provided in part (c) a corrected version of Table 2 in place of the one in Exhibit 7 / 1 / 2, including $820,144 in revenue from the GS > 50 kW class. The description in part (b) describes how it is based in part on existing rates and in part on an allocation of miscellaneous revenue to the class.

a. Please provide a breakdown of the total $820,144 by revenue from customers currently paying the GS > 50 kW non-TOU rate in Orangeville, customers currently paying the GS>50 kW rate in Grand Valley, customers paying the GS > 50 kW Time-of-Use rate in Orangeville, and Miscellaneous Revenue (in total, not broken down by customer group).

Response

Please see breakdown below:

Customer Class	Existing Rates	Existing Rates incl Misc Rev
GS >50 kW	12.01%	601,105
GS >50 kW - TOU-eliminate	2.32%	116,140
Grand Valley >50	1.11%	55,343
Sub-Total		**772,588**
Miscellaneous Revenue		47,556
TOTAL		**820,144**

b. Please provide the same break-down for the proposed revenue $861,026 in Table 5 (Exh 7 / 1 / 2 / p. 6)

Response

Please see breakdown below:

Customer Class	Rate Application	Rate Application
GS >50 kW	13.38%	669,913
GS >50 kW - TOU-eliminate	2.59%	129,435
Grand Valley >50	1.23%	61,678
Sub-total		**861,025**
Micellaneous Revenue		47,556
TOTAL	**17.20%**	**908,581**

Fixed:Variable Ratio of GS> 50 kW Class

67. Ref: IRR Board staff # 40

The original interrogatory requested a reconciliation of seemingly contradictory calculations in the Application. The response confirms that OHL intends to

maintain a constant fixed:variable ratio for the class as a whole, but does not provide the information that would confirm that this is being accomplished.

a. Please provide a detailed calculation of two hypothetical revenue forecasts, i) from monthly service charges and ii) from volumetric charges per kW, using the current approved rates, showing these amounts separately for each of the following groups:
   - customers currently paying the GS > 50 kW non-TOU rate in Orangeville,
   - customers currently paying the GS>50 kW rate in Grand Valley,
   - customers paying the GS > 50 kW Time-of-Use rate in Orangeville.

Response (a)

Class	Annual kW For Dx	Annualized Customers	Service Charge	Fixed Distribution Revenue	Volumetric Charge	Variable Distribution Revenue	Dist. Rev. Including Transformer	Transformer Allowance	Dist. Rev. Excluding Transformer
GS >50 kW - Orangeville	241,091	1,476	183.39	270,684	1.3313	320,964	591,647	66,358	525,289
GS >50 kW - TOU-eliminate	38,367	36	2,141.44	77,092	1.2556	48,173	125,265	23,773	101,492
GS >50 kW - Grand Valley	13,721	84	232.99	19,571	2.0984	28,791	48,362		48,362
Total Revenue > 50 kWClass	293,178	1,596		367,347		397,928	765,275	90,131	675,143

b. Please provide the revenue forecasts in the same amount of detail, using the proposed rates, ensuring that a consistent forecast of customer numbers and billing demands is used in parts (a) and (b).

Response (b)

Class	Annual kW For Dx	Annualized Customers	Service Charge	Fixed Distribution Revenue	Volumetric Charge	Variable Distribution Revenue	Dist. Rev. Including Transformer	Transformer Allowance	Dist. Rev. Excluding Transformer
GS >50 kW - Orangeville	241,091	1,476	259.37	382,830	1.8020	434,445	817,275	66,358	750,917
GS >50 kW - TOU-eliminate	38,367	36	259.37	9,337	1.8020	69,137	78,474	23,773	54,701
GS >50 kW - Grand Valley	13,721	84	259.37	21,787	1.8020	24,725	46,512		46,512
Total Revenue > 50 kWClass	293,178	1,596		413,955		528,306	942,261	90,131	852,129

Deferral and Variance Accounts

68. Ref: IRR Board staff # 46(b), and Exh 9 / 1 / 3 / p. 2

OHL has calculated a rate rider for the GS > 50 kW class, based on a balance that includes the entire amount of the Global Adjustment sub-account in Account 1588.

a. Please confirm that all customers in this class are non-RPP customers, and that all non-RPP customers of OHL are in this class. If this statement cannot be confirmed, i.e. if the GS>50 kW class and OHL's non-RPP customers are not the identical group of customers, please provide information on kWh forecast for the exceptions, in particular any non-RPP kWh in other classes other than GS > 50 kW.

Response

OHL cannot confirm that all customers in this class are non-RPP customers. There will be some customers in the GS>50 class that are RPP customers, since they are using less than 250,000 kWh or they are self-designated. Not all non-RPP customers of OHL are in the general service > 50 class.

Would OHL's billing system be able to accommodate a separate rate rider that would be applicable to non-RPP customers only?

Response

OHL has been in discussion with the UCS group regarding the existing capabilities of the Harris Northstar billing system. Yes, it has been identified that a separate rate rider for disposition of the GA variance account could be done on a class by class basis and that the rate rider would be added as a "distribution variable charge" only of the consumer. The system will not allow for the adjustment to be part of a "distribution fixed charge". Given that in the majority of cases, the customers in the General Service >50 class were "responsible" for the GA rate and the resulting variance regardless of if they had a Retailer account or not, it can be assumed that the entire class can be treated fairly for the period from 2005 through to the end of 2008 if the associated GA account variance is applied to the entire class. Another problem with applying the GA variance to the currently enrolled customers is the fact the some customers have left the retailers that were responsible for that variance and new customers that were not responsible for the variance would be subject to pay.

Operating Costs

69. Ref: IRR Board staff # 25, and Exh 4 / 2 / 3 / p. 12

The response provides a breakdown of the factors in the increase of Account 5605 'Executive Salaries and Expenses' from 2008 actual to the test year forecast. Amongst the factors are an increase in personnel, inflation and staff shift.

a. Please provide a similar breakdown for accounts 5610 and 5615, including an explanation of any decrease due to the staff shift toward account 5605.

Response

Account 5605	Amount
2009 Increase - Board Member	27,000
2009 Increase - Staff Shift	60,500
2009 Increase - Managerial Services	8,500
2009 Increase - Inflation/Progression 4.6%	11,638
Total 2009	**107,638**
2010 Increase - Conferences/Training Courses	7,500
2010 Increase - Home Internet Access	1,500
2010 Increase - Inflation/Progression/ 5.3%	19,107
Total 2010	**28,107**

Account 5610	Amount
2009 Increase - Managerial Services	29,500
2009 Increase - Staff Shift	(60,500)
2009Increase - Cell/Home Internet Access	1,100
2009 Increase - Additional conferences/Training	500
2009 Increase - Inflation 3%	4,645
Total 2009	**(24,755)**
2010 Increase - Training Courses/Conferences	(1,000)
2010 Increse - Inflation 3%	3,966
Total 2010	**2,966**

Account 5615	Amount
2009 Increase - Managerial Services	51,000
2009 Decrease - Staff Shift	(6,100)
2009 Increase - Inflation 2.5%	3,338
Total 2009	**48,238**
2010 Increase - Regulatory Assistant	82,000
2010 Increase - Training/Conferences	1,000
2010 Increase - Inflation 2.7%	4,944

The above tables show the similar breakdown provided in the first round of interrogatories. Upon completing this exercise it was noted that the flow into account 5605 was incorrect as it affected the flow from account 5610. Therefore we have provided a new table above.

b. Please provide a similar breakdown of account 5630 'Outside Service Employed', including an explanation of how the decrease in that account affects any of accounts 5605, 5610, or 5615.

Response

Account 5630	Amount
2009 Decrease - Managerial Services	(89,000)
2009 Decrease - Strat Plan	(10,000)
2009 Decrease - Valuation	(18,000)
2009 Decrease - Grand Valley Legal	(11,000)
2009 Decrease - Actuarial for Benefits	(3,278)
2009 Increase - Inflation 2%	1,586
Total 2009	**(129,692)**
2010 Increase - IFRS $100,000/4 Years	25,000
2010 Increase - Inflation 1%	690
Total 2010	**25,690**

The decrease in 2009 was primarily due to the managerial services and has affected an increase in 5605 amounting to $11,500; 5610 for $23,000; 5615 for $51,000. The tables noted above in #69 (a) show the flow of these dollars and how they affect the accounts.

70. Ref: IRR Board staff # 25, and Exh 4 / 2 / 3 / pp. 8 – 9

Inflation at 2.5% in 2009 and 2.3% in 2010 are cited as reasons for increases in contractor and payroll costs. The response to the interrogatory cites inflation at 6% in 2009 and 7% in 2010 as factors in the increase in Executive Salaries and Expenses.

Please reconcile these divergent assumptions about inflation, using the data provided in the response to the previous interrogatory and/or additional information that may enable the Board to assess whether the proposed payroll costs are appropriate.

Response

You are correct in stating these assumptions are divergent and duly noted. Upon completing the exercise for interrogatory #69, OHL had the flow of expenditures was incorrectly stated from 5610 into 5605. Please see above in question #69, that OHL has revised the figures stated as an increase in account 5605 and that the inflationary amounts are 4.6% in 2009 and 5.3% in 2010. Please also note that the amount of increase is not only for inflationary reasons but because of progression in an executive position.

Calculation of Revenue Deficiency or Surplus

71. Ref: IRR VECC # 32(b), and IRR SEC #11(b)

VECC requested an itemization of adjustments and revisions made by OHL that affect the 2010 revenue requirement, and hence the calculated revenue deficiency. The adjustments and revisions are weighted cost of debt, tax rate, LV

expense, and an item relating to CDM. The table provided has a number of columns that lack a heading.

a. Please provide headings for the table that has been submitted in response to VECC # 32(b), and/or provide a simpler version of the table that would give only the critical information about each adjustment/revision.

Response

The summary has also been updated to reflect changes in the Manual adjustments to the correct loss factor and the removal of the File Nexus Software as requested in VECC IR # 45 (b)

Orangeville Hydro Ltd.
Summary of Proposed Changes

	Regulated Return on Capital	Regulated Rate of Return	Rate Base	Working Capital	Amortization	PILs	OM&A	Service Revenue Requirement	Base Revenue Requirement	Gross Revenue Deficiency
Original Submission August 2009	**$1,223,220**	**6.87%**	**$17,799,124**	**$22,435,528**	**$1,119,762**	**$250,237**	**$2,769,015**	**$5,362,234**	**$5,005,962**	**$631,388**
Weighted Cost of Debt - OEB IR#32, VECC IR#31	**$1,141,133**	**6.41%**	**$17,799,123**	**$22,435,528**	**$1,119,762**	**$250,237**	**$2,769,015**	**$5,280,148**	**$4,923,876**	**$549,302**
Change	-$82,086	$0	-$1	$0	$0	$0	$0	-$82,086	-$82,086	-$82,086
PILs Correction - Tax Rates - VECC IR#30	**$1,141,133**	**6.41%**	**$17,799,123**	**$22,435,528**	**$1,119,762**	**$229,091**	**$2,769,015**	**$5,259,002**	**$4,902,730**	**$528,155**
Change	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	-$21,146	$0	-$21,146	-$21,146	-$21,146
Cost of Power - LV Correction - OEB IR#9	**$1,141,791**	**6.41%**	**$17,809,387**	**$22,503,958**	**$1,119,762**	**$229,266**	**$2,769,015**	**$5,259,835**	**$4,903,563**	**$528,988**
Change	$658	$0	$10,265	$68,430	$0	$175	$0	$833	$833	$833
CDM Forecast Reduction for Residential/CDM Inclusion GS < 50 VECC IR#22 (i), (e)	**$1,142,259**	**6.41%**	**$17,816,683**	**$22,552,596**	**$1,119,762**	**$229,391**	**$2,769,015**	**$5,260,427**	**$4,904,155**	**$522,427**
Change	$468	$0	$7,296	$48,637	$0	$125	$0	$592	$592	-$6,562
Manual Adjustment VECC IR #51 (a) & (b) - corrected to 1.0343	**$1,142,259**	**6.41%**	**$17,816,683**	**$22,552,596**	**$1,119,762**	**$229,391**	**$2,769,015**	**$5,260,427**	**$4,904,155**	**$522,366**
Change	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	-$61
Adjust to Remove File Nexus Software, OEB IR #7, VECC IR 45 (b)	**$1,140,286**	**6.41%**	**$17,785,905**	**$22,552,596**	**$1,110,968**	**$235,585**	**$2,769,015**	**$5,255,854**	**$4,899,582**	**$517,793**
Change	-$1,973	$0	-$30,778	$0	-$8,794	$6,194	$0	-$4,573	-$4,573	-$4,573
Proposed at December 24, 2009	**$1,140,286**	**6.41%**	**$17,785,905**	**$22,552,596**	**$1,110,968**	**$235,585**	**$2,769,015**	**$5,255,854**	**$4,899,582**	**$517,793**

b. Please provide a description of the fourth item in the table, which relates to CDM, or alternatively provide a reference to the Application or an interrogatory response that describes the item.

Response

The description has been provided in the table above. The reference to CDM stems from VECC IR# 22 (i) and (e).

c. The response to SEC # 11(b) appears to involve an adjustment in the cost of membership in the CHEC Group from $12,058 to $35,750. Is this an adjustment that should be added to the list provided in the response to VECC # 32(b)?

Response

No there should not be an adjustment for the membership for the CHEC group increase from $12,058- There was a discussion of the increase in the CHEC dues in Exhibit 4/2/3 page 7 along with the EDA dues.

Green Energy Plan

72. Ref: IRR Board staff # 53, Appendix A (revised Table 4), and IRR VECC # 42(h)

Marketing expense of $16,000 has been removed from each year, relating to Infrastructure Upgrades.

a. Please confirm that this amount is still included in OHL's revenue requirement for the test year.

Response

Yes the marketing expense of $16,000 is included in OHL's revenue requirement.

b. If it is included, please indicate where it is included in Exhibit 4 / 2 / 3 / Table 5 of the Application.

Response

The marketing expense of $16,000 is recorded under 5410-Community relations. The amount was missed in the cost driver analysis for 2010 cost drivers and was attributed to changes in work plan for maintenance activities noted in VECC IR#25f.

c. Please provide a brief description of the likely role of marketing related to Infrastructure Upgrades.

Response

The amount of $16,000 does not include expenses for Infrastructure Upgrades. Please see the table below outlining the in-the-schools generation/safety education plan . The funding is beyond amount available through the OPA. Therefore OHL is requesting approval in our Green Energy Plan.

Program Budget

Activity	Year 1 - 2010 Total	Year 2 - 2011 Total	Year 3 - 2012 Total	Year 4 - 2013 Total
Generation / Safety Program				
School Safety Initiative				
Marketing & Communication	$ 2,700	$ 2,762	$ 2,824	$ 2,886
Materials - 8 schools per year	$ 8,000	$ 8,184	$ 8,368	$ 8,552
Safety Consultant	$ 2,100	$ 2,148	$ 2,197	$ 2,245
Presentations	$ 3,200	$ 3,274	$ 3,347	$ 3,421
Science Fair Sub-total	**$ 16,000**	**$ 16,368**	**$ 16,736**	**$ 17,104**

d. In light of the response to VECC # 42(h), should there be an amount for Marketing and/or Customer Incentives in Table 4, in the final section of the table where costs are assumed to be allocated to those outside OHL/s service area?

Response

The final section of Table 4, OHL has provided an estimate of the funding amounting to $277,701.79 in Year 1, $266,693 in year 2, $232,108.26 in Year 3, $227,250.29 in Year 4 and $240,691.32 in year 5 that would be required for OEB approval to enable our GEA plan for Conservation and Demand management. So, in essence, if the OPA does not continue the programs, OHL sees value in the programs and has asked to continue them in accordance with our CDM budget and plan.

73. Ref: IRR Board staff # 50(a)

The response indicates that OHL's distribution system can handle expected additional load due to MicroFIT. However, Table 4 of the Green Energy Plan continues to include in the Infrastructure Upgrades section an capital expenditure of $50,000 in 2010 and amounts of $50,000 or $100,000 in various years during the Plan.

Please provide an explanation of this seeming contradiction.

Response

Capacity-wise, OHL's distribution system can handle expected additional load due to MicroFIT. However, OHL would still require recover y of metering and connection costs which represent the 2010 amounts. Should these costs be disallowed OHL will seek to recover from the Customer as a capital contribution.

74. Ref: IRR Board staff # 53 (revised Table 4), and IRR VECC # 42(b)

The revised table includes $10,000 expense per year relating to CIS Upgrades, in the section that would be included in OHL Distribution Rates.

a. Please explain whether this amount is included in the cost forecast in Exhibit 3, or alternatively whether it is an additional expense.

Response

Yes the expense of $10,000 is included in OHL distribution rates under account 5315. Therefore it is included in Exhibit 3.

b. Please explain whether the capital expenditure referred to in the response to VECC # 42(b), which is $60,000, is the same expenditure or is in addition to the OM&A expense of $60,000 in Exhibit 4 / 2 / 3 / p. 8 (under item (c)(ii).

Response

The capital expenditure for $60,000 relates to the cost of changes to the Customer Information System to enable the automated settlement of contracts under the FIT program. The on-going expenses of $10,000 are the CIS annual support amounts that are expected going forward. There is no additional OM&A expense of $60,000, the additional OM&A expense is $10,000 and recorded under 5315.

III POPULATION IS FORECAST TO INCREASE BY 4,530 AND NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDING SPACE BY 137,065 SQUARE METRES BY 2018

This section provides the basis for the growth forecasts used in calculating the development charges and provides a summary of the forecast results. Details of the forecast are provided in Appendix A.

The present growth forecast differs significantly from previous forecasts prepared for development charges purposes, reflecting the introduction in 2006 of the Provincial *Places to Grow* legislation. That legislation establishes a new policy framework for growth across the Greater Golden Horseshoe region, including the County of Dufferin and its lower-tier member municipalities. The forecast used in this study derives from the Growth Management Study (GMS) prepared for the County and its member municipalities as part of their official plan conformity exercises.[1] It is noted that that study assumes that servicing constraints in Orangeville (as well as other municipalities) can be satisfactorily resolved. It is also recognized that the County and its area municipalities are requesting the Province to approve an alternative development target and development monitoring program. Nevertheless, at this time, the forecast for Orangeville used in this study includes targets as set out in the Dufferin County GMS. These forecasts have been reviewed by the Town's planning department staff and are considered appropriate at this time.

A. THE RESIDENTIAL FORECAST IS BASED ON THE 2006 CENSUS AND GROWTH ANTICIPATED WITHIN DUFFERIN COUNTY

Table 1 provides a summary of the residential forecast for two planning periods: a ten year planning period, 2009–2018, and 2009–2031. The ten year planning period is used throughout this study for the general services and the longer term forecast for engineering services. The Town is expected to experience a "net" increase in population of about 4,530 over the next ten years, reaching about 31,600 by 2018. The population is expected to reach 32,950 by 2031.

The population figures referred to above reflect the "net" increase in population. However, nearly 2,220 new units are to be built between 2009 and 2018, adding nearly 6,150 new residents in the Town. The population stemming from new units is partially offset by a

[1] The County of Dufferin & Its Member Municipalities, *Growth Management Study, Phase 1 & 2 Consolidated Report*, Dillon Consulting and Watson & Associates Ltd.

decline in the number of people within the existing stock of units — this is the result of declining average household size which occurs in virtually every community as it ages. In a maturing community like Orangeville, the effect of the decline in population in the existing base of units becomes a very significant factor in determining the overall "net" population increase in the community.

The importance of this to the development charges calculation is that the servicing plans included in this study (growth-related capital programs) are based on providing facilities for the higher level of population (6,150) that will come from new housing units added between 2009 and 2018. This helps to ensure that the growth-related capital facilities to be added by the Town to meet the increased need occasioned by new development can be provided at the average historic service levels that have been enjoyed by the existing community. This new method being employed in this study is considered more equitable than the prior method (based on net population growth) since the implicit increase in service levels in the existing community due to the expected population decline is not used to reduce development charges payable by new development. It is maintained as a benefit to the existing community.

For the 2009–2031 period, 3,620 housing units, yielding a new population of nearly 9,020 are forecast. The housing units forecast over the period to 2031 will result in a significant shift in the housing unit mix in the Town as required to meet the *Places to Grow* targets.

B. NON-RESIDENTIAL SPACE FORECAST IS BASED ON PREVAILING ACTIVITY RATES AND HISTORICAL PATTERNS

The non-residential space forecast prepared for development charges purposes is also summarized on Table 1.

Employment is forecast to grow by 16 per cent, or 2,219 employees, over the 10-year forecast period to 2018 and 20 per cent, or 2,875 employees, to 2031. This growth is based on the assumption that the growth in employment increases in relation to the growth in population and assuming that the activity rate reflects the average activity rate in the Town over the 1996–2006 period. By 2031, the Town's activity rate is estimated to decline very marginally from the 52 per cent level based on the 2006 census.

Just over 137,050 m^2 of non-residential gross floor space is anticipated to be added during the 2009–2018 planning period while nearly 177,600 m^2 is anticipated to be added over the period from 2009–2031.

TABLE 1

TOWN OF ORANGEVILLE
SUMMARY OF RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL
DEVELOPMENT FORECAST

	Existing	2009-2018		2009-2031	
	As At Mid-Year 2008	Forecast Change	As at Mid-Year 2018	Forecast Change	As at Mid-Year 2031
Housing Units	9,776	2,220	11,996	3,620	13,396
Population in Existing Units	27,082	(1,617)	25,464	(3,150)	23,931
Forecast Population in New Units		6,148		9,019	
Total Population	**27,082**	**4,530**	**31,612**	**5,868**	**32,950**

	Existing	2009-2018		2009-2031	
	As At Mid-Year 2008	Forecast Change	As at Mid-Year 2018	Forecast Change	As at Mid-Year 2031
Employment	14,082	2,219	16,302	2,875	16,958
Non-Residential Floor Space (sq. m)		137,065		177,558	

APPENDIX A

RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL GROWTH FORECAST

A. BACKGROUND

This appendix provides the growth forecast that is used in the preparation of the *Development Charges Background Study* for the Town. The basis for the forecast discussed. The results of the forecasts are provided in a series of tables.

The present growth forecast differs significantly from previous forecasts prepared for development charges purposes, reflecting the introduction in 2006 of the Provincial Places to Grow legislation. That legislation establishes a new policy framework for growth across the Greater Golden Horseshoe region, including the County of Dufferin and its lower-tier member municipalities. The forecast used in this study derives from the Growth Management Study (GMS) prepared for the County and its member municipalities as part of their official plan conformity exercises.[1] It is noted that that study assumes that servicing constraints in Orangeville (as well as other municipalities) can be satisfactorily resolved. It is also recognized that the County and its area municipalities are requesting the Province to approve an alternative development target and development monitoring program. Nevertheless, at this time, the forecast for Orangeville used in this study includes targets as set out in the Dufferin County GMS. These forecasts have been reviewed by the Town's planning department staff and are considered appropriate at this time.

Population forecasts used in the development charges forecast and in the GMS are "census" based and do not include any adjustment for the Census under coverage which was estimated at 3.9 per cent in the GMS. Therefore, the stated population numbers may be slightly lower than those in the *Places to Grow* documents.

Total employment numbers used in the forecast are based on Statistics Canada Place of Work data. Place of work employment numbers reflect where someone works rather than their place of residence. It is noted that the employment forecast in this study

[1] *The County of Dufferin & Its Member Municipalities*, Growth Management Study, Phase 1 & 2 Consolidated Report, *Dillon Consulting and Watson & Associates Ltd*.

exceeds the estimates established in the GMS, reflecting Orangeville's function as a regional centre and non-residential land supply.

B. RESULTS OF THE ORANGEVILLE FORECAST

The following summarizes the key findings and results of the development charges forecast:

- Orangeville is estimated grow to a population of 31,612 by 2018 and 32,950 by 2031. This represents respective increases of 4,530 (17 per cent) and 5,868 (22 per cent) when measured against the Town's estimated 2008 population of 27,082. These estimates reflect the "net" increase in population.

- Approximately 2,220 housing units are anticipated to be added during the 2009 to 2018 period and 3,620 to 2031. Over the period to 2031it is estimated that 1,029 singles and semis, 1,392 rows and other multiples and 1,199 apartments (including secondary suites) will be added.

- The housing unit forecast is based on Option C of the Dufferin County GMS for Orangeville and reflects known development applications, increased densities on several greenfield sites and intensification consistent with meeting the *Places to Grow* targets.

- The number of units added annually is expected to increase gradually from recent development levels to a peak of about 250 to 260 units annually in the 2014–2020 period. The peak in annual growth is consistent with the capital program which is assumed to resolve current wastewater servicing issues. In the post–2021period, development will be focused on medium and high density units as lands for low density development are expected to be built out.

- The population in new dwelling units forecast during the 2009–2018 planning period is 6,148 and 9,019 for the 2009–2031 period. The "net" population increases noted above reflect the growth in population in new housing units noted here after adjusting for declines in population in the existing housing stock as the community ages.