

POLLUTION PROBE INTERROGATORY 1

QUESTION

Issue 2.1, Reference: Exhibit A, Tab 2, Schedule 1, page 8

Please provide your most recent best information (e.g. actuals or best estimates/forecasts) regarding your net cumulative conservation savings (in MW) as of December 31, 2009. Please break-out this amount according to at least the following categories:

- a) peaksaver;
- b) DR1;
- c) DR2;
- d) DR3;
- e) Northern York Region DR;
- f) energy efficiency; and
- g) other.

RESPONSE

The Evaluation, Measurement and Verification ("EM&V") process on 2009 Conservation Programs is currently underway. Final Conservation Results for 2009 programs are scheduled to be available in the third quarter of 2010. The OPA does not release interim or preliminary conservation program results.

The incremental and cumulative net conservation resources obtained from 2006, 2007 and 2008 OPA-funded conservation programs are summarized in the table below. These savings are incremental to the 1,350 MW achieved by the end of 2007, as announced in the 2008 CECO Report, as filed in EB-2008-0312, Exhibit A-3-1. Please note the following:

- All savings are at the end-user and therefore do not include avoided transmission or distribution losses.
- Savings are for OPA-funded programs only; savings from other programs (e.g. provincial, LDC-funded) or policies (e.g. codes and standards) which contribute to the Ontario's conservation goals are not shown here.
- Demand Response savings represent the total contracted resources available within each DR program. They do not represent actual curtailments.
- Northern York Region DR includes the Rodan contract only. This does not represent the total conservation results from OPA-funded programs in Northern York Region as

some of the savings shown in the other province-wide categories may have occurred in Northern York Region.

- “Other” includes savings from: Loblaw DR contract, customer based generation contracts, and the Hydro One Double Return initiative.

	2006		2007		2008	
	Incremental savings (MW)	Cumulative savings (MW)	Incremental savings (MW)	Cumulative savings (MW)	Incremental savings (MW)	Cumulative savings (MW)
Peaksaver	0	0	13.3	13.3	34.1	47.4
DR1	266	266	51.4	317.4	122.2	439.6
DR2	0	0	0	0	0	0
DR3	0	0	0	0	85	85
Northern York Region DR	3	3	13.4	16.4	2.8	19.2
Energy Efficiency	16.2	16.2	207.3	223.5	55.6	178.6
Other	10	10	1.95	11.95	61.1	73
Total	295.2	295.2	287.4	582.6	360.8	942.8

POLLUTION PROBE INTERROGATORY 2

QUESTION

Issue 2.1, Reference: Exhibit A, Tab 2, Schedule 1, page 8

Please provide your best estimate of the total cost of obtaining the stated net cumulative conservation savings as of December 31, 2009.

RESPONSE

The OPA's operating costs are developed based on the OPA's divisional requirements. All departments within the Conservation division, as well as several departments within other divisions, provide support to more than one conservation program, thereby prohibiting the allocation of operating costs to individual conservation programs. Those costs which are directly related to the procurement of conservation resources through conservation programs are captured in the OPA's charges, which are not part of the OPA's Revenue Requirement Submission.

POLLUTION PROBE INTERROGATORY 3

QUESTION

Issue 2.1, Reference: Exhibit A, Tab 2, Schedule 1, page 8

Please provide a break-out of your incremental net cumulative conservation savings (in MW) for 2010 according to at least the following categories:

- a) peaksaver;
- b) DR1;
- c) DR2;
- d) DR3;
- e) Northern York Region DR;
- f) energy efficiency; and
- g) other.

RESPONSE

As shown in its 2010-2012 Business Plan (Exhibit A-2-1, p. 8), the OPA is projecting a net cumulative conservation savings, from OPA funded programs starting in 2006, of 2,172 MW by the end of 2010. The OPA manages its conservation programs on a portfolio basis and therefore does not publish initiative-level forecasts.

POLLUTION PROBE INTERROGATORY 4

QUESTION

Issue 2.1, Reference: Exhibit A, Tab 2, Schedule 1, page 8; and Ex.B, Tab 2, Schedule 1, page 14

Please provide a break-out of your 2010 conservation budget (i.e. \$16,484,000) according to at least the following categories:

- a) peaksaver;
- b) DR1;
- c) DR2;
- d) DR3;
- e) Northern York Region DR;
- f) energy efficiency; and
- g) other.

RESPONSE

The OPA's operating costs are developed based on the OPA's organizational structure. All departments within the Conservation division, as well as several departments within other divisions, provide support to more than one conservation program, thereby prohibiting the allocation of operating costs to individual conservation programs. Those costs which are directly related to the procurement of conservation resources through conservation programs are captured in the OPA's charges, which are not part of the OPA's Revenue Requirement Submission.

POLLUTION PROBE INTERROGATORY 5

QUESTION

Issue 3.1, Reference: Exhibit B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, page 5

Please state the amount of the \$7,836,000 generation procurement budget that is allocated to the procurement of new combined heat and power ("CHP") resources. Please further break-out the new CHP procurement budget according to at least the following categories:

- a) bi-lateral negotiations with large industrial consumers (e.g. St. Marys Paper, AbitibiBowater);
- b) small clean energy standard offer program; and
- c) other.

For the purposes of this interrogatory, please note that new CHP does not include re-negotiated NUG contracts.

RESPONSE

Out of the \$7,836,000 generation procurement budget, \$320,000 has been allocated for all CHP procurements. Further break-out to the categories stated above has not been conducted. The OPA will be examining specific system needs, locational constraints and capacity remaining after the FIT launch period. These factors will affect the timing and specific procurement mechanism for launching one or more CHP procurements as mentioned above in 2010.

POLLUTION PROBE INTERROGATORY 6

QUESTION

Issue 3.1, Reference: Ex. B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, page 5

Please state the amount (in MW) of new CHP capacity that the OPA expects to contract for in 2010. Please break-out this forecast according to at least the following categories:

- a) bi-lateral negotiations with large industrial consumers (e.g., St Marys Paper, AbitibiBowater);
- b) small clean energy standard offer program; and
- c) other.

For the purposes of this interrogatory, please note that new CHP does not include re-negotiated NUG contracts.

RESPONSE

In the event that a new CHP procurement is launched in 2010, the amount of contracted MW will likely align with the total amount of outstanding capacity to be procured under the 2005 Combined Heat and Power Directive. Approximately 500 MW remains to be contracted under this Directive. Additional capacity could also be procured through the Clean Energy Standard Offer Program ("CESOP").

The OPA is still examining the specific system needs and locational constraints (after assessing the FIT launch period); these factors affect the timing and specific procurement mechanism for launching one or more CHP procurements mentioned above in 2010.

Based on preliminary information, the amount of capacity that could potentially be contracted is as follows (broken down according to requested categories):

- a) Capacity related to bi-lateral negotiations with large industrial consumers (St. Mary's, Abitibi Bowater) is approximately 70 MW;
- b) Capacity related to smaller clean projects that could be procured through a clean energy standard offer program is approximately 150 MW based on information collected from parties that have expressed interest to the OPA;
- c) All other CHP projects total approximately 1,000 MW, based on information collected from parties that have expressed interest to the OPA.

