VINCENT J. DEROSE

direct tel.: (613) 787-3589 e-mail: vderose@blgcanada.com

Kirsten Walli Board Secretary Ontario Energy Board

P.O. Box 2319 27th floor

August 26, 2010

2300 Yonge Street

Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms Walli,

Hydro One Networks Inc. ("Hydro One")

2011-2012 Transmission Rates

Board File No.:

EB-2010-0002

Our File No.:

339583-000057

Please find attached the evidence of Bruce Sharp from Aegent Energy Advisors Inc. ("Aegent"), which is being filed on behalf of Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters ("CME").

Yours very truly,

Vincent J. DeRose

VJD\slc enclosures

C .

Anne-Marie Reilly (Hydro One) EB-2010-0002 Intervenors

Paul Clipsham

OTT01\4169965\1

to . Vand

.....

Montrópi

27.00



Ontario Electricity Total Bill Impact Analysis August 2011 to July 2015

About Aegent Energy Advisors

Aegent Energy Advisors Inc. ("Aegent") is a consulting company providing independent, objective advice to large energy buyers on all aspects of their electricity and natural gas procurement. Aegent specializes in helping buyers to reduce commodity cost, manage commodity price risk, and optimize utility contracts.

More on Aegent can be found at www.aegent.ca.

Background

With all of the changes the Ontario electricity industry is undergoing, it is clear there will be future cost increases and resulting customer impacts. Related to the Ontario Energy Board ("OEB") process for considering Hydro One's application for transmission rate increases for 2011 and 2012 (EB-2010-0002), Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters ("CME") commissioned Aegent to develop a total bill impact analysis of increases over the next five years. CME takes the position that the total bill impact of any specific utility rate application the OEB considers cannot be evaluated by simply considering utility-specific changes to line items in the electricity bill and holding everything else constant. Rather, there is a need to consider the total bill impact of what a particular utility is proposing in conjunction with everything else in the electricity bill that is simultaneously changing.

CME asked Aegent to provide this analysis because Aegent has experience in estimating total bill impacts of this nature. An example of this type of analysis was released by Aegent in March 2010 in a report. A copy of this is attached at Tab A.

This document provides a discussion of the method Aegent has applied and the results of the analysis. These materials have been prepared by Mr. Bruce Sharp of Aegent. Mr. Sharp, whose curriculum vitae is attached at Tab B, will testify to support this analysis.

The information upon which this analysis is based includes information published by the Ontario Power Authority ("OPA"), the Independent Electricity System Operator ("IESO"), Ontario electricity distributors, and rate case filings with the OEB made by Hydro One Networks Inc. ("Hydro One") and Ontario Power Generation Inc. ("OPG"). Almost all of these entities, except some of the electricity distributors, are owned by the Government of Ontario, and all are entities over which the OEB exercises regulatory authority.

Aegent does not have access to the five (5) year Business Plans of these entities. Accordingly, where necessary, this analysis provides Aegent's estimates, based on assumptions that it considers to be reasonable and conservative, of the electricity price implications of the five (5) year Business Plans of these entities that will have an influence on elements of the electricity bill. Aegent readily acknowledges that entities such as the OEB or the Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure ("MEI" or the Ministry of Energy), with an ability to access the five (5) year Business Plans of the OPA, IESO, Hydro One, OPG and other transmitters and distributors the OEB regulates, are in a position to provide any information that is needed to better align Aegent's estimates with the contents of those five (5) year Business Plans.

It is possible that the OEB and/or the MEI have already prepared total bill impact reports of the type presented in this analysis. If they are conducting total bill impact studies, then the results of those studies or reports should be made public. They are urgently needed by manufacturers and other consumers for business planning purposes.

Time Period Covered

This analysis assumes that there will be no lag in the bill impact of utility cost increases for a particular year for which the OEB sets prospective test period rates. Cost increases derived from information on file with the OEB are assumed to have an effect on the bill in each particular year for which those costs are either forecast or estimated to be incurred. For other cost increases, including those linked to procurements by the OPA, the analysis assumes that there will be a lag between the contracting commitments made by the OPA and the total bill impact of those procurement arrangements. The analysis assumes that commitments made between August of one year and July of the ensuing year will affect electricity bills in that ensuing year, so that costs reflected in OPA publications pertaining to the period August 2010 to July 2011 will be reflected in the analysis for the year 2011. Procurement commitments made by the OPA in the period between August 2011 and July 2012 will be reflected in the analysis for the year 2012. The same method is applied to estimate cost increases for 2013, 2014, and for early 2015.

Cost Increase Elements

The following cost increase elements, shown with the residential bill areas they fall under, were evaluated:

cost increase element	bill area	table
Feed-In-Tariff (FIT)	Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	1a, 1b, 1c
Renewable Energy Standard Offer Program (RESOP)	Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	2
Renewables (other)	Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	3
Bruce Power (existing)	Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	4
Bruce Power (new)	Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	5
OPG	Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	6
Natural Gas	Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	7
Non-Utility Generators (NUGs)	Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	8
Conservation and Demand Management (CDM)	Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	9
Transmission	Delivery or Regulatory	10a, 10b, 10c
Distribution (non-Green Energy Act)	Delivery	11
Distribution (Green Energy Act)	Delivery or Regulatory	12

Excluded Cost Increase Elements - Already in Effect

The following cost increase elements have already come into effect for residential consumers:

- a) Two-tier RPP rate increase This increase came into effect May 1, 2010. For consumers using 800 kWh per month, this increase amounted to \$7.10/MWh (12 month impact).
- b) TOU RPP increase This has affected some residential consumers, with most to follow. The cost increase is in the order of \$ 4/MWh.
- c) Special Purpose Charge Effective May 1, 2010 many or most local distribution companies began collecting this from customers. The rate/increase is \$ 0.38/MWh.
- d) HST Introduction of the Harmonized Sales Tax on July 1, 2010 resulted in the sales tax on electricity increasing from 5 % to 13 % -- a residential bill impact. The additional 8 % adds about \$ 9/MWh to an approximate, previous GST-exclusive residential unit rate of about \$ 115/MWh.

The total of items a) to c) is about \$ 11.50/MWh (no HST) or \$ 13/MWh with HST. In combination with item d), the total bill impact of the items already in effect is about \$ 22/MWh. This is an increase of about 18% from a previous GST- inclusive

unit price of about \$ 120/MWh. Increases included in this analysis are additive, though there is some overlap with these excluded items (in the order of \$ 3/MWh).

Excluded Cost Increase Elements - Other

The following elements were not included in the analysis as they have non-uniform and/or uncertain impacts:

- a) Industrial "time-of use" rates This concerns the reallocation of Global Adjustment / Provincial Benefit costs, from a
 postage-stamp basis to one determined by coincident peak demands.
- b) Coincident peak allocation of future transmission costs Similar to the Global Adjustment/Provincial Benefit reallocation noted above, the same could occur with transmission. Even with transmission rates rising rapidly, there are less total dollars involved and so if this occurs the ultimate (into 2015) increase would likely be less than \$ 0.50/MWh.
- c) IESO Smart Grid investment These costs may arise in the future but as of this date the IESO has not identified any significant related costs in its most recent Business Plan (2010 2012).
- d) Ancillary services The integration of a huge amount of new generation will most likely lead to significant operating challenges, which in turn will result in increased ancillary services (including operating reserve and regulation service) costs.

General Methodology

The following general methodology was used in analyzing each cost increase element:

- a) Calculate cost in reference time period prior to first increase period, if applicable (\$ million)
- b) Calculate cumulative cost in forecast periods (\$ million)
- c) Cumulative increase for each forecast period is value or value less reference period value (\$ million)
- d) Use IESO total annual energy consumption forecast (and escalated) values (TWh)
- e) Calculate cumulative unit cost increase values (\$/MWh)
- f) Increases will manifest themselves through increases to the Global Adjustment/Provincial Benefit, transmission distribution and possibly regulatory charges.

Methodology Details

The following methodologies were used in analyzing groups of or individual cost increase elements:

FIT, RESOP, Renewables (other), Bruce Power (new)

- For each period, subtract reference spot price from contract price to arrive at premium over spot price in \$/MWh
- Estimate MW quantities added each period
- Calculate cumulative MW quantities to end of each period
- Use capacity factors and 8,760 hours in year to arrive at cumulative MWh to the end of each period
- Cumulative \$, to end of period = cumulative MWh, to end of period x \$/MWh
- Cumulative increase \$ = cumulative \$ (all "new" so no reference required to prior to Aug10)

Bruce Power (existing)

- For each period, subtract reference spot price from contract price to arrive at premium over spot price in \$/MWh
- Use current, uniform MW quantity in each period
- Apply capacity factors and 8,760 hours in year to arrive at cumulative MWh in each period
- Cumulative \$ to end of each period = cumulative MWh x \$/MWh

Cumulative increase \$, to end of each period = cumulative \$, in each period less cumulative \$, prior to Aug10

OPG, NUGs

- Subtract reference spot price from contract price to arrive at premium over spot price in \$/MWh
- Use annual TWh quantities for each period
- Calculate premium-over-spot \$ in period = \$/MWh x MWh
- Increase \$ to end of period = premium-over-spot \$ in period less same, prior to Aug10

Natural Gas

- Estimate MW quantities added each period
- Calculate cumulative MW quantities to end of each period
- Estimate contingent support payment rates (\$/MW/year)
- Cumulative \$ to end of each period = cumulative MW x \$/MW/year
- Cumulative increase \$ = cumulative \$

CDM

- Estimate expenditures in each period
- Cumulative increase \$, to end of each period = cumulative \$, to end of period less cumulative \$, prior to Aug10

Transmission

- Determine / estimate Rates Revenue Requirement in reference and each forecast period
- Cumulative increase \$, to end of each period = cumulative \$, to end of period less cumulative \$, prior to Aug10

Distribution (non-GEA)

- Use 2009 total Ontario LDC distribution revenue (OEB's 2009 Yearbook of Electricity Distributors)
- Estimate annual increase percentages
- Calculate increased annual revenues
- Cumulative increase \$, to end of each period = revenue, each period less revenue, 2010

Distribution (GEA)

- Use Hydro One Distribution Green Energy Act data to extrapolate total Green Energy Act investment by all Ontario LDCs
- Determine / estimate Rates Revenue Requirement in reference and each forecast period
- Cumulative increase \$, to end of each period = cumulative \$, to end of period less cumulative \$, prior to Aug10

Commodity Price Assumptions

For this analysis we define the total commodity price for electricity as being comprised of the spot price of electricity and the Global Adjustment (the "GA"). By spot price we generally refer to the arithmetic average price of electricity, also referred to as the Hourly Ontario Energy Price ("HOEP"). The GA is also referred to as the Provincial Benefit on local distribution company ("LDC") – served customers' electricity bills).

HOEP-GA Interaction

There is a clear interaction between the spot price of electricity and the GA. When spot prices fall, the GA rises and vice versa. This occurs because the government and its agencies have entered into electricity supply arrangements that cover off a very large majority of Ontario electricity supply requirements. The majority of these contracts included fixed prices (some with escalators). With the huge amount of contracted generation coming in to service over the next five years, virtually no new supply will be un-contracted and so this interaction will become even stronger.

The dynamic is more complex than that but for the purposes of this analysis we assume that the combination of HOEP and the GA are generally fixed. This means that a lower spot price is offset by a correspondingly higher GA and vice versa.

Uniform Forecast of HOEP

We also assume that HOEP is fixed during the forecast period. This simplifies the analysis related to most of the generation-related elements, by taking away the need to forecast and incorporate HOEP and the GA for each year analyzed. Even if different HOEP forecast values were used for each period, HOEP-GA interaction assumption would have an offsetting impact, resulting in the same reference total commodity price and rendering varying annual HOEP values moot.

Reference Spot Market Prices

Based on the monthly behavior of HOEP and the GA over the last six to twelve months, we estimate the current, total commodity price to be approximately \$ 65/MWh, comprised of HOEP at \$ 38/MWh and the GA at \$ 27/MWh. For most of the new generation sources with fixed-price contracts, we assume they will be paid \$ 38/MWh from the spot market and then be "made whole" through payments funded through the GA. Solar and NUG projects are the exception – as they produce energy during higher-priced daylight and on-peak hours. We assume they will be paid \$ 48/MWh from the spot market, with the remainder funded through the GA.

Other Assumptions

This analysis includes a number of assumptions. Some relate to forecast years beyond test periods documented in OEB rate cases; in those cases we assumed similar and/or moderate increases in future years. In all cases we have tried to be reasonable and err on the side of being conservative, i.e. the low side.

One major assumption of note is the amount of FIT generation that will come into service during the forecast period. For our analysis, we assume a total of 10,500 MW of FIT generation will come online by July 2015. This is comprised of 8,000 MW of FIT applications received by the OPA as of April 2010 and 2,500 MW of Samsung wind and solar projects.

Incremental Surplus from New Generation

Using near-term IESO forecasts and similar escalation rates, we estimate that annual Ontario energy consumption will grow by 6.2 TWh between 2010 and 2015. By 2015, the new generation (FIT, remaining RESOP, other renewable, new Bruce Power) identified in this analysis will produce an approximate 41 TWh (25.9 + 1.4 + 1.5 + 12.0) of incremental annual energy.

Generation that will or could be retired or otherwise out of service in the next few years includes coal (10 TWh in 2009) and nuclear (OPG's Pickering B: 2,160 MW at a capacity factor of 85% ~ 16 TWh), for a total of about 26 TWh. Not included in this number is the inevitable contribution of energy from incremental natural gas generation, required for system operability and other purposes.

That leaves an incremental surplus of at least 15 TWh. Possible consequences of this surplus include:

- a) Displacement of OPG's unregulated generation
- b) Displacement of Bruce Power or renewable output, both with possible take-or-pay implications
- c) Significantly increased surplus base load generation
- d) Significantly increased (and subsidized) exports

Concerning the potential for renewable-related take-or-pay or curtailment events, if just 10% or 2.9 TWh of new renewable energy output by 2015 had to be dispatched off and still paid the above-market premium (an average of over \$ 140/MWh), the impact would be \$ 406 million. It should be noted however that in the context of this analysis this would not be additional as the above-market cost is already accounted for.

Results

Throughout the analysis we have used nominal (i.e. non-constant) dollars.

Cumulative Increase, Total Dollars (\$ million)

The cumulative total dollar increase from 2011 to early 2015 is \$ 7.739 billion. The cumulative dollar increase for each element and in total, on a year-by-year basis, is shown below:

element	2011	2012	2013	2014	е	arly 2015
Feed-In-Tariff (FIT)	\$ 481	\$ 963	\$ 1,444	\$ 2,646	\$	3,848
Renewable Energy Standard Offer Program (RESOP)	\$ •	\$ 110	\$ 220	\$ 330	\$	330
Renewables (other)	\$ -	\$ 7	\$ 36	\$ 66	\$	96
Bruce Power (existing)	\$ 14	\$ 29	\$ 43	\$ 58	\$	74
Bruce Power (new)	\$ •	\$ 377	\$ 404	\$ 443	\$	461
OPG	\$ 234	\$ 304	\$ 166	\$ 166	\$	237
Natural Gas	\$ 57	\$ 86	\$ 111	\$ 111	\$	192
Non-Utility Generators (NUGs)	\$ 94	\$ 197	\$ 158	\$ 258	\$	170
Conservation and Demand Management (CDM)	\$ 105	\$ 187	\$ 226	\$ 265	\$	267
Transmission	\$ 189	\$ 299	\$ 505	\$ 704	\$	1,012
Distribution (non-Green Energy Act)	\$ 80	\$ 163	\$ 206	\$ 249	\$	293
Distribution (Green Energy Act)	\$ 156	\$ 310	\$ 465	\$ 615	\$	759
total	\$ 1,411	\$ 3,032	\$ 3,986	\$ 5,911	\$	7,739

Annual Energy

The following Ontario total annual energy consumption values were used. The 2011 value is the IESO's most recent weather-normalized forecast. We used the same energy quantity for 2012 – 2015 as we believe that increased conservation and demand management efforts will offset load growth that would otherwise take place.

for	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Ontario annual energy, TWh	142.9	142.9	142.9	142.9	142.9

Cumulative Increase, Unit Cost, (\$/MWh)

The cumulative unit cost increase from 2011 to early 2015 is \$ 54.15/MWh (no HST) and \$ 61.19/MWh with HST. The GST/HST-exclusive cumulative increases for each element and in total, on a year-by-year basis, are shown below:

element	2011	2012	2013	2014	•	early 2015
Feed-In-Tariff (FIT)	\$ 3.37	\$ 6.74	\$ 10.11	\$ 18.52	\$	26.93
Renewable Energy Standard Offer Program (RESOP)	\$ -	\$ 0.77	\$ 1.54	\$ 2.31	\$	2.31
Renewables (other)	\$ •	\$ 0.05	\$ 0.25	\$ 0.46	\$	0.67
Bruce Power (existing)	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.20	\$ 0.30	\$ 0.41	\$	0.52
Bruce Power (new)	\$ -	\$ 2.64	\$ 2.83	\$ 3.10	\$	3.22
OPG	\$ 1.63	\$ 2.13	\$ 1.16	\$ 1.16	\$	1.66
Natural Gas	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.78	\$ 0.78	\$	1.35
Non-Utility Generators (NUGs)	\$ 0.66	\$ 1.38	\$ 1.11	\$ 1.80	\$	1.19
Conservation and Demand Management (CDM)	\$ 0.73	\$ 1.31	\$ 1.58	\$ 1.85	\$	1.87
Transmission	\$ 1.32	\$ 2.09	\$ 3.53	\$ 4.92	\$	7.08
Distribution (non-Green Energy Act)	\$ 0.56	\$ 1.14	\$ 1.44	\$ 1.74	\$	2.05
Distribution (Green Energy Act)	\$ 1.09	\$ 2.17	\$ 3.26	\$ 4.30	\$	5.31
total	\$ 9.87	\$ 21.22	\$ 27.90	\$ 41.36	\$	54.15

Unit Cost Impacts

Non-Residential

Unit costs can vary greatly, depending on load characteristics and LDC rates.

Based on the forecast total unit cost increase and depending on the reference unit cost, by early 2015, non-residential consumers would see their total unit cost rise by 47% - 64% (over the increase already experienced in 2010). This is equivalent to an average, annual, compounded increase of 8.0% – 10.4% (again, over the increase already experienced in 2010).

The table below shows the unit cost impacts for August 2010 reference unit costs ranging from \$ 85/MWh to \$ 115/MWh. This range has been selected as being representative of the total bill unit cost that small to large manufacturers currently pay. Note that all unit rates shown in the table below exclude GST/HST.

	mulative ocrease	\$ 9.87	\$ 21.22	\$ 27.90	\$ 41.36	\$	54.15	% increas	se, Aug10 - Jul15
Aug	gust 2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	ea	arly 2015	total	average annual (compounded)
\$	85.00	\$ 94.87	\$ 106.22	\$ 112.90	\$ 126.36	\$	139.15	63.7%	10.4%
\$	90.00	\$ 99.87	\$ 111.22	\$ 117.90	\$ 131.36	\$	144.15	60.2%	9.9%
\$	95.00	\$ 104.87	\$ 116.22	\$ 122.90	\$ 136.36	\$	149.15	57.0%	9.4%
\$	100.00	\$ 109.87	\$ 121.22	\$ 127.90	\$ 141.36	\$	154.15	54.2%	9.0%
\$	105.00	\$ 114.87	\$ 126.22	\$ 132.90	\$ 146.36	\$	159.15	51.6%	8.7%
\$	110.00	\$ 119.87	\$ 131.22	\$ 137.90	\$ 151.36	\$	164.15	49.2%	8.3%
\$	115.00	\$ 124.87	\$ 136.22	\$ 142.90	\$ 156.36	\$	169.15	47.1%	8.0%

Residential

This metric is included in this analysis as it is one the board is familiar with and regularly applies. Unit costs can vary greatly, depending on LDC rates.

Based on the forecast total unit cost increase and depending on the reference unit cost, by early 2015, residential consumers would see their total unit cost rise by 38% - 47% (over the significant increase already experienced in 2010). This is equivalent to an average, annual, compounded increase of 6.7 – 8.0% (again, over the significant increase already experienced in 2010).

The table below shows the unit cost impacts for August 2010, HST-inclusive reference unit costs ranging from \$ 130/MWh to \$ 160/MWh.

cumulative	no HST	\$ 9.87	\$	21.22	\$ 27.90	\$ 41.36	\$	54.15	9/ incres	se, Aug10 - Jul15
increase	with HST	\$ 11.15	\$	23.97	\$ 31.52	\$ 46.74	\$	61.19	/o II ICI ea	se, Aug 10 - Jul 15
			W	ith HST					total	average annual
Augus	t 2010	2011		2012	2013	2014	ea	rly 2015	ισιαι	(compounded)
\$13	0.00	\$ 141.15	\$	153.97	\$ 161.52	\$ 176.74	\$	191.19	47.1%	8.0%
\$13	5.00	\$ 146.15	\$	158.97	\$ 166.52	\$ 181.74	\$	196.19	45.3%	7.8%
\$14	0.00	\$ 151.15	\$	163.97	\$ 171.52	\$ 186.74	\$	201.19	43.7%	7.5%
\$14	5.00	\$ 156.15	\$	168.97	\$ 176.52	\$ 191.74	\$	206.19	42.2%	7.3%
\$15	0.00	\$ 161.15	\$	173.97	\$ 181.52	\$ 196.74	\$	211.19	40.8%	7.1%
\$15	5.00	\$ 166.15	\$	178.97	\$ 186.52	\$ 201.74	\$	216.19	39.5%	6.9%
\$16	0.00	\$ 171.15	\$	183.97	\$ 191.52	\$ 206.74	\$	221.19	38.2%	6.7%

TAB A



Client Login



SERVICES	CLIENTS RESOURCES NEWS	ABOUT CONTA
	Home > News >	Insights
Past Newsletter	Beware the Electricity Cost	Outside One F
Articles »	Iceberg	Ontario's Green Energy / A Major Shift Read more»
	 The Ontario Government's recently announced green levy or tax of \$4/year for a typical residential consumer is only a small part of the total electricity bill increase that will occur by the end of 2011. By the end of 2011, green levy, smart meter, generation and HST-related increases will cause the typical residential bill to rise by 26% or \$304. Residential consumers moving to the Smart Meter Regulated Price Plan will see their costs rise by \$50/year. Pending generation cost increases will cause the typical residential bill to rise by \$30/year, and future generation cost increases will cause a further increase of \$122/year. Combined with near-term cost increases, the HST will add \$98/year to the typical residential bill On March 20, the Ontario Government announced a green levy or tax on electricity that will take effect soon. The levy is intended to help cover the government's conservation and green energy program. The cost to a typical residential electricity consumer is only \$4 per year and yet many are up in arms over it. The problem is this cost is only a small portion of what consumers will 	Subscribe to Aegent Update Your email: Privacy by SafeSubscr Sample »: Privacy Policy
	see over the next eighteen or so months - the tip of an approaching iceberg.	
	Above the Water Line	
	Although it has drawn a lot of attention in the press, the new \$4 levy for a typical residential consumer with modest, annual consumption of 10,000 kWh is relatively minor. The charge is based on a total annual collection of about \$54 million. Spread across all Ontario users, it works out to about 0.04 cents/kWh. This cost increase is insignificant compared to other, less-obvious increases, some pending and others expected in the future.	
	Ontario Power Generation (OPG) has announced an application for a 9.6% increase (about 0.5 cents/kWh) on the rates paid for its regulated generation, which represents about 47% of Ontario consumption. In the past, OPG has not received its full requested increase. If this time around they were to receive say 2/3 or about 0.3 cents/kWh of the increase, the residential bill impact would be 0.15 cents/kWh or \$15/year.	
	Also pending is the Harmonized Sales Tax (HST) that will take effect July 1, 2010. It will add 8% or \$92 to a current typical residential bill. The HST will also have the compound effect of adding 8% to all other cost increases that are incurred down the road. The HST is a fiscal policy, not an energy policy, but consumers will see that as a distinction without a difference when their energy bill arrives in August.	

Below the Water Line - Smart Meters

In May 2009, the Ontario Government set targets for the number of consumers on time-of-use rates under the Regulated Price Plan (RPP). This plan is also commonly referred to as the Smart Meter RPP. As of the end of 2009, Ontario utilities had installed about 3.4 million smart meters and about 350,000 residential consumers were on smart meter rates. By the summer of 2010, 1 million consumers are to pay these rates while by June 2011, the target is 3.6 million consumers.

Unfortunately, there are cost impacts with the Smart Meter RPP.

Typical residential consumers will see a cost increase when moving from the conventional RPP rates to the new Smart Meter RPP, because of a difference in how the rates allocate costs. The conventional RPP rate charges a lower energy cost to smaller volume users, something that tends to benefit residential consumers because they are subsidized by commercial or institutional users (whose use is greater). When they move to Smart Meter RPP rates, these customers will pay for energy based on time of use, and will no longer get a small volume discount rate. Residential consumers will see a cost increase of 0.38 cents/kWh or \$38/year from the loss of this small volume discount that was imbedded in the conventional RPP rate.

The second Smart Meter cost impact is the assumed load profile used to set the Smart Meter RPP prices - currently 9.3, 8.0 and 4.4 cents/kWh for the on-, mid- and off-peak periods. Ostensibly, the OEB set these rates to recover the same average revenue used in setting the conventional meter rates. In so doing, the OEB identified two different load profiles - one for a typical Smart Meter RPP consumer and one for those with conventional or energy meters. If not on the RPP, the latter group would be charged for electricity based on an assumed load profile; namely, their utility's Net System Load Shape or NSLS. Close examination of Toronto Hydro's 2009 NSLS, however, indicates that if that collective group switched to Smart Meter RPP rates, they would pay 6.34 cents/kWh. The additional cost of 0.12 cents/kWh equates to \$12/year for a typical residential consumer.

(Once all RPP consumers have moved to the Smart Meter RPP, revenues will reach an equilibrium state and the 0.12 cent/kWh or \$12/year increase should disappear.)

Individual consumers who move to the Smart Meter RPP may in fact see an energy cost decrease based on their energy use profile. Our comments here address the overall impact on the average residential users.

The total impact of the Smart Meter increases is therefore 0.50 cents/kWh or \$50/year for a typical residential consumer.

Below the Water Line - Pending Generation Cost Increases

A number of factors have caused the actual costs underlying the Regulated Price Plans to be higher than anticipated. General RPP rates will therefore rise to cover these higher actual costs and the unfavourable variance that has accumulated since November 2009. The new rates that take effect May 1 will be announced in mid-April. Aegent's current estimate for the RPP increase is 0.30 - 0.40 cents/kWh. Choosing the lower value, the increase for a typical residential consumer is \$30/year.

It's worth noting that the RPP rate increases could be higher,

depending on the extent to which the OEB anticipates future cost increases and includes them in the rates established for May 1.

Below the Water Line - Near-term, Future Generation Cost Increases

A number of generation plants are coming online, under a variety of Ontario Power Authority programs. All plants will be paid above-market rates or receive other supporting payments. The estimated cost impacts are shown in the table that follows.

generation type	estimated contract cost, ¢/kWh	increase, ¢/kWh per 1,000 MW added	MW added in 2010 and 2011	resulting cost increase, ¢/kWh	\$/year for residential consumer
natural gas- fired	\$75,000/M W/year	0.05	900	0.05	5
nuclear	7	0.16	1,500	0.24	24
RESOP - wind	14.1 (FIT pricing, as below)	0.22	300	0.07	<i>₁</i> 7
RESOP - solar	44.3 (FIT)	0.38	500	0.19	.19
FIT – solar	44.3	0.38	500	0.19	19
FIT – wind	14.1	0.22	1,500 (estimated)	0.33 \$1.07	33 \$107

Notes and Assumptions:

- increases calculated relative to base spot price of 4.0 cents/kWh
- costs spread across Ontario total annual consumption of 141 TWh
- natural gas-fired: Clean Energy, Combined Heat and Power; cost is conservative Deemed Dispatch Payment
- 4. nuclear capacity factor of 85%
- RESOP is Renewable Energy Standard Offer Program, precursor to Feed-In-Tariff program (FIT); majority of RESOP projects assumed to be paid FIT prices
- wind assumed to be 90% onshore, 10% offshore with combined capacity factor of 31%
- wind assumed to require natural gas fired back-up and enabling wires investments
- solar assumed to be ground-mounted and less than 10 MW, capacity factor of 15%

As noted earlier, some of these cost increases could affect the new RPP rates that will take effect on May 1, 2010.

Summary of Cost Increases

Aegent's analysis indicates that by the end of 2011, a typical residential consumer could see a total cost increase of 3.04 cents/kWh or \$304/year in their electricity bill. This represents a 26% increase over their current total cost of electricity. The components of the increase are:

source of increase	resulting cost increase, ¢/kWh	\$/year for residential consumer
green levy <i>i</i> tax	0.04	4
Smart Meter RPP	0.5	50
pending generation cost increases	0.3	30
HST (based on new, imminent total cost of 12.3 ¢/kWh)	0.98	98
sub-total, increases in next 9 months	1.82	182
near-term, future OPG	0.15	15
near-term, other future generation		
cost increases	1.07	107
total increase to end of 2011	3.04	\$304

Looking Ahead

In a future article, look for Aegent to discuss a cost increase wildcard: largely-fixed costs such as transmission and distribution and how Ontario's recent step-change drop in total consumption could cause associated unit cost increases. We'll also discuss how conservation may generate lower savings than expected and how non-conserving entities will see their total electricity costs rise as they shoulder more of the fixed-cost burden.

Ontario's Green Energy Act: A Major Shift Read more»

Home Services Clients Resources News About Contact Privacy Policy | Disclaimer

416 622-9449 info@aegi © 2001 - 2009 Aegent Energy Advisors Inc. All rights rest

TAB B

BRUCE SHARP, P. Eng.

SUMMARY

Bruce is Aegent Energy Advisor's senior resource in electricity consulting. Bruce holds a Bachelor of Applied Science degree in Mechanical Engineering from the University of Waterloo and has 23 years of experience in the energy business. Bruce is a professional engineer and a Chartered Industrial Gas Consultant.

Prior to joining Aegent, and as principal of his own company, Bruce provided independent advice to medium- and large-volume consumers of electricity and to small generators, on purchasing power and operating in the new Ontario market. As Manager, Power Products and Services with Engage Energy, he was actively involved in the design, sale, and delivery of client products and services targeted at the commodity segment of the electricity business. Bruce's professional experience also includes work at Ontario Hydro as an industrial energy advisor and at The Consumers' Gas Company Limited working with industrial and commercial customers.

Bruce has been a repeat speaker at industry conferences on the topic of practical power procurement strategies, and copies of these presentations are available on Aegent's web site. Bruce has been widely quoted in the press for his insightful analysis of the economic implications of government energy policy decisions.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2002 - Present	Aegent Energy Advisors Inc. Senior Consultant
2001 - 2002	Sharp Energy Advice Principal
1998 - 2001	Engage Energy Canada, L.P. / Encore Energy Solutions, L.P. Manager, Power Products & Services
1995 - 1997	The Consumers' Gas Company Limited Manager, Industrial Product Marketing Industrial Utilization Consultant
1987 - 1993	Ontario Hydro Industrial Energy Advisor Assistant Engineer, Hydraulic Generation

Engineering Trainee, Hydraulic Generation

TAB C

		contract price by year, \$/MWh	reference spot market price, \$/MWh	premium over spot market, \$/MWh	et,
	biomass < 10 MW	\$ 138	\$ 38	↔	100 contract prices as per OPA FIT schedule August 13, 2010; non-solar contract prices DO
	biomass > 10 MW	\$ 130	\$ 38	↔	92 NOT INCLUDE 20%-of-CPI escalator
	biogas, on-farm < 100 kW	\$ 195	\$ 38		157
_	biogas, on-farm 100 to 250 kW	\$ 185	\$ 38	€9	147
_	biogas < 500 kW	\$ 160	\$ 38	€9	122
	biogas > 500 kW to 10 MW	\$ 147	\$ 38	€9	109
	biogas > 10 MW	\$ 104	\$ 38	ss	99
_	water < 10 MW	\$ 131	\$ 38	€	63
_	water > 10 MW	\$ 122	\$ 38	₩	84
	landfill < 10 MW	\$ 111	\$ 38	↔	73
	landfill > 10 MW	\$ 103	\$ 38	€	65
•	solar, rooftop < 10 kW	\$ 802	\$ 48	s	754 solar reference spot price at estimated premium to HOEP
••	solar, rooftop 10 to 250 kW	\$ 713	\$ 48	s	999
٠,	solar, rooftop 250 to 500 kW	\$ 635	\$ 48	€9	587
•	solar, rooftop > 500 kW	\$ 539	\$ 48	٠ جه	491
٠,	solar, ground < 10 kW	\$ 642	\$ 48	⇔	594
•	solar, ground > 500 kW	\$ 443	\$ 48	s	395
	wind, on shore	\$ 135	\$ 38	s	26
_	wind,offshore	\$ 190	\$ 38		152

T1b - element = FIT / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)

comments

added during / to end of	Aug10 - Jul11	Aug11 - Jul12	Aug12 - Jul13	Aug13 - Jul14	Aug14 - Jul15	
quantity added during year, MW	c	C		,	1	
DIOMESS < 10 MIV	C: 6	e: 9	9.5	75.8 8.6	15.8	
biomass > 10 MWV biomas on farm < 100 kW	•	•	•	•	•	subsequent year quantities in same proportions; exception is last two years, when 50% of
Diogas, Ortiginal 100 NV	, ,	, ,		, !	, !	each of Samsung project types is added
biogas, on-farm 100 to 250 kW	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.7	1.7	
biogas < 500 kW	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.3	3.3	
biogas > 500 kW to 10 MW	8.0	8.0	8.0	13.3	13.3	
biogas > 10 MW	•	•	•	•	•	
water < 10 MW	96.5	96.5	96.5	160.0	160.0	
water > 10 MW	•	•	•	•	•	
landfill < 10 MW	7.5	7.5	7.5	12.4	12.4	
landfill > 10 MW	•	•	•	•	•	
solar, rooftop < 10 kW	•	•	•	•	•	
solar, rooftop 10 to 250 kW	•	•	•	•	•	
solar, rooftop 250 to 500 kW	51.0	51.0	51.0	84.6	84.6	
solar, rooftop > 500 kW	•	•		•	•	
solar, ground < 10 kW	•	•	•	•	•	
solar, ground > 10 kW to 10 MW	326.0	326.0	326.0	790.6	790.6	
wind, onshore	615.0	615.0	615.0	2,019.9	2,019.9	
wind,offshore	150.0	150.0	150.0	248.7	248.7	
total	1,267	1,267	1,267	3,350	3,350	
quantity, end-year, MW						
biomass < 10 MW	9.5	19.0	28.5	44.3	0.09	
biomass > 10 MW	•	•	•	•	•	
biogas, on-farm < 100 kW	•	•	•	•		
biogas, on-farm 100 to 250 kW	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.7	6.3	
biogas < 500 kW	2.0	4.0	0.9	9.3	12.6	
biogas > 500 kW to 10 MW	8.0	16.0	24.0	37.3	50.5	
biogas > 10 MW	•	•	•	•		
water < 10 MW	96.5	193.0	289.5	449.5	9.609	
water > 10 MW	•	•	•	•	•	
landfill < 10 MW	7.5	15.0	22.5	34.9	47.4	
landfill > 10 MW	•	•	•	•	•	
solar, rooftop < 10 kW	•	•	•	ŧ	•	
solar, rooftop 10 to 250 kW	•		•		•	
solar, rooftop 250 to 500 kW	51.0	102.0	153.0	237.6	322.1	
solar, rooftop > 500 kW	•	•	í	•	1	
solar, ground < 10 kW		•	•	•	•	
solar, ground > 10 kW to 10 MW	326.0	652.0	978.0	1,768.6	2,559.2	2,559.2 includes Samsung, 250 MW in each of 13/14, 14/15
wind, on shore	615.0	1,230.0	1,845.0	3,864.9	5,884.7	includes Samsung, 1000 MW in each of 13/14, 14/15
wind,offshore	150.0	300.0	420.0	698.7	947.5	
total	1,267	2,533	3,800	7,150	10,500	2.533 MW approved to April 2010; 8,000 MW of applications received to April 2010; includes additional 2,500 MW from Samsung

Aug10-Jul11 Aug11-Jul12 Aug12-Jul13 Aug13-Jul14 Aug14-Jul15

Orogan or heart 10 MW 88% 70,737 14,444 21,211 220,515 44,616 or panely bactors as per CPA assumptions bronass + 10 MW Boogas or heart 10 MW 88% 7.46 44,622 22,2241 44,617 61,724 44,617 61,724 61	85% 70,737 85% 70,737 85% 70,737 85% 70,737 85% 7446 85% 7446 85% 89,588 85% 89,588 85% 70,737 85% 70,737 85% 70,737 80,7	w w	12,211 22,338 18,704 118,730 14,236 14,236 14,236 14,236 12,23 18,540 116,645 116,645	329,515 - 34,686 69,372 277,486 - 2,047,685 - 91,815 - 2,169,022 10,156,884 2,284,777 17,711,762	446,819 capacity 47,034 94,067 376,268 - 124,501 - 124,501 3,136,862 - 3,138,625 15,465,049 25,906,879
19 10 MW 85% 14 82 22.338 34.686 150 kW 85% 14 82 22.338 34.686 150 kW 85% 14 82 29.784 44.676 69.372 25.00 kW 10 kW 85% 19.577 87.748 178,704 277,486 277,486 27.748 10 kW 85% 19.77 87.748 178,704 277,486 27.748 277,486 27.748 27.7	85% 7446 85% 7446 85% 14,892 85% 59,568 85% 59,568 85% 439,577 52% 439,577 30% 19,710 30% 19,710 30% 14,00 30% 2,00 30% 30,00	w w	22,338 44,676 78,704 118,730 59,130 59,130 74,236 76,236 7	34,686 69,372 277,486 2,047,685 91,815 - 270,549 - 2,169,022 10,156,884 2,264,777 17,711,762	47,034 94,067 376,268 2,776,640 124,501 124,501 - 366,862 - 3,138,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879
On-Farm C100 WW 65% 7,446 14,892 22,338 3,686 4,10 FSON WW 65% 7,446 14,892 22,338 3,686 4,10 FSON WW 65% 39,588 119,136 178,704 277,466 376,2 FSON WW 52% 4,3857 87,154 41,570 274,466 376,2 10 MW 52% 4,3857 87,154 178,704 277,466 376,2 10 MW 52% 4,3857 87,154 178,704 277,466 376,2 10 MW 52% 19,710 39,420 59,130 91,815 177,66 10 MW 30% 19,710 39,420 59,130 91,815 174,66 10 MW 30% 19,710 39,420 59,130 91,815 174,66 10 MW 13% 13% 16,148 174,286 17,146 377,64 10 MW 14% 39,806 79,813 17,172 25,906 37,172 37,172	W 85% 746 85% 14,892 85% 85% 59,588 85% 25% 439,577 52% 19,710 30% 19,710 30% 13% 58,079 13% 399,806 30% 30% 486,180 37% 486,180 37% 389,806 37% 389,806 37% 389,806 37% 389,806 37% 389,806 37% 389,806 37% 389,806 37% 389,806 389,806 380% 389,806	w w	22,238 44,676 78,704 118,730 59,130 74,236 76,236 7	34,686 69,372 277,486 2,047,685 91,815 - 2,169,022 10,156,854 2,264,777 17,711,762	47,034 94,067 376,268 2,776,640 124,501 124,501 - 386,862 - 31,88,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879
OWAN BSSW 7,446 14,882 22,338 34,686 47,198 47,198 47,198 47,198 47,198 47,198 47,198 47,198 47,198 37,124	W 85% 7,446 85% 14,882 85% 59,588 85% 439,577 52% 439,770 30% 19,710 30% 19,710 31% - 13% 5,079 13% 389,806 30% 1,616,220 37% 466,120 37% 466,120 37% 466,120 37% 5,5	w w	22,338 704,4676 78,704 118,730 59,130 74,236 74,236 74,236 74,236 75,236 76,236 77,236	34,686 69,372 277,486 2,047,885 91,815 - 91,815 - 2,169,022 10,156,854 2,284,777 17,711,762	47,034 94,067 376,268 2,776,640 124,501 - 366,862 - 3,138,625 - 3,71,015 25,906,879 - 45
1,000,000	85% 14,892 85% 59,568 85% 439,577 52% 439,777 30% 19,710 30% 13% 13% 5,079 13% 399,806 30% 466,120 31,712,215 5 5 5	 	78,704 118,730 118,730 59,130 174,236	69,372 277,486 2,047,685 91,815 - 270,549 - 2,169,022 10,156,854 2,264,777 17,711,762	94,067 376,268 - 2,776,640 124,501 - 366,862 - 3,138,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879
10 MW 25% 19,568 119,156 118,704 277,466 277,569 10 MW 25% 19,710 30,420 59,130 2,047,665 2,7776 10 MW 25% 19,710 30,420 59,130 2,047,665 2,7776 10 MW 25% 19,710 30,420 59,130 31,815 1,24,5110 10 MW 13% 13,815 1,138,130 2,142,269 2,142,26	85% 59.568 85% 59.568 85% 439.577 52% 439.577 30% 19,710 30% 13% - 13% - 13% - 13% - 13% - 13% - 14% 399.806 30% 1,616.220 3 37% 486,180 30% 39,806 31,72,215 6 8 \$ 7 \$ \$, "	78,704 118,730 59,130 74,236 76,236 7	277,486 - 2,047,685 - 91,815 - 270,549 - 2,169,022 10,156,884 2,264,777 17,711,762	376,268 - 2,776,640 124,501 - 366,862 - 3,138,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879
10 MW 52% 43957 873,154 1318,730 2.047,685 2.776, 10 MW 52% 19,710 39,420 59,130 51,915 176, 10 MW 30% 10 MW 30% 19,710 39,420 59,130 51,915 176, 10 MW 30% 10 MW 30% 10 MW 30% 10 MW 13% 2.04,00 110 MW 13% 2.04,00 110 MW 14% 2.04,00 110 MW 20 MW	85% 439,577 52% 439,577 52% 439,577 52% 439,577 52% 19,710 30% 19,710 13% - 13% 58,079 13% - 14% 339,806 30% 16,16,220 37% 486,180 30% 16,16,220 37% 5,5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5		118,730 59,130 74,236 76,236 7	2,047,885 91,815 	2,776,640 124,501 124,501 3.06,862 3,138,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879
10 MW 52% 499 577 879 154 1318,730 2,047 686 2,776 10 MW 10	52% 439,577 52% 19,710 30% 19,710 30% 19,710 30% 13% - 13% 58,079 13% 14% 399,806 30% 1616,220 30% 1616,220 37% 486,180 30% 151,2215 5 5 5	w w	118,730 59,130 	2,047,685 91,815 - 91,815 - 2,169,022 10,156,884 2,284,777 17,711,762	2,776,640 124,501 3,138,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879
10 MWW 30% 19,710 39,420 59,130 91,815 1245 110 MWW 30% 19,710 39,420 59,130 91,815 1245 110 MWW 30% 13%	52% 19,710 30% 19,710 30% 13,710 13% 58,079 13% 58,079 14% 399,806 30% 1616,200 30% 1486,180 30% 30% 486,180 37% 486,180 37% 58, 2 \$	w w	29,130 	91,815 	124,501
19.WW 30% 19,710 39,420 59,130 91,815 124,5 10,0 WW 30% 13%	30% 19,710 30% 19,710 13% - 13% 13% 14% 14% 399,806 30% 1,616,220 3 37% 466,120 3 37% 466,120 3 37% 5 5 5 5	<i>∞ ∞</i>	29,130 	91,815 270,549 - 2,169,022 10,166,834 2,284,777 17,711,762	124,501
10 MW	30% 13% - 13% 13% 58,079 14% 399,806 - 1,616,220 30% 1,616,220 37% 486,180 37% 486,180 37% 5 17 \$ \$ 7 \$ \$ 5 5 \$	so so	74,236 74,236 48,660 58,540 116,645 21 \$	270,549 270,549 2,169,022 10,16,86,854 17,711,762 33 \$	366,862 3,138,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879
othop c10 kW 13% 58.079 116,158 174,236 270,549 366,8 or othop 2500 kW 13% 58.079 116,158 174,236 270,549 366,8 or othop 2500 kW 14% 14% 239,806 7799,613 1,199,419 2,169,022 3,1398, or othop 2500 kW 14% 239,806 7799,613 1,199,419 2,169,022 3,1398, or othop 2500 kW 14% 239,806 772,800 1,156,845 17,711,762 25,906,8 or othop 2500 kW 14% 23,172,215 6,344,430 9,516,645 17,711,762 25,906,8 or othop 2500 kW 14% 23,172,215 6,344,430 9,516,645 17,711,762 25,906,8 or othop 2500 kW 10 k	13%	w w	74,236 74,236 74,236 74,236 74,260 75,540 116,645 71,540 7	270,549 2,169,022 10,156,884 2,264,777 17,711,762	366,862 3,138,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879
ortop 10 to 250 kW 13% 58,079 116,158 174,236 270,549 366.8 follo 250 kW 13% 58,079 116,158 174,236 270,549 366.8 follo 250 kW to 10 kW to	13% 58,079 13% 58,079 13% - 14% 389,806 30% 1616,220 37% 486,180 317% 486,180 317% 5 5 6 W 5 5 5	у м	74,236 - - 99,419 48,660 58,540 116,645 - 21 \$	270,549 2,169,022 10,156,884 2,284,777 17,711,762	366,862 - 3,138,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879
orboy 2500 kW 13% 58,079 116,158 174,236 270,549 306,86 orboy 500 kW 13% - - - - - - orboy 500 kW 14% - - - - - - - ound < 10 kW	MW 14% 399,806 30% 1618,220 37% 486,180 37% 377,245 6. NN	w w	74,236 - - 99,419 48,660 16,645 - 21 \$	270,549 - 2,169,022 10,156,884 2,284,777 17,711,762 33 \$	366,862 3,138,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879
ornd > 500 kW 13% ound < 10 kW 14% 399,806 799,613 1,199,419 2,166,520 3,138,544 3,172,215 6,344,430 9,516,645 17,711,762 25,906,8 shore ound > 10 kW to k	13% 14% 14% 399,806 30% 1,616,220 37% 466,120 3,172,215 6 3,172,215 6 W \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	w w	99,419 48,660 58,540 116,645 21 \$	2,169,022 10,156,894 2,264,777 17,711,762 33 \$	3,138,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879
ound < 10 kW to 10 kW	14% 399,806 30% 1618,220 3 37% 488,180 3,172,215 6, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8, 8,	w w	99,419 48,660 58,540 116,645 21 \$	2,169,022 10,156,854 2,264,777 17,711,762 33 \$	3,138,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879
ound > 10 kW to 10 kW 14% 399,806 799,613 1,199,419 2,169,022 3,138,806 1516,520 3,132,440 4,848,660 10,156,854 15,166,824 15,166,824 15,166,824 15,166,824 15,166,824 15,17,17,722 3,071,084 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68 15,17,17,722 2,530,68	1,616,220 3.0% 1,616,220 3.0% 1,616,220 3.0% 1,616,220 3.0% 1,616,220 3.0% 1,616,220 3.0% 1,712,215 6.0% 1,712,	s s	99,419 48,660 58,540 116,645 21 \$ 21 \$	2,169,022 10,156,854 2,264,777 17,711,762 33 \$	3,138,625 15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879 45
shore 30% 1,616,220 3,222,440 4,848,660 10,156,894 15,465, shore 37% 486,180 972,360 1458,940 2,264,777 3,077.0 25,906,8	30% 1,616,220 3,37% 486,180 3,172,215 6,3,172,215 6,5,180 5,5,172,215 6,5,172,	69 69	748,660 58,540 116,645 21 \$	10,156,854 2,264,777 17,711,762 33 \$	15,465,049 3,071,015 25,906,879 45
shore a 37% 466,180 972,360 1,458,540 2,264,777 3,071,010	377, 486,180 3,172215 5 7 8 5 1 5 8	w w	21 \$	33 \$	25,906,879 45
3,172,215 6,344,430 9,516,645 17,711,762 25,906 14,430 14,430 9,516,645 17,711,762 25,906 14,430 14,440 10,	3,172,215 6,344, 8 7 8 8 - 8 8 - 8 8 - 8 9 - 5 9 - 5	w w	16,645 21 \$ - \$	33 \$	25,906,879
an over spot \$ million a very spot \$ million b votation \$ 7 \$ 14 \$ 21 \$ 33 \$	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	8 s 8 s	8	33 8 4	. 45
10 MW	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	. 45 °	24	33	. 45
> 10 MW	KW	s ,			٠.
on-farm 100 kW short farm 100 kW short farm 100 to 250 kW short farm 100 to 250 kW short farm 100 to 250 kW short farm 100 kW short farm 100 to 250 kW short farm 100 kW short f	KW 8 8 7 1 8 8 1 8 8 8 1 8 8 8 1 8 8 8 8 8		· 69	•	
5 5 5 7 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	KW \$ 1 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	s			
5.500 kW 5 5 4 5 5 8 8 5 5 8 8 5 5 8 8 5 13 5 9 8 9 5 9 8 9	8 2 2 8	2 \$	8	5	7
Sook kW to 10 MW \$ 13 \$ 19 \$ 30 \$ 10 MW \$ -	<i>u</i>	4 \$	2	89	Ħ
10 MW 5 41 5 82 5 123 5 190 5 2 10 MW 10 MW 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1	A A			30	14
10 MW 10 MW 11 MW 12 MW 13 MW 14 MW 15 MW 15 MW 15 MW 16 MW 16 MW 16 MW 17 MW 18 MW 18 MW 19 MW	- \$ - \$	\$	ده	,	,
10 MW 10 MW 11 MW 12 MW 13 MW 14 MW 15 MW 15 MW 16 MW 16 MW 17 MW 18 MW 19 MW	\$ 41.5	82.8		190 \$	258
10 MW	• es) } }	} ,
10 MW				1	c
10 MWW 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 -	ANN OI > II	A (# (50
oftop < 10 kW		,			
oftop 10 to 250 kW	69 ·	69	€ >	\$	
oftop 250 to 500 kW \$ 34 \$ 68 \$ 102 \$ 159 \$ 2 \$ 2 \$ 100 > 500 kW \$ 5 \$	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\$	\$	·	
9 ound < 10 kW 5	\$ 34 \$	\$ 89	102 \$	159 \$	215
ound < 10 kW S 158 \$ 316 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 5 173 \$ 316 \$ 474 \$ 857 \$ 1.2 185 shore S 174 \$ 148 \$ 222 \$ 344 \$ 1.5 Shore S 174 \$ 148 \$ 222 \$ 345 \$ 1.5 Shore S 175 \$ 314 \$ 144 \$ 2.619 \$ 3.7 S 152 \$ 152 \$ 152 \$ 148 \$ 1.5 S 152 \$ 152 \$ 148 \$ 1.5 S 153 \$ 152 \$ 148 \$ 1.5 S 154 \$ 155 \$ 1.5 S 155 \$ 155 \$ 148 \$ 1.5 S 155 \$ 155 \$ 148 \$ 1.5 S 155 \$ 155 \$ 155 \$ 155 \$ 155 S 155 \$ 155 \$ 155 \$ 155 S 155 \$. ss	69	\$		•
ound > 10 kW to 10 MW	s s	69	\$	•	•
shore \$ 157 \$ 314 \$ 470 \$ 985 \$ 1,5 shore \$ 74 \$ 148 \$ 222 \$ 344 \$ 1,5 shore \$ 481 \$ 983 \$ 1,444 \$ 2,619 \$ 3,7 \$ 1,5 shore \$ 481 \$ 983 \$ 1,444 \$ 2,619 \$ 3,7 \$ 1,5 shore \$ 1,5	to 10 MW \$ 158 \$	316 \$	474 \$	857 \$	1,240
shore \$ 74 \$ 148 \$ 222 \$ 344 \$ 4 \$ 4 \$ 6 \$ 6 \$ 6 \$ 6 \$ 6 \$ 6 \$ 6 \$	\$ 157 \$	314 \$	470 \$	985 \$	1.500
\$ 481 \$ 963 \$ 1,444 \$ 2,619 \$ 3,7 \$ 600 conomic development adder, \$ million	5 72 8	148 \$	222 \$	344 \$	467
9 401 5 503 5 1,444 5 2,015 5 5,015 9 5,7 18 8 152 \$ 152 \$ 152 \$ 148 \$ 1 18 8 1	÷ 6				505
\$ 152 \$ 152 \$ 148 \$ 19 Geonomic development adder, \$ million	A	202	44. 44.	\$ 6L0'7	3,793
	\$ 152 \$				146
	msung economic development adder, \$ million		•		1

total increase, \$ million

\$ 481 \$ 963 \$ 1,444 \$ 2,646 \$ 3,848

,	뜯	
	ᅙ	
	≣	
	ᇹ	
	ပ	

T2 - element = RESOP (remaining) / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)

	assumes FIT pricing	Jul14 Aug14 - Jul15		100 total quantities as per OPA's 2010 Q1 generation report	166 total quantities as per OPA's 2010 Q1 generation report	266		300 300	500 500	008 008	capacity factor	788,400 788,400 30% OPA assumption for on-shore wind CF	613,200	1,401,600		81.21 \$ 81.21	€9	330 \$ 330
premium over spot market, \$/MWh	103 405	Aug12 - Jul13 Aug13 - Jul14		100	167	267		200	334	534		525,600 788		-		54.14 \$ 8	€9	220 \$
reference spot pre market price, sp \$/MWh	* * * 38 38 8 38 8 8 8			100	167	267		100	167	267		262,800	204,809	467,609		\$ 27.07 \$	\$ 82.95 \$	\$ 110 \$
contract price by year, \$/MWh	\$ 141 8 \$ 443	Aug10 - Jul11 Aug11 - Jul12	WW						•	•			•			· •	· ·	· +
	wind solar	added during / to end of	quantity added during year, MW	wind	solar	total	quantity, end-year, MW	wind	solar	total	energy guantity. MWh	wind	solar	total	premium over spot, \$ million	wind	solar	total

comments

	contract price by year, \$/MWh	price \$/MWh	reference spot market price, \$/MWh	s spot orice, /h	premium over spot market, \$/MWh	æ,			
wind water	မှာ မှာ	100	& &	88 88		62 72			estimated pricing
added during / to end of	Aug10 - Jul11	Jul11	Aug11 - Jul12		Aug12 - Jul13		Aug13 - Jul14	Aug14 - Jul15	
quantity added during year, MW wind	W				,	143	142	143	total quantifies as ner OPA's 2010 O1 generation report
water				20		20	70	50	
total						163	162	163	
quantity, end-year, MW					`	9	100	60	
Wind						143	782	478	
water				20		40	09	80	
total				70	-	183	345	208	
:									capacity factor
energy quantity, MWn						į			
wind				, 5	375,804	50 5	748,980	1,124,784	30% OPA assumption for on-shore wind CF
total			, 0,	91,104	558,012	112	1,022,292	1,489,200	OZ /O OT A SOSUMPTION TO WARE O
premium over spot, \$ million									
wind	69		ss	,	\$ 23	23.30 \$	46.44 \$	69.74	
water	↔		↔	6.56	\$ 13	13.12 \$	19.68 \$	26.24	
total	↔		⇔	7	s	36 \$	\$ 99	96	
ingresses & million									
1010gggg, 4	\$		s	7	69	36 \$	\$ 99	96	

74

58 \$

43 \$

29 \$

14 \$

increase, \$ million

		scalated at 2 %						
comments		76.18 2010 pricing as per OEB RPP Price Report from Apr 10 ; escalated at 2 $%$			710 750 less current output 670			
	Aug14 - Jul15	76.18	38.00	38.18	710	1,380	5,286,660 4,988,820 10,275,480	201.85 190.48 392
	Aug13 - Jul14 Au	74.69 \$	38.00 \$	36.69 \$	710	1,380	5,286,660 4,988,820 10,275,480	193.96 \$ 183.03 \$ 377 \$
	Aug12 - Jul13 Au	73.22 \$	38.00 \$	35.22 \$	710	1,380	5,286,660 4,988,820 10,275,480	186.21 \$ 175.72 \$ 362 \$
	Aug11 - Jul12 Au	71.79 \$	38.00 \$	33.79 \$	710	1,380	5,286,660 4,988,820 10,275,480	178.62 \$ 168.56 \$ 347 \$
incial Benefit)	Aug10 - Jul11 Au	70.38 \$	38.00 \$	32.38 \$	710	1,380	5,286,660 4,988,820 10,275,480	171.18 \$ 161.54 \$ 333 \$
Electricity (Provi	previous A	\$ 00.69	38.00	31.00 \$	710	1,380	5,286,660 4,988,820 10,275,480	163.89 \$ 154.65 \$ 319 \$
ting) / bill area = [⋻	Wh	ь			capacity factor 85% 85%	& & &
T4 - element = Bruce Power (existing) / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	added during / to end of	contract price by year, \$/MWh nuclear	reference spot market price, \$/MWh nuclear	contract price increase, \$/MWh nuclear	quantity, end-year, MW Bruce A U3 Bruce A U4	total	energy quantity, MWh Bruce A U3 Bruce A U4 total	premium over spot, \$ million Bruce A U3 Bruce A U4 total

T5 - element = Bruce Power (new) / bill area = Electricity	a = Electri	city (Provin	(Provincial Benefit)	nefit)					comments
added during / to end of previous		Aug10 - Jul11	Aug11	Aug11 - Jul12 /	Aug12 - Jul13		Aug13 - Jul14 /	Aug14 - Jul15	5
contract price by year, \$/MWh nuclear \$ 69	\$ 00.69	70.38	€>	71.79 \$	73.22	22 \$	74.69 \$		76.18 2010 pricing as per OEB RPP Price Report from Apr10; escalated at 2.5%
reference spot market price, \$/MWh nuclear	49	38.00	↔	38.00 \$	38.00	\$ 00	38.00 \$	38.00	00
premium over spot market price, \$/MWh nuclear	49	32.38	₩	33.79 \$	35.22	22 \$	36.69 \$	38.18	18
quantity added during year, MW Bruce A U1, 2 Bruce A U3				1,500	·	40			quantities as per OPA's 2010 Q1 report quantities as per OPA's 2010 Q1 report, current output
Bruce A U4 total		•		1,500	-	40	80 80	,	
quantity, end-year, MW				9	ū	S.	4 6	7	
Bruce A U3				00.'	<u>.</u>	§ 4	,500 40	2	1,300 40
Bruce A U4		•		•	•		8		80
total		•		1,500	7,5	1,540	1,620	1,6	1,620
energy quantity, MWh capacity factor	ctor								
	85%	•	Ξ	11,169,000	11,169,000	8	11,169,000	11,169,0	11,169,000 estimated
	85%	•			297,840	4	297,840	297,840	40
Bruce A U4	85%	•			•		595,680	295,680	08
total		•	£	11,169,000	11,466,840	4	12,062,520	12,062,520	20
premium over spot, \$ million									
Bruce A U1, 2	ક્ક	•	s	377.37 \$	393.41	41 \$	409.77 \$	426.45	45
Bruce A U3	s	•	↔	٠	10.49	49 \$	10.93 \$	11.37	37
Bruce A U4	s	•	s	\$	•	\$	21.85 \$	22.74	74
total	s	•	s	377 \$		404 \$	443 \$	4	461
increase, \$ million									
	49	•	s	377 \$		404 \$	443 \$	4	461

2010: pricing as per EB-2009-0174; 2011/12 as EB-2010-0008, Ex I1, Tab 2, Sch 1; 13/14 = 38.89 57.58 2010: pricing as per EB-2009-0174; 2011/12 as EB-2010-0008, Ex I1, Tab 3, Sch 1; 13/14 = 19.0 2010/1/2 Qs as per EB-2010-0008, Ex I1, Tab 1, Sch 1; 2013/4/5 = 2012 50.0 11/12 esclated by 2 %; 15 = 13/14 esclated by 2% comments 57.58 38.00 0.89 17 979 996 237 2015 38.13 \$ ↔ ↔ ઝ ↔ 69 38.13 56.45 0.13 56.45 38.00 19.0 50.0 922 166 2014 38.13 \$ 0.13 \$ s 38.00 \$ 56.45 \$ 56.45 \$ ↔ ↔ 38.13 922 19.0 166 2013 37.38 \$ 34.92 \$ 55.34 \$ 60.43 \$ (3.08) \$ 22.43 \$ 304 \$ ↔ \$ \$ \$ (2.46)5.09 38.00 19.0 50.0 1,122 1,063 (23) 2012 37.38 \$ 234 \$ es es T6 - element = OPG / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit) (2.46) 34.92 (3.08) 22.43 55.34 5.09 38.00 19.4 46.9 (60) 1,052 992 2011 (1.34) \$ 16.98 \$ 52.98 \$ 54.98 \$ (26) \$ 784 \$ 759 \$ ↔ 69 ↔ 2.00 36.66 36.66 38.00 19.3 2010 reference spot market price, \$/MWh premium over spot market, \$/MWh 6 6 contract price by year, \$/MWh premium over spot, \$ million energy quantity, TWh increase, \$ million hydro and nuclear payment amount payment amount payment rider payment rider total payment total payment for year nuclear nuclear nuclear nuclear hydro hydro

	quantities as per OPA's 2010 Q1 generation report																						
u115	quantities as p		006		632	408	280	006	2,220		estimated						98.9	29.38	5.20	1.00	192		192
Aug14 - Jı																	49	s s	⇔	\$	⇔		ક્ક
lug13 - Jul14			•		632	408	280	•	1,320								56.88	29.38	25.20	•	111		111
Aug10-Jul11 Aug11-Jul12 Aug12-Jul13 Aug13-Jul14 Aug14-Jul15		280	280		632	408	280		1,320								56.88 \$	29.38 \$	25.20 \$	φ. '	111 \$		111 \$
ug11 - Jul12 A	408		408		632	408	•	•	1,040								56.88 \$	29.38 \$	ь э	У Э	\$ 98		\$ 98
g10 - Jul11 A	632		632		632	•			632		90,000	72,000	000'06	000'06			56.88 \$	·	↔	€ Э	27 \$		\$ 22
	y year, MW			>						ayment, \$/MW/	ક્ક	S	s	69			ક્ક	ક્ક	ક્ક	₩	es		\$
added during / to end of	quantity added during year, MW Halton Hills York	Greenfield South	total	quantity, end-year, MW	Halton Hills	York	Greenfield South	Oakville	total	contingent support payment, \$/MW/year	Halton Hills	York	Greenfield South	Oakville	total	premium, \$ million	Halton Hills	York	Greenfield South	Oakville	total	increase, \$ million	

comments

T7 - element = Natural Gas / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)

T8 - element = NUGs / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit	e Ele	ectricity	(Prov	incial Ben	efit)					comments
during	2	2010	. •	2011	2012	2	2013	8	2014	2015
contract price by year, \$/MWh NUGs	es E	95.00	↔	95.00 \$ 103.55	↔	112.87 \$	123.03 \$		134.10 \$	134.10 \$ 146.17 2010 pricing estimated; remainder escalated at estimated OEFC Total Market Cost escalation rate of 9%
reference spot market price, \$/MWh NUGs	\$/MWh \$	48.00 \$	↔	48.00 \$		48.00 \$	48.00 \$	\$	48.00 \$	48.00 on-peak operation at premium to HOEP
premium over spot market price, \$/MWh NUGs \$ 47.0	rice, \$ //	se, \$/MWh \$ 47.00 \$	↔	55.55	€9	64.87 \$	75.03 \$	↔	86.10 \$	98.17
energy quantity, TWh NUGs		-		7		£	თ		တ	7 as per OPA 2007 IPSP
premium over spot, \$ million NUGs	↔	517	↔	611	↔	714 \$	675	↔	\$ 277	289
increase over 2010, \$ million			8	94	₩.	\$ 161	158	49	258 \$	170

T9 - element = CDM / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit	ectricity	y (Provincia	l Benef	æ									comments
		5009	. 7	2010	Aug10 - Jul11	Jul11	Aug11 - Jul12 Aug12 - Jul13	12 Au	1912 - Jul	3 Au	Aug13 - Jul14		Aug14 - Jul15
operating, OPA	↔	70	s	25	5 \$	35	€9	36 \$.,	37 \$		38	39 approx., from OPA 2009 annal report
operating, LDC					ss	8	€9	40 \$,	±		42 \$	43 estimated
program costs, excl. low-income	€ >	224	s	287	\$ 2	325	3	320 \$	ਲੱ	350 \$	• • •	350 \$	350 bolded value from OPA 2009 annal report
program costs, low-income					ss	37	s	73 \$	÷	110 \$	•	147 \$	147 50 % of LI households addressed by end-2014
total, current year	↔	244	↔	312	2 \$	417	\$	499 \$	λ	538 \$	-,	\$ 22	579
increase, \$ million					\$	105	\$	187 \$	2.	\$ 972		265 \$	267
low income households		733,000 OPA	OPA										
basis		10%											
basis households		73,300											
expenditure/household	s	1,000											
total basis expenditure	s	73.30											

T10a - element = Transmission or Delivery / bill area = Delivery			12282.5	13503			comments	
Rate Base	×	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
Gross Plant incl. I-S CA	•	11,478 \$	12,297 \$	13,510 \$	15.029 \$	16,594 \$	18.839 bolded values are mid-year and from EB-2010-0002. Ex D1. Tab 1. Sch 1	
Accum Dep	s	4,189 \$	4,429 \$	4,691	5,011 \$	5,441 \$	5,923	
Net Plant in Service (NPiS)	s	7,289 \$	7,868 \$	8,819 \$	10,018 \$	11,153 \$	12,916	
In-Service Capital Additions (ISCA) - Sustaining, Operations, Other				69	\$ 009	515 \$	530 estimated	
ISCA - Development - Non-GEA				S	100 \$	100 \$	100 estimated	
ISCA - Development - GEA, major				69	564 \$	947 \$	2,001 from TX, Green Energy Plan - EB-2010-0002, Ex A, Tab 11, Sch 4; also T10b	
ISCA - Development - GEA, sched B + Short Circuit				€9	300 \$	194 \$	193 from TX, Green Energy Plan EB-2010-0002, Ex A, Tab 11, Sch 4; also T10c	
ISCA - total		798 \$	871 \$	1,619 \$	1,464 \$	1,756 \$	2,824 bolded values from EB-2010-0002, Ex D1, Tab 1, Sch 1	
Retirements	s	30	39	42			actual	
				69	45 \$	45 \$	45 estimated	
Depreciaton, declining balance, existing		4.00%					estimated	
	s	260 \$	280 \$	288 \$	401 \$	446 \$	517	
Depreciation, declining balance, new assets		2.00%					estimated	
	s	16 \$	17 \$	32 \$	29 \$	35 \$	99	
Depreciation in year, total	s	276 \$	297 \$	320 \$	430 \$	481 \$	573	
NPiS	€9	7,289 \$	7,868 \$	8,819 \$	10,018 \$	11,153 \$	12,916	
Total Revenue Requirement, actual	s	1,257 \$	1,446 \$	1,547			bolded values are mid-year and from EB-2010-0002, Ex E1, Tab 1, Sch 1	
TRRNPiS, calculated		€9	0.1838 \$	0.1754			calculated metric	
TRR/NPiS, estimated					0.1750 \$	0.1750 \$	0.1750 estimated metric	
Total Revenue Requirement, calculated				s	1,753 \$	1,952 \$	2,260	
Total Revenue Requirement, forecast	↔	1,257 \$	1,446 \$	1,547 \$	1,753 \$	1,952 \$	2,260	
external revenues		8 -	÷	-25	;	,	actual, from EB-2010-0002	
other		-21	œ	κ'n	-72	ç.	-25 estimated actual, from EB-2010-0002	
					ç	ψ	-5 estimated	
reductions to RRR		-39	-39	93	-30	93	-30	
Rates Revenue Requirement	w	1,218 \$	1,407 \$	1,517 \$	1,723 \$	1,922 \$	2,230	
added RRR from 2010		နှ	189 \$	\$ 662	\$ 202	704 \$	1,012	

prital 511 884 432 706 167 167 1706 1884 884 189 189 189 189 1914 1914 1914	l6 2017, after		from TX, Green Energy Plan EB-2010-0002, Ex A, Tab 11, Sch 4			902	167													\$ 1,234	\$ 306	\$ 1,006		
prital 511 884 432 706 167 2,700 121 84 112 787 104 898 105 1,006 1,006	2015 2016				32					69	25				↔	5	4							
										€9														
sion Pro	Schedule A - Transmission Projects	capital		\$	↔	ક્ક	€9	69	capital					capital			69 6	÷	capital			↔	•	20 \$ 2,546

T10c - Transmission, supplemental information (GEA, schedule B and short circuit projects)

schedule B 2013 2014 2015
1 \$ 76
2 \$ 83 \$ 83 \$ 83
\$ 83 \$
\$ 83 \$ \$ 79 \$ \$ 32 \$
\$ 83 \$ \$ 79 \$ \$ 32 \$ \$
\$ 83 \$ 83 \$ \$ 79 \$ 79 \$ \$ 32 \$ 32 \$ \$ - \$ - \$ \$ 270 \$ 194 \$
\$ 83 \$ 83 \$ 83 \$ 83 \$ 83 \$ 83 \$ 83 \$ 83

T11 - element = Distribution, non-GEA / bill area = Delivery

comment

		5009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
escalator, from previous year			3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	1.5%	1.5%	1.5% estimated, reflects decreased throughput and inflation
annual revenue	છ	2,601 \$	2,679 \$	2,759 \$	2,842 \$	2,885 \$	2,928 \$	2,972 2009 annual revenue as per 2009 OEB Distributors' Yearbook
increase. \$ million			8	-S	163 \$	206 \$	249 \$	293

	from DX, Green Energy Plan – EB-2009-0096, Ex A, Tab 14, Sch 2	as per HONI HONI proportion slightly higher HONI proportion significantly higher	provincial quantities scaled up from HONI quantities, by using percent estimates above				estimated metric	
2015	310 83 fr	Ť Ť %	620 238 pr 858	3,765 324 3,441	138 17 155 4,623	479 4,144 4,194 401		717
2014	310 83		620 \$ 238 \$ 858 \$		108 \$ 17 \$ 126 \$ 3,765 \$	324 \$ 3,441 \$ 3,336 \$ 261 \$	3,075 \$ 0.200 \$ 615 \$	574 \$
2013	310 83		620 \$ 238 \$ 858 \$	2,049 \$ 104 \$ 1,945 \$	78 \$ 17 \$ 95 \$ 2,907 \$	199 \$ 2,709 \$ 2,478 \$ 151		424 \$
2012	310 83		620 \$ 238 \$ 858 \$		46 \$ 17 \$ 63 \$ 2,049 \$			\$ 892
2011 2	296		592 \$ 177 \$ 769 \$	422 \$ 8 \$ 413 \$	17 \$ 15 \$ 32 \$ 1,191 \$			115 \$
2010 2	30	28% 50% 35%	336 \$ 86 \$ 422 \$.	, 8 8 8 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	8 \$ 413 \$ \$ 211 \$ \$ 4		s
.,			-	& & &		.	· • • •	
				beginning	4.00%	end average	1	
Rate Base	GEA DX additions, HONI Renewable Generation Smart Grid	HONI DX, % of province customers Renewable Generation Smart Grid	GEA DX additions, provincial Renewable Generation Smart Grid, HONI total GEA additions	Gross Plant incl. I-S CA Accum Dep Net Plant in Service	Dep on existing NPiS Dep on Cap Adds Dep, total Gross Plant incl. I-S CA	Accum Dep Net Plant in Service Gross Plant incl. I-S CA Accum Dep	Net Plant in Service TRR/NPiS Total/Rate Revenue Requirement	increase, \$ million

comments

T12 - element = Distribution, GEA / bill area = Delivery or Regulatory