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 2300 Yonge Street

Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

August 31, 2010

Dear Ms Walli,

Ontario Power Generation Inc. ("OPG") 2011-2012 Payment Amounts Application

Board File No.:
Our File No.:

EB-2010-0008 339583-000064

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 thuly,

Vincent J. DeRose

VJD\slc enclosures

c.

Barbara Reuber (OPG) EB-2010-0008 Intervenors

Paul Clipsham

OTT01\4175865\1

· Vancour

· Montr

Calgary

IN THE MATTER OF the *Ontario Energy Board Act*, 1998, S.O. 1998, c. 15, Schedule B;

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Application by Ontario Power Generation Inc. pursuant to section 78.1 of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998 for an order or orders determining payment amounts for the output of certain of its generating facilities.

EVIDENCE OF BRUCE SHARP FROM AEGENT ENERGY ADVISORS INC. ("AEGENT")

ON BEHALF OF CANADIAN MANUFACTURERS & EXPORTERS ("CME")

August 31, 2010

Peter C. P. Thompson, Q.C. Vincent J. DeRose
Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
World Exchange Plaza
100 Queen Street
Suite 1100
Ottawa ON K1P 1J9

Telephone (613) 237-5160 Facsimile (613) 230-8842 Counsel for CME

INDEX	TAB#
Evidence of Bruce Sharp from Aegent Energy Advisors Inc. ("Aegent"), August 2010	
Attachments	
Aegent Report of March 2010	Α
Curriculum Vitae of Bruce Sharp of Aegent	В
Tables	С
Table 1a – FIT (prices) Table 1b – FIT (capacity additions) Table 1c – FIT (energy, added costs)	1
Table 2 – RESOP (remaining)	2
Table 3 – Renewables (other)	3
Table 4 – Bruce Power (existing)	4
Table 5 – Bruce Power (new)	5
Table 6 – OPG	6
Table 7 – Natural Gas	7
Table 8 – NUGs	8
Table 9 – CDM	9
Table 10a – Transmission Table 10b – Transmission (GEA, major) Table 10c – Transmission (GEA, other)	. 10
Table 11 – Distribution (non-GEA)	11
Table 12 – Distribution (GEA)	12



Ontario Electricity Total Bill Impact Analysis August 2010 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 Networks Inc.'s ("Hydro One") 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 has concluded that this total bill impact analysis is also relevant to Ontario Power Generation Inc.'s ("OPG") application for payment amounts for 2011 and 2012 (EB-2010-0008). In this regard, 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. It is within this context that CME files this evidence.

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 and 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

AEGENT ENERGY ADVISORS INC.
August 2010

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 Aug 10

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	T	2011	2012	2013	Π	2014	ea	rly 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	ea	arly 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.

١.	mulative ncrease	\$ 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	oo Aug 10 Jul 15
increase	with HST	\$ 11.15	\$	23.97	\$ 31.52	\$ 46.74	\$	61.19	% increase, Aug10 - Jul15	
			W	ith HST					total	average annual
	t 2010	2011		2012	2013	2014	ea	rly 2015	iolai	(compounded)
\$130		\$ 141.15	\$	153.97	\$ 161.52	\$ 176.74	\$	191.19	47.1%	8.0%
\$135		\$ 146.15	\$	158.97	\$ 166.52	\$ 181.74	\$	196.19	45.3%	7.8%
\$140		\$ 151.15	\$	163.97	\$ 171.52	\$ 186.74	\$	201.19	43.7%	7.5%
\$145		\$ 156.15	\$	168.97	\$ 176.52	\$ 191.74	\$	206.19	42.2%	7.3%
\$150		\$ 161.15	\$	173.97	\$ 181.52	\$ 196.74	\$	211.19	40.8%	7.1%
\$155	5.00	\$ 166.15	\$	178.97	\$ 186.52	\$ 201.74	\$	216.19	39.5%	6.9%
\$160	0.00	\$ 171.15	\$	183.97	\$ 191.52	\$ 206.74	\$	221.19	38.2%	6.7%



Client Login



SERVICES CLIENTS RESOURCES NEWS ABOUT COMT Home > News > Insights **Beware the Electricity Cost** Past Newsletter Ontario's Green Energy /

Articles »

Iceberg

- 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 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.

Subscribe to Aegent Update

A Major Shift Read more :

Your email:

Privacy by SafeSubscr

Sample » : Privacy Policy .

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.

achorator	estimated	increase, ¢/kWh per	MW added	resulting cost	\$/year for
generation type	contract cost, ¢/k///n	1,000 MW added	In 2010 and 2011	increase,	residential consumer
riatural gas- fired	\$75,000/M W/year	0.05	900	0.05	5
nuclear	7	0.16	1,600	0.24	24
RESOP - Wind	14.1 (FIT pricing, as below)	0.22	300	0.07	7
RESOP - solar	44.3 (F)T)	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	33
total				\$1.07	\$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	\$/year for residential consumer
green lewyitax.	0.04	34
Smart Meter RPP	0.5	60
pending generation cost increases	0,3	30
HST (based on new, imminent total cost of 12.3 #/k/Wh)	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 entitles 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

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

	contract price by year, \$/MWI	price /MWh	reference spot market price, \$/MWh	premium over spot market, \$/MWh	
biomass < 10 MW	↔	138	æ *	\$ 100) contract prices as per OPA FIT schedule August 13, 2010; non-solar contract actions
biomass > 10 MW	↔	130	\$ 38	\$ 92	
biogas, on-farm < 100 kW	⇔	195	\$ 38	\$ 157	
biogas, on-farm 100 to 250 kW	€3	185	\$	\$ 147	
biogas < 500 kW	₩	160	38	\$ 122	
biogas > 500 kW to 10 MW	⇔	147	\$ 38	\$ 109	
biogas > 10 MW	4 3	40	38	99 \$	
water < 10 MW	₩	131	. 38	\$ 93	
water > 10 MW	⇔	122	\$ 38	\$ 84	
landfill < 10 MW	↔	Ξ	38	\$ 73	
landfill > 10 MW	€9	103	38	\$ 65	
solar, rooftop < 10 kW	\$	805	\$ 48	\$ 754	solar reference spot price at estimated premium to HOEP
solar, rooftop 10 to 250 kW	ઝ	713	\$ 48	\$ 665	
solar, rooftop 250 to 500 kW	↔	635	\$ 48	\$ 587	
solar, rooftop > 500 kW	↔	539	48	\$ 491	
solar, ground < 10 kW	↔	645	48	\$ 594	
solar, ground > 500 kW	↔	443	\$ 48	\$ 395	
wind, on shore	↔	135	88	\$ 97	
wind,offshore	€9	190	38	\$ 152	

						CONTREMES	
added during / to end of	Aug10 - Jul11	Aug11 - Jul12	Aug12 - Jul13	Aug13 - Jul14	Aug14 - Jul15		
quantity added during year, MW							
biomass < 10 MW	9.5	5.6	g	9 1	ţ		
biomass > 10 MW	١,,	} ,	3	13.6	5.0		
biogas, on-farm < 100 kW	•	,		•	•	Subsequent year quantities in same proportions; exception is last two years, when 50% of	
biogas, on-farm 100 to 250 kW	10	6	, +	, •	, ;	each of Sansung project types is added	
biogas < 500 kW	20	2.5	3 5	· ·	7.1		
biogas > 500 kW to 10 MW) &	27 8	07	S. 6	333		
biogas > 10 MW	3	0.0	9.0	13.3	13.3		
water < 10 MW	, ,	. }	•	•	•		
water > 10 MW	96.5 20.5	96.5	96.5	160.0	160.0		
Maich 10 MW	•	•	•	•	٠		
WW OL > BROKET	7.5	7.5	7.5	12.4	12.4		
tandtiti > 10 MW	•	•	•	•	•		
solar, rooftop < 10 kW	•	,	•	•	•		
solar, rooftop 10 to 250 kW	٠		•	•	, ,		
solar, rooftop 250 to 500 kW	51.0	510	013	2 70	, 3		
solar, rooftop > 500 kW	3	2.5	0.16	9.9	84.5 5		
Solar crownol 20 MW	,		•	•	•		
Section of the sectio	•	•		•	•		
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	90	ç	8	;	;		
piomass > 10 MW	6	19:0	C97	44.3	90.0		
Nicose co-farm / 100 kW	•	•	•	•	•		
orogica, or form 400 to DEO LAN	. !	٠	•	•	•		
Angles, Urigini (to to 250 KW	0.1	20	3.0	4.7	6.3		
Wy no see a second to se	20	4.0	6.0	9.3	12.6		
Social KW to 10 MW	8.0	16.0	24.0	37.3	50.5		
AUGAS > 10 MW		•	•		•		
water < 10 MW	96.5	193.0	289.5	449.5	9.609		
Value > 10 MW	•	•	•	•	·		
	7.5	15.0	22.5	34.9	47.4		
Profite > 10 Mily	•	•	•	•			
olar, rooftop < 10 kW	•		•	٠	•		
olar, rooftop 10 to 250 kW	•	•	•	•	•		
olar, rooftop 250 to 500 kW	51.0	102.0	153.0	237.6	322.1		
olar, rooftop > 500 kW	٠		•		•		
olar, ground < 10 kW	•	•			•		
olar, ground > 10 kW to 10 MW	326.0	652.0	978.0	1.768.6	2,559.2	2559.2 includes Samering 250 kMV in analy of 1214 14155	
ind, anshore	615.0	1,230.0	1,845.0	3,864.9	5.884.7	5.884.7 includes Samsing 1000 MW in part of 1914 1415	
ind, offshore	150.0	300.0	420.0	698.7	947.5	C. P	
ital	1,267	2533	3800	7 150	10 500	2,533 MW approved to April 2010; 8,000 MW of applications received to April 2010:	
		}	806	3		includes additional 2,500 MW from Samsung	

to be seminated to the control of the control of the control of the community of the control of the control of

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

şţ		
comments		
	Aug14 - Jul15	
	Aug13 - Jul14	
	Aug12 - Jul13	
	Augio-Julii Augii-Juliz Augi2-Juli3 Augi3-Juli4 Augi4-Juli5	
Benefit)	Aug10 - Jul11	
a = Electricity (Provincial		capacity factor
T1c - element = FIT / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)		energy quantity. MWh

	capacity factor						
erer yy quantry, mwn	•						
Contass < 10 MW	82%	76,737	141,474	212,211	329,515	446,819	446,819 capacity factors as per OPA assumptions
Diomass > 10 MW	85%				•	. •	Signature of the same of the s
biogas, on-farm < 100 kW	85%	•	٠	,		•	
biogas, on-farm 100 to 250 kW	85%	7 446	14 800	000		. ;	
biocas < 500 kW	900	900	2011	2,330	8	47,034	
bioose - 600 tW to 40 state	8 8	760,41	\$ 7	44,676	69,372	94,067	
COURSE > SOUTH TO TO MAN	% Q	895'65 67	119,136	178,704	277,486	376,268	
Diogras > 10 MW	%28 82%					٠.	
water < 10 MW	25%	439,577	879,154	1,318,730	2.047.685	2776640	
water > 10 MW	25%	•	. •			200	
tandfill < 10 MW	30%	19 710	30 430	60		, ,	
Sandilla 10 MW	è		ON, TEU	3	010/16	124,501	
and the state of t	80%		•		٠.	•	
Soldi, 1001lop < 10 KW	35	•	•	•		•	
solar, rooftop 10 to 250 kW	13%	•	•	•	•	•	
solar, rooftop 250 to 500 kW	13%	58,079	116.158	174.236	270 549	366 869	
solar, rooftop > 500 kW	13%	. •	!		2	300,000	
solar, pround < 10 kW	14%			•	•	•	
Apple 10 140 40 140 40 140 40 140 40 140 40 140 1	2 ;	. ;	•			•	
Sokar, ground > 10 KW to 10 MW	14%	399,806	799,613	1,199,419	2,169,022	3,138,625	
wind, on shore	30%	1,616,220	3,232,440	4,848,660	10,156,854	15.465.049	
wind, offshore	37%	486,180	972,360	1.458.540	2264777	3 071 015	
total		3,172,215	6,344,430	9,516,645	17,711,762	25.906.879	
premium over spot. S million							
biomass < 10 MW		•	:	3	1	!	
biomass > 10 MW			•	7	3	č.	
himse confarm / 100 kW		,			,	•	
history of the same				,	·	•	
Mayor, Urigini 100 to 250 KW		S -	2 \$	9	S.	7	
Diogas < 500 KW		\$ 2 \$	4 5	5	∞	=	
biogas > 500 kW to 10 MW		\$ 9	13 \$	19 \$	8	4	
biogas > 10 MW					,	•	
water < 10 MW		\$ 41 \$	8	123 6	5	976	
water > 10 MW			,		3	3	
Sandilla < 10 MW			,	•	•	. '	
Sandill > 10 MW			* •	*	~	מ	
solar motion / 10 kW	•	•	,	·	•	•	
solar mofton 10 to 250 kW		,	,	,		•	
South, toolings to to 250 KW		•	,	•	•	•	
solar, rooftop 250 to 500 kW		88	∞	102	159 \$	215	
solar, rooftop > 500 kW			•		,	•	
solar, ground < 10 kW			,			•	
solar, ground > 10 kW to 10 MW		\$ 851	346	474 €	2 238	1 240	
wind.onshore		<u> </u>			200	0+2+	
wind offshore			* *	9 0	200	06,	
		7	E	23	34.	467	
VOLZE		\$ 481 \$	963	1,444 \$	2,619 \$	3,793	
SMWh		\$ 152 \$	152	\$ 521	148 \$	146	
Samsung economic development adder. \$ million	dder, \$ million						
•	•			•	280	S	setting and broad on address of \$ 40 / 68187.
•				•		3	So estimated, based on adder of \$ 10 / MWh
A.A. 1							

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

	contra by year	contract price by year, \$/MWh	reference spot market price, \$/MWh	e spot price, Vh	premium over spot market, \$/MWh	over irket, /h				
wind solar	-	141 443		88		103				assumes FIT pricing
added during / to end of	Aug10	Aug10 - Jul11	Aug11 - Jul12	Jul12	Aug12 - Jul13		Aug13 - Jul14	Aug	Aug14 - Jul15	
quantity added during year, MW wind	MW			5		Ę	Ę			
solar				167		167	166		-	total quantities as per OPA's 2010 U1 generation report
total				267		267	266			the state of the s
quantity, end-year, MW										
wind		•		5		200	300		300	
solar		•		167		334	200		200	
total		•		267		534	800		800	·
energy quantity, MWh									cap	capacity factor
wind		•	26	262,800	25	525,600	788,400		788,400	30% OPA assumption for on-shore wind CF
solar		•	8	204,809	4	409,618	613,200		613,200	14% OPA assumption for ground-mount solar CF
total		•	94	467,609	88	935,218	1,401,600		1,401,600	
premium over spot, \$ million										
wind	↔	•	69	27.07	49 49	54.14 \$	81.21	69	81.21	
solar	ક્ક		↔	82.95	\$	165.90 \$	248.35	₩	248.35	
total	↔	•	ss	110	\$	220 \$	330	↔	330	
increase, \$ million										
	ક્ર		₩	19	\$	\$ 022	330	69	330	

T3 - element = Renewables (other) / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)

	contract price by year, \$/MWh		reference spot market price, \$/MWh	premium over spot market, \$/MWh			
wind water	\$ 100	100 \$ 110 \$	88	\$ 62 \$ 72			estimated pricing
added during / to end of	Aug10 - Jul11	Aug11 - Jui12		Aug12 - Jui13	Aug13 - Jul14	Aug14 - Jul15	
quantity added during year, MW wind	>			143	142	143	total contentition as not ODA's 2010 Of
water			8	8	. 8	2 8	total qualitities as belief of A.S. 2010 of generation report
total				163	162	163	
quantity, end-year, MW							
puiw	•		•	143	285	428	
water			8	4	8	80	
total	•		8	183	345	208	
energy quantity, MWh	•						capacity factor
wind	•			375,804	748,980	1,124,784	30% OPA assumption for on-shore wind CF
water			91,104	182,208	273,312	364,416	52% OPA assumption for water CF
total	•		91,104	558,012	1,022,292	1,489,200	
premium over spot, \$ million							
wind	•	€9	⇔	23.30	\$ 46.44	\$ 69.74	
water	· \$3	↔	6.56 \$	13.12		\$ 26.24	
total	€ 9	6	\$ ~	36	99	æ 38	
increase, \$ million							
	\$	₩.	\$ 2	88	99	96	

;											
added during / to end of	_	previous	Aug	Aug10 - Jui11	Aug1	Aug11 - Jul12 /	Aug12 - Ju	113 A	Aug12 - Jul13 Aug13 - Jul14 Aug14 - Jul15	Aug14 - J.	ul15
contract price by year, \$MWh nuclear	•	69.00	↔	70.38	€9	71.79 \$		73.22 \$	74.69	\$	76.18 2010 pricing as per OEB RPP Price Report from Apr10; escalated at 2 %
reference spot market price, \$MWh nuclear	↔	38.00	69	38.00	€9	38.00 \$		38.00 \$	38.00	€9 69	38.00
contract price increase, \$MMh nuclear	↔	31.00	69	32.38	. 69	33.79 \$		35.22 \$	36.69	Ф	38.18
quantity, end-year, MW Bruce A U3		710		710	,	710	,,	710	710		710 750 less current output
Bruce A U4 total		670 1,380		670 1,380		670 1,380	- 12	670 1,380	670	 -	670 5380
energy quantity, MWh capacity factor	5										
	× ;	5,286,660	47	5,286,660	ທໍ	5,286,660	5,286,660	990	5,286,660	5,286,660	099
fortion A O4 85% total		4,988,820 10,275,480	, ,	4,988,820 10,275,480	4 0	4,988,820 10,275,480	4,988,820 10,275,480	82 188 189	4,988,820 10,275,480	4,988,820 10,275,480	,480
premium over spot, \$ million Bruce A U3	↔	163.89	69	171.18		178.62 \$	186.21		193.96	8	201.85
Bruce A U4 total	↔ ↔	154.65 319	↔ ↔	161.54 333	\$ \$	168.56 \$	11	175.72 \$ 362 \$		\$ 6	190.48 392
increase, \$ million			မှာ	4	₩	23		43 \$	88	es.	4

14 - element = Bruce Power (existing) / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)

T5 - element = Bruce Power (new) / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	w) / bill area =	Electrici	ty (Provi	ncial Ber	efit)					Ю	comments	
added during / to end of	previous	Aug10	Aug10 - Jul11	Aug11	Aug11 - Jul12	Aug12	Jult3	Aug12 - Jul13 Aug13 - Jul14	Aug14 - Jul15	Julis		
contract price by year, \$MWh nuclear	\$ 69.00	€9	70.38	₩.	71.79	↔	73.22 \$	74.69	↔	76.18 201	76.18 2010 pricing as per OEB RPP Price Report from Apr10; escalated at 2.5%	2.5%
reference spot market price, \$MWh nuclear	Wh	€>	38.00	↔	38.00	\$	38.00 \$	38.00	↔	38.00		
premium over spot market price, \$/MWh nuclear	, SMWh	↔	32.38	₩	33.79	↔	35.22 \$	36.69	€9	38.18		
quantity added during year, MW Bruce A U1, 2					5							
Bruce A U3					<u> </u>		\$			dna dna	quantities as per OPA's 2010 Q1 report quantities as per OPA's 2010 Q1 report, current output	
oruce A U4 total		٠.	. •		1,500		8	88		dnar	quantities as per OPA's 2010 Q1 report, current output	
quantity, end-year, MW Bruce A U1. 2					8	•	Ş					
Bruce A U3			•		<u>}</u> ,	_	<u>5</u> 4	00c,1		904,1		
Bruce A U4					•		٠.	2 &		₽ &		
total			•		1,500	-	1,540	1,620		1,620		
energy quantity, MWh	capacity factor											
Bruce A U1, 2	85%		•	11,16	11,169,000	11,169,000	000	11,169,000	11.16	11.169.000 estimated		
Bruce A U3	85%					282	297,840	297,840	58	297,840		
Bruce A U4	82%							295,680	29	295,680		
total				11,16	11,169,000	11,466,840	840	12,062,520	12,062,520	2,520		
premium over spot, \$ million												
Bruce A U1, 2		€>	•	€7 €7	377.37 \$		393.41 \$	409.77	ده 4	426.45		
Bruce A U3		⇔		69	⇔		10.49 \$	10.93	. ↔	11.37		
Bruce A U4		₩	,	↔	69		⇔	21.85	₩	22.74		
total		∽	,	⇔	377 \$		404 \$	443	€>	461		
increase, \$ million												
		s		55	377 \$		404 \$	443	64	461		
					1				*	-		

Secretarian and the second of the second of

<pre>16 - element = OPG / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)</pre>	l area = Eleci	tricity (Provin	icial Benefit)					comments
for year	ಸ	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
contract price by year, \$MWh	MWh							
hydro				,				
payment amount	s	36.66 \$	37.38 \$	37.38 \$	38.13 \$	38.13 \$	38.89	
payment rider		€₽	(2.46) \$	(2.46)				2010: pricing as per EB-2009-0174; 2011/12 as EB-2010-0008, Ex I1, Tab 2, Sch 1; 13/14=
total payment	⇔	36.66 \$	34.92 \$	34.92 \$	38.13 \$	38.13 \$	38.89	11/12 esclated by 2 %; 15 = 13/14 esclated by 2%
nuclear								
payment amount	⇔	52.98 \$	55.34 \$	55.34 \$	56.45 \$. 56.45 \$	57.58	
payment rider	↔	2.00 \$	\$ 60.9	5.09			3	2010: pricing as per EB-2009-0174; 2011/12 as EB-2010-0008, Ex I1, Tab 3, Sch 1; 13/14 =
total payment	↔	54.98 \$	60.43 \$	60.43 \$	56.45 \$	56.45 \$	57.58	11/12 esclated by 2 %; 15 = 13/14 esclated by 2%
reference spot market price, \$/MWh	rice, \$/MWh							
hydro and nuclear	↔	38.00 \$	38.00 \$	38.00 \$	38.00 \$	38.00 \$	38.00	
premium over spot market, \$MWh	et, \$/MWh							
hydro	↔	(1.34) \$	(3.08)	(3.08) \$	0.13 \$	0.13 \$	0.89	
nuclear	↔	16.98 \$	22.43 \$	22.43 \$			19.58	
energy quantity, TWh			1					
hydro		19.3	19.4	19.0	19.0	19.0	19.0	
nuclear		46.2	46.9	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	50.0 2010/1/2 Gs as per EB-2010-0008, Ex 11, Tab 1, Sch 1; 2013/4/5 = 2012
premium over spot, \$ million	llion							
hydro	₩	\$ (92)	\$ (09)	\$ (65)	2	2	17	
nuclear	69		1,052 \$	1,122 \$	\$ 226	\$ 226	979	
total	↔	\$ 652	\$ 766	1,063 \$	\$ 526	\$ 526	966	
increase, \$ million								
		\$	234 \$	304 \$	166 \$	166 \$	237	

T6 - element = OPG / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)

77 - element = Natural Gas / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	l area = Electricity	(Provincial Ben	efit)			comments
added during / to end of	Aug10 - Jul11	Aug11 - Jul12	Aug12 - Jul13	Aug13 - Jul14	Aug14 - Jul15	
quantity added during year, MW	~					
Halton Hills	ઝ					guantities as per OPA's 2010 O1 generation record
York		408				deministration of As 2010 of generation report
Greenfield South			280			
Oakville					006	
total	632	408	280	•	006	
quantity, end-year, MW						
Hatton Hills	632	632	632	632	632	
York	•	408	408	408	408	
Greenfield South	•	•	280	280	280	
Oakville		•	•	•	006	
total	632	1,040	1,320	1,320	2,220	
contingent support payment, \$/MW/year	MW/year					
Halton Hills	\$ 90,000					estimated
York	\$ 72,000					
Greenfield South	\$ 90,000					
Oakville	\$ 90,000					
total						
premium, \$ million						
Halton Hills	\$ 56.88	\$ 56.88	\$ 56.88	\$ 56.88	\$ 56.88	
York	•	\$ 29.38	\$ 29.38	\$ 29.38	\$ 29.38	
Greenfield South	, \$	•	\$ 25.20	\$ 25.20	\$ 25.20	
Oakville	· •	, \$	- - -	, \$	\$ 81.00	
total	25	\$ 86	\$ 111	\$ 111	\$ 192	
increase, \$ million						
	\$ 22	\$ 86	\$ 111	\$ 111	\$ 192	

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

	134.10 \$ 146.17 2010 pricing estimated; remainder escalated at estimated OEFC Total Market Cost escalation rate of 9%	at premium to HOEP		PSP		
2015	146.17 2010 pricing estim	48.00 on-peak operation at premium to HOEP	98.17	7 as per OPA 2007 IPSP	289	170
8	↔	↔	₩		↔	69
2014	134.10	48.00	86.10	6	775	258
	123.03 \$	48.00 \$	↔	on.	63	€9
2013	123.0	48.0	75.03	. ,	675	158
	\$	↔	\$		4	\$
2012	112.87	48.00	64.87	-	714	197
	€ 9	48.00 \$	55.55 \$	_	↔	24 \$
2011	95.00 \$ 103.55 \$	48.0	55.5	=	611	8
	↔	€9	↔		↔	49
2010	95.00	48.00 \$	1Wh 47.00	=	517	
8	€9	MWh \$	% % %		↔	
during	contract price by year, \$MWh NUGs	reference spot market price, \$MWh NUGs	premium over spot market price, \$MWh NUGs \$ 47.	energy quantity, TWh NUGs	premium over spot, \$ million NUGs	increase over 2010, \$ million

78 - element = NUGs / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)

I 9 - element = CDM / bill area = Electricity (Provincial Benefit)	ectricity	r (Provincial Ben	efit)									
		2000		0	•							Comments
, do	,		0107	Aug 10 - Jul 1	l Aug11	- Juf12	Aug11 - Jul12 Aug12 - Jul13 Aug13 - Jul14 Aug14 - Jul15	3 Aug 1:	3- Jul 14	Aug14	Julis	
operating, UPA	69	\$	22 \$	က	35 \$	ဆ	··	37 \$	88	, 43	30	approx from ODA 2000 const
operating, LDC			49	8	\$ \$0	₽	'A	. 	4	• 6 5	3 8	de deprov., nom of a 2003 aima lepon
program costs, excl. low-income	s	224 \$	287 \$	325	2 2	320	ř	350 \$	350	÷ 65	3 5	350 holded refine from OBA 2000 ceres and
program costs, low-income			€9	37	\$ 2	23	-	10 \$	147	÷ 43	147	50 % of 11 households addressed by our post
total, current year	₩	244 \$	312 \$	417	\$ 1	499	_ີ ຄົນ	238 \$	577) 6 9	579	o to things and essen by end-2014
increase, \$ million			8	9	\$ 30	187 \$		\$ 922	265	55	267	
low income households		733,000 OPA										
basis		10%										
basis households		73,300										
expenditure/household	69	1,000										
total basis expenditure	↔	73.30										

		71, Tab 1, Sch 1 11, Sch 4; also 710b 11, Sch 4; also 710c			1, Tab 1, Sch 1				
comments	2015	18,839 bolded values are mid-year and from EB-2010-0002, Ex D1, Tab 1, Sch 1 5,923 12,916 530 estimated 100 estimated 2,001 from TX, Green Energy Plan – EB-2010-0002, Ex A, Tab 11, Sch 4; also 710c 193 from TX, Green Energy Plan – EB-2010-0002, Ex A, Tab 11, Sch 4; also 710c 2,824 bolded values from EB-2010-0002, Ex D1, Tab 1, Sch 1	actual 45 estimated estimated 517	estimated 56 573	12,916 bolded values are mid-year and from EB-2010-0002, Ex E1, Tab 1, Sch 1 calculated metric 0.1750 estimated metric 2,260	2,260	actual, from EB-2010-0002 -25 estimated actual, from EB-2010-0002	-5 estimated -30	2230 1,012
	2014	16,594 \$ 5,441 \$ 11,153 \$ 515 \$ 100 \$ 947 \$ 1,756 \$	45 \$	35 \$ 481 \$	11,153 \$ 0.1750 \$ 1,952 \$	1,952 \$	-52	љ ģ	1,922 \$
	2013	15,029 \$ 5,011 \$ 10,018 \$ 500 \$ 100 \$ 500 \$ 564 \$ 500 \$ 1464 \$ 564 \$ 500	45 \$ 401 \$	83 85 \$ \$	10,018 \$ 0.1750 \$ 1,753 \$	1,753 \$	ŞŞ	က် ဗိ	1,723 \$
13503	2012	13,510 \$ 4,691 \$ 8,819 \$ \$ 5 1,619 \$	42 288 5	\$ 02 25 25	8,819 \$ 1,547 0.1754 \$	1,547 \$;	ê	1,517 \$
12282.5	2011	12,297 \$ 4,429 \$ 7,868 \$	28 28 28	17 \$ 297 \$	7,868 \$ 1,446 \$ 0.1838 \$	1,446 \$	5 ° P	နှ	1,407 \$
	2010	11,478 \$ 4,189 \$ 7,289 \$	4.00% 260 \$	16 \$ 276 \$	7.289 \$ 1,257 \$ \$	1,257 \$; ;	Ŗ	1,218 \$
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	у	60 6	69 US	∞			•
T10a - element = Transmission or Delivery / bill area = Delivery	Rate Base	Gross Plant incl. I-S CA Accum Dep Net Plant in Service (NPIS) In-Service Capital Additions (ISCA) - Sustaining, Operations, Other ISCA - Development - Non-GEA ISCA - Development - GEA, major ISCA - Development - GEA, sched B + Short Circuit ISCA - total Retirements	Depreciator, declining balance, existing Depreciation, declining balance, new assets	Depreciation in year, total	NPiS Total Revenue Requirement, actual TRRANPIS, calculated TRRANPIS, estimated Total Revenue Requirement, calculated	Total Revenue Requirement, forecast external revenues	other	reductions to RRR	Rates Revenue Requirement added RRR from 2010

		trom IX, Green Energy Plan EB-2010-0002, Ex A, Tab 11, Sch 4																													,
2017, after																									1234	308	1.006	!		2.546	<u>:</u>
2016				902	167																				69	· 6 3	· 63	•		873 \$	
2015	,	. v		69	· ·	•				Q	4	\$ 121	\$	\$ 112					\$ 289	s	₹									\$ 2,001	
2014			8							\$ 169										\$ 105	\$ 104									\$ 947	
2013									\$ 164									\$ 400												\$ 564	
cts	capital			902	167	2,700		capital	<u>\$</u>	169	137				787		capital	400	289	105	\$	868	•	capital	1,234	306	1,006	2,546		4,385	
nission Proje	devit		9	83		72 \$	2.7%	devt	9	∞	∞	9	9	12 \$		2.8%	devî	8	-		-	\$3 •	2.8%	devi	5	10 \$	S	8	0	143	3.3%
Schedule A - Transmission Projects	Network 1 \$	2,3		5		₩		Connection	\$ 6,7	\$			12 \$		₩		Regional	14 \$	15 \$	16 \$	17 \$	⇔			18 \$	19 \$	\$	₩	₩	€9	
Schedul	Net	2	•		-			Com	7,	-	-	_	_	-			Regi							Long-Term							

110b - Transmission, supplemental information (GEA, schedule A / major projects)

T10c, Transmission (GEA, other)

ţ
į
È
į
2
į
Ē
P
8
E e
jed
SC
ĸ
<u>5</u>
<u>.</u> 5
mat
وَ
=
ata
Ē
츁
Sup
Ĕ,
SSi
Ĕ
ä
F
8
F

schedule B		2013		2014		2015	from TX Green Energy Plan. EB 2040 0003 F.: A T-L 44 O. 1
-	↔	9/					
2	↔	æ	₩	88	69	83	
က	↔	79	67	62	⇔	78	
4	∽	32	67	32	∽	32	
S	\$	•	₩	,	~		
	⇔	270	⇔	<u>\$</u>	6 9	193	
short circuit, Manby	· 65	30					
sched B + SC	65	300 \$ 194 \$ 193		192		193	

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

2015	1 EV. certimated authorise december 1 L.	2972 2009 annital revenue as not 2000 OED District Control	293
2014	1.5%	2.928 \$	249 \$
2013	1.5%	2,885 \$	206 \$
. 2012	3.0%	2,842 \$	163 \$
2011	3.0%	2,759 \$	\$ 08
2010	3.0%	2,679 \$	s
5003		2,601 \$	
	escalator, from previous year	annual revenue	increase, \$ million

comments	2015	310 83 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	620 238 provincial quantities scaled up from HONI quantities, by using percent estimates above 858	3,765 324 3.44	138	155 4,623 479 4,144	4,194 401 3,793	0.200 estimated metric 759
	2014	310 83		620 \$ 238 \$ 858 \$	2,907 \$	108 \$ 17	3,765 \$ 3,765 \$ 3,441 \$	3,336 \$ 261 \$ 3,075 \$	615 \$
	2013	310 83		620 238 858 858 858	2,049 \$		2,907 \$ 199 \$ 2,709 \$	2,478 \$ 151 \$ 2,327 \$	0.200 \$
	2012	310 83		620 \$ 238 \$ 858 \$	1,191 \$		2,049 \$ 104 \$	1,520 \$	310 \$
	2011	62 63		592 \$ 177 \$ 769 \$	422 \$ 8 \$			886 87 87 87 87 87 87 87 87 87 87 87 87 87	156 \$
gulatory	2010	85 SC	28% 50% 35%	\$ 336 \$ 422 \$			4 4	211 \$ 4 \$ 207 \$	0.200 \$
l area = Delivery or Re				<i>\$</i> \$ \$	\$ beginning \$	4.00% \$	end on the	average \$	
T12 - element = Distribution, GEA / bill area = Delivery or Regulatory	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 Den total	Gross Plant incl. I-S CA Accum Dep Net Plant in Service	Gross Plant ind. 1-5 CA Accum Dep Net Plant in Service	TRRNNPIS Total/Rate Revenue Requirement