ONTARIO POWER GENERATION INC. 2011-2012 Payment Amounts for Prescribed Facilities

Technical Conference Hearing

EB-2010-0008

KT	EXHIBITS
	August 26, 2010
1.1	Compendium of questions
1.2	Document entitled "Environmental Performance Index, VECC technical conference Question No. 3
1.3	Handout referencing VECC technical conference question No. 9
1.4	Document Entitled "Fuel Channel Aggregate Risk Draft as of August 16th, 2010, REV 4, including major components"
1.5	Answers by Ms. McShane on cost of capital
1.6	One-page table, calculations underlying revenue requirement impacts
1.7	Global Insight Report
1.8	One page document, components of tax loss variance account
1.9	Chestnut park accord

JT	UNDERTAKINGS	Response Filed
	August 26, 2010	
1.1	To provide lessons learned from G7 that informed the rescheduling of G9 and G10, if available.	August 26, 2010
1.2	To Provide numbers for capitalized interest during Darlington construction.	August 27, 2010
1.3	To Explain 6 to 8 cent result from Monte Carlo analysis.	Sept. 2, 2010
1.4	To provide impact of sunk costs on LUEC number.	Sept. 2, 2010
1.5	To provide breakdown of totals in interrogatory No. 3.	Sept. 2, 2010
1.6	To provide answer to Mr. Shepherd's question re issue 4.5, SEC interrogatory No. 16.	Sept. 3, 2010
1.7	To provide answers to three AMPCO questions.	Sept. 3, 2010

JT	UNDERTAKINGS	Response Filed
1.8	To describe how rate impact is considered in company's business plan development.	Sept. 2, 2010
1.9	To provide estimate of the annual number for HST.	Sept. 3, 2010
1.10	To advise whether further alternatives were presented to the OPG board of directors, other than extending the term of variance account recovery.	Sept. 2, 2010
1.11	To provide copies of Ministry of Energy backgrounder document.	August 27, 2010
1.12	To Advise of OPG's position on producing documentation related to whether deferral or extension of recovery periods for deferral and variance accounts would affect the company's financial situation.	Sept. 9, 2010
1.13	To provide a comparison of the risks associated with the Darlington refurbishment project costs, illustrated in a series of S curves in exhibit D2, tab 2, schedule 1, attachment 4, page 28, and the hydroelectric business case.	August 27, 2010
1.14	To determine whether 2005 relativity study should be produced.	Sept. 3, 2010
1.15	To disaggregate the five lines in the answer with respect to issue 1.3 and SEC interrogatory No. 1.	Sept. 10, 2010
1.16	To advise if documentation was provided to OPG executives to support the decision to extend the lease.	Sept. 2, 2010
1.17	To provide everything that available in electronic form and a listing of those things not in electronic form.	Sept. 9, 2010
1.18	To provide cost to company of over the counter drugs.	Sept. 2, 2010
JTX1.1	Redacted	Sept. 13, 2010
JTX1.2	Unredacted only	Sept. 3, 2010
JTX1.3	Redacted	Sept. 3, 2010