

PUBLIC INTEREST ADVOCACY CENTRE LE CENTRE POUR LA DEFENSE DE L'INTERET PUBLIC

ONE Nicholas Street, Suite 1204, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 7B7

Tel: (613) 562-4002. Fax: (613) 562-0007. e-mail: piac@piac.ca. http://www.piac.ca

Michael Buonaguro Counsel for VECC (416) 767-1666

October 8, 2010

VIA MAIL and E-MAIL

Ms. Kirsten Walli Board Secretary Ontario Energy Board P.O. Box 2319 2300 Yonge St. Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: Newmarket-Tay Power Distribution Ltd. – 2010 Electricity Distribution Rate Application (EB-2009-0269)

Please find enclosed the interrogatories of VECC in the above noted proceeding.

Yours truly,

Michael Buonaguro Counsel for VECC

Encl.

cc: Newmarket-Tay Power Distribution Ltd.

Attention: Mr. Paul Ferguson

NEWMARKET TAY POWER (Newmarket/Tay)

2010 RATE APPLICATION (EB-2009-0269)

VECC INTERROGATORIES – ROUND #1

LOAD FORECASTING

QUESTION #1

Reference: Exhibit 3/Tab 1/Schedule 1, page 1

a) Please provide a schedule that breaks down the 2010 Test Year Revenue by Customer Class (at 2009 rates) as between the Newmarket and Tay service areas.

Response:

Revenue by Location @ 2009 Rates										
Class	Newmarket	Tay	Total							
	\$	\$	\$							
Residential	7,417,837	997,335	8,415,172							
GS<50	2,248,980	124,724	2,373,704							
USL	17,676	7,357	25,033							
GS>50	3,655,570	75,361	3,730,931							
Street Lights	282,712	10,003	292,715							
Sentinel										
Lights	13,853	185	14,038							
Total	13,636,628	1,214,965	14,851,593							

QUESTION #2

Reference: Exhibit 3/Tab 1/Schedule 2, pages 3 and 4

Preamble: The Application states that the load forecast prepared by Elenchus was further adjusted for the expected future achievement of CDM results in either of its service areas.

Response to VECC IR 2 a) -e)

On the top of page three the statement should read "has <u>not</u> further adjusted the load forecast for the expected future achievement of CDM results". The Applicant regrets any confusion this has caused.

a) Please provide a listing of the CDM programs administered by the OPA for 2010 and, in each case, indicate whether or not Newmarket/Tay is participating in the program and when the participation started.

Response:

2010 CDM Programs Participation Started

Peaksaver 2006
Refrigerator Round-Up 2006
Power Savings Blitz 2007
Electric Retrofit Incentive Program 2007

b) Please provide a schedule that sets out by customer class, the load forecast as prepared by Elenchus; the proposed CDM adjustment and the resulting load forecast proposed for the test year.

Response:

Please see the response to the preamble for this question.

c) Please fully document the basis for the CDM adjustments include in the response to part (b).

Response:

Please see the response to the preamble for this question.

d) Since the load forecast model developed by Elenchus uses actual data up to December 2009, how did Newmarket-Tay account for the CDM trends that will be captured by Elenchus' model when determining the CDM adjustment for 2010?

Response:

Please see the response to the preamble for this question.

e) On page 4, the Application states that Newmarket-Tay has adopted the load forecast produced by the econometric model prepared by Elenchus. This appears to contradict the statements made on page 3 (lines3-5). Please reconcile.

Response:

Please see the response to the preamble for this question.

QUESTION #3

Reference: Exhibit 3/Tab 1/Schedule 2, Attachment 1

a) At the top of page 3, the Report states that "NTPDL also requires that separate accounting for the Newmarket service territory of NTPDL be available". Please explain why.

Response:

Response

This comment is base on the fact that NTPDL requested Elenchus to prepare the load forecast on a specific service territory basis since historical data is available for the two locations.

b) With respect to page 3, what is the difference between customers who "cease operations" versus customers that "have closed completely"?

Response

Customers that have "ceased operations" are still customers but are not operating or operating at lower capacity. Customers that have "closed completely" have closed down and are no longer customers.

c) With respect to page 9, please explain how the "Weather Normal" values in Table 5 were determined.

Response

Please see response to Energy Probe IR No.20 (a).

- d) Please provide a schedule that for 2009 sets out
 - The weather normal wholesale purchases as calculated by Elenchus for each of the Newmarket and Tay service areas
 - ii) The actual wholesale purchases for each of the two service areas
 - iii) The actual HDD and CDD values for the year for each service area
 - iv) A weather normal adjustment for each service area based the equation coefficients from Table 1 and the difference between the actual HDD/CDD values and those used to define "weather normal" (per Table 3)
 - v) The weather adjusted actual use calculated as (ii) + (iv)

Response

Elenchus did not calculate weather normal wholesale purchases but rather, weather normalized WSL (weather sensitive load). The table below presents actual and normalized WSL along with HDD, CDD and the requested calculations. As can be seen from the table below, VECC's proposed calculation results in

weather normal WSL kWh for NTPDL that is approximately 0.22% lower than what was calculated in the Load Forecast Report.

2009							
	A	В	C	D	E	F	G
Newmarket S	Service Territo	ry					
						VECC weather normal adj	VECC requested weather
<u>Date</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>HDD</u>	<u>Actual</u> <u>CDD</u>	<u>Norm</u> <u>HDD</u>	<u>Norm</u> CDD	Actual WSL kWh	requested in 3(d) iv.	$\underline{normal\ kWh\ (E+F)}$
Jan-09	830.2	0	700.18	0	59,681,170	-1,974,914	57,706,257
Feb-09	606.4	0	625.48	0	51,423,252	289,812	51,713,064
Mar-09	533.8	0	543.19	0	53,939,156	142,628	54,081,783
Apr-09	305.8	1.2	317.36	1.21	48,585,319	176,649	48,761,969
May-09	158.8	6.9	156.87	12.34	48,352,004	547,782	48,899,786
Jun-09	49.3	34.2	28.07	76.19	51, 184, 776	4,132,003	55,316,779
<i>Jul-09</i>	6.2	43.7	2.39	133.94	<i>52,604,200</i>	9,515,158	62,119,358
Aug-09	9.8	91	5.72	110.92	58,472,510	2,051,223	60,523,733
Sep-09	55.2	20.9	52.85	41.18	50,996,912	2,115,691	53,112,603
Oct-09	287.8	0	243.21	4.32	50,696,684	-219,008	50,477,676
Nov-09	361.2	0	403.26	0	50,682,435	638,862	51,321,298
Dec-09	631.3	0	614	0	58,076,510	-262,775	57,813,735
Total	3,836	198	3,693	380	634,694,929	17,153,111	651,848,040
	A	В	С	D	E	F	G
Tay Service			· ·	D	_	•	· ·
ray corrido	romitory					VECC weather normal adj	VECC requested weather
<u>Date</u>	Actual	<u>Actual</u>	Norm	<u>Norm</u>	Actual WSL	requested in 3(d) iv.	normal kWh $(E + F)$
<u> </u>	HDD	CDD	HDD	CDD	<u>kWh</u>		
Jan-09	830.2	0	700.18	0	5,277,351	-372,370	4,904,981
Feb-09	606.4	^					
Mar-09		0	625.48	0	4,311,441	54,644	4,366,085
	533.8	0	543.19	0	4,264,212	26,892	4,291,105
Apr-09	305.8	0 1.2	543.19 317.36	0 1.21	4,264,212 3,510,706	26,892 33,174	4,291,105 3,543,880
May-09	305.8 158.8	0 1.2 6.9	543.19 317.36 156.87	0 1.21 12.34	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395	26,892 33,174 30,710	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105
May-09 Jun-09	305.8 158.8 49.3	0 1.2 6.9 34.2	543.19 317.36 156.87 28.07	0 1.21 12.34 76.19	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395 3,282,474	26,892 33,174 30,710 218,904	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105 3,501,379
May-09 Jun-09 Jul-09	305.8 158.8 49.3 6.2	0 1.2 6.9 34.2 43.7	543.19 317.36 156.87 28.07 2.39	0 1.21 12.34 76.19 133.94	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395 3,282,474 3,416,319	26,892 33,174 30,710 218,904 590,200	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105 3,501,379 4,006,519
May-09 Jun-09 Jul-09 Aug-09	305.8 158.8 49.3 6.2 9.8	0 1.2 6.9 34.2 43.7 91	543.19 317.36 156.87 28.07 2.39 5.72	0 1.21 12.34 76.19 133.94 110.92	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395 3,282,474 3,416,319 3,685,634	26,892 33,174 30,710 218,904 590,200 121,007	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105 3,501,379 4,006,519 3,806,641
May-09 Jun-09 Jul-09 Aug-09 Sep-09	305.8 158.8 49.3 6.2 9.8 55.2	0 1.2 6.9 34.2 43.7 91 20.9	543.19 317.36 156.87 28.07 2.39 5.72 52.85	0 1.21 12.34 76.19 133.94 110.92 41.18	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395 3,282,474 3,416,319 3,685,634 3,229,826	26,892 33,174 30,710 218,904 590,200 121,007 128,360	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105 3,501,379 4,006,519 3,806,641 3,358,186
May-09 Jun-09 Jul-09 Aug-09 Sep-09 Oct-09	305.8 158.8 49.3 6.2 9.8 55.2 287.8	0 1.2 6.9 34.2 43.7 91 20.9	543.19 317.36 156.87 28.07 2.39 5.72 52.85 243.21	0 1.21 12.34 76.19 133.94 110.92 41.18 4.32	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395 3,282,474 3,416,319 3,685,634 3,229,826 3,696,090	26,892 33,174 30,710 218,904 590,200 121,007 128,360 -98,927	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105 3,501,379 4,006,519 3,806,641 3,358,186 3,597,163
May-09 Jun-09 Jul-09 Aug-09 Sep-09 Oct-09 Nov-09	305.8 158.8 49.3 6.2 9.8 55.2 287.8 361.2	0 1.2 6.9 34.2 43.7 91 20.9 0	543.19 317.36 156.87 28.07 2.39 5.72 52.85 243.21 403.26	0 1.21 12.34 76.19 133.94 110.92 41.18 4.32 0	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395 3,282,474 3,416,319 3,685,634 3,229,826 3,696,090 3,591,541	26,892 33,174 30,710 218,904 590,200 121,007 128,360 -98,927 120,458	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105 3,501,379 4,006,519 3,806,641 3,358,186 3,597,163 3,711,999
May-09 Jun-09 Jul-09 Aug-09 Sep-09 Oct-09	305.8 158.8 49.3 6.2 9.8 55.2 287.8	0 1.2 6.9 34.2 43.7 91 20.9	543.19 317.36 156.87 28.07 2.39 5.72 52.85 243.21	0 1.21 12.34 76.19 133.94 110.92 41.18 4.32	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395 3,282,474 3,416,319 3,685,634 3,229,826 3,696,090	26,892 33,174 30,710 218,904 590,200 121,007 128,360 -98,927	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105 3,501,379 4,006,519 3,806,641 3,358,186 3,597,163
May-09 Jun-09 Jul-09 Aug-09 Sep-09 Oct-09 Nov-09	305.8 158.8 49.3 6.2 9.8 55.2 287.8 361.2	0 1.2 6.9 34.2 43.7 91 20.9 0	543.19 317.36 156.87 28.07 2.39 5.72 52.85 243.21 403.26	0 1.21 12.34 76.19 133.94 110.92 41.18 4.32 0	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395 3,282,474 3,416,319 3,685,634 3,229,826 3,696,090 3,591,541	26,892 33,174 30,710 218,904 590,200 121,007 128,360 -98,927 120,458	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105 3,501,379 4,006,519 3,806,641 3,358,186 3,597,163 3,711,999
May-09 Jun-09 Jul-09 Aug-09 Sep-09 Oct-09 Nov-09 Dec-09	305.8 158.8 49.3 6.2 9.8 55.2 287.8 361.2 631.3	0 1.2 6.9 34.2 43.7 91 20.9 0 0	543.19 317.36 156.87 28.07 2.39 5.72 52.85 243.21 403.26 614	0 1.21 12.34 76.19 133.94 110.92 41.18 4.32 0	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395 3,282,474 3,416,319 3,685,634 3,229,826 3,696,090 3,591,541 4,741,672	26,892 33,174 30,710 218,904 590,200 121,007 128,360 -98,927 120,458 -49,546	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105 3,501,379 4,006,519 3,806,641 3,358,186 3,597,163 3,711,999 4,692,126
May-09 Jun-09 Jul-09 Aug-09 Sep-09 Oct-09 Nov-09 Dec-09	305.8 158.8 49.3 6.2 9.8 55.2 287.8 361.2 631.3	0 1.2 6.9 34.2 43.7 91 20.9 0 0	543.19 317.36 156.87 28.07 2.39 5.72 52.85 243.21 403.26 614 3,693	0 1.21 12.34 76.19 133.94 110.92 41.18 4.32 0 0	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395 3,282,474 3,416,319 3,685,634 3,229,826 3,696,090 3,591,541 4,741,672 46,323,663	26,892 33,174 30,710 218,904 590,200 121,007 128,360 -98,927 120,458 -49,546	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105 3,501,379 4,006,519 3,806,641 3,358,186 3,597,163 3,711,999 4,692,126
May-09 Jun-09 Jul-09 Aug-09 Sep-09 Oct-09 Nov-09 Dec-09	305.8 158.8 49.3 6.2 9.8 55.2 287.8 361.2 631.3	0 1.2 6.9 34.2 43.7 91 20.9 0 0	543.19 317.36 156.87 28.07 2.39 5.72 52.85 243.21 403.26 614 3,693	0 1.21 12.34 76.19 133.94 110.92 41.18 4.32 0 0	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395 3,282,474 3,416,319 3,685,634 3,229,826 3,696,090 3,591,541 4,741,672 46,323,663	26,892 33,174 30,710 218,904 590,200 121,007 128,360 -98,927 120,458 -49,546	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105 3,501,379 4,006,519 3,806,641 3,358,186 3,597,163 3,711,999 4,692,126
May-09 Jun-09 Jul-09 Aug-09 Sep-09 Oct-09 Nov-09 Dec-09	305.8 158.8 49.3 6.2 9.8 55.2 287.8 361.2 631.3	0 1.2 6.9 34.2 43.7 91 20.9 0 0	543.19 317.36 156.87 28.07 2.39 5.72 52.85 243.21 403.26 614 3,693	0 1.21 12.34 76.19 133.94 110.92 41.18 4.32 0 0	4,264,212 3,510,706 3,316,395 3,282,474 3,416,319 3,685,634 3,229,826 3,696,090 3,591,541 4,741,672 46,323,663	26,892 33,174 30,710 218,904 590,200 121,007 128,360 -98,927 120,458 -49,546 803,506	4,291,105 3,543,880 3,347,105 3,501,379 4,006,519 3,806,641 3,358,186 3,597,163 3,711,999 4,692,126 47,127,169

Feb-09	606.4	0	625.48	0	55,734,693	344,456	56,079,149
Mar-09	533.8	0	543.19	0	58,203,368	169,520	58,372,888
Apr-09	305.8	1.2	317.36	1.21	52,096,025	209,823	52,305,848
May-09	158.8	6.9	156.87	12.34	51,668,399	578,492	52,246,891
Jun-09	49.3	34.2	28.07	76.19	54,467,251	4,350,907	58,818,158
Jul-09	6.2	43.7	2.39	133.94	56,020,519	10,105,358	66, 125, 877
Aug-09	9.8	91	5.72	110.92	62, 158, 144	2,172,230	64,330,374
Sep-09	55.2	20.9	52.85	41.18	54,226,738	2,244,051	56,470,789
Oct-09	287.8	0	243.21	4.32	54,392,774	-317,935	54,074,839
Nov-09	361.2	0	403.26	0	54,273,976	759,320	55,033,296
Dec-09	631.3	0	614	0	62,818,183	-312,321	62,505,861
Total	3,836	198	3,693	380	681,018,592	17,956,617	698,975,209

Per Elenchus Report

%Diff, VECC-Elenchus

e) With respect to page 11 (Table 5), please explain how the weather normal values for each customer class were determined. If the actual customer shares were applied to the weather normal total purchases, please confirm that this assumes all customer classes are equally weather sensitive and explain why this is a reasonable assumption.

Response

NTPDL believes VECC is actually referring to Table 6 on page 11. Weather normal values for each customer class in each year are based on each class' actual consumption share in actual WSL. Forecast years' shares are based on 2009 class shares, as outlined on page 10 of the Report. The methodology used by Elenchus treats each class weather sensitive load as equally weather sensitive. This assumption was necessary in order to develop an econometric model of weather sensitivity, since it was not possible to develop class specific weather sensitivities.

f) With respect to pages 10-12, do the GS>50 kWh shown in Table 6 include or exclude the 4 large customers that were excluded from the regression analysis.

Response

Table 6 includes the 4 large customers.

g) Please provide a schedule that sets out the total annual actual sales to these four customers for the period 2005 – 2009 and the forecast value assumed for 2010.

Response

Year Actual Sales (2010 Forecast)

700,500,002

-0.22%

	(kWh)
2005	59,201,841
2006	55,894,669
2007	50,701,943
2008	49,026,279
2009	19,726,402
2010F	5,904,710

h) With respect to pages 12-13, please explain more fully how the forecast 2010 "average annual customer connections" for each customer class was determined.

Response

Please see response to Board Staff IR No.10 (a & b).

i) With respect to Street Lights, please confirm whether the average number of connections (8574) forecast for 2010 is based on the number of fixtures? If not, please indicate the number of Street Light fixtures in 2009 and forecast for 2010.

Response:

The Applicant confirms that 8,547 represents the forecast average number of street light connections for 2010.

j) Is there any link between the forecast kWh for 2010 by customer class and the forecast number of customers/connections by class or are the two forecasts done independently of each other?

Response

The forecast of kWh and the forecast of customer connections are done independently of one another.

k) Please provide the 2009 year end customer/connection count for each class and the current customer/connection count as of September 30, 2010.

Response

Please see the response to Energy Probe IR No. 22 a)

QUESTION #4

Reference: Exhibit 3/Tab 1/Schedule 3

a) Please confirm that the values shown in the Table on page 1 are in dollars.

Response:

Confirmed.

b) Based on 2009 actual sales, what portion of each customer's kWh are supplied through the RPP?

Response:

The portion of actual RPP kWhs sold in 1999 was 49.08%.

- c) Please provide a table that for 2010 sets out:
 - RPP sales by class for 2010 (using the forecast 2010 sales and the percentages from part (b))
 - The total retail sales that are RPP vs. non-RPP
 - The commodity cost of power where i) the RPP price is applied to RPP sales and ii) the HOEP plus the forecast Global Adjustment is applied to non-RPP sales

Response:

The Applicant used the estimate of the RPP commodity price of \$0.06215/kWh, from the Board RPP Report of October 15, 2009 in the Cost of Service Application. At July 31, 2010, the actual energy cost is \$65.21/mWh.

The following chart shows the requested data.

	Retail kWh	Loss Factor	Wholesale kWh	RPP % July 2010	RPP kWh	Non-Rpp kWh
Residential	274,854,374	1.0356	284,632,524	86.71%	246,815,350	37,817,174
GS<50	95,754,008	1.0356	99,160,529	81.63%	80,947,756	18,212,772
USL	391,118	1.0356	405,032	100.00%	405,032	0
GS>50	313,112,560	1.0356	324,251,774	6.82%	22,127,372	302,124,402
Street Lights	5,355,339	1.0356	5,545,859	0.00%	0	5,545,859
Sentinel Lights	306,233	1.0356	317,127	100.00%	317,127	0
Total	689,773,632		714,312,845	49.08%	350,612,638	363,700,207
Suggested Wholesa	le Price	\$			0.0607	0.0592
Suggested Wholesale Cost		\$			21,289,199	21,512,867
Total Wholesale Sug	gested Cost	\$				42,802,067

d) Please provide the basis for the rate change factor and the kWh change factor used in the derivation of the 2010 Transmission Network and Connection costs (per page 4).

Response:

The Rate Change factor was based on the percentage increase of 2010 over 2008. 2008 was used because it was the last year where there was no change in the rates during the year. The kWh factor was the change between 2008 actual and 2010 projected kWh. The Applicant applied this factor to the 2008 Transmission charge amount to estimate the 2010 Transmission amount. Wholesale kW was not available at the time. The Applicant has since projected this value using a kW factor and applying 2010 rates. This detail is shown in response to VECC IR No. 14.

QUESTION #5

Reference: Exhibit 3/Tab 2/Schedule 3

a) With respect to page 10, do the averages shown here include or exclude the four large customers that were excluded from the regression analysis?

Response:

The four customers are included in the historical data.

b) If it includes these four customers. please provide a chart that sets out the average use for GS>50 class for the period 2006-2010, excluding these four customers.

Response:

Once the annual kWh are removed for these customers the average annual weather normal kWh/Customer are as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Avg kWh</u>
2006	820,156
2007	821,275
2008	819,601
2009	766,933
2010	780,829

QUESTION #6

Reference: Exhibit 3/Tab 3/Schedule 3

a) On page 3 (last paragraph), the Applicant explained that it discounted by 25% the quantities for certain categories of Specific Service Charges. Part of the rationale is that "residential customers are currently paying less than half the proposed amounts". Please explain this point more fully.

Response:

The Specific Service Charges ("SSC") referred to in the Application are Arrears Certificates, Statement of Account and Duplicate Invoices.

There are several impacts that will affect the future requests for these services, the most significant being cost. The Newmarket rates are currently based on 1998 RUD methodology and when the proposed harmonized SSC's are implemented the charges will rise from \$8.50 to \$15.00 for Arrears Certificates and Statement of Account; and from \$3.25 to \$15.00 for Duplicate Invoices.

The Applicant is projecting that the demand for these services will decline by approximately 25% with the increased charges reducing the revenue from this source. Also statement of Account and Duplicate invoices are expected to be available on line in 2011.

b) Also, how long have the statements involved with each of these three charges been available on-line?

Response:

Duplicate statements and Statements of account are not presently available on line. The applicant hopes to implement this service in 2011.

c) With respect to page 5, under what circumstances would Newmarket-Tay seek a credit agency report?

Response:

In accordance with the Applicant's Conditions of Service, it would seek a credit agency report if requested to do so by the residential consumer.

COST ALLOCATION

QUESTION #7

Reference: Exhibit 7/Tab 1/Schedule 1, page 2

Board Report RP-2005-0317 Cost Allocation Review

Preamble: The Application states that the 2006 CAR-IF methodology assumes that each street light connection point is the equivalent of a single residential customer.

a) On pages 67-68 of the Board's Cost Allocation Review Report, provision is made for distributors to assume there a number of street lighting fixtures per connection. When Newmarket-Tay uses the term "connection" in reference to Street Lights is it assuming the number of connections equals the number of fixtures? If not, what is the adjustment factor?

Response:

The Applicant is assuming the number of connections equals the number of fixtures.

b) Is Newmarket Tay's 25% cost factor equivalent to assuming there are four fixtures per connection? Please fully explain the basis for the response.

Response:

The result is equivalent. The methodology used to arrive at the result is different as explained in Exhibit 7/Tab 1/Schedule 1. Please see the model referenced in the response to SEC IR No. 26a)

QUESTION #8

Reference: Exhibit 7/Tab 1/Schedule 2

a) With respect to page 4, please explain why the number of connections reported in CA Run #4 (w/o SL adjustment) - Sheet I6 for Street Lights (8252) and Sentinel Lights (80) differ from those set out in Exhibit 3/Tab 1/Schedule 2, Attachment 1, page 13.

Response:

The correct values are those shown in Exhibit 3/Tab 1/Schedule 2, Attachment 1 – i.e. 8,574 and 414 respectively.

b) With respect to page 5 and Sheet I7.2, please explain how the units applicable to meter reads were established for each class. In the case of Residential the number of meter read units is roughly 12 x the number of meters (per Sheet I7.1). However, in the case of GS<50 the units of meter reading are only 4.6x the number of meters.

Response:

The values on sheet I7.2 were determined by multiplying the number of meters shown on I7.1 by 12. However, one formula was missed for the GS<50 Class. This was for the meters with no demand (i.e. 1,752 meter x 12 = 21,024).

With this change made in the model along with the changes in the number of lights in Question 8 a) the Revenue to Expense ratios are as follows:

_					_	
D	ום	ION	LIA	to	Expense	0/2

CLASS	With Changes	As Submitted
Residential	90.68%	90.43%
GS <50	90.49%	91.27%
GS>50-Regular	143.41%	143.22%
Street Light	110.95%	113.49%
Sentinel	89.60 %	99.38%
Unmetered Scattered		
Load	89.89 %	89.79%

c) With respect to page 5, please confirm that the demand data from the 2007 filing was "scaled" to match the changes in kWh by class between the 2007 CA filing and 2010.

Response:

The Demand Data shown on I8 was developed by adding the 2007 data together for the two locations and the reducing the GS>50 Class by the demand data for the lost customers.

QUESTION #9

Reference: Exhibit 7/Tab 2/Schedule 1

a) Please provide a schedule that sets out the calculation of the Distribution Revenue by Customer Class as shown on page 1. If it is based on revenues at current (2009) rates, please set out the derivation of revenues at current rates by class as used in the calculation.

Response:

The Distribution Revenue values on this chart are determined by applying the proposed 2010 rates to 2010 forecast statistical data. The following schedule provides the calculations by class:

1

	kWh	kW	Avg Cust/Con	Fixed	Variable	Fixed \$	Variable \$	Total (to CA Model)
Residential	274,854,374		29,370	17.00	0.0143	5,991,480	3,935,186	9,926,666
GS<50	95,754,008		2,901	33.00	0.0172	1,148,796	1,643,223	2,792,019
USL	391,118		125	12.00	0.0293	18,000	11,445	29,445
GS>50	313,112,560	788,495	401	150.00	5.1840	721,800	4,087,527	4,809,327
GS>50 T/A		(601,285)			0.7000	0	(420,900)	(420,900)
Street Lights	5,355,339	14,582	8,574	2.00	7.5452	205,776	110,024	315,800
Sentinel Lights	306,233	850	407	2.00	7.9298	9,768	6,740	16,508
Total	689,773,632					8,095,620	9,373,245	17,468,865

The following schedule provides the detailed calculations of applying current rates to 2010 forecast statistical data. It also shows the calculation of the current weighted average rates for the Applicant:

Service Territory: Newmarket

OCIVIOC I CITILO	iidi Not							
	2010 Statistical Data				pproved ates	Revenue		
	kWh	kW	Avg Cust/Con	Fixed	Variable	Fixed	Variable	Total
Residential	242,673,431		25,530	13.44	0.0136	4,117,478	3,300,359	7,417,837
GS<50	90,591,182		2,676	25.18	0.0159	808,580	1,440,400	2,248,980
USL	211,968		75	16.39	0.0138	14,751	2,925	17,676
GS>50	307,538,497	774,860	385	157.04	4.3209	725,525	3,348,093	4,073,617
GS>50 T/A		(597,211)			0.7000		(418,048)	(418,048)
Street Lights	4,917,148	13,360	7,862	1.76	8.7325	166,045	116,666	282,712
Sentinel Lights	297,183	826	393	1.76	6.7192	8,300	5,550	13,850
Total	646,229,409					5,840,680	7,795,945	13,636,625

Service Territory: Tay

	2010 Statistical Data				pproved ates	Revenue		
	kWh	kW	Avg Cust/Con	Fixed	Variable	Fixed	Variable	Total
Residential	32,180,943		3,840	14.59	0.0101	672,307	325,028	997,335
GS<50	5,162,826		225	14.72	0.0165	39,744	84,980	124,724
USL	179,150		50	7.35	0.0165	4,410	2,947	7,357
GS>50	5,574,063	13,635	16	208.34	2.7726	40,001	37,804	77,806
GS>50 T/A		(4,074)			0.6000		(2,445)	(2,445)
Street Lights	438,191	1,222	712	0.69	3.3617	5,895	4,108	10,003
Sentinel Lights	9,050	24	14	0.72	2.7786	118	67	185
Total	43,544,223					762,476	452,489	1,214,965

Service Territory: Newmarket Tay

	2010 \$	Statistical D	ata		pproved ates		Revenue	
	kWh	kW	Avg Cust/Con	Fixed	Variable	Fixed	Variable	Total
Residential	274,854,374		29,370	13.59	0.0132	4,789,786	3,625,386	8,415,172
GS<50	95,754,008		2,901	24.37	0.0159	848,324	1,525,380	2,373,704
USL	391,118		125	12.77	0.0150	19,161	5,872	25,033
GS>50	313,112,560	788,495	401	159.09	4.2941	765,526	3,385,897	4,151,423
GS>50 T/A		(601,285)			0.6993		(420,492)	(420,492)
Street Lights	5,355,339	14,582	8,574	1.67	8.2824	171,941	120,774	292,715
Sentinel Lights	306,233	850	407	1.72	6.6079	8,418	5,617	14,035
Total	689,773,632					6,603,156	8,248,434	14,851,590

QUESTION #10

Reference: Exhibit 7/Tab 2/Schedule 3

Exhibit 7/Tab 3/Schedule 1

a) Please confirm that the only difference between Run #4 and Run #5 was that for Run #5 the number of Street Light Connections in Sheet I6 was reduced by a factor of four (i.e., from 8252 to 2058). If this is not the case, please indicate precisely what other changes were made.

Response:

The Applicant confirms that the number of Street Light connections is the only change.

RATE DESIGN QUESTION #11

Reference: Exhibit 8/Tab 3/Schedule 2

- a) Please confirm that the rates used determine revenues at currently approved rates:
 - Exclude the smart meter rate adder
 - Exclude LV rate adders

If this is not the case, please re-do the Tables with these adjustments.

Response:

The Applicant confirms that Smart Meter and LV Adders are not included.

b) The discussion regarding the NTD Distribution Revenue at Weighted Average Rates (page 2) suggests that the following table would be based on the weighted average (2009) rates calculated for each class. However, the table is the same as that set out on page 1. Please re-do, using the weighted average fixed and variable rates for each class.

Response:

The Applicant did not copy the entire chart on to the Application. The table is presented in response to VECC IR No. 9.

QUESTION #12

Reference: Exhibit 8/Tab 4/Schedule 1

a) Please show the resulting fixed and variable rates by class assuming the shortfall was made up by increasing both the fixed and variable charges by the same percentage while maintaining the same percentage of total distribution revenue by rate class.

Response:

2010 Rates With Shortfall Split Between Fixed and Variable

Class	Fixed	Variable	Revenue %
Residential	15.51	0.0162	56.66%
GS<50	29.71	0.0184	15.98%
USL	14.08	0.0213	0.17%
GS>50	219.84	4.7572	25.12%
GS>50 T/A		0.7000	
Street Lights	1.89	10.2471	1.97%
Sentinel Lights	1.95	8.2240	0.09%
			100.00%

b) Please re-do the part (a) results for Residential and Street Lights, assuming \$28,500 in revenue requirement responsibility is shifted from Street Lights to Residential.

Response

2010 Rates With Shortfall Split Between Fixed and Variable With transfer of \$28,500 from Street Lights to Residential Class Fixed Variable Revenue %

Residential	15.46	0.0162	56.82%
GS<50	29.71	0.0184	15.98%
USL	14.08	0.0213	0.17%
GS>50	219.84	4.7572	25.12%
GS>50 T/A		0.7000	
Street Lights	1.74	9.3989	1.81%
Sentinel Lights	1.95	8.2240	0.09%
			100.00%

QUESTION #13

Reference: Exhibit 8/Tab 4/Schedule 2

a) What is the foregone revenue for 2010 based on the requested \$0.70/kW transformer credit?

Response:

Upon review of the data relating to the Transformer Credit, the Applicant found an inconsistency between Exhibit 7 Cost Allocation and Exhibit 8 Rate Design. The statement in Exhibit 8 regarding the calculated rate should have read \$0.77/kW, not \$0.67/kW. The chart in Exhibit 7 Tab 5 Schedule 1 shows the detailed calculation of the \$0.77/kW rate. Using the \$0.70/kW rate, the foregone revenue in the Transformer Allowance credit would be \$42,497.

b) Where in the design of the proposed rates is this foregone revenue accounted for?

Response:

The foregone revenue for this difference is accounted for in the GS>50 Variable Rate.

QUESTION #14

Reference: Exhibit 8/Tab 5/Schedule 1

a) Please provide a schedule that sets out the 2009 Transmission Network billing quantities for Newmarket-Tay (both from the IESO and HON) and calculates the bill assuming these quantities are billed at the approved 2010 Transmission Network rates.

Response:

Transmission Network Charges

	Annual kW (Actual)	2010 Rate	2009 Annual \$ @ 2010 Rate
2009 kW Newmarket	1,163,314	2.97	3,455,041
2009 kW Tay	89,116	2.65	236,157
Total Transmission Network at 2010 Rates	1,252,430		3,691,199

The Applicant has recalculated the 2010 Transmission Network Charges using the above approach: The results are in the following chart:

Transmission Network Charges

	2010 kW (est)	2010 Rate	2010 Annual \$ @ 2010 Rate
2010 kW Newmarket	1,143,881	2.97	3,397,326
2010 kW Tay	93,216	2.65	247,022
Total Transmission Network at 2010 Rates	1,237,097	·	3,644,349

b) Please provide a schedule that sets out the 2009 Transmission Connection billing quantities for Newmarket-Tay (both from the IESO and HON) and calculates the bill assuming these quantities are billed at the approved 2010 Connection rates.

Response:

Transmission Connection Charges

	Annual kW (Actual)	2010 Rate	2009 Annual \$ @ 2010 Rate
2009 kW Newmarket	1,182,044	2.44	2,884,186
2009 kW Tay	94,080	2.14	201,331
Total Transmission Connection at 2010 Rates			3,085,518

The Applicant has recalculated the 2010 Transmission Connection Charges using the above approach: The results are in the following chart:

Transmission Connection Charges

	2010 kW (est)	2010 Rate	2010 Annual \$ @ 2010 Rate
2010 kW Newmarket	1,162,298	2.44	2,836,007

2010 kW Tay	42,429	2.14	90,799
Total Transmission Connection at 2010 Rates	1,204,727		2,926,806

QUESTION #15

Reference: Exhibit 8/Tab 6/Schedule 1

a) Please provide a schedule that sets out the 2009 LV billing quantities for Newmarket-Tay (from HON) and calculates the bill assuming these quantities are billed at HON's approved 2010 LV rates.

Response:

2009 LV Quantities at 2010 Rates

				LV Metering	
	kW Rate	kW	kW \$	\$	Total\$
Jan	0.442	9374	4143.308	1392.54	5535.848
Feb	0.442	8465	3741.53	1392.54	5134.07
Mar	0.442	7556	3339.752	1392.54	4732.292
Apr	0.442	6397	2827.474	1392.54	4220.014
May	0.442	6543	2892.006	1392.54	4284.546
Jun	0.442	6782	2997.644	1392.54	4390.184
Jul	0.442	7043	3113.006	1392.54	4505.546
Aug	0.442	8040	3553.68	1392.54	4946.22
Sep	0.442	6214	2746.588	1392.54	4139.128
Oct	0.442	7350	3248.7	1392.54	4641.24
Nov	0.442	8123	3590.366	1392.54	4982.906
Dec	0.442	9944	4395.248	1392.54	5787.788
Totals		91831	40589.302	16710.48	57299.782

QUESTION #16

Reference: Exhibit 8/Tab 9/Schedule 3

Exhibit 8/Tab 4/Schedule 4, page 1

a) Please provide a schedule that sets out the number of Residential customers in the Newmarket service area that (for 2009) used less than 250 kWh per month.

Response

In 2009, the Applicant had 842 customers whose average monthly consumption was less than 250 kWh per month in the Newmarket service area.

b) Given the materially higher bill impacts for lower volume Residential customers, why didn't Newmarket-Tay propose a rate design for this class than involved a fixed charge of less than \$17.00 per month, particularly when the \$17.00 is virtually at the upper end of the range set by the Board's Guidelines?

Response:

The volume of electricity consumed by a residential customer is a function of personal lifestyle, the physical aspects of their domicile (i.e. luxury home, town house, duplex, etc.), its age of construction and the nature of the heating system (i.e. gas vs. electric) to name some of the factors. Customers are able to meet their electric consumption needs by virtue of connection to the Applicant's distribution system; connections that must be equally provided and maintained for all. The Applicant's preference is to have one fixed charge for each service class (residential, GS<50, GS>50) that captures as much of the connection costs as possible to minimize subsidy within the class.

<u>LRAM</u>

QUESTION #17

Reference: Exhibit 9/Tab 2/Schedule 2, Page 1 of 4

a) Confirm/correct/complete the following details of measures, Input Assumptions and Kwh savings based on Exhibit 9 Tab 2 Schedule 2 Pages 1 – 4 in the format below for Residential Mass Market measures and Social Housing measures. *Include any missing measures/programs related to CFLs, PTs and Seasonal Lights:*

Program	Efficient Measure	Participants /units As filed	As Filed unit kw savings assumption kwh	Free Ridership	Net Kwh Per as Filed LRAM Claim	OPA 2007 EKC Calc or OPA Measures List kwh	Free Ridership
2006							
Residential							
EKC Spring	E Star CFI 15w	8,742	104	10%	912,624	n/a	n/a
	PTs	216	216	10%	23,026	n/a	n/a
EKC Fall	E Star CFI 15w	12,961	104	10%	1,353,152	n/a	n/a
	PTs	206	216	10%	107,370	n/a	n/a
EKC Fall	SLED Xmas ights	3120	31	5%	95,933	n/a	n/a
OTHER	CFLs						
TOTAL 2006 kwh							
2007							
Residential							
EKC 2007	E Star CFL15w	15,662	43	30%	673,459	43	30%
	E Star CFL 20w+	2,550	62	22%	158,330	43	30%
	Porch light CFL	3296	43	24%	141,718	43	24%
Cool Savings	PTs	310	55	54%	16,918	55	64%
OTHER	e.g.CFLs						
Social Housing							
	7/9W CFL	0	34				
	13/14W CFL	0	50			43	
	23W CFL	0	84				
	40W CFL	0	120				
Other	e.g. CFL						
Total 2007 kwh	<i>6</i> : -						
2008							
Residential							
EKC 2008	E Star CFI 15w		43	30%		43	30%
OPA Cool Savings Rebate	PTs	186	54	54%	9,987	54	64%
2008 Summer Sweepstakes	E Star CFI 15w		43	30%		43	30%
OTHER	CFLs						
TOTAL 2008 kwh							
TOTAL 2006=2008 CUMULATIVE KWH SAVINGS							
TOTAL 2006=2009 CUMULATIVE KWH SAVINGS							

20

Response:

Input Assumptions and Kwh savings based on Exhibit 9 Tab 2 Schedule 2 Pages 1 – 4 as received from the OPA are:

OPA Conservation & Demand Management Programs

Measure Results

Newmarket - Tay Power Distribution Ltd.

.0	
Ħ	
er Distribı	Results Status
ay Pow	Program Year
Newmarket - Tay Power Distribution	Program Name
2	Initiative Name
For:	#

Measure Name	Unit Sa	Unit Savings Assumptions	ions
	Summer	Annual	Effective
	Peak	Energy	Useful
	Demand	Savings	Life
	Savings	per Unit	(EUL)
	per Unit	(kWh)	
	(kW)		

LDC Total (# Units)

Provincial Total (# Units)

245

107

81

8

72

64

33

Final

2006

Consumer

2006 Secondary Fridge Retirement Pilot

8,742

Final

2006

Consumer

2006 Every Kilowatt Counts

2006

Final

2006

Consumer

(spring)
2006 Every
Kilowatt Counts
(spring)
2006 Every
Kilowatt Counts

Final

2006

Consumer

Final

2006

Consumer

2006 Every Kilowatt Counts (spring)

(spring)

Final

2006

Consumer

2006 Cool Savings Rebate Program

Final

2006

Consumer

2006 Cool Savings Rebate Program

0

Final

2006

Consumer

2006 Cool Savings Rebate Program

Final

2006

Consumer

2006 Secondary Fridge Retirement Pilot

က

1,338,276	37,518	16,320	12,415	14,393	10,965	9,816	5,018	217
4	20	15	20	7 1	18	8	9	9
104	183	216	141	351	159	698	1,200	006
0.00	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.36	0.16	0.04	0.27	0.20

		ı		1		1		
4	20	15	20	14	18	8	9	9
104	183	216	141	351	159	369	1,200	006
00:00	00:0	0.05	0.01	0.36	0.16	0.04	0.27	0.20
Energy Star® Compact Fluorescent Light Bulb	Electric Timers	Programmable Thermostats	Energy Star® Ceiling Fans	Energy Star® Air Conditioner	Programmable Thermostats	Air Conditioner Tune- Up	Refrigerator Retirement	Freezer Retirement
-	7	ო	4	-	7	က	-	7

	12,961	3,120	206	163	28	12		342	117	2	4	4	219	310	343	185	0
	1,984,267	477,612	31,484	0	0	1,875		37,123	10,652	581	325	758	33,178	46,989	51,990	28,048	21,997
	4	30	18	10	20	18		တ	ω	O	ω	ß	18	15	15	5	4
	104	31	522	139	209	1,466		745	515	490	339	240	152	22	832	235	006
•	0.00	0.00	0.12	00.00	0.00	00:00		0.07	0.07	90.0	0.04	0.56	0.17	0.03	0.49	0.26	0.04
(Energy Star® Compact Fluorescent Light Bulb	Seasonal Light Emitting Diode Light String	Programmable Thermostats	Dimmers	Indoor Mation Sensors	Programmable Basebaord Thermostats		Refrigerator	Freezer	Small Refrigerator	Small Freezer	Window Air Conditioner	ENERGY STAR® Central Air Conditioner	Programmable Thermostat	Furnace with Electronically Commutated Motor	Central Air Conditioning Tune Up	Consumer Retrofit Kit
	1	2	3	4	S.	9		-	2	ო	4	2	-	2	ო	4	-
i	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final		Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006		2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007
(Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer		Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer
I	2006 Every Kilowatt Counts (fall)	2006 Every Kilowatt Counts (fall)	2006 Every Kilowatt Counts (fall)	2006 Every Kilowatt Counts (fall)	2006 Every Kilowatt Counts (fall)	2006 Every Kilowatt Counts (fall)		2007 Great Refrigerator Roundup	2007 Cool Savings Rebate	2007 Cool Savings Rebate	2007 Cool Savings Rebate	2007 Cool Savings Rebate	2007 Aboriginal – Pilot				
	4	4	4	4	4	4	2007	7	2	7	7	2	ω	8	ω	∞	6

15,662	2,550	3,296	126	509	2,011	201	128	61	4,149	119	123	26	644	5,675	64
2,376,053	386,799	500,000	19,166	77,226	305,048	30,516	19,390	9,229	629,498	18,088	18,633	8,442	97,742	858,039	089'6
	•	•	•	•	•			•					•		
∞	∞	∞	10	_	ಬ	10	10	16	ಬ	18	15	10	10	2	10
43	62	43	06	38	33	160	24	123	14	37	75	72	72	787	Custom
00:00	0.00	00.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	00.0	0.01	0.02	0.44	Custom
15 W CFL	20 W+ CFLs	Project Porchlight CFLs	Energy Star Ceiling Fan	Furnace Filter	Solar Lights	Outdoor Motion Sensor	Dimmer Switch	Energy Star Light Fixtures	SLEDs	T8	Programmable Thermostat	Power Bar with Timer	Lighting Control Devices	Household	Custom Retrofit Projects
~	2	က	4	2	9	7	ω	6	10		12	13	14	-	-
Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007	2007
Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer
2007 Every Consumer Kilowatt Counts	2007 Every Consumer Kilowatt Counts	2007 Every Consumer Kilowatt Counts	2007 Every Consumer Kilowatt Counts	2007 Every Consumer Kilowatt Counts	nts	2007 Every Consumer Kilowatt Counts	2007 Every Consumer Kilowatt Counts	2007 Every Consumer Kilowatt Counts	2007 Summer Consumer Savings	cial – Pilot					

205

18,376

8

740

0.08

Freezer

Final

2008

Consumer

2008 Great
Refrigerator
Roundup
2008 Great
Refrigerator
Roundup

21

581

62,968

277

0.08

Refrigerator

Final

Consumer

21

10	61	29	48	0	219	145	186	0	863	258	2,797	4,340	86	790
1,587	9)366	4,499	7,291	0	33,546	22,241	28,505	0	62,670	39,053	423,741	609'299	14,885	119,646
4.5	15	18	15	S	18	18	18	10	~	~	7	16	10	16
197	837	155	54	235	819	125	54	2,820	768	38	88	133	301	37
0.20	0.50	0.17	0.03	0.26	0.49	0.14	0.03	1.60	0.20	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00
Room Air Conditioner	2007 Efficient Furnance with Electronically Commutable Motor	2007 ENERGYSTAR® Central Air Conditioner	2007 Programable Thermostat	2007 Central Air Conditioner Tune-ups	2008 Efficient Furnance with Electronically Commutable Motor	2008 ENERGYSTAR® Central Air Conditioner	2008 Programable Thermostat	Building Retrofits	Households	Air Conditioner/Furnace Filters	Energy Star® Qualified Compact Fluorescent Floods (Indoor & Outdoor)	Energy Star® Qualified Light Fixtures	Heavy Duty Timers	T8 Fluorescent Fixtures
က	~	7	ო	4	2	9	2	1	-	1	2	3	4	S
Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008
Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer
2008 Great Refrigerator Roundup	2008 Cool Savings Rebate	2008 Cool Savings Rebate	2008 Cool Savings Rebate	2008 Cool Savings Rebate	2008 Cool Savings Rebate	2008 Cool Savings Rebate	2008 Cool Savings Rebate	2008 Aboriginal	2008 Summer Sweepstakes	2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event
27	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	23	24	25	25	25	25	25

10,073	649	47	274	n/a	5,962	849	187	3,020	93	5,562	728
1,526,248	98,397	7,055	41,495	n/a	903,439	128,609	28,376	457,649	14,029	842,772	110,248
4	9	10	15	n/a	8	10	n/a	n/a	n/a	9	n/a
30	86	53	64	n/a	53	102	0	0	0	38	0
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	n/a	00.00	00.00	00.00	0.00	00.00	0.00	0.00
ENERGY STAR Decorative CFLs	ENERGY STAR Dimmable CFLs	Power Bars with Timers	Programmable Thermostats - Baseboard	Car block heater timer	Energy Star® Qualified Compact Fluorescent Light Bulbs	Lighting Control Devices	Awnings	Window Films	Electric Water Heater Blankets	Pipe Wrap	Low-Flow Toilets
9	_	ω	თ	10		12	13	4	15	16	17
Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008
Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer
2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event					
25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25

							Ι_		I _		l <u>.</u>		I.	
2	2	52	56	45	652	0	0	2	1,310	∞	73	15	7	179
263	295	7,897	8,535	6,808	28,831	14,152	318	104	18,026	287	3,256	53	35	1,775
12	o	12	o	16	13	13	13	13	15	16	2	7	15	0
200	141	200	141	275	17	17	9	74	151	237	191	436	277	0
0.29	0.14	0.29	0.14	0.01	0.87	0.87	0:30	3.70	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.00
Keep Cool – Dehumidifier	Keep Cool – Room Air Conditioner	Rewards for Recycling – Dehumidifier	Rewards for Recycling - Room Air Conditioner	Rewards for Recycling - Halogen Lamp	Residential Programmable Thermostat	Residential Air Conditioner Switch	Residential Water Heater Switch	Commercial Programmable Thermostat	T8 Fixture With Electronic Ballast	Energy Star® rated LED Exit Sign	Energy Star® rated CLF	Electric Water Heater Tank Wrap	Electric Water Heater Pipe Insulation	Other
18	19	20	21	22	-	7	က	4	-	7	က	4	2	##
Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final	Final
2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008	2008
Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer	Consumer, Business	Consumer, Business	Consumer, Business	Consumer, Business	Business	Business	Business	Business	Business	Business
2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	2008 peaksaver®	2008 peaksaver®	2008 peaksaver®	2008 peaksaver®	2008 Power Savings Blitz	2008 Power Savings Blitz	2008 Power Savings Blitz	2008 Power Savings Blitz	2008 Power Savings Blitz	2008 Power Savings Blitz				
52	25	25	25	25	26	26	26	26	30	30	30	30	30	30
							•							

b) Reconcile the annual and cumulative residential and overall Totals to those in the OPA Tables and to Exhibit 9 Tab 2 Schedule 3 (Weighted average Rate Calculation)

Response:

The following was taken directly from the OPA Tables and summarized by Class and by Savings:

#	Initiative Name	Rate		N	et			N	et	
		Class	Sui	mmer Pe		and	Anı	nual Energy	Savings (MW	/h)
			2006	2007	2008	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009
1	2006 Every Kilowatt Counts (spring)	Res	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	893	893	893	893
2	2006 Cool Savings Rebate Program	Res	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	68	68	68	68
3	2006 Secondary Fridge Retirement Pilot	Res	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	37	37	37	37
4	2006 Every Kilowatt Counts (fall)	Res	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	1,448	1,448	1,448	1,448
6	2006 Demand Response 1	> 50	0.32	0.32	0.32	0.00	0	0	0	0
2006	6 Subtotal		0.42	0.42	0.42	0.11	2,446	2,446	2,446	2,446
7	2007 Great Refrigerator Roundup	Res	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	129	129	129
8	2007 Cool Savings Rebate	Res	0.00	0.13	0.13	0.13	0	199	199	199
9	2007 Aboriginal – Pilot	Res	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
10	2007 Every Kilowatt Counts	Res	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.03	0	870	860	860
11	2007 peaksaver®	Res	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
12	2007 Summer Savings	Res	0.00	0.30	0.30	0.00	0	536	536	0
13	2007 Affordable Housing – Pilot	Res	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
14	2007 Social Housing – Pilot	Res	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	78	78	78
15	2007 Energy Efficiency Assistance for Houses –	Das	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	24	24	04
16	Pilot 2007 Toronto Comprehensive	Res	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0	21	21 0	21 0
17	2007 Electricity Retrofit Incentive Program	- FO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	16	16	16
18	2007 Demand Response 1	> 50	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0	0	0	0
19	2007 Other Demand Response	> 50 > 50	0.00	0.08	0.08	0.00	0	0	0	0
20	2007 Renewable Energy Standard Offer	/ 30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
2007	7 Subtotal		0.00	0.59	0.59	0.00	0	1,849	1,839	1,303
			0.00	0.53	0.53	0.20		1,043	1,033	1,303
21	2008 Great Refrigerator Roundup	Res	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.04	0	0	327	327
22	2008 Cool Savings Rebate	Res	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.10	0	0	153	153
23	2008 Aboriginal	Res	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
24	2008 Summer Sweepstakes	Res	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.08	0	0	517	187
25	2008 Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	Res	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.04	0	0	784	780
26	2008 peaksaver®	Res	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.51	0	0	10	10
27	2008 Electricity Retrofit Incentive	> 50	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.11	0	0	569	569
28	2008 Toronto Comprehensive	, 00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
29	2008 High Performance New Construction		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
30	2008 Power Savings Blitz	<50	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.03	0	0	207	207

31	2008 Chiller Plant Re-Commissioning		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
32	2008 Demand Response 1	> 50	0.00	0.00	0.68	0.00	0	0	0	0
33	2008 Demand Response 3	> 50	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.48	0	0	0	0
34	2008 Other Demand Response	> 50	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0	0	0	0
35	2008 LDC Custom		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
36	2008 Renewable Energy Standard Offer		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
37	2008 Other Customer Based Generation		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	0
200	8 Subtotal								_	
200	o Subtotal		0.00	0.00	2.14	1.38	0	0	2,567	2,234
200	o Gubiotai		0.00		2.14 Immary	1.38	0		2,567 ummary	2,234
200	o Subtotal		0.00			1.38	2,446			5,982
200	o Subtotal			mW St	ımmary			mWh S	ummary	,
200	o Subtotal	Res		mW St	mmary 3.15			mWh S	ummary 6,852	,
200	o Subtotal	<50	0.42	mW St 1.01 kW Su	3.15 mmary	1.68	2,446	mWh Si 4,295 kWh Si	ummary 6,852 ummary	5,982
200	o Subtotal		0.42	mW Su 1.01 kW Su 599	3.15 mmary 1,416	1,060	2,446	mWh Si 4,295 kWh Si 4,278,716	6,852 ummary 6,059,130	5,982 5,189,469

c) Explain why an LRAM is claimed for 2009 savings (carry-forward 2006-2008) when the 2009 Load forecast includes these savings and ratepayers are covering this loss of load in rates in 2009 and 2010

Response:

The Applicant reviewed other LDC Applications and found that 2009 was awarded in the Approval. Until that time, the calculation was based on the period to 2008.

d) Provide a Version of the Table in Exhibit 9 Tab 2 Schedule 3 that includes only savings for 2006-2008 only

Response:

The Applicant is not clear on this request, but assumes that this request relates to Schedule 4 and the presents the revised schedule below:

			Net			Net	
Initiative Name	Bill Class		er Peak D vings (M		Annual E	nergy Saviı	ngs (MWh)
		2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008
2006							_
2006 Every Kilowatt	Residential						
Counts (spring)		0.01	0.01	0.01	893	893	893
2006 Cool Savings	Residential						
Rebate Program		0.07	0.07	0.07	68	68	68
2006 Secondary Fridge	Residential						
Retirement Pilot		0.01	0.01	0.01	37	37	37

2008 Other Demand Response	GS >50 kW	0.00	0.00	0.02	0	0	<u>0</u> 2,567
Response 3	kW	0.00	0.00	0.48	0	0	0
Response 1 2008 Demand	kW GS >50	0.00	0.00	0.68	0	0	0
2008 Demand	GS >50				0	0	
2008 Power Savings Blitz	GS <50 kW	0.00	0.00	0.03	0	0	207
2008 Electricity Retrofit Incentive	GS >50 kW	0.00	0.00	0.11	0	0	569
Counts Power Savings Event 2008 peaksaver®	Residential	0.00	0.00	0.04 0.51	0	0	784 10
2008 Every Kilowatt	Residential	0.00	0.00	0.10	3	<u> </u>	317
2008 Summer Sweepstakes	Residential	0.00	0.00	0.10	0	0	517
2008 Cool Savings Rebate	Residential	0.00	0.00	0.10	0	0	153
2008 Great Refrigerator Roundup	Residential	0.00	0.00	0.04	0	0	327
2008							
		0.00	0.59	0.59	0	1,849	1,839
2007 Other Demand Response	GS >50 kW	0.00	0.03	0.03	0	0	0
2007 Demand Response 1	GS >50 kW	0.00	0.06	0.06	0	0	0
2007 Electricity Retrofit Incentive Program	GS >50 kW	0.00	0.01	0.01	0	16	16
Assistance for Houses – Pilot		0.00	0.01	0.01	0	21	21
Pilot 2007 Energy Efficiency	Residential	0.00	0.01	0.01	0	78	78
2007 Summer Savings 2007 Social Housing –	Residential Residential	0.00	0.30	0.30	0	536	536
2007 Every Kilowatt Counts	Residential	0.00	0.03	0.03	0	870	860
Rebate		0.00	0.13	0.13	0	199	199
Roundup 2007 Cool Savings	Residential	0.00	0.01	0.01	0	129	129
2007 2007 Great Refrigerator	Residential						
2007		0.42	0.42	0.42	2,446	2,446	2,446
Response 1	kW	0.32	0.32	0.32	0	0	0
2006 Demand	GS >50				.,	.,	.,
2006 Every Kilowatt Counts (fall)	Residential	0.02	0.02	0.02	1,448	1,448	1,448

					4	6	
		0.000	0.000	0.000			
Weighted Average Rate		0	0	0	0.0131	0.0131	0.0131
LRAM Calculation		0	0	0	32,009	56,011	79,284
Total LRAM for the					-		-
Class							
GS <50 kWh		0	0	28	0	0	206,714
		0.000	0.000	0.000			,
Weighted Average Rate		0	0	0	0.0171	0.0171	0.0171
LRAM Calculation		0	0	0		0	3,528
Total LRAM for the							-
Class							
GS >50 kW		317	414	1,701	0	16,120	585,516
		3.201	3.201	3.200		,	,
Weighted Average Rate		0	4	4	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
LRAM Calculation		1,014	1,324	5,443	0	0	0
Total LRAM for the				·			
Class							
					2,445,62	4,294,83	6851360.4
Total LRAM kW/kWh	Total	422	1,013	3,145	4	6	9
Total LRAM \$		1,014	1,324	5,443	32,009	56,011	82812.35
Grand Total LRAM kWh							
\$							6,740,460
Grand Total LRAM kW							
\$							4,580
Grand Total LRAM \$							178,614

QUESTION #18

References: Exhibit 9/Tab 2/Schedule 1

Exhibit 9/Tab 2/Schedule 4, page 2 Exhibit 9/Tab 2/Schedule 5, page 1 Exhibit 9/Tab 3/Schedule 5, page 2

a) Please confirm that in accordance with the EB-2007-0776 Settlement Agreement, 2008 rates were set using actual loads and that these rates were the basis for setting 2009 rates under IRM.

Response:

The Applicant confirms that the above statement is correct for the Newmarket service area.

b) If part (a) is affirmed, please explain why the LRAM for 2009 includes any CDM savings other than those that would be incremental what is reflected in the actual 2008 loads?

Response:

In regard to the Newmarket service area, the Applicant does not believe that as part of the settlement in EB-2007-0776 it agreed to forego any past CDM savings. In regard to Tay service area, the settlement in EB-2007-0776 is not applicable.

c) Provide a version of the LRAM Calculation exhibit that includes the savings for 2006-2008 but 2009 excludes the actual savings up to the end of 2008.

Response:

The Applicant did not request the savings for the 2009 programs; just the savings for the 2006 to 2008 programs that affect 2009. Therefore, the answer to this question would be the same as 17 d) above. If the savings for 2006 to 2008 are prorated to May 1, 2009 for Newmarket and Tay's savings are included for the entire year, the overall savings mentioned in 17d) would increase from \$178,614 by \$22,474 to \$201,088.

d) Provide a Version of the Bill Impact exhibit resulting from savings as outlined in part c).

Response

The overall revenue change relating to this request is \$74,294. If the 2009 component is prorated the impact would be \$51,820. The Applicant has chosen to provide a revised "Summary of Impacts" as provided in Exhibit 8 Tab 9 Schedule 3 Attachment 1. The following chart assumes the \$74,294 change and also provides a comparison with the chart submitted:

Summary of Bill Impacts Based on Total I	Bill Before Tax					As
Class/Location	kWh/Mn	kW/Mn	Old Bill \$	New Bill \$	% Change	Submitted
Residential - Newmarket	100		24.25	27.41	13.04%	13.09%
	250		39.17	42.65	8.88%	8.96%
	500		64.05	68.05	6.26%	6.35%
	800		95.95	100.59	4.83%	4.93%
	1,000		117.72	122.77	4.29%	4.40%
Residential - Tay	100		27.80	27.41	-1.39%	-1.35%
	250		43.35	42.65	-1.61%	-1.54%
	500		69.27	68.05	-1.76%	-1.67%
	800		102.80	100.59	-2.15%	-2.05%
	1,000		125.49	122.77	-2.16%	-2.06%
GS Less than 50 kW - Newmarket	1,000		128.07	138.63	8.25%	8.26%
	2,000		236.85	250.77	5.87%	5.89%
	5,000		563.20	587.16	4.25%	4.27%
	10,000		1,107.11	1,147.83	3.68%	3.69%

	1		1			
GS Less than 50 kW - Tay	1,000		127.64	138.63	8.61%	8.62%
	2,000		244.47	250.77	2.57%	2.59%
	5,000		594.97	587.16	-1.31%	-1.30%
	10,000		1,179.13	1,147.83	-2.65%	-2.64%
Unmetered Scattered Load - Newmarket	200		36.53	32.58	-10.81%	-10.81%
	500		66.37	63.08	-4.96%	-4.96%
Unmetered Scattered Load - Tay	200		29.81	32.58	9.30%	9.30%
	500		63.12	63.08	-0.07%	-0.07%
GS Greater Than 50 kW - Newmarket	25,000	60	2,694.23	2,777.92	3.11%	3.11%
Analog/Smart Meter	40,000	100	4,182.71	4,327.39	3.46%	3.46%
Analog/Smart Meter	200,000	<i>500</i>	20,308.95	21,062.97	3.71%	3.72%
Analog/Smart Meter	400,000	1,000	40,466.75	41,982.43	3.75%	3.75%
GS Greater Than 50 kW - Tay	25,000	60	2,814.40	2,777.92	-1.30%	-1.29%
Analog/Smart Meter	40,000	100	4,351.93	4,327.39	-0.56%	-0.56%
Analog/Smart Meter	200,000	500	20,941.77	21,062.97	0.58%	0.58%
Street Lights -Newmarket	402,353	1,092	61,424.84	62,462.41	1.69%	1.69%
Street Lights -Tay	37,201	104	4,593.79	5,799.69	26.25%	26.25%
Sentinel Lts - Newmarket	60	0.18	8.46	8.69	2.72%	2.72%
Sentinel Lts - Tay	60	0.18	7.87	8.66	10.04%	10.04%

e) Provide a version of the exhibit at Exhibit 9/Tab 3/Schedule 5, page 2 that shows CDM savings as described in part c).

Response:

Alternative 1 (Preferred - LRAM recovered over 2 years with Deferral balances)

Annual Recovery of Deferral Accounts at 2010 Activity

Class	kWh	kW	Rate	Recovery
Residential	274,854,374		0.00224	617,014
GS<50	95,754,008		0.00180	172,047
USL	391,118		0.00074	288
GS>50		788,495	0.21019	165,737
Street Lights		14,582	0.16828	2,454
Sentinel Lights		850	0.18218	155
Annual				957,694
Recovery May 1, 2	2010 to Apr 30,	2013		1,915,388

Alternative 2 (LRAM recovered over 1 year, Deferral balances over 2 years)

@ Proposed Rates with 2010 Statistics

Deferral Accounts

Class	kWh	kW	DA Rate	Recovery
0.10.00		1000		
Residential	274,854,374		0.00194	533,362
GS<50	95,754,008		0.00178	170,282
USL	391,118		0.00074	288
GS>50		788,495	0.20526	161,847
Street Lights		14,582	0.16828	2,454
Sentinel Lights		850	0.18218	155
Annual				868,387
Recovery May 1, 2	2009 to Apr 30,	2011		1,736,774
	Li	RAM		
Class	kWh	kW	LRAM Rate	Recovery
Residential	274,854,374		0.00061	167,305
GS<50	95,754,008		0.00004	3,528
GS>50		788,495	0.00987	7,781
Recovery May 1, 2	2010 to Apr 30,	2011		178,614
	_			
Total Recovery D	uring Rate Peri	od		1,915,388

f) Please confirm that if the load forecast used to set the rates for 2006 (and by implication also 2007 and 2008) had included the anticipated CDM savings for those years, then the lower overall sales levels would have resulted in increased rates for all customer classes.

Response:

The Applicant's predecessor company, Newmarket Hydro Ltd did not participate in the 2006 – 2008 EDR process. As such, the Applicant cannot confirm this.

SMART METER COST RECOVERY

QUESTION #19

References: OEB Guideline G-2008-0002:

OEB Filing Requirements for Smart Meter Investment Plans, October 26,

2006

a) Confirm that Guideline G-2008-0002 has not superseded the Filing Requirements for Smart Meter Investment Plans, October 26, 2006

Response:

The Applicant cannot confirm this one way or the other.

Chapter 3 of the Filing Requirements for Transmission and Distribution Applications issued July 9, 2010 at pare 14 indicates:

"2.3 Smart Meter Funding Adder

The Smart Meter Funding adder currently applied to all metered customers in accordance with the Board's Decision RP-2005-0020/EB-2005-0529 and as subsequently revised in Board decisions and rate Orders for each distributor.

This funding adder is not subject to the price cap adjustment.

Requests for changes to smart meter funding adders should comply with the latest version of the Board Guideline G-2008-0002 Smart Meter Funding and Cost Recovery. The Rate Generator Model will also include a schedule for a distributor to include the rate adder on the proposed Tariff of Rates and Charges."

Therefore, it is the Applicant's understanding that the Filing Requirements for Smart Meter Investment Plans, October 26, 2006 have been superseded by Guideline G-2008-0002.

- b) Confirm that paragraph 7 of the Filing Requirements specifies that
 - 7. Specifically, and in as much detail as possible, please provide the following informtion for your planned implementation of the SMIP:
 - the effect of the SMIP on the level of the allowance for PILs.

the number of meters installed by class and by year, both in absolute terms and as a percentage of the class;

Response:

	20	006	20	07	20	08	20	<i>0</i> 9	Projected 201	
	Res	GS<50	Res	GS<50	Res	GS<50	Res	GS<50	Res	GS<50
Smart Meters Installed in Year	250	_	27,612	-	622	300	654	_	464	_
Total Smart Meter Customers	250	•	27,862		28,484	300	29,138	300	29,602	300
Total Customers % Installed	27,862 0.9%	2,769 0.0%	27,862 100.0%	2,815 0.0%	28,484 100.0%	2,870 10.5%	29,138 100.0%	2,880 10.4%	29,602 100.0%	2,909 10.3%

• the capital expenditures and amortization by class and by year;

Response

200	06	200	7	20	008	20	09	Projec	ted 2010
Exp	Depn	Exp	Depn	Ехр	Depn	Exp	Depn	Ехр	Depn

Residential	294,833	9,828	3,676,850	71,840	686,566	334,925	473,285	324,925	
Less than									
<i>50</i>			50,220	279	162,550	14,185		14,185	

• the operating expenses by class and by year;

Response

O&M	2009	2010 Projection
Residential	209,292	369,270
GS<50	2,137	3,730
Total	211,429	373,000

• the effect of the SMIP on the level of the allowance for PILs.

Response

Please see Energy Probe IR 7.

c) Has NTP kept records by class as required and are accounts 1556 and 1555 segregated by rate class? Please elaborate.

Response:

As of September 2010, the majority of Smart Meters that have been installed are all single phase units, with a few of these are installed in GS<50 locations as shown in the Cost Allocation Model (Residential – 29,370 and GS<50 – 300). Costs in these accounts would be split in this ratio.

QUESTION #20

Reference: Exhibit 9/Tab 3/Schedule 2, pages 2-9

Preamble: This request is to provide a breakdown of Residential and Commercial meter installations in 2006, 2007, 2008, 2010 (to March 31 2010)

a) Provide by year Support/details of the 2006-2010 (to March 31 2010) Residential Class SM Unit costs (procurement and installation separately).

Response

Smart Meter Unit Costs - Residential

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Total Units Installed	250	27,862	28,484	29,138	29,602
Procurement (Meter) Costs	20,012	2,475,955	2,716,333	2,792,656	2,792,656
Per Unit Meter Costs	80.05	88.86	95.36	95.84	94.34
Installation Costs	3,532	308,109	315,620	321,804	323,289
Per Unit Installation Costs	14.13	11.06	11.08	11.04	10.92
Communications & Back Office Costs	271,289	1,178,353	1,609,040	1,995,034	2,001,393
Per Unit Com and Back Office Costs	1,085.16	42.29	56.49	68.47	67.61
Total Residential Costs	294,833	3,962,417	4,640,994	5,109,493	5,117,338
Total Residential Per Unit Costs	1,179.33	142.22	162.93	175.35	172.87

b) Provide by year support/details of the 2006-2010 (to March 31 2010) Residential Class SM AMI, communications and back office costs (procurement and installation).

Response

See a) above

c) Provide by year support/details of the 2006-2010 (to March 31 2010) *Commercial Class* SM Unit costs (procurement and installation separately).

Response

Smart Meter Unit Costs - GS < 50 kW

Sinar motor	311111 00010	00 100 .			
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Total Units Installed	0	0	300	300	300
Procurement (Meter) Costs	0	50,220	212,740	213,520	213,520
Per Unit Meter Costs	0.00	0.00	709.13	711.73	711.73
Installation Costs	0	0	3,622	3,685	3,700
Per Unit Installation Costs	0.00	0.00	12.07	12.28	12.33
Communications & Back Office Costs	0	9,265	13,664	17,607	17,672
Per Unit Com and Back Office Costs	0.00	0.00	45.55	58.69	58.91
Total GS < 50 Costs	0	59,486	230,026	234,812	234,892

Total GS < 50 Per Unit Costs	0.00	0.00	766.75	782.71	782.97

d) Provide by year support/details of the 2006-2010 actual (to March 31 2010) Commercial Class SM AMI, communications and back office costs (procurement and installation).

Response Please see c) above.

e) Provide a schedule that gives a breakdown of the 2006 – 2010 (to March 31 2010) Capital Costs between the Residential and GS<50kw classes. Reconcile to Tables in pre-filed evidence.

Response

Smart Meter Unit Costs - Total NT Power

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Total Units Installed	250	27862	28784	29438	29902
Procurement (Meter) Costs	20,012	2,526,176	2,929,073	3,006,175	3,006,175
Per Unit Meter Costs	80.05	90.67	101.76	102.12	100.53
Installation Costs	3,532	308,109	319,241	325,489	326,989
Per Unit Installation Costs	14.13	11.06	11.09	11.06	10.94
Communications & Back Office Costs	271,289	1,187,618	1,622,705	2,012,641	2,019,065
Per Unit Com and Back Office Costs	1,085.16	42.63	56.38	68.37	67.52
Total Costs	294,833	4,021,903	4,871,020	5,344,305	5,352,229
Total Per Unit Costs	1,179.33	144.35	169.23	181.54	178.99

f) Provide a breakdown of the O&M costs for meters installed in 2006 – 2010 (to March 31 2010) between the Residential, GS<50kw classes. Reconcile to Tables in prefiled evidence.

Response

	2009	Mar 2010
Residential	209,292	<i>53,934</i>
GS<50	2,137	550
Total	211,430	54,485

g) Were/are any SM installed in other classes? If so provide details of costs, if any, to be recovered.

Response:

None have been installed in other classes.

 h) Provide the details of the balances and the amounts to be disposed of in Accounts 1555 and 1556 by class. Include the carrying cost calculation(s).
 Response

1555

Smart Meter costs included in the model shown in Exhibit 9, Tab 3, Schedule 2 include only the costs for "Residential" type Smart Meters. At March 2010, there were 29,200 of these installed in the Residential class and 300 installed in the GG<50 Class. The GS<50 Class meters are factored into that class by actual price while all other capital costs are apportioned by number of installs:

	r Capital Allocationrch 31, 2010	on	
Class S	%		
Residential	5,117,338	95.6%	
GS<50	S<50 234,892		
Total Installs	5,352,229	100.0%	
1555 Smart Meter Co	apital	\$	
Residential		225,534	
GS<50	10,352		
1555 Total		235,886	

Response

1556

O&M Costs are allocated to the classes by number of installs:

Smart	Meter O&M Allocation					
to March 31, 2010						
Class	Class SM's Installed %					
Residential	99.0%					
GS<50	1.0%					
Total Installs	29,500	100.0%				

1556 Smart Meter O&M	\$
Residential	873,880
GS<50	8,926
1556 Total	882,806

Reference: Exhibit 9 Tab 3 Schedule 2

a) Provide a rate adder cash flow projection for NTP showing SM rate adder revenue and SM expenditures by Class per Month for the 2006-2010 Actual (to March 31 2010)

Response:

Response:

The following charts highlight the SM cash flow as requested.

The first chart shows the inflows of cash related to SM's from Rate Adders.

Cash from Rate Adder:

Month	Total Cash Month Inflow					
	Residential	GS<50	GS>50	Month Total	Life to Date	
May-06	(31.62)	(1.53)	(0.23)	(33.39)	(33.39)	
Jun-06	(596.69)	(35.13)	(1.82)	(633.64)	(667.03)	
Jul-06	(1,019.71)	(58.62)	(0.84)	(1,079.17)	(1,746.20)	
Aug-06	(1,009.11)	(60.05)	(2.80)	(1,071.96)	(2,818.16)	
Sep-06	(998.80)	(61.16)	(3.36)	(1,063.32)	(3,881.48)	
Oct-06	(1,101.52)	(61.05)	(2.80)	(1,165.37)	(5,046.85)	
Nov-06	(1,043.56)	(58.82)	(2.80)	(1,105.18)	(6,152.03)	
Dec-06	(1,045.77)	(66.51)	(2.52)	(1,114.80)	(7,266.83)	
Jan-07	(1,047.51)	(66.91)	(3.36)	(1,117.78)	(8,384.61)	
Feb-07	(1,052.21)	(68.03)	(3.36)	(1,123.60)	(9,508.21)	
Mar-07	(1,047.76)	(67.55)	(5.60)	(1,120.91)	(10,629.12)	
Apr-07	(342.63)	(18.81)	(1.18)	(362.61)	(10,991.73)	
May-07	(1,057.91)	(60.53)	(3.09)	(1,121.53)	(12,113.26)	
Jun-07	(9,648.96)	(552.04)	(28.19)	(10,229.19)	(22,342.45)	
Jul-07	(8,265.42)	(472.88)	(24.15)	(8,762.45)	(31,104.90)	
Aug-07	(8,102.86)	(463.58)	(23.68)	(8,590.11)	(39,695.01)	
Sep-07	(8,111.33)	(464.07)	(23.70)	(8,599.09)	(48,294.10)	

Oct-07	(8,195.47)	(468.88)	(23.95)	(8,688.29)	(56,982.40)
Nov-07	(8,127.57)	(465.00)	(23.75)	(8,616.32)	(65,598.72)
Dec-07	(8,190.96)	(468.62)	(23.93)	(8,683.52)	(74,282.24)
Jan-08	(9,793.15)	(545.86)	(29.75)	(10,368.77)	(84,651.00)
Feb-08	(9,793.15)	(545.86)	(29.75)	(10,368.77)	(95,019.77)
Mar-08	(9,793.15)	(545.86)	(29.75)	(10,368.77)	(105,388.54)
Apr-08	(9,874.00)	(569.03)	(29.91)	(10,472.94)	(115,861.48)
May-08	(9,874.00)	(569.03)	(29.91)	(10,472.94)	(126,334.42)
Jun-08	(9,875.00)	(569.03)	(29.91)	(10,473.94)	(136,808.36)
Jul-08	(9,845.15)	(565.10)	(29.80)	(10,440.05)	(147,248.41)
Aug-08	(9,845.15)	(565.10)	(29.80)	(10,440.05)	(157,688.45)
Sep-08	(9,845.15)	(565.10)	(29.80)	(10,440.05)	(168,128.50)
Oct-08	(9,859.98)	(565.15)	(29.82)	(10,454.96)	(178,583.45)
Nov-08	(9,859.98)	(565.15)	(29.82)	(10,454.96)	(189,038.41)
Dec-08	(9,859.98)	(565.15)	(29.82)	(10,454.96)	(199,493.37)
Jan-09	(9,891.09)	(563.65)	(29.76)	(10,484.50)	(209,977.86)
Feb-09	(9,891.09)	(563.65)	(29.76)	(10,484.50)	(220,462.36)
Mar-09	(9,891.09)	(563.65)	(29.76)	(10,484.50)	(230,946.86)
Apr-09	(9,861.51)	(565.24)	(29.82)	(10,456.58)	(241,403.43)
May-09	(9,861.51)	(565.24)	(29.82)	(10,456.58)	(251,860.01)
Jun-09	(18,326.73)	(1,489.80)	(158.76)	(19,975.30)	(271,835.31)
Jul-09	(24,582.18)	(2,164.92)	(253.90)	(27,001.01)	(298,836.31)
Aug-09	(24,590.98)	(2,165.80)	(254.19)	(27,010.97)	(325,847.29)
Sep-09	(24,626.16)	(2,166.10)	(254.48)	(27,046.74)	(352,894.03)
Oct-09	(24,660.38)	(2,170.26)	(253.95)	(27,084.59)	(379,978.61)
Nov-09	(24,689.99)	(2,172.90)	(253.95)	(27,116.83)	(407,095.45)
Dec-09	(24,713.73)	(2,174.95)	(253.95)	(27,142.63)	(434,238.08)
Jan-10	(24,766.66)	(2,182.27)	(251.44)	(27,200.37)	(461,438.44)
Feb-10	(24,686.10)	(2,172.65)	(250.10)	(27,108.85)	(488,547.29)
Mar-10	(24,872.24)	(2,191.04)	(253.25)	(27,316.53)	(515,863.82)

The following chart shows the outflow of cash for the SM Program on a monthly basis. It includes outlays for all capitalized costs and Operation and Maintenance costs from September 2009 to March 2010.

Total Cash Outflows

Month			Total Cash Outflow		
	Residential	GS<50	GS>50	Month Total	Life to Date
May-06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jun-06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jul-06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Aug-06	51,052.24	0.00	0.00	51,052.24	51,052.24
Sep-06	19,691.18	0.00	0.00	19,691.18	70,743.41
Oct-06	<i>50,073.26</i>	0.00	0.00	50,073.26	120,816.67
Nov-06	48,689.09	0.00	0.00	48,689.09	169,505.76

Dec-06	125,327.24	0.00	0.00	125,327.24	294,833.00
Jan-07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	294,833.00
Feb-07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	294,833.00
Mar-07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	294,833.00
Apr-07	1,242,488.28	12,691.40	0.00	1,255,179.68	1,550,012.68
May-07	93,095.88	950.93	0.00	94,046.81	1,644,059.49
Jun-07	289,460.65	2,956.70	0.00	292,417.35	1,936,476.84
Jul-07	484,759.81	4,951.58	0.00	489,711.39	2,426,188.23
Aug-07	338,463.88	3,457.24	0.00	341,921.12	2,768,109.35
Sep-07	<i>478,523.70</i>	4,887.88	0.00	483,411.58	3,251,520.93
Oct-07	70,538.93	720.52	0.00	71,259.45	3,322,780.38
Nov-07	152,376.77	1,556.45	0.00	153,933.22	3,476,713.60
Dec-07	489,456.48	<i>55,732.53</i>	0.00	545,189.01	4,021,902.61
Jan-08	10,055.79	102.71	0.00	<i>10,158.50</i>	4,032,061.11
Feb-08	40,519.19	413.88	0.00	40,933.07	4,072,994.18
Mar-08	29,553.95	164,481.94	0.00	194,035.89	4,267,030.07
Apr-08	39,758.01	406.11	0.00	40,164.12	4,307,194.19
May-08	47,345.80	483.61	0.00	47,829.41	4,355,023.60
Jun-08	<i>29,805.97</i>	304.45	0.00	30,110.42	4,385,134.02
Jul-08	40,948.14	418.27	0.00	41,366.41	4,426,500.43
Aug-08	<i>57,884.97</i>	<i>5</i> 91.27	0.00	<i>58,476.24</i>	4,484,976.67
Sep-08	232,172.49	2,371.53	0.00	234,544.02	4,719,520.69
Oct-08	74,137.64	<i>757.28</i>	0.00	74,894.92	4,794,415.61
Nov-08	41,841.22	<i>4</i> 27.39	0.00	42,268.61	4,836,684.22
Dec-08	33,987.70	347.17	0.00	34,334.87	4,871,019.09
Jan-09	23,788.42	242.99	0.00	24,031.41	4,895,050.50
Feb-09	47,360.06	483.76	0.00	47,843.82	4,942,894.32
Mar-09	23,539.66	240.45	0.00	23,780.11	4,966,674.43
Apr-09	46,902.65	479.09	0.00	47,381.74	<i>5,014,056.17</i>
May-09	<i>69,855.98</i>	713.54	0.00	<i>70,</i> 569.52	5,084,625.69
Jun-09	48,186.89	492.21	0.00	48,679.10	5,133,304.79
Jul-09	34,570.27	353.12	0.00	34,923.39	5,168,228.18
Aug-09	116,980.60	1,194.90	0.00	118,175.50	<i>5,286,403.68</i>
Sep-09	33,810.52	345.36	0.00	34,155.88	<i>5,320,559.56</i>
Oct-09	<i>45,641.88</i>	466.21	0.00	46,108.09	<i>5,366,667.65</i>
Nov-09	61,527.88	628.48	0.00	62,156.36	5,428,824.01
Dec-09	125,627.76	1,283.23	0.00	126,910.99	<i>5,555,735.00</i>
Jan-10	23,779.36	242.89	0.00	24,022.25	5,579,757.25
Feb-10	14,147.27	144.51	0.00	14,291.78	5,594,049.03
Mar-10	23,851.43	243.63	0.00	24,095.06	5,618,144.09

b) Compare the forecast surplus/deficit for each class to the proposed aggregate (residential and GS<50 kw) rate adder per customer per month

Response:

Net Cash Flow (Inflow less Outflow)

Month	Net Cash Flow					
	Residential	GS<50	GS>50	Month Total	Life to Date	
May-06	(31.62)	(1.53)	(0.23)	(33.39)	(33.39)	
Jun-06	(596.69)	(35.13)	(1.82)	(633.64)	(667.03)	
Jul-06	(1,019.71)	(58.62)	(0.84)	(1,079.17)	(1,746.20	
Aug-06	50,043.13	(60.05)	(2.80)	49,980.27	48,234.07	
Sep-06	18,692.38	(61.16)	(3.36)	18,627.86	66,861.93	
Oct-06	48,971.74	<i>(61.05)</i>	(2.80)	48,907.89	115,769.82	
Nov-06	47,645.53	(58.82)	(2.80)	<i>47,583.91</i>	163,353.73	
Dec-06	124,281.47	(66.51)	(2.52)	124,212.44	287,566.1 7	
Jan-07	(1,047.51)	(66.91)	(3.36)	(1,117.78)	286,448.3	
Feb-07	(1,052.21)	(68.03)	(3.36)	(1,123.60)	285,324.7	
Mar-07	(1,047.76)	<i>(67.55)</i>	(5.60)	(1,120.91)	284,203.8	
Apr-07	1,242,145.65	12,672.60	(1.18)	1,254,817.07	1,539,020.9	
May-07	92,037.97	890.40	(3.09)	92,925.28	1,631,946.2	
Jun-07	279,811.70	2,404.66	(28.19)	282,188.16	1,914,134.3	
Jul-07	476,494.39	4,478.70	(24.15)	480,948.94	2,395,083.3	
Aug-07	330,361.02	2,993.66	(23.68)	333,331.01	2,728,414.3	
Sep-07	470,412.37	4,423.82	(23.70)	474,812.49	3,203,226.8	
Oct-07	62,343.46	251.64	(23.95)	62,571.16	3,265,797.9	
Nov-07	144,249.19	1,091.46	(23.75)	145,316.90	3,411,114.8	
Dec-07	481,265.52	<i>55,263.91</i>	(23.93)	<i>5</i> 36, <i>5</i> 05.49	3,947,620.3	
Jan-08	262.63	(443.14)	(29.75)	(210.27)	3,947,410.1	
Feb-08	30,726.03	(131.97)	(29.75)	30,564.30	3,977,974.4	
Mar-08	19,760.79	163,936.08	(29.75)	183,667.12	4,161,641.5	
Apr-08	29,884.02	(162.92)	(29.91)	29,691.18	4,191,332.7	
May-08	37,471.80	(85.42)	(29.91)	37,356.47	4,228,689.1	
Jun-08	19,930.97	<i>(264.58)</i>	(29.91)	19,636.48	4,248,325.6	
Jul-08	31,102.99	(146.83)	(29.80)	30,926.36	4,279,252.0	
Aug-08	48,039.82	26.17	(29.80)	<i>48,036.19</i>	4,327,288.2	
Sep-08	222,327.34	1,806.43	(29.80)	224,103.97	<i>4,551,392.1</i> :	
Oct-08	64,277.66	192.13	(29.82)	<i>64,43</i> 9.96	4,615,832.1	
Nov-08	31,981.24	(137.77)	(29.82)	31,813.65	4,647,645.8	
Dec-08	24,127.72	(217.99)	(29.82)	23,879.91	4,671,525.7	
Jan-09	13,897.34	(320.66)	(29.76)	13,546.91	4,685,072.6	
Feb-09	37,468.97	(79.89)	(29.76)	37,359.32	4,722,431.9	
Mar-09	13,648.58	(323.20)	(29.76)	13,295.61	4,735,727.5	
Apr-09	37,041.14	<i>(</i> 86.15)	(29.82)	36,925.16	4,772,652.7	
May-09	59,994.47	148.30	(29.82)	60,112.94	4,832,765.6	
Jun-09	29,860.16	(997.60)	(158.76)	28,703.80	4,861,469.4	
Jul-09	9,988.09	(1,811.81)	(253.90)	7,922.38	4,869,391.8	
Aug-09	92,389.62	(970.90)	(254.19)	91,164.53	4,960,556.3	
Sep-09	9,184.37	(1,820.74)	(254.48)	7,109.14	4,967,665.5	
Oct-09	20,981.50	(1,704.05)	(253.95)	19,023.50	4,986,689.0	
Nov-09	36,837.90	(1,544.42)	(253.95)	35,039.53	5,021,728.5	
Dec-09	100,914.03	(891.73)	(253.95)	99,768.36	5,121,496.9	

Jan-10	(987.30)	(1,939.38)	(251.44)	(3,178.12)	5,118,318.81
Feb-10	(10,538.83)	(2,028.14)	(250.10)	(12,817.07)	5,105,501.74
Mar-10	(1,020.81)	(1,947.41)	(253.25)	(3,221.47)	5,102,280.27
Total	4,873,512.25	231,917.88	(3,149.86)	5,102,280.27	

Reference: Exhibit 9 Tab 3 Schedule 4 Pages 1 and 3

a) Provide a Copy of OEB Worksheets that calculate the net fixed assets, revenue requirement and rate adder revenue to generate the SM Actual cost recovery rate rider by rate class (Residential, GS<50kw) Compare with the Allocation at Exhibit 9/Tab 3/Schedule 4, page 3

Response:

Smart Meter costs included in the model shown in Exhibit 9, Tab 3, Schedule 2 include only the costs for single phase Smart Meters. At March 2010, there were 29,200 of these installed in the Residential class and 300 installed in the GS<50 Class. These meters are identical for either class and therefore a fair allocation is to simply calculate the percentage of the total by class. The following table demonstrates this:

	Meter Deployment March 31, 2010	
Class	Smart Meters	%
Residential	29200	98.99%
GS<50	300	1.01%
Total Installs	29500	100.00%
1555 Smart Meter	Capital	\$
Residential	•	233,501
GS<50		2,385
1555 Total		235,886
1556 Smart Meter	O&M	\$
Residential		873,880
GS<50		8,926
1556 Total		882,806

Exhibit 9, Tab 3, Schedule 4, page 3 used total meter \$ allocation from the Cost Allocation Model to distribute these costs. This method resulted in the following allocation:

1555 Smart Meter Capital	\$
Residential	165,278
GS<50	53,682
GS>50	16,926
1555 Total	235,886
1556 Smart Meter O&M	\$
Residential	618,555
GS<50	200,905
GS>50	63,346
1556 Total	882,806

The following Deferral Account Rates were submitted with the Application for the 3 classes:

	Allocator	Rate
Residential	kWh	0.00194
GS<50	kWh	0.00178
GS>50	kW	0.20526

If the actual cost approach is used, the new recovery rates are as follows:

	Allocator	Rate \$
Residential	kWh	0.0025
GS<50	kWh	0.0005
GS>50	kW	0.1544

OPERATING COSTS

QUESTION #23

Reference: Exhibit 1 Tab 1 Schedule 3 Pages 13 -14

a) The evidence states that "The main reason for the OM&A increase in 2009 is that the Applicant reassigned its line men from capital projects back to preventive maintenance programs." Please provide the number of FTEs involved in this reassignment and the impact of such a transfer on utility costs and revenue requirement in 2009.

Response

It represents approximately 1.5 people per annum.

On the assumption that the intervener meant the effect on the 2010 revenue requirement, it would be approximately a maximum differential of \$175,000 to \$185,000.

The Applicant is currently calculating the effect of the intervener request on a proxy 2009 revenue requirement. As the intervener can appreciate this is requiring time to develop a complete a 2009 revenue requirement.

b) Please provide the percentage increase in the utility's insurance costs in 2010 along with the overall market increase in insurance costs in 2010.

Response

The Applicant had budgeted for a 47% increase in Insurance costs from its insurance provider. The Applicant is unaware of the overall market increase in insurance costs.

c) Please indicate any changes in insurance coverage in 2010 as compared to 2009.

Response

There are no changes in coverage.

QUESTION #24

Reference: Exhibit 4 Tab 1 Schedule 1 Pages 1-2, Note 2 and Note 6

a) Please provide separate OM&A Trend Tables similar to that shown on page 1, for Tay and for Newmarket.

Response

Response

Newmarket	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Test
Operation & Maintenance	1,662,771	1,710,875	1,529,501	1,888,148	2,171,628
Billing & Collecting	1,290,839	1,353,231	1,403,982	1,551,342	1,930,823
Administration Labour & Exp	1,793,853	1,871,067	2,039,638	2,105,775	2,384,322

Community Relations & Advertising	100,304	71,707	55,252	42,668	58,561
Total OMA	4,841,907	5,006,880	5,361,430	5,584,933	6,545,334
Interest	1,778,564	1,493,713	1,375,000	1,443,780	2,021,920
Amortization	3,316,391	3,974,558	3,719,099	3,926,294	4,157,519
Property Tax	253,097	257,506	245,738	234,342	158,819
Income Taxes	2,221,551	1,962,288	1,607,996	1,728,792	1,034,788
Grand Total	12,411,510	12,694,945	12,309,262	12,918,141	13,918,380

Тау	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Test
Operation & Maintenance	198,184	184,117	301,638	319,879	388,596
Billing & Collecting	216,910	300,286	346,482	301,344	400,441
Administration Labour & Exp	274,150	392,025	334,896	336,598	414,076
Community Relations & Advertising	7,449	7,769	16,755	20,534	17,771
Total OMA	696,694	884,196	999,771	978,355	1,220,884
Interest	169,418	139,911	128,931	123,579	142,664
Amortization	225,497	278,658	362,949	344,178	368,171
Property Tax	14,378	14,351	14,539	11,967	15,127
Income Taxes	225,497	-	-		119,300
Grand Total	1,317,116	1,317,116	1,506,190	1,458,079	1,746,846

b) Please provide the number of FTEs in each year, 2006-2010 for Tay and for Newmarket.

Response

Newmarket

Number of Employees (full time)

		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Management		5	5	5	5	5
Supervisors		9	10	10	10	11
Non unionized		11	11	11	11	11
Unionized		20	18	18	19	20
7	Total	45	44	44	45	47

Tay

Number of Employees (full time)

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Management	2	2	2	2	2
Supervisors	0	0	0	0	0
Non unionized	4	4	4	4	4
Unionized	3	3	3	3	3
T	otal 9	9	9	9	9

c) Please provide the details of any wage and benefit increases pursuant to a collective agreement for 2009 and 2010.

Response

Wage increase 2009 3%

Wage increase 2010 3%

d) Please provide a copy of any collective agreement(s) currently in effect.

Response:

The agreements are attached as: Attach_1_PWU_Agreement Attach_2_Office_Association

QUESTION #25

Reference: Exhibit 4 Tab 1 Schedule 1 Page 4, lines 2-3 and lines 18-19

a) Please provide a detailed breakdown of the drivers of the 40% increase in O&M costs from 2008 to 2010.

Response:

Please see Exhibit 4, Tab 1, Schedule 2 and the response to SEC IR No. 23

b) Please provide the utility's view as to why an annual increase of 5% from 2003 through 2009 is acceptable.

Response:

As explained in the response to VECC IR No. 25a) above, the Applicant is responding to ever increasing diligence demands respecting distribution system safety and inspections, restrictions on accessing regional road allowances, work site safety, an unprecedented increase in infrastructure in a short time because of

delays in approval by other authorities and aging underground plant. The Applicant properly responds to these demands, and incurs the resulting costs.

c) Please provide the actual 2003 costs supporting the contention that there has been a 5% annual increase in costs since 2003.

Response

The amounts presented in the Application are on a consolidated basis. The Applicant's response to this question is based upon the Newmarket service area only; it does not take into account the fact that within the Tay service area there were only two linemen at non union wage rates in 2003 and the application includes three at union rates.

The 2003 Newmarket Hydro Audited Financial Statements Operational Line item was 1,761,433. This amount less amortization expense of \$243,278 included in operations and maintenance yields a non amortized expense of \$1,518,155. Since January 2003 to September 2010 inflation has been at 2.4% per annum. In addition to inflation the Applicant has had an annual increase in customers of 2.5% per annum with a corresponding increase in underground plant of 2.5%. Combining the annual inflation and increased plant yields an average increase to costs of potentially 5 % per annum.

QUESTION #26

Reference: Exhibit 4 Tab 1 Schedule 1 Page 3 Table

a) Please augment this table to include the years 2006 and 2007.

Response

	2006	2007	Change	Change 2006-07		2007 2008		Change 2007- 2008	
	Actual	Actual	\$	%	Actual	Test	\$	%	
Operation & Maintenance	1,860,955	1,894,991	34,036	1.83%	1,894,991	1,831,140	(63,851)	3.37%	
Billing & Collecting	1,507,749	1,653,517	145,768	9.67%	1,653,517	1,750,464	96,946	5.86%	
Administration Labour & Exp	2,068,003	2,263,092	195,089	9.43%	2,263,092	2,374,534	111,442	4.92%	
Community Relations & Advertising	107,754	79,476	(28,278)	- 26.24%	79,476	72,007	(7,469)	9.40%	
Total OMA	5,544,461	5,891,076	346,615	6.25%	5,891,076	6,028,145	137,069	2.33%	

Reference: Exhibit 4 Tab 2 Schedule 1 Page 1 Table and Page 2 Table

a) Please augment the referenced tables to include the years 2006 and 2007.

Response: Page 1 Table

OMA (cost per custor	ner and FTEE	•	
		2006		2007
Number of Customers		30,256		30,774
Total OMA	\$ 5,	544,461	\$	5,891,076
OMA per Customer	\$	183	\$	191
Number of FTEE'S		54		53
FTEEs/Customer		560		581
OMA cost per FTEE	\$ 1	102,675	\$	111,152

Page 2 Table

	2006	2006 average	benefits as a %	2007	2007 average	benefits
	(\$)	per employee (\$)	earnings	(\$)	per employee (\$)	as a % earnings
Management	126,093	18,013	0.20	135,933	19,419	0.20
Supervisors	156,105	17,345	0.24	181,913	18,191	0.22
Non unionized	184,181	12,279	0.27	187,761	12,517	0.26
Unionized	349,946	15,215	0.26	370,601	17,648	0.26
Total	816,324	15,117	0.24	876,208	16,532	0.24

QUESTION #28

Reference: Exhibit 4 Tab 4 Schedule 1 Pages 2-3 Table

a) Please augment the referenced table to include the years 2006 and 2007.

Response

Newmarket-Tay Power Distribution Ltd

Number of employees (FTEs including Part-Time)	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Executive	7	7	7	7	7
Management	9	10	10	10	11
Non-Union	15	15	15	15	15
Union	23	21	21	22	23
Total	54	53	53	54	56
Total Salary and Wages					
Executive	639,841	676,319	719,496	740,806	762,759
Management	689,346	854,816	880,629	906,134	1,054,418
Non-Union	670,026	711,039	744,618	762,324	786,334
Union	1,674,182	1,641,025	1,793,111	1,929,765	2,006,995
Total	3,673,395	3,883,199	4,137,854	4,339,029	4,610,506
Total Benefits					
Executive	126,093	135,933	139,980	145,140	152,669
Management	156,105	181,913	189,797	192,230	228,272
Non-Union	184,181	187,760	201,136	211,938	220,429
Union	349,946	370,601	367,743	399,353	433,124
Total	816,325	876,207	898,656	948,661	1,034,494
Total Compensation (Salary, Wages, and Benefits)					
Executive	765,934	812,252	859,476	885,946	915,428
Management	845,451	1,036,729	1,070,426	1,098,364	1,282,690
Non-Union	854,207	898,799	945,754	974,262	1,006,763
Union	2,024,128	2,011,626	2,160,854	2,329,118	2,440,119
Total	4,489,720	4,759,406	5,036,510	5,287,690	5,645,000
Compensation - Average Yearly Base Wages					
Executive	91,406	95,331	101,496	104,544	107,680
Management	73,705	81,982	84,563	87,113	92,220
Non-Union	44,668	47,403	49,641	50,822	52,422
Union	59,303	67,269	70,371	71,648	73,032
Total	61,800	68,129	71,293	72,991	75,612
Compensation - Average Yearly Overtime					
Executive					
Management					
Non-Union					
Union	13,487	11,186	15,015	16,068	14,228
Total					
Average Yearly Incentive Pay					
Executive					
Management	2,889	4,400	4,400	4,400	<i>4,455</i>
Non-Union					
Union					
Total					

Compensation - Average Yearly Benefits					
Executive	18,013	19,419	19,997	20,734	21,810
Management	17,345	18,191	18,980	19,223	20,752
Non-Union	12,279	12,517	13,409	14,129	14,695
Union	15,215	17,648	17,512	18,1 52	18,831
Total	15,117	16,532	16,956	17,568	18,473
Total Compensation	4,489,720	4,759,406	5,036,510	5,287,690	5,645,000
Total Compensation Charged to OM&A	3,053,010	3,188,802	3,308,987	3,529,170	3,782,150
Total Compensation Capitalized	1,436,710	1,570,604	1,727,523	1,758,520	1,862,850

Reference: General

a) Please provide the operating budgets as approved by the Board of Directors for each year 2006-2010 inclusive.

Response:

Please refer to the response to School Energy Coalition IR No. 12 for the 2010 OM&A budget. It is taking extra time for the Applicant to gather the prior years information and will file it separately.

CORPORATE STRUCTURE

QUESTION #30

Reference: Exhibit 1 Tab 2 Schedule 3 Attachment

a) The attached chart shows seven numbered companies 100% owned by NHHI. Please specify the nature of these seven businesses.

Response

Please see the response to Board Staff IR No. 13a).

RATE BASE AND CAPITAL SPENDING

QUESTION #31

Reference: Exhibit 2 Tab 3 Schedule 1

a) Please provide the year-to-date capital spending in 2010.

Response

Please see Consumers Council of Canada IR 3.

b) Please provide the amount of grants and contributions received to date in 2010.

Response:

Capital Contributions to July 31 = \$745,973.

QUESTION #32

Reference: Exhibit 2 Tab 4 Schedule 3

a) Please provide the capital budgets as approved by the Board of Directors for each year 2006-2010 inclusive.

Response:

USoA Account		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Distribution - Land	1805	125,000	125,000	0	208,509	0
Distribution - Land Rights	1806	0	0	400,000	0	0
Mun Trans Stn<50kv	1820	<i>515,200</i>	480,200	981,700	858,393	1,429,792
Distribution Lines o/h Poles	1830	721,784	735,258	1,732,105	1,283,559	2,262,680
Distribution Lines o/h Cable	1835	721,784	735,258	2,129,860	1,326,257	2,319,612
Distribution Lines u/g Conduit	1840	178,290	178,290	255,000	601,791	537,894
Distribution Lines u/g Cable	1845	717,072	715,660	1,568,587	1,774,972	1,679,077
Services	1855	962,259	954,450	1,024,890	846,693	674,471
Distribution Transformers	1850	674,850	674,850	983,311	930,505	1,489,888
Distribution Meters	1860	882,000	877,000	401,640	117,323	49,364
Smart Meters	1860	0	0	1,696,019	649,242	2,027,551
Leasehold Improvements	1910	58,000	58,000	58,000	125,000	95 ,000
Office Equipment	1915	23,200	23,200	6,236	8,200	12,040
Computer Equipment	1920	<i>58,300</i>	65,800	33,350	71,800	45 , 100
Computer Software	1925	63,000	64,000	96,650	77,500	260,200
Stores Whse Equipment	1935	0	0	0	0	0
Rolling Stock & Equip.	1930	288,000	249,000	843,080	385,000	115,000
Misc. Tools & Equip.	1940	141,500	141,500	93,690	99,770	45 ,000
Measurement & Test Equip	1945			0	0	35,000
System Supervisory Equip	1980	100,000	100,000	20,000	0	0
Buildings	1908	1,200		0	62,853	0
Gross Total		6,231,439	6,177,465	12,324,117	9,427,367	13,077,668
Contributed Capital	1,995	(1,635,670)	(1,636,470)	(2,149,442)	(1,900,242)	(2,694,061)
Net Total		4,595,769	4,540,995	10,174,675	7,527,125	10,383,607

QUESTION #33

Reference: Exhibit 2 Tab 4 Schedule 6 Page 1, lines 9-11

a) Please specify how the utility determines that "the frequency of service disruptions have reached an unacceptable or uneconomic level," i.e., what metrics are used to determine when an asset need replacement, refurbishment, etc.?

RESPONSE

In managing service disruptions, the Applicant considers the risk associated with the failure of the major system component parts as discussed in Exhibit. 2. Tab 4, Schedule 5 page 1. Irrespective of the load or economic loss risk, these are trumped by public and worker safety or environmental impairment. The Applicant also reviews its year over year SQI results to verify they are being maintained through proper system management or if a worsening or improving trend is apparent.

Using this system management philosophy, the Applicant then employs a number of metrics on major assets to assess their performance, serviceability and determine when replacement or refurbishment is required. The metrics, in priority order, are summarized as follows:

- i) Potential risk to public or worker safety
- ii) Potential for environmental impairment
- iii) Asset category 44 kV, substation or 13.8/8 kV
- iv) Performance
- v) Condition
- vi) Type of technology, where applicable
- vii) Location
- viii) Age
- ix) History
- x) Obsolescence

Refurbishment/replacement decisions are based on cost, technology and obsolescence.

QUESTION #34

Reference: Exhibit 2 Tab 3 Schedule 1, Page 1 Table 1, and Page 4, Table 4

a) Please reconcile the capital additions shown in Table 4 with the additions shown in Table 1 for each year.

Response:

This Table should have been used:

Newmarket Tay Power Distribution Ltd.

rotal Capital Expenditures						
	2007	2008	2009	2010		

Land & Land Rights	51,571	756,243	149,794	0
Buildings	2,743	0	18,892	0
Mun Trans Stn<50kv	171,053	412,930	<i>(0)</i>	1,429,792
Distribution Lines	3,662,808	4,111,673	5,398,419	7,473,734
Distribution Transformers	1,025,697	993,043	1,012,859	1,489,888
Distribution Meters	4,119,253	1,299,338	653,147	2,076,914
Vehicles	141,250	725,821	346,763	115,000
Other Equipment	136,728	180,654	70,390	137,140
Other Fixed Assets	386,376	107,996	292,451	355,200
Contributed Capital	(1,421,423)	(1,570,253)	(2,021,935)	(2,694,061)
Total	8,276,055	7,017,446	5,920,779	10,383,607

SQIs

QUESTION #35

Reference: Exhibit 2 Tab 6 Schedule 1, Attachment containing SQI Results

a) The SAIDI, SAIFI, and CAIDI results that were submitted in January 2009 appear to be significantly worse than those submitted in January 2008 and in 2010. Please discuss.

Response:

The January, 2009 SAIDI, SAIFI and CAIDI submission reflect 2008 performance. As required by the Ontario Energy Board, this was the first full year the Applicant reported these statistics for the combined Newmarket and Tay service areas. The 2008 performance was negatively impacted by a substation fuse problem in Tay.

b) Is it the utility's understanding that the SQI targets are to be met on a monthly basis or on an annual basis.

Response:

The Applicant is not aware of specific SQI targets. As explained in the response to question 35 (a), the Applicant reviews SQI performance on an annual basis to determine if there is upward or downward trending from prior years.

c) For each month in which actual performance falls below target, please provide a brief explanation.

Response:

This question requires significant time and effort on the part of the Applicant to prepare a response. We question its probative value in this proceeding as the Applicant uses annual SQI performance as part of its system management decisions.