BRANT COUNTY POWER INC. (Brant)
2011 RATE APPLICATION (EB-2010-0125)

VECC INTERROGATORIES
(ROUND #1)

QUESTION #1

Reference: Exhibit 1/Tab 1/Schedule 6, page 1

a) Is Brant fully embedded within Brantford Power? If not, what other supply points are there and what rates are applicable at each?

b) Please confirm whether Brant is a registered IESO market participant

Response:

a) Brant is not fully embedded with Brantford Power. Rather they are embedded at three supply points – Colborne E, Colborne W. and Powerline Road.

b) Yes, BCP is a registered market participant.

QUESTION #2

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

a) Please provide a schedule that shows the derivation of the 2011 revenues by customer class, including the rates and volumes used.

b) Do the revenues shown in the table (and also reported in Appendix 2-C) include SS Admin Fee revenues? If so, where are they reported (i.e., what account)? Please provide the annual revenues for 2008-2011.

Response:

a) Please see requested table below.

2011 Test - applied for rates							
	Customers	Consumption	Fixed Charge	Variable Charge	Fixed Revenue	Variable Revenue	Distribution Revenues
	(Year-End)	(kWh / KW)					($)
Residential	8,290	80,122,583	11.00	0.0303	1,094,280	2,426,981	3,521,261
GS<50	1,315	39,095,551	17.00	0.0205	268,260	799,777	1,068,037
GS>50 to 499 kW	106	388,493	95.00	2.3436	120,840	910,470	1,031,310
Unmetered Scattered Load	51	493,370	2.00	0.0209	1,224	10,310	11,534
Sentinel Lighting	218	574	2.00	21.8402	5,232	12,536	17,768
Street Lighting	2,630	4,783	1.50	44.2301	47,340	211,553	258,893
TOTAL					1,537,176	4,371,626	5,908,802

b) The SS Admin fee is not contained in the above, but is recorded in Other Distribution Revenue in the referenced document.

QUESTION #3

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

a) Are the customer counts reported here year-end or average annual values?

b) The second and third tables make reference to "Normalized Average Consumption". Please clarify whether the historical values shown for 2002-2009 are the actual sales for each class or the "weather normalized" sales. If weather normalized please provide:
   - The actual sales by class for each year
   - An explanation as to how the sales for each class were weather normalized.

c) Please provide a table that shows the average use (per customer) for each class for each year from 2002-2011.

d) Please explain why the sales to the GS>50 class (i.e., kWh) are higher in the period 2007-2009 than in earlier years even though the number of customers is less.

Response:

a) The customer counts are year end values.

b) The historical values are actual sales values. The only weather normalized statistic are load values to 2010 and 2011.

c) See requested table below.

Consumption Per Customer										
	2002	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**
RESIDENTIAL	9,797	10,084	9,902	10,742	10,347	10,243	10,032	9,902	9,495	9,665
GENERAL SERVICE										
Less than 50 kW	25,106	25,071	26,438	28,566	27,591	28,141	29,124	28,922	28,471	29,730
Greater than 50 to 4,999 kW	558,356	617,357	771,802	860,601	922,031	1,544,867	1,523,525	1,473,650	1,440,671	1,431,611
Unmetered Scattered Load	8,972	11,339	10,888	10,641	9,204	9,305	9,136	9,543	9,605	9,674
Sentinel Lighting	1,014	925	924	980	1,090	1,383	1,348	1,008	997	987
Street Lighting	546	612	568	625	640	641	645	643	648	649

d) Sales in the GS>50 class (i.e. KWH) are higher, even though the number of customers are lower because even though some customers were “lost” due to recessionary times and other economic factors, the ones that remained in this class used significantly more power.

QUESTION #4

Reference: Exhibit 3/Tab 2/Schedule 1, pages 2-8

a) Please explain why the regression analysis was limited to the years 2005-2009 and did not include earlier years in the analysis.

b) Please describe any other model specifications (i.e., combinations of independent variables) that were tested and explain why each was rejected in favour of the proposed model.

c) Why was a GS>50 "flag" included for 2006?

d) Please provide the actual prediction model used (i.e., the equation with the coefficient values).

e) Please provide the historical CDM activity data use in the analysis and provide copies of any source documents relied on that support/explain the values used.

f) Have the CDM activity values been revised (as necessary) to reflect the most up-to-date estimates as to the unit saving for the various CDM programs included? If not, please provide an updated historical CDM data series (showing the various adjustments made); re-do the regression analysis, and update the purchase forecast for 2010 and 2011.

g) Please confirm that Brant's cumulative CDM energy target for the period 2011-2014 is 9.85 GWh.

h) Please provide the forecast CDM activity values use for 2010 and 2011. Please also explain the basis for the forecast and how it relates to Brant's CDM target.

i) Please provide the Ontario GDP forecast used for 2010 and 2011 and indicate when it was prepared.

j) Is Brant or its Consultant aware of any more recent economic forecasts for Ontario? If so, please provide and update the projection.

k) Please provide the 2009 actual value and the 2010 and 2011 forecast values for each independent variables used in the regression model.

l) Please provide the details of the geometric mean analysis used to forecast the customer count for each customer class.

m) Please provide the details for the third and fourth steps of the methodology (per page 2) wherein the class shares of the total billed load are determined for 2010 and 2011.

n) Please provide an update as to the current actual customer count by class based on the latest month for which data is available.

o) Please provide the actual 2010 purchases.

p) Using the regression model coefficients and the difference between the actual and weather normal HDD and CDD values – please determine the impact of actual vs. normal weather on purchases in 2009 and 2010. Using these results, please adjust the actual purchase values for each year to determine a "weather normal" sales for the year.

Response

a) Brant County Power was only able to supply Burman Energy with Energy Consumption from 2005-2009. Data earlier than 2005 was not available.

b) Various different variables have been tested in the regression analysis and many did not have a T-STAT of greater than 1 and therefore have been rejected. Below is a list of independent variables that have been tested and resulted in a T-STAT less than 1.

- Food Manufacturing (Fresh Poultry Meats)
- Plastic Manufacturing
- Chemical Manufacture
- Metal Manufacturing

c) The Energy Consumption and Demand (kWh and kW) data for the GS>50 kW has significant drop in 2006 and thus to compensate for this drop in the regression analysis a flag with a constant 1 is used in the regression analysis.

d)

	Coefficients
Intercept	- 14859932.85
Heating Degree Days	6014.761825
Cooling Degree Days	43198.63816
GS>50kW Flag for 2006	5461949.591
Number of Days in Month	391961.5878
Ontario Real GDP Monthly %	145506.6749
CDM Activity Variable	- 5.258390622

$$Purchased\ kWh_{Predicted} = (HDD_{coefficient} * HDD) + (CDD_{coefficient} * CDD) + (GS > 50kW\ Flag_{Coefficient} * 'Constant') + (Number\ of\ Days\ in\ a\ Month_{Coefficient} * Number\ of\ days\ in\ a\ month) + (Ontario\ real\ GDP_{Coefficient} * GDP) + (CDM\ Activity_{coefficient} * CDM\ activity) + \ Intercept$$

e) OPA Conservation results Files-Brant County power to provide files.

Month	CDM Activity Variable	Month	CDM Activity Variable	Month	CDM Activity Variable
Jan-06	10,539.41	Jan-07	125,508.89	Jan-08	122,011.60
Feb-06	21,078.82	Feb-07	124,544.83	Feb-08	129,118.91
Mar-06	31,618.24	Mar-07	123,580.78	Mar-08	136,226.22
Apr-06	42,157.65	Apr-07	122,616.73	Apr-08	143,333.53
May-06	52,697.06	May-07	121,652.67	May-08	150,440.84
Jun-06	63,236.47	Jun-07	120,688.62	Jun-08	157,548.14
Jul-06	73,775.88	Jul-07	119,724.56	Jul-08	164,655.45
Aug-06	84,315.29	Aug-07	118,760.51	Aug-08	171,762.76
Sep-06	94,854.71	Sep-07	117,796.45	Sep-08	178,870.07
Oct-06	105,394.12	Oct-07	116,832.40	Oct-08	185,977.38
Nov-06	115,933.53	Nov-07	115,868.35	Nov-08	193,084.69
Dec-06	126,472.94	Dec-07	114,904.29	Dec-08	200,192.00
Jan-09	194,161.25	Jan-10	132,925.95	Jan-11	191,542.93
Feb-09	188,130.50	Feb-10	138,028.89	Feb-11	194,027.55
Mar-09	182,099.75	Mar-10	143,131.83	Mar-11	196,512.16
Apr-09	176,069.00	Apr-10	148,234.77	Apr-11	198,996.78
May-09	170,038.25	May-10	153,337.72	May-11	201,481.40
Jun-09	164,007.50	Jun-10	158,440.66	Jun-11	203,966.02
Jul-09	157,976.75	Jul-10	163,543.60	Jul-11	206,450.64
Aug-09	151,946.00	Aug-10	168,646.54	Aug-11	208,935.26
Sep-09	145,915.25	Sep-10	173,749.48	Sep-11	211,419.88
Oct-09	139,884.51	Oct-10	178,852.42	Oct-11	213,904.50
Nov-09	133,853.76	Nov-10	183,955.36	Nov-11	216,389.12
Dec-09	127,823.01	Dec-10	189,058.31	Dec-11	218,873.74

Year	TOTAL ANNUAL CDM RESULTS	Increase over Previous year (kWh)	Rate	Year	Value
2006	822,074.12	822,074.12339	10,539.41	2006	1,517,675.30
2007	1,442,479.07	- **75,196.23**	- **964.05**	2007	1,378,851.49
2008	1,933,221.58	554,370.09	7,107.31	2008	2,402,303.96
2009	1,931,905.53	- **470,398.43**	- **6,030.75**	2009	1,533,876.09
2010	1,931,905.53	398,029.44	5,102.94	2010	2,268,699.67
2011-2014 (GWh)	9.85	-	-	2011	2,626,484.89
2011	2,462,500.00	193,800.33	2,484.62		

CDM Results for 2006-2009 is obtained from OPA Conservation file provided by Brant County Power.

The Rate is obtained by taking the value in `Increase over previous year (kWh)` x `Constan Number (=78)`

`Increase over previous year (kWh)` is obtained by taking the `Total Annual CDM Results` - `value`

For example, 2007 `Increase over previous year (kWh)` = 2007 ` Total Annual CDM Results` - 2006 `Value`

f) The Table below reflects the new revised CDM Targets as well as the revised GDP growth rate provided by Energy Probe.

Predicted kWh Purchases (Using Revised CDM Target and New GDP Rate)									
Year	Month	Heating Degree Days	Cooling Degree Days	Ontario Real GDP Monthly % (New GDP Rate)	Number of Days/Month	GS>50kW Flag for 2006	CDM Activity Variable (Revised Target)	Predicted Purchase kWh	Predicted Purchase kWh Sum
2010	Jan	742	0.00	135.11	31.00	1	132,925.95	26,182,968	293,745,517
	Feb	667	0.00	135.47	28.00	1	138,028.89	24,581,556	
	Mar	560	0.00	135.83	31.00	1	143,131.83	25,139,322	
	Apr	332	0.00	136.19	30.00	1	148,234.77	23,398,836	
	May	179	8.81	136.55	31.00	1	153,337.72	23,279,429	
	June	37	56.39	136.91	30.00	1	158,440.66	24,114,593	
	July	5	89.51	137.28	31.00	1	163,543.60	25,771,134	
	Aug	12	71.80	137.64	31.00	1	168,646.54	25,072,794	
	Sep	63	18.70	138.01	30.00	1	173,749.48	22,719,785	
	Oct	261	2.73	138.38	31.00	1	178,852.42	23,639,819	
	Nov	413	0.00	138.75	30.00	1	183,955.36	24,071,256	
	Dec	627	0.00	139.12	31.00	1	189,058.31	25,774,026	
2011	Jan	741.5857143	0.00	139.39	31.00	1	191,542.93	26,491,568	297,521,928
	Feb	667.1571429	0.00	139.66	28.00	1	194,027.55	24,891,468	
	Mar	559.8714286	0.00	139.94	31.00	1	196,512.16	25,450,485	
	Apr	331.7714286	0.00	140.21	30.00	1	198,996.78	23,711,190	
	May	179.1714286	8.81	140.49	31.00	1	201,481.40	23,592,913	
	June	37.4	56.39	140.76	30.00	1	203,966.02	24,429,147	
	July	5.242857143	89.51	141.04	31.00	1	206,450.64	26,086,696	
	Aug	12.11428571	71.80	141.31	31.00	1	208,935.26	25,389,303	
	Sep	63.37142857	18.70	141.59	30.00	1	211,419.88	23,037,179	
	Oct	261.3	2.73	141.87	31.00	1	213,904.50	23,958,037	
	Nov	413.4714286	0.00	142.15	30.00	1	216,389.12	24,390,236	
	Dec	626.7285714	0.00	142.43	31.00	1	218,873.74	26,093,705	

Brant County Power- Load Forecast

(yellow)	Actual
(green)	Predicted

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010-Weather Normal	2011-Weather Normal
Actual kWh Purchases	236,756,080	242,722,450	306,747,610	297,492,850	285,044,124		
Predicted kWh Purchases	237,127,721	241,513,183	303,219,259	298,052,295	288,850,657	293,745,517	297,521,928
% Difference	0.157%	-0.498%	-1.150%	0.188%	1.335%		
Billed kWh	221,115,207	221,518,681	287,802,804	281,438,922	271,310,355	280,004,127	284,124,025
By Class							
Residential							
Customers		7,689	7,822	7,920	8,033	8,170	8,290
kWh	81,427,289	79,560,842	80,124,626	79,456,965	79,540,610	85,508,547	88,163,969
General Service (GS) <50 kW							
Customers		1,247	1,200	1,203	1,249	1,314	1,315
kWh	36,179,422	34,406,201	33,769,287	35,036,376	36,124,082	41,239,096	43,019,319
General Service (GS) 50 - 4,999 kW							
Customers		114	111	108	104	109	106
kWh	101,120,635	105,111,506	171,480,226	164,540,705	153,259,553	164,321,116	158,764,344
kW	321,664	332,145	356,488	353,530	342,070	420,674	406,448
Streetlights (Not Weather sensitive)							
Customers		2,646	2,653	2,640	2,640	2,640	2,630
kWh	1,645,693	1,707,240	1,712,240	1,714,986	1,709,467	1,711,505	1,707,054
kW	4,685	4,779	4,779	4,770	4,770	4,795	4,783
Sentinel Lights (Not Weather Sensitive)							
Connections		190	141	138	179	221	218
kWh	210,113	208,256	196,420	187,414	180,387	220,581	215,167
kW	560.301	555.349	523.787	499.771	481.032	588	574
Unmetered Scattered Load (USL)							
Connections		58	57	55	52	52	51
kWh	532,055	524,636	520,005	502,476	496,256	499,482	493,370
Total							
Customer Connections		11,943	11,983	12,063	12,257	12,507	12,611
kWh from all classes	221,115,207	221,518,681	287,802,804	281,438,922	271,310,355	293,500,326	292,363,223
kW from applicable classes	326,909	337,479	361,790	358,800	347,322	426,057	411,805

g) Note: The CDM Target for Brant County power is not 14 GWh. Brant County Power asked for a revised reduction in CDM Targets to 9.85 GWh due to smart metering.

Electricity Conservation and Demand Management Targets EB-2010-0216.
The Minister of Energy and Infrastructure has now issued a directive (the "Directive"), dated March 31, 2010 to the Ontario Energy Board (the "Board") with regard to electricity conservation and demand management ("CDM") Targets to be met by licensed electricity distributors…

Appendix D: The OPA's CDM Target Advice

Energy Savings Target

The projected residential sector contribution to LDC provincial aggregate energy savings target is 1,150 GWh. The projected non-residential sector contribution to LDC provincial aggregate energy savings target is 4,850 GWh. The 2011-2014 LDC provincial aggregate energy savings target is 6,000 GWh.

#	Local Distribution Company	Energy Target Allocation Factors (Per 2008 OEB Distributors Yearbook + HONI Adjustment)		2011-2014 Energy Savings Target (GWh)	Overall Portion of Provincial Total (%)
		Portion of Total 2008 Residential Energy Consumption by all LDCs that have CDM Targets (%)	Portion of Total 2008 Non-Residential Energy Consumption by all LDCs that have CDM Targets (%)		
1	Algoma Power Inc.	0.22%	0.11%	8	0.13%
2	Atikokan Hydro Inc.	0.03%	0.02%	1	0.02%
3	Attawapiskat Power Corporation	0.01%	0.00%	0.1	0.00%
4	Bluewater Power Distribution Corporation	0.64%	1.00%	56	0.93%
5	Brant County Power Inc.	0.20%	0.24%	14	0.23%

h) Refer to Question e) above.

i) The Ontario GDP forecast used for 2010 and 2011 was prepared on July 5, 2010. Below is a list of sources that have been used for the GDP forecast.

Sources:

1. 1988 to 2006: 2003 and 2008 Ontario Economic Outlook and Fiscal Review, Ontario Ministry of Finance
2. 2007 to 2011: 2010 Ontario Budget March 25, 2010, Ontario Ministry of Finance

Year	Real Ontario GDP (chained $1997)	Growth Rate	Real Ontario GDP (chained $1997 with Base 100 in 1997)	Check Growth Rate
1988	312.0		86.8	
1989	322.5	3.4%	89.7	3.4%
1990	316.9	-1.7%	88.2	-1.7%
1991	304.5	-3.9%	84.7	-3.9%
1992	307.2	0.9%	85.5	0.9%
1993	310.2	1.0%	86.3	1.0%
1994	328.5	5.9%	91.4	5.9%
1995	340.1	3.5%	94.6	3.5%
1996	343.8	1.1%	95.7	1.1%
1997	**359.4**	**4.5%**	**100.0**	**4.5%**
1998	376.7	4.8%	104.8	4.8%
1999	405.0	7.5%	112.7	7.5%
2000	427.9	5.7%	119.1	5.7%
2001	435.4	1.8%	121.1	1.8%
2002	451.1	3.6%	125.5	3.6%
2003	457.4	1.4%	127.3	1.4%
2004	468.9	2.5%	130.5	2.5%
2005	481.5	2.7%	134.0	2.7%
2006	493.5	2.5%	137.3	2.5%
2007	504.9	2.3%	140.5	2.3%
2008	502.4	-0.5%	139.8	-0.5%
2009	485.3	-3.4%	135.0	-3.4%
2010	498.4	2.7%	138.7	2.7%
2011	514.3	3.2%	143.1	3.2%
2012	530.8	3.2%	147.7	3.2%

j) An updated projection for a more recent economic forecast is shown in Question J) of Energy Probe IR 13, which is provided below.

j)

	Forecast Date	2010	2011
CIBC	Sept. 30, 2010	3.4	1.7
TD	Dec. 17, 2010	3	2.4
BMO	Dec. 23, 2010	3.3	2.6
Scotiabank	Dec. 7, 2010	3.2	2.1
RBC	Dec., 2010	3.3	3.1
	Average	3.24	2.38

Predicted Purchase kWh (New GDP Growth Rate used)								
Year	Month	Heating Degree Days	Cooling Degree Days	Ontario Real GDP Monthly %	Number of Days/Month	GS>50kW Flag for 2006	CDM Activity Variable	Predicted Purchase kWh
2010	Jan	741.59	0.00	135.33	31.00	1.00	132,925.95	26,205,586.17
	Feb	667.16	0.00	135.63	28.00	1.00	138,028.89	24,598,964.38
	Mar	559.87	0.00	135.93	31.00	1.00	143,131.83	25,146,581.51
	Apr	331.77	0.00	136.23	30.00	1.00	148,234.77	23,399,780.62
	May	179.17	8.81	136.54	31.00	1.00	153,337.72	23,271,880.28
	June	37.40	56.39	136.84	30.00	1.00	158,440.66	24,099,541.75
	July	5.24	89.51	137.14	31.00	1.00	163,543.60	25,746,616.61
	Aug	12.11	71.80	137.45	31.00	1.00	168,646.54	25,040,233.61
	Sep	63.37	18.70	137.75	30.00	1.00	173,749.48	22,680,342.44
	Oct	261.30	2.73	138.06	31.00	1.00	178,852.42	23,590,570.68
	Nov	413.47	0.00	138.37	30.00	1.00	183,955.36	24,013,829.84
	Dec	626.73	0.00	138.67	31.00	1.00	189,058.31	25,706,398.00
2011	Jan	741.59	0.00	139.04	31.00	1.00	204,844.21	26,367,262.75
	Feb	667.16	0.00	139.40	28.00	1.00	220,630.11	24,713,873.64
	Mar	559.87	0.00	139.77	31.00	1.00	236,416.01	25,214,765.92
	Apr	331.77	0.00	140.14	30.00	1.00	252,201.91	23,421,282.83
	May	179.17	8.81	140.51	31.00	1.00	267,987.81	23,246,743.06
	June	37.40	56.39	140.88	30.00	1.00	283,773.72	24,027,808.05
	July	5.24	89.51	141.25	31.00	1.00	299,559.62	25,628,329.52
	Aug	12.11	71.80	141.62	31.00	1.00	315,345.52	24,875,436.37
	Sep	63.37	18.70	141.99	30.00	1.00	331,131.42	22,469,078.45
	Oct	261.30	2.73	142.36	31.00	1.00	346,917.32	23,332,883.49
	Nov	413.47	0.00	142.74	30.00	1.00	362,703.22	23,709,763.15
	Dec	626.73	0.00	143.11	31.00	1.00	378,489.13	25,355,995.69

Rate Class Energy Model (With New Economic Rate)										
Year	kWh Purchases	Modeled kWh Purchases	Loss Factor	Total Billed	Residential	GS < 50 kW	GS > 50kW (50 to 4,999 kW)	Street Lighting	Sentinel Lighting	Unmetered Scattered Load (USL)
2005	236,756,080	237,105,183	1.0707	221,115,207	81,427,289	36,179,422	101,120,635	1,645,693	210,113	532,055
2006	242,722,450	241,529,155	1.0957	221,518,681	79,560,842	34,406,201	105,111,506	1,707,240	208,256	524,636
2007	306,747,610	303,227,205	1.0658	287,802,804	80,124,626	33,769,287	171,480,226	1,712,240	196,420	520,005
2008	297,492,850	298,065,175	1.0570	281,438,922	79,456,965	35,036,376	164,540,705	1,714,986	187,414	502,476
2009	285,044,124	288,836,397	1.0506	271,310,355	79,540,610	36,124,082	153,259,553	1,709,467	180,387	496,256
2010		293,687,170	1.0482	280,182,380	79,960,664	38,563,460	159,226,689	1,711,505	220,581	499,482
2011		297,531,381		283,849,820	84,556,802	41,259,213	155,618,215	1,707,054	215,167	493,370

The table above shows a weather corrected kWh for each class type for 2010 and 2011.

k) **Note:** The values of the independent variables in the table are based on the old assumption of GDP growth rate and CDM target.

Year	Month	Heating Degree Days	Cooling Degree Days	Ontario Real GDP Monthly %	Number of Days/Month	GS>50kW Flag for 2006	CDM Activity Variable
2009	Jan	860.90	0.00	139.38	31	1.00	194,161.25
	Feb	619.60	0.00	138.98	28	1.00	188,130.50
	Mar	533.50	0.00	138.58	31	1.00	182,099.75
	Apr	308.70	0.00	138.18	30	1.00	176,069.00
	May	171.90	1.70	137.78	31	1.00	170,038.25
	June	52.70	40.40	137.38	30	1.00	164,007.50
	July	15.60	21.30	136.99	31	1.00	157,976.75
	Aug	10.80	59.70	136.59	31	1.00	151,946.00
	Sep	65.40	8.00	136.20	30	1.00	145,915.25
	Oct	265.50	0.00	135.81	31	1.00	139,884.51
	Nov	367.60	0.00	135.42	30	1.00	133,853.76
	Dec	633.30	0.00	135.03	31	1.00	127,823.01
2010	Jan	741.59	0.00	135.33	31	1.00	132,925.95
	Feb	667.16	0.00	135.63	28	1.00	138,028.89
	Mar	559.87	0.00	135.93	31	1.00	143,131.83
	Apr	331.77	0.00	136.23	30	1.00	148,234.77
	May	179.17	8.81	136.54	31	1.00	153,337.72
	June	37.40	56.39	136.84	30	1.00	158,440.66
	July	5.24	89.51	137.14	31	1.00	163,543.60
	Aug	12.11	71.80	137.45	31	1.00	168,646.54
	Sep	63.37	18.70	137.75	30	1.00	173,749.48
	Oct	261.30	2.73	138.06	31	1.00	178,852.42
	Nov	413.47	0.00	138.37	30	1.00	183,955.36
	Dec	626.73	0.00	138.67	31	1.00	189,058.31
2011	Jan	741.59	0.00	139.04	31	1.00	204,844.21
	Feb	667.16	0.00	139.40	28	1.00	220,630.11
	Mar	559.87	0.00	139.77	31	1.00	236,416.01
	Apr	331.77	0.00	140.14	30	1.00	252,201.91
	May	179.17	8.81	140.51	31	1.00	267,987.81
	June	37.40	56.39	140.88	30	1.00	283,773.72
	July	5.24	89.51	141.25	31	1.00	299,559.62
	Aug	12.11	71.80	141.62	31	1.00	315,345.52
	Sep	63.37	18.70	141.99	30	1.00	331,131.42
	Oct	261.30	2.73	142.36	31	1.00	346,917.32
	Nov	413.47	0.00	142.74	30	1.00	362,703.22
	Dec	626.73	0.00	143.11	31	1.00	378,489.13

l) **Table 1:**

Average Customer Number								
Year	Residential	GS < 50 kW	GS > 50 kW (50 to 4999 kW)	Streetlight	Sentinel Light	Unmetered Scattered Load (USL)	Total	Total Customer
2006	7,689	1,247	114	2,646	242	58	11,995	9,049
2007	7,822	1,200	111	2,653	240	57	12,081	9,133
2008	7,920	1,203	108	2,640	231	55	12,156	9,231
2009	8,033	1,249	104	2,640	225	52	12,302	9,385
2010	8,170	1,314	109	2,640	221	52	12,507	9,594
2011	8,290	1,315	106	2,630	218	51	12,611	9,711

In order to calculate the Growth rate in customer number, the customer count from 2007 is divided by the customer count in 2006 and as a result the growth rate for 2007 is calculated. For example, in the Residential class growth rate in 2007 is calculated as follows,
7,822 / 7,689 = 1.017

Table 2:

Growth Rate in Customer Number						
Year	Residential	GS < 50 kW	GS > 50 kW (50 to 4999 kW)	Streetlight	Sentinel Light	Unmetered Scattered Load (USL)
2007	1.017	0.963	0.969	1.002	0.991	0.975
2008	1.013	1.002	0.977	0.995	0.964	0.965
2009	1.014	1.038	0.959	1.000	0.973	0.961
Geometric Mean	**1.015**	**1.001**	**0.969**	**0.999**	**0.976**	**0.967**

Once the growth rate is obtained for the different classes, the geometric mean function in excel is used. Using the Geometric Mean from table 2 above for the different customer class and customer count in 2009, the 2010 customer count is calculated and 2011 customer count is calculated using 2010 customer count multiplied by the geometric mean.

For example, 2010 Residential class customer number is obtained as follows, 1.015 * 8,033 (from 2009) = 8,153 +17 = 8,170.

Note:

a. In order to obtain growth rates for 2005 and 2006, Burman Energy Consultants would require customer count data as far back as 2003.
b. 2010 Customer count data for the Residential, GS<50 kW and GS>50 kW is calculated using the geometric mean for the different classes and then incremented by 17 (Residential), 65 (GS<50 kW), 9 (GS>50 kW). Brant County Power confirmed customer numbers to be as noted in table 1 above (Email sent August 16, 2010).

m) BCP did not respond to this IR as we did not understand the question. If the responses provided through Board Staff, VECC and Energy Probe do not provide sufficient information, please let us know and we will undertake to provide a full response.

n) USL Information not available.

Current Actual Customer Count by Class							
Year	Month	Residential	GS < 50 kW	GS>50kW (50 to 4,999 kW)	Street Lighting	Sentinel Lighting	Unmetered Scattered Load (USL)
2010	Jan	8,145	1,288	107	2,640	218	
	Feb	8,180	1,291	105	2,640	216	
	Mar	8,175	1,290	106	2,640	215	
	Apr	8,189	1,287	106	2,640	215	
	May	8,184	1,287	106	2,640	213	
	June	8,170	1,314	109	2,640	213	
	July	8,202	1,344	110	2,640	213	
	Aug	8,194	1,348	111	2,640	212	
	Sep	8,193	1,342	111	2,640	209	
	Oct	8,219	1,345	113	2,640	210	
	Nov	8,213	1,337	115	2,640	210	
	Dec	8,215	1,337	115	2,640	210	

o)

2010 Actual Purchases by Class										
Year	Month	Residential	GS < 50 kW	GS>50kW (50 to 4,999 kW)		Street Lighting		Sentinel Lighting		Unmetered Scattered Load (USL)
		kWh	kWh	kWh	kW	kWh	kW	kWh	kW	kWh
2010	Jan	7,256,748	3,311,680	13,790,950	30,818	190,765	401	14,705	41	42,412
	Feb	8,326,173	3,677,446	13,954,782	30,003	189,687	401	15,266	40	42,412
	Mar	7,111,749	3,330,317	12,924,353	29,507	156,832	401	15,316	41	42,412
	Apr	6,542,937	3,218,070	13,531,422	26,623	158,431	401	15,188	40	42,412
	May	5,902,349	2,964,516	12,095,217	25,956	134,580	401	15,188	40	41,984
	June	5,568,955	2,646,414	12,869,919	29,389	123,941	400	15,175	40	40,578
	July	6,721,166	2,871,728	13,321,409	28,160	110,590	400	15,016	40	40,578
	Aug	8,179,720	3,151,451	14,384,786	28,800	117,474	401	15,059	40	38,977
	Sep	8,098,259	3,613,813	15,177,097	28,096	131,485	401	14,785	39	38,977
	Oct	6,655,912	3,667,446	14,194,855	28,093	145,010	401	14,884	39	38,977
	Nov	5,566,885	2,941,900	12,964,790	27,000	156,275	401	14,899	39	38,977
	Dec	5,854,951	2,921,833	13,661,932	27,790	178,388	401	14,798	39	38,977

p) Please see Energy Probe IR 13.

QUESTION #5

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

a) Please provide further deals regarding the calculation of $135,000 in Other Utility Operating Income for 2011.

b) What is the basis for the Revenue and Expenses from Non-Utility Operations (#4370 and #4375) for the years prior to 2010? Why are there no values for 2010 and 2011?

c) Please confirm that the Interest and Dividend Income (#4405) does not include any interest debits/credits associated with the deferral/variance accounts.

d) Is Brant proposing to change any of its existing specific service charges or introduce any new ones for 2011? If yes, please provide details and set out the change in revenue anticipated.

Response

a) Please see Board staff IR #12, replicated below.

Board Staff Interrogatories

Brant County Power Inc.
2011 Electricity Distribution Rates Application
EB-2010-0125

IR 12

Ref: Exhibit 3 Tab 1 Schedule 3 Exhibit 3 Tab 3 Schedule 1

Issue: Other Utility Operating Income

On Exhibit 3 Tab 1 Schedule 3, Brant County states that there is an increase to other revenue of $135,000 relating to Green Energy Act initiatives. On Exhibit 3 Tab 3 Schedule 1, Brant County shows for the test year Other Utility Operating Income of $135,000.

a) Is the $135,000 in Other Utility Operating Income Exhibit 3 Tab 3 Schedule 1 for the Green Energy Act initiatives? If not please explain what the $135,000 shown on the exhibit is and where the Green Energy Act initiatives are recorded.

b) Please state what the initiatives are and show the determination of the $135,000.

Response:

a) Yes

b) Brant County created a new renewable division – Brant Renewable Energy, which focuses on promoting, educating and facilitating renewable energy projects. It has hired an employee to lead the division and the $135,000 is the expected gross margin the company expects to receive, before admin expenses. All other expenses of this division are included in the admin expense section of the forecast.

b) We do not build any profit margin in to contract work, therefore have assumed the values are immaterial.

c) The actual numbers for account #4405 do include net interest debits associated with the variance accounts along with other interest included in normal course of business. However, there were no interest debits contemplated for the 2010 and 2011 bridge and test years respectively.

d) No

QUESTION #6

Reference: Exhibit 7/Tab 1/Schedule 1

a) Please confirm whether or not the Demand data in Sheet I8 was updated from that used in the original CA Informational Filing. It seems that it was not, as the I8 Sheets provided in Schedules 1 and 2 appear to be the same.

b) If part (a) is confirmed, please provide a revised Sheet I8 based on the percentage change in kWh for the respective customer classes as between the two CA runs.

c) Please confirm that Schedule 2 contains a Cost Allocation run based on 2011 revenue requirement.

d) Please confirm that Schedule 3 is the CA Informational filing based on 2006 rate application data. Please also confirm that these results are the original filing – prior to any adjustment for the transformer ownership allowance. If not please explain what CA run in the Schedule represents.

e) Brant has filed the Excel versions of two cost allocation model runs (BCP 2010 CA Model and BCP Model_version 1-2 – run 3 detailed). Please explain what each of these runs represents and how they differ from the run results presented in Exhibit 7/Tab 1/Schedules 2 and 3.

Response:

a) Demand data I8 was not updated.

b) As indicated in the original filing, this data is not available.

c) Exhibit 7, Tab 1, Schedule 2 is a cost allocation run based on 2011 revenue requirement.

d) Exhibit 7, Tab 1, Schedule 3 is a cost allocation run based on 2006 rate application data (2004 values) and was based on BCP's optional 3rd run.

e) The excel models filed represent c) and d) above. If these do not reconcile, please let us know and we will update the excel models.

QUESTION #7

Reference: Exhibit 7/Tab 1/Schedule 2

a) Are the results shown in this Schedule meant to be the 2011 results based on the Board's June 2010 Filing Guidelines (Section 2.8.2)?
   - If no, where are the results based on these guidelines provided? If not part of the filing, please provide.
   - If yes, please indicate if the cost of the transformer ownership allowance have been excluded and if the revenues for GS>50 have been reduced by the amount of the transformer discount received, as required.

b) With respect to Sheet I6 (page 1), please reconcile the customer counts shown here (ID CAA) versus those reported in Exhibit 3/Tab 2/Schedule 1, page 8.

c) With respect to Sheet O1 (page 3), please reconcile the following:
   - The Miscellaneous Revenues reported here ($557,326) versus those reported in Exhibit 6/Tab 1/Schedule 1 ($606,494)
   - The total Revenue Requirement reported here ($6,538,679) with that reported in Exhibit 6/Tab 1/Schedule 1 ($6,466,128).
   - Why Total Revenue ($6,466,128) does not equal the Total Revenue Requirement ($6,538,679).

d) With respect to Sheet O1 (page 3), please explain how the distribution revenue for each class was determined (e.g., $2,938,680 for Residential).

e) Please provide a schedule that sets out the derivation of revenue at current rates ($6,209,190 – per Exhibit 6/Tab 1/Schedule 1, page 2) by customer class.

f) Please provide a revised response to part (e) which shows the revenue by class net of the transformer discount.

g) Please provide a revised 2011 Cost Allocation run (I.e., the full excel cost allocation model run):
   - Distribution revenues across the customer classes total $5,859,634 and the revenue for each individual class is based on the class revenue shares per part (f).
   - Miscellaneous Revenues equal $606,494
   - Distribution Expenses are as proposed and Revenue Requirement totals $6,466,128.
   - The customer data in Sheet I6 has been revised as required.
   - The Demand data in Sheet I8 has been updated to reflect 2011 loads based on the response to Question #6 b).

Response:

a) The referenced exhibit (Exhibit 7, Tab 1, Schedule 2) was an attempt to follow the Boards June 2010 Filing Guidelines, with a transformer allowance of $49,168 excluded from the model.

We have re-worked this cost allocation model in response to IR 7g), please see attachment.

b) There is no reconciliation available. The customer counts in I6 of the Cost Allocation run contained Exhibit 7, Tab 1, Schedule 2 was updated for the final version of the customer count forecast (note: consumption and load forecast were updated). BCP will correct and file final rates with a CA model incorporating customer counts reconciling to Exhibit # 3 along with any other rendered changes.

c) Bullet 1 – the difference here is the Transformer Allowance
Bullet 2 & 3 – a portion of this is the transformer allowance and the remainder is due to minor outages in the model. Board Staff IR # 24 referenced a similar complication on the rate base side.

d) The values should match the summary table below in part 3 of this IR. BCP will incorporate this change into the final cost allocation model run and rate design.

e) See summary table below:

2011 Test - existing rates							
	Customers	Consumption	Fixed Charge	Variable Charge	Fixed Revenue	Variable Revenue	Distribution Revenues
	(Year-End)	(kWh / KW)					($)
Residential	8,290	80,122,583	11.02	0.0225	1,096,270	1,802,758	2,899,028
GS<50	1,315	39,095,551	16.54	0.0194	261,001	758,454	1,019,455
GS>50 to 499 kW	106	388,493	29.47	5.6124	37,486	2,180,378	2,217,864
Unmetered Scattered Load	51	493,370	8.27	0.0194	5,061	9,571	14,633
Sentinel Lighting	218	574	2.53	8.5088	6,618	4,884	11,503
Street Lighting	2,630	4,783	0.81	4.4208	25,564	21,145	46,708
TOTAL					1,432,000	4,777,190	6,209,190

f) The entire Transformer allowance of $49,168 is allocated to the GS > 50 class for cost allocation purposes.

g) See attached PDF summary Including Sheet O1 as requested. Please note, the rate base and expenses are off by 1%. BCP could not remove this minor variance and submits that this will not alter the allocation of costs in a material manner.

QUESTION #8

Reference: Exhibit 7/Tab 2/Schedules 1 and 2

a) Is the result shown here meant to be equivalent to the results in Tab 1/Schedule 2 – but prior to the removal of the transformer allowance discount?

b) If the response to part (a) is yes, please explain why the revenue requirement and revenue is the same in both.

c) If the response to part (a) is no, please explain the relationship between this run and that presented in Tab 1/Schedule 2.

Response:

a) The results in “Exhibit 7, Tab 1, Schedule 2 were meant to be different that Exhibit 7, Tab 2, Schedule 2. Tab 1 was supposed to incorporate the removal of transformer allowance as instructed.

   The model was not altered properly and we have attached a revised O1 sheet from the Transformer Allowance Adjusted Model in response to 7g of these IR’s.

   Attachment 7g should replace Exhibit 7, Tab 1, Schedule 2.

b) N/A – see attachment 7g.

c) N/A – see attachment 7g.

QUESTION #9

Reference: Exhibit 7/Tab 3/Schedule 1

a) With respect to the results reported for 2011 Updated CA Model – Existing Rates, please undertake the following:
   - Provide a copy of the CA Model run supporting the results
   - Explain the basis for the $329,489 deficiency value when Exhibit 6 shows a sufficiency of $300,388.
   - Explain why the value used for revenues at current rates ($6,209,190) is before excluding the transformer ownership discount.
   - Explain how the 2011 Adjusted Revenue by customer class was established.
   - Explain why the total allocated expenses differ between this result and the one presented just below it for 2011 at Proposed Rates.

b) With respect to the results reported for 2011 – Updated CA Model Proposed Rates, has Brant filed a Cost Allocation run that supports the customer class allocation shown for the $6,466,128 in 2011 Expenses? If not, please provide.

Response:

a) See attachment 7g
   - The chart in Exhibit 7, Tab 3, Schedule 1 indicating a deficiency of $329,489 is based on existing rates using a revised CA model. These results will not occur and are fictitious. The bottom section of this table shows the applied for rates of $6,466,128 of total revenue requirement which ties into Determination of Net Utility Income in Exhibit 6.
   - IR 7e) above provides the derivation of existing rates distribution revenue starting at $6,209,190.
   - Again the existing rates section is fictitious and is not used for rate setting.
   - BCP utilized a cost allocation model to derive the Allocated Expenses. The cost allocation model was not balances (non material differences that could not be fixed by BCP). The pertinent values on this table are the proposed rates which allocate proper 2011 proposed expenses and reconciles to Exhibit 6 the determination of net income and revenue sufficiency.

b) See attachment 7g from above.

QUESTION #10

Reference: Exhibit 8/Tab 1/Schedule 1

a) Please provide a schedule that sets out the proposed base revenue requirement by customer class that is to be recovered through fixed variable distribution charges.

b) Please indicate how the revenue offsets ($557,326) were allocated to customer classes.

c) Was the cost of the transformer ownership discount allocated directly to the GS>50 class? If not, how is it being recovered?

d) Why is it more appropriate to use the average of the 5 highest monthly demands as opposed to the average demand over all of the previous 12 months when determining a customer's classification?

e) Please confirm that if the average is within 5% of the limit, the decision to switch will be totally at Brant's discretion.

Response:

a) See replication of table generated for VECC IR #2a. This table sets out the fixed revenue by customer class.

<u>2011 Test - applied for rates</u>							
	Customers	**Consumption**	**Fixed Charge**	**Variable Charge**	**Fixed Revenue**	**Variable Revenue**	**Distribution Revenues**
	(Year-End)	**(kWh / KW)**					**($)**
Residential	8,290	80,122,583	11.00	0.0303	1,094,280	2,426,981	3,521,261
GS<50	1,315	39,095,551	17.00	0.0205	268,260	799,777	1,068,037
GS>50 to 499 kW	106	388,493	95.00	2.3436	120,840	910,470	1,031,310
Unmetered Scattered Load	51	493,370	2.00	0.0209	1,224	10,310	11,534
Sentinel Lighting	218	574	2.00	21.8402	5,232	12,536	17,768
Street Lighting	2,630	4,783	1.50	44.2301	47,340	211,553	258,893
TOTAL					1,537,176	4,371,626	5,908,802

b) Revenue off sets were allocated based on distribution revenue percentages.

c) The transformer allowance is being allocated as part of revenue off-sets, not directly to the GS > 50 class.

d) See response to Board Staff IR 25. In addition, there are factors being considered by BCP such as the equipment/infrastructure for a customer is based upon peak demand of a customer which may be reduce significantly by a 12 month average and it was felt it was consistent with the approach taken by the Distribution System Code, section 2.5, which uses a 5 consecutive month period for a review and re-classification.

e) BCP will make the ultimate decision. The intention is to provide a clear methodology. BCP is hoping to avoid unnecessary re-classifications as the result of temporary changes to a customer’s activity and wishes to retain some Scott to respond as relates to customer classification and descriptions

QUESTION #11

Reference: Exhibit 8/Tab 1/Schedule 2

a) What would be the monthly service charge for each customer class if the current (2010) fixed-variable split was maintained for each customer class?

Response:

a) Please see summary table below:

	Current Fixed Ratio	2011 revenue @ current Fixed Rates
Residential	38.2%	$ 13.52
GS < 50 kW	26.4%	$ 17.87
GS 50 to 4,999 kW	1.7%	$ 13.78
Street Light	54.8%	$ 4.50
Sentinel Light	57.3%	$ 3.89
Unmetered Loads	34.7%	$ 6.54

QUESTION #12

Reference: Exhibit 8/Tab 1/Schedule 3

a) Please provide a schedule that sets out the 2009 Billing quantities used by Brant's host(s) to bill for Network and Connection service.

b) Please provide a schedule that sets out the revenues the host(s) would receive using 2009 billing quantities and approved 2010 rates.

Response:

a) See requested table below.
b) See requested table below.

Note, Brantford is the only Host distributor and only Brantford Network, Connection and LV demand have been listed. OEB IR # 26 has a completed RTSR attached if you require Hydro 1 and IESO charges and quantities.

		2009 Billed	2010					
	Metering Point	Quantity	NW Rate	NW $	CN Rate	CN $	LV Rate	LV $
Jan	Powerline	2,399	2.2939	$ 5,503.07	1.7255	$ 4,139.47	2.6932	$ 6,460.99
	Colbourne W	3,224	2.2939	$ 7,395.53	1.7255	$ 5,563.01	2.6932	$ 8,682.88
	Colbourne E	9,198	2.2939	$ 21,099.29	1.7255	$ 15,871.15	2.6932	$ 24,772.05
	Total	14,821		$ 33,997.89		$ 25,573.64		$ 39,915.92
Feb	Powerline	2,316	2.2939	$ 5,312.67	1.7255	$ 3,996.26	2.6932	$ 6,237.45
	Colbourne W	3,079	2.2939	$ 7,062.92	1.7255	$ 5,312.81	2.6932	$ 8,292.36
	Colbourne E	8,974	2.2939	$ 20,585.46	1.7255	$ 15,484.64	2.6932	$ 24,168.78
	Total	14,369		$ 32,961.05		$ 24,793.71		$ 38,698.59
Mar	Powerline	2,352	2.2939	$ 5,395.25	1.7255	$ 4,058.38	2.6932	$ 6,334.41
	Colbourne W	3,031	2.2939	$ 6,952.81	1.7255	$ 5,229.99	2.6932	$ 8,163.09
	Colbourne E	8,705	2.2939	$ 19,968.40	1.7255	$ 15,020.48	2.6932	$ 23,444.31
	Total	14,088		$ 32,316.46		$ 24,308.84		$ 37,941.80
Apr	Powerline	1,790	2.2939	$ 4,106.08	1.7255	$ 3,088.65	2.6932	$ 4,820.83
	Colbourne W	2,816	2.2939	$ 6,459.62	1.7255	$ 4,859.01	2.6932	$ 7,584.05
	Colbourne E	7,729	2.2939	$ 17,729.55	1.7255	$ 13,336.39	2.6932	$ 20,815.74
	Total	12,335		$ 28,295.26		$ 21,284.04		$ 33,220.62
May	Powerline	1,407	2.2939	$ 3,227.04	1.7255	$ 2,427.42	2.6932	$ 3,788.77
	Colbourne W	2,740	2.2939	$ 6,284.39	1.7255	$ 4,727.20	2.6932	$ 7,378.32
	Colbourne E	7,511	2.2939	$ 17,229.78	1.7255	$ 12,960.45	2.6932	$ 20,228.98
	Total	11,658		$ 26,741.21		$ 20,115.07		$ 31,396.06
June	Powerline	1,847	2.2939	$ 4,237.61	1.7255	$ 3,187.59	2.6932	$ 4,975.26
	Colbourne W	3,478	2.2939	$ 7,977.79	1.7255	$ 6,001.00	2.6932	$ 9,366.49
	Colbourne E	8,336	2.2939	$ 19,121.49	1.7255	$ 14,383.42	2.6932	$ 22,449.98
	Total	13,661		$ 31,336.90		$ 23,572.00		$ 36,791.72
July	Powerline	1,532	2.2939	$ 3,515.36	1.7255	$ 2,644.29	2.6932	$ 4,127.28
	Colbourne W	3,077	2.2939	$ 7,057.44	1.7255	$ 5,308.69	2.6932	$ 8,285.93
	Colbourne E	7,166	2.2939	$ 16,437.22	1.7255	$ 12,364.28	2.6932	$ 19,298.45
	Total	11,775		$ 27,010.01		$ 20,317.26		$ 31,711.65
Aug	Powerline	1,697	2.2939	$ 3,892.17	1.7255	$ 2,927.74	2.6932	$ 4,569.69
	Colbourne W	3,794	2.2939	$ 8,702.02	1.7255	$ 6,545.77	2.6932	$ 10,216.79
	Colbourne E	8,444	2.2939	$ 19,369.03	1.7255	$ 14,569.62	2.6932	$ 22,740.60
	Total	13,934		$ 31,963.23		$ 24,043.13		$ 37,527.08
Sept	Powerline	1,274	2.2939	$ 2,923.23	1.7255	$ 2,198.89	2.6932	$ 3,432.08
	Colbourne W	3,039	2.2939	$ 6,971.55	1.7255	$ 5,244.09	2.6932	$ 8,185.09
	Colbourne E	7,554	2.2939	$ 17,327.43	1.7255	$ 13,033.91	2.6932	$ 20,343.62
	Total	11,867		$ 27,222.22		$ 20,476.89		$ 31,960.80
Oct	Powerline	1,514	2.2939	$ 3,472.30	1.7255	$ 2,611.91	2.6932	$ 4,076.72
	Colbourne W	2,860	2.2939	$ 6,560.81	1.7255	$ 4,935.12	2.6932	$ 7,702.85
	Colbourne E	7,957	2.2939	$ 18,251.71	1.7255	$ 13,729.17	2.6932	$ 21,428.80
	Total	12,330		$ 28,284.82		$ 21,276.19		$ 33,208.37
Nov	Powerline	1,448	2.2939	$ 3,322.42	1.7255	$ 2,499.16	2.6932	$ 3,900.75
	Colbourne W	-	2.2939	$ -	1.7255	$ -	2.6932	$ -
	Colbourne E	-	2.2939	$ -	1.7255	$ -	2.6932	$ -
	Total	1,448		$ 3,322.42		$ 2,499.16		$ 3,900.75
Dec	Powerline	1,993	2.2939	$ 4,571.44	1.7255	$ 3,438.70	2.6932	$ 5,367.20
	Colbourne W	3,089	2.2939	$ 7,085.40	1.7255	$ 5,329.72	2.6932	$ 8,318.76
	Colbourne E	-	2.2939	$ -	1.7255	$ -	2.6932	$ -
	Total	5,082		$ 11,656.84		$ 8,768.42		$ 13,685.95
	Plus fixed LV charges							$ 10,970.28
Grand Total		137,368		$ 315,108.29		$ 237,028.36		$ 380,929.59

QUESTION #13

Reference: Exhibit 8/Tab 1/Schedule 4

a) Please provide a schedule that sets out the 2009 Billing quantities used by Brant's host(s) to bill for LV service.

c) Please provide a schedule that sets out the LV revenues the host(s) would receive using 2009 billing quantities and approved 2010 rates.

Response:

a) See requested table below.
b) See requested table below.

Note, Brantford is the only Host distributor and only Brantford Network, Connection and LV demand have been listed. OEB IR # 26 has a completed RTSR attached if you require Hydro 1 and IESO charges and quantities.

		2009 Billed	2010					
	Metering Point	Quantity	NW Rate	NW $	CN Rate	CN $	LV Rate	LV $
Jan	Powerline	2,399	2.2939	$ 5,503.07	1.7255	$ 4,139.47	2.6932	$ 6,460.99
	Colbourne W	3,224	2.2939	$ 7,395.53	1.7255	$ 5,563.01	2.6932	$ 8,682.88
	Colbourne E	9,198	2.2939	$ 21,099.29	1.7255	$ 15,871.15	2.6932	$ 24,772.05
	Total	14,821		$ 33,997.89		$ 25,573.64		$ 39,915.92
Feb	Powerline	2,316	2.2939	$ 5,312.67	1.7255	$ 3,996.26	2.6932	$ 6,237.45
	Colbourne W	3,079	2.2939	$ 7,062.92	1.7255	$ 5,312.81	2.6932	$ 8,292.36
	Colbourne E	8,974	2.2939	$ 20,585.46	1.7255	$ 15,484.64	2.6932	$ 24,168.78
	Total	14,369		$ 32,961.05		$ 24,793.71		$ 38,698.59
Mar	Powerline	2,352	2.2939	$ 5,395.25	1.7255	$ 4,058.38	2.6932	$ 6,334.41
	Colbourne W	3,031	2.2939	$ 6,952.81	1.7255	$ 5,229.99	2.6932	$ 8,163.09
	Colbourne E	8,705	2.2939	$ 19,968.40	1.7255	$ 15,020.48	2.6932	$ 23,444.31
	Total	14,088		$ 32,316.46		$ 24,308.84		$ 37,941.80
Apr	Powerline	1,790	2.2939	$ 4,106.08	1.7255	$ 3,088.65	2.6932	$ 4,820.83
	Colbourne W	2,816	2.2939	$ 6,459.62	1.7255	$ 4,859.01	2.6932	$ 7,584.05
	Colbourne E	7,729	2.2939	$ 17,729.55	1.7255	$ 13,336.39	2.6932	$ 20,815.74
	Total	12,335		$ 28,295.26		$ 21,284.04		$ 33,220.62
May	Powerline	1,407	2.2939	$ 3,227.04	1.7255	$ 2,427.42	2.6932	$ 3,788.77
	Colbourne W	2,740	2.2939	$ 6,284.39	1.7255	$ 4,727.20	2.6932	$ 7,378.32
	Colbourne E	7,511	2.2939	$ 17,229.78	1.7255	$ 12,960.45	2.6932	$ 20,228.98
	Total	11,658		$ 26,741.21		$ 20,115.07		$ 31,396.06
June	Powerline	1,847	2.2939	$ 4,237.61	1.7255	$ 3,187.59	2.6932	$ 4,975.26
	Colbourne W	3,478	2.2939	$ 7,977.79	1.7255	$ 6,001.00	2.6932	$ 9,366.49
	Colbourne E	8,336	2.2939	$ 19,121.49	1.7255	$ 14,383.42	2.6932	$ 22,449.98
	Total	13,661		$ 31,336.90		$ 23,572.00		$ 36,791.72
July	Powerline	1,532	2.2939	$ 3,515.36	1.7255	$ 2,644.29	2.6932	$ 4,127.28
	Colbourne W	3,077	2.2939	$ 7,057.44	1.7255	$ 5,308.69	2.6932	$ 8,285.93
	Colbourne E	7,166	2.2939	$ 16,437.22	1.7255	$ 12,364.28	2.6932	$ 19,298.45
	Total	11,775		$ 27,010.01		$ 20,317.26		$ 31,711.65
Aug	Powerline	1,697	2.2939	$ 3,892.17	1.7255	$ 2,927.74	2.6932	$ 4,569.69
	Colbourne W	3,794	2.2939	$ 8,702.02	1.7255	$ 6,545.77	2.6932	$ 10,216.79
	Colbourne E	8,444	2.2939	$ 19,369.03	1.7255	$ 14,569.62	2.6932	$ 22,740.60
	Total	13,934		$ 31,963.23		$ 24,043.13		$ 37,527.08
Sept	Powerline	1,274	2.2939	$ 2,923.23	1.7255	$ 2,198.89	2.6932	$ 3,432.08
	Colbourne W	3,039	2.2939	$ 6,971.55	1.7255	$ 5,244.09	2.6932	$ 8,185.09
	Colbourne E	7,554	2.2939	$ 17,327.43	1.7255	$ 13,033.91	2.6932	$ 20,343.62
	Total	11,867		$ 27,222.22		$ 20,476.89		$ 31,960.80
Oct	Powerline	1,514	2.2939	$ 3,472.30	1.7255	$ 2,611.91	2.6932	$ 4,076.72
	Colbourne W	2,860	2.2939	$ 6,560.81	1.7255	$ 4,935.12	2.6932	$ 7,702.85
	Colbourne E	7,957	2.2939	$ 18,251.71	1.7255	$ 13,729.17	2.6932	$ 21,428.80
	Total	12,330		$ 28,284.82		$ 21,276.19		$ 33,208.37
Nov	Powerline	1,448	2.2939	$ 3,322.42	1.7255	$ 2,499.16	2.6932	$ 3,900.75
	Colbourne W	-	2.2939	$ -	1.7255	$ -	2.6932	$ -
	Colbourne E	-	2.2939	$ -	1.7255	$ -	2.6932	$ -
	Total	1,448		$ 3,322.42		$ 2,499.16		$ 3,900.75
Dec	Powerline	1,993	2.2939	$ 4,571.44	1.7255	$ 3,438.70	2.6932	$ 5,367.20
	Colbourne W	3,089	2.2939	$ 7,085.40	1.7255	$ 5,329.72	2.6932	$ 8,318.76
	Colbourne E	-	2.2939	$ -	1.7255	$ -	2.6932	$ -
	Total	5,082		$ 11,656.84		$ 8,768.42		$ 13,685.95
	Plus fixed LV charges							$ 10,970.28
Grand Total		137,368		$ 315,108.29		$ 237,028.36		$ 380,929.59

QUESTION #14

Reference: Exhibit 9/Tab 1/Schedule 2

a) At the top of page 1 Brant states that it is not requesting the disposition of balances as the end of 2009. However, the amounts requested for disposition on page 3 include principal up to December 31, 2009. Please reconcile.

b) Please reconcile the projected distribution revenue by class shown on page 4 with the revenues by class (and in total) shown in Exhibit 7/Tab 3/Schedule 1, page 1 and Exhibit 3/Tab 1/Schedule 2, page 1.

Response:

a) Brant County has provided the OEB and interveners with a variance model populated up to Dec. 31, 2009 to provide some details on our variance disposition request.

   To avoid rate shock to customers (a yo-yo effect on deferral / variance account rate riders), Brant County is requesting disposition of variance balances after Dec. 31, 2010. This delayed date allows for all charges relating to the Brantford Motion to rehear have been incorporated and the principal balances applied for disposition are final and accurate.

   An updated model will be filed once year-end activities are finished.

b) Brant County could not find distribution revenue on page 4 of Exhibit 9, Tab 1, Schedule 2 to compare to the other references provided and cannot provide a response.

QUESTION # 15

References: i) Exhibit 10/Tab1/Schedule 1 Page 2
ii) Exhibit 10/Tab1, Indeco Report, pages 3-4 Table 3 and Appendix A (Schedule 2, pages 27-29)

Preamble: "for Calculation of SSM claims the best available information at the beginning of the year was used. This is consistent with the guidance in Section 7.3 of the OEB *Guidelines for Electricity CDM* (OEB2008a)"

a) Explain why the Residential Every Kilowatt Counts EKC programs 2006-2007 are classed as Third tranche funded as opposed to OPA funded programs, as is the case for the 2008 and 2009 programs. Discuss the implications for SSM eligibility.

b) When (year and date) did the OPA change its Input assumptions (unit savings and free ridership) for CFLs under the Every Kilowatt Counts Campaigns?

c) Provide a copy of the SeeLine EKC calculators before and after the change.

d) Confirm /Show how the assumptions for CFLs and SLEDs used in this claim for programs implemented in 2007 compare to
   i. post (fall 2006?) OPA EKC calculator change and
   ii. the latest OPA Mass Market Measures and Input Assumptions.

e) For 2007 Residential CFL and SLED exchanges provide a revised SSM claim using the OPA 2006/07 EKC input assumptions (i.e. revised Schedule 2, pages 27-29 and Table 3 total Residential SSM claim)

Response:

a) The EKC programs in 2006 and 2007 were fundamentally different from other OPA programs BCP was involved in:

- The 2006 and 2007 EKC programs were delivered in partnership with the OPA, not under contract to the OPA;
- BCP integrated these programs into its third-tranche offerings;
- BCP did not receive any funding from the OPA in support of the program, but funded its portion of these programs out of its third-tranche budget; and
- BCP reported interim results on these programs in its annual CDM reports for 2006 and 2007.

BCP's contribution to the program was central, based on the following facts:

- The program built on a pilot program offered by BCP and other LDCs in 2005;
- The program was based on a mail-out of coupons to electricity customers in BCP's service area. BCP's customer mailing list was provided and used for this purpose;
- BCP's corporate name and logo were prominently featured on all communications with customers. At the time of these programs, OPA was an unknown entity to most customers, whereas BCP was well known and respected. Studies of customer responses to conservation initiatives have demonstrated the importance of customer recognition and trust of the agency seeking their involvement – no doubt that is why OPA sought ought BCP as a partner, and made use of their name recognition; and
- BCP co-promoted the program as part of its Seasonal Light Exchange, Energy Exhibition and Walter's Greenhouse/Nova Vita Ladies' Night third-tranche programs.

BCP's participation in the programs was thus central to the effective implementation of these programs within BCP's service area. BCP is therefore entitled to claim an SSM for these programs.

The program design was changed in 2008 and BCP's participation was not integral to the program, and therefore no SSM is claimed on net benefits from the 2008 and 2009 programs.

b) There are two sources of unit energy savings and free ridership for CFLs under the EKC programs:

- Published measures and assumptions values, beginning with the OEB's Total Resource Cost Guide, until the OPA's 2010 Prescriptive Measures and Assumptions report
- Reported program results for the EKC program, which included early estimates of savings distributed by the OPA in March 2007 until final results for 2006 through 2009 distributed in December 2010. These were only ever provided after the program was delivered, not before.

Both sources show different unit energy savings in each year, though in some cases they are not directly comparable since the EKC program results appear to be a mix of different types of bulbs (e.g. 11W, 13W, 15W, etc.). There are significant changes in the unit energy savings from 2006 (104 kWh/a) to 2007 (43-44 kWh/a) reflecting a drop in the number of hours the bulb is assumed to be used per day. In the EKC results for 2009, but not in the OPA *2010 Predictive Measures and Assumptions* report, unit savings are again lower (23-25 kWh/a).

For free riders, the OEB TRC Guide showed a rate of 10% for CFLs. Free ridership is not provided for CFLs in the various versions of the OPA's Measures and Assumptions reports. The free rider rates for CFLs in the reported results for the EKC program are different in every year of the program and for different bulb types.

c) Copies of the SeeLine EKC calculators for the 2006 Fall and Spring EKC Campaigns are appended. We do not have EKC calculators for 2007, 2008, and 2009.

d) (i) The table below compares the values for CFLs and SLEDs used in the SSM claim for programs implemented in 2007 with the values for CFLs and SLEDs found in the OPA 2006 Fall EKC calculator which was distributed on March 3, 2007. Input assumptions for 20W+ CFLs are not provided in the OPA 2006 Fall EKC calculator.

Program	Energy Efficient Measure	Used for the SSM claim			Fall 2006 OPA EKC calculator assumptions		
		Measure life	Free-rider rate	Gross savings (kWh/a)	Measure life	Free-rider rate	Gross savings (kWh/a)
2007 EKC	15 W CFL	8	22%	43	4	10%	104.4
2007 EKC	20 W+ CFLs	8	22%	62.1	NA	NA	NA
2007 EKC	Project Porchlight CFLs	8	24%	43	4	10%	104.4
2007 EKC	SLEDs	5	51%	13.7	30	5%	29.1
2007 CDM other admin costs - NEPA	15 W CFL	4	10%	104.4	4	10%	104.4
2007 Project porchlight	15 W CFL	4	10%	104.4	4	10%	104.4
2007 Walter's greenhouse/Nova Vita Ladies Night	15 W CFL	4	10%	104.4	4	10%	104.4
2007 SLED exchange	LED Lights - 5W bulbs	30	10%	19	30	5%	42
2007 SLED exchange	LED Lights - minis	30	10%	7	30	5%	16.1

(ii) The table below compares the values for CFLs and SLEDs used in the SSM claim for programs implemented in 2007 with the values for CFLs and SLEDs found in the 2010 OPA Measures and Assumptions list.

Program	Energy Efficient Measure	Used for the SSM claim			2010 OPA M&A list		
		Measure life	Free-rider rate	Gross savings (kWh/a)	Measure life	Free-rider rate	Gross savings (kWh/a)
2007 EKC	15 W CFL	8	22%	43	8	NA	44.4
2007 EKC	20 W+ CFLs	8	22%	62.1	8	NA	62.8
2007 EKC	Project Porchlight CFLs	8	24%	43	8	NA	44.4
2007 EKC	SLEDs	5	51%	13.7	5	NA	13.5
2007 CDM other admin costs - NEPA	15 W CFL	4	10%	104.4	8	NA	44.4
2007 Project porchlight	15 W CFL	4	10%	104.4	8	NA	44.4
2007 Walter's greenhouse/Nova Vita Ladies Night	15 W CFL	4	10%	104.4	8	NA	44.4
2007 SLED exchange	LED Lights - 5W bulbs	30	10%	19	5	NA	13.5
2007 SLED exchange	LED Lights - minis	30	10%	7	5	NA	4.8

e) We understand VECC's question 15 e to be a request to recalculate Schedule 2, pages 27-29 and Table 3 using the values from Table 15 d (i) above in the columns labeled "**Fall 2006 OPA EKC calculator assumptions**" in place of the original values, which are those in Table 15 d (i) above in the columns labeled "Used for the SSM claim"

Tables using these alternate values follow. The SSM claim that would be associated with these values is $23,680, which is $4,878 more than the claim as filed. Because the 2006 calculator did not provide unit savings, lifetimes or free riders for CFLs rated at 20 W or higher, for these values we used the values reported in the OEB's 2006 Total Resource Cost Guide for 20 W bulbs for all bulbs rated greater than 20 W.

Rate class	Program	Energy Efficient Measure	Number of units	Measure life	SSM Free Ridership	Total benefits	Total costs	Annual energy savings (kWh/a)	Contribution to SSM
Residential	2006 EKC	Energy Star® CFL - Spring Campaign	2,641	4	10%	$69,899	$6,603	104	$2,848
	2006 EKC	Electric Timers - Spring Campaign	74	20	10%	$12,554	$925	183	$523
	2006 EKC	Programmable Thermostats - Spring Campaign	32	15	10%	$6,210	$2,080	216	$186
	2006 EKC	Energy Star® Ceiling Fans - Spring Campaign	25	20	10%	$3,503	$625	141	$130
	2006 EKC	Energy Star® CFL - Autumn Campaign	3,916	4	10%	$103,247	$6,344	104	$4,361
	2006 EKC	SLED - Autumn Campaign	943	30	10%	$30,177	$8,204	31	$989
	2006 EKC	Programmable Thermostats - Autumn Campaign	62	18	10%	$35,800	$1,550	522	$1,541
	2006 EKC	Dimmers - Autumn Campaign	49	10	10%	$3,656	$637	139	$136
	2006 EKC	Indoor Motion Sensors - Autumn Campaign	18	20	10%	$3,488	$360	209	$141
	2006 EKC	Programmable Basebaord Thermostats - Autumn Campaign	4	18	10%	$5,143	$100	1,466	$227
	2007 EKC	15 W CFL	4,680	4	10%	$125,192	$9,359	43	$5,212
	2007 EKC	20+ W CFL	762	4	10%	$25,041	$2,666	62	$1,007
	2007 EKC	Energy Star® Light Fixture	18	16	45%	$1,927	$436	123	$41
	2007 EKC	T8 Fluorescent Tube	36	18	23%	$1,232	$712	37	$20
	2007 EKC	Seasonal LED Light String	1,240	30	5%	$38,021	$2,480	14	$1,688
	2007 EKC	Project Porchlight CFL	985	4	10%	$26,345	$1,970	43	$1,097
	2007 EKC	Solar Light	601	5	87%	$851	$2,854	5	($13)
	2007 EKC	Energy Star® Ceiling Fan	38	10	45%	$1,963	$1,774	90	$5
	2007 EKC	Furnace Filter	152	1	45%	$388	$1,825	38	($40)
	2007 EKC	Power Bar with Timer	17	10	23%	$717	$416	72	$12
	2007 EKC	Lighting Control Device	193	10	45%	$9,491	$4,004	72	$151
	2007 EKC	Outdoor Motion Sensor	60	10	45%	$5,286	$974	160	$119

Rate class	Program	Energy Efficient Measure	Number of units	Measur e life	SSM Free Ridership	Total benefits	Total costs	Annual energy savings (kWh/a)	Contribution to SSM
	2007 EKC	Dimmer Switch	38	10	45%	$528	$496	24	$1
	2007 EKC	Programmable Thermostat	37	15	45%	$2,179	$917	75	$35
	2005 Conservation County – CFLs	15 W CFL	500	4	10%	$13,233	$1,000	104	$551
	2005 Lighting your electricity bill	15W CFL	575	4	10%	$15,218	$1,150	104	$633
	2005 Lighting your electricity bill	Seasonal LED Lights - 5W	55	30	5%	$2,527	$110	45	$115
	2005 Lighting your electricity bill	Seasonal LED Lights - Mini Lights	55	30	5%	$965	$110	17	$41
	2005 Lighting your electricity bill	Pstat - Space Heating	15	18	10%	$19,194	$900	1,459	$823
	2005 Lighting your electricity bill	Pstat - Space Cooling	39	18	10%	$9,486	$2,340	158	$322
	2005 Lighting your electricity bill	Outdoor Timer	21	20	10%	$5,685	$420	292	$237
	2005 Lighting your electricity bill	Indoor Timer	4	20	10%	$530	$28	98	$23
	2005 Lighting your electricity bill	Indoor Timer for AC	3	20	10%	$656	$21	109	$29
	2005 Lighting your electricity bill	Ceiling Fan	16	20	10%	$0	$672	0	($30)
	2005 Cold water wash program	Cold water wash detergent	351	1	25%	$14,529	$3,510	623	$413
	2006 Seasonal LED light exchange	LED Lights	300	30	5%	$5,884	$2,759	19	$148
	2006 Seasonal LED light exchange	LED Lights	50	30	5%	$361	$460	7	($5)
	2007 CDM other admin costs – NEPA	15 W CFL	350	4	10%	$9,258	$600	43	$390
	2007 Project porchlight	15 W CFL	660	4	10%	$17,458	$1,200	43	$732
	2007 Walter's greenhouse/Nova Vita Ladies Night	15 W CFL	200	4	10%	$5,290	$400	43	$220
	2007 Seasonal LED	LED Lights	407	30	5%	$18,015	$2,925	14	$717

Rate class	Program	Energy Efficient Measure	Number of units	Measur e life	SSM Free Ridership	Total benefits	Total costs	Annual energy savings (kWh/a)	Contribution to SSM
	light exchange								
	2007 Seasonal LED light exchange	LED Lights	517	30	5%	$8,772	$3,716	14	$240
Residential total						$651,127	$76,917		$26,013
GS < 50 kW	2005 Conservation County - lighting retrofit	2 - T8 32 W (58 W) reflectorized w/EL ballast	48	9	10%	$7,843	$2,544	392	$238
	2005 Conservation County - lighting retrofit	1 - T8 32 W (38 W) w/EL HBF ballast	4	9	10%	$267	$144	160	$6
	2005 Conservation County - lighting retrofit	15 W CFL	15	4	10%	$480	$30	104	$20
	2005 Conservation County - lighting retrofit	3 W LED Exit sign	10	25	10%	$2,372	$950	237	$64
	2005 Garage door replacement	Garage door replacement from R5 to R10.5	1	15	0%	$4,908	$12,000	5,766	($355)
GS < 50 kW total						$15,870	$15,668		($26)
Streetlighting	2008 Traffic light conversion	LED traffic lights	4	14	0%	$84,955	$22,400	26,578	$3,128
	2008 Streetlight conversion	LED streetlight	25	14	0%	$8,926	$22,437	456	($676)
Streelighting total						$93,881	$44,837		$2,452
Total						**$760,877**	**$137,422**		**$28,439**

The net TRC benefits are the total technology benefits less the total technology costs (net of free riders) less the total program costs. The total gross technology benefits and costs, from the table above, are $760,877 and $137,422, respectively. The total net technology benefits and costs are $695,586 and $126,815. The total program cost for all programs is $95,177. Net TRC benefits are thus $473,594. The SSM incentive is 5% of these net TRC benefits, or $23,680. The residential rate class portion of this SSM claim is $23,502.

The table below is Exhibit 10 Tab 1 Schedule 2 pg 18 (Table 3 – Summary of net TRC benefits and SSM entitlement) reported using the values from Table 15 d (i) above in the columns labeled "**Fall 2006 OPA EKC calculator assumptions**" in place of the original values, which are those in Table 15 d (i) above in the columns labeled "Used for the SSM claim".

Table 3 – Summary of net TRC benefits and SSM entitlement

Program	**Year**	**Residential**	**GS < 50 kW**	**GS 50 to 4,999 kW**	**Street lighting**	**Sentinel lights**	**Net TRC**	**SSM amount**
CDM other admin costs - Breakfast seminar	2005			($1,247)			*($1,247)*	*($62)*
CDM other admin costs - NEPA	2005	($3,838)					*($3,838)*	*($192)*
	2006	($900)					*($900)*	*($45)*
	2007	$6,289					*$6,289*	*$314*
Cold water wash program	2005	$7,764					*$7,764*	*$388*
Conservation County - CFLs	2005	$9,010					*$9,010*	*$451*
Conservation County - education	2005	($19,522)	($19,522)	($4,338)			*($43,383)*	*($2,169)*
Conservation County - lighting retrofit	2005		($5,436)				*($5,436)*	*($272)*
Energy exhibition - October 14, 2006	2006	($1,318)	($264)	($176)			*($1,758)*	*($88)*
Every Kilowatt Counts	2006	$221,479					*$221,479*	*$11,074*
	2007	$186,695					*$186,695*	*$9,335*
Garage door replacement	2005		($7,092)				*($7,092)*	*($355)*
Lighting your electricity bill	2005	$33,786					*$33,786*	*$1,689*
Planning, administration & monitoring	2005	($6,237)	($3,742)	($2,370)		($125)	*($12,473)*	*($624)*
	2006	($214)	($128)	($81)		($4)	*($427)*	*($21)*
Project porchlight	2007	$13,247					*$13,247*	*$662*
Seasonal LED light exchange	2006	$2,445					*$2,445*	*$122*
	2007	$18,596					*$18,596*	*$930*
Staff development	2005	($531)	($319)	($202)		($11)	*($1,063)*	*($53)*
	2006	($431)	($259)	($164)		($9)	*($862)*	*($43)*
Streetlight conversion	2008				($13,511)		*($13,511)*	*($676)*
Traffic light conversion	2008				$62,555		*$62,555*	*$3,128*
Walter's greenhouse/Nova Vita Ladies Night	2007	$3,718					*$3,718*	*$186*
Total net TRC benefits		*$470,038*	*($36,761)*	*($8,578)*	*$49,044*	*($148)*	*$473,594*	
Total net SSM		*$23,502*	*($1,838)*	*($429)*	*$2,452*	*($7)*		**$23,680**

Question Date: January 14, 2011
Response Date: January 26, 2011

QUESTION #16

References: i) Exhibit 10/Tab 1/Schedule 1, Tables 3 and 4
ii) Exhibit 10/Tab 2/Schedule 2, IndEco Report, page 7, Tables 1 and 10 (Schedule 2, pages 31-44)

Preamble: "IndEco finds that appropriate measure specifications were used to calculate program energy savings. For the calculation of LRAM claims, values provided by the 2010 OPA Measures and Assumptions list were used for prescriptive measures (OPA 2010a and 2010b)."

a) For LRAM the OEB Guidelines and Policy Letter of January 27, 2009 Specify that

LRAM

The input assumptions used for the calculation of LRAM should be the best available at the time of the third party assessment referred to in section 7.5.
For example, if any input assumptions change in 2007, those changes should apply for LRAM purposes from the beginning of 2007 onwards until changed again…..

Confirm/discuss how the claim is in conformity with this Guideline and the Board's Decision regarding Horizon Utilities (EB-2009-0192).

b) Confirm/Show how the EKC assumptions used in this claim compare to post (2006?) OPA EKC calculator change and to the latest OPA Mass Market Measures and Input Assumptions.

c) What persistence factors have been applied to the 2006 EKC programs and Measures, specifically CFLs and SLEDs?

d) The Indeco Report (page 5) lists 4 exceptions to the OPA 2010a and b prescriptive input assumptions for residential CDM:
- OPA preliminary Results 2009
- One measure from the 2005 Lighten your Electricity Bill program (indoor timers?)
- Switch to cold water wash
- 2005 Garage Door replacement program

  i. Provide a copy of the OPA 2009 Final results and update the OPA program component of the LRAM claim as necessary
  ii. Provide details and support for each of the other 3 listed exceptions including links to, or copies of, sources used.

e) Confirm the Input Assumptions used by IndEco for the following 3rd tranche CDM programs [Reference - Exhibit 10/Tab 1/Schedule 2, page 32 (page 24 of Appendix A Indeco Report)

- Residential EKC 2006-- list of measures, # units and unit kwh savings, lifetime and free ridership for each of 2006-2010.
  If not included in above
- Project Porchlight
- Seasonal LED Exchange
- Walters Greenhouse Ladies Night CFLs
- CDM Other admin costs NEPA

f) For each of the above measures in the current claim, provide the comparable input values from the OPA 2010 Mass Market Measures and Assumptions List

g) For CFLs installed in 2005/2006 explain why the unit savings is maintained at 104 kWh and the free-ridership is maintained at 10% in the current claim (for 2009 and 2010).

Response:

a)

The claim is in conformity with this Guideline. It uses the best available input assumptions for each measure of each program. In some cases, input assumptions for a particular measure are available from multiple sources. In these cases, information is taken from the sources highest in the information hierarchy. The information hierarchy (from greatest to least confidence) for LRAM calculations is:

1. Information or results from an OPA conducted or sponsored evaluation of the specific program
2. Information or results from a third-party evaluation of the specific program
3. Information or results from a site-specific assessment of the application of the technology, including on-site measurement or survey of the specific customer
4. Manufacturer specifications for energy use/demand of a specific technology installation
5. Information from the OPA's most current measures and assumptions lists
6. Information from earlier OPA measures and assumptions lists
7. Information from the OEB's TRC guide list of measures and assumptions.

Where there is a program specific evaluation, as there is for the programs evaluated by the OPA, that evaluation provides more specific and appropriate input values than the generic ones in the measures and assumptions lists. OPA provided evaluated results for the OPA-funded programs, and for the 2006 and 2007 Every Kilowatt Counts programs that were offered by Brant County Power in partnership with the OPA. As noted by the OPA, the results provided in its report are in accordance with OPA practices and policies for reporting progress against the provincial conservation goals.

The Board Decision regarding Horizon Utilities (EB-2009-0192) was that Horizon's LRAM amounts associated with the third tranche 2005/2006 programs used generic input assumptions and associated carrying charges should be adjusted to use the most up to date input assumptions available at the time of the third party review. Brant County's LRAM claim for all programs in all rate classes conforms to this decision. The table below gives a brief summary of the sources of all input assumptions used to calculate Brant County's LRAM claim for third tranche programs.

Rate class	**Program**	**Source of LRAM inputs**
Residential	2005 Cold water wash program	2008 OEB TRC guide list
Residential	2005 Conservation County - CFLs	2010 OPA M&A list
Residential	2005 Lighten your electricity bill	2010 OPA M&A list, SeeLine 2006
Residential	2006 Every Kilowatt Counts	2010 OPA Final EKC Results for the 2006 program
Residential	2006 Seasonal LED light exchange	2010 OPA M&A list
Residential	2007 CDM other admin costs - NEPA	2010 OPA M&A list
Residential	2007 Every Kilowatt Counts	2010 OPA Final EKC Results for the 2007 program
Residential	2007 Project porchlight	2010 OPA M&A list
Residential	2007 Seasonal LED light exchange	2010 OPA M&A list
Residential	2007 Walter's greenhouse/Nova Vita Ladies Night	2010 OPA M&A list
GS < 50 kW	2005 Conservation County - lighting retrofit	2010 OPA M&A list
GS < 50 kW	2005 Garage door replacement	BCP engineering assessment
Street lighting	2008 Streetlight conversion	BCP engineering assessment
Street lighting	2008 Traffic light conversion	BCP engineering assessment

1. The 2008 OEB TRC guide list was used for input assumptions for cold water washing, which is not found on the 2010 OPA M&A list.
2. The 2006 and 2007 Final EKC Program results used are consistent with the Final 2006-2009 OPA Program results provided by the OPA in December 2010.
3. 2006-2009 Final OPA results were provided in December 2010
4. SeeLine 2006 was used for input assumptions for AC indoor timers, which is not found on the 2010 OPA M&A list
5. Specific program evaluations were used for custom measures, which were not found on the 2010 OPA M&A list

b)

The EKC assumptions used in this LRAM claim as filed and those listed in the 2010 M&A list are provided in the table below. The assumptions used in the LRAM claim are the same as what VECC refers to as 'post 2006 EKC Calculator change' assumptions. The assumptions used in the LRM claim as filed for the 2006, 2007 and 2008 EKC campaigns are consistent with those found in the 2006-2009 Final OPA program results provided December 2010. The assumptions used for the 2009 EKC campaign in the LRAM claim as filed (and provided in the table below) are preliminary 2009 EKC results. Upon the receipt of the 2009 Final OPA Program results, the LRAM claim was updated. See response to VECC Q16d for an updated LRAM claim using final results for all 2006-2009 OPA programs.

The OPA results of the evaluations of the 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 EKC programs provide little or no information on the measures found within these programs. Consequently, for some measures, particularly programmable thermostats, it was difficult to respond to VECC's IR #16b to compare the inputs used with the values in the OPA Measures and Assumptions list. Assumptions had to be made on the basis of the limited information provided in the OPA results, the program, and the measures found in the Measures and Assumptions list. We do not have confidence in considering the input values from the 2010 M&A list as being comparable to the inputs used in the LRAM claim for 2006-2009 EKC, and consider the values from the OPA evaluation to be more meaningful than the assumed values from the Measures and Assumptions list.

		Used in filed LRAM claim		**From 2010 OPA M&A list**	
Program	**Energy Efficient Measure**	**Measure life**	**Gross savings (kWh/a)**	**Measure life**	**Gross savings (kWh/a)**
2006 EKC	Energy Star® Compact Fluorescent Light Bulb	4	104	8	44
2006 EKC	Electric Timers	20	183	10	144
2006 EKC	Programmable Thermostats	15	216	11	203
2006 EKC	Energy Star® Ceiling Fans	20	141	10	123
2006 EKC	Energy Star® Compact Fluorescent Light Bulb	4	104	8	44
2006 EKC	Seasonal Light Emitting Diode Light String	30	31	5	14
2006 EKC	Programmable Thermostats	18	522	11	2151
2006 EKC	Dimmers	10	139	10	24
2006 EKC	Indoor Motion Sensors	20	209	10	64
2006 EKC	Programmable Baseboard Thermostats	18	1466	11	63
2007 EKC	15 W CFL	8	43	8	44

		Used in filed LRAM claim		From 2010 OPA M&A list	
Program	**Energy Efficient Measure**	**Measure life**	**Gross savings (kWh/a)**	**Measure life**	**Gross savings (kWh/a)**
2007 EKC	20 W+ CFLs	8	62	8	63
2007 EKC	Project Porchlight CFLs	8	43	8	44
2007 EKC	Energy Star Ceiling Fan	10	90	10	123
2007 EKC	Solar Lights	5	33	5	5
2007 EKC	Outdoor Motion Sensor	10	160	10	159
2007 EKC	Dimmer Switch	10	24	10	24
2007 EKC	Energy Star Light Fixtures	16	123	16	166
2007 EKC	SLEDs	5	14	5	14
2007 EKC	T8	18	37	18	28
2007 EKC	Programmable Thermostat	15	75	11	63
2007 EKC	Power Bar with Timer	10	72	10	53
2007 EKC	Lighting Control Devices	10	72	10	107
2008 EKC PSE	Energy Star® CFLs	8	53	8	54
2008 EKC PSE	Energy Star® Qualified Dimmable CFLs	6	98	5	92
2008 EKC PSE	Energy Star® Qualified Decorative CFLs	4	30	5	31
2008 EKC PSE	Energy Star® CFL Floods (Indoor & Outdoor)	7	88	5.5	89
2008 EKC PSE	Energy Star® Qualified Light Fixtures	16	133	16	166
2008 EKC PSE	T8 Fluorescent Fixtures	16	37	18	28
2008 EKC PSE	Lighting Control Devices	10	102	10	107
2008 EKC PSE	Power Bars with Timers	10	53	10	53
2008 EKC PSE	Car block heater timer	0	0	10	653
2008 EKC PSE	Heavy Duty Timers	10	301	10	575
2008 EKC	Programmable Thermostats - Baseboard	15	64	11	63

		Used in filed LRAM claim		From 2010 OPA M&A list	
Program	**Energy Efficient Measure**	**Measure life**	**Gross savings (kWh/a)**	**Measure life**	**Gross savings (kWh/a)**
PSE					
2008 EKC PSE	Air Conditioner/Furnace Filters	1	38	1	34
2008 EKC PSE	Awnings	0	0	NA	NA
2008 EKC PSE	Window Films	0	0	10	1601
2008 EKC PSE	Electric Water Heater Blankets	0	0	NA	NA
2008 EKC PSE	Pipe Wrap	6	38	15	38
2008 EKC PSE	Low-Flow Toilets	0	0	NA	NA
2008 EKC PSE	Keep Cool Pilot – Dehumidifier	12	500	12	500
2008 EKC PSE	Keep Cool Pilot – Room Air Conditioner	9	141	9	141
2008 EKC PSE	Rewards for Recycling – Dehumidifier	12	500	12	500
2008 EKC PSE	Rewards for Recycling – Room Air Conditioner	9	141	9	141
2008 EKC PSE	Rewards for Recycling – Halogen Lamp	16	275	16	275
2009 EKC PSE	Standard CFL (single pack)	8	53	8	54
2009 EKC PSE	Standard CFL (multi (6) pack)	8	258	NA	NA
2009 EKC PSE	Energy Star Specialty CFL	6	63	NA	NA
2009 EKC PSE	Energy Star Light Fixtures	16	123	16	187
2009 EKC PSE	Energy Star Hard–Wired Indoor Light Fixtures	16	123	16	125
2009 EKC PSE	Energy Star Ceiling Fans	10	90	10	123
2009 EKC PSE	Weather Stripping (packages)	2	2	NA	NA

		Used in filed LRAM claim		From 2010 OPA M&A list	
Program	**Energy Efficient Measure**	**Measure life**	**Gross savings (kWh/a)**	**Measure life**	**Gross savings (kWh/a)**
2009 EKC PSE	Weather Stripping (door kits)	2	2	NA	NA
2009 EKC PSE	Pipe Wrap – Purchase of 3	6	38	15	38
2009 EKC PSE	Water Heater Blanket	6	270	NA	NA
2009 EKC PSE	Window Film	10	45	10	1601
2009 EKC PSE	Lighting and Appliance Controls – Unspecified	10	72	10	112
2009 EKC PSE	Lighting and Appliance Controls – Power Bar with Integrated Timer	10	72	10	53
2009 EKC PSE	Lighting and Appliance Controls – Hard Wired Indoor Timer	10	219	10	219
2009 EKC PSE	Lighting and Appliance Controls – Hard Wired Motion Sensor	10	64	10	64
2009 EKC PSE	Lighting and Appliance Controls – Heavy Duty Outdoor Timer includes Pool Timers	10	511	10	575
2009 EKC PSE	Programmable Thermostat (single pack)	15	75	NA	NA
2009 EKC PSE	Programmable Thermostat (multi (3) pack)	15	225	NA	NA
2009 EKC PSE	Clothes Line Kit or Cloths Line Umbrella Stand	10	226	10	141
2009 EKC PSE	Energy Star Dehumidifier Recycling	12	342	12	500
2009 EKC PSE	Energy Star Room Air Conditioner Recycling	9	96	9	141
2009 EKC PSE	Halogen Floor Lamp Recycling	6	225	16	275

c)

Persistence factors of 100% were applied to the 2006 EKC programs and measures, including CFLs and SLEDs. This is consistent with the program-specific persistence factors contained in the 2006-2009 Final OPA program results provided by the OPA.

d)

i) A copy of the Excel spreadsheet containing the final 2009 OPA program results is appended.

The following table shows the amended LRAM claim using the final 2009 OPA program results. The revised residential LRAM claim is $184,526. The total LRAM claim is $247,802.

The residential LRAM claim as filed was $182,777. The total LRAM claim as filed was $251,022.

Revised LRAM claim with final 2009 OPA program

Funding	Program	Year	Residential	GS < 50 kW	GS 50 to 4,999 kW	Street lighting	6-year LRAM
OPA	Cool & Hot Savings Rebate	2006	$3,214	$0	$0	$0	*$3,214*
		2007	$3,984	$0	$0	$0	*$3,984*
	Cool Savings Rebate	2008	$3,130	$0	$0	$0	*$3,130*
		2009	$2,562	$0	$0	$0	*$2,562*
	ERIP	2007	$0	$450	$240	$0	*$690*
		2008	$0	$3,341	$714	$0	*$4,055*
		2009	$0	$19,579	$3,323	$0	*$22,903*
	EKC PSE	2008	$15,843	$0	$0	$0	*$15,843*
		2009	$4,364	$0	$0	$0	*$4,364*
	Great Refrigerator Roundup	2007	$3,955	$0	$0	$0	*$3,955*
		2008	$8,960	$0	$0	$0	*$8,960*
		2009	$4,827	$0	$0	$0	*$4,827*
	High Performance New Construction	2008	$0	$42	$0	$0	*$42*
		2009	$0	$833	$0	$0	*$833*
	peaksaver®	2008	$106	$5	$0	$0	*$111*
		2009	$42	$2	$0	$0	*$44*
	Power Savings Blitz	2009	$0	$31,342	$0	$0	*$31,342*
	Secondary Refrigerator Retirement Pilot	2006	$1,302	$0	$0	$0	*$1,302*
	Social Housing Pilot	2007	$2,171	$0	$0	$0	*$2,171*
	Summer Sweepstakes	2008	$21,024	$0	$0	$0	*$21,024*
OPA total			*$75,485*	*$55,594*	*$4,277*	*$0*	*$135,356*
Third-tranche	CDM other admin costs - NEPA	2007	$872	$0	$0	$0	*$872*
	Cold water wash program	2005	$3,395	$0	$0	$0	*$3,395*
	Conservation County - CFLs	2005	$1,954	$0	$0	$0	*$1,954*
	Conservation County - lighting retrofit	2005	$0	$994	$0	$0	*$994*
	Every Kilowatt Counts	2006	$69,968	$0	$0	$0	*$69,968*
		2007	$23,669	$0	$0	$0	*$23,669*
	Garage door replacement	2005	$0	$680	$0	$0	*$680*
	Lighting your electricity bill	2005	$6,274	$0	$0	$0	*$6,274*
	Project porchlight	2007	$1,645	$0	$0	$0	*$1,645*
	Seasonal LED light exchange	2006	$316	$0	$0	$0	*$316*
		2007	$449	$0	$0	$0	*$449*
	Streetlight conversion	2008	$0	$0	$0	$132	*$132*
	Traffic light conversion	2008	$0	$0	$0	$1,599	*$1,599*
	Walter's greenhouse/Nova Vita Ladies Night	2007	$499	$0	$0	$0	*$499*
Third tranche total			*$109,041*	*$1,674*	*$0*	*$1,731*	*$112,446*
Portfolio total			*$184,526*	*$57,268*	*$4,277*	*$1,731*	**$247,802**

results

ii) The measure assumptions used for the other three listed exceptions are provided below.

Program	Measure	Units	Measure life	LRAM Free Ridership	Energy savings (kWh/a)	Contribution to LRAM	Assumption source
2005 Lighten your electricity bill	Indoor Timer for AC	3	20	30%	109	$29	SeeLine 2006
2005 Cold water wash program	Cold water wash detergent	351	1	25%	623	$3,395	OEB 2008
2005 Garage door replacement	Garage door replacement from R5 to R10.5	1	15	0%	5,766	$680	Brant County 2006

1. Seeline Group Inc. (SeeLine) 2006. Total resource cost test assessment of the '2005 Lighten your Electricity Bill' program
2. Ontario Energy Board (OEB) 2008. Inputs and Assumptions for Calculating Total Resource Cost. (March 28)
3. Brant County 2006. TRC tool – garage door replacement. Spreadsheet provided by Brant County Power.

The SeeLine 2006 report and the Brant County garage door replacement spreadsheet calculator are appended. OEB 2008 can be found at the following link: http://www.oeb.gov.on.ca/documents/cases/EB-2008-0037/Inputs_and_Assumptions_20080328.pdf

e)

The input assumptions used to calculate LRAM claims for the requested programs are found in the table below. The same assumptions were used in each applicable year between 2006 and 2010 for the requested programs.

Program	Energy Efficient Measure	Units	Measure life	LRAM Free Ridership	Energy savings (kWh/a)
2006 EKC	Energy Star® CFL - Spring Campaign	2,641	4	10%	104
2006 EKC	Electric Timers - Spring Campaign	74	20	10%	183
2006 EKC	Programmable Thermostats - Spring Campaign	32	15	10%	216
2006 EKC	Energy Star® Ceiling Fans - Spring Campaign	25	20	10%	141
2006 EKC	Energy Star® CFL Bulb - Autumn Campaign	3,916	4	10%	104
2006 EKC	SLED Light String - Autumn Campaign	943	30	10%	31
2006 EKC	PStats - Autumn Campaign	62	18	10%	522
2006 EKC	Dimmers - Autumn Campaign	49	10	10%	139
2006 EKC	Indoor Motion Sensors - Autumn Campaign	18	20	10%	209
2006 EKC	Baseboard PStat - Autumn Campaign	4	18	10%	1,466
2006 SLED exchange	LED Lights	300	5	30%	14
2006 SLED exchange	LED Lights	50	5	30%	5
2007 CDM other admin costs - NEPA	15 W CFL	350	8	30%	44
2007 Project porchlight	15 W CFL	660	8	30%	44
2007 Walter's greenhouse/Nova Vita Ladies Night	15 W CFL	200	8	30%	44
2007 SLED exchange	LED Lights	407	5	30%	14
2007 SLED exchange	LED Lights	517	5	30%	5

f)

The response to VECC IR Q16b provides comparable input values from the 2010 OPA M&A list for the 2006 EKC campaign. The inputs used to calculate LRAM claims for Project Porchlight, Seasonal LED Exchange, Walter's Greenhouse Ladies' Night CFLs and CDM Other Admin Costs NEPA programs are those taken directly from the 2010 OPA M&A list.

g)

Because there was not a program-specific evaluation of the 2005 program, the generic assumptions from the 2010 Prescriptive Measures and Assumptions report for CFLs were used, and none of these are based on unit savings of 104 kWh or free-ridership of 10% for the LRAM claim.

For all programs that were specifically evaluated by the OPA and for which OPA reported results, the values from these OPA results were adopted. Within these results, OPA reported in December 2010 that CFLs delivered through the 2006 EKC program in Spring and Fall 2006 had unit savings of 104 kWh and free ridership rates of 10%. Brant County Power has no information or rationale to justify substituting different values for any particular program, including the EKC 2006 programs, for those that resulted from OPA's program-specific evaluations; BPC has not independently evaluated these programs. These evaluated results have been adopted in accordance with Board recommendations that "The Board would consider an evaluation by the OPA or a third party designated by the OPA to be sufficient." Further, OPA has advised BPC that these estimates are prepared in a manner consistent with OPA current practice, and are the same values used to report progress against provincial conservation targets.

QUESTION # 17

References: i) Exhibit 10/Tab1/Schedule 1, Tables 3, 4 and 5
ii) Exhibit 10/Tab1/Schedule 2, IndEco Report, Tables 4 and 7 and 10 (Schedule 2, page 32)

Preamble: As noted in the above interrogatories, the LRAM claim as filed appears to have a number of exceptions and differences to the use of the OPA 2010 Mass Market Measures and Assumptions input values.

a) Using as the **only** source of assumptions for the residential sector third tranche LRAM, the OPA 2010 Mass Market Measures and Assumptions adopted by the Board in January 2009, provide a calculation of the residential sector 2009-2010 LRAM claim and supporting LRAM schedules (for 3rd tranche (including Carrying charges) and recalculate the rate riders.

b) Using the recalculated LRAM together with the SSM claim (from VECC IR#15 e)), amend the residential LRAM/SSM rate riders as necessary.

Response:

a)

The LRAM claim as filed used the 2010 OPA M&A list for all residential third tranche programs with the exception of two measures not found on the 2010 M&A list (AC timers and cold water wash) as well as the 2006 and 2007 EKC campaigns, which used final program results provided by the OPA.

The table below shows the LRAM claim with the use of the 2010 OPA M&A list for residential third tranche programs, including 2006 and 2007 EKC. The two aforementioned measures not found on the OPA M&A list have kept the assumptions as originally filed. Only the values in the table below for the 2006 and 2007 EKC programs, which were based on the OPA results from their program-specific evaluations, differ from the original filing.

LRAM with carrying charges using only the 2010 OPA M&A list for residential third tranche programs

Funding	Program	Year	Residential	GS < 50 kW	GS 50 to 4,999 kW	Street lighting	Total LRAM
OPA	**Cool & Hot Savings Rebate**	**2006**	**$3,214**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$3,214***
		2007	**$3,984**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$3,984***
	Cool Savings Rebate	**2008**	**$3,130**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$3,130***
		2009	**$3,224**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$3,224***
	ERIP	**2007**	**$0**	**$450**	**$240**	**$0**	***$690***
		2008	**$0**	**$3,341**	**$714**	**$0**	***$4,055***
		2009	**$0**	**$4,403**	**$2,093**	**$0**	***$6,496***
	Every Kilowatt Counts Power Savings Event	**2008**	**$15,843**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$15,843***
		2009	**$2,788**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$2,788***
	Great Refrigerator Roundup	**2007**	**$3,955**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$3,955***
		2008	**$8,960**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$8,960***
		2009	**$3,899**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$3,899***
	High Performance New Construction	**2008**	**$0**	**$42**	**$0**	**$0**	***$42***
		2009	**$0**	**$846**	**$0**	**$0**	***$846***
	peaksaver®	**2008**	**$106**	**$5**	**$0**	**$0**	***$111***
		2009	**$135**	**$6**	**$0**	**$0**	***$141***
	Power Savings Blitz	**2009**	**$0**	**$52,700**	**$0**	**$0**	***$52,700***
	Secondary Refrigerator Retirement Pilot	**2006**	**$1,302**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$1,302***
	Social Housing Pilot	**2007**	**$2,171**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$2,171***
	Summer Sweepstakes	**2008**	**$21,024**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$21,024***
OPA total			***$73,735***	***$61,793***	***$3,047***	***$0***	***$138,576***
Third-tranche	**CDM admin costs - NEPA**	**2007**	**$872**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$872***
	Cold water wash program	**2005**	**$3,395**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$3,395***
	Conservation County CFLs	**2005**	**$1,954**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$1,954***
	Conservation County - lighting retrofit	**2005**	**$0**	**$994**	**$0**	**$0**	***$994***
	Every Kilowatt Counts	**2006**	**$48,806**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$48,806***
		2007	**$24,613**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$24,613***
	Garage door replacement	**2005**	**$0**	**$680**	**$0**	**$0**	***$680***
	Lighten your electricity bill	**2005**	**$6,274**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$6,274***
	Project porchlight	**2007**	**$1,645**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$1,645***
	SLED light exchange	**2006**	**$316**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	***$316***

Funding	Program	Year	Residential	GS < 50 kW	GS 50 to 4,999 kW	Street lighting	Total LRAM
		2007	$449	$0	$0	$0	*$449*
	Streetlight conversion	2008	$0	$0	$0	$132	*$132*
	Traffic light conversion	2008	$0	$0	$0	$1,599	*$1,599*
	Walter's greenhouse/Nova Vita Ladies Night	2007	$499	$0	$0	$0	*$499*
Third tranche total			***$88,823***	***$1,674***	***$0***	***$1,731***	***$92,228***
Total			***$162,558***	***$63,467***	***$3,047***	***$1,731***	**$230,804**

b)

Rate riders associated with the response to VECC Q17a and VECC Q15e are given in the table below.

Customer Class	LRAM	Carrying Charges	SSM	Total	Unit	2011 Billed kWh/kW	1-yr Rate Rider $/unit
Residential	**$155,634**	**$6,924**	**$23,502**	**$186,060**	**kWh**	**80,122,583**	**0.0023**
GS < 50 kW	**$62,479**	**$988**	**($1,838)**	**$61,629**	**kWh**	**39,095,551**	**0.0016**
GS 50 to 4,999 kW	**$2,992**	**$55**	**($429)**	**$2,618**	**kW**	**388,493**	**0.0067**
Street lighting	**$1,699**	**$32**	**$2,452**	**$4,183**	**kW**	**4,783**	**0.8746**
Sentinel lights	**$0**	**$0**	**($7)**	**($7)**	**kW**	**574**	**(0.0129)**
Total	***$222,804***	***$8,000***	***$23,680***	***$254,484***	**--**	**--**	**--**

QUESTION # 18

References: Exhibit 1/Tab 3/Schedule 4, page 5

Preamble: The evidence states that “[p]roductivity measures are a critical component to the success of any company. All team members have, or are in the process of having developed, quantifiable meaningful measures and associated objectives. These measures permit us to benchmark thereby allowing us to both recognize individual success and opportunities for improvement.”

a) Have productivity measures been developed for each position? If not, please indicate when this exercise is expected to be completed.

b) Please provide the positions and the quantifiable meaningful measures and associated objectives that have been developed for them to date.

c) Will there be incentive payments associated with attainment of targets? Have any such estimated amounts been included in the revenue requirement?

d) Please provide an update with respect to BCP’s benchmarking exercise.

Response:

a) No. BCP is still in the process of establishing measures for some positions. It is expected these will be ready for the start of the 2012 performance year.

b) The performance measures are to be set for each and every position. Specific criteria for each position is confidential for that employee. The objectives address both the functional requirements of the position (e.g. quantifiable measures such as response times), as well as educational and “soft skills” expected of the person in carrying out the activities. Depending upon the measures and position, the requirement may be set by reference to OEB requirements, governing trade or professional organizations or management/executive expectations. For example, one measure may be Telephone Accessibility, an OEB requirement. In other instances it may be a requirement to attend a minimum number of educational activities to maintain certification or licensing.

c) BCP does not use an incentive payment program for any employees and does not intend to implement such a program during the IRM period. As such, there is no incorporation of financial payments related to incentive payments in the revenue requirement.

d) Of the 32 positions, BCP has completed the establishment of benchmarks for 21 positions. Once a position has been benchmarked, it will be reviewed every 6 months, as part of the regular employee performance review process.

QUESTION #19

References: Exhibit 1/Tab 1/Schedule 8, page 2, $563.8K loan to affiliate

a) What is the "prevailing market rate" on this loan and how is it determined?

b) How did the utility finance this loan, e.g., from retained earnings?

c) Please provide a copy of the agreement(s) underpinning this loan including the current document in effect along with any predecessor agreements.

d) Please provide the minutes of the Board of Directors meeting at which this loan was approved along with any other materials provided to the Board related to this loan.

e) Please provide (i) the principal amount outstanding and (ii) the interest income that BCP has received from its affiliate for each year that the loan has been outstanding, starting when the debt was issued.

f) Please provide the forecasted interest income in the Test Year and confirm that this amount is included as an offset to the Test Year revenue requirement. If unable to so confirm, please explain.

g) Please reconcile the $563.8K principal amount with the amount of $582.850K amount shown as "Loans to Other Corporation" at Exhibit 4/Tab 8/Schedule 1, page 3.

Response

a) See EP IR 1c below.

b) The utility financed this loan out of current cash flow or retained earnings.

c) See EP IR 1a below.

d) Please see attached.

e) The principal balance of the loan outstanding as of December 31, 2010 is $545,011.

f) Yes – confirmed.

g) The former is the balance of the loan as of the filing date of this rate application versus the balance of the loan as of the last year end – December 31, 2009.

EP Interrogatory # 1

Ref: Exhibit 1, Tab 1, Schedule 8

- **a) Please provide a copy of the loan agreement between BCP and BCPS. There is formal agreement in place.**
- **b) What is the expected average loan balance for 2011?**
- **c) What is the current market rate on this loan?**
- **d) How have the rates charged by BCP for time spent on BCPS activities been calculated?**
- **e) Are the separate billing systems in place?**
- **f) How were the costs of the separate billing systems split between BCP and BCPS? Please explain the rationale for this allocation of costs.**
- **g) Does BCPS have its own Board of Directors?**
- **h) Please confirm that there is no cost associated with the BCPS Board of Directors in the BCP revenue requirement.**

Response:

- a) The loans and related terms were approved by the board of directors in both companies via minutes, no formal agreements in place.
- b) The average expected loan balance for 2011 is $495,270.
- c) The interest rate is P + 1.75% or currently 4.75%.
- d) See answer to Part F below.
- e) Historically, the billings systems were intertwined for water heaters and softeners in Brant County's service territory. We have since been working to separate these billing systems, which has been completed. The first separate bills were issued late January 2011.
- f) The costs of the separate billing systems are split based on actual costs and borne by each entity. Previously an estimate for time spent by staff was allocated to BCP's revenue (as a reduction of admin expenses). The company has moved to a time sheet system whereby actual costs (based on time spent) will be recorded. This will be effective January 1, 2011.
- g) YES
- h) Yes – that's correct.

QUESTION #20

References: Exhibit 1/Tab 1/Schedule 8, page 2, Board of Directors

a) Please provide the name and affiliation(s) of each member of the utility's current Board of Directors.

b) Please provide the name and affiliation(s) of each member of the current Board of Directors of any affiliated entities, e.g., for BCPS Inc and any other affiliates.

c) Please provide the amount included in the Test Year revenue requirement in respect of (i) the utility's current Board of Directors and (ii) the current Board of Directors of any affiliated entities.

Response

a) Please see attached.

b) Please see attached.

c) In 2010, $72,658 vs $75,661 in 2011 – includes salary and all other costs.

QUESTION #21

References: Exhibit 1/Tab 1/Schedule 8, page 2, Services provided to Affiliates

a) Please indicate how BCP determines the rate charged to affiliates for services provided to the affiliates. For example are only direct costs charged or is there a mark-up to reflect overhead costs and return? .

b) Please provide a table showing the annual recoveries from affiliates for services provided for each year that BCP has provided such services.

c) Please explain how BCP has forecasted these revenues for the Test Year.

d) When did the utility first adopt the “time sheet” approach?

e) Prior to using the time sheets, how did BCP determine the appropriate amount to charge for services provided?

f) Please provide an update with respect to separating the billing systems of BCP and BCPS.

g) Please provide the actual costs or, if actual costs are unavailable, the estimated costs of separating the billing systems and indicate how these costs have been allocated between BCP and BCPS.

Response

a) BCP only charges for estimated actual costs. No markup is recorded on these charges. Please see OEB IR # 3b for further information.

b) Please see attached.

c) BCP has forecasted these based on estimated management time spent on BCPS activity. See OEB IR # 3 for more information.

d) The company first adopted the time sheet approach in the fall of 2010 which will be effective January 1, 2011.

e) These amounts were estimated and not material to the operations of either company.

f) Effective January 2011, the company has separated the billing systems of both companies.

g) All costs are internal costs. No third parties have been engaged.

QUESTION #22

References: i) Exhibit 2, Tab 1, Schedule 3
ii) Exhibit 2/Tab 6/Schedule 1, page 48

a) Please provide a description of each vehicle that was in the utility's fleet in 2006, including the make, model, vintage, mileage, and purpose of each vehicle.

b) Please provide a description of each vehicle in the utility's fleet in the 2011 Test Year, including the make, model, vintage, mileage, and purpose of each vehicle.

c) The first reference indicates vehicle disposals only in 2007 and 2008. Please confirm that there were no disposals in other years and no disposals forecast for the Test Year.

d) Please indicate the amounts received for sale/trade-in/salvage upon disposition of any transportation equipment disposals that have occurred or are forecast to occur in the period 2006-2011 inclusive.

e) Please indicate how BCP has treated or will treat any amounts received for sale/trade-in/salvage upon disposition of any transportation equipment disposals that have occurred or are forecast to occur in the period 2006-2011 inclusive.

f) There appear to be inconsistencies between the information provided in the two references cited. For example, the first reference cited indicates that forecast additions to Account 1930, Transportation Equipment, are $130K in 2011 (Exhibit 2, Tab 1, Schedule 3, page 7.) However the second reference cited only indicates that two ½ ton pickups, at an estimated cost of $60K in total are scheduled for replacement in 2011 (Exhibit 2/Tab 6/Schedule 1, page 48). As another example, the first reference indicates 2010 additions to Account 1930 as $325K (Exhibit 2, Tab 1, Schedule 3, page 6) while the second reference indicates a cost of $310K in 2010 (Exhibit 2/Tab 6/Schedule 1, page 48). Please reconcile the information in the first referenced item with the information in the second.

g) Please provide a brief justification for (i) each addition to Account 1930 and (ii) each disposal from Account 1930, made or forecast to be made in the period 2006-2011 inclusive.

Response

a) Please see attached file.

b) Please provide a description of each vehicle in the utility's fleet in the 2011 Test Year, including the make, model, vintage, mileage, and purpose of each vehicle. Please see attached file.

c) There are no other disposals other than the ones described in 2007-08 and none forecast for the Test Year.

d) Please see OEB IR 7 a-c, copied below.

e) Please see OEB IR 7a-c, copied below.

Board Staff Interrogatories

Brant County Power Inc.
2011 Electricity Distribution Rates Application
EB-2010-0125

IR 7

Ref: Exhibit 2 Tab 1 Schedule 3

Exhibit 2 Tab 1 Schedule 1

Issue: Proceeds from Asset Dispositions

Board staff is interested in proceeds from disposed assets as seen on Exhibit 2 Tab 1 Schedule 3. Brant County is showing disposals for transportation equipment of $365,717 in 2007 and $484,348 for 2008.

(a) Were there any proceeds from the disposition of these vehicles? If not, why not.

(b) If Brant County receives proceeds from asset disposition, are there any proceeds forecast for 2011 - 2014?

(c) If there are expected proceeds from asset dispositions, how has Brant County recognized them in this application?

Response:

a) In 2008, there were two bucket trucks destroyed in a motor vehicle accident – total costs of these vehicles were $484,348. Insurance proceeds of $207,800 were received which was used to assist in the replacement of these vehicles.

   In 2007, there were several pieces of transportation equipment sold (cost value of $365,717) including one truck, a trailer, a van and a pickup truck with proceeds totalling $44,822.

b) There are no proceeds recognized / forecasted for 2011 – 2014.

c) N/A

f) There are only two vehicles schedule for replacement in 2011, being the aforementioned ½ ton pickups. However, we have purchased a hybrid vehicle for our renewable energy division as well as the purchase of a second vehicle to offset the mileage costs the company is incurring for employees using personal vehicles for business use. In addition, the 2010 additions amount of $325,000 is the correct updated number, the estimated replacement cost on the latter reference is incorrect (should be $325k not $310k).

g) The additions and disposals in the subject years and their justification are as follows:

- 2006 – Additions totaled $202,832 including a single bucket truck and a forklift. The forklift was needed to assist in inventory receiving and the bucket truck was required to assist in the service of BCP's large service territory. There were no disposals in 2006.
- 2007 – Additions totaled $147,261 including final payment on single bucket truck denoted in the immediately preceding paragraph as well as a 2007 Chev Van and 2007 pickup. These vehicles were used to replace a 1999 Chev Astro van and a 1999 Chev S-10 as part of a normal replacement program. These were disposed as part of the $365,717 disposed in 2007. For details of the remaining disposals in 2007 – please see OEB IR 7.
- 2008 – See OEB IR 7.
- 2009 – Additions in 2009 totaled $218,906 for a single bucket truck which was required to assist in the service of BCP's large service territory.
- 2010 – Additions in 2010 totaled $364,828 including $33,580 for a Toyota Prius hybrid vehicle for Brant Renewable Energy (a division of Brant County Power. See OEB IR 12 for more information). The balance of the additions was for a double bucket truck to replace an old single bucket truck, which is past its estimated useful life. BCP is currently looking for disposal opportunities for this vehicle. The Prius was in the 2011 budget for this rate application but was purchased in late 2010.
- 2011 – see part f above for a description of the 2011 proposed additions.

<u>QUESTION #23</u>

References: Exhibit 2/Tab 5/Schedule 1, page 8

a) Please update this exhibit to include 2010 capital projects.

Response:

BCP has included both 2010 and 2011 in attachment.

<u>QUESTION #24</u>

References: Exhibit 2/Tab 6/Schedule 1, Tables shown on pages 11and12

a) Please provide similar tables for the five-year plan that immediately preceded the 2010-2014 plan shown on pages 11 and 12.

Response

Please see attached file.

QUESTION #25

References: Exhibit 1/Tab 2/Schedule 2, Budget Overview

a) Please provide a table showing the capital budget as approved by the Board of Directors and the actual capital expenditure for each year 2006-2010 inclusive. Please provide an explanation for any significant variances between budgeted and actual amounts.

b) Please provide a table showing the operating budget as approved by the Board of Directors and the actual operating expenses for each year 2006-2010 inclusive. Please provide an explanation for any significant variances between budgeted and actual amounts.

Response

Please see attached file. Note, BCP could not locate 2006 approved budget, but have provided 2007 to 2010 values as requested.

QUESTION #26

References: Exhibit 4/Tab 1/Schedule 1, page 2

a) Please provide the annual costs of the outsourced collection function.

b) Please provide a copy of the agreement currently in effect that underpins the outsourced collection function.

c) Please explain fully and provide numerical support with respect to why BCP expects “that this cost {Junior Collector] will be offset by savings in our outsourced collections costs.”

Response:

a) The annual cost of the outsourced collection function approximates $30,000 per year.

b) Please see attached file.

c) While we agree that on the surface there will not be 100% savings by replacing the outsourced function with a staff member, we believe the outsourced function costs will increase because of the complexity of the new customer service rules which were recently implemented. In addition, with the complexity of these rules, we believe it better to bring this function back in house as more “handholding” will be required.

QUESTION #27

References: Exhibit 4/Tab 2/Schedule 1, page 10

a) Please explain why BCP expects intervenor costs to total only $15K in 2011.

Response:

BCP has used our staff and external consultant's past experience to derive a place holder for intervener costs for the 2011 cost of service application. The $15,000 was our best estimate at the time of submission.

BCP has 2 registered interveners who can claim costs (VECC and Energy Probe) and 1 which cannot (Brantford Power).

QUESTION #28

References: Exhibit 4/Tab 4/Schedule 1, page 2, Appendix 2-K, Employee Costs

a) The table indicates that union average base wages increased by 36.6%, from $53,339 to $72,883, over the three-year period from 2006 to 2009. Please explain why the increase is so large.

Response:

This includes the average cost of living increases during this period and adjustments for moving up on the pay grid. In addition, a comparison study was done against neighbouring LDCs for line crew wages. BCP was significantly under the comparison group and as a result BCP brought wages in line with other LDC over a 3-year period.

<u>QUESTION #29</u>

References: Exhibit 5/Tab 1/Schedule 2

a) Please provide BCP’s actual (not deemed) capital structure as forecast for 2011.

Response:

a) As 2011 is not completed, BCP cannot predict actual capital structure for an uncompleted year.

VECC IR # 7g Attachment

2011 COST ALLOCATION MODEL - WITH TRANSFORMER
BRANT COUNTY POWER INC.

July-19-10

Sheet O1 Revenue to Cost Summary Worksheet - Optional Third Run

Class Revenue, Cost Analysis, and Return on Rate Base

Rate Base Assets			1	2	3	7	8	9
		Total	Residential	GS <50	GS>50-Regular	Street Light	Sentinel	Unmetered Scattered Load
crev	Distribution Revenue (sale)	$5,859,634	$2,938,680	$960,548	$1,871,928	$47,026	$12,345	$29,108
mi	Miscellaneous Revenue (mi)	$606,494	$437,172	$132,119	$35,977	$53	$909	$264
	Total Revenue	**$6,466,128**	**$3,375,852**	**$1,092,667**	**$1,907,904**	**$47,079**	**$13,253**	**$29,372**
	Expenses							
di	Distribution Costs (di)	$1,289,420	$661,745	$217,134	$298,708	$101,976	$6,651	$3,206
cu	Customer Related Costs (cu)	$984,164	$678,815	$197,831	$72,427	$31,402	$2,862	$827
ad	General and Administration (ad)	$1,571,454	$925,480	$286,363	$257,768	$92,461	$6,584	$2,799
dep	Depreciation and Amortization (dep)	$968,765	$547,699	$158,803	$185,432	$70,075	$4,570	$2,186
INPUT	PILs (INPUT)	$101,117	$55,212	$16,698	$21,758	$6,785	$442	$221
INT	Interest	$735,548	$401,629	$121,467	$158,273	$49,353	$3,219	$1,607
	Total Expenses	**$5,650,468**	**$3,270,581**	**$998,295**	**$994,366**	**$352,052**	**$24,328**	**$10,846**
	Direct Allocation	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
NI	Allocated Net Income (NI)	$888,212	$484,987	$146,678	$191,123	$59,596	$3,887	$1,941
	Revenue Requirement (includes NI)	**$6,538,679**	$3,755,568	$1,144,973	$1,185,488	$411,648	$28,215	$12,787
		Revenue Requirement Input Does Not Equal Output						
	Rate Base Calculation							
	Net Assets							
dp	Distribution Plant - Gross	$28,002,813	$15,446,856	$4,616,793	$5,663,172	$2,076,202	$135,411	$64,380
gp	General Plant - Gross	$3,849,223	$2,110,619	$635,620	$808,463	$268,430	$17,507	$8,585
accum dep	Accumulated Depreciation	($11,002,991)	($6,125,457)	($1,809,623)	($2,092,652)	($890,701)	($58,092)	($26,467)
co	Capital Contribution	($1,191,455)	($694,577)	($196,584)	($157,793)	($130,519)	($8,512)	($3,470)
	Total Net Plant	**$19,657,590**	**$10,737,440**	**$3,246,205**	**$4,221,191**	**$1,323,412**	**$86,313**	**$43,028**
	Directly Allocated Net Fixed Assets	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
COP	Cost of Power (COP)	$23,320,775	$6,834,773	$3,335,005	$12,944,938	$145,618	$18,355	$42,086
	OM&A Expenses	$3,845,038	$2,266,040	$701,327	$628,903	$225,839	$16,097	$6,832
	Directly Allocated Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
	Subtotal	***$27,165,813***	***$9,100,813***	***$4,036,332***	***$13,573,841***	***$371,458***	***$34,451***	***$48,919***
	Working Capital	**$4,074,872**	**$1,365,122**	**$605,450**	**$2,036,076**	**$55,719**	**$5,168**	**$7,338**
	Total Rate Base	**$23,732,462**	**$12,102,562**	**$3,851,655**	**$6,257,267**	**$1,379,130**	**$91,481**	**$50,366**
		Rate Base Input Does Not Equal Output						
	Equity Component of Rate Base	**$9,492,985**	**$4,841,025**	**$1,540,662**	**$2,502,907**	**$551,652**	**$36,592**	**$20,146**
	Net Income on Allocated Assets	**$815,661**	**$105,272**	**$94,372**	**$913,539**	**($304,973)**	**($11,075)**	**$18,526**
	Net Income on Direct Allocation Assets	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
	Net Income	**$815,661**	**$105,272**	**$94,372**	**$913,539**	**($304,973)**	**($11,075)**	**$18,526**
	RATIOS ANALYSIS							
	REVENUE TO EXPENSES %	**98.89%**	89.89%	95.43%	160.94%	11.44%	46.97%	229.71%
	EXISTING REVENUE MINUS ALLOCATED COSTS	**($72,551)**	($379,716)	($52,306)	$722,416	($364,569)	($14,962)	$16,585
	RETURN ON EQUITY COMPONENT OF RATE BASE	8.59%	2.17%	6.13%	36.50%	-55.28%	-30.27%	91.96%

VECC IR # 15c Attachment

TOTAL RESOURCE COST TEST ASSESSMENT OF THE ‘2005 LIGHTEN YOUR ELECTRICITY BILL’ PROGRAM

For
Brant County Power

By
SeeLine Group Inc.
416-703-8695

February 2006
Revised

1.0 Introduction

Energyshop.com was engaged by 32 Local Distribution Companies (LDCs), across the province of Ontario, to design, deliver and track a fall coupon campaign with retailer Canadian Tire. Throughout the late summer and early fall billing periods, participating utilities provided their customers with a bill insert containing valuable energy-savings coupons to help them save on their electricity bill.

Customers from each of the 32 LDCs, had until December 31, 2005 to redeem their point of purchase coupons at any local Canadian Tire outlet. Upon redemption, Canadian Tire sent the coupon to a redemption house, who then sorted by utility and product.

As part of this effort, SeeLine Group Inc. (SLG) was asked to undertake a Total Resource Costs (TRC) test assessment of the 2005 Lighten Your Electricity Bill Program as delivered by Energyshop.com. Using many of the technology cost and savings estimates outlined in the Ontario Energy Board's TRC Guide, program results were screened using SLG's SeeTool™ TRC Calculator. The number of participants and program cost data were provided by Energyshop.com.

This report includes a summary of assumptions and results from the TRC screening. Appendix A and B provides the detailed information on program assumptions.

2.0 Program Objectives

As outlined by Energyshop.com, this program was designed to achieve the following objectives:

- To help participating utilities achieve energy conservation and demand management results for their 2005 program year.
- Increase public awareness of energy conservation and demand management in the province of Ontario.
- Contribute to the overall development of an energy conservation culture in Ontario.

3.0 Program Results

3.1 Technology Savings Assumptions

SLG used many of the technology savings identified by the OEB in its Total Resource Guide.[1] For those technologies without defined savings, every effort was made to develop reasonable assumptions, defensible under the OEB guidelines. The following provides a brief outline of the savings assumptions used for this assessment.

Compact Fluorescent Bulbs

---

[1] http://www.oeb.gov.on.ca/documents/cases/RP-2004-0203/cdm_assumptionsmeasureslist_141005.xls

The 2005 program provided customers with a $3 coupon on any pack of compact fluorescent bulbs. Using store data provided by Energyshop.com, the number of bulbs sold by wattage was used to develop the average wattage of bulb sold. Based on this information, it was assumed that the average wattage sold during this program was 15 watts. Additional detail can be found in Appendix A.

LED Seasonal Lights

Like the CFLs, customers were provided with a $5 coupon for the purchase of any package of LED seasonal lights. Using store data provided by Energyshop.com, average size of LED light string sold during the campaign was determined. Based on this information, it was assumed that the average string sold had 59 bulbs.

Using the information in the OEB's TRC Guide, LED savings assumptions were adjusted to reflect a string with 59 bulbs as opposed to the 25 bulbs per string. Additional detail can be found in Appendix A.

With guidance from Energyshop.com, it was also assumed that 50% of the LED lights sold were those replacing a 5 watt Christmas string and the remaining 50% were used to replace mini lights which yields a slightly lower savings.

Ceiling Fans

At the time of this analysis, SLG felt there was not enough significant evidence to support a savings estimate for ceiling fans.

Programmable Thermostats

SLG used the savings estimate outlined in the OEB's TRC Guide. Participant rates were adjusted to account for market share. Using data provided by Energyshop.com and other studies, the following province wide fuel share assumptions were used:

Electrical Space Heating	17.3%
Electrical Space Cooling (central air)	45.0%

Indoor Timers

In the absence of OEB savings estimates for indoor timers, SLG developed savings estimates for timers used on indoor lighting and air conditioners. Detailed information can be found in Appendix B.

The savings estimate for timers for indoor lighting is considered to be small. It assumes that the timer is used on a 60 W bulb and provides savings during the winter peak, winter mid peak and summer peak periods. In total, the timer is expected to provide approximately 98 kWh savings.

The savings estimate developed for timers used on unit air conditioners is based on the owner setting the timer to bring the air conditioner on a few hours before he or she arrives home. Based on this assumption, a timer used for a unit air conditioner would provide approximately 108 kWh in annual savings.

Based on discussions with EnergyShop.com it was assumed that 50% of the timers would be used for lighting and the remaining 50% would be used for air conditioners. SLG made an additional assumption and assumed that it was unlikely that all of the timers would be used appropriately; participation rates were reduced by 30%.

Outdoor Timers

The savings estimate for the outdoor timer is based on information from the OEB's TRC Guide.

EnerGuide for Homes

Based on information provided by Energyshop.com the potential savings for space heating load is estimated to be 250 kWh. Using the participant data provided by EnergyShop.com, SLG made adjustments to account for uptake on the audit recommendations and fuel market share. No additional fuel savings were considered for this analysis.

3.2 Summary of Program Participation

Technology	Number of Participants	Free Ridership
Compact Fluorescent Bulbs	575	10.0%
LED Christmas Lights (indoor or outdoor) Replacing 5w Christmas Lights C-7 (25 Lights)	55	5.0%
LED Christmas Lights (indoor or outdoor) Replacing Incandescent Mini Lights	55	5.0%
Programmable Thermostat - Space Heating, Existing Single Family Detached	15	10.0%
Programmable Thermostat - Space Cooling, Existing Single Family Detached	39	10.0%
Timer - Outdoor Light	21	10.0%
Timer - Indoor - Light	4	10.0%
Timer - Indoor - Air Conditioners	3	10.0%
Ceiling Fan	16	10.0%
EnerGuide for Existing Homes - Space Heating	-	10.0%

* Adjusted for fuel share and usage uptake

3.3 Summary of Net Program Savings

Technology	Summer Peak kW Savings	Annual kWh Savings in Year	Measure Life	Lifecycle kWh Savings
Compact Fluorescent Bulbs	0	54,032	4	216126.79
LED Christmas Lights (indoor or outdoor) Replacing 5w Christmas Lights C-7 (25 Lights)	0.00	2,325	30.00	69756.96
LED Christmas Lights (indoor or outdoor) Replacing Incandescent Mini Lights	0.00	890	30.00	26697.11
Programmable Thermostat - Space Heating, Existing Single Family Detached	0.00	19,635	18.00	353423.27
Programmable Thermostat - Space Cooling, Existing Single Family Detached	5.68	5,541	18.00	99736.12
Timer - Outdoor Light	0.00	5,519	20.00	110376
Timer - Indoor - Light	0.21	353	20.00	7061.76
Timer - Indoor - Air Conditioners	0.47	294	20.00	5875.2
Ceiling Fan	0.00	-	20.00	0
EnerGuide for Existing Homes - Space Heating	0.00	-	25.00	0
Total	**6.36**	**88,588**		**889,053**

3.4 Summary of Total Resource Cost Test Results

Technology	TRC Benefits	Incremental Equipment Costs	Utility Program Costs	TRC Net Benefits	TRC B/C Ratio
Compact Fluorescent Bulbs	$13,168	$1,035	$ -	**$12,132**	**12.72**
LED Christmas Lights (indoor or outdoor) Replacing 5w Christmas Lights C-7 (25 Lights)	$2,164	$105	$-	**$2,060**	**20.71**
LED Christmas Lights (indoor or outdoor) Replacing Incandescent Mini Lights	$828	$105	$-	**$724**	**7.93**
Programmable Thermostat - Space Heating, Existing Single Family Detached	$13,458	$803	$-	**$12,655**	**16.75**
Programmable Thermostat - Space Cooling, Existing Single Family Detached	$6,710	$2,090	$-	**$4,620**	**3.21**
Timer - Outdoor Light	$4,102	$378	$-	**$3,724**	**10.85**
Timer - Indoor - Light	$374	$25	$-	**$348**	**14.83**
Timer - Indoor - Air Conditioners	$461	$19	$-	**$442**	**24.38**
Ceiling Fan	$-	$605	$-	**($605)**	**0.00**
EnerGuide for Existing Homes - Space Heating	$-	$-	$-	**$-**	**N/A**
Program Costs	$-	$-	$1,795	**($1,795)**	**0.00**
					5.93
Total	**$41,265**	**$5,164**	**$1,795**	**$34,306**	**12.72**

Appendix A

Compact Fluorescent Bulb and LED Light Details

Data provided by Energyshop.com

CFL Sales - Ontario

Product Number	Description	Watts	Pack Size	Units Sold	Bulbs Sold	Ave # of bulbs	Average Wattage
052-5109-0	COMPFL-REPL.13W 2700	13	1	3,510	3,510		45630
052-5119-6	COMPFL-REPL.9W 4100	9	1	794	794		7144.2
052-5120-0	CFL 13W SPIRL 3PK	13	3	79,920	239,760		3116880
052-5121-8	CFL 26W SPIRL 3PK	26	3	60,480	181,440		4717440
052-5124-2	13W MINI 6PK NOMA	13	6	41,310	247,860		3222180
052-5125-0	26W MINI NOMA	26	1	4,644	4,644		120744
052-5126-8	10W MINI 2PK GE	10	2	10,800	21,600		216000
052-5127-6	26W MINI 2PK GE	26	2	15,390	30,780		800280
052-5128-4	CFL 10W SPIRL 3PK	10	3	32,940	98,820		988200
052-5135-6	32W MINI GE	32	1	1,620	1,620		51840
052-5137-2	45W MINI GE	45	1	3,024	3,024		136080
052-5140-2	TRI 15/26/40 NOMA	40	1	1,890	1,890		75600
052-5141-0	TRI 12/23/32 MINI GE	32	1	1,620	1,620		51840
052-5144-4	DIMMABLE 29W BIAX GE	29	1	216	216		6264
052-5146-0	13W MINI BLACK NOMA	13	1	2,754	2,754		35802
052-5153-2	13W MINI RED NOMA	13	1	3,240	3,240		42120
052-5157-4	13W MINI GREEN NOMA	13	1	3,348	3,348		43524
052-5159-0	13W MINI BLUE NOMA	13	1	3,456	3,456		44928
052-5167-0	TUBE-CIRCLNE12"32WKB	32	1	540	540		17280
052-5168-8	TUBE-CIRCLNE8"22WK&B	22	1	918	918		20196
052-5176-8	13W MINI 2PK GE	13	2	32,454	64,908		843804
052-5182-2	CFL 12/20/26W TRILIT	26	1	3,780	3,780		98280
052-5183-0	COMPFL 26W SW DIMMBL	26	1	1,620	1,620		42120
052-5189-8	11W MINI BUG LGHT GE	11	1	540	540		5940
052-5190-2	CFL BUG LIGHT 13W	13	1	2,052	2,052		26676
052-5191-0	CFL BUG LIGHT 23W	23	1	864	864		19872
052-5192-8	9W NAT/COOL 2PK NOMA	9	2	13,554	27,108		243972
052-5193-6	13W NAT/COOL 2PKNOMA	13	2	25,380	50,760		659880
052-5194-4	23W NAT/COOL 2PKNOMA	23	2	19,440	38,880		894240
052-5195-2	10W MINI NOMA	10	1	2,160	2,160		21600
052-5196-0	13W MINI NOMA	13	1	4,320	4,320		56160
052-5331-8	COMPFL 9WG25 3PK	9	3	1,458	4,374		39366
052-5332-6	COMPFL 7W A-LINE	7	1	3,186	3,186		22302
052-5333-4	COMPFL 15W R30	15	1	2,268	2,268		34020
052-5334-2	COMPFL 23W PAR38	23	1	1,890	1,890		43470
052-5335-0	COMPFL 15WR30 2PK	15	2	2,484	4,968		74520
052-5352-8	R20 11W FLD NOMA	11	1	1,890	1,890		20790
052-5353-6	R20 11W FLD GE	11	1	1,080	1,080		11880
052-5355-2	R30 15W FLD GE	15	1	1,998	1,998		29970
052-5356-0	R30 15W FLD DIM GE	15	1	540	540		8100
052-5357-8	PAR38 26W FLD 2PK NO	26	2	2,160	4,320		112320
052-5358-6	PAR38 26W FLD GE	26	1	2,592	2,592		67392
052-5360-8	PAR38 23W FLD RED NO	23	1	1,998	1,998		45954
052-5361-6	PAR38 23W FLD GRN NO	23	1	1,620	1,620		37260
052-5362-4	PAR38 23W FLD BLU NO	23	1	1,242	1,242		28566
052-5363-2	PAR38 23W FLD YLW NO	23	1	594	594		13662
052-5364-0	R40 26W FLD NOMA	26	1	918	918		23868
052-5365-8	R40 26W FLD GE	26	1	540	540		14040
052-5366-6	R40 26W FLD DIM GE	26	1	270	270		7020
052-5367-4	A-LINE 11W GE	11	1	1,026	1,026		11286
052-5368-2	A-LINE 15W NOMA	15	1	1,620	1,620		24300
052-5369-0	A-LINE 15W GE	15	1	2,700	2,700		40500
052-5370-4	G25 9W NOMA	9	1	1,188	1,188		10692
052-5371-2	G25 9W GE	9	1	972	972		8748
052-5372-0	G30 15W GE	15	1	378	378		5670
052-5373-8	CHANDLR 5W MED GE	5	1	540	540		2700
052-5374-6	CHANDLR 7W MED NOMA	7	1	756	756		5292
052-5375-4	CHANDLR 7W MED GE	7	1	540	540		3780
052-5376-2	CHANDLR 9W MED GE	9	1	756	756		6804
052-5377-0	CHANDLR 5W CAN GE	5	1	540	540		2700
052-5378-8	CHANDLR 7W CAN NOMA	7	1	756	756		5292
052-5379-6	CHANDLR 7W CAN GE	7	1	648	648		4536
052-5382-6	CHANDLR 9W CAN GE	9	1	1,350	1,350		12150
052-5390-6	9W ULTRAMINI 3PK NOM	3	3	7,668	23,004		69012
052-5391-4	13W ULTRAMINI 3PK NO	13	3	12,042	36,126		469638
052-5392-2	13W ULTRAMINI 6PK NO	13	6	2,754	16,524		214812
				443,540	**1,174,538**	2.65	18,204,928
							15.499653 average watts

Data provided by Energyshop.com

SLEDs		**Total Units Sold**		
		50524		
Lights / string	%age	Program sales	Whole number	Average Bulb per String
25	15%	7384.266944	7384	3.653841216
35	22%	11311.7249	11314	7.836085259
70	52%	26025.92566	26026	36.05840386
100	11%	5802.082488	5802	11.4838146
				59.03214493

Appendix B

Technology Savings Data

TOTAL RESOURCE COST TEST																			
Program	Participant/Technology Information				Unit Energy Savings														
									Electricity Savings										Comments
									Winter			Summer			Shoulder				
	Measure Life	Distribution Line Losses	Unit Incremental Costs	Program Delivery Costs	Unit Water Savings m3 (000's litres)	Unit Propane Savings m3 (000's litres)	Unit Oil Savings litres	Unit Diesel Savings m3	On Peak	Mid Peak	Off Peak	On Peak	Mid Peak	Off Peak	Mid Peak	Off Peak	Demand Type (C, DR)	Peak Demand Savings (Summer)	
CFL Screw-In 15W	4	0.00%	$2.00	$ -	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.5	7.7	20.3	0.0	11.7	14.0	17.5	17.7	C	0.000	Average wattage of bulb sold during campaign (see Appendix A)
LED Christmas Lights (indoor or outdoor) Replacing 5w Ch	30	0.00%	$2.00	$ -	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.4	8.9	22.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	C	0.000	Savings based on 59 bulbs per string. Refer to Appendix A
LED Christmas Lights (indoor or outdoor) Replacing Incand	30	0.00%	$2.00	$ -	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.1	3.4	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	C	0.000	Savings based on 59 bulbs per string. Refer to Appendix A
Programmable Thermostat - Space Heating, Existing Singl	18	0.00%	$60.00	$ -	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	202.1	231.0	541.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	219.0	272.4	C	0.000	
Programmable Thermostat - Space Cooling, Existing Singl	18	0.00%	$60.00	$ -	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.4	42.5	88.2	0.0	0.0	C	0.163	
Timer - Outdoor Light	20	0.00%	$20.00	$ -	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	43.3	21.6	56.9	0.0	32.9	39.0	48.8	49.5	C	0.000	
Timer - Indoor - Light	20	0.00%	$7.00	$ -	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.5	7.3	19.1	0.0	11.0	13.1	16.4	16.6	C	0.059	
Timer - Indoor - Air Conditioners	20	0.00%	$7.00	$ -	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.4	29.1	60.3	0.0	0.0	C	0.174	
Ceiling Fan	20	0.00%	$42.00	$ -	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	C	0.000	
EnerGuide for Existing Homes - Space Heating	25	0.00%	$150.00	$ -	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	34.5	39.4	92.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.3	46.4	C	0.000	
				$ -															

VECC IR # 19d Attachment

Date	Brant County Power Inc. Resolutions
Oct 12/05	Brant County Power Inc. will loan Brant County Power Services Inc. approximately $400,000 over a 10 year repayment term at a competitive interest rate in order for Brant County Power Services Inc. to start up a Water Softener Rental Business
Dec 14/05	Brant County Power Inc. loan Brant County Power Services Inc. $450,000 to purchase Water Softener Accounts from Culligan at an interest rate of 4.125% per annum.
Nov 15/06	THAT Brant County Power Inc. loan Brant County Power Services Inc. $80,000 over a 10 year repayment term at a competitive interest rate subject to a loan service agreement in order for Brant County Power Services Inc. to start up a Fiber Optic Business
Dec 13/06	THAT Brant County Power Inc. loan an additional $250,000 to Brant County Power Services for a maximum of 90 days at an interest rate TBD by the Chief Financial Officer "subject to Shareholder approval"
Feb 14/07	THAT BCPI loan BCPSI $100,000
Sept 12/07	THAT the three existing loans between BCPI and BCPSI be called and renegotiated incorporating the following terms; Prime +2% with 5 year repayment terms. These loans will be subject to the availability of a Strategic Plan from BCPSI.
Oct 10/07	THAT BCPSI will request a loan of approx $750,000 from their Shareholder the County of Brant at a competitive interest rate and that BCPI will guarantee said loan
Feb 6/08	BE IT RESOLVED THAT Brant County Power Inc. loan $123,000 to Brant County Power Services Inc. at an interest rate of prime +1%, only after all other loan options have been exhausted. If this loan is granted, $50,000 will be paid back by mid-year 2008
	BE IT RESOLVED THAT the outstanding loans between Brant County Power Inc. and BCPSI be renegotiated as a demand note at an interest rate of prime +1%

Date	Brant County Power Services Inc. Resolutions
Oct 12/05	Brant County Power Services Inc. will enter into a Partnering Agreement with Culligan including the purchase of 400 existing accounts subject to review by our solicitors. In order to proceed with this purchase Brant County Power Services Inc. will request a loan from Brant County Power Inc.
Feb 14/07	THAT BCPSI request a $100,000 loan from BCPI in order to pay outstanding fiber optics business invoices
Jan 17/08	THAT Brant County Power Services Inc. (BCPSI) request a $123,000 loan from Brant County Power Inc. at an interest rate of prime +1%”
	THAT the outstanding loans between Brant County Power Inc. and BCPSI be renegotiated at an interest rate of prime +1%”
July 16/09	BE IT RESOLVED THAT effective June 2009 for a period of six months, Brant County Power Services Inc. will pay interest only on the loan payable to Brant County Power Inc.

VECC IR # 20 a & b Attachment

Brant County Power Inc.
Board of Directors
December 2010 (4 year term)

Name & Address	Phone/Fax Numbers	**email**
Terry Collins, Chair 197 Grand River St N Paris, ON N3L 2N2	(519) 442-6796 (res) (519) 771-7979 (cell) (519) 442-6796 (fax)	ttcollins@rogers.com
Randy Wilson, Vice Chair 34 Fourth Concession Rd RR 1 Burford, ON N0E 1A0	(519) 732-2774 (cell)	Randy@RJWilson.ca
Julie Zarboni 11 Jury Street Paris, ON N3L 2W3 (effective Oct 6/09)	(519) 442-3851	jtzarboni@gmail.com
Sandra Vos 97 Queensway Drive Brantford, ON N3R 4X1	(519) 753-2077 (res) (519) 758-8844	vos97@rogers.com
Trevor Carre 135 Race Street Paris, ON N3L 3X2	(519) 442-3157	trevorcarre@hotmail.com trevor.carre@scotiabank.com
Mayor Ron Eddy 71 Kitchen School Rd, RR #1 Paris, ON N3L 3E1	(519) 442-2040 (res) (519) 717-3028 (cell)	ron.eddy@brant.ca
Cliff Atfield 42 Amelia Street Paris, ON N3L 1Z6	(519) 442-6041	wingsc42@sympatico.ca

Additional Contact Information:

Bruce Noble Cell # 519-732-1164
email bnoble@brantcountypower.com

Back Door Telephone # 519-442-3363 ext 739 (board room)

Revised January 25, 2011

Brant County Power Services Inc.
Board of Directors
December 2010 (4 year term)

Name & Address	Phone/Fax Numbers	email
Jack Peirce, Chair 113 Silver St Paris, ON N3L 1V2	(519) 442-4787 (res) (519) 717-5522 (cell)	bjetc@rogers.com
Ron Budreau 149 Hillside Ave Paris, ON N3L 3L4	(519) 442-1376 (res) 1(519) 502-4051 (cell)	rbudreau@gmail.com
Betteanne M. Cadman 5 Kimberley Road RR #2 Burford, ON N0E 1A0	(519) 449-2851 (res) (519) 754-7204 (cell)	bmcadman@sympatico.ca bmc@bell.blackberry.net
Mayor Ron Eddy 71 Kitchen School Rd, RR #1 Paris, ON N3L 3E1	(519) 442-2040 (res/fax) (519) 717-3028 (cell)	ron.eddy@brant.ca
Don Cardy 11 St. Patrick Street Paris, ON N3L 1P6	(519) 442-6665 (res) (226) 388-4997 (cell)	don.cardy28@gmail.com

Additional Contact Information:

Bruce Noble Cell # 519-732-1164
email bnoble@brantcountypower.com

Back Door Telephone # 519-442-3363 ext 739 (board room)

Revised January 25, 2011

VECC IR # 21b Attachment

BRANT COUNTY POWER INC.

Admin Expenses

		General Admin	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Budget	2011 Budget	
	5625	*Administrative Expense Transferred - Credit -BCPSI*							
M1		Billing costs			$ (9,672)	$ (9,672)	$ (9,600)	$ (9,600)	800 per month for billing
M2		Administration	(32,798)	(46,817)	(53,572)	(27,867)	(25,000)	(25,000)	Other admin costs
M3		Executive and Management Services Fee	(10,038)	(3,476)	(4,016)	(4,637)	(5,000)	(5,000)	CEO/CFO
M4		Accounting & Bookkeeping Services Fee	(4,717)	(11,020)	(10,200)	(9,016)	(8,800)	(8,800)	Accounting dept
			$ (47,553)	$ (61,313)	$ (77,460)	$ (51,192)	$ (48,400)	$ (48,400)	

VECC IR # 22a Attachment

VEHICLE #	YEAR	MAKE	TYPE	FUEL	V.I.N.	LICENSE	RGVW
1	1995	FORD	40' SINGLE BUCKET	D	1FDYR82E5SVA55450	JF4311	20000
3	2005	CHEV	PICK UP	G	1GCEC14V95Z284689	6616NY	3000
6	2003	GMC	PICK UP	G	1GTEC14VX3Z146155	7885LH	3000
8	1995	INTER	50' DOUBLE BUCKET	D	1HTSCAAR1SH640437	CY7425	20000
10	2003	GMC	PICK UP	G	1GTEC14V73E138005	7853LH	3000
11	1991	INTER	DIGGER DERICK	D	1HTSDPBR1MH391817	Z04062	20000
16	1999	CHEV-S10	PICK UP	G	1GCCS19X7X8182787	8608HA	3000
17	1999	CHEV	VAN	G	1GNDM19W1XB201382	8640HA	3000
18	2003	FRHT	42' SINGLE BUCKET	D	1FVABXAK53HL72774	YH5541	20000
20	2004	GMC	PICKUP	G	1GTEC14V04Z165119	6679MP	3000
21	2004	INTER	DIGGER DERRICK	D	1HTWGADR14J029689	6779NE	25000
22	2004	CHEV	PICKUP	G	1GCEC14V74E262020	8498MN	3000
23	2005	CHEV	DUMP	D	1GB1C34265E287271	7061NY	4500
24	2005	CHEV	PICKUP	G	1GCEC14VX5Z283919	6615NY	3000
26	2007	INTER	40' SINGLE BUCKET	D	1HTMKAAR37H452084	2616TX	20000
77	2004	FRHT	55' DOUBLE BUCKET	D	1FVHBZAK64HM19004	8883TD	30000

VECC IR # 22b Attachment

Truck Number	Light Truck	Heavy Truck	Other	Make	Model	VIN Number	Year
3	*			Chev	Silverado	1GCEC14V952234689	2005
4	*			Chev	Silverado	1GCEC14VX52203919	2005
6	*			GM	Sierra	1GTEC14VX3Z146155	2003
11		*		Intl	40S	1HTSDPBR1MH391817	1991
13		*		Intl	70S	IHTWNAZT89J124493	2009
20	*			GM	Sierra	1GTTEC14V04Z165119	2003
21		*		Intl	70S	1HTWGADR14J029689	2004
23	*			CHEV	Silverado	1GBJC34265E287271	2005
24		*		Intl	40S	IHTMKAAR37H452084	2007
25	*			Chev	Silverado	1GCEC19X77Z631756	2007
27	*			Chev	Express	1GCFG15X371228550	2007
28	*			Chev	Express	1GCFG15X471231215	2007
33		*		Intl	70S	1HTMKAAR79H124816	2009
44		*		Freight	EM2	1FVC5CV5ADA53113	2010
			*	Toyota	Prius	JTDKN3DU4A0030208	2010

License Number
6616NY
6615NY
7885LH
Z04062
9804XH
6679MP
6779NE
5767YC
2616TX
4735VB
4734VB
4498VJ
9902XH
524 IVY
BKNP864

VECC IR # 23 Attachment

2010 Capital projects

Padmount Transformers and Pads in Paris and St George

We found a number of padmount transformer pads were crumbling in older underground fed areas of our system. These were dangerous for our employees to work on and as dirt kept washing in it was creating a hazard to the public as well. New transformer pads were installed as well as new wet well transformers were purchased as these are safer to operate than the old dry well type. Work was done in July and August, 2010.

Mile Hill Conversion

Mile Hill was converted from 8320 to 27.6 kV to increase line capacity and improve line loss. This project was done in February and March of 2010.

Rest Acres Road – Line Construction

The PM4 feeder was extended from the town of Paris to Powerline Road. This line will be a part of our Smart Grid and feeds the new twin pad arena.

Mt Pleasant Road – Line Construction

Approximately 2 km of 27.6 feeder was built to permit a new subdivision to be fed from our system. Previously the subdivision was fed from our 8 kV system which was at capacity. This was the final phase for this project.

Re-pole a Section of Line on Powerline Rd

New poles were installed on Powerline Road from Oak Park Road to the Grand River in preparation for reconductoring the feeder.

Rotted Pole Replacements

Continuation of project.

Miscellaneous Small Projects

Small Capital Projects occur at various times throughout the year.

2011 Capital Projects

Paris Conversions

Several small conversions are planned for the North end of Paris. This will eliminate a step down transformer, reduce our line loss and improve system reliability,

Rest Acres Road Conversions

The remaining services which are fed from our 8 kV system on Rest Acres Road will be converted to the 27.6 kV system.

New PM6 Feeder

The PM6 feeder will be built from Powerline MTS to Powerline Road.

River Crossing

The new double circuit river crossing will be installed in 2011.

Smart Grid Development

The first two Scada-Mate switches are planned to be installed in the Paris area. This will allow the industrial area in North Paris to be switched automatically between feeders in the event that one feeder fails. An S&C Vista Switch is being installed to allow the downtown Paris area to be switched between feeders to allow for the system to be restored quickly if a feeder fails.

VECC IR # 24 Attachment

Brant County Power
Summar of Additions

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Land and buildings	39,251	24,339	116,514	28,287	10,500	60,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Overhead Distribution Projects	711,434	596,637	585,548	728,618	794,576	812,769	769,265	792,344	816,114
Underground Disbribution Projects	80,706	45,745	105,397	128,182	134,756	249,014	133,521	137,528	141,653
Disbribution Transformers	445,408	313,219	180,140	250,877	195,428	197,599	203,852	209,968	216,267
Services	91,904	89,532	37,099	47,836	84,660	87,309	90,323	93,034	95,824
Distribution Meters (Smart Meters)	90,639	84,060	25,155	141,958	1,461,350	130,963	65,962	57,300	31,500
Vehicles and Trailers	202,832	147,261	313,663	218,906	325,000	130,000	-	100,000	290,000
Computer Equipment	29,999	92,588	60,724	34,742	162,300	180,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Automated Switches	-	-	-	-	-	120,000	123,600	127,308	131,127
Tools & Misc. Equipment	20,074	25,022	17,672	38,170	28,000	10,500	20,600	21,218	21,855
River Crossing	-	-	-	-	-	825,000	-	-	-
Solar installation	-	-	-	-	-	100,000	-	-	-
Contributed Capital	(10,767)	(60,603)	(90,610)	(8,661)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,300)	(10,600)	(11,000)
	1,701,480	**1,357,800**	**1,351,302**	**1,608,915**	**3,186,570**	**2,893,154**	**1,516,823**	**1,648,100**	**1,853,340**

VECC IR # 25 Attachment

BRANT COUNTY POWER INC.
2010 BUDGET SUMMARY

	2010 BUDGET	2009 BUDGET	2008 BUDGET	2007 BUDGET	2006 BUDGET	2010 ACTUAL	2009 ACTUAL	2008 ACTUAL	2007 ACTUAL	2006 ACTUAL	2010 VAR	2009 VAR	2008 VAR	2007 VAR	2006 VAR
Distribution Services Revenue															
Residential	$ 2,940,174	$ 2,983,903	$2,900,000	$2,456,000			$2,846,853	$3,145,523	$2,869,873	$2,534,358	$ 2,940,174	$ 137,050	$ (245,523)	$ (413,873)	$(2,534,358)
General	2,912,231	2,898,673	2,800,000	2,189,000			2,735,475	2,622,553	2,878,826	2,416,893	2,912,231	163,198	177,447	(689,826)	(2,416,893)
Large User	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	40,609	-	-	-	-	(40,609)
Street lighting	47,050	47,634	50,000	36,000			46,800	35,586	51,307	47,093	47,050	834	14,414	(15,307)	(47,093)
Sentinel Lighting	12,351	11,341	12,000	7,000			11,493	11,869	12,213	10,996	12,351	(152)	131	(5,213)	(10,996)
Total Distribution Revenue	$ 5,911,806	$ 5,941,552	$5,762,000	$4,688,000	$ -	$ -	$5,640,621	$5,815,531	$5,812,219	$5,049,949	$ 5,911,806	$ 300,931	$ (53,531)	$(1,124,219)	$(5,049,949)
Other Operating Revenue	428,494	398,294	399,584	467,400			413,962	450,107	504,388	479,800	428,494	(15,668)	(50,523)	(36,988)	(479,800)
Investment Income	45,408	63,739	60,000	62,500			28,640	49,023	75,583	36,241	45,408	35,099	10,977	(13,083)	(36,241)
TOTAL REVENUE	$ 6,385,708	$ 6,403,585	$6,221,584	$5,217,900	$ -	$ -	$6,083,223	$6,314,661	$6,392,190	$5,565,990	$ 6,385,708	$ 320,362	$ (93,077)	$(1,174,290)	$(5,565,990)
EXPENSES															
Distribution Expense - Operations and maintenance	$ 1,274,347	1,139,826	1,356,130	1,032,139			1,234,295	1,250,643	1,305,033	1,164,887	1,274,347	(94,469)	105,487	(272,894)	(1,164,887)
Billing and Collecting	700,602	808,023	848,655	924,430			720,925	778,857	870,899	862,851	700,602	87,098	69,798	53,531	(862,851)
General Administration	1,078,577	1,098,350	1,020,741	1,099,523			1,541,434	1,219,940	1,126,053	1,039,172	1,078,577	(443,084)	(199,199)	(26,530)	(1,039,172)
Shareholder expenses	-	50,000	10,000	50,000			-	-	-	-	-	50,000	10,000	50,000	-
Amortization	1,164,376	1,250,000	1,100,000	950,000			1,015,883	1,041,813	1,006,228	969,174	1,164,376	234,117	58,187	(56,228)	(969,174)
Community Relations, Conservation	165,529	97,903	155,685	141,789			123,948	119,225	104,500	59,848	165,529	(26,045)	36,460	37,289	(59,848)
Interest on Customer Deposits	540	4,500	8,800	8,800			1,129	5,772	21,047	6,470	540	3,371	3,028	(12,247)	(6,470)
Interest on Debt	317,500	307,500	360,000	300,000			326,162	365,832	384,371	389,676	317,500	(18,662)	(5,832)	(84,371)	(389,676)
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSE	$ 4,701,472	$ 4,756,102	$4,860,011	$4,506,681	$ -	$ -	$4,963,776	$4,782,082	$4,818,131	$4,492,078	$ 4,701,472	$ (207,674)	$ 77,929	$ (311,450)	$(4,492,078)
NET INCOME BEFORE UNDERNOTED ITEMS	$ 1,684,237	$ 1,647,483	$1,361,573	$ 711,219	$ -	$ -	$1,119,447	$1,532,579	$1,574,059	$1,073,912	$ 1,684,237	$ 528,036	$ (171,006)	$ (862,840)	$(1,073,912)
Loss (Gain) on Disposal of Equipment								(9,578)			-	-	9,578	-	-
Employee Future Benefits Provision	(28,640)	(28,640)	(28,640)	(180,000)			(28,800)	(28,640)	1,711,140	(299,000)	(28,640)	160	-	(1,891,140)	299,000
Income Tax Provision	(589,483)	(576,620)	(600,000)	(200,000)			(342,923)	(698,563)	(730,869)	(830,728)	(589,483)	(233,697)	98,563	530,869	830,728
NET INCOME (LOSS)	$ 1,066,114	$ 1,042,223	$ 732,933	$ 331,219	$ -	$ -	$ 747,724	$ 795,798	$2,554,330	$ (55,816)	$ 1,066,114	$ 294,499	$ (62,865)	$(2,223,111)	$ 55,816
Check											0	(0)	0	0	0
											Note 1	Note 2	Note 3	Note 4	Note 5

Note 1 - 2010 audited results not yet available.

Note 2 - Main reasons for different is variance account rebuild resulting in some adjustments to distribution revenue, operating expense and variance accounts.

Note 3 - difference not considered to be material

Note 4 - Different management regime - no rigorous budget process

Note 5 - Different management regime - no rigorous budget process, cannot locate 2006 budget

BRANT COUNTY POWER INC.
Capital Budget

		2010 BUDGET	2009 BUDGET	2008 BUDGET	2007 BUDGET	2006 BUDGET	2010 ACTUAL	2009 ACTUAL	2008 ACTUAL	2007 ACTUAL	2006 ACTUAL	2010 VAR	2009 VAR	2008 VAR	2007 VAR	2006 VAR
T/S station #1815		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ 2,543	$ -	$ 67,054	$ -	$ -	$ (2,543)	$ -	$ (67,054)
Land #1805								6,380				-	(6,380)	-	-	-
Long Term Load Transfer costs			-	240,285	-				-	-	-	-	-	240,285	-	-
Buildings and fixtures	#1808		-		-			-	3,640	7,067	39,251	-	-	(3,640)	(7,067)	(39,251)
Electrical plant	#2010		-		-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dist station equip	#1820		-		-				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dist poles,towers	#1830	425,616	324,292	256,146	375,000			428,137	378,246	437,857	456,927	425,616	(103,845)	(122,100)	(62,857)	(456,927)
Dist O/H con/devices	#1835	368,960	368,858	100,712	125,000			300,481	207,302	158,780	254,506	368,960	68,377	(106,590)	(33,780)	(254,506)
Dist U/G conduit	#1840	63,598	14,629	15,495	130,000			72,833	32,980	26,002	33,622	63,598	(58,204)	(17,485)	103,998	(33,622)
Dist U/G con/devices	#1845	71,158	18,619	21,195	235,000			55,349	72,417	19,743	47,084	71,158	(36,731)	(51,222)	215,257	(47,084)
Dist line transformers	#1850	195,428	317,241	95,788	135,000			250,877	177,597	313,220	378,354	195,428	66,364	(81,809)	(178,220)	(378,354)
Dist services-O/H	#1855	48,734	29,069	12,710	30,000			29,448	7,953	46,710	33,863	48,734	(379)	4,757	(16,710)	(33,863)
Dist services-U/G	#1856	35,926	29,069	12,710	70,000			18,388	29,146	42,822	58,041	35,926	10,681	(16,436)	27,178	(58,041)
Dist meters	#1860	1,461,350	24,404	51,200	150,000			141,958	25,155	84,060	90,639	1,461,350	(117,554)	26,045	65,940	(90,639)
		$ 2,670,770	$ 1,126,181	$ 806,241	$ 1,250,000	$ -	$ -	$ 1,303,851	$ 936,978	$ 1,136,261	$ 1,459,341	$ 2,670,770	$ (177,670)	$ (130,737)	$ 113,739	$ (1,459,341)
Office bldg	#1908	$ 10,000	$ 75,000	$ 200,000	$ 900,000			$ 21,907	$ 112,874	$ 17,272	$ -	$ 10,000	$ 53,093	$ 87,126	$ 882,728	$ -
Office furn/equip	#1915	500	3,000	-	1,500			25,000	-	2,306	7,349	500	(22,000)	-	(806)	(7,349)
Computer	#1920/1925	162,300	46,000	83,600	80,000			34,742	60,724	92,588	29,999	162,300	11,258	22,877	(12,588)	(29,999)
Vehicles	#1930	325,000	150,000	120,000	197,500			218,906	313,663	147,261	202,832	325,000	(68,906)	(193,663)	50,239	(202,832)
Stores equip	#1935	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tools, shop equip	#1940	13,000	15,000	15,000	30,220			12,346	14,950	15,726	12,724	13,000	2,654	50	14,494	(12,724)
Meas/testing equip	#1945	15,000	6,000	6,000	9,000			824	2,137	6,991		15,000	5,176	3,863	2,009	-
Power operated equip	#1950	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Communication equip	#1955	-	1,400	1,000	2,500			-	584	-	-	-	1,400	416	2,500	-
Misc equip	#1960	-	-	-	-				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		$ 525,800	$ 296,400	$ 425,600	$ 1,220,720	$ -	$ -	$ 313,725	$ 504,932	$ 282,144	$ 252,904	$ 525,800	$ (17,325)	$ (79,332)	$ 938,576	$ (252,904)
total additions		$ 3,196,570	$ 1,422,581	$ 1,231,841	$ 2,470,720	$ -	$ -	$ 1,617,576	$ 1,441,910	$ 1,418,405	$ 1,712,244	$ 3,196,570	$ (194,995)	$ (210,069)	$ 1,052,315	$ (1,712,244)
Cont capital	#1995	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	0			(8,661)	(90,610)	(60,603)	(10,767)	(10,000)	(1,339)	80,610	60,603	10,767
net additions		$ 3,186,570	$ 1,412,581	$ 1,221,841	$ 2,470,720	$ -	$ -	$ 1,608,915	$ 1,351,300	$ 1,357,802	$ 1,701,477	$ 3,186,570	$ (196,334)	$ (129,459)	$ 1,112,918	$ (1,701,477)
Check												0	0	(0)	0	0
												Note 1	Note 2	Note 3	Note 4	Note 5

Note 1 - 2010 audited results not yet available.
Note 2 - Main reasons for different is variance account rebuild resulting in some adjustments to distribution revenue, operating expense and variance accounts.
Note 3 - difference not considered to be material
Note 4 - Different management regime - no rigorous budget process
Note 5 - Different management regime - no rigorous budget process, cannot locate 2006 budget

VECC IR # 26b Attachment

MASTER COLLECTION AGENCY & OUTSOUCE SERVICES AGREEMENT

This Master Agency Services Agreement ("Agreement") dated as of January 28, 2009 is hereby entered into by and between Collectcents Inc. o/a Credit Bureau of Canada Collections ("Agency ") and Brant County Power Inc. ("Brant").

BRANT desires to engage Agency and Agency desires to accept such engagement to collect past due or delinquent debts ("Accounts") owed to BRANT by its customers, clients and others ("Debtors") and provide Outsource services as required.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants herein contained, incorporating the foregoing by reference, and intending to be legally bound hereby, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, BRANT and Agency agree as follows:

1. **Engagement.** This Agreement shall commence as of date set forth above, and shall continue in effect indefinitely subject to the right of either party to terminate the Agreement upon thirty (30) days prior written notice.

2. **Compliance with laws.** Agency agrees to use its best efforts to collect Accounts, but will refrain from using any technique, approach, method or procedure which would be contrary to law, or detrimental or adverse to BRANT's policies or to BRANT's public image. Agency represents and warrants that it is in the business of collection Accounts collateral and that is has knowledge of the laws, rules and regulations is bonded and licensed to perform the services described herein, if required by law.

3. **Indemnification.** Agency agrees to indemnify and hold BRANT harmless against and from: all claims, lawsuits, damages, expenses and losses (collectively, "Claims") arising out of: (a) a breach of this Agreement by Agency; or (b) the conduct of Agency and/or its agents in endeavoring to collect any Accounts. Agency agrees to reimburse BRANT for and, if BRANT requests, defend BRANT against any Claims.

4. **Insurance.** Agency will maintain insurance in accordance with standard practice for collection agencies generally, or in accordance with such requirements as BRANT may from time to time establish and provide written notice thereof to Agency.

5. **Agency's Compensation.** As compensation for the services performed hereunder by Agency, BRANT agrees to pay to Agency certain compensation, in accordance with the tariff as set forth on Exhibit A attached hereto and made a part hereof ("Compensation").

6. **No Agency.** Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed to place BRANT and Agency in a relationship as partners, joint ventures, or principal and agent. Neither BRANT nor Agency shall act as or represent itself as an agent, partner, or joint venture of the other. Agency has entered into this Agreement with the express intention, understanding and knowledge that its relationship to BRANT is that of an independent contractor, and not that of any agent, servant, or employee; and that Agency shall have no power or authorization to bind or otherwise obligate BRANT on any matter whatsoever, except as provided in the express terms and conditions of this Agreement. No acts, omissions or assistance given by BRANT, its officers, staff, employees, agents, representatives or associated companies shall be construed to alter "Agency" status as an independent contractor.

7. **Proceeds held in trust.** All proceeds collected on the Accounts referred hereunder shall be held by the Agency in trust for BRANT in the Collections Agency's Trust Account, separate and apart from and not commingled with, the Agency's own monies.

8. **Legal Action.** The Agency must have BRANT's written authorization to bring legal action to effect collection of any Account. The Agency shall immediately notify BRANT of any potential or threatened counterclaim or actual counterclaim and shall forward to BRANT immediately upon the

Agency's receipt, all relevant correspondence and pleadings containing such counterclaim or threatened counterclaim.

9. **Withdrawal of Account/Active Period.** BRANT may, at any time in its sole discretion, recall a specific Account after referral of such Account to Agency. Notwithstanding the above, if the Agency determines at any time that an Account is uncollectible, it may return that Account with a written statement of its reasons

10. **Amendments.** This Agreement and any Repossession Schedule may only be amended by a writing signed by the parties hereto.

11. **Advertising; Confidentiality.** Agency shall not advertise, market or otherwise disclose to any other person, any information relating to the making of his Agreement nor use BRANT's name or logo without BRANT's written consent. Any information or material which is transmitted by BRANT to Agency shall be treated as confidential except for information which: (i) is or becomes available to the public other than as a result of the disclosure by Agency; or (ii) is required to be disclosed under applicable law.

12. **Notices.** All notices or other communications in furtherance of this Agreement, except as otherwise noted, shall be deemed to have been duly given when made in writing and delivered in person, via facsimile transmission or deposited in Canada Post, postage prepaid and addressed as follows:

To Agency:

Credit Bureau of Canada Collections
1450 Meyerside DR.
7th Floor
Mississauga, ON L5T 2N5
Attn: John Kim
Fax: (905) 670 7069

To BRANT:

Brant County Power Inc.
65 Dundas Street East
Paris, Ontario
N3L 3H1
Attn: Grant Brooker
Fax: (519) 442 3701

Or to such other address as a party may from time to time specify to the other party.

13. **Entire Agreement.** This agreement supersedes all previous arrangements or agreements, whether written or oral, and comprises the entire Agreement of the parties.

14. **Survival.** The representations and agreements in this Agreement shall survive the execution and delivery of this Agreement and consummation of any transaction hereunder. This Agreement shall be binding on and inure to the benefit of the parties, their respective successors and assigns.

15. **Assignment.** Agency's rights or obligations hereunder may not be assigned to any other party without the express prior written consent of BRANT.

16. **CHOICE OF LAW.** THIS AGREEMENT IS TO BE CONSTRUED AND ENFORCED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAWS OF THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO. THE PARTIES CONSENT TO THE JURISDICTION OF ANY COURT LOCATED WITHIN ONTARIO AND EXPRESSLY WAIVE ANY RIGHTS OT A TRIAL BY JURY.

Brant County Power Inc.	**AGENCY**
By: Grant Brooker	By: John Kim
Title: Chief Financial Officer	Title: Executive Vice President
Date:	Date:

EXHIBIT A

COMPENSATION

First Party Outsourcing

Half Full Time Employee (FTE) at $2,000 per month

Half FTE monthly minimum

Initial set up fee $1,000

Thirty (30) day cancellation notice

Start date tentatively Monday February 16th, 2009

Network system and process training to be provided by Brant County Power Inc.

Scripting to be determined

Contingency Collections

Flat 20%