



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

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

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

Michael Buonaguro
Counsel for VECC
(416) 767-1666

January 05, 2012

VIA MAIL and E-MAIL

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

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition (VECC)
EB-2010-0018: Interrogatories

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

Thank you.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'M. Buonaguro'.

Michael Buonaguro
Counsel for VECC
Encl.

Norfolk Power Distribution Inc. (Norfolk)

2012 Rates Application, EB-2011-0272

**Round 2 Interrogatories/Technical Conference
Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition (“VECC”)**

RATE BASE

1 Reference: Board Staff # 21

- a) Please update the 2011 subdivision costs based based on projects completed at year end.
- b) How many new lots were serviced in 2011?

LOAD FORECAST AND REVENUE OFFSETS

2 Reference: Board Staff #41

- a) Please confirm that actual values reported for January – August 2011 have not been weather normalized.
- b) Please confirm whether the “Predicted Power Purchased” values shown are based on weather normal conditions or the actual HDD/CDD values for each month.
- c) If the predicted values are based on weather normal conditions, please re-do the “predicted values” using the actual weather conditions for each month.

3 Reference: Board Staff #42

- a) In Table 2.5 of the original Application please confirm whether the predicted values for 2003-2010 are based on that year’s actual HDD/CDD values or the weather normal values.
- b) If based on actual values, please reconcile this fact with the response to Board Staff #42.
- c) If based on “weather normal values”, please re-do Table 2.5 using the actual HDD/CDD values for each year as the basis for the prediction.

4 Reference: Board Staff #43

- a) What does the 7.5% translate into in terms of kWh savings for the month and for the year to date?
- b) Please explain the basis for the 7.5% kWh savings value quoted as at September 2011.

**5 Reference: Board Staff #5
Energy Probe #16 b)**

- a) Please explain why the RRWF was not revised to reflect the updated load forecast for 2012 as per Energy Probe #16 b).
- b) If appropriate, please provide a revised RRWF.

6 Reference: Energy Probe #18

- a) Please update the response to reflect the most recent year-to-date values for 2010 and 2011.

**7 Reference: Energy Probe #19
Board Staff #37 c)
Board Staff #5**

- a) Please reconcile the increased number of MicroFit connections reported in Energy Probe #19 for 2010 and 2011 with the annual connections forecast In Board Staff #37 c).
- b) Board Staff #5 reports a revised MicroFit Revenue for 2012 of \$5,130. However, Energy Probe #19 reports a value of \$5,103. Please reconcile.

COST ALLOCATION

8 Reference: VECC #25 a)

- a) Please explain why, in the current cost allocation, there are now no Services weighting factors for Street Lights, Sentinel Lights or USL.
- b) Please provide the basis for the revised Billing and Collecting weighting factors.

9 Reference: VECC #25 b) and c)

- a) How many GS<50 customers have transformer rated or poly-phase type meters (i.e., comparable to the 480 Residential customers)?
- b) In Sheet I7.1 of the Cost Allocation model all Residential and GS<50 customers are shown as having the \$200 smart meter. Please reconcile this with the response provided to VECC #25 b) which suggests that some of the customers in both classes use poly-phase meter.
- c) What is the average cost of these transformer rated/poly-phase meters – on a comparable basis to the \$200 smart meter?
- d) In Sheet I7.1 of the Cost Allocation model the vast majority of GS>50 customers (146 out of 167) are shown as having the \$200 smart meter. However, the response to VECC #25 c) suggests that all GS>50 customers have a different type of meter. Please reconcile.
- e) What is the average cost of the meters capable of recording demand and vars as used for the majority of the GS>50 customers? Are these meters capable of recording time of use and, if not, why isn't this necessary?
- f) Please provide a revised Cost Allocation where Sheet I7.1 has been updated to reflect the types of meters (and cost of meters) actually used for each customer class.