Ontario Energy Board P.O. Box 2319 27th. Floor 2300 Yonge Street Toronto ON M4P 1E4 Telephone: 416- 481-1967 Facsimile: 416- 440-7656 Toll free: 1-888-632-6273 Commission de l'énergie de l'Ontario C.P. 2319 27e étage 2300, rue Yonge Toronto ON M4P 1E4 Téléphone; 416-481-1967 Télécopieur: 416-440-7656 Numéro sans frais: 1-888-632-6273



BY E-MAIL

August 10, 2012

Kirsten Walli Board Secretary Ontario Energy Board 2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: Veridian Connections Inc. Disposition of Account 1562 – Deferred PILs Board Staff Interrogatories Board File No. EB-2012-0061

In accordance with the Notice of Application and Hearing, please find attached Board Staff Interrogatories in the above proceeding.

In addition, Board staff reminds Veridian Connections Inc. that responses to interrogatories are due by August 31, 2012.

Yours truly,

Original Signed By

Daniel Kim Analyst – Applications & Regulatory Audit

Encl.

Veridian Connections Inc. Disposition of Account 1562 – Deferred PILs Board Staff Interrogatories

<u>Gravenhurst</u>

Reference: PILs Recovery Worksheet PILs Recoveries from Customers

- In the application evidence filed in 2002, 2004 and 2005, Gravenhurst provided statistics of demand data. In 2006 EDR, Gravenhurst also provided statistics for 2002-2004. The trend for the majority of distributors is that the PILs recoveries exceed the proxies for the full years of 2003, 2004 and 2005. As demand and population grew, the PILs dollar amounts recovered were higher than the proxy set using 2001 billing determinants. The table below shows Gravenhurst's evidence from 2002 to 2006.
 - a) Please explain why the PILs recoveries are so much lower than one would expect in 2002 and 2005 as seen in the table below.

PILs Proxies vs. Recoveries	2002 partial	2003	2004	2005	2006 partial
PILs Proxies in Rates	328,177	392,169	344,175	248,477	73,970
PILs Recovery Calculations	-193,485	-430,922	-351,381	-242,045	-93,885
Difference	134,692	-38,753	-7,206	6,432	-19,915

b) The volumetric billing determinants for 10 months of 2002 appear to be lower than the full year statistics would indicate. Board staff prorated (10/12) the 2002 statistics as filed in the 2006 EDR application and compared the prorated volumes with those used in the PILs recovery calculations. Please explain.

Customer Class	Billing Parameter	Billed Consumption Mar. 1/02 to Dec 31/02	Prorated 2002 Statistics Filed in 2006 EDR	2002 Statistics Filed in 2006 EDR
Residential urban	kWh's	4,623,047	23,115,235	27,738,282
Residential suburban	kWh's	1,493,457	7,467,286	8,960,743

Residential seasonal	kWh's	1,742,878	8,714,390	10,457,268
GS<50	kWh's	1,926,154	9,630,768	11,556,921
GS>50	kW's	7,325	36,627	43,952
Sentinel Lights	kWs	9,743	135	162
Streetlight	kW's	92,428	1,431	1,717
GS<50 suburban	kWh's	589,796	2,948,978	3,538,773
GS>50 suburban	kW's	7,848	39,242	47,091

c) If there are any adjustments that need to be made to the PILs recovery calculations, please update and file the revised PILs continuity schedule in active Excel format.

Reference: 2001 through 2005 SIMPIL Models Income Tax Rates

2) Veridian used the following income tax rates in the table below to calculate the true-up variances in the SIMPIL models for Gravenhurst.

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Income tax rate used in SIMPIL	34.12%	34.12%	31.87%	31.87%	27.50%

- a) How did Veridian select the income tax rates for 2001 to 2005? Please provide the calculations in Excel format.
- b) Gravenhurst's 2002 rate base was \$8,718,402. Please explain why the minimum income tax rates would not be appropriate for Gravenhurst? Please refer to Midland EB-2012-0219/ EB-2011-0182. Veridian used the minimum income tax rates for Scugog's evidence. Why would these minimum income rates also not be used for Gravenhurst?

Scugog Hydro

Reference: PILs Recovery Worksheet PILs Recoveries from Customers

 In the application evidence filed in 2002, 2004 and 2005, Scugog Hydro provided statistics of demand data. In 2006 EDR, Scugog Hydro also provided statistics for 2002-2004. The trend for the majority of distributors is that the PILs recoveries exceed the proxies for the full years of 2003, 2004 and 2005. As demand and population grew, the PILs dollar amounts recovered were higher than the proxy set using 2001 billing determinants. The table below shows Scugog Hydro's evidence from 2002 to 2006.

a) Please explain why the PILs recoveries are so much lower than one would expect in 2002, 2004 and 2005 as seen in the table below.

PILs Proxies vs. Recoveries	2002 partial	2003	2004	2005	2006 partial
PILs Proxies in Rates	26,063	31,083	27,318	38,715	14,311
PILs Recovery Calculations	-24,645	-32,180	-24,554	-38,028	-15,721
Difference	1,418	-1,097	2,764	687	-1,410

b) The volumetric billing determinants for 10 months of 2002 appear to be lower than the full year statistics would indicate. Board staff prorated (10/12) the 2002 statistics as filed in the 2006 EDR application and compared the prorated volumes with those used in the PILs recovery calculations. The billing determinant data for the Sentinel Lights and Streetlight rate classes used for PILs recovery are not consistent with the load forecast data contained in Scugog Hydro's last cost of service application for 2003 as seen in the table below. Please explain.

Customer Class	Billing Parameter	Billed Consumption Mar. 1/02 to Dec 31/02	Prorated 2002 Statistics Filed in 2006 EDR	2002 Statistics Filed in 2006 EDR
Residential	kWh's	15,119,762	16,799,735	20,159,682
General Service < 50 KW	kWh's	7,829,495	8,691,105	10,429,326
General Service > 50 KW	kW's	28,628	31,809	38,171
USL	kWh's	130,998	134,443	161,331
Sentinel Lights	kWs	21	23	28
Streetlight - TOU	kW's	860	956	1,147

Customer Class	Billing Parameter	Billed Consumption 2003	2003 Statistics Filed in 2006 EDR
Sentinel Lights	kWs	-	19
Streetlight - TOU	kW's	-	1,175

c) If there are any adjustments that need to be made to the PILs recovery calculations, please update and file the revised PILs continuity schedule in active Excel format.

<u>Veridian</u>

Reference: Veridian_ED Disposition_1562 Balance_20120501.xls

4) Tab E1.1 Disposition of 1562 Balance

 a) The description indicates that the worksheet only goes to October 31, 2005 rather than April 30, 2006. Please explain.

b) Large Corporation Tax ("LCT")

In the consolidation of Veridian for the 2005 regulatory information there is an amount for LCT of \$125,764. Did Veridian include 4/12ths of this amount in its continuity schedule as explained in APH FAQ July 2007?

5) Tab C1.1 - VCI - March to December 2002

The volumetric data for the ten months of 2002 look to be low when compared to 2002 full year statistics provided in the 2004 RAM application model. Please explain.

6) Tab C1.1 - Belleville - March to December 2002

Volumetric data for street lighting seems to be missing. Please explain and revise the spreadsheet where necessary.

7) Tab C1.2 – Port Hope – 2003

The volumetric data look to be low when compared to the 2003 statistics provided in the 2005 RAM application model. Please explain.

8) Tab C1.6 - Belleville – April to December 2005

The volumetric data for large use appear to be on the incorrect line. No PILs recovery has been calculated. Please correct the worksheet and re-file the workbook.

Reference: Veridian – 2004 SIMPIL Model – LCT True-up Variance

9) The LCT threshold increased to \$50 million in 2004 from \$10 million prior to 2004. On sheet TAXCALC in cell E172 the original LCT of \$246,873 appears. Above this in cell E170 the revised LCT amount of \$126,586 has been calculated. A credit variance of \$118,287 should appear in cell E173. The grossed-up amount is \$181,980. Please confirm the formula and file the revised 2004 SIMPIL and disposition workbook.

Reference: 2005 Tax Returns

10) In the Manager's Summary on page 16 there is reference to summation of the details of three tax returns filed in 2005. Board staff was unable to locate this summary. Please provide the reference in the evidence filed. If the summary has not been filed, please file it.