

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

## ONE Nicholas Street, Suite 1204, Ottawa, Ontario, CanadaK1N 7B7

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

Michael Janigan Counsel for VECC 613-562-4002

November 27, 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: EB-2012-0147 Midland Power Utility Corporation

Please find enclosed the 2<sup>nd</sup> round interrogatories of VECC in the above-noted proceeding.

Yours truly,

Michael Janigan Counsel for VECC

Encl.

cc. Midland Power Utility Corporation - Christine Bell - cbell@midlandpuc.ca

REQUESTOR NAME VECC INFORMATION REQUEST ROUND # 2

NO:

TO: Midland Power Utility
DATE: November 26, 2012

CASE NO: EB-2012 -0147

APPLICATION NAME 2012 Cost of Service Electricity
Distribution Rate Application

## **31.0 REFERENCE**: VECC#8 c)

a) Please provide the results (i.e., equations, adjusted R-squared values and t-statistics) for the following models:

### Model #1:

Independent variables to include: HDD, CDD, Number of Days in Month, Number of Peak Hours, GDP

#### Model#2

Independent variables to include: HDD, CDD, Number Days in Month, Number of Peak Hours, Employment

b) If the Adjusted-R Square value for either equation in part (a) exceeds 85%
 - please provide the projected 2013 purchases using the model and also provide the 2011, 2012 and 2013 values used for GDP/employment.

#### **VECC TCQ#2**

## 32.0 REFERENCE: VECC 24 a)

- a) Were internal Midland Staff costs incurred to install the Rex 2 meters on GS<50 customers capitalized and are they included in the rate base proposed for 2013?
- b) If the response to part (a) is no, how were these costs treated?
- c) If the response to part (a) is yes, please indicate the amount and recalculate the cost of GS<50 smart meters so as to include these costs.

#### VECC TCQ#3

## 33.0 REFERENCE: VECC 25 a) and VECC 28 a)

- a) The revenue to cost ratios quoted in these responses as the starting point based on VECC #24 (i.e., 96.94% for GS>50 and 111.7% for Residential) don't match those in Sheet O1 of the CA model filed with the interrogatory responses. What is the basis for the CA Model filed with the interrogatory responses?
- b) Please provide the CA Model consistent with the results of VECC #24 and based on the revised load forecast per VECC 9 e).
- c) With respect to VECC 25 a), please explain how if the Street Lighting and USL ratios are being <u>reduced</u> to 120% the offsetting adjustment to the GS>50 ratio is also a reduction (from 96.94% to 82.55%). One would have expected the GS>50 ratio to increase.

\*\*\*End of Document\*\*\*