

Ontario Energy Board

IN THE MATTER OF the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998*,
S.O. 1998, c. 15, Sched. B, as amended:

AND IN THE MATTER OF an application by Collus
PowerStream Corporation for an Order or Orders approving or
fixing just and reasonable rates and other service charges for
the distribution of electricity, effective September 1, 2013.

**INTERROGATORIES OF
ENERGY PROBE RESEARCH FOUNDATION
("ENERGY PROBE")**

July 30, 2013

**COLLUS POWERSTREAM CORPORATION
2013 RATES REBASING CASE
EB-2012-0116**

**ENERGY PROBE RESEARCH FOUNDATION
INTERROGATORIES**

EXHIBIT 1 – ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENTS

1-Energy Probe-1

Ref: Exhibit 1, Tab 1, Schedule 2

The evidence indicates that the 2013 COS application was filed on April 30, 2013. Please confirm that due to missing information a revised application and evidence was filed on May 24, 2013. Please also confirm that further amendments to the evidence were filed on June 6, 2013.

1-Energy Probe-2

Ref: Exhibit 1, Tab 1, Schedule 12

- a) The evidence indicates that no costs associated with the sales transaction have been included in the 2013 revenue requirement. Have any costs, capital, OM&A or other that were incurred in 2012 or previous years been included in the figures provided for those years? If yes, please identify the cost, type of cost and year in which it was incurred.**
- b) Are any of the costs associated with the Board of Directors of the corporate entities shown on page 2, other than Collus PowerStream Corp. been included in any of the historical data shown for 2012 or previous years, or in the 2013 revenue requirement? If yes, please identify these costs, the amounts and the reasons they are included in the regulated utility costs in a historical, bridge or test year.**

1-Energy Probe-3

Ref: Exhibit 1, Tab 1, Schedule 16

What is the status of the review of the Service Level Agreements, as noted on page 2? If now available and necessary, please update the application, including the filing of the external study referenced.

1-Energy Probe-4

Ref: Exhibit 1, Tab 2, Schedule 1

- a) Please explain why the savings related to back office support in finance and regulatory processes and the reduction in costs through expertise in the area of regulatory issues and the "soft savings" through the sharing of knowledge and expertise in specialized areas are not quantifiable at this time.**
- b) When does Collus PowerStream expect to realize quantifiable benefits?**

1-Energy Probe-5

Ref: Exhibit 1, Tab 2, Schedule 1

Collus PowerStream is requesting rates effective September 1, 2013 through April 30, 2014. Is Collus PowerStream requesting recovery of the full \$934.3K deficiency over this period or a prorated portion of this amount?

1-Energy Probe-6

Ref: Exhibit 1, Tab 2, Schedule 2

- a) Please identify the amount of revenues and expenses that were recorded in 2012 related to smart meter technology and time-of-use billing that were incurred over previous years. Please provide a break out of these revenues and expenses by year in which they were incurred.**
- b) Does Collus PowerStream have a deferral or variance account for costs associated with moving to IFRS? If yes, please explain why the preparation for the movement to IFRS is listed as a cost driver in 2013 relative to 2009 costs. Please identify the increase in 2013 OM&A costs associated with the preparation for the movement to IFRS that are included in the 2013 revenue requirement.**

1-Energy Probe-7

**Ref: Exhibit 1, Tab 2, Schedule 2 &
Exhibit 1, Tab 3, Schedule 3**

Please explain and reconcile the different figures shown for 2009 and 2010 in Tables 1 of the above noted exhibits.

EXHIBIT 2 - RATE BASE

2-Energy Probe-8

Ref: Exhibit 2, Tab 1, Schedule 1

Please confirm that the bridge year figures for 2012 are all actual figures and not part forecast or preliminary estimates for 2012. If this cannot be confirmed, please update all of the figures in Exhibit 2 to reflect final actual data for 2012.

2-Energy Probe-9

Ref: Exhibit 2, Tab 1, Schedule 2

- a) The evidence at page 4 indicates that the rate base for the 2012 Bridge Year is a forecasted increased of \$555K over 2011. Please update Tables 4 and 5, if necessary, to reflect actual final figures for 2012.**
- b) Please provide the reference at line 13 of page 4 and lines 8 and 10 of page 5.**
- c) Please explain why Collus PowerStream changed the WCA factor from 15% to 13% for 2012 in the absence of a COS proceeding to set 2012 rates.**

2-Energy Probe-10

Ref: Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1

- a) Please confirm that the figures in Table 1 reflect additions closed to rate base in the year. If this cannot be confirmed, please provide a revised Table 1 that reflects only additions closed to rate base in the year.**

- b) **Please confirm that Table 1 reflects actual finalized data for 2012. If this cannot be confirmed, please update Table 1 to reflect actual finalized data for 2012.**
- c) **What is the difference between the capital expenditures shown in Table 2 from the additions shown in Table 1? Is the difference related solely to work in progress? If not, please provide a reconciliation of the figures in Tables 1 and 2.**
- d) **Please explain why the additions shown in Table 1 for 2009 through 2012 do not match the additions shown in the continuity schedules shown in Tables 3 through 6, even though the disposals shown in Table 1 appear to match those shown in Tables 3 through 6.**

2-Energy Probe-11

Ref: Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1

- a) **Please explain why there are no disposals shown for 2013 in Table 7.**
- b) **Please explain the accumulated depreciation disposals that total (\$30,000) shown for 2013 in Table 7.**
- c) **If Tables 6 and 7 do not reflect actual finalized figures for 2012, please provide updated tables that do reflect actual finalized figures for 2012.**
- e) **Please provide a table that shows for each of 2009 through 2012 actual along with 2013 forecast, the level of Contributions & Grants received and the gross level of capital expenditures to which those contributions and grants were related. Please explain any significant change in the ratio of these two figures on a year to year basis.**

2-Energy Probe-12

Ref: Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1

- a) **Please explain and show the calculation of the depreciation expense of \$58,097.47 shown for 2009 in Table 3 for Meters with a life of 15 years.**
- b) **Please confirm that Collus PowerStream used the full year rule for depreciation of assets added in the test year as part of the 2009 cost of service application. If this cannot be confirmed, what depreciation methodology was used for assets added in the current year as part of the 2009 COS filing?**

- c) **Has Collus PowerStream continued to use the full year rule for depreciation of assets added in each of 2010 through 2012? If not, please explain any changes made and when they were applied.**
- d) **Please explain why there is no depreciation expense (addition to accumulated depreciation) shown for 2010 in Table 4 for the Meters that remained in the category with a life of 15 years after the transfer out of stranded meters.**
- e) **Please explain why stranded meters were moved out of the Meters assets with a life of 15 years in 2009 to a category for stranded meters with an asset life of 25 years in 2010?**
- f) **Please confirm that these stranded meters were included in rate base and in the revenue requirement approved by the Board for 2009 rates based on a 15 year life. If this cannot be confirmed, please provide evidence from the 2009 proceeding that supported a different life for these meters.**
- g) **Please explain the decrease in the depreciation expense shown in 2012 in Table 6 for stranded meters to \$31,907 from \$61,082 in 2011.**

2-Energy Probe-13

Ref: Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1

- a) **Please confirm that computer software and computer equipment were both depreciated over a 3 year period in 2009. If this cannot be confirmed, please explain where computer equipment was recorded for 2009 in Table 3.**
- b) **In Table 5 for 2011, computer equipment and computer software are shown as separate line items for the first time. The depreciation rate for computer equipment is shown as 3 years, while there is no period shown for computer software. What period was used in 2011 to depreciate computer software over?**
- c) **In Table 6 for 2012, computer software is shown in a depreciation rate based on a 5 year life. Please explain why and when this change occurred.**
- d) **Please show the calculation of the depreciation expense of \$91,557.80 in 2011 and \$91,349.00 in 2012, including all assumptions made for both years.**
- e) **Other than changes for computer software and stranded meters, please confirm that Collus PowerStream has not made any changes to depreciation rates from those approved by the Board in the 2009 COS application until those proposed for 2013. If this cannot be confirmed, please provide details of all other changes made through to the end of 2012.**

2-Energy Probe-14

Ref: Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 4

Please explain how the figure of \$17.6K in decreased amortization costs related to the stranded meters that have been disposed of in 2012 has been calculated (page 3).

2-Energy Probe-15

Ref: Exhibit 2, Tab 3, Schedule 4

- a) Please provide additional information on the lands purchased from CNR. In particular, the size and shape of the land and the Collus PowerStream infrastructure located on the land. For example, is the land an abandoned railway right of way or a former railway yard?**
- b) Did Collus PowerStream have a right of way on the CNR lands?**
- c) Under what authority did CNR have to tell Collus PowerStream to vacate the land or purchase it?**
- d) Will Collus PowerStream be able to sell any of the purchased land at a future date because all of the land purchased is not needed to ensure access to the infrastructure? If yes, please estimate the percentage of the land purchased that could be sold in the future.**

2-Energy Probe-16

Ref: Exhibit 2, Tab 3, Schedule 4

- a) Are all of the projects shown on pages 19 through 22 included in rate base by the end of 2013?**
- b) Based on the most recent information available year to date 2013, are all of the projects for 2013 shown on pages 19 through 22 forecast to be completed and in-service by the end of 2013?**

2-Energy Probe-17

Ref: Exhibit 2, Tab 4, Schedule 1

On page 3 of the evidence it states that the RPP and non-RPP prices are taken from the Ontario Wholesale Electricity Market Price Forecast Report dated March 28, 2013. Table 3 shows a commodity (spot) price of 0.02068 for May, 2013 through October, 2013 and a price of 0.02213 for November and December. In addition, Table 3 shows a Global Adjustment rate of 0.07075 for May, 2013 through October, 2013 and a rate of 0.06176 for November and December. With reference to the above noted Report, please explain where these figures come from.

EXHIBIT 3 - OPERATING REVENUE

3-Energy Probe-18

Ref: Exhibit 3, Tab 1, Schedule 2

- a) For each rate class shown in Table 1, please indicate whether the customers are billed on a monthly or bi-monthly basis.**
- b) Has there been any change in the billing frequency for any rate class between 2009 and 2013? If yes, please provide details.**

3-Energy Probe-19

Ref: Exhibit 3, Tab 1, Schedule 3

- a) Does Table 3 include actual OPA verified figures for 2012? If not, please update Table 3 to reflect actual data for 2012.**
- b) Please explain the reduction in CDM Target volumes shown for 2012 relative to that for 2011, along with the significant increase forecast for 2013 and then the reduction shown for 2014.**
- c) Why has Collus PowerStream provided 2014 forecasts when 2013 is the test year?**
- d) With respect to Table 4, please explain why forecast figures based on normalized 10-year and 20-year weather data have been provided for 2014 instead of 2013.**

- e) **Please update Table 4 to reflect actual data for all of 2012.**
- f) **Please update Table 10 to reflect actual data, adjusted for CDM, for each month that is currently available for 2013.**
- g) **Please explain how the average 2009-2011 percentages shown in Table 15 have been calculated. For example, how can the 2009-2011 residential average be 40.18% when each of 2009 through 2011 are lower than this figure?**
- h) **Please confirm that the service area customer count used in the regression model is actually only the number of residential customers, consistent with the figures shown in Appendix A.**
- i) **Please estimate the regression equation that uses the number of residential, GS < 50 and GS > 50 customers as an explanatory variable in place of the customer count used by Collus PowerStream. Please provide the regression data in the same format as Tables 8 and 9, along with the forecast for 2013 as shown in Table 10.**
- j) **Please update Tables 14 and 15 to reflect actual data for all of 2012.**
- k) **What is the impact on the distribution revenue forecast if the average ratios for 2009 through 2011 were used from Table 15, rather than the average of 2005 through 2011, which appears to have been used?**
- l) **Please explain how the monthly forecast of customers used in the regression equation for 2012 (October through December) and for 2013 was determined. In particular, please explain the decrease of 41 customers between September, 2012 and October, 2012.**
- m) **Please provide the actual number of residential customers for each month from October, 2012 through to the most recent month currently available in 2013.**

3-Energy Probe-20

**Ref: Exhibit 3, Tab 1, Schedule 3 &
Exhibit 3, Tab 2, Schedule 1**

- a) **Based on the explanation provided on pages 19-20 of Exhibit 3, Tab 1, Schedule 3, please show the calculation of the forecasted kW figures for 2013 shown in Table 5 of Exhibit 3, Tab 2, Schedule 1.**

- b) Please explain the decrease in the number of GS > 50 customers from 117 in 2012 to 114 in 2013, as shown in Table 4 of Exhibit 3, Tab 2, Schedule 1.

3-Energy Probe-21

Ref: Exhibit 3, Tab 1, Schedule 5

The evidence indicates that since the balance in account 1568 is immaterial, Collus PowerStream is not applying for the disposition of the balance at this time. Does this mean that Collus PowerStream will forgo recovery of the balance for 2011 programs or that it will recover this amount in a future application?

3-Energy Probe-22

Ref: Exhibit 3, Tab 3, Schedule 1

- a) Please update Tables 1, 2 and 3 to reflect actual data for all of 2012, if required.
- b) Where are the SSS Admin charges shown in Table 2 for 2012 and 2013? What is the actual SSS Admin charge revenue for 2012 and what is the forecast amount for 2013?
- c) Please explain the significant reduction in Late Payment Charges between 2012 and 2013 despite bad debt expenses remaining stable over these two years.
- d) Please provide the 2011 and 2012 amounts included in Late Payment Charges associated with the large customer noted on page 1 of Exhibit 3, Tab 3, Schedule 2.
- e) What is the difference in the Specific Service Charges shown in Table 2 and the amounts shown in Table 3?
- f) Please provide the most recent year-to-date revenues for 2013 in the same level of detail as shown in Table 2. Please also provide the year-to-date revenues for the corresponding period in 2012 in the same level of detail.
- g) Please explain why there is no gain on disposition of property forecast for 2013 given that Collus PowerStream is replacing a number of vehicles in 2013. In particular, are the vehicles being replaced in 2013 per the capital expenditure forecast fully depreciated? If not, please provide the remaining net book value of the vehicles being replaced in 2013, along with the expected salvage value of the vehicles being replaced.

- h) Where are the revenues associated with the MicroFit rate class included?
What is the forecast of revenues for 2013?**

EXHIBIT 4 - OPERATING COSTS

4-Energy Probe-23

Ref: Exhibit 4, Tab 1, Schedule 1, page 1 and page 5

- a) What was the smart meter costs charged to OM&A in 2012 as a result of EB-2012-0017 (\$315,000 as indicated on page 1 or \$325,000 as indicated on page 5)?**
- b) Please provide a breakout of the smart meter costs charged to OM&A in 2012, into the years in which the costs were incurred.**
- c) Is the amount included in 2013 OM&A related to the 'on-going' nature of smart meter costs (page 1) the \$240,000 noted on page 5?**

4-Energy Probe-24

Ref: Exhibit 4, Tab 1, Schedule 1, pages 7-9

- a) Please explain the statement that donations in the 2013 Test Year have not yet been determined, along with the statement that Test Year donations made by Collus PowerStream have been included in regulatory OM&A expenses due to their expected nature.**
- b) Table 3 includes \$31,465 in donations for 2013, of which \$9,100 is identified as LEAP funding (page 9). Please provide a breakdown of the remaining \$22,365 and indicate why ratepayers should pay for these donations rather than the shareholders.**
- c) Please confirm that Collus PowerStream has the one-time regulatory costs associated with this application, totaling \$254,394 (Table 2) over 4 years, and not the total regulatory costs of \$366,600, which include ongoing costs. If this cannot be confirmed, please explain why ongoing costs should be amortized.**
- d) Please reconcile the regulatory costs shown in Table 2 with the \$81,000 figure shown in Appendix 2-G in Account 5655.**

4-Energy Probe-25

Ref: Exhibit 4, Tab 1, Schedule 1 & Appendix 2-G

- a) Do the figures shown in Table 1 of Exhibit 4, Tab 1, Schedule 1 and in Appendix 2-G include final actual audited figures for 2012?**
- b) If the response to part (a) is no, please provide an updated Table 1 and Appendix 2-G that incorporate final audited figures for 2012.**

4-Energy Probe-26

Ref: Exhibit 4, Tab 1, Schedule 2

- a) Have any of synergies and cost reductions noted as a result of the PowerStream acquisition of 50% of the shares of Collingwood Utility Services Corp. been reflected in the 2013 revenue requirement? If not, why not? If yes, please provide an estimate of the impact.**
- b) Does Collus PowerStream have an estimate of the savings in years beyond 2013? If yes, please provide the details.**
- c) What costs have been incurred in 2012 and/or in 2013 as a result of the acquisition by PowerStream of 50% of the shares of Collingwood Utility Services Corp. as they relate to the regulated distributor (such as the name change, changes to letterhead, changes to bills, etc.)?**
- d) If any of the costs identified in part (b) above are included in the Collus PowerStream OM&A in 2012 or 2013, please quantify the amounts included in each year and provide a breakdown of the expenses.**

4-Energy Probe-27

Ref: Exhibit 4, Tab 4, Schedule 2

- a) Please explain the cost driver for Operations in Table 1(a) that talks about the focus shift from water to power business.**
- b) Please explain the cost driver for Administrative & General in Table 1(a) that states the movement to new depreciation approach - work associated with analysis for new system inputs. Why would this not be considered a one-time cost?**

- c) Under the Total area, the explanation includes a statement of inflation running at approximately 2-3%. Please provide a table that shows the percentage increases in inflation as measured by the GDP IPI FDD, the unionized staff wage increases and the non-union staff wage increases for each of 2009 through 2012 on an actual basis and the forecasts for 2013.

4-Energy Probe-28

Ref: Exhibit 4, Tab 4, Schedule 3

- a) What is the relationship between the \$72,000 noted on line 7 and the \$172,800 shown in Table 1?
- b) Please provide more detail on the rent charged directly to OM&A. In particular, what is being rented and from whom is it being rented?

4-Energy Probe-29

Ref: Exhibit 4, Tab 4, Schedule 4

- a) Please explain why Collus PowerStream incurred any costs in 2012 related to the 50% share transaction with PowerStream and the parent company of Collus PowerStream.
- b) Please provide the total costs included in the 2012 OM&A of \$4,843,305 associated with the 50% share transaction with PowerStream. Please also provide a breakdown of these costs.
- c) Would the costs associated with the 50% share transaction with PowerStream be considered a one-time cost to Collus PowerStream? If not, please explain why not.
- d) Please provide the cost in 2012 associated with the buy out/early retirement for a former senior employee. Has Collus PowerStream had any similar costs in 2009 through 2011? If yes, please quantify by year. Are any similar costs forecast for 2013? If yes, please quantify.
- e) If not included in the response to part (b) above, please provide the 2012 costs paid to Solutions for additional services they provided on the transaction.

- f) If not included in the response to part (b) above, please provide the additional 2012 costs associated with the audit associated with the share acquisition.**
- g) Does Collus PowerStream expect to issue any new debt in 2013? If no, please provide the additional legal cost incurred in 2012 associated with the review of the Infrastructure Ontario loan.**
- h) Please indicate the level of legal costs incurred in 2012 associated with the PowerStream share transaction if these costs are not included in the response to part (b) above.**
- i) Please explain the increase forecast for 2013 for load dispatching costs that result from an employee's time now being more fully allocated to work in Collus PowerStream rather than the water affiliate as a direct result of a change in his activities. In particular, please explain how this function was performed before and after the change in activities and why there is an increase in the costs.**

4-Energy Probe-30

Ref: Exhibit 4, Tab 4, Schedule 5

The evidence on page 2 indicates unionized increases of 2.5%, 3.0% and 3.0%, but lists four years (2010 through 2013). Please show the increases applicable to each of 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013.

4-Energy Probe-31

Ref: Exhibit 4, Tab 4, Schedule 5

- a) Does Table 1 reflect actual final data for 2012? If not, please update Table 1 to reflect actual data for 2012.**
- b) Please provide a table for 2009 through 2013 that shows the total incentive paid each year, the total potential incentive available each year and the corresponding ratio of incentive payments to maximum incentives available.**
- c) Please provide the type of performance targets that are used to evaluate the amount of incentive payment available to each of the four categories of employees shown under Variable Compensation in Appendix B.**

4-Energy Probe-32

**Ref: Exhibit 4, Tab 4, Schedule 7 &
Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1 &
RRWF**

The depreciation expense for 2013 found in Table 2 of Exhibit 4, Tab 4, Schedule 7 matches that found in Table 7 of Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1.

- a) Please explain the difference in the depreciation expense of \$946,065 found in Table 7 of Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1 and the expense of \$948,979 found in the RRWF.**
- b) Please explain why in Table 7 of Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1, an amount of \$35,241 is added to the depreciation expense for stranded meters, when stranded meters have been removed from rate base at the end of 2012.**

4-Energy Probe-33

Ref: Exhibit 4, Tab 4, Schedule 8

Please confirm that Collus PowerStream does not have any employees that qualify for the Ontario Apprenticeship tax credit, federal job training tax credit, or the Ontario Co-op Education tax credit. If this cannot be confirmed, please provide the number of employees that qualify for each credit in 2013.

4-Energy Probe-34

Ref: Exhibit 4, Tab 6, Schedule 1

Has Collus PowerStream included any costs associated with the Board of Directors of any of the corporations shown in the diagram on page 1? If yes, please quantify and explain the basis upon which those costs are allocated to the associated companies.

EXHIBIT 5 - COST OF CAPITAL AND RATE OF RETURN

5-Energy Probe-35

Ref: Exhibit 5, Tab 1, Schedule 1

- a) Please confirm that the Board's Cost of Capital Parameter Updates for 2013 Cost of Service Applications letter issued on February 14, 2013 is applicable for the 2013 COS application of Collus PowerStream.**
- b) Please indicate why Collus PowerStream "will update for the most current approved cost of capital parameters" prior to the finalization of the Tariff of Rates and Charges?**
- c) Please explain the difference in the long-term debt rate for 2013 shown in Table 1 of 4.12% and the figure of 4.05% shown in Tables 2 and 3.**

5-Energy Probe-36

Ref: Exhibit 5, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Appendix A

- a) Please confirm that Collus PowerStream has the right to repay the promissory note from the Town of Collingwood (principal and accrued interest) at any time.**
- b) Has Collus PowerStream investigated replacing the Town of Collingwood promissory note with a lower cost loan from a third party? If not, why not? If yes, please provide details of available replacement financing and indicate why Collus PowerStream has not opted to replace the promissory note.**

EXHIBIT 8 - RATE DESIGN

8-Energy Probe-37

Ref: Exhibit 8, Tab 1, Schedule 2

Please explain why Collus PowerStream is not proposing to raise the USL monthly service charge to the floor value of \$0.46, as shown in Table 2.

8-Energy Probe-38

Ref: Exhibit 8, Tab 1, Schedule 8

Please update Table 1 to include actual data for 2012. Please also calculate the 5-year average using data from 2008 through 2012.

EXHIBIT 9 - DEFERRAL AND VARIANCE ACCOUNTS

9-Energy Probe-39

Ref: Exhibit 9, Tab 1, Schedule 1

- a) Was Account 1508 - sub-account Pension Contributions created by a generic OEB order or was there a specific account order for Collus PowerStream?**
- b) What were the carrying charges that would have been recovered if Collus PowerStream had sought recovery of the Pension Contributions sub-account of account 1508 at its last COS rebasing application for 2009 rates?**
- c) Why does Collus PowerStream believe that it should recover the 2011 costs related to the transition to IFRS now rather than waiting to recover all costs (including those incurred in 2012) when it actually converts to IFRS?**
- d) Please provide Table 4 expanded to include actual 2012 costs associated with the transition to IFRS. Does Collus PowerStream expect to incur any further transition costs in 2013? If yes, please detail.**

9-Energy Probe-40

**Ref: Exhibit 9, Tab 1, Schedule 1 &
Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1**

- a) Please show the calculation of the depreciation expense that is implicitly used in the calculation of the accumulated depreciation figures shown in Table 10 of Exhibit 9, Tab 1, Schedule 1 for each of the years shown.**
- b) Table 3 of Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1 indicates that meters were depreciated over a 15 year period. Tables 4-6 of the same exhibit shows that when the meters were transferred to stranded meters, the depreciation period changed from 15 years to 25 years. Please confirm that this was the case.**

- c) **Please reconcile the difference in accumulated depreciation for each of 2009 through 2012 in Table 10 of Exhibit 9, Tab 1, Schedule 1 with the depreciation expense shown in Tables 3-6 in Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1.**
- d) **What depreciation rate (or years) has Collus PowerStream used to depreciate the stranded meters in 2013?**
- e) **What is the decrease in the NBV of the stranded meters for each month beyond August 31, 2013?**

9-Energy Probe-41

**Ref: Exhibit 9, Tab 1, Schedule 1 &
Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1**

- a) **Please provide more details on the requested new sub-account for account 1555 to capture the remaining net book value of older smart meters that need to be replaced due to new technical requirements.**
- b) **When were these older smart meters replaced? Please provide a table that shows the NBV by year of replacement both historically and, if applicable, in the 2013 test year.**
- c) **If any of these older smart meters were replaced prior to the end of 2012, have these meters been removed from rate base? If so, please reconcile with no disposals shown for smart meters in Table 6 of Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1 for 2012 or for meters in previous years.**
- d) **If any of these older smart meters are forecast to be replaced in 2013, have these meters been removed from rate base in the test year? If so, please reconcile with no disposals shown for smart meters in Table 7 of Exhibit 2, Tab 2, Schedule 1 for 2013.**