EB-2013-0321

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF the *Ontario Energy Board Act 1998*, Schedule B to the *Energy Competition Act*, 1998, S.O. 1998, c.15;

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Application Ontario Power Generation Inc. for an order or orders approving payment amounts for prescribed generating facilities commencing January 1, 2014.

SCHOOL ENERGY COALITION CROSS-EXAMINATION COMPENDIUM
(Panel 2 – Hydro/Energy Markets Panel – OM&A)

Jay Shepherd P.C.
2300 Yonge Street, Suite 806
Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4

Jay Shepherd
Mark Rubenstein
Tel: 416-483-3300
Fax: 416-483-3305

Counsel to the School Energy Coalition

AMPCO Interrogatory #036

Ref: Exhibit F1, tab 1, Schedule 1, Page 5

Issue Number: 6.2
Issue: Is the benchmarking methodology reasonable? Are the benchmarking results and targets flowing from those results for the regulated hydroelectric facilities reasonable?

Interrogatory

a) Please include 2013 Target and/or 2013 Actual in the charts 1a, 1b, Chart 2c and Chart 2d.

b) Page 18 – Chart 4 -Please provide the unit energy cost for 2012.

c) Page 18 –Chart 4 – Please explain why SAB II has moved from Q1 in 2009 to Q2 in 2011.

d) Page 18 – Chart 4 – Please explain why SAB I moved from the lower range of Q4 in 2009 to the upper range of Q4 in 2011.

e) Page 9 – please explain why the combined (total Hydroelectric) plant met the AIR targets in 2010 and 2012 but not in 2011.

Response

a) As requested, Ex. F1-1-1, Charts 1a, 1b, 2c, and 2d, updated for 2013 actuals, are attached below.

b) The requested 2012 Unit Energy Costs ("UEC") are attached below in an update to Ex. F1-1-1, Chart 4.

c) Navigant Consulting uses a methodology that applies currency exchange rates and regional wage adjustments to costs reported to them in Canadian dollars. hile in 2011 SAB II UEC moved from Q1 to Q2, this was mainly due to the Canadian dollar increasing in value over these two years (+18.6%). The currency exchange impact was partially offset by a regional wage adjustment that resulted in a net increase of +11.4%. Over these two years, the underlying UEC in Canadian dollars went up by only 5.6% which was very much in line with the increases in the median and average costs for this peer group. SAB II placed #8 among 27 plants in the peer group. The station's 2011 UEC was about 1% higher than the last plant in Q1.

d) The main contributing factor was a stronger Canadian dollar (same as for SAB II above). The other major factor affecting SAB I is the fact that SAB I is adjacent to SAB II but its generators are older and less efficient than those at SAB II. Consequently, SAB II generators get dispatch priority and SAB I only gets water in excess of SAB II capacity. Compared to 2009, SAB I generated 15% less energy in 2011 which increased its UEC.

Witness Panel: Hydro / Energy Markets

e) AIR targets are determined based upon the results of the top quartile of participating companies in the Canadian Electricity Association. The 2011 AIR target of 1.54 was very aggressive compared to the 2010 target of 2.50 and the 2012 target of 1.66. Although Hydroelectric experienced a year-over-year reduction in incidents from 2010 to 2011, it was unable to meet the target of 1.54 when normalized by injuries per 200 000 hours.

Ex. F1-1-1, Chart 1a (Updated for 2013 Actuals)
Regulated Hydroelectric Facilities – History and Targets for Availability (%)

Station/ Group Name	2010 Target	2010 Actual	2011 Target	2011 Actual	2012 Target	2012 Actual	2013 Target	2013 Actual
DeCew Falls GS No. 2	90.2	95.9	94.6	96.9	95.4	95.1	89.9	73.8
Sir Adam Beck 1 GS	79.3	82.8	83.5	84.2	80.5	78.2	89.3	86.4
Sir Adam Beck 2 GS	94.3	95.4	95.6	95.5	96.7	95.3	95.0	95.3
Sir Adam Beck Pump GS	82.3	95.8	79.8	78.4	80.6	92.6	73.6	82.1
R.H. Saunders GS	93.7	93.8	89.1	90.1	93.7	93.2	93.8	93.9
Niagara & Saunders	**89.9**	**92.8**	**89.4**	**89.7**	**90.9**	**91.4**	**90.7**	**90.8**
Abitibi Canyon GS	82.3	79.7	91.3	87.1	92.7	94.9	89.1	95.9
Lower Notch GS	94.8	85.4	94.0	94.2	81.8	81.0	90.5	97.0
Otter Rapids GS	93.3	95.2	93.3	92.3	93.3	94.2	91.7	94.9
Northeast PG	**88.6**	**86.4**	**92.5**	**90.3**	**90.9**	**92.2**	**90.3**	**95.7**
Aguasabon GS	95.5	94.0	92.1	94.5	93.4	91.8	84.6	51.3
Alexander GS	88.8	84.5	90.6	90.5	92.3	91.8	94.5	99.1
Cameron Falls GS	97.6	96.6	94.8	94.1	97.7	98.9	97.5	99.1
Caribou Falls GS	91.9	99.1	95.1	92.7	93.0	96.6	90.5	86.5
Kakabeka Falls GS	89.9	93.3	91.2	92.3	96.8	93.8	95.8	94.4
Manitou Falls GS	96.7	97.0	92.1	96.3	96.3	95.0	95.6	94.9
Pine Portage GS	92.2	97.2	97.3	97.2	86.8	88.5	81.6	84.6
Silver Falls GS	93.5	97.4	82.1	85.0	93.8	89.4	91.1	94.1
Whitedog GS	87.9	82.2	86.9	84.8	90.7	84.0	98.8	96.3
Northwest PG	**93.0**	**93.4**	**92.5**	**92.8**	**93.9**	**93.2**	**93.3**	**91.9**
Arnprior GS	85.4	97.0	82.1	77.8	76.6	74.3	93.9	96.4
Barrett Chute GS	82.8	96.2	80.3	85.5	83.5	79.1	87.4	84.2
Chats Falls GS	88.8	87.3	93.2	93.3	91.5	91.2	92.1	92.9
Chenaux GS	93.8	93.8	93.2	94.0	89.1	89.8	92.7	92.3
Des Joachims GS	92.3	91.3	91.7	92.0	91.9	92.0	89.4	89.7
Mountain Chute GS	67.4	56.8	59.8	67.4	70.3	70.5	75.2	85.6
Otto Holden GS	91.0	93.4	95.0	95.2	91.9	92.4	93.8	92.7
Stewartville GS	88.5	95.8	93.7	96.5	86.8	90.6	91.4	89.3
Otaawa St. Lawrence PG	**89.0**	**91.1**	**90.2**	**91.4**	**88.4**	**88.6**	**90.9**	**90.2**
Newly reg. - large plants	**90.5**	**91.4**	**91.3**	**91.8**	**90.8**	**90.7**	**91.7**	**91.8**
CHPG - small plants			**87.7**	**87.9**	**89.8**	**87.6**	**89.8**	**86.4**

Note: High availability factor is good.

Ex. F1-1-1, Chart 1b (Updated for 2013 Actuals)
Regulated Hydroelectric Facilities – History and Targets for EFOR (%)

Station/ Group Name	2010 Target	2010 Actual	2011 Target	2011 Actual	2012 Target	2012 Actual	2013 Target	2013 Actual
DeCew Falls GS No. 2	2.6	0.2	1.0	0.1	0.8	2.8	0.7	0.2
Sir Adam Beck 1 GS	3.5	0.6	3.1	1.0	3.1	6.9	3.3	3.4
Sir Adam Beck 2 GS	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.1
Sir Adam Beck Pump GS	4.8	1.2	5.1	11.3	5.1	6.9	6.7	1.7
R.H. Saunders GS	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.6	0.7
Niagara & Saunders	**1.3**	**0.3**	**1.1**	**1.2**	**1.2**	**2.1**	**1.4**	**1.0**
Abitibi Canyon GS	2.7	3.9	3.3	1.4	3.4	1.4	3.4	0.6
Lower Notch GS	2.9	23.0	2.4	3.1	3.3	0.1	4.3	0.2
Otter Rapids GS	2.6	4.1	2.8	4.9	2.9	1.3	4.2	1.0
Northeast PG	**2.7**	**7.3**	**3.0**	**2.9**	**3.2**	**1.2**	**3.8**	**0.7**
Aguasabon GS	0.6	1.2	1.0	0.2	1.1	0.8	1.7	42.3
Alexander GS	0.5	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.0
Cameron Falls GS	1.0	0.6	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.4	1.0	0.2
Caribou Falls GS	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.7	11.5
Kakabeka Falls GS	1.8	3.0	1.7	0.5	1.7	1.3	2.2	1.2
Manitou Falls GS	0.7	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.9	2.4
Pine Portage GS	0.5	0.1	0.4	2.1	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.5
Silver Falls GS	0.4	1.0	0.3	0.6	0.3	1.5	0.6	0.0
Whitedog GS	0.8	1.8	0.5	1.8	0.5	10.3	1.1	0.1
Northwest PG	**1.0**	**0.8**	**1.0**	**0.9**	**1.0**	**1.3**	**1.0**	**4.0**
Arnprior GS	2.5	1.1	1.3	0.0	1.4	7.3	2.1	1.5
Barrett Chute GS	11.7	2.7	6.5	8.0	3.0	8.8	4.7	4.1
Chats Falls GS	3.1	0.8	1.5	0.7	1.2	1.4	1.7	0.4
Chenaux GS	1.4	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.6	0.1	0.6	0.3
Des Joachims GS	0.9	1.0	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.6
Mountain Chute GS	13.9	41.6	9.4	1.0	5.0	3.7	8.1	8.0
Otto Holden GS	0.9	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.7	0.4
Stewartville GS	5.8	6.3	2.5	0.9	3.0	2.5	4.2	4.4
Otaawa St. Lawrence PG	**2.6**	**2.5**	**3.5**	**0.8**	**2.4**	**1.2**	**3.5**	**1.4**
Newly reg. - large plants	**1.9**	**2.4**	**2.4**	**1.1**	**1.8**	**1.3**	**2.6**	**2.2**
CHPG - small plants			**4.3**	**3.4**	**3.4**	**5.2**	**3.4**	**8.1**

Note: Low EFOR is good.

Ex. F1-1-1, Chart 2c (Updated for 2013 Actuals)
OM&A Unit Energy Cost Targets ($/MWh)

Plant Group	2010 Target	2010 Actual	2011 Target	2011 Actual	2012 Target	2012 Actual	2013 Target	2013 Actual	2014 Target	2015 Target
Niagara Plant Group	4.1	4.0	4.7	3.2	4.1	4.8	5.2	4.5	5.2	4.5
Saunders GS	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.8	2.4	3.4	3.1	3.5	3.8
Total - Niagara and Saunders	3.5	3.4	4.0	2.9	3.6	4.0	4.6	4.0	4.6	4.3
Ottawa-St.Lawrence Plant Group	7.6	8.7	8.5	7.5	8.2	8.8	8.1	7.1	8.2	10.0
Central Hydro Plant Group	53.5	45.4	53.1	52.3	48.0	50.5	52.8	42.9	64.6	58.1
Northeast Plant Group	12.5	20.9	9.4	11.9	10.9	12.0	11.3	12.1	12.8	12.0
Northwest Plant Group	8.1	13.9	8.4	10.4	7.9	9.7	7.6	9.2	8.2	8.1
Total - Newly Regulated	10.6	14.0	10.5	11.1	10.4	11.3	10.4	10.2	11.1	11.7

Note: Above OM&A Unit Energy costs are consistent with OEB filing guidelines: SBG, NYPA water transactions, and related Gross Revenue Charge are excluded from the target levels. Northwest PG 2010 OM&A costs include a $11.3M First Nations settlement provision, and $9M of shoreline remediation projects for other First Nations. Niagara PG 2011 OM&A cost include an extraordinary credit of $19.0M related to the reversal of a provision for the environmental cleanup of Lake Gibson (DeCew Falls GS).

Ex. F1-1-1, Chart 2d (Updated for 2013 Actuals)
All Injury Rate (number of medical treatment injuries / 200,000 hours worked)

Plant Group	2010		2011		2012		2013-2015	2013
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
Niagara	2.50	0.96	1.54	0.00	1.66	1.01	1.56	0.54
Ottawa St. Lawrence (incl. Saunders)	2.50	1.30	1.54	2.52	1.66	1.28	1.56	1.81
Northeast	2.50	1.51	1.54	3.31	1.66	2.49	1.56	1.56
Northwest	2.50	5.78	1.54	1.60	1.66	1.65	1.56	3.51
Central Hydro	2.50	2.00	1.54	0.91	1.66	0.00	1.56	5.00
Hydro Total	2.50	1.98	1.54	1.78	1.66	1.40	1.56	1.92

Note: The above AIR statistics are Plant Group totals that include both regulated and unregulated stations.

Ex. F1-1-1, Chart 4 (Updated for 2012)
Navigant Consulting Hydroelectric Benchmarking Results (USD/MWh)

Station/Group Name	2009	2010	2011	2012	2012 Quartile	Peer Group (Navigant 2012 data)
DeCew Falls I	Not Available (outage all 2009)	Not Available (outage all 2010)	50.7 (Q4)	25.9 (Q4)	Q4: 24.5 to 88.1	40 micro plants (< 30 MW)
DeCew Falls II	3.3 (Q1)	3.0 (Q1)	3.1 (Q1)	4.8 (Q1)	Q1: 2.1 to 5.2	54 small plants (30 to 150 MW)
SAB I	6.5 (Q4)	8.0 (Q4)	9.1 (Q4)	8.3 (Q4)	Q4: 5.6 to 8.9	13 med-large plants (400 to 700 MW)
SAB II	1.7 (Q1)	1.96 (Q1)	2.0 (Q2)	2.3 (Q2)	Q2: 2.1 to 2.7	27 large plants (700 MW or more)
SAB PGS	65.2 (Q4)	90.1 (Q4)	128.2 (Q4)	94.0 (Q4)	Q4: 24.7 to 281	15 PGS plants
Saunders	2.2 (Q2)	2.65 (Q2/3)	2.4 (Q2)	2.5 (Q2)	Q2: 2.1 to 2.7	27 large plants (700 MW or more)
OPG plants (excl. PGS)	2.4 (Q1)	2.76 (Q1)	2.9 (Q1)	3.1 (Q1)	Q1: 0.6 to 4.1	186 plants
OPG plants (incl. PGS)	2.8 (Q1)	3.2 (Q1)	3.4 (Q1)	3.6 (Q1)	Q1: 0.6 to 4.3	212 plants

Notes:

- The above energy costs exclude: gross revenue charges, water rental fees, and capital and OM&A investment costs. Hydro common cost and corporate allocations are included
- Plant labour costs are normalized to US rates using Regional Wage Adjusters for skilled Trades.
- The costs are expresses in US dollars using International Monetary Fund report (International Financial Statistics). The following factors have been applied to 2009 = 0.85631, 2010 = 0.96562, 2011 = 1.01516, 2012 = 0.99907
- In 2009 and 2010 DeCew Falls I was out of service. In these years, it is excluded from composite indices (OPG index)

SEC Interrogatory #084

Ref: F1/1/1/p.12

Issue Number: 6.2
Issue: Is the benchmarking methodology reasonable? Are the benchmarking results and targets flowing from those results for the regulated hydroelectric facilities reasonable?

Interrogatory

Please provide copies of all documents, reports, presentations, and any other analysis for hydroelectric benchmarking undertaken by OPG, including without limitation those conducted by:
(a) EUCG Inc.
(b) Navigant Consulting (GKS Hydro Benchmarking)
(c) Canadian Electrical Association ("CEA")

Response

OPG does not have any benchmarking reports prepared specific to OPG's hydroelectric facilities by third parties as contemplated by this interrogatory. OPG conducts benchmarking specific to its hydroelectric facilities using data provided confidentially by these parties. The result of this work is reflected in OPG's evidence.

One of the most important factors in successful benchmarking is the ability to collect significant number of data points (plants) to ensure conclusions derived from the data are representative. OPG's participation in EUCG, Navigant and CEA benchmarking programs ensures comparisons with a broad representative population and data. All three organizations extensively vet the data submitted by utilities for consistency, continuity and reasonableness.

Additional value of participation in the programs comes from interfacing with other utilities at annual or semiannual meetings. It not only allows for better insight into the reported numbers, but also for comparing maintenance or operational best practices that may be applicable to their utilities to reduce costs and/or improve reliability.

The following is additional information to what has already been provided respecting the benchmarks provided by OPG in the Ex. F1-1-1 evidence:

- We have shown costs at the top level of aggregation (i.e., total OM&A) since accuracy is generally better when costs are aggregated at the higher levels (due to allocations required for the more granular analyses), and total OM&A cost best correlates to electricity rates and overall cost metrics used by most utilities. Notwithstanding this, OPG also examines subcategories of total OMA such as operations, maintenance, and administration.

Witness Panel: Hydro / Energy Markets

- We have presented costs per unit of energy because this cost is most closely linked to electricity rates.

- We have excluded Gross Revenue Charge and water rental fees as these costs are not under OPG control, are not applicable in other jurisdictions, vary with production, and would overshadow controllable costs.

- In Chart 4, we created "OPG data points" by combining appropriate costs for all six or five OPG plants and dividing it by the sum of MWh generation, to provide overall comparisons. This is consistent with the past two applications.

- We have used availability factor ("AF") and equivalent forced outage rates ("EFOR") to rank reliability of OPG plants. The reason is that these are standard measures used in the industry.

- Since there are often "trade offs" between cost efficiency and reliability performance, we have prepared Chart 6 from the data. This shows OPGs previously and newly regulated plants in availability versus cost quadrants (four quadrants are created by appropriate medians).

- With regard to employee safety, we have shown standard Canadian industry safety measures: All Injury Rate ("AIR") and Accident Severity Rate ("ASR") (from CEA Incident Statistics Report).

CCC Interrogatory #017

Ref: Ex. F1/T1/S1/Table 1

Issue Number: 6.1
Issue: Is the test period Operations, Maintenance and Administration budget for the regulated hydroelectric facilities appropriate?

Interrogatory

Please complete Table I by providing forecast costs for 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013.

Response

See revised F1-1-1 Table 1 below.

Table 1 (Revised for CCC Interrogatory #17)
Operating Costs Summary - Previously Regulated Hydroelectric ($M)

Line No.	Cost Item	2010 Budget	2010 Actual	2011 Board Approved	2011 Actual	2012 Board Approved	2012 Actual	2013 Budget	2014 Plan	2015 Plan
		(aa)	(a)	(bb)	(b)	(cc)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
	OM&A:									
1	**Base OM&A**[1]	61.8	59.4	68.7	50.1	62.2	60.2	71.9	74.6	68.6
2	**Project OM&A**	5.3	5.4	9.7	6.6	10.0	13.6	13.0	13.5	17.9
3	**Allocation of Corporate Costs**	25.1	22.4	24.8	22.0	26.3	24.5	29.7	29.8	26.9
4	**Allocation of Centrally Held Costs**	20.3	19.6	22.9	15.9	25.5	19.6	25.1	26.1	26.0
5	**Asset Service Fee**	2.0	2.1	2.1	1.6	2.0	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.7
6	**Total OM&A**	114.4	108.8	128.2	96.3	125.9	119.7	141.3	145.5	141.1
7	**Gross Revenue Charge**	257.2	252.2	263.7	259.4	263.7	244.5	243.5	253.3	269.5
	Other Operating Cost Items:									
8	**Depreciation and Amortization**	N/A	63.5	N/A	65.6	N/A	70.0	79.0	82.1	81.9
9	**Income Tax**	N/A	29.9	N/A	33.4	N/A	32.3	(0.7)	48.5	61.5
10	**Capital Tax**	N/A	2.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
11	**Property Tax**	N/A	0.1	N/A	0.2	N/A	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3
12	**Total Operating Costs**	N/A	457.4	N/A	454.9	N/A	466.6	463.5	529.5	554.4

Notes:
1 2011 Actual Base OM&A cost includes an extraordinary credit of $19.0M in Niagara Plant Group related to the reversal of a provision for the environmental cleanup of Lake Gibson (DeCew Falls GS).

Witness Panel: Hydro / Energy Markets

CCC Interrogatory #018

Ref: Ex. F1/T1/S1/Table 2

Issue Number: 6.1
Issue: Is the test period Operations, Maintenance and Administration budget for the regulated hydroelectric facilities appropriate?

Interrogatory

Please complete Table 2 by providing forecast costs for 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013.

Response

See revised F1-1-1 Table 2 below.

Table 2 (revised for CCC Interrogatory #18)
Operating Costs Summary - Newly Regulated Hydroelectric ($M)

Line No.	Cost Item	2010 Budget	2010 Actual	2011 Budget	2011 Actual	2012 Budget	2012 Actual	2013 Budget	2014 Plan	2015 Plan
		(aa)	(a)	(bb)	(b)	(cc)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
	OM&A:									
1	**Base OM&A**	93.7	100.0	103.7	106.0	108.8	102.9	113.2	113.4	113.7
2	**Project OM&A**	37.1	39.8	27.3	21.6	20.6	20.3	16.0	24.5	32.1
3	**Allocation of Corporate Costs**	N/A	31.4	N/A	32.3	N/A	36.6	38.8	42.1	39.6
4	**Allocation of Centrally Held Costs**	N/A	19.0	N/A	25.1	N/A	33.1	47.2	49.6	48.7
5	**Asset Service Fee**	N/A	3.6	N/A	3.4	N/A	3.3	3.1	2.9	3.0
6	**Total OM&A**	N/A	193.8	N/A	188.4	N/A	196.2	218.2	232.5	237.2
7	**Gross Revenue Charge**	73.8	54.9	74.9	67.7	74.9	65.6	75.6	75.6	77.5
	Other Operating Cost Items:									
8	**Depreciation and Amortization**	N/A	58.3	N/A	58.0	N/A	58.6	61.4	62.2	63.1
9	**Income Tax**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	31.4	43.2
10	**Capital Tax**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
11	**Property Tax**	N/A	0.2	N/A	0.2	N/A	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
12	**Total Operating Costs**	N/A	307.2	N/A	314.3	N/A	320.6	355.5	401.9	421.2

Witness Panel: Hydro / Energy Markets

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Table 15

Operating Costs Summary - Previously Regulated Hydroelectric ($M)

Line No.	Cost Item	2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Actual	2013 Actual	2014 Plan	2015 Plan
		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
	OM&A:						
1	**Base OM&A**[1]	59.4	50.1	60.2	61.6	74.6	68.6
2	**Project OM&A**	5.4	6.6	13.6	14.7	13.5	17.9
3	**Allocation of Corporate Costs**	22.4	22.0	24.5	26.1	29.8	26.9
4	**Allocation of Centrally Held Costs**	19.6	15.9	19.6	20.7	26.1	26.0
5	**Asset Service Fee**	2.1	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.7
6	**Total OM&A**	108.8	96.3	119.7	124.7	145.5	141.1
7	**Gross Revenue Charge**	252.2	259.4	244.5	249.5	253.3	269.5
	Other Operating Cost Items:						
8	**Depreciation and Amortization**[2]	63.5	65.6	70.0	80.5	82.1	81.9
9	**Income Tax**	29.9	33.4	32.3	(0.1)	48.5	61.5
10	**Capital Tax**	2.8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
11	**Property Tax**	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3
12	**Total Operating Costs**	457.4	454.9	466.6	454.7	529.5	554.4

Notes:

1 2011 Actual Base OM&A cost includes an extraordinary credit of $19.0M in Niagara Plant Group related to the reversal of a provision for the environmental cleanup of Lake Gibson (DeCew Falls GS).

2 From Ex. L-01.0.1 Staff-002, Attachment 1, Table 27, line 5.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Table 16

Operating Costs Summary - Newly Regulated Hydroelectric ($M)

Line No.	Cost Item	2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Actual	2013 Actual	2014 Plan	2015 Plan
		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
	OM&A:						
1	**Base OM&A**	100.0	106.0	102.9	103.5	113.4	113.7
2	**Project OM&A**	39.8	21.6	20.3	23.1	24.5	32.1
3	**Allocation of Corporate Costs**	31.4	32.3	36.6	35.2	42.1	39.6
4	**Allocation of Centrally Held Costs**	19.0	25.1	33.1	31.8	49.6	48.7
5	**Asset Service Fee**	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.0	2.9	3.0
6	**Total OM&A**	193.8	188.4	196.2	196.6	232.5	237.2
7	**Gross Revenue Charge**	54.9	67.7	65.6	75.4	75.6	77.5
	Other Operating Cost Items:						
8	**Depreciation and Amortization**[1]	58.3	58.0	58.6	59.0	62.2	63.1
9	**Income Tax**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	31.4	43.2
10	**Capital Tax**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
11	**Property Tax**	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
12	**Total Operating Costs**	307.2	314.3	320.6	331.3	401.9	421.2

Notes:

1 From Ex. L-01.0.1 Staff-002, Attachment 1, Table 27, line 11.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Filed: 2014-03-19
EB-2013-0321
Exhibit L
Tab 1.0
Schedule 1 Staff-002
Attachment 1
Table 17

Table 17

Base OM&A - Previously Regulated Hydroelectric and Newly Regulated Hydroelectric ($M)

Line No.	Item	2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Actual	2013 Actual	2014 Plan	2015 Plan
		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
	Base OM&A:						
	Niagara Plant Group and Saunders GS:						
1	**Niagara Plant Group**[1]	44.3	33.7	45.4	46.1	56.8	50.4
2	**Saunders GS**	15.1	16.4	14.8	15.5	17.8	18.1
3	**Subtotal**	59.4	50.1	60.2	61.6	74.6	68.6
	Newly Regulated Hydroelectric:						
4	**Ottawa-St.Lawrence Plant Group**[2]	30.2	34.4	32.8	35.5	37.8	37.6
5	**Central Hydro Plant Group**	18.9	22.4	21.1	20.8	24.2	24.7
6	**Northeast Plant Group**	19.0	21.3	21.9	23.3	23.8	23.6
7	**Northwest Plant Group**	31.8	27.9	27.2	24.0	27.5	27.8
8	**Subtotal**	100.0	106.0	102.9	103.5	113.4	113.7
9	**Total Base OM&A**	159.4	156.1	163.1	165.2	188.0	182.3
	OM&A Labour:[3]						
	Niagara Plant Group and Saunders GS:						
10	**Niagara Plant Group**	27.6	30.7	31.7	32.1	36.1	35.5
11	**Saunders GS**	8.7	9.3	9.6	9.8	10.8	11.0
12	**Subtotal**	36.3	40.0	41.3	41.9	46.9	46.5
	Newly Regulated Hydroelectric:						
13	**Ottawa-St.Lawrence Plant Group**[2]	17.2	19.3	20.3	22.6	24.9	24.3
14	**Central Hydro Plant Group**	11.9	13.0	13.7	14.2	16.5	16.7
15	**Northeast Plant Group**	11.8	13.3	14.2	15.5	16.8	16.2
16	**Northwest Plant Group**	12.2	14.3	15.7	15.5	18.8	18.6
17	**Subtotal**	53.0	60.0	63.9	67.9	76.9	75.9
18	**Total OM&A Labour**	89.3	100.0	105.1	109.8	123.8	122.4

Notes:

1 Niagara Plant Group 2011 Actual costs include an extraordinary credit of $19M related to the reversal of a provision for the environmental cleanup of Lake Gibson (DeCew Falls GS).

2 Ottawa-St. Lawrence Plant Group values are for the balance of the Plant Group, i.e. Saunders GS costs are excluded.

3 Labour expense is included in Base OM&A.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Table 18

Project OM&A - Previously Regulated Hydroelectric and Newly Regulated Hydroelectric ($M)

Line No.	Prescribed Facility	2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Actual	2013 Actual	2014 Plan	2015 Plan
		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
	Niagara Plant Group and Saunders GS:						
1	**Niagara Plant Group**	4.9	6.2	12.4	10.2	9.3	11.0
2	**Saunders GS**	0.4	0.4	1.2	4.5	4.2	7.0
3	**Subtotal**	5.4	6.6	13.6	14.7	13.5	17.9
	Newly Regulated Hydroelectric:						
4	**Ottawa-St.Lawrence Plant Group**[1]	10.6	8.5	12.0	9.2	9.0	19.0
5	**Central Hydro Plant Group**	3.1	4.1	1.2	2.6	4.2	4.0
6	**Northeast Plant Group**	10.9	2.6	1.9	4.3	7.8	6.0
7	**Northwest Plant Group**	15.2	6.5	5.3	6.9	3.5	3.2
8	**Subtotal**	39.8	21.6	20.3	23.1	24.5	32.1
9	**Total**	45.1	28.2	33.9	37.7	38.0	50.1

Notes:

1 Ottawa-St. Lawrence Plant Group values are for the balance of the Plant Group, i.e. Saunders GS costs are excluded.