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## Andrew Mandyam

Director, Regulatory Affairs and Financial Performance phone: 416-495-6350
fax: (416) 495-6072
Email: andrew.mandyam@enbridge.com

August 19, 2014

Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street
Suite 2700
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms Walli:

## Re: Draft Rate Order, EB-2012-0459 Enbridge Gas Distribution Customized IR Application Reply Submission

On July 17, 2014, the Board issued its EB-2012-0459 Decision and Order (the "Decision") in respect of the Customized Incentive Regulation application by Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. ("Enbridge"). In the Decision, the Board gave directions regarding the Draft Rate Order and Draft Accounting Order (collectively, the "DRO") arising out of the Decision. Among other things, the Decision provided for submissions by parties on the DRO to be filed by August 14, 2014 and a reply by Enbridge to be filed on August 19, 2014.

In the context of its directions regarding the DRO, the Board indicated that Enbridge should file a DRO that would "comprehensively reflect the Board's findings in this decision and allow the decision to be implemented as soon as possible". The Board also indicated that the material filed by Enbridge should allow the Board and parties to verify that "the Board's findings are properly addressed" and the Board stated its expectation that the Final Rate Order and Accounting Order would be available for an October 1, 2014 implementation timeframe. ${ }^{1}$

Two points emerge very clearly from these directions given by the Board in the Decision: first, the intent of the Board's directions is to ensure that the DRO reflects the findings made by the Board in the decision and, second, the Board's expectation is that the Decision will be implemented as soon as possible and, specifically, within an October 1, 2014 implementation timeframe.

[^0]Enbridge has received submissions or comments with respect to the DRO from the following:
(1) Board Staff;
(2) Association of Power Producers of Ontario ("APPrO");
(3) Building Owners and Managers Association Toronto ("BOMA");
(4) Canadian Manufacturers \& Exporters ("CME");
(5) Consumers Council of Canada ("CCC");
(6) Energy Probe Research Foundation ("Energy Probe");
(7) Federation of Rental-housing Providers of Ontario ("FRPO");
(8) School Energy Coalition ("SEC"); and
(9) Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition ("VECC").

In reply to submissions and comments from Board Staff and intervenors, Enbridge will address three main issues. These issues relate to the determination of the cost of debt during each year of the term of the Customized IR plan; the determination of Rider E amounts and the manner and timing of clearance of Rider E; and the annual amounts to be refunded in order to give effect to the Board's findings regarding Site Restoration Costs ("SRC"). Enbridge will address each of these issues under the headings that follow.

## A. Cost of Debt

Board Staff and certain parties ${ }^{2}$ have made submissions about the determination of the cost of debt during each year of the IR term. They submit that the forecast weighted average cost of debt should be determined each year by taking into consideration not only forecast cost rates for forecast debt issuances, but also by taking into account the actual cost rates and the influence of actual levels and timing of debt issuances that have occurred in years prior to the rate application year.

Enbridge submits that the position put forward by these parties is not a realistic reflection of how the Decision can appropriately be implemented. Enbridge must fix the forecast levels and timing of debt issuances at this time in order to match the fixing of forecast rate base levels for five years in accordance with the Decision. Any attempt to mix actual levels of debt and timing of debt issuances (which correlate to actual rate base) with a capital structure that is matched to a forecast level of rate base would result in an unmatched weighted average cost of capital. While, under the Customized IR plan as approved in the Decision, Enbridge will be carrying out an annual, prospective update of Return on Equity ("ROE"), Enbridge will not be determining a forecast ROE that is influenced by actual returns during the previous years of the IR term. The same proposition holds true for the weighted average cost of debt.

[^1]The impact of variances in levels of actual compared to forecast rate base, and actual compared to forecast ROE, along with variances in most other revenues and costs ${ }^{3}$ will be handled through the Earnings Sharing Mechanism approved by the Board and will not be trued up prospectively for ratemaking on an annual basis. The impact of variances in the levels of debt issued, and associated cost rates, should be treated no differently in order for the Decision to be applied consistently.

## B. SRC Refund

In its evidence with respect to SRC, Enbridge proposed a refund to customers of $\$ 259.8$ million and it proposed the annual amount that would be refunded each year from 2014 to 2018. Enbridge's evidence made clear that the annual amounts to be refunded had been determined with a view to reducing the potential impact of a jump in customer bills after the end of the refund period.

In the Decision, the Board required that the SRC refund be increased from $\$ 259.8$ million to $\$ 379.8$ million. ${ }^{4}$ However, the Board did not require any change to Enbridge's proposal that the annual refund amounts be determined with a view to reducing potential bill impact at the end of the refund period, nor did the Board make any finding whatsoever in the Decision suggesting that such a change should be made. Accordingly, in the DRO materials prepared by Enbridge to give effect to the findings in the Decision, "the updated refund amount to be returned each year is based on the same refund profile as the originally filed amount". ${ }^{5}$

In its submission, Board Staff confirms these points and expresses its support for the SRC refund "pattern" put forward by Enbridge. Specifically, Board Staff states that,

In the DRO, Enbridge presented updated SRC amounts in response to the Board's SRC findings. Board staff notes that the 5-year refund pattern is in direct proportion to the profile proposed in its original evidence, as explained in TCU-RO 1.1. Enbridge provided its rationale for the refund profile in its evidence at D1/T5/S1 paragraphs 34 through 37. In essence, the pattern is designed to mitigate rate shock issues at the end of the plan term. Board staff also notes that the Board in its Decision with Reasons did not raise any concerns with Enbridge's original proposed refund pattern.

As such, Board staff has no concerns with Enbridge's proposal. ${ }^{6}$

[^2]Some parties have proposed that the SRC refund profile should be changed to produce what they perceive to be smoother customer bills over the term of the Customized IR plan. SEC, for example, proposes adjustments that are based on an assumption that "the SRC refund is used in a back-loaded way to smooth the bill increases for customers". ${ }^{7}$ SEC's "Comparison of Refund Patterns - Proposed vs. Smoothed" is attached to its submissions.

Underlying SEC's proposal for a change to the SRC refund profile is a notion that the approach proposed by Enbridge will result in a sharp bill decrease for 2014, followed by sharp bill increases in each of the next four years. ${ }^{8}$ In fact, SEC's Comparison of Refund Patterns shows a percentage change in annual Allowed Revenues, not bill impacts. This is confirmed in SEC's submissions, which state that the refund pattern referred to by SEC is "directionally similar to the figures provided by Enbridge", but is "based on changes to revenue requirement, rather than rates". 9

In order to gain some insight into bill impacts, one can look to Enbridge's response to Undertaking TCU-RO 1.8. This evidence reveals that, after the reduction in 2014 to typical customer estimated bill amounts, with SRC credits included, the majority of rate classes do not return to approximate 2013 bill impact levels until 2017. ${ }^{10}$

Energy Probe does not agree with SEC's smoothing conclusions, at least insofar as residential customers are concerned. Energy Probe provides analysis in support of its view that a residential customer will enjoy a reduction from current (2013) rates through rates in 2014, 2015 and 2016 and then, even in 2017, a residential customer will be paying only a small amount more than in $2013 .{ }^{11}$ Further, Energy Probe points out that "changing the SRC refund profile would change a number of factors that determine the revenue requirement" and it expresses its concern about a "significant increase in 2019 following the current customized IR plan of deviating from the SRC refund profile". ${ }^{12}$

It appears that CCC and VECC support the submissions made by SEC with regard to the SRC refund. However, Energy Probe provides analysis to back up its conclusion that it is "better for residential customers" ${ }^{13}$ not to change the SRC refund profile, while CCC and VECC offer no similar analysis, nor even any comment on Energy Probe's analysis. ${ }^{14}$

Enbridge submits that suggestions about changing the profile of the SRC refund should be rejected for a number of reasons. These reasons are set out under the subheadings that follow.

[^3]
## (i) DRO Process

As made clear by the Board in the Decision, the intent of the DRO Process is to verify that the Board's findings are properly addressed. In the Decision, the Board made a finding that required an increase in the SRC refund amount. The Board did not make any finding about a change to the proposed profile for the SRC refund. Enbridge submits that proposals to change the SRC refund profile do not fall within the scope of the DRO process and should be rejected by the Board on that ground alone.

More generally, Enbridge submits that the process for review of a draft rate order is not intended to be an opportunity for a second hearing of issues that were before the Board when a final decision was rendered and neither is the process intended to be a forum for parties to introduce new proposals and ideas that were not addressed in the Board's decision. There can be little doubt that other parties would object if, during a draft order review process, an applicant were to attempt to modify or adjust the proposal that it asked the Board to approve. In this case, for example, it was not open to Enbridge to propose, during the DRO process, a different approach to the SRC refund profile after Enbridge had made a proposal to the Board in that regard and the Decision provided no basis whatsoever for changing that proposal. In short, the DRO review process should give effect to the applicant's evidence and proposals, except where the Board's final decision provides a basis to change or refine what the applicant has put forward.

## (ii) The Decision

Enbridge's proposal for the pattern of the SRC refund was clearly and distinctly based on an effort to avoid a large impact at the end of the refund period and there is nothing in the Decision to suggest that the Board determined or directed that there should be any departure from Enbridge's approach. Enbridge submits that the Decision is effectively an implied approval of Enbridge's approach to the SRC refund pattern. Obviously, a Board decision does not explicitly approve every aspect of the application before the Board: often in matters before the Board, many of the details of an application do not receive explicit mention in a decision. To the extent that a Board decision does not give any basis for changing particular aspects of the applicant's proposals, it is the applicant's evidence to which one must look in order to find the aspects of the applicant's case that have been implicitly approved by the Board. As stated above, the updated refund amounts in the DRO materials are based on the same refund profile as proposed in Enbridge's evidence.

## (iii) Allowed Revenues

As pointed out by Energy Probe, changing the SRC refund profile changes a number of factors that determine "revenue requirement". The response to Undertaking TCU-RO 1.1 indicates that,
...the annual Rider D refund amounts, which represent bill impacts only, do also have an impact and a direct link within the derivation of the allowed revenues and sufficiency/deficiency amounts presented in Appendix A of the Draft Rate Order. If the annual refund/profile amounts were to be altered, it would directly impact the corresponding annual tax deductions, rate base calculations (requiring monthly inputs), and very likely planned debt issuances, all of which would impact forecast capital structures, allowed revenues and sufficiency and deficiency amounts. ${ }^{15}$

Enbridge submits that the Allowed Revenues that Enbridge asked the Board to approve in the Customized IR application can and should be changed only to the extent that any such change flows from the Decision. The DRO process cannot and should not result in a change to Allowed Revenues that was not contemplated by the Decision and that does not flow from the Decision.

## (iv) Timing

The evidence given in the response to Undertaking TCU-RO 1.1 is that changing the proposed profile for the SRC refund would require updating or recalculation of the financial results in Appendix A of the Draft Rate Order, the Rate Handbook in Appendix $B$, the Rider amounts in Appendix $C$, the rate approximations in Appendix $D$ and the planned debt issuances in Appendix H . This evidence goes on to state that performing an update of this magnitude would take significant time and effort and would require the involvement of external resources and that, if a revised refund profile were to be determined, the time required to perform the calculations and produce validated results is estimated to be a minimum of a few weeks. ${ }^{16}$ SEC commented that stakeholders asked Enbridge to provide a table using the assumptions eventually forwarded in SEC's submission. Enbridge declined to provide a quickly thrown together scenario as it would not take into account all of the re-forecasting of required debt issuances through the term and would not properly re-determine Allowed Revenues, which as indicated above would take a much greater time than required within the Decision and would not permit rates to be implemented by October 1, 2014 as further process would likely have to be ordered by the Board in reviewing all of the newly calculated results and forecasts of debt issues, and rate schedule re-works.

Enbridge is mindful of the Board's directions that the DRO should "allow the decision to be implemented as soon as possible" and the Board's expectation that the Final Rate Order and Accounting Order will be available for an October 1, 2014 implementation timeframe. Enbridge submits that, particularly given the Board's expectations regarding implementation of the Decision, it is not appropriate to embark on changes to the SRC refund profile that will entail weeks of work in order to produce validated results, and as such, delay the implementation of new rates beyond October 1, 2014

[^4]
## C. Rider E

## (i) Forecast or Actual Volumes Data for January 1 to September 30, 2014

The 2014 revenue sufficiency resulting from implementation of the Decision is \$62.1 million. This revenue sufficiency represents the difference between revenues at base rates and revenues at 2014 final rates applied to the 2014 Board-approved volume forecast. Given that 2014 final rates are effective January 1, 2014 and will be implemented as of October 1, 2014, Enbridge determined the revenue sufficiency for the period from January 1 to September 30, 2014, again based on the 2014 Boardapproved volume forecast. The revenue sufficiency for this period is $\$ 43.9$ million.

Board Staff and Energy Probe agree with Enbridge's determination of the revenue sufficiency for the period from January 1 to September 30, 2014. Some parties, though, have put forward the notion of using actual volumes to determine the sufficiency for this period.

As stated by Board Staff, "the use of actual volumes, which are not weather normalized, would be counter to the forward test year approach where the revenue requirement and the load forecast is based on a weather normalized forecast." ${ }^{17}$ Further, Board Staff correctly points out that "the approach of calculating adjustments on the basis of a test year forecast is consistent with previous Board decisions in both the natural gas and electricity sector."18

Similarly, Energy Probe notes that "the 2014 rates are based entirely on forecasted volumes" and that "[t]he difference between the approved rates and the interim rates in place over the first months of 2014 should be applied to volumes on the same basis as the new rates were derived". ${ }^{19}$

In the response to TCU-RO 1.5 the Company highlighted that: "...there is no appropriate basis to introduce any actuals into the draft rate order. The volumes could have been lower than the forecast, yet the Rider E would still be developed based on forecast information to align it with the Ontario Energy Board (the "Board") approved rate making principles for utilities (i.e., revenue requirement and rates developed based on a forward looking test year.)"20

SEC submits that actual volumes should be used to determine the level of sufficiency for the January 1 to September 30 period because Enbridge "failed to complete the process for getting new rates in a timely manner." ${ }^{21}$ Enbridge disagrees. As the Board said in the Decision, Enbridge's application for a "Custom IR plan" was the first of its

[^5]kind since the Board issued the Renewed Regulatory Framework for Electricity report. ${ }^{22}$ It was important that the evidence and process for consideration of Enbridge's application be sufficient to allow thorough examination of the issues in the first "Custom IR plan". This is not, by any stretch of the imagination, a reason to depart from established rate-making principles that are based on a prospective test year.

Enbridge submits that the revenue sufficiency of \$43.9 million for the period January 1 to September 30, 2014, which was derived based on the 2014 Board-approved volume forecast, is the appropriate amount to be cleared to customers through Rider E. This approach is aligned with forward test year ratemaking principles for utilities.

## (ii) Clearance of Rider E to Customers

In their submissions parties raise concerns about the manner of, and period for, Rider E clearance. ${ }^{23}$ Specifically, a concern has been expressed that Enbridge's proposal for Rider E clearance could result in "winners and losers". ${ }^{24}$ In its submissions, Energy Probe states that clearing the $\$ 43.9$ million as "[a] one-time rebate to customers based on their actual consumption over the January 2014 through September 2014 period" is "the most appropriate approach." and that such an approach "would be more reflective of individual consumption over the relevant period than basing the rebate on one or three months of future consumption". ${ }^{25}$

Enbridge agrees with the concern that, if the Rider E amount of $\$ 43.9$ million is cleared to customers in the manner originally proposed by Enbridge, the variance between actual volumes and forecast volumes could create "winners and losers". In light of the relatively large amount of the refund and the unpredictability of fall weather, Enbridge agrees that the one month prospective clearance proposed by Enbridge is not the most appropriate approach in these specific circumstances.

In order to address the concerns raised by parties, Enbridge submits that either one of two approaches can be taken to the clearance of Rider E. Consequently, Enbridge supports and is able to implement either of the two following solutions to the issue raised about Rider E clearance. However, Enbridge's preferred approach is (a) OneTime Disposition Based on Actual Volumes.

## (a) One-Time Disposition Based on Actual Volumes

Under this approach, Enbridge would implement a one-time disposition of the \$43.9 million Rider E amount, based on each customer's actual volumes for the January 1 to September 30, 2014 period. Enbridge would be able to implement this one-time disposition on January 2015 bills.

[^6]The January 1, 2015 disposition would coincide with the rate change implementation for the January 2015 QRAM. Consequently, the one-time disposition would be brought to the attention of customers in the rate change notice in the same month when the disposition is effective on customer bills. This one-time credit back to customers on their January 2015 bills would also offset the level of their January bills which are typically the highest of the winter season.

Should the Board decide to approve the one-time disposition based on actual volumes of individual customers, Enbridge asks the Board to approve a 2014 Rider E Deferral Account ("2014 REDA"). A description of the accounting treatment for a 2014 REDA is attached as Appendix A to these reply submissions. The Company would prepare the derivation of the Rider E unit rates (based on $\$ 43.9$ million plus interest and based on actual January to September 2014 volumes) once September actual volumes become available and seek approval prior to its January 1, 2015 QRAM application.

As noted in some intervenor submissions, the one-time disposition based on actual volumes (which are static) does not create volumetric differences. As well the $\$ 43.9$ million would be refunded to customers based on their individual consumption profiles. Another possible approach to the one-time disposition would be to make it part of the clearance of 2014 deferral and variance account balances. The added benefit of this approach is that the \$43.9 million refund would offset debit balances in the 2014 UDCDA and 2014 DDCTDA (the combined balance of which is forecast to be approximately $\$ 30$ million at year end). However, implementation of this approach would mean a delay in refunding the Rider E amount to customers until the spring or summer of 2015.

## (b) Prospective Disposition from October to December 2014

Under this approach, the $\$ 43.9$ million Rider E disposition would be implemented over three months, October to December of 2014, and a Rider E variance account would be established to capture any over-refund or under-refund to customers. As Energy Probe has observed, "the addition of the variance account ensures that neither Enbridge nor ratepayers win or lose. It also creates an approach that mirrors the disposition of deferral account balances." ${ }^{26}$

Disposition of Rider E over the three months from October to December, with a variance account, would completely align the approach to disposition for both Riders D and E . The Rider D amount for the January to September, 2014 period will also be credited to customers over the three months from October to December and there is a variance account to capture any over-refund or under-refund in respect of Rider D. Customers would receive a credit amount for Rider E and Rider D on their October, November and December, 2014 bills.
To facilitate implementation of this approach, Enbridge has attached at Appendix B the derivation of Rider E unit rates reflecting an October to December disposition period

[^7]and at Appendix C a description of the accounting treatment for a 2014 Rider E Variance Account ("2014 REVA"). The 2014 REVA amount would be cleared in conjunction with the Company's 2014 Deferral and Variance accounts in the spring or summer of 2015.

## D. Conclusion

For all of the reasons set out above, Enbridge submits that no change should be made to the DRO in relation to: (1) the determination of the cost of debt during each year of the term of the Customized IR plan; (2) the pattern of the SRC refund; or (3) the determination of the January 1 to September 30 sufficiency to be cleared through Rider E. Enbridge agrees that the DRO should give effect to a one-time disposition of Rider E, by way of a credit on January 2015 bills, based on actual volumes of individual customers during the period from January 1 to September 30, 2014, with a 2014 REDA to record the Rider E amount to be returned to customers, as set out in the proposed accounting treatment at Appendix A to this reply submission.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Yours truly,
(Original Signed)
Andrew Mandyam
Director, Regulatory Affairs and
Financial Performance

Attachments

# ACCOUNTING TREATMENT FOR A RIDER E DEFERRAL ACCOUNT ("2014 REDA") 

For the 2014 Fiscal Year
January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014)
The purpose of the Rider E Deferral Account (REDA) is to record the 2014 Board approved Rider E amount to be refunded to customers. For 2014, Rider E represents the revenue variance between interim rates, which were in place from January $1^{\text {st }}$ to September $30^{\text {th }} 2014$, and the final Board approved 2014 rates, which were implemented on October $1^{\text {st }}$ 2014, but effective January 1st 2014. The approved Rider $E$ refund was calculated to be $\$ 43.9$ million.

Simple interest is to be calculated on the opening monthly balance of this account using the Board approved EB-2006-0117 interest rate methodology. The balance of this account, together with carrying charges, will be disposed of in a manner designated by the Board in a future rate hearing.

## Accounting Entries

1. To record the approved 2014 Rider E refund amount:
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Debit: } & \text { Operating revenue } & \text { (Account 300.000) } \\ \text { Credit: } & 2014 \text { REDA } & \text { (Account 179. ---) }\end{array}$
To record the approved 2014 Rider E amount, representing the January through September 2014 revenue variance between interim rates and final approved rates.
2. Interest accrual:

| Debit: | Interest Expense | (Account 323. 000) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Credit: | Interest on 2014 REDA | (Account 179. ---) |

To record simple interest on the opening monthly balance of the 2014 REDA using the Board approved EB-2006-0117 interest rate methodology.

## Revenue Adjustment Rider (Rider E) Summary

Period: October 1st to December 31st, 2014

|  | Col. 1 | Col. 2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Col. } 3 \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { Western } \\ \text { Transportation } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Col. 4 <br> Ontario <br> Transportation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Item No. | Description | Sales Service | Service | Service |
|  |  | (cent/m ${ }^{3}$ ) | (cent/m ${ }^{3}$ ) | (cent/m ${ }^{3}$ ) |
| Bundled Services |  |  |  |  |
| 1. | Rate 1 | (2.5080) | (2.4836) | (2.5022) |
| 2. | Rate 6 | (1.3530) | (1.2914) | (1.3099) |
| 3. | Rate 9 | (1.2271) | (1.2608) | (1.2743) |
| 4. | Rate 100 | - | - | - |
| 5. | Rate 110 | (0.3328) | (0.3728) | (0.3910) |
| 6. | Rate 115 | (0.0665) | (0.1053) | (0.1247) |
| 7. | Rate 135 | (0.0742) | (0.0496) | (0.0596) |
| 8. | Rate 145 | (0.1066) | (0.2539) | (0.2707) |
| 9. | Rate 170 | (0.0833) | (0.1133) | (0.1285) |
| 10. | Rate 200 | (0.6410) | (0.6777) | (0.6955) |


| Unbundled Services |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 11. | Rate $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $(3.0120)$ |
| 12. | Rate $\mathbf{3 0 0}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $(21.0190)$ |

Notes: Sales Service Rider includes Distribution, Gas Supply Load Balancing, Transportation and Commodity unit rates shown on Page 2.
Western Transportation includes Distribution, Gas Supply Load Balancing, Transportation
unit rates shown on Page 2.
Ontario Transportation includes Distribution and Gas Supply Load Balancing.
unit rates shown on Page 2.
Derivation of Revenue Adjustment Rider (Rider E) Unit Rates
Period: October 1st to December 31st, 2014
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Col. 12


Col. 11

2014 SALES, TRANSPORTATION AND DELIVERY VOLUME SUMMARY


## TOTAL TRANSPORTATION VOLUME SUMMARIES ( $10^{\circ} \mathrm{m}^{3}$ ). by Rate

| To |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Rate 1 | 762,422 | 765,079 | 631,247 | | $\substack{\text { Total Rate } 1 \\ \text { Total Rate } 6 \\ \text { Toat Rate } 9 \\ \text { ToTAL GS voL } \\ \text { TO } \\ \hline}$ |
| :--- |
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For the 2014 Fiscal Year
January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014)
The purpose of the Rider E Variance Account (REVA) is to record the difference between the actual Rider E amount refunded to customers, and the approved 2014 Rider E amount to be refunded to customers. For 2014, Rider E was designed to refund the revenue variance between interim rates, which were in place from January $1^{\text {st }}$ to September $30^{\text {th }} 2014$, and the final Board approved 2014 rates, which were implemented on October $1^{\text {st }} 2014$, but effective January 1st 2014. The approved Rider E refund was calculated to be $\$ 43.9$ million, which was then converted into a volumetric based rider (utilizing forecast October through December 2014 volumes) to be applied to actual customer volumes between October and December 2014. Variances between actual volumes and forecast volumes between October and December 2014 will cause the actual Rider E refund to be either lower or higher than the approved $\$ 43.9$ million. The Rider E Variance Account will ensure that the actual amount refunded to customers will be equivalent to the approved amount.

Simple interest is to be calculated on the opening monthly balance of this account using the Board approved EB-2006-0117 interest rate methodology. The balance of this account, together with carrying charges, will be disposed of in a manner designated by the Board in a future rate hearing.

## Accounting Entries

1. To record the variance in the Rider E refund credited to ratepayers:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { Debit/Credit: } & \text { Operating revenue } & \text { (Account 300.000) } \\
\text { Credit/Debit: } & 2014 \text { REVA } & \text { (Account 179. ---) }
\end{array}
$$

To record the variance between actual and approved Rider E amounts credited to ratepayers resulting from variances between actual and forecast volumes.
2. Interest accrual:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Debit/Credit: } & \text { Interest Expense } \\
\text { Credit/Debit: } & \text { Interest on } 2014 \text { REVA }
\end{array}
$$

To record simple interest on the opening monthly balance of the 2014 REVA using the Board approved EB-2006-0117 interest rate methodology.
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