

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Application by Milton Hydro Distribution Inc. to the Ontario Energy Board for an Order or Orders approving the recovery of amounts related to the restoration of electricity service in the Town of Milton due to the December 2013 Southern and Eastern Ontario Ice Storm.

MILTON HYDRO DISTRIBUTION INC. (“Milton Hydro”)

EB-2014-0162

**APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF A Z-FACTOR RATE RIDER FOR
RECOVERY OF ICE STORM RELATED RESTORATION COSTS**

REPLY SUBMISSION

Filed: September 4, 2014

Cameron McKenzie, CPA, CGA
Director, Regulatory Affairs
Milton Hydro Distribution Inc.
8069 Lawson Road
Milton, Ontario
L9T 5C4

Tel: (289) 429-5212

cameronmckenzie@miltonhydro.com

1 1.8 Milton Hydro received written submissions from OEB Staff, Energy Probe and VECC on
2 August 20, 2014.

3 1.9 Milton Hydro submits its Reply Submission.
4

5 **2. Reply Submission**

6 2.1 Milton Hydro submits that its Z-Factor Application has met the OEB Z-Factor eligibility
7 criteria of causation, materiality and prudence. In making this submission Milton
8 Hydro refers to the following:

- 9 • OEB Staff submission, page 5, states “In summary, based on its review of the
10 evidence, Board staff submits that the criteria of causation, materiality and
11 prudence were met. As such, Board staff supports the amount requested for
12 recovery.”;
- 13 • Energy Probe submission, page 1, states “Energy Probe takes no issue with
14 the claim of Z factor eligibility. Energy Probe submits that Milton Hydro has
15 adequately substantiated the claim.”; and
- 16 • VECC submission, page 4, states “In considering the above, VECC submits
17 the Z-Factor amounts were prudently incurred.”

18 2.2 Milton Hydro further submits that recovery of the Z-Factor costs, by way of a Fixed
19 Rate Rider is also supported by OEB Staff, Energy Probe and VECC. Milton Hydro
20 would refer to the following:

- 21 • OEB Staff, page 7 states “Board staff further submits that, for reasons of
22 simplicity and fairness, a fixed rate rider derived by allocating... [method of
23 allocation of restoration costs is dealt with separately below]... would result in
24 the best outcome.”;
- 25 • Energy Probe, page 5, states “Energy Probe submits that the recovery of the Z
26 factor amount through the use of a fixed rate rider is appropriate.”; and
- 27 • VECC, page 5, states “VECC further submits that the use of a Fixed Rate
28 Rider is more appropriate than Fixed and Variable Rate Riders as the costs
29 are fixed and not driven by consumption.”

1 **3. Detailed Submissions from OEB Staff, Energy Probe and VECC**

2 3.1 OEB Staff and Intervenors provided detailed submissions on the following matters:

3 Z-Factor Costs Claimed

4 OEB Staff

- 5 • Amount of claim meets Z-Factor eligibility criteria.

6 Energy Probe and VECC

- 7 • The Z-Factor amount should be reduced by \$134,315 for excess storm related
8 costs already included in rates;

9 Allocation of Z-Factor costs –

10 OEB Staff and VECC

- 11 • Allocated across all customer classes based on Milton Hydro's distribution
12 revenue as approved in its 2011 Cost of Service Rate Application.

13 Energy Probe:

- 14 • Allocated across all customer classes on the same basis as USofA 5120
15 and 5215 using Milton Hydro's 2011 Cost Allocation Model.

16 Calculation of the Fixed Rate Rider –

17 OEB Staff

- 18 • Calculate using the customer counts for all rate classes based on Milton
19 Hydro's distribution revenue as approved in its 2011 Cost of Service
20 Application.

21 Energy Probe and VECC

- 22 • Calculate for all rate classes using the average number of customers
23 forecasted from November 1, 2014 to April 30, 2016.

24

25

26

1 **Response to Detailed Submissions**

2 Z-Factor Costs Claimed

3 OEB Staff

4 3.2 OEB Staff state on page 5 of their submission “In summary, based on its review of the
5 evidence, Board staff submits that the criteria of causation, materiality and prudence
6 were met. As such, Board staff supports the amount requested for recovery.”

7 Energy Probe and VECC

8 3.3 In response to OEB Staff Interrogatory #11d, Milton Hydro provided a table of
9 Emergency Distribution Systems Problems comparing Budget to Actual for the years
10 2008 to 2013. In that interrogatory Milton Hydro explained that “Beginning in 2012,
11 Milton Hydro discontinued allocating burdens to overtime labour which accounts for
12 the significant decrease in the budget and actual amounts for 2012 and 2013.” In a
13 clarifying conversation with OEB Staff, Milton Hydro explained that the burdens
14 included in the Emergency Distribution Systems Problems budget of \$269,120 in
15 2011 were now being charged and allocated on regular hours only, effective with
16 Milton Hydro’s 2012 budgeting process. The burden costs continue to be incurred by
17 Milton Hydro and continue to be included in the base costs upon which rates were
18 set. The only change is the allocation method.

19 3.4 Energy Probe and VECC, in their submissions, interpreted the reduction in the
20 Emergency Distribution Systems Problems budget as a cost savings to Milton Hydro,
21 which, as explained in the above paragraph, is not the case. Milton Hydro has simply
22 changed its method of allocating the burdens. Milton Hydro submits that a reduction
23 to its Z-Factor claim is not appropriate as the burden costs continue to be included in
24 Milton Hydro’s current costs as they were in the base costs upon which the 2011
25 rates were set.

26

27

28

29

1 Allocation of Z-Factor costs

2 OEB Staff and VECC

3 3.5 OEB Staff state in Interrogatory #7, “Board staff further notes that in the Board’s
4 Decision on The Combined Proceeding on Storm Damage Cost Claims (EB-2007-
5 0514/0595/0571/0551) and the Board’s Decision on Niagara-on-the-Lake Hydro Inc.’s
6 wind storm damage Z-factor claim (EB-2011-0186), the Board ruled that approved
7 costs shall be allocated to the classes on the basis of distribution revenue and using
8 the last Board approved fixed-variable split.

9 Board staff also notes that in the Settlement Agreement approved by the Board with
10 respect to West Coast Huron Energy Inc.’s tornado damage claim embedded within
11 its 2013 cost of service rate application (EB-2012-0175), approved costs were
12 allocated to the classes on the basis of dollar weighted allocators, i.e. distribution
13 revenue.”

14 3.6 OEB Staff submit that “ice storm damage is a general distribution system problem
15 and that normally in electricity distribution rate-setting, the Board allocates distribution
16 costs between classes on the basis of distribution revenue.”

17 3.7 VECC repeated this reference in its submission beginning at page 4. VECC supports
18 that allocation of Milton Hydro’s Z-Factor costs based on Milton Hydro’s OEB-
19 Approved 2011 Cost of Service distribution revenue.

20 3.8 Milton Hydro agrees with the submissions of OEB Staff and VECC that consistency
21 with the previous OEB-Approved methodology of allocating Z-Factor costs based on
22 distribution revenue is appropriate. However, as explained below in Milton Hydro’s
23 response to Energy Probe, Milton Hydro proposes to update its 2011 OEB-Approved
24 distribution revenue for the re-alignment of the revenue to cost ratios Approved in
25 Milton Hydro’s 2012 Incentive Regulation Mechanism (“IRM”) Rate Application.

26 Energy Probe

27 3.9 Energy Probe, in its submission also reference the OEB Staff Interrogatory #7,
28 however, Energy Probe proposed a new method of allocating Z-Factor costs by using
29 Milton Hydro’s OEB-Approved 2011 Cost Allocation Model and the Uniform System of
30 Accounts – UsaA 5120 Maintenance of Poles, Towers and Fixtures and 5125

1 Maintenance of Overhead Conductors and Devices. In proposing this method of
2 allocating the Z-Factor costs Energy Probe reference the revenue to cost ratios from
3 Milton Hydro's 2011 Cost of Service Rate Application EB-2010-0137 and in particular
4 the range from a high of 115% to a low of 41.6% as representing subsidization among
5 classes.

6 3.10 Milton Hydro's revenue to cost ratios were re-aligned in its 2012 Incentive Regulation
7 Mechanism ("IRM") Rate Application EB-2011-0183 as set out in Table 1 below.

8
9 **Table 1**
10 **2012 IRM Revenue to Cost Ratios**

| Rate Class | 2012 IRM Re-Alignment |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Residential | 1.04 |
| General Service Less Than 50 kW | 0.99 |
| General Service 50 to 999 kW | 0.84 |
| General Service 1,000 to 4,999 kW | 1.05 |
| Large Use | 1.05 |
| Unmetered Scattered Load | 1.05 |
| Sentinel Lighting | 0.70 |
| Street Lighting | 0.70 |

11
12
13 3.11 The revised range is now a high of 1.05% to a low of 0.70% for the Street Lighting
14 and Sentinel Lighting customer classes which have been recognized as outliers. In
15 addition, it was agreed by all parties in Milton Hydro's Settlement Agreement to its
16 2011 Cost of Service Rate Application that the revenue to cost ratio for the General
17 Service 50 to 999 kW class would not be changed.

18 3.12 Milton Hydro submits that revenue to cost ratios will never be perfect, however, with
19 the re-alignment of the revenue to cost ratios in its 2012 IRM Rate Application the
20 subsidization across classes has been significantly reduced and therefore allocation
21 of the Z-Factor costs based on Milton Hydro's 2011 Cost Allocation Model is not
22 required or applicable.

1 3.13 In order to address Energy Probe’s concerns with using Milton Hydro’s 2011 OEB-
2 Approved Cost of Service distribution revenue Milton Hydro submits that it is more
3 appropriate to use Milton Hydro’s 2011 Cost of Service distribution revenue adjusted
4 for the revenue to cost ratios in its OEB-Approved 2012 IRM Rate Application, which
5 better reflects the revenue to costs and minimizes cross subsidization.

6 3.14 The following Table 2 is taken from Milton Hydro’s OEB-Approved 2012 IRM model
7 “MILTON_FINAL_REVCOST”, Tab “10. Proposed R C Ratio Adj” and Tab “11.
8 Proposed Revenue”. These two tabs adjust Milton Hydro’s 2011 OEB-Approved Cost
9 of Service distribution revenue of \$13,005,098 for the updated revenue to cost ratios
10 for each customer class as set out in Table 1 above.

11
12 **Table 2**
13 **2011 Cost of Service Distribution Revenue Adjusted for 2012 Revenue to Cost**
14 **Ratios**

| Rate Class | TAB 10. Proposed R C Ratio Adj | | | | TAB 11. Proposed Revenue | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|-------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| | Adjusted Revenue | 2011 Cost of Service Revenue to Cost Ratios | Re-Allocated Cost | 2012 IRM Revenue to Cost Ratios | Final Adjusted Revenue | Allocated Re-Based Revenue Offsets | Revenue Requirement from Rates Before Transformer Allowance |
| Residential | 9,354,377 | 1.04 | 8,960,132 | 1.04 | 9,354,378 | 950,983 | 8,403,395 |
| General Service Less Than 50 kW | 1,888,300 | 0.99 | 1,899,699 | 0.99 | 1,884,501 | 185,007 | 1,699,494 |
| General Service 50 to 999 kW | 1,674,035 | 0.83 | 2,012,061 | 0.84 | 1,686,787 | 190,404 | 1,496,383 |
| General Service 1,000 to 4,999 kW | 759,627 | 1.15 | 660,545 | 1.05 | 693,573 | 58,921 | 634,652 |
| Large Use | 583,274 | 1.15 | 507,195 | 1.05 | 532,555 | 39,316 | 493,239 |
| Unmetered Scattered Load | 49,692 | 1.10 | 45,175 | 1.05 | 47,433 | 5,032 | 42,401 |
| Sentinel Lighting | 11,266 | 0.44 | 25,374 | 0.70 | 17,762 | 1,899 | 15,863 |
| Street Lighting | 147,092 | 0.42 | 353,586 | 0.70 | 247,511 | 27,838 | 219,673 |
| | 14,467,664 | | 14,463,767 | | 14,464,498 | 1,459,400 | 13,005,098 |

15
16
17
18 3.15 Milton Hydro has provided the following Table 3 which sets out the allocation of its Z-
19 Factor costs, in the amount of \$946,967 including carrying costs, based on Milton
20 Hydro’s 2011 OEB-Approved Cost of Service distribution revenue as adjusted for the
21 revenue to cost ratios from Milton Hydro’s 2012 OEB-Approved IRM Rate Application
22 as set out in Table 2 above..

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18

Table 3
Ice Storm Costs Allocation on 2011 Distribution Revenue
Updated for 2012 IRM Revenue to Cost Ratios

| 2011 Cost of Service Distribution Revenue Updated for 2012 IRM Revenue to Cost Ratios | | Ice Storm Cost Allocated on Dist. Rev. |
|--|-------------------------|---|
| Customer Class | Distribution Revenue | |
| | | 946,967 |
| Residential | 8,403,395 | 611,894 |
| General Service <50kW | 1,699,494 | 123,749 |
| General Service 50 to 999 kW | 1,496,383 | 108,959 |
| General Service 1000 to 4999 kW | 634,652 | 46,212 |
| Large Users | 493,239 | 35,915 |
| Umetered Scattered Load | 42,401 | 3,087 |
| Sentinel Lighting | 15,863 | 1,155 |
| Street Lighting | 219,673 | 15,995 |
| Total | 13,005,098 | 946,967 |

Calculation of the Fixed Rate Rider

3.16 As discussed above in paragraph 2.2, OEB Staff, Energy Probe and VECC each supported recovery of Milton Hydro’s Z-Factor claim by way of a Fixed Rate Rider. While Milton Hydro proposed to calculate the fixed rate rider on metered customers only, OEB Staff, Energy Probe and VECC each argued that the fixed rate rider should be calculated on all customer classes base on the number of customers or connections. Milton Hydro accepts this argument and agrees that the Fixed Rate Rider should be calculated on all customer classes.

OEB Staff

3.17 In their submission, OEB Staff make reference to interrogatory #7 and that the amount of the fixed rate rider for a Residential customer would be \$1.26 per month. The \$1.26 is calculated using the customer counts approved in Milton Hydro’s 2011 Cost of Service Rate Application. OEB staff submits that the fixed rate rider should

1 be calculated for all customer classes based on the number of customers or
2 connections approved in Milton Hydro's 2011 Cost of Service Rate Application.

3 3.18 Milton Hydro does not agree with OEB Staff in that the 2011 customer counts are
4 outdated compared to Milton Hydro's current customer counts and the use of 2011
5 customer counts will result in higher Fixed Rate Riders than required.

6 Energy Probe and VECC

7 3.19 Energy Probe's submission, page 5, recommends that the fixed rate rider should be
8 calculated on the "expected average number of customers/connections in each rate
9 class over the term of the rate rider".

10 3.20 VECC's submission, also at page 5, agreed with Energy Probe's recommendation.

11 3.21 Milton Hydro does not agree with Energy Probe's recommendation as the forecasted
12 customer counts are not founded or supported by discussions with developers in the
13 Town of Milton and therefore the forecasts are not necessarily reliable and are used
14 for internal purposes only.

15
16 3.22 Milton Hydro submits that its customer count as at December 2013, as proposed in its
17 Z-Factor Application is an accurate count of metered customers, however, Milton
18 Hydro's customer count may be further updated with the actual number of customers
19 and connections to the end of August 2014 being the most current data.

20 3.23 Milton Hydro has provided the following Table 4 calculating the Fixed Rate Rider
21 based on the allocation of its Z-Factor costs using its 2011 OEB-Approved distribution
22 revenue adjusted for its OEB-Approved 2012 IRM Rate Application revenue to cost
23 ratios as set out in Table 3 above and Milton Hydro's actual customer/connections
24 count as at August 2014.

25
26
27
28
29
30

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

Table 4
Fixed Rate Rider Based on August 2014 Customers/Connections

| 2011 Cost of Service Distribution Revenue Updated for 2012 IRM Revenue to Cost Ratios | | Ice Storm Cost Allocated on Dist. Rev. | August 2014 Customers / Connections | Fixed Rate Rider over 18 Months |
|--|-------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| Customer Class | Distribution Revenue | | | |
| | | 946,967 | | |
| Residential | 8,403,395 | 611,894 | 31,837 | 1.07 |
| General Service <50kW | 1,699,494 | 123,749 | 2,521 | 2.73 |
| General Service 50 to 999 kW | 1,496,383 | 108,959 | 283 | 21.39 |
| General Service 1000 to 4999 kW | 634,652 | 46,212 | 12 | 213.95 |
| Large Users | 493,239 | 35,915 | 3 | 665.10 |
| Umetered Scattered Load | 42,401 | 3,087 | 190 | 0.90 |
| Sentinel Lighting | 15,863 | 1,155 | 251 | 0.26 |
| Street Lighting | 219,673 | 15,995 | 3078 | 0.29 |
| Total | 13,005,098 | 946,967 | | |

4. Conclusion

4.1 All participants in Milton Hydro’s Z-Factor Application acknowledge that Milton Hydro has met the Z-Factor criteria of Causation, Materiality and Prudence.

4.2 All participants in Milton Hydro’s Z-Factor Application support the recovery of the ice storm restoration costs by way of a Fixed Rate Rider.

3.24 Milton Hydro has explained the change in the allocation of burdens from overtime labour to regular labour hours in its budget for its 2012 and 2013 Emergency Distribution Systems Problems. While the methodology used to allocate burdens was changed the burden costs continue to be included in Milton Hydro’s current costs as they were in the base costs upon which the 2011 rates were set.

4.3 Milton Hydro agrees with the submissions of OEB Staff and VECC that consistency with previous OEB-Approved methodology of allocating Z-Factor costs on distribution revenue is appropriate. In determining the appropriate distribution revenue to use, Milton Hydro has taken into consideration the concerns of Energy Probe with regards

1 to Milton Hydro's revenue to cost ratios as approved in Milton Hydro's 2011 Cost of
2 Service Rate Application and adjusted the 2011 OEB-Approved distribution revenue
3 for the revenue to cost ratios determined in Milton Hydro's OEB-Approved 2012 IRM
4 Rate Application. The updated distribution revenue better reflects the customer class
5 revenue to cost coverage and significantly reduces the cross subsidization. Table 2
6 above provides the 2011 Cost of Service Distribution Revenue Adjusted for 2012
7 OEB-Approved Revenue to Cost Ratios.

8 4.4 Milton Hydro agrees with OEB staff, Energy Probe and VECC that all customer
9 classes should be allocated the Z-Factor costs. Milton Hydro submits that the 2011
10 customer counts are out of date and that the Fixed Rate Rider should be based on
11 the best available actual customer/connections count at this time, which Milton Hydro
12 submits, is August 2014.

13
14 **5. Relief Sought**

15 5.1 Milton Hydro is seeking recovery of its ice storm costs in the amount of \$935,507 plus
16 carrying charges of \$11,460 for a total cost of restoration of electricity of \$946,967 by
17 way of a Fixed Rate Rider over eighteen (18) month commencing November 1, 2014
18 and ending April 30, 2016, as filed in Milton Hydro's Z-Factor Application.

19 5.2 Milton Hydro is seeking approval to update its OEB-Approved 2011 distribution
20 revenue for the revenue to cost ratios as approved by the OEB in Milton Hydro's 2012
21 IRM Rate Application to significantly reduce the potential cross subsidization of Milton
22 Hydro's Z-Factor costs thereby addressing the concerns of Energy Probe.

23 5.3 Milton Hydro is seeking approval to base the calculation of the Fixed Rate Rider on its
24 August 2014 actual customer/connections count for all customer classes.

25 5.4 Based on the above Milton Hydro is requesting Ontario Energy Board approval for the
26 Fixed Rate Riders, as set out in Table 5 below, for the recovery of prudently incurred
27 costs to restore electricity during and after the December 21st and 22nd 2013 ice
28 storm.

29
30

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

Table 5
Fixed Rate Riders for Z-Factor Costs Recovery

| Customer Class | Fixed Rate Rider |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Residential | 1.07 |
| General Service <50kW | 2.73 |
| General Service 50 to 999 kW | 21.39 |
| General Service 1000 to 4999 kW | 213.95 |
| Large Users | 665.10 |
| Umetered Scattered Load | 0.90 |
| Sentinel Lighting | 0.26 |
| Street Lighting | 0.29 |

5.5 Milton Hydro further requests Ontario Energy Board approval to track the costs and recovery in the Uniform System of Accounts (“USoA”) account 1572 Extraordinary Event Costs – Ice Storm Z-Factor for disposition at a date to be determined.

Respectfully submitted this 4th day of September, 2014.

Original signed by Cameron McKenzie

Cameron McKenzie, CPA, CGA
Director, Regulatory Affairs
Milton Hydro Distribution Inc.