



October 24, 2014

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

**RE: 2015 ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION RATE APPLICATION FOR ALGOMA POWER INC.
("API") – EB-2014-0055
ARGUMENT IN CHIEF**

Please find accompanying this letter, two (2) copies of the API's Argument In Chief. Coincidentally with the submission, an electronic copy of this has been filed via the Board's Regulatory Electronic Submission System.

If you have any questions in connection with the above matter, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (905) 994-3634.

Yours truly,

Original Signed By:

Douglas R. Bradbury
Director, Regulatory Affairs

Enclosures

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF an application by Algoma Power Inc. for an order approving just and reasonable rates and other charges for electricity distribution to be effective January 1, 2015.

Algoma Power Inc.
Argument in Chief
October 24, 2014

This is the Argument in Chief of Algoma Power Inc. ("Algoma Power" or "API") in regard to the following unsettled issues in this proceeding:

1. Is the applicant's proposal to recover the RRRP funding variance from the 2002 to 2007 period appropriate?
2. Are the proposed revenue-to-cost ratios appropriate?
3. Are the proposed fixed/variable splits appropriate?

Each of these issues is addressed below.

1) RRRP FUNDING VARIANCE

As set out in API's application at Exhibit 9, Tab 8, Schedule 1, in 2003 the government announced plans to extend the RRRP funding to all of Great Lakes Power's customers (Great Lakes Power was API's predecessor, and is therefore hereinafter referred to as "API" or "Algoma Power").

Accordingly, on July 11, 2003, the Board issued a rate order that included rates that were discounted by \$28.50/month.¹ This 28.50 discount (or "RRRP subsidy") was the same RRRP subsidy that was afforded to Hydro One's low density customers.² In order to allow API to recover its Board approved \$9.8 million revenue requirement in light of the lost revenues from its discounted rates, API was compensated \$194,484 per month based on an annual compensation amount of \$2,333,808 ($\$28.50 \times 6,824 \text{ customers} \times 12 \text{ months} = \$2,333,808$). This compensation was (and still is) administered by Hydro One pursuant to Ontario Regulation 442/01.³

API has determined that between 2002-2007 it was not sufficiently compensated for its lost revenues caused by its discounted rates. The cause of this under-compensation was that API's billing system allocated the monthly \$28.50 RRRP subsidy on a 30 day basis, creating a deficiency since more RRRP subsidy was credited to customers than compensation received by API. Therefore, for a 31 day billing period the billing system would allocate a benefit of \$29.45 per customer ($31/30 \times \$28.50 = \29.45). Over a year for 6,824 customers, this resulted in a shortfall in compensation of approximately \$30,000 per year, resulting in unrecovered lost revenues of \$188,001.

Additionally, the funding regime did not address the variability in customer counts. As the number of eligible customers decreased from 6,824 in 2002 to 6,797 in 2007, API was compensated for more customers receiving the RRRP subsidy than number of customers actually receiving the RRRP subsidy, resulting in over-recovery of \$14,467.

¹ API's Application, Exhibit 9, Tab 8, Schedule 1, Appendix A.

² Oral Hearing, Exhibit No. K1.2 and attached hereto as Attachment #1.

³ Attached hereto as Attachment #2.

From 2002 to 2007, the net of these two factors was \$173,534 in unrecovered lost revenues (\$188,001 - \$14,467 = \$173,534). A breakdown of these figures is as follows:⁴

	RRRP Payments			RRRP Credits			Initial # Cust	RRRP Credits to Customers	Days Pro-rated Variance	Change in # Cust	Customer Count Variance
	Days	from HONI	Days	# Cust	to Customers	Variance					
2002	245	\$1,555,872	245	6,845	\$1,593,145	\$37,273	6,824	1,588,286	32,414	21	4,859
2003	365	\$2,333,808	365	6,866	\$2,380,612	\$46,804	6,824	2,366,222	32,414	42	14,390
2004	366	\$2,333,808	366	6,820	\$2,371,430	\$37,622	6,824	2,372,705	38,897	(4)	(1,275)
2005	365	\$2,333,808	365	6,789	\$2,354,144	\$20,336	6,824	2,366,222	32,414	(35)	(12,078)
2006	365	\$2,333,808	365	6,784	\$2,352,208	\$18,400	6,824	2,366,222	32,414	(40)	(14,014)
2007	243	\$1,555,872	243	6,797	\$1,568,972	\$13,100	6,824	1,575,320	19,448	(28)	(6,348)
		<u>\$12,446,976</u>			<u>\$12,620,510</u>	<u>\$173,534</u>			<u>\$188,001</u>		<u>(\$14,467)</u>

API is seeking a determination from the Board that it is entitled to be compensated for the \$173,534 in lost revenues for which it received no compensation. For greater clarity, API is not seeking a rate order from the Board on this issue. Rather, a determination of entitlement will allow API to be compensated from the RRRP pool administered by Hydro One.

API submits that the basis for its entitlement to compensation for its lost revenues of \$173,534 is subsection 79(3) of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998* (the "OEB Act"). The relevant subsections of Section 79 are as follows:

Rural or remote consumers

79. (1) The Board, in approving just and reasonable rates for a distributor who delivers electricity to rural or remote consumers, shall provide rate protection for those consumers or prescribed classes of those consumers by reducing the rates that would otherwise apply in accordance with the prescribed rules.

Compensation

(3) A distributor is entitled to be compensated for lost revenue resulting from the rate reduction provided under subsection (1).

Liability for compensation

(4) All consumers are required to contribute towards the amount of any compensation required under subsection (3) in accordance with the regulations.

⁴ Response to Undertaking J1.4, filed August 22, 2014.

API submits that this circumstance differs from the typical recovery of a cost that forms part of revenue requirement. Whereas the Board has a great deal of discretion to determine whether a cost is recoverable (i.e. if it is prudent) when setting rates under section 78 of the OEB Act, the Board is required by law to comply with subsection 79(3) of the OEB Act.

API has established that it was not compensated for its lost revenue from 2002 to 2007 in the amount of \$173,534. Therefore, API is entitled to be compensated for this lost revenue pursuant to subsection 79(3) of the OEB Act.

2) REVENUE TO COST RATIOS

As set out in the application at Exhibit 7, Tab 1, Schedule 2, API has proposed to maintain status quo revenue to cost ratios for the 2015 Test Year.

In the proposed settlement agreement, matters including changes to the Test Year forecast, operating cost and rate base gave cause to produce an updated version of the Test Year Cost Allocation Study. Accompanying its submission of the Proposed Settlement Agreement, API presented the updated Cost Allocation model and Appendix 2-P Cost Allocation. API is maintaining its proposal to use the status quo revenue to cost ratios arising from this updated Cost Allocation model for the 2015 Test Year.

The methodology employed by API to allocate costs to its customer classes has been consistent since the 2011 electricity distribution rate application, EB-2008-0278 and the same methodology was used in this Application. Historically and in this Application, API has not categorized any of its distribution assets as bulk assets, as is accommodated by the Board's Cost Allocation Model, neither has the cost allocation recognized the uniqueness of the configuration of its distribution system when compared with other Ontario distributors.

Past attempts at cost allocation for API's customer classes may not have been responsive to electrical and geographical attributes of the API distribution system. As a result, the individual rate classes may not have been allocated the appropriate costs.

In the Application at Exhibit 1, Tab 3, Schedule 1, API has provided a detailed overview of the electrical and geographical attributes of its Distribution system. In particular, beginning on page 4 of 24 of this Exhibit, API describes the concept of Express Lines (a.k.a. sub-transmission facilities). In providing an example, API has detailed the Limer #4 Circuit; a 44 kV distribution line extending 86 km from the delivery point to its furthest load center with approximately 90% of its demand associated with only two Residential – R2 customers. This type of distribution system configuration is common at API and is a legacy of the resource based industry and the remote communities that developed in the vicinity of this type of industry.

While preparing this Application and the cost allocation, API became increasingly cognizant of the factors and attributes contributing to the allocation of costs to its customer classes. Realizing that the attributes of both the configuration of API's distribution system and the operation of the distribution system it becomes obvious that API is unlike almost every other Ontario distributor.

As has been discussed in the review phase of this Application, more specifically within interrogatories such as 7-Board Staff-33 and 7-VECC-34, the density factor has not been properly addressed in the previous application EB-2009-0278. Essentially, with like for like cost allocations but for the inclusion of the density allocation, the Test Year customer class allocation changes significantly for most customer classes.

In the Application, Exhibit 7, Tab 1, Schedule 2 beginning at page 9 of 11, API has addressed its concerns with implementing the results of the Test Year Cost Allocation Study. Within the normal convention, API would, beginning in the Test Year, gradually and methodically move the Street Lighting and Seasonal customer classes toward the lower boundary of the Board's policy range. The Residential – R1 and Residential – R2 customer classes would, by default, benefit from this reallocation of revenues. API has presented evidence in Exhibit 7, Tab 1, Schedule 2, as to why it proposes to maintain the status quo revenue to cost ratios.

API's proposed solution to its concerns raised in Exhibit 7 Tab 1 Schedule 2 is to maintain status quo R/C ratios for the Test Year. In 2015, API will bring forward an application for 2016 electricity distribution rates proposing a methodology consistent with 4th Generation Incentive Rate-setting. As part of that application, API will present a cost allocation study using the approved customer and load forecast and approved costs for 2015, arising from the Board's decision and order in this Application; EB-2014-0055. API has proposed to work with Board staff and the intervenors of record to produce an appropriate Cost Allocation Study for API. API further proposed that the results of this Study may be used by the Board to establish the appropriate class specific revenue to cost ratios through the balance of the incentive rate-setting period beginning with the 2016 rate year.

3) FIXED/VARIABLE SPLITS

In the Application, API is maintaining its design philosophy of fixed/variable splits consistent with the approach agreed to in the previous cost of service application; EB-2009-0278 and used throughout the intervening incentive rate-setting period from 2012 to 2014 inclusive.

The fixed/variable split for the Residential – R1 class is solely based on the indexing of current fixed and variable rates by the RRRP Adjustment Factor and the resultant fixed and variable revenues derived from the accepted customer and load forecast. The fixed monthly service charge and volumetric rate are purely a function of the RRRP Adjustment Factor; no attempt is made to modify the resultant fixed/variable split. This methodology ensures that all customers in this customer class experience the same rate impact regardless of the energy consumption.

For the Residential – R2 customer class, the parties to the accepted settlement agreement in the previous cost of service proceeding, EB-2009-0278, accepted a methodology that held the fixed monthly service charge at the then approved rate of \$596.12. The intent of the parties was to hold the fixed charge constant. In this Application, API has maintained this standing rate design philosophy and has modified the fixed/variable split as to maintain a fixed monthly service charge at \$596.12.

In the case of the Seasonal class rate design, while not detailed in EB-2009-0278, the parties recognized the rate impacts. At that time a conscious effort was made to limit increases in the fixed monthly service charge component of the tariff while allowing approved increases to flow to the volumetric component. The rationale was to give individual consumers more ability to influence their overall costs. API has maintained this design philosophy in this Application.

Prior to the previous Application, EB-2009-0278, there was no fixed component in the tariff for the Street Lighting customer class. During the settlement proceedings of EB-2009-0278, the parties agreed to institute a nominal fixed monthly service charge of \$0.96. Throughout the incentive rate-setting period, API has maintained a rate design philosophy consistent with the intent of the parties and has allowed the fixed to move only \$0.02 to \$0.98.

In this Application, API's design philosophy with respect to the fixed/variable splits is to maintain consistency with the intent of the parties to the settlement of EB-2009-0278.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

October 24, 2014

Algoma Power Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andrew Taylor', is written over a horizontal line.

By its Counsel: Andrew Taylor
The Energy Boutique

Attachment #1



RESIDENTIAL DELIVERY RATES

What is a home delivery rate?

A delivery rate is the price you pay to have your electricity delivered to your home. It covers the cost of maintenance,

upkeep, and all the little things that go into making sure

you have the energy you need, when you need it.



Understanding Delivery Rates

All residential delivery rates are based on your service type. Service types are determined by the area you live in and the number of customers in your area. The fewer people who live in your area, the more it takes to bring you reliable energy, and the higher the cost. You can locate your service type and delivery rates on page two of your bill.

- **Urban High Density** - contains 3,000 or more customers, with at least 60 customers for every kilometer of power line used to supply energy to the zone
- **Medium Density** - contains 100 or more customers, with at least 15 customers for every kilometer of power line used to supply energy to the zone.
- **Low Density** - the remaining area not covered by Urban or Medium Density areas.

You may notice some changes to your delivery and regulatory rates starting January 1, 2014. Find out more about these changes [here](#).

About Year-Round Residential Rate Status

If you live at your seasonal residence year-round or you have a farm with a primary residence, you can [apply](#) for year-round residential rate status. To see if you qualify for year-round residential rate status, visit our [Frequently Asked Questions](#) page.

Read the chart below to see how the delivery rate prices factor into your bill (as of January 1, 2014).

Curious about the bigger picture? Find out how all the factors - including electricity prices and delivery rates - work their way into your bill.

Delivery Rates	Urban High Density	Medium Density	Low Density
Distribution service charge (\$ / month)	\$16.64	\$24.07	\$33.03 (includes \$28.50 RRRP credit)
Distribution volume charge (metered usage - ¢ / kWh)	2.618 ¢	3.497 ¢	3.932 ¢
Transmission connection charge (adjusted usage - ¢ / kWh)	0.489 ¢	0.499 ¢	0.470 ¢
Transmission network charge (adjusted usage - ¢ / kWh)	0.707 ¢	0.719 ¢	0.702 ¢
Smart metering entity charge** (\$ / month)	\$ 0.79	\$ 0.79	\$ 0.79

Attachment #2



ONTARIO REGULATION 442/01

made under the

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD ACT, 1998

Made: November 28, 2001

Filed: November 30, 2001

Printed in *The Ontario Gazette*: December 15, 2001

RURAL OR REMOTE ELECTRICITY RATE PROTECTION

Definitions

1. (1) In this Regulation,

“government premises” means premises occupied by the Crown in right of Canada or Ontario or a facility that is funded in whole or in part by the Crown in right of Canada or Ontario, but does not include premises occupied by,

(a) Canada Post Corporation, the Services Corporation or a subsidiary of the Services Corporation, or

(b) social housing, a library, a recreational or sports facility, or a radio, television or cable television facility;

“IMO” and “IMO-controlled grid” have the same meaning as in the *Electricity Act, 1998*;

“market participant” means a market participant under the *Electricity Act, 1998*;

“rate protection” means rate protection under section 79 of the Act;

“remote area” means those parts of Ontario not connected to the IMO-controlled grid that, before March 31, 1999, received electricity from Ontario Hydro and, at the time subsection 26 (1) of the *Electricity Act, 1998* comes into force, are receiving electricity from Hydro One Remote Communities Inc.;

“residential premises” means a dwelling occupied as a residence continuously for at least eight months of the year and, where the residential premises is located on a farm, includes other farm premises associated with the residential electricity meter;

“rural area” means those parts of Ontario connected to the IMO-controlled grid that, before March 31, 1999, received electricity from Ontario Hydro and, at the time subsection 26 (1) of the *Electricity Act, 1998* comes into force, are receiving electricity from Hydro One Networks Inc.;

“Services Corporation” has the same meaning as in the *Electricity Act, 1998*;

“Transitional Revenue Allocation Agreement” means the Transitional Revenue Allocation Agreement entered into under subsection 3 (2) of Ontario Regulation 80/01 by Ontario Electricity Financial Corporation, Ontario Power Generation Inc., Hydro One Inc., Electrical Safety Authority and the IMO, and available to the public from the Ministry of Energy, Science and Technology, as it read on October 31, 2001.

(2) A reference in this Regulation to a municipality referred to in Schedules 1 to 15 shall be deemed to be a reference to that municipality as it existed on May 6, 1999.

Eligibility for rate protection

2. In addition to the persons described in subsection 79 (2) of the Act, the following classes of consumers in Ontario are eligible for rate protection:

1. Consumers who occupy residential premises in a municipality referred to in Schedules 1 to 15.
2. Consumers who occupy residential premises in a rural area and who, if section 108 of the *Power Corporation Act* had not been repealed by section 28 of Schedule E to the *Energy Competition Act, 1998* and electricity had continued to be distributed by Ontario Hydro, would have been entitled, pursuant to section 108 of the *Power Corporation Act* as it read on March 31, 1999, to pay Ontario Hydro a discounted rate for the electricity they consumed.
3. Consumers who occupy residential premises in an area referred to in Schedule 16, if Ontario Hydro distributed electricity in the area before December 16, 1997 and electricity in the area is now distributed by a distributor connected to the IMO-controlled grid, other than a subsidiary of Hydro One Networks Inc.
4. Consumers who occupy premises, other than government premises, in a remote area.

Amount of rate protection: market opening to Dec. 31, 2002

3. (1) For the period from the day subsection 26 (1) of the *Electricity Act, 1998* comes into force to December 31, 2002, the total amount of rate protection available for eligible consumers is the sum of the 12 amounts set out in the second row applicable to 2001 in Schedule 2 of Appendix 3 of the Transitional Revenue Allocation Agreement.

(2) For the period from the day subsection 26 (1) of the *Electricity Act, 1998* comes into force to December 31, 2002, the Board shall calculate the amount of rate protection for individual consumers referred to in subsection 79 (2) of the Act and in section 2 of this Regulation in a manner that ensures that the total amount of rate protection for those consumers is equal to the total amount of rate protection available under subsection (1), according to the following rules:

1. For each municipality referred to in Schedules 1 to 15, the Board shall take reasonable steps to ensure that, for each month in a period set out in the Schedule that applies to that municipality, the total amount of rate protection for consumers in the municipality who are in the class described in paragraph 1 of section 2 is the total monthly amount set out for that period in that Schedule.
2. For each of the areas referred to in Schedule 16, the Board shall take reasonable steps to ensure that, for each month, the total amount of rate protection for consumers in the area who are in the class described in paragraph 3 of section 2 is the total monthly amount set out for that area in Schedule 16.
3. The Board shall take reasonable steps to ensure that an amount equal to the sum of the 12 amounts set out in the second row applicable to 2001 in Schedule 2 of Appendix 3 of the Transitional Revenue Allocation Agreement, less \$127 million, is used to provide rate protection to consumers who are in the class described in paragraph 4 of section 2.
4. After paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 are complied with, the Board shall take reasonable steps to ensure that the remainder of the total amount of rate protection available under subsection (1) is used to provide rate protection to the persons described in subsection 79 (2) of the Act and the consumers who are in the class described by paragraph 2 of section 2.

(3) If subsection 26 (1) of the *Electricity Act, 1998* does not come into force on January 1, 2002, the following amounts shall be prorated to reflect the part of that year that subsection 26 (1) of that Act is in force:

1. The total amount of rate protection available for eligible consumers under subsection (1).
2. The amount referred to in paragraph 3 of subsection (2).

Amount of rate protection: 2003 and 2004

4. (1) The total amount of rate protection available for eligible consumers in each of the years 2003 and 2004 is \$127 million, plus the amount calculated under subsection (2) for the year.

(2) For each of the years 2003 and 2004, the Board shall calculate the amount by which Hydro One Remote

Communities Inc.'s forecasted revenue requirement for the year, as approved by the Board, exceeds Hydro One Remote Communities Inc.'s forecasted consumer revenues for the year, as approved by the Board.

(3) For the purpose of subsection (2), Hydro One Remote Communities Inc.'s forecasted consumer revenues for a year shall be based on the rate classes set out in Transitional Rate Order RP-1998-0001 made by the Board and on the rates set out for those classes in the most recent rate order made by the Board.

(4) For each of the years 2003 and 2004, the Board shall calculate the amount of rate protection for individual consumers referred to in subsection 79 (2) of the Act and in section 2 of this Regulation in a manner that ensures that the total amount of rate protection for those consumers is equal to the total amount of rate protection available for the year under subsection (1), according to the following rules:

1. For each municipality referred to in Schedules 1 to 15, the Board shall take reasonable steps to ensure that, for each month in a period set out in the Schedule that applies to that municipality, the total amount of rate protection for consumers in the municipality who are in the class described in paragraph 1 of section 2 is the total monthly amount set out for that period in that Schedule.
2. For each of the areas referred to in Schedule 16, the Board shall take reasonable steps to ensure that, for each month, the total amount of rate protection for consumers in the area who are in the class described in paragraph 3 of section 2 is the total monthly amount set out for that area in Schedule 16.
3. The Board shall take reasonable steps to ensure that an amount equal to the amount calculated under subsection (2) for the year is used to provide rate protection to consumers who are in the class described in paragraph 4 of section 2.
4. After paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 are complied with, the Board shall take reasonable steps to ensure that the remainder of the total amount of rate protection available under subsections (1) and (2) is used to provide rate protection to the persons described in subsection 79 (2) of the Act and the consumers who are in the class described by paragraph 2 of section 2.

Compensation for distributors

5. (1) With respect to rate protection provided after subsection 26 (1) of the *Electricity Act, 1998* comes into force, the Board shall calculate the amount of the charge to be collected by the IMO under subsection (5) for each kilowatt hour of electricity that is withdrawn from the IMO-controlled grid, as determined in accordance with the market rules, for use by consumers in Ontario, so that the total amount forecast to be collected is equal to the total amount of rate protection to be provided.

(2) At least 60 days before the end of each calendar year, the IMO shall submit to the Board,

- (a) a forecast of the number of kilowatt hours of electricity that will be withdrawn from the IMO-controlled grid, as determined in accordance with the market rules, for use by consumers in Ontario during the next calendar year; and
- (b) supporting documentation for the forecast.

(3) The forecast shall be derived from information submitted to the Board under section 19 of the *Electricity Act, 1998* in respect of the next fiscal year

(4) The IMO shall give a copy of the forecast and supporting documentation to Hydro One Networks Inc.

(5) The IMO shall collect the charge calculated by the Board under subsection (1) from market participants and any other person who, with the approval of the IMO, withdraws electricity from the IMO-controlled grid for use by consumers in Ontario.

(6) A distributor or retailer who bills a consumer for electricity shall aggregate the amount that the consumer is required to contribute to the compensation required by subsection 79 (3) of the Act with the wholesale market service rate described in the Electricity Distribution Rate Handbook issued by the Board, as it read on October 31, 2001.

(7) Each month, the IMO shall pay the charges it collected under subsection (5) in the preceding month to Hydro One

Networks Inc.

- (8) Hydro One Networks Inc. shall pay the amounts it receives under subsection (7) into a separate account.
- (9) Each month, Hydro One Networks Inc. shall, from the account referred to in subsection (8), pay distributors the compensation to which they are entitled under subsection 79 (3) of the Act.
- (10) If the amount collected under subsection (5) in the period from the day subsection 26 (1) of the Act comes into force until December 31, 2002 exceeds the total amount of rate protection available for eligible consumers under subsection 3 (1) in that period, the excess shall be applied against the amount necessary to compensate distributors who are entitled to compensation under subsection 79 (3) of the Act for 2003.
- (11) If the amount collected under subsection (5) in the period from the day subsection 26 (1) of the Act comes into force until December 31, 2002 is less than the total amount of rate protection available for eligible consumers under subsection 3 (1) in that period, the difference shall be added to the amount necessary to compensate distributors who are entitled to compensation under subsection 79 (3) of the Act for 2003.
- (12) If the amount collected under subsection (5) in 2003 exceeds the total amount of rate protection available for eligible consumers under subsection 4 (1) in 2003, the excess shall be applied against the amount necessary to compensate distributors who are entitled to compensation under subsection 79 (3) of the Act for 2004.
- (13) If the amount collected under subsection (5) in 2003 is less than the total amount of rate protection available for eligible consumers under subsection 3 (1) in that period, the difference shall be added to the amount necessary to compensate distributors who are entitled to compensation under subsection 79 (3) of the Act for 2004.
- (14) Any interest or other income earned on the account referred to in subsection (8) shall be held in the account and shall be used for the purpose of subsection (9).

Transition

6. This Regulation does not apply to electricity consumed after December 31, 2004.

Revocation

7. Ontario Regulations 315/99 and 2/01 are revoked.

Commencement

8. (1) Subject to subsection (2), this Regulation comes into force on the day subsection 26 (1) of the *Electricity Act, 1998* comes into force.
- (2) Sections 1 and 3, subsections 5 (1), (2), (3) and (4) and this section come into force on the day this Regulation is filed.

SCHEDULE 1

TOWN OF BRACEBRIDGE

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
April 1, 2001 to March 31, 2002	\$5,876.28
April 1, 2002 to March 31, 2003	3,917.52
April 1, 2003 to March 31, 2004	1,958.76

SCHEDULE 2

TOWN OF CALEDON

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
April 1, 2001 to March 31, 2002	\$111,085.07
April 1, 2002 to March 31, 2003	74,056.72
April 1, 2003 to March 31, 2004	37,028.36

SCHEDULE 3

TOWN OF COLLINGWOOD

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
--------	--------------------------------------------

April 1, 2001 to March 31, 2002	\$425.70
April 1, 2002 to March 31, 2003	283.80
April 1, 2003 to March 31, 2004	141.90

SCHEDULE 4

TOWN OF DUNNVILLE

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
January 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002	\$18,912.60
January 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003	9,456.30

SCHEDULE 5

TOWN OF ESPANOLA

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
April 1, 2001 to March 31, 2002	\$2,223.00
April 1, 2002 to March 31, 2003	1,482.00
April 1, 2003 to March 31, 2004	741.00

SCHEDULE 6

TOWN OF FLAMBOROUGH

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
May 1, 2001 to April 30, 2002	\$91.98
May 1, 2002 to April 30, 2003	61.32
May 1, 2003 to April 30, 2004	30.66

SCHEDULE 7

TOWNSHIP OF GOULBOURN

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
January 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002	\$13,573.56
January 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003	6,786.78

SCHEDULE 8

TOWN OF GRAVENHURST

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
May 1, 2001 to April 30, 2002	\$9,933.12
May 1, 2002 to April 30, 2003	6,622.08
May 1, 2003 to April 30, 2004	3,311.04

SCHEDULE 9

TOWN OF HALDIMAND

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
April 1, 2001 to March 31, 2002	\$57,133.62
April 1, 2002 to March 31, 2003	38,089.08
April 1, 2003 to March 31, 2004	19,044.54

SCHEDULE 10

TOWN OF LINCOLN

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
January 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002	\$21,016.30
January 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003	10,508.15

SCHEDULE 11

CITY OF NANTICOKE

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
April 1, 2001 to March 31, 2002	\$64,424.25
April 1, 2002 to March 31, 2003	42,949.50
April 1, 2003 to March 31, 2004	21,474.75

SCHEDULE 12

TOWN OF SIOUX LOOKOUT

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
January 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002	\$5,848.20
January 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003	2,924.10

SCHEDULE 13

MUNICIPALITY OF SOUTH BRUCE

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
January 1, 2002 to December 31, 2002	\$344.88
January 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003	172.44

SCHEDULE 14

TOWNSHIP OF TAY

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
June 1, 2001 to May 31, 2002	\$3,223.62
June 1, 2002 to May 31, 2003	2,149.08
June 1, 2003 to May 31, 2004	1,074.54

SCHEDULE 15

TOWNSHIP OF WEST LINCOLN

Period	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
June 1, 2001 to May 31, 2002	\$46,770.36
June 1, 2002 to May 31, 2003	31,180.24
June 1, 2003 to May 31, 2004	15,590.12

SCHEDULE 16

OTHER AREAS

Area	Total Monthly Amount of Rate Protection
Attawapiskat	\$53,333.33
Fort Albany	30,000.00
Kaschechewan	50,000.00

[Back to top](#)