



PUBLIC INTEREST ADVOCACY CENTRE

LE CENTRE POUR LA DEFENSE DE L'INTERET PUBLIC

ONE Nicholas Street, Suite 1204, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 7B7

Tel: (613) 562-4002 Fax: (613) 562-0007 e-mail: mjanigan@piac.ca <http://www.piac.ca>

Michael Janigan
Counsel for VECC

April 29, 2015

VIA E-MAIL

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
P.O. Box 2319
2300 Yonge St.
Toronto, ON
M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: EB-2014-0099 - North Bay Hydro Distribution Limited – 2015 Rates

In accordance with Procedural Order No. 1 VECC would advise that it may have clarification or follow-up questions with respect to all exhibits other than exhibit 6. We are therefore in agreement with Mr. Rennick that a technical conference would be beneficial to this proceeding.

In order to be of assistance to the VECC has enclosed a number of specific questions of clarification. We continue to review the responses and will have further questions which are better asked at the time of the Conference.

Yours truly,

Michael Janigan
Counsel for VECC

Cc: North Bay Hydro – Ms. Melissa Casson – mcasson@northbayhydro.com
[Intervenors of record](#)

**NORTH BAY HYDRO DISTRIBUTION
2015 DISTRIBUTION RATE APPLICATION
VECC'S TECHNICAL CONFERENCE QUESTIONS**

NB: Numbering starts at last VECC IRs

3.0 OPERATING REVENUE (EXHIBIT 3)

3.0 –VECC - 49

Reference: 3-Energy Probe 36
3-VECC 18 c)
4-VECC 30 c)

- a) Please provide the source document(s) that support the values presented in the revised Table 3-16 in Energy Probe 36.
- b) Please confirm that for the program years 2011-2013 the values provided in response to VECC 18 c) will mirror those provided in Energy Probe 36.

3.0 –VECC - 50

Reference: 3-Energy Probe 34 d)
3-Energy Probe 37 a)

- a) Since the updated load forecast uses 2014 actual data and the GS>50 customer shut down in June 2014, why is it necessary to adjust the 2015 load forecast for the customer's estimated full annual usage?
- b) What was this customer's actual kWh usage in 2014?
- c) Why would it not be appropriate to adjust the 2015 forecast for this customer's 2014 usage?

3.0 –VECC - 51

Reference: 3-VECC 23 d)

- a) Please explain the agreement that NBHDL has reached with the City of North Bay as to how the future demand for the Street Lighting class will be determined and how this agreement was incorporated into the load forecast.

- b) What are the total kWh savings associated with the GS 50-2999 class in

3.0 –VECC - 52

Reference: 3-VECC 23 d) – Revised Table 3-17
3-VECC 26 a)

- a) Is there a reason why the 2015 LRAM threshold shown in VECC 23 d) (19,374,043 kWh) does not equal the total impact in 2015 from 2013-2015 CDM programs as shown in Energy Probe 36 a) – Revised Table 3-16?
- b) With respect to VECC 26 a), please explain the following:
- Why were any 2013 savings included in the manual adjustment since the load forecast uses actual 2013 and 2014 data and will therefore fully capture the annual impact of 2013 CDM programs?
 - Why wasn't the ½ rule applied to the 2014 estimated CDM savings?

3.0 –VECC - 53

Reference: 3-VECC 30 c)

- a) Please revise the tables so as to show the detail at a kWh level by customer class.

7.0 COST ALLOCATION

7.0 – VECC – 54

Reference: 7-Staff-20

- a) It appears that NBDHL has used the average late payment charges collected by rate class to allocate its forecast 2015 collection costs to customer classes. Please confirm if this is the case.
- b) If yes, why is this appropriate?
- c) If not, what is the basis of the allocation?

7.0 – VECC – 55

Reference: 7-VECC -43

- a) According to page 3, lines 17-21 it appears that NBHDL charges all customers for new/upgraded services. As a result, it appears that the only costs in account 1855 would be those incurred to correct non-standard or outdated services. Please confirm if this is the case.
- b) Does NBHDL require GS 50-2999 and GS 3000-4999 customers to pay for the costs of correcting non-standard and outdated services?

8.0 RATE DESIGN

8.0 –VECC - 56

Reference: 8-Staff 23

- a) How many of the cases cited were based on Settlement Agreements?

9.0 –VECC - 57

Reference: 8-VECC 47 a)

- a) Are the proposed 2015 LV rates set out in the response based on the updated LV costs for 2015 of \$34,675 provided in Staff 24?

End of document