EXHIBIT 1- GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE

1-Energy Probe TCQ 2

Ref: : 1-Staff-1 & RRWF

The Revenue Deficiency/Sufficiency sheet in the RRWF shows an increase in distribution revenues at approved current rates of $335,486 ($16,123,389 to $16,458,875).

a) Please indicate what this increase is based on and provide references to the interrogatory responses that give rise to this change. For example, does it reflect the response to 3-VECC-21 related to the updated CDM figures?

b) If the response in part (a) is that the increase is based on the updated regression provided in the Excel file 'Brantford_Weather Regression Model_-Interrogatory Responses' that includes 6 more months of actual consumption, please explain why the regression model does not appear to have used actual data for those additional six months for all of the explanatory variables (i.e. heating and cooling degree days and GDP).

c) Please show the derivation of the increase of $2,352,243 in working capital as a result of the cost of power adjustments shown in the Tracking Form in the RRWF.

Response:

a) The increase in distribution revenues at approved current rates increased $169,075 ($16,289,800 as per the original application vs. $16,458,875). The difference is related to the adjustments made in the load forecast, as per response to 3-VECC-57, which totaled $174,258, less an adjustment to the Transformer Allowance, $5,184.

b) BPI acknowledges it should have updated for the most current information available for the GDP and HDD/CDD information. Update will be made to the load forecast to reflect the most up to date information available.

c) Not answered at this time.

1-Energy Probe-TCQ 3

Ref: 1-Energy Probe-2

Has BPI now calculated the additional revenue that should be reflected for 2016 and 2017 as noted in the response to part (b)? If yes, please provide the figures.

Response:

Given that BPI will not be providing services to affiliates related to the FIS in 2016, there are no revenues for 2016. BPI has not yet estimated the allocations to affiliates related to new systems for 2017.

1-Energy Probe-TCQ 4

Ref: 1-Energy Probe-8

Please reconcile the response to part (a) with the statement on page 10 of Exhibit 4, Tab 5, Schedule 1 that BPI includes its proportionate share, or $8,333 of the BEC Board of Director costs in the revenue requirement.

Response:

BPI's Board of Directors consists of 9 members: 3 independent and 6 which are shared with BEC. The honoraria for shared members do not get paid separately, but BPI has included 1/3 of the honoraria for the shared members, representing the cost associated with BPI.

1.0 – VECC - 50

Reference: 1-VECC-2
a) Did BPI produce a report based on its salary survey? If yes please provide this survey.

Response

BPI did not produce a formal report with the intent of sharing with members of the LDC sector. An environmental scan was completed by Human Resources that reflected wage information. This data was completed through collaborative working groups and the independent review of available collective bargaining agreement. BPI Management shared information with its Board of Directors to consider in providing approval for a mandate for the negotiation process which has not formally concluded at this time.

EXHIBIT 2- RATE BASE

2-Energy Probe-TCQ 5

Ref: 2-Energy Probe-18

Please confirm that BPI uses different depreciation rates for the various types of meters in the "Meters" category and that it applies a higher depreciation rate for smart meters than for some other types of meters. If this cannot be confirmed, please explain fully.

Response:

Brantford Power (BPI) confirms that it uses different depreciation rates for various types of meters in the "Meters" category. BPI confirms that it applies a higher depreciation rate for smart meters than for some other types of meters.

BPI uses the following depreciation rates for various types of meters:

Asset Details	Useful Life Range		USoA Account Number	USoA Account Description	Current	
Category| Component | Type					Years	Rate
Residential Energy Meters	25	35				
Industrial/Commercial Energy Meters	25	35	1860	Meters	25	4%
Wholesale Energy Meters	15	30	1860	Meters	15	7%
Current & Potential Transformer (CT & PT)	35	50	1860	Meters	35	3%
Smart Meters	5	15	1860	Meters	15	7%
Repeaters - Smart Metering	10	15	1860	Meters	15	7%
Data Collectors - Smart Metering	15	20	1860	Meters	15	7%

2-Energy Probe-TCQ 6

Ref: 2-SEC-10 & 2-Energy Probe-17

a) Please confirm that the cost of the Dalhousie (Drummond-Stanley) Rebuild of $108,314 as found in Table .5-AH in Exhibit 2, Tab 5, Schedule 2 is included in the capital expenditures shown in Table 2.5-A.

b) Please confirm that this amount is also included in the in-service additions shown in the 2016 continuity schedule provided in the response to 2-Energy Probe-17. If this cannot be confirmed, please explain fully.

c) Given the response to 2-SEC-10 that the costs for this project are treated as work in progress, please explain the costs associated with this project still appear to be included in rate base in both 2016 and 2017.

Response:

a) Brantford Power (BPI) confirms the $108,314 for planned cost of the Dalhousie (Drummond-Stanley) Rebuild is included in the capital expenditures shown in Table 2.5-A.

b) BPI confirms the $108,314 noted in part a) is included in the in-service additions shown in the 2016 continuity schedule provided in response to 2-Energy Probe-17.

c) BPI completed the responses to 2-SEC-10 with respect to the 2016 material capital projects identified in Ex. 2-A-DSP. BPI updated the rate base for both 2016 and 2017 to reflect the removal of the building, land and facility manager. BPI did not update the rate base for the Dalhousie (Drummond-Stanley) Rebuild because other non-material system access projects have replaced this project in the 2016 work plan. BPI believed that the overall changes in projects being completed in 2016 would even out at the end of the year. The two projects that have replaced the Dalhousie project are:

(i) Garden Avenue infrastructure relocation at the request of the City of Brantford to be completed by mid-October and

(ii) Oak Park Road – Highway 403 Interchange infrastructure relocation at the request of the City of Brantford and the MTO to be completed before the end of the year.

2.0 – VECC - 51

Reference: 2-Staff-7 / E2/T1/S1/pg.11

a) BPI has removed the new building costs from the application. The costs listed in rate base are $14,750,349 (E2/T1/S1). The costs shown removed in the Summary of proposed changes (Revised_2017_Rev_Req Excel Spreadsheet) are $14,075,527. Please explain the variance.

b) Please explain (and show the calculation) for the adjustment to working capital associated with this change.
This is associated with the incorrect initial application figures

c) Has BPI removed the forecast rental revenues of $124,080 from the updated RRWF?
Yes, this was done with the first change listed on sheet 14.

d) What is the expected date (year) for the revival of the building project?

Response:

a) The Initial Application line in the RRWF included errors. After correcting for this, the difference is related to the working capital allowance adjustment due to changes in OM&A and the impact of 2017 amortization expense.

Corrected starting rate base:	88,429,953
Remaining difference:	14,431,449
Expectation in IR:	14,750,349
Difference to explain:	$318,900
Amortization:	305k
WCA:	14k

b) Not answered at this time.

c) Yes, BPI confirms that the rental revenues of $124,080 have been removed.

d) The building project is still ongoing; however BPI does not expect to occupy the new building within the Bridge or Test Years.

2.0 – VECC -52

Reference: 2-EP-17 / 2-SEC-20/ 2-SEC-16
a) Please confirm that BPI has made no adjustments to its Fixed Asset Continuity Schedule for 2016 and 2017 other than those items related to the proposed new building?
b) If this is confirmed then please explain why no adjustment has been made for the deferment of the Dalhousie Drummond-Stanley project which is now deferred until 2019.

Response

a) Brantford Power (BPI) confirms that it has made on other adjustments to the Fixed Asset Continuity Schedule for 2016 and 2017 other than those items related to the proposed new building.

b) Please see response to 2-Energy Probe-TCQ 6.

2.0 – VECC - 53

Reference: 2-VECC-11
a) Please explain by how much the projects listed in the response to 2-VECC-11 will reduce outages due to defective equipment (i.e. show the past trend as compared to the expected future trend).

Response:

a) Brantford Power (BPI) has not and does not track outages with sufficient detail that will allow it to accurately identify how much any of the projects will reduce outages due to defective equipment.

EXHIBIT 3- OPERATING REVENUES

3-Energy Probe-TCQ 7

Ref: 3-Energy Probe-28 & RRWF

a) Please explain why the total other operating revenue shown in Table 3-EP-28 in the response to the interrogatory ($1,293,372) is not the amount shown in the RRWF as revenue offsets ($1,169,292).

b) If the difference is due solely to the exclusion of the net revenue in accounts 4375 and 4380, please confirm that this reflects the removal of the forecasted income associated with the building that has been removed from the application.

Response:

a) Table 3-EP-28 is before the building adjustment was made. Table 3-EP-28 was just to remove CDM related revenues (account 4375) and costs (account 4380) in all the years shown, as well as revenues/costs associated with interest on regulatory assets.

b) The amount shown in the RRWF reflects the removal of the forecasted income associated with the building that has been removed from the application.

3-Energy Probe-TCQ 8

Ref: 3-Energy Probe-29

Is the reason that the table provided in the response has no entries for accounts 4375 and 4380 is that the only non-CDM and non-new building revenues and costs included in these accounts is related to affiliate costs and that the revenue is equal to those costs?

Response:

Yes, BPI confirms that the only other revenues and costs included in these accounts are related to affiliate costs and that the revenue is equal to those costs.

Please refer to updated Appendix 2-H provided on September 9, 2016 for the breakdown of 4375 and 4380.

3-Energy Probe-TCQ 9

Ref: 3-Energy Probe-30

a) Please confirm that the $189,930 figure provided in the response to part (c) is for field collection revenue.

b) The response indicates that BPI increased its expectation for 2016 field collection charges in the updated revenue offsets included with 1-Staff-1. What is the updated forecast for 2016 and did BPI also change the forecast for 2017? If so, what is the new forecast?

c) The response to part (d) indicates that the reduction in investment income was based on declining bank balances, partly due to funding a portion of the building purchase. Given the removal of the building purchase, what is the impact on the cash balances and the forecast for investment income?

d) What adjustment did BPI make to 2016 and 2017 for investment income included in the response to 1-Staff-1.

Response:

a) Confirmed.

b) BPI did not update its forecast for 2017.

c) Answer not provided at this time

d) BPI decreased 2016 investment income by $18,000. BPI did not make an adjustment to 2017 investment income resulting from the removal of the building process. As BPI has invested working capital that exceeds the working capital allowance provided at the prescribed 7.5% level, the customers are only contributing to the return on capital up to the $9,611,000 reflected in the working capital allowance.

   BPI believes is inappropriate for the customers to benefit from investment income offsets resulting from returns on invested working capital that they have not been paying for. As BPI's cash component of its working capital is typically greater than the deemed working capital allowance, BPI is proposing that investment income offsets be limited to a value that reflects the investment income that would be earned up to the value of the working capital allowance of $9,611,000. This translates to a total investment income offset of $115,000 ($9,611,000 x 1.2%)

3.0 - VECC - 55

Reference: 3-Energy Probe-27 b)
a) Please confirm that the first row of values shown in the response is not the results per the original application (as labelled) but the results using trend equation to establish the kW/kWh ratio.

Response:

a) BPI confirms that the first row of values shown in the response is not the results per the original application (as labelled) but the results using trend equation to establish the kW/kWh ratio.

3.0 - VECC - 56

Reference: 3-Energy Probe-30 c)
3-VECC-29
a) The response states that the Specific Service Charge revenues have been increased for 2016 to account for higher field collection charges. Why wasn't the forecast for 2017 also increased?

Response:

The interrogatory in 1-Staff-1 requested changes to 2016 as a result of YTD 2016 actuals. BPI limited the changes to the 2017 Test Year to those associated with the facility relocation removal. In addition, BPI notes there have been recent measure to address electricity affordability which are expected to have an impact on the number of field collections.

3.0 - VECC - 57

Reference: 1-Staff-1
3-VECC-21
3-VECC-22 b)
a) Please itemize the changes that were made to the revised Load Forecast Model filed with the IR responses versus that filed with the original Application.

Response:

a) Please refer to the chart below with itemizes the changes that were made to the revised Load Forecast Model filed with the IR responses versus that filed with the original Application.

		2016	2017
kWh's as per application		**905,675,276**	**924,712,894**
Update for YTD June 2016 purchases	1-Staff-1	12,299,263	14,366,643
Update for 2015 Verified CDM	3-VECC-21	(2,889,866)	(4,317,382)
Updated for CDM Persistence (Burman)	3-VECC-22	3,406,904	10,594,945
Updated Load Forecast		**918,491,576**	**945,357,100**

3.0 - VECC - 58

Reference: 3-VECC-22 b)
3-VECC-23 b)
1-Staff-1 (Revised Load Forecast Model)
a) The CDM results for 2011-2013 reported in VECC 22 b) and used in the revised Load Forecast model (CDM Results Tab) do not match those reported in VECC 23 b). Please reconcile and indicate whether the Load Forecast model needs to be revised further.

Response:

BPI acknowledges the 2011 and 2012 figures did not get reflected in the Load Forecast Model (CDM Results Tab) as reflected in the response to VECC 23 b). BPI confirms the Load Forecast model needs to be revised further.

		Results Year											
		2006	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**	**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**
Program Year	**2006**	2,666,105	2,666,105	2,666,105	2,666,105	463,043	463,043	423,559	423,559	397,999	397,999	376,021	376,021
	2007	0	1,387,120	1,375,497	1,375,497	1,375,497	1,374,565	1,319,406	1,319,449	1,319,406	451,387	311,035	164,898
	2008	0	0	2,696,911	2,083,518	2,083,518	2,083,518	1,953,835	1,952,703	1,818,844	1,718,921	1,280,426	950,424
	2009	0	0	0	6,943,327	6,230,629	6,230,629	6,227,931	6,110,636	5,806,438	5,738,138	5,736,648	4,440,683
	2010	0	0	0	0	4,170,820	2,995,440	2,991,631	2,989,542	2,866,698	2,447,090	2,432,987	2,367,568
	2011	0	0	0	0	0	4,286,345	4,273,421	4,269,480	4,164,655	4,044,925	3,842,745	3,585,982
	2012	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,854,213	5,801,327	5,778,849	5,681,217	5,580,103	5,264,741
	2013	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,993,979	6,908,925	6,895,581	6,806,732	6,111,099
	2014	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33,821,560	33,152,890	33,032,221	32,854,801
	2015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,539,722	7,402,101	7,402,101
	2016	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,730,072	7,730,072
	2017	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,611,676
	Total	2,666,105	4,053,225	6,738,513	13,068,447	14,323,507	17,433,541	23,043,997	29,860,675	62,883,374	68,067,869	74,531,091	86,860,067

3.0 - VECC - 59

Reference: 3-VECC-24

a) What is the basis for the 6,351 connections value, i.e., is it an actual value as of a certain date?

b) How was the 9,770 value for the number of Street Light devices in 2017 established (as per the Cost Allocation Model)?

Response:

a) Brantford Power (BPI) based the 6,351 connections on the data available at the time of the rate application filing. Since the filing, BPI has met with the street light customer (SL Customer) to confirm the connections value. The SL Customer and BPI exchanged data on the connection points and streetlights contained within their respective GIS databases. BPI analysed the data and after consultation with the SL Customer, has identified there are 5,767 connection points as of September 2016.

b) As a result of the data analysis and consultation with the SL Customer, BPI has identified there are 10,118 streetlights as of September 2016. Based on new procedures to track the installation of street lights and connection points, BPI and the street lighting customer will be regularly tracking and updating both the number of connections and devices.

4.0 OPERATING COSTS (EXHIBIT 4)

4-Staff-55

BPI completed Appendix 2-KA, which compares OPEB amounts recovered in rates to the paid benefit amounts. From the chart, there have been excess recoveries from 2013 to 2015. What has BPI used these excess recoveries for?

Response:

As is the case with any item of OM&A that differs from the expected cost of service, these over or under recoveries are included in the total OM&A pool reflected in the actual OM&A results. If excess recoveries have not been required to offset other under recoveries, the after tax impact would be reported in Net Income for the particular year.

4-Energy Probe-TCQ 10

Ref: 4-Energy Probe-33

a) The response to part (a) did not answer the question. Was the $536,035 expense incurred in 2013 or 2014 or was it incurred in 2012 or previous years?

b) Please indicate whether the $362,000 in amortization expense is included in the 2013 or 2014 actual figures shown in Table 4.2-B.

c) Please indicate whether the $174,035 OM&A expense is included in the 2013 or 2014 actual figures shown in Table 4.2-B.

d) Please confirm that the response labelled as part (e) is the response to the question labelled as part (d).

e) Please provide the response to the question in part (e).

Response:

a) The expense of $536,035 was incurred in 2013.

b) The $362,000 is included in 2013 actual figures.

c) The $174,035 is included in 2013 actual figures.

d) BPI confirms this response was mislabeled.

e) The $63,700 included in the original cost drivers table (Table 4.2-B) represents the 2016-only amount which is proposed to be amortized over 5 years ($318,499, from 4.7.2-A, divided by 5). The amount of 318,499 is included in the total of $347,659 which is proposed to be amortized over 5 years.

4-Energy Probe-TCQ 11

Ref: 4-Energy Probe-38

a) What is the $25,000 difference between the $10,470,506 figure shown in Table 4-EP-38 (and in Table 4.1-A) and the figure of $10,495,506 shown as the OM&A expense in the Application column of the RRWF?

b) Please show the movement from the original $10,470,506 in OM&A expenses to the new figure of $10,670,611 shown in the RRWF. Please explain all adjustments.

Response:

a) The difference is due to LEAP in the amount of $25,000. This amount was not included in Table 4-EP-38 and 4.1-A, however it was correctly included in the RRWF.

b) Note that the amount of OM&A that was included in the Original application was $10,495,506. Refer below for the reconciliation.

	OM&A	
Original COS Application	10,495,506	
Updated with IR changes	10,670,511	
Difference	(175,005)	
Reconciliation		
Building Adjustments	(400,757)	Note 1
Rental Facilities Adjustment	581,823	Note 2
CDM Adjustment	(6,061)	Note 3
Remaining Difference	-	

Note 1: These adjustments relate to the removal of repairs and maintenance that were originally budgeted for the new facility.
Note 2: These adjustments related to the addback of rental facilities, since BPI is assuming no new facility in 2017
Note 3: This adjustment is to remove $6,061 from OM&A for VP Customer Service and Conservation to be recovered from IESO.

4-Energy Probe-TCQ 12

Ref: 4-Energy Probe-44

Please provide a PILS workform that reflects the loss carry forward of $159,164 being brought into the 2016 bridge year for regulatory PILS purposes.

Response:

BPI as completed and attached (Attachment 4-EP TCQ 12) the PILS workform that reflects the loss carry forward of $159,164 being brought into the 2016 bridge year for regulatory PILS purposes. However, BPI notes the remaining loss carry forward of $159,164, which BPI will use in 2016 to reduce taxes, is the remaining balance of the loss carry forward generated in 2014 related to changes in regulatory assets/liabilities. Since regulatory assets/liabilities are excluded for tax calculations for regulatory purposes, BPI does not believe the amount should be included in the calculation of PILS for regulatory purposes.

4-Energy Probe-TCQ 13

Ref: 4-Energy Probe-47

Please confirm that the property tax of $20,031 is still included in the updated forecast of OM&A of $10,670,511 shown in the revised RRWF. If this cannot be confirmed, please explain why there is no property tax shown in the RRWF.

Response:

Yes, BPI confirms that the property tax of $20,031 is included in the OM&A of $10,670,511. BPI notes that, for cost allocation purposes, the $20,031 is correctly included in account 6105 and therefore allocated according to the model's treatment for non-PILS taxes, rather than for a component of OM&A.

4.0 – VECC - 61

Reference ; 4-Staff-45 / 4-VECC-38
a) What are the annual ongoing costs of maintaining access to FIS and any other systems owned and operated by the City of Brantford, but being replaced by future BPI IT systems?

Response:

Annual ongoing costs of maintaining access to the FIS system owned and operated by the City of Brantford: $ 6,353

Other systems being replaced by BPI are not owned by the City of Brantford.

4.0 – VECC - 62

Reference; 4-SEC-20
a) Has BPI adjusted the application for the delay in developing a new CIS system?

Response:

Although BPI had put the CIS RFP on hold until completion of the FIS procurement, BPI does not foresee a delay in the procurement and subsequent implementation of the CIS system. BPI expects to implement CIS by end of 2017, as originally included in the application. Hence, no adjustment is required to the application.

4.0 - VECC - 63

Reference: 3-VECC 22 b)
a) Please confirm that the LRAM Rate Riders set out at page 193 of 339 are just for recovery of the impact of 2005-2010 programs for 2013. If not, what do they represent?
b) Please clarify what Brantford's total proposed LRAM claim by class is, what periods it is meant to cover and the resulting rate riders by class.

Response:

a) BPI confirms that the LRAM Rate Riders in the lower part of the chart set out at page 193 of 339 are just for recovery of the impact of 2006-2010 programs for 2013.

b) BPI's total proposed LRAM claim by class as shown in IR 3-VECC-22 is shown below. The proposed amount is recovery of the impact of 2011-2014 programs for 2014. The rate rider calculation, as provided in the 2017 DVA continuity schedule, has also been included.

LRAMVA Claim by Customer Class							
Customer Class	**2011-2014 CDM Program Lost Revenues in 2014**	**2014 LRAMVA Baseline**	**LRAMVA (Lost Revs-Baseline)**	**Carrying Charges**	**Total Claim**	**2017 Forecast Billing Units**	**2017 Proposed LRAM Rate Rider**
Residential	$ 67,300	$ 55,518	$ 11,782	$ 151	$ 11,933	300,579,328	$ -
General Service less than 50 kW	$ 43,794	$ 35,187	$ 8,607	$ 111	$ 8,718	102,906,032	$ 0.0001
General Service 50 to 4,999 kW	$ 180,799	$ 41,468	$ 139,332	$ 1,789	$ 141,121	1,259,313	$ 0.1121
Total	**$ 291,893**	**$ 132,172**	**$ 159,721**	**$ 2,051**	**$ 161,772**		

4.0 – VECC - 64

Reference; 4-Staff-60 a)
3-VECC-22, Attachment 3
a) Please update the response to 4-Staff 60 a) based on the revised calculations in VECC-22, Attachment 3.

Response:

a) Below is an updated (in red) response to 4-Staff 60 a) based on the revised calculations in VECC-22, Attachment 3.

BPI confirms it is requesting the amount of $118,295 for the persistence of 2006-2010 CDM savings into 2013. BPI's total request (in account 1568) is for $161,772 including carrying charges. This represents the impact of 2011 to 2014 programs in 2014. BPI is not claiming the amount of ($1,108) calculated by Burman as the differences between the LRAMVA baseline included in the 2013 COS and the 2013 Actual CDM results. BPI's Settlement Agreement in EB-2012-0109 included the agreement that no amounts for 2013 would be booked to Account 1568. The derivation of the $161,772 included for disposition in account 1568 is below:

Burman LRAMVA total (excl. carrying charges)	$ 158,612
Less: Amount calculated for 2013 impact *	$ 1,108
Sub-Total	**$159,721**
Plus Carrying Charges	$ 2,051
Total Claim	**$ 161,772**

*Please note amount of 2013 impact adjustment is a negative and is therefore added.

Exhibit 5- COST OF CAPITAL AND RATE OF RETURN

5-Energy Probe-TCQ 14

Ref: 5-Energy Probe-51 & RRWF

a) Please provide the Infrastructure Ontario debt rate for a 5 year term that was available when the affiliate debt was renewed.

b) Please provide the 2017 table in Appendix 2-OB that reflects the updated long term debt rate of 4.29% used in the revised RRWF.

Response:

a) BPI has provided a screen short (labeled as Attachment 4-VECC-44) from the Infrastructure website from February 17th 2016. The debt rate for a 5 year term on this date was 1.84%.
b) Please see Table 5-EP-TCQ 14 below.

Table 5-EP-TCQ-14

Appendix 2-OB
Debt Instruments

This table must be completed for all required historical years, the bridge year and the test year.

Year 2017

Row	Description	Lender	Affiliated or Third-Party Debt?	Fixed or Variable-Rate?	Start Date	Term (years)	Principal ($)	Rate (%) 2	Interest ($) 1
1	Promissory Note	The Corporation of the City of Brantford	Affiliated	Fixed Rate	1-Feb-11	5	$ 24,189,168	4.20%	1,015,945
2	Powerline Municipal Transformer Station B	Royal Bank	Third-Party	Fixed Rate	31-Jan-06	15	$ 2,012,583	5.51%	110,893
3	General borrowings	Ontario Infrastructure & Lands Corporation	Third-Party	Fixed Rate	3-Dec-07	25	$ 1,852,754	5.14%	95,232
4	General borrowings	Ontario Infrastructure & Lands Corporation	Third-Party	Fixed Rate	1-Dec-10	40	$ 4,517,238	4.95%	223,603
5	Smart meter borrowings	Ontario Infrastructure & Lands Corporation	Third-Party	Fixed Rate	18-Nov-09	15	$ 4,185,695	3.46%	144,825
6	General borrowings	Ontario Infrastructure & Lands Corporation	Third-Party	Fixed Rate	3-Dec-12	30	$ 3,673,452	3.90%	143,265
Total							$ 40,430,890	4.29%	1,733,763

5.0-VECC-65

Reference: 1-EP-1
a) As of September 15, 2016 the Ontario Infrastructure 30 year lending rates for Local Distribution Companies was 3.32% for serial loans and 3.40% for amortizer loans (http://www.infrastructureontario.ca/Templates/RateForm.aspx?ekfrm=2147483942&langtype=1033&sector=ldc). Please provide the source of the 3.89% shown in response to 1-EP-1.

Response:

As shown in the table, BPI consulted the Infrastructure Ontario website for rates as of December 3, 2015. BPI does not have a screen shot to confirm this, and historic rates are not available on the IO website.

5.0-VECC-66

Reference: 5-VECC-43
a) Why did BPI believe that a rate of 5.70 for the renewed promissory note was reasonable?
b) If the note shown at Exhibit 5, Attachment 5-A is not a new promissory note then please file the original (and presumably in force) note.

Response:

a) BPI did not propose the rate of 5.70% but rather 4.20%, and believes it to be reasonable because it satisfies the terms of the promissory note, and additionally, is favourable in comparison to the OEB's deemed long term debt rate at the time of renewal of 4.54%.

b) BPI wishes to correct the record with respect to this item. Attachment 5-A is the current/new promissory note. BPI's arrangement with the City of Brantford was extended in 2016 with this note. BPI wishes to highlight that the note is affiliated debt which is not callable on demand, as can be concluded from Attachment 5-A.

EXHIBIT 9- DEFERRAL AND VARIANCE ACCOUNTS

9-Staff-67

The allocated balance for Class B customers in Account 1589 in the table is $1.46M, which corresponded to the original application where BPI proposed its own methodology in calculating the allocation of Account 1589 to Class B customers who became Class A customers in 2015. BPI revised the allocation using the OEB's DVA continuity schedule and the allocated balance for remaining Class B in the DVA continuity schedule is $1.56M. Can you confirm which one is the allocated balance BPI is proposing to dispose?

Response:

BPI confirms the chart in response to 9-Staff-67 was based on the original application. Based on the updates BPI confirms it is proposing to dispose of the allocated balance for Class B customers in Account 1589 of $1.56m as per the chart below.

Rate Class	2017 Predicted kWh	2017 Predicted kW	Allocated Balance	Unit for Disposition	Rate Rider
Residential	20,619,742	-	$ 69,103	kWh	$ 0.0034
GS<50 KW	14,303,938	-	$ 47,937	kWh	$ 0.0034
GS>50 KW	423,264,025	1,172,294	$ 1,418,487	kWh	$ 0.0034
Street Light	7,460,329	22,796	$ 25,002	kWh	$ 0.0034
Sentinal Lighting	67,475	208	$ 226	kWh	$ 0.0034
Unmetered Scatter Load	-	-	$ -	kWh	$ -
Embedded Distributor	-	139,437	$ -	kWh	$ -
Total	**465,715,510**	**1,334,737**	**1,560,754**		

Attachments: Attachment 4-EP TCQ 12