

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 Welland Hydro-Electric Distribution Corp. to the Ontario Energy Board for an Order or Orders approving or fixing just and reasonable rates and other service charges for the distribution of electricity as of May 1, 2017.

**INTERROGATORIES FROM THE
SCHOOL ENERGY COALITION**

1.0-SEC-1

[Ex. 1, p. 11] Please provide the “extensive assessment” referred to at line 26.

1.0-SEC-2

[Ex. 1, p. 14] Attached are two tables comparing the 2016 and 2017 typical distribution bills for all of the electricity distributors in Ontario, based on Board orders, draft rate orders, and rate applications, as indicated. With respect to the existing and proposed distribution bills for the Applicant:

- (a) Please confirm that, to the best of the Applicant’s knowledge, the calculations in the attached tables are correct. If the Applicant believes any are incorrect, please provide details.
- (b) Please confirm that the Applicant is proposing to move from the 18th highest rates in the province to the 34th highest rates in the province. Please explain how this maintains rates that are “competitive with LDCs in Ontario”.
- (c) Please confirm that the Applicant currently has the 33rd highest residential distribution bills in the province, and proposes to move to 43rd highest (out of 63) in 2017. Please explain how this maintains residential rates that are “competitive with LDCs in Ontario”.
- (d) Please confirm that the Applicant current has the 27th highest GS>50 distribution bills in the province, and proposes to move to 41st highest in 2017. Please explain how this maintains GS>50 rates that are “competitive with LDCs in Ontario”.
- (e) Please confirm that the Applicant believes the six Niagara area LDCs are the appropriate comparator group for the Applicant’s rates.

- (f) Please confirm that the Applicant's residential rates are currently lower than all Niagara area LDCs, but that under the current proposals in 2017 it will move higher than Grimsby and Horizon, but remain lower than the other three comparators. Please explain the main factors causing Welland Hydro to have greater cost pressures for residential customers than Grimsby and Horizon.
- (g) Please confirm that the Applicant's GS>50 rates are currently lower than all Niagara area LDCs except Niagara-on-the-Lake, but that under the current proposals in 2017 only Canadian Niagara Power would be higher than the Applicant. The other four would be lower. Please explain the main factors causing Welland Hydro to have greater cost pressures for GS>50 customers than the other Niagara area LDCs.

1.0-SEC-3

[Ex.1, p. 17] Please explain why the Applicant has set 2017 targets for SAIDI and SAIFI that are worse performance than 2015 actual results.

1.0-SEC-4

[Ex.1, p. 40] Please confirm that the reduction of the working capital percentage from 12% to 7.5% reduces rate base by \$2.4 million, and reduces revenue requirement by more than \$180,000. Please show where that driver of the deficiency is included in the summary on page 40.

1.0-SEC-5

[Ex. 1, p. 59] Please confirm that 81% (31% + 50%) of customers believe that capital should be invested at levels less than or equal to the levels necessary to maintain current outage levels, but not at levels needed to improve outage levels.

1.0-SEC-6

[Ex.1, p. 60] Please provide a list of asset classes/types that the Applicant will continue to run to failure notwithstanding the views of residential customers as expressed in the survey.

1.0-SEC-7

[Ex. 1, p. 65] Please confirm that the Applicant only asked for feedback from customers on one General Plant project, and for that project 70% of the customers said No. Please provide details as to why website self-service options would cost customers more than the costs currently incurred by the Applicant for providing those services.

1.0-SEC-8

[Ex. 1, p. 75] Please explain why the benchmarking model filed by the Applicant shows that the Predicted Cost for the Applicant should increase from 2016 to 2017 by 6.47%. Please confirm that,

despite the Applicant's costs increasing from 2016 to 2017 by 5.24%, the high increase in Predicted Cost is the only reason why the Applicant's Cost Performance improves.

1.0-SEC-9

[Ex 1, p. 75] Attached is a table showing the benchmarking results for all current LDCs for the six years ending 2015, showing the Applicant 12th in Ontario in cost performance, on both a three year average and one year (2015) basis.

- (a) Please advise if the Applicant believes any of the figures in the table are incorrect.
- (b) Please confirm that the predicted costs of the Applicant in the model in 2013 were \$12,272,513, and that pursuant to the model the predicted costs of the Applicant were expected to increase by 18.90% from 2013 to 2017, a compound annual growth rate of more than 4.4% per year.
- (c) Please confirm that the actual costs of the Applicant in the model in 2013 were \$10,542,875, and that it is forecast that they will increase to \$11,960,287 in 2017, an increase of 13.44%, which is a CAGR of 3.2% per year.
- (d) Please explain why, given the declining volumes being delivered to customers by Welland Hydro over that same period, it is appropriate for actual costs to increase at more than inflation.

1.0-SEC-10

[App. 1-I, p. 32] Please explain how the 6.25% promissory note can be described as having "no material difference between market and carrying values".

1.0-SEC-11

Please provide a copy of the most current Shareholder Declaration, if any. If the Shareholder Declaration has changed since the date the EB-2012-0173 application for the last rebasing was filed, please provide the Shareholder Declaration at that time, and all revisions since then.

1.0-SEC-12

Please describe how, if at all, the Applicant's policies or approaches with respect to operational and capital expenses changed due to the results of the customer engagement activities.

2.0-SEC-13

[Ex. 2, p. 5] With respect to Table 2-1:

- (a) Please confirm that the Applicant is proposing a Test Year Gross Fixed Assets that is 14.92% higher than 2013 Actual GFA, a CAGR of 3.54% per year.

- (b) Please confirm that the Applicant is proposing a Test Year Net Book Value of PP&E that is 15.70% higher than 2013 Actual NBV, a CAGR of 3.71% per year.
- (c) Please advise whether the increase in GFA and the increase in NBV for that four year period are higher or lower than the increases in those items for the previous four year period (2009 to 2013), and the four year period prior to that (2005-2009).
- (d) Please provide the percentage increases and CAGR for both GFA and NBV for each of those prior periods, and provide a high level explanation of any acceleration or deceleration in the pace of capital asset increases since then.

2.0-SEC-14

[Ex. 2, p. 26] With respect to Table 2-17:

- (a) Please confirm that the line after 1908 should be labelled “Subtotal Buildings and Fixtures”.
- (b) Please confirm that the line after 1960 should be labelled “Subtotal Equipment”.
- (c) Please advise whether the 49.66% increase in GFA of IT Assets from 2013 Actual to 2017 Forecast, a CAGR of 10.6% per year, is expected to continue for the next four year period. Please explain your answer, either way.
- (d) Please advise whether the 30.03% increase in GFA of Equipment from 2013 Actual to 2017 Forecast, a CAGR of 6.8% per year, is expected to continue for the next four year period. Please explain your answer, either way.
- (e) Please explain why, given the large increases in General Plant, the increase in GFA of Distribution Plant (in 2-16) from 2013 Actual to 2017 Forecast is only 9.43%, a CAGR of 2.28% per year.

3.0-SEC-15

Please explain the Applicant’s strategy to reduce costs to maintain pace with declining billing determinants for some rate classes. If possible, please provide numerical targets that tie the rate of decline of billing determinants to the rate of decline of costs.

4.0-SEC-16

[Ex. 4, p. 21] With respect to Table 4-9:

- (a) Please confirm that Salary and Wages per FTE for Management is proposed to increase from 2013 Actual to 2017 Forecast by 19.33%, a CAGR of 4.5% per year.

- (b) Please confirm that Total Compensation per FTE for Management is proposed to increase from 2013 Actual to 2017 Forecast by 18.83%, a CAGR of 4.4% per year.
- (c) Please confirm that Salary and Wages per FTE for Non-Management is proposed to increase from 2013 Actual to 2017 Forecast by 13.10%, a CAGR of 3.1% per year.
- (d) Please confirm that Total Compensation per FTE for Non-Management is proposed to increase from 2013 Actual to 2017 Forecast by 12.38%, a CAGR of 2.9% per year.
- (e) Please provide the primary reasons why Management compensation is increasing at a more rapid rate than Non-Management compensation, and whether that difference is expected to continue into the future.
- (f) Please provide any benchmarking of the absolute levels of Management and Non-Management compensation or components of compensation that demonstrates that the rates of increase proposed by the Applicant are necessary either as “catch-up” or other adjustment to benchmark levels.

4.0-SEC-17

[Ex. 4, p. 22] Please provide the most recent report of the “external consultant” referred to in line 5, plus any prior report in the last two years that has recommended greater than normal increases to bring employees or groups of employees into line with expected levels.

7.0-SEC-18

[Ex. 7, p. 6] Please provide a side by side table showing the costs allocated to the GS>50 class in the 2013 Board approved Cost Allocation Study, and the costs allocated in the Application, with an explanation of each of the major changes in allocated amounts.

8.0-SEC-19

[Ex. 8, p. 5] Please confirm that,

- (a) If the GS>50 fixed monthly charge is set at the Minimum System with PLCC, \$69.59, the variable charge would be \$4.3394/kW.
- (b) If the GS>50 fixed monthly charge is set at the current level, \$281.42, the variable charge would be \$3.2953/kW.

8.0-SEC-20

Please confirm that the Applicant serves 35 school accounts. Please advise how many school accounts are in each of GS<50 and GS>50.

All of which is respectfully submitted this February 28, 2017.

Annual Distribution Bill Comparison - All LDCs 2016 Rates
(monthly charge and volumetric rate)

	<i>Utility</i>	<i>Residential</i>		<i>GS<50</i>		<i>GS>50</i>		<i>Overall</i>	<i>Number of</i>
		<i>800 kwh</i>	<i>% of Avg</i>	<i>2000 kwh</i>	<i>% of Avg</i>	<i>250 KW</i>	<i>% of Avg</i>	<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Customers</i>
1	Hydro Hawkesbury	\$188.16	55.3%	\$332.04	50.0%	\$7,352.88	61.9%	55.73%	5,499
2	E.L.K.	\$219.48	64.5%	\$309.24	46.6%	\$6,994.14	58.8%	56.65%	12,398
3	Hearst (2015)	\$264.12	77.6%	\$368.40	55.5%	\$5,923.44	49.8%	60.99%	2,718
4	Hydro 2000	\$334.92	98.5%	\$495.84	74.7%	\$5,247.90	44.2%	72.43%	1,221
5	Lakefront	\$266.16	78.2%	\$493.92	74.4%	\$11,315.46	95.2%	82.62%	9,996
6	Peterborough	\$272.64	80.1%	\$584.76	88.1%	\$10,045.44	84.5%	84.25%	36,058
7	Kingston	\$301.20	88.5%	\$521.64	78.6%	\$10,222.14	86.0%	84.38%	27,356
8	Westario	\$311.88	91.7%	\$563.28	84.9%	\$9,177.84	77.2%	84.58%	22,822
9	Rideau St. Lawr. (2015)	\$302.28	88.9%	\$587.04	88.4%	\$9,351.60	78.7%	85.32%	5,858
10	Brantford	\$281.28	82.7%	\$483.12	72.8%	\$11,965.86	100.7%	85.38%	38,789
11	Orangeville	\$316.20	93.0%	\$621.48	93.6%	\$8,625.90	72.6%	86.38%	11,685
12	Ottawa River	\$292.08	85.9%	\$564.24	85.0%	\$11,289.00	95.0%	88.61%	10,820
13	Burlington	\$305.52	89.8%	\$635.28	95.7%	\$9,559.32	80.4%	88.65%	66,366
14	Thunder Bay	\$276.00	81.1%	\$661.68	99.7%	\$10,248.78	86.2%	89.01%	50,482
15	Entegrus	\$301.68	88.7%	\$597.60	90.0%	\$10,832.64	91.1%	89.95%	40,503
16	COLLUS	\$311.88	91.7%	\$576.60	86.9%	\$10,861.38	91.4%	89.97%	16,426
17	London	\$313.20	92.1%	\$636.60	95.9%	\$9,780.00	82.3%	90.08%	152,544
18	Welland	\$325.92	95.8%	\$557.16	83.9%	\$10,761.24	90.5%	90.09%	22,470
19	Hydro One Brampton	\$285.12	83.8%	\$690.84	104.1%	\$9,862.32	83.0%	90.29%	149,618
20	Northern Ontario Wires	\$409.08	120.3%	\$718.44	108.2%	\$5,052.30	42.5%	90.33%	6,062
21	Guelph	\$365.40	107.4%	\$524.76	79.1%	\$10,215.66	85.9%	90.80%	52,963
22	Essex	\$310.32	91.2%	\$697.56	105.1%	\$9,260.58	77.9%	91.41%	28,640
23	Veridian	\$313.68	92.2%	\$600.36	90.4%	\$11,112.06	93.5%	92.05%	117,494
24	Halton Hills	\$300.48	88.3%	\$567.72	85.5%	\$12,231.00	102.9%	92.25%	21,534
25	Milton (DRO)	\$329.76	96.9%	\$616.20	92.8%	\$10,612.26	89.3%	93.02%	35,111
26	Renfrew (2015)	\$306.84	90.2%	\$703.80	106.0%	\$9,870.54	83.0%	93.09%	4,246
27	Cambridge North Dumfries	\$305.76	89.9%	\$506.52	76.3%	\$13,666.32	115.0%	93.72%	52,684
28	Tillsonburg	\$354.72	104.3%	\$749.04	112.8%	\$7,764.18	65.3%	94.15%	6,935
29	Oshawa	\$270.84	79.6%	\$569.04	85.7%	\$14,048.40	118.2%	94.51%	54,731
30	Powerstream (DRO)	\$292.08	85.9%	\$659.40	99.3%	\$11,854.74	99.7%	94.98%	353,284
31	Woodstock	\$367.44	108.0%	\$650.28	98.0%	\$9,412.62	79.2%	95.06%	15,745
32	Erie Thames	\$366.00	107.6%	\$606.48	91.4%	\$10,671.30	89.8%	96.25%	18,265
33	Embrun	\$320.76	94.3%	\$558.84	84.2%	\$13,229.16	111.3%	96.59%	1,985
34	St.Thomas	\$330.60	97.2%	\$669.84	100.9%	\$11,455.02	96.4%	98.16%	16,918
35	Niagara-on-the-Lake	\$346.80	101.9%	\$737.28	111.1%	\$9,801.18	82.5%	98.49%	8,672
36	WestCoast Huron	\$425.28	125.0%	\$642.72	96.8%	\$8,964.00	75.4%	99.09%	3,797
37	Kenora	\$371.52	109.2%	\$611.04	92.1%	\$11,550.00	97.2%	99.48%	5,558
38	Wasaga	\$292.20	85.9%	\$534.72	80.6%	\$15,692.16	132.0%	99.49%	12,985
39	North Bay	\$330.48	97.1%	\$721.08	108.6%	\$11,086.02	93.3%	99.68%	23,975
40	Midland	\$382.92	112.6%	\$663.60	100.0%	\$10,390.74	87.4%	99.98%	7,035
41	Festival	\$350.52	103.0%	\$746.04	112.4%	\$10,267.44	86.4%	100.60%	20,362

42	Brant County	\$338.76	99.6%	\$640.32	96.5%	\$12,952.86	109.0%	101.67%	9,971
43	Centre Wellington	\$325.20	95.6%	\$671.40	101.1%	\$12,968.82	109.1%	101.95%	6,729
44	Kitchener-Wilmot	\$283.32	83.3%	\$626.88	94.4%	\$15,819.06	133.1%	103.60%	91,143
45	Innpower	\$431.64	126.9%	\$611.16	92.1%	\$11,158.80	93.9%	104.28%	15,790
46	Sioux Lookout	\$460.20	135.3%	\$708.72	106.8%	\$8,557.26	72.0%	104.68%	2,779
47	Horizon	\$341.76	100.5%	\$748.92	112.8%	\$12,147.66	102.2%	105.16%	240,076
48	Enersource	\$286.92	84.3%	\$788.04	118.7%	\$14,064.18	118.3%	107.13%	201,359
49	Greater Sudbury	\$312.84	92.0%	\$708.48	106.7%	\$14,822.28	124.7%	107.80%	47,187
50	Niagara Peninsula	\$396.72	116.6%	\$790.20	119.0%	\$11,383.86	95.8%	110.48%	51,824
51	Lakeland	\$392.40	115.4%	\$753.72	113.5%	\$12,245.22	103.0%	110.64%	13,264
52	Hydro Ottawa	\$340.80	100.2%	\$725.16	109.2%	\$14,611.80	122.9%	110.79%	319,536
53	PUC Distribution	\$290.28	85.3%	\$687.24	103.5%	\$17,432.34	146.7%	111.84%	33,487
54	EnWin	\$329.28	96.8%	\$727.68	109.6%	\$15,800.34	132.9%	113.12%	86,662
55	Whitby	\$362.88	106.7%	\$749.40	112.9%	\$14,935.92	125.7%	115.08%	41,488
56	Orillia	\$334.08	98.2%	\$845.04	127.3%	\$14,834.70	124.8%	116.77%	13,340
57	Grimsby (proposed)	\$387.48	113.9%	\$858.36	129.3%	\$12,982.86	109.2%	117.48%	11,038
58	Oakville (interim)	\$334.80	98.4%	\$807.48	121.6%	\$15,749.28	132.5%	117.52%	66,530
59	Newmarket-Tay	\$323.28	95.0%	\$834.72	125.8%	\$15,794.52	132.9%	117.89%	34,871
60	Haldimand County	\$438.96	129.0%	\$779.28	117.4%	\$12,805.02	107.7%	118.06%	21,323
61	Bluewater	\$397.80	116.9%	\$799.32	120.4%	\$14,722.08	123.9%	120.40%	36,115
62	Wellington North	\$434.52	127.7%	\$930.12	140.1%	\$11,205.30	94.3%	120.71%	3,731
63	Waterloo North	\$384.36	113.0%	\$765.12	115.3%	\$16,627.26	139.9%	122.71%	54,674
64	Norfolk	\$455.64	133.9%	\$974.16	146.8%	\$14,827.20	124.7%	135.15%	19,559
65	Canadian Niagara	\$427.20	125.6%	\$891.12	134.2%	\$21,888.06	184.1%	147.99%	28,627
66	Toronto Hydro	\$461.87	135.8%	\$1,052.70	158.6%	\$21,534.03	181.2%	158.51%	744,252
67	Algoma	\$605.76	178.1%			\$16,876.98	142.0%	160.03%	11,650
	AVERAGE	\$340.18		\$663.79		\$11,886.16			

Annual Distribution Bill Comparison - 2017 Rates
(monthly charge and volumetric rate)

	<i>Utility</i>	<i>Residential</i>		<i>GS<50</i>		<i>GS>50</i>		<i>Overall</i>	<i>Number of</i>
		<i>800 kwh</i>	<i>% of Avg</i>	<i>2000 kwh</i>	<i>% of Avg</i>	<i>250 KW</i>	<i>% of Avg</i>	<i>Ranking</i>	<i>Customers</i>
1	Hydro Hawkesbury	\$191.76	55.5%	\$332.04	48.7%	\$7,352.88	60.1%	54.75%	5,499
2	Hearst (DRO)	\$273.72	79.2%	\$374.64	54.9%	\$5,935.56	48.5%	60.87%	2,718
3	E.L.K. (Applied)	\$258.84	74.9%	\$456.60	66.9%	\$8,231.76	67.3%	69.70%	12,398
4	Hydro 2000 (Applied)	\$354.00	102.5%	\$505.44	74.1%	\$5,342.46	43.7%	73.39%	1,221
5	Lakefront	\$264.96	76.7%	\$484.32	71.0%	\$11,130.78	91.0%	79.54%	9,996
6	Peterborough (2016)	\$272.64	78.9%	\$584.76	85.7%	\$10,045.44	82.1%	82.23%	36,058
7	Westario (2016)	\$311.88	90.3%	\$563.28	82.5%	\$9,177.84	75.0%	82.60%	22,822
8	Kingston	\$301.20	87.2%	\$537.48	78.8%	\$10,592.88	86.6%	84.17%	27,356
9	Brantford	\$286.56	82.9%	\$551.28	80.8%	\$11,199.66	91.5%	85.08%	38,789
10	Orangeville	\$318.24	92.1%	\$632.52	92.7%	\$8,763.78	71.6%	85.47%	11,685
11	Ottawa River (DRO)	\$292.68	84.7%	\$573.24	84.0%	\$11,469.66	93.7%	87.48%	10,820
12	Burlington (Applied)	\$308.76	89.4%	\$645.60	94.6%	\$9,731.28	79.5%	87.83%	66,366
13	Entegrus (DRO)	\$301.80	87.3%	\$608.76	89.2%	\$11,022.24	90.1%	88.87%	40,503
14	COLLUS (Applied)	\$310.92	90.0%	\$588.60	86.3%	\$11,073.12	90.5%	88.91%	16,426
15	London (DRO)	\$310.80	90.0%	\$646.20	94.7%	\$10,051.20	82.1%	88.93%	152,544
16	Guelph	\$362.40	104.9%	\$532.68	78.1%	\$10,379.22	84.8%	89.25%	52,963
17	Hydro One Brampton	\$288.48	83.5%	\$702.24	102.9%	\$10,020.06	81.9%	89.43%	149,618
18	Milton (Applied)	\$331.92	96.1%	\$626.52	91.8%	\$10,141.56	82.9%	90.25%	35,111
19	Veridian (Applied)	\$316.92	91.7%	\$611.16	89.6%	\$11,311.98	92.4%	91.24%	117,494
20	Essex (Applied)	\$320.04	92.6%	\$710.40	104.1%	\$9,441.30	77.1%	91.29%	28,640
21	Halton Hills (DRO)	\$308.64	89.3%	\$578.76	84.8%	\$12,466.50	101.9%	92.00%	21,534
22	Tillsonburg (DRO)	\$352.92	102.1%	\$757.92	111.1%	\$7,865.10	64.3%	92.49%	6,935
23	Energy Plus (Applied)	\$305.40	88.4%	\$516.60	75.7%	\$13,912.38	113.7%	92.59%	52,684
24	Rideau St. Lawr. (Applied)	\$337.80	97.8%	\$656.64	96.2%	\$10,775.70	88.1%	94.01%	5,858
25	Oshawa	\$275.28	79.7%	\$581.28	85.2%	\$14,347.26	117.2%	94.03%	54,731
26	Erie Thames (DRO)	\$368.88	106.8%	\$615.48	90.2%	\$10,842.12	88.6%	95.18%	18,265
27	Renfrew	\$318.00	92.0%	\$742.20	108.8%	\$10,862.04	88.8%	96.52%	4,246
28	Embrun	\$331.56	96.0%	\$570.00	83.5%	\$13,480.50	110.2%	96.55%	1,985
29	St.Thomas	\$328.20	95.0%	\$681.60	99.9%	\$11,638.38	95.1%	96.66%	16,918
30	WestCoast Huron	\$419.16	121.3%	\$650.04	95.3%	\$9,080.46	74.2%	96.92%	3,797
31	Niagara-on-the-Lake (DRO)	\$351.60	101.8%	\$749.52	109.8%	\$9,958.08	81.4%	97.66%	8,672
32	Wasaga (Applied)	\$288.48	83.5%	\$545.28	79.9%	\$15,990.24	130.7%	98.02%	12,985
33	Kenora (DRO)	\$372.24	107.7%	\$619.44	90.8%	\$11,700.12	95.6%	98.04%	5,558
34	Welland (Applied)	\$348.00	100.7%	\$608.52	89.2%	\$12,811.62	104.7%	98.19%	22,470
35	Midland (DRO)	\$381.12	110.3%	\$672.24	98.5%	\$10,541.46	86.1%	98.32%	7,035
36	Festival	\$347.04	100.4%	\$756.24	110.8%	\$10,416.24	85.1%	98.79%	20,362
37	North Bay (DRO)	\$336.12	97.3%	\$732.84	107.4%	\$11,263.50	92.0%	98.90%	23,975
38	Grimsby	\$333.72	96.6%	\$753.00	110.3%	\$11,544.66	94.3%	100.42%	11,038
39	Centre Wellington (Applied)	\$323.76	93.7%	\$682.56	100.0%	\$13,202.46	107.9%	100.54%	6,729
40	Thunder Bay	\$313.56	90.8%	\$774.00	113.4%	\$12,022.62	98.2%	100.81%	50,482
41	Kitchener-Wilmot	\$280.32	81.1%	\$637.32	93.4%	\$16,101.42	131.6%	102.03%	91,143

42	Horizon	\$333.84	96.6%	\$753.84	110.5%	\$12,204.36	99.7%	102.27%	240,076
43	Northern Ontario Wires (Applied)	\$473.52	137.1%	\$845.88	124.0%	\$5,859.00	47.9%	102.96%	6,062
44	Sioux Lookout	\$484.32	140.2%	\$719.40	105.4%	\$8,687.94	71.0%	105.53%	2,779
45	Greater Sudbury (DRO)	\$317.40	91.9%	\$719.88	105.5%	\$15,086.76	123.3%	106.88%	47,187
46	Enersource	\$295.56	85.5%	\$828.00	121.3%	\$14,785.38	120.8%	109.23%	201,359
47	Niagara Peninsula (Applied)	\$400.08	115.8%	\$805.56	118.0%	\$11,588.88	94.7%	109.51%	51,824
48	Lakeland	\$398.76	115.4%	\$764.64	112.0%	\$12,441.18	101.7%	109.71%	13,264
49	Powerstream	\$346.92	100.4%	\$784.08	114.9%	\$14,302.74	116.9%	110.73%	353,284
50	EnWin (Applied)	\$328.56	95.1%	\$739.68	108.4%	\$16,037.28	131.0%	111.51%	86,662
51	PUC Distribution (Applied)	\$302.64	87.6%	\$697.80	102.3%	\$17,719.86	144.8%	111.55%	33,487
52	Hydro Ottawa	\$344.16	99.6%	\$759.48	111.3%	\$15,373.50	125.6%	112.18%	319,536
53	Whitby	\$367.80	106.5%	\$760.68	111.5%	\$15,174.72	124.0%	113.97%	41,488
54	Orillia (Applied)	\$340.92	98.7%	\$860.28	126.1%	\$15,101.76	123.4%	116.05%	13,340
55	Newmarket-Tay (Applied)	\$327.48	94.8%	\$847.32	124.2%	\$16,031.52	131.0%	116.65%	34,871
56	Oakville (interim)	\$342.12	99.0%	\$821.52	120.4%	\$16,001.28	130.8%	116.72%	66,530
57	Bluewater (DRO)	\$395.76	114.5%	\$811.80	119.0%	\$14,963.64	122.3%	118.59%	36,115
58	Wellington North	\$434.28	125.7%	\$944.52	138.4%	\$11,367.90	92.9%	119.00%	3,731
59	Waterloo North	\$386.64	111.9%	\$778.44	114.1%	\$16,893.18	138.0%	121.34%	54,674
60	Innpower (Applied)	\$570.84	165.2%	\$818.88	120.0%	\$13,830.78	113.0%	132.74%	15,790
61	Canadian Niagara (Applied)	\$460.92	133.4%	\$975.84	143.0%	\$23,852.64	194.9%	157.10%	28,627
62	Algoma	\$631.92	182.9%			\$17,345.58	141.7%	162.32%	11,650
63	Toronto Hydro	\$482.28	139.6%	\$1,123.40	164.6%	\$23,088.97	188.7%	164.29%	744,252
	AVERAGE	\$345.51		\$682.42		\$12,237.72			

	<i>Distributor</i>	<i>Benchmarking Results</i>						
		<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	<i>2012</i>	<i>2013</i>	<i>2014</i>	<i>2015</i>	<i>3 Year</i>
1	Hydro Hawkesbury	-61.8%	-59.4%	-55.8%	-51.1%	-64.3%	-68.1%	-61.2%
2	Wasaga Distribution	-46.8%	-46.3%	-37.8%	-41.6%	-41.6%	-45.6%	-42.9%
3	E.L.K. Energy	-28.2%	-26.2%	-25.4%	-33.2%	-44.9%	-34.7%	-37.6%
4	Northern Ontario Wires	-38.5%	-35.7%	-25.8%	-25.1%	-32.6%	-42.2%	-33.3%
5	Halton Hills Hydro	-27.2%	-24.9%	-27.5%	-35.7%	-31.3%	-28.2%	-31.7%
6	Cooperative Hydro Embrun	-19.3%	-16.9%	-26.4%	-18.7%	-29.7%	-33.2%	-27.2%
7	Haldimand County Hydro	-27.6%	-24.1%	-18.7%	-23.7%	-23.6%	-21.4%	-22.9%
8	Espanola Regional Hydro	-22.6%	-21.8%	-15.5%	-19.3%	-25.4%	-20.4%	-21.7%
9	Hearst Power	-26.3%	-30.1%	-28.4%	-33.1%	-22.4%	-7.4%	-21.0%
10	Kitchener-Wilmot Hydro	-22.9%	-22.8%	-20.7%	-19.3%	-19.0%	-22.3%	-20.2%
11	Newmarket-Tay Power	-14.6%	-21.0%	-19.5%	-19.5%	-18.6%	-19.3%	-19.1%
12	Welland Hydro	-19.6%	-16.2%	-10.4%	-15.2%	-17.3%	-18.7%	-17.0%
13	Grimsby Power	-23.1%	-18.6%	-9.6%	-16.9%	-17.3%	-17.0%	-17.0%
14	Oshawa PUC	-21.7%	-18.0%	-14.5%	-17.4%	-18.1%	-14.9%	-16.8%
15	Entegrus Powerlines	-13.1%	-13.4%	-10.9%	-14.7%	-16.7%	-17.3%	-16.3%
16	Lakefront Utilities	-14.7%	-12.5%	-18.7%	-7.4%	-16.0%	-22.1%	-15.2%
17	Essex Powerlines	-17.0%	-17.1%	-12.6%	-17.2%	-12.7%	-13.5%	-14.5%
18	COLLUS PowerStream	-8.2%	-9.5%	-1.2%	-12.3%	-14.2%	-14.2%	-13.6%
19	London Hydro	-16.8%	-10.1%	-11.1%	-11.0%	-12.8%	-9.9%	-11.3%
20	Enersource Hydro Mississauga	-9.5%	-16.1%	-9.5%	-10.7%	-13.9%	-8.2%	-11.0%
21	Burlington Hydro	-7.6%	-7.1%	-9.0%	-7.5%	-9.4%	-10.3%	-9.0%
22	Kenora Hydro	-11.5%	-4.6%	-5.2%	-11.2%	-11.0%	-3.9%	-8.7%
23	Hydro 2000	-14.8%	-12.2%	-0.8%	-1.0%	-15.3%	-6.2%	-7.5%
24	St. Thomas Energy	-6.4%	-4.5%	6.8%	-4.6%	-6.3%	-10.3%	-7.1%
25	Rideau St. Lawrence Distribution	-10.6%	-13.8%	-6.7%	-7.2%	-8.1%	-4.8%	-6.7%
26	Orillia Power	-3.5%	-1.9%	-3.7%	-4.7%	-5.3%	-8.0%	-6.0%
27	Whitby Hydro	0.4%	-3.0%	-7.0%	-5.7%	-6.8%	-2.6%	-5.0%
28	Horizon Utilities	-13.0%	-13.7%	-6.9%	-5.5%	-5.3%	-2.1%	-4.3%
29	Hydro One Brampton	-5.8%	-7.4%	-9.2%	-5.7%	-3.3%	-2.9%	-4.0%
30	Ottawa River Power	-2.9%	2.7%	0.0%	4.3%	-6.9%	-9.3%	-4.0%
31	Brant County	15.6%	22.4%	11.5%	5.5%	-3.6%	-13.6%	-3.9%
32	Orangeville Hydro	-2.7%	1.6%	0.8%	0.1%	-4.0%	-7.6%	-3.8%
33	Niagara-on-the-Lake Hydro	7.6%	6.5%	2.7%	-1.1%	-2.8%	-6.6%	-3.5%
34	Lakeland Power	na	na	-6.4%	-0.9%	-1.9%	-7.6%	-3.5%
35	Brantford Power	3.8%	-2.5%	4.7%	0.7%	-3.6%	-6.1%	-3.0%
36	Westario Power	-3.1%	-0.2%	-1.4%	2.2%	-4.2%	-6.0%	-2.6%
37	Guelph Hydro	12.4%	14.7%	-2.0%	0.8%	-4.8%	-3.8%	-2.6%
38	Centre Wellington Hydro	-8.7%	-4.9%	0.4%	-3.2%	-3.1%	-1.2%	-2.5%
39	Veridian Connections	-4.7%	-4.5%	2.4%	-1.3%	-3.0%	-2.7%	-2.3%
40	Milton Hydro	-4.1%	-3.0%	-37.6%	-4.6%	-4.0%	2.7%	-2.0%
41	Cambridge and North Dumfries	-10.1%	-7.8%	-3.3%	0.5%	-1.9%	-3.6%	-1.7%
42	Kingston Hydro	0.1%	2.2%	2.4%	3.7%	-3.6%	-3.1%	-1.0%
43	Innpower	-7.1%	-6.2%	-2.4%	-2.8%	-2.8%	8.5%	1.0%
44	Sioux Lookout Hydro	0.6%	-1.4%	7.2%	2.9%	6.2%	-4.3%	1.6%
45	Bluewater Power	-3.2%	1.7%	6.4%	5.9%	0.3%	0.8%	2.3%
46	Norfolk Power	-1.8%	-2.6%	6.0%	1.2%	6.5%	NA	3.9%
47	Niagara Peninsula Energy	5.4%	5.2%	10.2%	1.1%	7.7%	4.5%	4.5%
48	Atikokan Hydro	14.9%	7.7%	32.9%	10.3%	-4.9%	9.7%	5.0%
49	PowerStream	-7.4%	-6.4%	1.2%	3.0%	5.6%	8.1%	5.6%
50	Fort Frances Power	14.8%	10.5%	11.7%	6.4%	5.6%	5.1%	5.7%

51	North Bay Hydro	3.6%	5.5%	5.8%	5.4%	8.2%	7.0%	6.9%
52	Erie Thames Powerlines	14.9%	14.4%	3.9%	7.9%	7.0%	7.0%	7.3%
53	Tillsonburg Hydro	13.5%	10.7%	12.2%	19.5%	4.4%	-0.5%	7.8%
54	Thunder Bay Hydro	9.6%	8.0%	-2.8%	8.1%	7.4%	8.6%	8.0%
55	Greater Sudbury Hydro	-2.4%	14.1%	16.7%	4.8%	14.9%	8.0%	9.3%
56	Oakville Hydro	7.6%	12.4%	10.6%	13.8%	8.7%	6.9%	9.8%
57	Waterloo North Hydro	-3.1%	6.4%	4.3%	10.6%	11.0%	8.2%	9.9%
58	EnWin Utilities	17.8%	16.8%	23.9%	10.3%	10.9%	9.9%	10.3%
59	Hydro Ottawa	-0.1%	-2.6%	7.8%	8.5%	12.7%	15.2%	12.1%
60	Renfrew Hydro	15.3%	18.3%	18.3%	15.7%	10.4%	10.6%	12.2%
61	Canadian Niagara Power	16.4%	15.6%	10.0%	11.0%	12.9%	13.0%	12.3%
62	Peterborough Distribution	14.0%	15.6%	13.2%	14.5%	14.5%	11.0%	13.3%
63	Wellington North Power	7.4%	18.0%	12.8%	17.7%	14.2%	11.8%	14.6%
64	Midland Power	16.4%	17.0%	19.6%	18.7%	15.2%	13.8%	15.9%
65	Festival Hydro	20.5%	18.0%	20.2%	19.6%	16.6%	14.0%	16.8%
66	PUC Distribution	-8.5%	-5.2%	13.4%	22.7%	14.6%	16.2%	17.8%
67	Woodstock Hydro	33.5%	32.9%	29.0%	25.9%	23.0%	19.5%	22.8%
68	Chapleau Public Utilities	17.5%	14.8%	24.0%	20.5%	27.7%	23.9%	24.0%
69	Hydro One Networks	58.6%	57.3%	58.7%	27.6%	30.0%	20.3%	26.0%
70	West Coast Huron Energy	14.4%	16.0%	34.8%	41.4%	32.8%	33.5%	35.9%
71	Toronto Hydro	41.7%	47.7%	45.1%	48.4%	49.9%	51.5%	49.9%
72	Algoma Power	62.0%	68.1%	66.4%	69.1%	68.1%	70.6%	69.3%