Filed: 2017-03-03 EB-2016-0152 J3.3 Page **1** of **1** 

#### **UNDERTAKING J3.3**

3	
4	<b>Undertaking</b>
5	

- To provide an updated resource plan, if available.
- 6 7

1 2

- 8
- 9 10
- 10
- 11

# 12 <u>Response</u>13

- 14 The request was to provide the current status of the actual staff levels versus the
- 15 planned staff levels in a similar chart to that provided in response to Ex. L 4.3-2
- 16 AMPCO-087, part d). The chart as of January 2017 is provided in Attachment 1. Note
- 17 that since August 2016, the staffing gap has been reduced by approximately 180 full
- 18 time equivalents.



### J 3.3 Attachment 1 : January 2017 Full Time Equivalents Against Staffing Plan at RQE

Filed: 2017-03-03 EB-2016-0152

Filed: 2017-03-03 EB-2016-0152 J3.5 Page **1** of **1** 

#### **UNDERTAKING J3.5**

#### 3 4 **Undertal**

4 <u>Undertaking</u> 5

To provide the methodology to get to the Unit 2 in-service amounts at an alternate P level, if there is one. If not, advise that there is no methodology.

7 8

6

1 2

- 9
- 10
- 11

## 12 <u>Response</u>13

14 The methodology used in OPG's response to Ex. L-4.3-5 CCC-018, part b) to prorate

15 the contingency amount for Unit 2 by the ratio of the P50 contingency amount to the

16 P90 contingency amount for the overall DRP, can also be used to estimate the revised

in-service amount for Unit 2 at other confidence levels, e.g. P70.

18

19 This methodology, while providing a reasonable approximation of a revised in-service

20 amount at any particular revised confidence level, would not yield an accurate in-service

amount. An accurate in-service amount can only be generated by determining the

22 contingency cash flow at the revised confidence level, apply it over the base estimate,

and re-doing the detailed escalation and interest calculations.