ECONALYSIS CONSULTING SERVICES

34 KING STREET EAST, SUITE 630, TORONTO, ONTARIO M5C 2X8

Mark Garner markgarner@rogers.com 647-408-4501

Bill Harper bharper@econalysis.ca 416-348-0193

www.econalysis.ca

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

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: EB-2016-0066 E.L.K. Energy Inc. 2017 Rates
Pre-ADR interrogatories of Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition (VECC)

Please find attached clarification questions following the interrogatory responses of E.L.K. Energy. While the Board has not made provision for supplementary interrogatories, early responses to these questions will help VECC more efficiently develop its positions for the upcoming Settlement Conference. As we continue to analyse the interrogatory responses we may have further questions which, if necessary, will be raised at the time of the Conference.

Yours truly,

M. Garner

1/3

Mark Danelon, Director, Finance & Regulatory Affairs
Email: mdanelon@elkenergy.com

E.L.K. ENERGY INC.

2017 DISTRIBUTION RATE APPLICATION (EB-2016-0066)

VECC'S PRE-ADR CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

3-VECC 48

Reference: VECC 23 a)
Exhibit 3, page 15 (Table 3-15)

a) The Application states (Exhibit 3, page 15) that the 2015-2017 CDM savings are based on ELK's2015-2020 CDM Plan. However the savings values for 2016 and 2017 as used in the Application differ from those in the CDM Plan filed in response to VECC 23 a) as follows:
   - 2016 – 1,785,578 kWh per Application vs. 1,846,000 kWh per Plan.
   - 2017 – 1,855,381 kWh per Application vs. 1,947,000 kWh per Plan.

   Please explain why the values for 2016 and 2017 do not match those in the CDM plan and whether the load forecast for 2017 needs to be revised to reflect the values in the 2015-2020 CDM Plan.

b) Does the LRAMVA Threshold for 2017 need to be revised and, if so, what is the revised value?

3-VECC 49

Reference: VECC 22 c)

a) It is noted that in the response the revised Table 3-12 has a total billed energy prior to any CDM adjustment of 229.4 GWh (i.e., 225.1 + 4.3). Please explain how this value was determined and why it differs from the 233.1 GWh value in the Application.

3-VECC 50

Reference: VECC 24 a) & b)

a) The response to VECC 24 a) states that there are no material variances between the 2016 Other Revenues as forecast in the Application and the actual (unaudited results). However, there appear to be material changes (I.e., > $50,000) in the following accounts:
   - Account #4375 – Where the 2016 actual is $917,119 vs. a forecast value of $571,514.
   - Account #4380 – Where the 2016 actual is -$470,223 vs. a forecast value of -$319,593.

   Please explain the reason for the material change in the forecast vs. actual 2016 values for each account and whether, based on these actual values, the 2017 forecast for either account needs to be revised.

b) The total 2017 Other Revenues in the revised Table 3-46 still do not reconcile with the forecast 2017 Other Revenues in Appendix 2-H. Which set of values is correct?

4-VECC 51

Reference: VECC 43 a)

a) The response indicates that the requested file will be provided in "live Excel format". However, all that was provided in a PDF version. Please provide the live Excel format version of the 2011-2014 Persistence Report.

7-VECC 52

Reference: Exhibit 8, page 9

a) Why is it necessary for two staff persons to attend a service call?
b) For after regular hours work, are staff compensated at time and half or at double their regular rates?

End of document