**Orangeville Hydro Limited**

 **EB-2017-0068**

**OHL’s Responses to Staff Questions**

**January 12, 2018**

**Question #1**

**Ref: IRM Model Tab 3: Account 1589 RSVA GA - RPP settlement true-up;**

**GA Analysis Workform – Note 5 - Reconciling Item 1b**

As indicated in note 4 on tab 3 of the IRM model, effective May 23, 2017, per the OEB’s letter titled Guidance on Disposition of Accounts 1588 and 1589, applicants must reflect RPP settlement true-up claims pertaining to the period that is being requested for disposition in Accounts 1588 and 1589. This is to include true ups that impact the GA as well. The amount requested for disposition starts with the audited account balance. If the audited account balance does not reflect the true-up claims for that year, the impacts of the true-up claims are to be shown in the Adjustment column in that year.

In Note 5 of the GA Analysis Workform, Orangeville Hydro reported a reconciling item 1b in amount of -$68,409 related to 2016 RPP settlement true-up that was booked in 2017.

1. Please confirm if this RPP settlement true-up amount should be recorded in the principal adjustment column in 2016 in the DVA continuity schedule. If so, please update the IRM model to include this adjustment (and include the updated model in your responses). Otherwise, please explain why the RPP true-up amount should not be recorded in the DVA continuity schedule.

**Orangeville Hydro Response**

The RPP settlement true-up amount of -$68,409 should be recorded in the principal adjustment column in the 2016 DVA continuity schedule. The IRM model has been updated to include this adjustment and the model is provided in our response submission.

**Question #2**

**Ref: Account 1588 Power**

With regards to the Dec. 31 balance in Account 1588, all components that flow into Account 1588 (i to iv in table below) should be all based on actuals at year end. Please complete the following table to a) indicate whether the component is based on estimates or actuals at year end and b) quantify the adjustment pertaining to each component that is trued up from estimate to actual.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Component** | **a) Estimate or Actual** | **Notes/Comments** | **b) Quantify True Up Adjustment** |
| i | Revenues (i.e. is unbilled revenues trued up by year end)  | **Actual** |  |  |
| ii | Expenses – Commodity: Charge Type 101 (i.e. is expense based on IESO invoice at year end) | **Actual** |  |  |
| iii | Expenses - GA RPP: Charge Type 148 with respect to the quantum dollar amount (i.e. is expense based on IESO invoice at year end) | **Actual** |  |  |
| iv | Expenses - GA RPP: Charge Type 148 with respect and RPP/non-RPP pro-ration percentages | **Actual** |  |  |
| v | RPP Settlement: Charge Type 142 including any data used for determining the RPP/HOEP/RPP GA components of the charge type | **Actual** |  |  |

**Question #3**

**Ref: IRM Model Tab 20 Bill Impacts**

1. As noted in Tab 20 of the IRM model, bill impacts are required to be provided for general service customers consuming 2,000 kWh per month and having a monthly demand of less than 50 kW.

Please update Table 1 in Tab 20 to include the consumption level of 2,000 kWh for GS less than 50 kW rate class.

**Orangeville Hydro Response**

Table 1 in Tab 20 has been updated to include the consumption level of 2,000 kWh for the GS less than 50kW rate class.

1. According to Orangeville Hydro’s tariff of rates and charges, the volumetric rates and rate riders in the Sentinel Lighting class are all based on kWs (except for the GA rate rider). In the bill impacts, the monthly demand kW value for a typical Sentinel Lighting connection is needed to complete the total bill calculations.

Please update Table 1 in Tab 20 include a non-zero demand kW value for the Sentinel Lighting rate class.

**Orangeville Hydro Response**

Table 1 in Tab 20 has been updated to include a non-zero demand kW value for the Sentinel Lighting rate class.