EB-2017-0049 BLC COMPENDIUM PANEL 7

Updated: 2017-06-07 EB-2017-0049 Exhibit H1 Tab 1 Schedule 1 Page 9 of 32

the total bill impact for a typical DGen customer to no more than 10%. This is the same
approach proposed, and approved by the Board, in Hydro One's 2016 and 2017 Draft
Rate Orders (EB-2015-0079 and EB-2016-0081). The increase in revenue collected from
the DGen class is offset by decreasing the revenue collected from USL and Seasonal
classes, which have the highest R/C ratios above 1.

- 6
- 7
- 8

	:	2017		20	18		Board Range
Rate Class R/C		Revenue Requirement (\$ M)	I	R/C	Revenue Rev N	R/C (%)	
			CAM	After Rate Design	САМ	After Rate Design	
UR	1.10	87.6	1.05	1.05	96.2	96.2	85 - 115
R1	1.10	310.9	1.07	1.07	323.5	323.5	85 - 115
R2	0.95	519.4	0.95	0.95	529.4	529.4	<mark>85 - 115</mark>
Seasonal	1.04	113.4	1.09	1.09	114.1	113.9	85 - 115
GSe	0.99	160.6	1.01	1.01	160.5	160.5	80 - 120
UGe	0.95	21.8	1.02	1.02	22.7	22.7	80 - 120
GSd	0.95	145.5	0.97	0.97	143.5	143.5	80 - 120
UGd	0.95	30.3	0.95	0.95	29.8	29.8	80 - 120
St Lgt	0.95	12.1	0.93	0.93	12.5	12.5	80 - 120
Sen Lgt	0.95	7.3	1.03	1.03	6.4	6.4	80 - 120
USL	1.10	3.2	1.15	1.09	3.4	3.2	80 - 120
DGen	0.61	4.6	0.57	0.63	3.7	4.1	80 - 120*
ST	0.95	51.0	0.98	0.98	54.2	54.2	85 - 115
TOTAL		1,467.6			1,499.9	1,499.9	

 Table 5: Revenue-to-Cost Ratios and Class Revenue Recovery – 2017 to 2018

9 **TOTAL** 1,467.6 10 * Assume same as for GS, as previously approved in EB-2013-0416

11

12 <u>R/C Ratio from 2018 to 2020</u>

Table 6 and Table 7 show how the R/C ratio and revenue requirement by class are adjusted by the 2019 and 2020 rate design process. Hydro One proposes to continue increasing the DGen class R/C ratio from 0.63 in 2018 to 0.76 in 2019, which limits the total bill impact for a typical DGen customer to no more than 10% per year. The increase in revenue from the DGen class is made up by decreasing the revenue collected from the

Updated: 2018-05-24 EB-2017-0049 Exhibit JT 3.23 Page 1 of 1

<u>UNDERTAKING – JT 3.23</u>

2 3 **U**

<u>Undertaking</u>

With reference to Interrogatory Exhibit I, Tab 49, Schedule BLC 5, Part b, to examine whether a response is doable or if it is not doable; and if not why not.

6

1

7 **Response**

In response to Undertaking JT 3.23, Hydro One has reviewed the information requested under part b) of I-49-BLC-5 and is providing the requested material in this updated submission. The percentage split of seasonal customers between the UR, R1 and R2 classes is based on the same information as in the Seasonal report previously prepared for proceeding EB-2016-0315, updated to incorporate the results of the recent rate class review, as discussed in Exhibit G1, Tab 02, Schedule 1.

14

Hydro One also notes that sub-part iii of the question asks that the density factors, 15 weightings, and other factors for the "new" Seasonal class consisting only of R2-16 Seasonal customers be maintained at the currently proposed values for the combined 17 Seasonal class. This is not appropriate as the new R2-Seasonal class would consist of a 18 substantially different subset of customers than the current Seasonal class that includes 19 both medium and low density seasonal customers. As such, Hydro One completed the 20 requested cost allocation model run using the density factors, weightings, and other 21 factors appropriate for a Seasonal class consisting solely of R2-Seasonal customers. 22 Hydro One has adopted all the R2 class weighting factors for the new "R2-Seasonal" 23 class, with the exception of the Meter Reading weighting factor. The new R2-Seasonal 24 class consists of relatively more water access and dispersed service points than the typical 25 R2 year-round residential customers, and so Hydro One has applied the current, higher, 26 meter reading weight for the existing status-quo Seasonal class to the new R2-seasonal 27 class. 28

29

Table 1 in Attachment 1 to this response shows a version of the 2018 Rate Design Sheet similar to Exhibit H1, Tab 1, Schedule 2, page 1, with adjustments described above. This

table is also provided in Excel format.

Filed: 2018-05-24 EB-2017-0049 Exhibit JT 3.23 Attachment 1 Page 1 of 1

Table 1 – 2018 Rate Design with I-49-BLC-5 part b adjustments

	Number of Customers	GWh	kWs	Revenue (A)	Costs Alloca Previous Stu (\$)	ated from ady (2017) (%)	Allocated C (B)	osts (%)	Misc Rev (C)	Revenue from Rates (D=A-C)	2017 R/C Ratio	F=A/B)	Target 2018 R/C Ratio (G)	Total rev to be collected (H=BxG)	Shifted Rev (I=H-A)	% Change in revenue from rates (J=I/D)	Fixed Charge (\$/month)	Revenue from Fixed Charge	Fixed Rev %	Revenue from Volumetric Charge (L=H-C-K)	Volumetric Charge (\$/kWh)	Volumetric Charge (\$/kW)	CSTA Rate Adders (\$/kW)	Hopper Foundry Rate Adder (\$/kW)	Total Volumetric Charge (\$/kW)
UR	226,192	2,048		97,201,92	\$ 79,598,95	52 5.42% \$	92,100,224	6.14% \$	5,125,181 \$	92,076,747	1.10	1.06	1.06	97,201,928		0.0%	\$ 27.8	\$ 75,532,617	82%	\$ 16,544,130	\$ 0.0081				
R1	516,794	5,212	- 4	\$ 365,346,90	\$ 282,627,93	36 19.26% \$	329,291,941	21.95% \$	14,877,408 \$	350,469,493	1.10	1.11	1.11	365,190,102	(156,799)	0.0%	\$ 37.5	\$ 232,906,883	66%	\$ 117,405,810	\$ 0.0225				
R2	328,410	4,539	- 1	\$ 534,664,45	\$ 544,114,24	42 37.07% \$	560,291,895	37.36% \$	17,045,784 \$	517,618,671	0.95	0.95	0.95	534,664,454		0.0%	\$ 88.8	\$ 350,081,815	68%	\$ 167,536,855	\$ 0.0369				
Seasonal R2	78,544	343	- 1	61,618,41	\$ 108,746,44	48 7.41% \$	5 71,571,267	4.77% \$	2,025,513 \$	59,592,906	1.04	0.86	0.86	61,618,419		0.0%	\$ 40.7	\$ 38,427,812	64%	\$ 21,165,094	\$ 0.0617				1
GSe	88,484	2,104	- 5	\$ 162,061,11	\$ 161,477,75	51 11.00% \$	159,037,370	10.60% \$	5,163,653 \$	156,897,462	0.99	1.02	1.02	162,061,115		0.0%	\$ 29.8	7 \$ 31,710,871	20%	\$ 125,186,591	\$ 0.0595				
GSd	5,406	2,342	8,025,918	\$ 144,916,85	\$ 152,368,18	82 10.38% \$	149,099,563	9.94% \$	2,818,413 \$	142,098,447	0.95	0.97	0.97	144,916,859		0.0%	\$ 103.5	\$ 6,717,987	5%	\$ 135,380,460		\$ 16.8679	\$ 0.0637	\$ 0.0078	\$ 16.9394
UGe	18,074	598	- 5	22,951,11	\$ 22,785,47	76 1.55% \$	22,400,661	1.49% \$	887,474 \$	22,063,637	0.95	1.02	1.02	22,951,112		0.0%	\$ 24.1	\$ 5,231,493	24%	\$ 16,832,144	\$ 0.0281				
UGd	1,744	1,058	2,832,322	\$ 30,114,73	\$ 31,755,02	25 2.16% \$	31,545,045	2.10% \$	634,915 \$	29,479,825	0.95	0.95	0.95	30,114,739		0.0%	\$ 101.7	5 \$ 2,129,760	7%	\$ 27,350,064		\$ 9.6564	\$ 0.0637		\$ 9.7201
St Lgt	5,323	121	- 5	12,627,80	\$ 12,719,45	53 0.87% \$	13,497,695	0.90% \$	403,394 \$	12,224,410	0.95	0.94	0.94	12,627,804		0.0%	\$ 4.1	\$ 262,512	2%	\$ 11,961,898	\$ 0.0986				
Sen Lgt	23,987	20	- 4	\$ 6,465,68	\$ 7,616,60	0.52%	6,258,136	0.42% \$	3,079,639 \$	3,386,041	0.95	1.03	1.03	6,465,680		0.0%	\$ 3.1	9 \$ 916,903	27%	\$ 2,469,138	\$ 0.1211				1
USL	5,597	24	- 1	\$ 3,385,03	\$ 2,953,44	43 0.20% \$	2,902,577	0.19% \$	128,913 \$	3,256,117	1.10	1.17	1.11	3,219,005	(166,025	-5.1%	\$ 35.4	3 \$ 2,381,783	77%	\$ 708,310	\$ 0.0290				
DGen	1,152	18	184,739	\$ 3,740,57	\$ 7,407,47	70 0.50% \$	6,445,239	0.43% \$	175,595 \$	3,564,981	0.61	0.58	0.63	4,063,400	322,824	9.1%	\$ 196.1	5 \$ 2,712,713	70%	\$ 1,175,091		\$ 6.3608	\$ 0.0637		\$ 6.4245
ST	808	15,528	29,977,946	\$ 54,787,30	\$ 53,453,33	34 3.64% \$	55,440,314	3.70% \$	1,264,602 \$	53,522,707	0.95	0.99	0.99	54,787,309		0.0%	N/A *	\$ 10,014,219	19%	\$ 43,508,489		N/A **			N/A **
	1,300,516	33,957	41,020,926	\$ 1,499,881,92	7 \$ 1,467,624,31	15 100% \$	\$ 1,499,881,927	100% \$	53,630,485 \$	1,446,251,442					(0)			\$ 759,027,367		\$ 687,224,075					
** ST rates are c	alculated on a separate si	heet																	Total Rev (K+L) Misc Rev (C) Total Rev Req	\$ 1,446,251,442 \$ 53,630,485 \$ 1,499,881,927					

	Rate Class	20 Fi	17 Current xed Charge	20	18 All-Fixed Charge	Phase-in Period (Remaining Years)	lı Fb	Annual ncrease in xed Charge	F Fix	2018 Proposed red Charge
U	R	\$	24.78	\$	33.92	3	\$	3.05	\$	27.83
R	1	\$	33.77	\$	56.49	6	\$	3.79	\$	37.56
R:	2	\$	80.33	\$	131.34	6	\$	8.50	\$	88.83
St	easonal R2	\$	36.28	\$	63.23	6	\$	4.49	ŝ	40.77

Updated: 2017-06-07 EB-2017-0049 Exhibit H1 Tab 1 Schedule 2 Page 1 of 5

2018 Rate Design Including 3rd Year of Phase-in to All-Fixed Rates

	Number of Customers	GWh	kWs	Revenue (A)	Costs Alloc Previous Str (\$)	ated from udy (2017) (%)	Allocated C	costs (%)	Misc Rev (C)	Revenue from Rates (D=A-C)	2017 R/C Ratio (E)	R/C Ratio from the CAM (F=A/B)	Target 2018 R/C Ratio	Total rev to be collected (H=BxG)	Shifted Rev (I=H-A)	% Change in revenue from rates (J=I/D)	F Cł (\$/n	ixed harge nonth)	Revenue from Fixed Charge (K)	Fixed Rev %	Revenue from Volumetric Charge (L=H-C-K)	Volumetric Charge (\$/kWh)	Volumetric Charge (\$/kW)	CSTA Rate Adders (\$/kW)	Hopper Foundry Rate Adder (\$/kW)	Total Volumetric Charge (\$/kW)
UR	225,944	2,047	-	\$ 96,173,150	\$ 79,598,9	52 5.42%	\$ 91,807,608	6.12% \$	\$ 5,113,873 \$	91,059,278	1.10	1.05	1.05	96,173,150	-	0.0%	\$	27.71	\$ 75,144,268	83%	\$ 15,915,009	\$ 0.0078				
R1	446,102	4,924		\$ 323,539,529	\$ 282,627,9	36 19.26%	\$ 301,376,300	20.09% \$	\$ 13,762,853 \$	309,776,676	1.10	1.07	1.07	323,539,529		0.0%	\$	37.79	\$ 202,277,927	65%	\$ 107,498,749	\$ 0.0218				
R2	328,410	4,539	-	\$ 529,368,662	\$ 544,114,2	42 37.07%	\$ 557,706,225	37.18% \$	\$ 16,978,792 \$	512,389,870	0.95	0.95	0.95	529,368,662	-	0.0%	\$	88.61	\$ 349,210,348	68%	\$ 163,179,522	\$ 0.0359				
Seasonal	149,485	632	-	\$ 114,092,030	\$ 108,746,4	48 7.41%	\$ 104,711,041	6.98% \$	\$ 3,251,750 \$	110,840,280	1.04	1.09	1.09	113,925,781	(166,250)	-0.1%	\$	40.52	\$ 72,678,702	66%	\$ 37,995,328	\$ 0.0601				
GSe	88,484	2,104	-	\$ 160,456,449	\$ 161,477,7	51 11.00%	\$ 158,109,324	10.54%	\$ 5,143,910 \$	155,312,539	0.99	1.01	1.01	160,456,449		0.0%	S	29.56	\$ 31,390,539	20%	\$ 123,922,000	\$ 0.0589				
GSd	5,406	2,342	8,025,918	\$ 143,462,225	\$ 152,368,1	82 10.38%	\$ 148,142,418	9.88% \$	\$ 2,799,207 \$	140,663,018	0.95	0.97	0.97	143,462,225	-	0.0%	S	102.52	\$ 6,650,124	5%	\$ 134,012,894	\$-	\$ 16.6975	\$ 0.0637	\$ 0.0077	\$ 16.7689
UGe	18,074	598		\$ 22,725,406	\$ 22,785,4	76 1.55%	\$ 22,272,612	1.48% \$	\$ 884,648 \$	21,840,758	0.95	1.02	1.02	22,725,406	-	0.0%	\$	23.88	\$ 5,178,646	24%	\$ 16,662,112	\$ 0.0278				
UGd	1,744	1,058	2,832,322	\$ 29,812,914	\$ 31,755,0	25 2.16%	\$ 31,348,758	2.09%	\$ 630,884 \$	29,182,030	0.95	0.95	0.95	29,812,914	-	0.0%	S	100.72	\$ 2,108,246	7%	\$ 27,073,784	\$-	\$ 9.5589	\$ 0.0637		\$ 9.6226
St Lgt	5,323	121		\$ 12,501,834	\$ 12,719,4	53 0.87%	\$ 13,405,033	0.89% \$	\$ 400,910 \$	12,100,924	0.95	0.93	0.93	12,501,834	-	0.0%	S	4.07	\$ 259,860	2%	\$ 11,841,064	\$ 0.0976				
Sen Lgt	23,987	20		\$ 6,447,526	\$ 7,616,6	02 0.52%	\$ 6,258,629	0.42% \$	\$ 3,095,690 \$	3,351,836	0.95	1.03	1.03	6,447,526	-	0.0%	S	3.15	\$ 907,640	27%	\$ 2,444,196	\$ 0.1199				
USL	5,597	24		\$ 3,352,139	\$ 2,953,4	43 0.20%	\$ 2,902,765	0.19% \$	\$ 128,914 \$	3,223,225	1.10	1.15	1.09	3,158,213	(193,925)	-6.0%	S	34.76	\$ 2,334,924	77%	\$ 694,375	\$ 0.0284				
DGen	1,152	18	184,739	\$ 3,704,518	\$ 7,407,4	70 0.50%	\$ 6,445,207	0.43% \$	\$ 175,550 \$	3,528,969	0.61	0.57	0.63	4,064,693	360,175	10.2%	S	196.16	\$ 2,712,852	70%	\$ 1,176,292	\$-	\$ 6.3673	\$ 0.0637		\$ 6.4310
ST	808	15,528	29,977,946	\$ 54,245,544	\$ 53,453,3	34 3.64%	\$ 55,396,005	3.69% \$	\$ 1,263,504 \$	52,982,040	0.95	0.98	0.98	54,245,544	-	0.0%		N/A **	\$ 9,913,059	19%	\$ 43,068,981	\$ -	N/A **			N/A **
	1,300,516	33,957	41,020,926	\$ 1,499,881,927	\$ 1,467,624,3	15 100%	\$ 1,499,881,927	100% \$	\$ 53,630,485 \$	1,446,251,442					(0)				\$ 760,767,136	:	\$ 685,484,306					
** ST rates	are listed in Exhibit H1,	, Tab 1, Schedule 3																	1	Total Rev (K+L) Misc Rev (C) Total Rev Req	\$ 1,446,251,442 \$ 53,630,485 \$ 1,499,881,927					

Rate Class	201 Fixe	7 Current d Charge	201	8 All-Fixed Charge	Phase-in Period (Remaining Years)	/ Inc Fixe	Annual rease in d Charge	Pr Fixe	2018 oposed d Charge
UR	\$	24.78	\$	33.58	3	\$	2.93	\$	27.71
R1	\$	33.77	\$	57.87	6	\$	4.02	\$	37.79
R2	\$	80.33	\$	130.02	6	\$	8.28	\$	88.61
Seasonal	\$	36.28	\$	61.70	6	\$	4.24	\$	40.52

Filed: 2018-06-25 EB-2017-0049 Exhibit J 4.5 Page 1 of 1

<u>UNDERTAKING – J 4.5</u>

- 1 2
- 3 **<u>Reference</u>**
- K4.5
- 4] 5
- 6 **Undertaking**

To provide the analysis that was done in January 2017 in support of the proposal with respect to prioritization of customers between the R1 and R2 class and resulting in a conclusion by Hydro One to exclude seasonal customers from the relief they are requesting from the government.

- 11
- 12 **Response**

Hydro One's proposal to the Government of Ontario focused on addressing affordability
 concerns for its most vulnerable customers.

15

Based on an analysis of overdue receivables for residential customers at 2016 year-end, R1 and R2 residential customers accounted for 84% of the corresponding overdue receivables (approximately \$74 million of \$88 million), whereas seasonal customers only accounted for approximately 5% of the overdue receivables (approximately \$4 million of \$88 million).

21

22 Since non-seasonal residential customers were experiencing significant challenges with

affordability, Hydro One felt that immediately addressing that was the priority.

24

25 Of the four proposals outlined to the provincial government in Hydro One's submission,

²⁶ three of them provide benefit to seasonal customers.

Filed: 2018-02-12 EB-2017-0049 Exhibit I Tab 49 Schedule BLC-6 Page 1 of 2

Balsam Lake Coalition Interrogatory # 6

2	
3	Issue:
4	Issue 49: Are the inputs to the cost allocation model appropriate and are costs appropriately
5	allocated?
6	
7	Reference:
8	G1-03-01 Page 5. Table 4
9	EB-2013-0416/EB-2016-0315 Report on Elimination of the Seasonal Class dated December 1.
10	2016
11	
10	Interrogetory
12	This reference asserts that the density factors proposed in the application remain unchanged from
13	2017 including the proposed density factor of 3.6 for the Seasonal Class
14	2017, including the proposed density factor of 5.0 for the Seasonal Class.
15	a) Please provide the weighted average density factor for the Seasonal Class that would result
10	from using the 2018 forecast number of UR R1 and R2 seasonal customers as provided in
17	norm using the 2010 forceast number of OK, KT and K2 seasonal customers as provided in part a) above along with the density weighting for each of those classes. By way of
10	example using the density factors of 1 for UR customers 1.9 for R1 customers and 48 for R2
19	customers, and applying those factors to the split of Seasonal Customers as between UP
20	(271) R1 (70 721) and R2 (84 041) as set out in the EB-2013-0416/EB-2016-0315 Report on
21	Elimination of the Sessonal Class dated December 1, 2016, page 5, produces a weighted
22	average density factor of 3.47 for the Seasonal Class
23	average density factor of 5.47 for the Seasonal Class.
24	b) Please explain why Hydro One uses a density factor of 3.6 for the Seasonal Class, when it
25	appears to Palsam Lake that it is possible to calculate a weighted average density factor for
26	the along using the specific density factors attributely to the UP P1 and P2 Sessonal
27	Customers. Please quantify the impact on the costs ellocated to the Seasonal Class if the
28	weighted average density factor calculated in part a) is used in the allocation run as encoded
29	to the proposed factor of 2.6
30	
31	Degraded
32	

a) The Table below provides the derivation of the weighted average density factor for the
 Seasonal Class using the requested approach. The 2018 forecast number of Seasonal
 customers has been assigned to UR, R1 and R2 classes assuming the same split as set out in
 Hydro One's Report on Elimination of Seasonal Customers filed on December 1, 2016.

1

Filed: 2018-02-12 EB-2017-0049 Exhibit I Tab 49 Schedule BLC-6 Page 2 of 2

Rate Class	2018 Forecast Number of Customers	Density Factors
UR	261	1
R1	68,190	1.9
R2	81,033	4.8
Seasonal	149,485	3.47

Weighted Average Density Factor for the Seasonal Class

2

1

b) The 3.6 density factor for the Seasonal class was established using the methodology 3 documented on pages 10-12 of Exhibit G1, Tab 3, Schedule 1 of proceeding EB-2013-0416, 4 which was approved by the Board. As documented in that exhibit, the relationship between 5 weighted average customer density and the density factors for UR, R1 and R2 classes was 6 plotted and a non-linear trend line established to interpolate the density factor for the 7 Seasonal class. The inputs underlying the calculation of the density factors have not changed 8 and so a factor of 3.6 for the Seasonal class continues to be appropriate. The Table below 9 provides the difference in the 2018 costs allocated to the Seasonal class using density factors 10 of 3.6 and 3.47. 11

12

Costs allocated to the Seasonal class with density	\$104,711,041
factor of 3.6	
Costs allocated to	
the Seasonal class	¢102 259 705
with density	\$102,238,795
factor of 3.47	
Difference	-\$2,452,246

13