

OEB Staff Technical Conference Questions to Energy+
January 16, 2019

TC Question #1

Updated Evidence – Facilities Plan

- a) Please explain the basis of Class C estimate i.e. how much of the design has been completed? How about Class A and Class B estimates?
- b) Please provide the architectural fees incurred to date (including the cost to prepare the Design Brief). Please clarify whether or not the architectural fees will be part of the ACM.
- c) Please clarify whether or not Energy+ will bear any costs for the environmental approvals and building permits. If so, please specify the costs and clarify whether or not such costs will be part of the ACM. If not, why not.
- d) In responses to 2-Staff-12 k), Energy+ stated that it will engage a project manager to help ensure that the renovations are completed on schedule, within scope and within budget.
 - i. Please provide the forecast costs for hiring a project manager.
 - ii. Will such costs be part of the ACM?
- e) Please provide the cost estimates to engage a third-party environmental firm to conduct a peer review of the Record of Site Condition and the recommended mitigation measures.
- f) Please provide a bill impact analysis for the Southworks Facility.

TC Question #2

Updated Evidence – DVA Account 1508 Sub-Account Monthly Billing

- a) Please provide the detailed calculation to support the estimate of \$6,185,566 one-time monthly billing collection benefit.
- b) Please estimate the cash flow benefit resulting from the monthly billing for GS<50 kW customers in the CND rate zone.

TC Question #3

Ref: Cost Allocation, 7-Staff-79

Energy+ estimated that “between the years 2012 and 2017, the value of service drops in the CND service territory was \$3,564,000.” It stated that accounts 1830, 1835, 1840, 1845, and 1850 have been used to track these costs. Energy+ also estimated average costs of \$655 and \$1,750 for overhead and underground residential service drops respectively.

- a) Of the \$3,564,000 in service drops in the CND territory, please indicate approximately how much would have been tracked in each USoA account.
- b) Please estimate what proportion of Residential customers are provided with overhead services versus underground services.

TC Question #4

Ref: LRAMVA, 4-Staff-68

OEB staff would like to request further information on the demand savings claimed for the CHP project in the CND rate zone. This CHP project was implemented in 2015, and the persistence of monthly peak demand savings in 2016 and 2017 are included as lost revenues as part of the LRAMVA.

In response to part a, Energy+ confirmed that this was a project undertaken as part of the Process and Systems Upgrades Initiatives (PSUI), and Energy+ is seeking to claim demand savings from the CHP project only. Energy+ confirmed that it has been working with the IESO to identify a modelling approach that would estimate statistically significant savings for the chiller project. As such, demand savings from the chiller project have not been included in the LRAMVA.

- a) How is Energy+ defining peak demand of the facility? Are the estimated monthly peaks based on an analysis of highest peak usage in all months of the year? If not, please explain the approach to determine the monthly peak.
- b) Please provide the peak hours in each month of 2016 and 2017 when:
 - i. The facility was at its peak with the CHP
 - ii. The facility would have been at its peak in the absence of the CHP

**Energy+ Inc. 2019 Cost of Service Rate Application
OEB Staff Technical Conference Questions to Energy+**

- c) Please explain why it would be appropriate to capture lost revenues based on what was billed (with and without the CHP) as opposed to comparing lost load from the peak at the same hour of the day.
- d) Please provide the detailed calculations for the table in tab 8 of the LRAMVA workform, including monthly inputs and assumptions to support the demand reductions from the CHP project for both 2016 and 2017. Please show calculations in excel format.
- e) Please provide the correspondence from the IESO indicating any conclusions or determinations that the methodology to calculate CHP savings is appropriate.
- f) Please confirm the amount of the project cost funded by the IESO through Energy+'s participation in the PSUI.

TC Question #5

Ref: LRAMVA, 4-Staff-69

OEB staff would like to request more information on the calculation of streetlight demand savings in the Brant County rate zone. OEB staff would like to see the analysis underpinning the calculation of the baseline and demand from the energy efficient upgrade.

- a) Please explain detailed calculations, including inputs and assumptions (for example, # of lightbulbs replaced, corresponding kW of the lightbulbs replaced), to confirm baseline savings of 397.54 kW.
- b) If 397.54 kW is not the baseline, please explain the appropriateness of the lost revenue calculation based on the change in demand at the time of new conversion (i.e. July 2016, November 2016 and February 2017) and initial billed demand in January 2016.
- c) Please explain the detailed calculations, including inputs and assumptions (for example, # of new LEDs installed, corresponding kW of the lightbulbs installed) to determine the monthly billed demand kW from June to December 2016.
- d) Please confirm whether you have received reports from municipalities that confirm the number of lightbulbs replaced.
- e) In excel format, please provide the monthly calculations of baseline and demand from the energy efficient upgrade in 2016 and 2017.