LRAMVA - Main Rate Zone

**Follow-up Question-12**

**Ref: OEB Staff Question 20 d)**

In Tab 5 of the LRAMVA, it appears that the energy savings from the 2015 and 2018 street lighting projects are not excluded from the retrofit program. Specifically the sign on the kWh savings are positive, and not negative. Please confirm whether an adjustment needs to be made.

RESPONSE:

The values should be negative. An updated LRAMVA workform is attached.

**Follow-up Question-13**

**Ref: OEB Staff Question 21 b)**

a)    Please clarify what is being captured as lost revenues from implementing the CHP project when either the maximum facility or grid peaks (used in lost revenue calculations) may occur when the CHP is off.

b)    Based on the data submitted in Tab 8 of the LRAMVA workform, please identify the monthly facility and grid peak(s) where the CHP is not running.

c)    Please discuss why this methodology is more appropriate to capture lost revenues impacts from implementing the CHP project.

d)    If Erie Thames removes the instances of when the CHP project is off, please quantify the lost revenue impact from the CHP project and impact on total LRAMVA.

 RESPONSE:

1. If the hour with the highest demand in the month occurs when the CHP is off, there would be no impact on revenues in that month as when the CHP is off, the facility demand and the grid demand are the same.
2. Tab 9 shows four months in 2017 when the monthly peak occurred when the CHP was not running: January, May, June and August. The monthly peak demand in kilowatts in those months was 42,639; 44,654; 45,645 and 53,437 respectively. No loss of revenue was claimed.
3. The methodology captures the actual impact on revenues since it considers what the impact would have been without the CHP (the maximum hourly facility peak in each month) and what it was with the CHP (the maximum hourly grid peak in each month). This methodology uses actual metered data to determine the lost revenue. In contrast, the IESO 2017 final report shows the impact of this project as yielding 17,265,066 kWh of savings (LDC Progress tab, Cell CR21) and zero kW of peak demand savings (LDC Progress tab, Cell DR21). The IESO report estimates the impact on system peak demand, not the facility peak demand. The estimate of zero is inferior to the actual impact as determined from meter readings.
4. No lost revenues have been claimed for when the CHP project is off.

**Follow-up Question-14**

**Ref: OEB Staff Question 22 c)**

a)    For the 2018 retrofit program, please explain where 509,451 kWh of unverified savings comes from. OEB staff notes that this savings figure is not identified on the 2019 Participation and Cost Report.  Please file the supporting documentation (detailed project level savings data) in excel format to validate this figure.

b)    Please explain why these additional savings should be eligible for recovery in the LRAMVA claim.

 RESPONSE

1. Staff 22c asked where the unverified savings for the Retrofit program in 2017 of 509,451 kWh came from as it does not appear in the 2019 P&C report, already filed as “ERTH Power\_2020 IRM\_Participation and Cost Report\_Erie Thames Powerlines\_20191105”. That value was from the December 2018 P&C report, where it appears at cell BA15 on the LDC Progress tab. As noted in the earlier response, the workform submitted in January 2020 updated the values to the April 2019 P&C report, which shows a value for unverified 2017 retrofit savings of 593,860 kWh, which appears at cell BB15 of the April 2019 P&C report on the “LDC Progress” tab. Unfortunately, the 2020 persistence value of 590,923 kWh was inadvertently entered into cell D497 of Tab 5 (from cell CF15 on the LDC Progress tab), rather than the first year energy savings of 593,860. This has been corrected in the updated LRAMVA workform.
2. These additional savings are identified by the IESO as having been realized in the Participation and Cost report so should be eligible for recovery.

**Follow-up Question-15**

a)    Please re-file any update(s) to the LRAMVA workform and re-confirm the bill impact change (if any) for the Main RZ.

b)    Please highlight all changes made and identify the change(s) in Tab 1-a of the revised LRAMVA workform.

RESPONSE

1. An updated LRAMVA workform has been filed. Bill impacts will be updated when IRM model is refiled reflecting all changes from IRs.
2. Changes made are identified on Tab 1-a of the workform.