Energy Probe Interrogatory #6

Interrogatory

Reference:
Exhibit B3, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Table 1

Please provide variance explanations for the following variances:

a) 2017 OEB Approved versus 2017 Actual

b) 2018 OEB Approved versus 2018 Actual

c) 2019 OEB Approved versus 2019 Actual

d) 2020 OEB Approved versus 2020 Budget

e) 2021 OEB Approved versus 2021 Budget

Response

a) 2017 actual nuclear prescribed facility rate base was higher than the 2017 OEB approved amount by $189.8M, primarily driven by the D2O Storage Project as it was excluded from the rate base approved in EB-2016-0152.

b) 2018 actual nuclear prescribed facility rate base was higher than the 2018 OEB approved amount by $508.4M, primarily driven by the D2O Storage Project, the impact of extending Pickering NGS accounting end-of-life ("EOL") date and cumulatively higher DRP and non-DRP in service capital.

c) 2019 actual nuclear prescribed facility rate base was higher than the 2019 OEB approved amount by $673.1M, primarily driven by the D2O Storage Project, the impact of extending Pickering NGS accounting end-of-life ("EOL") date and cumulatively higher DRP and non-DRP in service capital.

d) 2020 budgeted nuclear prescribed facility rate base was lower than the 2020 OEB approved amount by $314.7M, primarily driven by revised timing for the return to service of Unit 2, partly offset by the D2O Storage Project, the impact of extending Pickering NGS accounting EOL date and cumulatively higher non-DRP in service capital.

e) 2021 nuclear prescribed facility rate base is budgeted to be higher than the 2021 OEB approved amount by $1,230.7M, primarily driven by D2O Storage Project, the impact of extending Pickering NGS accounting EOL date and cumulatively higher DRP and non-DRP in service capital.