1	RESPONSES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD STAFF INTERROGATORIES
2	
3	INTERROGATORY 2A-STAFF-104
4	Reference: Appendix 2-AA and Appendix 2-AB
5	
6	QUESTION:
7	a) Please update actual capital expenditures for 2023 bridge year in Appendix 2-AA format
8	and Appendix 2-AB format (and update other related tabs in Chapter 2 Appendices
9	accordingly). Please specify for which months actual data has been used versus forecast.
10	
11	RESPONSE:
12	Please refer to Appendix A and Appendix B for updated OEB Appendices 2-AA and 2-AB for 2023
13	Actuals (as of December 31, 2023), and updated 2024 Bridge.
14	
15	Additionally, the following appendixes have been updated for 2023 actuals and updated 2024
16	bridge through interrogatory responses:
17	
18	• OEB Appendix 2-BA can be found in the response to 1B-SEC-01 (e).
19	• OEB Appendix 2-FA-FB can be found in the response to 2A-Staff-109 (a)
20	• In-Service Additions by Investment Category can be found in the response to 1B-SEC-01 (d)
21	
22	As noted in the Application Update Cover Letter ¹ , the remaining tabs in Chapter 2 Appendixes will
23	be provided in advance of the Technical Conference.

¹ <u>EB-2023-0195, Toronto Hydro 2025-2029 Custom Rate Application For Electricity Distribution Rates and</u> <u>Charges – Evidence Update, January 29,2024, page 1.</u>

RESPO	NSES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD STAFF INTERROGATORIES
INTERROGAT	DRY 2A-STAFF-105
References:	Exhibit 2A, Tab 1, Schedule 2 - OEB Appendix 2-BA
	Exhibit 2B, Exhibit E4, Appendix A - OEB Appendix 2-AB
	Exhibit 2B, Section E4, Table 3
Preamble:	
OEB staff have	e compiled information from the references above to compare yearly expenditures to
	RESPO INTERROGATO References: <u>Preamble:</u> OEB staff have

10 yearly in service additions in the table below. The "difference" row in the table below also aligns

11 with the difference in closing CWIP in Table 3 in reference 3.

12

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Net Capital Expenditures	448.1	533.2	597.9	582.9	625.3	734.6	767.3	836.2	837.9	825.7
Additions	447.9	485.2	554.4	607.9	606.3	645.9	699.4	795.6	769.2	875.4
Difference	0.2	48.0	43.4	(24.9)	19.0	88.8	67.9	40.6	68.7	(49.6)

13

14

15 QUESTION (A):

a) Please outline the reasons for the year over year variances in the difference between net
 capital expenditures and in service additions.

18

19 **RESPONSE (A)**:

20 Year-over-year variances are attributed to the nature of capital projects resulting in a timing lag

- 21 between the completion of the project, the close-out process and any validation required to
- complete a project and bring it into service. Additionally, large projects may incur ongoing
- expenditure over multiple years before they are put in-service. This difference between capital
- 24 expenditures and in-service additions remains in Construction Work-in-Progress ("CWIP") until the
- 25 expenditures are in service, on project completion.

- 1 Additionally, Toronto Hydro notes that the yearly expenditures included in the question include
- 2 Renewable Generation Facility Assets and Other Non-Rate-Regulated Utility Assets¹ whereas the in-
- 3 service additions do not. Table 1 below provides Capital Expenditures normalized for these
- 4 expenditures, In-Service Additions as well as Opening and Closing CWIP for the 2020-2029 period.
- 5

	Actuals		Bridge		Forecast					
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
Opening CWIP	381.2	380.6	427.8	471.2	442.4	456.4	536.3	595.1	622.7	681.7
Additions (CAPEX)	447.4	532.4	597.8	579.1	620.3	725.8	758.1	823.2	828.2	812.3
Deductions (In	(447 9)	(485.2)	(554.4)	(607.9)	(606.3)	(645 9)	(699.4)	(795.6)	(769.2)	(875 4)
Service Additions)	(++7.5)	(405.2)	(554.4)	(007.5)	(000.5)	(0+3.3)	(000.4)	(755.0)	(705.2)	(075.4)
Closing CWIP	380.6	427.8	471.2	442.4	456.4	536.3	595.1	622.7	681.7	618.6
Difference	(0.5)	47.2	43.3	(28.8)	14.0	79.9	58.7	27.6	59.0	(63.1)

6 Table 1: Forecasted CWIP (\$Millions)

¹ Exhibit 2B, Section E4, Appendix B - OEB Appendix 2-AA

RESPONSES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD STAFF INTERROGATORIES 1 2 **INTERROGATORY 2A-STAFF-106** 3 Reference: Exhibit 2A, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Appendix D 4 5 Preamble: 6 7 In its depreciation report for Toronto Hydro, Concentric noted that "Through the completion of the depreciation study, Concentric was made aware that the currently utilized account structure for 8 facilities was leading to non-homogeneous assets being grouped together. Concentric recommends 9 Toronto Hydro examine the facilities accounts and create a set of accounts that better aligns with 10 the actual use of facilities assets." Concentric then provided a recommended account structure 11 with proposed useful lives. 12 13 **QUESTION (A) AND (B):** 14 a) Using Concentric's proposed account structure, please provide a comparison of the 15 depreciation expense included in Toronto Hydro's forecast rates for 2025-2029 and the 16 depreciation expense using the account structure recommended by Concentric. 17 b) Please discuss if Toronto Hydro has addressed this recommendation in the current 18 19 application. If not, why not and how Toronto Hydro plans to address Concentric's recommendation. 20 21 22 **RESPONSE (A) AND (B):** The depreciation expense included in Toronto Hydro's forecast rates for 2025-2029 is using 23 24 Concentric's proposed account structure. 25 Concentric's recommendations have been addressed in the current application. 26

1	RESPONSES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD STAFF INTERROGATORIES
2	
3	INTERROGATORY 2A-STAFF-107
4	Reference: Exhibit 2A, Tab 3, Schedule 1, Page.1
5	
6	Question(s):
7	a) Please file the Lead-Lag study done by Guidehouse based on 2023 actuals. If the study is
8	not yet completed, please advise when it will be.
9	
10	RESPONSE:
11	Toronto Hydro has not yet initiated the Lead-Lag study as the 2023 billing data is pending
12	finalization. Please refer to response 1A-Staff-01, a).

1	RESPC	INSES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD STAFF INTERROGATORIES
2		
3	INTERROGAT	ORY 2A-STAFF-108
4	Reference:	Exhibit 2A, Tab 5
5		Exhibit 2B, Section E5.5, pp. 8, 18, 19
6		Exhibit 2B, Section E7.2, p
7		
8	Preamble:	
9	In reference 1	Toronto Hydro presents Table 1 which includes investments over the 2025-2029 rate
10	period, with f	ootnote 8 that states "Toronto Hydro is not proposing any specific Renewable
11	Expansion inv	estments during 2025-2029."
12	In Reference 2	2, Toronto Hydro outlines the specific locations where bus-tie reactors will be
13	installed in Ta	ble 9.
14		
15	QUESTION (A):
16	a) Please	e explain if the plan to install Bus Tie Reactors as outline in reference 2, Table 9 and
17	the re	lated exhibit, are Toronto Hydro's plans for installation over the 2025-2029 period.
18		
19	RESPONSE (A)):
20	Confirmed. Ex	hibit 2B, Section 5.5, Table 9 provides the proposed schedule for the bus-tie reactor
21	project.	
22		
23	QUESTION (B):
24	b) In refe	erence 2, page 8 Toronto Hydro states it has engaged Hydro One to coordinate bus-tie
25	reacto	or installations. In reference 2 page 18, Toronto Hydro states the "bus-tie reactor
26	instal	ations will occur in accordance with Hydro One feasibility studies."
27	i.	What is the status of the approvals required by Hydro One to install this
28		equipment?

1	ii. If the locations identified are not approved for reactor installation by Hydro One,
2	what actions will Toronto Hydro take to both alleviate the restrictions and handle
3	the excess funds?
4	
5	RESPONSE (B):
6	Toronto Hydro has submitted applications to Hydro One for the assessment and implementation of
7	a bus-tie reactor for Richview TS. Project timeline discussions are underway.
8	
9	Should the proposed locations not be suitable for bus-tie reactor installation following the study,
10	Toronto Hydro would look to leverage other mitigation strategies such as station upgrades and
11	technical policy agreements to improve short circuit capacity in coordination with Hydro One.
12	
13	Excess funds, if any, will be recorded in Account 1533 ¹ and returned to the IESO at the end of the
14	2025-2029 rate period, similar to how excess funds associated with RGCRP in the 2015-2019 period
15	were returned.
16	
17	QUESTION (C):
18	c) Will the reactors be installed in advance of committed generation connection request to
19	allow for future connections, or will the reactors be installed when and where required for
20	committed generation connection requests?
21	
22	RESPONSE (C):
23	Bus-tie reactors address the existing and forecasted short circuit constraints at the station buses,
24	based on the DER forecast outlined in Exhibit 2B Section E3. Toronto Hydro intends to install bus-tie
25	reactors at 8 stations as outlined in Section E5.5 in order to accommodate future connections.
26	
27	QUESTION (D):

 $^{^1}$ Refer to Toronto Hydro's response to 9-Staff-348 (b) for excess funds associated with RGCRP in 2020-2024 that were recorded in the 2020-2024 period.

1	d)	ls Toro	nto Hydro's plans for the Energy Storage System (ESS) to install the equipment on
2		the 9 f	eeders in advance of committed generation connection requests to allow future
3		genera	ition, or in response to committed generation connection requests?
4			
5	RESPO	NSE (D)	:
6	As des	cribed ir	Exhibit 2B, Section E7.2, Toronto Hydro intends to install energy storage systems on
7	the nin	ie feede	rs to enable forecasted generation, not in response to committed generation
8	connec	ction rec	juests.
9			
10	QUEST	ION (E):	
11	e)	For c) a	and d) above, if the approach is other than in response to a committed generation
12		conne	ction request,
13		i.	Please explain why these expenditures prior to committed generation are prudent
14			enhancements to the distribution system.
15		ii.	Please outline how this meets the requirements of the renewable enabling funding
16			program.
17			
18	RESPO	NSE (E):	
19	The p	roposed	investments to accommodate the connection of renewable energy generation
20	facilitie	es are al	igned with section 3.3.2 of the Distribution System Code (DSC) and the definition of
21	"renew	vable en	abling improvement". It can take one to two years to complete a bus tie reactor or
22	and at	least on	e year to complete an ESS project (depending on the size). If these investments were
23	to be n	nade in	response to a committed generation request, rather than proactively, it would result
24	in und	ue delay	s and barriers to connecting renewables.
25			
26	QUEST	ION (F):	
27	f)	Please	provide the number of applications from renewable generators over 10 kW for
28		conne	ction on each of the locations where ESS and reactors are planned to be installed.
29			

1 **RESPONSE (F):**

There were a total of 40 pre-assessments performed between 2020 to 2023 for project applications on station buses identified on the list of station's proposed for bus-tie reactor installation and feeder candidates for the renewable enabling battery storage system program. For detailed descriptions of the needs at these stations and feeders please refer to the Generation Protection, Monitoring and Control (Exhibit 2B, Section E5.5) and Non-Wires Solutions (Exhibit 2B, Section E7.2) programs, respectively.

8

9 QUESTION (G):

g) If the forecast demand for Generation Protection - Monitoring Control expenditures does not materialize, how will Toronto Hydro handle the excess funds?

12

13 **RESPONSE (G):**

Account 1533- Renewable Generation Connection Funding Adder Deferral Account, as described in 14 Exhibit 9, Tab 1, Schedule 1 at page 17 tracks track variances between 2020-2024 revenue 15 requirement associated with Renewable Enabling Improvements ("REI") investments funded 16 17 through Provincial Rate Protection and collected through payments from the IESO. Toronto Hydro has requested the continuation of the account in the 2025-2029 rate period. If the forecast demand 18 19 does not materialize, and thereby, the costs are not incurred, similar to the 2020-2024 rate period, the variance between actual and forecasted revenue requirement will be recorded in the variance 20 account as a payable (credit) balance to the IESO. 21

22

Please refer to Toronto Hydro's response to 9-Staff-348 (b) for the payable (credit) balance recorded
 for the 2020-2024 period.

1	RESPC	INSES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD STAFF INTERROGATORIES
2		
3	INTERROGAT	DRY 2A-STAFF-109
4	References:	Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S02-3 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB
5		- Energy Storage_20231117
6		Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S04-5 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB
7		- GPMC_20231117
8		Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S05-6 - OEB Appendices 2-FA-
9		FB- Stations Expansion_20240129
10		Exhibit 9, Tab 2, Schedule 1,
11		THESL_9_T02_S01Continuity_Schedule_20231117, Tab 2b Continuity Schedule
12		
13	Preamble:	
14	OEB staff has	identified some issues which may require updates to the Excel models in references
15	1, 2 and 3 as v	vell as Account 1533 recorded in the continuity schedules in reference 4.
16		
17	OEB staff note	es that the Excel models in references 1 and 2 are hard coded and do not contain any
18	formulas used	to derive revenue requirement calculations.
19		
20	QUESTION (A):
21	a) Please	e provide the Excel models with formulas after Toronto Hydro incorporates all the
22	chang	es to the Excels models as part of its responses to interrogatories for renewable
23	gener	ation connection rate protection (RGCRP).
24		
25	RESPONSE (A)	:
26	Please see Ap	pendix A through C to the response for excel models with formulas reflecting all the
27	additional info	prmation and modifications to the model requested within interrogatories for
28	renewable ge	neration connection rate protection (RGCP).
29		

1	QUESTION (B):
2	b) Based on updated evidence in (a), please provide:
3	i. A spreadsheet detailing all the changes made.
4	ii. A summary table comparing the following information from the historic period
5	(including 2023 actuals if available) to the forecast period up to 2029:
6	 Approved revenue requirement amounts from the OEB's previously
7	approved decisions
8	 Actual/forecast revenue requirement amounts for provincial rate
9	protection
10	Variance account balances
11	
12	RESPONSE (B):
13	i. Please see Appendix D summarizing the changes made between the Appendices as filed and
14	the revised Appendices. The provided spreadsheet notes changes made, which are also
15	summarized below.
16	
17	The spreadsheets include specific calculations based on the mix of assets, timing of in-service
18	additions, and different Capital Cost Allowance ("CCA") assumptions for PILs.
19	
20	Toronto Hydro notes that the amounts included in Account 1533 are aligned with the detailed
21	calculations of revenue requirement presented in these appendices, no changes were made to
22	actual revenue requirement presented in account 1533 ¹ besides updates for 2023 actuals and
23	2024 updated forecast impacts.
24	
25	Custom changes were made to Appendix 2-FB in order to facilitate the calculations with
26	formulas and integrate the changes above. Specifically, in OEB Appendices 2-FB for GPMC
27	(Appendix B to the response):

¹ Exhibit 9, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Table 11

1		٠	a new column was added for the 2015 to 2019 years to facilitate different capital						
2			nputs for the tabs "App.2-FB Calc of Reg A", "App.2-FB Calc of Reg B" and "App.2-FB						
3			Calc of Reg C".						
4		•	In the tab "App.2-FB Calc of REG D":						
5			\circ an additional row was added to accommodate a catch-up amortization for the						
6			2020 In Service Amounts related to 2019 projects.						
7			 an accelerated CCA formula was added for Bill C-97. 						
8			\circ there were changes to the formulas of the Current Year Amortization (before						
9			additions) line to accommodate assets that are fully depreciated and reach a						
10			Net Book Value of zero.						
11		•	Tab "App.2-FB Calc of REG Consol" is a consolidation of all the separate formula-based						
12			calculations from the various tabs described above.						
13									
14	ii.	Please	see Table 1 with the 2020-2024 approved and actual/forecast revenue requirement for						
15		all the	investments.						

16

17 Table 1: Approved versus Actual/Forecast Revenue Requirement for provincial rate protection

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Approved Revenue Requirement	1.4	2.3	2.7	3.0	3.2
GPMC	0.9	1.5	1.7	1.9	2.1
Energy Storage	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.1	1.2
Actual/Forecast Revenue Requirement	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.3	0.9
GPMC	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.3	0.9
Energy Storage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Variance Account Balance	(0.7)	(1.0)	(1.4)	(1.7)	(2.4)

Note: Variances due to rounding may exist

1 Please see Table 2 with 2025-2029 forecast revenue requirement for all the investments.

2 Table 2: Forecast Revenue Requirement for provincial rate protection

	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
GPMC	1.0	1.2	1.6	2.3	3.4
Energy Storage	0.0	0.1	0.4	1.0	1.5
Stations Expansion	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
Total Forecast Revenue Requirement	1.0	1.3	2.1	3.3	5.8

Note: Variances due to rounding may exist

1	RESPO	NSES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD STAFF INTERROGATORIES
2		
3	INTERROGAT	DRY 2A-STAFF-110
4	References:	Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_X04-5 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB -
5		GPMC_20231117
6		Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S02-3 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB -
7		Energy Storage_20231117
8		Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S05-6 - OEB Appendices 2-FA-FB-
9		Stations Expansion_20240129
10		
11	Preamble:	
12	In references	1, 2 and 3, OEB staff notes that the cost of capital calculations are derived using the
13	same working	capital allowance, ROE, short term interest rate, and long term interest rate for each
14	of the entire f	ve year custom IR terms (from 2020-2024 and from 2025-2029).
15		
16	QUESTION (A)	:
17	a) Please	confirm that the working capital allowance, ROE, short term interest and long-term
18	intere	st rates are fixed for each of the custom IR terms.
19	i.	If not, please recalculate the cost of capital calculations in references 1 and 2 using
20		approved cost of capital parameters (or proposed numbers if the approved
21		numbers are not available) for each of the years and comment whether the
22		changes in short term and long-term debt values produce revenue requirement
23		amounts that are materially different from those calculated in the original models.
24	ii.	If the changes in revenue requirement amounts in (i) are material, please revise
25		Excel models in references 1 and 2 as needed.

1 **RESPONSE (A):**

- 2 Toronto Hydro confirms that the Working Capital Allowance, ROE, Short Term Interest and Long-
- 3 Term Interest rates are fixed for each of the 2015-2019¹, 2020-2024² and 2025-2029³ Custom IR
- 4 Terms. Toronto Hydro notes that the Working Capital Allowance rate is not used as there are no
- 5 OM&A costs related to these investments.
- 6 i. There were no changes to the capital parameters.
- 7 ii. There were no changes required based on question i)

¹ EB-2014-0116, Reply Submission to Draft Rate Order Comments, January 22, 2016, Schedule 1-1, page 3

² EB-2018-0165, Draft Rate Order, February 12, 2020, Schedule 1-1, page 3

³ EB-2023-0195, Exhibit 5, Tab 1, Schedule 2, Appendix 2-OA

1	R	RESPO	NSES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD STAFF INTERROGATORIES					
2								
3	INTERR	OGATO	RY 2A-STAFF-111					
4	References: Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S04-5 – OEB Appendices 2-FA-FE							
5			GPMC_20231117					
6			Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S02-3 – OEB Appendices 2-FA-FB -					
7			Energy Storage_20231117					
8			Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S05-6 - OEB Appendices 2-FA-FB -					
9			Stations Expansion_20240129					
10								
11	Preamb	ole:						
12	In refer	rences 1	and 2, Tab App.2-FA shows the total capital cost per year in line 62 and Tab App.2-					
13	FB show	ws capit	al additions per year in line 73. In each model, OEB staff notes that the value in line					
14	62 doe	s not red	concile with line 73 for each of the years.					
15								
16	In refer	rence 3,	Tab App.2-FA Proposed REG Inves Cx and Tab App. 2-FA Proposed REG ISA show the					
17	total ca	pital co	st per year in line 62 and Tab App.2-FB shows capital additions per year in line 73. In					
18	the mo	del, OEE	3 staff notes that the sum of the values in line 62 in App.2-FA Proposed REG Inves Cx					
19	and in ⁻	Tab App	.2-FA Proposed REG ISA for each year does not reconcile with the value in line 73 for					
20	each of	f the yea	irs.					
21								
22	QUEST	ION (A):						
23	a)	Please	explain why the total capital costs in Tab App. 2-FA are different from the capital					
24		additio	ns for each of the years and revise the evidence as needed.					
25								
26	RESPO	NSE (A):						
27	The pri	mary re	ason for the difference between amounts presented in 2-FA and 2-FB is that 2-FA					
28	presen	ts capita	Il expenditures incurred by year, whereas 2-FB presents in-service additions. There is					
29	a differ	ence in	timing between expenditure incurred and when the assets are put in-service (in-					

- 1 service additions). The difference between capital expenditures and in-service additions remains in
- 2 CWIP. Appendix A and B in the response to 2A-Staff-109 include a presentation of expenditures by
- 3 year, as well as in-service additions by year.

1	RESPON	SES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD S	TAFF INTERR	OGATORIES
2				
3	INTERROGATOR	Y 2A-STAFF-112		
4	Reference:	Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T	05_X04-5 - OEBA	ppendices 2-FA-FB -
5	(GPMC_20231117, tab App.2-FB		
6				
7	Preamble:			
8	From the Excel n	nodels in the reference, cells E72, E76 and E8	3 in tab App.2-FB	show the opening
9	gross fixed asset	s of \$5,856,601, opening accumulated amorti	zation of \$576,92	L3, and opening UCC
10	of \$3,760,802 re	spectively.		
11				
12	QUESTION (A):			
13	a) Please e	xplain in detail how Toronto Hydro derives th	ese numbers and	include references
14	to suppo	ort the derivation (e.g., EB#, exhibit, tab, sche	dule, date, and pa	age number, etc).
15				
16	RESPONSE (A):			
17	Toronto Hydro is	providing this response on the basis of the re	evised OEB Apper	ndix 2-FB for GPMC
18	filed as Appendix	x B to 2A-Staff-109.		
19				
20	The opening bala	ances in the references are derived from tabs	"App.2-FB Calc o	f REG A", "App.2-FB
21	Calc of REG B", "	App.2-FB Calc of REG C. Please see Tables 1-3	below. These an	nounts are derived
22	based on pre-20	20 in-service additions, depreciation and CCA		
23				
24		Table 1: Opening Gross Fixed	Assets	
		Opening Gross Fixed Assets	2020	
		App.2-FB Calc of REG A tab	2,129,811	
		App.2-FB Calc of REG B tab	751,453	

App.2-FB Calc of REG C tab

Total

2,975,337 **5,856,601**

25

Toronto Hydro-Electric System Limited EB-2023-0195 Interrogatory Responses **2A-Staff-112** FILED: March 11, 2024 Page **2** of **2**

Table 2: Opening Accumulated Amortization

Opening Accumulated Amortization	2020
App.2-FB Calc of REG A tab	193,619
App.2-FB Calc of REG B tab	77,286
App.2-FB Calc of REG C tab	306,009
Total	576,913

Table 3: Opening UCC

Opening UCC	2020
App.2-FB Calc of REG A tab	1,730,565
App.2-FB Calc of REG B tab	544,204
App.2-FB Calc of REG C tab	1,486,032
Total	3,760,802

3

4

1

1	RESPO	NSES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD STAFF INTERROGATORIES
2		
3	INTERROGATO	RY 2A-STAFF-113
4	References:	Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_X04-5 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB -
5		GPMC_20231117
6		Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S02-3 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB -
7		Energy Storage_20231117
8		Exhibit 2A, Tab 5, Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S05-6 - OEB Appendices 2-FA-FB-
9		Stations Expansion_20240129
10		
11	Preamble:	
12	In tab App.2-F	3 in the references, Toronto Hydro provides values for amortization period, CCA Rate
13	Class and CCA	Rate in cells B71, B93 and B94.
14		
15	QUESTION:	
16	Please explain	the rationale for using these values in the models and provide references to support
17	the use of thes	e numbers (e.g. EB#, exhibit, tab, schedule, date, and page number, etc).
18		
19	RESPONSE:	
20	Please see belo	ow comments for each reference.
21		
22	<u>Reference 1: Ex</u>	<u> khibit 2A / Tab 5 / Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_X04-5 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB -</u>
23	<u>GPMC_202311</u>	<u>17</u>
24	The average us	eful life of assets in-service is 27.5 years and aligns with the useful lives used in both
25	the 2020-2024	¹ and the 2015-2019 CIR Applications. ² It assumes a mix of various distribution assets
26	from these pot	ential investments with useful lives ranging from 15 to 40 years, resulting in an

¹ EB-2018-0165, Exhibit 2A, Tab 6, Schedule 5

² EB-2014-0116, Exhibit 2A, Tab 8, Schedule 1

1	average of 27.5 years. The exception is the Energy Monitoring and Control software, ³ which
2	includes IT related assets put in-service in 2019-2020 with an approximate useful life of 5-years.
3	This is reflected in the updated appendices to Toronto Hydro's response to interrogatory 2A-Staff-
4	109.
5	
6	With regard to the CCA Classes, for the distribution related assets, CCA Class 47 was used with a
7	CCA Rate of 8%; for IT software related assets, CCA 12 with a CCA rate of 100%; and for IT hardware
8	related assets, CCA Class 50 with a CCA rate of 55%. Please refer to Toronto Hydro's response to
9	2A-Staff-109 for the updated templates.
10	
11	Please refer to Exhibit 2B, Section E5.5 for further details about this program.
12	
13	<u>Reference 2: Exhibit 2A / Tab 5 / Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S02-3 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB -</u>
14	Energy Storage_20231117
15	The expected assets from the energy storage investments have an expected useful life of 15 years
16	and a CCA Class of 43.1 with a CCA Rate of 30% based on the expected specifications of the
17	investments. Please refer to Exhibit 2B, Section E7.2 for investments related to Energy Storage
18	Systems for the nature of these investments.
19	
20	<u>Reference 3: Exhibit 2A / Tab 5 / Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S05-6 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB-</u>
21	Stations Expansion_20240129
22	The Stations Expansion investments referenced are capital contributions paid to Hydro One for the
23	Sheppard TS Bus Expansion, where a useful life of 25 years was used. These investments are
24	subject to CCA Class 14.1 which has a CCA Rate of 5%. Please refer to Exhibit 2B, Section E7.4.4.3
25	for additional information.

³ 2A-Staff-114 (a)

1	RESPO	NSES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD STAFF INTERROGATORIES
2		
3	INTERROGATO	RY 2A-STAFF-114
4	Reference:	Filing Requirements For Electricity Distribution Rate Applications - 2023 Edition
5		for 2024 Rate Applications - Chapter 2, Appendix A
6		Decision and Order, Green Energy Plan Electricity Rate Protection Benefit and
7		Charge, EB-2016-0170, May 19, 2016
8		Exhibit 2A / Tab 5 / Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_X04-5 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB
9		- GPMC_20231117
10		Exhibit 2A / Tab 5 / Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S02-3 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB
11		- Energy Storage_20231117
12		Exhibit 9, Tab 1, Schedule 1, December 19, 2023, p. 19, Table 11
13		
14	Preamble:	
15	Reference 1 sta	ates that: "For distributors that are already receiving rate protection as a result of a
16	previous applic	ation and approval (in many cases, based on a forecast of capital expenditures on
17	qualifying conn	ection assets), the new (current) cost of service application should include an
18	update to inclu	de the actual costs incurred for the investments as well as a depreciation
19	adjustment to	calculate a new capital amount for input into Appendices 2-FA through 2-FC. This
20	would generate	e a new up-to-date rate protection amount for the test year and beyond, which will
21	be subject to the	ne materiality threshold in section 2.0.8."
22		
23	OEB staff notes	that Toronto Hydro received funding for renewable generation connection prior to
24	2020. For exam	ple, in Reference 2, the OEB approved renewable generation connection funding for
25	Toronto Hydro	in the amount of \$1,173,258 for May 1 to December 31, 2016.
26		
27	In references 3	and 4, OEB staff notes that the Excel models contain revenue requirement
28	calculations for	provincial rate protection starting from 2020 (there are no previous calculations
29	prior to 2020).	

1	OEB staff also notes that the revenue requirement amounts for provincial rate protection for the
2	2020-2022 period in the Excel model (reference 3) do not reconcile with actual revenue
3	requirement amounts in Table 11 (reference 5) for the period 2020 - 2022.
4	
5	QUESTION (A):
6	a) Please provide a list of all the renewable generation connection investments that Toronto
7	Hydro made and received funding from the IESO prior to 2020 as well as a short description
8	of each investment.
9	
10	RESPONSE (A):
11	The investments made prior to 2020 as part of the Generation Protection Monitoring and Control
12	program over the 2015-2019 period include: ¹
13	Monitoring and Control Buyback: purchase of customer-installed monitoring equipment
14	for SCADA communication; and
15	Energy Monitoring and Control: installation of a Distributed Energy Resource (DER)
16	Management System platform (DER SCADA Management)
17	
18	QUESTION (B) AND (C):
19	b) In references 3 and 4, please confirm whether revenue requirement amounts in tab App.2-
20	FB in both Excel models are derived based on previously approved investment projects
21	prior to 2020 (if any), plus the revenue requirement derived from capital expenditures
22	from the approved projects from 2020 to 2024 and the proposed projects from 2025-2029
23	or not.
24	c) If not in (b), based on the Excel models in references 3 and 4 and all the past approved
25	investments in (a), please provide the following:
26	i. Extend the historic period in the Excel models to reflect the actual capital and start-
27	up OM&A costs incurred starting from the first year that Toronto Hydro made
28	renewable generation connection investments which were approved by the OEB.

¹ EB-2018-0165, Exhibit 2B, Section E5.5 at pages 17-18.

1	i	i.	If the investments made prior to 2020 are substantially different from the
2			investments made during 2020-2024 and from 2025-2029 which require different
3			assumptions for WCA percentage, debt percentages, interest rates, kWh, tax rates,
4			amortization period, and CCA, please create and provide a new Excel model instead
5			of extending the historic period as described in (i). In the new Excel model, please
6			include the revenue requirement calculations starting from the first year that
7			Toronto Hydro made renewable generation connection investments until 2029.
8	ii	i.	For the Excel models in (i) and (ii), please calculate actual revenue requirement
9			amounts for provincial protection resulting from actual capital costs, start-up
10			OM&A costs (if any), and depreciation adjustments. Please include 2023 actual
11			results if available at the time of preparing interrogatories.
12			
13	RESPONSE	(B) A	AND (C):
14	Toronto Hy	/dro	confirms that the revenue requirement amounts are composed of investment
15	projects fro	om 2	016 to 2029. Please see 2A-Staff-109 for the revenue requirement calculations.
16			
17	QUESTION	(D)	AND (E):
18	d) Fro	om th	ne revised excel models in (c), please provide a summary table showing the revised
19	act	tual a	and forecast revenue requirement amounts for provincial rate protection per year
20	for	eacl	h of the Excel models for the historic period (starting from the first year the
21	inv	estm	nents were made) up to the forecast period ending 2029.
22	e) Fro	om tł	ne summary table in (d), please comment whether the revised actual revenue
23	rec	quire	ment amounts for provincial rate protection for 2020-2022 reconcile with Table 11
24	in r	refer	ence 5 or not.
25		i.	If not, please revise all the evidence affected by the changes in actual revenue
26			requirement amounts (e.g. revise amounts recorded in Account 1533 in the
27			Continuity Schedule) as needed.

1 **RESPONSE (D) AND (E):**

- 2 Please see Table 1 based on the revised calculations in 2A-Staff-109. This table reconciles to Exhibit
- 9, Tab 1, Schedule 1, December 19, 2023, at page 19, Table 11 for the 2020 to 2022 actuals and has
- 4 been updated to reflect 2023 actuals and an updated 2024 forecast.
- 5

6 Table 1: Revenue Requirement Under Provincial Rate Protection (\$ Millions)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
GPMC													
Revenue	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.3	0.9	1.0	1.2	1.6	2.3	3.4
Requirement													
Energy Storage													
Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	1.0	1.5
Requirement													
Stations													
Expansion													0.8
Revenue	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.8
Requirement													
Variance	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.8	1.3	1.3	1.3	0.9	1.0	1.3	2.1	3.3	5.8

Note: Variances due to rounding may exist

7

8 QUESTION (F):

9	f	f) From the revised models in (b), for the historical actual capital/start-up OM&A spendings,				
10	please provide details of the work related to renewable generation connection projects					
11	that required these spendings and include the following:					
12			i.	Please provide a list of generation connected, the type of connection, and the		
13				actual amount of spending for each type.		
14			ii.	Please describe the work involved.		
15	iii. Please explain drivers for any material increases in capital costs and start-up OM&					
16				costs (if applicable).		
17						
18	RESF	POI	NSE (F):			
19	i)	T	oronto	Hydro notes that OEB Staff's question assumes these investments were made in		
20		re	esponse	to committed generation connection requests. As described in the response to 2A-		
21		St	taff-108	(e), actual renewable enabling improvement investments were made prior to		

committed generation connections as to do otherwise would result in undue delays and
 barriers to connecting renewables. As such, Toronto Hydro does not have a list of generation
 connected, type of connections and amounts spent per type associated with these
 investments. Table 2 below provides the cost per unit for monitoring and control equipment
 and antenna installations.

- 6
- 7

8

Table 2: Generation Protection Monitoring and Control Investments

Program	Typical Amount (Per Unit)		
Monitoring and Control Equipment	\$10,000		
Antenna Installation	\$25,000		

For a breakdown of generations connected to Toronto Hydro's system, please refer to Exhibit
2B, Section E3 and E5.1, and for actual and forecast expenditures over the 2020-2029 period,
please refer to Exhibit 2B, Section E5.5.4.

12

ii) For descriptions of the monitoring and control equipment and antenna installations, please
 refer to Exhibit 2B, Section E5.5.3.3, Section 3 at pages 12-15.

15

16 iii) The increases are attributed to the system needs identified by Toronto Hydro's DER forecast.

17 The forecast considers a combination of historical trends, project pipeline, economic

- 18 environment and the current energy policies at the time of the forecast. See Exhibit 2B,
- 19 Section E5.1.3.2 for further details of Toronto Hydro's DER connection forecast methodology

1	RES	PONSES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD STAFF INTERROGATORIES
2		
3	INTERROG	ATORY 2A-STAFF-115
4	References	Exhibit 2A / Tab 5 / Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_X04-5 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB
5		- GPMC_20231117
6		Exhibit 2A / Tab 5 / Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S02-3 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB
7		- Energy Storage_20231117
8		Exhibit 2A / Tab 5 / Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S05-6 - OEB Appendices 2-FA-
9		FB- Stations Expansion_20240129
10		
11	Preamble:	
12	Toronto Hy	dro provides the forecast revenue requirement amounts for provincial rate protection
13	derived fro	m forecast capital additions in the references.
14		
15	QUESTION	(A):
16	a) For the	forecast period, please provide the following for each of the models referenced:
17	i)	Please describe the information that has led to the forecast of capital additions and
18		start-up OM&A costs (if applicable) for each of the forecast years.
19	ii)	Please provide a list of forecast renewable generation connection and type of
20		connection if available.
21	iii)	Please explain drivers for any material increases in capital additions and start-up
22		OM&A costs (if applicable).
23		
24	RESPONSE	(A):
25	Re – Refere	ence: Exhibit 2A / Tab 5 / Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_X04-5 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB
26	- GPMC_20	231117
27	i) The	e evidence in Exhibit 2B, Section E5.1 notes that the DER forecast is separated into
28	rer	newable, energy storage and non-renewable segments. For each segment, forecast DER
29	cap	pacity was approximated using a mathematical model that best represented recent and

1		anticipated growth patterns, considering a combination of historical trends, project
2		pipeline, economic environment and the current energy policies at the time of forecast.
3	ii)	Tables 6 and 7 in Exhibit 2B, Section E5.1.
4	iii)	The increase is driven by the projected system constraints due to the forecasted growth in
5		DER applications and the investments required to address them. Please refer to Exhibit 2B
6		Section E3 for a detailed description of the forecast and the system constraints.
7		
8	Re – Re	ference: Exhibit 2A / Tab 5 / Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S02-3 - OEBAppendices 2-FA-FB
9	- Energ	y Storage_20231117
10	i)	The Energy Storage (ESS) segment reference refers to Toronto Hydro's plans to own and
11		operate renewable-enbabling energy storage system (REBESS). The forecasted costs for
12		this segment, as well as an explanation of how these costs were derived, are detailed in
13		Exhibit 2B, Section E7.2 at page 3.
14	ii)	N/A to this segment
15	iii)	N/A to this segment
16		
17	Re – Re	ference: Exhibit 2A / Tab 5 / Excel Model - THESL_2A_T05_S05-6 - OEB Appendices 2-FA-
18	FB- Sta	tions Expansion_20240129
19	i)	As per Exhibit 2B E7.4.3 page 4, Toronto Hydro has considered multiple inputs to develop a
20		plan that will satisfy its capacity needs. These inputs are: Toronto Hydro's 10-Year peak
21		demand forecast, City of Toronto Development plans, and the Future Energy Scenarios
22		(FES).
23	ii)	N/A to this segment
24	iii)	As described in Exhibit 2B E7.4.3, the increased expenditures in stations expansion are
25		driven by the City of Toronto Development Plans, acceleration of electrification, and a lack
26		of short circuit capacity (required to connect new DERs to Toronto Hydro's system).

1	RESPONSES TO ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD STAFF INTERROGATORIES
2	
3	INTERROGATORY 2A-Staff-116
4	REFERENCE: THESL_2A_T03_S01_AppA - Cost of Power_20231117.xls
5	
6	Preamble:
7	In the sheet titled "App.2-ZB_2028 Cost of Power" at cell D69, the kW value for Streetlighting class
8	is the exact same as Large User class, of 3,390,747 kW. It appears that this may be a data entry
9	error.
10	
11	Question(s):
12	a) Please confirm that this is a data entry error.
13	i. If this is a data entry error, please verify that no other errors exist in the sheets of
14	this file.
15	ii. If any other errors are noted, please identify them.
16	b) Please provide a corrected excel file.
17	
18	RESPONSE
19	a) Toronto Hydro confirms the data entry error noted above.
20	i) Toronto Hydro verifies this is the only error.
21	ii) Not applicable.
22	
23	b) Toronto Hydro submits the excel file for 2A-Staff-116, Appendix A.

1	RESPONSES TO ASSOCIATION OF MAJOR POWER CONSUMERS IN ONTARIO
2	INTERROGATORIES
3	
4	INTERROGATORY 2A-AMPCO-13
5	Reference: Exhibit 2A, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Page 2
6	
7	Please provide the OEB-approved depreciation amounts for the years 2020 to 2024.
8	
9	RESPONSE:
10	Please see Table 1 for 2020-2024 OEB-approved depreciation amounts.
11	
12	Table 1: 2020-2024 OEB-Approved Depreciation (\$ Millions) ¹

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Depreciation Expense ²	265.4	280.8	291.0	311.9	324.3

¹ These amounts align with Schedule 3 of the Draft Rate Order in EB-2018-0165 updated on February 12, 2020.

² Excluding allocated transportation depreciation.

RESPONSES TO ASSOCIATION OF MAJOR POWER CONSUMERS IN ONTARIO 1 **INTERROGATORIES** 2 3 **INTERROGATORY 2A-AMPCO-14** 4 Reference: Exhibit 2A, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Page 3 5 6 7 Please confirm the number of asset types included in Concentric Advisor's Depreciation Study (Appendix D) and the total asset count covered by the study. 8 9 **RESPONSE PREPARED BY CONCENTRIC:** 10 11 As shown on pages 4-2 through 4-6 of the depreciation study, the total number of asset classes 12 considered was 150, which includes all asset classes that existed at the time of the study, with the exception of the seven asset classes identified at page 4-6 of the depreciation study under the 13 heading "Plant Not Studied". Depreciation calculations, including the retirement rate analysis 14 conducted for Toronto Hydro, are conducted based on the surviving original cost of all assets 15 installed within a given account. As such, none of the calculations rely upon an asset count; therefore, 16 17 an asset count was not conducted as part of the depreciation study. Concentric does not know the number of assets considered within any given account nor within the Toronto Hydro system. 18 19 **RESPONSE PREPARED BY TORONTO HYDRO:** 20 Furthermore, Toronto Hydro notes that in addition to the asset count not being relevant to the 21

quantification of depreciation expense impacts as a result of the study, the data on total number of
 assets studied will not be meaningful as it would consist of various incomparable units of measure
 such as units based on length (e.g. cables, ducts, etc.) as opposed to number of poles or meters, for
 example. Certain other assets, such as software initiatives or facilities investments in buildings, do
 not necessarily have a relevant unit of measure.

1	RESPO	NSES TO CONSUMERS COUNCIL OF CANADA INTERROGATORIES
2		
3	INTERROGAT	ORY 2A-CCC-51
4	Reference:	Exhibit 2A, Tab 1, Schedule 1, p. 3 - Table 3 2020-2024 In-Service Additions
5		Variances
6		
7	Please recast	Table 3 2020-2024 In Service Additions Variance to include 2023 actuals.
8		
9	RESPONSE:	
10	Please see Ta	ble 1 with 2023 actuals and updated 2024 forecast.
11		

12 Table 1: 2020-2024 In-Service Additions Variances (\$ Millions)

	2020-2024 DRO	2020-2024 Actual/Bridge	Var. (\$)	Var. (%)
System Access	469.1	632.7	163.6	34.9%
System Renewal	1,535.8	1,396.2	(139.6)	-9.1%
System Service	259.8	271.6	11.8	4.5%
General Plant	403.7	396.9	(6.8)	-1.7%
Other	5.1	4.9	(0.2)	-3.5%
Net In-Service Additions	2,673.4	2,702.3	28.9	1.1%

	RESPO	NSES TO CONSUMERS COUNCIL OF CANADA INTERROGATORIES
	INTERROGAT	ORY 2A-CCC-52
	Reference:	Exhibit 2A, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Pages 5-6 - Table 4 2020-2024 Gross and Net
		PP&E/Table 5 2025-2029 Gross and Net PP&E
	Please explair	n if Toronto Hydro forecasts Contributions and Grants for each year during the rate
	plan period.	If so, what are the implications if Contributions and Grants are greater or lesser than
	forecast durir	ng the rate plan period. In the years 2020-2024 Contributions and Grants went from
	\$334.7 millior	n to \$898.8 million. For each of those years what level of Contributions and Grants
	were forecast	? Has Toronto Hydro ever considered DVA treatment for Contributions and Grants?
	If not, why no	pt?
Ļ	RESPONSE:	
	Toronto Hydr	o confirms that contributions and grants are forecasted in the 2025-2029 period.
5	These are pri	marily associated with the Customer Connections (Exhibit 2B, Section E5.1) and
	Externally Init	iated Plant Relocations and Expansion (Exhibit 2B, Section E5.2) programs.
	Contributions	and Grants are recoveries to offset costs that would otherwise increase rate base
	and depreciat	tion. Therefore, if Contributions and Grants are greater than forecast, then rate base
	and depreciat	tion would be lower than forecast. If Contributions and Grants are lower than
	forecast, the	result would be that rate base and depreciation would be higher than forecast.
	Please see Ta	ble 1 for forecasted Contributions and Grants during the 2020-2024 rate period.
	Table 1: Fore	casted Contributions and Grants (\$ Millions)

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Capital Contributions & Grants ¹	(378.0)	(448.4)	(504.6)	(556.8)	(789.8)

¹ EB-2018-0165, Draft Rate Order Update (February 12, 2020), Schedule 2 – OEB Appendix 2-BA

- 1 Toronto Hydro has proposed the Demand Related Variance Account² ("DRVA") as part of the 2025-
- 2 2029 application, which includes capital-related revenue requirement associated with both
- 3 programs (Customer Connections and Externally Initiated Plant Relocations and Expansion) that are
- 4 expected to generate Contributions and Grants. For more information on the DRVA, please see
- 5 Exhibit 9, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Appendix B and Exhibit 1B, Tab 2, Schedule 1.

² Exhibit 9, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Section 9.2

RESPONSES TO CONSUMERS COUNCIL OF CANADA INTERROGATORIES 1 2 **INTERROGATORY 2A-CCC-53** 3 **Reference:** Exhibit 2A, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Page 3 4 5 In accordance with the OEB's Decision in the 2020-2024 Rate Application (EB-2018-0165) Toronto 6 Hydro retained Concentric Advisors ULC to complete a depreciation study which resulted in 7 changes to depreciation rates effective January 1, 2023. Please provide the annual depreciation 8 expense for Toronto Hydro for each year 2024-2029 under the previous and proposed 9 methodologies. 10 11 **RESPONSE:** 12 13 Please see Table 1 for the annual depreciation expense for the 2024-2029 period with and without the asset useful life changes. 14

15

16 Table 1: Depreciation based on asset useful life with and without changes (\$ Millions)

	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029
	Bridge	Forecast	Forecast	Forecast	Forecast	Forecast
Depreciation and Amortization	291.6	305.0	321.7	344.4	368.6	381.9
Expense (without UL changes)						
Depreciation and Amortization	237.2	247.4	260.1	278.5	300.1	311.2
Expense (with UL change)						
Difference	(54.4)	(57.6)	(61.5)	(65.9)	(68.5)	(70.6)

1		RESPONSES TO POLLUTION PROBE INTERROGATORIES
2		
3	INTERR	ROGATORY 2A-PP-24
4	Refere	nces: Capitalization Policy dated 2023-10-18
5		Exhibit 2A, Tab 4, Schedule 1, App A
6		
7	QUEST	ION (A):
8	a)	Is THESL requesting OEB approval of the updated Capitalization Policy? If not, what is the
9		process to have a new Capitalization Policy approved for use?
10		
11	RESPO	NSE (A):
12	No. Thi	is policy was filed in accordance with section 2.2.9 Capitalization of the OEB's Chapter 2
13	Filing R	equirements for Electricity Distributors (December 15, 2022). Toronto Hydro follows the
14	Interna	ational Financial Reporting Standards ("IFRS") in updating its Capitalization Policy. This is in
15	line wit	th the expectations set out in the Accounting Procedures Handbook. ¹ The process for
16	approv	ing changes to the Capitalization Policy is described in Section 11.2 of the Capitalization
17	Policy v	which can be found in Exhibit 2A, Tab 4, Schedule 1, Appendix A, and was last approved on
18	Octobe	er 24, 2023.
19		
20	QUEST	ION (B):
21	b)	Please provide a summary of the major changes compared to the previous version of the
22		Capitalization Policy, or if easier simply provide a copy in track changes of the 2023 version
23		against the previous version.
24		
25	RESPO	NSE (B):
26	Please	refer to Exhibit 2A, Tab 4, Schedule 1, page 1-5 for a list of changes to the previous version
27	of the (Capitalization Policy.

¹ OEB Accounting Procedures Handbook (issued December 2011) at page 7

1 QUESTION (C):

- c) Cloud computing is typically an O&M expense since there are no physical assets owned by
 the utility. How does THESL current treat cloud computing (Capital or OM&A) and please
 explain why these costs should be capitalized in the 2025-2029 rate term.
- 5

6 **RESPONSE (C)**:

- 7 While typically cloud computing is treated as an O&M expense, the accounting treatment is unique
- to each contract as described in section 8.1.4 of the Capitalization Policy filed in Exhibit 2A, Tab 4,
- 9 Schedule 1, Appendix A. Additionally, accounting treatment of cloud implementation costs are also
- assessed based on the nature of the cost and accounting for under IFRS requirements. Please refer
- 11 to Appendix C of the Capitalization Policy for the decision tree for this assessment.

12

- 13 Regarding the treatment of cloud computing costs in the 2025-2029 rate period, please refer to
- 14 Toronto Hydro's responses to 2B-Staff-263, subparts (a) and (b).

1	RESPONSES TO POLLUTION PROBE INTERROGATORIES
2	
3	INTERROGATORY 2A-PP-25
4	Reference: Exhibit 2A, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Page 3
5	
6	"Concentric Report, plus as summarized in Appendix D at Tables 1 - 3, the financial average service
7	lives of six asset classes were shortened by the Study, and the financial average service lives of 73
8	asset were lengthened by Study, resulting in a significant overall reduction in depreciation
9	expenses."
10	
11	QUESTION (A):
12	a) Please explain how the significant increase in service life proposed by Concentric would
13	impact the definition and percent of THESL assets that are at or beyond their useful life.
14	Please also provide a recalculation of the THESL statistics on assets at or beyond useful life
15	if the Concentric recommendations are applied.
16	
17	RESPONSE (A):
18	Toronto Hydro has already reviewed and made adjustments informed by Concentric's
19	recommended service lives within the Assets Past Useful Life ("APUL") metric presented in Exhibit
20	2B, Section A3.1, Page 7. For additional details on Toronto Hydro's useful life values and their use
21	within the asset management system, please see response to 2B-Staff-131, part (a).
22	
23	QUESTION (B):
24	b) Please provide a list of the pros and cons (including impacts on rate payer Energy
25	Transition, temporal risk, etc.) of increasing the average accounting life of THESL assets.
26	
27	RESPONSE (B):
28	The impacts of increasing the average accounting life of Toronto Hydro's assets include:

1	•	Depreciation Expense: decreased annual depreciation expense, resulting in a significantly
2		lower revenue requirement in the near future.
3	•	Rate Base: Lower annual depreciation expense resulting in higher asset book values, thus
4		increasing rate base, the ROE and deemed interest components of revenue requirement
5		gradually, albeit at a lesser magnitude than depreciation.
6	•	Derecognition: Assets that may be derecognized prior to end of accounting life would have
7		a higher book value at the time of derecognition resulting in an increase to rates.
8		
9	QUEST	ION (C):
10	c)	Is the proposed service life change only for new assets or retroactive?
11		
12	RESPO	NSE (C):
13	The pro	pposed service life change was applied prospectively to the depreciation on all assets, both
14	existin	g assets as of 2022 and new additions from 2023 onwards.

1		RESPONSES TO POLLUTION PROBE INTERROGATORIES				
2						
3	INTERROGATORY 2A-PP-26					
4	References:	Concentric Report and Table 8: Depreciation and Amortization Expense 2025 to				
5		2029 (\$ Millions) [Exhibit 2A, Tab 2, Schedule 1, Page 6]				
6						
7	Please provide	a copy of Table 8 including the impact of the Concentric service life changes. If those				
8	were already a	pplied, please provide a copy of Table 8 based on current asset life (i.e. without				
9	changes).					
10						
11	RESPONSE:					
12	Please refer to	Toronto Hydro's response to interrogatory 2A-CCC-53.				

RESPONSES TO SCHOOL ENERGY COALITION INTERROGATORIES 1 2 **INTERROGATORY 2A-SEC-30** 3 **References:** Exhibit 2A, Tab 1 4 5 SEC seeks to understand the revenue requirement impact of the proposal capital expenditures. 6 7 Please provide a table that shows for each year between 2025 and 2029, the revenue requirements, broken down by component, related only to the proposed 2025 to 2029 capital 8 expenditures. 9 10 **RESPONSE:** 11 Table 1 below presents an estimate of 2025-2029 revenue requirement associated with 2025-2029 12 13 capital expenditures broken down by component. The revenue requirement provided below is based on an estimate of the updated 2025-2029 total Revenue Requirement, which includes 14 impact from: (i) the 2023 actuals and updated 2024 forecast (presented in 2A-Staff-104), and (ii) 15 16 the January 29, 2024 evidence update. The final PILS models for the updated 2025-2029 total Revenue Requirement (Exhibit 6) are not yet available because it was not possible to complete this 17 work within the timelines for responding to interrogatories. This information will be provided in 18 19 advance of the Technical Conference as indicated in 1A-Staff-01 and noted in the Application Evidence Update cover letter.¹ 20 21

Table 1: 2025-2029 Estimated Capital-Related Revenue Requirement

	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2025-2029
ROE	4.3	19.7	42.1	66.8	90.6	223.5
Deemed Interest	2.8	12.8	27.3	43.3	58.7	144.7
Depreciation	39.6	55.4	83.9	115.9	146.2	441.0
PILS	(0.3)	(12.0)	(29.5)	4.0	(2.9)	(40.7)

¹ <u>EB-2023-0195</u>, Toronto Hydro 2025-2029 Custom Rate Application For Electricity Distribution Rates and Charges – Evidence Update, January 29,2024, page 1.

Revenue Requirement	46.3	75.9	123.8	230.0	292.5	768.5
----------------------------	------	------	-------	-------	-------	-------

1 Rounding variances may exist