

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF the *Ontario Energy Board Act*, 1998
S.O. 1998, c. 15, Schedule B, as amended;

AND IN THE MATTER OF a Generic Hearing on Uniform
Transmission Rates Related Issues

JOINT SUBMISSION OF:

Niagara-on-the-Lake Hydro Inc.
Canadian Niagara Power Inc.
Enwin Utilities Ltd.
Entegrus Powerlines Inc.
Halton Hills Hydro Inc.

Clarifying Questions

The following clarifying questions all relate to the Hydro One Networks Inc (“HONI”) background report on Phase 2 of the Generic Hearing on Uniform Transmission Rates – Issue 4.

1. Ref: HONI Background Report on Issue 4, p. 3, line 22
 - a. Could HONI please explain whether the incremental revenue from double peak billing, realized from year to year, is incorporated into existing Uniform Transmission Rates and, if so, describe how this is done?
2. Ref: HONI Background Report on Issue 4, p. 8, line 29
 - a. HONI has noted that Option 2 would involve significant effort for the IESO billing and settlement systems. Presumably this would also be the case for HONI should it also adopt this approach. How many meters could HONI totalize before significant changes to the billing and settlement systems are required?
 - b. Can we ask the IESO this same question?
3. Ref: HONI Background Report on Issue 4, p. 12, line 16
 - a. HONI notes that under an approach where double peak billing was tracked in a deferral account, a methodology for calculating the refund amount would need to be established. Please provide details on how HONI would envision the calculation of the double peaking deferral account working, including deferral account mechanics and other considerations.
 - b. Please provide details on how Hydro One would foresee instances of double peaking being identified.
4. Ref: HONI Background Report on Issue 4, p. 10, lines 1-2 and lines 21 - 30

- a. Please explain how double peaking from planned (or unplanned) outages are currently factored into HONI's load forecast.
 - b. Is there any other manner in which double peaking is factored into Hydro One's current rate design?
- 5. Ref: HONI Background Report on Issue 4, p.6, lines 21 – 29 and p. 7, lines 1-6
HONI Background Report on Issue 4, Appendix B
 - a. Please provide details of all circumstances in the examples in Appendix B where HONI has worked with an LDC to mitigate double peaking in the manner described in the evidence referenced above.
 - c. Please discuss all other mitigating actions (including permitting chargeback compensation from the LDC to Hydro One) facilitated with customers to mitigate double peaking transmission costs in the Appendix B examples.
 - d. Please provide any other examples since January 1, 2014 of either HONI Transmission or HONI Distribution providing LDCs with measures to mitigate double peaking (i.e. operational, maintenance timing, or chargeback compensation) to LDCs.
- 6. Ref: HONI Background Report on Issue 4, p. 4, lines 24 - 29
 - a. HONI notes that clarification from the OEB as to the treatment of unplanned outages in the context of the current proceeding will help avoid future complaints and confusion. Please provide indicate whether HONI feels unplanned outages should be included in the proceeding and why?
- 7. Ref: HONI Background Report on Issue 4, p. 5, lines 10 - 18
 - a. Please explain in more detail the anomalous/unfair outcome for customers if double peak billing issues are resolved for transmission-connected customers in the current proceeding, but not for distribution-connected customers.
- 8. Ref: HONI Background Report on Issue 4, Appendix B
 - a. In Appendix B, multiple examples of HONI Distribution incurring double peak billing are described. Since January 1, 2014, what has been the annual frequency of occurrence of double peak billing to HONI Distribution, as well as the financial impact of such double peak billing?
 - b. Are double peaking billing costs passed on to the customers of HONI Distribution. If so, how?