

HYDRO OTTAWA LIMITED
2016-2030 RATES (EB-2024-0115)
PARTIAL LIST OF VECC's TECHNICAL CONFERENCE QUESTIONS

- 1.0 Reference:** Exhibit 1, Tab 3, Schedule 1, page 26
Exhibit 8, Tab 4, Schedule 1, page 8
Exhibit 8, Tab 4, Schedule 3, page 1
6-Staff 189
8-VECC 68

Preamble: Exhibit 1-3-1 states:
“Hydro Ottawa “proposes to set both rates and revenue related to Other Revenue for 5 years. Where rates are proposed to be adjusted in years two to five, for simplicity, an annual inflation rate of 2.1% is proposed to avoid annual adjustments to the rates throughout the rate term.”

With respect to the wireline pole attachment rate, Exhibit 8-4-1 states:

“For the purpose of calculating revenue requirement, Hydro Ottawa has used the OEB-approved 2025 rate for 2026-2030 estimate. This approach was taken to mitigate any decrease in the number of pole attachments due to the increased desire for third parties to move assets underground.”

Exhibit 8-4-3 states:

“Table 1 below provides illustrative RSCs for 2026-2030. The 2026 charges are consistent with 2025 approved rates in the OEB Decision and Order for retailer service charges. As a placeholder for the generic RSCs the 2027-2030 period, charges have been held flat for illustrative purposes. Hydro Ottawa proposes to update RSCs in accordance with applicable OEB Decisions and Orders during the 2026-2030 period.”

VECC 68 states:

“Hydro Ottawa is proposing to update the Wireline Pole Attachment charge annually based on the OEB approved rate.”

With respect to USOA 4082 and 4084, Staff 189 states:

“The assumption used to forecast Retail Services Revenue amounts is based on the number of applicable retailer customers multiplied by the OEB generic rates.”

- 1.1** It is understood that the current 2026 forecast for revenues from Retail Service Charges (USOA 4082 and 4084) is based on the approved 2025 rates (Exhibit 8-4-3, page 1). Is Hydro Ottawa

proposing to update this forecast now that the OEB has approved (Decision and Order EB-2025-0199) the rates for 2026?

- 1.2 For purposes of determining Other Revenues for 2027-2030, is Hydro Ottawa proposing that the revenues from Retail Service Charges be: i) held constant at the forecast level for 2026 (per Exhibit 6-3-4, Table 2), ii) escalated using the 2.1% per annum inflation factor (per Exhibit 1-3-1) or iii) escalated based on the approved generic rate for the year (per Staff 189)?
- 1.3 It is understood that the current forecast revenues from 3rd party wireline pole attachments are based on the approved 2025 rates (Exhibit 8-4-1, page 8). Is Hydro Ottawa proposing to update this forecast now that the OEB has approved (Decision and Order EB-2025-0200) the rate for 2026?

**2.0 Reference: 6-Staff 189
Exhibit 8, Tab 3, Schedule 2, page 2**

- Preamble:** With respect to the SSS Administration Charge, Staff 189 states:
“The assumption used to forecast Standard Supply Admin Charge amounts is based on the number of applicable retailer customers multiplied by the prescribed OEB generic rates in 2021-2025, 2026 was determined through a cost-based approach and 2027-2030 were based on the proposed inflation factor, pending OEB approval”.
Exhibit 8-3-2 states:
“To remain consistent with OEB province wide charges, such as the pole attachment and retailer service charges, Hydro Ottawa proposes to inflate the 2026 rate by the OEB approved inflationary factor for the 2027-2030 period.”
- 2.1 For purposes of determining Other Revenues for 2027-2030, is Hydro Ottawa proposing that the revenues from SSS Administration Charges 2026 be escalated using: i) the 2.1% per annum inflation factor or ii) the OEB approved inflation factor for each of the years?
 - 2.2 For purposes of determining Other Revenues for 2027-2030, is Hydro Ottawa proposing that the revenues from SSS Administration Charges 2026 also be escalated based on the forecasted (per the Load Forecast) number of customers to whom the rate will be applicable (and not the number of retailer customers per Staff 189)?

**3.0 Reference: 6-Staff 189
6-Staff 186 d)**

Preamble: With respect to USOA 4090 – Electric Services Incidental to Energy Sales, Staff 189 states:
“As per Section 4 of Schedule 6-3-4 Other Operating Revenue. The assumption used to forecast Fixed Distribution Charge amounts is based on the number of applicable retailer customers multiplied by the OEB generic rates.”

3.1 Please confirm that: i) Section 4 of Schedule 6-3-4 deals with charges applicable to generators and not retailers and ii) with the exception of MicroFIT, there no OEB generic rates for generators.

3.1.1 Please revise the response to Staff 189 accordingly.

3.2 Section 4 of 6-3-4 includes a discussion regarding the proposed MicroFIT charges However Staff 186 d) states that MicroFIT revenues are included in USOA 4235. Please confirm which account includes MicroFIT revenues - 4090 or 4235.

3.3 In terms of the actual generator service charges for 2027-2030 (including MicroFIT) is Hydro Ottawa proposing that: i) they be approved as part of this application and set using the 2.1% annual inflation factor or ii) they be adjusted throughout the 2027-2030 term based on the OEB approved inflation factors for each of those years?

3.4 In terms of the forecast revenues from generator charges to be included as Other Revenue for 2027 to 2030, is Hydro Ottawa proposing that they are to be set as part of this Application assuming a 2.1% annual increase in the related service charges?

3.5 Do the forecast 2027-2030 revenues from generator charges assume any increase in the number of generators over the 2026-2030 period?

3.5.1 If yes, what at the forecast billing units for each charge for 2027-2030?

**4.0 Reference: 6-Staff 189
8-VECC 68
8-SEC 85
Exhibit 6, Tab 3, Schedule 2, pages 1 & 4**

Preamble: With respect to USOA 4235 (Miscellaneous Revenues), VECC 68 sets out how each of the specific service charges will be determined for the years 2026-2030.

With respect to USOA 4235, Staff 189 states:

“As outlined in Schedule 6-3-2 Specific Service Charge Revenue and Schedule 8-4-1 Specific Service Charges. The assumption used to forecast Miscellaneous Services Revenue is based on the rate factored by the estimated volume.”

SEC 85 sets out the historical 2021-2024 and forecast 2025-2026 billing units for each of the Specific Service Charges.

- 4.1 For each of the Specific Service , please provide the forecast 2027-2030 billing units used to establish the forecast Other Revenue from USOA 4235 (per Exhibit 6-3-2, Table 2).

5.0 References: 3-SEC-62 a) and b)
Attachment 3-SEC-62(B) – Updated Revenue Load Forecast Appendix 2-IB.

Preamble: SEC 62 a) provides updated actual customer numbers and load for November and December 2024 and up to June 2025.

SEC 62 b) and the accompanying attachment provide the resulting forecast customer numbers and load for 2026-2030 using the updated data.

- 5.1 Please provide versions of the following files (submitted as part of the initial application) that support the forecast provided in SEC 62 b)
- HOL_Attachment 3-1-1(C) - 1.Load Forecast Data – Customers
 - HOL_Attachment 3-1-1(C) - 2.Load Forecast Data – kWh
 - HOL_Attachment 3-1-1(C) - 3.Load Forecast Data – kW
- 5.2 In preparing the update load forecast, did Hydro Ottawa’s assumptions change regarding the Savings from DSM programs in 2024-2030?
- 5.2.1 If so, update Exhibit 3, Attachment 3-1-1(B) – Table 3-2 and explain the changes.
- 5.3 In preparing the update load forecast, did Hydro Ottawa’s assumptions change regarding the Customer Reclassification and LU class disaggregation?
- 5.3.1 If so, indicate what the changes were in terms of both customer counts and kWh by class by year.
- 5.4 In preparing the update load forecast, did Hydro Ottawa’s assumptions change regarding Electrification and Large Loads?

5.4.1 If so, please provide revised versions of Exhibit 3-1-1, Table 7 and Exhibit 3, Attachment 3-1-1(B) Tables 3-3 and 3-4.

5.5 In Attachment 3-SEC 62(B) the customer count, kWh and billing kW results are not broken down as between the GS 50-1499 and GS1500-4999 classes. Please provide revised schedules with this breakdown.

**6.0 Reference: 3-VECC 15 d) and Attachment 3.0-VECC-15(A)
3-SEC 64 a)
3-Staff 127 b)
3-VECC 29 c)**

6.1 Attachment 3.0-VECC-15(A) provides tabs setting out the initial forecast for each class, the reclassification adjustments for each class, the electrification impacts by class and final forecast by customer class. However, for the GS<50, GS5—999, GS1500-5000 and LU classes – the results in the Initial Forecast, Reclassification and Electrification tabs don't sum to the results set out in the final forecast tab. Please explain why and provide a revised response that reconciles the values in the four tabs.

6.2 It is understood that the customer count forecast also includes the impact of a LU customer being disaggregated into a number of smaller GS customers (per Exhibit 3-1-1, Attachment B, page 17 of 40). Please indicate:

- When this disaggregation is forecast to occur, and
- How many GS customers result from this disaggregation by GS customer class?

6.3 In Attachment 3.0-VECC-15(A), the changes in the Reclassification tab net to zero and the changes in the Electrification tab all show increases in the LU customer count. As a result, please explain where the impact of the LU customer disaggregation is captured and provide a revised file that explicitly sets out the impact of the LU disaggregation as part of the response.

6.4 SEC 64 a) states that the "requests included in the revenue load forecast are from current customers". However, in Staff 127 b) (Table A) – the changes in each year do not net out to zero which suggests that the electrification does change the total number of customers. Please reconcile these two responses and revise as necessary.

6.5 The customer class changes due to electrification as set out in Staff 127 b) don't line up with the changes in Attachment 3.0-VECC-15(A). For example:

- VECC 15 shows no customers being reclassified from GS 1500-4999 to the LU class whereas Staff 127 shows one customer being reclassified starting in 2027.

- VECC 15 shows one customer in GS 50-999 class being reclassified due to LU starting in 2026 whereas Staff 127 does not show any.
- VECC 15 shows one customer in the GS<50 class being reclassified to LU starting in 2029 whereas Staff 127 does not show any.

Please reconcile the two responses and provides revised versions as necessary.

- 6.6 In VECC 29 c) the results for 2025 and 2026 suggest that electrification resulted in some increase in GS 1000-1500 loads whereas VECC 15 indicates that only LU class load increases due to electrification. Please reconcile and provide revised responses as necessary.

7.0 Reference: 3-VECC 21, 22, 23, 24 and 27

- 7.1 The attachments provided in VECC 21, 22, 23, 24 and 27 set out the impact of the reclassification on the forecast volumes for the GS<50, GS50-999, GS1000-1499, GS1500-4999 and LU classes respectively and the values net to zero as expected. The attachments provided in VECC 21, 22, 23 and 24 also set out the impact of the LU customer disaggregation on the forecast volumes for the GS<50, GS50-999, GS1000-1499 and GS1500-4999 classes respectively. However the attachment to VECC 27 does not include the impact on the LU class volumes of the LU customer disaggregation. Please explain where the impact of the LU customer disaggregation is captured in the attachment to VECC 27 and provide a revised file that explicitly sets out the impact of the LU disaggregation as part of the response.

8.0 Reference: 3-VECC 29 a)

- 8.1 VECC 29 a) requested the MW from Figure 1 (Exhibit 1-3-1, page 2) that were included in the load forecast. The response provided a chart and indicated that it represents the MWs included in the planning forecast. Does the chart also represent the MWs included in the load forecast per Exhibit 3-1-1?

8.1.1 If not, what is the difference and why?

9.0 Reference: 3-VECC 19 a) – f) 3-VECC 21 c) – h) 3-VECC 22 b) – g) 3-VECC 23 c) – h) 3-VECC 24 b) – g)

- 9.1 The referenced interrogatories requested details regarding the determination of the actual 2013-2024 values as well as the forecast 2025-2030 values for the XHeat, XCool and XOther

variables used in the various load forecast models. In each case the response stated:

“Itron is unable to execute within the timelines for responding to interrogatories. With Itron’s support, Hydro Ottawa will be prepared to provide the requested information by way of undertaking at the Technical Conference.”

Please provide the responses to cited interrogatories.

9.2 Do the forecast 2025-2030 XHeat, XCool and XOther variables used in the various models assumed further efficiency improvements after 2024?

9.2.1 If so, how is overlap avoided between these assumptions and the eDSM values subsequently used to subsequently adjust the customer class load forecasts?

9.2.2 If so, please separate out the impact of the additional efficiency improvements built into the various models for 2026-2030 and provide revised forecasts assuming these improvements are not made?

10.0 Reference: 3-VECC 21 a)

10.1 VECC 21 a) asked if the GS<50 forecast model was tested with a COVID variable also included. The response indicates that it was and the attachment referenced in the response provides the monthly forecast values based on a model which includes a COVID variable. Please provide the full model results – similar what was provided for the GS<50 model in Attachment 3-1-1(C) - 2. Load Forecast Data – kWh filed with the original application.

11.0 Reference: 3-VECC 24 h)

11.1 VECC 24 h) provides the results for version of the GS 1500-5000 model that included a CDM variable. Did the version of the model that was tested with a CDM variable also include a Trend variable?

11.1.1 If yes, please provide the results (i.e., model, model statistics and resulting forecast) for a model that includes a CDM variable but no Trend variable?

**12.0 Reference: Exhibit 3-1-1, Table 11 (page 18)
3-DRC-10
3-VECC 28 c)**

12.1 Exhibit 3-1-1, Table 11 sets out the total number of EVs for each year from 2023 to 2030 (as confirmed in VECC 28 c). DRC 10 provides the number of new EVs in each year. However, the values in DCR 10 do not reconcile with the changes in the year over year values shown in Table 11. As an example DRC 10

shows that the number of new EVs in 2030 is 8,000. However, in Table 11 the change in number of total EVs from 2029 to 2030 is 5,690. Please explain why the annual increases in DRC 10 don't align with the changes in the annual totals in Table 11 and revise the evidence as necessary?

13.0 Reference: Exhibit 3, Attachment 3-1-1(B), Table 3-2 (page 24 of 40) 3-VECC 30 a) and f) 1-Staff 11

Preamble: VECC 30 a) asked for:
“a schedule for each rate class that set out for, each of the years shown (i.e., 2013-2030), the contribution to the year's cumulative saving made by CDM program savings in that year and in each of the preceding years” and “a similar “schedule for the total cumulative CDM savings in each year (2013-2030).”
The response referred to 1-Staff 11 which provided an excel file – HOL_IRR_Att-1-Staff 11(A).

13.1 According to the text in Exhibit 3, Attachment 3-1-1(B), Table 3-2 sets out the historical and forecast CDM used in the load forecast. Were the CDM values used in the forecast adjusted to reflect the fact that the full annualized savings will not be achieved in the first year of a CDM program?

13.1.1 If yes, is this adjustment reflected in the values set out in Table 3-2?

13.1.2 If not, why not?

13.2 VECC 30 f) states that “The CDM savings for 2023 and 2024 were taken from the IESO's 2021-2024 CDM Framework - Program Plan released on December 15, 2022.” Please confirm that for the years 2018-2023 CDM program savings data used is all from IESO reports regarding actual savings achieved.

13.3 For each of the years 2018-2030, the sum the customer class values in Exhibit 3, Attachment 3-1-1(B), Table 3-2 do not match the totals in the file HOL_IRR_ATT_1.Staff 11 (A) – CDM Supporting Data (CDM Summary Tab). Please explain why and update the evidence as necessary.

13.4 The excel file provided in response to Staff 11 just provides totals for each year. It does not provide a breakdown of each year's total as to the contribution from CDM programs in that year and each of the previous years or by customer class – as requested in the original interrogatory VECC 30 a). Please provide the schedules as originally requested in VECC 30 a)?

14.0 References: 3-VECC 30 e)

Exhibit 3, Attachment 3-1-1(B), Table 3-2

**Exhibit 3, Attachment 3-1-1(C) – 2. Load Forecast Data – kWh
3-Staff 11**

Preamble: VECC 30 e) states:

“The CDM savings as reported in Table 3-2 from Attachment 3-1-1(B) - Hydro Ottawa Long-Term Electric Energy and Demand Forecast were used to determine the CDM variable for the revenue load forecast.”

Attachment 3-1-1(C) – 2 Load Forecast Data – kWh provides the monthly historic CDM data used in the Residential, GS<50 and GS1000 models.

- 14.1 For both the GS<50 and GS 1000 classes, the sum of the monthly CDM values for any of the years 2018-2023 (per Attachment 3-1-1(C) - 2) does not equal annual values set out in Table 3-2. Please explain why.
- 14.2 Similarly, for the Residential class, for each of the years 2018-2030 multiplying the monthly average CDM per customer by the number of customers in the month and summing over the year does not equal the annual values as set out in Table 3-2. Please explain why.
- 14.3 For purposes of using the models to forecast sales after October 2024, it is understood that the CDM variables used in the models are based on savings from programs implemented up to October 2024 and that savings from the programs after October 2024 are meant to be captured by the eDSM adjustment. In Attachment 3-1-1(C) – 2. Load Forecast Data – kWh the post October 2024 values used for the CDM variables are all held constant at the October 2024 value for the relevant customer class. However, for CDM programs implemented in 2018-2023, Staff 11 shows that the savings in the years after 2024 decline. Why wasn't this decline reflected in the values used for purposes of the load forecast models?

15.0 References: Exhibit 3, Attachment 3-1-1(B), Table 3-2

**Exhibit 3-1-1, Table 13
3-VECC 30 e)**

Preamble: Exhibit 3-1-1, Table 13 sets out the further adjustment made to the load forecast for each customer class to account for DSM savings implemented after October 2024.

VECC 30 e) states that the savings from DSM savings implemented after October 2024 are included in Table 3-2 of Exhibit 3, Attachment 3-1-1(B) and that they were

determined by subtracting the cumulative savings as of October 2024 from the forecast value for 2024 through 2030?

- 15.1 The totals in Table 13 for each of the years 2025 to 2030 are less than the difference between the value for that year in Table 3-2 and the value for 2024 from Table 3-2. If anything one would have expected the values in Table 13 to be greater since Table 13 is meant to also capture the last two months of 2024. Please reconcile this discrepancy and provide schedules for each class that demonstrates how the values in Table 13 were derived from those in Table 3-2.

16.0 Reference: Exhibit 3-1-1, page 19
3-VECC 30 f)
1-Staff 11
IESO 2025-2027 Electricity Demand Side Management Program Plan
[2025-2036 Electricity Demand Side Management Framework](#)
IESO 2021-2024 CDM Framework
[2021-2024 Conservation and Demand Management Framework](#)

- 16.1 VECC 30 f) states “The CDM savings for 2023 and 2024 were taken from the IESO’s 2021-2024 CDM Framework - Program Plan released on December 15, 2022.” It is noted that the Framework’s total provincial savings for 2024 are 1,575 GWh. The CDM 2026-2030 Tab in the attachment to Staff 11 sets out Hydro Ottawa’s assumed savings for 2024. Please provide an excel file that sets out the derivation of Hydro Ottawa’s share of the provincial savings for each of the program areas identified in the IESO’s 2021-2024 CDM Framework - Program Plan and identify the sources for any additional inputs used.

- 16.2 Exhibit 3-1-1 states that the eDSM impacts from 2025-2030 programs are based on Ontario’s new 12-year eDSM framework that came into effect January 1, 2025. Please provide the total MWh of eDSM provincial savings used for each of the year 2025-2030 for purposes of deriving Hydro Ottawa’s share and provide the basis for each year’s value (i.e., either the source or the calculations as to how it was derived).

- 16.2.1 If the MWh values for the eDSM provincial savings for 2025-2027 are not equal to those set out in the IESO 2025-2027 Demand Side Management Program Plan, please explain why

16.3 Please provide a excel file that sets out the derivation of Hydro Ottawa's share of the provincial eDSM MWh savings for each of the years 2025-2030 and identify the sources for inputs used.

17.0 Reference: 7-VECC 52

Preamble: VECC 52 requested "the calculations supporting the proposed Billing and Collecting weighting factors for 2026". The response notes that Hydro Ottawa has identified six distinct patterns of customer utilization for the 18 major vendors providing Bill and Collect services and identifies the allocation factors for each. However, the response does not provide the calculation of the proposed 2026 Billing and Collecting weighting factors.

17.1 Please provide a schedule that sets out:

- The total 2026 forecast expenses associated with each of the six customer utilization patterns,
- The allocation of each the six pattern category's total expense to customer classes based on the category's allocation factors and the forecast 2026 customers by class,
- The total Billing and Collecting costs allocated to each class, and
- The resulting weighting factors (with Residential having a weight of 1.0).

**18.0 Reference: 8-VECC 65 b)
Exhibit 8-2-1, page 5**

18.1 VECC 65 b) states: "Hydro Ottawa proposes the 2027-2030 LV rates will be set annually based on the proposed RTSRs and RTSR model inputs for the corresponding year." For the years 2027-2030 is Hydro Ottawa proposing that: i) the LV expense used in the RTSR model will be set as part of this application where the current values are set out in Exhibit 8-2-1, page 5 or ii) that the LV expense will be forecasted at the time the rates are set for each of those years and then the LV rates determined using the RTSR model for the rate year?

**19.0 Reference: 7-VECC 60 a)
7-Staff 196 a)**

Preamble: The response to VECC 60 a) sets out what the 2026 Standby Rates would be based on Hydro Ottawa's current rate design methodology.

Staff 196 a) provides the Standby bill for 2026 using the current/status quo rate design for three scenarios detailed in Schedule 7-1-3. The service charge used is \$186.89 while

the volumetric charge used is \$4.0144/kW in Example 1 (\$3211.52/800kW) and Example 3 (\$2207.92/550).

- 19.1 Please explain why the 2026 status quo service charge and volumetric rate used in Staff 196 a) don't match those in VECC 60 a)

**20.0 Reference: 7-VECC 61 I)
Exhibit 7-1-3, page 5**

Preamble: Exhibit 7-1-3 sets out the formula for calculating the Standby billing demand when Generation is ON and OFF during certain periods as:

Contract Demand – (Metered Peak generator OFF kW – Metered Peak generator ON of kW) – (the lower of Metered Peak generator ON or 500 kW).

VECC 61 I) provides Standby bills for a number of scenarios. Deconstructing the Standby bills yields the following Standby billing demands for the 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th scenarios using the proposed Standby service charge of \$186.89 and a volumetric rate of \$4.0144/kW:

Scenario #4: $\{(\$2,194.42 - \$186.89) / \$4.0144\} = 500 \text{ kW}$

Scenario #5: $\{(\$1,391.41 - \$186.89) / \$4.0144\} = 300 \text{ kW}$

Scenario #6: $\{(\$588.33 - \$186.89) / \$4.0144\} = 100 \text{ kW}$

Scenario #7: $\{(\$1,792.91 - \$186.89) / \$4.0144\} = 400 \text{ kW}$

Scenario #8: $\{(\$989.90 - \$186.89) / \$4.0144\} = 200 \text{ kW}$

- 20.1 Based on the scenario descriptions provided in the interrogatory (both question and response), it is understood that scenarios are as follows:

- If the peak Gross Load of 1,000 kW occurs when the Generation is ON then the Metered Peak generator ON is 200 kW and the Metered Peak Generator OFF is 450 kW.
- If the peak Gross Load of 1,000 kW occurs when the Generation is OFF then the Metered Peak generator ON is 200 kW and the Metered Peak Generator OFF is 1,000 kW

Based on the above understanding of the scenarios and the contract values attributed to each scenario the formula for determining the Standby billing demand does not appear to yield the billing demand values set out in the Preamble for Scenarios 4-8. Please reconcile and explain whether the issue is with the billing demand formula as described or with the interpretation of the scenarios. Also, as necessary, please re-calculate the Standby billing demand for each of the five scenarios.

**21.0 Reference: Exhibit 7-1-3, page 5
VECC 61 f)**

Preamble: Exhibit 7-1-3 sets out the formula for calculating the Backup Overrun demand when Generation is ON and OFF during certain periods as:

Contract Demand – (Metered Peak generator OFF kW – Metered Peak generator ON of kW) – (the lower of Metered Peak generator ON or 500 kW).

21.1 The response to VECC 61 f) states:

“if the Contract Demand is 100 kW and the Metered Peak Generator OFF was 550 kW then the Backup Overrun Demand would be 50 kW. The calculation would be as follows: Contract Demand of 100 kW - (Metered Peak generator OFF of 550 kW – Metered Peak generator ON of 200 kW) minus the lower of Metered Peak generator ON or 500 kW.”

However, application of the formula as set out in the response would appear to yield a negative value (i.e., $100 - (550 - 200) - 200 = -450$). Please reconcile.