

- 1 Q. With regard to Brickhill's evidence page 8, lines 24 B 29 and schedule II:
- 2 1. Provide data to show the variation over time.
- 3 2. What was the rationale for using years 1994, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999
- 4 & 2000 in schedule II?
- 5 3. Why was 1995 omitted?
- 6 4. Provide the 1CP, 2CP, 3CP and 4CP allocators for the three customer
- 7 classes for each year 1992 to 2000 inclusive.
- 8
- 9 A. 1. See attached.
- 10
- 11 2. The years were selected to review the data since the Board's Order
- 12 (1993).
- 13
- 14 3. 1995 data was not immediately available in the required format when
- 15 the analysis was prepared. Since the analysis was intended to
- 16 provide only an indication of the variation in base data, no further
- 17 effort was expended. Schedule II has been reproduced, with 1995
- 18 included, in the attached page 4.
- 19
- 20 4. System Peak data prior to 1994 was not reported in a manner
- 21 designed to capture the data provided in 1994 and subsequent years,
- 22 after Hydro received approval from the Board for a change in
- 23 methodology. The effort required to produce the data consistent with
- 24 that methodology is not considered necessary for the matters currently
- 25 before the Board.
- 26
- 27 Multiple CP kW for 1994-2002, at the transmission level, are attached
- 28 as page 5. Transmission level kW do not include allocated losses

1           between generation and transmission, as do the CP kW used in the  
2           Test Year Cost of Service to allocate production demand costs.  
3           Please see IC-142 for generation level class CPs for 1999-2000.  
4           Historic models are not equipped to provide multiple CP allocators at  
5           generation. On a percentage per customer basis, the results should  
6           not vary significantly after losses are allocated to derive the CP at  
7           generation number.