

**From:** J. te Raa [johnteraa@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 07, 2010 10:25 AM  
**To:** Geldert, Bill  
**Cc:** Mark Lanigan  
**Subject:** Questions related to June 14 Rate Hearing

**Attachments:** Ratestructure.xls

Dear Mr. Geldert

Please refer to the attached spreadsheet.

**For the worksheet identified as "CODES";**

Column B lines 3 thru 19 refer to MECL billing codes.

For lines 3 to 19 please provide number of accounts under each code and associated kWh per month. Preferably in excel format. Thank you.

For lines 24 to 32 for MECL code # 110 please provide number of accounts that had a one month peak kWh consumption as per identified ranges and the associated total kWh for those accounts. Preferably in excel format. Thank you.

For lines 36 to 44 for MECL code # 130 please provide number of accounts that had a one month peak kWh consumption as per identified ranges and the associated total kWh for those accounts. Preferably in excel format. Thank you.

For lines 48 to 56 for MECL code # 130 please provide number of accounts that had a January, 2009 peak kWh consumption as per identified ranges and the associated total kWh for those accounts. Preferably in excel format. Thank you.

**For the worksheet identified as "DSM";**

As per spreadsheet for codes 110 & 130 please provide a breakdown of number of accounts that participated in the identified consumption ranges with the associated consumption and the number of accounts that met the challenge as per breakdown of accounts with the associated consumption. Preferably in excel format. Thank you.

John te Raa

cc Mark Lanigan

**From:** J. te Raa [johnteraa@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 07, 2010 11:21 AM  
**To:** Geldert, Bill  
**Cc:** Mark Lanigan  
**Subject:** Re: Questions related to June 14 Rate Hearing  
**Supplemental Questions Re Rate Hearing June 14,2010.**

1) MECL submitted a Supplemental Affidavit April 8, 2010

I refer you to section 13.

Has the April 14, 2010 meeting in Montreal and/or subsequent meetings had any material impact on the submitted information related to this hearing?

2) I have analysed data submitted as follows:

	2007	2008	2009actual	2010forecast	2011forecast
Load growth over 2007	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Dividend Payout	0%	17%	67%	100%	100%
G & A	0%	2%	12%	9%	10%
Transmission	0%	14%	-3%	33%	44%
distribution	0%	16%	27%	30%	34%
Energy	0%	29%	29%	24%	23%

From the Balance Sheet(Appendix 2)

Cost recoverable from Customers(ECAM)		Jan 2010 application	April 2010 application	
	2009	\$44,258,385	\$44,258,385	
	2010	\$49,416,300	\$51,052,600	
	Increase	\$5,157,915	\$6,794,215	1,636,300
Energy Cost 2010		\$122,177,700	\$122,177,700	
Percentage of energy costs deferred		4.22%	5.56%	1.34%

Please explain in layman's terms the lack of correlation between dividend pay-out growth and company growth. Specifically dividend pay-out has doubled over four years while company growth is zero. I thought companys had to grow in order to increase dividend pay-outs.

Please explain why the reallocation of revenues related to the Second Block Rate should cause an increase of \$1,636,300 to the deferred ECAM account.

Thank you John te Raa