Filed: 2016-05-27 EB-2016-0152 Exhibit A1 Tab 10 Schedule 1 Page 1 of 4

DRAFT ISSUES LIST¹

2

1

1. GENERAL

- 4 1.1. Secondary Has OPG responded appropriately to all relevant Board directions
 from previous proceedings?
- 6 1.2. Primary Are OPG's economic and business planning assumptions appropriate for the nuclear assets?
 - 1.3. Primary Is the overall increase in nuclear payment amounts reasonable given the overall bill impact on customers?

10 11

8

9

2. RATE BASE

2.1. Primary - Are the amounts proposed for nuclear rate base appropriate?

121314

3. CAPITAL STRUCTURE AND COST OF CAPITAL

- 15 3.1. Primary Are OPG's proposed capital structure and rate of return on equity appropriate?
- 3.2. Secondary Are OPG's proposed costs for the long-term and short-term debt
 components of its capital structure appropriate?

19 20

21

4. CAPITAL PROJECTS

Nuclear

- 4.1. Primary Do the costs associated with the nuclear projects that are subject to section 6(2)4 of O. Reg. 53/05 and proposed for recovery meet the requirements of that section?
- 25 4.2. Primary Are the proposed nuclear capital expenditures and/or financial commitments reasonable?
- 27 4.3. Primary Are the proposed test period in-service additions for nuclear projects (excluding those for the Darlington Refurbishment Program) appropriate?

.

¹ The draft Issues List includes prioritization of issues into primary and secondary issues as specified in EB-2011-0286, *Filing Guidelines for Ontario Power Generation*, November 11, 2011.

Filed: 2016-05-27 EB-2016-0152 Exhibit A Tab 10 Schedule 1 Page 2 of 4

4.4. Primary - Are the proposed test period in-service additions for the Darlington
 Refurbishment Program appropriate?

3

5

5. PRODUCTION FORECASTS

Nuclear

5.1. Primary - Is the proposed nuclear production forecast appropriate?

6 7 8

9

6. OPERATING COSTS

Nuclear

- 10 6.1. Primary Is the test period Operations, Maintenance and Administration budget for the nuclear facilities appropriate?
- 12 6.2. Primary Are the benchmarking results and targets flowing from OPG's nuclear benchmarking reasonable?
- 14 6.3. Secondary Is the forecast of nuclear fuel costs appropriate?
- 15 6.4. Primary Is the test period Operations, Maintenance and Administration budget for the Darlington Refurbishment Program appropriate?
 - 6.5. Primary Are the test period expenditures related to extended operations for Pickering appropriate?

18 19 20

17

Corporate Costs

- 21 6.6. Primary Are the test period human resource related costs for the nuclear facilities 22 (wages, salaries, benefits, incentive payments, FTEs and pension costs) 23 appropriate?
- 24 6.7. Primary Are the corporate support services costs allocated to the nuclear business appropriate?
- 26 6.8. Primary Are the centrally held costs allocated to the nuclear business appropriate?

28

29

30

Filed: 2016-05-27 EB-2016-0152 Exhibit A1 Tab 10 Schedule 1 Page 3 of 4

1		Depreciation		
2		6.9.	Secondary - Is the proposed test period nuclear depreciation expense	
3			appropriate?	
4				
5		Income and Property Taxes		
6		6.10.	Secondary - Are the amounts proposed to be included in the test period nuclear	
7			revenue requirement for income and property taxes appropriate?	
8				
9		Other Costs		
10		6.11.	Secondary - Are the asset service fee amounts charged to the nuclear business	
11			appropriate?	
12				
13	7.	OTHER REVENUES		
14	4 Nuclear		ear	
15		7.1.	Secondary - Are the forecasts of nuclear business non-energy revenues	
16			appropriate?	
17				
18		Bruce	e Generating Station	
19		7.2.	Secondary - Are the test period costs related to the Bruce Generating Station, and	
20			costs and revenues related to the Bruce lease appropriate?	
21				
22	8.	NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT AND DECOMMISSIONING LIABILITIES		
23		8.1.	Primary - Is the revenue requirement impact of the nuclear liabilities appropriately	
24			determined?	
25				
26	9.	DEFERRAL AND VARIANCE ACCOUNTS		
27		9.1.	Secondary - Is the nature or type of costs recorded in the deferral and variance	
28			accounts appropriate?	
29		9.2.	Secondary - Are the balances for recovery in each of the deferral and variance	

9.3. Secondary - Are the proposed disposition amounts appropriate?

30

31

accounts appropriate?

Filed: 2016-05-27 EB-2016-0152 Exhibit A Tab 10 Schedule 1 Page 4 of 4

- 1 9.4. Secondary Is the disposition methodology appropriate?
- 9.5. Secondary Is the proposed continuation of deferral and variance accounts
 appropriate?
 - 9.6. Primary Are the deferral and variance accounts that OPG proposes to establish appropriate?

5 6 7

8

4

10. REPORTING AND RECORD KEEPING REQUIREMENTS

10.1. Secondary – Are the proposed reporting and record keeping requirements appropriate?

9 10 11

11. METHODOLOGIES FOR SETTING PAYMENT AMOUNTS AND RATE SMOOTHING

- 12 11.1. Primary Has OPG responded appropriately to Board direction on establishing incentive regulation?
- 14 11.2. Secondary Is the design of the regulated hydroelectric and nuclear payment 15 amounts appropriate?
 - 11.3. Primary Is OPG's proposal for smoothing nuclear payment amounts consistent with O. Reg. 53/05?

171819

20

16

12. IMPLEMENTATION

12.1. Primary - Are the effective dates for new payment amounts and riders appropriate?