

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Filed: 2010-05-26
EB-2010-0008
Exhibit D2
Tab 2
Schedule 1
Table 1

Table 1
Rate Base and Return on Rate Base Impact of Darlington Refurbishment Project (\$M)
Years Ending December 31, 2011 and 2012

Line No.	Description	Notes	Net Plant Opening Balance	Relative Change in Net Plant	(a)+(b) Closing Balance	((a)+(c))/2 Net Plant Rate Base Amount	Carrying Charges	(d) x (e) Pre-Tax Revenue Requirement	Income Tax	(f)+(g) Revenue Requirement Impact
			(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
							Note 4		Note 5	
	2011 Plan:									
1	CWIP in Rate Base	1	72.9	105.2	178.1	125.5	7.56%	9.5	1.6	11.1
2	Asset Retirement Cost	2	565.7	90.6	656.3	611.0	5.58%	34.1	12.3	46.4
3	Extension to Darlington End-of-Service Life	3	24.2	24.2	48.5	36.4	7.56%	2.7	0.5	3.2
	2012 Plan:									
4	CWIP in Rate Base	1	178.1	255.8	433.9	306.0	7.59%	23.2	3.6	26.8
5	Asset Retirement Cost	2	656.3	90.6	746.8	701.6	5.58%	39.1	13.0	52.2
6	Extension to Darlington End-of-Service Life	3	48.5	24.2	72.7	60.6	7.59%	4.6	0.7	5.3
7	Combined Balance		882.8		1,253.5	1,068.2				
	Test Period Total:									
8	CWIP in Rate Base (line 1 + line 4)							32.7	5.2	37.9
9	Asset Retirement Cost (line 2 + line 5)							73.2	25.3	98.6
10	Extension to Darlington End-of-Service Life (line 3 + line 6)							7.3	1.2	8.5
11	Total Revenue Requirement Impact							113.3	31.8	145.1

Notes:

- CWIP net changes are detailed in Ex. B3-T3-S1 Table 2. Total Rate Base is increased and the lesser of ARC and UNL amount is unchanged. Therefore the rate base financed by the OEB approved capital structure increases by 100% of the change.
- The ARC increased by \$475.2M effective January 1, 2010 per Ex C2-T1-S2 Table 3. The annual depreciation expense impact on ARC for the prescribed facilities of \$90.6M is described in Ex. C2-T1-S2 Table 4. As the effective date is January 1, 2010, the 2011 opening balance of accumulated depreciation reflects a full year of depreciation expense. The ARC is always "lesser" than UNL as illustrated in Ex C2-T1-S2 Table 1. Total rate base increases by ARC; Therefore the rate base financed by the OEB's approved capital structure is unchanged. The OEB methodology requires that the accretion rate be used to finance the lesser of ARC and UNL.
- The total impact on depreciation expense on OPG's prescribed facilities of \$114.8M is discussed in Ex F4-T1-S1, Page 6. The depreciation expense impact resulting from the extension of service life is the total depreciation expense of \$114.8M less the depreciation expense on ARC of \$90.6M described in footnote 2. As the effective date of the extension of service life is January 1, 2010, the 2011 opening balance of accumulated depreciation reflects a full year of depreciation expense. Total Rate Base is increased and the lesser of ARC and UNL amount is unchanged; Therefore the rate base financed by the OEB approved capital structure increases by 100% of the change.
- Weighted average cost of capital financing OPG's funded rate base and weighted average accretion rate per Ex C1-T1-S1 Table 1 (2012) and Table 2 (2011).
- Taxes on incremental taxable income calculated by applying: tax rate / (1 - tax rate). Tax rates from Ex. F4-T2-S1 Table 5.

Table 2
Revenue Requirement Impact of Darlington Refurbishment Project (\$M)

Line No.	Description	Note or Reference	Test Period Revenue Requirement Impact
			(a)
	PRESCRIBED FACILITIES		
	Return on Rate Base:		
1	Accretion Rate on Lesser of ARC and UNL	D2-T2-S1 Table 1, col. (f)	73.2
2	CWIP in Rate Base Impacts	D2-T2-S1 Table 1, col. (f)	32.7
3	Extension to Darlington Service Life Impacts	D2-T2-S1 Table 1, col. (f)	7.3
4	Total Return on Rate Base Impact		113.3
	Depreciation Expense:		
5	Asset Retirement Costs	Note 1, C2-T1-S2 Table 4, col. (e)	(181.1)
6	Extension to Darlington Service Life Impacts	Note 1, D2-T2-S1 Table 1, col. (b)	(48.5)
7	Total Depreciation Expense Impact		(229.6)
	Other Expenses:		
8	Darlington Refurbishment Project OM&A	F2-T7-S1 Table 1, line 3, cols. (d), (e)	10.4
9	Used Fuel Storage and Disposal Variable Expenses	Note 1, C2-T1-S2 Table 4, col. (e)	8.2
10	Total Other Expenses		18.6
	Income Taxes:		
11	Accretion Rate on Lesser of ARC and UNL	D2-T2-S1 Table 1, col. (g)	25.3
12	CWIP in Rate Base Impacts	D2-T2-S1 Table 1, col. (g)	5.2
13	Extension to Darlington Service Life Impacts	D2-T2-S1 Table 1, col. (g)	1.2
14	Depreciation Expense on Asset Retirement Costs	Note 1	(62.8)
15	Used Fuel Storage and Disposal Variable Expenses	Note 1	2.8
16	Depreciation Expense on Darlington Service Life	Note 1	(16.8)
17	Total Income Tax Impact		(45.0)
18	Total Revenue Requirement Impact - Prescribed Facilities (line 4 + line 7 + line 10 + line 17)		(142.7)
	BRUCE FACILITIES		
19	Rate Base		0.0
20	Depreciation Expense Impact: Asset Retirement Costs	C2-T1-S2 Table 4, col. (e)	(40.2)
	Other Expenses:		
21	Accretion	C2-T1-S2 Table 4, col. (e)	(18.3)
22	Used Fuel Storage and Disposal Variable Expenses	C2-T1-S2 Table 4, col. (e)	4.2
23	Total Other Expenses Impact		(14.1)
	Income Taxes:		
24	Impact on Bruce Facilities' Income Tax Calculation	Note 2, Note 3, Note 4	13.9
25	Impact on Prescribed Facilities' Income Tax Calculation	Note 5	(14.0)
26	Total Income Tax Impact		(0.1)
27	Total Revenue Requirement Impact - Bruce Facilities (line 19 + line 20 + line 23 + line 26)		(54.4)
28	Total Revenue Requirement Impact of Darlington Refurbishment Project (line 18 + line 27)		(197.1)

Notes:

- Amounts impact regulatory income taxes as they represent non-deductible expenses for regulatory tax purposes. Regulatory income taxes are determined using the pre-tax non-deductible expense x tax rate / (1 - tax rate). The tax rate is 25.75%, which is the average of the 2011 and 2012 tax rates as per Ex. F4-T2-S1 Table 5, line 31.
- Current Income Tax:
Depreciation, Accretion and Used Fuel Storage and Disposal Variable Expenses are not deductible for tax purposes. In determining taxable income for Bruce, the increase in Bruce earnings before tax is reduced by the non-deductible expenses; therefore there is no current tax impact.
- Future Income Taxes:
The non-deductible expenses represent temporary timing differences. The increase in net revenues resulting from these temporary timing differences will be taxed in the future. In accordance with GAAP, that increase in future tax is recognized in the test period.
- Tax Rate For Future Income Taxes:
The tax rate applicable to Depreciation Expense is 25.75%, which is the average of the current tax rate for 2011 and 2012 as per Ex. G2-T2-S1 Table 7, Line 34. The tax rate of 25.00% applicable to Other Expenses is the average of the long-term tax rates for 2011 and 2012 as per Ex. G2-T2-S1, Table 7, Line 38.
- Impact on Prescribed Facilities' Income Tax Calculation:
Changes in Bruce Lease Net Revenues impact regulatory earnings before tax and, therefore, regulatory taxable income of the prescribed facilities, as presented in Ex. F4-T2-S1 Table 5. The impact on prescribed facilities' income taxes is determined as: (line 19 + line 20 + line 23 + line 24) x tax rate / (1 - tax rate). The tax rate is 25.75%, which is the average of the 2011 and 2012 tax rates as per Ex. F4-T2-S1 Table 5, line 31.

Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Filed: 2010-05-26
 EB-2010-0008
 Exhibit D2
 Tab 2
 Schedule 1
 Table 3

Table 3
Capital Expenditures Summary - Nuclear Generation Development Projects (\$M)

Line No.	Description	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Budget	2011 Plan	2012 Plan
		(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
	Darlington Refurbishment						
1	Darlington Refurbishment Project - Definition Phase	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	42.2	149.2
2	Darlington Campus Master Plan	0.0	0.0	1.0	28.6	63.0	106.6
3	Total Darlington Refurbishment	0.0	0.0	1.0	72.9	105.2	255.8
4	Darlington New Nuclear Project	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5	Total Generation Development Capital	0.0	0.0	1.0	72.9	105.2	255.8