

IN THE MATTER OF the Ontario Energy Board Act  
1998, S.O. 1998, c. 15, (Schedule B);

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Application by Hydro One  
Networks Inc. for an Order or Orders approving or fixing  
just and reasonable rates and other charges for the  
transmission of electricity commencing January 1,  
2009.

AND IN THE MATTER OF a supplemental filing by  
Hydro One Networks Inc. in respect of certain capital  
projects.

INTERROGATORIES  
OF THE  
SCHOOL ENERGY COALITION

1. Please state what relief, if any, HON is requesting in this application in respect of projects D9 and D10.
2. For projects D7 and D8, please provide a summary of any change in scope, as well as the associated change in cost, as between the current evidence and the evidence originally filed as part of the Application.
3. A-2-1, p. 2: the evidence states that the current evidence would increase 2009 approved capital spending by \$82.7 million. Please provide the current status of projects D7 and D8, including all expenditures incurred to date.
4. Ref. Exhibit C-1-2, pg. 5 of 9: the OPA evidence refers to the Reinforcement Projects as an alternative to building a new transmission line but then (at lines 22-24) states that the Reinforcements "provide a smaller incremental increase in transmission capability and do not prevent the installation of a new transmission line at a later time if it is needed." Is there a possibility that, despite the Reinforcement Projects being completed, a new transmission line will still be needed? If so, please discuss to what extent the Reinforcement Projects will have been a redundant exercise?

5. The IESO's System Impact Assessment states that "the enhanced transfer capability provided by the installation of these new facilities would be adequate to accommodate all of the existing and committed generating facilities north of Sudbury together with an increase of 433MW in the output from the expanded Mattagami River plants." Does the IESO believe the Reinforcements would be adequate to also accommodate the additional generating facilities listed as "Other Resources" in the OPA's evidence (which totalled 134MW as of May 2008, but which now are projected to total 375MW- see C-1-2, pp. 3 and 7 of 9) or other generation currently being contemplated? **In the IESO's opinion**, how likely is it that, despite the Reinforcement projects described in this application, a new transmission line will still be needed?

6. Recently, it was reported that the Minister of Energy and Infrastructure instructed HON to proceed with \$2.3 Billion in transmission expansion and reinforcement projects.<sup>1</sup> Does the Direction from the Minister include work that could render the Reinforcement Projects discussed in the current evidence redundant. (For example, does the direction include a new single circuit 500kV line described in HON's current evidence as 'Alternative 4' or 'Alternative 3' at Exhibit B-1-3, p. 3 and B-2-3, p. 2 respectively?)

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Ontario bets billions on wind*, Toronto Star, September 22, 2009: <http://www.thestar.com/sciencetech/environment/article/698928>