



September 28, 2009

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
P.O. Box 2319, 27th Floor
2300 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

**Re: Hydro One Networks Inc. 2009-2010 Transmission Revenue Requirement -
Supplementary Evidence in Support of Capital Projects D7 & D8
Board File No. EB-2007-0272**

Pursuant to Procedural Order No. 6 dated September 18, 2009, attached please find AMPCO's interrogatories in the above proceeding.

Please contact me if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely yours,

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Adam White
President
Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario

Copies: Hydro One Networks Inc.
Intervenors (email)

Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario

www.ampco.org

372 Bay Street, Suite 1702
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2W9

P. 416-260-0280
F. 416-260-0442

**AMPCO Interrogatories
EB-2008-0272 Hydro One Networks Inc.
2009-2010 Electricity Transmission Rates
Supplementary Evidence on Capital Projects D7 & D8**

Interrogatory #1

Reference: Ex C/Tab 1/Sch 2/page 6 of 9/Table3

Please augment Table 3 with respect to the four specific projects identified in these schedules:

Project	Existing (pre-project) Capacity (MW)	Planned Capacity (MW)	Planned or Actual In-Service Date
Lac Seul		12	In-service
Hound Chute		10	2010
Upper Mattagami		35	2010
Sub-total			
Lower Mattagami		450	2014
Total			

Interrogatory #2

Reference: Ex C/Tab 1/Sch 2/page 7 of 9/Table 4

Please provide a modified Table 4 with a column identifying the existing pre-project capacities for the generation projects noted in this table.

Interrogatory #3

Please provide an explanation of the technical consequences if one of either D7 or D8 is rejected by the Board for 2010 in-service, but the other is accepted. In other words, to what extent would the existing and emergent system concerns be addressed if only one of these projects was approved?

Interrogatory #4

Reference: Ex C/Tab 1/Sch2/page 4 of 9, lines 2-7

Please provide a brief list of the times when generation rejection has been activated (vs. simply armed) on generation units in Northern Ontario in order to limit flows on the North-South Tie, since 2005. Please include the capacity and energy that was rejected.

Interrogatory #5

Reference: Ex B/Tab 1/Sch1

- a) Please identify if and/or how often a single circuit contingency on the Porcupine – Hanmer TS 500kv circuits has led to the transmission system separating at Kirkland Lake TS.
- b) Please identify what correction or mitigation measures are available (beyond 500kV circuit restoration) to the IESO and/or Hydro One in the event that a single 500kv contingency results in separation at Kirkland Lake TS.

Interrogatory #6

Please discuss whether Hydro One or the IESO or others have considered the use of demand side options to mitigate contingencies and/or limit North-South tie flows in the period until these projects are built.