HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC.

2009-2010 TRANSMISSION REVENUE & RATES

ORAL HEARING

EB-2008-0272

Exh. K	**EXHIBITS**
	March 3, 2009
6.1	AMPCO'S EVIDENTIARY BRIEF
6.2	FLIP-CHART PRESENTATION BY AMPCO
6.3	AMPCO DOCUMENT ENTITLED "PROTECTING THE INTERESTS OF CONSUMERS", DATED 26 FEBRUARY 2007
6.4	COPY OF A PRESENTATION TO THE D.R. EXPO ON 8 DECEMBER 2008
	March 2, 2009
5.1	CHART PROVIDED BY BOARD STAFF SHOWING INFORMATION RELATED TO DELIVERY POINTS.
	February 27, 2009
4.1	EXCERPTS FROM EB-2007-0681
4.2	EXCERPT FROM COLLUS POWER CORPORATION’S SUBMISSIONS IN ITS RECENT RATE APPLICATION.
4.3	COPY OF AN EXHIBIT FILED IN THE RECENT OPG FEES CASE, EXHIBIT NO. F3, TAB 4, SCHEDULE 1
	February 26, 2009
3.1	ATTACHMENTS A AND B FROM EB-2008-0272
3.2	ASSET NEED ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT
3.3	ENERGY PROBE’S CROSS-EXAMINATION MATERIALS.
X3.4	(CONFIDENTIAL): SCHEDULE A TO HONI BUSINESS PLAN DATED AUGUST 14, 2008.
X3.5	(CONFIDENTIAL): SUBMISSION TO HONI BOARD OF DIRECTORS DATED NOVEMBER 13, 2008.

February 24, 2009

2.1	HYDRO ONE TRANSMISSION, SUSTAINING DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATIONS, OM&A
2.2	HYDRO ONE TRANSMISSION, 2007 OM&A BENCHMARK
2.3	ENERGY PROBE'S CROSS-EXAMINATION BRIEF
2.4	CHART SHOWING HYDRO ONE'S TRANSMISSION OM&A EXPENSES BROKEN DOWN INTO CATEGORIES.

February 23, 2009

1.1	VECC OVERVIEW OF HYDRO ONE NETWORKS' MAJOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.
1.2	POLLUTION PROBE CROSS-EXAMINATION REFERENCE BOOK
1.3	ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD FILING REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION APPLICATIONS.
1.4	EXCERPTS FROM THE DECISION WITH REASONS OF 9 FEBRUARY 2006 IN EB-2005-0001.
1.5	EXCERPTED EVIDENCE FILED IN THE RECENT ENWIN 2009 DISTRIBUTION RATES APPLICATION EB-2008-0227
1.6	ONE-PAGE CHART OF A SUMMARY OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR 2007 TO 2010

UNDERTAKINGS

Exh J		Response Filed
	March 3, 2009	
6.1	TO REVIEW AND COMMENT UPON VECC'S CALCULATION OF THE CURRENT TRANSMISSION SHADOW PRICE FOR CUSTOMERS BILLED AT 85 PERCENT OF NON-COINCIDENT PEAK	March 11, 2009
6.2	TO PROVIDE THE ANSWER TO WHY THE PRICE OF$57.02 IN COLUMN 3 OF THE TABLE AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 8 OF 9, EXHIBIT I-17-14, IS DIFFERENT THAN $55.40 IN I-17-14, PAGE 4 OF 9 UNDER THE "MEAN OF HOEP" COLUMN IN THE DATA SUMMARY.	March 11, 2009
6.3	TO PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF HOW THE FIGURES IN EXHIBIT I, TAB 17, SCHEDULE 14, PAGE 8 OF 9, OF -18.68, -5.77, AND -4.70 ARE CALCULATED	March 11, 2009

Exh J		Response Filed
6.4	TO CONFIRM THAT THE REDUCTION IN PRICE IS OVER THE SAME PERIOD AS THE AVERAGE DEMAND REDUCTION BEING REPORTED; AND TO CLARIFY HOW THE -.222 MEGAWATT HOURS' OVERALL IMPACT WAS DETERMINED AND TO WHICH PERIOD IT IS APPLICABLE	March 11, 2009
6.5	TO PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF WHY THE EQUATION IN THE TABLE AT EXHIBIT 1, TAB 17, SCHEDULE 14 USES THE HOEP PRICE IN THE OFF-PEAK PERIOD; AND TO PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF HOW THE FIGURE $.068 WAS DETERMINED AND TO WHICH PERIOD IT IS APPLICABLE	March 11, 2009
6.6	TO PROVIDE JCP&L TARIFF AND ERCOT.	March 11, 2009
6.7	TO PROVIDE AN ESTIMATE ON HOW THE $6.8 MILLION WOULD BE SPLIT BETWEEN LDCs ON THE ONE HAND AND ALL OTHER CUSTOMERS ON THE OTHER, INCLUDING ANY ASSUMPTIONS USED TO ARRIVE AT THE ESTIMATE AND THE CALCULATION USED TO ARRIVE AT THE $6.8 MILLION.	March 11, 2009
	March 2, 2009	
5.1	TO ADD A COLUMN TO TABLES 1 AND 2 OF EXHIBIT A, TAB 14, SCHEDULE 3 SHOWING ACTUAL PEAK MONTHLY DEMAND.	March 3, 2009
5.2	TO PROVIDE A COPY OF LETTER FROM THE BOARD DATED FEBRUARY 24, 2009.	March 3, 2009
5.3	TO PROVIDE THE ACTUAL DOLLAR IMPACTS AND DOLLAR INCREASES FOR EACH CUSTOMER, FOR THE 45 DELIVERY POINTS	March 5, 2009
5.4	TO PROVIDE THE CALCULATION FOR THE 430 MEGAWATT INCREASE IN PEAK.	March 3, 2009
	February 27, 2009	
4.1	TO FILE A COPY OF THE SHPIGLER REPORT	March 3, 2009
4.2	TO PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF WHAT WAS INCLUDED IN THE CAPITAL CATEGORY AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF ELIMINATING IT	March 5, 2009
4.3	TO PROVIDE THE PRODUCTIVITY INDICATORS FROM THE MERCER WYMAN STUDY USING FORCAST 2009 DATA FOR HYDRO ONE ONLY.	March 5, 2009
4.4	TO DESCRIBE WHAT PHASE 1 IS AND HOW IT IS USED AND USEFUL FOR THE 2010 TEST YEAR	March 3, 2009
	February 26, 2009	
3.1	TO PROVIDE 2009 AND 2010 FORECAST YIELD SHOWN IN TABLE 4 OF EXHIBIT B1, TAB 2, SCHEDULE 1, AND WHETHER IT WILL BE UPDATED BASED ON CURRENT INFORMATION AVAILABLE.	March 2, 2009

Exh J		Response Filed
3.2	TO PROVIDE THE ACTUAL 2008 EXPORT TRANSMISSION REVENUES SHOWN IN RESPONSE TO VECC IR NO. 66.	February 27, 2009
3.3	TO EXPLAIN THE NET ADJUSTMENT OF THE $30 MILLION REDUCTION IN CLASS 47 IN THE 2007 CCA CALCULATION AND TO EXPLAIN WHY THERE IS NO NET ADJUSTMENT IN THE CALCULATION.	March 3, 2009
3.4	TO PROVIDE THE INCREASED CREDIT THAT RESULTED IN LINE 8 AND TABLES 2 AND 4 UNDER THE SCENARIO OF A DEFERRAL-ACCOUNT CLEARANCE OVER TWO YEARS, RATHER THAN FOUR	March 3, 2009
3.5	TO PROVIDE THE IMPACT ON THE OVERALL REVENUE REQUIREMENT IF HYDRO ONE COMPENSATION WAS EQUIVALENT TO THE MEDIAN, OR TO PROVIDE THE EXPLANATION WHY THAT CANNOT BE DONE.	March 5, 2009
3.6	TO PROVIDE REPORTS OR ANALYSES, IF ANY, FROM ACCENTURE WITH RESPECT TO THE CORNERSTONE PROJECT FOR THE TEST YEARS.	March 2, 2009
	February 24, 2009	
2.1	TO ADVISE IF HYDRO ONE NETWORKS PROVIDED A COST-EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS FOR THE TRANSMISSION COMPONENTS OF EXHIBIT K1.1 PROJECTS; TO PROVIDE WHAT WAS PRODUCED IN THAT CONTEXT FOR THE OPA FOR EACH OF THE NON-SECTION 92 APPROVED PROJECTS.	February 27, 2009
2.2	TO PROVIDE THE TOTAL TRANSMISSION LINES FOR 2008, 2009, 2010 AND TOTAL UNITS TRANSMITTED IN TERAWATT HOURS FOR 2008, 2009 and 2010.	February 26, 2009
2.3	TO PROVIDE A BREAKDOWN OF ADDITIONAL WORK TO BE PERFORMED UNDER THE ANCILLARY-SYSTEMS PROGRAM.	March 5, 2009
2.4	TO IDENTIFY WHICH PROJECTS ARE NOT RELATED TO IPSP IN EXHIBIT C1, TAB 2, SCHEDULE 3, PAGE 7.	February 26, 2009
2.5	TO FILE AN INTERROGATORY RESPONSE, AMPCO INTERROGATORY NO. 1.	February 26, 2009
2.6	TO CONFIRM THAT PROJECTS 11 THROUGH 14 ARE STILL REQUIRED CONTINGENCY PLANS UNDER THE OPA'S IPSP WITH RESPECT TO GENERATION FACILITIES.	February 27, 2009
2.7	TO PROVIDE THE MINIMUM LEVELS GOING INTO THE PLANNING PROCESS, AS WELL AS ANY CONTEXT NECESSARY TO PROVIDE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE NUMBERS.	February 26, 2009
2.8	TO RECONCILE THE APPARENT DIFFERENCE IN THE DATA BETWEEN EXHIBIT C1, TAB 2, SCHEDULE 2, PAGE 15, FIGURE 1 VERSUS EXHIBIT I, TAB 1, SCHEDULE 22.	February 26, 2009
	February 23, 2009	
1.1	TO PROVIDE A SAMPLE OF AN OPA LETTER RECOMMENDING A PARTICULAR PROJECT	February 26, 2009

Exh J		Response Filed
1.2	TO PROVIDE ANSWER TO WHERE EXTRA $60 MILLION IN 2008 CAPITAL SPENDING WENT BY PROJECT.	February 26, 2009
1.3	TO PROVIDE RECOMMENDATION LETTER FROM OPA WITH RESPECT TO PROJECTS FOR WHICH THE APPLICANT HAS RECOMMENDATIONS.	February 26, 2009
1.4	TO IDENTIFY WHICH OF THE SEVEN NON-DISCRETIONARY CATEGORY 2 PROJECTS HAD ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED, AND FOR THOSE THAT NO ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED, IF ANY, EXPLAIN WHY NO ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED.	February 26, 2009