



Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
Lawyers • Patent & Trade-mark Agents
Scotia Plaza, 40 King Street West
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5H 3Y4
tel.: (416) 367-6000 fax: (416) 367-6749
www.blgcanada.com

JAMES C. SIDLOFSKY
direct tel.: 416-367-6277
direct fax: 416-361-2751
e-mail: jsidlofsky@blgcanada.com

June 16, 2009

Delivered by Courier and E-mail

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

Dear Ms. Walli:

**Re: Innisfil Hydro Distribution Systems Limited and COLLUS Power Corp.
Applications to the Ontario Energy Board for 2009 Electricity
Distribution Rates effective May 1, 2009 - VECC motions for review of
Decisions – EB-2009-0130**

As previously advised, we are counsel to Innisfil Hydro Distribution Systems Limited (“Innisfil”) and to COLLUS Power Corp. (“COLLUS”) in the above-captioned matter. We write in response the letter addressed to your attention by counsel for the Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition (“VECC”), dated June 12, 2009 (the “VECC Letter”).

In his letter, counsel for VECC advised that VECC had “no objection to the requests for procedural accommodations *per se*,” but that VECC believed the motions could be “dealt with in a timeframe similar to what was contemplated by” Procedural Order #1 (“P.O. #1”), and that counsel for VECC is in any case presently not available in August. VECC also expressed concern regarding the scope of the evidence that it stated it believed Innisfil and COLLUS intend to file.

From the VECC Letter, Innisfil and COLLUS therefore understand that VECC does not object to the procedural requests made by Innisfil and COLLUS in our letter of June 10, 2009, including the opportunity to file responding materials, and the scheduling of the hearing or hearings for a date when the Chief Financial Officer of COLLUS and I are available. It appears that VECC wishes any re-scheduling to accommodate its counsel’s current unavailability in August, and to adhere to a “similar” timeframe to that set out in P.O. #1.

We reiterate our position set out in our letter of June 10, 2009 that the threshold question should be determined, whether by written or oral submissions, separately from any subsequent hearing on the merits of the motion. This will be the most effective use of the Board’s and the parties’ resources. We agree with VECC that it is reasonable that any re-scheduling take VECC’s counsel’s availability into account. Again, we note that the

Vancouver
.
Toronto
.
Ottawa
.
Montréal
.
Calgary



utilities will in the interim in any case abide by the Board's directions on the tracking of differences, when received.

With respect to VECC's expressed concern regarding the scope of the responding materials sought to be filed by Innisfil and COLLUS, we observe the right to file materials in response to VECC's motions is a matter of procedural fairness. Since VECC has filed materials in support of its motion, Innisfil and COLLUS must be given a reasonable opportunity to participate in the decision-making process by doing the same.

Yours very truly,

BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS LLP

Original Signed by James C. Sidlofsky

James C. Sidlofsky

JCS/dp

Encl.

cc: Laurie Ann Cooledge, CFO/Treasurer, Innisfil Hydro Distribution Systems
Limited
Mr. Tim Fryer, CFO, COLLUS Power Corp.
Bruce Bacon, BLG
Intervenors of Record in EB-2008-0233

::ODMA\PCDOCS\TOR01\4108671\2