



BORDEN  
LADNER  
GERVAIS

By electronic filing and by e-mail

September 28, 2009

Kirsten Walli  
Board Secretary  
Ontario Energy Board  
2300 Yonge Street  
27<sup>th</sup> floor  
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms Walli,

**Hydro One Networks Inc. ("Hydro One")**

**Supplemental Evidence**

**Board File No.: EB-2008-0272**

**Our File No.: 339583-000027**

We are enclosing CME's Interrogatories with respect to the additional evidence filed by Hydro One on September 4, 2009.

We have attempted to confine these Interrogatories to matters not already addressed in the Interrogatories submitted by Board Staff, the School Energy Coalition ("SEC") and by the Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition ("VECC").

Yours very truly,

Peter C.P. Thompson, Q.C.

PCT\slc  
enclosures

- c. Glen MacDonald (Hydro One)
- Interested Parties
- Paul Clipsham (CME)
- Vince DeRose

OTT01\3829853\1

Borden Ladner Gervais LLP  
Lawyers • Patent & Trade-mark Agents  
World Exchange Plaza  
100 Queen Street, Suite 1100  
Ottawa ON K1P 1J9  
tel.: (613) 237-5160 fax: (613) 230-8842  
www.blgcanada.com

**PETER C.P. THOMPSON, Q.C.**  
direct tel.: (613) 787-3528  
e-mail: pthompson@blgcanada.com

CALGARY • MONTREAL • OTTAWA • TORONTO • VANCOUVER • WATERLOO REGION

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

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** a review of an application filed by Hydro One Networks Inc. under section 78 of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998*, seeking changes to the uniform provincial transmission rates.

**INTERROGATORIES OF  
CANADIAN MANUFACTURERS & EXPORTERS ("CME")  
TO HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC. ("HYDRO ONE")**

**1. Reference: Exhibit A, Tab 1, Schedule 1, page 2**

The evidence indicates that approval of capital Projects D7 and D8 will increase the Board approved capital program for 2009 by \$82.7M, from about \$853.8M to \$936.5M; and for 2010 by \$62M, from \$995.6M to \$1,057.6M. As a consequence, Hydro One appears to be asking the Board to increase the 2010 Revenue Requirement by \$7.1M. In connection with this evidence, please provide the following information:

- (a) Please provide a status report on the Board approved 2009 capital spending of \$853.8M, based on eight (8) months of actual spending and four (4) months of projected spending. In particular, we are interested in determining whether actual spending to date and expected spending for the four (4) months September to December 2009 inclusive is likely to be less than the current Board approved amount for 2009 of \$853.8M.
- (b) Please provide a status report on actual in-service dates for major capital spending projects in 2009, year-to-date, compared to the in-service dates reflected in the Board approved capital spending plan of \$853.8M.
- (c) In particular, has there been any material slippage in actual compared to planned in-service dates in 2009? If so, then please provide an estimate of the extent to which the Board approved 2009 revenue requirement would be reduced if the actual 2009 in-service dates for 2009 capital spending are used in its calculation.
- (d) Please provide a status report on the current Board approved capital expenditures for 2010 of \$995.6M having regard to actual 2009 capital spending to August 31, 2009, and expected 2009 capital spending between September and December 2009.

In particular, is the actual pace of capital spending to date and expected spending for the balance of 2009, either separately or in combination with other factors, likely to reduce the amount of actual capital spending in 2010 to an amount below the currently approved sum of \$995.6M? If so, then what is Hydro One's current estimate of the amount of capital that is now likely to be spent in 2010 in connection with the Board's currently approved capital spending plan of \$995.6M?

- (e) Please provide a status report on the currently expected in-service dates for major capital spending projects in the 2010 Board approved plan compared to the forecasted in-service dates reflected in that approved plan.
- (f) If there is any slippage between the in-service dates reflected in the Board approved 2010 capital spending plan and the 2010 in-service dates now expected, then provide an estimate of the extent to which the Board approved 2010 Revenue Requirement of \$1,242.2M would be reduced if these later in-service dates for 2010 capital spending are used in its derivation.