

IN THE MATTER OF the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998*;

AND IN THE MATTER OF a review of an application filed by Hydro One Networks Inc. for an order approving just and reasonable rates and other charges for electricity distribution for 2010 and 2011.

**INTERROGATORIES FOR HYDRO ONE
from ROGERS CABLE COMMUNICATIONS INC. (Rogers)**

1. *[Reference: Ex. G1/T4/S5]* The evidence cites a fixed service charge for USL customers derived from the *Cost Allocation Study* of \$27.80, being the sum of a starting fixed service charge of \$33.95 and a derived USL credit of \$6.15.

[Reference: Ex. G1/T4/S2, p.2] The evidence cites a proposed fixed charge for the General Service Energy Billed customer class of \$35.79.

- (a) Please confirm the quantum of the fixed and variable charge components proposed for legacy general service energy billed customers for 2010.
 - (b) Please confirm that the variable charge for legacy USL customers is proposed to be the same as the variable charge for legacy GSe customers.
 - (c) Please reconcile the \$33.95 fixed charge cited in the first referenced exhibit and the \$35.79 fixed charge cited in the second referenced exhibit.
 - (d) Please document the derivation (i.e. component elements) of the proposed \$6.15 USL fixed charge credit.
 - (e) In EB-2007-0681 the USL credit was derived as \$6.86 [see Ex. G1/T4/S5 in that proceeding]. Please reconcile and explain the decrease in USL fixed charge credits from the EB-2007-0681 proceeding to the current proceeding.
2. *[Reference: Ex. G1/T4/S2, p.2 and G1/T4/S5]* The evidence proposes a fixed charge per account of \$1.00 for street lights and sentinel lights, and a fixed charge of \$27.80 per connection for USL customers (after application of the derived metering credit for USL customers).
- (a) Please explain the difference between an account, as used in reference to street lights and sentinel lights, and a connection as used in reference to USL customers.
 - (b) Please explain the difference in distribution services provided to street lights and sentinel lights on the one hand, and to USL customers on the other, which explain the apparently significant difference in fixed charges.

3. [Reference: Ex. G1/T3/S1] The referenced exhibit provides the revenue to cost ratios resulting from Hydro One's cost allocation study in support of this application.
- (a) Please provide a revenue to cost ratio for legacy USL customers. Please provide all detail in support of the derivation of the ratio.
 - (b) If a precise revenue to cost ratio for legacy USL customers cannot be provided, please provide the basis for the requested approval for distribution charges proposed for USL customers in this application, and explain how the Board can conclude that the proposed USL charges are in accord with the directions provided in the Board's November 28, 2007 EB-2007-0667 report - *Application of Cost Allocation for Electricity Distributors* - at Page 9 regarding USL customers.

155558.v1