

Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP
Suite 2500, TransCanada Tower
450 - 1st Street S.W.
Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2P 5H1
403.260.7000 MAIN
403.260.7024 FACSIMILE

OSLER

March 10, 2008

Gordon M. Nettleton
Direct Dial: 403.260.7047
gnettleton@osler.com
Our Matter Number: 1099714

BY ELECTRONIC MAIL & COURIER

Ontario Energy Board
P.O. Box 2319
2300 Yonge Street
Suite 2700
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Attention: Ms. Kirsten Walli, Board Secretary

Dear Ms. Walli:

**Re: EB-2007-0050 – Hydro One Networks Inc., (“Hydro One”) Bruce to Milton
Transmission Reinforcement Project**


I am writing to you on behalf of Hydro One in response to Mr. Alexander’s letter of March 6, 2008 on behalf of Pollution Probe. In that letter Pollution Probe suggests that Hydro One should take further efforts to obtain requested pre-2002 historical generation information.

Hydro One respectfully disagrees. Hydro One has acted reasonably in these circumstances by consulting with the Ontario Power Authority (“OPA”) and the Independent Electric System Operator (“IESO”). Hydro One undertook those steps given the roles that the OPA and the IESO have had in the preparation of this application. These circumstances are unique but they do not justify Hydro One being compelled to undertake the broad type of inquiry Pollution Probe now appears to be seeking. Hydro One stands in the same place as Pollution Probe in requesting information from third parties. If Pollution Probe wants to take the time to make those inquiries, it can certainly choose to do so. However, Hydro One’s role as applicant does not place it in any better position to obtain the information that Pollution Probe seeks.

Finally, and with respect to Pollution Probe’s comments on relevance, Hydro One has viewed its lack of possession of the requested information to be the most appropriate factor related to the purpose and obligations set out in Paragraph 3 of Procedural Order No. 5: to advise a requesting party of Hydro One’s decision to not answer specific interrogatories and so that decisions could be expedited on whether formal motions should be made to provide such responses.

Hydro One has not interpreted Paragraph 3 of Procedural Order No. 5 to require it to identify all of the substantive arguments that it may choose to rely upon and in response to a yet to be filed formal motion. Those matters could only be determined after Hydro One has first reviewed any motion.

Yours very truly,

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. M. Nettleton", is written over the typed name and email address.

Gordon M. Nettleton
GMN:njm