Hydro One Networks Inc. ("HONI") – Chris Aristides Pappas
INTERROGATORY 1

Ref. Pappas emails of April 18-22, 2008
Question:
Could you please explain your intentions with respect to how you wish the Board and Parties to consider the information that you filed on Friday, April 18, 2008. In your response, please indicate whether you or someone on your behalf is intending to appear as a witness in this proceeding? If so, please provide their background and qualifications.

Response:

My intentions derive from my consideration of this application. I am, certainly, neither an activist, by definition, nor a NIMBY. I am always concerned with environmental, developmental and infrastructural issues. However, my point of concern is always with what is appropriate and what is not. Consider this. In some cases the comparative costs of two options may be the primary consideration. In other cases, there may be hidden and ancillary costs now and into the future. Here, the comparative initial costs are no longer relevant or primary.

While not formally educated at higher levels, I am an extremely knowledgeable layman, reasonably conversant in a number of disciplines.

I will appear, unrepresented. As I have neither formal legal education nor formal electrical engineering education, I have no intention of intricate pursuits in examination or in complex technical argument. In other words, I will not attempt to be lawyerly nor technically expert. I have no intention of detailed, lengthy examination or argument regarding my evidentiary submissions. My focus will derive from the requirements of the Issues List. While my evidentiary submissions seem extensive, most will require very short treatment. In fact, most of my

questions will only require an affirmative, negative or no comment response. My approach will regard the authenticity and the authority of the document and of its publication date. Depending on the subject of these documents, it may involve a response regarding, but not limited to the following: Installation, especially in North America, of various transmission technologies, such as conductors, series capacitors, and FACTS devices [eg. Thyristor Controlled Series Capacitors], and the dates of those installations. Otherwise, the documents may derive from regulatory bodies with which our utilities and generators are bound to comply. Again, simple responses will suffice. Simply the conclusions and edicts of those bodies regulate what can and cannot be done in North America. They also determine, through our Transmission Code, what must be considered in the advancement of an application.
They determine the nature of the alternate options that must be considered in the advancement of an application.
I may ask for responses regarding the stated use of some of these devices, eg. power flow control, loop flow control, voltage control, etc. Again, a simple response will suffice. I have no intention arguing against the response. Yes, no or no comment is all that I will expect. It will be up to the Board to decide the relevance. I simply wish to ensure that relevant historical and regulatory information is before the Board and available to the Applicant, Intervenors and expert witnesses.

In order to better understand my approach, I include the following. I am advancing the particular Issues List items with which I will concern myself, and my own conclusions for each Issue. Following that, I submit short excerpts from the Transmission Code regarding "good utility practice", its definition and application.