Filed: April 30, 2010 EB-2009-0425 Exhibit C Tab 3 Schedule 5 Page 1 of 3

1	<u>North Rosedale Ratepayers Association (NRRA) INTERROGATORY #1 List 3</u>
2	
3	Interrogatory
4	
5	Reference:
6	1) Section 4.8 - Key Issues Summary and Hydro One Responses
7	
8	Preamble:
9	Table 4-2 contains very general "Hydro One Responses" and fails to address a number of
10	serious concerns.
11	
12	Question/Request:
13	Please be more specific about the following:
14	
15	a) ROUTE SELECTION
16	(i) Requested Plans and/or Surveys showing full details of the existing use of the relevant
17	portion of the CPR corridor with dimensions have not been provided.
18	(ii) Details of "existing below-ground infrastructure" on Shaftesbury Avenue and Yonge
19	Street have not been provided.
20	(iii) Details of "easement requirements" for trenching alternative have not been provided.
21	
22	b) COST OF BURYING TRANSMISSION LINE
23	(i) Detailed cost comparisons for the various routing alternatives for both the trenching
24	option and for the tunneling option have not been provided in sufficient detail to assess
25	the merits of each approach.
26	(ii) Additional detail is required on the differences between the two approaches from the
27	construction perspective: type, operating time and cost of equipment used and labour
28	component in terms of hours and cost.
29	(iii) In Exhibit C, Tab 1, Schedule 5, to which we have been referred, Hydro One states
30	that trenching costs are estimated to be \$12,300,000 per kilometer and tunneling costs are
31	estimated to be \$12,500,000 per kilometer, but the basis for such estimates has not been
32	provided.
33	(iv) In Exhibit C, Tab 1, Schedule 5, it is stated that, since the original proposal for this
34	project, real estate costs have increased by 395 %, contingency allowances have
35	increased by 290% and interest costs have increased by 368%, but the basis for these
36	statements has not been provided.
37	
38	

Filed: April 30, 2010 EB-2009-0425 Exhibit C Tab 3 Schedule 5 Page 2 of 3

Response 1 2 3 a) Please see the attached CD for the plans and/or surveys showing Hydro One's i) 4 existing uses on the CPR corridor. Hydro One does not have plans or surveys 5 showing existing uses of other parties on the CPR corridor. 6 7 ii) Please see Attachment 2 for details of the existing below-ground infrastructure in 8 the vicinity of Shaftesbury Ave. and Yonge St. 9 10 iii) Please see Appendix A below for details of easement requirements for the 11 trenching alternative. 12 13 b) (i), (ii) (iii) Please see Table 1 below which shows a detailed cost comparison of 14 trenching vs. tunneling for the preferred routing alternative. Hydro One does not 15 have detailed cost comparisons for the other routing alternatives, as detailed costs 16 were not prepared for alternatives that were rejected during the evaluation process. 17 18 (1) (iv) With respect to the basis for the increase in Real Estate costs, please see Note 19 1 on page 4 of Exhibit C, Tab 1, Schedule 4. As indicated in the note: 20 21 "Real estate costs are significantly higher than anticipated in 2007, as 22 the current proposal is based on an in-depth assessment of easement 23 requirements and land values compared with the 2007 estimate, which 24 was preliminary in nature. As well real estate values in Toronto have 25 generally increased since 2007." 26 27 Additionally, considerable detail on the real estate requirements and costs 28 (including market value assumptions) for both the trenching and tunneling 29 alternative are included in the response to a (iii) above. 30 31 With respect to the basis for the increase in contingency, please see part c) of Exhibit 32 C, Tab 1, Schedule 12 for information regarding the amount included as contingency 33 in the current proposal. As indicated in that response, the amount included for 34 contingency in the current proposal was informed by Hydro One's experience on the 35 John x Esplanade project. That experience was not available at the time the original 36 proposal was prepared in the 2005/2006 timeframe. As well the original proposal 37 was for the trenching alternative, not tunneling and as such the contingency amounts 38 for each are not directly comparable. Finally, the original cost proposal was 39 preliminary in nature using budgetary costs compared with the detailed cost estimate 40 that has been prepared for the current proposal. 41 42

Filed: April 30, 2010 EB-2009-0425 Exhibit C Tab 3 Schedule 5 Page 3 of 3

With respect to the basis for the increase in interest costs, please see the table in part 1 2 h) of Exhibit C, Tab 1, Schedule 4. As indicated in that table, interest costs have increased for the following reasons: 3

"Higher project costs, longer construction time and higher interest rates result in the increase in costs."

Interest during construction (Allowance for Funds used During Construction or AFUDC) 8 is calculated for costing and regulatory purposes based on the construction cost balance 9 over the construction period. An increase in the estimated construction cost and a longer 10 forecast construction period, coupled with a higher forecast interest rate, will 11 automatically lead to an increase in the forecast amount of interest during construction 12 included for the project, as is the case for the Midtown project. Please note that the 13 interest rate that Hydro One charges to construction costs is an OEB-prescribed rate 14 (AFUDC rate) which is re-set quarterly by the OEB, based on an index of bond yields. 15 Hydro One's forecast AFUDC rate used for cost estimating purposes is based on a 16 forecast of that index. 17

18

4

5

6 7

19

		<u>Ta</u>	able <u>1</u>	
		Cost of Burying (Cables - Comparison	
		Trench Option		\$M
	<u>г</u>			ψινι
Birch x Bayview	1	Yonge St Crossing	Soft Ground Tunnel	5.8
(install 2 cables in		U/G Trench/Duct (Civil Material)		8.8
concrete duct by	3	Civil labour includes directional drilling	3	4.0
trench construction)	4	15% escalation of direct cost + increm	nental real eastate cost (\$23.6M x 5%)	3.5
	5	Real Estate Costs	9m easement required	11.0
	6	Engineering		1.7
	7	Project Management		0.7
	8	Cable Supply and Install		15.0
	9	Total		50.5
Notes:		·		
cost (\$5M) and escala Incremental Real Esta	tion te C	of 15% (\$3.5M) for a cost of \$27.1M/2	ed to direct cost for calculation of trench per kilome	
		Tunnel Option		\$M
Bayview x Birch				
(install 2 cables in	1	Deep Rock Tunnel (Civil)	escalation included in rock tunnel	27.5
deep rock tunnel)	2	Cable Supply and Install		15.0
Civil price includes	3	Real Estate Costs	5m easement required (55.5% of 9m easem	6.0
stairs in main shaft,	4	Terminations @ Jcts.	Included with cable replacement	
ventilation in main	5	Engineering		1.7
shaft - 1 main shaft, 2	6	Project Management		0.5
exit shafts and 2	7	Total		50.7
rescue shafts				
Notes:		-		
		cluding liner and shafts was by budget		
Price per kilometer wa	s ca	alculated for the tunnel direct cost \$27.	5M/2.2km = \$12.5M/km.	

__ _ _

20 21

Filed: April 30, 2010 EB-2009-0425 Exhibit C-3-5 Appendix A Page 1 of 3

1	<u>Appendix A</u>
2	
3	MIDTOWN PROJECT: REAL ESTATE COST ESTIMATION
4	
5	Methodology Real estate costs have been estimated for a 6 mater underground assement and then
6	Real estate costs have been estimated for a 6 meter underground easement and then converted to the 5 meter equivalent required for a tunnel and the 9 meter equivalent
7 8	required for a trench. The land requirements for each section of the line between
9	Bayview and Birch (the underground part of the Midtown project) are shown below.
10	Costs are based on estimated land market values ranging between \$800k and \$13M per
11	acre for the various sections.
12	
13	
14	Moorehill Drive to Moore Park Ravine
15	
16	Area Requirements: Underground 6 meter easements from Moorehill Drive, along the
17	CPR corridor to the rear Moorehill Drive, to Moore Park Ravine
18	
19	Affected Landowners: CPR, Toronto District School Board, City of Toronto
20	Route Requirements
21 22	<u>Koute Kequitements</u>
22	Moorehill Drive to Moore Park Ravine, 100 m by 6 m easement in rear of properties
24	along Moorehill Drive:
25	
26	600 m2 or 0.148 acres
27	
28	Moore Park Ravine, 100 m by 6 m easement:
29	
30	600 m2 or 0.148 acres
31	Construction Requirements
32 33	<u>Construction Requirements</u>
34	Construction Access Easement of 0.05 acre property fronting on Bayview Heights
35	Drive, beside the Bayview JCT site:
36	
37	0.05 acres
38	
39	
40	Access Roads
41	A coord off Dormion Area couth to Dormington II 14 1- 200 (
42	Access off Bayview Ave south to Bennington Heights park 300m x 6 m access road, 3
43 44	year term:
44 45	1800 m2 or 0.445 acres

Filed: April 30, 2010 EB-2009-0425 Exhibit C-3-5 Appendix A Page 2 of 3

Access to Bayview JCT to from Bennington Heights 300 m x 6 m access road, 3 year term: 1800 m2 or 0.445 acres Moore Park Ravine to Rosedale Heights Drive Area Requirements: Underground 6 meter easements from Moore Park Ravine, along the CPR corridor to the rear of properties along Rosedale Heights Drive, to Hydro One property on Old Bridle Path. Affected Landowners: CPR, City of Toronto **Route Requirements** Moore Park Ravine to Old Bridle Path, 410 m by 6 m easement on CPR corridor to the rear of properties along Rosedale Heights Drive: 2460 m2 or 0.608 acres **David Balfour Park** Area Requirements: Underground 6meter easements from Mount Pleasant Road crossing David a Balfour Park to CPR corridor. Affected Landowners: City of Toronto, TRCA **Route Requirements** Mount Pleasant Road to David a Balfour Park 150 m by 6 m easement: 900 m2 or 0.222 acres Crossover under bridge within David Balfour Park 20 m by 6 m easement: 120 m2 or 0.029 acres **Construction Requirements Temporary construction area 30 m x 40 m to accommodate tunnel:** 1200 m2 or 0.297 acres

Filed: April 30, 2010 EB-2009-0425 Exhibit C-3-5 Appendix A Page 3 of 3

David Ba	
	four Park to Birch JCT
Area Req Shaftesbur	uirements: Underground 6 meter easements from David Balfour Park to y
Affected 1	Land Owners: Private
Route Re	<u>quirements</u>
	vid Balfour Park paralleling CPR Corridor to Summerhill/ Shaftsbury wance 80 m by 6 m easement:
480 m2 or	0.11 acres
Real Esta	te Costs for Bayview x Birch Cable Section with 6m Easement
	te Costs for Bayview x Birch Cable Section with 5m Easement required f
	te Costs for Bayview x Birch Cable Section with 5th Easement required r
	the costs for Bayview x birch cable Section with Sin Easement required re- mement is suitable for 3m tunnel seement cost x $83.5\% = $5,713,668*$
5m eas 6m eas * Cost abo	ement is suitable for 3m tunnel
5m eas 6m eas * Cost abo \$9.9M inc	eement is suitable for 3m tunnel bement cost x 83.5% = \$ 5,713,668* ove for the Bayview x Birch section of the line differs from the real estate cost
5m eas 6m eas * <i>Cost abo</i> \$9.9 <i>M inc</i> Real Esta trench 9m eas 6m eas (In ado	The ment is suitable for 3m tunnel the ment cost x 83.5% = $$5,713,668*$ the ve for the Bayview x Birch section of the line differs from the real estate buded in Exhibit B, Tab 4, Schedule 2, which is for the entire project. The Costs for Bayview x Birch Cable Section with 9m Easement requine the ment is suitable for concrete duct option the ment cost x 150% = $$10,264,074$ bition to above cost the trench option would require an easement from B to Yonge St. as Shaftesbuty Ave. road allowance space is unavailable at t

Filed: April 30, 2010 EB-2009-0425 Exhibit C-3-5 Attachment 1 Page 1 of 1

Attachment 1 can be found on the attached CD.

