



## Jay Shepherd

Professional Corporation  
2300 Yonge Street  
Suite 806, Box 2305  
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

### **BY EMAIL and RESS**

September 19, 2011

Ontario Energy Board  
2300 Yonge Street  
27<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, Ontario  
M4P 1E4

**Attn: Kirsten Walli, Board Secretary**

Dear Ms. Walli:

**Re: EB-2011-0054 – Hydro Ottawa Limited – Technical Conference Questions**

Please find attached the Technical Conference questions of the School Energy Coalition (SEC) in respect of the above-noted proceeding.

Should you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,

*Originally signed by*

Mark Rubenstein

cc: J. Shepherd, SEC  
W. McNally, SEC  
P. Hoey, Hydro Ottawa  
F. Cass, Aird & Berlis  
Interested Parties

T. (416) 483-3300 F. (416) 483-3305

[mark.rubenstein@canadianenergylawyers.com](mailto:mark.rubenstein@canadianenergylawyers.com)  
[www.canadianenergylawyers.com](http://www.canadianenergylawyers.com)

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

**AND IN THE MATTER** of an Application by Hydro Ottawa Limited for an Order or Orders approving just and reasonable rates and other service charges for the distribution of electricity to be effective January 1, 2012.

**TECHNICAL CONFERENCE QUESTIONS**  
**FROM THE**  
**SCHOOL ENERGY COALITION**

1. [K2-2.1-2, Staff #8]  
Please provide a source to substantiate the Applicant's position that the test the Board uses for inclusion in rate base is "used or useful" and not "used and useful".
2. [K2-2.3-4, Staff #15]  
During the test year, what percentage of the vehicles usage will be used for training compared to maintaining distribution assets?
3. [K2-2.3-8, SEC #19]  
Does the Applicant believe there have been or will be any cost savings from the discussions it has had to date? If so, please provide details?
4. [K2-2.1-34, Envirocentre #2] and [K2-2.3-15, SEC #21]  
Please reconcile the answer to K2-2.1-34, in which the Applicant states that it has not assessed the difference in operation costs between hybrid and non-hybrid vehicles, with its answer to K2-2.3-15] with respect to cost impact of its 'environmental standards and associated point system procurement policy?
5. [K2-2.3-17, SEC #23]  
Please explain the why the Applicant exceeded its budget by \$750k in 2008 for in-the-field expenditures.
6. [K2-2.3-23, SEC #29]  
Please provide details on the cost of this specific project.
7. [K2-2.3-26, SEC #32]  
Please provide evidence to substantiate the Applicant's estimated per acre cost of the two plots of land.

8. [K2-2.3-28, SEC #34]  
Please provide details, with respect to the Applicant's determination that the "associated costs of administering residential security depositions outweigh the anticipated benefits".
9. [K2-2.4-1, VECC #19]  
Please provide a copy of the benchmarking analysis and the KPMG review opinion referred to in the answer.
10. [K4-4.1-10, EP #37]  
SEC will seek clarification at the technical conference with respect to this answer.
11. [K4-4.2-3, EP #42]  
With respect to table 2, please provide the factors that explain the forecasted increase.
12. [K4-4.4-14, SEC #42]  
Please provide *all* documents related to the outcome of the review.
13. [D1-2-1, A1-7-4]  
In addition to TCQ# 12, SEC will seek clarification at the technical conference with respect to this subject matter.
14. [[http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/source/regs/english/2011/elaws\\_src\\_regs\\_r11423\\_e.htm](http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/source/regs/english/2011/elaws_src_regs_r11423_e.htm)]  
Is there a revenue requirement impact of Ontario Regulation 423/11 made under the *Electricity Act, 1998* which was filed on August 31, 2011?
15. [K5-5.1-4, VECC #15]  
With respect to part (d) of the answer to this interrogatory:
  - a) Please provide the revenue impact in this application of the administration and insurance costs of the debt.
  - b) Please provide the specific expenses and their amounts, incurred or projected to be incurred for administration and insurance costs for each debt issuance since the Applicant's last cost of service application.
  - c) Is Hydro One aware of any other OEB regulated utility that has applied administration and issuance costs to its deemed long-term debt rate.
16. [K8-8.1-2, VECC #52]  
Why does the Applicant feel it is appropriate to *increase* the MSC for those classes that are above the Board's upper bound?

Submitted by the School Energy Coalition on this 19th day of September, 2011.

---

Mark Rubenstein