



Fraser Milner Casgrain LLP

77 King Street West, Suite 400
Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON, Canada M5K 0A1

MAIN 416 863 4511

FAX 416 863 4592

FILED ELECTRONICALLY AND VIA COURIER

October 26, 2011

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street
PO Box 2319, 27th Floor
Toronto, ON
M4P 1E4

Helen T Newland

Helen.Newland@FMC-law.com

DIRECT 416-863-4471

Dear Ms. Walli:

**RE: Application by Canadian Distributed
 Antenna Systems Coalition ("CANDAS");
 Board File No.: EB-2011-0120**

We are writing to file the responses of CANDAS to the interrogatories of Consumers Council of Canada in respect of CANDAS' Reply Evidence. We will file two paper copies of the responses as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,

(signed) H.T. Newland

HTN/ko

cc: Mr. George Vinyard
 All Intervenors

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Application by the **Canadian Distributed Antenna Systems Coalition** for certain orders under the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998*.

**RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES OF
CONSUMERS COUNCIL OF CANADA
(on the Reply Evidence of the Applicant, CANDAS)**

October 26, 2011

Question 1:

Does Dr. Ware agree that there are safety, operational and cost concerns that are insurmountable impediments to wireless attachments?

Response:

No. In fact, the evidence that has been tendered in this proceeding suggests the exact opposite of this statement. As indicated in the CANDAS application and the Reply Evidence of Johanne Lemay, Toronto Hydro has already permitted wireless attachments to its power poles and lamp standards, including by DAScom, the Toronto Transit Commission and Toronto Hydro itself. The evidence of Johanne Lemay also indicates that Quebec Hydro's poles are used extensively for wireless attachments.

Question 2:

How do the federal and provincial regulatory agencies Dr. Ware refers to take into account the safety, operational and cost concerns identified by Ms Byrne while at the same time prescribing mandatory access?

Response:

I am not an expert on electrical safety matters, but I would expect that any regulatory agency that has jurisdiction over safety and operational matters would consider the concerns identified by Ms Byrne and determine whether these concerns are valid.

The fact that Toronto Hydro permits wireless attachments to its own utility infrastructure by both itself and others, as well as the fact that wireless attachments have been permitted on this type of infrastructure in other jurisdictions in Canada and the United States suggests that whatever safety or operational concerns are alleged to exist, they can be readily resolved if not by the parties, then by the appropriate regulatory authority.

*** END OF DOCUMENT ***