

**Board Staff Technical Conference
Questions**

**Application by the
Canadian Distributed Antenna Systems
Coalition**

EB-2011-0120

November 7, 2011

- 1. Reference:** Evidence of Ms. Mary Byrne Paragraph 33 “THESL’s observation is that there are real and material differences between wireline and wireless NDAs.....”

Questions:

- (a) Please confirm that wireless systems consist of two main components (i) the communication cables which are similar to the cables used on wireline systems, and (ii) the antenna and associated power supply equipment that constitutes the material difference between the wireless and wireline systems?
- (b) Based on THESL’s experience in reviewing applications for wireless attachments, please indicate whether a typical application for attachment of wireless system involves both the antenna attachment and attachment of cables or whether the application for the antenna portion is separate from the application for the cable portion.
- (c) Approximately how many span length of cable is typically connected to an antenna node?

- 2. Reference:** Evidence of Ms. Mary Byrne – Paragraph 46 “installing wireless antennas on pole tops above energized electric facilities, creates a number of additional safety and operational concerns...”

Questions:

- (a) Please describe the exact nature of the safety concern. How might the existence of the equipment on a pole cause injury and to whom?
- (b) How could such safety risks be mitigated and how much would they cost?

- 3. Reference:** Evidence of Ms. Mary Byrne- Paragraph 46 “pole top attachments require workers to pass through energized lines to work on those attachments, posing a safety risk to those workers operating on THESL Poles”.

Question:

- (a) In your opinion will the attachment of antennas on pole tops also pose a safety hazard, if the antennas are installed only on top of those poles carrying only street lights and low voltage cables in form of insulated aerial bundle conductors, with no plans to install additional power circuits in the foreseeable future?

4. **Reference:** Evidence of Ms. Mary Byrne- Paragraph 33 “THESL’s Cost Concerns with Hosting Wireless”

Questions:

- (a) Would your cost concerns be addressed from THESL’s point of view if the pole attachment rates fully recovered the higher costs associated with wireless attachments?
- (b) Are you aware of any instance where plans for mounting additional distribution equipment had to be changed because of antenna attachments on the pole(s) that would otherwise have been used for distribution equipment? If yes, please explain the implications for the planning process, and costs associated with such changes.

5. **Reference:**

- THESL Responses to Board Staff IR-16: “Average cost (total staff/contractor costs divided by the number of telecommunications permit applications processed):2009: \$101, 2010: \$676.
- THESL Response to Board Staff IR – 22: “As THESL does not allocate common costs to discrete projects, costs of management time such as supervisors and engineers are not captured.”

Questions:

- (a) Please clarify whether “staff costs” include a) salaries; b) benefits; c) allocations of any of the following: building floor space; computer workstation hardware and software; costs of supporting functions such as Human Resources and Payroll; d) vehicles. If the answer is “no” to any of these types of costs, would that suggest that the fully allocated costs of processing telecommunications permit applications was actually higher than \$676 in 2010?
- (b) Would the costs of management, supervisory and engineering time be appropriately added to the \$676 per application in computing fully allocated costs? If so, would this be over and above any additional costs identified in response to question (a) above?

6. Reference:

- Dr. Yatchew’s affidavit, p.31, line 16: “that wherever power poles are owned by private sector companies, there is no issue of transferring a valuable asset from the public sector to the private sector. That is not the case in Ontario.”
- THESL Response to Energy Probe IR-10:
 - a) In the event that it is in the interest of the utility and the ratepayers to lease a portion of utility assets, it should be at fair market value, if at all possible.

It is for the same reason that THESL should not be required to lease spare office space at other than market rents, it should not be required to lease pole space at a fraction of its value. To do otherwise would constitute an undue transfer of wealth to a private company.

b) Issues relating to access and pricing may also arise if the utility were to be privately owned. However, the issue of wealth transfer from a public utility to a private company would not be present.

Questions:

- (a) Please confirm that Dr. Yatchew has in mind THESL's shareholder as the party from whom the asset would be transferred. If this understanding is incorrect, please clarify.
- (b) If the Board approved a distribution revenue requirement and electricity distribution rates based on leasing pole space "at a fraction of its value", would it be THESL's customers, rather than its shareholder, from whom the asset would be transferred?
- (c) If the answer to question (b) above is yes, how does this affect the issue raised by Dr. Yatchew?