

ntréal • ottawa • toronto • hamilton • waterloo region • calgary • vancouver • beijing • moscow • london

February 12, 2015

VIA RESS AND COURIER

Ms. Kirsten Walli **ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD** P.O. Box 2319, 27th Floor 2300 Yonge Street Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4 lan A. Mondrow Direct: 416-369-4670 ian.mondrow@gowlings.com

Assistant: Cathy Galler Direct: 416-369-4570 cathy.galler@gowlings.com

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: EB-2013-0421: Hydro One Networks' (Hydro One) Leave to Construct Supply to Essex County Transmission Reinforcement (SECTR) Project (Project).

Procedural Order No. 3.

We write on behalf of "E3 Coalition" (composed for the purposes of this proceeding of E.L.K. Energy Inc., Entegrus Powerlines Inc. and Essex Powerlines Corporation).

Procedural Order No. 3 herein establishes two phases for the captioned proceeding, and directs any party not already an intervenor in Phase 1 and who wishes to be a party in Phase 2 to apply for intervenor status, and for cost eligibility if applicable. As the Procedural Order also grants E3 Coalition intervenor status and cost eligibility for Phase 2 of the proceeding, we are assuming that no further notice or request from E3 Coalition for Phase 2 participation and cost eligibility is required.

In respect of the procedural matters set out in the Procedural Order:

1. E3 Coalition notes Phase 2 interrogatory responses are due April 3rd, which is Good Friday, and intervenors are directed to indicate whether they intend to file evidence by April 7th, which is the following Tuesday. The intervening weekday - Monday April 6th - is Easter Monday.

E3 Coalition requires information from Hydro One and the IESO in order to assess the proposed allocation of SECTR Project costs, and until that information is received and reviewed will be unable to determine whether it will seek to file evidence. E3 Coalition respectfully requests that the Board modify the schedule set out in Procedural Order No. 3 to allow additional time for parties to review Hydro One's Phase 2 interrogatory responses and determine whether



they will seek to file evidence. E3 Coalition suggests that the April 7th date in the Procedural Order be changed to April 21st.

2. Procedural Order No. 3 also requests that parties indicate their views on an oral versus a written hearing for Phase 2.

In our November 26, 2014 letter filed herein on behalf of E3 Coalition we indicated the coalition's expectation that it would seek to cross-examine witnesses in respect of the proposed SECTR Project cost allocations, and alternatives thereto. Subject to responses to the interrogatories, in addition to cross-examination of Hydro One witnesses E3 Coalition may seek provision in a future procedural order for cross-examination of IESO witnesses regarding the IESO's proposed allocation of costs between transmission and distribution.

E3 Coalition thus requests that the Board provide for an oral hearing of Phase 2 of the proceeding, subject to reassessment following the close of interrogatories and the filing of evidence by intervenors or Board Staff, if any.

E3 Coalition appreciates the Board's careful consideration of an appropriate approach to review of Hydro One's proposal for transmission reinforcement cost allocation and the implications of that proposal for the electricity distribution sector and its customers.

Yours truly,

lathy Saller

far: Ian A. Mondrow

c. Mark Danelon, E.L.K. ENERGY INC. David Ferguson, ENTEGRUS POWERLINES INC. Richard Dimmel, ESSEX POWERLINES CORPORATION Mike Roger, ELENCHUS RESEARCH ASSOCIATES Michael Engelberg, HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC. David Richmond, OEB Staff

TOR_LAW\ 8626426\2