



## Jay Shepherd

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

**BY EMAIL and RESS**

May 29, 2015  
Our File: EB20130421

Ontario Energy Board  
2300 Yonge Street  
27th Floor  
Toronto, Ontario  
M4P 1E4

**Attn: Kirsten Walli, Board Secretary**

Dear Ms. Walli:

**Re: EB-2013-0421 – Hydro One SECTR Phase 2 – SEC Technical Conference**

We are counsel to the School Energy Coalition ("SEC"). Enclosed, please find the Technical Conference Questions on behalf of SEC.

Yours very truly,  
**Jay Shepherd P.C.**

*Original signed by*

Mark Rubenstein

cc: Wayne McNally, SEC (by email)  
Applicant and intervenors (by email)

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

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

**ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD**

**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 Hydro One Networks Inc. for an order or orders pursuant to section 92 of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998* granting leave to construct transmission line facilities in the Windsor Essex Region, Ontario.

**TECHNICAL CONFERENCE QUESTIONS**

**ON BEHALF OF THE**

**SCHOOL ENERGY COALITION**

**SEC-1**

[PWU #2(b), I-p2-4-2] The proposed cost allocation methodology may lead to the requirement of an LDC customer to pay significant capital contributions that they may otherwise have not have expected as they are not the triggering customer. This may lead to significant rate increases that were unexpected and would not be offset by any load growth. Does Hydro One see any role for rate mitigation, not just between a benefiting LDC and its customers, but also between Hydro One Transmission and a benefiting LDC?

**SEC-2**

[E3 #14(a), I-P2-2-14] Please indicate which sections of the current Hydro One template Capital Cost Recovery Agreement (CCRA) it believes would need to be revised if its proposed cost allocation methodology is approved.

**SEC-3**

[CLD #1(a), I-P2-12-1] For transmission upgrades that do not require section 92 approval, what process does Hydro One envision to resolve any dispute between Hydro One Tx and an LDC (or other load customer) on any aspect of the determination of system versus customer benefit by the IESO?

Submitted by the School Energy Coalition on this 29<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2015.

*Original signed by*

---

Mark Rubenstein  
Counsel for the School Energy Coalition