

**Ontario Energy  
Board**

P.O. Box 2319  
2300 Yonge Street  
27<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto ON M4P 1E4  
Telephone: 416-481-1967  
Facsimile: 416-440-7656  
Toll free: 1-888-632-6273

**Commission de l'énergie  
de l'Ontario**

C.P. 2319  
2300, rue Yonge  
27<sup>e</sup> étage  
Toronto ON M4P 1E4  
Téléphone: 416-481-1967  
Télécopieur: 416-440-7656  
Numéro sans frais: 1-888-632-6273



**BY EMAIL**

September 15, 2017

Richard P. Stephenson  
Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP  
115 Wellington Street West, 35<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, Ontario, M5V 3H1

Dear Mr. Stephenson:

**Re: Power Workers' Union request to amend Procedural Order No. 1  
Alectra Utilities Corporation's Application for Distribution Rates  
Ontario Energy Board File No. EB-2017-0024**

The Ontario Energy Board (OEB) received your letter dated September 12 requesting that the OEB "...amend Procedural Order No. 1 to grant intervenor status to the PWU" in Alectra Utilities Corporation's electricity distribution rate application (EB-2017-0024). The OEB's decision in Procedural Order No. 1 denied the request of the Power Workers' Union (PWU) for intervenor status.

In the letter the PWU notes that the OEB "...may have been under the misapprehension that the PWU was seeking costs eligibility for this proceeding", which the PWU confirmed it is not. The OEB clarifies that it was under no such misapprehension and confirms the decision to deny intervenor status to the PWU for the reasons set out in Procedural Order No. 1. It is acknowledged, however, that Procedural Order No.1 erroneously included PWU in a list of parties seeking both intervenor status and cost eligibility. The OEB has corrected and re-issued Procedural Order No. 1 to address this error.

The PWU's letter further asks whether a formal notice of motion is required to request that the OEB "amend" (which the OEB interprets as a request to review and vary) the decision in Procedural Order No. 1 denying the PWU's request for intervenor status. Should the PWU continue to wish to seek a review of the decision in Procedural Order No. 1, the letter of September 12 may be treated as a notice of motion to vary the OEB's decision; however, the PWU may choose to file a formal motion initiating the review process and should advise the OEB accordingly.

The present letter does not constitute a review of Procedural Order No. 1, nor does it

initiate such a review. It is intended only to correct the misstatement in Procedural Order No. 1 that the PWU was seeking cost eligibility in the proceeding.

Yours truly,

Original signed by

Kristi Sebalj  
Registrar