

April 26, 2018

Robert B. Warren
T: 416-947-5075
rwarren@weirfoulds.com

Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
Suite 2701
2300 Yonge Street
Toronto ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms Walli:

Re: EB-2017-0364/Hearing of Motion

We are counsel to Hydro One Networks Inc. ("HONI") in this matter.

We wrote to you on April 16, 2018 asking for answers to four questions. A copy of that letter is attached for your reference. We have yet to receive a response.

As the date for the filing of evidence as required by the Notice of Hearing of Motion dated April 6, 2018, is fast approaching, we would appreciate your early response to the questions set out in our letter.

Yours truly,

WeirFoulds LLP



Robert B. Warren

RBW/dh

cc: Lawren Murray, OEB Counsel
Zora Crnojacki, OEB Case Manager
Fred Cass, Aird & Berlis, LLP
Michael Engelberg, Hydro One Networks Inc.
Rosalind H. Cooper, Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP

11685096.1

April 16, 2018

Robert B. Warren
T: 416-947-5075
rwarren@weirfoulds.com

Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
Suite 2701
2300 Yonge Street
Toronto ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms Walli:

Re: EB-2017-0364/Hearing of Motion

We have been retained by Hydro One Networks Inc. ("HONI") to represent its interests in the hearing of the Motion that is the subject of the Notice of Hearing of Motion ("Notice") dated April 6, 2018.

We require information on a number of matters with respect to the Motion. To begin with, we require answers to the following questions:

1. What evidence will be before the OEB on the hearing of the Motion? The Notice of Motion, dated February 27, 2018, is replete with references to, among other things, the evidence filed by HONI and by NextBridge in support of their respective applications for leave to construct. Will that evidence be before the OEB on the hearing of the Motion?
2. The Notice provides for a transcribed technical conference to take place on May 15, 2018. The purpose of a technical conference, according to the OEB's standard practice, is to respond to questions seeking clarification of the answers to written interrogatories. The Notice makes no provision for written interrogatories. Why has no provision been made for written interrogatories? In the absence of written interrogatories, what is the scope of the questions that may be asked at the technical conference, particularly given that, as set out above, it is unclear what evidence will be before the OEB on the hearing of the Motion?
3. Will there be oral evidence, and cross-examination at the hearing of the Motion? The Notice of Motion refers to materials from the IESO and the Minister of Energy. Will representatives of the IESO and the Minister be giving evidence? And if not, why not?

4. While provision is made for interventions, no provision is made for the filing of evidence by those intervening. Will they be required to file evidence? And if not, why not?

It is our position that, once it is determined what evidence will be before the OEB on the hearing of the Motion, provision should be made for written interrogatories. Making provision for written interrogatories will, among other things, provide structure for the questions to be asked at the technical conference.

We look forward to your response to these questions at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,

WeirFoulds LLP



Robert B. Warren

RBW/dh

cc: Lawren Murray, OEB Counsel
Zora Crnojacki, OEB Case Manager
Fred Cass, Aird & Berlis, LLP
Michael Engelberg, Hydro One Networks Inc.

11647344.1