Filed: 2018-09-24 EB-2017-0364 Exhibit I Tab 1 Schedule 17 Page 1 of 1

OEB Staff Interrogatory # 17

| 1 | <u>OEB Staff Interrogatory # 17</u> |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | <u>Reference:</u> |
| 4 | IESO's Addendum to the 2017 Updated Assessment for the Need for the East-West Tie |
| 5 | Expansion |
| 6 | |
| 7 | The IESO's "Addendum to the 2017 Updated Assessment for the Need for the East-West Tie |
| 8 | Expansion" states: |
| 9 | |
| 10 | If the in-service date is delayed beyond 2020, using interim measures to manage the need will |
| 11 | result in additional costs and increased risks to system reliability. |
| 12 | |
| 13 | The IESO's Addendum then goes on to forecast the potential capital and energy costs, as well as |
| 14 | the foregone loss savings, of a delay to the in-service date. |
| 15 | |
| 16 | <u>Interrogatory:</u> |
| 17 | a) Is Hydro One prepared, if granted LTC approval, to pay the annual system costs associated |
| 18 | with a delay beyond the date proposed in its application (i.e. December 2021)? Please |
| 19 | explain. |
| 20 | |
| 21 | <u>Response:</u> |
| 22 | a) No, Hydro One is not prepared to pay any annual system costs associated with a delay |
| 23 | beyond 2021. |
| 24 | |
| 25 | Any potential annual system cost increase, estimated by the IESO to be as much as |
| 26 | approximately \$20M annually, that would be incurred by ratepayers during any delay period |
| 27 | would be offset by the delay in in-servicing the asset and its corresponding effect on Hydro |
| 28 | One's revenue requirement, estimated to be approximately \$30M in year 1 and |
| 29 | approximately \$50M in year two as provided in Exhibit B, Tab 9, Schedule 1. |