HydroOttawa

By RESS and Email

December 8, 2022

Ms. Nancy Marconi Registrar Ontario Energy Board PO Box 2319 2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor Toronto, ON, M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Marconi:

Subject: Interrogatories to Hydro One Networks Inc. Service Area Amendment Application Ontario Energy Board File Number: EB-2022-0234

Pursuant to the Ontario Energy Board's Notice of Hearing and Procedural Order No. 2, issued November 30, 2022, Hydro Ottawa Limited ("Hydro Ottawa") hereby submits the attached interrogatories to Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One), with regards to Hydro One's Supplemental Evidence submitted on November 7, 2022.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require further information.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

April Barnie — 1E403775748B4CB..

April Barrie Director, Regulatory Affairs Directeur, Affaires réglementaires aprilbarrie@hydroottawa.com Tel./tél.: 613 738-5499 | ext./poste 2106 Cell.: 613 808-3261

Cc:

Joanne Richardson, Director, Regulatory Affairs, Hydro One Networks Inc. Jeffrey Smith, Director Regulatory Compliance, Hydro One Networks Inc. Pasquale Catalano, Sr. Regulatory Advisor, Hydro One Networks Inc. Shuo Zhang, Case Manager, Ontario Energy Board James Sidlofsky, Counsel, Ontario Energy Board Claudio Bertone

2711 Hunt Club Road / chemin Hunt Club PO Box 8700 / C.P. 8700 Ottawa, Ontario K1G 3S4





| 1 2 | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 3 4 | 3 THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD ORDERS THAT: | | | | | |
| 5 6 7 8 9 | Hydro One and Hydro Ottawa shall request any information and documentation from each oth on Hydro One's supplementary evidence and Hydro Ottawa's new evidence on its alternative policies line, by written interrogatories filed with the OEB and delivered to all parties by December 2022. | | | | | |
| 10 | Interrogatories | | | | | |
| 11 12 | HOL 19. | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | |
| 14 | Reference: Hydro One's supplemental evidence 20221107 - Hydro One Pole Line | | | | | |
| 15 | Upgrade | | | | | |
| 16 | Email exchange from June 9, 2021, as provided in response to HONI-7, Attachment B | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | |
| 18 | Preamble: On June 9, 2021 Hydro Ottawa informed Hydro One of the customer connection | | | | | |
| 19 | request at 626 Principale St, Casselman and indicated Hydro Ottawa's ability to service on | | | | | |
| 20 | the 8kV system, noting a system expansion and upgrade of Hydro One poles would be | | | | | |
| 21 | needed. Furthermore, Hydro Ottawa enquired as to who the contact at Hydro One should be | | | | | |
| 22 | to discuss the request. Also on June 9, a Hydro One staff member stated they would look | | | | | |
| 23 | into the request. Hydro One provided Hydro Ottawa with a high level cost estimate for | | | | | |
| 24 | upgrading this pole line on July 11, 2022 at a cost of \$600k which is +/- 50%. | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | |
| 26 | Questions: | | | | | |
| 27 | a. Why did Hydro One not inform Hydro Ottawa when it was approached by | | | | | |
| 28 | Existing Joint Use Tenant ("Existing Joint Use Tenant") customer in March, 2022 | | | | | |
| 29 | to upgrade the pole line, when Hydro One was aware that Hydro Ottawa would | | | | | |
| 30 | require this pole line to accommodate Hydro Ottawa's circuit, as indicated in the | | | | | |
| 31 | June 9, 2021 email? | | | | | |
| 32 | b. Why did Hydro One not include the height requirements in its pole line upgrade | | | | | |
| 33 | design needed to allow Hydro Ottawa the ability to provide a Hydro Ottawa | | | | | |
| 34 | circuit, as indicated in the June 9, 2021 email and reflected in Hydro One's high | | | | | |
| 35 | level cost estimate provided to Hydro Ottawa in the July 11, 2022 email? | | | | | |
| 36 | c. When Hydro One was informed of the requirements of the Ministry of | | | | | |
| 37 | Transportation (MTO) for increased circuits and height in August, 2022, why did | | | | | |
| 38 | Hydro One not engage Hydro Ottawa to discuss the requirements and options, | | | | | |
| 39 | since Hydro One was aware that Hydro Ottawa was interested in bringing in a | | | | | |
| 40 | second feeder? | | | | | |
| 41 | d. Please provide all responses to Hydro Ottawa's request to attach to Hydro One's | | | | | |
| 42 | poles in June 2021. | | | | | |



| 1 | HOL 20. | | | | |
|----------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 ⊿ | Reference: Hydro One's supplemental evidence 20221107 - Hydro One Pole Line | | | | |
| 4 5 | Upgrade | | | | |
| 6 | Preamble: Hydro One indicated that, in order to service future adjacent loads, a 44kV line | | | | |
| 7 | may be required. | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| 9 | Questions: | | | | |
| 10 | a. Does Hydro One's plan to upgrade its pole line to accommodate a future 44kV | | | | |
| 11 | circuit, as part of the pole upgrade being driven by the telecom, take into account | | | | |
| 12 | forecasted load growth? | | | | |
| 13 | b. If so, is forecasted load growth being prioritized over the ability to support Hydro | | | | |
| 14 | Ottawa's requested circuit? | | | | |
| 15 | c. Is the MTO's concern and potential relocation of the pole line being driven by the | | | | |
| 16 17 | pole height, with the assumption of accommodating the existing Hydro One 8kV and proposed Hydro Ottawa 8kV circuits, or does it also include space for a | | | | |
| 18 | Hydro One 44kV circuit? | | | | |
| 19 | d. Did Hydro One request or have discussion with the MTO to use the pole line to | | | | |
| 20 | accommodate a 44kV line? | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | |
| 22 | HOL 21. | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 | Reference: Hydro One's supplemental evidence 20221107 - Pole Upgrade Request by | | | | |
| 25 | Existing Joint Use Tenant, page 1, lines 19 to 31 | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | |
| 27 | Preamble: Hydro One states that "In August of 2022, the MTO informed Hydro One that to | | | | |
| 28 | accommodate the additional request from the Existing Joint Use Tenant, the existing poles | | | | |
| 29 30 | would need to be increased in size to maintain necessary height clearances at the Principale | | | | |
| 30 31 | Street and Highway 417 interchange. Hydro One has been working with the Existing Joint Use Tenant and MTO to establish a design and apportion cost responsibilities for the new | | | | |
| 32 | poles. On September 27, 2022, an agreement in principle was reached by all parties on the | | | | |
| 33 | design and cost responsibilities. Discussions amongst the impacted parties and coordination | | | | |
| 34 | activities are ongoing, including, the sourcing of materials to meet the Existing Joint Use | | | | |
| 35 | Tenant's request and install their requested equipment. As Hydro Ottawa is not a joint use | | | | |
| 36 | tenant on this pole line, the Existing Joint Use Tenant-initiated and MTO-driven work should | | | | |
| 37 | not have any impact on the operations of Hydro Ottawa, however, as a courtesy, Hydro | | | | |
| 38 | Ottawa will be notified of the implementation schedule of the Joint Use Project when | | | | |
| 39 | established." | | | | |
| 40 | | | | | |

41 Hydro One and Hydro Ottawa have a joint use agreement.



| 1 | Question | S: | |
|----------|--|---|--|
| 2 | a. | What is the timeline required by the joint use tenant for the completion of Hydro | |
| 3 | | One's pole line upgrade? | |
| 4 | b. | Does Hydro One's Joint Use Agreement include provisions for the prioritization of | |
| 5 | | pole attachment requests when they are received from more than one party? | |
| 6 | C. | Does Hydro One prioritize existing tenants on poles over other joint use requests | |
| 7 | | by other parties with existing joint use agreements that are submitted regardless | |
| 8 | | of timing? | |
| 9 | d. | Does Hydro One prioritize telecom joint use requests over LDC requests for joint | |
| 10 | | use on the pole? | |
| 11 | e. | If there are no prioritization provisions, please confirm how Hydro One prioritizes | |
| 12 | | requests from multiple third parties for pole attachments. | |
| 13 | f. | When other joint use parties request use of Hydro One poles, can distributors | |
| 14 | | rely on Hydro One to provide access to their poles? | |
| 15 | g. | | |
| 16 | | customer and subsequently a telecommunication company, either a current | |
| 17 | | tenant or not, requests access to the pole, is the distributor's request at risk? | |
| 18 | h. | Please provide a current version of Hydro One's Joint Use Agreement with Hydro | |
| 19 00 | | Ottawa. | |
| 20 | i. | Please explain how the Existing Joint Use Tenant and MTO work should not | |
| 21 | : | have any impact on the operations of Hydro Ottawa? | |
| 22 23 | j. | What is the typical timeframe for Hydro One to answer a joint use request on its poles to other distributors? | |
| 24 | k. | How does Hydro One's statement in the preamble to this question align with the | |
| 25 | | OEB's position on joint use poles? | |
| 26 | Ι. | Please confirm that no work would be required on the poles discussed in Hydro | |
| 27 | | One's supplemental evidence 20221107, if the Existing Joint Use Tenant's | |
| 28 | | request had not been made. | |
| 29 | m. | Please confirm that Hydro One has no other projects or project requests related | |
| 30 | | to the poles Hydro Ottawa has requested joint use of in relation to the connection | |
| 31 | | of 626 Principale St, Casselman. | |
| 32 | | | |
| 33 | HOL 22. | | |
| 34 | | | |
| 35 | | e: Hydro One's supplemental evidence 20221107 - MTO Permit, page 2, lines | |
| 36 | 5 to 17 | | |
| 37 | | | |
| 38 | | : "The new poles that will be installed on the existing pole centre-line as part of | |
| 39 | | Jse Project will likely not be able to accommodate two 8.32kV circuits (one-three | |
| 40 | phase 8.32kV Hydro One circuit is already on these Hydro One poles) due to MTO | | |
| 41 42 | requirements. In discussions with the MTO about this project, Hydro One was made aware | | |
| 42 | inat the pe | ermit being sought from the MTO would not support a second circuit on the existing | |



pole centre-line. If a second circuit is sought, the MTO has shared that the distributor will
 need to secure an additional permit and will be required to relocate the centre-line of the
 pole line to the west to maintain an 80m separation from the location of the overpass.

Should a determination be made by the OEB that a second 8.32kV circuit needs to
be accommodated on this pole line for Hydro Ottawa to serve 626 Principale Street, a new
pole line will need to be redesigned, replaced, and potentially relocated, contingent on the
requirements of the MTO."

| 9 | 9 Questions: | | |
|----------|--------------|---|--|
| 10 | a. | Please confirm if Hydro One initially requested a permit for one or two 8.32 kV | |
| 11 | | circuits from the MTO? | |
| 12 | b. | When the MTO advised that an additional permit would be required for a second | |
| 13 | | circuit, as well as, relocating the centre-line of the pole line to the west to | |
| 14 | | maintain an 80m separation from the location of the overpass, did Hydro One | |
| 15 | | weigh the potential cost implications to both Hydro One and Hydro Ottawa, in | |
| 16 | | light of the active Hydro Ottawa disputed Hydro One SAA? | |
| 17 18 | С. | Would Hydro Ottawa's request, regardless of the Telecom Existing Joint Use Tenant request, require the pole line to be moved? | |
| 19 | d. | If Hydro Ottawa's joint pole use request had been actioned first, would the | |
| 20 | | Telecom Existing Joint Use Tenant request have been required to have the pole | |
| 21 | | line moved? | |
| 22 | e. | If Hydro Ottawa's joint pole use request had been actioned first, would the | |
| 23 | | Telecom Existing Joint Use Tenant be required to pay to move the pole? | |
| 24 | f. | When the MTO advised that an additional permit would be required for a second | |
| 25 | | circuit, as well as relocating the centre-line of the pole line to the west to maintain | |
| 26 | | an 80m separation from the location of the overpass, did Hydro One weigh the | |
| 27 | | potential cost implications to both Hydro One and Hydro Ottawa, in light of the | |
| 28 | | request by Hydro Ottawa to attach to Hydro One's poles? | |
| 29 | g. | Please confirm if Hydro One estimated the costs of upgrading the poles to | |
| 30 | | accommodate the Existing Joint Use Tenant, as well as, Hydro Ottawa's plans to | |
| 31 | | utilize the pole line for an 8.32kV circuit? | |
| 32 | | i. If so, what was the estimated cost? | |
| 33 | | ii. If no assessment was made, please explain why? | |
| 34 | h. | Please provide any written requests made on or after June 9, 2021 to the MTO in | |
| 35 | | regards to the poles Hydro Ottawa requested joint use of in order to serve the | |
| 36 | | customer at 626 Principale St, Casselman. | |
| 37 | i. | Please provide a summary of any verbal requests made on or after June 9, 2021 | |
| 38 | | to the MTO in regards to the poles Hydro Ottawa requested joint use of in order | |
| 39 | | to serve the customer at 626 Principale St, Casselman. | |
| | | | |



| 1 | HOL | 23. |
|---|-----|-----|
|---|-----|-----|

2 3

4

5

12

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Reference: Hydro One's supplemental evidence 20221107 - Cost of Hydro Ottawa's Proposal, page 2, lines 19-24

Preamble: "As a result, if Hydro Ottawa was to serve the customer at 626 Principale Street,
the work described above will not reduce the cost of the Hydro Ottawa proposal from an
incremental capital cost perspective. In fact, addressing the request may increase the cost
of the high-level estimate provided to Hydro Ottawa because of the redesign, replacement
and potential relocation of the poles that will be necessitated by the addition of a second
8.32kV circuit on this pole line."

13 Questions:

- a. Please confirm the rationale for Hydro One's support of a likely higher-cost
 solution to meet the needs of the Existing Joint Use Tenant and potential needs
 of Hydro Ottawa?
 b. Could the Existing Joint Use Tenant have achieved savings if Hydro Ottawa's
 - b. Could the Existing Joint Use Tenant have achieved savings if Hydro Ottawa's request had been coordinated?
 - c. Will Hydro One customers pay for any of the work related to the Existing Joint Use Tenant requested work?
 - d. Is it Hydro One's assertion that the cost to Hydro Ottawa is likely to go up based solely on the fact that the Existing Joint Use Tenant request would be actioned first?

25 HOL 24.

26 27

28

30

- Reference: Hydro One's supplemental evidence 20221107 Hydro One Pole Line Upgrade
- 29 Reference: Hydro One's SAA Application Submission dated 2022-09-09,
- Preamble: Hydro One is providing this correspondence as it has become clear during the
 development of responses to interrogatory questions posed by OEB Staff and Hydro Ottawa
 that there may be additional information that the OEB and/or Hydro Ottawa may find
 pertinent to this proceeding, specifically regarding works that have been requested along the
 same pole line that will require upgrading for Hydro Ottawa to execute its proposed
 connection to the Subject Area of this proceeding.
- 37

3839 Questions:

40 a. When Hydro One receives multiple requests for joint use of the same poles or
41 other assets, does Hydro One treat each request independently without
42 consideration of the impact on other requestors?



| 1 2 | b. Does Hydro One have processes in place to coordinate multiple projects involving the same assets in order to efficiently manage design work and to avoid | | |
|--------|---|--|--|
| 3 | or limit the need to redesign or rebuild electricity infrastructure? | | |
| 4 | c. If processes are in place, how does Hydro One engage the associated | | |
| 5 | stakeholders? | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | IOL 25. | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | Reference: Hydro One's supplemental evidence 20221107 - Hydro One Pole Line | | |
| 10 | Upgrade | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | Preamble: As Hydro Ottawa is not a joint use tenant on this pole line, the Existing Joint Use | | |
| 13 | Tenant-initiated and MTO-driven work should not have any impact on the operations of | | |
| 14 | Hydro Ottawa, however, as a courtesy, Hydro Ottawa will be notified of the implementation | | |
| 15 | schedule of the Joint Use Project when established. | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | Questions: | | |
| 18 | a. Does Hydro One have an update to the implementation schedule? | | |
| 19 | b. If yes, please provide the updated implementation schedule. | | |