Hydro One Networks Inc.

483 Bay Street, South Tower, 8TH Floor Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G 2P5

LAW

Monica E. Caceres, Assistant General Counsel

Telephone: (647) 505-3341 Fax: (416) 345-6972

E-mail: Monica.Caceres@HydroOne.com



April 24, 2023

BY EMAIL

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

Dear Ms. Marconi,

Re: EB-2022-0178 Entegrus Application for a Service Area Amendment ("Application") - Entegrus' Request for Updated Process Steps

Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One) is in receipt of Entegrus' letter to the OEB dated April 20, 2023 requesting an opportunity to file Supplementary Evidence to their Application on the ground that their application did not fully canvass the areas of evidence filed by the Intervenors (Hydro One and Formet Industries). In addition, Entegrus' further requests that the OEB provide for a one-day settlement conference as between the parties to discuss resolution which Entegrus suggests should take place before interrogatories, and after the filing of supplementary evidence, assuming the OEB grants said request.

In response, Hydro One states that Entegrus' submission supporting their request to file Supplementary Evidence does not provide any details as the type and scope of evidence and whether it is new evidence they seek to rely on, with respect to the contemplated areas: Hydro One's evidence about 2003 OEB decisions and the LTLT; the implications of the MAADs Decision for St. Thomas; the customer reliability impacts; and, the relative costs of service of each distributor to serve the Customer. Hydro One notes that the OEB decisions and MAADs decision, are relevant decisions which were known or should have been known to Entegrus at the time of the filing of their application.

For efficiency and procedural fairness, Hydro One suggests that any decision by the OEB to grant Entegrus' request should be limited in scope to new evidence which Entegrus could not have reasonably known at the time of the filing of their Application. Should the OEB grant Entegrus'

request to file Supplementary Evidence, Hydro One should be afforded the same opportunity to respond to the new evidence filed by Entegrus, and understands that any additional material filed by Hydro One would also be limited in scope as per any conditions ordered by the OEB. In the event of the granting of Entegrus' request to file Supplementary Evidence, Hydro One states that it would be appropriate to adjust the procedural timelines to reflect the added steps in the proceeding.

With respect to Entegrus' request for a settlement conference and the timing of same, Hydro One states that in principle it does not object to a settlement conference. However, given Entegrus' request to file Supplementary Evidence, and Hydro One's position as noted above, Hydro One is not in a position to address the merits of the request for a Settlement Conference and the timing, until the evidentiary record is complete.

Yours truly,

HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC.

Monica E. Caceres