



RECEIVED

MAY 08 2009

ONTARIO ENERGY BD

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chair, GAIL REGAN

President, Cara Holdings Ltd.

President, PATRICIA ADAMS

MAX ALLEN

Producer, IDEAS, CBC Radio

GEORGE CONNELL

President Emeritus, University of Toronto

ANDREW COYNE

Journalist

IAN GRAY

President, St. Lawrence Starch Co.

Secretary/Treasurer, ANNETTA TURNER

DAVID NOWLAN

Professor Emeritus, Economics, University of Toronto

CLIFFORD ORWIN

Professor of Political Science, University of Toronto

ANDREW ROMAN

Barrister & Solicitor, Miller Thomson

MARGARET WENTE

Columnist, Globe and Mail

May 7, 2009

BY EMAIL & BY COURIER

Ms. Kirsten Walli

Board Secretary

Ontario Energy Board

2300 Yonge St, Suite 2701

Toronto ON M4P 1E4

EB-2008-0235

OEB BOARD SECRETARY	
File No:	Sub File: 9
Panel	PS, CC, DC
Licensing	KR.
Other	
00/04	NS

Dear Ms. Walli:

Board File No. EB-2008-0235

London Hydro Inc. – 2009 Rates Rebasing Application

Energy Probe Round Two Interrogatories

Pursuant to Procedural Order No. 2, issued by the Board on April 23, 2009, please find attached two hard copies of the Round Two Interrogatories from Energy Probe Research Foundation (Energy Probe) to London Hydro in the EB-2008-0235 proceeding. An electronic version of this communication will be forwarded in PDF format.

Should you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours truly,

David S. MacIntosh

Case Manager

cc: David B. Williamson, London Hydro Inc. (By email)
James C. Sidlofsky, Borden Ladner Gervais LLP (By email)
Peter Faye, Energy Probe Counsel (By email)
Interested Parties (By email)

Energy Probe Research Foundation 225 BRUNSWICK AVE., TORONTO, ONTARIO M5S 2M6

Phone: (416) 964-9223 Fax: (416) 964-8239 E-mail: EnergyProbe@nextcity.com Internet: www.EnergyProbe.org

Ontario Energy Board

IN THE MATTER OF the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998*,
S.O. 1998, c.15 (Schedule B);

AND IN THE MATTER OF an application by London Hydro
Inc. for an order approving just and reasonable rates and other
charges for electricity distribution to be effective May 1, 2009.

ROUND TWO INTERROGATORIES OF ENERGY PROBE RESEARCH FOUNDATION ("ENERGY PROBE")

May 7, 2009

**LONDON HYDRO INC.
2009 RATES REBASING PROCEEDING
EB-2008-0235**

**ENERGY PROBE RESEARCH FOUNDATION
ROUND TWO INTERROGATORIES**

Interrogatory # 29

Ref: Response to Energy Probe Interrogatory # 7

The response to this IR references “municipal infrastructure improvements in Canada” as a driver for city works projects requiring London Hydro plant work. Please provide details of the “announced government infrastructure initiatives” referred to in the IR response and specific road or buried municipal utility infrastructure in London that will require London Hydro involvement.

Interrogatory # 30

Ref: Response to Energy Probe Interrogatory # 11

The response to part (a) of this IR states that developers have so far in 2009 committed to 60 lots. In addition London Hydro states that there is a high probability of another 120 lots being committed and a further 430 lots are “under discussion”. The response seems to suggest that there are about 180 lots of SFR development that are either committed or likely to be committed for 2009. Another 430 lots are possible for a potential total of 610 lots. London Hydro has forecast 800 lots of SFR development in 2009. Should this forecast be revised downwards for 2009?

Interrogatory # 31

Ref: Response to Energy Probe Interrogatory # 24

The response to this IR refers Energy Probe to the response to SEC #10. That response in part (c) addresses the subject of base labour costs due to “corporate reorganization and industry changes” but appears to conclude that labour costs have decreased as a result of these influences. Energy Probe’s IR#24 questioned the base labour increase in OM&A which does not appear to be addressed in the SEC #10 response. Please explain.

Interrogatory # 32

Ref: Response to Energy Probe Interrogatory # 26

The response to part (d) of this IR concerning what actions London Hydro is taking to control benefit costs did not mention asking employees to bear a larger share of these costs. Has London Hydro considered this option? If yes, what has been the response of the employees? If not, why not?