



McCarthy Tétrault LLP  
PO Box 48, Suite 5300  
Toronto-Dominion Bank Tower  
Toronto ON M5K 1E6  
Canada  
Tel: 416-362-1812  
Fax: 416-868-0673

**Gordon M. Nettleton**  
Partner | Associé  
Direct Line: 416-601-7509  
Email: gnettleton@mccarthy.ca

February 1, 2024

**BY EMAIL AND RESS**

Ms. Nancy Marconi  
Registrar  
Ontario Energy Board  
Suite 2700, 2300 Yonge Street  
P.O. Box 2319  
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Marconi:

**Re: Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One) Application for Leave to Construct –  
Waasigan Project Ontario Energy Board File Number: EB-2023-0198**

We are counsel to Hydro One in this matter. Yesterday, intervener NOTL filed a letter making certain assertions concerning the Waasigan Transmission Line Project and requesting that Hydro One “calculate the fair cost estimate of [the] proposed route from Thunder Bay to Dryden and present [it] ... at the OEB for consideration”.

While the OEB’s Procedural Orders do not appear to contemplate this request, Hydro One is mindful of the directions in Procedural Order No. 3 for Hydro One to provide further responses to certain of intervener Larry Richard’s interrogatories.<sup>1</sup> In that light, and in an attempt to assist NOTL, Hydro One provides the following response.

As noted in Hydro One’s Exhibit I-03-01 (Hydro One’s responses to NOTL interrogatories), the multi-year process undertaken to identify alternative routes to be evaluated for the Project under the Environmental Assessment (**EA**) process is detailed in the Amended Terms of Reference approved by the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (**MECP**) almost two years ago in February 2022.

As explained in Exhibit I-01-05 (Hydro One’s responses to OEB Staff interrogatories), Hydro One did not perform a ‘financial assessment’ of NOTL’s proposed alternative route (to go directly from Thunder Bay to Dryden via Upsala and Ignace bypassing Atikokan) as it does not meet the Independent Electricity System Operator’s (**IESO**) system planning requirements for the Project to connect through the Mackenzie Transformer Station in Atikokan Ontario.<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, as reflected in Exhibit I-01-17, Hydro One takes no issue with, and in fact expects, any approval of its leave to construct application to be subject to the OEB’s standard conditions including obtaining all necessary approvals, permits, licences, certificates, agreements and rights

---

<sup>1</sup> Hydro One’s responses to Larry Richard’s interrogatories 1(a), 2(a) and 3(a) to (g).

<sup>2</sup> Exhibit B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, Attachments 5 to 9 which all reference the need for the line connecting to Mackenzie Transformer Station in Atikokan, Ontario.

required to construct, operate and maintain the Project. This includes the EA by the MECP, which may be granted after MECP has completed, among other things, its evaluation of alternative route evidence filed as part of the EA process.

As for the remaining issues raised in NOTL's January 31 letter, Hydro One does not have any further information or documentation beyond that which has already been provided on the record in this proceeding, including interrogatory responses relating to the competitive bidding processes used to manage Project costs (I-01-07(e), I-01-08(b), I-01-10(a), I-01-11(d), I-01-19(b) and (e)); and relating to mining claims (Exhibit I-03-01(c)).

Yours truly,

**McCarthy Tétrault LLP**



Per:

Gordon M. Nettleton  
Partner | Associé

c: Reena Goyal, McCarthy Tétrault LLP  
Joanne Richardson, Hydro One  
Andrew Flannery, Hydro One