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Thursday, September 25, 2025

--- On commencing at 9:30 a.m.

PRELIMINARY MATTERS

M. MILLAR: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the fourth and final day of our technical conference for Hydro Ottawa. We are continuing our questioning of panel 3. Mr. Myers, are there any preliminary matters we need to address?

J. MYERS: No, not this morning.

HYDRO OTTAWA LIMITED – PANEL 3, RESUMED RATE FRAMEWORK, COST OF CAPITAL, PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES, BENCHMARKING, LOAD FORECASTING, WORKING CAPITAL, COST ALLOCATION, RATE DESIGN, DEFERRAL AND VARIANCE ACCOUNTS, AND REGULATORY COSTS

APRIL BARRIE

CUC DUONG

MEGHAN FEE

NEIL TEJWANI

M. MILLAR: Okay. I understand the witnesses are ready, too. I will hand it over to you, Ms. DeFazio.

EXAMINATION BY M. DEFAZIO

M. DEFAZIO: Thank you, good morning. I would like to start by pulling up reference IR 2-Staff-78, please. And good morning, Panel. Thank you. In the response to this IR -- sorry, maybe scroll down. I may have -- there we go. Keep going. Thank you. Table C. If we look at Table C, this is the difference in system access capital contributions due to the changes in the residential connections, connection horizon to 40 years. The OEB has established a generic DVA called extended horizons variance account. I would like to ask the panel if you intend on using this account or using your estimates in your budgets for the rate period?

C. DUONG: Good morning. We will just take a moment to consult. Thank you. Thank you. I just want to make sure we are clear on the record, the information that we provided in 1-Staff-1 do not include any adjustments to our budget values for the customer contribution values. So as you can see in Table C here, these are our estimated contribution changes that may take effect once we calculate the -- our capital contributions based on the revised update with the residential revenue extension. So, just to summarize then, is we do intend to use our own account to capitalize and track the differences in the capital contributions due to the residential revenue horizon changes.

M. DEFAZIO: Okay. The accounting order requests or states that distributors as part of their next cost based application incorporate the impact of the expansion of the horizons into their forecast for the test year and beyond; would you be able to come up with that forecast to include it in this cost of service -- sorry, this rebasing application?

A. BARRIE: Hi, Ms. DeFazio. So, that part of the proceeding occurred significantly into Hydro Ottawa preparing for this rate application and at this time we could not update our estimates in order to accommodate a change in what we consider may be our capital contributions. What Hydro Ottawa has proposed as part of this rate application is to capture those changes within our system access deferral account.

M. DEFAZIO: Okay, thank you. Could we please go to Exhibit 1, Tab 3, Schedule 1? And down to page 24, please. So, here Table 7 shows the compound annual growth rate from 2025 to 2030 based on forecast customer count, and this is the amount that's proposed to be used as part of the OM&A growth factor in the custom formula. And calculating the CAGR for this period, Hydro Ottawa has included 2025. Just curious why 2025 is included when you are, in fact, rebasing for '26 and then the growth would be over the forecast period, not relative to '25 but relative to the rebasing in '26?

A. BARRIE: Hydro Ottawa had looked at the growth period over '25 to '30 as customers come online throughout the year of 2026. So by including 2025, it gives you a better approximation of what a five-year growth increase would look like.

M. DEFAZIO: So the numbers in this table, are they the middle of the year, the average of the year, the end of the year?

A. BARRIE: If I can just have a moment. It's the monthly average.

M. DEFAZIO: So the monthly average for '25 and the monthly average for...

A. BARRIE: For 2030.

M. DEFAZIO: Correct. Okay, thank you. If we can go to Table 8, please? We have same question here, that the compound annual growth rate includes '25 when the forecast period starts at '26 and goes till 2030.

A. BARRIE: So for the growth cap CAGR there we were trying to capture the growth that we were forecasting over the five-year period and incorporated that into the capital -- or the capacity related growth.

M. DEFAZIO: So the numbers shown in the table, would they be, again, the beginning of the year, the end of the year?

A. BARRIE: It would be the end of the year.

M. DEFAZIO: Okay, thank you. Could we please go down to -- sorry, move to Exhibit 1, Tab 3, Schedule 1, page 25?

L. CHARTRAND: Sorry, Ms. DeFazio, can you repeat the reference? I believe we are on page 25.

M. DEFAZIO: You are. My apologies. Could we please go to 2-Staff-77? So, I just have some questions about how the customer count and the growth factor is calculated. And Hydro Ottawa has -- says that it uses the count of customers excluding standby customers. Were there any other adjustments done to the customer count?

C. DUONG: No.

M. DEFAZIO: How are street lighting connections handled in the customer count?

C. DUONG: We estimated street lighting customer count based on what is expected out of the forecast itself.

M. DEFAZIO: Okay. And when it comes to the multiple customer metering system conversions where you have a bulk metered residential, let's say, apartment building and then Hydro Ottawa converts it to a multiple customer metered or individually suite metered building, that would have the effect of changing the customer count; is that correct? Because everyone has their own meter now.

C. DUONG: That's correct, yes.

M. DEFAZIO: And that would be captured in the growth factor as well?

C. DUONG: If I could take a moment to confer, thank you. Thank you. Just to clarify my last statement about the streetlight customers, we have an estimate of streetlight customer changes over the test period. However, that's not -- those customer counts are not part of the growth factor, that's part of the CROF calculation.

And then to answer your current question, we do have a forecast of retrofit changes in our low forecast and also part of our CROF calculation. However, we have been seeing a shift in the number of buildings moving to retrofitting model or retrofitting metering. So we have incorporated some historical changes to our residential count from shifting of bulk metered buildings to suite metered buildings. However, we are seeing a decline in that shift and have incorporated that into our low forecast, which also use -- or was used or is used for our CROF calculation.

M. DEFAZIO: From the table in front of us, we don't see a decline. Could you clarify?

C. DUONG: Yes. This table A here is just a listing of our -- specifically our retrofit suite metering changes over the '19 to '24 period. Though you don't see this change, what you're not seeing as well is there's a lot of new bulk meter customer requests -- or apartment requests that have chosen either bulk metered or unit metering, and that is where we have been seeing the historical trend in change.

And I would say, subject to check, in '21 up to '23 there have been a lot of requests from these buildings to be unit metering and therefore we have increased our residential customer forecast based on that. But that has shifted to less changes going forward. So in recent years, being 2025, we have been seeing less new apartment buildings asking for suite metering from Hydro Ottawa.

M. DEFAZIO: Thank you. Could we please go to interrogatory 1-Staff-5. And in this question Hydro Ottawa states that 5 percent per year was added to equipment costs and I would just like to talk about the capital forecast. So equipment costs were escalated in the forecast by 5 percent a year. Part (c)(2) states that outside services for the capital program were escalated by 3 percent from 2027 to 2030, and that 69 percent of the volumes of those contracts have been negotiated already.

If we now go to 1-SEC-8, part (a) states that -- the response states that annual inflation factors are used between 2.1 and 5 percent for '26 and 2.1 and 5 percent for '27 to 2030, depending on the nature of the spend. It goes on to explain the capital inflation.

When discussing capital spending, I think of capital in a couple of categories such as labour, material, outside services, vehicle and tool rates. Are there any categories of capital cost in the capital forecast that were not adjusted by an inflation factor year over year?

A. BARRIE: Ms. DeFazio, that would have been a better question for panel 2, as they were dealing with budgets. I know they did come out with a technical conference undertaking related to inflation. I am not quite sure if that's going to cover everything that you are looking for with respect to this particular item. But if there is something maybe we could augment that technical conference response? Or take a different one for this specific question in terms of if there was anything that wasn't inflated?

M. DEFAZIO: Sure. If you could take an undertaking just to check if there was a category of spending in the capital forecast that was not inflated year over year for inflation, or adjusted year over year for inflation?

A. BARRIE: Yes, we can do that.

M. DEFAZIO: Thank you.

M. MILLAR: JT4.1.

UNDERTAKING JT4.1: Determine if a category of spending in the capital forecast exists that was not inflated year over year or adjusted year over year for inflation

M. DEFAZIO: I would like to ask a question about the tariff deferral account. We had -- there was some discussions with intervenors and Hydro Ottawa yesterday to understand what they were proposing to put in the account. I would just like to follow up with Hydro Ottawa. Is there any circumstances that Hydro Ottawa sees as unique to itself, compared to the other distributors in Ontario, that give it a higher level of risk to these tariffs or potential tariffs?

A. BARRIE: So I can't speak to the level of risk of other utilities. The risk that we, however, are encountering -- utilities aren't at this point in time, is the timing of our rebasing application, and so we -- we put in our application at the time when the US government started to use tariffs in a very different way than it has been, and it's been -- the policy on that has been fluctuating quite a bit. And as a result, at this point in time we believe it's prudent to ask for this request, as well as looking at previous decisions by the OEB in terms of flagging these types of risks. It appeared appropriate that we should be doing that as part of this rate application.

M. DEFAZIO: Thank you. Could we please go to Exhibit 1, Tab 3, Section 1 -- darn, I did it again. I am going to pull this up because I am -- can you scroll up on the page just a little bit, I'm wondering if -- ah, that's where it is. Thank you. So in this table, this shows the forecast MVA each year over the forecast period, and we note that 2028 and 2029 have the same amount. And there was an intervenor IR just clarifying that this meant no capacity was added to the system in these years, which Hydro Ottawa confirmed.

Now if we go to the updated Excel file for 1-Staff-1 IR. I am sorry, not that one, attachment 2-SEC-33A, which is an Excel file. So this shows the in-service additions year over year. If we go down to row 28, we see "Capacity Upgrades". And for 2029, there are in-service additions for capacity upgrades, but that's not reflected in the capacity upgrades in the reference in Exhibit 1. Could you explain the discrepancy or explain how that -- how that reconciles for me, please?

A. BARRIE: So all I could -- without having the details of that particular budget, all I can do is to assume it is related to capacity-related work. On the station that doesn't actually create additional capacity, so I would have to take an undertaking in order to confirm that, why that would be the case.

M. DEFAZIO: Could you, please?

A. BARRIE: Yes.

M. DEFAZIO: Thank you. Mike, can we --

M. MILLAR: Yes, that's JT4.2.

UNDERTAKING JT4.2: Explain discrepancy regarding in-service additions for capacity upgrades

M. DEFAZIO: Thank you.

Could we go to 1-Staff-16, please? In this IR, we asked about the capacity, how Hydro Ottawa's considered capacity added to the systems for purpose of the growth factor. And thank you for the response. It is when a substation is energized, feeders not be constructed, the capacity is there and available for use.

I would just like to understand, is Hydro Ottawa using the growth factor to account for extra costs of having these substations in use? Or is it a type of proxy for capacity in the system?

A. BARRIE: Ms. DeFazio, could you repeat your question, please?

M. DEFAZIO: Sure. So the growth factor is partially calculated by addition of stations’ capacity to the distribution system. Is the growth factor meant to capture the extra costs of those substations’ OM&A costs? Or is it a proxy for growth in the system? Or is substation capacity being used as a proxy for growth in the system?

A. BARRIE: Thank you. So the capacity is used as a proxy for the growth in the OM&A. So as I think Ms. Collier spoke to yesterday that, with increased growth in electrification in our system we are seeing additional requirements on capital. But we are also seeing in order to support those needs additional costs in head count increases to support, either directly or indirectly through things like support in staffing, right down to accounting functions and procurement functions and as well as, you know, safety and training. As a result, we have used that as our proxy in terms of showing the extra costs in OM&A.

We have also looked at the investments that we are needing to put into our assets through the management of additional data in order to assess our assets, our aging assets, in a better capability in order to be able to extend the life of those assets and the investments we need to make on the OM&A side to be able to do that.

M. DEFAZIO: Thank you.

Could we please go to interrogatory response to 9-SEC-87? And down to page 4, please. So I have a bunch of questions about this.

I am trying to understand what has been included in the system access symmetrical account versus the system access asymmetrical account. In different parts of the application, you referred to the symmetrical account as growth capital additions account.

So this table only has two lines showing what the baseline would be for the account. One is customer connections. So I would like to clarify that; that would include residential development like subdivisions? Would that be correct?

C. DUONG: Yes, that's correct.

M. DEFAZIO: And what about individual houses that pop up here or there that are sometimes referred to as infills? Would those be included?

C. DUONG: Should the infills require significant system expansion, they would be included. However, there are many infill requests that are not requiring a system upgrade and therefore they would not be included here.

M. DEFAZIO: Thank you. Now, commercial connections, would they be included in the customer connections as well?

C. DUONG: For a commercial, new commercial connections relating to a high-rise building, yes. That would include of course the public load of these high-rise buildings.

M. DEFAZIO: And I assume that would also include then multi-use buildings where it's commercial on a couple of levels and residential above. They would be included?

C. DUONG: Where they are primarily, yes, primarily residential use.

M. DEFAZIO: Thank you.

If we go, please, to the response to 1-Staff-1, the Excel file, sorry. And to tab 2AA, please. Thank you.

At the very top, the first? Yes, so system access. And we see customer connections is line 20. The amounts that you have in customer connections are much higher here than in the proposed symmetrical DVA.

Is it going to be simply based on residential use that separates out what goes in the DVA?

I am just thinking you have a new subdivision and they put a school in it; would the school be included? Because in other parts of the application, you use the terminology, “if commercial development supports the residential use, it would be included.”

I am just trying to see what commercial use would be included and what wouldn't.

C. DUONG: Yes. So in your example, where there is a new school in a new subdivision, that would not be included in this count for the symmetric account.

M. DEFAZIO: Okay, thank you. And if we go back to the exhibit, there's - you were on the right page, sorry. No, sorry, it wasn't the exhibit. Sorry, 9-SEC-87. There we go. Yeah.

Plant relocations. And, again, plant relocations here is much different than plant relocations in 2AA. It's much smaller. What plant relocations? Like, how would you determine what goes into the symmetrical account versus the asymmetrical account?

C. DUONG: The line here for plant relocations, just to clarify, this portion of the SA account, we have had this account since the 2021 to 2025, or we do have this account from the 2021 to 2025 application, as well. So there are no proposed changes to what we are including here from the 2026 to 2030 period.

Having said that, all plant relocation requests are included in this, these balances.

M. DEFAZIO: Could we go to 2AA, please, back to that Excel file? If we look at plant relocations in 2AA, we have got $6 million, $7 million in the forecast period. If we go back to the IR, it's much lower than that.

C. DUONG: Hi, Ms. DeFazio. I just want to clarify that the values in Appendix 2AA are expenditures and the values that we see here are capital additions. So there would be a timing difference between the two.

M. DEFAZIO: Okay. And would there be a difference also, gross and net?

C. DUONG: Subject to check, yes.

M. DEFAZIO: Okay, okay. And one more question about this. When I look at the description in Exhibit 1, you don't need to pull it up, for the symmetrical account, it's to record over/under spending in system access investments related by third party plant relocations, commercial and residential expansions, and systems service investments related to capacity upgrades to enable housing development. And there is no line item in this table for the variance account baseline for capacity upgrades to enable housing development.

C. DUONG: Could you provide the reference in Staff-1 --

M. DEFAZIO: Sure. It is Exhibit 1, Tab 3, Schedule 1, page 10. And if you scroll down just a little bit it will say symmetrical, it's on the screen now, on the right-hand column is the '26 to 2030 framework.

A. BARRIE: Hi, Ms. DeFazio. So, what was put in this chart was really to try to capture the difference between the current symmetrical account versus the addition, so I think it's probably more in terms of how we laid that out. It had intended to be capturing the third party relocation as before.

M. DEFAZIO: Okay, thank you. And that's all I have, thank you very much.

M. MILLAR: Thank you, Ms. DeFazio. Mr. Kumar, are you next?

EXAMINATION BY G. KUMAR

G. KUMAR: Yes, that's right. Good morning, can you hear me?

M. MILLAR: We can.

G. KUMAR: Okay. Good morning, Panel. So, I am going to ask a couple questions about benchmarking. Could you please navigate to interrogatory response SEC-20, please? Thank you. If you wouldn't mind just scrolling down to the next page, there's a couple tables. Right, perfect. I apologize, just give me one moment. I just want to make sure I am on the same page. Page 4 and 5 of 10, please. Right. So, you present here -- Hydro Ottawa presents here a step-by-step recalculation of the forecasted annual cost performance results, essentially incorporating for each of these steps the historical, circuit kilometres, CDM and other revenues and we were trying to replicate this. Could Hydro Ottawa please explicitly identify what changes were made in each of the steps? That might be site location or if you have provided this elsewhere in the application, the original and adjusted values so that the OEB may better understand your analysis and results here? I would like to be able to replicate Step 1 and 2. So, what changes did you make from the PEG model with no updates to Step 1, 2 and 3?.

M. FEE: Yes. Hi, Mr. Kumar. So, for Step 1 we updated the circuit kilometres of line back to 2002. And then, if we go -- do you want me to walk by it step by step or are you asking us to --

G. KUMAR: If you wouldn't mind, yeah. Just very briefly, that would be helpful. Thank you.

M. FEE: Sure, yes. So, Step 1 was updated for the historical circuit kilometres of line, as is detailed in schedule 1-3-3A. And then, if we scroll down a little bit to the end, Step 2 covers both pages here. So Step 2 is where we updated for the difference in CDM. So here, this is where the kilowatt hours and kilowatt have been updated as well as the capacity proxy in the PEG model.

G. KUMAR: Okay. When you say for, you know, updated the historical kilometres back to 2002, we usually -- the PEG model works by calculating the average, as you may be aware. So, did you update each of the years back to 2002 and then use that average to produce the table in Step 1?.

M. FEE: Yes.

G. KUMAR: Thank you. Okay. That is helpful thank you very much.

M. MILLAR: Sorry, that's an undertaking?

M. FEE: I don't believe so.

M. MILLAR: Okay, my mistake. I am sorry, I misheard. That's fine.

G. KUMAR: Okay. Could we navigate to, could you please pull up --

M. FEE: Yeah, sorry. I will just note there is still one more step that we didn't get through.

G. KUMAR: Yes, okay. The last one?

M. FEE: Yes, if we scroll down. The Step 3 that was updated for other revenue was where we added in the other revenue, and so subtracted it off our costs.

G. KUMAR: Thank you for that clarification. Okay. The next question, could you navigate, please, to the Excel file 1-3-3G. So I think that's Exhibit 1. Thank you. And on the benchmarking calculations tab, so third tab, could you scroll to row 128 first? It says number of customers across row 128. Could you please explain or clarify why the number of customers increases from column AQ, so if you scroll all the way to are the right, column AQ, which is Hydro Ottawa, increases -- it changes from 358,901 -- yeah -- to the value that's in -- put on the left there in column G to 364,334.

M. FEE: Yes, Lianne, can you scroll back over to AQ, column AQ? That's something that I would have to take away and look at, why there is that discrepancy.

G. KUMAR: Okay, thank you. So --

M. MILLAR: Okay, yeah, I think that one is an undertaking.

M. FEE: Yes.

M. MILLAR: Which would be JT4.3.

UNDERTAKING JT4.3: Explain or clarify why the number of customers increases from 358,901 to 364,334

G. KUMAR: Okay, thank you. On the same sheet, if we could go to Row 99. Again, it's columns AQ and G. Could Hydro Ottawa please explain or confirm the reason for the increase in the variable distribution kilometres? So it's row -- we can scroll all the way to the left, just so it's clear.

M. FEE: Yes, so in this case the 2023 value that's in column AQ is the unadjusted historical circuit kilometres of line that were reported at the time. And then in column G it's the adjusted, so as mentioned, as we talked about a few moments ago, the adjusted amounts for the secondary circuit kilometres of line. So essentially column G includes secondary, and column AQ does not include secondary.

G. KUMAR: Thank you. That's good. Yeah, that's what I thought it was, thank you for confirming. Okay, so I will ask a similar question for the annual peak demand, which is row 130. So the annual peak demand here is 1,540,267. And I wanted to confirm that this is different -- we will have to navigate to another -- to another file here.

Could you please also open up interrogatory response ATT, 1-SEC-20A? It's also the Excel file. Right, and if you go to the benchmarking calculations. Thank you. Row 130 again. Yeah, So the annual peak demand here is a different value, 1,438,526. And I am just looking for confirmation that this is really a difference accounting for CDM, or clarify if it's some other reason.

M. FEE: So I believe -- sorry, Lianne, can you go to the actual interrogatory, the PDF of 1-SEC-20? And can you go up to the question. Yes, okay. Yes, you are correct. So for the Excel file here, for 1-SEC-20A, it's the unadjusted value versus the other Excel file we were looking at in 1-3-3G is the adjusted value for CDM.

G. KUMAR: So the difference between that would be the CDM value; is that correct?

M. FEE: Yes, correct.

G. KUMAR: Okay. All right, thank you. I have one other question that could -- could we navigate to 1-Staff-11, page 3, please? So you mention here that, you know, the CDM, this paragraph right in the middle of the page there:

“The CDM may reduce load, but the physical

infrastructure and service obligations do not

scale down proportionately. As a result, the

PEG model does not fully capture the cost

implications all the way to impact.”

So I would just like to understand a bit more. So with respect to total cost benchmarking, could Hydro Ottawa clarify the view -- the annual peak demand, or the energy supplied, as being a more significant factor in determining the total cost? So in other words, I am trying to ascertain with respect to, you know, CDM infrastructure being installed, how does Hydro Ottawa see the total cost change? Is it based on a reduction to annual peak demand, or the energy supplied as being the more significant factor for total cost?

A. BARRIE: So what Hydro Ottawa is doing as part of the adjustments related to CDM, is the fact that CDM is a provincial program that is targeting to reduce the peaks on a provincial system, and as a result, it doesn't go down to the distribution level and try to target particular savings for the distributors in and of itself. And as a result, what we have seen and what you can see through our historical PEG model is our peak has not increased since 2010, that we have had significant growth in our service territory, as you can see even by the increase in the number of cost unit, and these tend to be in greenfield areas.

And so the CDM that has occurred in -- in other areas of our distribution system has not offset the cost of needing to -- in terms of maintenance and other activities -- in order to support new customers in growing areas of our distribution system has not impacted that. However, the way that the PEG model works is as our peak has not grown, it is not growing any costs related to that. So we feel that it unfortunately -- it does not provide the expected growth [indiscernible] --

--- Reporter interjection re audio quality

M. DEFAZIO: It was here as well. Can you repeat it, April?

G. KUMAR: Please.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

C. DUONG: She is going to change her microphone, thank you.

J. MYERS: Is there a point at which you want her to pick up on what she was saying? Perhaps when she's back, the reporter can read back the last part that was clear, so Ms. Barrie can understand what she needs to repeat.

THE REPORTER: Oh, I thought I saw Ms. Barrie. Maybe not.

C. DUONG: So we're still working on her mic.

THE REPORTER: Okay, thanks.

A. BARRIE: Can you hear me now?

THE REPORTER: Yes.

J. MYERS: Ms. Barrie, are you ready to proceed?

A. BARRIE: Yes, I'm ready to proceed. If you could, though, let me know where I trailed?

--- Reporter readback provided

A. BARRIE: Okay, so we would -- so as a --

So as a result, we don't feel that the PEG model adjusts for the expected growth that we would anticipate for new assets that are reporting to our system as a result of CDM in other areas where we are not seeing that growth offsetting that peak load. And, as a result, we are not getting the future predicted costs related to the new assets that we need to invest in order to support customers in our service territory.

G. KUMAR: Thank you for clarifying. Just give me one moment here.

A point of clarification: Can we move to 1-Staff-14, please, page 2 of 4? Thank you. Hydro Ottawa has elected to provide an example here, with Alectra, citing some secondary kilometres in the table there.

I just want to confirm that Hydro Ottawa recognizes for the 2018 that the cost performance of negative 0.68 per cent for 2018, while there were no secondary kilometres reported, I just want to make sure that we interpret that the same way.

M. FEE: Sorry, I am not sure I understand the question. So you're referring to Alectra's results?

G. KUMAR: Right. The table provided here, under 2018. There are no secondary kilometres reported in 2018.

M. FEE: Yes.

G. KUMAR: However, the cost performance is negative 0.68 per cent. I just wanted to clarify that it represents an improvement in 2018 that does not include secondary kilometres? Or is Hydro Ottawa suggesting that there is something else going on there?

M. FEE: Sorry, I am not sure; I still am not sure that I understand what you are asking.

So, in 2018, Alectra did not report secondary kilometres. But their efficiency score was lower is what you are looking for me to confirm?

G. KUMAR: Correct, yeah -- just confirm that that’s correct. Okay.

M. FEE: Yes, I confirm that. But I also note that that was when Alectra amalgamated then, the number of other utilities. So that I believe there is a number of changes that occurred at that time.

G. KUMAR: I appreciate that, thank you.

I have no other questions, thank you. Appreciate it, panel.

M. FEE: Thank you.

M. MILLAR: Thank you, Mr. Kumar. I believe Ms. Cheng, are you up next?

S. CHENG: I am just trying to get my video working. Can you hear me in the meantime?

M. MILLAR: We can both hear and see you now.

EXAMINATION BY S. CHENG

S. CHENG: Okay, great, thanks.

I just have two questions on LRAM and a follow-up from Tuesday, so I shouldn't take too long. So I will begin with the LRAM questions.

So according to the updated LRAM claim amount per the OEB LRAM work form in interrogatory response, attachment 1-Staff-1(r), if you could pull that up, that would be great.

There is an LRAM claim amount of $634,070. And that is made up of a principal balance of $584,670 and interest of $49,399.

And then I would also need you to bring up the updated continuity schedule for the interrogatory response attachment to 1-Staff-1C. We need to go to the continuity schedule. Under row 91, I believe, is the LRAM amount. And it should read a credit of $682,163.

So looking at the two values between the two attachments that we just pulled up, can you please confirm the LRAM amount that Hydro Ottawa is requesting for disposition?

A. BARRIE: Lianne, would it be possible to make the spreadsheet a little bit smaller and go to the left a little bit?

C. DUONG: Are you asking about the interest amount or the total claim?

S. CHENG: Basically, I just wanted to confirm the LRAM amount that you are requesting for disposition, because there is a discrepancy between what you see in the LRAM work form versus the continuity schedule.

So if you can also help me reconcile as to why there is that difference between those two reference documents, that would be great.

C. DUONG: Lianne, could we bring up the 1-Staff-1 response? I believe we have a section on the amounts for disposition updates.

And I believe yesterday, we also took an undertaking to provide more detailed information for our updated disposition amounts. So could we respond to your question now through that undertaking that's already taken yesterday?

S. CHENG: Sure.

C. DUONG: Okay, thank you.

S. CHENG: And just to add to that, if there is a discrepancy between the two that -- or there needs to be an update, can we just make sure that the schedules are updated to ensure that the claim amount is matching between the two references?

C. DUONG: Yes.

S. CHENG: Thanks.

I just have one other question about LRAM. So in Hydro Ottawa's response to IR 9-Staff-218, Hydro Ottawa notes that:

“LRAM amounts related to 2024 and 2025 still

need to be recorded and disposed of through the

LRAM variance account in a future application.

Hydro Ottawa plans on calculating LRAM for these years once IESO releases its reports for 2024 and 2025.”

So can you please confirm if Hydro Ottawa is choosing to delay final disposition -- sorry, to delay final LRAM disposition, because it currently has two local initiatives programs? I believe they are the residential CoolSaver and the BizEnergySaver and market.

And so Hydro Ottawa would like to update LRAM balance to reflect the 2024 and 2025 program-year results that are currently being evaluated by the IESO?

A. BARRIE: No, that's not actually why Hydro Ottawa is waiting to defer. So we don't have any information yet from the IESO related to their well, I don't think, maybe we have received it by now but, certainly at the time of, no.

So we don't have any information, sorry, for the 2024 report. And the 2025 report from the IESO is not going to come out, likely until the fall of next year. So we don't have any information on which to base the LRAM claim on, at this point in time.

S. CHENG: Okay. Are there any other reasons as to why you might be delaying final disposition, instead of disposing the LRAM balance on a prospective basis?

A. BARRIE: Other than not having the IESO report yet?

S. CHENG: Yes.

A. BARRIE: No. So the LRAM claims are supported by the IESO information that is provided as part of Hydro Ottawa's last rate application. Due to the timing of the ending of the CDM programs, this was the agreed mechanism on which to consider future CDM activity within Hydro Ottawa's service territory. And we would rely on reporting of the IESO in order to do that.

S. CHENG: Thank you. And lastly, I want to bring up a question that was asked by my colleague on Tuesday for panel 1 but it was redirected to Panel 3. So, can we please bring up 2-SEC-53, part (a)? So on Tuesday panel 1 confirmed that the 10 million funding amount request -- the 10 million funding request mentioned in this response was associated with customer incentives for the non-wires customers solutions program. And in 2-SEC-53 Hydro Ottawa also mentions incentives for third parties and any margin on payments in reference to the $10 million budget for the non-wires customers solutions programs. So could you please clarify whether the $10 million overall or the 2 million annual budget for the non-wires customers solutions program is inclusive of any incentive payments to Hydro Ottawa, for example the margin of payment incentive for the use of third party DERs as non-wires solutions?

A. BARRIE: Yes, the intended -- the $2 million is intended to include any sharing mechanism through the program of non-wires solutions.

S. CHENG: Okay. So it would include incentives for third parties on any margin on payments? Okay.

A. BARRIE: That is correct.

S. CHENG: Okay. So, could you please provide, by way of undertaking, the required details specified in the OEB's filing guidelines for incentives for electricity distributors to use third party DERs as non-wires alternatives when proposing a margin on payment incentive mechanism? And more specifically, that would include things like the value of the incentive, the rationale for its inclusion, and the forecast of payments for the proposed incentive term.

A. BARRIE: So, those updated guidelines came out after Hydro Ottawa proposed its application and we haven't had the opportunity to go back and look at that. And we have outlined what we can -- what we have proposed as part of our non-wires solutions and as a result of the timing of a number of activities, including the IESO's Stream 2, we have looked at proposing a way of managing non-wires solutions through the use of a variance account in order to true up any of those types of costs in the future. However, specifically for the margins on payments, that guidance came out after Hydro Ottawa submitted its applications and we have not been able to go back and do that work.

S. CHENG: Okay. That's all the questions I have. Thank you, Panel.

M. MILLAR: Thank you very much, Ms. Cheng. Ms. Wang, are you next?

H. WANG: Yes, I am. Can everyone hear me right?

M. MILLAR: Yes.

EXAMINATION BY H. WANG

H. WANG: Thank you, Mr. Millar. Good morning, Panel 3. I would like to start with a DVA continuity schedule attached to 1-Staff-1, please. Thank you. Now could we please go to Tab 2A. In cells BE35. So, if you scroll to the left a little bit and then look for column BE. Thank you. So, BE35 and BJ35, there are no amounts reported for the OEB approved disposition during 2024 for account 1595, sub account 2020. However, you don't have to pull it up, in Hydro Ottawa 2024 CIR update proceeding, EB number 2023-0032, in the decision rate order issued on December 14th, 2023, on page 17 it states that the OEB approves the disposition of account 1595, sub account 2020 of a credit balance of $148,521 and this amount includes interest of a credit amount of $52,864. Could you please provide an updated DVA continuity schedule, Tab 2A that reflects the OEB approved disposition of account 1595, sub account 2020 by way of undertaking?

C. DUONG: Hi, Lianne. Could you go to the right and just keep going? There is a place with the check boxes. Sorry, just to clarify some information sheet. Thank you. Hi. Thanks, Ms. Wang. Certainly, subject to check, we will make any corrections to the DVA account and schedule here as required.

H. WANG: Thank you, I appreciate that.

M. MILLAR: I will mark that, Ms. Wang, as JT4.4.

UNDERTAKING JT4.4: Provide updated DVA continuity schedule, Tab 2A, that reflects the OEB approved disposition of account 1595, sub account 2020

H. WANG: Thank you. Now, if we go back to Tab 2A again, please. We will look at cell BT26. This is for account 1580, RSVA wholesale market service charge. So, in this cell, BT26, there is a total claimed credit balance of 4.28 million reported for this account. You don't need to pull it up. The approved total claim for this account is a credit balance of 8.68 million from Hydro Ottawa's 2024 CAR update application, EB number 2024-0035. Could you please explain the substantial increase in the proposed disposition balance from a credit of 8.68 million to a credit of 4.28 million in a year in the current application?

C. DUONG: Hi, Ms. Wang. Certainly, subject to check, but I believe the significant change is due to how much was charged to Hydro Ottawa during the time period which then we would be charging to our customers which is also regulated amount and I believe the difference relates to us being charged significantly more.

H. WANG: Thank you. Is it possible for you to undertake to provide a detailed explanation, including the key drivers for the decrease?

C. DUONG: Yes. Subject to check, but I believe we already provided an IR response to that explanation. I will just take a moment to find that.

H. WANG: Right. Yeah, I don't think the group 1 DVAs were provided in the initial application evidence. It was provided as part of response to 1-Staff-1. So in the same undertaking, could you please provide the breakdown of the variance into WMS revenue collected from the customers and the WMS charged by the IESO in 2024 and tie this difference to the variance amount booked in account 1580, wholesale market service charge?

C. DUONG: Yes. I believe you are referring to the undertaking we have agreed to already which we will provide the details. And, yes, we will include that in that undertaking.

H. WANG: Thank you. Thank you. And the last part of this undertaking is that -- well, maybe you can answer me now. Could you please confirm that the 2024 principal transactions reported in the schedule, which is a credit amount of 4.08 million, do not include the current period and the prior period adjustments?

J. MYERS: I am sorry, I just want to clarify. It sounds like there is a bit of confusion on whether this is a new undertaking or an existing undertaking.

H. WANG: My last question?

J. MYERS: No, the previous discussion just in the last few moments.

H. WANG: Oh, the -- yeah, the previous --

J. MYERS: Ms. Duong indicated that she would provide that as part of an existing undertaking, but then you seemed to suggest it was a new undertaking. Ms. Duong, what's your understanding at this stage?

H. WANG: Yeah, so this undertaking is related to account 1580 wholesale market service charge. So I think the previous undertaking that Ms. Duong referred to was an explanation for the substantial increase in this account. And then my second question related to the breakdown variance, it should be included in the same undertaking, but we haven't got assigned with an undertaking number yet.

J. MYERS: And that's what I wanted to make sure of. If there have been undertakings, then they need to be assigned numbers. If there is something that is part of a previous undertaking that has already been given a number, I want to make sure that it's clear.

H. WANG: Right, no, we haven't got assigned a number yet.

M. MILLAR: Okay, so do we need a new undertaking number?

H. WANG: Yes, please, yeah.

M. MILLAR: Okay, so that will be JT4.5. And, Ms. Wang, could you just repeat what JT4.5 is for?

H. WANG: Right.

A. BARRIE: So just to be clear for Mr. Myers, I believe we had taken the undertaking so that we would ask -- answer all the deferral-related variance account questions in yesterday's undertaking, as a result we don't need a new undertaking number. Or are you -- just because the LRAM question we were going to add with yesterday's deferral, and that did not get a separate undertaking, so just so we are --

J. MYERS: Yes, that was clear to me. And so is this the continued questioning along these lines, is your understanding, Ms. Barrie, that you will also respond to these as part of that same undertaking?

A. BARRIE: That is correct.

J. MYERS: Okay, so we do not need a new undertaking number here.

M. MILLAR: Okay, so I am not making JT4.5 at this moment?

J. MYERS: That seems to be our understanding, that's right.

M. MILLAR: Ms. Wang, does that -- I think the important thing is the questions get answered as part of an undertaking.

J. MYERS: Yes.

M. MILLAR: But I want to make sure that nothing has been missed here. So, Ms. Wang, is there anything we need to add to a new undertaking at this point? I appreciate you still have more questions, and there could be further, but are we good up to this point?

H. WANG: Yes, I think we are good.

M. MILLAR: Okay, great.

J. MYERS: Thanks for clarifying.

H. WANG: Thank you. So, sorry, back to Ms. Duong. Could you please confirm that the 2024 principal transactions, with a credit amount of 4.08 million, do not include current period and prior period adjustments?

C. DUONG: The 4.3 million relates to the clearance of balances up to 2024, so should there be any adjustments subsequent to that, relating to that period, we would include that in this balance.

H. WANG: Thank you. And the next account I would like to look at on this continuity schedule is account 1586 RSVA retail transmission connection charge. In cell BT30, it shows a total claim credit balance of 4.38 million. Similarly, it's a similar question to my last question, is that the approved total claim for this account is a debit balance of 128,000 from last year's application, the EB number is EB-2024-0035.

Could you please explain the substantial decrease in the proposed disposition balance in the current application, that is a decrease from a debit of 128,000 to a credit of 4.38 million, and provide the key drivers for this decrease?

C. DUONG: Hi. Certainly subject to check. The explanation will be similar to the previous question, it's how much we could -- can charge our customers versus how much Hydro Ottawa has been charged these charges from our suppliers, IESO and HONI.

H. WANG: Thank you. If you could please undertake to provide the detailed explanation on that, I will appreciate that.

And then within the same undertaking, could you also please confirm that the 2024 principal transactions with a credit amount of 4.16 million do not include the current period and prior period adjustments?

C. DUONG: Yes, we can. And just to clarify, it will be relating to the balance that's in column BT?

H. WANG: The principal adjustment -- the principal transaction is not related the balance in BT, it will be in a different column. So if you could scroll to the left a little bit.

C. DUONG: Just to clarify my statement, if we are --

H. WANG: Oh.

C. DUONG: Sorry, if we are claiming for clearance of balances up to 2024, should there be adjustments in the current year 2025 relating to '24, we will be including that in the column BT.

H. WANG: Right, okay, thank you. And my next question is related --

M. MILLAR: Sorry, Ms. Wang, I think we need to mark this. There is a new undertaking, as I understand it.

C. DUONG: No.

H. WANG: This could be -- no.

C. DUONG: No, we will be adding it to the undertaking we took yesterday for the clearance of group 1 and 2.

M. MILLAR: Okay, thank you.

H. WANG: Thank you. And my next question is related to the CCA schedules as attached to 9-Staff-214, part B. And there are two CCA Excel schedules attached to this response to 9-Staff-214. So if we could go to Tab CCA, Tab 2026 ACC, so the first tab. And if we could all the way to the bottom. The total UCC at the beginning of test year 2026, and then scroll to the left of it, you will see that the amount is 1.016 billion. You probably want to scroll all the way to the left, sorry. Yes, so that's the total UCC reported in this schedule at the beginning of test year 2026, which is 1.016 billion. You don't have to pull it up, but this amount is the same as reported in the other attached CCA schedule file to this response, file B. However, this amount is different than what's reported in the 2026 to 2030 PILs work form attached to 1-Staff-1.

If we could please go to the 2026 to 2030 PILs work form, and could we please go to tab T8, Schedule A, CCA for 2026? Thank you. And the beginning UCC reported in this schedule, in cell E43, is 1.012 billion. This is different from the 1.016 billion reported in the other CCA schedule we just looked at. Could you please explain why the beginning UCC for 2026 does not reconcile between these two schedules?

N. TEJWANI: Hi Ms. Wang, we are just going to confer as a panel.

H. WANG: Thank you.

A. BARRIE: So as part of Staff 9 Staff, that was a question related to the original application. As part of 1-Staff-1, we updated the 2025 bridge year related to the ADMS project, which would adjust the opening balance in 2026 as seen on this schedule.

H. WANG: Thank you. That would make sense.

Could you please undertake to file updated CCA schedules A and B attached to IRRS 9-Staff-214, to reflect the updated UCC amount?

A. BARRIE: Sorry, I will just look at what 214 was originally providing.

So if you could just be clear on which part of 214 you would like us to update? Like, what part number?

H. WANG: Only in part (a). So that's the – yes.

A. BARRIE: Only - sorry, part (a)?

H. WANG: Yeah.

A. BARRIE: Part A, and then (i), or (ii)? Or just, like, part (a) in total? Or?

H. WANG: Sorry, part (b), my apologies. Is part (b) where Hydro Ottawa provided the detailed CCA schedules?

A. BARRIE: Okay. Yes, we can do that.

H. WANG: Thank you.

M. MILLAR: That is JT4.5.

UNDERTAKING JT4.5: File updated CCA schedules A and B attached to IRRS 9-Staff-214 to reflect updated UCC amount

H. WANG: Thank you. Can we please go to 9-Staff-214? Thank you. Can we please go down to page 4?

In the second bullet point, under part (d), Hydro Ottawa stated that it is:

“-- not aware of any precedent case in which a

similar smoothing mechanism where the AIP impact is being addressed outside of the PILs has been proposed.”

Did I get that right?

A. BARRIE: Sorry, which part? Sorry, I lost which part you were referring to.

H. WANG: It's the second bullet point in the middle of the page right here:

“Hydro Ottawa is not aware of any precedent case-- ”

A. BARRIE: Sorry, let me first --

H. WANG: It is line 4.

A. BARRIE: Yeah. So it is just that the answer doesn't reflect the question. So let me just look at the question, too.

Yes, that is the case; I confirm.

H. WANG: Thank you. OEB Staff notes that the OEB has accepted other CCA smoothing mechanisms in previous proceedings, for example Algoma Power, 2025 cost of service application -- the EB No. is EB-2024-0007 -- and the PUC Distribution Inc., 2023 cost of service application. The EB number is EB-2022-0058.

Is it possible for you to undertake to provide an updated 2026 to 2030 PILs work forms, Chapter 2 appendices and revenue requirement work forms reflecting the OEB-approved CCA smoothing mechanism as adopted in those previous proceedings that I just referenced?

A. BARRIE: Thank you for the detail of those two other cases; we weren't aware of those. So I can undertake to review them and then consider whether or not we do that, as I haven't actually looked at that detail and I am not sure - I will have to take a look and see if I understand what they have done there, and reflect those changes.

H. WANG: Thank you. That's reasonable. Could you also --

M. MILLAR: So just to -- go ahead, Ms. Wang.

H. WANG: Yeah. So in the same undertaking, could you also please compare the proposed PILs contribution methodology by Hydro Ottawa with the CCA smoothing mechanism previously approved by the OEB in those two referenced proceedings, and explain the impact on rate stability, intergenerational equity and the proposed 2026 to 2030 revenue requirement?

A. BARRIE: So assuming I can -- similarly, that I can read through those and understand what those proposals were and understand the differences between ours and theirs then, yes, I can do that.

H. WANG: Thank you, very much.

M. MILLAR: The undertaking is JT4.6.

UNDERTAKING JT4.6: Compare proposed PILs contribution methodology by Hydro Ottawa with CCA smoothing mechanism previously approved by OEB in two referenced proceedings and explain impact on rate stability, intergenerational equity and proposed 2026 to 2030 revenue requirement

M. MILLAR: Ms. Wang, we are getting close-ish to our morning break. So if there is a natural spot for you to pause in the next couple of minutes, that would be great.

H. WANG: Right. My next question is very short, so I think we can break after my next question.

So my next questions relate to 1508 subaccount, connection cost recovery account, CCRA. If we could please go to 9-Staff-205, part (e), on page 6? Thank you. Hydro Ottawa stated that:

“The draft accounting order for the CCRA has

been updated accordingly, in line 3.”

It doesn't appear that the updated draft accounting order is attached to this response. Could you please confirm?

C. DUONG: So the draft accounting order previously provided excluded the additional lines here in this table, and so we have provided just a table adjustment change. So we have now the additional subcategories for this account.

Otherwise, everything else in the accounting order relating to this is the same. We could put them all in one page, if you would like.

H. WANG: Yeah, I would appreciate that, if you could please file a copy of the updated drafting accounting order?

C. DUONG: Okay.

H. WANG: Thank you.

M. MILLAR: That is JT4.7.

UNDERTAKING JT4.7: File a copy of the updated drafting accounting order

M. MILLAR: And, Ms. Wang, is now a good time for a break?

H. WANG: Absolutely.

M. MILLAR: Okay. So we will break for 15 minutes, until 11:15. I think, just to give people a heads-up, Mr. Rubenstein has contacted me and I think he has a quick follow-up question. And just to assist him in his timing today, we might start with that when we get back. But I think this will only take a few minutes, and then we will be back to Ms. Wang. So we will see everyone at 11:15.

--- Recess taken at 10:59 a.m.

--- On resuming at 11:16 a.m.

 M. MILLAR: Jonathan, why don't we start with your matter?

J. MYERS: Sure, thank you. Yes. Ms. Duong has a correction to something she said earlier.

C. DUONG: Hello. After reviewing the transcript from yesterday's conversation with Mr. Brophy, I believe he was referring to residential solar roof panels and whether we've included those savings in our EDSM calculation, and I believe he was referring specifically to the HRSP program. That program is provided via the IESO provincial initiatives and if that's what he is referring to then, yes, we do have residential solar savings in our EDSM calculation. Thank you.

M. MILLAR: Okay, thank you. As I mentioned, I was going to turn it over to Mr. Rubenstein anyways, who I think had a follow-up question on a matter. So could I turn it to you Mark?

EXAMINATION BY M. RUBENSTEIN

M. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you, Panel. I had accidently forgot to ask a question on panel 2. And in my attempt to try to answer the question myself by trying to find some data, I have encountered a separate issue I would like to raise with this panel and just ask for clarification. So, let me just start with that component.

When I look at the benchmarking information which was provided in the underlying benchmarking data that you provided in 1-SEC-21B, which was the tables to the benchmarking information provided in 1-3-3 which, as I understand, is pulling data and is based on data from the RRRs. And when I look at Hydro Ottawa's RRR data for OM&A and capital expenditures, they don't seem to match the numbers that you're including in your application for the historic OM&A and capital expenditures, and I am not entirely clear why that is. Can you help me?

M. FEE: Hi, Mr. Rubenstein. Yes, so, sorry. What exact references are you referring to; can we potentially pull it up?

M. RUBENSTEIN: Sure, yeah, sure. So if we can pull up 1-SEC-21B, this is an Excel file. And if maybe we can go to the income statement tab. And find Hydro Ottawa. And if we scroll across to column Q. So, in column Q, this is the OM&A numbers that -- it calculates the OM&A numbers which are derived from the income statements which, as I understand, all this is from the RRR data that has been pulled. If you take a look for years, let's say, '21, '22, '23 those do not match those numbers which, for example, you provided in your OM&A tables for those years. They are off by a million or two dollars and I am just not clear, there may be a classification difference or why they are not matching.

And, similarly, if you look at the capital, it's the tab right before the income statement tab, and if you look at Hydro Ottawa's capital, which I believe is gross CAPEX in the RRRs that it's pulling from, they again don't match the CAPEX tables for '21, '22 '23. I didn't look at '29, 2020. And I am just not sure why that is the case, there may -- and so, I was wondering if you could undertake the reconcile that information?

M. FEE: And when you are referring to the tables, you are talking about the tables in appendices 2 and 4?

M. RUBENSTEIN: Yes, sorry. I am talking about the general appendices for OM&A and the evidence. Throughout the evidence you have --

M. FEE: The chapter 2 appendices?

M. RUBENSTEIN: Yes.

M. FEE: Okay. So, yes, I believe it's a matter of certain accounts are included in the income statement and not included in some of the Chapter 2 appendices, specifically for OM&A. But we can undertake to explain the exact differences of which accounts are included here versus there.

And then in terms of the capital, you are correct that this was all taken from the RRRs, so it's capital additions here in this. For the benchmarking it was used from the RRRs for capital additions.

M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Even though it's listed as CAPEX, those are at an additions level?

M. FEE: Sorry, where is it listed as CAPEX?

M. RUBENSTEIN: If you go to the tab right before, you click on that, it talks about sum of total CAPEX, sum of total CAPEX. Maybe you can just check that as well?

M. FEE: Yes, we can check that. But it is taken from 2 -- or, the capital additions section of the RRRs.

M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Well, just make sure that those reconcile to your additions table as well.

M. FEE: Yes. Yes, we can explain how they reconcile, so we will take that as an undertaking.

M. RUBENSTEIN: And then in my investigation of trying to figure out why these numbers don't match, I notice that the -- and this is not from this document, this is from the actual RRR open data numbers from the Board?

J. MYERS: Sorry, should we give an undertaking number to the last one?

M. RUBENSTEIN: Maybe there is just one other element that I am going to add to this.

J. MYERS: I see.

M. RUBENSTEIN: The specific US of A accounts, the trial balances those accounts, for at least I looked in 2022 and 2023 didn't match the numbers that you provided in 4-VECC-35A where you are providing -- where VECC asked you to provide the 2-JCE OM&A table on a US of A basis. And the totals are close but somehow, like, 80 percent of the accounts are different and I don't know is that -- what -- I am not looking for you to redo anything, I am just trying to understand what's happening, why is this the case? Is there some sort of -- you have changed things over time or what's occurring?

M. FEE: Yeah, I believe my colleague, Ms. Duong, may have a clarification here? No. Okay. So, yes, again we'd have to look at this. I am sure, I am sure the discrepancy is related to, is related to what accounts are included in different numbers. So, yes, we can undertake to do that. So, and I don't believe we got an undertaking number for the previous --

M. RUBENSTEIN: No. Well, I thought we would just wrap those --

M. FEE: Do it all in one? Okay.

M. MILLAR: So, we can assign that undertaking JT4.8, now. But I am going to need someone to summarize that because there was a lot there.

M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah, that's fine I can do that. I am seeking to understand reconciling the OM&A and capital numbers provided in the evidence with those -- in the appendices to the evidence, the main evidence, with those included in 1-SEC-21, attachment B, which is the RRR data. And then separately, understanding why the RRR data trial balances, which I think are -- I don't know if they are included on the record or just in -- on the OEB's website, differ from the information provided in VECC-35 for the OM&A.

M. MILLAR: Okay. Again, that's JT4.8. Was that all Mr. Rubenstein?

UNDERTAKING JT4.8: Provide a reconciliation of OM&A and capital numbers provided in the appendices to the main evidence with those in 1- SEC-21, attachment B, RRR data and why RRR data trial balances differ from the information provided in VECC-35 for OM&A

M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, no. Now I have just the question I actually was trying to get to. Is Hydro Ottawa able to provide the 2020 actual OM&A broken down in the 2JA categories?

A. BARRIE: Sorry, we are just going to take a moment. So, again, you are asking if we can take what?

M. RUBENSTEIN: You can provide the 2020 OM&A actuals broken down into the 2JA categories that's operations, maintenance, general, et cetera.

A. BARRIE: Just a moment. Yes, we can undertake to do that.

M. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you very much.

M. MILLAR: That's JT4.9.

UNDERTAKING JT4.9: Provide 2020 OM&A actuals broken down into 2JA categories

M. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you very much.

M. MILLAR: Anything -- okay. Thank you, Mr. Rubenstein. I understand Mr. Brophy may be here. He had a -- I think a quick follow-up on the update that Hydro Ottawa just provided after the break. Are you there, Mr. Brophy?

M. BROPHY: Yes. Yes, I am. Can you hear me?

M. MILLAR: Yes.

EXAMINATION BY M. BROPHY

M. BROPHY: Hi. Okay, yes, thank you, just a quick question. Again, for the court reporter, Michael Brophy on behalf of CAFES Ottawa. So there was an update just provided by Hydro Ottawa on a discussion we had yesterday and -- indicating that residential solar and battery, I think they called it "HRS", is in the forecast.

So I am just wondering if you'd be able to provide the numbers per year? So it would be the number of units or homes. And then if you have peak demand and energy savings related to that, whatever you can provide would be terrific.

C. DUONG: Hello, Mr. Brophy. We can certainly provide the impact of that by kilowatt and kilowatt hours, but we would not be able to provide that in the number homes.

M. BROPHY: So what about units? The kilowatt and kilowatt hours would have been number of units times a per unit assumption, so why wouldn't you be able to provide units?

C. DUONG: When we calculate our proportion of the provincial savings, we look back at a historical percentage of savings across, so in our territory, across Ontario, and then we use that proportion to calculate the future savings in our territory. That information does not provide actual number of homes impacted by these programs.

M. BROPHY: Okay, so that would be great. I will take that undertaking. And then maybe on a best-efforts basis, if you're able to make an estimate on the units, then great. If you have a lot of trouble coming up with that, then I understand.

C. DUONG: Okay.

M. BROPHY: Thank you.

M. MILLAR: Okay, the undertaking is JT4.10.

UNDERTAKING JT4.10: Provide impact of residential solar and battery by kilowatt and kilowatt hours on best-efforts basis and estimate units if possible

M. BROPHY: Thank you very much.

M. MILLAR: Okay, Ms. Wang, I think we are back to you.

EXAMINATION BY H. WANG - RESUMED

H. WANG: Thank you. My next question is related to account 1508 sub account gains and loss on disposal of fixed asset variance account. Could we please go to 6-Staff-190, please, and please scroll down to page 2. There is a table here, table A. This table summarizes the amounts transferred out of account 4362 to account 1508 sub account gains and loss on disposal of fixed asset variance account in the row labelled as transfer out of 4362 to 1508; is that correct?

C. DUONG: That's correct.

H. WANG: Thank you. So in this table for bridge year 2024, a credit of 704,000 is reported as the amount transferred out of account 4362 to the 1508 sub account during this year. If we could please go to the DVA continuity schedule attached to 1-Staff-1, please. On Tab 2B. In cell BD64. Thank you. So in this cell, a credit amount of $203,344 is reported as the total transaction during 2024 in the same sub account. Could you please explain the difference?

C. DUONG: Yes. So if you look back at table A amount, that table is referring to amounts for bridge year numbers for 2024. What we are seeing here is this has been updated for actual amounts.

H. WANG: I see. Could you -- is it possible for you to undertake to provide a reconciliation of these two dollar amounts?

C. DUONG: In our -- in our previous undertaking we mentioned that we would be providing more detailed information on the disposition of these accounts. So should that suffice in itself without needing to do a reconciliation?

H. WANG: Okay, that sounds reasonable to me. Thank you. Moving on to my next question. This is related to sub account 1508 capital variance account. So in cell BD73. The 2024 transaction amount is a debit amount of $454,092 for the capital variance account. Could you please provide the supporting revenue requirement calculation in a working Excel file by way of undertaking?

C. DUONG: Hi, so I believe -- hopefully this request should be suffice by the previous undertaking, that we would be explaining for all dispositions for group 1 and group 2 we would be providing the detailed calculation.

H. WANG: Okay, but I do want to add another note. So similar revenue requirement calculation were provided in the original application for the years 2021 to 2023, in a few tables, I think Table 12 to 14 in Schedule 9-1-3, page 22, 24. What I am looking for here specifically, for this account, the revenue requirement calculation should be in a similar fashion but in the working Excel file. Do you think that's something that you could provide?

C. DUONG: Yes, ma'am, Ms. Wang. And just to be very clear and to clarify what we will be doing, and the undertaking is anything that we have previously calculated for balances up to '23, we will be doing the same detailed calculation for amounts up to '24.

H. WANG: Thank you.

M. MILLAR: So, I'm sorry, that's a new taking or that's incorporated in a previous one?

C. DUONG: That's incorporated in the previous one.

M. MILLAR: Okay, thank you.

H. WANG: And so could you please provide the fixed asset continuity schedules to support the depreciation amounts presented in the revenue requirement calculation that I mentioned earlier provided in Tables 12 to 14 of Exhibit 9, Tab 1, Schedule 3 for the years 2021 to 2024?

A. BARRIE: I apologize, we missed what account you were referring to.

H. WANG: This is still under account -- sub account 1508 capital variance account. So Hydro Ottawa provided revenue requirement calculation in Tables 12 to 14 for the year 2021 to 2023 in Schedule 9-1-3. What I am looking for is that -- just the fixed asset continuity schedule to support the depreciation amounts listed in the revenue requirement calculation tables, but I want to expand the years not only for 2021 to 2023, but also including 2024, since Hydro Ottawa reported 2024 balances as well in the updated deferral variance account continuity schedule.

C. DUONG: Yes, that's correct. And, yes, we will be providing that information and the additional information that we will be providing in the undertaking. The depreciation portion of the revenue requirement will tie to the updated Appendix 2BA that's already provided in Staff, 1-Staff-1.

H. WANG: Thank you. So that will be a new undertaking, just specifically for this part. Right?

C. DUONG: So just to clarify, in Staff-1-Staff-1, there have been updated 2BA continuity schedules that reflect actual year-end continuity schedules.

H. WANG: I think it would be helpful if we actually go to exhibit 9, tab 1, schedule 3, page 20.

So this is an example of the revenue requirement calculation provided by Hydro Ottawa to support the amounts booked in the CCRA account – sorry, not the CCRA, the CBA account.

What I am looking for is really the supporting calculation for the depreciation, the current year depreciation amount reported in this table. And then similarly for Table 13 and Table 14. And so that's only for 2021 to 2023, but I am also looking for similar support for 2024.

A. BARRIE: Sorry. I think our confusion is you seem to be making a distinction between 2021 and 2023 to 2024. So have we already provided something from 2021 to 2023, and you are asking for it to be shown again for 2024?

H. WANG: No. So I have asked the IR on providing the CCA, the supporting CCA calculation to support the CCA amounts in the schedule.

So now I am asking to provide the supporting schedules, the fixed asset continuity schedule, to support the depreciation line for 2021 to 2024.

C. DUONG: Yes, we can provide that. As you are aware that all our CBA accounts, including CCRA, encompasses our assets. So when you summarize all the depreciation calculations in here, you will see that those totals will tie back to our appendix 2BA.

So when we are providing the updated data as it looks right here, but including 2024, you will be seeing the separate amounts for 2024's depreciation values. And, when it is all summed up, it will reconcile to the appendix 2BA update in Staff, 1-Staff 1.

And if we are doing that all in the same undertaking, I believe that should provide the evidence you are asking. Is that correct?

H. WANG: Okay. Okay. I think I can take that.

So then moving on to my next question, could you please provide a CCA schedule to support the CCA amounts that will be used in the revenue requirement calculation for 2024?

C. DUONG: If I could take a moment to consult, thank you. Thank you for the break.

We can certainly provide that information. Having said that, I just want to provide a bit of clarification. We will be updating some of the CCA balances to reflect the updated additions in 2024 as part of this update.

H. WANG: Thank you.

C. DUONG: Thank you.

H. WANG: Now can we please go to 9-Staff-206, and scroll down to page 3?

In response to part (a), Hydro Ottawa stated that:

“The only change in the updated deferral and

variance account continuity schedule in 1-Staff- 1 is to reflect 2024 actual amounts. Balances from periods --”

I guess it is prior periods

“-- remain unchanged.”

Is that correct?

C. DUONG: That's correct.

H. WANG: Thank you.

So can we please go back to the DVA continuity schedule?

Tab 2B in cell AW73, the closing principal balance as of December 31, 2023, for the CBA subaccount is a credit amount of $487,000. You don't have to pull it up, but this amount is different from the 2023 closing balance reported in the original DVA continuity schedule. In that DVA continuity schedule in cell BG73, a credit of $552,000 was recorded there.

Could you please explain the change by way of undertaking, given that Hydro Ottawa stated the balances from prior periods remain unchanged?

C. DUONG: If I could just first explain the rationale of the change, then maybe you won't need an undertaking.

H. WANG: Fine.

C. DUONG: In the original DVA model that we provided, we reflected the balances relating to the years in the year it's listed here. So, for example, we are staring at column AW for a closing principal balance of 2023. As noted, you have mentioned that, or as stated in here, there is a balance of $487,000 credit for CBA account. Some of that, a portion of those adjustments, were done in 2024. But in the original model, we recorded it in column AW.

In the updated 1-Staff-1 DVA model, we have changed it back to what appears to be what we should have done, which was any adjustments relating to 2023 that's done in 2024, we have put it to the column for the 2024 transactions.

So you may note that, in total, all the principal amounts tie back to each other in the original model, as well as its update model. It's just where did we put the transaction; was it in AW, or previously to AW, or was it to the columns to the right?

H. WANG: Right. So just to confirm, you are stating some of the 2024 adjustments were incorporated in AW73 in the original filing. Is that correct?

C. DUONG: That's right.

H. WANG: Could you please provide the dollar amount, the specific dollar amount that are incorporated in this balance related to the adjustment?

C. DUONG: Yes.

H. WANG: Thank you.

M. MILLAR: So that's undertaking JT4.11.

UNDERTAKING JT4.11: Provide specific dollar amount incorporated in the balance related to adjustment

H. WANG: Thank you. Next, I would like to talk about the proposed tariff impact account. Can we please go to 9-Staff-216, please, on page 4?

So the sister response to part (c), in the first bullet point, Hydro Ottawa stated that:

“The proposed tariff impact deferral account

will include the revenue requirements impact of

both OM&A and capital.”

Could you please provide the proposed journal entries to record the revenue requirement impact related to capital, by way of undertaking?

A. BARRIE: Yes, we can do that.

H. WANG: Thank you.

M. MILLAR: It's JT4.12.

UNDERTAKING JT4.12: Provide proposed journal entries to record revenue requirement impact related to capital

H. WANG: And in the same undertaking, JT4.12, could you please provide the updated accounting order to include the sample journal entry and proposed subaccounts related to the capital part?

A. BARRIE: So, if we can go -- it's just that I believe in our original evidence we just provided that as part of the embedded in the actual exhibit. So would you like a separate document with that accounting order?

H. WANG: Yes, please.

A. BARRIE: As opposed to updating original evidence? Okay, yes we can do that.

H. WANG: Thank you. Can we please go to Exhibit, Tab 2, Schedule 1? Scroll down to Table 1 on page 2. Thank you. So, Table 1 outlines Hydro Ottawa's forecast non-wires solutions cost included in OM&A and other income and deductions. In the second row here, Hydro Ottawa has forecasted an annual amount of 2 million under costs included in other income and deductions for years 2026 to 2030.

Could you please confirm whether the forecast costs included in the other income and deductions represent contributions to be received? For example, i.e., in other words, that the revenue offset to the base revenue requirements?

A. BARRIE: So, the $2 million a year is intended to be the incentives that Hydro Ottawa would have to pay to customers for above and beyond what the IESO would be paying for those, for those different initiatives. So it's -- is that -- so, just the way you worded it I am not sure that we are saying the same thing. I don't believe so.

H. WANG: No, I understood it the other way. So I thought these are included in other revenues, for instance will be part of the 2H other revenue. So you were saying --

A. BARRIE: It is part of the 2H revenue.

H. WANG: Oh, okay. Could you please provide the USoAs that Hydro Ottawa uses to record the forecast 2 million in Chapter 2 appendices, Tab 2H?

A. BARRIE: Yes, I can do that.

M. MILLAR: That's JT4.13.

UNDERTAKING JT4.13: Provide USoAs that Hydro Ottawa uses to record forecasted $2 million in Chapter 2 appendices, Tab 2H

H. WANG: Thank you. Can we please go to Exhibit 1, Tab 3, Schedule 1, on page 32? Thank you. Here Hydro Ottawa provides rationale regarding the eligibility criteria, if you scroll down a little bit, so the causation, prudence and materiality for the establishment of the proposed non-wires solutions variance account. Could you -- oh, yes, specifically under bullet point Number 3 regarding materiality. So, if we could go down a little bit on page 33? At the top of this page Hydro Ottawa explained that the amounts should be recorded in a proposed non-wires solution variance account could exceed its materiality threshold. Is it possible for you to provide an assessment of the likelihood that the annual amount should be recorded in this variance account will exceed Hydro Ottawa's materiality threshold?

A. BARRIE: So, it's difficult at this point in time to estimate exactly what the values will be. So what we have done is, I was sort of alluding to in responding to your other question, is the pieces that we are putting through specifically related to the customer incentive portion. It hasn't -- we don't know yet what piece the IESO may be looking at versus what piece we may and what expanded credits we may have to provide to customers. So, in the event that it should be more or less -- so it would be -- sorry, I am having a hard time getting the word out today -- a symmetrical account, then we believe the balances could be material. Because it is an unknown we can't specifically give you an estimate in terms of what we think those values may be. Because it is really reliant on some outcomes of CDM programs, as well.

As well as what we have estimated to go through this particular account is any funding of other items that we may be able to get through our non-wires program, Hydro Ottawa has been as successful as we have seen with things like the ODERA project, which is not intended to go through this account but is just an example of an account where we have received funding. And so, it was also intended that if Hydro Ottawa should be able to get funding through other provincial programs and such we would also put that through this account to offset any costs Hydro Ottawa would have.

So, those would be for programs we are not even aware of them existing yet, but we would try to ensure that we would be able to participate in them and provide our customers the benefit.

H. WANG: All right, thank you. Similarly, Hydro Ottawa made some statements regarding materiality of the amounts recorded in the proposed large load revenue variance account on page 34, you don't have to pull it up, and also the proposed tariff impact deferral account on page 35. So, could you please explain or provide assessment of the likelihood of the annual amount to be recorded in those two proposed variance accounts -- variance and deferral account?

A. BARRIE: If we could bring up 1-SEC-16? And if you could scroll down to the table on page 2. So, Hydro Ottawa provided an estimate of just the large load percentage in terms of our revenue requirement, and this does look at total large load. But it does indicate how significant it could be if the large loads don't materialize in totality. We -- would this suffice for the large load question that you've asked?

H. WANG: Yes. It just -- it's different than the statement that you provided in Schedule 1-3-1 that the Hydro Ottawa at this moment cannot -- sorry, is not starting with a materiality related to this account. So you already provide the Table A here -- actually provide a forecast [inaudible] related to large load revenue; is that correct?

A. BARRIE: So, this is a -- so just to be clear, this is 100 per cent of the revenue, so we would not estimate that --

H. WANG: Oh, so 30 --

A. BARRIE: -- 100 per cent -- so this gives 100 per cent risk, whereas we would not estimate that all of our large loads would not materialize.

H. WANG: Okay.

A. BARRIE: It just gives the materiality of what we built into our revenue forecast related to large loads that are not currently connected to our system.

H. WANG: Okay.

A. BARRIE: Like the additional, I should say, because these customers, too, have active accounts so the additional piece.

H. WANG: So -- yeah. So, I guess at this moment you are uncertain about the likelihood?

A. BARRIE: The likelihood of the timing of each of those large loads and when they would materialize, yes, that's correct.

H. WANG: Okay, thank you. What about the tariff impact deferral account? Would you be able --

 A. BARRIE: The tariff impact deferral account, it's a little bit harder to estimate. It continuously changes in terms of timing and what items may be tariffed. So, as we were discussing yesterday, it does make it very challenging for Hydro Ottawa to estimate what the impact could be. I believe in terms of speaking to the tariffs, it would have been better for Panel 2 to speak more specifically. I believe in our IRs we do have estimates of, like, the percentage of our suppliers that could potentially be impacted but we have not translated that into a dollar value.

H. WANG: Thank you. Now, I am going to ask a few questions that I have raised with panel 2 yesterday but were directed to panel 3. Can we please go to chapter 2 appendices attached to 1-Staff-1, tab 2BA? Tab 2BA, 2026 to 2030, thank you. Could we please look at net fixed asset for 2027 in row 155? Could you please click on the opening and closing at the same times and it will show the average calculation. So that will be D155 and G155.

So you will see that the average amount showing here is 2.259 billion. Now if we could please go to the updated 2027 revenue requirement work form as attached to 1-Staff-1, and in the "Data Input" tab, and then scroll, you will see that the net fixed asset amount reported here does not match. The net fixed asset amount here is 2.266 billion.

C. DUONG: Hi, so based on your question from yesterday, we did have a chance to review the information, and can confirm that the 2027 revenue requirement model was -- the incorrect version was filed and we will be filing the correct version.

H. WANG: Thank you. Just a reminder that this will include the average accumulated depreciation as well. Thank you.

C. DUONG: That's correct.

H. WANG: And now if we could please look at the rate base report in the 2027 revenue requirement work form in Tab 4 rate base. So could you please confirm that this rate base amount here is also -- also needs to be updated?

C. DUONG: Yes, that's correct.

H. WANG: Thank you. So this amount -- also another note on this amount, so this amount should reconcile with the 2026 to 2030 PILs work form as well?

C. DUONG: Sorry, let me just take a moment to confer.

M. MILLAR: Ms. Wang, it's Michael Millar here. Just while you're doing that, as an administrative matter, I wanted to let people know I actually have to run to a meeting, so Ms. Nowicki will be taking over for me for the rest of the day, so you will all be in her care. And thanks very much, everyone. And I guess we will -- we will see you when we see you. This file will continue. Thanks.

C. DUONG: Hi, sorry, could you repeat your question, please?

H. WANG: Right. So the -- there is a rate base amount also used in 2026 to 2030 PILs work form, and the rate base amount in that PILs work form reported for 2027 is different than the amount that we are looking at here in 2027 revenue requirement work form. So the rate base amount in the PILs work form is 1.698 billion. So I just wanted to confirm with you that the updated 2027 revenue requirement work form rate base should match what's reported in the PILs work form.

C. DUONG: Thanks for the clarification, and, yes, it should balance.

H. WANG: Thank you.

C. DUONG: And if there is any difference, we will adjust, but it should balance once we file the updated 2027 revenue requirement model.

H. WANG: Thank you. Now I wanted to talk about the recent OEB accounting order that was discussed yesterday. So the accounting order was issued on April 30th, 2025, for the establishment of a deferral account, to record impacts arising from implementing the electric vehicle charging rates. So this accounting order directs that electricity distributors whose OEB approved 2026 distribution rates become effective on January 1st, 2026, are to make the EVC rate available to eligible customers on January 1st, 2026. Additionally, the OEB also expects that these costs to be one-time implementation costs as opposed to ongoing costs. As such, the OEB does not anticipate that distributors will require the deferral account beyond their next cost base rate applications.

Yesterday, the panel confirmed that Hydro Ottawa is working on implementation and it will make EVC rate available to eligible customers on January 1st, 2026. Is that correct?

M. FEE: Hi Ms. Wang, yes, that's correct.

H. WANG: Thank you. Could you please clarify whether any implementation costs are included in the bridge year 2025 or the test year 2026 as part of the OM&A?

M. FEE: I will just take a moment to confer here. Hi Ms. Wang, I don't know that it's explicitly pointed out in the bridge year.

H. WANG: What about in the test year?

A. BARRIE: No.

M. FEE: No.

H. WANG: So could you please confirm if you intend to use this deferral account?

M. FEE: I don't believe we intend to use the deferral account. The costs are well below the materiality threshold.

H. WANG: Thank you. That's all my questions for today, thank you very much.

J. NOWICKI: Thank you, Ms. Wang. Mr. Frank, I see that you have come on screen, please proceed with your questions.

EXAMINATION BY A. FRANK

A. FRANK: Yes, thank you. I just want to start out with a follow-up on questioning by Ms. Scott. She was asking about large use loads being accumulated in a variance account. I understand Hydro Ottawa's response as being that only incremental loads over 5,000 kilowatts would be counted in the variance account, and not smaller increases that propel a general service customer over the threshold into large use volume; is that correct?

A. BARRIE: Yes, so if it was a smaller volume that just moved a customer from a C4 to a large use account, that would not be included within the large load account.

A. FRANK: Okay, thank you. And can we turn to Interrogatory 2-CO-21. And I guess I am just wondering in this interrogatory, is this the same type of increments that would be counted, that we just discussed? Or is something else being counted here?

A. BARRIE: Sorry, could you specify --

A. FRANK: Yeah, if you --

A. BARRIE: -- specifically what you're referring to, because the table, for instance, has inquiries.

A. FRANK: Sure. Actually, if you could scroll down to -- so I understand these to be similar incremental loads in -- well, similar incremental large loads. But are they the same ones that we were just talking about with the variance account, or is this something else?

A. BARRIE: If I could just take a minute.

A. FRANK: Sure.

A. BARRIE: So, I apologize, I am not familiar with exactly what is in every single line within this large load table. I know for sure like we wouldn't have been including anything related to the inquiries; however, some of it could be within the signed and submitted, but I couldn't say exactly right now how those two line up.

A. FRANK: Okay. Yes, it was attempting to try to reconcile the discussion yesterday with the effect - some of these values are under 5mVA, which I understand would mean they are also under 5,000 kilowatts.

A. BARRIE: So I appreciate it; it is just I am in the familiar with this particular table and how it was put together. So I just wouldn't want to misstate anything.

A. FRANK: Okay. Is that something you could look into?

A. BARRIE: I could. I know we have another undertaking from yesterday related to this table. So if they kind of overlap, we will just point this response to that one, if that's the case.

A. FRANK: Certainly, that would be great.

A. BARRIE: Thanks.

J. NOWICKI: So that will be JT4.14.

UNDERTAKING JT4.14: Explain differences and why they exist between table A and large-load forecasts for purpose of revenue load forecast

A. FRANK: Actually, I should probably add on one more point to this, since you probably will need to look into it, as well.

If they are intentionally different, can you explain which set of numbers is used to adjust the load forecast for the large-use class?

A. BARRIE: So just to clarify, the undertaking would be where there are differences between table A and how we looked at large-load forecasts for the purpose of the revenue load forecast, what those differences may be and why?

A. FRANK: Yes, please.

A. BARRIE: Yes, we can do that.

A. FRANK: All right, thank you.

J. NOWICKI: So, Mr. Frank, will that be part of JT4.14?

A. FRANK: I think that makes sense.

J. NOWICKI: Okay.

A. FRANK: If we could turn to 3-Staff-125 part (b)?

So I appreciate there is an attachment, but it produced a derivation of the economic variable used for customer connection growth in the residential rate class. And, in there, there is an underlying population and economic variable that is used in that derivation.

And I was wondering if we could get the source for the population and economic forecast out to 2030?

C. DUONG: Mr. Frank, if I understood your question correctly, I believe that information has been provided in the attachment 3-1-1B. So the source of our information comes from the Conference Board of Canada.

A. FRANK: Okay, thank you.

Turning over to 7-Staff-194, Hydro Ottawa indicated that:

“Poles with both primary and secondary

conductors attached are counted only as primary

poles for the purpose of cost allocation.”

And in this interrogatory, it also identified that the addition of secondary conductors sometimes necessitates more expensive poles due to, you know, additional length for clearance or for strength.

And from my understanding of the response, it looks like it would be a sizable undertaking to determine how many poles needed to be upgraded due to the weight, the forces imposed. So that would probably not be a feasible way of apportioning out secondary costs.

But has Hydro Ottawa considered looking at other methodologies for apportioning the cost of poles between primary and secondary, like the approach used for the pole attachment charge?

C. DUONG: If I can just take a moment to confer? Thank you.

Hi, Mr. Frank. So from my understanding of the pole attachment work, that work is to allocate out the cost of poles among LDCs and carriers. And I am trying to understand how does that relate to what you requested about a recalculation of our secondary supporting poles?

A. FRANK: Sure. So if you were to look at the report for the pole attachment charge, it was filed under EB-2015-0304, dated March 22, 2018. And it outlined a methodology of using usable pole length, essentially determining how many feet were required for power versus how many feet were required for, you know, the secondary, the communication attachments.

I was wondering if you thought about doing something similar to that for, you know, apportioning out the primary space from the secondary space and, you know, if so, you know, how much -- how would you split the costs between those two?

C. DUONG: So, at this point, we have not done that consideration. What we have proposed has been as noted in response to 7-Staff-194.

A. FRANK: Can I have you take a look at that approach and then write back with your thoughts on using such an approach, and how it might be implemented if it were to?

C. DUONG: At this point, is there any concern with how we have done our approach with our poles?

A. FRANK: Well, at the risk of getting into argument --

A. BARRIE: Mr. Frank, sorry. I think, instead, the concern is that we -- it would take a significant amount of time to review that report and consider how we may be able to adjust our cost allocation model at this point in the proceeding.

So it's just our responses are due October 6, and it is just --

A. FRANK: Okay.

A. BARRIE: -- I am not sure that we can undertake to do that level of analysis, prior to then.

A. FRANK: Okay, fair enough. Those are my questions.

J. NOWICKI: Thank you, Mr. Frank.

I believe that concludes OEB Staff's questions for panel 3. And if there are no other further questions for panel 3, I believe that also concludes our technical conference for Hydro Ottawa's application.

I would like to thank everyone for their efforts over the course of the week, including our court reporters for transcribing the event. I hope everyone has a good remainder of their week and weekend. Thank you.

J. MYERS: Thank you, very much.

--- Whereupon the proceeding adjourned at 12:15

p.m.