



Hydro One Networks Inc.

**Application for leave to construct an electricity
transmission line and to expropriate interests in certain
lands in the Municipalities of Welland, Thorold and the
City of Niagara**

PROCEDURAL ORDER NO. 1

February 6, 2026

Hydro One Networks Inc. (Hydro One) applied to the Ontario Energy Board (OEB) on November 18, 2025 under section 92 of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998* (OEB Act) for an order granting leave to construct approximately 18.5 kilometres of electricity transmission line and associated facilities between Abitibi Consolidated Junction and Crowland Transformer Station in the Niagara area (Welland-Thorold Project or the Project). Hydro One has also applied to the OEB, pursuant to section 97 of the OEB Act, for approval of the form of land-use agreements offered, or to be offered, to affected landowners.

Hydro One has further indicated in its application that if leave to construct is granted, it is also requesting relief under section 99(1) of the OEB Act for an order granting authority to expropriate certain interest in lands. Hydro One noted that the expropriation relief sought is limited to a finite number of properties where Hydro One has identified issues that effectively prevent Hydro One from engaging in any discussions with the landowners as the landowners cannot be located, or title information has not provided Hydro One with accurate landowner contact information.

The application will be heard by Commissioners: Robert Dodds (presiding), Damien Côté, and Vinay Sharma.

A Notice of Hearing (Notice) was issued on December 12, 2025, followed by a revised Notice on December 18, 2025. As indicated in the revised Notice, the deadline to file a request for intervenor status was January 7, 2026.

Intervention Requests

Each of 2853918 Ontario Inc. (2853918), the Corporation of the City of Welland (City of Welland), Futecan Canada Inc. (Futecan), Nyon Oil Inc. and 1170367 Ontario Inc. (collectively as Nyon and 1170367), applied for intervenor status. Futecan, Nyon and

1170367 also applied for cost eligibility. The City of Welland noted that it is not sure whether it will be seeking costs until the results of the hearing are determined.

In their intervention requests, each of 2853918, the City of Welland, and Futecan, indicated that they own land interests along the proposed route of the facilities that Hydro One seeks leave to construct in this proceeding.

2853918 indicated that it wishes to present evidence regarding material harm to its property value and usability, restricted access and interference with property use, a lack of demonstrated necessity and alternatives, and environmental and safety impacts. The City of Welland indicated that it wishes to seek clarification from Hydro One about the proposed land expropriations and to present alternatives options. Futecan indicated that it is seeking to advocate for an alternative alignment route for the Project and provide evidence to the OEB of adverse property impacts and economic impacts associated with the current proposal.

Nyon and 1170367's Intervention Request

Nyon and 1170367 together requested intervenor status in this proceeding (intervention request). In their intervention request, Nyon and 1170367 stated that they will object to the relief sought by Hydro One.

Nyon and 1170367 stated that they each own hydroelectric infrastructure connected to the Crowland Transformer Station (Crowland TS), and they enclosed maps and plans showing the location of their lands. Further, they stated that they own lands that Hydro One is seeking to expropriate in another ongoing OEB proceeding, EB-2024-0142.

With respect to the land interests sought by Hydro One in EB-2024-0142, Nyon and 1170367 stated that neither Hydro One nor its predecessors were ever granted leave to construct under Part VI of the OEB Act, and accordingly it is unlikely that Hydro One will be granted authority to expropriate Nyon and 1170367's property in that proceeding. Nyon and 1170367 stated further that, regardless, the hydroelectric infrastructure on the property that is connected to the Crowland TS will remain under ownership of Nyon and 1170367. Further, Nyon and 1170367 stated that one of the reasons Hydro One is seeking leave to construct a 230kV transmission line in this proceeding (EB-2025-0290) is to provide electricity to a substation located on property immediately adjacent to Nyon and 1170367's property. As such, Nyon and 1170367 stated, they will be impacted by any construction, maintenance or changes to the Crowland TS and Hydro One should not be granted leave to construct without their consent.

Hydro One's Objection Letter

On January 16, 2026 Hydro One filed a letter to the OEB indicating that it had no objections to the intervention requests made by Futeacan, 2853918 and the City of Welland but did object to the intervention request of Nyon and 1170367 (objection letter).¹

In its objection letter, Hydro One submitted that tribunals have broad discretion with respect to decisions regarding participation in administrative law proceedings. Hydro One referred to Rule 22 of the OEB's *Rules of Practice and Procedure*, particularly that a person applying for intervenor status must prove to the OEB that they have a substantial interest and intend to participate responsibly in the proceeding.

Hydro One submitted that Nyon and 1170367 have no direct or substantial interest in the outcome of this proceeding. Hydro One stated that unlike the other proposed intervenors, Nyon and 1170367 are not owners of land interests required for the safe and reliable construction and operation of the Project. Further, Hydro One stated that the dispute regarding the ownership of existing transmission facilities on Nyon and 1170367's property has been raised in another OEB proceeding (EB-2024-0142), and in civil litigation, and is not relevant to this proceeding as the Project concerns a new transmission line in a different location. Further, Hydro One stated that the transmission facilities situated across Nyon and 1170367's property are maintained and operated by Hydro One and will remain in operation following this proceeding regardless of the outcome.

Hydro One further submitted that that Nyon and 1170367 do not have technical or other expertise that may assist the OEB and cannot bring any evidence. Hydro One submitted that it is itself in the best position to provide any technical information to assist the OEB. Further, Hydro One submitted that the planned changes to Crowland TS will not negatively affect Nyon and 1170367, and their concerns regarding potential temporary impacts from construction activities that will not be conducted along their property are best characterized as speculative. Also, Hydro One submitted that there is no credible basis for the OEB to accept Nyon and 1170367's ownership allegations, as Nyon and 1170367 do not possess a requisite transmission licence from the OEB.

Hydro One also submitted that Nyon and 1170367's intervention would create regulatory inefficiencies and could lead to serious procedural fairness concerns if Nyon and 1170367 were permitted to relitigate issues raised in EB-2024-0142.

¹ EB-2025-0290, [Hydro One's objection letter](#) filed on January 16, 2026

Finally, Hydro One submitted, in the alternative, should the OEB decide to grant Nyon and 1170367 participatory rights, those rights should be limited and cost eligibility not awarded, as their concerns are best characterized as a general interest in energy matters. Hydro One further submitted that Nyon and 1170367 should be afforded only the right to provide a letter of written comment.

Nyon and 1170367's Response to Hydro One's Objection

On January 30, 2026, Nyon and 1170367 filed a letter with the OEB in response to Hydro One's objection letter (Nyon and 1170367's letter).

Nyon and 1170367 submitted that they have a direct and substantial interest in the outcome of this proceeding. With respect to the ownership of existing transmission facilities on their lands, which is in dispute in OEB proceeding EB-2025-0142, they submitted that much of this infrastructure was on their lands when the federal government first expropriated interests in the 1960s, and this infrastructure was never transferred back to Hydro One. Nyon and 1170367's position is that they are the owner of the infrastructure. Regardless, Nyon and 1170367 submitted further, it is undisputed that Nyon and 1170367 own the land that the infrastructure is affixed to and will continue to protect their property rights and monitor the use of hydroelectric fixtures on their land.

Nyon and 1170367 submitted that Hydro One's application only contains limited generic details of the proposed station expansion work at the Crowland TS, along with a significant budget (of \$76,500,000). Nyon and 1170367 stated that there is no specific information in Hydro One's application regarding the station work, and why the downstream infrastructure will not be affected. They submitted further that as they own significant downstream infrastructure, they have a direct interest in the alterations and upgrades being conducted on the Crowland TS. They enclosed survey plans showing the lands that they own.

Nyon and 1170367 also submitted that they have expertise and can bring evidence. In their letter, they listed eleven specific questions that they have about the Project, including, for example, whether a protection coordination or equivalent study has been conducted, whether the alterations will comply with the Protection Planning Standard for Transmission Generation Connections, and whether relay settings are being changed temporarily or permanently. Nyon and 1170367 stated that their concerns are not speculative or temporary; Rather, their concerns are real and directly related to the significant hydroelectric infrastructure on their property. Nyon and 1170367 submitted that their internal knowledge base, coupled with assistance from their experts and consultants, will allow them to review the detailed plans for the Crowland TS alterations, and will assist counsel in preparing interrogatories and cross-examinations.

In their response, Nyon and 1170367 also clarified that they take no position on the expropriations sought in this application, and they are exclusively interested in the proposed alterations to the Crowland TS and the grid, generally. Nyon and 1170367 also clarified that in their intervention request, they had directed the OEB to the evidentiary record in EB-2024-0142 to provide helpful background. They confirmed that they have no interest in relitigating the issues in EB-2024-0142.

With respect to the issue of a cost award, Nyon and 1170367 submitted that they are directly impacted by this application, and should the OEB grant Nyon and 1170367 intervenor status, there should be no impact on their cost award eligibility.

Hydro One's Reply to Nyon and 1170367's Response

On February 4, 2026, Hydro One filed a letter with the OEB in response to Nyon and 1170367's letter. Hydro One submitted that Nyon and 1170367's letter did not provide any new evidence or material information that would support granting intervenor status, and in fact, demonstrated why i) Nyon and 1170367's interest are not directly and substantially affected by the relief sought in this application and ii) that Nyon does not have expertise or evidence that would assist the OEB in determining the issues properly before it.

Hydro One submitted that EB-2024-0142 has no relevance to this proceeding and Nyon and 1170367's involvement in that unrelated proceeding does nothing to satisfy the onus that they meet the criteria for intervenor status in this proceeding. Hydro One noted that Rule 22 of the OEB's *Rules of Practice and Procedure* does not provide for intervention based on a generalized interest in electricity transmission or ownership of land elsewhere in Ontario.

Hydro One also submitted that Nyon and 1170367's letter conflated issues and mischaracterized the scope of the current application. In this regard, Hydro One stated that by attempting to frame their purported interest around upstream or system-wide technical issues, Nyon and 1170367 seek to conflate the current proceeding with EB-2024-0142 and expand the scope of the current application. Hydro One expressed that granting intervention on this basis would lead to regulatory inefficiency, distracting from the matters the OEB is required to decide, and waste the time and resources of other intervenors.

Hydro One further submitted that Nyon and 1170367 have not demonstrated any technical expertise that would assist the OEB. Hydro One submitted that Nyon and 1170367 indicated they intended to rely on the evidence submitted in EB-2024-0142, and reliance on another proceeding's evidentiary record does not establish expertise. Hydro One further stated that, moreover, in EB-2024-0142, Nyon and 1170367

acknowledged that they have no technical expertise in transmission matters. Hydro One also submitted that Nyon and 1170367 have not described any expertise they possess, and instead have listed a series of technical questions, many of which are outside the scope of this application.

Decision on Intervention Requests

The list of parties in this proceeding is attached as Schedule A to this Procedural Order.

Rule 22.02 of the OEB's *Rules of Practice and Procedure* provides that a person applying for intervenor status must satisfy the OEB that they have a substantial interest and intend to participate responsibly in the proceeding. Rule 22.02 provides further that a person has a substantial interest if they have a material interest that is within the scope of the proceeding. Examples of such a material interest include primarily representing the direct interests of consumers; primarily representing an interest or policy perspective relevant to the OEB's mandate and to the proceeding; and having an interest in land that may be affected by the outcome of the proceeding.

The OEB assesses intervention requests on a case-by-case basis, in light of the scope of the proceeding and considering, among other factors, the value that the party seeking intervention status will bring to the proceeding including expertise that the OEB would find helpful.

The OEB approves 2853918, City of Welland and Futeacan as intervenors. Cost eligibility for these intervenors is addressed in a further section of the decision below.

The OEB denies the request of Nyon and 1170367 for intervenor status in this proceeding for the following reasons:

1. Nyon and 1170367 have no direct, substantial or unique interest in the outcome of the proceeding within the meaning of Rule 22.02 of the OEB's *Rules of Practice and Procedure*.
2. Nyon and 1170367 have not demonstrated any technical expertise that would assist the OEB in the adjudication of this application.

Nyon and 1170367 state that the current application contains only sparse details with respect to what alterations and upgrades Hydro One intends to complete on the Crowland TS and go on to state that, as owners of significant downstream infrastructure, they have a direct and substantial interest in the alterations and upgrades being conducted on the Crowland TS. On the same basis, they also claim they have expertise and can bring evidence.

The OEB does not accept these assertions on the basis that the impact on **all** downstream customers will be considered in the normal course of the OEB's review. Nyon and 1170367 have not satisfied the OEB that they have a unique, specific or substantial interest within the meaning of Rule 22.02.

In addition, the OEB is confident that the evidentiary record in this proceeding will provide sufficient technical information and expertise, and the specific questions raised by Nyon and 1170367 will be addressed through the course of the proceeding without Nyon and 1170367's involvement.

The OEB further finds that the fact that Nyon and 1170367 were granted intervenor status in EB-2024-0142 has no bearing on this proceeding. At Nyon and 1170367's own admission, EB-2024-0142 is a separate proceeding on a different property regarding expropriation only and the OEB finds that attempts to link the two proceedings conflates distinct issues.

In its intervention request, Nyon and 1170367 directed the OEB to EB-2024-0142's evidentiary record to provide helpful background regarding the historical timelines, as well as Nyon and 1170367 and Hydro One's respective positions. The OEB expects that any required and relevant information will be found in this application (EB-2025-0290) or obtained through the course of this proceeding.

For the above reasons, Nyon and 1170367's intervention request is denied.

Intervenor Costs and Participation

As set out above, 2853918, Futecan and the City of Welland are approved as intervenors in this proceeding.

2853918 and Futecan are eligible to apply for an award of costs under the OEB's [Practice Direction on Cost Awards](#) (Practice Direction).

City of Welland is not eligible for an award of costs as per Section 3.05(h) the OEB's Practice Direction.

The OEB expects intervenors to limit their participation to the matters that are within the scope of the proceeding, as set through the final Issues List. For additional guidance on the OEB cost eligibility determination, refer to section 5.01 of the Practice Direction.

Cost eligible intervenors should be aware that the OEB will not generally allow the recovery of costs for the attendance of more than one representative of any party unless a compelling reason is provided when cost claims are filed.

Issues List and Scope of Proceeding

The issues with respect to the hearing of this application have their basis in sections 92 and 99 of the OEB Act.

Section 92 of the OEB Act states:

92 (1) No person shall construct, expand or reinforce an electricity transmission line or an electricity distribution line or make an interconnection without first obtaining from the Board an order granting leave to construct, expand or reinforce such line or interconnection.

Section 99 of the OEB Act states:

99 (1) The following persons may apply to the Board for authority to expropriate land for a work:

1. Any person who has leave under this Part or a predecessor of this Part.
2. Any person who intends to construct, expand or reinforce an electricity transmission line or an electricity distribution line or make an interconnection and who is exempted under this Act from the requirement to obtain leave.

Hydro One is seeking both leave to construct (under section 92 of the OEB Act) and expropriation (under section 99 of the OEB Act) relief in this application. Hydro One stated that the expropriation relief sought, if granted, will afford Hydro One additional time to address any land registration issues and mitigate risks of potential delays of the Project.

The OEB has established standard issues lists for electricity [leave to construct](#) and [expropriation](#) applications which are attached at Schedule B. The standard issues lists are intended to ensure that the OEB's review is focused and aligned with its mandate. Hydro One and intervenors are invited to provide any comments regarding the Issues List to the OEB by **February 12, 2026**.

OEB recognizes that Hydro One's approach to seek both leave to construct and expropriation approvals within the same application is unique. To inform OEB's view on this matter, Hydro One and intervenors are also invited to provide comments on whether the expropriation relief should be in the scope of this application by **February 12, 2026**.

Evidentiary Matters

2853918 and Futecan indicated a preference for filing evidence in this proceeding. The OEB will make its determination on these matters at a later date.

Interrogatories

At this time, provision is being made for written interrogatories on Hydro One's pre-filed evidence.

Parties should consult sections 26 and 27 of the OEB's [Rules of Practice and Procedure](#) regarding required naming and numbering conventions and other matters related to interrogatories.

Format of the Hearing

In its Notice, the OEB invited parties to state their preference for the type of format of the hearing. Hydro One and 2853918 did not express a preference while the City of Welland and Futecan requested an oral hearing. The OEB will make its determination on the format of the hearing at a later date.

The OEB is making provision for the following related to this proceeding. Further procedural orders may be issued by the OEB.

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD ORDERS THAT:

1. Hydro One and intervenors shall provide comments to the OEB on the standard Issues Lists for electricity [leave to construct](#) and [expropriation](#) applications by **February 12, 2026**. This may include comments on whether the expropriation relief should be in the scope of this application.
2. OEB staff and intervenors shall request any relevant information and documentation from Hydro One that is in addition to the evidence already filed, by written interrogatories filed with the OEB and served on all parties by **March 5, 2026**.
3. Hydro One shall file with the OEB complete written responses to all interrogatories and serve them on intervenors by **March 19, 2026**.

Direction for preparing materials

- Parties are responsible for ensuring that any documents they file with the OEB, such as applicant and intervenor evidence, interrogatories and responses to

interrogatories or any other type of document, **do not include personal information** (as that phrase is defined in the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*), unless filed in accordance with Rule 9A of the OEB's [Rules of Practice and Procedure](#).

- Filings should clearly state the filing date and the sender's name, postal address, telephone number and e-mail address.
- Other than for applications or as otherwise required or directed by the OEB, parties are not required to submit a cover letter for materials that are self-evident (e.g., interrogatories, submissions) unless the cover letter includes a request or additional information not included in the materials themselves.
- Parties are strongly encouraged to use bookmarks in their filings to aid in navigation.
- Parties should not append to their evidence entire OEB documents (e.g., decisions, policy documents, guidelines). Rather, parties should provide citations to the documents and a clear and concise summary of the relevant part(s) of the document. Parties are encouraged to use hyperlinks for complete, permanent, and publicly available versions of the documents, when possible.
- Parties should refrain from quoting material from documents unless it is essential to support their interrogatories or arguments.
- Parties are not required to provide a summary of the procedural history of a proceeding but may refer to that history where and to the extent needed for context to orient an issue or discussion.
- Parties must: (a) disclose where generative artificial intelligence was used to generate content included in a filing and (b) confirm that the accuracy of the portion of the filing generated by generative artificial intelligence has been verified by the party or its representative without the assistance of generative artificial intelligence.

How to file documents with the OEB

- Parties are required to quote file number (i.e., **EB-2025-0290**) for all materials filed and submit them in **searchable/unrestricted PDF format** (i.e., no printing or copying restrictions) with a digital signature through the [OEB's online filing portal](#).
- Parties should use the document naming conventions and document submission standards outlined in the [Regulatory Electronic Submission System \(RESS\) Document Guidelines](#) found at the [File documents online page](#) on the OEB's website.
- Parties are encouraged to use RESS. Those who have not yet [set up an account](#), or require assistance using the online filing portal can contact registrar@oeb.ca for assistance.

- Cost claims are filed through the OEB's online filing portal. Parties are encouraged to visit the [File documents online page](#) of the OEB's website for more information. Parties that are eligible for a cost award and that do not currently have an account in the cost claim portal should create an account as soon as their cost award eligibility has been confirmed by the OEB. All parties shall download a copy of their submitted cost claim for the purposes of service on the party(ies) paying cost awards as per the [Practice Direction on Cost Awards](#).
- All communications should be directed to the attention of the Registrar and be received by **4:45 p.m.** on the required date.
- With respect to distribution lists for all electronic correspondence and materials related to this proceeding, parties must include the Case Manager, Katherine Wang at Katherine.Wang@oeb.ca and OEB Counsel, Stephanie Pope at Stephanie.Pope@oeb.ca.

Email: registrar@oeb.ca

Tel: 1-877-632-2727 (Toll free)

DATED at Toronto, **February 6, 2026**

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

Ritchie Murray
Acting Registrar

SCHEDULE A
LIST OF APPLICANTS AND INTERVENORS
HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC.
PROCEDURAL ORDER NO. 1
EB-2025-0290
DATED: FEBRUARY 6, 2026

Hydro One Networks Inc.
EB-2025-0290

APPLICANT & LIST OF INTERVENORS

February 6, 2026

APPLICANT

Rep. and Contact Information for Service

Hydro One Networks Inc.

Eryn MacKinnon

Regulatory Advisor

Hydro One Networks Inc.

Tel: 437-318-3700

regulatoryaffairs@hydroone.com

Rep. and Contact Information for Service

Hydro One Networks Inc.

Emily Smythe

Hydro One Networks Inc.

Tel: 416-345-4479

Emily.Smythe@hydroone.com

Mark Ciufu

Sr. Advisor Regulatory Affairs

Hydro One Networks Inc.

Tel: 647-518-0494

Mark.Ciufu@HydroOne.com

APPLICANT COUNSEL

Gordon Nettleton

Partner

McCarthy Tétrault LLP

Tel: 416-601-7509

gnettleton@mccarthy.ca

Hydro One Networks Inc.
EB-2025-0290

APPLICANT & LIST OF INTERVENORS

February 6, 2026

Monica Caceres
Assistant General Counsel
Hydro One Networks Inc.
Tel: 647-505-3341
monica.caceres@hydroone.com

INTERVENORS

Rep. and Contact Information for Service

2853918 Ontario Inc

Navin Shahani
2853918 Ontario Inc
Tel: 905-341-1250
canadian.niagara.heritage@gmail.com

Douglas Burns
2853918 Ontario Inc
Tel: 905-341-1250
ns.ledc@gmail.com

Futecan Canada Inc.

David Stevens
Aird & Berlis LLP
Tel: 416-863-1500
dstevens@airdberlis.com

Kristi Ross
Aird & Berlis LLP
Tel: 416-865-3444
kross@airdberlis.com

Hydro One Networks Inc.
EB-2025-0290

APPLICANT & LIST OF INTERVENORS

February 6, 2026

Jessie zhao

Futecan Canada Inc.

Tel: 647-983-6520

jessie@lundymanor.ca

Corporation of the City of Welland

Bruce Smith

Corporation of the City of Welland

Tel: 905-735-1700 Ext: 2313

bruce.smith@welland.ca

Sarah Conidi

Corporation of the City of Welland

Tel: 905-735-1700 Ext: 2280

sarah.conidi@welland.ca

SCHEDULE B
STANDARD ISSUES LISTS
HYDRO ONE NETWORKS INC.
PROCEDURAL ORDER NO. 1
EB-2025-0290
DATED: FEBRUARY 6, 2026

Section 92 Leave to Construct Issues List

1.0 Prices: Need for the Project

- 1.1** Has the applicant demonstrated that the project is needed or would be beneficial in the case of discretionary projects? What factor(s) are driving the need – e.g. new customer demand, increased system capacity requirement, reliability, sustainment, system resilience, etc.?
- 1.2** Is the project consistent with any relevant power system plan (e.g., regional plan)?

2.0 Prices: Project Alternatives

- 2.1** Has the applicant demonstrated that the proposed project is the preferred option to address the need, as opposed to implementing a different transmission solution, a distribution solution, a non-wires solution, or some other solution?

3.0 Prices: Project Cost

- 3.1** Has the applicant provided sufficient information to demonstrate that the estimates of the project cost are reasonable? Are comparable projects selected by the applicant (as required by the filing requirements) sufficient and appropriate proxies for the proposed project?
- 3.2** Has the applicant adequately identified and described any risks associated with the proposed project? Is the proposed contingency budget appropriate and consistent with these identified risks?
- 3.3** If the applicant has requested that deferral accounts be established, has the applicant adequately demonstrated that the eligibility criteria of Causation, Materiality, and Prudence have been met?

4.0 Prices: Customer Impacts

- 4.1** Has the applicant correctly determined the need for and the amount of any capital contributions that are required for the project?
- 4.2** Are the projected transmission rate impacts that will result from the project reasonable given the need(s) it satisfies and the benefit(s) it provides?

5.0 Reliability and Quality of Electricity Service

- 5.1** Has the applicant established that the project will maintain or improve reliability?
- 5.2** Has the applicant provided a final System Impact Assessment (SIA)? Does the final SIA conclude that the project will not have a material adverse impact on the reliability of the integrated power system?
- 5.3** Has the applicant provided a final Customer Impact Assessment (CIA)? Does the final CIA conclude that the project will not have an adverse impact on customers, with respect to reliability and quality of electricity service?

6.0 Economic Growth

- 6.1** Where the applicant claims that a proposed project will support economic growth in a manner consistent with the policies of the Government of Ontario, has the applicant substantiated this claim?

7.0 Route Map and Form of Landowner Agreements

- 7.1** Are any proposed forms of landowner agreements under section 97 of the OEB Act appropriate and consistent with OEB requirements?
- 7.2** Does the route map provided pursuant to section 94 of the OEB Act show the general location of the proposed project and the municipalities, highways, railways, utility lines and navigable waters through, under, over, upon or across which the proposed project is to pass.

8.0 Conditions of Approval

- 8.1** The OEB's standard conditions of approval are attached as Schedule 1. If the OEB approves the proposed project, what additional or revised conditions, if any, are appropriate?

Schedule 1:

Standard Conditions of Approval for Electricity Leave to Construct Applications

1. [The Applicant] shall fulfill any requirements of the SIA and the CIA, and shall obtain all necessary approvals, permits, licences, certificates, agreements and rights required to construct, operate and maintain the project.
2. Unless otherwise ordered by the OEB, authorization for leave to construct shall terminate 12 months from the date of the Decision and Order, unless construction has commenced prior to that date.
3. [The Applicant] shall advise the OEB of any proposed material change in the project, including but not limited to changes in: the proposed route, construction schedule, necessary environmental assessment approvals, and all other approvals, permits, licences, certificates and rights required to construct the project.
4. [The Applicant] shall submit to the OEB written confirmation of the completion of the project construction. This written confirmation shall be provided within one month of the completion of construction.
5. [The Applicant] shall designate one of their employees as project manager who will be the point of contact for these conditions, and shall provide the employee's name and contact information to the OEB and to all affected landowners, and shall clearly post the project manager's contact information in a prominent place at the construction site.

Section 99 Expropriation Issues List

1. Is the proposed expropriation in the public interest?
2. Has the applicant requested expropriation of the minimum amount of land needed for the project, and the minimum legal interest required for that land?
3. What conditions, if any, should be attached to the OEB's Order in this proceeding?