

Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
Lawyers • Patent & Trade-mark Agents
Scotia Plaza, 40 King Street West
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5H 3Y4
tel.: (416) 367-6000 fax: (416) 367-6749
www.blgcanada.com

CHRISTINE E. LONG
direct tel.: (416) 367-6683
direct fax: (416) 361-2770
e-mail: clong@blgcanada.com



BORDEN
LADNER
GERVAIS

November 28, 2008

Delivered and sent via e-mail

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street
P.O. Box 2319, 27th floor
Toronto, Ontario
M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

**Re: Re: EB-2008-0335 PowerStream Inc. and Barrie Hydro Distribution Inc.
- Application for an Order from the Ontario Energy Board (the "Board")
granting leave to Amalgamate and related matters (the "Application")**

PowerStream Inc. ("PowerStream") and Barrie Hydro Distribution Inc. ("Barrie Hydro") (the "Applicants") have applied to the Board pursuant to section 86(1)(c) of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998* seeking leave to amalgamate (the "Proposed Transaction").

Pursuant to Procedural Order No. 1, the Applicants enclose answers to interrogatories submitted by the School Energy Coalition ("SEC") and the Energy Probe Research Foundation ("Energy Probe").

Two copies of the responses to interrogatories have been provided along with a copy on disk.

The Board established its scope of review for MAADs Applications in RP-2005-0018, EB-2005-0234; EB-2005-0254; EB-2005-0257 (the "Combined MAADs Proceeding"). In that proceeding, the Board clearly established that its review would focus solely on whether the transaction before it for review would cause an adverse effect in terms of the Board delineated objectives.

The Applicants have not answered a number of the interrogatories submitted on the basis that the interrogatories are very clearly outside the scope of review for a MAAD Application. Specific reasons for the objections are outlined in the Applicants' responses.

CALGARY • MONTREAL • OTTAWA • TORONTO • VANCOUVER • WATERLOO REGION



Another group of interrogatories have been answered despite the fact that the Applicants fail to understand how they are relevant to the Proposed Transaction before the Board for consideration. For example, the Shareholders Agreement of the predecessor company will in no way assist the Board with determining whether the Proposed Transaction meets the No Harm Test established in the Combined MAADs Proceeding. While the relevance of the interrogatories to the Application is questionable, in the interests of moving consideration of the Application forward and focussing on the merits of the case, answers have been provided. The intervenors should not view the Applicants willingness to answer these questions as confirmation that they are in agreement that the interrogatories are in any way relevant to the Application.

Yours very truly,

BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS LLP

Original Signed by Christine E. Long

CHRISTINE E. LONG

CL/mc
Encls.

cc: Anne-Marie Reilly, Hydro One Networks Inc. (via e-mail and courier)
Bob Williams, Ontario Education Services Corporation (via e-mail and courier)
Jay Shepherd, Shibley Righton LLP (via e-mail and courier)
Tanya Watson, Shibley Righton LLP (via e-mail and courier)
David MacIntosh, Energy Probe (via e-mail and courier)
Randy Aiken, Aiken & Associates (via e-mail and courier)
George Vegh, Counsel for Barrie Hydro Distribution Inc. (via e-mail and courier)
Stephen Perry, Barrie Hydro Distribution Inc. (via e-mail and courier)
Paula Conboy, PowerStream Inc. (via e-mail and courier)

:::ODMA\PCDOCS\TOR01\3955877\1