ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

FILE NO. **EB-2025-0252** **Alectra Utilities Corporation**

VOLUME: **1**

DATE: **March 5, 2026**

EB-2025-0252

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

Alectra Utilities Corporation

Technical Conference

Proceeding held in person and virtually
at 2300 Yonge Street, 25th Floor, Toronto, Ontario
on Thursday, March 5, 2026, commencing at 9:29 a.m.

VOLUME 1

A P P E A R A N C E S

RAMAN DHILLON	Board Counsel
SHELLY-ANN CONNELL NARISA JOTIBAN HASSAN AHMED MARGARET DEFAZIO	Board Staff
DALIANA COBAN JONATHAN MYERS CHRISTINE LONG TOM WASIK HANY IBRAHIM RICHARD BASSINDALE JIM BUTLER DOUG FAIRCHILD MIKE WITTEMUND	Alectra Utilities Corporation
SHELLEY GRICE	Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario
CLEMENT LI	Building Owners and Managers Association of Toronto
TOM LADANYI	Coalition of Concerned Manufacturers and Businesses of Canada (CCMBC) and Energy Probe Research Foundation
LAWRIE GLUCK	Consumers Council of Canada (CCC)
DANIEL VOLLMER	Distributed Resources Coalition (DRC)
SCOTT WALKER	Ontario Association of Physical Plant Administrators (OAPPA)
DAN ROSENBLUTH BAYU KIDANE	Power Workers' Union
MARK RUBENSTEIN JANE SCOTT	School Energy Coalition (SEC)
MARK GARNER	Vulnerable Energy Consumers

A P P E A R A N C E S

BILL HARPER Coalition (VECC)

I N D E X O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Description	Page No.
--- On commencing at 9:29 a.m.	1
LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	1
PRELIMINARY MATTERS	4
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY M. RUBENSTEIN	7
--- Recess taken at 10:49 a.m.	48
--- Upon resuming at 11:05 a.m.	48
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY J. SCOTT	69
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY L. GLUCK	75
--- Recess taken at 12:28 p.m.	94
--- Upon resuming at 1:31 p.m.	94
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY B. HARPER	112
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY M. GARNER	126
--- Recess taken at 3:05 p.m.	146
--- Upon resuming at 3:19 p.m.	147
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY S. GRICE	147
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY T. LADANYI	163
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY D. ROSENBLUTH	184
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY S. WALKER	187
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY C. LI	192
--- Whereupon matter adjourned at 5:10 p.m., to resume Friday, March 6th, 2026, at 9:30 a.m.	206

U N D E R T A K I N G S

Description	Page No.
UNDERTAKING JT-1.1: PROVIDE OEB STAFF'S WRITTEN QUESTIONS AS WELL AS ORAL QUESTIONS	6
UNDERTAKING JT-1.2: PROVIDE ED'S WRITTEN QUESTIONS AS WELL AS ORAL QUESTIONS	6
UNDERTAKING JT-1.3: PROVIDE DRC'S WRITTEN QUESTIONS AS WELL AS ORAL QUESTIONS	7
UNDERTAKING JT-1.4: PROVIDE EQUIVALENT OF SAIDI TARGET WHEN LOSS OF SUPPLY IS EXCLUDED	11
UNDERTAKING JT-1.5: PROVIDE A SPREADSHEET THAT LISTS ALL THE POTENTIAL PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS, INCLUDING THOSE THAT WERE NOT SELECTED	14
UNDERTAKING JT-1.6: PROVIDE THE INITIAL SET OF ANNUAL CAPEX RESTRAINTS USED IN THE FIRST MODEL RUN THAT INFORMED THE SIX ITERATIONS LEADING TO THE DRAFT CAPITAL PLAN, INCLUDING THE BASIS AND RATIONALE USED TO DETERMINE THOSE YEARLY RESTRAINTS AMOUNTS	24
UNDERTAKING JT-1.7: PROVIDE AN ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE OF A PROJECT OR A PROGRAM THAT TAKES THE ESTIMATED RELIABILITY BENEFIT AND TRANSLATES IT TO A DOLLAR FIGURE	29
UNDERTAKING JT-1.8: PROVIDE THE 2015 CEATI STUDY THAT ALECTRA UTILITIES BASES THEIR VALUE OF LOST LOAD ON	30
UNDERTAKING JT-1.9: RECONCILE THE NUMBERS FROM THE 2027 TO 2031 PLANNING OUTLOOK IN TERMS OF THE MEGAWATTS AND THE PLANNING ZONES	39
UNDERTAKING JT-1.10: ADVISE OF THE REASON WHY THE LAND FOR THE GTAA PROJECT IS CONSIDERED AN ENHANCEMENT BUT THE TRANSFORMER STATION IS CONSIDERED AN EXPANSION	41

U N D E R T A K I N G S

Description	Page No.
UNDERTAKING JT-1.11: PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION AS TO HOW TO COMPARE AND RECONCILE THE NUMBERS IN TABLE 1 AT 3-CCC-31 WITH THE NUMBERS IN SEC-57	43
UNDERTAKING JT-1.12: FOR ALL MATERIAL CAPITAL PROJECTS WHERE THE FINAL COST IS AT LEAST $1 MILLION AND THERE IS A COST OVERRUN OF AT LEAST 10 PERCENT AND 100,000, PROVIDE FOR AS FAR BACK AS POSSIBLE THE PROJECT NAME, THE PROGRAM THAT IT MAY SIT UNDER, THE ORIGINAL BUDGET COST, THE FINAL PROJECT COST, THE ORIGINAL START DATE, THE ACTUAL START DATE, THE ORIGINAL TARGET IN-SERVICE DATE, THE ACTUAL IN-SERVICE DATE, AND FINAL CPI AND SPI SCORES	59
UNDERTAKING JT-1.13: PROVIDE INFORMATION ON PRE MERGER CAPITAL EXPENDITURES INCLUDING WHAT HIGHER LEVEL INFORMATION MAY BE AVAILABLE FOR PERIODS PRIOR TO 2019, AND COMMENT ON THE COMPANY'S POSITION ON HOW THE BOARD SHOULD ASSESS THOSE EXPENDITURES IN THIS PROCEEDING GIVEN THE LIMITATIONS IN THE AVAILABLE DATA	64
UNDERTAKING JT-1.14: PROVIDE REVISED VERSIONS OF 2A-SEC-44 ATTACHMENT 1 AND SEC-45 ATTACHMENT 1 SHOWING THE NET BASIS AT THE PROGRAM OR SEGMENT LEVEL	69
UNDERTAKING JT-1.15: PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION FOR THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE 2025 ACTUAL ASSET MANAGEMENT COSTS SHOWN IN APPENDIX 2JC AND THE 2025 FORECAST ASSET MANAGEMENT COSTS SHOWN IN EXHIBIT 4, VECC-47	75
UNDERTAKING JT-1.16: PROVIDE THE BREAKDOWN OF THE UNSPECIFIED CATEGORY ON 2-CCC-18, ATTACHMENT 1 BETWEEN KNOWNS THAT ARE INCLUDED VERSUS USING THE HISTORICAL AVERAGE	84
UNDERTAKING JT-1.17: PROVIDE A SUMMARY OF THE INITIAL ECONOMIC ANALYSIS WITH RESPECT TO THE	

U N D E R T A K I N G S

Description	Page No.
PROJECTS THAT DO NOT ATTRACT A CAPITAL CONTRIBUTION	89
UNDERTAKING JT-1.18: ADVISE WHETHER THE COMPANY CATEGORIZES PROJECTS AS ENHANCEMENT THAT DO OR DO NOT HAVE RELATED APPLICATIONS OR OFFERS TO CONNECT	94
UNDERTAKING JT-1.19: PROVIDE ANY APPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE, OFFERS TO CONNECT, OR ANYTHING OF THAT NATURE ASSOCIATED WITH THE WEBB MS PROJECT	97
UNDERTAKING JT-1.20: EXPAND THE TABLE IN CCC-24 TO INCLUDE THE ENTIRE COST OF THE RELATED STATION CAPACITY PROJECT AND THE TOTAL CONTRIBUTION THAT WAS MADE	99
UNDERTAKING JT-1.21: PROVIDE ANY CHANGE ORDERS, PROJECT CLOSE-OUT REPORTS, OR OTHER INTERNAL DOCUMENTATION RELATED TO THE HAMILTON SOUTH MOUNTAIN FEEDERS CAPACITY RELIEF PROJECT AND THE EXTEND BUNTING M81 FEEDER PROJECT	106
UNDERTAKING JT-1.22: PROVIDE A SPREADSHEET OR CALCULATION THAT SHOWS THE GRANULAR APPROACH TAKEN IN REGARDS TO SHIFT SCHEDULES ACROSS VARIOUS RATE ZONES FOR VARIOUS YEARS	110
UNDERTAKING JT-1.23: PROVIDE THE BUDGET AND ACTUAL THAT MAKE UP THE VALUES FROM 2020 TO 2024 FOR TABLE P-2 IN APPENDIX P	151
UNDERTAKING JT-1.24: EXPLAIN WHY 195,600 WAS USED FOR LABOR HOURS, AND ADVISE WHY THE LABOUR HOURS ARE THE SAME EVERY YEAR IN REGARDS TO 2-AMPCO-21 PART C, AND COMMENT ON WHAT CHANGES THERE WERE BETWEEN ITERATION 1 AND 6	152
UNDERTAKING JT-1.25: PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION IN RELATION TO 2-AMPCO-26 FOR WHAT IS DRIVING YEAR-OVER-YEAR VARIANCES INCLUDING THE ZERO PERCENT ISSUE	154

U N D E R T A K I N G S

Description	Page No.
UNDERTAKING JT-1.26: ON A BEST-EFFORTS BASIS, RUN THE ASSET CONDITION ASSESSMENT USING THE SAME DATA SET AS 2023 BUT REMOVING AGE AS AN INPUT	157
UNDERTAKING JT-1.27: PROVIDE THE NUMBER OF STATIONS REMAINING IN SERVICE THAT ARE FOR A 4KV BY THE END OF 2031	160
UNDERTAKING JT-1.28: PROVIDE THE DOLLAR AMOUNT THAT EQUATES TO THE OVERRUN RELATED TO THE 1,617 PROJECTS IN 4-AMPCO-64	160
UNDERTAKING JT-1.29: PROVIDE A RESPONSE ON HOW THE SPI IS CALCULATED	163
UNDERTAKING JT-1.30: ADVISE WHAT PEER GROUP IS REFERENCED IN THE RESPONSE AT 4-CCMBC-3 AND ADVISE WHETHER ALECTRA DECIDED CONSCIOUSLY TO SPEND LESS OR WHETHER THEY ARE BEING CONSTRAINED FROM SPENDING MORE ON OM&A BECAUSE THEY DID NOT HAVE ENOUGH MONEY	164
UNDERTAKING JT-1.31: PROVIDE A TABLE SHOWING THE COMPARISON BETWEEN THE AMOUNTS REQUESTED BY WAY OF ICM APPLICATIONS IN EACH OF THE FIVE PROCEEDINGS VERSUS WHAT WAS APPROVED	185
UNDERTAKING JT-1.32: ON A BEST-EFFORTS BASIS, PROVIDE INFORMATION ON THE NUMERICAL AND NARRATIVE IMPACTS OF DEFERRED CAPITAL INVESTMENT ON THE BUSINESS	187
UNDERTAKING JT-1.33: RECONCILE THE DIFFERENCE IN THE NUMBER OF DERS REPORTED IN 2A-EP-8 QUESTION C AND THOSE REPORTED IN THE DSP, 2A, TAB 1, SCHEDULE 1, 5.2.1, PAGE 19	188
UNDERTAKING JT-1.34: PROVIDE, IF AVAILABLE, A COMPARISON OF THE CDM IMPACTS INCLUDED IN THE NON COINCIDENTAL SYSTEM PEAK FORECAST AND THOSE	

U N D E R T A K I N G S

Description	Page No.
INCLUDED IN THE CHARGE DETERMINED FORECAST, INCLUDING THE MAGNITUDE OF THE IMPACTS	198
UNDERTAKING JT-1.35: ADVISE HOW THE IMPACT OF THE DATA CENTRE, AI, AND CLOUD COMPUTING LOAD IN THE CHARGE DETERMINED FORECAST COMPARES WITH THE 425 MEGAWATT IMPACT AS LISTED IN THE PLANNING FORECAST	200

1 Thursday, March 5, 2026
2 --- On commencing at 9:29 a.m.
3 R. DHILLON: Good morning, everyone. Good
4 morning. Well, again, good morning, everyone.
5 Welcome to the multi-day technical conference for
6 Alectra Utilities Corporation, application number EB-
7 2025-0252.
8 My name is Raman Dhillon. I am OEB counsel, and
9 I will be your host for the next couple of days.
10 I would like to ask Ms. Connell if she can start
11 with the land acknowledgement.
12 **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**
13 S.A. CONNELL: The Ontario Energy Board
14 acknowledges that our headquarters in Toronto is
15 located on the territory of the Anishinaabeg, the
16 Haudenosaunee, and Huron Wendat Nations, and that
17 this land is covered by historic treaties.
18 Traditionally, the territory now called Toronto was a
19 meeting place for many nations and is still home to
20 many Indigenous peoples from across Turtle Island.
21 We are grateful for the opportunity to live, work,
22 and learn on this land and acknowledge our shared
23 responsibilities to our relations. Thank you.
24 R. DHILLON: Okay. And I just wanted to
25 introduce Ms. Narisa Jotiban, who is the case manager
26 on this matter.
27 N. JOTIBAN: Good morning, everyone.
28 R. DHILLON: Okay. I am going to start with the

1 appearances, for which I will do a roll call. I do
2 understand that there are two preliminary matters
3 that we will deal with after roll call.
4 So if I may start with Alectra, Ms. Coban.
5 D. COBAN: Good morning. Daliana Coban, counsel
6 for Alectra.
7 J. MYERS: Jonathan Myers, counsel for Alectra.
8 D. COBAN: And my apologies. I should just
9 introduce that we have here next to us Ms. Long from
10 Alectra. Thank you.
11 R. DHILLON: And I will just go down the list.
12 Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario.
13 S. GRICE: Good morning. Shelley Grice
14 representing the Association of Major Power Consumers
15 in Ontario.
16 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Ms. Grice.
17 Building Owners and Managers Association Greater
18 Toronto.
19 C. LI: Good morning. Clement Li representing
20 Building Owners and Managers Association of Toronto.
21 Thank you.
22 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Li.
23 Coalition of Concerned Manufacturers and
24 Businesses of Canada.
25 T. LADANYI: Good morning. My name is Tom
26 Ladanyi. I am representing CCMBC.
27 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Ladanyi.
28 Consumers Council of Canada.

1 L. GLUCK: Good morning. Lawrie Gluck on behalf
2 of the Consumers Council of Canada.
3 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Gluck.
4 Distributed Resources Coalition.
5 D. VOLLMER: Good morning. Daniel Vollmer,
6 counsel for Distributed Resources Coalition.
7 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Vollmer.
8 Energy Probe Research Foundation.
9 T. LADANYI: Good morning again. Tom Ladanyi.
10 I am representing Energy Probe Research Foundation.
11 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Ladanyi.
12 Environmental Defence.
13 Okay. Maybe we will have them join in a later
14 panel.
15 Ontario Association of Physical Plant
16 Administrators.
17 S. WALKER: Good morning. Scott Walker
18 representing OAPPA, who are fundamentally Ontario's
19 universities and colleges.
20 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Walker.
21 Power Workers' Union.
22 D. ROSENBLUTH: Good morning. Dan Rosenbluth
23 here for the Power Workers' Union, and I am joined by
24 my colleague Bayu Kidane.
25 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Rosenbluth.
26 School Energy Coalition.
27 M. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you. Mark Rubenstein,
28 counsel for School Energy Coalition, and I am joined

1 remotely by SEC consultant Jane Scott.
2 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Rubenstein.
3 Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition.
4 M. GARNER: Good morning. Mark Garner for VECC,
5 and I am joined virtually online by Mr. Bill Harper.
6 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Garner.
7 Unless I have missed anyone, I believe that is
8 it for roll call.
9 We are just going to start with a preliminary
10 matter from Mr. Walker.
11 **PRELIMINARY MATTERS**
12 S. WALKER: Thank you.
13 If there were CVs that were provided, I
14 apologize. I didn't actually note those. I was just
15 wondering -- sorry. Not contesting the validity of
16 any of the panel members, to be clear; however, if in
17 your introductions you could identify if any of you
18 are actually power system engineers and your
19 experience related to design of underground overhead
20 and substations and if you have actually had
21 experience with protection and control and if any of
22 you have actually functioned as linesmen or in the
23 electrical mechanical world or as forestry, please.
24 J. MYERS: Okay. We will now turn it over to
25 our panel to introduce themselves, and if they can,
26 to include the additional information that Mr. Walker
27 requested.
28 T. WASIK: Good morning. My name is Tom Wasik.

1 I am the senior vice president of asset management.
2 I am an electrical engineer by trade. I have been in
3 the industry for 25 years now in a variety of
4 engineering roles, including asset management.
5 To my right.
6 H. IBRAHIM: Hany Ibrahim -- Hany Ibrahim,
7 director of capital investment planning. I am an
8 engineer by trade. I have been in the industry about
9 16 years and with the variety of roles, including
10 asset management.
11 R. BASSINDALE: Richard Bassindale, director of
12 standards and asset sustainment. I am an electrical
13 engineer with 18 years' experience with the utility.
14 I have experience on a lot of the items you have
15 raised. Some of it might be a little rusty. Haven't
16 been doing it all, but I will try to assist.
17 J. BUTLER: Hello. Jim Butler, vice president
18 of centralized operations. I have been in the
19 industry 34 years, and I am a licensed professional
20 engineer in Ontario. Through my 34 years, I have
21 been involved with most areas of the utility, but for
22 this application, I currently am responsible for
23 system control, reliability stations, and PNC.
24 D. FAIRCHILD: Good morning. My name is Doug
25 Fairchild. I am the vice president of distribution
26 design. I oversee the design activities of, you
27 know, our customer connections, you know, our asset
28 management-driven work, not the station design work

1 specifically. I am an electrical engineer. I have
2 been in the industry since 2000, and I do have some
3 PNC experience, but those aren't really been active
4 for several years, so, yeah. Thank you.
5 M. WITTEMUND: Hi. Good morning. My name is
6 Mike Wittemund. I am the vice president of lines
7 operations with Alectra. I have been in the industry
8 for over 20 years. I am a licensed professional
9 engineer by trade, and I have experience and
10 oversight with design as well as operations of the
11 electrical distribution. Thank you.
12 J. MYERS: The panel is available for questions
13 now. Thank you.
14 Sorry. Maybe just as an administrative matter
15 before we get going, we have three sets of written
16 technical conference questions that we would like to
17 enter in as undertakings. OEB Staff has indicated
18 that they will be providing written questions as well
19 as their oral questions, so we would like those to be
20 marked as JT-1.1.
21 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.1: PROVIDE OEB STAFF'S WRITTEN**
22 **QUESTIONS AS WELL AS ORAL QUESTIONS**
23 J. MYERS: And then ED has a set of questions.
24 We would like those to be marked as JT-1.2.
25 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.2: PROVIDE ED'S WRITTEN**
26 **QUESTIONS AS WELL AS ORAL QUESTIONS**
27 J. MYERS: And DRC, their questions would be
28 marked as JT-1.3.

1 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.3: PROVIDE DRC'S WRITTEN**
2 **QUESTIONS AS WELL AS ORAL QUESTIONS**
3 R. DHILLON: Sorry, Mr. Myers. Can you repeat
4 the last one?
5 J. MYERS: DRC, JT-1.3.
6 And so all the questions for each of those three
7 would be included under that number.
8 R. DHILLON: Thank you. So we are marking as
9 Undertaking JT-1.1 the undertaking responses; JT-1.2,
10 the ED -- or the set of ED; and then JT-1.3, the DRC;
11 is that correct?
12 J. MYERS: Correct. Thank you.
13 R. DHILLON: Thank you.
14 The time is now 9:40. We will aim to take a
15 break around 10:45 this morning. And with that said,
16 I will turn it over to School Energy Coalition, Mr.
17 Rubenstein.
18 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY M. RUBENSTEIN**
19 M. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you very much.
20 I will have some questions, and my colleague Ms.
21 Scott will have some questions at the end. And just
22 to give you a bit of a roadmap, I am going to sort of
23 jump around different interrogatories just so we can
24 deal with sort of different topic areas in sequence.
25 And the first one I want to discuss with you is
26 at 2-Staff-140. Maybe we can have that pulled up.
27 And I want to ask about your response to part B.
28 And in it, you were asked about the relationship

1 between the reliability targets in the application
2 and those with respect to the OEB's performance
3 benchmarking reliability targets. And in your
4 response, you discuss that they are not essentially
5 like-for-like because the OEB targets exclude loss of
6 supply and major event days, and the Alectra targets
7 include loss of supply; do I have that right?
8 J. BUTLER: Yes, you have that correct.
9 M. RUBENSTEIN: And as I understand as well, you
10 only have a SAIDI target, not a SAIFI target, as
11 compared to the OEB's benchmarking, which does both?
12 J. BUTLER: Yes, that is correct.
13 M. RUBENSTEIN: All right.
14 And can you help me understand why you wouldn't
15 be able to develop a SAIDI target that excludes both
16 loss of supply and major event days so that there is
17 an apples-to-apples comparison?
18 J. BUTLER: We -- we chose our target, our SAIDI
19 target. We exclude MED days. We feel that they can
20 bias the results. You know, they are extreme events
21 and don't provide great analysis or insight, but we
22 do include a loss of supply.
23 We feel that is relevant for our internal
24 metrics and our internal targets and our programs to
25 support. Loss of supply minutes are experienced by
26 the customers, and we try to minimize them, so that
27 is included in our target, and we feel that is best
28 for Alectra.

1 The targets generated by the OEB excluded those,
2 and I can't speak to why they were excluded there,
3 but we feel it is appropriate to include them in our
4 internal targets.
5 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yes. Sorry. Maybe I am -- I
6 understand why you are proposing the target. Maybe I
7 am just trying to understand, are you able to take
8 your target and derive a version of it that would
9 then exclude loss of supply?
10 J. BUTLER: Mr. Rubenstein, our targets are --
11 they are referring to the 20 percent reduction in
12 SAIDI. Those were derived by assessing the impact of
13 our investment programs that were proposed here. The
14 investment programs don't specifically address lost
15 supply. That is outside of our control. We could
16 attempt to estimate the impact of lost supply, but it
17 is not under our direct control, so it would be a
18 rough estimation. But it is possible, I believe. I
19 don't know if it is relevant, but it is possible.
20 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, I mean, I do think it is
21 relevant. I mean, the Board has targets. You have
22 targets. I am trying to -- I think Staff in their
23 interrogatory also is trying to understand what the
24 true difference is, and I think your response was,
25 well, they are not exactly the same.
26 So I would ask you to undertake to do that. And
27 maybe before that, maybe it would be helpful to
28 understand, are you undertaking investments that

1 would deal directly with loss of -- reducing loss of
2 --
3 J. BUTLER: Sorry. Could you repeat that
4 question.
5 M. RUBENSTEIN: Are you undertaking investments
6 in the investment plan that is the basis of the
7 application that address reducing loss of supply?
8 R. BASSINDALE: Not as a primary driver, no.
9 M. RUBENSTEIN: Let me just back up. I
10 understand -- putting aside it is a primary driver,
11 is there any that will have the benefit of reducing
12 loss of supply -- let me say, materially, right?
13 R. BASSINDALE: Over the course of the DSP,
14 materially, no.
15 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Well, then I will go back
16 to the undertaking because it seems that if you have
17 no investments that are directly actually addressing
18 reducing loss of supply, then you can essentially do
19 the calculation of what that would look like; right?
20 J. BUTLER: We could. If I could reference
21 table 6 from AMPCO-54.
22 So you can see there that this table breaks down
23 the customer hours of interruption by cause code for
24 the last number of years, and when you do the math,
25 loss of supply is approximately 5 percent -- for
26 previous year or the average years, it is always
27 around 5 percent. So it would not have a material
28 impact. Removing loss of supply would not have a

1 material impact on the impact on our targets. So we
2 could take an undertaking to do that calculation, but
3 they would not have a material change.
4 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, let's do that just so
5 later on we are not arguing about what the correct
6 number here is of the math, if you are willing to
7 give that undertaking.
8 J. BUTLER: So can you please -- can we -- just
9 to make sure I understand the undertaking, can you
10 please repeat it.
11 M. RUBENSTEIN: Sure. I am trying to understand
12 what would be the equivalent of your SAIFI target --
13 sorry -- SAIDI target -- I apologize -- SAIDI target
14 if you excluded both loss of supply and --
15 J. MYERS: And as part of that undertaking, Mr.
16 Butler, are there any qualifications that you feel
17 you would need to include in the response?
18 J. BUTLER: There may be. We will include them
19 in the response.
20 M. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you very much. Can we now
21 go to --
22 R. DHILLON: Sorry. I am just going to mark
23 that as Undertaking JT-1.5.
24 D. COBAN: I think it is 1.4, Ms. Dhillon.
25 R. DHILLON: Oh, I apologize. JT-1.4.
26 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.4: PROVIDE EQUIVALENT OF SAIDI**
27 **TARGET WHEN LOSS OF SUPPLY IS EXCLUDED**
28 M. RUBENSTEIN: Can we now go to 2A-SEC-28. I

1 have some questions about the optimization process.
2 So in part A, we -- I won't read it, but we asked you
3 to provide in an Excel spreadsheet the key outputs of
4 the final Copperleaf optimization model, and there's
5 specific information, and you provided an attachment.
6 I just want to make sure I understand what is
7 included in the attachment and make sure I understand
8 how it all works. So just so I understand, the
9 attachment includes all of the projects or programs
10 that are included in the plan; correct?
11 H. IBRAHIM: That is correct.
12 M. RUBENSTEIN: But ultimately, there is a
13 larger set of potential projects and programs that
14 ultimately the optimization selected based on the
15 various factors in its optimization process. Do I
16 have that right?
17 H. IBRAHIM: No. The optimization -- the list
18 you are looking at in tab 1 that is -- of the
19 attachment, that is the portfolio of the final plan.
20 The optimization would have deferred the other
21 investments.
22 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah. So I think we are saying
23 the same thing here. Originally, there are more
24 potential -- there is a selection of potential
25 projects and programs, and then the optimization
26 process selects and determines, based on the
27 constraints, the projects that we are seeing in the
28 final -- in the attachment and ultimately what is in

1 the plan. Right?
2 H. IBRAHIM: Right. There are other projects
3 that are deferred.
4 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah. So the question we had
5 asked you, and maybe it just wasn't clear how it was
6 phrased, we were seeking that entire list. Because,
7 as you know, at the end, we asked you, the last
8 question is for you to tell -- the last part of that
9 is if the project or program is to be included in the
10 plan. So we are trying to understand the --
11 essentially one step back, all the list of projects
12 and their scores.
13 H. IBRAHIM: Okay.
14 M. RUBENSTEIN: Are you able to provide that
15 revised attachment?
16 J. MYERS: Mr. Rubenstein, what is the relevance
17 of the projects that are not part of the plan?
18 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, you are selecting certain
19 projects using a process. We want to understand
20 which projects those were selected over. That
21 determines the prudence of the expenditures you are
22 seeking, the individual projects.
23 J. MYERS: I think we can speak to the process,
24 but I am not sure what -- the relevance of the
25 projects that were deferred.
26 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, I think it is directly
27 relevant. You have a set of candidate projects in
28 the process. You have spent a lot of the evidence

1 discussing the calculation -- you know, how you --
2 the process of the optimization which comes out with
3 the programs. But, ultimately, those are selected
4 over other projects.
5 We would like to understand -- to properly
6 understand what the programs ultimately were chosen,
7 we need to understand the larger -- the larger set of
8 programs that were considered as part of the process,
9 and that is what the spreadsheet was asking for. It
10 is entirely relevant.
11 J. MYERS: Perhaps examples would help clarify
12 how that process works?
13 M. RUBENSTEIN: No. The -- no. I am seeking
14 the list of projects in -- as requested in the
15 original interrogatory.
16 J. MYERS: Just one moment.
17 I think what we can do is we can consider
18 whether we think that is relevant, and if we agree
19 that it is appropriate to provide that, then we will.
20 And if we continue to believe that it is not
21 relevant, then we will explain why.
22 R. DHILLON: Mr. Myers, would you like to mark
23 that as undertaking number JT-1.5?
24 J. MYERS: Yes, please.
25 R. DHILLON: Thank you.
26 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.5: PROVIDE A SPREADSHEET THAT**
27 **LISTS ALL THE POTENTIAL PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS,**
28 **INCLUDING THOSE THAT WERE NOT SELECTED**

1 M. RUBENSTEIN: Now, just so I understand the
2 optimization process, and we have that large list, as
3 I understand, there are constraints, and projects
4 have to be taken, and they are -- well, I will ask
5 you about that.
6 But let's just assume the projects that are not
7 part of that, right, so the ones where you have the
8 ability to defer, as I understand, you're selecting
9 based on a total values score. Do I have that right?
10 H. IBRAHIM: The optimizations does select based
11 on value, but it is an optimization, not a
12 prioritization.
13 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. I think is it not doing,
14 in some sense, both? It is optimizing between years
15 and, you know, some of the constraints, but it is
16 also then --
17 H. IBRAHIM: It also has the ability to select
18 different options within a project.
19 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yes.
20 H. IBRAHIM: A prioritization would not have
21 that capability, but optimization would. Again, it
22 is trying to maximize the total value.
23 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. But ultimately if we have
24 two -- let's just -- simplest example here. You have
25 two projects that have the same cost, right, and you
26 can only do one of them, the process will pick the
27 one with the higher total value score.
28 H. IBRAHIM: In a universe of two projects,

1 maybe. But let me give you an example of three where
2 the selection would be different.
3 M. RUBENSTEIN: Please.
4 H. IBRAHIM: And if I may.
5 So imagine there is a universe of three
6 projects. One for, let's say, an investment of $10,
7 and it would yield 10 points, let's say; and the
8 second one is $6, and it yields 6 points; and then
9 the third one would yield -- of $4 would yield 5
10 points.
11 If you were prioritizing and you have with a
12 constraint of $10, it would pick the first project
13 only. But if you were optimizing, you would select
14 the second and the third because they would provide a
15 higher value. 11 points, to be exact.
16 Optimization can yield a different -- in a
17 universe of two projects, yes, but that is not a fair
18 comparison with a portfolio of hundreds.
19 Optimization would yield a different outcome than
20 prioritization in our portfolio.
21 M. RUBENSTEIN: But let me ask you this
22 question: Is it looking at total value -- I mean, I
23 here -- I recognize -- but is it primarily looking at
24 optimizing for the total value or -- how might I put
25 it?
26 As I understand, total value is the sum of the
27 net benefits and the net -- the net benefit score and
28 the net risk score minus by the net present value of

1 the investment cost. Do I have that part right?
2 H. IBRAHIM: That is correct. In light of the -
3 - you have to consider the constraints as well.
4 M. RUBENSTEIN: Sure. But just of the score
5 component.
6 H. IBRAHIM: Yes.
7 M. RUBENSTEIN: And is it looking, then, at
8 optimizing for the total score, or -- so it is
9 optimizing for total score. Is there a reason why
10 you are using that approach versus one that looks at,
11 for example, the total benefits and the total -- the
12 total benefit score, the total risk score, but
13 divided by the investment risk score. So it is what
14 is the total value you are getting for every dollar
15 of investment.
16 I have seen that approach. Some utilities I
17 have seen use that approach. I am just trying to
18 understand why you are using one, others are using
19 others.
20 H. IBRAHIM: Our approach is to remove the cost,
21 the net present value of the cost, not divide the
22 cost. Dividing by the cost would actually skew the
23 portfolio or would skew the decision.
24 M. RUBENSTEIN: No, no, no, I understand that --
25 what you are doing.
26 My question is why are you taking that approach
27 versus one that looks at a, you know, benefit -- let
28 me put it this way, sort of changing the value of the

1 benefits and risks per dollar. I have seen that
2 approach used by other utilities. I have seen your
3 approach also. I am just trying to understand why
4 you have taken one versus the other. It is another
5 way of doing it, obviously.
6 H. IBRAHIM: It is another way. And I can't
7 comment on the other approach per se. I can comment
8 on our approach where it is essentially a net present
9 value approach. So if there is a return in benefit
10 or mitigated risk in dollars or monetized dollars of
11 risk in value, and there is an investment that is
12 cash flow, you would discount it and do a net present
13 value. I am not -- I can't comment on approach of
14 division.
15 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Now, the -- in the
16 evidence, it discusses what you call planning groups,
17 which as I -- in the evidence, it talks about the
18 planning groups "exclude," "must do," "in flight not
19 plausible," and "must do something" planning groups.
20 You are familiar with that?
21 H. IBRAHIM: Yes.
22 M. RUBENSTEIN: In the spreadsheet, though, that
23 you provided, there is a different -- there is one
24 that is not included in the evidence. I am just
25 wondering if you talk to it. It is called "new to
26 scenario." What is that?
27 D. COBAN: Mr. Rubenstein, maybe just for the
28 benefit of the room, can you give us an evidence

1 reference so we are looking at the --
2 M. RUBENSTEIN: Sure. If you are in 2A-SEC-28
3 attachment 1 in the big spreadsheet. There is sort
4 of a category of planning groups. And one, I just
5 note it is not referenced in the prefiled evidence
6 when you talk about planning groups. I am just
7 understanding what that one was.
8 H. IBRAHIM: Mr. Rubenstein, those projects "new
9 to scenario" are basically everything that is the
10 default that is not in a planning group. And I will
11 take that subject to check.
12 M. RUBENSTEIN: So as I understand, the planning
13 groups in the evidence there is "exclude," which
14 means, I guess, don't include it in the process, as I
15 understand the evidence. One is "in flight not
16 plausible." So it has already been started, can't
17 stop. There is "must do," which means you have to do
18 that project regardless of the value score. And then
19 there is "must do something," which is it is -- you
20 have to do it at some point, I guess, but it is
21 deferrable.
22 So I am just not clear when you say the default,
23 how does that work? How does that work compared to
24 the other planning groups?
25 H. IBRAHIM: So the planning groups are select
26 projects where there is limitations to the optimizer
27 and what it does with them.
28 The "new to scenario," subject to check, is

1 basically anything that the optimizer can move
2 around, select different options. It is not
3 constrained.
4 And I would like to basically clarify something
5 in the planning group. So some planning groups, when
6 you say "must do something," that means we are not
7 necessarily selecting an option. It is we are
8 telling the optimizer it has to select an option for
9 the optimization to run.
10 So there is different -- what I am trying to
11 explain is different planning groups have different
12 constraints. For example, you said the "must do" --
13 "must do," those are forced in the optimizer because
14 there is obligations towards those projects.
15 "In flight not plausible," that is basically
16 they started they can't stop at this point. Right.
17 "Must do something" is different constraints
18 than the other two. That is what I want to point
19 out.
20 A "new to scenario" is basically everything else
21 available to the optimizer to optimize and move
22 around and basically adjust the start dates, adjust
23 the options, pick whatever would provide the maximum
24 total portfolio value.
25 M. RUBENSTEIN: And can you just, then, clarify
26 the difference between that and "must do something."
27 H. IBRAHIM: "Must do something" is a project
28 where we are telling the optimizer you would have to

1 select an option from that project, a choice of that
2 project.
3 M. RUBENSTEIN: And so that would be as -- when
4 you say you have, you know, the reduced, accelerated,
5 those -- that is what you are talking about?
6 H. IBRAHIM: Yes.
7 M. RUBENSTEIN: You have to select one of those.
8 H. IBRAHIM: Yes.
9 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.
10 Now, I just have one question about one
11 project that just sort of stood out to me from this
12 list that didn't -- I just didn't know what it meant.
13 You have a project called "AMI metering renewal MRZ,"
14 and it was not -- but you also have, then, "AMI
15 metering renewal" for each of the five rate zones.
16 So what is "MRZ"?
17 H. IBRAHIM: Mr. Rubenstein, that question is
18 better answered by Panel 2.
19 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.
20 Can we go to 2-AMPCO-21. And in part C, you
21 were asked to provide the Copperleaf constraints, and
22 you provided per year in the draft capital plan. And
23 if we go down to page 3, you provide that table.
24 And you will see for the Capex constraints, they
25 go to -- from 406.9 up to 857.8. Do you see that?
26 H. IBRAHIM: Yes. I see table 1.
27 M. RUBENSTEIN: How were those Capex constraints
28 determined? Those are very specific numbers, so help

1 me understand how those were determined.
2 H. IBRAHIM: The capital constraint is set by --
3 or the initial one for the optimization was set by
4 the capital investment planning team and to start the
5 iterations, and as we submitted in the question we
6 went through, six iterations to refine all the
7 constraints within the optimization. And that is
8 where the constraint ended to -- basically for the
9 draft plan.
10 M. RUBENSTEIN: So are you saying the initial
11 optimization had different constraints? The number
12 was not 406.9; it was some other number?
13 H. IBRAHIM: The first iteration would have
14 started with a different set of constraints, and it
15 gets refined through the six iterations throughout
16 our company.
17 M. RUBENSTEIN: All right. Can you provide the
18 total Capex constraints for each of the different
19 optimization scenarios? Or not sure what language
20 you use.
21 J. MYERS: Mr. Rubenstein, what's the relevance
22 of that? It is not part of the plan that we are
23 proposing.
24 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, you started with some
25 number. The first process started with a number. I
26 am trying to -- first of all, I am trying to
27 understand what that number is and really how you got
28 to it. What was the basis of that number that then

1 you iterated from? What was the starting point? So
2 maybe we can -- you know, you can at least give me
3 the first one.
4 J. MYERS: And, again, this is --
5 M. RUBENSTEIN: Sorry. One sec. And if Alectra
6 can explain how those numbers were determined.
7 J. MYERS: I think we can provide the
8 explanation as to the process of how these were
9 determined, but I don't think the numbers from the
10 earlier iterations are relevant.
11 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, I do think they are
12 relevant. You started with a number, some number --
13 Alectra -- sorry -- not Mr. Myers. The company
14 started with a number that was used to iterate. That
15 was the starting point for a process that led to the
16 draft capital plan. I am trying to understand what
17 those numbers were, and very specifically, how were
18 they determined, right? Someone had to say
19 somewhere, this is a -- we think, a reasonable
20 starting point to develop a capital plan. I am just
21 trying to understand that.
22 J. MYERS: Well, in terms of the numbers, we can
23 undertake to consider whether we think that is
24 relevant and can be provided, and if not, then we
25 will explain why we think that's not relevant.
26 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Let's just -- let me just
27 make sure I ask the question so -- it got a little
28 garbled there as I was saying it.

1 I am looking to understand, and just to simplify
2 it, the first set of capital constraints on the first
3 run. That was the basis, as I understand or I
4 believe, the six iterations that led to the draft
5 capital plan, what those -- what those Capex
6 constraints were per year, and very importantly, how
7 they were determined, what was the basis of those
8 numbers.
9 J. MYERS: Subject to my -- my earlier
10 qualification, I think we can take that.
11 R. DHILLON: Thank you. We will mark that as
12 Undertaking JT-1.6.
13 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.6: PROVIDE THE INITIAL SET OF**
14 **ANNUAL CAPEX RESTRAINTS USED IN THE FIRST MODEL**
15 **RUN THAT INFORMED THE SIX ITERATIONS LEADING TO**
16 **THE DRAFT CAPITAL PLAN, INCLUDING THE BASIS AND**
17 **RATIONALE USED TO DETERMINE THOSE YEARLY**
18 **RESTRAINTS AMOUNTS**
19 M. RUBENSTEIN: So just -- now, if I can just
20 understand, there was some number, with the first,
21 and then you ran some various optimization
22 iterations. And maybe you could help me understand
23 what was happening between one and the draft plan,
24 why you were running six, what were the changes that
25 were being made through the process?
26 H. IBRAHIM: The six iterations. First, let's
27 take into context we are a larger organization, and
28 also we are refining the constraints. And so let's

1 say we start at, let's say, Iteration 1, the
2 optimization would result in a portfolio that would
3 go into informing how our execution plan will go. It
4 will also inform our workforce planning, and then it
5 would inform also our finance department and OM&A,
6 and that would result in an OM&A non-labour
7 constraint coming back.
8 And then that is why it is an iterative process;
9 it is not just you plug in the numbers and hit click
10 and it gives you the results. It is an iterative
11 process throughout the company, and that takes
12 iterations to do.
13 Again, the plan is not just here are a set of
14 projects. It is -- also ensures their executability
15 and, you know, the proper business planning around
16 it.
17 M. RUBENSTEIN: And were the constraints you are
18 showing on the screen for the draft capital plan --
19 were those actually the constraints or just the
20 outcome? And I ask it because you can imagine a
21 scenario where I can't find -- you put in a
22 constraint for some very specific number, and, you
23 know, the math doesn't add up. It is going to be
24 maybe slightly different; right?
25 H. IBRAHIM: To answer your question, you can
26 get no solution from an optimization, that is
27 correct. That is a possible outcome. When you
28 optimize against your constraint, you can get no

1 solution. So that is a possible outcome, yes.
2 M. RUBENSTEIN: But to my question, are those
3 the actual constraints or just the outcome of the
4 process of what the capital would look like?
5 H. IBRAHIM: Subject to check, these are the
6 actual constraints.
7 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.
8 Can we go to 2A-SEC-31. And in part C, we asked
9 you to provide for each draft and final plan the --
10 essentially the constraints that were used, and in
11 your response, you take us to your answer to part B -
12 - one sec here. Sorry. My computer is freezing here
13 -- where, in part B, you provide actually just the
14 total dollars and so -- for the different plans.
15 And so do I take it -- I just want to confirm it
16 as I understand, then -- that the -- when you get to
17 the final plan, you didn't rerun the optimization;
18 you just made some adjustments to the draft plan; do
19 I have that right?
20 H. IBRAHIM: That is correct. And the final
21 plan was an adjusted version of the draft plan --
22 M. RUBENSTEIN: All right.
23 H. IBRAHIM: -- incorporating customer feedback.
24 M. RUBENSTEIN: Can we go to 2A-SEC-29. And in
25 this question, we were asking you about reliability
26 improvement and the modelling you use, and we
27 referenced information you provided in a previous
28 Alectra proceeding where you did provide some

1 reliability projections.
2 And the response to part B, as I understand it,
3 is you are explaining -- it references part A. But
4 as I understand, the reliability benefits that you
5 were using or are using is derived from the value
6 framework process; right? Do I have that right?
7 R. BASSINDALE: That is correct.
8 M. RUBENSTEIN: And am I correct that how that
9 process works at a high level is you start with a
10 baseline reliability and then what you think the
11 process in terms of what the -- when you do the
12 project, how that would change? Am I understanding
13 that correctly?
14 R. BASSINDALE: As the reliability value is a
15 benefit, it is the avoidance of outages. So the --
16 specifically with the scorecard metric, it is based
17 on subject matter experts looking at the reliability
18 from the previous five years and setting that as kind
19 of the baseline and then projecting forward what they
20 think is going to occur if the investment doesn't get
21 completed. And then based on the assumptions, the
22 investment gets completed. There is a potential
23 reduction in reliability.
24 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. And so I think we are
25 saying the same thing. There is sort of a baseline
26 that you determine of what the reliability of that
27 would be without the investment, and then there is a
28 forecast of what the change would be with the

1 investment; do I have that right? That is step one?
2 R. BASSINDALE: So, no. We use the historical
3 reliability to forecast. That would occur if the
4 investment doesn't happen. I guess it is a slight
5 little nuance there.
6 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay.
7 As then as I understand, you then take that, and
8 then you translate it to a dollar value based on a
9 value of lost load calculation; do I have that right?
10 R. BASSINDALE: Yes, that is correct.
11 M. RUBENSTEIN: Now, you provided, in the DSP
12 appendix C, the value framework definitions. That is
13 confidential, so I am not going to ask you to take
14 it. So I am going to ask you to do this by way of
15 undertaking.
16 But I have reviewed it, and I can't actually
17 figure out how -- it doesn't -- how you actually go
18 from the change in reliability to the lost load, what
19 the numbers are, and then how -- how the math that
20 you are using is. And then is -- so that is question
21 number 1.
22 I was wondering if you can provide an
23 illustrative example of a project or a program where
24 you are then taking the change in reliability and
25 translating it to a dollar figure; is that something
26 you can do, sort of explain it and provide an
27 illustrative example? By way of undertaking, just to
28 be clear. I don't mean...

1 R. BASSINDALE: So to clarify, you would like us
2 to walk you through an illustrative example of how we
3 use the historical reliability to then project out
4 and turn it -- translate it into a net present value
5 for reliability benefit?
6 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yes.
7 R. BASSINDALE: Okay.
8 R. DHILLON: We will mark that as Undertaking
9 JT-1.7.
10 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.7: PROVIDE AN ILLUSTRATIVE**
11 **EXAMPLE OF A PROJECT OR A PROGRAM THAT TAKES THE**
12 **ESTIMATED RELIABILITY BENEFIT AND TRANSLATES IT**
13 **TO A DOLLAR FIGURE**
14 M. RUBENSTEIN: Now, with respect to the lost
15 load numbers, not clear to me -- they're in the -- I
16 don't want to talk about those specifically because I
17 believe they are confidential. But it is not clear
18 to me what the -- where you derive those lost load
19 calculations, what the source of that information is.
20 Can you talk about that, what -- your information you
21 are using, what is the date of it?
22 R. BASSINDALE: The value of lost load values
23 that Alectra Utilities utilizes is based on a 2015
24 CEATI study.
25 M. RUBENSTEIN: Can you provide a copy of that
26 study?
27 R. BASSINDALE: So we cannot provide the study
28 itself, but we could provide you the values that we

1 use from that study.
2 M. RUBENSTEIN: Why can't you provide the study?
3 R. BASSINDALE: It is confidential through
4 CEATI.
5 J. MYERS: Mr. Bassindale, is it a matter of
6 needing consent from CEATI to provide their report?
7 R. BASSINDALE: I would have to validate if that
8 is permissible.
9 J. MYERS: Okay. So maybe we can take that as
10 an undertaking subject to confirming that we are able
11 to provide the report. If we can't, we will explain
12 why. And if it needs to be filed confidentially,
13 then we would do so.
14 M. RUBENSTEIN: Sure.
15 J. MYERS: Does that work?
16 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah.
17 R. DHILLON: We will mark that as Undertaking
18 JT-1.8.
19 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.8: PROVIDE THE 2015 CEATI**
20 **STUDY THAT ALECTRA UTILITIES BASES THEIR VALUE**
21 **OF LOST LOAD ON**
22 M. RUBENSTEIN: Just so I can understand the
23 study at a high level, is it -- was this a study done
24 for Alectra, or is that a generic study?
25 R. BASSINDALE: It was a study completed for a
26 number of utilities both in the U.S. and Canada.
27 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay.
28 Can we go to 2-CCC-22. And this is just a good

1 table to work off because it has a list of all the
2 projects in the lines capacity group. So it is just
3 helpful in that regard.
4 And as I understand the table, it includes a
5 list of all the lines capacity projects; do I have
6 that right? Just so I am making sure I...
7 T. WASIK: That is correct.
8 M. RUBENSTEIN: I was wondering if you could
9 provide for each of the line capacity projects that
10 are listed on this table -- if you could provide the
11 total incremental capacity that they are providing,
12 how many offers to connect you've signed or are in
13 the process of working through with the customer or
14 their discussions or they are underway for each of
15 those lines and the total megawatts of capacity that
16 would account for. Is that something you could do?
17 T. WASIK: I'm sorry. I didn't understand the
18 first part, Mr. Rubenstein. You wanted the total
19 capacity, and then at the end --
20 M. RUBENSTEIN: The total incremental capacity
21 of the project, the total number of offers to connect
22 that you've signed related, obviously, to that
23 capacity -- that you've signed or that you are close
24 to signing. You've provided information just as a
25 backup in 2A-SEC-38 with the data centres giving sort
26 of a sense of where those projects are. And then how
27 many megawatts those offers to connect or those in
28 the -- that are close to it would represent for that

1 project. Is that something you can do?
2 T. WASIK: Mr. Rubenstein, I think it is
3 possible for us to be able to provide you the
4 megawatts, but it is extremely difficult to be able
5 to then map a specific customer to what could be, you
6 know, 40, 50 different feeder projects that are
7 configured to an open-loop distribution network to
8 determine whether or not they would or not be served
9 by customers or which customers.
10 These are feeders that we are proposing to
11 develop and construct and implement for larger areas
12 that also benefit existing customers as well. So
13 it's -- we can provide you the megawatts capacity
14 benefit of implementing these feeders, but it would
15 be not feasible for us to be able to map them to
16 specific customers or future customers.
17 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, I am not asking you to --
18 that is why I was kind of getting specific to ones
19 that you have offers to connect or you are close to
20 have offers connect; right? We are not talking about
21 something long in the future. I am trying to
22 understand that are under -- that are, like, in the
23 shorter term, closely underpinning the need for the
24 project.
25 T. WASIK: I think in that particular case, if
26 you are referring to SEC-38, we have 11 projects that
27 are quite discreet, and we can speak to those with
28 respect to where we are with implementing offers to

1 connect, sort of receiving design deposits.
2 But relative to a large number of projects
3 stemming from 2017 to 2031 and mapping them to
4 customers, you know, we could -- we have thousands of
5 customers, Mr. Rubenstein. I don't think it would be
6 feasible for us to be able to map them to these
7 specific projects as you have asked.
8 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, then maybe just make sure
9 I understand before I -- just make sure my question
10 is even getting at what I want, then, if -- and what
11 you're saying, just to make sure.
12 The evidence discusses with lines project -- and
13 I am going to have the same question with respect to
14 the station's capacity project about the need for all
15 the projects; right? You have a lot of evidence
16 explaining developments and large -- you know, some
17 data centres or, you know, whatever it is, some, you
18 know, municipal infrastructure projects.
19 I am trying to understand -- I am trying to get
20 a sense of it, of how much of that -- that demand
21 that is driving the need for those projects, at this
22 stage at least, is close -- either is underpinned by
23 an offer to connect or close to being underpinned by
24 an offer to connect. That is what I am trying to
25 understand.
26 T. WASIK: Okay.
27 M. RUBENSTEIN: And so when you are talking
28 about thousands of customers, I mean, maybe that is

1 the answer. There is thousands of offers to connect
2 that are being -- for one of these lines capacity
3 projects, but I am not sure that -- that doesn't --
4 maybe that's -- is that -- is that the answer?
5 T. WASIK: No, I don't think it is that simple,
6 Mr. Rubenstein. I think -- you ask a question
7 specifically. I know you are referencing a CCC
8 response, but I think you have asked a very similar
9 question in your IRRs relating to what is the date of
10 the need.
11 If you sort of take your attention to that one.
12 I don't have it lined up. It was your question, I
13 recall, Mr. Rubenstein, where we attempted to provide
14 you what the date of the need is. Maybe that would
15 be able to provide you the context that you are
16 looking for in terms of measuring the timing of when
17 we are planning to construct and implement these
18 solutions and when the load is anticipated to be
19 required in order to meet those needs. And we have
20 mapped that for you in your response. So perhaps if
21 you recall your question.
22 M. RUBENSTEIN: I did ask a question. I am just
23 trying to -- I don't have it off the top of my head,
24 the number.
25 T. WASIK: But I do recall, Mr. Rubenstein, you
26 asked for -- tell us the date of the need.
27 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yes.
28 T. WASIK: And I think that is more appropriate

1 for your own findings to match up our timing of
2 constructing with when the anticipated demand for
3 that particular project is required.
4 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Well, let's do this:
5 Let's pause this question. I will take a look at the
6 break, and we can circle back. I don't want to waste
7 time while I am CTRL F'ing the interrogatories.
8 Can we go now to, then, 2A-SEC-36. I want to
9 make sure I understand the response here.
10 So in part B, we asked for 2010 to 2025 for
11 Alectra or the predecessor's utilities non-actual
12 coincidental system peak and non-coincidental system
13 peak on a weather-normalized basis. And then we
14 asked the same thing for the coincidental peak in
15 part C.
16 And in your response, you provide the 1-in-2 and
17 1-in-10 starting in 2019. And I just want to make
18 sure I understand what you are doing here.
19 So is it what you are doing with respect to the
20 -- these weather-normalized approaches? You are
21 taking the actual load that was in that year, so the
22 actual what -- the usage of various customers, and
23 you are determining what it would have been on a 1-
24 in-2 and on a 1-in-10 basis? So if that same
25 customer is using it on a, you know, 1-in-10 hottest
26 day of the year, that is what it would be? Just to
27 make sure I understand.
28 T. WASIK: That is correct, Mr. Rubenstein.

1 They are weather corrected to the 1-in-2 and the 1-
2 in-10 scenarios as you describe.
3 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.
4 Now, can we go to 2A-SEC-57. You may have to
5 take this by way of undertaking. And in this, we
6 asked you for some information, which you provided a
7 helpful spreadsheet that breaks down all the
8 different stations and various loading information.
9 And so maybe we will just pull up the spreadsheet, if
10 that is possible. This is the attachment 1.
11 And if we go to the -- we move to the left-hand,
12 you have the planning zone, and then you have the
13 region, do you see that, for each of the stations?
14 T. WASIK: Yes, I am with you.
15 M. RUBENSTEIN: And when I look at this, and I
16 look at the numbers, and I compare it to the
17 information that you have in appendix J, figure 19,
18 which shows the 1-in-10 forecast by planning zone, I
19 get the same total. So all the numbers do add up.
20 But the -- but on a planning zone basis, there are
21 some differences.
22 And that is also when I -- as I understand, in
23 the other charts, you have -- you don't -- you have -
24 - you break down east into the York and the Simcoe
25 regions. But when I get it, I get different numbers.
26 And I was wondering if you could reconcile --
27 and that is also when I take this and I convert it --
28 I convert those other tables from megawatts to MVA, I

1 get different numbers. I was wondering if you can
2 reconcile that information for me.
3 T. WASIK: So just to be very clear, Mr.
4 Rubenstein, what you are asking of me is to reconcile
5 the table in response to 2A-SEC-57 broken down by
6 planning zones, and you would like to see those
7 table's planning zones reconciled to the --
8 M. RUBENSTEIN: Here, let me give you a -- if we
9 can go to appendix J, figure 19. Sorry. You
10 provided the -- sorry. I am looking at this. Just
11 give me a second here. But I had -- you provided
12 another response to the actual -- in a tabular form.
13 I apologize for this. Yeah, if you can go to -- in
14 2A-SEC-61 attachment, you provided --
15 T. WASIK: I am sorry, Mr. Rubenstein, can you
16 repeat the reference.
17 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah, no, I apologize. 2A-SEC-
18 61 attachment 1. It's an Excel spreadsheet where we
19 asked you to provide some of the tables in appendix J
20 in a tabular format.
21 T. WASIK: Yes.
22 M. RUBENSTEIN: In figure 19, as I understand,
23 the non-coincident summer peak load forecast with CBM
24 and EV is the planning forecast? The totals are the
25 same? The 1-in-10 is the planning forecast?
26 T. WASIK: Subject to check about the exclusion
27 of the CDM and EV values to confirm we are comparing
28 apples to apples --

1 M. RUBENSTEIN: I think they are saying the
2 totals all match up, so --
3 T. WASIK: Okay. Subject to check, yeah.
4 M. RUBENSTEIN: And so when I look through 2A-
5 SEC-57 attachment 1, and I try to compare the -- it
6 is the forecast loading number further down on that
7 screen. When I convert those from MVA to megawatts,
8 and then I compare them, the totals, per the regions
9 the way that you have done it in figure 19, they do
10 not add up. The totals all add up, so when you do
11 the total, but the zones -- and I am just trying to
12 understand is it that some stations actually -- they
13 may be listed here but serve a different region or --
14 I am just trying to -- I couldn't reconcile. Is that
15 something you --
16 T. WASIK: We can help. We can bring clarity to
17 that, Mr. Rubenstein.
18 M. RUBENSTEIN: Thanks.
19 T. WASIK: You are right, there are some
20 stations where the feeders might be, you know,
21 servicing perhaps a different planning zone per se.
22 But we can help you bring that up. So you are asking
23 us to reconcile the '27 to 2031 planning outlook in
24 terms of the megawatts and comparing them with the
25 planning zones to reconcile the numbers.
26 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah.
27 T. WASIK: We can take that on for you.
28 R. DHILLON: We will mark that as Undertaking

1 JT-1.9.

2 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.9: RECONCILE THE NUMBERS FROM**

3 **THE 2027 TO 2031 PLANNING OUTLOOK IN TERMS OF**

4 **THE MEGAWATTS AND THE PLANNING ZONES**

5 M. RUBENSTEIN: And then can I ask you about a

6 specific station that you listed here, and this is

7 the Markham TS number 5. And maybe if we sort by

8 plan station or something.

9 T. WASIK: I am sorry?

10 M. RUBENSTEIN: Sorry. Just if we can look at

11 the Markham TS number 5.

12 T. WASIK: Which table am I looking up now?

13 M. RUBENSTEIN: The one that is on the screen.

14 This is 57.

15 T. WASIK: Okay. So this is back to your SEC-57

16 question?

17 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah. So if we just scroll

18 across the screen here, you have projected loading

19 beginning -- you can't see this here, but the 68 is

20 in 2026.

21 T. WASIK: That might be 2028.

22 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, you are -- you see you are

23 getting to my question. I thought the project was

24 not going into service in 2028, but you are showing

25 loading in 2026?

26 T. WASIK: No, it says 2028.

27 M. RUBENSTEIN: Is that my error, then?

28 T. WASIK: Yes.

1 M. RUBENSTEIN: All right. Well, there you go.
2 I apologize.
3 T. WASIK: We require the station, yes, 2028,
4 Mr. Rubenstein.
5 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Ignore that, then.
6 Can I ask you to go to 2-CCC-26. And if we can
7 go to -- we can just scroll down. In this response,
8 you were asked to provide -- scroll down to the --
9 just to the table here. You provided information on
10 the various station projects and if there are
11 enhancements or expansions. Do you see that? And
12 you provide --
13 T. WASIK: Sorry. CCC-26 now?
14 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yes.
15 T. WASIK: Yes, I am with you.
16 M. RUBENSTEIN: And I was just confused by one
17 of them, maybe you can help me with, and that is --
18 just so I have the right thing up. It is with
19 respect to the GTAA project.
20 So as I understand -- and you can see this on
21 page 3 of the response, I will just scroll down to
22 that -- the land purchase for the GTAA, that is the
23 second one, is an enhancement. But then the actual
24 transformer -- sorry, the transformer station, which
25 you can see further down, is an expansion that comes
26 a couple of years later.
27 Can you help me understand? So the land is an
28 enhancement, but then when you build the station -- I

1 mean, you are getting the land for the station. If
2 the station is an expansion, why is the land an
3 enhancement?
4 T. WASIK: I see, Mr. Rubenstein. I am going to
5 have to take that one away and look at it. But your
6 -- the relationship between the land and the station,
7 as you point out, is appropriate. So I will have to
8 take that back and look at the classification
9 categorization and provide a response as to --
10 M. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you very much.
11 T. WASIK: -- what the appropriate positioning
12 of that is.
13 R. DHILLON: Mr. Rubenstein, is that an
14 undertaking?
15 M. RUBENSTEIN: I believe they are giving an
16 undertaking, yes.
17 R. DHILLON: We will mark that as Undertaking
18 JT-1.10.
19 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.10: ADVISE OF THE REASON WHY**
20 **THE LAND FOR THE GTAA PROJECT IS CONSIDERED AN**
21 **ENHANCEMENT BUT THE TRANSFORMER STATION IS**
22 **CONSIDERED AN EXPANSION**
23 T. WASIK: And you referring specifically just
24 to the land for the station?
25 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, it is just to reconcile
26 why all the land is an enhancement but the project is
27 an expansion.
28 T. WASIK: Understood.

1 M. RUBENSTEIN: The underlying transformer
2 station that will be built.
3 Can I ask you to go to -- just give me a second
4 here.
5 Can I ask you to go to 3-CCC-31. So if we go
6 down, you were asked to provide various information,
7 and you provide a helpful table. In the last line is
8 system capacity in megawatts. Do you see that?
9 T. WASIK: I am with you, Mr. Rubenstein.
10 M. RUBENSTEIN: And I am having trouble --
11 another question by way of undertaking. I am having
12 trouble reconciling that information with the
13 information that you provided in 2A-SEC-57 attachment
14 1 that we looked at before that has the per stations.
15 T. WASIK: Can you help me understand which
16 particular -- I understand the system capacity figure
17 that you referenced in table 1 to response to CCC-31.
18 Can you help me understand where you are trying to
19 reconcile it in SEC-57?
20 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah. So if I go to SEC-57, and
21 I do an analysis where I take all the new stations --
22 if I -- I will just help you understand the analysis
23 that I did and why I have got a different -- where
24 our number -- so SEC-57 provides all the stations and
25 the LTRs for the stations.
26 And if I take all the LTRs for that station in
27 any given year that that station is in service, I get
28 a very different number -- I get a different number

1 than what you are showing here, even when I convert
2 those stations' LTRs from MVA to megawatts.
3 T. WASIK: Okay.
4 M. RUBENSTEIN: Is that something you can
5 reconcile?
6 T. WASIK: Yeah. We can provide you an
7 explanation as to how to compare those numbers and
8 how you can reconcile these two particular system
9 capacity numbers with the table.
10 M. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you very much.
11 R. DHILLON: We will mark that as Undertaking
12 JT-1.11.
13 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.11: PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION AS**
14 **TO HOW TO COMPARE AND RECONCILE THE NUMBERS IN**
15 **TABLE 1 AT 3-CCC-31 WITH THE NUMBERS IN SEC-57**
16 M. RUBENSTEIN: And just to be clear, because it
17 is not the totals on the bottom of the screen that is
18 loading. It is if you went up and you picked, for
19 example -- you know, if it's at a 170 and it's in
20 service, the capacity would be -- at least how I am
21 doing the analysis of what is the LTRs for all the
22 years at the station? You know, you take those
23 numbers and --
24 T. WASIK: We will provide you the explanation
25 as to the appropriate way of comparing those numbers
26 and rationale as to how that should be done.
27 M. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you very much.
28 Can we go to 2A-SEC-41. And here you were asked

1 about the -- we asked you about the NWS program. And
2 as I understand, the program is about deferring five
3 stations where there are capacity?
4 T. WASIK: I'm sorry. Can you repeat that? I'm
5 not hearing --
6 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah, I apologize.
7 As I understand, the program is about -- has the
8 effect of deferring five stations where there are
9 capacity needs?
10 T. WASIK: That is correct.
11 M. RUBENSTEIN: Is the program actually
12 deferring projects? By that, I mean you could build
13 it earlier, but the program allows you to push it
14 out, or is it just to solve a capacity crunch that
15 you have until a station can be built?
16 T. WASIK: So we have identified the need first.
17 We have identified that an NWS solution could assist
18 by deferring that build, that traditional wire build,
19 by several years. So we identify the need first,
20 then we identify that we could deploy a non-wires
21 alternative, a non-wires solution, to -- to defer the
22 build of those particular stations, and we have
23 identified five sites such as that.
24 M. RUBENSTEIN: So the -- putting it -- saying
25 it back to you a different way, it is -- the project
26 is actually -- will defer -- or potentially defer, I
27 mean. You never know if the load ends up happening.
28 But based on your forecast of the load in the

1 area, it will defer?
2 T. WASIK: That is correct. That is -- that is
3 our proposal.
4 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay.
5 Can we go to 2A-SEC-47. And so here we asked
6 you some questions about the budgeting process, and
7 in table 1, you provide a list of estimation methods
8 by program. And then what you will see is, if you
9 scroll down, you provided further information with
10 respect to those that have a unit cost, and you
11 provide, so -- you know, a -- you provide a range for
12 the unit cost; do I have that right?
13 H. IBRAHIM: That is correct.
14 M. RUBENSTEIN: Can you help me understand why
15 there is such a wide range for the wood poles?
16 R. BASSINDALE: The range is due to the
17 different heights and classes that the poles would
18 have.
19 M. RUBENSTEIN: And can I ask a question. What
20 is the basis of the unit cost numbers here? Is it a
21 historical average? Is it a forecast of what the
22 unit cost may be based on, you know, whatever your,
23 you know, supply costs are and your estimated labour
24 costs, or can you help me understand how you get --
25 how you derive the unit costs?
26 R. BASSINDALE: For wood poles, it is based on
27 historical actuals.
28 M. RUBENSTEIN: For everything, just sort of as

1 a general -- or do they differ?
2 R. DHILLON: Mr. Rubenstein, we are approaching
3 a time for a morning break if you can find a break in
4 your questioning.
5 R. BASSINDALE: In table 1, we provide the
6 estimation method, which varies by investment
7 category. In conference with the panel, we used
8 historical actuals in coming up with those values,
9 but it provides some additional context. You know,
10 the transformers, you have single phase versus three
11 phase. You have, you know, 50 kVa versus, you know,
12 3 MVA for the transformation, similar fleet vehicles.
13 You have got bucket trucks versus SUVs, again,
14 switches between, you know, manual and automated. So
15 there is a variety of factors in terms of what builds
16 up the -- that range in the values provided.
17 M. RUBENSTEIN: Sure. But just -- let's just
18 take one asset that you are replacing. It's a, when
19 you say "historical average," multi-year average? Is
20 it just taking the last year of what the actual costs
21 were?
22 R. BASSINDALE: Subject to check, it is either
23 the most recent year. For filing, it would be 2022
24 or 2023, or it would be based on an average of
25 historical actuals. And then --
26 M. RUBENSTEIN: So you obviously did this plan
27 earlier than 2026, and then so is -- if we are using
28 historical numbers at the time you did the plan, then

1 the costing would have been 2024? And then do you --
2 less interested about the exact specific year. And
3 then do you -- did you sort of inflate the numbers to
4 get to where we are in the plan?
5 H. IBRAHIM: Mr. Rubenstein, the -- when the
6 business cases are estimated and material costs are
7 placed, they are from previous to 2024 because the
8 plan was put together in 2024. No added inflation
9 were placed by -- through the estimates. We
10 submitted a question to SEC, and we explained that
11 inflation is adjusted by Copperleaf, and we submitted
12 the response. I just can't find it on me right now.
13 But we submitted that it is about 2 percent per year
14 for the inflation and that Copperleaf adjusts that.
15 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. I had assumed that was
16 within the -- you know, if you are doing the project
17 in -- when you are optimizing and you are moving
18 around years, obviously the cost changes in the
19 context of that, but you are saying it goes back to
20 the -- to all the way back to sort of when the
21 business case was developed?
22 H. IBRAHIM: So when the business case is
23 developed, the costs are -- like, the known costs are
24 used, and then to give the -- the optimizer is what
25 adjusts for inflation because it can move the
26 project, so it needs to adjust for inflation
27 accordingly.
28 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.

1 Maybe we will take our break now.
2 R. DHILLON: Okay. Thank you. The time now is
3 10:48. Let's take about 15 minutes, so return around
4 11:05. Thank you.
5 --- Recess taken at 10:49 a.m.
6 --- Upon resuming at 11:05 a.m.
7 R. DHILLON: Okay. The time is 11:05 a.m., and
8 we will resume. So back to you, Mr. Rubenstein.
9 M. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you very much. I have
10 been instructed by everybody to talk a little louder,
11 so I am not raising my voice in anger.
12 Before the break -- actually, a bit before the
13 break, we were talking about the lines capacity and
14 about various information with respect to, you know,
15 offers to connect that underpin it, and we had a
16 discussion about that.
17 I propose, actually, to park that. I want -- I
18 -- you referenced another interrogatory. I haven't
19 had as much time to look at that, but I do want to
20 look at that, so maybe we will park that, and I will
21 have a discussion with my friends, and we can circle
22 back later on with this panel up just to address that
23 issue, if that is all right.
24 I want to ask you now, if we can go to -- sorry
25 -- 2A-SEC-59. And here we had asked you with respect
26 to the station capacity project to provide internal
27 business cases for projects over 10 million, and in
28 the response, you provide -- you cite to appendix Q

1 for some of them and then others you've provided
2 here. And what you do provide is what you call
3 material investment reports. That is what you refer
4 us to.
5 I just want to make sure if we are talking the
6 same language here. Is the material investment
7 report the business case that the company would have
8 for these large capital projects, or is it really
9 just a summary of that?
10 T. WASIK: This is the business case that is
11 used in Copperleaf for optimization, so this is the
12 business case for the station that summarizes the net
13 benefits and risks associated with the investment.
14 M. RUBENSTEIN: But just backing up for a
15 second, I know that is what you input into Copperleaf
16 and the narrative that you provide, but when you are
17 -- when you are doing work on a very large project
18 like a station, is there, that sits behind this, an
19 internal business case?
20 T. WASIK: This is the internal business case
21 that we would refer to.
22 M. RUBENSTEIN: So there is no -- there is
23 nothing behind this? There is no project, you know,
24 analysis of the -- something that is developed, to be
25 clear here, some report that sits that says, these
26 are the costs, here are the risks, here is the
27 benefits, here is the -- you know, the forecast load
28 that we need and all -- or that this station would be

1 dealing with. That doesn't exist? All you have is
2 this?
3 T. WASIK: It does, Mr. Rubenstein. It is all
4 included in these particular reports in terms of
5 summarizing sort of the risks. But just to be clear,
6 are you looking for sort of the details that underpin
7 sort of the benefits and the risks for each
8 particular case?
9 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, I am just trying to
10 understand what exists first before I -- just to make
11 sure I understand. Because you keep talking about
12 "it summarizes" or -- but is there a document that
13 sits behind this that you are summarizing?
14 T. WASIK: So in this particular investment
15 report is the summary of the, let's say, main points
16 of the business case that are relevant for
17 discussions, but there are details with respect to
18 each particular -- these -- this business case --
19 excuse me -- business case for the stations that
20 include the sort of -- the costs, the need for the
21 capacity, the particulars of what the costs are made
22 up of, and how things are put together.
23 M. RUBENSTEIN: So I am calling that an internal
24 business case, but that is just my language. I don't
25 know what you guys call it. Is there some report
26 that sits behind this that you summarized when you
27 put into Copperleaf?
28 T. WASIK: Not specifically as the way you put

1 it, Mr. Rubenstein. What we do is we did include in
2 appendix J, right, and in the DSP further details
3 around each of these particular station requirements.
4 So there is an adequacy assessment report that will
5 provide you, I think, the context that you are
6 looking for in terms of matching sort of the -- what
7 the needs of the demand is and how the station is
8 expected to meet those particular demands and what
9 are the particular benefits and challenges associated
10 with the investment.
11 M. RUBENSTEIN: You are pointing me to documents
12 in the evidence, and that is fine. But I just want
13 to be clear, from your point of view, from the
14 company, you are developing a project; right?
15 T. WASIK: Um-hmm.
16 M. RUBENSTEIN: A significant capital project.
17 Is there a document that exists -- what I --
18 again, what I am calling an internal business case
19 that is specific to looking at the need of that
20 project, the -- all the costs, all the risks, any
21 other issues, you know, the options that were
22 determined that is specific to that, that you may
23 summarize in other places that exists for that
24 project?
25 T. WASIK: I think I follow you, Mr. Rubenstein,
26 but the development of a case for, let's say, a
27 station starts with sort of the load forecast, does
28 the system adequacy assessment, then elements of that

1 information is carried over into the Copperleaf
2 business case in developing the Copperleaf investment
3 case.
4 And so what you are looking for is one
5 particular document for a station that doesn't exist.
6 It is carried over from all of the necessary system
7 assessment studies, and we think that is the
8 appropriate way of addressing specifically stations.
9 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Thank you. That is
10 helpful.
11 Can we go to 2-SEC-60. And in part C, we asked
12 you for the internal business case for the
13 distribution automation project. And you provide --
14 in response to that, you cite us to, again, an
15 investment summary document -- or I think I have got
16 the name wrong. I am confusing utilities with their
17 nomenclature -- but what you call a material
18 investment report.
19 Now, we just talked about it in the context of
20 stations. Is the same for the case for a project
21 like this? Is there something that sits behind this?
22 J. BUTLER: Mr. Rubenstein, it's -- in this
23 situation, it is the same as the situation we just
24 discussed with stations.
25 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. So what sits -- so when
26 you're -- the only document we have for, say, the
27 distribution automation project is -- that sort of
28 brings together all the different things that you are

1 looking at is the three-page material investment
2 report to justify that project internally.
3 J. BUTLER: Yes.
4 M. RUBENSTEIN: I understand how the company
5 thinks. Forget about -- sorry. Just to be clear, I
6 am trying to think about how the company is thinking
7 about it when it does it.
8 J. BUTLER: Yes, that is correct.
9 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay.
10 Can we go to 2A-SEC-63.
11 T. WASIK: Mr. Rubenstein, before you move on to
12 the next question, I think it might be also helpful
13 to reference you to the DSP narratives, specifically
14 appendix B14, which provides all -- I think the
15 context that you are looking for in terms of how the
16 investment was put together and all of the
17 engineering and thinking around specifically the DA,
18 the distribution automation investments, we think --
19 we think that might be able to sort of help you
20 understand sort of the process that the Alectra goes
21 through in terms of engineering, developing, and then
22 summarizing all of that into that investment report
23 that we provided to you.
24 So there is more than three pages. I just
25 wanted to be helpful and help you identify that there
26 is quite a significant amount of explanations with
27 great level of details with respect to the
28 distribution automation and how it fits into the

1 overall automation and system control process that is
2 available in appendix 14 and starts at page 573.
3 And it does include quite a lot of analysis,
4 including alternatives, examination of execution of
5 the work, and it ends at page 596. So it is more
6 than three pages. I just wanted to --
7 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah, but that gets to my
8 question --
9 T. WASIK: -- that it explains how things are
10 put together.
11 M. RUBENSTEIN: I understand that. But that is
12 a narrative you are providing to us, which that is
13 fine. But I am just trying to understand from the
14 company's perspective; right? I assume you are not
15 walking around with the DSP. Presumably before it is
16 included in the DSP and you are discussing it, all
17 that work is done internally.
18 And I am trying to -- does it sit in what I call
19 an internal business case, but it may -- you know,
20 you may have it -- I just want to make sure there is
21 not some other nomenclature that you -- that you
22 have.
23 T. WASIK: We think it is appropriately captured
24 in the narratives of the DSP, which summarize that
25 particular investment driver, the -- all of the
26 qualifications that Alectra took into considerations
27 in terms of developing and putting together. And we
28 used the same document for what we do internally with

1 what we present in the DSP, Mr. Rubenstein.
2 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yes. Sorry, to be clear, I am
3 not suggesting that you are doing something
4 different. But I am just -- it is sort of the
5 process from my perspective.
6 Okay. Can we go to 2A-SEC-63.
7 And so in this question, we asked you for all
8 the material capital projects since the last rebasing
9 of each of the predecessor utilities, we asked for a
10 certain set of information. Do you see that?
11 And in the response -- well, first, as I
12 understand, you say we can really only give you
13 information from 2019 onwards. Do I have that right?
14 It is the first issue.
15 T. WASIK: That is correct.
16 M. RUBENSTEIN: And then if we go to page 3
17 before you do the chart, you see this at line 7, you
18 discuss that you are providing the information on a
19 $5 million threshold because if not, there would be
20 about 500 capital investments.
21 T. WASIK: Yes, that is correct.
22 M. RUBENSTEIN: And as I look through the table,
23 I am not -- I am seeing more than projects, I am
24 seeing programs. Do I have that right?
25 T. WASIK: The investments include both programs
26 and projects that we thought were material for you to
27 -- to respond to your interrogatory.
28 M. RUBENSTEIN: Now, I would like you to provide

1 a response to the question posed. Let's put aside
2 the time issue, the 2017-2018 for a minute. So the
3 2019 to 2024, I would like you to answer the question
4 as requested.
5 T. WASIK: Mr. Rubenstein, there is subparts to
6 the particular question. Can you maybe provide me a
7 little bit more clarity as to what you are seeking?
8 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, as I understand it, you
9 have used a 5 million dollar -- the key thing is you
10 used a $5 million threshold instead of a $1 million
11 threshold. And I am asking you to provide, the
12 materiality threshold being 1 million, the response
13 to the question as posed.
14 D. COBAN: Mr. Rubenstein, the volume of
15 information that that would solicit, as you can see
16 here in the response, we think is just too broad, and
17 so that is why we have put the 5 million threshold.
18 We understand you have accepted this threshold in
19 other proceedings. So at this time, that is going to
20 be a refusal.
21 M. RUBENSTEIN: All right. Well, maybe let me
22 try to get at the issue more directly a different
23 way.
24 As I understand in your response to some
25 questions, and including 4-AMPCO-64, you -- the
26 company itself tracks projects delivered that were
27 greater than 10 percent of plan costs and over
28 $100,000. That is a metric the company uses. And

1 you provide that information on page C -- sorry, on
2 part C. Do I have that right?
3 D. FAIRCHILD: Mr. Rubenstein, would you mind
4 clarifying your question, if you don't mind, please.
5 M. RUBENSTEIN: As I understand, a metric that
6 the company tracks is the number of projects
7 delivered that were 10 percent above plan costs and
8 that are over 100,000. Am I wrong about that?
9 D. FAIRCHILD: That is correct. That is in
10 table 1. That is correct, yeah.
11 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. So maybe a -- and let's
12 use that category of costs as sort of a baseline
13 here, right, costs that are above 10 percent.
14 Because when I see this table, I am looking at about
15 29 percent of the costs in that period, projects that
16 meet that threshold.
17 And so maybe a different way to address the
18 issues that I am trying to get to in SEC-63 is if you
19 are able to provide a table, or further information
20 if the information is already included, that we look
21 at that category of projects, the 10 percent above
22 and the 100,000 over, but with a materiality
23 threshold a million dollars -- so that is, again, a
24 subset of those projects that you already are
25 tracking that are above 10 percent -- and that you
26 provide the project name, the original budgeted cost,
27 the final project cost, the original start date, the
28 actual start date, the original target in-service

1 date, the actual in-service date, and, as available,
2 the CPI and SPI scores. Is that something you can
3 do?
4 D. COBAN: Again, I think the volume of the
5 information you are requesting and the kind of time
6 and effort that it would take to pull that together
7 is really beyond what we can do here.
8 But in an effort to be helpful, maybe what we
9 can do is just consider your request. And if we are
10 able to provide something that gets at what you are
11 looking for and is helpful within the times, we can
12 do that. And if not, we will explain to you our
13 refusal.
14 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay.
15 R. DHILLON: We can mark that as Undertaking JT-
16 1.12.
17 M. RUBENSTEIN: Now, as I understand -- yeah.
18 Sorry.
19 R. BASSINDALE: Can we clarify what the request
20 was? Because you went through --
21 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yes.
22 R. BASSINDALE: -- a number of kind of steps
23 there. I want to make sure I have it down right. It
24 was using the --
25 M. RUBENSTEIN: Let me repeat it and then --
26 very clearly, and then you can tell me --
27 R. BASSINDALE: Okay.
28 M. RUBENSTEIN: -- where it doesn't make any

1 sense or you don't understand it.
2 Can you provide for all material capital
3 projects where the final cost is at least $1 million
4 and there is a cost overrun of at least 10 percent
5 and 100,000 -- so it is a subset of the projects that
6 you are tracking in that metric that we discussed --
7 and then for each of those projects, as far back as
8 you can -- so I think that table was 2020, but if we
9 have 2019, you would use that, and you would be
10 providing for that the project name, the program that
11 it may sit under, the original budget cost, the final
12 project cost, the original start date, the actual
13 start date, the original target in-service date, the
14 actual in-service date, and as I understand, you do
15 track for the CPI and SPI scores, final CPI and SPI.
16 D. COBAN: Again, we will consider whether we
17 think that is an appropriate request in terms of the
18 breadth of what you are asking for and the time
19 involved to prepare that information. And we will
20 take that away and advise if we are able to provide
21 you something. If not, we will explain the refusal.
22 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.12: FOR ALL MATERIAL CAPITAL**
23 **PROJECTS WHERE THE FINAL COST IS AT LEAST $1**
24 **MILLION AND THERE IS A COST OVERRUN OF AT LEAST**
25 **10 PERCENT AND 100,000, PROVIDE FOR AS FAR BACK**
26 **AS POSSIBLE THE PROJECT NAME, THE PROGRAM THAT**
27 **IT MAY SIT UNDER, THE ORIGINAL BUDGET COST, THE**
28 **FINAL PROJECT COST, THE ORIGINAL START DATE, THE**

1 **ACTUAL START DATE, THE ORIGINAL TARGET IN-**
2 **SERVICE DATE, THE ACTUAL IN-SERVICE DATE, AND**
3 **FINAL CPI AND SPI SCORES**
4 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Just to be clear, I am
5 trying to narrow down the original question that we
6 asked, that is the intent here, with some other
7 information. And just to be clear, I have had some
8 discussion with my friends trying to get all of our
9 issues into one question here.
10 Can I ask you, with respect to the pre-2019
11 information -- and maybe you can help me understand
12 how intervenors or the Board should look at your
13 inability to be able to provide this information.
14 How is -- how, from your perspective, is the Board,
15 most importantly the Board, assess the prudence of
16 these expenditures when you can't tell us if the
17 projects are over budget, under budget, the
18 performance of that?
19 T. WASIK: So, Mr. Rubenstein, I think we tried
20 to in our response to your question give you a couple
21 examples about how capital investments were managed,
22 reported, and tracked with legacy utilities, and how
23 the harmonization of that work with the
24 implementation of a common ERP system at Alectra in
25 2019 required us to rethink.
26 The challenge I think we had in answering your
27 question is you were looking to go historically back
28 and trend moving forward, and what we were explaining

1 is that it is two different methods.
2 And so us trying to respond to your question in
3 fullness and provide you what we think are the
4 relevant information that your IR was seeking for
5 would be very confusing trying to explain why
6 projects were bundled quite differently in the legacy
7 EnerSource. And I think we used that as an example
8 to then compare that to projects that were bundled in
9 legacy Horizon.
10 And so what would happen is there would be a
11 significant amount of confusion with, not only just
12 putting the information together, but trying to
13 explain the variances that you asked for. So that is
14 the first part.
15 The second part around it is that we have
16 submitted a DSP back in 2019 that also spoke to sort
17 of that transition, that being our first integrated
18 DSP. And so we have already submitted on the record,
19 sort of going back to the previous five years and
20 that DSP, some of the challenges with respect to
21 trying to map and explain things.
22 But I think the part that we were trying to be
23 helpful with is to bring forward the most relevant
24 sort of investments for you to demonstrate some of
25 the variances that you were seeking and explaining
26 why things went towards the plan or away from the
27 plan as you asked.
28 M. RUBENSTEIN: In the 2019 to 2024 period.

1 T. WASIK: So the cutoff we had is 2019 is when
2 we harmonized our practices. And from that moment,
3 we can explain consistently across our entire service
4 area all of the projects.
5 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah, no, I hear -- I read about
6 the technical issues of why you can't do it. But
7 putting that aside for a second, how do you suggest
8 and ultimately -- I mean, the Board has to go back
9 and make a determination that the opening rate base
10 in this case is appropriate, and that is an evolution
11 of projects from Alectra, but also actually from the
12 historic rate terms where there was no approval,
13 right. They were in price cap. So it has to go
14 back.
15 But we don't have any information about, you
16 know, how the projects went and all that. Do we just
17 kind of accept -- we just have to accept it? It is
18 what it is?
19 T. WASIK: We provided a schedule of sort of
20 capital investments, right. But what I think you are
21 seeking for here is a breakdown by project and
22 specific program levels. And we are just trying to
23 explain the complexities of the fact that they were
24 structured so differently in the legacy practices
25 that, you know, if you wanted to break it down by
26 project by project, it is not as simple as you asked.
27 M. RUBENSTEIN: All right.
28 D. COBAN: I think the challenge we have is with

1 the specificity of your question getting down to the
2 project level. Perhaps if I can ask the panel is
3 there a higher level that is not project, maybe just
4 looking at categories of investment or what have you,
5 that shed a bit more light on the 2017 and '18
6 expenditures to address Mr. Rubenstein's question?
7 T. WASIK: We can take that back and see what we
8 can provide.
9 M. RUBENSTEIN: That is fine. But just to be
10 clear, it goes back further potentially. It goes
11 back, really, to the rebasing of whatever the
12 predecessor entity was, right. So Hydro One Brampton
13 was 2015, just off -- right. And I am just trying to
14 understand those all -- because that all plays into
15 the rate -- the opening rate base you are seeking in
16 this application.
17 One of the things I am struggling with, with
18 this proceeding is good reasons, bad reasons, I am
19 not -- I don't mean -- I am not making a judgment on
20 it, we just don't have information that goes -- you
21 don't have information that goes back that far.
22 And that is the problem that, you know, what do
23 we -- is it just -- so I take the undertaking that I
24 think Ms. Coban is willing, but it is not just to the
25 beginning of the Alectra. It is to the last rebasing
26 proceedings of those predecessor entities.
27 D. COBAN: Just give me a moment.
28 Okay. Mr. Rubenstein, I think we can address

1 that part of your question in the same undertaking.
2 We will comment on the pre-merger capital and in
3 terms of your question around the assessment of that
4 capital and our position as to how that should be
5 done in this proceeding where we have the limitations
6 we do with respect to the data.
7 M. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you.
8 R. DHILLON: We will mark that as Undertaking
9 JT-1.13.
10 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.13: PROVIDE INFORMATION ON PRE**
11 **MERGER CAPITAL EXPENDITURES INCLUDING WHAT**
12 **HIGHER LEVEL INFORMATION MAY BE AVAILABLE FOR**
13 **PERIODS PRIOR TO 2019, AND COMMENT ON THE**
14 **COMPANY'S POSITION ON HOW THE BOARD SHOULD**
15 **ASSESS THOSE EXPENDITURES IN THIS PROCEEDING**
16 **GIVEN THE LIMITATIONS IN THE AVAILABLE DATA**
17 M. RUBENSTEIN: Can we go to 2A-SEC-32. And in
18 this question, we were asking you about project
19 execution and monitoring. And the evidence, as we
20 understood, and we cited it in part A, is with
21 respect to how you are -- how the company itself
22 manages or monitors the project and the type of
23 reporting that exists.
24 And we had asked you for a copy of the monthly
25 reporting, whatever that looks like, it wasn't
26 entirely clear, for three months, right. Just use
27 July as halfway through the year. Nothing special
28 about that, but just to understand over a couple of

1 years.
2 And in your response, you talk about the type of
3 reporting that you do provide, but then you decline
4 to provide the specific documents for those years.
5 And I am not -- so I am going to ask again for you to
6 provide it. I am not -- you know, if you want to
7 write some narrative around the documents that helps
8 provide that context, but I -- we do think it is
9 important to understanding how the company is --
10 internally is monitoring its capital program, so we'd
11 ask you to provide that.
12 D. COBAN: Mr. Rubenstein, maybe just in the
13 interest of time, I think to be efficient here, you
14 have the witnesses who are available to speak to you
15 about what this process looks like. But as you can
16 note in our response, the basis for this refusal is
17 that any documents that may be extracted lack the
18 context of understanding the specific discussions
19 that happen in the context of these meetings.
20 So our view is that without the benefit of being
21 at these meetings where relevant information is
22 discussed, the documents, you know, are only a
23 presentation aid to what is happening at the meeting.
24 So I think, you know, we would maintain our refusal,
25 but certainly you are welcome to ask the witnesses
26 questions about the nature of these meetings and the
27 kind of information discussed.
28 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, first, let me ask,

1 presumably the -- I don't know if the presentation or
2 report or whatever document that is provided includes
3 metrics, how the company is doing on projects either
4 at an aggregate level or individual level?
5 D. FAIRCHILD: That would be a correct
6 assertion, yes.
7 M. RUBENSTEIN: All right.
8 And what is it about the -- providing that --
9 this is to Ms. Coban, not to the witness panel. What
10 is providing those documents that would include that
11 sort of metric so we can understand what the -- what
12 the management is seeing lacks the necessary context?
13 I mean, we could have had that discussion right here
14 if the documents had been provided. And you are
15 happy to provide whatever narrative around it, but we
16 would ask for the information as requested.
17 D. COBAN: We think the level of detail, which
18 you are asking for that on a monthly basis, is
19 overbroad. It would be quite an undertaking to take
20 every single monthly result and have the ability to
21 provide you the appropriate context around each
22 result.
23 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, sorry. To be clear, I
24 didn't ask -- we didn't ask for every month. It
25 asked for three months specifically. We just picked
26 July, but it asked for July 23, 24, 25. We didn't
27 ask for every document -- every report, monthly
28 report. It's just a sample to us so we can

1 understand.
2 D. COBAN: At this time, we are going to
3 maintain our refusal.
4 M. RUBENSTEIN: Thank you.
5 I just have -- my colleague may have -- will
6 have some questions. I just have one final question.
7 By way of undertaking, I was wondering if you
8 can provide revised versions of SEC -- 2A-SEC-45,
9 attachment 1, and 2A-SEC-45, attachment 1. These are
10 versions of appendix 2A broken down by segments on a
11 Capex basis and an in-service additions basis. I was
12 wondering if you can provide revised versions that
13 have them on a net basis at the program or segment
14 level. Because currently the 2As have the gross
15 amounts, and then for each category, you see the
16 contributions. I was wondering if we can have it on
17 a program and segment basis on a net basis?
18 J. MYERS: Could we get those references again?
19 I think you said the same one twice.
20 M. RUBENSTEIN: There is SEC-44, attachment 1,
21 and then SEC-45, attachment 1. One is a Capex; one
22 is an in-service additions basis of that.
23 R. DHILLON: We can mark that as Undertaking JT-
24 1.14.
25 T. WASIK: Sorry, Mr. Rubenstein. I am now
26 looking at the schedule that we provided in Excel
27 format. Can you help me understand --
28 M. RUBENSTEIN: Sure.

1 T. WASIK: -- what difference -- what
2 differences --
3 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah.
4 T. WASIK: -- you are looking for at this point?
5 M. RUBENSTEIN: So as -- let's just look at the
6 system access category of spending. You are showing
7 -- you have it by each of the programs or segments on
8 a gross basis, and then you will see at the last line
9 -- the second-to-last line, you have sort of the
10 total access contributions, and then you have total
11 system access on that basis; right? Do you see that?
12 T. WASIK: I do. I am with you.
13 M. RUBENSTEIN: And what I am looking for is, at
14 the segment level, it all on a net basis.
15 T. WASIK: Say that again one more time.
16 M. RUBENSTEIN: At the segment level, it is on a
17 net basis, so it is already taking out the
18 contribution.
19 T. WASIK: Okay. So you would like to see the
20 contributions per each line?
21 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah, could you just put it in,
22 like, just showing it on a net basis. So we are
23 seeing -- so in a sense of what customers are
24 actually paying for each of these programs.
25 T. WASIK: Understood. Yeah, we can do that for
26 you.
27 M. RUBENSTEIN: In segments. Thank you.
28 And I think my colleague Ms. Scott may have some

1 questions.
2 D. COBAN: Let's just mark that undertaking.
3 R. DHILLON: Sorry. So we will mark that
4 undertaking as JT-1.14.
5 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.14: PROVIDE REVISED VERSIONS**
6 **OF 2A-SEC-44 ATTACHMENT 1 AND SEC-45 ATTACHMENT**
7 **1 SHOWING THE NET BASIS AT THE PROGRAM OR**
8 **SEGMENT LEVEL**
9 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY J. SCOTT**
10 J. SCOTT: Okay. Good morning, Panel. I just
11 had a few questions on their OM&A questions.
12 For 2A-SEC-27 -- I don't think you need to pull
13 it up -- asked about the Copperleaf training, and one
14 of the slides there talked about both Capex and OM&A
15 projects to be entered into Copperleaf. And also in
16 Exhibit 4, there was some discussion about using
17 Copperleaf to prioritize OM&A projects.
18 So is there a -- have you been putting the OM&A
19 projects into Copperleaf, I guess, is the first
20 question?
21 H. IBRAHIM: Only the OM&A costs that pertain to
22 the capital projects are placed in Copperleaf.
23 J. SCOTT: Okay. Is the plan to eventually put
24 OM&A projects into Copperleaf and prioritize them
25 that way?
26 H. IBRAHIM: We haven't -- we don't have that in
27 our plans at this point.
28 J. SCOTT: Okay.

1 4-SEC-86 is talking about cable locates, and
2 maybe we can pull that one up. And part C provided a
3 cost per locate, the average locate rate for 2025 of
4 40.04. Can you just explain what is covered in that?
5 Is it just the contractor cost, or is inspection and
6 supervision included?
7 M. WITTEMUND: Sorry, Ms. Scott. You referring
8 to part C; is that right?
9 J. SCOTT: Yes. Yeah.
10 M. WITTEMUND: Yes. That rate in part C there
11 is directly proportionate to contractor costs.
12 J. SCOTT: So the -- in 4-CC-53 -- again, I
13 don't know that you need to pull it up -- but the --
14 at that -- in that chart, if you divide the total
15 dollars by the number of locates, you get a figure of
16 45.30. That would have -- be all in, then, with the
17 supervision and inspection? That would explain the
18 difference between those two numbers?
19 If you want to pull that one up, yeah, 4-CC-53,
20 table 1, is the best.
21 If you take, subject to check, the total number
22 of locates and the total program costs, divide one
23 into the other, I get 45.3. Yeah, because you can
24 see the 40.4. Okay. I think I've answered my own
25 question.
26 On that chart, it shows, for 2026 going forward,
27 the same number of locates in every year. Is there a
28 reason for that?

1 M. WITTEMUND: We've -- we forecasted the locate
2 volume from 2026 to 2031 based on an average of the
3 past three years.
4 J. SCOTT: There is no expectation that the
5 number of locates changes with the amount of capital
6 being done or the amount of construction being done
7 or anything? So...
8 M. WITTEMUND: The number of locates, the volume
9 of locates, there is a number of factors that depend
10 on that. You are correct, it is based on
11 constructions. It is based on, you know, the
12 dedicated locater program. So there is a number of
13 different variables and factors. We found that, you
14 know, basing it on the past three years, the volumes
15 have been quite consistent over the past three years
16 to help us inform the forecast moving forward.
17 J. SCOTT: And if we can just go back to 4-SEC-
18 86, and I apologize to the person doing the --
19 bringing up the...
20 And at the table 1, can you explain to me how
21 the 40.04 in part C relates to these fees? And maybe
22 it is explaining what the billing unit is about the
23 different -- the explanation in the next paragraph,
24 if you just go down, just scroll down just slightly,
25 yeah, talks about the segment lengths and how that
26 works and what impact that has on the quote or the
27 cost.
28 M. WITTEMUND: The costs that are represented in

1 table 1 there, those are a standard single-utility
2 locate cost. So with our locate service providers,
3 there is -- there is various fees that we would pay,
4 depending on the sharing of locates amongst
5 utilities. And one of the factors in those locate
6 costs too, you can see that there is a difference in
7 the billing segment length. We have since harmonized
8 that rate, that billing length, across all of our
9 locate service providers to 300 metres.
10 J. SCOTT: And is that billing segment length
11 the minimum length that the contractor will bill for;
12 is that what it means?
13 M. WITTEMUND: It is the length of how the
14 locate is covered. So the locate -- the locate will
15 cover that billing length of 300 metres.
16 J. SCOTT: Okay.
17 And I guess going -- you don't have to pull this
18 up. But 4-SEC-89 showed that there is two new FTEs
19 in 2027 related to locates. One is for capital, and
20 one is for OM&A. So assuming that the number of
21 locates is staying relatively constant, what -- are
22 those two positions -- why are they required?
23 M. WITTEMUND: So captured under the cable
24 locates, portfolio and program is included, our field
25 inspectors that perform field inspections on our
26 capital and operational projects. So the cable
27 locates, that is the -- the resources that are
28 captured under there are included in the locates

1 portfolio, so there is no direct proportion to the
2 locate costs and the resources required. We don't
3 have internal resources that perform any locates.
4 J. SCOTT: The internal resources are doing --
5 oh, so when you say "inspection and supervision," you
6 are not referring to inspection and supervision of
7 the cable locates? You are referring to...
8 M. WITTEMUND: Correct. It is for inspections
9 of our capital projects.
10 J. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you.
11 4-VECC-47, there is a table there that -- and
12 maybe we can pull that up. And it shows the total in
13 2025 for asset management of 9.64 million. In the
14 updated 2JC, which was attached to 1-SEC-24, showed
15 an actual of 7.48 million, and I am wondering if you
16 can explain the variance there?
17 T. WASIK: Ms. Scott, I am with you on 4-VECC-
18 48. Can you tell me -- which other table you are
19 trying to reconcile to?
20 J. SCOTT: The updated 2JC, which was attached
21 to 1-SEC-24. So the -- 7,476,829 in 2025 actuals,
22 comparing that to the 9.64.
23 T. WASIK: So I am clear you are asking if we
24 prepared the 7 million in 2025 under the asset
25 management program costs --
26 J. SCOTT: Yes.
27 T. WASIK: -- to 7.4 million --
28 J. SCOTT: Yes.

1 T. WASIK: -- in asset management?
2 So subject to check, I believe that the -- this
3 particular response of VECC-48 refers only to the
4 asset management segment costs. There is a grid
5 modernization component cost that will be also
6 included in the 7.4 million in table appendix 2JC,
7 subject to check.
8 J. SCOTT: And where would that be found? Is
9 that in the digital or the --
10 T. WASIK: Yeah, I think it is in response to 4-
11 SEC-80, table 1. It is rounded in this particular
12 table, but it does reconcile. There you go, 7
13 million for asset management, 0.5 for grid
14 modernization, for a total of 7.5.
15 J. SCOTT: Right. That is the actual spend in
16 2025, so my question was comparing that to the
17 forecast spend.
18 T. WASIK: Okay.
19 J. SCOTT: Which I was taking from the VECC-47
20 just because it comes from the evidence, but it's --
21 T. WASIK: Yeah.
22 J. SCOTT: So I am taking that as the forecast
23 there.
24 T. WASIK: Ms. Scott, I am just trying to follow
25 you. You started with VECC-48.
26 J. SCOTT: No, no. He has got VECC-47 up.
27 VECC-47 is fine. He is -- yeah.
28 R. DHILLON: Sorry. Ms. Scott, just a reminder

1 that we have ten minutes allotted to the scheduled
2 time for SEC.
3 J. SCOTT: Yes. This is the last question so --
4 T. WASIK: Yeah, Ms. Scott, it might be helpful
5 if I just take that one away and provide you a
6 response as to the difference.
7 J. SCOTT: Okay. You could do that.
8 R. DHILLON: So we will mark that as Undertaking
9 JT-1.15.
10 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.15: PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION FOR**
11 **THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE 2025 ACTUAL ASSET**
12 **MANAGEMENT COSTS SHOWN IN APPENDIX 2JC AND THE**
13 **2025 FORECAST ASSET MANAGEMENT COSTS SHOWN IN**
14 **EXHIBIT 4, VECC-47**
15 J. SCOTT: Thank you. That is my questions.
16 R. DHILLON: So we will hand it over to
17 Consumers Council of Canada, Mr. Gluck.
18 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY L. GLUCK**
19 L. GLUCK: Good morning. My name is Lawrie
20 Gluck, and I have a few questions on behalf of the
21 Consumers Council of Canada.
22 I would like to start with some questions about
23 the customer connections program, please. So if we
24 can go to 2-CCC-16, part B, please. And if we could
25 go to the response to that question.
26 In this response, Alectra explains that in 2025,
27 the actual number of customer connections in the
28 subdivisions program were lower than forecast, but

1 the connections were at a higher gross unit cost than
2 forecast. Is that a reasonable summary of the
3 response?
4 D. FAIRCHILD: Yes.
5 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
6 And so if we could go to part C of the response,
7 there is a table there. For 2025, the actual
8 residential lot connections were 3,500, and the
9 forecast in the pre-filed evidence was 5,100. Would
10 you take that subject to check?
11 D. FAIRCHILD: Yes.
12 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thanks.
13 And so can you help me with what happened? Why
14 was there a 30 percent drop in residential lot
15 connections relative to forecast in 2025?
16 D. FAIRCHILD: 2024 was an extremely strong
17 year, but we did notice a decrease in 2025, primarily
18 due for economic reasons in the housing sector.
19 L. GLUCK: Thanks.
20 And just so I make sure I understand, the
21 residential lot connections that we are talking
22 about, these are detached, semi-detached, and
23 townhouses largely. Is that right?
24 D. FAIRCHILD: In referring to table 1, there is
25 residential lots with a quantity, and then there is
26 high-rise with a quantity, so -- and the residential
27 lots, you are correct, it is homes, detached, semi-
28 detached, stackable town homes, partial tied lands.

1 Yeah, any type of structure like that.
2 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.
3 And does Alectra have any concerns with this
4 segment of the residential market in terms of the
5 likelihood that its forecast for the 2026 to 2031
6 period will be realized?
7 D. FAIRCHILD: In terms of the housing forecast
8 outlook, I am confident that it will rebound from
9 2025 actuals. I think there are many positive
10 indicators that would suggest through both federal,
11 provincial, potential of HST rebates, many
12 municipalities are now looking at the removal of
13 development charges to facilitate further housing
14 starts. And -- thank you.
15 L. GLUCK: Thanks.
16 And you must be in contact with the subdivision
17 developers regularly. Is that right?
18 D. FAIRCHILD: Alectra is in contact with
19 subdivision developers. That is correct.
20 L. GLUCK: And you are not hearing anything from
21 those developers with respect to their plans for
22 housing starts in the next few years?
23 D. FAIRCHILD: I would knowledge that 2025 was a
24 difficult year, and '26, perhaps, is off to a little
25 bit of a slow start. I am not sure that is, you know
26 -- necessarily play into the future outlook from '27
27 to '31. Again, I think there is still positive
28 optimism that there will be a rebound in the housing

1 sector.
2 L. GLUCK: Thanks.
3 And with respect to the increase in gross costs
4 in 2025 relative to forecast, so my understanding is
5 the actual cost rate, 8,600 per lot, and the forecast
6 was 7,600 per lot. Can you just tell me what drove
7 that increase in 2025?
8 D. FAIRCHILD: There are many factors that can
9 influence the cost of a subdivision. For example,
10 looking back at 2023, we did also have a high per
11 unit cost. It is site specific to each and every
12 development in terms of density, in terms of what
13 electrical infrastructure needs to be installed to
14 support any given development.
15 So we have seen some increase for sure in
16 material cost that -- where I would be comfortable to
17 say that would attribute to the, you know, higher
18 unit cost as well. But I stand by that there's just
19 -- there are many factors that influence the cost,
20 the per unit cost, from -- in the subdivision
21 portfolio.
22 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
23 And now looking at the high-rise condo
24 connections, am I right that the original forecast
25 was 22 connections, and on an actual basis in 2025,
26 there were only five connections?
27 D. FAIRCHILD: Correct.
28 L. GLUCK: And similar to my question about the

1 residential subdivision aspect, what happened? For
2 the condo market, that is a 75 percent drop in actual
3 connections relative to forecast.
4 D. FAIRCHILD: Our forecast was off, I will
5 grant you that. In terms of the -- all the reasons
6 for that is somewhat beyond Alectra's control. But
7 clearly, the economy signaled that there was a slow
8 down in condo starts in that particular year.
9 L. GLUCK: And similar to my question about
10 residential lots, the company has no concerns with
11 its high-rise connection forecast for the forecast
12 period?
13 D. FAIRCHILD: With respect to the condo --
14 potential condo projects in the pipeline, I would
15 point you to table 4 of the same -- the same IR.
16 So within the projects that are known to us,
17 there is still a considerable amount of condos in the
18 pipeline in the order of 216. You know, our forecast
19 has taken a portion of that into account. Not all of
20 it, but certainly a portion into it. I think what
21 remains is still an underlying demand for housing,
22 residential, single detached, condos that remains.
23 In this particular point in time, we do appear
24 to be at a little bit of a lull in compared to past.
25 I don't necessarily think that is going to be
26 reflective of future with, again, government
27 initiatives that focus on housing and affordability,
28 the efforts that municipalities, you know, regions,

1 or the province are taking to activate more housing
2 starts, so...
3 L. GLUCK: Thank you for that.
4 And based on your response just now, I
5 understand for the high-rise condo connection
6 forecast, it is based on these proposed developments
7 in table 4, and then reduced with the expectation
8 that not every single project is going to occur. Is
9 that how you did your forecast for the condo segment?
10 D. FAIRCHILD: Yeah, that is correct. We looked
11 at all of the growth projects in the area. And these
12 are -- I mean, these are known. These are known
13 projects. They are also evidence-supported in
14 appendix B13 -- B12 -- sorry, B13.
15 So there is definitely lots of activity in
16 growth centres throughout Alectra's service
17 territory. And of the known projects to us --
18 meaning, you know, developers have spoken to us, we
19 have spoken to developers -- this is the information
20 that we have available to us. Certainly not
21 forecasting that every project, you know, is going to
22 get done, but it certainly is a very strong signal
23 that there is a pipeline of projects to come.
24 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
25 And the manner in which you forecasted the high-
26 rise condo segment is different from how you forecast
27 their residential lot segment. My understanding for
28 the residential -- the connection of residential

1 lots, it is not based on proposed development.
2 Instead, it is a forecast based on historical actuals
3 for '22 to '24, and then you applied a growth factor
4 to that. Is that right?
5 D. FAIRCHILD: That is correct.
6 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.
7 And if we could go to -- there is an attachment
8 to CCC-16. It is in Excel. I just have what I hope
9 is a pretty simple question about this.
10 If we look at 2027 for the new residential
11 subdivision row, it is a $50.4 million gross cost.
12 And I just want to make sure that that 50.4 million
13 is really just the combination of the residential lot
14 connections and the high-rise connection cost. Those
15 are the two categories of costs that are in that
16 line?
17 D. FAIRCHILD: That is correct.
18 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.
19 If we could go to 2-CCC-18, attachment 1, which
20 is also an Excel spreadsheet, and I would like to
21 discuss the unspecified customer-initiated expansion
22 and relocation projects. And if we go to -- I think
23 it is the first tab. Thank you.
24 So there is the -- row 4 is this category of
25 projects that I would like to discuss. And I
26 understand that at a summary level, Alectra used the
27 2022 to 2024 gross costs as the basis for the
28 forecast in the '27 to 2031 period. Is that right?

1 D. FAIRCHILD: Just to make sure I am hearing
2 you correctly, you want to know the period of the
3 average that we used?
4 L. GLUCK: Yes.
5 D. FAIRCHILD: Yeah. '22 to '24, is that what
6 you said?
7 L. GLUCK: Yes.
8 D. FAIRCHILD: Yes, that is correct.
9 L. GLUCK: Okay. And when I took an average of
10 those years in this table, so '22 to '24, I get an
11 annual spend -- gross spend of 13.2 million. So
12 between 2022 and 2024. Would you take that subject
13 to check?
14 D. FAIRCHILD: You said 13.4 million?
15 L. GLUCK: I said 13.2.
16 D. FAIRCHILD: Okay. Okay. Subject to check,
17 yes.
18 L. GLUCK: Thanks.
19 And for the '27 to '31 period, I get an average
20 annual growth spend of 22.8 million. So I am just
21 wondering what the difference between those numbers
22 are given that I had understood that you used an
23 average of the historical target.
24 D. FAIRCHILD: So just to be clear, you are
25 suggesting that from -- 13.2 million was the average
26 from '22 to '24, and then it jumps to 22.8 million
27 from '27 to 2031?
28 L. GLUCK: Yeah. The annual spend.

1 D. FAIRCHILD: For the unspecified, the buckets
2 of projects, yes?
3 L. GLUCK: That is right.
4 D. FAIRCHILD: So with respect to this category,
5 it really was a combination of both known projects
6 and unknown projects. So there are certainly some
7 known projects identified within the -- within the
8 unspecified customer initiated expansions and
9 relocation projects. And these buckets, they are
10 used to predict -- to help forecast the future.
11 What we have seen particularly in the last
12 couple of years based on the trend is that we are
13 seeing a lot more system expansions occurring than
14 historical. So we did factor that in as well. So in
15 addition to the very large projects, known projects,
16 there is a subset of anticipated increase for system
17 expansion projects in the historic -- you know,
18 compared to the historic buckets.
19 L. GLUCK: So just to make sure I understand
20 that response, essentially it is you started with a
21 baseline. You could look at it like '22 to '24 is a
22 baseline. You used that average, and then you added
23 what to it? What did you add as this "known unknown"
24 category?
25 If you would like to undertake to provide the
26 breakdown of the unspecified category between knowns
27 that are in there versus just using the historical
28 average, that would work for me as well.

1 D. FAIRCHILD: I can certainly -- I can
2 certainly do that. I mean, looking at the customer
3 initiated gross and net over that period of time, we
4 are actually seeing a reduction in the net -- in the
5 net spend for all categories combined from the known
6 projects and the unspecified projects.
7 But I will accept to undertake to provide more
8 details for the unspecified customers initiated
9 expansion and relocation projects.
10 L. GLUCK: I appreciate that. Thank you.
11 R. DHILLON: Let's mark that as Undertaking JT-
12 1.16.
13 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.16: PROVIDE THE BREAKDOWN OF**
14 **THE UNSPECIFIED CATEGORY ON 2-CCC-18, ATTACHMENT**
15 **1 BETWEEN KNOWNS THAT ARE INCLUDED VERSUS USING**
16 **THE HISTORICAL AVERAGE**
17 L. GLUCK: And I do have a question also about
18 the percentage of contributed capital with respect to
19 this same category of projects.
20 When I calculated the historical average
21 contribution, it was 63.6 percent, and in the
22 forecast period, it is fallen to 46.8 percent. And
23 can you help me understand how the capital
24 contribution forecasting the -- for the test period
25 was determined?
26 D. FAIRCHILD: Sorry, you calculated 63 percent?
27 L. GLUCK: In the historical period?
28 D. FAIRCHILD: Yeah.

1 L. GLUCK: Yeah. And 46.8 in the forecast
2 period.
3 D. FAIRCHILD: In the forecast.
4 The contributed -- the contributed capital is
5 decreasing, and that has largely contributed to the -
6 - some of the larger system expansion projects that
7 we are doing, many of which are lowering the
8 customers' contribution due to the revenue offset
9 through the economic model for many of these large
10 VLP projects over the forecast period.
11 L. GLUCK: This question, though, was related to
12 the unspecified category.
13 D. FAIRCHILD: Oh, just unspecified?
14 L. GLUCK: Yeah, just unspecified. So I
15 wouldn't have thought that there would be, like,
16 these large known projects in that bucket of costs.
17 D. FAIRCHILD: Can we amend that undertaking to
18 include that as well?
19 L. GLUCK: Yes. Absolutely, thank you.
20 Moving to 2-CCC-17, part B, please. And this is
21 -- these questions are about the very large projects
22 that are in the customer-initiated distribution
23 expansion and relocation segment of the customer
24 connection program.
25 And if we go to the response to part B, at the
26 end of the response, it states that:
27 "For subdivision-driven system expansions, it
28 is assumed that there will be no customer

1 capital contribution."[as read]
2 And then in part C of the same response, it says
3 that the projects that are predominantly residential
4 will be entirely covered by a capital contribution.
5 And I am just struggling a bit with what appears to
6 be a contradiction in those two parts.
7 D. FAIRCHILD: You are correct. That is a
8 contradiction. That is my fault, and I would like to
9 correct it here today.
10 For those -- I will start with some -- a little
11 bit of background.
12 Generally speaking, when a residential
13 subdivision is constructed, there is a cost split
14 between the utility and the developer. Again,
15 generally, that would mean any external expansion
16 outside of that subdivision, that portion of it would
17 be a hundred percent contributed to the customer. Is
18 that -- do you follow?
19 L. GLUCK: Maybe you could repeat that.
20 D. FAIRCHILD: Okay. So in our evidence, we
21 state that for a typical residential subdivision, our
22 contribution -- 58 percent contributed, you know, 42
23 percent Alectra. So, therefore, any additional
24 expansion outside of the subdivision, if we need to
25 bring a feeder or circuit to supply that subdivision,
26 that cost would be a hundred percent borne by the
27 developer.
28 That is -- that is generally -- that is

1 generally how the cost apportionment works through
2 the economic model. The error in this response was
3 to the reference to those four projects that you had
4 cited that there was zero contribution. In fact,
5 that is not correct.
6 We have ran the -- we have ran the economic
7 model for those. Those particular projects are very,
8 very large block projects. The load is quite large.
9 And for them, when we run a preliminary economic
10 model, we do, in fact, see that the revenues pay for
11 the entire external expansion.
12 And so I can take an undertaking to give you
13 that correction wording for both B and C, but that is
14 essentially the error that was made. And it also --
15 on 18, CCC-18, very similar. The error was followed
16 through on line 29, which, again, I would offer that
17 we would take the undertaking to provide that
18 correction.
19 L. GLUCK: Well, that is up to you. I am fine
20 with your correction right now, so --
21 D. FAIRCHILD: Thank you.
22 L. GLUCK: -- that is okay.
23 But I am interested in the response a bit. So
24 you started talking about the very large projects
25 where you ran the economic modelling, and it shows
26 that the revenues are sufficient to cover the cost.
27 And if we could just go to the table perhaps.
28 So I just wanted to sort of use an example. If we

1 looked at -- I think it is at the bottom of the
2 table. Maybe it is up -- the bottom of the next
3 page. Yeah, okay.
4 So looking at the Angus Glen developments as an
5 example, so there is no capital contribution
6 associated with that project; is that right?
7 D. FAIRCHILD: That is correct.
8 L. GLUCK: And this is one of the examples you
9 are giving of you ran the economic model, and the
10 revenues are sufficient to cover the cost; is that
11 right?
12 D. FAIRCHILD: Correct. For table 1, we ran a
13 preliminary economic model for each of these projects
14 to determine the cost share split.
15 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.
16 And can you undertake to provide those, the
17 initial economic analysis with respect to the
18 projects that do not attract a capital contribution?
19 D. FAIRCHILD: So just so that we are clear for
20 that project 152602 and then the last four. So we
21 would undertake to provide a summary. I won't
22 provide the full -- just because of confidentiality
23 of the workings of the economic model -- provide a
24 summary of the output of the economic model, if that
25 is fine.
26 L. GLUCK: We agree on which projects --
27 D. FAIRCHILD: Yeah.
28 L. GLUCK: -- that we are looking for the

1 information, but we do want the whole model. We want
2 to see what assumptions you made that led to the
3 result that there would be no capital contribution.
4 D. COBAN: I think we can provide you a summary
5 of the assumptions, but right now we are not prepared
6 to file the model.
7 L. GLUCK: So you are refusing that part, but
8 you will provide a summary?
9 D. COBAN: Yeah, and the summary will not just
10 be a number. You will have some --
11 L. GLUCK: The assumptions?
12 D. COBAN: Correct.
13 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.
14 R. DHILLON: Let's mark that as Undertaking JT-
15 1.17.
16 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.17: PROVIDE A SUMMARY OF THE**
17 **INITIAL ECONOMIC ANALYSIS WITH RESPECT TO THE**
18 **PROJECTS THAT DO NOT ATTRACT A CAPITAL**
19 **CONTRIBUTION**
20 R. DHILLON: And, Mr. Gluck, we are hoping to
21 take a break in the next ten minutes.
22 L. GLUCK: Sure.
23 R. DHILLON: Thank you.
24 L. GLUCK: I will ask one more question.
25 Thanks.
26 M. RUBENSTEIN: Can I just ask, what is the
27 basis of -- I am just not understanding -- the
28 refusal to provide the model? Is it the model, or

1 just -- just what is the...
2 D. COBAN: One, we think that having a summary
3 view will just be of assistance to the panel and the
4 parties in order to be able to analyze and understand
5 the key takeaways from the model. We think that is
6 just a more helpful view of the same information.
7 And, two, as you can appreciate, there is a lot
8 of sensitivity in these models with respect to the
9 customer data. And so, you know, we would be having
10 to file everything confidentially, which would, you
11 know, create additional administrative burden
12 associated with seeking confidential treatment of
13 that. So if the rolled-up view of the information
14 can satisfy the request, we think that is an
15 appropriate sort of level of disclosure that balances
16 those things.
17 L. GLUCK: If we could go to 2-CCC-22, page 2,
18 please.
19 Sorry. It is really page 3. I am looking at
20 the table below.
21 So I have a few questions on the categorization
22 of line capacity projects between enhancement and
23 expansion, and this table shows for each line
24 capacity project whether it has been categorized as
25 an enhancement or an expansion. And can you please
26 confirm that with the exception of two projects, all
27 of the line capacity projects are categorized as
28 enhancement projects?

1 T. WASIK: Yes, I can confirm that.
2 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
3 And I just want to use an example to understand
4 how the company goes about categorizing the line
5 capacity projects between those two types.
6 And if we could go to page 5, please. And if we
7 look at Project 150716, which is a feeder extension
8 for Williams Parkway to Heart Lake, do you see that?
9 T. WASIK: I do.
10 L. GLUCK: And this is an $8.9 million project
11 that has been classified as an enhancement; and,
12 therefore, there is no contributed capital; is that
13 right?
14 T. WASIK: That is correct.
15 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
16 Now, if we go to page 10 of the response and we
17 look at item 26, which is the rationale supporting
18 that categorization, it says that, in part at least,
19 the feeder expansion will provide capacity relief and
20 will supply capacity to new developments in Heart
21 Lake Road and Highway 410; is that right?
22 T. WASIK: That is what was provided in our
23 response, yes.
24 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
25 So at least in part, it appears that this feeder
26 extension is going to be providing a supply to a new
27 development. And so what -- so my question is, so
28 why would that project be categorized as an

1 enhancement?
2 T. WASIK: So, Mr. Gluck, in categorizing line
3 capacity projects as enhancements, we adhered to the
4 distribution system code, which in section 3.3 does
5 identify that a distributor shall continue to plan
6 and build a distribution system for reasonable
7 forecasted growth. A distributor may perform
8 enhancements for its distribution system for the
9 purpose of improving system operation characteristics
10 and for relieving system capacity constraints.
11 We believe under that definition, the
12 explanation rationale for that particular project,
13 which is addressing feeder 136M8, which has already
14 reached its planning capacity in the previous five
15 years, as a fact, is approaching closely to its
16 thermal limits at this particular moment, requires to
17 be addressed.
18 And in doing so, we are also looking at ensuring
19 that there is sufficient amount of capacity for the
20 general area growth in those particular areas. And
21 so that is how that rationale lines up with our
22 definition of an enhancement.
23 L. GLUCK: Is there a known development at Heart
24 Lake Road and Highway 410?
25 T. WASIK: There isn't a specific development
26 that this particular project is being proposed for.
27 It is the general area that is being provided to
28 relieve capacity in the general area, and that is why

1 it is defined as an enhancement.
2 L. GLUCK: Do you have any applications for
3 connections in that area?
4 T. WASIK: As I explained earlier to Mr.
5 Rubenstein, we operate on an open-circuit
6 configuration, and so there is constantly a
7 reconfiguration of feeders to be able to accommodate
8 that. I am not aware of that particular project
9 being driven by a specific customer. It is
10 identified as a general growth area.
11 L. GLUCK: And could you undertake to check if
12 you have any applications in that area?
13 T. WASIK: For this particular feeder project?
14 L. GLUCK: Yeah, I am trying -- I am sort of
15 narrowing the request that Mr. Rubenstein made
16 earlier to a single project on the line capacity side
17 to see if you could tie any -- if there are any
18 applications or offers to connect or offers to
19 connect being discussed in that region of Heart Lake
20 Road and Highway 410 that is going to be served by
21 this feeder extension.
22 D. COBAN: Mr. Gluck, maybe just to understand
23 the relevance of your request, I think Mr. Wasik
24 provided an explanation as to how the determination
25 is made around this project being an enhancement and
26 the rationale around that. So I am not sure that, in
27 light of that explanation, it is really relevant for
28 us to go and chase the additional information you are

1 looking for.
2 L. GLUCK: I don't really want to debate the DSC
3 or what the DSC says here. I think it would just be
4 helpful information for us to know whether the
5 company does categorize projects as enhancement that
6 do or do not have applications or offers to connect
7 related to them. It is a point of information that
8 would support the company's position that this is an
9 enhancement project.
10 D. COBAN: We will undertake to take that away
11 and consider your request, and if we think it is
12 appropriate, we will provide the information; if not,
13 we will explain why.
14 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.
15 R. DHILLON: Let's mark that as Undertaking JT-
16 1.18.
17 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.18: ADVISE WHETHER THE COMPANY**
18 **CATEGORIZES PROJECTS AS ENHANCEMENT THAT DO OR**
19 **DO NOT HAVE RELATED APPLICATIONS OR OFFERS TO**
20 **CONNECT**
21 L. GLUCK: We can take a break, if that works
22 for you.
23 R. DHILLON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Gluck.
24 The time now is 12:28. We will resume at 1:30.
25 --- Recess taken at 12:28 p.m.
26 --- Upon resuming at 1:31 p.m.
27 R. DHILLON: Good afternoon, everyone. We are
28 ready to continue the technical conference. I will

1 turn it over to Mr. Gluck.
2 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
3 If we could start with 2-CCC-26, please. And if
4 we could go to page 2 of that document, sort of
5 picking up where we left off but now with respect to
6 the station capacity projects. And similar to my
7 questions regarding the line capacity projects, I
8 would like to use an example to understand Alectra's
9 categorization of station capacity projects between
10 expansions and enhancements.
11 So if we could go to the bottom of page 3,
12 please. There is a project listed there as the Webb
13 MS new substation, and this is a $3 million
14 enhancement project that attracts no capital
15 contributions; is that right?
16 T. WASIK: Sorry. Mr. Gluck, where are you
17 referencing to the contributions?
18 L. GLUCK: It is not in this table, but my
19 understanding is that there is no capital
20 contributions associated with that?
21 T. WASIK: That is correct. Yes, I would agree
22 with that.
23 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.
24 If we could go to Exhibit 2A, tab 1, schedule 1,
25 appendix Q at page 88, please. Page 88. Sorry.
26 There it is. Thank you very much.
27 And here, with respect to the Webb MS substation
28 project, at the bottom of this first summary section,

1 it discusses that there are -- there is 45 MVA of new
2 projects in various stages of construction and
3 energization, and a new station is required to
4 connect these developments. Do you see that?
5 T. WASIK: I am with you, yes.
6 L. GLUCK: So can you explain to me why this
7 project would be categorized as an enhancement as
8 opposed to an expansion?
9 T. WASIK: So in a very similar manner as we
10 talked about with the lines capacity project, when
11 Alectra builds capacity for the general area and it
12 provides a benefit with respect to service and
13 operability and reliability for the general area, we
14 would classify that as an enhancement.
15 And in this particular case, Webb MS is not only
16 being proposed to be built to provide operational and
17 reliable service to the downtown core area, but when
18 doing so, we are also ensuring that it has sufficient
19 capacity for the general growth in the downtown core
20 as a result of intensification.
21 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
22 And do you have any -- would you be able to
23 undertake to provide -- look and provide, if there
24 are any, applications for service, offers to connect,
25 or anything of that nature associated with the Webb
26 MS project?
27 T. WASIK: So for certainty, we can take that
28 away, confirm. But we can look at Webb MS and

1 confirm whether or not there is any specific projects
2 associated to it.
3 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
4 R. DHILLON: Let's mark that as exhibit[sic] JT-
5 1.19.
6 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.19: PROVIDE ANY APPLICATIONS**
7 **FOR SERVICE, OFFERS TO CONNECT, OR ANYTHING OF**
8 **THAT NATURE ASSOCIATED WITH THE WEBB MS PROJECT**
9 L. GLUCK: If we could go back to 2-CCC-26 at
10 page 3, please. So a few of the projects listed on
11 this page are land purchases, and there is in-service
12 dates associated with those land purchases that are
13 in advance of the station that will use that land.
14 And my question is, are these in-service dates
15 provided here what is used for rate making purposes?
16 Like, you will be entering into rate base land that
17 there is no station on yet?
18 T. WASIK: Yes. But I would like to clarify,
19 Mr. Gluck, that purchasing of the land and preparing
20 the land for the station is part of the process in
21 terms of building the station. So we -- from an
22 accounting standpoint, upon the purchase of land, and
23 then the work that needs to be done to prepare the
24 land in order to build the station, including all the
25 necessary studies and environmental assessments.
26 There is value in terms of putting that asset into
27 service.
28 L. GLUCK: Okay. So these land purchases do

1 enter rate base when they are purchased?
2 T. WASIK: They are put into service upon the
3 purchase and are used in value in preparing for
4 construction of the station.
5 L. GLUCK: I am being very specific about the
6 rate base part. So is that -- are you saying yes to
7 that part, that they enter rate base --
8 T. WASIK: Yes.
9 L. GLUCK: Yes, okay.
10 T. WASIK: I am.
11 L. GLUCK: Thank you. Thank you very much.
12 If we can go to 2-CCC-24, please.
13 M. GARNER: Excuse me, Mr. Gluck. It is Mr.
14 Garner. Can I just ask you a follow-up about that
15 question?
16 When you said "rate base," are you saying it
17 goes into rate base, or are you saying it goes into
18 CWIP, as part of a CWIP calculation?
19 T. WASIK: I think that might be better question
20 to ask to a subsequent panel. Maybe Panel 3, 4.
21 M. GARNER: Okay. That is fine. Thank you.
22 Sorry, Mr. Gluck.
23 L. GLUCK: No. Thank you.
24 So in CCC-24, we asked a few questions
25 about the treatment of data centres that are
26 connecting to Alectra's system during the upcoming IR
27 term. And the first thing I would like to address is
28 if we could go -- if we go down a bit, there is a

1 table.
2 And under that table, there is a statement that
3 the station's capacity project related to the data
4 centres connections began in 2025, and the
5 contribution was applied against '25 and '26
6 expenditures.
7 Can you first confirm that this means that there
8 was a capital contribution paid related to the
9 stations work?
10 D. FAIRCHILD: Subject to check, I will confirm
11 we received a contribution.
12 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
13 And can you please undertake to expand the table
14 to include the entire cost of the related station
15 capacity project and the total contribution that was
16 made?
17 D. FAIRCHILD: Total station cost, so total
18 gross, total contribution, total net?
19 L. GLUCK: That is right. Just going back a few
20 years.
21 D. FAIRCHILD: Yeah, we can do that.
22 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
23 R. DHILLON: We will mark that as Undertaking
24 JT-1.20.
25 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.20: EXPAND THE TABLE IN CCC-24**
26 **TO INCLUDE THE ENTIRE COST OF THE RELATED**
27 **STATION CAPACITY PROJECT AND THE TOTAL**
28 **CONTRIBUTION THAT WAS MADE**

1 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
2 And can we go to the next page, please. And in
3 this part of the response, it discusses that Alectra
4 generally applies a 25-year revenue horizon for data
5 centre projects, but it was reduced in one case due
6 to the project-specific circumstances. Is that a
7 fair summary?
8 D. FAIRCHILD: That is correct.
9 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
10 And I would like to avoid discussing any
11 confidential information, if we can. If possible,
12 could you discuss generally what the reason would be
13 to reduce the revenue horizon and what would
14 differentiate one data centre project from another at
15 a general level?
16 D. FAIRCHILD: The standard revenue horizon
17 apply of 25 years was not used in this case. We find
18 ourselves with the transmitter for those portions as
19 well. That has applied a 15-year revenue horizon, so
20 we match that on the rest of the station portion.
21 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thanks.
22 So it is essentially Alectra aligning with Hydro
23 One? Is that what you're...
24 D. FAIRCHILD: That is correct.
25 L. GLUCK: Okay. And with respect to the
26 connection horizon for these data centre related
27 projects, how long is that horizon that you apply?
28 D. FAIRCHILD: Table 2 indicates it is 25 years.

1 L. GLUCK: No, I am speaking to the connection
2 horizon now. So the revenue horizon, I see it is 25
3 years. There is a --
4 D. FAIRCHILD: My apologies. It is standard 5-
5 year connection horizon.
6 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.
7 And you are requiring an expansion deposit from
8 the connecting data centres?
9 D. FAIRCHILD: Yes.
10 L. GLUCK: And if the data centres come online
11 at a demand that was forecast at any point during the
12 connection horizon, you refund that deposit? Is that
13 right?
14 D. FAIRCHILD: Can you just repeat the question?
15 L. GLUCK: Sure. If the data centre comes
16 online at the demand that was forecast, that you
17 forecast when you were collecting the deposit, you
18 give -- you refund that deposit to the customer. Is
19 that right?
20 D. FAIRCHILD: I will try and say it in the way
21 I understand it is an economic model would be ran
22 from this. The customer would pay a capital
23 contribution. The remaining balance would be held as
24 a security deposit. If their full load materializes
25 in the course of the connection horizon, then yes, we
26 would return the security deposit on hand to the data
27 centre.
28 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

1 And if the data centre ceases operation after it
2 has its deposit returned, but prior to the duration
3 of the revenue horizon ending, essentially everyone
4 else on the system will be responsible for covering
5 the revenue shortfall. Is that right?
6 D. FAIRCHILD: That is a risk, and that is what
7 would happen.
8 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
9 And does the company view data centres' load to
10 be more or less risky than other non-residential
11 connections?
12 D. FAIRCHILD: We treat the load from a data
13 centre similar to other loads. So there is no
14 specific provision for data centres in that regard.
15 L. GLUCK: And so I assume the answer to my next
16 question is with the exception of the one project
17 where you have matched Hydro One in a 15-year --
18 using a 15-year revenue horizon, the company has not
19 considered shortening the revenue horizon as a
20 standardized approach for all data centre
21 connections?
22 D. FAIRCHILD: At this time, we have not.
23 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.
24 R. DHILLON: Mr. Gluck, just a reminder that we
25 have about 5 or 6 minutes left allotted to CCC.
26 L. GLUCK: I will take time from future panels
27 to make up for it.
28 If we could go to 2-AMPCO-53 attachment 1,

1 please. It is an Excel spreadsheet. And I apologize
2 that this might be a bit difficult to follow, but I
3 did do some math, and I am going to ask you to take
4 that math subject to check.
5 So there is a line item here titled "Cable
6 Injection." And the cost -- the total cost of the
7 cable injection and the number of kilometres are the
8 units are set out in this table. And I calculated
9 that the average annual increase in the unit cost for
10 cable injection between '27 and '29 is about 12
11 percent. And that comes with a decrease of 4 percent
12 between '27 and '28, and then a very large increase
13 of 28 percent between 2028 and 2029. Would you take
14 that subject to check?
15 R. BASSINDALE: Can you please repeat those
16 numbers so we can just mark them down?
17 L. GLUCK: Absolutely. So between 2027 and
18 2028, I calculate a decrease of 4 percent on the unit
19 cost. So what I did was I divided the total cost by
20 the number of units to come up with the unit cost.
21 And between those two years, I see a 4 percent
22 reduction in unit cost.
23 And then going between '28 and '29, on the same
24 basis, a unit cost calculation, there is a 28 percent
25 increase. And on average, it is a 12 percent annual
26 increase.
27 And my question is actually what is driving what
28 seems to be a very significant annual change in cable

1 injection unit cost?
2 R. BASSINDALE: Mr. Gluck, there is a variety of
3 factors between the years in regards to the cable
4 being injected. So, you know, one example could be
5 the size of the cable being injected. Larger cables
6 cost more on a per unit basis. It could also be the
7 number of splices that they encountered when they
8 were going to do the injection work. More splices
9 equal more dollars. That gives a higher per unit
10 average.
11 I can't, you know, provide more details than
12 specifying that it depends on the exact segments
13 being injected and how much work is involved to make
14 that injection proceed.
15 L. GLUCK: Okay. So it is more to do --
16 repeating your answer back, but it is more to do with
17 the type of project you are doing, like, the actual
18 cable that needs to be injected in a given year, as
19 opposed to the actual cost of the activity?
20 R. BASSINDALE: Yes. I would agree with that
21 statement.
22 L. GLUCK: Okay. And in terms of -- Mr.
23 Rubenstein talked to you about this a bit this
24 morning, but in terms of -- just using cable
25 injection as an example, for inflationary -- the
26 inflationary adjustment that is applied, what
27 inflation would have been applied to this program in
28 total and for each of labour and materials?

1 H. IBRAHIM: Mr. Gluck, the project -- the
2 projects within the program would -- when the
3 optimizer moves them, it would apply the same 2
4 percent which we have submitted in the S-E-C, or SEC,
5 interrogatory.
6 L. GLUCK: And so the 2 percent is just a global
7 number and it would apply -- it would capture labour
8 inflation and materials inflation?
9 H. IBRAHIM: With the movement, yes. So if it
10 shifts a project by, let's say, one year, it would
11 shift it by -- it would add inflationary element of 2
12 percent to the components that can increase with
13 inflation.
14 L. GLUCK: Okay. And there is no other
15 adjustments in there for labour, for example? It
16 doesn't use, you know, the company's expectations
17 around compensation increases and the allocation of
18 that compensation allocated to capital?
19 H. IBRAHIM: No other adjustments are included,
20 no.
21 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.
22 We could go to 2A-SEC-63, page 21, please.
23 Thank you. And I think it is just down on this page
24 a little bit. All right.
25 So there is a project here, the Hamilton South
26 Mountain Feeders capacity relief project, and it
27 looks like it had a cost overage of about $6 million.
28 Do you see that?

1 H. IBRAHIM: Yes, I see it.
2 L. GLUCK: And do you have any change orders,
3 project close-out reports, or other internal
4 documentation related to this project?
5 M. WITTEMUND: Mr. Gluck, we will make best
6 efforts to determine if that information is
7 available. If it is, we can certainly produce it as
8 a -- yes.
9 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
10 R. DHILLON: Let's mark that as Undertaking JT-
11 1.21.
12 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.21: PROVIDE ANY CHANGE ORDERS,**
13 **PROJECT CLOSE-OUT REPORTS, OR OTHER INTERNAL**
14 **DOCUMENTATION RELATED TO THE HAMILTON SOUTH**
15 **MOUNTAIN FEEDERS CAPACITY RELIEF PROJECT AND THE**
16 **EXTEND BUNTING M81 FEEDER PROJECT**
17 L. GLUCK: On the next page, there is a project,
18 the Extend Bunting M81 Feeder project. And same
19 question on that one: Would it be possible to
20 provide any change orders, project close-out reports,
21 or other internal documentation related to this
22 project?
23 M. WITTEMUND: Yes, we could -- we will add it
24 to the undertaking before this and provide this
25 information if it is available.
26 L. GLUCK: That is great. Thank you.
27 If we could go to 4-CCC-50, page 4, please. And
28 I would like to discuss the system control

1 operational budget briefly.
2 With respect to the system operator program, I
3 understand that the company is seeking to increase
4 the number of operators significantly over the IR
5 term. Is that right?
6 J. BUTLER: Sorry, Mr. Gluck, I didn't hear the
7 complete question. Can you please repeat?
8 L. GLUCK: Sure. With respect to the system
9 operator program, I understand that the company is
10 seeking to increase the number of operators
11 significantly over the IR term. Is that correct?
12 J. BUTLER: That is correct. We are increasing
13 -- we are proposing to increase the number of
14 operators.
15 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
16 And if we go to the response in part F, here, it
17 states that:
18 "The system control resources needed are
19 proportional to the volume of crews
20 supported."[as read]
21 And when I read part E and F together, my
22 understanding is that the 2027 to 2031 forecast is
23 based on an extrapolation of the ratio of crews
24 supported by each operator based on 2025 data. Is
25 that right?
26 J. BUTLER: Yes, that is correct.
27 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
28 So if we can please go to Exhibit 4, tab 2,

1 schedule 9, page 9, please. Thank you.
2 And this table allows you to calculate the ratio
3 of operators to crews supported. And when I look at
4 2025, the ratio is 1.8 crews supported for each
5 operator. Would you take that subject to check?
6 J. BUTLER: Yes, I will take that subject to
7 check.
8 L. GLUCK: And then in 2027, I see that the
9 ratio falls to 1.6. Would you take that subject to
10 check?
11 J. BUTLER: Yes.
12 L. GLUCK: So can you help me understand how you
13 -- the methodology used to determine the resources
14 required in the IR term?
15 J. BUTLER: So if I heard the numbers correctly,
16 the ratio was 1.8 the one year and drops to 1.6?
17 L. GLUCK: That is right, yeah.
18 J. BUTLER: Yeah, the -- the -- yeah, the system
19 control is a little bit of a unique area. It is a 7
20 -- run 7 by 24, 365 days a year, so we need a
21 complete staffing for 24-hour coverage, and the crews
22 generally work 8- or sometimes 10-hour days, Monday
23 through Friday. So the extrapolation was really for
24 the daytime periods and how many operators we would
25 need per day, and it was actually done -- we have
26 essentially five different rate zones we support
27 through the operating room.
28 So we use that as the basis of the daytime

1 volumes for the extrapolation, but to support those
2 daytime numbers, you have to be able to fill out a
3 complete schedule, per se, and how many people it
4 takes to run a 24-hour schedule with coverage and all
5 that type of thing. So it is -- it is not 100
6 percent linear. It is very proportional. But there
7 can be some minor nuance differences just because of
8 the uniqueness of filling out a 7-by-24 shift.
9 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
10 So do you have a -- I don't know -- a
11 spreadsheet or a calculation that shows the more
12 granular approach that I think you have just
13 described to me? That -- like, I did it, obviously,
14 in a simple way with the evidence that was here, but
15 it sounds to me that there is sort of a day shift
16 calculation, a night shift calculation, and that led
17 to a requirement to decrease that ratio, essentially
18 that an operator is supporting less crews in the IR
19 term relative to the historic period?
20 J. BUTLER: Mr. Gluck, at best efforts, I will
21 put together or try and summarize in an intelligible
22 way what a shift schedule would look like across the
23 various rate zones for -- across the various years.
24 It's a lot of data, complicated to convey, but I will
25 make best efforts to have a -- provide you the
26 information you are requesting.
27 L. GLUCK: I appreciate that. Thank you.
28 R. DHILLON: I will mark that as Undertaking JT-

1 1.22.

2 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.22: PROVIDE A SPREADSHEET OR**

3 **CALCULATION THAT SHOWS THE GRANULAR APPROACH**

4 **TAKEN IN REGARDS TO SHIFT SCHEDULES ACROSS**

5 **VARIOUS RATE ZONES FOR VARIOUS YEARS**

6 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

7 I have only one more question.

8 If we could go to 4-CCC-53, please, and this is

9 at page 10 of that undertaking or interrogatory

10 response. And we asked about the historical use of

11 the dedicated locater program and whether the

12 forecast reflects the cost savings from that program,

13 and I just want to make sure that I understand the

14 response.

15 The response below the table I take to mean that

16 there is no forecast of the cost savings from the

17 dedicated locater program included in the custom IR

18 term forecast; is that fair?

19 M. WITTEMUND: That is correct.

20 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

21 And do you have available a high-level estimate

22 of the savings that would have resulted from the

23 historical experience with the dedicated locater

24 program?

25 M. WITTEMUND: That is something we would not

26 have, no.

27 L. GLUCK: And can you explain why?

28 M. WITTEMUND: We don't -- actually don't track

1 that information to that level where we would have
2 details as to the savings where locates would have
3 been involved from a dedicated locater perspective.
4 L. GLUCK: Thank you.
5 And just to make sure that I understand the
6 program at a more general level, in table 7, each one
7 of those, it doesn't represent a single locate; it
8 represents a project that they've decided to sign up
9 for this program, and they have their own locater.
10 So there is many locates, individual locates, that
11 underpin, you know, a single number in table 7, a
12 single -- single dedicated locater project; is that
13 fair?
14 M. WITTEMUND: Yes. So in table 7, we -- we
15 list out the number of projects that are related to
16 the dedicated locater program. Whether or not how
17 many locates are contributed to each of those
18 dedicated locaters or whether or not they would even
19 have locates for those projects if they didn't
20 materialize, those are the dedicated locaters that
21 have signed up in those various years.
22 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you. Those are my
23 questions.
24 M. WITTEMUND: Thank you.
25 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Gluck.
26 The time is now 2:06. I will turn it over to
27 Mr. Garner for Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition.
28 M. GARNER: Or it is easier just to say "VECC."

1 Thank you.
2 I think Mr. Harper, who is online, is going to
3 start, if he is actually online.
4 B. HARPER: Yes, I am, Mark.
5 M. GARNER: Thank you.
6 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY B. HARPER**
7 B. HARPER: Thank you. Good afternoon, Panel.
8 Can we turn to Exhibit 2A, tab 1, schedule 1,
9 ESP appendix J, page 46. It is PDF page 81.
10 R. BASSINDALE: Was that page 46 or 86?
11 B. HARPER: It was page 46. I am sorry. There
12 should be a figure 24 on the page. And I believe
13 that is it.
14 Now, as I understand, as part of your capacity
15 planning process, you develop zone peak forecast as
16 set out in figure 24 here; is that correct?
17 T. WASIK: I am sorry, Mr. Harper. Can you
18 repeat that? I am having a hard time following --
19 there's -- your audio.
20 B. HARPER: I am sorry. As I understand, as
21 part of your capacity planning process, you develop
22 zone peak forecasts, and those are what are set out
23 here in figure 24?
24 T. WASIK: If I -- I think, if I heard you
25 correctly, figure 24 presents the non-coincidental
26 winter system peak demand inclusive of CDM electric
27 vehicles, decarbonization, and retrofit under a
28 medium scenario for 1 and 2 weather, and the -- it

1 provides both the aggregated peak load per region and
2 then the total on the right axis.
3 B. HARPER: Right.
4 And would I be correct that it's population,
5 housing, and employment that are the key economic
6 drivers that you use in developing these forecasts?
7 T. WASIK: That is correct. Those are the --
8 population, housing, and employment are considered in
9 development of the system peak demand forecast.
10 B. HARPER: Okay.
11 Can we turn to Exhibit 2A, tab 1, schedule 1,
12 page 91. So I'd be -- would I be correct in saying
13 that if I look at this table, that those economic
14 drivers account for about a third of your non-
15 coincident peak load increase between '24 and --
16 between 2024 and 2031?
17 T. WASIK: That would be correct, Mr. Harper.
18 B. HARPER: And I notice on the same table that
19 transportation and electrification account for
20 roughly another -- a little over one-third of the
21 increase as well?
22 T. WASIK: That would be -- if you are referring
23 to from 2025 to 2031, that is correct.
24 B. HARPER: Right. And that's the 524.
25 And are you able to break that 524 down between
26 transportation and electrification and show -- and
27 give me the two numbers separately?
28 T. WASIK: So, Mr. Harper, during this

1 particular period of 2025 to 2031, it is all electric
2 vehicle transportation that are being considered
3 under the peak demand and none of the electrification
4 of heating.
5 B. HARPER: So there is no heating
6 electrification included in this forecast at all?
7 T. WASIK: That is correct. It might be simple
8 if I just tell you that the -- there is no capital
9 investments identified in this distribution system
10 plan stemming from electric heating as a driver.
11 B. HARPER: Okay. Fine.
12 Now, with respect to the 524, have you made any
13 assessment yet of what the impact of the Government
14 of Canada's new EV strategy is, which anticipates
15 only a 75 percent penetration of EV vehicles by 2035
16 as opposed to the hundred percent that was in its
17 earlier EV -- EV -- EV availability standard targets?
18 I am sorry.
19 T. WASIK: So, Mr. Harper, I would take your
20 attention to our response to 2-Staff-137.
21 B. HARPER: Okay.
22 T. WASIK: In that response, we identified that
23 we acknowledge the most recent announcements by the
24 Government of Canada to repeal the ZEV mandate sales
25 and replace it with a more stringent emission
26 standard. This particular point, we have also taken
27 into account that the government has also launched an
28 EVAP incentive program. It also introduced a $1.5

1 billion worth of funding for EV charging networks as
2 well as increased customer choice for lower-priced
3 EVs through partnerships with imports from China and
4 Republic of Korea.
5 And on balance, we recognize that it is, at this
6 particular point, too soon for us to evaluate what
7 the full impacts of these particular changes will be,
8 and as such, we believe that the current EV
9 projection forecast that is included in our
10 distribution system plan is still prudent and
11 appropriate.
12 B. HARPER: Okay. We will leave it at that.
13 Thank you.
14 Can we turn to Exhibit 2A, appendix 2AA.
15 Now, would I be correct that those zone peak
16 demand forecasts we were just looking at are a
17 primary driver for the forecast spending for capacity
18 lines and capacity stations component of system
19 service?
20 T. WASIK: In general terms, yes, but there are
21 also other drivers, including operational efficiency,
22 grid flexibility, and other backup and capacity-
23 related functions. But capacity is a primary driver,
24 yes.
25 B. HARPER: Are there any other spending
26 categories here where the peak demand forecasts are a
27 primary driver, or was it really just those two?
28 T. WASIK: Mr. Harper, can you perhaps help me

1 understand which specific investment line you're
2 referring to?
3 B. HARPER: Well, I was looking at all of the
4 investment lines you have here in terms of the --
5 under system access and system renewal and trying to
6 understand if apart from the two we've just
7 discussed, whether there are any other ones where the
8 peak demand forecast is a primary driver in
9 determining the amount of spending you have to make
10 in the future.
11 T. WASIK: Well, Mr. Harper, the peak demand
12 forecast does inform investments across the entire
13 distribution system. So it is not that
14 straightforward as to just identify a one-to-one
15 relationship. The organization reviews the system
16 peak demand increases and, obviously, makes the
17 necessary adjustments to what else is required with
18 respect to building out the system to meet that. So
19 it is not just a one-to-one relationship between the
20 load forecast and one line item.
21 B. HARPER: But I would assume something like
22 maybe network metering wouldn't be driven that much
23 by your peak demand forecast?
24 T. WASIK: So in that particular example, if
25 there is a projected growth increase anticipated
26 across the planning period, metering group would be
27 informed about those particular growths and take into
28 consideration inclusion of budgeting for additional

1 metering for the customers anticipated.
2 B. HARPER: Okay. So --
3 T. WASIK: That's just one example. There could
4 be many like that where the necessary budgeting is
5 informed by the overall growth in the organization.
6 B. HARPER: Okay.
7 Can we turn now to Exhibit 2A, tab 1, schedule
8 1, appendix B10, and that will be at page 402. And
9 scroll down to table -- that is right, B10-6.
10 And I believe you were talking to Mr. Gluck this
11 morning about the fact that for some of these
12 categories, you use a growth factor to forecast the
13 number of connections in the future, and I was
14 wondering if you could tell me for which categories
15 you would be using a growth factor?
16 D. FAIRCHILD: Specifically, subdivisions
17 included a very modest 1 percent growth factor. On
18 the residential units, we had provided a separate
19 forecast for the condo connections, so that had one
20 growth factor. The others were very much both ICI
21 and the layouts category, which is -- they are listed
22 -- had a component of electric vehicle,
23 electrification. And, yeah, I think that covers it.
24 B. HARPER: And what was the basis for your 1
25 percent? Like, I was wondering whether it was linked
26 at all to the population or the household forecast
27 that you had used -- that we had -- that we used in
28 the peak demand forecast?

1 D. FAIRCHILD: Yeah, the -- so the residential
2 subdivision forecast looked at the historical units,
3 and I believe, subject to check, that number came out
4 to 2,889. Let me just check that before we guess
5 here. Pardon me. One second. Just almost there.
6 B. HARPER: Sure.
7 D. FAIRCHILD: Yeah. So the residential -- for
8 residential, we looked at historicals, and we used a
9 2022 to 2024 period for the average number of
10 residential units. And from there, we added simply a
11 1 percent escalator year over year. You know, felt
12 that was a very conservative number.
13 Where we saw growth in that category was really
14 on the condo side, which we have already articulated.
15 So it was really just to account for somewhat of
16 an unknown, you know, all signaling to support the --
17 you know, the province's and municipality's mandate
18 to address housing in the province.
19 B. HARPER: Right. Okay. Fine. So it wasn't -
20 - the 1 percent wasn't linked at all to the
21 population or the household forecast that you were
22 using as the basis for your peak demand forecast,
23 then?
24 D. FAIRCHILD: It was not linked.
25 B. HARPER: Okay. Fine. Thank you.
26 Looking at that table, you don't have to turn it
27 up, but VECC-11C, in response to that, you indicated
28 that all the connections reported under new

1 subdivisions and condominiums were really new
2 customers. But when it came to the ICIs and the
3 layouts -- maybe we could just stay back. Okay. If
4 you want to go there, you can look at the response,
5 but I was hoping we could cut this shorter.
6 But for the residential and commercial layouts
7 of the ICIs, they included both new customers plus
8 upgrades. But in general, when I was looking at the
9 numbers here, would it be fair to say that the number
10 of new customer connections that you are forecasting
11 in each year is something in excess of 6,000? It
12 would be a portion of the layouts and ICIs plus all
13 of the condos and the subdivisions numbers. So it
14 would be fair to say it is more than 6,000 per year?
15 D. FAIRCHILD: So the number of new -- in this
16 table, table 10-6, the number of new subdivision lots
17 is just that, the -- would be individual, you know,
18 lots --
19 B. HARPER: Right --
20 D. FAIRCHILD: -- which would count as one
21 customer.
22 B. HARPER: Right.
23 D. FAIRCHILD: And then in addition to that,
24 yes, condo development buildings while it, for
25 example, in 2031 indicates 34, we haven't attempted
26 to say how many units are in any particular condo.
27 It could be 500. It could be 1,000.
28 Likewise, in the -- in ICI, that could be a

1 separate connection that possibly could have
2 residential-type living in there. But I think it is
3 important to make a distinction, in a condo, it is
4 classified as a GS greater than 50 customer and --
5 B. HARPER: I wasn't trying to get at
6 specifically residential. I mean in terms of total
7 number of connections that you are forecasting each
8 year, residential, general service, industrial, the
9 number of new connections, like new connections that
10 are being made, looking at this, would probably be in
11 excess of 6,000 each year. It is going to be all the
12 first line, all the second line --
13 D. FAIRCHILD: Yes.
14 B. HARPER: -- plus a portion of the third and
15 fourth lines.
16 D. FAIRCHILD: Right.
17 B. HARPER: That would seem to me to be --
18 probably be in excess of 6,000. I am just asking if
19 that was a reasonable assumption to make, looking at
20 these numbers.
21 D. FAIRCHILD: I agree with you, yes.
22 B. HARPER: Okay. Fine. That is really all I
23 was asking about.
24 When you are talking about connections here,
25 like in subdivisions, is that just individual
26 residential lots, or does that include things like
27 the streetlights as well?
28 D. FAIRCHILD: No. That is just the individual

1 lots.
2 B. HARPER: Okay, fine. Thank you very much.
3 Can we turn to VECC-12B. Here, we asked you to
4 provide additional information on the very large
5 projects identified in appendix B10, table B10-3.
6 And in terms of existing customer projects, which I
7 believe are identified in this table, you -- can you
8 confirm that there are six existing very large
9 customer projects that are adding additional large
10 load to the system during the 2027 to '31 period?
11 And I believe those are 151584, 152482, 152602,
12 152676, 153088, and 153090.
13 Would that be a reasonable interpretation from
14 this table?
15 D. FAIRCHILD: That is reasonable. I would like
16 to maybe just point out -- let's see the project,
17 sorry. Project 153088, it is marked as an existing
18 customer, but those are two new facilities being
19 constructed, just to be clear.
20 B. HARPER: Okay. Okay. So it sounds like it
21 is maybe five instead of six --
22 D. FAIRCHILD: I agree.
23 B. HARPER: -- projects there that are new
24 customers -- that are existing customers. So that --
25 that are existing customers, then.
26 And in each of -- each of these would be a
27 separate customer. It is not like two projects are
28 related to the same customer; each project would be a

1 separate specific customer?
2 D. FAIRCHILD: If we can use that one as an
3 example, they are an existing customer that already
4 have four data centres on separate parcels, and they
5 are creating two more data centres on two other
6 separate parcels. So from a customer perspective,
7 they are one customer, but, you know, they are six, I
8 guess, metered points, if that provides clarification
9 you need.
10 B. HARPER: Well, I guess maybe it is a matter
11 of when you say "customer," is it an account, or do
12 you mean a customer from the perspective in terms of
13 they are each billed -- they are two new customers
14 each billed separately?
15 D. FAIRCHILD: Yeah, those will be new separate
16 metered accounts. But I would have to look at each
17 one of these individually. For example, you know,
18 GTAA, they are an existing customer, but we could be,
19 you know, bringing in new metered points into, you
20 know, their locations. So it is really, I think,
21 site dependent.
22 B. HARPER: Right. So you really can't draw a
23 sort of straight line between each of these projects
24 and say this is a new customer being added to the
25 system?
26 D. FAIRCHILD: I guess if you are looking for a
27 definition, is there going to be a new meter account
28 put on to each one of these, I would say -- I would

1 want to actually just take that back and confirm for
2 you.
3 B. HARPER: Is that something you would be
4 willing to do both for the existing and the new
5 customers on this? I am just trying to understand
6 how many new metered accounts this gives rise to. I
7 was assuming the existing ones wouldn't be a new
8 metered account, but the new ones which are listed
9 towards the bottom of the table would be.
10 So are you willing to take that back and --
11 maybe I should have asked for this if I didn't
12 understand -- how many new metered accounts this
13 gives rise to.
14 D. FAIRCHILD: Yeah, the -- part of the -- you
15 know, can we discuss, for example -- let me pick a
16 project here. The very last project, 153236.
17 B. HARPER: Right.
18 D. FAIRCHILD: So it is indicating as a new
19 customer.
20 B. HARPER: Yeah.
21 D. FAIRCHILD: But the amount of metered points
22 off of there could be thousands. It is going to be a
23 large-scale subdivision over the course of build out
24 to 2036 or even beyond. So, I mean, we can attempt
25 to do that, but I am just wondering the relevance.
26 B. HARPER: So when you are saying "large load,"
27 these -- I guess maybe it is a matter of
28 understanding what the table is showing. It isn't

1 necessarily a large load associated with one
2 customer. It is a project that is going to give rise
3 to a large load, which could be a subdivision, it
4 could be an individual customer, it could be a mix of
5 either of those two. Is that a better way of
6 interpreting this table?
7 D. FAIRCHILD: That is correct.
8 B. HARPER: Okay.
9 D. FAIRCHILD: It -- I mean, it is -- yeah.
10 B. HARPER: I think that may be -- okay.
11 And maybe on my last question, then, if we could
12 turn to Exhibit 2A, tab 1, schedule 1. This is the
13 DSP appendix J again. And go back to page 43.
14 Right. Here it is.
15 Here, you were talking about the decarbonization
16 assumptions you made for the various scenarios. And
17 in this table -- and I believe the forecast we were
18 talking about earlier was the medium scenario. That
19 is the one that was sort of your expected case, if I
20 believe? The one you were focusing on for the
21 planning forecast?
22 T. WASIK: That is correct.
23 B. HARPER: Because I was having trouble because
24 earlier, you talked about how the transportation
25 electrification didn't include any rolling
26 electrification. But if I look at the medium
27 scenario here, it talks specifically about
28 assumptions about electrification of both new ICI

1 buildings and retrofit of the existing ICI building.
2 So I was wondering if you could reconcile the
3 assumptions in this scenario here with the comment
4 you just made earlier about how the forecast didn't
5 include any electrification.
6 T. WASIK: So, Mr. Harper, electrical heating
7 for decarbonization is a winter peaking activity.
8 And so as a result, Alectra's distribution system has
9 sufficient amount of winter peak capability, and so
10 any increase in electric heating decarbonization peak
11 demand is within our system's capacity and doesn't
12 require any enhancement.
13 B. HARPER: Right. I believe -- we don't have
14 to go back to it, but I believe the earlier tables we
15 were looking at at appendix J, there were also tables
16 in there for the wintertime as well as the
17 summertime, if my memory serves me correct. Right?
18 T. WASIK: That is correct. And --
19 B. HARPER: So the winter ones is where you
20 would see this -- the sort of the new building
21 electrification due to decarbonization showing up.
22 Would that be correct?
23 T. WASIK: That is correct. The impacts of
24 electrical heating for decarbonization would only be
25 applicable to the winter peak.
26 B. HARPER: Right. Okay. Fine. Thank you
27 anyway. Those are all my questions. I will turn it
28 back to Mr. Garner now.

1 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY M. GARNER**
2 M. GARNER: Thank you, Mr. Harper.
3 Good afternoon, Panel. Can I take you to 1-
4 VECC-3. And that is the custom performance
5 scorecard. And in this question, I asked -- I asked
6 a question, and I shouldn't have because you pointed
7 something out by pointing me somewhere else, but it
8 had actually answered it in the graph, I just
9 noticed. And that was I asked you why there wasn't a
10 performance metric for failed equipment, and there
11 is.
12 But what you did when you answered that
13 question, you pointed out there was, but you pointed
14 me to the performance -- DSP performance measures
15 which are at Exhibit 2A, tab 1, schedule 1.
16 And so my first question -- that got me
17 confused. My first question was what are these two
18 metric tables -- are they the same? Because I
19 started examining them, and they are partially or
20 somewhat the same. In some places, they seem to be
21 the same, but just describing things differently.
22 Are these tables the same, or are they different
23 things?
24 R. BASSINDALE: They are the same metrics.
25 M. GARNER: They are identical, you're saying.
26 So I can read one, and I can replace it for the
27 other. They are just slightly -- described slightly
28 differently? Is that what is happening?

1 Because, for instance, it is like one has
2 something about assets. I think the first one talks
3 about infrastructure asset renewal. And then I take
4 it if I go to the other one, there is a bunch of
5 infrastructure renewal, and that is where I replace
6 that same -- I get more detail in that one. Is that
7 what is happening?
8 R. BASSINDALE: Yes, Mr. Garner, I believe there
9 is more detail in the DSP reference.
10 M. GARNER: Okay. Now, the other difference is
11 the -- there seems to be targets in the one that is
12 in the DSP. They have so many meters installed. Are
13 they the same in that way? They are both -- they
14 both either have targets or don't have targets?
15 R. BASSINDALE: Sorry, can you clarify what you
16 mean by "don't have targets"?
17 M. GARNER: Well, so the -- when I looked at
18 Exhibit 2, it wasn't clear to me -- sorry, in the
19 Exhibit 2A, it wasn't clear this one had targets, but
20 there are specific targets in the other one. So they
21 both have the same targets. They are identical in
22 that way too. They are not in any way different in
23 what you are targeting for each one.
24 There isn't a target line in the other one, so I
25 am just assuming that I can take this target line and
26 it is fine.
27 So why I am saying that is, for instance, if --
28 I don't know if they all have the same number of

1 things -- I haven't gone through them in detail.
2 There is one -- they all have -- this one does have
3 poles, the other one has poles. I haven't done a
4 cross check to make sure they are all the same. But
5 you are telling me if there are targets in them, they
6 are all the same?
7 R. BASSINDALE: Subject to check, they should be
8 identical.
9 M. GARNER: Okay. Fair enough.
10 Now, earlier, Mr. Rubenstein, when he started
11 his examination, he brought you to 2-Staff-140, and
12 then there was a talk about the fact that loss of
13 supply is not in -- is in the SAIDI target, the SAIDI
14 number here but not MEDs, not major event days. Is
15 that the same for both of these too?
16 If I go to the other one, is that also what I am
17 looking at? Because this one. I am not sure I --
18 this one just says SAIDI excluding MEDs, it doesn't
19 say excluding loss of supply. This one -- if I read
20 it -- I might have it the wrong way, right.
21 This one says including MEDs in the DSP, and yet
22 you have excluding MEDs in the one in the performance
23 card. But it wasn't clear to me that the SAIDI in
24 here is also -- was loss of supply in the DSP one.
25 R. BASSINDALE: It is the same in both. It is
26 SAIDI without MEDs but with loss of supply.
27 M. GARNER: They are both without loss of
28 supply.

1 R. BASSINDALE: Sorry, they are both with, with
2 loss of supply and without MEDs --
3 M. GARNER: Sorry, they are both excluding MEDs
4 with loss of supply?
5 R. BASSINDALE: Yes.
6 M. GARNER: Sorry. Pardon me.
7 R. BASSINDALE: We provide more clarification on
8 that in 5.2.3.
9 M. GARNER: Right. And I did look at that and
10 I'm still a little -- I know you said you explained
11 this, but maybe you can help me more. I still don't
12 really understand that.
13 As Mr. Rubenstein went through this, and as I
14 look at the other stuff, you include major event
15 days, but you can do capital projects that harden
16 your system, I think is the nomenclature, right? But
17 you exclude MEDs -- I keep getting it reversed,
18 pardon me -- and you include the loss of supply
19 which, as I heard this morning, your capital program
20 can't do anything about. I just don't understand
21 that.
22 Why is the one that you actually conceivably --
23 and, you know, major event days is an issue. But
24 conceivably, you can do something about major events
25 days in the sense of investment.
26 R. BASSINDALE: I believe, Mr. Garner, you are
27 mischaracterizing the reference. We had stipulated
28 it wasn't the primary driver for any of the

1 investments, but there are a number of investments we
2 have that by building out the system to increase
3 feeder ties, if a station were to go down because of
4 Hydro One, we could try to transfer that load off to
5 another station. That wouldn't be possible without
6 those investments.
7 M. GARNER: Okay. Maybe I heard you wrong this
8 morning. So you are saying there are investments you
9 can make that will reduce your loss of supply
10 outages?
11 R. BASSINDALE: So the statement I made is
12 within this plan that we have. There are investment
13 -- there are no investments where the primary driver
14 is a reduction in loss of supply, but there are some
15 investments that will have an ancillary benefit of
16 assisting us should a loss of supply event occur.
17 M. GARNER: Yeah, that would be an outage for a
18 customer. It still would be due to -- then they
19 wouldn't be out due to loss of supply, right, because
20 they would still be on? It wouldn't be a loss of
21 supply outage anymore?
22 J. BUTLER: The -- yeah, just to maybe help
23 clarity, we do not have any investments in the DSP
24 that are targeted at reducing or eliminating a loss
25 of supply event. A lot of our investments aren't
26 targeted at -- when an event occurs, we have a
27 quicker restoration, therefore, limiting the overall
28 impact.

1 And those investments, distribution automation
2 being a great example of one, they are used to help
3 restoration upon occurrence of any event, whether
4 it's a failed piece of equipment, it is a tree
5 contact, it is a loss of supply.
6 So in that manner, we can reduce the impact of
7 lost supply, but we can't eliminate the occurrence.
8 M. GARNER: I see what you mean.
9 And where I am going with this is for a MED or a
10 major event day, you must have investments for that
11 because you put in a whole bunch of evidence from
12 Hatch study on climate change, et cetera, which
13 really goes to how you can make investments to --
14 again, I will use the term -- harden the system up.
15 So why aren't you measuring that? I mean,
16 you've provided a lot of evidence on the issue about,
17 you know, the changing weather climate and
18 reliability, and that is what MEDs really gets to is
19 that major event days are generally big climate-type
20 event days, not always. But, like, the derecho, if
21 that is how you pronounce it, that created a major
22 event day?
23 J. BUTLER: So, yes, we are -- we are working to
24 harden the system, improve reliability, and improve
25 resiliency. And we -- we -- we aim to not have MED
26 days and lower the impact of it, and our customer
27 consultation, those were two important factors is to
28 reduce the impact of adverse weather and reduce the

1 duration of outages when those occur.
2 So that is -- you know, that is a primary -- or
3 is a very important thing for Alectra, so we are
4 working hard on that, and we have lots of evidence,
5 as --
6 M. GARNER: Well, I am sure you are, and I don't
7 want to interrupt, but I am just still scratching my
8 head by the metric includes -- excludes one thing you
9 can impact and includes one thing you can't impact.
10 J. BUTLER: Yeah, yeah. No, no. Sorry. I'll -
11 -
12 M. GARNER: Again, that seems -- you know, that
13 is what I am trying to resolve.
14 J. BUTLER: Yeah, no. I will get to that right
15 now. Thank you.
16 What you find is the impact of MEDs are so
17 great, and we take the derecho, for example. When
18 you put it in there and you include that in your
19 analysis for your reliability outcomes and looking
20 for patterns and looking for root causes and what is
21 driving all your things and looking for the areas to
22 target to get the overall improvement, when you take
23 the results that include the MED days that really
24 biases the analysis, and it does not prove useful
25 analysis when you prove the MED days there because it
26 just -- it overwhelms everything else, and you don't
27 get the level of granularity to really know what is
28 driving your system for things that you have better

1 control over.
2 M. GARNER: Did you --
3 J. BUTLER: For example, again, I think it is
4 table 6, AMPCO-54, and we don't have to look at it.
5 When you look, year over year, 42, 44 percent of our
6 customer hours of interruption are due to failed
7 equipment, and the vast majority of that is due to
8 underground cables and cable accessories. And when
9 you look at that analysis removing the MEDs, that
10 pattern comes out loud and clear that the biggest
11 driver that we have to improve reliability is
12 investment in the underground.
13 If you left all the MED data in there, those
14 patterns wouldn't come out, and it wouldn't be as
15 obvious that that is the one lever that we have --
16 that is the best lever we have to really improve --
17 or one of the major ones we have -- to improve
18 overall customer reliability and customer experience.
19 You know, it would be flooded with adverse weather,
20 so we would be looking at, you know, tree-trimming or
21 cutbacks.
22 And -- so really, it gives us a better analysis
23 to do a more prudent and effective investment program
24 if we remove the MED data out of the analysis.
25 M. GARNER: Okay. So -- and pardon my ignorance
26 if there is something for this. Is -- you did put in
27 in this application this Hatch study and other stuff.
28 Is -- is there a place I go to in the evidence that

1 says or shows me the capital programs that are
2 addressing that issue about severe weather, MED or
3 not, but that type of thing?
4 Is -- do you have a whole -- do you have a list
5 of programs that say, these are the programs that are
6 going to address that, and this is how we are going
7 to measure whether that program is a success by
8 whatever metric? Do you have -- do you have
9 something like that in your -- in your application?
10 I just don't want to miss it. I just am looking
11 for, like, here is a set of projects, and we are
12 going to measure this, and this is what is going to
13 happen after it.
14 H. IBRAHIM: Mr. Garner, if I can point you to
15 2-AMPCO-15 --
16 M. GARNER: Okay.
17 H. IBRAHIM: -- where we have responded to the
18 expenditure driven by the Hatch study.
19 M. GARNER: And do you have a metric for those,
20 like, for success with those expenditures, a way to
21 measure whether you are achieving whatever it is you
22 want to achieve?
23 R. BASSINDALE: So the overall impact would be
24 on reliability, and so that would be on the -- both
25 the SAIDI and the failed equipment CHI.
26 M. GARNER: Would that be able to be traced back
27 to the projects, then, as a trace to whether that
28 project achieved it or not achieved success? I mean,

1 you can have a general result. I mean, you could
2 have all the investments in one part of your
3 franchise and all the event in the other one, and the
4 two don't actually come together; right?
5 R. BASSINDALE: It is too much of a hypothetical
6 to consider whether or not an outage would have
7 occurred in the absence of having made the
8 investment.
9 M. GARNER: Okay. Fair enough. So the answer
10 would be, no, you don't have what I'm looking for. I
11 am not saying you should have it or shouldn't. I
12 just wanted to know if you had it, and that's fine.
13 I want to be quick because I don't have much
14 time. And I wanted to just, again -- there are a
15 couple of things, but one of the things I wanted to
16 go to was 2-VECC-15. It goes to 9-Staff-72, which is
17 a DVA thing, but it is really about the -- I think it
18 is called the YRRT overruns or variances in the -- in
19 that project. And there is a table in there. Yeah,
20 I think the table may be -- you know, I don't have --
21 the table may be in the Staff -- 9-Staff-272, or it
22 may be in here. It is a table that shows the
23 contributions, the approved actuals for that project.
24 And we asked, like -- we couldn't figure out
25 what -- where the variance came from, and what you
26 said was, well, it came from -- it is explained in 9-
27 Staff-272, and so that is where I went to. Now, that
28 is the table.

1 And if you read the -- read the narrative below
2 -- which, by the way, thank you -- it talks about
3 this, and let me just sum it up this way: It sort of
4 says there is two reasons for the overrun; one is
5 beyond our control. The City and other people made
6 changes, and we had to make changes, and one is a
7 little bit about -- is we made some changes because
8 we decided, you know, on the ground we couldn't do
9 certain things or we made scope changes.
10 And what I am wondering, when you look at these
11 variances, and they are fairly considerable in this
12 project, is there any way to ascertain the difference
13 between those two reasons, the reasons where the
14 changes and the overruns were due to you making a
15 change in scope, you know, for whatever reason, or
16 where the municipality was calling on you to make a
17 change in scope -- caused you to make a change in
18 scope? Is there any way to pull that apart in those
19 -- that table?
20 D. FAIRCHILD: You are really testing my memory
21 on this one. It is many years ago.
22 M. GARNER: It looked like I caused a lot of
23 problems there. I'm sorry. I wasn't meaning to.
24 D. FAIRCHILD: The -- my recollection of the
25 largest change on this project was a joint decision
26 driven by doing -- making a large stretch along Yonge
27 Street underground, and it was caused by a couple
28 factors.

1 So there was -- there was infrastructure issues
2 in the way. There was sections where we definitely
3 needed to go underground. And case in point, there
4 was a section that a future building site was going
5 to be built too close to the proposed overhead
6 solution that forced an underground, and there was
7 enough of those along that stretch where the feeder
8 would have been overhead, gone down underground --
9 M. GARNER: So you just --
10 D. FAIRCHILD: -- back up overhead, so the
11 decision was made ultimately to go underground. And
12 that was a large --
13 M. GARNER: That's probably the large --
14 D. FAIRCHILD: That was a big one.
15 There was another large one on highway --
16 crossing the 400 by Highway 7 that's just -- you
17 know, it was MTO lands, and we were just -- where we
18 wanted to locate, we couldn't, and it was just -- it
19 drove up costs because of larger span lengths
20 required.
21 M. GARNER: And that was a change from the
22 original -- you didn't know that MTO wouldn't --
23 D. FAIRCHILD: Wouldn't have known, yeah.
24 M. GARNER: -- let you -- yeah, okay. That is
25 fine. Thank you. That is very helpful actually.
26 Thank you.
27 Two next ones are very quick.
28 This morning, Mr. Rubenstein was talking about

1 the table I was interested -- two tables, actually,
2 we are talking about today I was interested in, and
3 they were 2A-SEC-47, and this is unit cost, and then
4 2-AMPCO-53, attachment 1 or whatever. It is a table.
5 And what I would -- first of all, my first
6 question was -- was, could one -- is one deriving
7 these unit costs -- I mean, these are ranges in 2-
8 SEC-47 and in 2-AMPCO-53. It is a table with really
9 individual year-by-year stuff.
10 Is the data that you are getting your ranges
11 from derived from 2-AMPCO-53? That is the question.
12 And if it is, then I probably don't need to go any
13 farther than that. I am just trying to figure out
14 how these ranges were being made.
15 So fleet investments, like, I could understand a
16 $13,000 trailer, but I couldn't even figure for a
17 bucket truck it was $1.1 million unless it was, in my
18 term, gold-plated. So I -- you know, but then I saw
19 AMPCO-53, and I saw, oh, there is another line in
20 there. Maybe if I look at that, that is how that
21 average was built up.
22 So my question is can I use 2-AMPCO-53
23 attachment 2 in a way to derive those unit cost
24 ranges that are shown in 2-SEC-47? I am not asking
25 you to derive them. I am just wondering if that is a
26 way to do it. Because there is unit cost per year,
27 and then I -- you know, I could make averages and
28 create a system to do that.

1 R. BASSINDALE: So in 2-AMPCO-53, Mr. Garner,
2 for example, if we take poles which has been placed
3 together, that would be the entire pole renewal
4 program and then the number of units completed under
5 that. So specifically when you look at individual
6 projects under that, there will be details around
7 pole class and height. That information is then used
8 to derive the unit costing, which is why you see that
9 wide variety of range that was mentioned earlier.
10 M. GARNER: I am not sure that answers what I
11 was asking, though.
12 What I was asking -- let's say -- let's stick
13 with poles because it might be a good one, let's say
14 concrete poles. You will see BO-01, concrete poles.
15 You are at -- you have a range of 18,000 to 40,000.
16 And then you have in AMPCO-53, line 7, concrete
17 poles, although it doesn't look like there is a
18 number there. It looks like the wood poles and the
19 concrete poles are commingled, so it may not be a
20 good example. So I would have to commingle these two
21 numbers; is that how I would do it? Would I then get
22 the same average or roughly the same average?
23 R. BASSINDALE: So, again, maybe we are just
24 missing each other.
25 So if we look at 2019, for example --
26 M. GARNER: Right.
27 R. BASSINDALE: -- there is 11.5 million. That
28 is made up of a bunch of discreet, like, work orders

1 or projects, you know, whatever terminology you would
2 like to use. When you look into those specifics and
3 you see what height and class of pole is being
4 selected, that helped inform the unit costing that is
5 provided in the other response.
6 M. GARNER: Okay.
7 Can I ask you this question maybe because I am
8 being -- I am confused: If I took AMPCO-53 and 2019
9 and divided 588 by 11.5 million, I wouldn't be
10 getting the combined concrete wood pole average; I
11 would be getting something else like a project
12 average for doing something?
13 R. BASSINDALE: Correct. You would be getting
14 the project average.
15 M. GARNER: Whereas I look at the other table, I
16 am actually getting -- what? Am I getting the same
17 or I am getting a pole -- a wood pole average in
18 asset renewal, but I am also getting -- sorry. What
19 I am getting there? What am I shown in that table
20 then, as an average?
21 So if I go to 2-SEC-47, I look at wood poles, it
22 is 12,000 to 34,000, and then I took how many poles
23 you have --
24 R. BASSINDALE: So, again, I have established
25 that that is a range based on the pole height and the
26 pole class. So smaller pole, lower class, lower
27 cost; larger pole, higher class, higher cost.
28 M. GARNER: Okay.

1 R. BASSINDALE: Also some configuration in
2 framing. Single circuit two circuit. That plays a
3 part in terms of the cost for installing the asset.
4 M. GARNER: Okay. Then how did you do table 2A
5 47, then? Let's just forget about AMPCO, the other
6 one. Let's take vehicles because it is fairly easy.
7 So vehicles were 13,000 to 1.1 million. The way
8 I read that is the cheapest vehicle is 13,000 and the
9 most expensive is 1.1 million.
10 R. BASSINDALE: So, unfortunately, I would have
11 to default that to Panel 2.
12 M. GARNER: Okay. That is fair enough. Maybe
13 that is, at this point, where we should go. Thank
14 you.
15 I just have one very short question after this,
16 and I think I am done.
17 D. COBAN: Mr. Garner, sorry, I just want to
18 make sure that you are clear that what we have
19 deferred to Panel 2 is just the fleet-related
20 question. I just don't want you to miss your
21 opportunity to ask questions --
22 M. GARNER: Oh. Thank you for that. Maybe that
23 -- well, maybe then that is -- maybe that, then,
24 brings me to the question I was just going to ask
25 before about the AMPCO, AMPCO-53.
26 In order to get these numbers, 12,000 to 34,000,
27 you have a set of data and that -- is there a median
28 or an average for this group? Because that is a

1 range, right, so it doesn't really tell me kind of --
2 like, if you had 100 units of something, of whatever
3 this, it doesn't tell me anything, really. It just
4 sort of says I have got a range.
5 How did you get the range? You added up what
6 and what? And was there a median to that range? You
7 know, or an average where, you know, this is the
8 average in the range? Because the range itself is --
9 R. BASSINDALE: When we did the analysis, we did
10 not do any averaging of a range. We were
11 specifically looking at pole heights and pole classes
12 that were completed in some -- in a variety of
13 project actuals, and then averaging those projects to
14 get the average cost of that pole height and class.
15 M. GARNER: Can you do a median and average for
16 this unit cost? And/or average? It is not clear to
17 me that you can or can't. That is my question first.
18 Can you do a median or an average?
19 R. BASSINDALE: So, Mr. Garner, the reason we
20 provided a range is because it is going to be
21 dependent on the situation. Is it a highway
22 crossing? It is a concrete pole? Are we doing more
23 concrete poles in one year? More poles that are four
24 circuit versus two circuit versus one circuit? At
25 this point in time, we do not have a universal global
26 average cost.
27 M. GARNER: Yeah. Okay. Fair enough. Thank
28 you. I won't take up any more of your time on that.

1 Last and very quick question, it is for Panel 1,
2 it says, but I am not quite sure it is.
3 4-VECC-56. This is just a quick question. It
4 had a number of coordinators for program delivery.
5 And I had two questions.
6 One is the number of people, this coordinator
7 role, seems to be based on the dollar size of the
8 projects, i.e., the increase seems to be based -- and
9 I'm saying to you, you can correct me -- seems to be
10 based on the fact that the budgets are getting larger
11 and not on the concept that I have a number of
12 projects
13 So what I was trying to understand was, you
14 know, you could have five projects, and they could be
15 very expensive, and still need the same number of
16 coordinators, so to speak. Or you could have a
17 hundred projects and they are very -- you know, a lot
18 to track and do things.
19 So, first of all, I have that -- do I have that
20 right? Is the way you estimated your need for
21 coordinators was based on the quantum of your capital
22 budget? Is that way you do it?
23 M. WITTEMUND: Yes. We use the historical cost
24 to help us inform the number of coordinators we need
25 moving forward. That is right.
26 M. GARNER: Thank you.
27 And can you just tell me, you had eight -- it
28 was four in -- I take it six in '24, eight in '25,

1 now it is ten. Is there ten now, like, today?
2 M. WITTEMUND: There is not ten right now. We
3 are working towards having ten throughout the year.
4 M. GARNER: Right. How many do you have now?
5 M. WITTEMUND: At this moment, we have six right
6 now.
7 M. GARNER: Okay. Those are my questions.
8 Thank you for your indulgence. Thank you, Panel.
9 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Harper. We will
10 take a --
11 M. DEFAZIO: Excuse me. Sorry, can I just jump
12 in for a second?
13 R. DHILLON: Yes.
14 M. DEFAZIO: Hi. Sorry. Margaret DeFazio from
15 the Ontario Energy Board. Can I just jump in with a
16 follow-up to Mr. Harper's question quickly?
17 R. DHILLON: Yes. Go ahead.
18 M. DEFAZIO: Hi. Looking at the unit costs,
19 understanding that, for example, you know, the make
20 up of the types of poles you would install each year
21 would be different, which would give you a different
22 weighted average, but through what you put into fixed
23 assets and the number of poles that you would check
24 out of stores and install each year, could you not
25 come up with a weighted average for the last couple
26 of years and we could see there would be a range --
27 like you said, understanding sometimes you have -- it
28 is a lot different to cross the 400 than it is to go

1 down a rural section of Highway 7. As well as some
2 of the other assets, the switches, et cetera, you
3 could come up with an average.
4 R. BASSINDALE: So subject to check, the
5 financial is done on a pole basis, not an on
6 individual asset basis. So we would not be able to
7 get that information.
8 M. DEFAZIO: Do you not know how many poles you
9 install each year? Maybe not from the financials,
10 but you would know that from your inventory or
11 warehousing or GIS.
12 R. BASSINDALE: So we know the volume at the
13 start of the month and the end of the month. The
14 purposes and reasons why those poles are replaced, we
15 don't have that information.
16 M. DEFAZIO: So if you know how many poles you
17 installed, and you know how much money you put into
18 fixed assets for poles, that -- I am just confused.
19 But okay. Thank you.
20 T. WASIK: Maybe I can help to clarify the last
21 comment. We understand the number of poles at the
22 end of the month and at the beginning of month. But
23 what my colleague was trying to say is sometimes we
24 just install new poles, and sometimes we replace
25 poles, and the pole counts change. So trying to sort
26 of provide sort of a per unit cost for either a new
27 installation or replacement has -- is not separated
28 in our tracking.

1 M. DEFAZIO: Could you do it combined?
2 J. BUTLER: So, yes, we know the volume of
3 inventory going in and out of the stores, so we know
4 how many poles go out in a month. But if we are
5 looking at a -- if you are trying to find a
6 comparison, a range, or an average for installation
7 of poles, it is not -- just the volume going out and
8 the total dollar values don't give you a usable
9 range.
10 Like, when we are replacing poles reactively
11 because they break as part of programs, there is
12 stringing attached, which also goes into the cost
13 base. Sometimes we are replacing a pole because we
14 need to upgrade it because we are replacing a switch,
15 so the -- like, there is so many more assets than
16 just the pure pole and the cost of taking the pole
17 from stores, digging a hole, putting it in the
18 ground. Like, there is a lot more activity
19 surrounding that.
20 So to try and get you a usable average just
21 based on, you know, inventory volumes, I don't think
22 we would be able to provide a usable range or usable
23 value based on that.
24 M. DEFAZIO: Thank you.
25 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Ms. DeFazio.
26 We will take a short break. The time is now
27 3:05. We will return back at 3:20.
28 --- Recess taken at 3:05 p.m.

1 --- Upon resuming at 3:19 p.m.
2 R. DHILLON: So next we have AMPCO, and I will
3 turn it to Ms. Grice. I would just remind everyone
4 to stick to the allotted times. We have 60 minutes
5 scheduled for AMPCO. Thank you.
6 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY S. GRICE**
7 S. GRICE: Thank you.
8 Good afternoon, Panel. I have reduced the
9 number of questions based on what has already been
10 asked, so I don't think I will be 60 minutes.
11 Okay. My first question is with respect to 1-
12 AMPCO-2. So in this question, we were referencing
13 the evidence where Alectra talks about a net
14 reduction in the capital program over the 2027 to
15 2031 period of 106 million due to its customer
16 engagement Phase 2. And I just want to quickly go to
17 the reference for our question, which is Exhibit 1,
18 tab 3, schedule 1, page 22. Okay, thank you.
19 And if you just look at the description of what
20 happened as a result of the second phase of customer
21 engagement, and I am looking at lines -- beginning at
22 line 1. And it says that the adjustments that were
23 included was an accelerated investment in overhead
24 asset renewal, reduced investment in system
25 expansion, reduced investment in cable replacement,
26 and reduced investment in deployment of AMI 2.0
27 meters.
28 So if we can just go back to AMPCO interrogatory

1 1-AMPCO-2, we asked for a breakdown of all of the
2 capital reductions that resulted in the net reduction
3 of 106 million. And if we just go to the table 1 in
4 the response, if you just stay -- yeah.
5 So just with respect to customer connections,
6 which is the second one there, the total change is
7 71.1 million. And so my understanding, this would be
8 after the Copperleaf iteration where it produced the
9 draft plan. And I just wondered what happened as a
10 result of customer engagement Phase 2 that resulted
11 in a $71.1 million increase in customer connections
12 or, you know, just generally, how did that come to
13 be?
14 H. IBRAHIM: Ms. Grice, as we reduced system
15 service with the feedback from customer engagement,
16 we also updated the plan as customers have come
17 forward that notified us with their intent to
18 connect. So that is why you see an increase in
19 customer connections. So there is a reduction in
20 system service and an increase in customer
21 connections, and, overall, it is a $106 million
22 reduction.
23 S. GRICE: So it wasn't specifically related to
24 when you went out and talked to customers; it is just
25 something additional that came to be?
26 H. IBRAHIM: Yes. So the plan was updated to
27 reflect the latest known information at the time,
28 adjusting the plan with customer engagement.

1 S. GRICE: Okay. And then if you just go to
2 page 2, which is the rest of the inputs that make up
3 the 106 million, you have increased facilities
4 management by 4 million. Can you just talk about how
5 that came to be?
6 H. IBRAHIM: I would defer that particular
7 question to Panel 2.
8 S. GRICE: Okay. And then I guess you are going
9 to say the same thing about information technology
10 with an increase of 5 million?
11 H. IBRAHIM: That is correct.
12 S. GRICE: Panel 2? Okay. Okay. Thank you.
13 My next question is with respect to 2-AMPCO-19.
14 Just looking at part A, we asked for the results of
15 cost control, so planned actual -- or, sorry, planned
16 capital, which the description says is actual versus
17 budget performance for the years 2020 to 2024. And
18 if we can just go to the response of part A, it says
19 that it can be found in Exhibit 2, tab 1, schedule 1,
20 appendix P, page 3. If we could please just go to
21 that exhibit. Okay. And you see these percentages
22 there of 88.5 percent in 2020 all the way across to
23 80.5 percent in 2024. You see those percentages
24 there?
25 R. BASSINDALE: Yes, we do.
26 S. GRICE: Okay.
27 I just want to take you one more place because I
28 am just trying to reconcile a couple pieces of

1 evidence. Can you go to 1-AMPCO-3, please.
2 So you see in table 1, we asked that the plan
3 amounts be shown as well as the actual amounts, and
4 you have shown them there, that the total 2020 to
5 2024 DSP plan is 1.456 billion, and then the actuals
6 for 2020 to 2024 are 1.456 billion as well. So, in
7 my mind, the ratio of cost control, which was the
8 actual compared to budget, it looks like it is a
9 hundred percent. So that is why I am just confused
10 by the cost control percentages that I took you to in
11 appendix P, why they are, you know, below a hundred
12 percent every year.
13 R. BASSINDALE: If we can actually please flip
14 back to appendix P. So appendix P, when we are doing
15 this validation, based on the metric that we had
16 submitted in the last DSP, it is specific to projects
17 that were in the last DSP.
18 S. GRICE: Okay. So it is a subset --
19 R. BASSINDALE: Yes.
20 S. GRICE: -- of -- of the --
21 R. BASSINDALE: Of the actual -- you see in the
22 other number are net new projects.
23 S. GRICE: Is it -- could we get -- could we get
24 the dollar amounts that make up these percentages?
25 So would you -- could you share the actual versus the
26 budget for that subset of projects?
27 R. BASSINDALE: Just so I am clear, the
28 undertaking you are asking for is to provide the

1 budget and actual that make up the values from 2020
2 to 2024?
3 S. GRICE: Yes. In appendix P. Yes, please.
4 R. BASSINDALE: For table P-2?
5 S. GRICE: Yes. Thank you.
6 R. DHILLON: I will mark that down as
7 Undertaking Number JT-1.23.
8 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.23: PROVIDE THE BUDGET AND**
9 **ACTUAL THAT MAKE UP THE VALUES FROM 2020 TO 2024**
10 **FOR TABLE P-2 IN APPENDIX P**
11 S. GRICE: Okay. My next question is 2-AMPCO-
12 21, part C. Okay. Thank you.
13 And in part C, we asked Alectra to provide the
14 constraints that were used to develop the draft
15 capital plan, and if you look at the response to part
16 C, and Mr. Rubenstein had a discussion with you this
17 morning about the Capex numbers. And I just had a
18 question about the labour hours. How -- how was that
19 number derived? Like, what is it based on?
20 H. IBRAHIM: I just would like to clarify which
21 of the constraints, again, you are looking for.
22 S. GRICE: The labour hours, 195,600.
23 H. IBRAHIM: And you are looking for where it
24 came from; is that correct?
25 S. GRICE: Well, how is it derived? Like, why
26 did you use 195,600 as the constraint?
27 H. IBRAHIM: Okay. I will have to take that one
28 back. So I can provide --

1 S. GRICE: Okay. Thank you.
2 And just to expand on it, you have got the same
3 number of labour hours every year, but the capital --
4 the Capex number is going up, and I just wondered, as
5 part of that undertaking, could you explain why it is
6 the same labour hours every year?
7 H. IBRAHIM: I can.
8 S. GRICE: Okay.
9 And just last question on this --
10 J. MYERS: Sorry. Can we get an undertaking for
11 that one?
12 S. GRICE: Sorry. Sorry. Yeah.
13 J. MYERS: Number?
14 R. DHILLON: Sorry. So I will mark that down as
15 Undertaking Number JT-1.24.
16 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.24: EXPLAIN WHY 195,600 WAS**
17 **USED FOR LABOR HOURS, AND ADVISE WHY THE LABOUR**
18 **HOURS ARE THE SAME EVERY YEAR IN REGARDS TO 2-**
19 **AMPCO-21 PART C, AND COMMENT ON WHAT CHANGES**
20 **THERE WERE BETWEEN ITERATION 1 AND 6**
21 S. GRICE: And then just a final question. So
22 there were six iterations of Copperleaf, so am I
23 correct in assuming there were six different labour
24 hour quantities used in all of those iterations, or
25 was it the same number for all six?
26 H. IBRAHIM: I don't have that information on me
27 right now. And as I mentioned before to Mr.
28 Rubenstein, like, this is an iterative process for us

1 to go through as an organization, so I can't comment
2 at this point, like, whether it changed or not.
3 S. GRICE: Could you make that part of the
4 undertaking, just -- just to comment on what changes
5 there were between iteration 1 and 6?
6 H. IBRAHIM: For the labour hours, we will take
7 that back and see if it changed between the different
8 iterations.
9 S. GRICE: Okay. Thank you.
10 So that will be part of the same undertaking?
11 R. DHILLON: That is correct. Thank you.
12 S. GRICE: Thank you.
13 Okay. I just have a quick question on 2-AMPCO-
14 26 that involves just bringing up the spreadsheet
15 that was completed. And it is just a general
16 question. I just -- I am just wanting to understand
17 your resource strategy year over year.
18 So if we can just look at -- if you can go down
19 to overhead rebuilds, just as an example. So I am
20 just looking at -- sorry. The first year on the
21 table is 2020 actuals, and you have got a split of 89
22 percent internal and 11 percent external. And then
23 over in the year 2025, the split is now 38 percent
24 internal and 62 percent external. Can you just
25 explain internally what is happening to drive those
26 differences in internal versus external resources?
27 H. IBRAHIM: Ms. Grice, if you don't mind, can
28 you point us, again, to the numbers?

1 S. GRICE: Sure. So I am looking at overhead
2 rebuilds, which is line 70 on the table that is on
3 the screen.
4 So in 2020, it is an 89 percent internal versus
5 11 percent external in terms of the resource makeup.
6 And then if you go to 2025, it is 38 percent internal
7 and 62 percent external. And then you also have two
8 years with zero percent for both.
9 So I am just trying to understand in terms of
10 your resource strategy what is driving those year-
11 over-year variances.
12 H. IBRAHIM: We will have to take this one back
13 in order to provide you the explanation.
14 S. GRICE: Okay. Okay. Thank you. And can you
15 include the zero percent issue as well?
16 H. IBRAHIM: Yeah, we will.
17 S. GRICE: Okay. Thank you.
18 R. DHILLON: I will mark that down as
19 Undertaking JT-1.25.
20 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.25: PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION IN**
21 **RELATION TO 2-AMPCO-26 FOR WHAT IS DRIVING YEAR-**
22 **OVER-YEAR VARIANCES INCLUDING THE ZERO PERCENT**
23 **ISSUE**
24 S. GRICE: Okay.
25 My next question is 2-AMPCO-28.
26 Okay. In part B, we asked for Alectra's defined
27 thresholds and approval pathways for the project
28 change request process. And then if you look in the

1 response, in table 1, you identify where a project
2 change request is required and how it is approved,
3 and you have got two different tiers of projects
4 where the change threshold requires a project change
5 request.
6 So you have got greater than 0.3 million and
7 less than 1 million and then greater than 1 million.
8 And I guess my question is could Alectra provide the
9 project change requests, the forms for the projects
10 that fall into those two threshold categories?
11 T. WASIK: Ms. Grice, I believe that this is a
12 question for Panel Number 3.
13 S. GRICE: I am so sorry. It is. I swear I
14 thought it was on the list. Okay. Okay.
15 T. WASIK: Panel Number 3 would be --
16 S. GRICE: Thank you.
17 T. WASIK: -- the appropriate group to --
18 S. GRICE: Okay.
19 T. WASIK: -- address it.
20 S. GRICE: I will leave that, then.
21 T. WASIK: Thank you.
22 S. GRICE: Okay.
23 2-AMPCO-34, please. So this was a question
24 where we were asking some questions on your asset
25 condition assessment at appendix E, and we asked for
26 the list of asset groups in part C where age has a
27 significant weight in the calculation, and in the
28 response, you indicate that overhead conductors and

1 underground cables have a significant weight.
2 And in going back and looking at appendix E, age
3 is an input with varying input weights for most, if
4 not all, of Alectra's assets in the asset condition
5 assessment; would you agree with that?
6 R. BASSINDALE: Subject to check, I believe age
7 is a criteria on all the assets.
8 S. GRICE: Okay.
9 So I want to ask if you could run the asset
10 condition assessment using the same data set as 2023
11 but removing age as an input; is that something you
12 could do?
13 R. BASSINDALE: Just quickly, I want to make a
14 correction to an earlier statement. I had mentioned
15 that subject to check, all the assets had age. I
16 believe station assets do not have age in their
17 health index.
18 S. GRICE: But other than that, all the others
19 do?
20 R. BASSINDALE: Yes.
21 In regards to your request, we can offer that we
22 can take it back and take a look at what that would
23 mean in terms of the amount of work to rebuild the
24 ACA to be able to execute that type of analysis. It
25 is a possibility that if it is too intensive, we
26 might try to offer something else. But at this point
27 in time, like, without us taking a look, I wouldn't
28 be able to say whether we can perform the analysis

1 you are requesting.
2 S. GRICE: Okay. That is fine. Thank you.
3 R. DHILLON: I will mark that as Undertaking JT-
4 1.26.
5 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.26: ON A BEST-EFFORTS BASIS,**
6 **RUN THE ASSET CONDITION ASSESSMENT USING THE**
7 **SAME DATA SET AS 2023 BUT REMOVING AGE AS AN**
8 **INPUT**
9 S. GRICE: Okay.
10 2-AMPCO-35, please. And for this one, we need
11 to look at the Excel spreadsheet, if we can, please.
12 Okay. Thank you.
13 In the question, we asked that if you could
14 qualify, to the extent possible, the data gaps for
15 each category so that "low" would mean there is not
16 much more condition data needed to be incorporated
17 and "high" meaning important condition parameters
18 have yet to be incorporated.
19 So in this spreadsheet, it looks like for most -
20 - for all of the assets except for wood poles, there
21 is not much more condition data that is required.
22 But with respect to poles, it says "medium." Can you
23 just explain what data gaps are missing with respect
24 to poles for it to have a medium?
25 R. BASSINDALE: So, first off, just to make sure
26 we are talking about -- you want to know specifically
27 back in 2018 why it was medium, not in 2023? Is that
28 -- does that change --

1 S. GRICE: Yeah, yeah. No, no. You are right.
2 R. BASSINDALE: Okay.
3 S. GRICE: Yeah. Thank you. I looked at it
4 quickly and -- okay. Thank you very much. That
5 clarifies that.
6 Okay. 2-AMPCO-39, please.
7 Oh, can I -- can I just go back and ask. So it
8 moved from medium to low, so can you -- can you fill
9 in, then, what new data is being tracked for poles?
10 R. BASSINDALE: Increased wood pole testing
11 results.
12 S. GRICE: So for strength?
13 R. BASSINDALE: Yes.
14 S. GRICE: Okay. Okay. Thank you.
15 Okay. Back to AMPCO-39. We asked a question
16 about -- you showed the voltage conversion projects
17 that are underway 2020 to 2025, being 14, compared to
18 the next time period '26 to '31 being 11. And we
19 asked about the timeline and budget for the remaining
20 voltage conversion projects. And in your response,
21 you explain that until you optimize every project in
22 the DSP, it is difficult to provide this information
23 explicitly.
24 But I am just trying to get a sense of the
25 magnitude of voltage conversion projects coming that
26 are still sort of on your books that you need to do
27 and when the sunset will be. Is this, like, a 10-
28 year horizon for future voltage conversion projects?

1 Can you shed any light on that?
2 R. BASSINDALE: So, unfortunately, Ms. Grice, we
3 have the total number of municipal stations, but that
4 wouldn't necessarily be the ones that would qualify
5 for voltage conversion. Specifically, you are
6 talking the for a 4kV in your question. We will have
7 to take that back, but essentially it would be that
8 number minus 8.
9 S. GRICE: Okay. Thank you.
10 R. DHILLON: Sorry. Ms. Grice, is that an
11 undertaking?
12 S. GRICE: Yes, it was.
13 R. DHILLON: And can you repeat what the
14 undertaking is?
15 S. GRICE: Yes. It is to provide a timeline for
16 the remaining voltage --
17 R. BASSINDALE: So --
18 S. GRICE: Oh, sorry. You --
19 R. BASSINDALE: What we can provide is the
20 number of stations we will have remaining in service
21 that are for a 4kV by the end of 2031. That is what
22 we can provide.
23 S. GRICE: Okay. And then no -- no vision about
24 what sort of timeframe you are going to take to
25 address those?
26 R. BASSINDALE: So for some of the areas, we
27 haven't even started an investment plan long term yet
28 so --

1 S. GRICE: Okay. Okay. Okay. That is fine.
2 Thank you.
3 R. DHILLON: I will mark that as Undertaking JT-
4 1.27.
5 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.27: PROVIDE THE NUMBER OF**
6 **STATIONS REMAINING IN SERVICE THAT ARE FOR A 4KV**
7 **BY THE END OF 2031**
8 S. GRICE: Okay.
9 And then 4-AMPCO-64, please. So I am looking at
10 the response in part C, which the table is filled in
11 on page 2. And just in the last column there, you
12 provide the number of projects delivered that were
13 greater than 10 percent of the planned cost and
14 greater than $100,000, and you've -- you show that
15 there are 1,617 projects.
16 I wondered if you could provide the dollar
17 amount that equates to the overrun as it is described
18 there related to those 1,617 projects?
19 M. WITTEMUND: Ms. Grice, just so I understand,
20 in aggregate, the total value?
21 S. GRICE: Yes, in aggregate.
22 M. WITTEMUND: Yes, we can do that.
23 S. GRICE: Thank you.
24 R. DHILLON: I will mark that as Undertaking JT-
25 1.28.
26 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.28: PROVIDE THE DOLLAR AMOUNT**
27 **THAT EQUATES TO THE OVERRUN RELATED TO THE 1,617**
28 **PROJECTS IN 4-AMPCO-64**

1 S. GRICE: Okay.
2 And then I just have a question, just with
3 staying in this interrogatory. If we can go back a
4 page. I just want to look at the response to part B.
5 Okay. We will start with where you talk about
6 the cost performance index, and then you say that the
7 actual project costs are measured as a ratio of
8 actual to planned cost to determine the CPI. I just
9 -- I just want to clarify. So then if a ratio is 1
10 or less, that is a good thing. It means the project
11 came in under budget. I just want to make sure I am
12 understanding this CPI correctly. It came -- sorry.
13 It came in at or under budget?
14 M. WITTEMUND: Yeah. So if the ratio is under
15 1, then the actual cost of the project versus planned
16 came in under budget.
17 S. GRICE: Okay. Just wanting to make sure --
18 M. WITTEMUND: Yes, that is correct.
19 S. GRICE: -- I had that correct.
20 And then same thing with schedule, the SPI. Can
21 we just go to the next page, please. I just want to
22 make sure here too that this metric is the percentage
23 of projects which are completed within 90 days either
24 before or after the anticipated finish date. So can
25 you just explain, just in the same basis as CPI, what
26 -- that -- is the -- the ratio 1 and less for a
27 project that is on time? Or is it simply a
28 percentage?

1 M. WITTEMUND: Sorry, Ms. Grice, can you just
2 clarify that? I am just trying to understand again.
3 S. GRICE: Okay.
4 M. WITTEMUND: Yeah.
5 S. GRICE: Actually, if you can tell me sort of
6 what the SPI looks like. That is -- instead of me
7 guessing. That is what I am looking for.
8 M. WITTEMUND: Yes. The SPI is a ratio of the
9 schedule, so it is scheduled performance index. It
10 is the scheduled -- the date of the project as
11 compared to the actual completion date of the
12 project.
13 S. GRICE: So if the project is late, what does
14 the ratio look like?
15 M. WITTEMUND: So, Ms. Grice, just for
16 clarification, so the SPI metric is the percentage of
17 projects which we completed within 90 days before or
18 after the anticipated finish date.
19 So in column 2 there, we have stated that 2,059
20 projects were delivered within 90 days of the
21 finished project date.
22 S. GRICE: So then the SPI would be 2,059
23 divided by 5,534? No. Sorry, I am just trying to
24 understand how to calculate the SPI.
25 M. WITTEMUND: Okay. What we can do is we will
26 take that back and provide that to you. We will
27 provide a written, more informative response on that
28 one, if that is okay.

1 S. GRICE: Okay. That would be great. Thank
2 you very much.
3 M. WITTEMUND: Yeah.
4 R. DHILLON: Ms. Grice, can you just repeat that
5 undertaking, please?
6 S. GRICE: Yes. To provide a response on how
7 the SPI is calculated. Which is the scheduled
8 performance index.
9 R. DHILLON: I will mark that as Undertaking JT-
10 1.29.
11 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.29: PROVIDE A RESPONSE ON HOW**
12 **THE SPI IS CALCULATED**
13 S. GRICE: Thank you. And those are all of my
14 questions. Thank you very much.
15 R. DHILLON: Next we have Energy Probe. I
16 believe that is Mr. Ladanyi.
17 T. LADANYI: Yes. I am here.
18 R. DHILLON: Thank you. Go ahead.
19 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY T. LADANYI**
20 T. LADANYI: So as I introduced myself this
21 morning, I mentioned that I am representing two
22 intervenors, Energy Probe and the Coalition of
23 Concerned Manufacturers and Businesses of Canada,
24 CCMBC, and they are sharing my services to reduce
25 regulatory costs.
26 Now, in the schedule, it shows that Energy Probe
27 is -- questions are first for 20 minutes, and CCMBC
28 questions are second for 15, but I will reverse that.

1 I will start with CCMBC, if you don't mind.
2 So can you turn to 4-CCMBC-3. Thank you.
3 And in that question, I asked about the apparent
4 contradiction between the claim of prudently managing
5 costs and the claim of increasing backlog of
6 deteriorated assets. And you provided an answer.
7 And I am just going to point you to the bottom of the
8 page of that answer, and the last sentence on that
9 page says:
10 "OM&A per customer increased by only 1.4
11 percent annually over the period and was 16
12 percent lower than the Alectra Utilities' peer
13 group."[as read]
14 Which peer group is that?
15 If you don't know, we can have an undertaking.
16 It is not that important. I am just interested in
17 what the source of that reference is.
18 T. WASIK: That is acceptable. We will
19 undertake to provide the source of the peer group.
20 R. DHILLON: I will mark that as Undertaking JT-
21 1.30.
22 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.30: ADVISE WHAT PEER GROUP IS**
23 **REFERENCED IN THE RESPONSE AT 4-CCMBC-3 AND**
24 **ADVISE WHETHER ALECTRA DECIDED CONSCIOUSLY TO**
25 **SPEND LESS OR WHETHER THEY ARE BEING CONSTRAINED**
26 **FROM SPENDING MORE ON OM&A BECAUSE THEY DID NOT**
27 **HAVE ENOUGH MONEY**
28 T. LADANYI: And trying to understand that

1 answer in general, I won't read it to you, but are
2 you stating that you would have spent more on
3 maintenance if you had more money, or did you
4 consciously decide not to spend as much on
5 maintenance as the peer group?
6 T. WASIK: Mr. Ladanyi, I think the context of
7 that question is to demonstrate efficient and prudent
8 cost management relative to our peer group.
9 T. LADANYI: So as I understand your answer
10 right now, it was your conscious decision to not
11 spend as much on maintenance as the peer group did?
12 J. BUTLER: Mr. Ladanyi, I just want to clarify.
13 You stated you are asking about our spend, and what I
14 am hearing is total spend relative to the peer group
15 that we will define in that undertaking, but I think
16 the cost referring to is a per customer cost. So
17 even though our per customer cost may be higher or
18 lower than the peer group, it does not necessarily
19 reflect the higher or lower overall spend, so I am
20 not -- you may need to rephrase that question.
21 T. LADANYI: Well, I am trying to understand the
22 answer, but if you can -- you can actually rephrase
23 your answer and you can qualify it and say, it is
24 only per customer, and we actually spent in total
25 more than the peer group, but because we have more
26 customers, when you divide it by number of customers,
27 per customer number is different. But it is up to
28 you how you answer it.

1 Actually, you can also have an undertaking on
2 that one as well if this -- I don't want it to take
3 too much time with these. I have quite a few other
4 questions.
5 R. BASSINDALE: Sorry, Mr. Ladanyi, what
6 specifically was your question in that statement you
7 made?
8 T. LADANYI: The question was really about the
9 decisionmaking that Alectra has made. Have you
10 decided consciously to spend less, or are you
11 actually being constrained from spending more on OM&A
12 because you did not have enough money?
13 You can answer in writing if you want to. You
14 don't have to answer now if you don't want to. If
15 you prefer to answer in writing, I am fine with that.
16 R. BASSINDALE: We will take that as part of the
17 previous undertaking.
18 T. LADANYI: Very good. Thank you.
19 So now can you turn to 2A-EP-6. I am still on
20 CCMBC questions. It is 2A-EP-6, Energy Probe 6.
21 Yeah, down. Okay. And go to the next page, please.
22 And there is a link to the capacity information map.
23 You are familiar of -- there is a capacity
24 information map, I know that Alectra participated in
25 it, and there is a lot of interesting information
26 there. So can you actually click on that link, and
27 we can see the map on the screen, please.
28 So you see it has got two selections there:

1 available load capacity and available DER hosting
2 capacity. So I am going to ask some questions about
3 the data centres. So I assume that data centres are
4 actually loads. Is that right? They are not DERs?
5 T. WASIK: That is correct.
6 T. LADANYI: Could you click on "available load
7 capacity" and have it come up on the screen, please.
8 And now could you zoom into the Alectra service area
9 or service territory?
10 Just in general, I would say in the area north
11 of Toronto, that is the easiest, I am going
12 throughout the territory. I am just going to ask you
13 some general questions. Again, zoom some more until
14 it comes up. Keep zooming. Keep zooming. Keep
15 going. There it is. Now we are in business. Okay.
16 So can you tell me what the colours are, or are
17 we just going to use the legend on the side? Is
18 anybody on the panel familiar with the colours?
19 T. WASIK: We can speak to the best that we can
20 about the legend, but I believe that it is -- the
21 legend explains what the available load capacity and
22 MVA ratings are as per the OEB requirements.
23 T. LADANYI: All right. Very good. Actually,
24 and I don't need too many details. These are just
25 general questions.
26 So from what I gather, let's say if a data
27 centre wants to locate in an area where there is
28 insufficient capacity, what would you do? Would you

1 tell them to -- don't go there, or would you actually
2 try to provide them with capacity? What would
3 happen?
4 T. WASIK: Well, Mr. Ladanyi, it doesn't really
5 work that way. We don't advise load centres where to
6 go look. What typically happens is a customer
7 approaches us with a specific site and address in
8 mind, and they are asking for specific information
9 about what would it take to provide electrical
10 connections at those particular sites and locations.
11 T. LADANYI: So then you would inform them. And
12 if you go back to my interrogatory for a second. We
13 will return to a map in a minute. Okay. Just a
14 minute. So if you go to the previous page, to the
15 bottom. And there, you explain how you used the
16 distribution system code to calculate the
17 contribution that is required.
18 So if a data centre wants to locate in a
19 location where there is insufficient capacity, you
20 would do a calculation that would show what would be
21 required to bring sufficient capacity to that
22 location. Is that what you would we doing? And that
23 would be in part of this, what you describe here at
24 the bottom of the page?
25 T. WASIK: So, Mr. Ladanyi, there is a little
26 bit of a different sequence that I would like to
27 maybe clarify. If a data centre was to approach
28 Alectra with a specific site and address and ask us

1 if there is available capacity to connect, we would
2 review that and complete that study.
3 Depending on the size of the data centre and
4 depending on the magnitude of the connection, it may
5 follow different particular approach, and we may have
6 to be required to do a system impact assessment, we
7 would have to go through a significant amount of
8 planning.
9 Each particular site is done case-by-case. So
10 there isn't, you know, a general approach that we
11 take with data centres because they can vary in
12 significant magnitude connections as well as
13 requirements.
14 I think that is also an important part of it.
15 It is not just capacity. Data centres are also
16 seeking specific power quality, redundancy, and other
17 technical matters that are requested of Alectra by
18 the customer.
19 T. LADANYI: So then you would calculate what
20 deposit is required. Is that right? And then you
21 would tell the customer how much money they have to
22 give you, and then I guess things are going to start
23 happening, and you keep the deposit on your books.
24 And I think in a previous question this morning, we
25 saw how much deposit you have, and you have a bunch
26 of deposits for 2027. That is fine.
27 And you talk about a connection horizon, and a
28 connection horizon is a essentially prior to the

1 revenue horizon. So connection horizon would be,
2 let's say, three or four years might lapse before the
3 data centre is actually operating. So that would be
4 the connection horizon. And then the revenue horizon
5 is after the data centre starts operating and starts
6 paying you revenues. Would that be right?
7 T. WASIK: So a couple clarifications, Mr.
8 Ladanyi. The connection horizon is effective from
9 the point of connection and energization, which is
10 also when the revenue horizon starts, not from the
11 point of construction.
12 T. LADANYI: So for data centres, revenue
13 horizon starts on day 1 of the connection horizon.
14 But connection horizon is five years, so then what
15 happens with the remaining years of the connection
16 horizon? Nothing? Or it doesn't have any
17 significance?
18 Because I am trying to get this, and I think
19 maybe you can answer it. Suppose the data centre
20 does not actually start operating for another five
21 years, maybe it doesn't start operating for six
22 years. What happens then? Do they forego their
23 deposit? Can you explain what would happen if they
24 do not actually start operating for quite some time
25 after they have been connected?
26 D. FAIRCHILD: Yeah. In that example that you
27 provided where a data centre comes to Alectra, we go
28 through the process and offer to connect, economic

1 model is established, and once that project is
2 constructed and energized, the window -- the time
3 starts ticking for both the connection horizon and
4 the revenue horizon. They start at the same point.
5 If for some reason that data centre chooses to
6 delay any part of their load ramp-up schedule, and it
7 falls outside of the five years, yeah, very much, you
8 know, that -- you know, it is quite possible they
9 would have to -- they would have to pay back, you
10 know, whatever, you know, line of credit, letter of
11 credit on deposit that we have. So they do that have
12 right, though, for that five-year window.
13 T. LADANYI: Now, if the data centre wants to
14 locate and they can -- could you go back to the map,
15 please. Yeah. And let's say in the green area. I
16 understand the green area, this is most capacity.
17 And I guess you are actually assigning capacity to
18 customers on a first come, first serve basis.
19 So if a data centre comes and takes up a lot of
20 that capacity in the green area, are they charged a
21 contribution, or is this -- because there is no
22 incremental cost to you for a building new
23 facilities. Or are they charged nothing?
24 D. FAIRCHILD: The treatment of data centres is
25 a similar treatment for all of our other customers.
26 If a customer comes along and we refer to them as
27 "lies along customer," meaning there is already
28 available capacity, a front to their property, they

1 have access to it, like any other customer, on a
2 first come, first served basis.
3 T. LADANYI: And they are not treated in any way
4 differently than, let's say, members of CCMBC, who
5 are essentially medium and small manufacturers in the
6 commercial establishments? They are treated just the
7 same way? There is no special provision for data
8 centres?
9 D. FAIRCHILD: There are no special provisions
10 for data centres.
11 T. LADANYI: Now, in terms of the spare
12 capacity, and maybe this is kind of a subject for
13 argument or the discussion, the spare capacity exists
14 because some other customers have paid for assets to
15 provide the spare capacity. Is a new customer -- and
16 that would actually not just be data centre -- are
17 they required to -- essentially may pay some
18 contribution to the customers who already provided
19 this capacity, or it is you are not really taking --
20 looking after it that way?
21 D. FAIRCHILD: No. You are correct in your
22 thinking, is if there is a system expansion and
23 customer A pays for that system expansion and someone
24 comes along within a five-year period, there is a
25 mechanism to provide a rebate from the second
26 customer to the first customer.
27 T. LADANYI: And that is covered in appendix I
28 of the distribution system code; would that be right?

1 I think it is kind of discussed there, appendix I,
2 which is just the capacity allocation model, or
3 you're not familiar -- I don't want to test your
4 knowledge that way.
5 D. FAIRCHILD: Yeah, it is -- I don't believe it
6 is at appendix I, but it is definitely covered in --
7 T. LADANYI: Okay.
8 D. FAIRCHILD: The distribution system code
9 talks about factoring in things like when they
10 connect, where they connect, and the time within that
11 five years that they connect. So they look at those
12 three factors.
13 T. LADANYI: Okay. Thank you.
14 Now I am going to go to Energy Probe questions,
15 and we are still staying on the -- on the map. So if
16 you can go back -- so try to look at this, you know,
17 let's say, record this in your memory, and now go
18 back to the selection on the first, let's say, screen
19 of the capacity information map, and we will select
20 the DER selection.
21 Go back. Go back some more. Back, back. And -
22 - no. Go back the other way. Yes, to the -- to the
23 very -- all the way to the -- there. Yeah, now go
24 back some more. No. You are going the wrong way.
25 So you can select DER capacity. It has got a
26 separate selection button. There, the one at the
27 bottom. See, available DER hosting capacity. Okay.
28 And now let's go zooming back to Alectra service

1 territory. And you can see here the DER hosting
2 capacity is very different than the load capacity.
3 Can you tell me why they are so different?
4 J. BUTLER: Yes. The -- excuse me. The
5 connection of a load is very different than the
6 connection of a DER, which is essentially an
7 injection into the system or a deferral. Many of the
8 limitations for the DERs is -- is there is a thermal
9 or a -- or a short-circuit constraint, and that is
10 really what this is looking at.
11 From a technical standpoint, it deals with the
12 protection and controls of the system and show the
13 protections in place, which were generally designed
14 for one-way downward flow, can they handle multiple
15 injections of -- into the system?
16 You know, so a system was originally designed
17 for one-way power flow, cannot handle multiple
18 injections, so multi-injections.
19 T. LADANYI: Yes. That is my understanding. I
20 am actually -- so you are agreeing, what I expected.
21 J. BUTLER: Yes. So --
22 T. LADANYI: So do you have DER management
23 systems in place, and let's say in the red area, you
24 actually don't have it, or are you dealing with just
25 protection equipment? Because I understand from
26 other proceedings with other utilities that to
27 protect the distributor from problems that might be
28 caused by DERs, you'll need ADMS, which is advanced

1 distribution management systems; FLISR, which is
2 fault, location, isolation, and service restoration
3 system; and volt wire optimization to control voltage
4 and reactive power. Is that your understanding too?
5 J. BUTLER: Yes. As the penetration --
6 initially when DER penetration is very low, these
7 systems are generally not needed, but the deployment
8 or development of these systems allows a greater
9 penetration of DER onto the system.
10 T. LADANYI: And you are actually installing
11 these systems, or you have these systems throughout,
12 or are you in the process of installing these
13 systems, or have you installed them everywhere?
14 J. BUTLER: Just for clarification, I think we
15 need to be a little bit more succinct in what you are
16 defining as "systems." You know, Alectra has done a
17 lot of investments in distribution automation. We
18 are upgrading protection and control systems
19 throughout our service territory.
20 And if you -- and I don't -- we don't need to
21 pull it up, but appendix B14 talks about enabling
22 resiliency in modernization, so there is a section in
23 there on some of our plans moving forward to develop,
24 you know, more ADMS and DSO-type capabilities. That
25 is outlined in appendix B14. But there -- on those
26 systems, DSO and ADMS, it is still very early stages
27 for Alectra.
28 T. LADANYI: So they are needed for DER

1 customers that export power to the grid, but all
2 customers will be paying for it, according to your
3 plans; is that right?
4 J. BUTLER: These systems -- and, again, we need
5 to be careful that we don't be too broad with our
6 definition of "systems." The protection and control
7 systems we are putting in place at our stations that
8 are upgrades, they -- they assist in the enabling of
9 DER, but they actually have -- that is not the
10 primary driver. There is many benefits that we are
11 doing this for in the operation, the safe operation
12 and reliable operation, of our distribution system.
13 That is the driver for those.
14 With the IT systems themselves, they are
15 multiple benefits. So I don't think it is a fair
16 assertion that that investment is being done -- you
17 know, paid for by the entire rate base when it is
18 only benefiting a small number of customers. I don't
19 quite think that is an accurate statement.
20 T. LADANYI: Actually, I agree with you, it has
21 got other benefits, but they are -- you would not
22 need it, need these systems, if it wasn't for DERs
23 that export into the grid, otherwise you wouldn't
24 need it. There would be no rush to installing. You
25 could install them over many years. But the systems
26 have, obviously, many features, and I have discussed
27 this in other proceedings and discussions, but I will
28 accept what you are saying.

1 So if you receive an application for a DER
2 connection for an area with inadequate capacity, what
3 do you do? So in a red area there, for example, in
4 Markham.
5 J. BUTLER: Generally, in -- in -- I can -- let
6 me find the reference. It's -- fortunately, Alectra
7 is generally not constrained. I think it is ED 12,
8 has got the reference for it. Let me just check.
9 Yes. So if you go to ED-12 and table 2, which is on
10 page 2, you can see that -- oh, sorry. I will wait
11 for it to come up.
12 Okay. So that table there, you can see, you
13 know, we have a relatively small number of stations.
14 There is only two stations that are Alectra-owned
15 stations that have constraints, and these are
16 generally short-circuit constraints and -- so TS is
17 owned by Hydro One. There is a number of stations
18 there that are constrained, and it only represents 6
19 percent of our total customer -- customer base.
20 So, you know, when we are talking about red or
21 constrained areas for Alectra, it is a very small
22 percentage of our customer base. But saying that, at
23 present, we do not have a lot of the ability to
24 overcome some of the short-circuit constraints we
25 have. So there is not a lot of good solutions we
26 have. We are exploring those, but at present, we
27 don't have a great solution.
28 So if you are one of those 6 percent of our

1 customers, we don't have -- we don't have a lot of
2 solutions for you right now. We may not be able to
3 connect you.
4 R. DHILLON: Mr. Ladanyi, just as a reminder, we
5 have ten minutes remaining.
6 T. LADANYI: Ten minutes remaining, you said.
7 Okay. I will try to be quick. I am going to drop a
8 bunch of questions.
9 And let's go to 2A-EP-8, Energy Probe 8. And
10 there, in your answer -- keep going down so we can
11 see the answer. There, you talk about the increased
12 volumes, about the DER connections contribute to work
13 volumes, and you name them, and some of them are
14 actually capital costs, and some are maintenance
15 costs, operating costs.
16 And I asked you a question. I said, is
17 increasing work volumes different for exporting or
18 non-exporting DERs? And you surprised me. You said,
19 no, there were -- the increase in work volumes is not
20 different for exporting versus non-exporting DERs.
21 And I thought, if you -- for example, if I install on
22 my home rooftop panels, I have no intention of
23 exporting any power to any utility, they are only for
24 my own use, what -- how would that increase your work
25 volume?
26 J. BUTLER: Sorry. I am just trying to
27 understand the full context of the question. Your
28 question is the difference in work volume between

1 exporting and non-exporting DERs? That's --
2 T. LADANYI: Yes, it is. Yeah.
3 J. BUTLER: And your example is an installation
4 of -- I think -- did you say solar on your home that
5 is not injecting, so you are just load displacing?
6 T. LADANYI: Exactly. It just reduces the
7 amount of electricity I would be using. I don't have
8 -- I understand to export, you require an inverter
9 and some other equipment. I would not have an
10 inverter. I would not have any intention of ever
11 exporting power into the grid. Why would that
12 increase your workload?
13 J. BUTLER: I think we are saying it does not
14 change our workload; correct?
15 T. LADANYI: Well, that is what you said. You
16 said the same workload whether you were exporting or
17 not exporting.
18 J. BUTLER: Yes. So --
19 T. LADANYI: And I am telling you I don't
20 understand that.
21 J. BUTLER: So in your example where you are
22 connecting solar onto your house, there really -- so
23 initially, the assessment of it, there is no
24 difference whether you are injecting or not
25 injecting. It is still a short-circuit consideration
26 that we have to take into account, and is the system
27 able to handle that short-circuit injection?
28 And even if you don't inject, the impact

1 assessment has -- does not take that into account.
2 It assumes full injection because it is a theoretical
3 possibility, and we have to design for that. So
4 there is no difference in the assessment.
5 And in actual operations, yeah, you are not
6 injecting back in, but there still needs to be
7 protection and control equipment so that if, you
8 know, the circuit trips out and it detects a lack of
9 voltage, it drops the solar out. So there is still
10 extra equipment required there.
11 And that equipment actually is on your side --
12 or the customer's side, customer responsibility, so
13 it does not change the cost or the work volume for
14 Alectra. So that is the context in which we answer
15 that question.
16 T. LADANYI: So is that -- isn't that dependent
17 also if there is a bidirectional meter? So let's say
18 if customer has a bidirectional meter, they can
19 export into the grid, or if they do not have this
20 bidirectional meters, they can't; would that be
21 right?
22 J. BUTLER: Correct. You need a bidirectional
23 meter if you are feeding back into the grid. And
24 with the new electronic meters, I apologize. I am
25 not personally aware of if our standard residential
26 meter is -- can be programmed to be bidirectional or
27 if it may require a meter change. I would have to --
28 if you need that answer, I can get it for you. But

1 that is -- you know, the electronic meters are -- it
2 is pretty easy to program to be bidirectional. So it
3 may require a meter change, but that is a pretty,
4 pretty minor operation and minimal cost involved in
5 that.
6 T. LADANYI: So apart from what we just talked
7 about, once the customer is injecting -- or rather,
8 like, exporting customer is connected to the grid,
9 there are additional costs. And I am trying to
10 explore whether -- where these costs are and whether
11 these customers are charged for them.
12 And so the question is after DERs are connected
13 and in service, does Alectra incur incremental costs
14 dealing with them, for example, such as billing and
15 settlement -- from billing and settlement
16 perspective, customers who export to the grid impose
17 higher cost as it requires additional activity such
18 as billing function, data capture, review time, and
19 settlement with the ISO; would you agree with that?
20 J. BUTLER: The business process in billing and
21 settlement for someone -- you know, the example of a
22 residential household with solar that injects, it is
23 different from a house that does not have solar, but
24 -- so it is a different process, yes, but the overall
25 cost difference between the two processes would not
26 be material, so there would not be any material
27 difference in cost, although, yes, it is a different
28 process.

1 T. LADANYI: So how about customers who have
2 nothing? And this is what I understand, Alectra is
3 the largest distributor in Ontario with about a
4 million customers, and you are projecting to have in
5 five years 9,569.5 connected DERs, and -- or not 0.5.
6 I misread that -- 9,569 DERs, and you currently have,
7 I understand, 6,000 and something.
8 So that is actually less than 1 percent of your
9 customers will have DERs, and they are going to be
10 imposing all these costs that the other, let's say,
11 99 percent of the customers will not be imposing.
12 They will not be making you spend this money. Should
13 these DER owners not be charged incremental costs
14 that they are imposing on the distribution system?
15 J. BUTLER: So I don't agree with your assertion
16 that we are imposing incremental costs. I thought we
17 just kind of walked through where I showed that there
18 is no real incremental costs. And any costs
19 associated with the initial installation of the DER
20 is at the cost of the customer. We recover that cost
21 from the customer. So I don't believe that the rate
22 base in general is covering the cost or subsidizing,
23 if you will, DER customers connecting to the grid --
24 to our system.
25 T. LADANYI: Just a second. I think I am at the
26 end. I just wanted to ask a question. And this is
27 actually in relation to -- and you don't have to look
28 it up. It is in relation to the distribution system

1 code. And it is section 3.1.5. And it says:
2 "For non-residential customers other than
3 micro-embedded generation facilities customers,
4 a distributor may define a basic connection by
5 rate class and recover the cost of connection
6 either as a part of its revenue requirement or
7 through a basic connection charge to the
8 customer."[as read]
9 So this is in the May 5th version of the
10 distribution system code on page 52. You don't have
11 it to bring it up.
12 I want to ask you, what is your policy? Do you
13 actually charge everything in the cost of connection,
14 or do you recover it somehow through revenue
15 requirement? And you can take an undertaking on that
16 as well.
17 J. BUTLER: No, we recover the cost of
18 connection from the customer.
19 D. FAIRCHILD: That is true. We fully recover
20 the cost for the connection from the customer. But
21 as per the distribution connection code, there is a
22 basic allowance for residential customers that is
23 applied.
24 T. LADANYI: Okay. Thank you, Panel. These are
25 all my questions.
26 R. DHILLON: Thank you. The time is 4:30. And
27 next is PWU, and I will hand it over to you, Mr.
28 Rosenbluth.

1 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY D. ROSENBLUTH**
2 D. ROSENBLUTH: Thank you. I can -- I have
3 about -- I think I have 20 minutes -- sorry, 20
4 minutes scheduled. I am only actually going to be a
5 couple of minutes. I have revised my notes. So I
6 will get right into it.
7 I would like to go, please, to 3.1-PWU-1A. And
8 so there is a reference here to a deferral. I am on
9 line 1 of page 2:
10 "This approach resulted in the deferral of
11 certain medium- and long-term investments."[as
12 read]
13 Et cetera.
14 Is it possible to receive a table or summary
15 showing -- or sorry. I am actually -- the reference
16 is at line 2:
17 "Secondly, Alectra sought to attain incremental
18 capital funding through multiple
19 applications."[as read]
20 In relation to those ICM requests, is it
21 possible to provide a table showing the comparison
22 between the amounts requested by way of ICM
23 applications in each of these five proceedings versus
24 what was approved?
25 T. WASIK: Yes, we can provide that.
26 D. ROSENBLUTH: Thank you.
27 R. DHILLON: I will mark that as Undertaking JT-
28 1.31.

1 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.31: PROVIDE A TABLE SHOWING**
2 **THE COMPARISON BETWEEN THE AMOUNTS REQUESTED BY**
3 **WAY OF ICM APPLICATIONS IN EACH OF THE FIVE**
4 **PROCEEDINGS VERSUS WHAT WAS APPROVED**
5 D. ROSENBLUTH: Coming back to line 1, there was
6 a discussion of the deferral of certain investments.
7 And then actually just at the bottom of the page 1,
8 it says that this occurred -- this deferral occurs at
9 the expense of those investment needs.
10 Is it possible to quantify this in any more
11 detail? For example, to quantify the extent to which
12 these medium-, long-term investments are being
13 deferred, first of all?
14 H. IBRAHIM: It is not possible to quantify the
15 value of the deferrals. As mentioned in the
16 response, we were optimizing on yearly basis,
17 deferring the need. And, again, those deferrals were
18 at -- were cost at the time, and the cost wouldn't be
19 relevant unless we go back and update everything,
20 which is not reasonable.
21 D. ROSENBLUTH: Right. I am just trying to get
22 a sense of the scale here. When you say that the
23 approach resulted in the deferral of certain
24 investments, I guess I am just trying to understand,
25 are you saying it is not possible to put a number on
26 the total amount of investment spending that has been
27 deferred as a result of insufficient capital?
28 H. IBRAHIM: That is correct.

1 D. ROSENBLUTH: Okay. Pivoting slightly, we
2 were just talking about the deferral, but the flip
3 side of that as discussed here is that this happens
4 at the expense of the medium- and long-term
5 investment needs.
6 So leaving aside amount of capital investment
7 deferred, in terms of the impacts of that, clearly
8 Alectra is of the view that it has an impact. I
9 think that is what it is saying here. Are you able
10 to, whether it is numerically or narratively, give us
11 more information about that?
12 H. IBRAHIM: We will have to take this one back
13 to see what -- how can we quantify the deferral.
14 Again, it will be on best-efforts basis. And we will
15 have to qualify the work with caveats and
16 assumptions. Again, it will be on best-efforts
17 basis.
18 D. ROSENBLUTH: Thank you. And I guess as part
19 of that, like I said, I am interested in
20 understanding it both numerically and, I suppose I
21 would put it, narratively in the sense of what are
22 the types of -- what areas of the business are being
23 impacted and how. Certainly if we can understand
24 that quantitatively, that is great. But if not, you
25 know, your best estimates or assumptions just to
26 provide us all with a better understanding of that
27 would be helpful. So I will just leave that there
28 and treat that as part of the existing undertaking, I

1 think.

2 R. DHILLON: I will mark that as undertaking JT-

3 1.32.

4 D. ROSENBLUTH: Thank you.

5 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.32: ON A BEST-EFFORTS BASIS,**

6 **PROVIDE INFORMATION ON THE NUMERICAL AND**

7 **NARRATIVE IMPACTS OF DEFERRED CAPITAL INVESTMENT**

8 **ON THE BUSINESS**

9 D. ROSENBLUTH: Those are all my questions for

10 today. Thank you very much.

11 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Rosenbluth. Next we

12 have OAPPA, Mr. Walker, and the time now is 4:37.

13 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY S. WALKER**

14 S. WALKER: Thank you. Good afternoon, Panel.

15 Sorry. While we are pulling up 1-AMPCO-4, could I

16 ask for an undertaking associated with the

17 information you just provided to Mr. Ladanyi under

18 2A-EP-8 question C, the number of DERs that you are

19 reporting in your answer differ from those reported

20 in your DSP, specifically 2A, tab 1, schedule 1,

21 5.2.1, page 19.

22 There is a difference between the capacity and

23 the number of installed units. Could you reconcile

24 that for me?

25 J. BUTLER: Yes, we can take that undertaking.

26 S. WALKER: Awesome. Thank you.

27 R. DHILLON: I will mark that undertaking as JT-

28 1.33.

1 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.33: RECONCILE THE DIFFERENCE**
2 **IN THE NUMBER OF DERS REPORTED IN 2A-EP-8**
3 **QUESTION C AND THOSE REPORTED IN THE DSP, 2A,**
4 **TAB 1, SCHEDULE 1, 5.2.1, PAGE 19**
5 S. WALKER: So I am trying to get a bit of an
6 understanding in terms of, you know, Mr. Garner
7 referred to it earlier today, the sense of system
8 hardening that is happening and the contributions
9 that DER and load displacement generation provide to
10 the system kind of innately.
11 I know there is a lot of money that is being
12 asked for in terms of the information technology to
13 deal with DERs over the coming period. And in
14 referencing 1-AMPCO-4 here, I see that your SAIDI and
15 CAIDI performance measures are improving pretty
16 dramatically from the beginning of the last rate
17 period from 2019 through.
18 In your evidence you filed, you know, by the end
19 of 2023, you had -- I am going to get this number not
20 quite correct -- 6,300 DERs installed in the system,
21 340-some-odd megawatts of capacity.
22 I guess maybe I should ask you a general
23 question. I know that a lot of the SAIDI and CAIDI
24 numbers stem from outage -- equipment failures that
25 are precipitated by age and stress and strain that
26 are put on it. Mr. Butler, you had referred to, in
27 your address to Mr. Ladanyi, about how the system was
28 designed for one-way flows. And so the benefit of

1 the DER, obviously, is that it helps with that
2 problem, and it eases system constraints, et cetera.
3 So it is a bit of a generalized question, but
4 based on sort of the improvement SAIDI and CAIDI
5 numbers, how much of that is due to the DERs of the
6 load displacement generation generally? Have you
7 reviewed that?
8 J. BUTLER: Yes, Mr. Walker, I just want to
9 clarify we are talking SAIDI and SAIFI here, not
10 CAIDI but --
11 S. WALKER: Sorry.
12 J. BUTLER: Yeah, it is cool.
13 But at this point, actually, again, for a number
14 of different operational safety reasons, when the
15 system power is lost, a breaker opens at a breaker,
16 any DERs connected also disconnect. So the
17 reliability improvements -- and they are improving,
18 but if you note 2025, we got worse. So it is -- you
19 know, we regressed last year. But that is not due to
20 DERs or load displacement generation.
21 S. WALKER: My question was more around it
22 provides support for existing equipment that might
23 not wear and tear on it necessarily the way it would
24 if the DERs, if the load displacement generations
25 weren't necessarily in the system.
26 J. BUTLER: I am not sure it has an impact on --
27 it is dropping load overall. So I could say from an
28 overall loading perspective, it will, you know, bring

1 the load down, and so there is an effect of that as
2 well. But I don't know if it is at a material level
3 yet. I don't think it is at a material level yet.
4 S. WALKER: Okay. Maybe a little bit further on
5 this line, could I ask you to pull up 2A-SEC-29B.
6 So I was impressed by this. Clearly, power
7 systems design and software have moved a long way
8 since I ever last looked at it. I see how you have
9 been able to actually break down the SAIDI and the
10 SAIFI numbers based on capital installations and
11 their contribution to that.
12 Within the context of the fact that, you know,
13 you have -- you are installing DERs, you have looked
14 at installing DERs, is there a possibility of
15 evaluating through your software, through your
16 modelling, the contribution that DERs might have in
17 terms of improving your SAIDI and your SAIFI numbers?
18 J. BUTLER: Mr. Walker, at this time, with the
19 systems we have -- and, really, there is --
20 especially on, like, the large volume of DERs we have
21 are -- like, with the micro-fits and that, we have no
22 visibility of their operation, of when they are
23 operating and when they are not operating. So just
24 given the relative granularity and access to
25 information we have, I don't see it feasible being
26 able to make that calculation at this point in time.
27 S. WALKER: Yeah. Fair enough. I wasn't sure
28 that it could be, but I thought that I would ask. I

1 mean, you speak a fair amount of it in your system
2 plan about how it is a significant part of improving
3 your reliability and the system moving forward. I
4 was just wondering if you had started to think about
5 how you are quantifying that and how that is maybe
6 having some impact on existing operating and
7 maintenance or capital expenditures.
8 J. BUTLER: No. Alectra views DERs as an
9 important component of the overall solution for the
10 grid going forward, but we haven't been able to
11 quantify that at this point.
12 S. WALKER: Okay. Fair enough. Thank you.
13 Relatedly, if I could trouble you to pull up --
14 well, actually, let's just stay here, 2A-SEC-28. And
15 the answer to A on the next page, I guess. I have
16 the wrong reference, my apologies. Could we go to
17 2A-SEC-63. And the next page, please. The section
18 that talks about reactive power a little bit further
19 down.
20 D. COBAN: Can you give us a page number,
21 please?
22 S. WALKER: Yeah, I am sorry, I didn't actually
23 write it down. Sorry. The basic gist here is that
24 you have reactive capital renewal projects
25 approximating, you know, $179 million over the
26 current 2019 to 2024 period.
27 Is there any element of the reactive capital
28 program that is being obviated moving forward by the

1 installation of DERs?
2 And I need to ask a silly question. When we are
3 talking about reactive capital, we are talking about
4 the installation of capacitors, basically. Is that
5 correct?
6 J. BUTLER: No. Sorry. In this context,
7 reactive capital is replacing things that have failed
8 in service.
9 S. WALKER: Oh, okay. Fair enough. So it is a
10 responsive, poles are down, equipment has failed.
11 J. BUTLER: Correct.
12 S. WALKER: My complete misunderstanding.
13 J. BUTLER: Yeah, yeah.
14 S. WALKER: Yeah. I am sorry for that
15 misunderstanding. I have no further questions.
16 Thank you, Panel.
17 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Walker.
18 Next we have BOMA, and that is Mr. Li. I will
19 turn it over to you; however, Mr. Li, BOMA is
20 scheduled for about twenty minutes, 10 minutes today
21 and 10 minutes tomorrow morning. Do you anticipate
22 that you will be able to finish a few minutes past
23 5:00 today?
24 C. LI: Yes, I think so. It is -- yeah. The
25 worst would be, like, 5 minutes after 5. I hope
26 that's okay. Like, 20 minutes also.
27 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Li.
28 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY C. LI**

1 C. LI: Okay. Just give me one second here.
2 Sorry.
3 Okay. Well, good afternoon. My name is Clement
4 Li. I am representing Building Owners and Managers
5 Association of Toronto. I suspect some of my
6 questions probably touch both Panel 1 and Panel 4,
7 but I will go ahead and ask this panel now, and, of
8 course, stop me and let me know if it is more
9 appropriate to save this question for Panel 4, but,
10 anyway.
11 Actually, you know what, before I start with my
12 regular question, I want to have a quick follow-up
13 question regarding your earlier exchange with Mr.
14 Harper regarding building electrification.
15 During the exchange, you guys were looking at
16 your evidence. Let's turn there, table 5-3 -- I am
17 sorry -- table 5.3.1. It is actually in Exhibit 2A,
18 tab 1, schedule 1, page 91. And that is, yeah, table
19 5.3.1. I just want to make sure that I understand
20 correctly what you said during the exchange. So --
21 there we go. Yes, yes. There we go. Okay.
22 So you mentioned that in the last category, even
23 though it is listed as transportation and
24 electrification, the driver is really all
25 transportation. Because how I understand what you
26 said is building education only impacts your winter
27 peak, and you expect in 2031, your system in the
28 winter still has enough capacity to handle all the

1 load growth of building amplification; do I
2 understand it correctly?
3 T. WASIK: Yes, that is correct.
4 C. LI: Okay. Okay.
5 So having said that, I am going to take you to
6 another exhibit. Having said that, if you go to
7 evidence, Exhibit 2A, tab 1, schedule 1, appendix J,
8 there are two figures there. Go to figure 22 and 23
9 there just together. Sorry. I don't have the page
10 number there, but...
11 Okay. Okay. So -- so that is okay. So these
12 are winter -- these are winter planning system
13 forecasts, I guess, and one is 1-in-2, and where the
14 correction was, I guess one is 1-to-10. It doesn't
15 matter.
16 So my question is the additional load from
17 building electrification is due here, right, in these
18 numbers, even though it is not triggering any, I say,
19 capital investment, but the load is still included as
20 part of, like, whatever is shown here? Let's say,
21 for example, in 2031, medium scenario, you have,
22 like, 50 whatever, 57, something like that, 5,700
23 megawatt, so the electrification -- the additional
24 electrification load is included; it is just not
25 triggering investment; is -- do I understand it
26 correctly?
27 T. WASIK: That is correct.
28 C. LI: Okay. Okay. I just want to make sure

1 that I understand correctly.
2 So let's go back to my first original question,
3 so that is BOMA Number 1, the IR response. But let's
4 not go there because in part A and part B, your
5 response refer me to SEC-26. So let's go to -- sorry
6 -- let's go to SEC-26. If you go to page 2, table 1,
7 and -- there we go. Yes -- and you list all the
8 assumptions, right, between the two forecasts -- one
9 is -- I call that the billing -- the charge
10 determined forecast is on the right-hand side, and
11 then the left-hand side is the system peak forecast
12 rate. Okay.
13 So the first thing I noticed is the CDM impact
14 is missing in this table. Now, I understand, in the
15 same IR in your response in part E, that you
16 mentioned that you use different methodologies to
17 estimate impact of CDM in these two forecasts. In
18 the charge-determined forecast, you do not really
19 have a separate CDM variable, and you stated that the
20 historical usage captures the trend, and so you don't
21 really need a separate CDM variable. But if you go
22 to -- but then in your system -- planning system
23 forecast, you do have explicitly -- explicitly, you
24 have the CDM impact there.
25 So if you turn to your evidence again, Exhibit
26 2A, tab 1, schedule 1, appendix J, back to where we
27 were, figure 12. Figure 12. Sorry. There we go.
28 There we go. Okay. So I can see that clearly by,

1 again, 2031, the impact of CDM is a reduction of 200
2 megawatt on your planning forecast; is it correct?
3 T. WASIK: Yes, that is correct.
4 C. LI: Okay. All right.
5 So how does this compare to what is included in
6 your charge determined forecast? Like, did you try
7 to compare, or are you telling me that there is no
8 way to compare because really -- because it is not
9 modelled separately?
10 T. WASIK: So, Mr. Li, I can speak to the
11 methodology upon how the CDM impacts were included in
12 the non-coincidental system peak forecast, but I
13 can't speak to the energy efficiency and CDM as was
14 done by the Itron contractor for the customer and
15 billing revenue.
16 But what I can tell you from the perspective of
17 inclusion into the system peak forecast is that we
18 followed the methodology as laid out by the Ontario
19 Energy Board's load forecasting guideline, and we
20 incorporated the CDM peak demand reductions as
21 presented to us by the IESO and incorporated that
22 into our forecast.
23 C. LI: Yeah, I understand that.
24 But I guess my question is how -- I know you
25 cannot speak to it. So how does it work? Like, do I
26 wait until Panel 4, or --
27 D. COBAN: Well, actually --
28 C. LI: -- who can speak to that?

1 D. COBAN: Yeah, Mr. Li, questions for Itron
2 with respect to their models, we have agreed that we
3 are just going to deal with those by way of
4 undertaking. So if you would like to --
5 C. LI: Okay.
6 D. COBAN: -- submit that in writing, we can
7 introduce those on the record once we receive them
8 from you.
9 C. LI: Oh, so it has to be -- I cannot just
10 trigger an undertaking here; it has to be in writing?
11 D. COBAN: We can record it here. That is fine.
12 C. LI: Yeah, yeah. Can we do that? Because
13 that is my question, right?
14 D. COBAN: Yeah.
15 C. LI: So my question is -- well, you already
16 explained basically how you do it in the system, the
17 planning forecast when it comes to CDM impact, and I
18 understand that.
19 My question is how does it compare to the one
20 that is included in the charge determined forecast?
21 Did you do the comparison? If you did, is it about
22 200 megawatt? Is it about the same in terms of the
23 magnitude? Can you do that comparison for me as part
24 of an undertaking? That is the CDM impact in the
25 charge determined forecast.
26 D. COBAN: Okay. We'll give that --
27 C. LI: In terms of megawatt.
28 D. COBAN: -- an undertaking number, and just to

1 be clear, you know, we will take that away and
2 consider if we can provide what you are looking for
3 here, obviously recognizing we have to coordinate
4 with Itron on this.
5 C. LI: Okay. All right. Thank you. Thank
6 you. Okay.
7 R. DHILLON: I will write that down as
8 Undertaking JT-1.34.
9 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.34: PROVIDE, IF AVAILABLE, A**
10 **COMPARISON OF THE CDM IMPACTS INCLUDED IN THE**
11 **NON COINCIDENTAL SYSTEM PEAK FORECAST AND THOSE**
12 **INCLUDED IN THE CHARGE DETERMINED FORECAST,**
13 **INCLUDING THE MAGNITUDE OF THE IMPACTS**
14 C. LI: Okay.
15 Let's scroll down to -- sorry. Let's scroll
16 down to BOMA, the same IR, but part C. After reading
17 the response, it is still unclear to me --
18 J. MYERS: Sorry, Mr. Li. Which IR? We are in
19 an SEC one.
20 C. LI: I'm sorry. BOMA -- oh, this is back to
21 BOMA part C. This is the IRR --
22 J. MYERS: BOMA 1?
23 C. LI: -- BOMA Number 1 -- BOMA Number 1, part
24 C.
25 J. MYERS: Thank you.
26 C. LI: Yes. Yeah.
27 Okay. So we are talking about AI and data
28 centre and all that stuff here, right. So it is

1 still unclear to me what is the assumptions when it
2 comes to that load in the two separate forecasts. On
3 one hand, if I read the first part, it sounds like
4 you are telling me that the data centre or 425
5 megawatt increase -- that is how I quoted -- is
6 indeed included in the charge determined forecast.
7 But on the other hand, if I read the rest of the
8 response, it sounds like you are telling me that you
9 are including less because of all the uncertainty of
10 this kind of load. Can you clarify? Is it about --
11 because in the planning forecast, I see you --
12 clearly it's quoting 425 megawatt increase. But can
13 you clarify in the charge determined forecast what is
14 included?
15 D. COBAN: I don't think this panel can speak to
16 the revenue forecast, Mr. Li.
17 C. LI: Oh, okay. So -- so can we -- can we
18 sort of roll it into the undertaking for Itron, our
19 friends at Itron?
20 D. COBAN: Why don't we just give it a fresh
21 undertaking number so we don't get confused.
22 C. LI: Okay. So this will be the impact of
23 data centre and AI and cloud computing, how does it
24 compare to the 425 megawatt impact as listed -- as in
25 the planning forecast? In the charge determined
26 forecast, what is it? What is the number? How does
27 it compare to the 425 megawatt?
28 D. COBAN: Okay. That is fine. Thank you.

1 R. DHILLON: I will mark that.
2 C. LI: Thank you. Thank you.
3 R. DHILLON: Sorry. I am just going to mark
4 that as Undertaking JT-1.35.
5 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.35: ADVISE HOW THE IMPACT OF**
6 **THE DATA CENTRE, AI, AND CLOUD COMPUTING LOAD IN**
7 **THE CHARGE DETERMINED FORECAST COMPARES WITH THE**
8 **425 MEGAWATT IMPACT AS LISTED IN THE PLANNING**
9 **FORECAST**
10 C. LI: Thank you.
11 Now, if you go to -- now, this is an overall --
12 after asking all these questions, then -- then it is
13 sort of an overall -- so -- so can you please go to
14 evidence, Exhibit 2A, tab 1, schedule 1, appendix J,
15 same place, but this time, go to figure 19 and figure
16 23. So -- okay.
17 So figure 19 is the summer peak that includes
18 everything. When I say "everything," I mean, like,
19 CDM and EV and all that. And then figure 23 is the
20 winter peak that includes everything but is -- for
21 winter, is more specific, is medium decarbonization
22 scenario. And I think both of them are 1-in-2 where
23 the correction lies. It doesn't really matter. But
24 --
25 So -- so you have to trust me on this one
26 because I did some calculations. When I look at
27 these two figures, for summer, between 2024 and 2031,
28 looking at the numbers, the compound annual growth

1 rate for the summer peak in figure 19 is 3.2 percent.
2 And then for the winter, if I do the same thing, it
3 is 4.2 percent. So they grow at probably 3 -- 3 to 4
4 percent, both of them.
5 So I sense that it probably is going to go to
6 Itron again. But then when I go to the other
7 evidence, Exhibit 3, tab 1, schedule 1, attachment 3-
8 1, which is also OEB appendix 2ID, if you go there, I
9 am sure it is going to be Itron. I am sorry. If you
10 go to column AB to AF, that is where it shows the
11 percentage -- year-over-year percentage change. And
12 I am looking at two specific tables; one is the
13 demand table, and the other one is the consumption
14 table.
15 If you scroll down -- because I think you've
16 started with actual, and the bottom is the -- you
17 have to go back to the left-hand side to see the
18 label of the table, then there is, like, the weather-
19 corrected -- yes, weather-normalized -- I am sorry --
20 weather-normalized consumption and demand table,
21 right.
22 And if you scroll to the right now where the
23 growth rate is, like, go back to column AB. Okay.
24 There we go. In the -- again, you know, you have to
25 -- you have to -- subject to check, I guess, because
26 when I did some -- well, you can look at it. In the
27 demand table, the annual growth rate, they are pretty
28 low.

1 And I sum it up -- I know it is not right, but I
2 sum it up because you are missing residential class
3 and the GS less than 50KW class because they are both
4 energy billed.
5 So -- but if you just sum it up, the annual
6 growth rate for the same period, 2024 to 2031, is,
7 like, half a percent. But then I said, this is not -
8 - this is not fair, because I am not including
9 residential and GS50KW. So I used the consumption
10 table as a proxy. So if I do that and sum up
11 everything, the total load growth, again, annual
12 growth rate for the same period, is, like, 1.5
13 percent.
14 So that is my question.
15 So in the -- in the other part, the planning
16 forecast, winter and summer, we are looking at 3.2 --
17 4.2 percent annual growth rate, but if we look at the
18 charge determined, then it is growing at -- whatever,
19 0.5 or 1.5 percent growth.
20 Is that what you expected when you look at it?
21 Did you -- did you do a comparison? Does it make
22 sense? I understand that, obviously, these two
23 forecasts have different assumptions and purposes,
24 but many things are common or consistent. So is it
25 what you expected, or can this panel comment on that?
26 Did you guys have an internal discussion about this?
27 D. COBAN: I think, Mr. Li, this panel can speak
28 to you about the system planning forecast and the

1 basis for that. I think this kind of reconciliation
2 you are trying to do here with the live models is --
3 you know, we are sort of challenged by, first of all,
4 following your thread on it and then, second, given
5 the kind of detail you need.
6 So I might suggest we just punt this to Panel 4.
7 If they can assist you, they will; and if not, it
8 will be something we have to take away as part of a
9 Panel 4 undertaking.
10 C. LI: Right. Can I actually -- now that I
11 think about it, can I -- it just dawned on me. Maybe
12 it would be really helpful if I can draw an
13 undertaking to sort of summarize this question that I
14 have so far.
15 If you go back to the SEC-26 table, you know,
16 where it actually lists the difference in terms of
17 assumptions between the two forecasts. So if you go
18 to page 2, table 1, yeah, there. Do you think it is
19 possible to expand this table? First of all, I need
20 to add category. I need to add CDM. I also need to
21 add AI or data centre as additional roles.
22 But then on top of just listing the assumptions,
23 can you also have the demand too, the volume or the
24 percentage growth rate and the rationale why they are
25 different, like, to sort of sum up all my questions
26 in a way today, right? It is all about this.
27 Is this a difference between charge demand
28 forecast and the planning forecast? The assumptions

1 are here already, but then I missed two categories,
2 CDM, and then you have the AI data centre and then
3 the percentage annual growth rate in the period 2024
4 to '31, or if you want to do '26, that is fine,
5 whatever, around there, and megawatt difference and
6 then the rationale behind it, why they are different.
7 Is it something that you can do as an undertaking?
8 D. COBAN: Sure. We will take that undertaking.
9 There was a lot to follow in your exchange, so, you
10 know, we will need to kind of review the transcript
11 and make sure we are clear on this. But just so --
12 C. LI: I am happy to -- I am happy to jump on a
13 call and maybe offline just explain what it --
14 D. COBAN: Yeah.
15 C. LI: Yeah, yeah.
16 D. COBAN: We want to make sure all the parties
17 have access to the same information.
18 C. LI: Yeah, yeah. Oh, okay.
19 D. COBAN: So if you want to put it in writing
20 and send it to us, that is helpful, and then we will
21 make sure it is entered on the record exactly as you
22 intended. I am just mindful that we are at 5:00
23 p.m., it has been a long day. You know, I don't want
24 to miss anything.
25 C. LI: Sorry. You know what, I will submit it.
26 I will submit it, then, as an undertaking. Why don't
27 we leave the previous undertaking, and then I will
28 submit a new one, and if I feel that it can replace

1 the other one, then I will go ahead and mention that.
2 But I definitely will draft a new undertaking to
3 cover what I just said, this new table. That is
4 okay. I will do that.
5 J. MYERS: So are we withdrawing JT-1.35?
6 C. LI: No. No. I don't think so. Not yet.
7 J. MYERS: Okay.
8 C. LI: Oh, I am sorry, which one is which? I
9 lost track. In terms of -- because I -- I had two so
10 far, is it correct, undertakings?
11 D. COBAN: Yes. You had JT-1.34 related to CDM
12 reconciliation.
13 C. LI: Right.
14 D. COBAN: And then JT-1.35 related to data
15 centres.
16 C. LI: Let's leave them, and I will draft a new
17 one. When I draft it, I will tell you whether I want
18 to withdraw those two. But let's leave them for now.
19 Is that okay?
20 J. MYERS: That is fine.
21 C. LI: Okay. Okay. That is all the questions
22 I have for today.
23 R. DHILLON: Thank you, Mr. Li.
24 That concludes Day 1 of the technical
25 conference. Thank you to the panelists and to the
26 participants. We will continue the technical
27 conference tomorrow at 9:30, and we will adjourn for
28 today. Thank you.

1 --- Whereupon matter adjourned at 5:10 p.m., to

2 resume Friday, March 6th, 2026, at 9:30 a.m.