



ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

FILE NO. EB-2025-0312

Elexicon Energy Inc.

VOLUME: 1

DATE: June 22, 2026

THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

Elexicon Energy Inc.

Cost of Service Application

Technical Conference
held in person and virtually
at 2300 Yonge Street, 25th Floor, Toronto, Ontario
on Monday, June 22, 2026, commencing at 9:30 a.m.

Volume 1

A P P E A R A N C E S

TOBIAS HOBBINS	Ontario Energy Board
VITHOOSHAN GANESANATHAN	
BIRGIT ARMSTRONG	
PETAR PRAZIC	
ANDREW FRANK	
ANGELA YAN	
ZENAN AHMED	
SERENA JIA	
LIZZIE ZHANG	
ALEXANDER DI LIIO	
TIARA FEARON	
DALIANA COBAN	Elexicon Energy Inc.
ERIN STEVENS	
STEPHEN SHEEHY	Panel 1
SAAD LATIF	
USMAN KHAN	
SAM SADEGHI	
MUNISH MULTANI	
CLEMENT LI	Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA)
TOM LADANYI	Coalition of Concerned Manufacturers and Businesses of Canada (CCMBC) & Energy Probe
LAWRIE GLUCK	Consumers Council of Canada (CCC)
MICHAEL BROPHY	Pollution Probe
MARK RUBENSTEIN	School Energy Coalition (SEC)
JANE SCOTT	
DANIEL VOLLMER	Distributed Resource Coalition (DRC)
MARK GARNER	Vulnerable Energy Consumers
BILL HARPER	Coalition (VECC)
MICHAEL MCLEOD	Quinte Manufacturers Association

A P P E A R A N C E S

BAYU KIDANE

Power Workers' Union

SLADJANA KRLJANAC

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

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
--- Upon commencing at 9:30 a.m.	1
LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	1
APPEARANCES	2
PANEL 1	6
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY L. GLUCK (CCC):	6
--- Upon recessing at 11:00 a.m.	37
--- Upon resuming at 11:16 a.m.	37
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY J. SCOTT (SEC):	48
--- Upon recessing at 1:03 p.m.	75
--- Upon resuming at 1:59 p.m.	75
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY M. RUBENSTEIN (SEC)	75
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY B. HARPER (VECC)	90
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY M. GARNER (VECC)	109
--- Upon recessing at 3:29 p.m.	123
--- Upon resuming at 3:45 p.m.	123
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY C. LI (BOMA):	123
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY T. LADANYI (CCMBC):	142
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY T. LADANYI (ENERGY PROBE):	147
--- Whereupon the proceeding adjourned at 4:58 p.m. to resume Tuesday, June 23, 2026, at 9:30 a.m.	156

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

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
UNDERTAKING JT-1.1: DRC QUESTIONS SET OUT IN LETTER DATED JUNE 18	5
UNDERTAKING JT-1.2: VECC QUESTIONS RECEIVED ON JUNE 18	5
UNDERTAKING JT-1.3: PROVIDE THE SAME INFORMATION THAT WAS PROVIDED WITH RESPECT TO THE INPUTS TO THE PEAK DEMAND FORECAST FOR 2025 AS WAS PROVIDED FOR 2025 TO 2031 IN CCC-15, ATTACHMENT 1	13
UNDERTAKING JT-1.4: PROVIDE THE ADDITIONAL EXPANSION PROJECTS THAT ARE NOT LISTED IN TABLE 5 OF 2-STAFF-52 AND ADVISE HOW \$33 MILLION OF ASSETS WILL BE PUT IN THAT DO NOT APPEAR TO BE CONNECTED TO KNOWN CUSTOMERS	23
UNDERTAKING JT-1.5: CONFIRM WHETHER THE CABLE LISTED IN EXHIBIT 1, TAB 5, SCHEDULE 2 WOULD FALL INTO THE WIRE AND CABLE CATEGORY IN TABLE 1 OR ONE OF THE OTHER CABLES LISTED IN TABLE 2	29
UNDERTAKING JT-1.6: PROVIDE A MORE DETAILED RATIONALE, INCLUDING ANY INTERNAL DOCUMENTATION, FOR THE PROJECTS WHERE THE EXPLANATION IS VARIANCE ATTRIBUTABLE TO LABOUR AND MATERIAL COSTS EXCEEDING THE ORIGINAL ESTIMATE	30
UNDERTAKING JT-1.7: Provide the breakout of the ten transformers that are being assessed to be replaced by 2031 and what their condition is as between fair, good, or very good	33
UNDERTAKING JT-1.8: ADVISE OF THE DIFFERENCE IN UNIT COST BETWEEN CABLE INJECTION AND CABLE REPLACEMENT	35
UNDERTAKING JT-1.9: Explain what damage prevention and inspection activity is	38

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

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
UNDERTAKING JT-1.10: Provide a normalized 2025 that is comparable to the future period and provide an explanation as to what was done	39
UNDERTAKING JT-1.11: PROVIDE THE HISTORICAL ACTUALS FOR THE PERIOD OF 2020 TO 2025 FOR THE EQUIVALENT OF TABLE 4 IN EXHIBIT 4, TAB 1, SCHEDULE 4, PAGE 68	45
UNDERTAKING JT-1.12: ADVISE WHAT IS DRIVING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PROPOSAL OF \$30 MILLION AND THE ESTIMATED COST ABOUT THREE MONTHS AGO OF \$22 MILLION FOR OPTION C	47
UNDERTAKING JT-1.13: Produce the associated prioritization results for each of the projects that have been published thus far for the 2027 period and the corresponding math on how those scores were derived	61
UNDERTAKING JT-1.14: ADVISE WHETHER A SECOND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST POSITION IS BEING ADDED IN 2026	73
UNDERTAKING JT-1.15: PROVIDE ANY INFORMATION REGARDING THE NUMBER OF QUALIFIED OPERATORS, APPRENTICES, AND DISPATCHERS THAT TORONTO HYDRO AND ALECTRA HAVE IN THEIR CONTROL CENTRE	74
UNDERTAKING JT-1.16: Provide the OEB's targets based on the reliability performance targets for each year through 2031 and the calculations	76
UNDERTAKING JT-1.17: Clarify the impact of the probability assessment and the health index on system service projects IN CASES WHERE an asset is not being replaced	80
UNDERTAKING JT-1.18: Produce the 2026 list of projects with their criticality scores and the inputs to those criticality scores, and advise	

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

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
which projects are in and which are out of the 2026 program	85
UNDERTAKING JT-1.19: Provide links to the municipal planning documents that are used in the peak load forecast and compare the sources in the peak load forecast and the revenue forecast to confirm whether or not they are the same	99
UNDERTAKING JT-1.20: PROVIDE THE METRICS FOR THE HISTORICAL PERIOD BY DISTRICT	117
UNDERTAKING JT-1.21: Provide the numbers used to generate the winter peak numbers in Figure 9 in Exhibit 2B, Tab 3, Schedule 1	125
UNDERTAKING JT-1.22: PROVIDE A SUMMARY INCLUDING THE SUBCATEGORIES IN SECTION 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, AND ADVISE WHICH LOAD FORECAST DRIVES IT	130

1 Monday, June 22, 2026

2 --- Upon commencing at 9:30 a.m.

3 T. HOBBS: I think we will get started. Good
4 morning, everyone, and welcome to day 1 of the
5 technical conference for Elexicon Energy's cost of
6 service application, EB-2025-0312. This technical
7 conference is being transcribed and will form part of
8 the recording of this proceeding. My name is Tobias
9 Hobbs, and I am Board counsel. I will be assisting
10 with administering the technical conference and
11 keeping us all on schedule. The schedule was
12 circulated on Friday, which I trust you all received,
13 so we will just try and stick to that. And we will
14 begin with the land acknowledgement and some safety
15 information from Ms. Fearon.

16 **LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

17 T. FEARON: Good morning, everyone. The Ontario
18 Energy Board acknowledges that its headquarters in
19 Toronto is located on the territory of the
20 Anishinaabeg, Haudenosaunee, and Huron-Wendat
21 Nations, and that this land is covered by historic
22 treaties. Traditionally, the territory now called
23 Toronto was a meeting place for many Nations and is
24 still home to many Indigenous peoples from across
25 Turtle Island.

26 We are committed to listening, learning, and
27 respecting Indigenous rights and perspectives. We
28 are grateful for the opportunity to live and work on

1 these lands and honour the wisdom and resilience of
2 Indigenous communities, past and present. Thanks.

3 T. HOBBS: Okay. Let's move to appearances.
4 So perhaps I will start with the Applicant.

5 **APPEARANCES**

6 D. COBAN: Good morning. Daliana Coban, counsel
7 for the Applicant, and with me here today is Ms. Erin
8 Stevens, director of regulatory affairs. Would you
9 like me to introduce the panel now or --

10 T. HOBBS: Sure.

11 D. COBAN: Perfect. So this is Panel 1, as
12 indicated in the letter that we filed on June 10th,
13 and I will start off by handing it to Mr. Sheehy to
14 introduce himself and then pass it off to his
15 colleagues.

16 S. SHEEHY: Good morning, everyone. My name is
17 Stephen Sheehy. I am the director of asset planning
18 and system engineering at Elexicon Energy,
19 responsible for capital and maintenance investment
20 planning. I will pass it over to Saad Latif.

21 S. LATIF: Good morning, everyone. I am Saad
22 Latif. I am the supervisor of Distribution System
23 planning at Elexicon. My areas of responsibilities
24 today will be on the capital and the maintenance
25 investment plan from the distribution side, excluding
26 station. And I will pass it on to my colleague Mr.
27 Khan.

28 U. KHAN: Good morning. My name is Usman Khan.

1 I am the supervisor of load forecasting and stations
2 planning, and my responsibility will be on load
3 forecasting, capacity planning, and stations. I will
4 pass it over to Sam Sadeghi.

5 S. SADEGHI: Good morning. Sam Sadeghi. I am
6 the vice president of asset management and line
7 operations. I am responsible for the operations --
8 line operations across Elexicon as well as asset
9 management. I will pass it over to Mr. Munish
10 Multani.

11 M. MULTANI: Good morning, everyone. My name is
12 Munish Multani. I am the director of design and
13 construction. In my role, I oversee system design
14 and connections as well as field operations and
15 locates. Thank you.

16 T. HOBBINS: Thank you.

17 Perhaps we can go around the room and take the
18 rest of the appearances.

19 M. GARNER: Good morning. My name is Mark
20 Garner. I am here as a consultant for VECC, and I am
21 joined online by my colleague Mr. Bill Harper, also a
22 consultant with VECC.

23 M. RUBENSTEIN: Good morning. Mark Rubenstein,
24 counsel for the School Energy Coalition, and I am
25 joined online by SEC consultant Jane Scott.

26 L. GLUCK: Good morning. Lawrie Gluck on behalf
27 of the Consumers Council of Canada.

28 T. HOBBINS: And then perhaps we could go

1 online. I can't actually see who is there, so just
2 chime in.

3 M. BROPHY: Good morning --

4 M. MCLEOD: Oh, sorry. Go ahead, Michael.

5 M. BROPHY: Oh, sorry. Good morning. Michael
6 Brophy on behalf of Pollution Probe.

7 M. MCLEOD: Mike McLeod on behalf of the Quinte
8 Manufacturers Association.

9 T. HOBBINS: Perhaps Mr. Li.

10 C. LI: Clement Li. Good morning. On behalf of
11 Building Owners and Managers Association of Toronto.
12 Thank you.

13 T. HOBBINS: Mr. Ladanyi.

14 T. LADANYI: Good morning. Tom Ladanyi on
15 behalf of CCMBC and Energy Probe.

16 T. HOBBINS: And Mr. Vollmer.

17 D. VOLLMER: Good morning. Daniel Vollmer,
18 counsel for the Distributed Resource Coalition.

19 T. HOBBINS: Thank you, Mr. Vollmer.

20 And on behalf of Board Staff.

21 V. GANESANATHAN: Vithooshan Ganesanathan, OEB
22 Staff. I will be the case manager.

23 B. ARMSTRONG: And I am Birgit Armstrong. I am
24 a backup case manager in this meeting for OM&A and
25 the rate framework.

26 T. HOBBINS: And as mentioned, I am Tobias
27 Hobbins, Board counsel on this file. And I believe
28 we have one more OEB staffer online.

1 P. PRAZIC: Petar Prazic, OEB Staff.

2 T. HOBBINS: Sorry. I don't think we heard
3 that. But that would be Petar Prazic for OEB Staff.
4 And there will be several other OEB staffers over the
5 coming days who will be filtering in and out, and
6 they can provide their appearances as they appear.

7 So I think we can move to any preliminary
8 matters.

9 D. COBAN: Yes. There are two preliminary
10 matters related. We received questions in writing
11 from DRC and from VECC, and we would like to mark
12 those as undertakings.

13 So starting off with the DRC questions set out
14 in a letter dated June 18th, if we could give that an
15 undertaking number, please.

16 T. HOBBINS: Okay. So that will be questions
17 from DRC, JT-1.1.

18 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.1: DRC QUESTIONS SET OUT IN**
19 **LETTER DATED JUNE 18**

20 D. COBAN: And then the VECC questions received
21 on June 18th as well.

22 T. HOBBINS: Is that a separate undertaking?

23 D. COBAN: Yes, please.

24 T. HOBBINS: That will be JT-1.2.

25 D. COBAN: Thank you.

26 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.2: VECC QUESTIONS RECEIVED ON**
27 **JUNE 18**

28 T. HOBBINS: All right. So according to the

1 schedule, it looks like we have CCC up first unless
2 the Applicant has any other opening statements or...

3 D. COBAN: No. We are ready to proceed.

4 T. HOBBS: Okay. All right. So off to CCC.

5 **PANEL 1**

6 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY L. GLUCK (CCC):**

7 L. GLUCK: Thank you. Good morning. My first
8 set of questions are related to the peak demand
9 forecast and the implications on Elexicon's capital
10 plan. So if we could start by opening 2-CCC-15,
11 please. And if we could go to part E, please. Thank
12 you.

13 So in the response to Part E, Elexicon explains
14 that applying the low peak demand scenario does not
15 result in changes to Elexicon's capital plan. And
16 there is one part of the response that I am having a
17 bit of trouble following.

18 If we go to line 6 on page 4, so I think it is a
19 little bit below here, the company states that
20 selecting the low system peak load forecast scenario
21 does not eliminate the need to address existing
22 capacity constraints. It simply slows the rate at
23 which existing constraints intensify and places
24 greater risk on Elexicon's ability to serve future
25 load growth in the next rate period and beyond.

26 And what I am struggling to understand is why
27 selecting the low scenario would place greater risk
28 on the company's ability to serve future load growth

1 if it has no impact on what the company will actually
2 build during the upcoming rate term. So can you help
3 me with that?

4 U. KHAN: To clarify, the low scenario makes
5 things -- the capacity constraints less intense over
6 the rate period. The investments, for example, in
7 the substation growth narrative are to address
8 existing capacity constraints. And majority of
9 investments, as seen in the substation growth
10 narrative, the capacity constraints exist as of 2025
11 actual peak loads.

12 L. GLUCK: In terms -- so in terms of the last
13 part of the sentence there:

14 "And places greater risk on Elexicon's ability
15 to serve future load growth in the next rate
16 period and beyond." (as read)

17 Why would selecting the low-growth scenario do
18 that, given your response here and in this IR that
19 none of the capital investments change?

20 U. KHAN: Just to clarify, the -- selecting the
21 low peak load scenario would not necessarily change
22 the investments as part of the substation growth, for
23 example, portfolio, but it could worsen the
24 constraints that exist or the constraints that will
25 occur by 2031 as opposed to the medium or high
26 scenario.

27 So selecting the low scenario, and if a medium
28 or high scenario occurs, the constraints would

1 worsen, and that would increase the risk of worsening
2 constraints by 2031.

3 L. GLUCK: I am really trying to -- I am just
4 trying to connect the capital plan to the forecast.
5 So in this response, you say -- I'm going to -- it's
6 the same sentence, but the risk -- it places greater
7 risk on Elexicon's ability to serve future load
8 growth in the next rate period and beyond, but you
9 are also saying in the same response that you are --
10 you actually would not change your capital plan at
11 all if the low-growth scenario was selected instead
12 of the high-growth. So how does risk -- the risk to
13 the future increase when you are making the exact
14 same investments? That is -- that is the question.

15 U. KHAN: If I could point you to Exhibit 2B,
16 Tab 3, Schedule 2, page 64, this Table 26. So Table
17 26 here points out the number of municipal stations
18 that have limited capacity, 0 to 1,000 kVA; moderate
19 capacity, between 1,000, 2,000 kVA; and acceptable
20 capacity, over 2,000 kVA.

21 In the 2025 state, 44 stations are constrained
22 and have limited capacity. And if you look at the
23 end of 2031 state with investments of 21 MSs will
24 remain constrained by the end of 2031 with the
25 investments as part of this capital plan.

26 And this -- this assumes the load growth
27 scenario, the Elexicon-chosen scenario, as has been
28 described in Exhibit 2B. So selecting the low

1 scenario, while it does not necessarily change the
2 investments that you would select as part of, you
3 know, the substation growth narrative, as I
4 mentioned, it would impact the stations that would be
5 constrained.

6 And so selecting what we think is the reasonable
7 scenario gives us line of sight into how many
8 stations will continue to be constrained by 2031 so
9 we can appropriately monitor those stations.

10 L. GLUCK: Okay.

11 Could we go back to the -- to 2-CCC-15, please,
12 Part E -- at the top of Part E, please. So when I am
13 -- what am I -- when I am reading this response, is
14 it really entirely focused on the capacity-related
15 investments? Is that what this response is saying,
16 is that if you chose the low peak demand forecast
17 scenario, the capacity-related investments would not
18 change?

19 U. KHAN: That is correct.

20 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

21 And so I would like to discuss the potential
22 implications of the low-growth scenario on other
23 capital and operational budgets. So, first, I --
24 first, I would like to talk about the forecast
25 customer connection-related budgets. So if the low-
26 growth scenario was selected, would there be a
27 decrease in the amount of capital spending forecast
28 for the customer connections portion of the capital

1 plan?

2 S. SHEEHY: The answer, I would say, is
3 potentially. We have forecasted in 2B-SEC-58 our
4 forecast for -- forecast for new connection cost. If
5 we could go to 2B-SEC-58. And we will go to page 2
6 of 2 and look at Table 2.

7 So we have forecasted the connection and
8 generation connection segment based on a cost per new
9 connection, so if the new connections goes down, the
10 segment could potentially go down. But it is also
11 dependent on the type of connections. We have
12 different types of connections; new residential
13 services, service upgrades, so it depends on the mix
14 of what type of customer connection is in this.

15 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

16 So my question really is, so you -- you have
17 provided a number of scenarios, right, for peak --
18 the peak demand forecast, and one of them is the low-
19 growth scenario, and underpinning that are different
20 customer connection numbers than are in the Elexicon
21 scenario; is that fair?

22 U. KHAN: If I could point you to Exhibit 2B,
23 Tab 4, Schedule 3, Appendix B, page number 12 --
24 correction, it is page 11. So in Table 3, we have
25 got the customer count forecast for Elexicon, and the
26 customer count forecast that is used as part of the
27 customer and generation connections program does not
28 necessarily use the -- Elexicon's peak load forecast

1 numbers, the low, medium, or high scenario.

2 Rather, it uses the revenue load forecast,
3 customer forecast, which is a near- to medium-term
4 outlook for the purpose of rate setting and financial
5 planning, and that is what is used for the customer
6 connections program.

7 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

8 And for the system expansion work, does it use
9 the peak load forecast, or does it use something
10 else?

11 S. LATIF: The system expansion investment
12 program does not take into account any of the load
13 forecasts. Those are more specific projects driven
14 by the customers, driving major expansion needs on
15 the system.

16 L. GLUCK: So it doesn't take into account the
17 peak load forecast?

18 S. LATIF: No, it does not. Those specific
19 projects.

20 L. GLUCK: And with respect to -- so what does
21 take into account this forecast? Maybe that is the
22 better question.

23 U. KHAN: The purpose of the peak load forecast
24 is to provide a forward-looking view of system
25 loading under a variety of conditions. And in this
26 situation that Elexicon is in, there are several
27 existing constraints that our program is -- and our
28 capital plan is looking to address. And so the

1 implications of these scenarios become less
2 pronounced to the capital plan.

3 And so while the purpose of the peak load
4 forecast is to identify and note what constraints may
5 continue to occur in the forecast period up to 2031,
6 given the situation that we are in with 76 percent of
7 our municipal stations that have limited capacity of
8 0 to 1,000 kVA, we are in a situation where we are
9 addressing those constraints as opposed to
10 necessarily the impact of -- assessing the impact of
11 the low and high scenarios.

12 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

13 Could we open up CCC-15, Attachment 1, please.
14 It is an Excel spreadsheet that was filed by
15 Elexicon. Thanks. If we could go to the region by
16 region analysis, which is Part G. And thank you for
17 putting this all together for me. I appreciate it.
18 I know I asked for a lot of information here. But
19 there is one piece that I didn't ask for in my
20 question, and it would be helpful to complete the
21 time series.

22 So if you could undertake to provide the same
23 information that you provided with respect to the
24 inputs to the peak demand forecast for 2024 and 2025
25 as you did for '26 to 2031, I would appreciate that.

26 U. KHAN: Just to clarify, are you looking for
27 the customer growth, building electrification, and
28 electric vehicle load, and the weather-normalized

1 base load under the different scenarios for 2024 and
2 2025?

3 L. GLUCK: That is right.

4 U. KHAN: So actuals?

5 L. GLUCK: No, the forecast. I understand the
6 forecast was '24 to 2031.

7 U. KHAN: Just to clarify, the forecast was for
8 2025 to 2031.

9 L. GLUCK: Okay. So then '25.

10 U. KHAN: That can be provided.

11 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

12 T. HOBBINS: That will be Undertaking JT-1.3.

13 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.3: PROVIDE THE SAME INFORMATION**
14 **THAT WAS PROVIDED WITH RESPECT TO THE INPUTS TO**
15 **THE PEAK DEMAND FORECAST FOR 2025 AS WAS**
16 **PROVIDED FOR 2025 TO 2031 IN CCC-15, ATTACHMENT**
17 **1**

18 L. GLUCK: If we can move to 2-CCC-21, please.
19 And if we could go to Table 1. Thank you.

20 So Table 1 shows that over a four-year period
21 between 2022 and 2025, the number of residential
22 customers added was about 8,100, and that translates
23 to about 2,000 customers. Do you agree with that?

24 U. KHAN: Subject to check, it is approximately
25 2,000 customers per year.

26 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

27 Can we go to 2B, 4, 3, Appendix B, please.

28 D. COBAN: Can we just have that reference

1 again, please.

2 L. GLUCK: Yeah. 2B, 4, 3, Appendix B. If we
3 go to page 16. Thank you. And this table, Table 7,
4 shows the housing targets under the provincial
5 planning statements for the municipalities served by
6 Elexicon. And the 10-year housing target is 64,000,
7 which translates to about 6,400 housing units
8 annually; is that also correct?

9 U. KHAN: Subject to check, that seems correct.

10 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

11 And I guess I should confirm it just because
12 what the evidence says, but it is a 10-year target;
13 right? So, like, I asked you 64,000 turns into
14 6,400.

15 In the sentence below, it says 7,100. I assume
16 that was just -- that calculation was based on nine
17 years, but it is actually a 10-year housing target?
18 Just for clarity of the evidence. I think it is
19 6,400, you agreed, but it says 7,100 there.

20 U. KHAN: Assuming a 10-year period, 6,400 seems
21 correct.

22 L. GLUCK: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

23 So the planned growth in housing that underpins
24 the regional growth plan is not occurring at the pace
25 expected; is that correct? They were expecting
26 6,400. You are at 2,000. There is a gap.

27 U. KHAN: For the 2025 year, that is correct.

28 L. GLUCK: Yeah, '22 to '25. Over four years;

1 right? Four out of the ten years, you have hit --
2 your service area has 2,000 new customers, the goal
3 in the provincial statement was 6,400, so there is a
4 gap; is that right?

5 U. KHAN: That is correct.

6 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

7 And can we go to 2-CCC-21B, please. And in this
8 response, it says that the housing targets for
9 municipalities within Elexicon's service region under
10 the provincial planning statement are used as a key
11 forward-looking input into the customer and
12 generation connection program budget; is that
13 correct?

14 U. KHAN: It is one of the inputs.

15 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

16 So it seems to me that the information that the
17 company is using for customer connection-related
18 planning isn't matching the current reality. Would
19 you agree with that?

20 U. KHAN: I disagree with that statement. It is
21 -- the forecast from provincial entities and
22 municipal bodies is one of the inputs to the customer
23 connections customer forecast that is used. And if I
24 could point you to IR response BOMA-2, 3-BOMA-2.
25 Page number 4. The column with the heading "Revenue
26 Load Forecast," Exhibit 3.

27 As part of the customer connections narrative,
28 this is the residential forecast that underpins the

1 customer connections program and which uses, as I
2 mentioned, a variety of factors such as the
3 provincial level targets, municipal plans, historical
4 actual customers connected.

5 And I would also like to point out that the
6 numbers in this table include all the municipalities
7 that Elexicon serves, whereas the table that we were
8 looking at was a subset of the municipalities that
9 Elexicon serves where we deduce it was approximately
10 2,000 customers a year historically.

11 L. GLUCK: Thanks.

12 In that response, did you say that the revenue
13 load forecast there does reflect, at least in part,
14 the provincial planning statement, the targets, your
15 regional targets and the provincial targets. Is that
16 part of the revenue load forecast or not?

17 D. COBAN: Mr. Gluck, just, I think if we are
18 getting into questions about the revenue forecast,
19 that would be Panel 3 that is best equipped to deal
20 with those questions.

21 L. GLUCK: He did -- he brought me here, but
22 that is fine.

23 Can I ask you a question about this table? I
24 actually hadn't seen it before but -- so in this
25 table, you are showing the low customer connections
26 on the peak load forecast. So we were talking about
27 before does the low peak load forecast impact -- if
28 you were to use that, does that impact the customer

1 connection budget, and you provided a number of
2 customer connections that looks to be about, you
3 know, 60 percent of what you are using. So does it -
4 - is there an impact? If you were to switch to the
5 low?

6 U. KHAN: Sorry, what is the 60 percent number
7 there?

8 L. GLUCK: Oh, I did it in my head. 2,200 out
9 of 3,100. In 2025. 2,400 out of 3,400 -- that
10 number doesn't matter. I take it back.

11 What matters, the question is, we just talked
12 about whether the customer connection forecast is
13 impacted, the customer connection capital budget is
14 impacted, if you were to change to the low demand
15 forecast. And you said no.

16 This table shows a number -- a number of
17 customer connections under the low demand forecast
18 that is significantly lower than what you have told
19 me is built in to your calculation with the customer
20 connection forecast. So is there an impact if we
21 were to switch to the low demand forecast?

22 U. KHAN: The number of residential customers is
23 definitely an input to the customer connections
24 program, so variations in the number of residential
25 customers that connect would impact the customer
26 connections program; however, the forecast that is
27 used in the customer connections program is the
28 revenue load forecast as outlined in Exhibit 3.

1 L. GLUCK: Okay. And if you were to use the low
2 forecast, the low peak demand forecast, instead of
3 the revenue load forecast, would the budget reduce?

4 U. KHAN: That is correct. Having less
5 customers connect would impact the investment.

6 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

7 And the same would -- if we go down to Table 3.
8 I see the top of it. Just to confirm, the same would
9 be true for the non-residential. Instead of using
10 the revenue load forecast for the purposes of
11 determining the customer connection budget and you
12 switch to the low peak -- the low scenario for the
13 peak load forecast, there would be less non-
14 residential customer connection related capital
15 spending required; is that correct?

16 U. KHAN: For the customer connections program?

17 L. GLUCK: Yes.

18 U. KHAN: Updating the number of customers that
19 would connect would impact the budget.

20 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

21 Can we go to 2-Staff-52, please. And if we go
22 to Part A. Thanks, this table. This table
23 references the stage of project development for the
24 forecast system expansion projects. And can you
25 explain to me what each of those stages represent?

26 So one of them is the conceptual planning stage,
27 the design phase, and the phase where you were
28 awaiting customer responses. Can you explain each to

1 those to me, please?

2 S. LATIF: So the conceptual planning stage
3 essentially means that we have received connection
4 application from the customer, and we have received
5 some sort of a financial commitment, and the team is
6 working on basically building the plan and the scope
7 document for that project before moving towards an
8 offer to connect.

9 In terms of awaiting customer
10 response/deliverables, that means we are waiting for
11 some more additional information from the customer
12 such as their load forecast or their site plans and
13 things like that.

14 When it says "design," that means the project
15 has moved towards an advanced stage of design, is now
16 into design stage, and will be -- shortly be moving
17 towards the construction stage.

18 And a deferred means that the customer has
19 decided to defer their timeline on the project for
20 the energization date.

21 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

22 So what I took from that is the awaiting
23 customer response is before the conceptual planning
24 stage.

25 S. LATIF: That is correct.

26 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

27 And so if we were to take a look at -- let's
28 look at line -- Customer 5, Pickering. In there, you

1 have an estimated connection date of 2027, and that
2 project appears to be in the awaiting customer
3 response phase.

4 So how -- can you explain to me, you know,
5 essentially you are expecting to connect a customer
6 next year, build whatever this project is, and you
7 are still awaiting a response from that customer.
8 Can you explain that to me?

9 S. LATIF: The 2027 energization date is based
10 on what the customer requested. The deliverables
11 from the customers are also pending for Elexicon to -
12 - in order to put the project scope forward. In case
13 the customer does not submit these documents on time,
14 then this expansion can be delayed.

15 However, given the size of this expansion,
16 typically Elexicon needs 16 to 24 months in order to
17 design, construct, and plan this expansion. So it is
18 still doable towards the end of 2027.

19 L. GLUCK: And this underpins -- just to
20 confirm, Table 1 does underpin, at least in part, the
21 system expansion capital budget for rate making
22 purposes; is that right?

23 S. LATIF: That is correct.

24 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

25 Could we open 2-CCC-22, Attachment 1, please.
26 And I think it is an Excel spreadsheet. And if we
27 could open the "Economic Evaluation" tab for Project
28 1, so it is for Ajax EE. Thank you.

1 And I just want to make sure I understand what I
2 can see in this screenshot. So is the -- is this
3 project a project to connect three general service
4 customers?

5 S. LATIF: That is correct.

6 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

7 And with respect to the incremental OM&A costs,
8 can you explain how the company derives that? I see
9 for this project, there is \$175 per customer which,
10 all together, when I add it all up, it sounds like
11 that essentially in the net present value
12 calculation, you are flowing \$425 of annual OM&A on a
13 \$15.5 million capital project.

14 S. LATIF: I cannot really speak to that, like,
15 how the financial OM&A side of budget per customer is
16 derived. This might be a question more suitable for
17 Panel 2.

18 L. GLUCK: Okay. You want me to ask Panel 2
19 these? All right. Thank you.

20 D. COBAN: Mr. Gluck, just to be clear, your
21 questions related to OM&A are to be directed to Panel
22 2. But if you have other questions on these
23 schedules, I just want to make sure you don't miss
24 your opportunity.

25 L. GLUCK: Okay. I will ask Panel 2. Thank
26 you.

27 Can we go to 2-CCC-22, Part F, please. Thank
28 you. And if we look at Table 5, this is the in-

1 service addition view of the known and placeholder
2 system expansion projects, and I am trying to
3 understand the -- if we go down a little bit, please,
4 you will see that the -- sorry, it is there -- the
5 placeholder total in 2027 is almost \$33 million.

6 So can you help explain how there is sort of a
7 placeholder value and what it is related to, which is
8 a very significant in-service addition for 2027?

9 S. LATIF: Can we please go back to 2-Staff-52,
10 response to Part A, Table 1. Here we have a column
11 for the estimated connection year and the total cost
12 of the project, along with the estimated capital
13 contributions and the net capital expenditures.

14 Those ISA amounts are based on the energization
15 dates of these known and anticipated expansion
16 projects. This is based on whatever connection date
17 is estimated in Column 3. Those were the ISA amounts
18 added in that table.

19 L. GLUCK: Can we go back to that table for a
20 second, the table we were just looking at. It was
21 Table 5 here, below. I would have thought what we
22 just -- what you just brought me to, I would have
23 thought, was showing, you know, the 12 million for
24 Customer 3, the 8 million for Customer 5, and the --
25 you know, there is smaller numbers for Customers 7
26 and 8.

27 And then there is an additional \$33 million of
28 placeholder or unknown in-service additions that

1 aren't covered by that table -- or at least that is
2 how I am interpreting it. So can you help me with
3 that?

4 S. LATIF: There are several additional other
5 expansion projects that are not listed in this table.
6 We have a lot of smaller quantity or volume of --
7 large volume of expansions that are not part of this
8 table; therefore, that placeholder amount is \$32.85
9 million for those expansions.

10 L. GLUCK: Okay. Can you undertake to provide
11 what those projects are and how you are confident
12 that within, you know, 18 months from now, you are
13 going to be putting in \$33 million of assets that
14 don't seem to be connected to known customers?

15 S. LATIF: Yeah, we can undertake that.

16 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

17 T. HOBBINS: That will be Undertaking JT-1.4.

18 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.4: PROVIDE THE ADDITIONAL**
19 **EXPANSION PROJECTS THAT ARE NOT LISTED IN TABLE**
20 **5 OF 2-STAFF-52 AND ADVISE HOW \$33 MILLION OF**
21 **ASSETS WILL BE PUT IN THAT DO NOT APPEAR TO BE**
22 **CONNECTED TO KNOWN CUSTOMERS**

23 L. GLUCK: Can we go to 2-CCC-28, Part B,
24 please. Thank you. We could go to page 3. Okay. I
25 want to discuss the Winchester West MS.

26 And if we look at the -- well, first, I want to
27 ask, is the capital contribution that is sort of
28 notionally in there between the 13.9 and the 8.6

1 million, that -- that amount is related to Phase I
2 and is reflected in the 2024 and 2025 actuals for the
3 -- for this program?

4 U. KHAN: Just to clarify, the contributions are
5 in -- up to 2025 actuals, but also in 2026 as well,
6 we have forecast contributions for 2026 for this
7 project in addition to what we have received so far
8 from the customer.

9 Regarding the other part of your question, that
10 is correct, this is for Phase I.

11 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

12 Can we go to Exhibit 2B, Tab 4, Schedule 3 --
13 actually, no. It is fine. Thank you.

14 Can we look at the footnote at the bottom of
15 this page that we are on in CCC-28, please. And this
16 footnote explains that the capital contributions for
17 Phase II have not yet been determined; is that
18 correct?

19 U. KHAN: That is correct.

20 L. GLUCK: And are the Phase II costs for this
21 reflected in the upcoming rate term, the in-service
22 additions for this -- for Winchester West MS?

23 U. KHAN: That is correct. The gross costs for
24 Phase II of construction of the station are included.

25 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

26 And based on this -- this footnote and the fact
27 that a capital contribution was required for Phase I,
28 would you agree that there is some likelihood that a

1 capital contribution is going to be required for
2 Phase II?

3 U. KHAN: I don't know the answer to that,
4 whether there will be or to what amount of capital
5 contributions would be required, if any, for Phase
6 II.

7 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

8 Can we look at -- can we go up on this page a
9 little bit, please. And now with respect to the GTA
10 East TS, this project has been classified entirely as
11 a system enhancement project; is that correct?

12 U. KHAN: That is correct.

13 L. GLUCK: And can we go to 2-CCC-29, please.
14 And in Part A, if we could -- if you could keep the
15 question on the page. Thanks. So in this response,
16 Elexicon confirmed that the GTA East TS project is
17 being driven, in part, by known developments in
18 Northeast Pickering and in Brooklin; is that correct?

19 U. KHAN: That is correct.

20 L. GLUCK: And the GTA East project is necessary
21 to support the second stage of the Brooklin
22 development; is that also right?

23 U. KHAN: That is correct. Additional capacity
24 on the 44 kV upstream would be required to connect
25 Phase II of the North Brooklin development.

26 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

27 And so given these known developments that are
28 driving the need for the upstream infrastructure that

1 are going to be addressed by the GTA East project,
2 why isn't this project at least partially being
3 considered an expansion project similar to the Phase
4 I Winchester MS?

5 U. KHAN: If I could point you to Exhibit 2B,
6 Tab 4, Schedule 3, Appendix I-1, page number 9. This
7 table, Table 1, highlights the 44 kV stations within
8 the Ajax, Pickering, and Whitby area.

9 And one point to note is that existing as of
10 2025, three of these four TSs are fully utilized and
11 exceeding their capacity, and so the requirement and
12 the driver for the GTA East transformer station is to
13 relieve existing capacity constraints and provide
14 additional capacity on the 44 kV system.

15 There will be projects and customer connections
16 on the 44 kV that would be enabled by this -- this
17 station but may not necessarily be the primary driver
18 for the need for this station.

19 L. GLUCK: Right. So -- but they -- based on
20 what you just said, it appears to me that they are at
21 least partially driving the need for the station.
22 The reason the station is being built is to relieve
23 existing capacity constraints and support known
24 developments; is that a fair statement?

25 U. KHAN: What I would say is that in Ajax,
26 Pickering, Whitby on the downstream of this -- the 44
27 kV system, there are 23 municipal stations at the
28 13.8 kV level. And because of the constraints on

1 three of the TSs in this area, all of those municipal
2 stations are constrained and have limited capacity.
3 And so additional customers that would need to
4 connect to those municipal stations, those stations
5 are constrained, and so the primary driver to build
6 this station is to relieve the existing constraints
7 on those 23 municipal stations. And this would also
8 enable additional customers, whether they are
9 industrial, commercial, residential, to connect on
10 the 44 kV system as well.

11 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

12 Can we go to 2-CCC-19, Attachment 1, please.

13 And if we can look at line 49, please -- I have the
14 line wrong. It is line 46.

15 So with respect to the Church SS cable
16 replacement program, this is a -- this was a planned
17 project to replace certain feeder cables from the
18 Church substation; is that correct?

19 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct.

20 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

21 And the reason for the cost overrun is primarily
22 related to higher than estimated material cost; is
23 that the rationale?

24 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct. Perhaps we
25 can just scroll a little right to get that entire
26 cell in there. Thank you. But that is correct.

27 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

28 Can we go to Exhibit 1, Tab 5, Schedule 2,

1 please. And if we go to page 2. And the types of
2 cable that are listed in Table 2 there, are those --
3 are either of those the type of cable that would have
4 been used -- used in the Church SS replacement?

5 S. SHEEHY: Potentially. I would need to
6 confirm exactly what cable was used within the Church
7 substation cable replacement.

8 L. GLUCK: So would you accept that, you know,
9 if we used one of those -- those -- one of those
10 types of cable, there was a 25 percent or so compound
11 annual growth rate related to the material cost of
12 those cables?

13 S. SHEEHY: Sorry. What percentage did you say?

14 L. GLUCK: I said -- I said 25 percent. It is
15 in the range of the two types of cables it could have
16 been, the compound annual growth rate?

17 S. SHEEHY: Yeah, for the wire and cable within
18 this Table 1, it is showing a 48.77 percent increase,
19 right, compound annual growth rate.

20 L. GLUCK: No, that is right. I thought it
21 would be one of the station cables; am I wrong? In
22 Table 2, there is two types of cables listed there.

23 S. SHEEHY: For that project, it depends --

24 L. GLUCK: Okay.

25 S. SHEEHY: -- if the cable replacement was
26 distribution or substation-related. Would need to
27 confirm that.

28 L. GLUCK: Okay. I would appreciate if you

1 would undertake to confirm what type of cable,
2 whether it would fall into the wire and cable
3 category in Table 1 or one of the other cables listed
4 in Table 2. Could you undertake to do that?

5 S. SHEEHY: Yes, we can do that.

6 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

7 T. HOBBINS: That will be Undertaking JT-1.5.

8 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.5: CONFIRM WHETHER THE CABLE**
9 **LISTED IN EXHIBIT 1, TAB 5, SCHEDULE 2 WOULD**
10 **FALL INTO THE WIRE AND CABLE CATEGORY IN TABLE 1**
11 **OR ONE OF THE OTHER CABLES LISTED IN TABLE 2**

12 L. GLUCK: If we could go back to 2-CCC-19,
13 Attachment 1, please. If we could go to line 55 --
14 sorry. It is line 52. Thank you.

15 So this Montgomery Park project was a planned
16 system reliability improvement project that
17 experienced an 87 percent cost overrun; is that
18 correct?

19 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct.

20 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

21 And the explanation for the cost variance here
22 is that labour and materials exceeded the original
23 estimate, and can you help me with that -- help
24 explain exactly what led to the cost overrun for this
25 project? Because that is a bit of a generic
26 response.

27 S. SHEEHY: Similar to Church, we would have to
28 take this away -- take this away to deep-dive it.

1 However, just to give you additional context here,
2 when an initial scope is put together, and estimated
3 -- it could be based on a high-level planning
4 estimate at that time, and then subsequent to when
5 design and construction proceeds, there could be
6 variations in the plan. So that is the nature of
7 this comment here in the project description.

8 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

9 And I would appreciate if you could take away --
10 for the projects where the explanation is variance
11 attributable to labour and material costs exceeding
12 the original estimate, which is used for -- I don't
13 know -- a handful of the projects in this table, if
14 you could take it away and provide a more detailed
15 rationale, including any internal documentation.

16 S. SHEEHY: Yes. It is possible, though further
17 years back in the plan, it may be a bit of a
18 challenge to find that level of granularity and
19 detail, but we could endeavour to look within these
20 and provide an update.

21 L. GLUCK: I appreciate that. Thank you.

22 T. HOBBINS: That will be Undertaking JT-1.6.

23 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.6: PROVIDE A MORE DETAILED**
24 **RATIONALE, INCLUDING ANY INTERNAL DOCUMENTATION,**
25 **FOR THE PROJECTS WHERE THE EXPLANATION IS**
26 **VARIANCE ATTRIBUTABLE TO LABOUR AND MATERIAL**
27 **COSTS EXCEEDING THE ORIGINAL ESTIMATE**

28 L. GLUCK: Can we move to 2-CCC-24, please. And

1 looking at the top of page 3. Thank you. And in the
2 first sentence here, there is a mention of some
3 errors with the project completion years with respect
4 to the station renewal investments.

5 And my question is simply is this just an error
6 in the pre-filed table, or does this error have
7 implications for, you know, the Chapter 2 appendices
8 and things like that that actually flow into the
9 setting of rates?

10 U. KHAN: The error in the Appendix 2B, Tab 4,
11 Schedule 3, Appendix E, Table 1 was just regarding
12 the project completion years just in that table and
13 did not impact the narratives further below,
14 including the investment timeline. So it was just
15 Table 1.

16 L. GLUCK: Okay. No, that is perfect. Thank
17 you.

18 And if we go to Table 3 on the next page,
19 please. This table shows the net expenditures for
20 station rebuild projects between the balanced and low
21 investment scenarios. And for a few of these
22 projects where the proposed completion dates are in
23 the test period, I am not exactly sure how to
24 understand the table.

25 So if we were to look at the Riverside MS, I
26 understand that in your proposal, this project is
27 supposed to be completed in 2030 at a \$10 million
28 cost; is that correct?

1 U. KHAN: The balanced investment plan, that is
2 correct.

3 L. GLUCK: And the balance -- just so I am sure,
4 the balanced investment plan is the selected plan by
5 the --

6 U. KHAN: That is correct.

7 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

8 And in terms of the low investment plan, so for
9 Riverside MS still, so there is \$4 million of net
10 expenditures in this term. So is the implication
11 that because it does not match the total investment,
12 that it is just not completed during the upcoming
13 term, and it would fall into the next term? Is that
14 how I am supposed to understand this table?

15 U. KHAN: If I could point you to 2-Staff-55
16 attachment. It is an Excel attachment. Part B, if
17 you go to -- there it is. So if you look at the "Low
18 Investment" column versus the "Balanced Investment"
19 column, in brackets, it explains that the project
20 would be initiated but not completed within the
21 investment plan.

22 L. GLUCK: Okay. That is very helpful.

23 And if we could go back to 2-CCC-24 at Part D,
24 please. And in this response, the company explains
25 that 10 of the 12 transformers that will be replaced
26 through the station renewal program are in fair or
27 better condition. And can you further explain why
28 that -- that would be necessary to replace assets

1 that are in fair or better condition?

2 U. KHAN: The station health index is one of the
3 eight parameters that are used to prioritize and
4 evaluate the risk at municipal substation, amongst
5 other factors such as safety, environmental impact.
6 And these are outlined in response to Staff-55.

7 Another thing I would like to point out is that
8 fair transformers, even though they may not be in
9 very poor or poor condition, given the lead time to
10 order transformers and procure transformers, as well
11 as the impact of transformers, the criticality of
12 these assets, it would be prudent to also replace
13 these assets if they are in fair condition.

14 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

15 And if you don't have it with you now, could you
16 undertake to provide the breakout of the ten
17 transformers that are in fair or better condition as
18 between fair, good, or very good?

19 U. KHAN: Just to confirm, you would like to
20 know the condition of the transformers that are being
21 assessed to be replaced by 2031 and what their
22 condition is?

23 L. GLUCK: Yes.

24 U. KHAN: That can be done.

25 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

26 T. HOBBINS: I will mark that as JT-1.7.

27 MR. GLUCK: Thanks.

28 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.7: Provide the breakout of the**

1 **ten transformers that are being assessed to be**
2 **replaced by 2031 and what their condition is as**
3 **between fair, good, or very good**

4 L. GLUCK: Can we go to 2-CCC-25, please. And
5 if we could go to Part C, the response to Part C.
6 And starting at line 21, the company explains that
7 some of the underground cable that is scheduled for
8 replacement may be candidates for cable injection,
9 and then discusses the total amount of Elexicon's
10 underground cable that is in poor or very poor
11 condition.

12 So can you help me understand why rejuvenation
13 for the segments of underground cable, where it is
14 possible to do that, could not be used instead of the
15 planned cable replacement of those segments?

16 S. LATIF: What we mean by this line over here
17 is that the cable that we are planning to replace --
18 to be replaced are past their typical useful life.
19 And they can be injected, but there is less of a
20 success rate post injection, and there is a high risk
21 of failure for those cables even if they are injected
22 since they are past the TUL.

23 L. GLUCK: Okay. And just in terms of the
24 dollar value between -- the unit cost between
25 injection and replacement, if that is not directly on
26 the record, is that something you could undertake to
27 provide?

28 S. LATIF: I would like to point you to 2B-SEC-

1 62, response to Part B, Table 2. So in this table,
2 we have provided the summary of expenditures for
3 cable replacement and injection by the forecast year.

4 L. GLUCK: And we have the unit somewhere?

5 S. LATIF: Those can be calculated. We have
6 provided the total kilometres in the --

7 MR. GLUCK: Okay.

8 S. LATIF: -- pre-filed evidence, and we can
9 provide that as well.

10 L. GLUCK: Are you saying you are going to
11 provide it, or it is already on the record and I can
12 do the math?

13 S. LATIF: The per unit cost is not -

14 MR. GLUCK: Okay.

15 S. LATIF: -- but we can do the math for you.

16 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

17 T. HOBBINS: So that will be Undertaking JT-1.8.

18 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

19 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.8: ADVISE OF THE DIFFERENCE IN**
20 **UNIT COST BETWEEN CABLE INJECTION AND CABLE**
21 **REPLACEMENT**

22 MR. GLUCK: Can we go to 4-CCC-41B, please.
23 Thank you. Actually, if we could go to the table
24 below. Thanks. Table 1.

25 So my understanding of this table is that it
26 shows that the enhanced inspection protocols make up
27 approximately 13 percent on average of the total
28 distribution system maintenance segment budget in the

1 test period; is that correct?

2 S. LATIF: Subject to check, that is correct.

3 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

4 And I just want to make sure I understand what
5 these incremental costs cover. And in the response,
6 I think it might be above, you suggest that we read
7 Exhibit 4, Tab 1, Schedule 4, page 25. So if we
8 could go there, please. It's at page 25. Thank you.

9 And so this page, starting at line 5, it
10 mentions quite a few enhanced activities that will be
11 undertaken in the test period, but it also mentions a
12 little bit lower down on the page customer growth.
13 So you will see that at line 19 into 20.

14 So what I am trying to understand is in the
15 table we were just looking at, is it really just
16 enhancements, like, changes of strategies or, you
17 know, it mentions the reinstatement of insulator
18 washing, so is it really about those sorts of things,
19 or is it also about growth?

20 S. LATIF: We did take into account the asset
21 base growing as part of the future rate period. So
22 there are some costs involved in that, but those
23 costs are negligible.

24 L. GLUCK: Okay. So the 4-CCC-41B, Table 1
25 where the percentage was set out about the
26 enhancements, enhanced protocols versus the rest of
27 the budget, that is really scoped to just the
28 enhancements? That is what I am trying to confirm.

1 S. LATIF: That is correct.

2 L. GLUCK: Okay. Perfect. Maybe we can...

3 T. HOBBINS: Sure. We are approaching the
4 morning break, so we will take 15 minutes and return
5 at 11:15.

6 --- Upon recessing at 11:00 a.m.

7 --- Upon resuming at 11:16 a.m.

8 T. HOBBINS: Okay. We will resume. I believe
9 it is back to CCC.

10 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

11 If we could go to 4-CCC-41, Attachment 1,
12 please. Thank you. And this table sets out the
13 distribution maintenance segment costs by year. And
14 I would like to start by looking at 2025 in this
15 table, and I would like to understand what the
16 historical costs write off line is referring to.

17 S. LATIF: What I know is that these historical
18 cost write-offs were to do with some capital
19 projects. The costs were within setting those
20 capital projects that were cancelled; however, for
21 more details, I would refer this -- I would ask you
22 to refer this question to Panel 2, please.

23 L. GLUCK: Okay. And with respect to the pole
24 testing line, can you explain why all the pole
25 testing costs from 2020 to 2024 are being shown in
26 2025 only?

27 S. LATIF: Historically, pole testing costs were
28 charged to the capital side of things, which was

1 incorrect, and this was corrected in 2025.

2 L. GLUCK: Does -- can you explain that further?

3 S. LATIF: So we have like-for-like our capital
4 pole replacement program, and then we have a pole
5 testing program as well. So any poles found to have
6 been in a very poor condition, those costs were
7 capitalized for the pole testing; however, there were
8 additional poles that were not replaced, and they
9 should have been charged to the OM&A program, not the
10 capital program.

11 L. GLUCK: Does that have implications on rate
12 base, that you were capitalizing pole testing
13 previously that should not have been capitalized?

14 D. COBAN: Maybe we could punt this question to
15 Panel 2, who is able to speak to all the financial
16 models that underlie rate base.

17 L. GLUCK: Sure. With respect to the damage
18 prevention and inspection activity, can you just
19 explain what that is? It looks like it is a new
20 activity that started in 2025.

21 S. LATIF: I will have to take this away to get
22 you more specific details on this one.

23 L. GLUCK: That is fine. Thank you. I think
24 that is an undertaking.

25 T. HOBBINS: That will be Undertaking JT-1.9.

26 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

27 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.9: Explain what damage**
28 **prevention and inspection activity is**

1 MR. GLUCK: And with respect to the total 2025
2 costs, you will see that they are quite a bit higher
3 than any other year in the historical period, and I
4 think it is related to some of the things we just
5 talked about in terms of there being a historical
6 cost write-off added in 2025, all of this pole
7 testing, dollars, whatever that is related to, being
8 shown in 2025.

9 And my question for you is how would I go about
10 normalizing 2025 as the, you know, most recent
11 actuals but to get rid of sort of these one-time
12 things that seem to be not actually part of an
13 ongoing distribution system maintenance plan?

14 S. LATIF: Just to clarify, you want me to
15 remove any one-time costs in the 2025 actuals and
16 provide you the cost for the regular system
17 maintenance program of cyclic activities?

18 L. GLUCK: Yeah, I think so. What I would like
19 is a normalized 2025 that you believe is comparable
20 to the future period. And with an explanation as to
21 what you did.

22 S. LATIF: That can be provided.

23 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

24 T. HOBBS: That will be Undertaking JT-1.10.

25 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.10: Provide a normalized 2025**
26 **that is comparable to the future period and**
27 **provide an explanation as to what was done**

28 L. GLUCK: Can we go to 4-CCC-44, Table 2,

1 please. Thank you.

2 And so if we look at 2028 in this table, you
3 will see that once fully implemented, the LiDAR costs
4 are expected to cost about \$520,000 for that year,
5 and that is the full implementation year; is that
6 right?

7 S. LATIF: That is correct.

8 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

9 And in Part E to this response, I understand
10 that the LiDAR technology and AI-powered vegetation
11 analytics is expected to allow more targeted trimming
12 rather than Elexicon needing to trim an entire
13 feeder; is that also right?

14 S. LATIF: Ultimately that is the goal. That is
15 correct.

16 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

17 If we go back to Table 2, you can see that in
18 2028, the spot trimming costs start to increase
19 significantly, and that aligns with what we just
20 talked about; is that fair?

21 S. LATIF: Yes. The spot trimming costs are
22 forecasted to increase for the '27 to 2031 period.

23 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

24 And can we go to Table 3, please. And we can
25 see here the three-year pattern of cyclical tree
26 trimming. I just want to confirm with you that 2020
27 is the same area as 2023, 2026, and 2029; is that
28 right?

1 S. LATIF: For the 2026 and 2029 period, there
2 has been a change in the program. We are moved
3 towards a feeder-based trimming cycle rather than an
4 area-based cycle, and the kilometres differ between
5 2023 and 2026; however, they are the same for 2026
6 and 2029.

7 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

8 And if we go look at Table 2. So we just
9 discussed that 2026 and 2029 are trimming -- the
10 vegetation management is targeting the same area.
11 And you can see that the costs rise from 1.2 million
12 to 1.37 million in 2029, and that is after the
13 company has introduced the incremental costs related
14 to the full implementation of LiDAR and the
15 incremental targeted spot trimming costs.

16 So what I am trying to understand is why there
17 would be no reduction to the cyclical vegetation
18 management costs with the introduction of more spot
19 trimming and the LiDAR technology.

20 S. LATIF: Can I point you to Exhibit 4, Tab 1,
21 Schedule 4, line number 16 to 21. So in this pre-
22 filed evidence, we talk about the outages and the
23 growing volume of the reactive spot trimming in the
24 historical period as well as the --

25 S. SHEEHY: Sorry. That was on page 56.

26 S. LATIF: Page 56, my apologies.

27 So can I ask you to focus on line 16 to 21. So
28 in the forecast period, Elexicon is increasing the

1 volume of vegetation management. The minimum cycle
2 as per the DSC is three years, which is the minimum
3 standard; however, for the worst performing feeders,
4 we will be increasing our volume of vegetation
5 management, and some of the feeders will be moved to
6 a two-year cycle. Therefore, those planned
7 vegetation management costs are forecasted to
8 slightly increase when comparing the same areas '26
9 to 2029.

10 Along with that, we are -- also will be focusing
11 on removing dead trees during the forecast period
12 that were identified as part of the planned trimming
13 cycles, and our fundings were constrained in the
14 historical period, preventing us from taking such
15 sort of investments.

16 L. GLUCK: So as part of that response, you said
17 that you are changing the cycles for some of the
18 areas?

19 S. LATIF: That is correct. We will be doing a
20 mid-cycle trimming for some of the worst performing
21 feeders that serve our rural areas, mostly. Those
22 feeders will be having a mid-spot trimming cycle that
23 would be at the mid-year mark of the three-year
24 cycle.

25 L. GLUCK: Is that shown in Table 3, or is that
26 something outside of that? Table 3 of 4-CCC-44.

27 S. LATIF: That is outside of that table.

28 L. GLUCK: Okay. It is outside of that table.

1 Okay. Thank you.

2 Can we go to 4-CCC-45, Table 1, please. And
3 there is a column here titled "Other Third Party
4 Locate Costs." Can you advise what that is?

5 M. MULTANI: Sorry, can you repeat your
6 question.

7 L. GLUCK: Can you explain what the "Other Third
8 Party Locate Costs" column is referring to?

9 M. MULTANI: That refers to some of the locate
10 software programs we use such as Competers as well as
11 Planview.

12 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

13 And in 2029, there is a large increase in the
14 internal supervision costs. Can you explain what is
15 driving that?

16 M. MULTANI: I will refer you to Exhibit 4, Tab
17 1, Schedule 4, page 68 of 68. Yeah, the cost
18 increase in 2029 is because of addition of staff, of
19 field staff we are adding to our locates department.

20 L. GLUCK: Okay.

21 If we go back to the Table we were looking at.
22 And just above the Table, the company explains that
23 the locate volumes in 2026 and into the rate term
24 period are based on an average of 2023 and -- to 2025
25 volumes and then adjusted for expected ongoing
26 construction, development, and infrastructure
27 activity; is that accurate?

28 M. MULTANI: Yes, that is correct. We also just

1 want to come up with a context here. We don't
2 generally use locate volume forecast for cost
3 allocation. It's -- locates is demand-driven and
4 non-discretionary.

5 L. GLUCK: When you -- what is the difference
6 between locate demand and locate volumes?

7 M. MULTANI: In the context of my -- what I said
8 -- what I mean is for locate demand is if we -- if --
9 depending on the construction activity, if we get a
10 locate request, we must respond.

11 The volume for '26 to 2031, as we see in this
12 response, we have forecasted based on an expected
13 volume we -- we believe on the construction activity.

14 L. GLUCK: So let me ask -- ask it this way: If
15 -- if -- if the locate volumes -- if your forecast of
16 locate volumes is too high, does that impact the
17 budget, like, what you will actually spend?

18 M. MULTANI: Yes. The actual will be based on
19 what actual locates we get in the particular year.

20 L. GLUCK: Okay.

21 So the -- can we just look at the Table for a
22 sec, please. So just to confirm that we are saying
23 the same thing, if those locate volumes in '27 to
24 2031 on an actual basis are lower than the actual
25 spend in this segment, will be lower than what you
26 are forecasting; is that right?

27 M. MULTANI: That is correct.

28 L. GLUCK: Okay.

1 M. MULTANI: The actual spend will be based on
2 actual locates.

3 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

4 And I have a number of questions about the
5 *Getting Ontario Connected Act* variance account, and I
6 just want to ask whether that is for this panel or
7 for another panel?

8 D. COBAN: I think those questions would be
9 better directed at Panel 2.

10 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

11 And this is my last set of questions. This is
12 related to the system control centre. And if we can
13 go to 10-CCC-71, please. And if we could go to Table
14 4. Thank you. Can you please undertake to provide a
15 version of Table 4 that includes the 2020 to 2025
16 period?

17 S. SADEGHI: The ask is to provide the
18 historical actuals for the period of 2020 to 2025 for
19 the equivalent of Table 4?

20 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

21 S. SADEGHI: Yeah, I accept it.

22 T. HOBBINS: That will be Undertaking JT-1.11.

23 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.11: PROVIDE THE HISTORICAL**
24 **ACTUALS FOR THE PERIOD OF 2020 TO 2025 FOR THE**
25 **EQUIVALENT OF TABLE 4 IN EXHIBIT 4, TAB 1,**
26 **SCHEDULE 4, PAGE 68**

27 L. GLUCK: Can you also undertake to provide a
28 version of Table 6 that includes 2020 to 2025?

1 S. SADEGHI: What you are asking for would be a
2 duplication of the previous ask because of the
3 information listed in Table 6 would be equivalent to
4 what is in Table 4.

5 L. GLUCK: So the -- to confirm what you are
6 saying, the positions and the FTEs would be exactly
7 the same? Because the first -- Table 4 is on a
8 position basis. Table 6 is on an FTE basis. So if
9 they are the same, they are the same. That is fine.
10 But if they are not, then the question still stands.

11 S. SADEGHI: Subject to check, the position and
12 the FTEs for the historical actuals for the period of
13 2020 to 2025 will be the same.

14 L. GLUCK: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

15 Can we go to Attachment 1 of this response,
16 please. I think it is -- it is not an Excel. I
17 think it is just in there. Thank you. And can you
18 first confirm that this options analysis was
19 developed in February of 2026?

20 S. SADEGHI: The options analysis was finalized
21 in February of 2026.

22 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

23 And the evidence update with respect to the
24 control centre, the system control centre, was filed
25 near the end of May 2026; is that right?

26 S. SADEGHI: The updated evidence for the
27 control centre was filed on April 2nd, 2026.

28 L. GLUCK: Okay. Thank you.

1 And if we go to page 7, please. Just up a page.
2 Thank you. Can you confirm the company selected
3 Option C and that is what underpins the updated
4 forecast for the system control centre operations
5 segment?

6 S. SADEGHI: That is correct. As noted in the
7 evidence, Option C, which is called "the bare-bone
8 option" was selected.

9 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

10 And the updated '27 to 2031 control centre costs
11 are forecast to be about \$30,000,000; is that also
12 right?

13 S. SADEGHI: That is correct.

14 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

15 And if we go to page -- the next page of this
16 presentation here, Option C in the little table at
17 the top right was forecast to cost \$22 million -- is
18 that right -- for the '27 to 2031 period?

19 S. SADEGHI: Correct.

20 L. GLUCK: So what is the -- so what is driving
21 the difference between the proposal of 30 million and
22 the estimated cost about three months ago of 22
23 million?

24 S. SADEGHI: We will take that as an
25 undertaking.

26 L. GLUCK: Thank you.

27 T. HOBBINS: That will be Undertaking JT-1.12.

28 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.12: ADVISE WHAT IS DRIVING THE**

1 **DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PROPOSAL OF \$30 MILLION**
2 **AND THE ESTIMATED COST ABOUT THREE MONTHS AGO OF**
3 **\$22 MILLION FOR OPTION C**

4 L. GLUCK: Those are my questions. Thank you
5 very much, Panel.

6 S. SADEGHI: Thank you.

7 T. HOBBINS: And so next on the schedule looks
8 to be SEC.

9 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY J. SCOTT (SEC):**

10 J. SCOTT: Good morning, Panel. It is Jane
11 Scott, a consultant for the School Energy Coalition.
12 Mr. Gluck did cover some of my questions, so
13 hopefully we can reduce our time. I am going to ask
14 some questions, and then my colleague Mr. Rubenstein
15 is going to follow, and hopefully we can be done by
16 lunch time.

17 1-SEC-12 was mapped to Panels 2 and 3, but I --
18 I had capital-related questions. So if we could pull
19 up Table 1 of 1-SEC-12. Thank you. And you can tell
20 me if it should be -- if you are the correct place or
21 this should go to the other panels.

22 So looking at the 102.9 million increase in
23 capital, and my understanding is this was from the
24 original draft budget after customer engagement to
25 the final budget, that this was the increase in
26 capital; correct?

27 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct. This
28 approximately 103 million was the final update post

1 the Phase II customer engagement to the final plan.

2 J. SCOTT: And we don't have to pull it up, but
3 I think in the 1-SEC-1, Attachment 1, it stated that
4 though these changes were made, there was no change
5 in the outcomes of the plan. Those outcomes being
6 the returning reliability to historic levels,
7 capacity constraints, dealing with capacity
8 constraints, the customer connections/growth, and
9 keeping the residential distribution impact --
10 average distribution impact less than 10 percent?

11 D. COBAN: Ms. Scott, maybe you could direct us
12 to the page of that attachment that you are looking
13 at, just so we can all have it in front of us.

14 J. SCOTT: 1-SEC-1, Attachment 1, page 1. No,
15 it is not -- sorry. It is not an Excel spreadsheet.
16 It is just a -- it is a presentation, I think, from,
17 yeah, the Board. Yeah, so there -- go back. Go
18 back. Sorry. Yeah, so the third paragraph down:

19 "The proposed plan will deliver the same
20 outcomes as a draft plan." (as read)

21 S. SHEEHY: I am sorry. Could you repeat the
22 specific question pertaining to this again for me,
23 please.

24 J. SCOTT: Just a confirmation that the -- the
25 outcomes were the same regardless of adding the 102.9
26 -- or 2.9 -- 109.2, whichever it is -- 102.9 million?

27 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct.

28 J. SCOTT: So maybe if we can look at the list,

1 and if you -- and I think I understand, certainly,
2 the Dx NEXT. After the draft plan, it was decided
3 that that was operating not capital, so that is a
4 reduction.

5 The capital constraint investments, there was an
6 increase there. Do you know what that was for?

7 S. SHEEHY: Yes. The 26 million line item you
8 are referring to there?

9 J. SCOTT: Yes.

10 S. SHEEHY: And sorry. What is your specific
11 question on this one for me, please?

12 J. SCOTT: Well, what specifically -- I am
13 assuming that if materials for those projects
14 increase, that is captured in the 63.2 million. And
15 if the outcomes are staying the same, my question is
16 what -- what changed?

17 S. SHEEHY: I could provide you specifics on
18 what changed within the capacity constrained
19 investments, if you would like me to walk you through
20 those. Is that what you are looking to get here from
21 this?

22 J. SCOTT: Yes, yes. Are you doing that as an
23 undertaking, or are you -- is that...

24 S. SHEEHY: No. I can explain this. Just --

25 J. SCOTT: Okay.

26 S. SHEEHY: -- give me a second here.

27 J. SCOTT: Okay.

28 S. SHEEHY: What specifically changed within

1 this \$26 million line item is as the planning team
2 was advancing within this draft process to
3 finalization, as we were preparing our evidence for
4 our capacity maps, digging deep within our municipal
5 stations and distribution feeders, we realized we
6 needed to make additional capacity-related
7 investments.

8 And within this 26 million, that was
9 specifically for Bradshaw MS, which was a substation
10 growth project. And additionally, we needed to make
11 some investments within the grid enhancements
12 investment program, and specifically, feeder
13 enhancements within those. So that is the totality
14 of the 26 million.

15 J. SCOTT: Okay.

16 The reliability investments were reduced. Now,
17 what -- what would that have been related to that
18 doesn't change the reliability outcome?

19 S. SHEEHY: The minus 14 million in reliability
20 investments --

21 J. SCOTT: Mm-hmm.

22 S. SHEEHY: -- was the reduction of grid
23 enhancement projects within specific areas of
24 Elexicon's service territory.

25 J. SCOTT: And that was determined that it would
26 not affect the outcome of the reliability returning
27 to the historical average; is that correct?

28 S. SHEEHY: What I would say is when you look at

1 the investments above it, so, for example, capacity
2 investments, station upgrades, there is an element of
3 reliability benefits from those.

4 So, for example, station upgrades were also
5 within our grid enhancements. So there is an offset,
6 I would say, between the capacity investments and the
7 station upgrades to the reliability investment
8 deferral that we put in.

9 J. SCOTT: Okay.

10 And I was going to also ask about the reactive
11 capital. Was that a result of reducing the
12 reliability investment, that you increase the
13 reactive capital as a result?

14 S. SHEEHY: Sorry. You were just trailing off
15 at the end there. Could I get you to repeat that,
16 specifically for reliability?

17 J. SCOTT: Yes. The reactive capital
18 increasing, was that a result of the reliability
19 investments reducing?

20 S. SHEEHY: Similar to the capacity constraint
21 comment I just had, as we progress further through
22 the draft plan to final plan, and we saw the impact
23 that -- that reliability was having with SAIDI and
24 SAIFI and the growing defective equipment
25 replacements that we were faced with. We determined
26 that we needed to add 9.1 million of additional
27 funding to address reliability risks to our system,
28 and we added those within the 2027 and 2028 years of

1 our plan.

2 J. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you.

3 If we could look at 2B-SEC-46. And this was the
4 question about prioritizing your projects and, if I
5 understand your response, that you do not do an
6 overriding prioritization process with all projects.

7 So am I correct that you don't have something
8 like a Copperleaf program that you put all projects
9 into to get a consistent across the board
10 prioritization score?

11 S. SHEEHY: Yes. If we could look at the answer
12 to B, I would say, first of all, that is correct, we
13 do not have the Copperleaf tool within Elexicon.
14 What we do is as a team, as an organization, we work
15 cross-functionally across all of our investment
16 programs to select the right level of investment that
17 aligns with the strategic parameters of our plan.

18 J. SCOTT: So if we move down to Part D of this
19 response, and it talks about -- if you -- no. Sorry.
20 Too far. Yeah. Yeah, stop -- stop there. Yes --
21 that the mandatory investments are -- and it lists
22 them there; externally initiated plant, customer
23 generation connection, system expansion, metering
24 except AMI, reactive capital, substation growth
25 facilities, management security, fleet, IT systems,
26 and equipment.

27 I think -- and I can understand the externally
28 initiated plant relocation, customer connections,

1 metering, system expansion, reactive capital,
2 substation growth.

3 Can you explain the mandatory aspect of the
4 facilities' management security, the fleet, the IT
5 systems, and the equipment?

6 S. SHEEHY: Yes. Those general plant
7 investments were set with the minimum levels that we
8 need within the 2027 to 2031 period. Details on all
9 of those investment programs can be found within our
10 Distribution System Plan, but they were selected as
11 mandatory, representing the minimum cost that we have
12 for those years, '27 to '31.

13 J. SCOTT: And is this a change in your
14 prioritization? Has your prioritization process
15 changed since the last time you prepared a DSP? I
16 say that just because when I look in the old -- the
17 '22 to '26 DSP, those ones are not considered
18 mandatory. And I can refer you to a reference of
19 that but -- if necessary.

20 S. SHEEHY: Yes, please, if you could refer --

21 J. SCOTT: If we have the '22 to '26 DSP
22 available.

23 D. COBAN: I don't believe we have that loaded
24 in our materials, but if you can provide us a
25 reference, we could check it over the lunch hour.

26 J. SCOTT: Page 6 of Appendix I states that:
27 "Mandatory projects include customer service
28 requests, plant relocations as a result of

1 third party infrastructure development
2 requirements, and metering." (as read)

3 D. COBAN: So, again, we don't have those
4 materials in front of us to be able to look at that
5 and answer questions on them, but we can take a look
6 at them over the lunch break, get back to you.

7 J. SCOTT: Okay. I did ask for it to be put on
8 the record, but I was told that because it was public
9 information, it was accessible, so... If you could.
10 And just what maybe -- I am interested in any other
11 changes to the prioritization process since that
12 previous DSP.

13 So if we go back to Part C, I think it was -- or
14 was it part B? Yeah, just Part B. And you quoted
15 that about the working cross-functionally to select
16 an investment level for each category. I guess I am
17 still not clear of how -- if you have a project in
18 one category versus a project in another category and
19 have a limited amount of funds, how you would choose
20 between the two.

21 S. SHEEHY: Through this collaboration, we would
22 look at the drivers of the investment, the outcomes
23 of the investment, and the management team would, you
24 know, essentially provide our judgment to which
25 investments tackle the primary drivers within our
26 rate application. So it is a collaborative effort.

27 It is an iterative effort as a management team
28 to assess, you know, the prudence of our needs, the

1 drivers, and to make sure that we have the right
2 outcomes and the right investments targeting those
3 outcomes.

4 J. SCOTT: Okay. In that same -- actually, in
5 the next IR, we asked for a list of the results of
6 the prioritization process, and we were referred to
7 2-Staff-41, which you don't have to pull up, but
8 there -- no list was provided, but it did state that
9 the prioritization of 2027 projects has not been done
10 yet.

11 So we are almost halfway through the year before
12 2027. Has any of the prioritization been done for
13 the projects for 2027?

14 If you want to pull up, yeah, maybe 2-Staff-41,
15 that might -- it gives -- that is where... If you go
16 down. Yeah:

17 "The project scopes for 2027 execution are
18 still in development, along with the
19 corresponding prioritization." (as read)

20 S. SHEEHY: At the time of this IR response, it
21 is correct that our 2027 scopes and onwards were
22 still in development; however, at this time, yes, we
23 do have a significant number of scopes that have been
24 created with the associated prioritization scores for
25 2027.

26 J. SCOTT: Can you undertake to provide what you
27 have to us?

28 S. SHEEHY: Yeah, what I would say, there is a

1 significant volume of scopes and associated
2 prioritization scores, but we would need to assess
3 what we could share.

4 J. SCOTT: The primary interest is in the
5 prioritization score and sort of the details of the
6 score. From my understanding, the project scope
7 document is very similar to the sort of material
8 narrative that has already been provided. Am I
9 correct in that, in saying that?

10 S. SHEEHY: Yes. The scope document is the
11 segue into the prioritization score. So we would
12 have the prioritization scores for the scopes we have
13 thus far created.

14 J. SCOTT: Okay. And how -- how do you prepare
15 the 2027 budget if you don't have the prioritization
16 scores of the projects?

17 S. SHEEHY: As we noted in the response to 2B-
18 SEC-46, Part D, so just to give you some clarity on
19 this process, so we -- we balanced the levels of
20 investment -- I will wait until it is pulled up, Part
21 D. If we scroll down to line 1 on page 3.

22 So we -- we balanced it within the individual
23 investment programs to the predetermined levels that
24 we have set within each of our investment categories
25 and investment programs.

26 What the team does prior to the scope production
27 phase and the prioritization scores, for those
28 programs that go through the scoping process, we do

1 what we consider in the -- in substation growth, we
2 have a pre-prioritization where we identify the
3 substation growth projects using the eight variables
4 within the substation growth process, and then that
5 feeds into the scope production phase here.

6 And in the other system renewal and system
7 service investment categories, we look at the typical
8 inputs, so reliability results, asset condition
9 assessment, typical useful life, et cetera, and we
10 shortlist investment projects to then funnel into the
11 scope production phase which then produces a scope
12 prioritization score.

13 So we have line of sight into each of the
14 investment programs prioritizing assets within each
15 of those for replacement, and then we work to that
16 predetermined level of investment.

17 J. SCOTT: Okay. So maybe just so I -- I will
18 repeat it back, that I understand it. So the level
19 of investment in each of the categories is sort of
20 set first; is that correct?

21 And then you get a bucket of projects that you
22 would like to do, and it is not until sort of this
23 stage of the process do you see if you can do all of
24 those projects within that level of investment, and,
25 if not, you have got a prioritization list at that
26 point?

27 S. SHEEHY: Yes. The only -- the only
28 difference I would say within that is within

1 substation growth, which has discrete projects that
2 are prioritized over the '27 to 2031 period; however,
3 within programs such as underground system renewal,
4 overhead system renewal, we know the amount of
5 funding within each of the program years, but we
6 prioritize projects typically a year in advance
7 within each of those execution years, which then
8 feeds into that prioritization process.

9 J. SCOTT: Okay. So I was going to ask you
10 about the substation renewal, and you mentioned that,
11 that it is a different method of prioritization, you
12 called it a pre-prioritization process, than the one
13 that is -- the document that is attached to this 2B-
14 SEC-46; is that correct?

15 So in 2B-SEC-61 and 2-Staff-55, you have given
16 us a list of priority scores for the substation
17 renewals. So they are done in a -- from what I
18 understand, a different methodology than how you
19 would do system service and system renewal projects
20 prioritization.

21 S. SHEEHY: Just to clarify, so the subrenewal
22 project prioritization is -- has its own standalone
23 project prioritization than that. Those results then
24 feed into this scope process and prioritization
25 score. So it is a precursor, I would say, for the
26 substation growth. But ultimately, those investments
27 in projects would funnel into the same scope and
28 project prioritization process.

1 J. SCOTT: Okay. So if the capital budget needs
2 to be cut back for whatever reason, how would -- how
3 would you go about deciding which projects would be
4 deferred or eliminated if required? Like, would it
5 be within each category, then?

6 S. SHEEHY: What I would say to that is we would
7 have to assess each change, whether it is a cut or an
8 addition, on a case-by-case basis, and we would
9 collaborate cross functionally and prioritize which
10 investments to either cut or include using inputs
11 such as the prioritization matrix.

12 J. SCOTT: Okay. So just to confirm, we did get
13 an undertaking number for the prioritization and the
14 scope documents that have been produced for 2027 so
15 far; is that correct?

16 D. COBAN: I don't believe we marked that.

17 J. SCOTT: Yeah. I don't -- that is why I don't
18 remember hearing one.

19 T. HOBBS: No, we haven't. But I am not sure
20 about the response to the undertaking.

21 D. COBAN: Do you want to clarify the
22 undertaking, Mr. Sheehy, your understanding of it?

23 Can you clarify the undertaking, your
24 understanding of it?

25 S. SHEEHY: Yeah. Just so I am clear, so the
26 undertaking is to produce the associated
27 prioritization results for each of the projects that
28 have been published thus far for the 2027 period and

1 the corresponding math on how those scores were
2 derived.

3 J. SCOTT: Yes. I am not sure what you mean by
4 "published" or that you have produced, that you have
5 --

6 S. SHEEHY: Yes. We can undertake to publish
7 the prioritization scores for the projects that have
8 thus been created with our 2027 plan.

9 T. HOBBS: Okay. That will be JT-1.13.

10 J. SCOTT: Thank you.

11 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.13: Produce the associated**
12 **prioritization results for each of the projects**
13 **that have been published thus far for the 2027**
14 **period and the corresponding math on how those**
15 **scores were derived**

16 J. SCOTT: So if we can move on to one of the
17 outcomes, that being the restoring reliability to
18 historic levels. And 1-SEC-9 asked about the
19 definition of that, and I think the best one we were
20 referred to was 4.1-PWU-13.

21 So Table 3, I think, is the -- shows the target
22 for SAIDI at the end of 2031 based on the average of
23 '21 to '25; is that correct?

24 S. SHEEHY: So for the SAIDI target at the end
25 of 2031, it was based on the five-year average from
26 2021 to 2025, 1.60. And then there is a mathematical
27 formula following the OEB RPQR formula to get to
28 those ranges by the end of 2031.

1 So in the evidence, we have percentage
2 improvement factors for SAIDI that range between 0.25
3 to 0.5 percent. So that is why there is a range of
4 outcomes. So there is -- it uses the five-year
5 average, but there is a mathematical formula to get
6 to the end of 2031, which is explained in the
7 evidence.

8 J. SCOTT: Mm-hmm. And that is to determine
9 whether you have met that target is by looking at the
10 five-year average of '27 to '31; is that correct?

11 S. SHEEHY: If I could refer us to Exhibit 2B,
12 Tab 2, Schedule 2. And if we could go to page 10,
13 please. I thought it would be helpful to show this
14 here because, yes, the five-year average -- it has
15 been updated since this pre-filed evidence -- it
16 would be used as the baseline for the 2027 SAIDI
17 target. And then the performance improvement targets
18 would be applied from years '28 to '31. And the
19 values in 2031 would be the -- or correspond to the
20 targets that we have set for the end of 2031.

21 J. SCOTT: So, sorry, so say that again. So for
22 2027, as you say, it has been updated, but the target
23 for 2027, then, would be based on the new update in
24 the IR, would be the 1.6 or -- sorry.

25 S. SHEEHY: Yes. It is 1.60, which is the
26 updated version. That value would be placed in 2027,
27 and then the performance improvement targets would be
28 applied from years '28 -- sequentially from years

1 2028 to 2031.

2 J. SCOTT: Okay. Just subject -- you might
3 check -- I get 1.59 when I average it in 4.1-PWU-13,
4 but I will leave that with you.

5 So when I look at the five-year averages, it
6 would appear that SAIDI is more of a problem than
7 SAIFI, looking at three of the five values in -- for
8 SAIDI are above the five-year average versus just one
9 for SAIFI. Would you agree with that?

10 S. SHEEHY: If we could go back to 4.1-PWU-13.
11 And if we could go specifically to page 2, I would
12 like to look at the SAIDI chart first on page 2, and
13 then the SAIFI chart on page 3.

14 I wouldn't agree with the characterization that
15 SAIDI is more of a problem. If we look at this chart
16 here, we can see the SAIDI impact increasing over
17 time. If we scroll to the next page and look at the
18 graph for SAIFI, we also see a similar upwards
19 trajectory on SAIFI, especially over the last three
20 years. So I characterize both as a challenge for
21 Elexicon, not necessarily one more than the other.

22 J. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you. Maybe I will move
23 on to another area. Let's see. As I said, some of
24 my questions were handled by Mr. Gluck.

25 Can we look at 2B-SEC-49. And actually, if we
26 could call up the spreadsheet. This asked for the
27 capacity rating and the actual loading for stations,
28 and Elexicon provided a spreadsheet. Okay.

1 So maybe you can explain to me just how I am to
2 read this. I don't know if we can get it all in. My
3 understanding is Columns C to N are the capacity of
4 the station 20 -- and then Column O2Z is the
5 forecast. And then the final columns, AA, this is
6 whether you -- it is limited, acceptable.

7 Can we look at Edgehill station on here. I
8 would have to -- so if I look at Edgehill in 2025,
9 the capacity, this implies -- is 21,336, but
10 something is happening, obviously, in 2028 that the
11 capacity is going to increase.

12 But when I look at the loading, for instance, in
13 2025 -- well, even if we look at 2020, it says
14 "limited capacity less than 1,000." Can you -- I
15 would have thought that in 2020, Edgehill was
16 acceptable loading. Maybe you can explain that to
17 me.

18 U. KHAN: I would just like to explain the
19 methodology of how the acceptable, limited, and
20 moderate capacities are identified in Columns AA to
21 AE and onwards. This capacity not only looks at the
22 load versus capacity of just the municipal station,
23 but it also looks at upstream constraints that may
24 occur, so the TS feeder that would supply the station
25 as well as the transformer station LTR that the TS
26 feeder comes out of.

27 And so in the case of Edgehill, in the historic
28 periods, the TS feeder is constrained, and while

1 there may be capacity available at the municipal
2 station, you can't actually connect additional load
3 to that station because upstream, the 44 kV feeder is
4 constrained.

5 J. SCOTT: Okay. But that -- this spreadsheet
6 doesn't really tell us that. I mean, it tells us
7 something is limited, but it doesn't tell us what is
8 limited; is that correct?

9 U. KHAN: The specific constraint, constraining
10 asset, has not been identified in this table.

11 J. SCOTT: Okay.

12 Now, this question -- this question and previous
13 questions when Mr. Gluck was asking about -- about
14 the capacity spending, you often refer to this 76
15 percent of municipal stations across Elexicon's
16 system have less than 1,000 kVA of available
17 capacity.

18 Is that one of your planning criteria, that when
19 a station is less than 1,000 kVA, something needs to
20 be done?

21 U. KHAN: So Elexicon does track the load --
22 loading of stations against the capacity of those
23 stations and also provides that data to the OEB by
24 way of the capacity map that is produced.

25 In terms of the investments that are then
26 allocated, for example, in a substation growth
27 program, Elexicon assesses the capacity of the
28 existing stations against a load that is

1 materializing. And much of the investments, as I
2 have mentioned previously, are to address the
3 existing capacity constraints that are at those
4 stations, and the stations in the subgrowth narrative
5 fall within the 0 to 1,000 kVA range.

6 J. SCOTT: But if we wanted to see a listing of
7 what was the constraint that was necessitating the
8 project, it would have to be a -- another
9 spreadsheet, would it not, that -- and I am -- so I
10 am thinking of -- and you did look at, with Mr.
11 Gluck, the table of the 4 kV transmission stations
12 that were requiring -- were overloaded and -- and --
13 and are in -- I don't know what you call it -- a
14 grouping that were requiring the new station to be --
15 the GTA station.

16 And if we want, we can go to 2B-4-3, Appendix I,
17 Table 4. You had it up earlier. Yes, there. So I
18 am trying to relate this information to the table
19 that we were looking at previously. Maybe you can
20 help me on that.

21 U. KHAN: If I understand correctly, you are
22 looking to understand the different points where
23 constraints may occur within the system, and I think
24 a good place that I could refer you to is Exhibit 2B,
25 Tab 3, Schedule 2, page 50.

26 And maybe before we go to page 50, if we could
27 go to page 47. So on this -- on this page, Figure 23
28 just depicts the municipal substations and where they

1 fall within the overall system, and the TS feeders
2 that supply the municipal station could be
3 constrained. The transformer substation that
4 supplies the municipal substation could be
5 constrained, which would also then constrain the
6 municipal substation.

7 And, therefore, we look at a variety of relief
8 options, such as in our program, we have got relief
9 options for the station supply capacity, the
10 transformer station, which would be the GTA East TS.
11 And we have also got options to relieve capacity on
12 the -- what is depicted here, the distribution system
13 capacity, which would be by building new and
14 upgrading municipal substations.

15 And so if -- if we actually scroll down, there
16 are additional tables within page 50 and onwards that
17 also depict the remaining capacity of both the
18 transformer stations and also the TS feeders. And
19 these TS feeders on the 44 kV then supply the
20 municipal substations.

21 And so there are a variety of conditions.
22 Sometimes it is the TS -- the transformer station
23 that is limiting downstream constraints, and
24 sometimes it is the municipal station transformer.
25 And so we assess what the driving constraint is and
26 address it accordingly.

27 J. SCOTT: Mm-hmm. I guess I still go back to
28 that, but that spreadsheet doesn't tell me that, so

1 it is -- it is -- is it possible to provide for that
2 list of stations, if we go back to -- maybe if -- if
3 there is a -- well, I guess a couple of things; one
4 is -- and I am not sure how you can show it -- is the
5 -- the idea of, you know, sort of your N minus one
6 contingency and things like that, how do you show
7 that kind of -- some of these are constrained because
8 they -- under another station going out, they can't
9 take the full load, so showing -- somehow for each of
10 these stations, showing what the constraint is?

11 U. KHAN: If I understand that correctly, you
12 are looking to assess, for the municipal stations
13 within this list, if there are upstream constraints
14 that exist as of today, additional to any constraints
15 that may exist at the municipal station level?

16 J. SCOTT: Yes. But also what -- because a
17 limit -- if I understand this table correctly,
18 limited capacity does not tell me that -- that
19 something needs to be done immediately. I mean, you
20 -- maybe -- you would operate -- you could operate a
21 station with a limited capacity for a period of time
22 without a problem; is that correct?

23 S. SADEGHI: We would like to confer as a panel,
24 please.

25 U. KHAN: I don't necessarily agree with -- with
26 your view on limited -- limited capacity at stations
27 wouldn't be a problem. What I would say is that
28 implications do exist operationally under

1 contingency, but also to connect additional customers
2 -- to connect customers over one MVA would be a
3 concern for the stations that have limited capacity.

4 And the second point I would like to mention is
5 that in the instances where you are addressing
6 upstream capacity constraints, for example, we talked
7 about the Ajax, Pickering, and Whitby area, the 44 kV
8 system where we are addressing that by building a new
9 transformer station by 2031. The MSs that are on --
10 the municipal stations that are on the 44 kV would
11 remain constrained up until the relief is provided
12 upstream.

13 So you are operating in a situation where you
14 have limited capacity at these stations and there are
15 operational constraints and also constraints on
16 ability to connect large-load customers at the MSs.
17 But the relief that would be provided is at the 44 kV
18 level, which would be addressed by building the new
19 transformer station.

20 J. SCOTT: So maybe my last question on this:
21 So what I heard from you is that if a station is in
22 this limited capacity characterization because it is
23 less than -- it is 0 to 1,000 kVA because they may
24 not be able to attach -- to connect a -- obviously, a
25 customer over 1,000 or a larger customer, that is
26 considered a -- I don't want to say -- an issue that
27 needs to be addressed?

28 U. KHAN: That is correct. When you do have

1 limited capacity, operational constraints may occur
2 as well as limited ability to connect new customers
3 from that specific municipal station, and we would be
4 looking at options to address those limitations.

5 J. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you.

6 If I could move on to some --

7 T. HOBBINS: Sorry. Just to clarify, Ms. Scott,
8 are you seeking an undertaking in respect of this
9 information?

10 J. SCOTT: Well, no. No.

11 T. HOBBINS: Okay. Thank you.

12 J. SCOTT: System -- for the questions on the
13 system control centre cost, and you talked to Mr.
14 Gluck about this, but if we -- maybe the best one is
15 to pull up the CCC-71, 10-CCC-71, and the attachment.
16 I had some further questions on that. And if you go
17 down to Slide 4, which was the current state. Yes,
18 there.

19 So in 10-SEC-102, we had asked about the 2025
20 actuals, and the response was that the -- it was --
21 2.75 million was the spending in 2025 on the system
22 control centre. And if we need to see that, but we
23 don't have to go to it, it is -- Table 1 in this IR
24 breaks it down. Is that 2.75 based on this current
25 state -- or based on the 2025 current state that is
26 shown here with the five vacancies?

27 S. SADEGHI: The 2.75 million that is referenced
28 in SEC-103 pertains to 2025 actuals. What you

1 referenced on page 4 is based on the current state
2 noted at the time of compiling this presentation,
3 which dates to February 17th, 2026. So there is a
4 difference between the 2.75 million for 2025 and the
5 current state that is reflected in page 4.

6 J. SCOTT: So had you -- and it sort of leads
7 into my next question, which was what is the status
8 of the 2026 hiring? So between the end of '25 and
9 when you prepared this report, had you done some
10 hiring?

11 Maybe I could just ask for an undertaking where
12 you could update on what positions have been hired
13 for the system control centre.

14 S. SADEGHI: I can answer that question. As of
15 right now, none of the positions have been formally
16 filled. We have made significant progress with
17 respect to posting the positions and going through
18 the screening process. But as of today, I am not
19 aware of any of the positions having been filled.

20 J. SCOTT: Okay.

21 I just -- there is one on the updated version of
22 4-Staff-103 which lists all the positions, and it
23 did, for the system control centre, show, I guess,
24 what I -- what I hadn't seen before was an emergency
25 management specialist, which was not -- did not
26 appear to be referenced in -- the next page, yeah, if
27 you keep going down. Yeah. So, yes, that was what
28 was added in the update.

1 So is that an additional position for the system
2 control centre, or is -- one of the other positions
3 has been turned into that position or...

4 S. SADEGHI: The emergency management specialist
5 position that's noted on this table is not a part of
6 the control centre evidence update that took place,
7 meaning that position was already part of our head
8 count plan prior to the update for the control
9 centre.

10 J. SCOTT: But it is a new position, is it?

11 S. SADEGHI: When you say "new," are you
12 referring to -- to compared to '24, '25 period?

13 J. SCOTT: '25.

14 S. SADEGHI: The emergency management specialist
15 position was introduced, subject to check, early
16 2025.

17 J. SCOTT: So the fact it is on -- it is showing
18 in 4-Staff-103 in 2026 means it hasn't been -- how do
19 I interpret that, then -- then? The -- we -- it was
20 shown in 2024, so this is an additional position?
21 The -- in 4-Staff-102, emergency management
22 specialist, one position, as I understand these
23 tables, was added in 2024. So a second position is
24 being added in 2026?

25 S. SADEGHI: We will take that as an
26 undertaking.

27 J. SCOTT: Thank you.

28 T. HOBBS: That will be Undertaking JT-1.14.

1 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.14: ADVISE WHETHER A SECOND**
2 **EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST POSITION IS**
3 **BEING ADDED IN 2026**

4 J. SCOTT: Part I of 10-CCC-71 talked about the
5 use of dispatchers and that Toronto and Alectra use
6 dispatchers. Does Elexicon have any further details
7 from Toronto and Alectra regarding number of staff in
8 the control room and the amount of capital budget,
9 number of field crews, that sort of information?

10 S. SADEGHI: Just to clarify, the question was
11 does Elexicon have any information from Toronto Hydro
12 and Alectra with respect to the number of field crews
13 and dispatchers and other positions?

14 J. SCOTT: Well, it appears when you did your
15 review that you did look at other utilities, and the
16 fact that they had dispatchers affected, maybe, your
17 plan. Did you also look at, you know, number of
18 operators, how many crews they -- they were able to
19 support, things like that?

20 S. SADEGHI: Yes. We did look at information
21 such as the number of qualified operators,
22 apprentices, and dispatchers that Toronto Hydro and
23 Alectra have in their control centre.

24 J. SCOTT: Could you provide us with that
25 information?

26 S. SADEGHI: The ones that are publicly
27 available, yes, we will.

28 T. HOBBINS: That would be Undertaking JT-1.15.

1 UNDERTAKING JT-1.15: PROVIDE ANY INFORMATION
2 REGARDING THE NUMBER OF QUALIFIED OPERATORS,
3 APPRENTICES, AND DISPATCHERS THAT TORONTO HYDRO
4 AND ALECTRA HAVE IN THEIR CONTROL CENTRE

5 J. SCOTT: Okay.

6 And my last -- just my last question. 4-Staff-
7 108 shows the overtime for the system control centre.
8 Yes, that. Can you explain the increases in '27 to
9 2031?

10 With this plan, I guess I would have expected to
11 see a reduction in overtime.

12 S. SADEGHI: I would like to take you to Exhibit
13 10, Tab 2, Schedule 1, page 7 of 15, Figure 1. Thank
14 you. As noted in line 7 and 8, you will notice that
15 the apprentices that we hire have very limited
16 clearance to perform critical control centre
17 functions until such time that they reach their Level
18 4 or Level 5, which typically happens after being an
19 apprentice for four to five years. And as a result
20 of that, we will continue to see overtime hours being
21 incurred during the apprenticeship period.

22 So despite the fact that we are hiring
23 additional apprentices, they are not really able to
24 perform any of the critical functions in a control
25 room until such time that they reach Level 4 and 5,
26 hence you will see the continuation of overtime until
27 such time that the apprentices would have graduated.

28 J. SCOTT: And is -- is all of the overtime

1 related to system operators/apprentices versus the
2 other positions that you have there?

3 S. SADEGHI: The vast majority of overtime is
4 due to apprentices and the qualified system
5 operators.

6 J. SCOTT: Okay. Thank you.

7 I think I will stop there. I don't know if you
8 want SEC to finish or...

9 M. RUBENSTEIN: I'd say I have about 10, 15
10 minutes of questions so --

11 J. SCOTT: Yeah.

12 D. COBAN: I think we should break for lunch
13 now. We have been going for about an hour and 45.

14 T. HOBBINS: Okay. We will take the lunch
15 break. We will return at 2:00.

16 --- Upon recessing at 1:03 p.m.

17 --- Upon resuming at 1:59 p.m.

18 T. HOBBINS: I think we are ready to resume. So
19 it will be CCC continuing -- or, sorry, that is not
20 correct, SEC continuing.

21 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY M. RUBENSTEIN (SEC)**

22 M. RUBENSTEIN: Good afternoon, Panel. I just
23 have a few questions. So maybe we can start at 1-PP-
24 16. And in this question, you were asked about the
25 reliability targets. And at line 23, you say:

26 "Elexicon considered the OEB's reliability and
27 power quality review annual performance targets
28 and selected annual performance targets that

1 meet or exceeded the annual reliability
2 benchmarking targets established for Elexicon
3 within its peer group."

4 Do you see that?

5 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct.

6 M. RUBENSTEIN: Are you able to provide the
7 OEB's targets based on the reliability performance
8 targets for each year through 2031? And the
9 calculations? Is that something you can do?

10 S. SHEEHY: To clarify, I would need to confirm
11 exactly the OEB's RPQR targets and how far forward
12 they go. I would need to assess that and determine
13 the appropriate response.

14 M. RUBENSTEIN: Sure.

15 T. HOBBINS: So that will be Undertaking JT-
16 1.16.

17 M. RUBENSTEIN: Thanks.

18 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.16: Provide the OEB's targets**
19 **based on the reliability performance targets for**
20 **each year through 2031 and the calculations**

21 M. RUBENSTEIN: Can we go to 2B-SEC-46 and
22 Attachment A. In this attachment, you provide your
23 prioritization process methodology document. And in
24 Attachment A to the Attachment A, there is a -- it
25 shows the full calculations, and I just want to make
26 sure I walk through and make sure I understand how
27 this -- how it works.

28 And as I understand, this is applied for the

1 system service and system renewal projects; correct?

2 S. SHEEHY: To clarify, system access are also
3 through this. They are just given a mandatory score
4 for prioritization as well.

5 M. RUBENSTEIN: And so the scoring doesn't apply
6 to them? They are just -- so then for the purposes
7 of setting a score to prioritize, it would only be
8 system service and system renewal; correct.

9 S. SHEEHY: That is correct.

10 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. And as I understand the
11 projects that are then subject to the prioritization
12 scoring system, there is -- they are given a
13 criticality score, which is the impact score
14 multiplied by the probability assessment?

15 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct. That is shown
16 further down in this process document, but that is
17 correct.

18 M. RUBENSTEIN: And the impact score is a sum of
19 financial score, reliability score, environmental
20 score, and safety score?

21 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct.

22 M. RUBENSTEIN: And those scores have different
23 weights based on the category, and the table shows
24 that, that is on the screen; correct?

25 S. SHEEHY: That is correct, yes.

26 M. RUBENSTEIN: And now if we go to page 3, so
27 if we scroll down to the -- I think it is the next
28 page. Yes. We see, for example, financial score, it

1 lays out the various categories of financial scores;
2 correct?

3 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct.

4 M. RUBENSTEIN: And it is based on project cost;
5 do I have that right?

6 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct.

7 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. So where it says "project
8 cost with a total value greater," it just means the
9 project costs are greater?

10 S. SHEEHY: Yes, the protect cost in the notes
11 there. So the material, labour, and contingency for
12 that project, so the project cost.

13 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. And so then how I would
14 understand this to work is if all else being equal in
15 all other categories and all other factors, the
16 project with a higher cost has a higher impact score;
17 do I have that right?

18 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct.

19 M. RUBENSTEIN: And so a project that has the
20 same reliability score, the same environmental score,
21 the same safety score, the same -- which -- and
22 ultimately, then, the same probability score, if it
23 is a higher project cost and is in a different
24 category, it would have a higher criticality score
25 and thus be prioritized higher; correct?

26 S. SHEEHY: Yes. The output of that would be a
27 higher criticality score.

28 M. RUBENSTEIN: Can you help me understand why

1 that -- why that would be -- why your prioritization
2 system is designed that way?

3 S. SHEEHY: One of the rationales being that the
4 greater the financial cost of a project, the greater
5 number of assets that are included within it, so a
6 greater overall scope within that project.

7 M. RUBENSTEIN: That is the reason? That is the
8 reason why you are ranking financial score in this
9 way? It just represents there would be -- just be,
10 generally speaking, more assets?

11 S. SHEEHY: Yes, yes.

12 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.

13 And then as I understand, for the probability
14 assessment, it is really -- you know, it is
15 calculated by -- it is using the health index score;
16 correct? 1 minus the health index would be the
17 probability?

18 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct. Probability
19 assessment is 1 minus the health index score.

20 M. RUBENSTEIN: And that is done by the -- and
21 as I understand the -- it is the average health index
22 of the assets that are being replaced?

23 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct.

24 M. RUBENSTEIN: And how does that work for, say,
25 system service where you may not be replacing an
26 asset? A new asset or expansion of an asset or
27 something like that?

28 S. SHEEHY: Subject to check, I need to pull up

1 a system service example, but it depends on the
2 nature of the assets being replaced or addressed
3 within those -- within that project. But I would
4 need to confirm that within the system service
5 example.

6 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. So it is an undertaking,
7 then, I guess.

8 S. SHEEHY: So to be clear, the undertaking is
9 to clarify the impact of the probability assessment
10 and the health index on system service projects?

11 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yes. And specifically, I am
12 interested in where you are not replacing an asset
13 that is -- where you are expanding an asset or you
14 are building something new or something that fits
15 under that. It is not clear to me what the -- how
16 you are measuring the probability.

17 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is fair.

18 T. HOBBINS: Okay. That will be Undertaking JT-
19 1.17.

20 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.17: Clarify the impact of the**
21 **probability assessment and the health index on**
22 **system service projects IN CASES WHERE an asset**
23 **is not being replaced**

24 M. RUBENSTEIN: And I understand from the
25 discussions you had earlier on this issue -- let's
26 use 2026 as an example because the year is in flight.
27 In advance of the year, you will determine based on
28 all the various potential projects, you will -- that

1 you will essentially complete the analysis required
2 for each -- to get a criticality score, and then
3 essentially rank the projects; do I have that right?

4 S. SHEEHY: I would characterize the criticality
5 store as one variable in the decision-making process.
6 There would be others in terms of operational impact
7 and resource utilization, things like that. It is
8 not the only variable we use within a decision-making
9 process.

10 But once we have a criticality score for a
11 project, it does give us line of sight in terms of,
12 all things being equal, one project's criticality
13 score versus another. But there are other
14 considerations that go with this.

15 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Before we get to the
16 other considerations, just focus on your -- you get
17 the criticality score for all the various potential
18 projects; correct? Is that Step 1?

19 S. SHEEHY: Yes. All projects that go through
20 this scoping phase will then have an associated
21 criticality score that we would then leverage to make
22 decisions with.

23 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. And so you have a list of
24 projects, I think system access is automatic, and
25 then you have scores for the system renewal and
26 system service. And I assume, then, based on the
27 budget envelope, there is sort of a cutoff point to
28 some degree; correct?

1 At that first stage, you are taking those that
2 are at the higher scores; is that correct? Is that
3 how it works?

4 S. SHEEHY: Again, I would say it depends. Yes,
5 we would leverage the criticality score, but there is
6 also other considerations with the project that we
7 would look at in terms of where it is in our service
8 territory, resource utilization. It is certainly a
9 variable that we would leverage. It is not the only
10 variable.

11 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Well, let's use 2026 as
12 an example because you would have obviously done this
13 for 2026; correct?

14 And so does it start with a list, and then you
15 make adjustments after? Does it start with the list
16 that I am talking about, sort of a -- I am thinking
17 about a ranked list based on criticality score, and
18 then you are making adjustments afterwards? How does
19 this actually work in practice?

20 S. SHEEHY: Yes, so using 2026 as an example, we
21 would have the prioritization scores associated with
22 all of our projects. We would then use that to help
23 make decisions on what is in, what is out.

24 If -- in your scenario, if we only had a certain
25 ceiling that we could hit, all things being equal, if
26 two projects had different prioritization scores, we
27 would leverage that information to make decisions.

28 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, my -- is there a ceiling?

1 Is there a point -- or I don't know if -- it is not a
2 ceiling, but is there a budget cutoff where you have
3 to say certain projects, we can't do this year, even
4 though we have a criticality score? There is --
5 like, you have done a criticality assessment of it?

6 S. SHEEHY: As part of our execution work
7 program, we would have budgets assigned with each of
8 our investment programs. The planning team may push
9 more scopes through that process to, you know, have
10 more work available in case we need to execute, you
11 know, should something arise on a project.

12 But we work to a defined and prescribe budget
13 within our various investment categories and
14 programs, and we leverage the prioritization then to
15 help make decisions.

16 M. RUBENSTEIN: So for 2026, for example, you
17 start off with a -- I am calling it sort of a ranking
18 of projects by criticality score. Is there a point
19 where the budget is less than -- is the budget less
20 than the total cost of all the projects that you
21 scored?

22 S. SHEEHY: What happens in practice is the
23 planning team looks at the assigned budget, and we
24 look to scope out the work that is roughly required
25 to meet that budget. We would not want to
26 overproduce scope packages. You know, things could
27 change and -- you know, down the road. But we work
28 to the budget that is assigned.

1 And before the prioritization scores are
2 produced, we are also looking at our -- certain
3 variables like asset condition, typical useful life,
4 reliability information, and shortlisting the work
5 that even goes into the prioritization process in the
6 first place.

7 M. RUBENSTEIN: So is the answer yes or no? I
8 am -- is the list of project -- if you are looking at
9 the list of projects for 2026 that went through this
10 process, is the total budget of that more than the
11 envelope that you were given?

12 Are there projects at that point you say, okay,
13 we can't do them because, you know, for whatever
14 reason, we don't have the budget even though we have
15 a score for them.

16 S. SHEEHY: I would need to confirm exactly what
17 was put in versus the total budget, but it would be
18 at least at the budget level.

19 M. RUBENSTEIN: I understand it would be at
20 least. My question is actually is the list longer,
21 and so you are prioritizing in and out, essentially,
22 in that year?

23 S. SHEEHY: It would be longer. I couldn't give
24 you the exact magnitude of the length, but it would
25 be longer than the budget.

26 M. RUBENSTEIN: Okay. Well, this is what I am
27 going to ask you to do by way of undertaking. I
28 would like you to produce the 2026 list of projects

1 and the criticality scores and the inputs to the
2 criticality scores, and then let us know -- and the
3 project cost -- I guess that would flow into the
4 financial component -- and let us know which projects
5 are in and out. Is that something you can do?

6 S. SHEEHY: So just so I am clear on the
7 undertaking.

8 M. RUBENSTEIN: Sure.

9 S. SHEEHY: It is to, for the 2026 projects,
10 have the criticality scores, the project costs, and
11 indicate if the projects are in or out of the 2026
12 program?

13 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah. And for the criticality
14 score, all -- the math for all of it. So each of the
15 financial score, the safety score, environmental
16 score, reliability score, the health index,
17 essentially, the numerical inputs to it.

18 S. SHEEHY: All the variables that went into the
19 score?

20 M. RUBENSTEIN: Yeah.

21 S. SHEEHY: Yes.

22 M. RUBENSTEIN: Is that something you can do?
23 Thank you.

24 S. SHEEHY: Yes.

25 T. HOBBINS: Okay. That will be Undertaking JT-
26 1.18.

27 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.18: Produce the 2026 list of**
28 **projects with their criticality scores and the**

1 **inputs to those criticality scores, and advise**
2 **which projects are in and which are out of the**
3 **2026 program**

4 M. RUBENSTEIN: And you mentioned we may have
5 this list, but things -- we are going to make -- this
6 is my words -- you know, we make adjustments, and you
7 talked about that there may be resource constraints
8 where you may do a project that has a different --
9 you know, a lower -- I am saying a lower criticality
10 score.

11 Now, you mentioned some others. I think -- can
12 you -- I think you mentioned where in the service
13 territory it is. Can you just -- what are the other
14 factors that may -- that impacts?

15 S. SHEEHY: Subject to check, you know, based on
16 my knowledge, the other factors that I was referring
17 to are we are a non-contiguous service territory in
18 Elexicon, so we have crews disbursed across different
19 work centres. So we look at the project mix that are
20 going to those work centres and those resources and
21 are prioritizing appropriately for them.

22 And that is what I was referring to, the
23 resource utilization side of things for that, is, you
24 know, making sure that our lists that we are putting
25 into the work program is tackling the highest risks
26 that we have across our entire service territory. So
27 we look at more variables than just what is going
28 into the criticality score. We are looking beyond

1 that as well.

2 M. RUBENSTEIN: That is the question beyond it.
3 So I understand the labour constraints or the
4 resource constraints if you only have so many people
5 and -- because of your non-continuous area to do the
6 work. So I understand that one. Is that the only
7 one?

8 S. SHEEHY: Some other examples I would give
9 would be some project-level dependencies that may
10 take place. So a voltage conversion, for example, on
11 the distribution side would be coordinated with the
12 work on the substation side. So there could be
13 project interdependencies that take place that are
14 another driver of this.

15 M. RUBENSTEIN: All right. Fair enough.

16 Can I ask you now to go to 2B-SEC-51. And in
17 the interrogatory, we asked you to provide a revised
18 table of -- revised version of Table 4 -- this is an
19 asset condition assessment table -- removing 8 as a
20 condition parameter.

21 Do you see that? That is a question. I am just
22 asking if you see the question to make sure we are on
23 the same page.

24 S. SHEEHY: Yes, I see that.

25 M. RUBENSTEIN: Now, in the response, you talk
26 about why you think service age is in there, and, you
27 know, you provide a table showing -- I think trying
28 to reflect that, in your view, it is not a

1 significant component of most assets. But you didn't
2 actually answer the question.

3 Are you able to provide a revised version of
4 Table 4 in the BBA report, which is the asset
5 condition assessment, that removes age as a condition
6 parameter? So what would your asset condition
7 assessment look like if age was not a parameter; is
8 that something you are able to do?

9 S. SHEEHY: As I noted in the response to A here
10 on the screen, if we could get that up, please, on
11 page 1, so Elexicon's asset condition assessment
12 health index formulation are comprised of many
13 different condition parameters.

14 They each have their own weights, their
15 rankings, their corresponding numerical grades. They
16 have been developed based on industry best practices.
17 And any revisions that we make to this process need
18 to be carefully considered and analyzed prior to
19 implementing.

20 And I believe I did answer your question. In
21 light of this information, Elexicon respectfully
22 submits that the ACA is fit for purpose, and any
23 revisions to any of the condition parameters, whether
24 it's service, age, or other variables, are not
25 required to be evaluated.

26 M. RUBENSTEIN: Well, I mean, that is the
27 company's view. Fair enough. I understand your
28 position. But we would ask that you provide the

1 information as requested.

2 D. COBAN: Our position is that the methodology
3 is sound. And I think, you know, looking to do the
4 analysis that you are asking for, Mr. Rubenstein,
5 would compromise that methodology that we believe is
6 fit for purpose. So we don't think that is an
7 appropriate analysis to undertake.

8 M. RUBENSTEIN: So that's a refusal?

9 D. COBAN: Yes.

10 M. RUBENSTEIN: All right.

11 Can we go to 2B-SEC-56. And in Part C, we
12 asked, for each investment scenario, to provide the
13 2031 ACA asset condition demographics for each asset
14 relevant to the specific program.

15 And if we scroll down to Part C. Actually, you
16 know what, maybe I -- just give me a second. I
17 apologize.

18 You know what, never mind. You did answer the
19 question. I apologize. I can't read my -- I can't
20 read the screen. All right. Thank you very much,
21 Panel. Those are all my questions.

22 T. HOBBINS: Okay. I believe it is VECC up
23 next.

24 M. GARNER: Thank you. I believe actually Mr.
25 Harper is online, and he is going to start if he is
26 online.

27 B. HARPER: Yes, I am. And thank you very much,
28 Mr. Garner.

1 M. GARNER: Thank you.

2 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY B. HARPER (VECC)**

3 B. HARPER: So as Mr. Garner gave, my name is
4 Mr. Harper. I am also a consultant for VECC. And
5 could we start by going to SEC-58. Now, here you set
6 out your forecast of new connections and associated
7 net cost forecast, and I know you had some discussion
8 with Mr. Gluck this morning about this, but there are
9 a few things I would just like to clarify in my own
10 mind.

11 And the first thing is -- is, are the number of
12 new connections you are talking about here, is this
13 just load connections, or does it also include
14 generation connections?

15 S. SHEEHY: If we can scroll to Answer B within
16 this IR, this is to confirm that this includes only
17 the connection costs. There are no net costs
18 associated with the generation component, so it is
19 not in this table.

20 B. HARPER: No, I saw that. But when I read
21 that, it was referring to Tables 12 and 13 in the
22 evidence, and I wasn't too sure if those were the
23 same tables that were the basis for the response in
24 SEC-58. And if you are telling me they are, that is
25 fine.

26 So this response is equally applicable too to
27 the table you provided up in SEC-58, Part A, then?

28 S. SHEEHY: I am sorry. Could you please repeat

1 that question. I am having trouble hearing you.

2 B. HARPER: The response you give here in Part B
3 is talking about the Tables 12 and 13 that were
4 provided in Exhibit B, Tab 4, Schedule 3. It wasn't
5 talking specifically about the table you provided in
6 response to SEC-58, and that is really why I was
7 asking the question was I wanted to make sure that
8 that response which I saw there did also apply to the
9 information you provided in the first part of the
10 response to SEC-58.

11 S. SHEEHY: Yes. To confirm, that also applies
12 to the first part. So this is not factoring in the
13 generation connections.

14 B. HARPER: Okay. Great.

15 Also, in your discussion with Mr. Gluck this
16 morning -- and I believe maybe I misheard you; and,
17 therefore, this is why I am asking -- I believe you
18 indicated that the connections forecast included not
19 only new customer connections, but also service
20 upgrades for existing customers? Did I hear you
21 correct, or did I hear you incorrectly in that?

22 S. SHEEHY: Yes. To confirm, this -- this
23 customer generation connection is inclusive of all
24 service connections, new connections, service
25 upgrades, the capital component of those costs, yes.

26 B. HARPER: Right.

27 And so those counts you have there, let's say
28 the 3,587 for 2027, that would include new customer

1 connections plus, you know, account of expected
2 service upgrades to existing customers, then?

3 S. SHEEHY: Just to clarify, so if we look at
4 this table here, we were forecasting connection costs
5 using new connections as -- to give us line of sight
6 when we look at a new connection cost and the average
7 cost that we experience in the historical period to
8 help us build a forecast budget.

9 So this was specifically looking at new
10 connections only for this to give us an estimated
11 average net cost per connection to help us establish
12 the forward-looking budget.

13 B. HARPER: Right.

14 So if it is -- I am just trying to clarify.
15 When you say "new connections," do you mean a
16 connection of a new customer or whether it also
17 includes service upgrades for existing customers,
18 which, you know, might count as a new connection
19 because -- because it is different than the previous
20 connection, but it is still for an existing customer.
21 That is all I was trying to clarify here as to what
22 these counts that you have got here for each of the
23 years included.

24 And if it is easier for you to go away and sort
25 of respond to this by undertaking, that is fine by
26 me. But I was just wanting to be cured in my own
27 mind as to what we are talking about here when I say
28 each of those numbers in the first row under "new

1 connections."

2 S. SHEEHY: Yes. To confirm, in Table 2, the
3 line item for new connections is for new connections
4 only, not upgrades within that line item.

5 B. HARPER: Okay. Fine. Thank you very much.

6 Now, before we go on to the next one, I would
7 just like to take note and maybe park in the back of
8 your mind the net costs you have down there for 2030
9 and 2031, which were 8.66 and 8.92 respectively.

10 So if you can now go to CCC-21. And scroll down
11 to the -- there should be a table. If you scroll
12 down to the response, there should be a table. Keep
13 scrolling down. Right -- right there. Okay. That
14 is fine, yeah. Table 2 was the -- Table 2 and Table
15 3 was the one I was looking for. Thank you very
16 much.

17 Now, what I was curious about, I assume this was
18 building on the same information that you looked at
19 in SEC-58. And while the difference isn't great,
20 there is a difference, if I look at the total net
21 cost for each of the years, as to what is reported
22 here as opposed to what was reported in SEC-58. And
23 I was wondering if there was any -- any specific
24 reason for that or why the costs were different?

25 S. SHEEHY: Just to clarify for me, so you are
26 looking to understand the delta between --

27 B. HARPER: Well, I was looking at --

28 S. SHEEHY: -- the two tables, the differences?

1 B. HARPER: Let's say if we look at Table 3
2 here, the total net cost for 2031 is 8.97 million.
3 You remember we looked back at the previous table, it
4 was 8.92 million. I know it is a small difference,
5 but I just would have thought it would have been
6 exactly the same numbers.

7 And so I was wondering if there was some
8 specific reason as to why they were different and
9 saying there is a difference in -- for all the years
10 shown here? I mean, it's not a large point, but it
11 just caught out my eye. And as I said, I thought
12 they would be exactly the same number.

13 U. KHAN: Table 3 in CCC-21 is what aligns with
14 the customer connections program. I am not sure what
15 the small difference in the total dollars is, but I
16 do see what you mean here. 8.97 million in 2031 for
17 CCC-21 --

18 B. HARPER: Well, if you don't know off the top
19 of your head, that is fine. I just thought maybe
20 there was some -- some actually concrete reason why
21 there was a difference. But if you don't know, it is
22 only small, and we can -- we can move on. There is
23 no problem. Okay.

24 Now, this just talks about cost. If I was
25 looking for a breakdown between the forecast number
26 of new connections between residential and general
27 service customers, would the year-to-year changes in
28 customer count set out in Table 3 of Exhibit 2B, Tab

1 4, Schedule 3, page 11 be the place -- be the place
2 where I would find those year-to-year connection
3 values?

4 And you can go to that if you want. That was
5 Exhibit 2B, Table 4, Schedule 3, page 11.

6 D. COBAN: Mr. Harper, I didn't catch that
7 reference. Could we have that one more time.

8 B. HARPER: It was Exhibit 2B, Tab 4, Schedule
9 3, page 11.

10 D. COBAN: Thank you.

11 B. HARPER: Go to that page. There should be a
12 Table 3. No. It is not -- it is not in the
13 appendix.

14 U. KHAN: I believe the reference was Exhibit
15 2B, Tab 4, Schedule 3, Appendix B?

16 B. HARPER: No, not Appendix B. Just Schedule
17 3, page 11. Maybe I have got -- I have got the wrong
18 reference here. We will move on. Oh, I am sorry.
19 You are right. It was Appendix B. I apologize.

20 Exhibit 2B, Tab 4, Schedule 3, Appendix B, page
21 11. I apologize. Right. If I was to take the year-
22 over-year changes in, let's say, the residential
23 customers here, that would give me -- that would
24 basically be the -- that change every year, let's
25 say, from 2030 to 2031 will be the number of new
26 residential connections that you're assuming for
27 purposes of your capital spending forecast that
28 you've shown in CCC-21?

1 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct.

2 B. HARPER: Okay. Fine. No, I just wanted to
3 make sure I understood how the numbers all linked
4 together. Thank you very much.

5 So if we can now go to Exhibit 2B, Tab 3,
6 Schedule 1, page 18. Right. Okay. And here, if you
7 just scroll down, it's starting at line 13. Here you
8 list -- you identify the municipal planning documents
9 you relied on for purposes of developing the growth
10 forecast for the residential sector for purposes of
11 your planning forecast.

12 Now, on the next page -- on the next page -- if
13 you scroll to the next page, I believe you list
14 exactly the same municipal planning documents as the
15 one that you used as the sources for your economic
16 growth forecast, again, for purposes of developing
17 your planning forecast; is that correct?

18 U. KHAN: That is correct. Pages 18 and 19 --

19 B. HARPER: Okay. Right.

20 U. KHAN: -- of the --

21 B. HARPER: Now, if we go -- if we go to the --
22 your response to Staff Interrogatory 94, Part A.
23 Scroll down. Here in this table, you were asked for
24 and you list the various planning documents that you
25 used in your revenue forecast -- that was Exhibit 3 -
26 - for purposes of developing your residential growth
27 forecast.

28 And it wasn't clear to me, but I just -- I think

1 it is, but I just wanted you to confirm that the
2 municipal planning documents you refer to here are
3 exactly the same ones as you used for your capacity
4 planning that we talked about earlier from Exhibit
5 2B?

6 U. KHAN: There are slight differences in some
7 of the reports that are used for the revenue forecast
8 and the peak load forecast, and to provide more
9 details on the revenue forecast, Panel 2 would be the
10 better resource.

11 But what I can say is that one of the inputs
12 that is used in the revenue forecast, for example, is
13 the provincial-level finance forecast that are not
14 necessarily used in the peak load forecast --

15 B. HARPER: No, I --

16 U. KHAN: -- in addition, historical customer
17 connections are also used in the revenue forecast
18 that are not used in the peak load forecast.

19 B. HARPER: No, I understand that. I was just
20 referring -- I just wanted -- I understand that the
21 revenue forecast is developed through using a number
22 of multiple different sources. One of those sources
23 was the municipal planning documents and -- because I
24 was wondering whether the municipal planning
25 documents, which is one of the inputs into the
26 revenue forecast, were the municipal planning
27 documents that were used for the purposes of the
28 revenue forecast in Exhibit 3 were the same municipal

1 planning forecasts that you used.

2 And the reason I couldn't match them up is,
3 here, if you will notice, the documents are all
4 identified by a website link, whereas in your Exhibit
5 2B, you list it by the actual title of the planning
6 document. So I wasn't -- I wasn't too sure if it was
7 just different ways of referring to the same
8 document.

9 So I understand the overall process involves a
10 number of inputs on the revenue forecast side. I am
11 just wanting to know if the municipal planning
12 documents used in both cases were exactly the same
13 for the planning and for the revenue.

14 U. KHAN: I would have to verify that.

15 B. HARPER: Okay. Well, maybe as part of the
16 verification, like I said, in your Exhibit 2B, you
17 listed the titles of the documents. If you could, as
18 part of your verification process, give me either the
19 original document or a link to where the original
20 document can be found so that maybe I can then
21 compare it with, you know -- compare it with the
22 links that are here as part of the undertaking, that
23 would be very useful.

24 U. KHAN: Just to confirm, the undertaking is to
25 provide links to the municipal planning documents
26 that are used in the peak load --

27 B. HARPER: Right. And confirm --

28 U. KHAN: -- forecast and compare the sources in

1 the peak load forecast and the revenue forecast.

2 B. HARPER: And confirm whether or not they are
3 the same, yes.

4 U. KHAN: That can be done.

5 B. HARPER: Okay, thank you very much.

6 T. HOBBS: Okay. That will be Undertaking JT-
7 1.19.

8 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.19: Provide links to the**
9 **municipal planning documents that are used in**
10 **the peak load forecast and compare the sources**
11 **in the peak load forecast and the revenue**
12 **forecast to confirm whether or not they are the**
13 **same**

14 B. HARPER: Now, in responding to SEC-68,
15 Elexicon has updated its revenue planning forecast,
16 and in doing so, it used more recent planning
17 documents for both Durham and Belleville.

18 And these are identified, if you notice in this
19 -- if you notice -- and we stay with 64 -- excuse me,
20 if we stay with the response to Staff-94A, you will
21 notice in the table, in a couple of cases for Durham
22 Region and Belleville, there are two references.

23 The first reference being the one that was used
24 in the initial forecast, and the second reference
25 being the one that was used in the update provided in
26 SEC-68.

27 And I was just wondering whether, on the
28 planning side, you have done any work to identify

1 what the implications would be of these newer
2 planning forecasts would have on your capacity
3 planning, either the connections forecast or the
4 overall peak demand forecast, and have you done any
5 investigation into that or not?

6 U. KHAN: We have not directly assessed the
7 impact of updated forecast numbers; however, we do
8 perform sensitivity analysis on the municipal plans
9 that we have access to and that we have used in the
10 peak load forecast, a low, medium, and high scenario
11 that were assessed for the sensitivity for
12 residential and commercial/industrial developments.

13 B. HARPER: And I think you have provided that
14 on the record already, have you not? I think I
15 recall seeing something to that effect. If I am
16 mistaken, you can correct me.

17 U. KHAN: Those details, as well as the
18 scenarios, are described in Exhibit 2B, Tab 3,
19 Schedule 1, page 14 and onwards.

20 B. HARPER: Right, okay. No, I thought I had
21 seen that. Thank you very much.

22 Can we go to Exhibit 2B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, page
23 20. Okay. Starting on this page -- starting at the
24 bottom of this page, you outline the building
25 electrification substations used in your capacity
26 planning forecast, your peak planning forecast.

27 And at page 23, if you scroll down a little bit,
28 you indicate that for planning purposes, you adopted

1 your high scenario for retrofits which assumed
2 residential and commercial/industrial targets from
3 municipal plans for retrofits.

4 For new residential, you assumed 100 percent
5 electrification by 2030. And for new
6 commercial/industrial, you assume the targets
7 available from the municipal energy plans. I think I
8 -- hopefully, I have summarized the assumptions there
9 correctly.

10 Can we turn now to Exhibit 3, Appendix A, page
11 111. Appendix A, page 111. That is -- yeah. If it
12 helps, it is PDF page 124. Scroll down -- that is
13 right. There.

14 In the paragraph underneath the table, you talk
15 about -- there about the electrification assumptions
16 that were used for the revenue forecast for both
17 residential and the GS less than 50 customer classes.

18 Now, I was just wondering, would it be possible
19 for you to outline what the assumptions were in the
20 municipal planning documents were for residential
21 retrofits and how they compare with the assumptions
22 used here in the revenue forecast?

23 And if you want to do that by way of
24 undertaking, that is fine by me. Or if you can do it
25 right now, that would be fine as well.

26 U. KHAN: If I could point you to IR response 3-
27 BOMA-2.

28 B. HARPER: Okay.

1 U. KHAN: If you could go to page number 5,
2 Table 5. So Table 5 here compares the electric
3 heating customer additions in the revenue load
4 forecast, Exhibit 3, compared to the peak load
5 forecast for the residential customers.

6 As noted in the paragraph below that, there are
7 key differences between the peak load forecast and
8 the revenue forecast as it relates to electric
9 heating penetration. The peak load forecast, as you
10 outlined, over time aligns with electrification
11 targets whereas the revenue load forecast is more
12 sensitive to realized customer behaviour.

13 B. HARPER: Okay. Now, this is the comparison
14 of electric heating for the residential class. Was
15 there a similar comparison provided for the general
16 service classes?

17 U. KHAN: There was not. As explained in -- if
18 you go to the next page, there is a key difference in
19 the way electric heating load is calculated for
20 commercial customers.

21 In the case of the peak load forecast, the
22 electrification targets are floor space based, and a
23 peak impact is determined by applying the end use
24 intensities to that floor space.

25 B. HARPER: Okay.

26 U. KHAN: Whereas on the revenue side, it is
27 more about the number of customers with electric
28 heating.

1 B. HARPER: So there is no way of getting any
2 sense as to whether -- as to the extent to which
3 forecast is higher than the other or to what extent
4 they are comparable? There is no way of doing that,
5 I guess?

6 U. KHAN: As I mentioned, that comparison would
7 be difficult to do given that they are produced in
8 different ways and customers attract in different
9 ways.

10 B. HARPER: One thing I would highlight, though,
11 I noticed this, I noticed on the page you have up
12 there, the sentence just before the table talks about
13 how -- I guess you talk about electric heating for
14 residential GS less than 50 and GS 50 to 2,999
15 kilowatt customers.

16 I guess those are the classes that was for
17 electric heating assumptions in the planning and the
18 PP -- PP planning forecast. Am I correct?

19 U. KHAN: I am sorry, could you please repeat
20 that.

21 B. HARPER: Yeah. I was just reading just now,
22 it caught my eye, the sentence just before that --
23 just before Table 6 where it says:

24 "Therefore, the number of commercial customers
25 with electric heating is not established in the
26 revenue forecast." (as read)

27 It goes on to say -- it goes on to talk about --
28 in this one, that is right. In the last three lines,

1 it talks about:

2 "The electricity consumption from electric
3 heating is determined by establishing the
4 number of customers with electric heating for
5 residential GS greater than 50 and GS 50 to
6 2,999 kilowatt customers." (as read)

7 Are you talking there about your -- about the
8 revenue forecast or about your planning forecast?

9 U. KHAN: As is stated in that paragraph, if I
10 will just -- I will start reading from line number 6.

11 B. HARPER: Okay. And I am sorry, okay. Yeah.

12 U. KHAN: In the case of the peak load forecast,
13 the electrification targets are floor-space based.

14 B. HARPER: Right.

15 U. KHAN: And the peak impact is determined by
16 applying the end use intensities per floor space to
17 that floor space.

18 B. HARPER: Okay.

19 U. KHAN: And so we don't have the number of
20 electrified customers, if you will, in the peak load
21 forecast. Contrast that to the revenue load forecast
22 where you do have the number of customers.

23 B. HARPER: Okay, fine. I understand. I am
24 sorry, I just caught this now, and if I had taken a
25 few minutes to read it, I probably would have
26 understood it better. Thank you very much.

27 In this same exhibit, could you go to page 19 in
28 Exhibit 2B, Tab 3, Schedule 1. If we go back to the

1 exhibit we were just talking about, Exhibit 2B, Tab
2 3, Schedule 1, page 19. And it is PDF page 518. If
3 it is part of the document. 3-1, page 19. Page 19.

4 Given what you just told me, you talk here about
5 commercial and -- okay. But this -- starting at page
6 8, you talk here about employment growth forecast for
7 each region would translate into business counts and
8 mapped to sector-specific load intensities. I
9 understood this to mean you determine business counts
10 and you determine business counts on a sector-
11 specific basis. Is that a proper way of interpreting
12 what you are saying here?

13 U. KHAN: I believe that is correct. If I
14 understand you correctly, the --

15 B. HARPER: Okay. Now, if we could scroll down
16 to page 20 on the next page. Here, you talk about
17 the various scenarios that you used.

18 On the commercial side, you had three scenarios,
19 and your low scenario assumed 50 percent of the
20 customer counts, medium assumed 75 percent, and
21 highest assumed 100 percent of the customer counts
22 you developed through those forecasts, you developed
23 through use of municipal planning documents.

24 Would it be possible for you to undertake to
25 give me what -- what the customer count forecast was
26 derived from the municipal planning documents for
27 each of the years for the CNI sector that would be,
28 you know, the hundred percent scenario?

1 U. KHAN: We have provided the non-residential
2 customer additions in Table 3 of IR response BOMA-2.

3 B. HARPER: And those -- and those additions
4 would align with -- I think you used the high growths
5 -- those additions were aligned with your high growth
6 scenario, the 100 percent?

7 U. KHAN: If you could scroll to page 4 of this
8 response, Table 3 are the forecasted non-residential
9 customer additions in the high, medium, and low
10 scenarios --

11 B. HARPER: Okay.

12 U. KHAN: -- used at the peak load forecast.

13 B. HARPER: Okay. Fine. Thank you very much.

14 Actually, I just have -- those are all the
15 questions I have for this specific panel; however,
16 there were two areas of questioning where the
17 assignment of the relevant evidence was split between
18 members of the different panels.

19 And before I let you go, I just want to make
20 sure that it is not you I should have been asking
21 these quick questions to as opposed to one of the
22 forthcoming panels.

23 And so the first has to with a large load
24 variance account and the choice as to which customer
25 variances between forecast and actual load are going
26 to be tracking that account. And while DVAs are
27 assigned to Panel 2, the actual interrogatory dealing
28 with this, which was SEC-101, is assigned to both

1 your panel, Panel 1, and Panel 3.

2 And so I was wondering, on that particular
3 topic, maybe you can tell me, are you the ones to
4 answer that? Is Panel 2 the ones to answer that? Or
5 is it -- should I be saving that for Panel 3?

6 D. COBAN: Is there a particular part of SEC-101
7 that you are looking at?

8 B. HARPER: Well, I wanted to start with the
9 original evidence, and what I was wanting to talk
10 about, understand, was the fact that in the base
11 evidence, I think it identified some 72 customers,
12 potentially new customers or customer additions, that
13 could lead to additional increase in load.

14 And I was wondering what the rationale --
15 understand better the rationale for picking -- I
16 can't remember, originally there was -- I don't have
17 the numbers off the top of my head. I have to look
18 at my questions.

19 But originally, there was a very small subset of
20 that that was proposed to be tracked in the variance
21 account. And then in SEC-101, it notes that even now
22 a smaller set is being proposed to track for purposes
23 of the account.

24 And I was just wanting to talk to somebody about
25 what the rationale was for picking the customers you
26 decided to include and track for purposes of the
27 account as opposed to the one -- as opposed to the
28 other ones you weren't going to track. That is all.

1 Like, what led to a customer being included for
2 purposes of the account and what -- as opposed to
3 being excluded?

4 And like I said, I wasn't too sure which panel I
5 should be asking that question of.

6 D. COBAN: So Panel 2 can help you out with
7 that, Mr. Harper.

8 B. HARPER: Okay. Fine. Thank you very much.
9 Like I said, I just didn't want to miss the
10 opportunity.

11 My second question is with respect to the
12 historical IESO-led local CDM initiatives in your
13 service area. And, again, the related interrogatory,
14 VECC-35, was assigned to both this panel and Panel 3.

15 So, again, this is something I wanted to
16 understand a little bit more about, should I be
17 talking about this with you or with Panel 3? This is
18 VECC-35.

19 D. COBAN: I think similarly, it would be
20 helpful to understand the nature of your question in
21 order to determine if this panel or --

22 B. HARPER: No, that is fine. I guess -- and in
23 this question, you talk about the fact that, you
24 know, there are IESO-led programs, but I wanted to
25 understand because, to be quite frank, I would have
26 thought that if the IESO was going to be introducing
27 a local program in their area, they would at least
28 have had the courtesy of advising you of that; or if

1 not, you are talking to your customers every day.

2 Some customer might have mentioned it to you.

3 So I was just curious as to -- you said they're
4 IO-led, but whether -- whether you were aware of the
5 IESO actually having done any local programs in your
6 area over the '21 -- over the '21 to '24 period?

7 D. COBAN: Also a Panel 2 question, so we will
8 give them a heads-up.

9 B. HARPER: Okay. Fine. Thank you very much.

10 And I will turn it now back to Mr. Garner. I
11 believe he has a few questions.

12 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY M. GARNER (VECC)**

13 M. GARNER: Thank you. Good afternoon, Panel.
14 I just have a very few questions, and they are really
15 all in one area, and I want you to help me
16 understand. And you don't need to bring up the
17 reference, but the questions were really about
18 service areas and service districts.

19 And I think the best way to start my questions
20 is could you pick up -- or bring up Exhibit 1, Tab 3,
21 Schedule 2, and it is just a map. And it is just
22 going to help me orient my questions with you about -
23 - about something. And they have to do a bit about
24 metrics and reliability and other things for planning
25 purposes.

26 And so we asked a question about what is -- what
27 lies in the distinction between these districts and
28 these service areas, and -- and it was awkwardly put.

1 You did give us some really good answers. It did
2 help me understand what you were talking about. But
3 I probably should have asked a little bit differently
4 about what I was trying to figure out.

5 I do understand here the service areas, as I
6 understand it, are really the cities, the old little
7 towns, the actual places that you are in. And then
8 you kind of amalgamated certain ones of them into
9 districts, service districts that you do, right.

10 And so you have, like, the Brock one, which has,
11 you know, five communities in it and that. And so
12 what I was trying to really understand is what lies
13 in that, first of all, as the way the company
14 operates? So in every service district, do you have
15 a -- do you have a place where you have crews, and
16 they are dispatched from that area? Is that part of
17 what creates a service district?

18 M. MULTANI: Yes, that is correct.

19 M. GARNER: Okay. So in the Brock area, where
20 would be the service centre for Brock? Which --
21 which part of -- which service area would be the
22 place?

23 M. MULTANI: As you will see on the map with the
24 dotted white line --

25 M. GARNER: Right.

26 M. MULTANI: -- that is the area served by
27 Brock, and the other operating centre is in
28 Beaverton.

1 M. GARNER: It is in Beaverton?

2 M. MULTANI: Yes.

3 M. GARNER: Okay. And typically, are they quite
4 different operating centres? I imagine, like,
5 Whitby, Pickering, Ajax, a bigger area operating -- I
6 mean, I have seen your building in around Taunton
7 Road. It is a bigger area. You have an operating
8 centre there. That must be quite different from,
9 let's say, Clarington. Do you -- where is your
10 Clarington operating centre?

11 M. MULTANI: Yes. Clarington operating centre
12 is in Bowmanville.

13 M. GARNER: Bowmanville. Okay. And it is,
14 like, scaled smaller, I imagine, for the smaller
15 area; right? Okay.

16 Now, when you are doing your -- let me ask this:
17 Do you do any metric calculation that helps you
18 understand, for instance, how quickly you can service
19 or roll out a crew to an area? Like, you know, when
20 you are in -- when you are in Whitby, you have got a
21 lot of crews, and you've got a lot of things. But
22 when you are up in Gravenhurst, you know, you have
23 maybe one crew to do the whole area.

24 Do you have any metrics in that to help you
25 understand how well you are servicing a service
26 district out of your operations centre or any way you
27 judge that performance or -- you know?

28 M. MULTANI: There are a couple of indications

1 for that. One will be our performance metrics, which
2 is measured by OEB. It is services connected on
3 time, appointments met -- scheduled and met on time.
4 Second metric would be our emergency response to
5 emergency events. Those are the few things we track.

6 M. GARNER: And those are done by -- I am sorry
7 -- district, service district, so you can understand
8 -- what I am trying to get at is you can understand,
9 for instance, if a -- if a -- you have a faulty
10 switch, that you can get to it in Brock in within the
11 hour and same as in Clarington and same as in
12 Gravenhurst. You know, you are trying to meet the
13 same standard.

14 Is that -- would that give you that information
15 that you are meeting a standard for each of the
16 service districts in a similar way? That is what I
17 am trying to understand. I am trying to understand
18 if you understand it, and then if you do, how you --
19 how you actually understand that that service quality
20 is equivalent or, you know, close to equivalent in
21 those areas?

22 M. MULTANI: The response time, we measure that
23 which -- which is to our emergencies, and that is
24 both district-wide as well as aggregated, which is
25 reported back to OEB.

26 M. GARNER: And is that the only one that you
27 have is emergency response time that gives you
28 information about, you know, how well you dispatch

1 out of every -- each one of your service districts?

2 That would be the only one you have?

3 M. MULTANI: Yes, that is correct.

4 M. GARNER: Okay. Thank you.

5 In 2-VECC-16, we asked you to give us outages by
6 cause code by all of the different service districts,
7 and thank you. You did. It struck me, though -- and
8 my mistake if it is not there -- we didn't -- we
9 didn't ask you there if you could give us the SAIDI
10 and SAIFI items for each district -- service
11 district.

12 And I don't know if it is in the evidence
13 somewhere else, you know, just the full SAIDI and
14 SAIFI for each one of those districts. And if I was
15 asking for it, if it isn't there, the other one would
16 be -- and you are going to have to help me with this
17 one because I don't know this acronym -- FESI-7,
18 which is in your scorecard.

19 Maybe you could first tell me what FESI-7 is and
20 whether that is also done by each one of the service
21 districts?

22 S. SHEEHY: Yeah, to clarify, FESI-7 is feeders
23 experiencing 7 -- sustained interruptions, 7 or more.

24 M. GARNER: Thank you.

25 S. SHEEHY: Or sorry. More than 7.

26 M. GARNER: More than 7.

27 S. SHEEHY: Feeders experiencing sustained
28 interruptions more than 7.

1 M. GARNER: Right. And are those -- do you have
2 those -- I will call them "macro metrics" for each
3 one of those 20 to 25 years for each one of the
4 service districts, and if so, is it in the evidence;
5 and if it isn't, can you make it available?

6 I just can't remember seeing it. I see these by
7 cause codes, but I didn't ask for it, and I should
8 have maybe, or maybe it was there and I didn't -- at
9 the time, I saw it somewhere. I am not sure.

10 S. LATIF: I would like to point you to 2-VECC-
11 17. As part of the response to that IR, we have
12 provided the customer hours of interruption,
13 customers interrupted as well as number of
14 interruptions by cause code by district.

15 M. GARNER: Yeah, I see that. And then maybe it
16 is my ignorance, but if I am trying to actually
17 compare this to the actual -- what I call the macro
18 SAIDI/SAIFI figures used in your metrics, so what I
19 am kind of trying to say to myself, how do -- I am
20 not sure I can interpret those by cause codes, which
21 are more detailed, right, to roll them up to what
22 they mean in the sense of comparing that to your
23 targets but by each one of the service districts.

24 So what I am really attempting to try and do and
25 understand is you have metric on your scorecard,
26 right, and -- but you have a -- a unique utility.
27 You are, so to speak, all over the map, right, and a
28 big challenge for you.

1 And I am just trying to understand how relevant
2 using that macro metric is as compared to if one were
3 looking at the -- each service district almost like
4 its own little utility and was it performing. So
5 when you average them, it can be great, right, but
6 then maybe Brock is, you know, terrible, and Whitby
7 is wonderful, do you know what I mean?

8 I am just trying to make sure I understand that
9 that is not the case, or if it is, whether you got --
10 what you do -- what you do about it. So can you help
11 me with that?

12 S. LATIF: I just want to clarify. The ask is
13 that we look at all the districts as an individual
14 utility and give the metric for the specific district
15 rather than aggregating it on a system level and
16 averaging it out?

17 M. GARNER: Right. Which -- pardon me. Pardon
18 me. Which I assume you can do simply because you
19 have them all by cause code for each district. So
20 the math is just you are not showing the overall
21 figure. You have done all the cause codes.

22 But right now, for instance, you have a target
23 of 1.49 to 1.52 for SAIDI, right. And then on the
24 corporate basis, Elexicon basis, you are going to
25 report that. Let's say it is, you know, within the
26 metric.

27 But if I said, oh, yeah, but if I now look at
28 each one of those districts, that is really three

1 districts that are at, you know, 0.7 and two that are
2 at 1.8, and that is how it all averages out to
3 whatever, you know, you do on a corporate basis.

4 So that is what I am trying to do. I am
5 assuming it should be easy because you have them by
6 cause code for every one of those same districts,
7 right, so you have all the data?

8 S. SHEEHY: To clarify, the targets that we have
9 are at the system level by the end of 2031. They are
10 not at a district level.

11 M. GARNER: No, I understand that.

12 S. SHEEHY: So that is our position for this
13 target --

14 M. GARNER: I -- yeah.

15 S. SHEEHY: -- is to be at the --

16 M. GARNER: We may be talking at cross purposes.
17 I am not -- I am not even talking about that. What I
18 am trying to understand is because of your unique
19 circumstances, you are in the position where your
20 average and your service districts could -- you could
21 have a service district with very poor performance
22 covered up by service districts with very good
23 performance, right. Do you know what I mean?

24 And I am just testing that to understand, do all
25 Elexicon customers, are they getting that -- when you
26 get that metric, are they all experiencing that
27 metric or some of them experience a different type of
28 metric because they happen to be in an area that is,

1 you know, having a lot of problems? So is the metric
2 truly representative of all aspects of the company's
3 service, is the question, do you know what I mean?

4 And it is because you are -- you are probably
5 one of the most unique companies this way because of
6 the way your service territory is challenging, right.
7 And it seems to me it is more of a -- you have got
8 the data. It is just a math issue. And you don't
9 have to agree with me about you should have a metric
10 on each one of the areas. I am not even sure I agree
11 with that. That is not really where I am at right
12 now. I am just trying to understand the information.

13 S. LATIF: So if I am understanding that
14 correctly, your statement was that customers in
15 different service districts might -- might experience
16 different durations of outages, which might be masked
17 by the average duration --

18 M. GARNER: Yeah, and frequency.

19 S. LATIF: -- index and the SAIFI.

20 For the historical period, by district, we can
21 provide those metrics, and we can take that as an
22 undertaking.

23 M. GARNER: Thank you.

24 T. HOBBINS: That will be Undertaking JT-1.21.

25 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.20: PROVIDE THE METRICS FOR THE**
26 **HISTORICAL PERIOD BY DISTRICT**

27 M. GARNER: Now, if we go to 2-VECC-18. And,
28 again, thank you. You really gave a lot of

1 information here that really was helpful for me
2 trying to understand. Again, I am testing the idea
3 of what happens in these different districts. And so
4 let me actually start with this question, is do the -
5 - do the outages by cause code for defective
6 equipment -- do they somehow feed into your
7 Distribution System Plan?

8 Do those statistics kind of come in and then in
9 all of the -- you know, the -- as my colleague was
10 going through the -- you know, where you are scoring,
11 et cetera, does that feed in somehow to the planning
12 process?

13 S. LATIF: Yes, it does. It does. We look at
14 the reliability for different aspects of our system,
15 and our system renewal plans are based on those
16 reliability results.

17 M. GARNER: Yeah, that's -- and that would seem
18 natural to me. So, for instance, say, if you have
19 these defective insulators popping up everywhere, you
20 start looking into what is going on with our
21 insulators and then -- and do that.

22 But -- and that is what got me to the 2-VECC-18,
23 and you helpfully gave the equipment outages for
24 those in the different areas, and that is very
25 useful, except I struggle with this problem is how to
26 normalize it among each one of them.

27 So you have -- if you look at table -- I am on
28 Table 3. You could look at that table. It is a good

1 place to start. And you look at defective switches.
2 And I go, wow, you know, like, in 2020, Clarington
3 had 1,100, and Brock had 120. But, of course, what I
4 don't know is maybe Brock only has 125 switches,
5 right, and maybe Clarington has 20,000 switches.
6 Obviously, that's not true, but you know what I mean?

7 I have no relative way of looking at those and
8 understanding, does Brock have a bigger problem than
9 Clarington on -- or has Clarington got the biggest
10 problem in 2020?

11 Is there a way that you normalize that type of
12 data so you can understand in a district if you are
13 running into a particular type of equipment issue in
14 that district? Because you have inherited all these
15 older utilities who have gotten their own, you know,
16 built in at certain times, and you may run into
17 similar problems in certain districts I am assuming.

18 So is there any way you normalize this data in
19 order to understand if a district, or even the
20 service area, has a historical or -- problem or a
21 problem that you need to address inside your plan?

22 S. LATIF: Yes. We do look at type of asset
23 failures within each district, and we look at the
24 root causes of those asset failures, and that kind of
25 serves as an input into investing or making
26 investment plans for those districts.

27 For example, if we know more switches are
28 failing in Brock, we would hire -- of switches in

1 Brock versus in Clarington, for example.

2 M. GARNER: So that --

3 S. LATIF: And --

4 M. GARNER: Sorry, go ahead.

5 S. LATIF: And also the asset condition
6 assessment, that kind of drives that decision making
7 as well.

8 M. GARNER: Thank you. And I am glad you
9 brought up that latter one because -- and I could be
10 wrong, and maybe I need to go back and look at it.
11 In one of the questions of -- basically between
12 Questions 14 and 18, I explore this area, and one of
13 the questions I do ask is how it -- how you deal with
14 it in your capital plan. And you say, well, the
15 capital plan is corporate.

16 And that struck me as a bit odd only in this
17 way, is that, to put it colloquial, it seems to me
18 that sometimes people would sit around a table and
19 say, you know, Sunderland, you know, Sunderland has
20 got this problem, guys. We have to fix it. And this
21 is their problem. They got a 4.1 system, let's say,
22 it is falling apart, and we need to go there and get
23 it done, right. And so that is kind of the table
24 talk about how you get something done.

25 When I look the ACA and that, all of the asset
26 stuff is done at a global level, and so it is not
27 easy from there to distinguish is the problem
28 everywhere or is the problem -- oh, it is a

1 Gravenhurst problem, merely, this one.

2 Really, this is the utility it is -- or --
3 utility. This is my service district it is really
4 affecting. It doesn't have the big subdivision
5 underground problem. It has a very different
6 problem. They are very different. I mean,
7 Gravenhurst and Pickering are very different, right?
8 Gravenhurst is closer to a lake. Just -- you know.

9 But that is why I am kind of wondering is, like,
10 there is no -- there is no roll up I see in your
11 evidence about the actual district and the condition
12 of the assets in that district and how they might be
13 done. Do you not have that as part of your planning,
14 so when I am looking at these numbers and that?

15 So let me give you a really good example of it,
16 just so you help me understand. You know you are
17 doing the voltage conversion. And I think you have -
18 - you are doing them in Pickering -- North Pickering
19 -- was it Belleville? North Pickering, Port Hope and
20 Belleville.

21 I thought to myself, gee, that is interesting,
22 and that is good. But I thought, gee, I wonder, you
23 know, the older places up north, aren't they all
24 4.162 and what -- like, are they? Right. That is my
25 question to you is are they?

26 And you just picked those because there are more
27 people there, they have the same issue, there is less
28 people. You don't -- I am trying to get a feel about

1 how you understand that.

2 So does the northern community have a lot of
3 4.16 distribution in it like Gravenhurst?

4 S. SHEEHY: Sorry. Just before we move on to
5 that voltage conversion, I think you were raising the
6 item of asset condition assessment by our service
7 area. So we do have within our asset condition
8 assessment report results by service area --

9 M. GARNER: Okay. Thank you.

10 S. SHEEHY: -- so our planners do have line of
11 sight into the service area viewpoints of the various
12 asset classes within our ACA. I just wanted to flag
13 that. It is in our report. I can point you to it if
14 you need to.

15 M. GARNER: Okay. No, I will take another look.
16 I guess I was looking at the tables, and the normal
17 tables, I usually see graphed out showing asset
18 condition, they were all at the corporate levels.
19 You are saying there are similar tables also at the
20 district level?

21 S. SHEEHY: Yes. By service area, the asset
22 condition assessment results are broken out. I could
23 take us to there now if you would like to see it.

24 M. GARNER: I will take your word, and I can
25 look at it. Maybe I just -- I have forgotten. So if
26 you say it is there, then I am sure it is.

27 Okay. There is one more minute. Okay. I think
28 -- we are running behind, so I think that is going to

1 be my questions. Thank you very much.

2 D. COBAN: I just wanted to note that I think we
3 have got a misnumbering in the undertakings.

4 T. HOBBINS: Yeah. I was just going to correct
5 the record on that. So the most recent undertaking
6 from Mr. Garner was marked as JT-1.21, but it should
7 actually be JT-1.20.

8 M. GARNER: Thank you.

9 T. HOBBINS: We have also come up to 3:30, so I
10 propose we take the afternoon break, and then we will
11 continue with BOMA at 3:45.

12 --- Upon recessing at 3:29 p.m.

13 --- Upon resuming at 3:45 p.m.

14 T. HOBBINS: Okay. I think we will resume. And
15 that would be BOMA up next.

16 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY C. LI (BOMA):**

17 C. LI: Hello. Can you see me?

18 T. HOBBINS: Yes, yes, we can see and hear you.

19 C. LI: Oh, okay. Perfect. Good afternoon,
20 Panel. Clement Li on behalf of BOMA Toronto.

21 My first question is on your response to IR 3-
22 BOMA-2. In Part A, your response basically points me
23 to Exhibit 2B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, Figure 8. Let's go
24 there, actually. My original question was -- because
25 it is just a graph, that I was looking for the
26 numbers behind the graph, but then, actually, this
27 morning, hearing your exchange with Mr. Gluck, CCC, I
28 realized that you already provide that -- those

1 numbers in CCC-15 anyway. But I want more than that.

2 If you go back to Figure 8, after that, there is
3 Figure 9. Can you -- can you, as an undertaking,
4 provide the numbers you used to generate Figure 9 in
5 Exhibit 2B, Tab 3, Schedule 1?

6 Those are the winter peak numbers. You probably
7 have to go to -- yeah, yeah. I think that is where
8 you are going right now. Exhibit 2B, Tab 3, Schedule
9 1, Figure 9. Can you do that?

10 U. KHAN: Yes, that can be provided.

11 C. LI: Okay.

12 U. KHAN: I believe in CCC-15, Attachment 1, we
13 provided the summer --

14 C. LI: Yeah, that is right. Figure 8. That is
15 Figure 8, right. So I don't need that because I got
16 CCC-15 already. So I just need Figure 9.

17 U. KHAN: That's right, the Figure 9 summer peak
18 load --

19 C. LI: No, no. Not summer. Winter.

20 U. KHAN: -- is outstanding.

21 Yes, we can provide the winter peak load.

22 C. LI: Oh, I am sorry. I am sorry. I am
23 sorry. Yeah, yeah, the summer peak load is the same
24 as what you have provided in CCC-15 already; right?
25 Is it correct?

26 U. KHAN: That is correct.

27 C. LI: Yeah. So I just -- yeah, we can just
28 give me the winter peak numbers in Figure 9. That

1 would be wonderful.

2 U. KHAN: Yes, we can do that.

3 T. HOBBINS: Okay. That will be --

4 C. LI: Thank you.

5 T. HOBBINS: -- Undertaking JT-1.21.

6 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.21: Provide the numbers used to**
7 **generate the winter peak numbers in Figure 9 in**
8 **Exhibit 2B, Tab 3, Schedule 1**

9 C. LI: Okay. Let's move on to Part 2, same
10 question. In your response, Table 1, the first row
11 there is labelled as "Elexicon scenario," and then
12 the next three rows are high, medium, and low.

13 Before I drafted this IR question, when I was
14 reading your evidence -- actually, it would be
15 helpful, I am sorry, if you turn to Exhibit 2B, Tab
16 3, Schedule 1, page 25, line number 14. I am just
17 going to read the first sentence there. "For
18 capacity planning purposes --" okay. Maybe I will
19 wait a little bit. Sorry.

20 If you go to line number 14, it says:

21 "For capacity planning purposes, the medium
22 scenario was selected. This scenario reflects
23 realistic --" (as read)

24 Whatever, I am not going to read the whole
25 thing. So basically, it tells me the medium scenario
26 is used.

27 But then I kept on reading. If I go to which --
28 the next paragraph, which starts at line number 20,

1 then it describes how high scenario customer growth
2 and high scenario building electrification and medium
3 scenario EVs were aggregated into Elexicon scenario
4 and ultimately, that is being used to support your
5 capital plan.

6 Now, going back to -- you don't have to go
7 there. Like, just -- I am just saying that going
8 back to your response to Part A, you point me to
9 Figure 8, so -- which has multiple scenarios,
10 obviously. So I am assuming that you are using
11 different scenarios for different capital categories.

12 And then after I listened to your exchange this
13 morning, again, with Mr. Gluck, it sort of confirmed
14 my assumption that indeed you were using different
15 scenarios to support your CapEx -- like, specifically
16 this morning, you mentioned your customer connection
17 program is driven by the revenue load forecast
18 provided in Exhibit 3 instead of the peak load
19 forecast provided in your Exhibit 2B.

20 And I think you also mentioned that your system
21 expansion program actually is not really driven by
22 your load forecast at all. You gave some other
23 reasons too. So I am a little bit confused.

24 So far, in Table 1 -- back to my -- back to your
25 response to BOMA-2. So there is the Elexicon
26 scenario, and there is the high, medium, and low
27 scenario. And there is also the revenue load
28 forecast.

1 Like, can you as an undertaking summarize which
2 load forecast do you use to drive your capital
3 programs as listed in Table 14 of -- let's go there.
4 Let's go to Table 14 of Exhibit 2B, Tab 1, Schedule
5 1, which is on page 36. But not -- not only at that
6 table, but also adding these subcategories that you
7 discussed just immediately after -- like, following
8 this Table 14, in Section 4.1 to 4.4, if you scroll
9 down. Then in 4.1, then you break it into --

10 D. COBAN: Sorry, Mr. Li, we are really having a
11 hard time in the room following your references. You
12 are jumping around a fair bit. So if I could just
13 ask you to just slow down a bit with the references
14 so we can pull those up on the screen, please.

15 C. LI: Sorry, sorry. So I think if you can go
16 to Exhibit 2B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Table 14. So let's
17 stop there. Sorry about that. Schedule 1, Exhibit
18 2B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, page 36.

19 D. COBAN: Do you have a page number, Mr. Li?

20 C. LI: Page 36.

21 D. COBAN: Thank you.

22 C. LI: There we go. So that is Table 14, okay.
23 So let -- I am sorry, let me go back. Okay.

24 So can you as an undertaking summarize which
25 peak load forecast do you use to drive your capital
26 programs that is listed in Table 14. But not only
27 Table 14. But if you scroll down, then you see that,
28 like, each section from 4.1 to 4.4, you discuss,

1 like, subcategories.

2 So, for example, if you go to 4.1, "System
3 Access," then you see that there are -- one, two,
4 three, four -- four subcategories there, right. And
5 the same thing when you go to 4.2, then you see
6 "Substation Renew," "Underground Station Renew."

7 So if you can -- I know some of them are
8 irrelevant. Like, if you go to general plant, like,
9 IT stuff probably is irrelevant. But you can just
10 say -- if you go through that and say irrelevant, it
11 is not driven by load -- and maybe it is, I don't
12 know. I am just saying that.

13 But if you can -- can you do that? And for each
14 subcategory, basically list which peak forecast do
15 you use to drive that capital plan -- or program, I
16 should say.

17 Because I find it very confusing because
18 sometimes you use high and low and medium, and
19 sometimes you use load forecast -- I mean, revenue
20 load forecast versus the peak load forecast.

21 So I am hoping that you can just put it in a
22 table and tell me what drives what. That would be
23 really useful as an undertaking.

24 U. KHAN: First of all, I would like to clarify
25 something that you said regarding line number 14 on
26 Exhibit 2B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, page 25.

27 C. LI: Page -- okay.

28 U. KHAN: I will just wait for it to be pulled

1 up here.

2 C. LI: Sure. Okay.

3 U. KHAN: So line number 14 where it says "for
4 capacity planning purposes, the medium scenario was
5 selected," this is --

6 C. LI: Right.

7 U. KHAN: -- specifically referring to the
8 electric vehicle subcomponent of the load forecast.
9 And within this section, the development of the peak
10 load forecast has four subcomponents, which are the
11 weather normalization, the electric vehicle,
12 electrification of buildings, and the customer
13 growth.

14 And the paragraph that starts in line number 20
15 summarizes which scenario was chosen for each of
16 these subcomponents in that peak load forecast.

17 C. LI: Right. Okay. Well, thank you. Thank
18 you for clarifying that. But can you still provide
19 this summary table that I was asking for?

20 U. KHAN: So just to confirm, the ask is to
21 identify whether the peak load forecast scenario was
22 used or the revenue forecast was used for the inputs
23 that go into each of the capital programs?

24 C. LI: Yeah, like, under -- from 4.1 to 4.4 in
25 -- like, just right after Table 14, yes. Well,
26 actually, it is more than that, though, because don't
27 you have different scenarios or you always -- because
28 under the peak load -- or are you talking about just

1 an Elexicon scenario?

2 That is the one you are talking about versus the
3 revenue load forecast peak load?

4 U. KHAN: The Elexicon scenario is what is used
5 to understand capacity constraints at both the
6 municipal station and the transformer station level
7 and also to understand how those constraints
8 exacerbate by 2031, and that is the Elexicon-chosen
9 scenario.

10 C. LI: Right. Okay. So if you can do that, if
11 you put together a summary including the
12 subcategories in Section 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, and for
13 each subcategory, tell me which load forecast drives
14 it, that would be wonderful. Yes.

15 U. KHAN: That can be done.

16 C. LI: Thank you. Thank you very much.

17 T. HOBBINS: Okay. That will be Undertaking JT-
18 1.22.

19 **UNDERTAKING JT-1.22: PROVIDE A SUMMARY INCLUDING**
20 **THE SUBCATEGORIES IN SECTION 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4,**
21 **AND ADVISE WHICH LOAD FORECAST DRIVES IT**

22 C. LI: Okay.

23 My next question -- I am still on the same
24 question. Sorry about that. Looking at Table 2 in
25 the same response. I am just going to go through it
26 fairly quickly. Like, the revenue load forecast
27 figures are quite close to the medium scenario of the
28 peak load forecast, and the same can be said for

1 Table 3 and Table 4. They are pretty close to -- if
2 you look, even compared to revenue load forecast --
3 sorry. I should wait for you. Okay.

4 In Table 2, 3, and 4 basically, so the revenue
5 load forecast figures were fairly close to the medium
6 scenario, but in Table 5, they are quite different.
7 I think you briefly discussed that with Mr. Harper
8 earlier, but I -- I am not sure if I followed it, so
9 I am going to ask it again. So while I appreciate
10 that after Table 5, you -- you provide some more
11 explanation, but I -- I am not sure if I follow that.

12 If I jump to Table 6, under the category
13 "Electrification of Heating," in the peak load
14 forecast, you mention municipal energy plans, and in
15 the revenue demand forecast, you did not mention
16 municipal energy plans.

17 And it appears that the impact of heating
18 electrification relies heavily or solely on
19 historical growth way. Is that the reason why the
20 figures in Table 5 are so different?

21 Like, just for context, if you look at Table 5,
22 the revenue demand forecasts are even quite a bit
23 smaller, like, even when it is compared to the low
24 scenario. Forget about the medium scenario. Like,
25 even compared to the low scenario, it is still lower.
26 Is that the reason why they are so different?

27 U. KHAN: That is correct. The two forecasts,
28 being the peak load forecast and the revenue

1 forecast, they use different methods to forecast the
2 electric heating stock for the forecast period. And
3 the low scenario for the peak load forecast -- I am
4 reading off Exhibit 2B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, page 22.
5 The assumption for the low scenario on this page --
6 maybe I will wait for this to get pulled up. Page
7 22.

8 So the residential new build target for the low
9 scenario aims for hundred percent electrification by
10 2035 in the low scenario as well, whereas, discussed
11 in response in BOMA-2, the revenue load forecast
12 primarily relies on historical adoption of electric
13 heating.

14 C. LI: Right. I understand that. Thank you.

15 But why -- why use such different assumptions?
16 Can you help me out? Does it -- does it mean that --
17 that just because -- I am sorry. Just the numbers
18 are so different, and does it represent lack of
19 confidence when it comes to if its electrification
20 will materialize, and that is why in the revenue
21 forecast, the numbers are so much lower? I am just
22 wondering.

23 U. KHAN: Not necessarily. The reason why there
24 is two different methodologies and why the forecasts
25 are different is because they are developed for
26 different purposes and they use different
27 methodologies, so they rely on different assumptions.

28 The peak load forecast, it is designed as a

1 forward-looking assessment, and it is used to support
2 capacity planning to ensure that infrastructure is in
3 place to support developments, whereas the revenue
4 load forecast, the intention with that forecast is to
5 support rate setting and financial planning.

6 So it is a more near-term view of build demand
7 and energy consumption that is used to set rates,
8 whereas the peak load forecast is to ensure that
9 infrastructure is in place to address capacity
10 constraints and enable growth.

11 C. LI: Right.

12 So can I say that the -- would you agree that
13 the revenue load forecast is actually the -- more
14 closer to the most likely scenario in the rate term,
15 like, between 2027 to 2031?

16 U. KHAN: Not necessarily. I would say that the
17 revenue load forecast and the peak load forecast, as
18 I mentioned, are for different purposes. And so they
19 are, in their own way, correct, and their use is for
20 different purposes, and so the assumptions that are
21 used in those forecasts are appropriate for their
22 respective purposes.

23 C. LI: Okay. Okay. I will move on. Thank
24 you.

25 Still in Part B, let's move to Table 6, your
26 response to Table 6, BOMA-2. For peak load forecast,
27 CDM assumption listed as gross peak load used, and
28 then for revenue demand forecasts, the CDM is based

1 on Elexicon allocation of provincial eDSM plan.

2 Why is it appropriate to use gross load forecast
3 in the peak forecast assumptions? I guess, in other
4 words, what "gross" means is you are not including
5 the impact of CDM in the peak forecast; right? Can
6 you -- can you help me understand why?

7 U. KHAN: If I could point you to IR response 1-
8 PP-10.

9 C. LI: PP-10. Are you going to bring -- you
10 are going to bring it up? Thank you.

11 U. KHAN: If you could go to page 2, Part B of
12 the response.

13 C. LI: Let me -- sorry. Let me -- let me make
14 the screen a little bit bigger. I need new glasses,
15 so I cannot see. Okay. PP-10; right? Okay. Which
16 part? I am sorry.

17 U. KHAN: Part B.

18 C. LI: Part B. Okay.

19 U. KHAN: So as noted in the response here, the
20 impact of CDM demand side management is modelled by
21 the IESO as reductions to the gross demand, and those
22 are based on program participation and policy
23 assumptions that the IESO does as part of the
24 regional planning exercise. And that is noted on
25 page 3.

26 C. LI: So are you saying that the CDM impact is
27 indeed included in the peak load forecast? Is that
28 what you are saying? It is just when you -- when you

1 do the revenue load forecast, you used a location, a
2 share from the provincial IESO -- or I mean -- I am
3 sorry -- the eDSM plan. But then in here, it is also
4 including CDM impact, but using a different source;
5 is that what you are saying?

6 U. KHAN: Let me clarify. The peak load
7 forecast and the starting points for the peak load
8 forecast are net actuals, and so those include impact
9 of CDM and also any distributed generation. And so
10 the forecast is -- essentially utilizes the persisted
11 impacts of those CDM but does not account for
12 additional CDM impacts. However --

13 C. LI: Okay.

14 U. KHAN: -- the IESO does a forecast for
15 regional planning where the impacts of CDM forecast
16 are also included.

17 C. LI: In the peak load forecast; is it
18 correct?

19 U. KHAN: As part of the regional planning
20 exercise.

21 C. LI: Right.

22 U. KHAN: Not necessarily Elexicon's peak load
23 forecast.

24 C. LI: Right. Okay.

25 I understand the starting point is net already.
26 I am still a little bit confused when it comes to any
27 future CDM activities in Elexicon between '27 to '31.
28 Is that included in the peak load forecast on top of

1 the persistence from the previous -- by your starting
2 point?

3 U. KHAN: As I noted, the Elexicon peak load
4 forecast, as provided in Exhibit 2B, is -- does not
5 include additional CDM and distributed generation
6 measures and only includes the persisted -- persisted
7 impact of the starting points.

8 C. LI: Okay.

9 U. KHAN: The IESO, as part of regional planning
10 and any capacity constraints and needs that are
11 identified as part of regional planning, would
12 include the net impact and future forecasted CDM
13 measures.

14 C. LI: Okay. All right. I got it. Thank you.
15 Thank you.

16 Okay. So you also mentioned DER, right. So --
17 so just can you confirm that -- because I don't see --
18 - in Table 6, I don't see any -- there is no DER
19 category. So I assume that there is no assumption in
20 both peak load forecast and revenue load forecast
21 when it comes to DER in the Elexicon service area --
22 is it correct -- other than whatever is there
23 already? Like, there is no additional assumption,
24 right, between '27 to 2031. That is -- I guess that
25 is what I mean.

26 U. KHAN: That is correct. As --

27 C. LI: Okay.

28 U. KHAN: As the response in Part D of PP-10,

1 Elexicon confirms that it does not explicitly model
2 DERs.

3 C. LI: Okay. Yeah, I missed that. I am sorry.
4 Okay. Thank you.

5 I have one last question on Table 6, same
6 question still. Is it -- if you go to Table 6 from -
7 - no, no -- from your response to BOMA-2. Sorry.
8 That -- oh, yeah, yeah. It is. It is, yes.

9 Is it possible as an undertaking to expand Table
10 6 to -- for each category to include the magnitude of
11 the contribution? I know in some cases, it doesn't
12 make sense. Like, area -- like, how do you do
13 disaggregation, that is irrelevant. But when it
14 comes to the driver, I guess, right, residential
15 growth projection or non-residential growth, that
16 kind of -- those are drivers to me -- or
17 electrification of transportation, those are drivers.

18 Can you actually put in additional column for
19 each of these drivers and just give me some
20 indication of the contribution when it comes to, you
21 know, percentage or even megawatt -- I don't know --
22 some kind of indication so I know which are the key
23 drivers. Maybe some are positive, some are negative.
24 But is it possible to do that?

25 If you -- and at the same time, if you can just
26 add one more category and call it "data centre
27 addition assumption" because it affects both peak and
28 revenue load forecast, I assume. That will be

1 helpful.

2 U. KHAN: If I could point you to the CCC-15
3 attachment.

4 C. LI: CCC-15. I think I might have missed
5 that, but can you show it to me, please?

6 U. KHAN: It would be an Excel.

7 C. LI: Okay.

8 U. KHAN: In this tab that you have up, each row
9 actually indicates the megawatt impact for the
10 different scenarios in the peak load forecast for
11 electric vehicles, building electrifications,
12 customer growth, and the base load.

13 C. LI: Okay. That is helpful.

14 But what about the revenue load forecast? Do
15 you have -- because this is all peak load; right?

16 U. KHAN: That is correct. This is for the peak
17 load forecast.

18 C. LI: Right. Do you have similar -- a similar
19 table for the revenue load forecast?

20 U. KHAN: I would suggest that answer might be
21 better responded to by Panel 2 on details of the
22 revenue forecast and what breakdown is available.

23 C. LI: Right --

24 D. COBAN: And sorry. Mr. Li, that is actually
25 Panel 3 that is dealing with the revenue forecast,
26 just for your --

27 C. LI: Okay.

28 D. COBAN: -- your notes.

1 C. LI: Thank you. Yeah, thank you.

2 Stay there for a second here. Would it be
3 possible to add one more category to this table
4 called "data centre assumption"?

5 U. KHAN: The peak load forecast does not
6 include specific data centres as part of the forecast
7 through 2031; however, the revenue forecast does, and
8 I will pass it on to my colleague Mr. Latif to point
9 you to where that customer list is provided for data
10 centres and large customers.

11 S. LATIF: Mr. Li, I would like you to -- I
12 would like to point you to 3-Staff-93 as part of
13 response to Part B. I will let that be pulled up
14 first. So if you can please scroll down to Part B.

15 So as part of Part B, we have provided a large
16 customer list that has been included in the revenue
17 load forecast, and over there, we have identified the
18 type of customers. That also includes data centres
19 as well.

20 C. LI: Right.

21 S. LATIF: If you just scroll down a little bit,
22 there is one data centre on that list.

23 C. LI: Can you tell me where it is?

24 S. LATIF: It is Row Number 26 that says
25 "industrial."

26 C. LI: Oh.

27 S. LATIF: 40 megawatts there, yeah.

28 C. LI: So I am sorry, let me write it down. So

1 this is Row Number 26. I see. So is there any
2 reason why this is not included in the peak load
3 forecast? If it is in the revenue load forecast, why
4 wouldn't you include that in the peak load forecast?
5 Or is it included in some other category? I am just
6 curious.

7 U. KHAN: The intention of the peak load
8 forecast is to provide a forward-looking view with
9 available information from municipal plans and energy
10 plans, and data centres are a very specific type of
11 large load customer that isn't forecasted as part of
12 the macro forecast that the peak load forecast
13 produces. And so instead, it is included as part of
14 the system expansion program as noted here.

15 C. LI: Oh, so it is part of the system
16 expansion program. Okay. Okay. Okay. No, that is
17 helpful. Thank you.

18 So just one follow-up question when it comes to
19 data centre. I think I saw it already, but I -- so
20 these have -- this particular data centre has
21 received and signed an offer to connect, and the MOU
22 and agreed upon load and all that -- all that is
23 committed already. It is; right? I am just looking
24 at the status here.

25 S. LATIF: We have signed an MOU, memorandum of
26 understanding, with this customer, and he has already
27 also made a design deposit; however, the offer to
28 connect is in progress right now.

1 C. LI: Oh, so it is in progress. So in-service
2 is -- or connect is actually '27; right? It is a
3 brand new customer, obviously. Okay. Okay. No,
4 thank you. That is very helpful. Okay.

5 I have one last question. This is a short one.
6 If you go to IR response 1-PP-21, Part D. So I will
7 let you go there first. If you go to Part D. Okay.
8 So in here, your response confirms that a monthly
9 billed to peak demand ratio of 70 percent is applied
10 to all large load connection forecasts to recognize
11 the customers do not reach -- whether their -- the
12 maximum anticipated demands.

13 Can you please explain how you came up with this
14 70 percent ratio? Is it based on some kind of
15 historical average? Can you -- as an undertaking,
16 can you provide the support calculations that you
17 used to derive the 70 percent ratio?

18 S. LATIF: Mr. Li, this question will be more
19 suitable for Panel 3.

20 C. LI: Oh, this is Panel 3. Okay.

21 I believe these are all my questions. I am
22 done. Thank you. Thank you, Panel. I really
23 appreciate it.

24 T. HOBBINS: Thank you, Mr. Li.

25 I note that we are approaching 4:30. The next
26 party on the list is CCMBC, and they are scheduled
27 for 15 minutes. Do we want to take that now or
28 continue tomorrow?

1 T. LADANYI: I can take it now. It really
2 depends on the court reporter, if the court reporter
3 wants to go.

4 T. HOBBS: Does the court reporter have 15
5 minutes?

6 Okay. So we will continue.

7 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY T. LADANYI (CCMBC) :**

8 T. LADANYI: All right. So you might remember
9 from this morning, my name is Tom Ladanyi, and my
10 questions are on behalf of the Coalition of Concerned
11 Manufacturers and Businesses of Canada, which is a
12 group of about 400 manufacturers and businesses, many
13 of them located in the Elexicon's service area.
14 First, I am going to compliment you on excellent
15 evidence so I only have question in one area here.

16 Please turn to 2B-CCMBC-5. Can we have that on
17 the screen? And my written interrogatory was in
18 reference to Exhibit 2B, Tab 3, Schedule 1, page 29.
19 And you don't have to have that on the screen. In
20 the preamble, I provided a quote from your evidence:

21 "In alignment with the OEB's vulnerability
22 assessment and storm hardening, VASH,
23 framework, Elexicon will identify areas within
24 the grid for strategic investment opportunities
25 to modernize and harden the grid to mitigate
26 the risks and customer impacts." (as read)

27 And my question was:

28 "Are there any proposed capital projects that

1 are supported by OEB's VASH framework analysis
2 in this application? If the answer is yes,
3 please list them and file the respective VASH
4 framework analysis of each one. If the answer
5 is no, please explain why not." (as read)

6 In your answer, you directed me, as you can see,
7 to Staff -- 1-Staff-31C. Can we have that on the
8 screen, please. And in Question C, Staff asked you a
9 question that is similar to mine. They asked:

10 "Has Elexicon Energy considered the system
11 hardening investments in the context of OEB's
12 vulnerability assessment and system hardening
13 report? If not, why not?" (as read)

14 And your answer is now on the next page. Can
15 you turn to the next page, please. Yeah, there it
16 is. And the answer is:

17 "These investments are not specifically
18 considered in the context of OEB's
19 vulnerability assessment and storm hardening,
20 VASH, report given the timing of the release of
21 the VASH report and toolkit in 2025 and
22 Elexicon's Distribution System Plan and
23 associated investments were already in an
24 advanced state at that time." (as read)

25 I looked up the date of the release of the VASH
26 report and toolkit, and it was released on October
27 7th, 2025. Is that your recollection too?

28 We can take that subject to check. It really is

1 not that important. So we can save time.

2 S. SHEEHY: -- subject to check, yes. We would
3 have to confirm that, but it was released around that
4 time.

5 T. LADANYI: Yes. And when did you file your
6 application? Was it on December 18th, 2025?

7 S. SHEEHY: Subject to check the exact date,
8 but, yes, that sounds correct.

9 T. LADANYI: Very good. So I understand you did
10 not have time to apply the VASH report of -- to use
11 and used the toolkit -- toolkit in development of the
12 Distribution System Plan. So it is now June 22nd,
13 2026, and many months have passed. Have you made any
14 changes to the Distribution System Plan?

15 S. SHEEHY: I am sorry, could you just repeat
16 that question for me.

17 T. LADANYI: Yes. Okay. So we have now -- the
18 VASH report came out in October of last year. And
19 now it is many months since then, it is now June
20 22nd. And I was wondering whether since then you
21 have made any changes to your Distribution System
22 Plan as a result of VASH report.

23 S. SHEEHY: I can confirm we have not yet made
24 any changes with respect to our asset management
25 process or Distribution System planning activities.
26 With the release of the VASH toolkit, that is still a
27 work in progress for Elexicon to assess that toolkit
28 and introduce it, as we state in our evidence.

1 T. LADANYI: I am not surprised you haven't, but
2 when exactly would you be making these changes, if
3 ever?

4 S. SHEEHY: What I would say prior to committing
5 to a date, our intentions are to pilot the VASH
6 toolkit on a select asset class, learn from the
7 implementation of that pilot to determine our next
8 steps.

9 So I do not have a specific date I can provide
10 you at this point, but our next steps for this
11 toolkit is to pilot it, assess the results, and
12 engage implementation from there.

13 T. LADANYI: Now, my clients asked me, what are
14 system hardening investments? Like, can you give me
15 some examples? I think it could be installing, for
16 example, composite poles instead of wooden poles. Is
17 that one? Would there be some others?

18 S. SHEEHY: Composite poles would be one
19 example. A few other examples I could give you would
20 be our asset renewal plans within our system renewal
21 category, so replacing aged assets that are in poor
22 and very poor condition with new infrastructure that
23 is upgraded to the latest standards of today, would
24 be another example.

25 A second example would be rear lot conversion.
26 We are undertaking rear lot conversions from -- to
27 the front lot to harden our system and, you know,
28 withstand the impacts that that would have on system

1 reliability.

2 And a third example I would give is vegetation
3 management. So increased vegetation management would
4 harden our grid by reducing the frequency of tree
5 contacts on our system.

6 Those are a few of the examples I would say for
7 storm hardening.

8 T. LADANYI: So what you describe there are
9 essentially things you are already doing. In fact,
10 they are not doing -- they are nothing different.
11 You have been doing those things for years, haven't
12 you?

13 S. SHEEHY: Yes, that is correct. The examples
14 I gave are kind of good utility practice for what we
15 have been doing. And the VASH toolkit, once -- like
16 I said, once we assess the pilot and determine the
17 results would be what I would characterize as an
18 incremental improvement, maybe some enhanced insights
19 into our system where there are vulnerabilities, that
20 would help drive decision making. But we would need
21 to assess the pilot and go from there.

22 T. LADANYI: Thank you. These are all my
23 questions for this panel. Now, I will have questions
24 of this panel on behalf of my other client, but I
25 think that will probably be tomorrow.

26 T. HOBBS: Thank you, Mr. Ladanyi.

27 Does DRC have any questions for the Applicant
28 today? If they are on the line. Mr. Vollmer?

1 D. COBAN: My understanding --

2 C. LI: I am sorry, I drifted a little bit. Did
3 you mention something about me?

4 T. HOBBINS: Sorry, no. I was actually trying
5 to get a hold of Mr. Vollmer.

6 C. LI: Oh, I am sorry, I am sorry. Never mind.

7 D. COBAN: It is our understanding that DRC is
8 not going to proceed with oral questions in light of
9 the undertaking we gave this morning.

10 T. HOBBINS: Okay.

11 D. VOLLMER: Yeah, that is correct. We have no
12 questions.

13 T. HOBBINS: All right. Then we have Energy
14 Probe for 15 minutes. Do you want to take that today
15 or defer to tomorrow?

16 T. LADANYI: Sorry, let me get me camera going.
17 Yes, I would be happy to go with that today unless,
18 you know, if the witness panel is too tired or
19 anybody else, I mean, I don't want to push it to the
20 limit. This might take a little longer. I can start
21 some, or we can just start tomorrow. Whatever you
22 like.

23 D. COBAN: I think we should make good use of
24 the time we have today, if that is okay.

25 **CROSS-EXAMINATION BY T. LADANYI (ENERGY PROBE):**

26 T. LADANYI: Okay. Very good.

27 So my first question on behalf of Energy Probe
28 is -- can you turn to 2B-EP-5. And this is in

1 regards to the customer engagement survey. I asked:

2 "Were participants in the customer engagement
3 survey informed how much they would have to pay
4 in rates for the cost of grid modernization.

5 If the answer is yes, please file the
6 information provided to them. If the answer is
7 no, please explain why not." (as read)

8 And in your response, you directed me to Exhibit
9 1, Tab 7, Schedule 1, Appendix A, pages 10 to 13.

10 And can we have, let's say, page 10 on the screen of
11 that. So it is the customer engagement survey. And
12 let's go to page 10 because that is where you
13 directed me.

14 Now, I have got a problem with this document
15 because this has two page numbers, and which -- I
16 don't know which one -- which page 10 you are
17 referring to. Each page has two numbers.

18 S. SHEEHY: In the IR response, we were
19 referring to the page numbers within this -- this
20 appendix. So, like, page 10 that is shown here would
21 correspond to page 10 that was in 2B-EP --

22 T. LADANYI: Okay. And where in those pages are
23 customers informed how much they would have to pay in
24 rates for the cost of grid modernization? Where was
25 that? Because I couldn't find it, but maybe you can
26 spot it.

27 S. SHEEHY: It might be helpful if we could go
28 to page 18.

1 T. LADANYI: Oh, 18, okay.

2 S. SHEEHY: Yeah. And just to clarify, so the
3 customers were given options within this for spending
4 more, the draft plan, spending less. So there was --
5 they were presented with choices that they could make
6 within the survey. And that is how they were
7 presented with the cost of the modernization plans.

8 T. LADANYI: Sure. But there is no actual rate
9 impact. There was nothing -- they see these
10 percentages, and they say, well, we don't know how
11 much it is. Maybe we are going to have a, like, 1
12 percent rate increase or a 1.5 percent rate increase.
13 You can't tell from these numbers what their rate
14 increase would be, can you?

15 S. SHEEHY: It might be helpful if we could
16 scroll up to page 16. So if I could direct you to
17 the top right box. So modernization represents 5
18 percent, so that would be the 5 percent of the 1.1
19 billion investment plan within this chart.

20 T. LADANYI: Sure, no, I see that. But I still
21 don't see anything about rates.

22 E. STEVENS: If I can clarify. This is Ms.
23 Stevens. On page 323 -- actually, 324 of the PDF
24 itself, there is a customer engagement workbook which
25 does speak to a rate impact related to modernizing
26 the grid. So this would be in Appendix 10. I
27 realize there is a lot of appendices in this customer
28 engagement summary.

1 Yes, so if we jump actually -- jump about ahead
2 50 pages. Go a couple more. Yes, right there. If
3 you scroll to the bottom of this slide, you will see
4 there is a demonstrative rate impact put forward for
5 this particular investment plan.

6 T. LADANYI: Which page is that again?

7 E. STEVENS: There is two pages. 54 is
8 associated with the actual appendix page, but the PDF
9 is 324, but Appendix 10 is page 54.

10 T. LADANYI: Okay. I will study that. Thank
11 you.

12 Now, please turn to 2B-EP-6. Can we have that
13 on the screen? And this is about the need for the
14 grid modernization plan. I asked a few simple
15 questions.

16 Now, you are spending 59.69 million for the grid
17 modernization plan; is that right? I think it is on
18 -- in table -- in the exhibit. Not in this -- it is
19 in your evidence. It doesn't really matter. I mean,
20 you can take this subject to check. It is in your
21 evidence. I mean, I didn't make it up.

22 In my interrogatory, I asked in Part B if a wind
23 farm can be connected to a traditional grid, and your
24 answer was that it can. And I also asked if an EV
25 charger can be connected to a traditional grid, and
26 you also said it can. Now, in the answer on the wind
27 farm, you said:

28 "I guess a wind farm can be connected to a

1 traditional grid; however, interconnection
2 feasibility depends on on-site-specific
3 technical and operational considerations that
4 are assessed on a case-by-case basis." (as
5 read)

6 What happens if it cannot be connected to a
7 traditional grid because of technical and operational
8 issues?

9 S. SHEEHY: My response to that would be I don't
10 know. It would be a case-by-case basis that we would
11 need to assess and determine the drivers for why it
12 can't be connected. So I couldn't give you a
13 generalized response. It would have to be an
14 analysis done on a project-by-project basis.

15 T. LADANYI: Okay.

16 Well, let's say in theory, wouldn't that -- you
17 would tell the wind farm owner, yes, we can connect
18 you, but we are going to have to make some
19 modifications, and would you ask the wind farm owner
20 to pay a contribution to pay for modifications or
21 improvements?

22 S. SHEEHY: We would assess that project and
23 follow the distribution system code appropriately to
24 determine any contributions that are required.

25 T. LADANYI: Now, would your grid modernization
26 plan benefit rooftop solar owners?

27 S. SHEEHY: I am sorry. Could you repeat that
28 for me, please.

1 T. LADANYI: Let's try again. Would your grid
2 modernization plan benefit rooftop solar owners?

3 S. SHEEHY: Rooftop solar is a type of
4 distributed energy resource, and our grid
5 modernization plans do have elements that benefit
6 distributed energy resources within the plan. So the
7 answer would be yes.

8 T. LADANYI: Let's try it this way: Is your
9 grid modernization plan required to allow rooftop
10 solar owners and rooftop solar aggregators to have
11 two-way flow of electricity?

12 S. SHEEHY: If I could point us quickly to
13 Exhibit 2B, Tab 3, Schedule 2, and Appendix A. If we
14 could go to page 20. It starts on page 19, but the
15 section from page 19 to page 20 for distributed
16 energy and electrification. So if we look more
17 closely at page 20, and we will look at, you know,
18 from line 1, page 20.

19 So there are a number of investments that would
20 be -- that would leverage the two-way communication
21 of flow. So AMI2.0 is one of the investments as well
22 as DSO enablement in future years. So this -- this -
23 - this phase of the project is really preparing the
24 grid for increased energy demand and bidirectional
25 flow, and this section here covers that off.

26 T. LADANYI: So I read this, and actually, it is
27 very interesting. I want to know whether it is
28 actually required for bidirectional flow that is

1 required by distributed energy at many locations,
2 like, for example, rooftop solar and the rooftop
3 solar used by aggregators.

4 I am not really discussing specifically a gas-
5 fired generator that might be at some industrial
6 plant. I am -- something -- what you were talking
7 about here is what is required to get the system
8 working that consists of many rooftop solar locations
9 throughout your system, different places coming on
10 and off at different times. And your modernization
11 plan is primarily directed to allow this; isn't that
12 right?

13 S. SHEEHY: I believe the answer in this is
14 there is a suite at investments that would be
15 required. I could take this away, if you would like,
16 to get a specific investment program. But, to me, it
17 is --

18 T. LADANYI: Not at all. Not at all. I am
19 asking for a basic concept, like, why exactly is this
20 required, and who is going to benefit from it. Now,
21 I am trying -- let me simplify it for you: Some poor
22 person living in a small house in Whitby that has a
23 fridge, stove, few light bulbs and a TV, they don't
24 need the grid modernization plan.

25 However, somebody -- some rich person who has a
26 large house with many rooftop solar panels who wants
27 to export excessive electricity into the grid will
28 need it, and that is what I am talking about.

1 It is most customers. Your -- most of your
2 customers really don't need this grid modernization
3 plan. Oh, yeah, they might -- it might be useful,
4 but most of them will, in fact -- in fact, can live
5 without it. But I can put this in argument. So that
6 is what I was trying to explain. But let me go to
7 another question because it is kind of getting late
8 in the day.

9 So can we turn to 2B-Energy Probe-9. And there
10 I was trying to find out what is the impact of the
11 grid modernization plan on OM&A, does it require
12 additional staff or fewer staff. And I actually am
13 not clear what your answer is trying to tell me. So
14 essentially, you don't know.

15 Because I would think if you got all this new
16 automatic equipment, maybe you don't need as many
17 employees and because -- to make decisions or
18 whatever. This is all going to happen automatically,
19 but you don't know. In fact, it might cost more.
20 Can you explain that to me, please?

21 S. SADEGHI: Mr. Ladanyi, we would like to
22 confer as a panel, please.

23 S. SHEEHY: Mr. Ladanyi, before I respond to
24 your question here in 2B-EP-09, I just wanted to
25 quickly touch on something that you commented on in
26 the previous IR in that the Whitby example, you know,
27 poor person, only rich people benefit. I view that
28 as a mischaracterization of the grid modernization

1 plan. As we outline within that grid modernization
2 plan, it will benefit all of Elexicon's customers.

3 We have investments lined up to improve
4 reliability, to improve grid resiliency. And I
5 wanted to make that clear, that this wasn't a case of
6 just benefiting rich or the poor. This is -- the
7 impetus of the grid mod plan is to benefit all of
8 Elexicon's customers across our service territory.

9 Now, in terms of 2B-EP-9 and new and additional
10 staff, as I noted within lines 20 to 25, the grid mod
11 plan is going to bring with it capabilities needed to
12 plan, design, implement, and enhance these
13 modernization initiatives.

14 The plan is for these capabilities to be
15 addressed through upskilling of existing staff. And
16 when we recruit for new roles, these requirements
17 will be incorporated within that recruitment.

18 So I believe that answers the question. It is
19 to -- it is targeted upskilling of existing staff,
20 not necessarily new staff coming in as a result of
21 the grid modernization plan.

22 T. LADANYI: All right.

23 At the start of your answer, you provided an
24 argument, and I would be happy to argue with you
25 about this, but I will leave that for my written
26 argument. Okay.

27 And I -- can we go to the next question, which
28 is 2B-EP-11 --

1 T. HOBBSINS: Mr. Ladanyi, I am wondering if we
2 can wrap up for the day, seeing that we are back on
3 schedule, and we can resume with your time tomorrow?

4 T. LADANYI: Definitely.

5 T. HOBBSINS: Okay.

6 All right. So that is all for today. This
7 session is adjourned. We will see you again tomorrow
8 at 9:30.

9 --- Whereupon the proceeding adjourned at 4:58
10 p.m. to resume Tuesday, June 23, 2026, at
11 9:30 a.m.