

PUBLIC INTEREST ADVOCACY CENTRE LE CENTRE POUR LA DEFENSE DE L'INTERET PUBLIC

ONE Nicholas Street, Suite 1204, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 7B7

Tel: (613) 562-4002. Fax: (613) 562-0007. e-mail: piac@piac.ca. http://www.piac.ca

Michael Buonaguro Counsel for VECC (416) 767-1666

December 5, 2008

VIA MAIL and E-MAIL

Ms. Kirsten Walli Board Secretary Ontario Energy Board P.O. Box 2319 2300 Yonge St. Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: Procedural Order No. 3

Innisfil Hydro Distribution Systems Limited Application for 2009 Electricity Distribution Rates

Board File No. EB-2008-0233

The following are the submissions of the Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition (VECC) on the procedural issues identified in the Board's Procedural Order No. 3 issued November 26, 2008:

a) whether further discovery is required, either in the form of further interrogatories or a technical conference;

VECC has reviewed the interrogatory responses of the Applicant and submits that provision for a second round of interrogatories is warranted. VECC notes that the first-round responses include interrogatories that were not answered fully such as:

- VECC #1 d) where the response did not make the adjustments requested;
- VECC #4 a) where the response did not follow adjustments requested;
- VECC #4 b) where the response was not based on the comparison requested.

VECC further submits that the other IRs require follow-up. An example of this is Energy Probe #4 which indicates that for many customer classes the September 2008 customer counts already exceed the 2008 year end forecast.

Finally, VECC submits that in its IR responses Innisfil has identified a number of revisions to its application but has not summarized the revisions and their expected impacts in one place – information that VECC believes would facilitate the balance of the process.

For these reasons VECC asks that the Board make provision for a second round of interrogatories.

b) whether a settlement conference would be appropriate; and

VECC does not believe that a settlement conference is appropriate.

c) Whether a written or oral hearing is preferred.

VECC believes that in this case a written hearing would suffice and be more cost-effective than an oral proceeding.

Yours truly,

Michael Buonaguro Counsel for VECC