

Barristers

M. Philip Tunley
Direct Line: 416-593-3495
Direct Fax: 416-593-9345
philt@stockwoods.ca

December 11, 2006

Sent via E-mail

Ms. Kirstin Walli Board Secretary Ontario Energy Board 2300 Yonge Street P.O. Box 2319, Suite 2700 Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: Cost of Capital and IRR Mechanism (EB-2006-0088/89): Comments on Draft Report of the Board, November 30, 2006 ("Draft Report")

This letter responds to the Board's invitation to submit comments on the above-noted Draft Report, on behalf of Bluewater Power Distribution Corporation, Chatham-Kent Hydro Inc., Middlesex Power Distribution Corp., Newmarket Hydro Ltd. and Welland Hydro-Electric Systems Corporation (the "Distributors").

The Distributors welcome the Board's decision to discontinue the Code-based procedure for cost of capital and IRR regulation, and instead use rate filing guidelines as in previous years. However, they are deeply disappointed with the substance of the guidelines proposed in the Draft Report, specifically with respect to cost of capital.

The Draft Report acknowledges, quite properly, that "there is a large potential range of risk" among Ontario LDCs. Yet it proposes a single "deemed" capital structure for all LDCs. That decision simply makes no effort whatever to properly reflect for rate-making purposes the range of risk that the Board, itself, recognizes. The result, inevitably, will be to penalize many LDCs and their stakeholders unfairly, while giving an unfair bonus to a few others, not based on their real business risk differences but just on where they happen to live.

These proposals give many affected smaller LDCs the unpalatable choice between scrambling to leverage a further 10% of their capital base to match the new "deemed" norm, or suffering an unfair shortfall on the recovery of their actual costs of capital and a reduced ability to provide a reasonable return to shareholders. Those who choose to seek new debt in the marketplace not only raise their own borrowing costs, but also risk raising the cost, or reducing the availability of

new investment capital to all participants in Ontario's electricity industry. Those who cannot do so, or prefer to suffer the shortfall, will simply transfer some of the legitimate costs of electricity infrastructure to their shareholders, in the form of unfairly low rates of return. In the case of municipally owned LCDs, the end result is to transfer those costs from electricity consumers to municipal stakeholders.

Nor do the Distributors believe these measures will remove barriers to, or encourage LDC consolidation, as the Draft Report claims. Rather, prudent municipal owners are being driven to make a decision, whether that decision is to sell or hold, based upon incorrect considerations, namely regulatory changes proposed by the Board rather that market forces.

It is also ironic that, at the same time the Supreme Court of Canada is recognizing the need for our law to take better account of increased economic globalization, the Ontario Energy Board is simply closing its eyes to neighbouring U.S. market realities. Ontario LDCs' ability to compete for market capital on reasonable terms is the only sure casualty on this approach.

Moreover, it is disappointing that all of these unintended effects are being driven not by market-based decision-making, but by regulatory fiat.

The Distributors fear this is bad policy. They believe it is based upon an inadequate evidentiary record, and/or a badly flawed assessment of the available evidence. Indeed, reviewing the whole record of the Board's consultation in this matter, the inadequacies of the Board's process and the extent to which the outcomes on both capital structure and return on equity were pre-determined from the outset are concerning.

The Distributors no longer expect, however, that these problems can or will be addressed in the context of the current consultative process. Rather, they propose to await the opportunity to address them in a proper evidentiary hearing context, either in their individual 2008 rate filings, or in generic processes that may result from them. Given the importance of these issues, the Distributors respectfully submit that the Board should anticipate and make sufficient provision for those hearing processes to begin at the earliest possible opportunity.

Yours very truly,

M. Philip Tunley

MPT/sb

c. see attached list

INTERVENORS

lgoma Coalition F	Paul R. Cassan
lgoma Coalition F	Robert Reid
ity of Toronto N	Michael A. Smith
onsumers Council of Canada J	Julie Girvan
DA C	Guru Kalyanraman
nergy Cost Management F	Roger White
nergy Probe I	David McIntosh
nergy Probe	Thomas Adams
nersource Hydro Mississauga Inc.	Kathy Litt
reat Lakes Power	Viggo Lunchild
reat Lakes Power C	Charles Keizer
orizon	Cameron McKenzie
ydro One Networks	Glen MacDonald
ydro Ottawa I	Lynne Anderson
dustrial Gas F	Peter C.P. Thompson
dustrial Gas F	Peter Fournier
ocal Distribution Companies J	Iim Hogan
ondon Hydro S	Scott Stoll
ondon Hydro I	an McKenzie
orth Bay Hydro J	James Sidlofsky
orth Bay Hydro J	Jim Snider
owerstream F	Paula Conboy
ower Workers E	Bob Menard
ower Workers J	Judy Kwik
ower Workers F	Richard Stephenson
oronto Hydro C	Colin McLorg (or R. Zebrowski?)
chool Energy E	Bob Williams
Phool Energy J	Jay Shepherd
chool Energy T	Γanya Watson
eridian	George Armstrong

Vulnerable Energy	Michael Buonaguro	
Vulnerable Energy	Bill Harper	
Waterloo North Hydro	G. Hilhorst	