

**CHATHAM-KENT HYDRO RESPONSES TO VULNERABLE  
ENERGY CONSUMERS COALITION (VECC)  
INTERROGATORIES**

**VECC'S Question 1:**

Reference : October 2002 Application, paragraph 2.4

- a) Please explain how, under Hydro One's proposed service arrangement for the development, Hydro One would become an "embedded distributor" within Chatham-Kent's distribution system?

---

**Chatham-Kent Hydro Inc. Answer to Question 1:**

It was assumed that Hydro One would be connecting to Chatham-Kent Hydro's 27.6 kV feeder for one of their supply options.

**CHATHAM-KENT HYDRO RESPONSES TO VULNERABLE  
ENERGY CONSUMERS COALITION (VECC)  
INTERROGETORIES**

**VECC'S Question 2:**

Reference: October 2002 Application, paragraph 2.5

- a) Please explain how the approval of the Chatham-Kent Application will avoid the need of duplicating equipment requirements and what duplication would occur under the Hydro One proposal?
  - b) Will the Chatham-Kent proposal result in the construction of new distribution lines (owned by Chatham-Kent) along side existing Hydro One lines?
- 

**Chatham-Kent Hydro Inc. Answer to Question 2:**

- a) Chatham-Kent Hydro's 27.6 kV lines are the closest 27.6 kV feeders to the Bloomfield Business Park.

It was believed that the Hydro One proposal would be to construct a 27.6 kV line along a side road where Chatham-Kent Hydro has an existing 27.6 kV line, therefore duplicating Chatham-Kent Hydro's the asset.

- b) The distribution lines that are required to service the Bloomfield Business Park are 27.6 kV. The existing Hydro One lines are at a lower voltage of 8 kV. Therefore, Chatham-Kent Hydro would not construct a line at the same voltage as Hydro One and would not be constructing the same voltage line along side Hydro One.

**CHATHAM-KENT HYDRO RESPONSES TO VULNERABLE  
ENERGY CONSUMERS COALITION (VECC)  
INTERROGETORIES**

**VECC'S Question 3:**

Reference: Chatham-Kent Reply, paragraph 2.6

- a) What would be Chatham-Kent's position and response be if an existing Hydro One customer, lying along Chatham-Kent's newly constructed distribution, approached Chatham-Kent for connection and distribution service?
- b) If Chatham-Kent's position is that it would offer to connect such customers please provide Chatham-Kent's view as what financial compensation, if any, should be provided to the incumbent distributor and who should provide the compensation, i.e., Chatham-Kent or the customer. (note: Please assume, in responding to this question, that the OEB finds that it has jurisdictional to deal with service area amendments for existing customers)
- c) Would Chatham-Kent's position and response as outlined in response to (a & b) be any different if an expansion of its system (as per Distribution Code Section 3.2) was required to connect the Hydro One customer? If yes, please explain.
- d) Would Chatham-Kent's position and response as outlined in response to (a & b) be any different if the customer was a new customer as opposed to an existing Hydro One customer? If yes, please explain.

---

**Chatham-Kent Hydro Inc. Answer to Question 3:**

- a) If an existing Hydro One customer lying along Chatham-Kent Hydro's newly constructed 27.6 kV distribution line requested to be connected to Chatham-Kent Hydro, then Chatham-Kent Hydro would provide the potential customer with an offer to connect.

- b) If a customer accepted the offer to connect, Chatham-Kent Hydro would negotiate with Hydro One to purchase the customer at Chatham-Kent Hydro's expense.
- c) Chatham-Kent Hydro's position would be the same if a system expansion were required.
- d) If the customer were a new customer, then Chatham-Kent Hydro would not have to negotiate with Hydro One to purchase a new customer. However, if the Board determined that Hydro One incurred stranded costs as a direct result of the new connection, then Chatham-Kent Hydro would comply with the Board's direction to compensate Hydro One.