

BEFORE THE ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998,
S.O. 1998, c.15, (Sched. B);

AND IN THE MATTER OF applications by Centre Wellington Hydro, Veridian Connections Inc., EnWin Powerlines Ltd., Erie Thames Powerlines Corp., Chatham-Kent Hydro Inc., Essex Powerlines Corp., Cooperative Hydro Embrun Inc. and Hydro One Networks Inc. pursuant to subsection 74(1) of the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998 to amend Schedule 1 of their Transitional Distribution Licences.

**Vulnerable Energy Consumers' Coalition ("VECC")
Interrogatories Regarding Evidence Filed by Chatham-Kent Hydro Inc.
(Chatham-Kent)**

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?

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?

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 the jurisdiction 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 System 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.