

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.

Application to Amend the Distribution Licence of Chatham-Kent Hydro Inc.

Critical Customer In-service Requirements Hearing

May 14, 2003

FINAL ARGUMENT OF CHATHAM-KENT HYDRO INC.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Chatham-Kent Hydro Inc. (the “Applicant”) filed an application to amend its service territory with the Board on October 18, 2002 (Ex. A3.1). This Application was in response to a direction from the Chief Administrative Officer of The Municipality of Chatham-Kent (the “Municipality”). The Municipality’s recommendation was based, in part, on a consultant’s report that indicated that the Applicant be selected over Hydro One Networks Inc. (“Hydro One”) to service the Highway 401/Bloomfield Road Commercial/Industrial Park (the “Bloomfield Business Park”).

Since that time the Board decided to consolidate the proceedings of eight other applications by distributors to amend their service areas. As a result of the consolidation of applications, the Board required those applicants with critical customer in-service requirements to present their case by way of written submissions and an oral proceeding.

2.0 CRITICAL IN-SERVICE DATE REQUIREMENT OF THE MUNICIPALITY

The Municipality has an urgent requirement for distribution services at its Bloomfield Business Park because it has determined that it must be able to advise prospective businesses that it has the requisite services in place in order to sell lots. Those services include water, sewage, natural gas, telecommunication and electricity. Based on a variety of studies, the Municipality determined that it required an initial 10MW dual feeder supply at 27.6 kV per feeder.

3.0 THE APPLICANT'S OFFER TO CONNECT

3.1 Construction Time (Transcript, paragraphs 791 to 798)

The Applicant is able to construct the services required by the Municipality within six to eight weeks from the time of Board approval of the Application. The Applicant made inquiries as to the available capacity at the Kent TS for its planning purposes and has determined that it will have the necessary capacity to service the Bloomfield Business Park. It has procured the materials for the project from suppliers and will not be penalized if these materials are not required (Transcript, paragraph 1058). In addition, it has received the necessary approvals from regulatory agencies such as the Ministry of Transportation for highway crossing, Hydro One for lines under the transmission lines and the Municipality for rights-of-way. This process took approximately four months.

In Undertaking D.3.2, Hydro One has proposed service routes that are different from any of their previous submissions. Hydro One claims it can provide dual 27.6kV feeders with 10MW service to the Industrial Park from the M1 and M18 feeders in eight weeks. However, this time frame does not contemplate the time required for negotiating the connection agreement with the Municipality, nor does it allow for the time that may be required to obtain approvals from regulatory agencies or individual property owners.

3.2 Reliability of Service (Transcript, paragraphs 866 to 884; 1075 to 1137)

The Municipality stated in its request for proposals (Ex A3.1, Tab 2) and in testimony at the oral hearing, that the targeted end-use customers in Bloomfield Business Park require a high level of power quality and reliability in order to attract its targeted businesses (Transcript, paragraphs 247, 255).

The Applicant can meet the reliability requirements. Mr. Schwarz stated that the main factor affecting reliability is the length of the feeders, such that reliability decreases as the length of the feeder increases. This was also confirmed by Hydro One (Ex. A3.2, Tab 5). He determined that the Applicant's service route would require an extension of their M3 and M8 feeders of approximately four kilometres from the former City of Chatham boundary and with the proposed "wing-type" configuration, lightning and tree limb interference would be minimal.

On the other hand, the route proposed by Hydro One in Undertaking D.3.2 incorporates supply from the M1 and M18 feeders, both of which are in excess of sixty kilometres and therefore a higher probability of interruptions resulting from lightning, accidents and damage by animals. Although these lines have reclosures, the Applicant believes that these are situated at least ten to twenty kilometres from the taps to the Bloomfield Business Park.

Ms. Aldred suggests that industry can compensate for the affects of interruptions caused by long exposed feeders by installing uninterrupted power supply systems (UPS) on their equipment. As Mr. Schwartz stated these systems are very expensive (Transcript, paragraph 1116).

The Applicant submits that end-use customers should not be required to install expensive UPS systems on their equipment in order to manage poor reliability resulting from Hydro One's long rural feeders. In addition, the Applicant believes that the Municipality would be obliged to advise prospective businesses of this requirement to the detriment of their ability to market the Bloomfield Business Park.

Mr. Klootra states that Hydro One has increased the reliability of the M17 feeder to Solvay Automotive's satisfaction (Transcript, paragraph 1649). The Applicant disagrees with this statement. The Applicant has been advised by Solvay Automotive and customers in the community of Blenheim that they continue to experience power quality problems. As indicated

in the Siemens Westinghouse report, several upgrades were required to improve the reliability of the M17 feeder (Ex A3.2, Tab 3, page 2). To the Applicant's knowledge, Hydro One has not completed all of the upgrades and as a result, power quality continues to be a problem.

The Applicant is also concerned that the additional load that Hydro One plans to add to the M1 and M18 feeders will reduce or eliminate the backup capability that these feeders provide as support services for the Applicant's embedded customers in Tilbury and Blenheim. In addition, the Applicant believes that its industrial customers, such as Solvay Automotive, Siemens VDO, Autoliv, and Arvin Merritor will experience greater reliability problems because the Hydro One feeders will be close to or at maximum capacity.

The Applicant believes that it is not in the best interest of the public to increase the risk of extended power interruptions and reduce power quality to its existing industrial customers in Tilbury and Blenheim. The Applicant submits that the Hydro One proposal is an example of Hydro One not taking a regional approach to system planning and a lack of local knowledge of service requirements in the Municipality.

Hydro One is proposing to rebuild and convert the 8 kV system and to install step-down transformation supplied from the M1 and M18 27.6 kV system (Undertaking D.3.2, page 1, lines 15 to 16). Based on the Applicant's experience with step-down transformers to supply distribution voltages, step-down transformation adds another element to the system that will decrease the reliability of the feeders. Consequently, the Applicant believes that the additional 8 kV step-down transformation to the feeders will increase the probability of reliability problems associated with long rural feeders supplying the Bloomfield Business Park.

3.3 Applicant's Distribution Rates and Required Capital Contribution

3.3.1 Attracting End-use Customers

As stated by Mr. Pavelka, one of the key factors for the Municipality to sell the lots in the Bloomfield Business Park is to provide the lowest possible energy rates (Transcript, paragraphs 181 to 182). This position is also supported by the report prepared by Stevens Associates which states:

“It is clearly in the financial interests of the future occupants of the Bloomfield Road commercial/industrial park to be served by Chatham-Kent Hydro rather than Hydro One.”...

“The difference in distribution charges discussed in the previous section is large enough (\$21,000/ month for a 3,000 kW customer) that it could make a difference to some businesses in their decision on whether to locate in this commercial/industrial park. This could affect the financial viability of this development” (Ex B3.5, Tab 3, page 4)

The Applicant submits that the end-use customers that locate in the Bloomfield Business Park should benefit from the lowest energy costs possible. The Applicant believes that if the Municipality is not able to offer the lowest distribution rates to prospective businesses, that the attractiveness of the Bloomfield Business Park will be diminished. Furthermore, if the Municipality is not able to sell the lots, then the taxpayers may bear the risk of its \$11 million investment.

3.3.2 The Applicant’s Rates are Lower (Transcript, paragraphs 909 to 913)

The Board approved the Applicant’s distribution rates on two occasions and found the rates to be just and reasonable (RP-1999-0033 and RP-2002-0081).

The Stevens Associates reports states that the Applicant’s rates are 3 to 8 times lower than Hydro One’s and that the overall electricity bill for the end use customer will be 28 to 36 per cent greater if Hydro One is the distributor for the Bloomfield Business Park (Ex B3.5, Tab 3, page 4). Mr. Hogan confirmed the lower rates in his testimony.

The Applicant’s rates are lower for a number of reasons. The Applicant applied for a 6.05 per cent return on equity in the initial rate unbundling, approximately two thirds of the maximum approved by the Board (RP-1999-0034). The Applicant opted for a lower return on equity in order to reduce rates for existing customers and to assist in promoting economic development in the Municipality.

In 1998, the Applicant was part of an amalgamation that brought eleven utilities together and resulted in a decrease in operating and maintenance costs of 13 per cent or \$759,000. Given the fact that rates were based on costs incurred in 1999, this cost base did not include the \$759,000 and therefore, customer rates were lower than they would have been without the efficiencies

gained (Transcript, paragraphs 1186 and 1192). Conversely, any utility that amalgamated or merged during or after the 1999 base year would not have been able to reduce rates resulting from efficiency gains because the rate unbundling was based on costs incurred in 1999.

3.3.3 Low Voltage Charges (Transcript, paragraphs 928 to 933)

Hydro One claims that the low voltage charges that were approved for recovery from embedded distributors are not part of current rates and if low voltage charges were included, then end use customers would have significantly higher rates. Hydro One also claims in their evidence that the Applicant's 11 non-contiguous service areas are all connected to Hydro One's low voltage facilities (Ex B3.6, Table 3, page 12). Both of these statements are incorrect.

When low voltages charges are imposed, the impact on the Applicant's end-use customers will be minimal. The estimated additional charges would be \$477,000, which amounts to an increase of 0.6 per cent based on revenue of \$80.3 million in 2002. This is an insignificant increase and obviously less than the Board's 10 per cent threshold for significant rate increases.

It is also important to note that service to the Bloomfield Business Park will be provided from a feeder that is directly connected to the transmission system; therefore low voltage charges would not apply to the end-use customers in the Bloomfield Business Park.

3.3.4 Transitional Nature of Rates (Transcript, paragraphs 1169 to 1192)

Hydro One claims that distribution rates are transitional and therefore, should not be used as a determining factor in selecting a distributor for the Bloomfield Business Park (Ex B3.6, Table 3, page 11).

The Applicant disagrees with this assessment. The rates that were used as the starting point for unbundling were approved by the former regulator Ontario Hydro and these were based on a pooled cost allocation model (Transcript, paragraph 1157). Therefore the original rates were approved using a cost allocation model.

The methods for unbundling the rates are described in the Board's Distribution Rate Handbook, which provided the equations to be used in calculating unbundled rates for Board approval as just and reasonable rates.

Under the Performance Based Regulatory (“PBR”) rate making, rates and costs decouple as a natural outcome. Because decoupling flows from PBR rate setting and will be the basis for future rate setting, Hydro One should not be surprised that decoupling may occur. In addition, there is no evidence that the Applicant’s rates are significantly different than the costs by rate class.

Cost of service studies are not required by the Board. However, a cost allocation study must be provided by all distribution companies as part of the Second Generation PBR. At that time, cost allocation studies will be used to analyse the costs of services and not to disprove them or to highlight that the initial PBR rates were incorrect. The rates that are currently charged were originally approved by Ontario Hydro on a pooled cost allocation basis.

It should also be noted that the cost allocation studies required to assist in setting the rates for Second Generation PBR may provide evidence that the rates charged to the customers in the Bloomfield Business Park will be reduced.

3.3.5 Rate Impacts on End-use Customers (Transcript, paragraphs 1229 to 1247)

Future end-use customers in the Bloomfield Business Park will pay significantly lower electricity rates if the Applicant provides distribution services to the Bloomfield Business Park (Ex B3.5, Tab 3, page 6).

Exhibit C.3.2 provides two scenarios that compare the distribution charges of the Applicant and Hydro One and the resulting savings that end-use customers would realize if the Applicant is granted an order to service the Bloomfield Business Park. A further analysis is provided in Undertaking D.3.1 that provides two additional scenarios and summary of the savings.

Undertaking D.3.1 indicates that the savings to end-use customers are significant if the Applicant provides distribution services. The savings range from \$3.2 million (Scenario 1) to \$7.4 million (Scenario 2) over a period of ten years for a maximum of ten customers with total monthly demands ranging from 7,000 kW to 11,400 kW.

Scenario 2 indicates that if eight customers located in the Bloomfield Business Park over a ten year period, then they would realise a total savings of \$7.4 million or \$0.925 million per

customer (Ex C.3.2) Based on discussions with the Economic Development staff of the Municipality, in connection with prospective businesses locating at the Bloomfield Business Park, the Applicant believes that Scenario 2 is the most likely outcome.

The Applicant submits that the competitive advantage of its rates meets one of the Board's objectives in the Act regarding the protection of interests of consumers with respect to prices.

3.3.6 Capital Contribution (Transcript, paragraphs 935 to 940)

The Applicant follows the Distribution System Code (section 3) in determining the capital contribution required from any developer. As a result, the Applicant requires the capital contribution up front from the developer as in this case, where the Municipality would be required to, and has agreed to, provide the required capital contribution. As load develops over a five-year period, the developer receives a rebate equivalent to the amount of earnings above the allowable amounts for distributors.

The Applicant's policy ensures that existing customers are protected in that they do not subsidize any new developments. It also provides the developer with future cash receipts, rather than future payments to the Applicant.

A key component in reducing the capital contribution from a developer is the distribution rates charged to the end use customers. If end-use customers are charged higher rates, then there will be lower costs to the developer. In this case, the Hydro One rates are 3 to 8 times higher than the Applicant's rates; therefore the end-use customers will pay for the development rather than the developer.

Undertaking D.3.1 shows the capital contribution rebates that may flow to Municipality under four scenarios. Scenario 2 indicates an expected rebate of \$748,000, resulting in a net capital contribution of \$250,000, based on the estimated capital cost of \$998,000. Scenarios 3 and 4 indicate that the Municipality will receive a full refund of its capital contribution within five years. However, it is also important to note that if 10MW of load were connected during the first year of the development of the Bloomfield Business Park, then the Municipality would receive a full refund of its capital contribution during the first year.

Hydro One has not provided any detailed scenarios regarding the potential exposure the Municipality may face in terms of capital contribution requirements, nor do they provide any details on the revenue guarantee that the Municipality would be required to provide to Hydro One. This lack of information does not assist the Municipality in its decision making process or provide certainty for future businesses in the Bloomfield Business Park.

The Applicant applied the capital contribution model accurately and fairly in determining the contribution required from the Municipality for the Bloomfield Business Park. The Municipality of Chatham-Kent is not receiving any special treatment from its distributor. It was treated no differently than any other developer (Transcript, paragraph 1457).

3.4 Service Centres (Transcript, paragraphs 1008 to 1017)

Hydro One indicated that their service centre is in close proximity to the Bloomfield Business Park. The Applicant wishes to raise a few points in this regard:

- Hydro One witnesses were not from the Hydro One's service centre in Chatham-Kent;
- Mr. Coffey's letter, dated March 14, 2002, to the Municipality was from Hydro One's office in Guelph (Ex B3.6, Tab 2);
- the Applicant believes that a Hydro One customer can only access Hydro One through its call centre in Markham, Ontario;
- the Hydro One account executive responsible for the Municipality is located in either London or Essex, (Ex A3.2, Tabs 5 and 6); and
- the Hydro One system control room is located in Barrie Ontario and not within the Municipality.

Consequently, the Applicant believes that the staff at Hydro One's service centre in Chatham-Kent is not empowered to make decisions that fall outside of day-to-day activities because all contacts with Hydro One offices are outside of the Municipality.

On the other hand, the Applicant's service centre is located 7.8 kilometres from the Bloomfield Business Park. Services available at this service centre include the 24/7 call centre, customer service staff, billing, engineering, metering, line crews, system control, and the President and senior management.

4.0 APPLICANT'S COMMENTS ON HYDRO ONE'S PROPOSALS

The Applicant understands that Hydro One is no longer offering the proposal described in its initial response to the Municipality's request for proposal (Ex. B3.6, Tab 3) or the proposal described in its evidence (Ex B3.6, pages 7 to 8).

The Hydro One proposals before the Board are described in Undertaking D.3.2 and the interim solution described at the proceedings providing for an 8 kV system restricted to 1 MW (Transcript, paragraph 1834).

4.1 The Interim Proposal

The Applicant submits that the 8 kV 1 MW option is not a viable option for this development because it is restricted to 500 KVA or 0.5 MW capacity per customer and would not be an efficient use of distribution assets (Transcript, paragraphs 1299 to 1309). In addition, it is likely that some of these 8 kV assets may become stranded because the Bloomfield Business Park requires 27.6 kV voltage.

The Municipality has made it clear that the end-use customer will require a dual 27.6 kV supply of 10 MW per feeder. The Hydro One interim solution will not meet the customer's requirement.

4.2 Undertaking D.3.2

The second Hydro One option is described in Undertaking D.3.2 which provides the costs for two 27.6 kV lines with 10 MW capacity, supplied from the M1 along Bloomfield Road and the M18, south of Highway 401 (Transcript, paragraphs 1826-1832). Hydro One indicated a preliminary estimate for this proposal would be \$1,200,000 (Transcript, paragraphs 1822 and 1824). However, the proposal in response to Undertaking D.3.2 indicates that the cost is \$760,000, which is 40 per cent less than the preliminary estimate.

The Hydro One proposal (Undertaking D.3.2) leads the Applicant to believe that Hydro One does not have local knowledge of the Municipality in planning for system expansions. For example, their initial proposal of March 14, 2002 indicated that a transmission system upgrade (new breaker position) would be required (Ex. B3.6, Tab 3) whereas the most recent proposal does not require a transmission system upgrade.

Similarly, the March 14, 2002 proposal indicated that the M1 feeder could only supply 5 MWs capacity at a cost of \$750,000; the most recent proposal suggests that the M1 feeder is capable of supplying 10 MW. In addition, the recent proposal states that the cost to construct the M1 feeder with capacity of 10 MW is \$350,000 or approximately 50 per cent less than the March 14, 2002 proposal to build the M1 with a capacity of 5 MW. In the Applicant's experience, doubling the capacity of a 27.6 KV feeder would require significant additional upgrades of conductors or regulators and reclosures. Consequently, the Applicant does not understand Hydro One's ability to double the capacity of the M1 feeder at a cost that is approximately 50 per cent lower than cost provided in March 2002.

In the Applicant's reply argument, it was stated that if Hydro One constructed the M1 feeder along the Bloomfield Road, it would traverse through the Applicant's service territory and result in duplication of the Applicant's assets (Ex A.3.2, page 6, section 2.4). Hydro One's proposal in Undertaking D.3.2 and the attached map indicate a tap from the M1 feeder that would run parallel to Applicant's feeder but located approximately 650 metres east on privately held farmland. This route also includes a section of approximately 1.2 kilometres that is inaccessible during much of the year because of farming activities.

The Applicant believes that the owner plants cash crops on this farmland annually (the land is currently under cultivation) and as a result, construction of a feeder along this route would have a significant impact on the farmland. The Applicant's experience with power lines that travel through farmlands is that the lands are inaccessible while crops are in the ground and during adverse weather.

In addition to the impacts on the land owner, the Applicant believes that Hydro One would be faced with significant delays in bringing distribution services to the Bloomfield Business Park because it would have to reach an agreement with the farmland owner in conveying an easement to Hydro One not only for the lines, but also for access of service equipment to repair damages to the M1 feeder.

The Applicant also questions whether Hydro One has registered easements in place for this section of line. Based on the route map provided with Undertaking D.3.2, the Applicant

conducted a search at the local Land Registry Office. The search indicated that Hydro One did not have a registered easement to cross this private property.

Based on this information, the Applicant does not understand how Hydro One could acquire easements and complete construction of this off-road system within eight weeks while the local farmers are involved in planting their crops. Construction through private farm property to supply the Bloomfield Business Park would not be in the best interest of the public.

Hydro One is also proposing to convert approximately 25 to 30 of their 8kV customers during this project and in the Applicant's opinion, the existing customer base may be subsidizing this expansion.

The second 27.6 kV supply feeder (M18) proposed by Hydro One will require an extension running east on Charing Cross Road (Undertaking D.3.2). The length of this extension is in question in that in Hydro One's proposal of February 21, 2003 it is stated to be 3.5 kilometres, the Elecsar report indicates that the extension is 5.0 kilometres and the Undertaking states that the extension is 4.3 kilometres (Ex B3.6, page 16, line 4; Ex A3.6, Attachment A, page 5, paragraph one; Undertaking D.3.2, page 1, line 30).

The variations in these distances cause the Applicant to question the estimates provided by Hydro One of \$400,000 for a 3.5 kilometre extension and \$360,000 for a 4.3 kilometre extension, given that the actual length is 5 kilometres (Ex B3.6, page 7, Table 1; Undertaking D.3.2, page, line 9). It should also be pointed out that the proposed route along the 8th Concession Road is heavily treed and as a result, the Applicant believes that construction would be difficult. In addition, a 66 centimetre water main has recently been installed along this road allowance to service the Bloomfield Business Park and occupies a substantial portion of the road allowance.

Finally, Mr. Klootra stated that a reclosure was recently installed on the M18 feeder. The Applicant submits that locations of the reclosures and small conductor size would limit the capacity and as a result, their capacity would be exceeded with an additional 10 MW. In addition, with the existing trip settings of the relays at Kent TS and the current configuration of

the feeders, an additional 10 MW may exceed the trip settings and cause the feeders to trip resulting in interruptions during peak load periods.

5.0 THE APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL (Transcript, paragraphs 791 and 800 to 811)

The Applicant's proposal consists of a dual 10 MW each, 27.6 KV supply with remotely operated SCADA (Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition) switching system at a cost of \$998,000. The Applicant's proposal also indicated that a 5MW load connected in the first year would provide a rebate of \$752,000.

The Applicant wishes to emphasize that its proposal includes:

- An optional underground crossing of Highway 401. This cost is \$100,000 and is included in the \$998,000 cost. However, the Applicant has determined that it will have an aerial crossing thereby reducing the cost to \$898,000.
- SCADA controlled and remote operated reclosures on both feeders at a cost of \$100,000, which is included in the \$998,000 proposal.
- One SCADA remote operated 27.6 KV tie switch at a cost of \$50,000, which is included in the \$998,000.

The Applicant has extensive experience in constructing and operating the system it is proposing. In addition, this plant will meet the power quality requirements of the end use customers that the Municipality wishes to attract to the Bloomfield Business Park. It is important to note that the Applicant's proposal is designed to provide high power quality along with the ability to transfer customers from one feeder to the other by remote control from its service centre in Chatham.

The Hydro One proposal does not offer these features and will not include a locally operated SCADA switching system. As a result, this will require Hydro One personnel to travel to site switches and manually transfer loads.

The Applicant could offer a rural type system similar to the one proposed by Hydro One for a cost of \$748,000, but the Applicant believes that this would not be in the best interest of the end-use customer or the Municipality in marketing the Bloomfield Business Park as a prestige, high power quality industrial park.

Hydro One suggests that the Applicant's proposal to construct dual feeders on the same poles is not an appropriate way to supply the Bloomfield Business Park (Transcript, paragraph 1629). The Applicant disagrees with this assertion and wishes to clarify that of the 9.1 kilometre circuit length of these feeders; approximately 3 kilometres would be on double circuit poles. This is a common practice in the industry because this type of construction ensures efficient use of distribution assets. The important issue to note is that these feeders are supplied by different buss systems at Kent TS as indicated by Mr. Schwarz, which is where the majority of the system disturbances originate (Transcript, paragraph 867).

The Applicant's proposed route, which was questioned by Hydro One, is located on the Bloomfield Road with the poles set back approximately 13 metres from the travelled section of the road and a small ditch between the poles and the road. Consequently, there is minimal exposure to traffic accidents. It should also be noted that Hydro One uses this same type of construction practice in Wallaceburg and Tilbury (where 2 of our 3 large users are located) where the Applicant's embedded loads are supplied by Hydro One double 27.6 KV feeder systems constructed on the same pole lines. The portion of the Wallaceburg supply with two 27.6 feeders on Hydro One poles is 2 kilometres in length and is set back only 3 metres from the road. In Undertaking D.3.2, Hydro One also proposes to construct both of their 27.6 KV feeders on the same poles for a section of the supply to the Bloomfield Industrial Park.

6.0 CUSTOMER CHOICE

The Applicant believes its proposal to supply the Bloomfield Business Park meets the needs of the type of the end use customer the Municipality intends to attract. The Applicant believes that the Municipality's request for proposals clearly outlined its requirements and that if these requirements were not clear, then the onus was the respondent to contact the Municipality to understand the nature of the servicing requirements. Given the fact that the Bloomfield Business Park has been in the public domain in the Municipality since 1998, Hydro One can not argue that it has local knowledge and at the same time state that it was unaware of the nature and urgency for service in March 2003 (Transcript, paragraphs 94 to 96; 123 to 132; Ex B3.6, page 12. lines 14 to 15).

7.0 REQUEST FOR AN ORDER TO AMEND SERVICE TERRITORY

Based on the information provided, the Applicant respectfully requests the Board to issue an order to amend the service area description in Schedule 1 – Distribution Service Area of its Electricity Distribution Licence to include the Bloomfield Business Park.

All of which is respectfully submitted this 23rd day of May, 2003.

James E. Fisher
Counsel to the Applicant