KLIPPENSTEINS
BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS
160 JOHN STREET, SUITE 300,
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5V 2E5
TEL: (416) 598-0288
FAX: (416) 598-9520

February 13, 2008

BY COURIER (10 COPIES) AND EMAIL

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
P.O. Box 2319
2300 Yonge Street, Suite 2700
Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4
Fax: (416) 440-7656
Email: boardsec@oeb.gov.on.ca

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: Pollution Probe – Request to Slightly Revisit Timetable
EB-2007-0050 – Hydro One – Bruce-Milton Transmission Reinforcement Project

Introduction

We write on behalf of Pollution Probe to respectfully request that the Board slightly revisit the timetable set out in Procedural Order No. 4. Pollution Probe notes that the project's required Environmental Assessment is currently subject to an ongoing postponement (indeed, the terms of reference are not yet even approved). Pollution Probe also notes that the existing timetable does not appear to account for the nature or history of this project or this proceeding, and appropriate changes should be made. Pollution Probe thus respectfully submits that a slightly revisited timetable would allow the Board to gain a greater understanding of the issues for this proceeding without the accrual of any prejudice, particularly since such a revisit would likely only add about 2 months to the current timetable. If necessary, Pollution Probe is prepared to appear before the Board to discuss these issues as part of a formal motion.

Detailed Submissions

1. The EA Process Has Been Substantially Delayed

Pollution Probe respectfully submits that the Board can revisit the timetable and introduce additional time without prejudice given the current status of the parallel environmental assessment ("EA") process.

The Board previously stated that "[it] is of the view that the [EA and Board] processes should not be significantly out of step."[1] At the time, Hydro One expected that the EA terms of reference would be approved by September 2008, and the EA approval would be granted by September 2008.[2] Hydro One subsequently amended these expectations to approval of the EA terms of reference by "late 2007 or early 2008," and the granting of EA approval by January 2009.[3] Pollution Probe thus submits that, even if these expectations could still be met, additional time can be introduced into the Board's timetable without any prejudice.

However, given recent developments, it does not appear that even these expectations will met. On December 21, 2007, Pollution Probe received from Hydro One a "Notice of ***Resubmission*** of [the EA] Terms of Reference [emphasis added]." This notice effectively restarted the consultation and comment process with respect to the EA terms of reference due to significant amendments to the proposed EA terms of reference, and the comment period was scheduled to close only recently on February 4, 2008. Pollution Probe submits that it is unlikely that approval of the EA terms of reference will be forthcoming soon, and thus the entire EA process will be further postponed.

Pollution Probe thus submits that ample time exists to introduce additional time into the Board's timetable without the accrual of any prejudice, and the introduction of such additional time would keep the Board "in step" with the current status of the parallel EA process.

2. The Existing Timetable Appears To Inadvertently Not Consider the Nature and History of This Project and This Proceeding

Pollution Probe submits that the existing timetable appears to inadvertently not consider the nature and history of this project and this proceeding. The timetable should be thus revisited and amended to allow for additional time.

As the Board is aware, several parties requested by motions that the Board introduce additional time into its first timetable. For example, Pollution Probe's motion submitted that:

> Pollution Probe is surprised and concerned at the speed with which the Board is proceeding with this Application ... Pollution Probe submits that it is in the public interest to allow a more considered approach and analysis of the application by extending the timelines for this application. In particular, Pollution probe and its intended specialized expert would be better able to contribute to the Board's understanding of the key issues associated with this application.[4]

---

[1] *Decision and Order on Motion* dated July 4, 2007 at pg. 5.
[2] Exhibit A, Tab 2, Schedule 1, page 4, filed March 29, 2007.
[3] Exhibit A, Tab 2, Schedule 1, page 4, updated November 30, 2007.
[4] Motion by Pollution Probe dated June 12, 2007 at Tab 1, para. 10, 14.

After hearing oral submissions, the Board subsequently adjusted the schedule to allow for additional time.[5]

Pollution Probe respectfully submits that these submissions would apply equally to the timetable in Procedural Order No. 4. It appears that the timetable was inadvertently created as if this case was a standard annual rates proceeding. However, Pollution Probe submits that a typical rates timetable is not appropriate for this case, particularly since the proceeding is about a significant transmission line, not annual rate changes, that will involve significant specialized evidence. This proceeding also engages very different interests and issues compared to an annual rates case (e.g. long-distance transmission issues, a large proposed cost of $635 million, and potentially significant expropriations). Pollution Probe thus submits that it is appropriate to introduce additional time and steps into a slightly revisited timetable. Such changes would also be in line with the spirit of previous submissions to the Board and the Board's subsequent decision allowing for additional time.

3. Specific Proposed Extensions and Additions For a Slightly Revisited Timetable

Pollution Probe proposes the following specific extensions and additions to the timetable included in Procedural Order No. 4. A revised summary timetable is included below as a potential starting point for your ease of reference:

Additional Issues Submissions	Friday, February 15, 2008
Potential Issues Day	Thursday, February 21, 2008
Interrogatories to Hydro One	Monday, March 10, 2008
Hydro One's Interrogatory Responses	Monday, March 31, 2008
Motions Day	Monday, April 14, 2008
Filing of Intervenor Evidence	Monday, May 12, 2008
Interrogatories to Intervenors	Friday, May 23, 2008
Intervenor Interrogatory Responses	Monday, June 9, 2008
2nd Motions Day (if needed)	Thursday, June 19, 2008
Oral Hearings to Commence	No earlier than July 7, 2008

If these suggested changes were implemented, the commencement of oral hearings would be rescheduled by only about 2 months. Pollution Probe submits that such a minor rescheduling is appropriate, particularly given the current status of the EA process. For clarity, Pollution Probe does not oppose additional extensions as may be suggested by others or that may be required in light of the Board's schedule.

The rationales for the specific extensions and additions to the timetable are discussed below.

First, out of fairness, Hydro One should be given at least an extra week to respond to interrogatories. As outlined in our October 22, 2007 correspondence (which we enclose for

[5] *Decision and Order on Motion* dated July 4, 2007 at pg. 6.

your ease of reference at Tab 1), Hydro One chose to take a narrow and limited approach to the technical conference, an approach which it aggressively defended. The result is that the interrogatory process has now become broader rather than more scoped, and Hydro One will need appropriate time to provide full and adequate responses to the substantial forthcoming interrogatories (particularly since the Easter holiday falls during this period).

As an example, we include at Tab 2 a copy of the questions that Pollution Probe previously submitted to Hydro One in anticipation of the technical conference. While a few of these questions were answered, a cursory review of the transcript shows that the bulk of the questions remain unanswered in light of the narrow and limited approach taken by Hydro One. This result was exacerbated by the fact that Hydro One gave notice that it was not going to provide any undertakings.[6] Pollution Probe notes that these previous questions are not exhaustive, and Pollution Probe intends to modify these questions as appropriate and submit additional questions as part of the interrogatory process.

Pollution Probe also notes that, given the nature of this proceeding, the interrogatories will likely ask Hydro One to conduct some time-consuming modelling. Our specialized transmission expert, Mr. Lanzalotta, started to inquire during the technical conference into whether Hydro One would be willing to conduct this modelling. However, Hydro One did not respond either way and simply said it wanted to see it as a formal interrogatory.[7] As Mr. Lanzalotta advises us that running these models requires significant time, Hydro One should be granted additional time in order to provide full and adequate responses to such interrogatories.

Second, in light of the positions and approach that Hydro One took at the technical conference, a Motions Day should be added to the timetable. This first Motions Day would be intended to deal with issues and disputes likely arising from Hydro One's interrogatory responses. Unfortunately, as detailed in our October 22, 2007 correspondence, the technical conference made it readily apparent that such disputes are in fact likely and not merely hypothetical.[8] Hearings before the Board should thus be scheduled in a proactive manner to allow for the resolution of such issues. The unacceptable alternative is that a Motions Day would need to be scheduled on an ad hoc basis with unknown impacts and complications on the overall schedule. These impacts and compilations are significant because the preparation of the intervenors' evidence will likely require all of Hydro One's full and adequate interrogatory responses. In terms of timing, this Motions Day would need to be scheduled at least 2 weeks after the receipt of Hydro One's likely voluminous interrogatory responses to allow for proper analysis and preparation. Pollution Probe notes that if a Motions Day is not needed, the Board could then simply cancel it.

Third, the filing of intervenor evidence would also need to be rescheduled since intervenor evidence will be largely dependent on the final receipt of all full and adequate interrogatory

---

[6] See last paragraph of letter dated October 10, 2007 at 7:02 pm (Eastern Time) from Gordon M. Nettleton, counsel for Hydro One, to the Board Secretary.
[7] See *e.g.* Technical Conference Transcript for October 15, 2007 at pg. 59.
[8] Tab 1, pg. 7-8.

responses from Hydro One. From a practical viewpoint, a rescheduled date would need to allow:

1. The Board to render decisions regarding disputed interrogatories;
2. Hydro One to provide full and adequate interrogatory responses in accordance with the Board's decisions; and
3. Time for intervenor experts to review the interrogatory responses and to prepare their evidence. Substantial time would likely be needed given the specialized nature of the evidence and the fact that intervenor experts may be required to run time-consuming modelling.[9]

Accounting for these factors, it would appear that the filing of intervenor evidence would occur at least 4 weeks after the Motions Day.

Fourth, it would be helpful if intervenors had a small amount of additional time to fully and adequately respond to interrogatories. While such interrogatories are not expected to be of the same scope or scale as Hydro One, Pollution Probe submits that these interrogatories will likely be of a very technical nature and require some time in order to provide full and adequate responses. Out of an abundance of caution, the Board may also wish to proactively schedule a second Motions Day a reasonable time after the intervenors provide their interrogatory responses. However, Pollution Probe notes that there are no clear indications that such a Motions Day would be required as of yet (unlike the situation with Hydro One).

For the Board's reference, a revisited timetable would also allow Pollution Probe's specialized transmission expert to better contribute to this matter. Unfortunately, Procedural Order No. 4 was given with relatively short notice, and Mr. Lanzalotta, who attended the technical conference, is already scheduled to appear at an oral hearing before the Board's Pennsylvania equivalent during the weeks of March 24 and March 31. In addition, Mr. Lanzalotta is also required to file rebuttal evidence with the Board's Illinois equivalent by April 8, 2008 as well as appear before the relevant Commission during the week of April 28 for about half of the week. These dates are unfortunately predetermined hard dates, and a slightly revisited timetable for this matter would allow Mr. Lanzalotta to contribute appropriately here. Pollution Probe notes that it would be difficult to find other experts to take Mr. Lanzalotta's place, particularly since there are so few of them.

Pollution Probe submits that these proposed changes are reasonable, particularly since the changes only add about 2 months to the current timetable. In addition, no or minimal prejudice would accrued given the current status of the parallel EA process.

[9] The need for such time-consuming modelling would likely only be determined after reviewing Hydro One's interrogatory responses. In addition, such time-consuming modelling would likely be dependent on some of Hydro One's interrogatory responses.

Conclusion

Pollution Probe submits that it is appropriate to slightly revisit the current timetable for this matter. Such a revisit would likely only add about 2 months to the existing timetable, and it would significantly increase the Board's understanding of the issues that it will need to decide. These minor changes would also keep the Board's processes "in step" with the EA process, which is currently subject to an ongoing postponement. If the Board considers it necessary, we are willing to appear before the Board to discuss these issues as part of a formal motion.

We hope that the Board will address Pollution Probe's reasonable concerns, and please do not hesitate to contact Murray Klippenstein or the undersigned if you wish to discuss this matter further.

Yours truly,

Basil Alexander

BA/ba

Encl.

cc: Applicant and Intervenors per Procedural Order #4

Tab 1

KLIPPENSTEINS
BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS
160 JOHN STREET, SUITE 300,
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5V 2E5
TEL: (416) 598-0288
FAX: (416) 598-9520

October 22, 2007

BY COURIER (10 COPIES) AND EMAIL

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
P.O. Box 2319
2300 Yonge Street, Suite 2700
Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4
Fax: (416) 440-7656
Email: boardsec@oeb.gov.on.ca

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: Pollution Probe – Request to Postpone Interrogatories and Other Steps
EB-2007-0050 – Hydro One – Bruce-Milton Transmission Reinforcement Project

We write to provide Pollution Probe's position regarding the request by the Ross Firm landowners to postpone the interrogatories (and consequently the remaining other steps) in this proceeding.

Overview

Pollution Probe strongly supports the requested postponement, particularly in light of Hydro One's very narrow and limited approach to the disclosure and explanation aspects of the technical conference (as detailed below). This position, which Hydro One aggressively defended at the technical conference (as detailed below), essentially precluded answers to many of the intended questions and thus thwarted what our client believes is the technical conference's intended purpose. Pollution Probe submits that Hydro One should not benefit from its very narrow approach, and substantial additional time should now be allowed in order for the intervenors to prepare the extensive interrogatories that the technical conference was intended to avoid.

In addition, Pollution Probe submits that such a delay is warranted since Hydro One apparently expects to file additional evidence shortly, of which the intervenors only recently became aware. In fact, Pollution Probe only first became aware of the potential filing of this new evidence on the last business day before the technical conference due to a letter from the Board to Hydro One (i.e. not because of any actions by Hydro One). Pollution Probe submits that all evidence should have submitted well before the technical conference, particularly since Hydro One ultimately bears the onus of proving its application. Pollution Probe accordingly submits that Hydro One should not benefit from the fact that it is filing additional evidence after the technical conference, and thus a

substantial delay in the interrogatories (as well as the other steps) for this proceeding is appropriate and warranted.

Finally, based on the technical conference experience and Hydro One's position that technical conference disputes should be taken to the Board (which was obviously not feasible), Pollution Probe submits that the Board should incorporate methods to help resolve significant disputes between the parties as part of the remaining steps for this proceeding. For example, Pollution Probe submits that, if any future technical conferences are to occur, the Board should retain the services of an experienced facilitator familiar with Board processes (e.g. Ken Rosenberg) to assist the parties through such processes. In addition, the Board should set a Motions Day as part of the next procedural order to deal with any potential issues that might (in fact, are almost surely to) arise regarding Hydro One's interrogatory responses. Pollution Probe will continue to act in good faith and hopes that such mechanisms will ultimately not be needed, but Pollution Probe submits that it is only prudent that the Board incorporate methods to resolve disputes between the parties as part of this proceeding's remaining steps in light of the outcome of the technical conference.

Detailed Submissions

The Technical Conference's Intent

Pollution Probe submits that the technical conference was intended to discuss both the prefiled evidence as well as to obtain other reasonable information and understanding related to issues on the final approved Issues List, which is consistent with the Board's past practice. This viewpoint is reinforced by the following exchange between Hydro One's counsel and Panel Member Chaplin on Motions Day:[1]

> MR. NETTLETON: ... And a Technical Conference, in our submission, needs to therefore have specific purposes, have issues identified up front in terms of what is to be discussed, so that parties can be focussed and matters can be addressed in an efficient manner.
> MS. CHAPLIN: Mr. Nettleton?
> MR. NETTLETON: Yes.
> MS. CHAPLIN: Perhaps I was incorrect but it was my impression that the proposal was that the Technical Conference would come after the Issues Day and it would be after the Issues Day that the Board would set down the list of issues. **So would that not address your concern regarding the scope of the Technical Conference? Would it not be set by that issues list?**
> MR. NETTLETON: **I think the Issues Day could very much help frame the types of issues that we would be prepared to discuss. Obviously, if the Board issues the list of issues, that would go a great way to resolve the issues of approaching or going into areas that are beyond the purpose of this application in this proceeding.**

[1] Motions Day Transcript (June 25, 2007), page 186, line 19 to page 187, line 12.

> So I take your point.
> MS. CHAPLIN: Thank you. [emphasis added]

Pollution Probe submits that it is clear from this exchange that the scope of the technical conference would be ultimately limited by the Issues List (as it is normally done in Board processes). This viewpoint is reinforced by the following excerpt from paragraph 5 of the Board's Procedural Order No. 3:

> ... At this conference Hydro One will provide an overview of its pre-filed evidence **and there will be an opportunity for questions by intervenors and Board staff.** ... [emphasis added]

Pollution Probe submits that, in accordance with the Board's practice, this clause clearly anticipates that reasonable clarifying questions could be asked as long as they were in accordance with the Issues List. This interpretation is also consistent with the exchange between Hydro One and the Board at Motions Day, and Pollution Probe accordingly submitted several questions in good faith in advance of the technical conference.

Hydro One's Subsequent Very Narrow Approach to the Technical Conference

Unfortunately, as became apparent very shortly before the technical conference and at the technical conference, Hydro One took the very narrow and restrictive position that the ***entirety*** of the technical conference (***including intervenor questions***) was limited ***only*** to the prefiled evidence of Hydro One even if the questions related to a bona fide issue on the Issues List.

One example is how Hydro One chose to respond to a question about alternatives, although Hydro One responded with a similar reasoning and tone to other questions related to other topics on the Issues List. The following exchange between counsel for Hydro One and counsel for Powerline Connections at the technical conference is an illustrative summary of the significant difference of position between Hydro One and several of the intervenors as well as the issues that inevitably arose as a result:[2]

> MR. NETTLETON: Why don't you go back and look at what the procedural order looks and says and why don't you go back to the decision that was taken when the motion was made by Pollution Probe?
> MR. SPERDUTI: **As far as I understand it, this process is intended to deal with the issues. And the issues include an assessment of alternatives.**
> If I happen to raise an alternative that you haven't considered, then I don't think that it is objectionable for me to ask the question. I think if the answer is, We haven't studied it, I think it is fair for me to say, Are you going to?
> MR. NETTLETON: Let's be clear, Mr. Sperduti.
> Paragraph 5 of Procedural Order No. 3 says, and I quote:
> "A technical conference involving Board Staff, intervenors and Hydro One

[2] Technical Conference Transcript (October 15, 2007), page 91, line 18 to page 93, line 6.

> will be convened in the Board's North Hearing Room located on the 25th floor, 2300 Yonge Street, Toronto, Ontario, Monday October 15th, 2007, at 930 a.m. and may continue on Tuesday, October 16th, if needed.
> "At this conference, Hydro One will provide an overview of its prefiled evidence and there will be an opportunity for questions by intervenors and Board Staff. Those parties that wish to provide written questions to Hydro One in advance of the technical conference shall submit their questions to Hydro One with copies to the Board and all intervenors by Monday, October 1, 2007. Note that parties are not required prefile their questions. The technical conference will be transcribed.
>
> The purpose of that read in, Mr. Sperduti, is that **it is the prefiled evidence that we're here to speak to, not additional questions that relate to matters outside that prefiled evidence.**
> The issues list has included as one of the issues reasonable alternatives. What Mr. Schneider and Mr. Chow have said is that **they have not included the analysis of the option that you're speaking of, and it's not part of our application.**
> MR. SPERDUTI: **We disagree, then, on the meaning of that paragraph of the Board's order.**
> MR. NETTLETON: **Then I suggest, sir, you take it to the Board.**
> MR. SPERDUTI: Maybe I will, Mr. Nettleton. But first I want to ask the questions and understand the responses. **But I don't think that this order precludes me from asking questions about an alternative that you haven't considered.**
> MR. NETTLETON: **It doesn't compel answers, either.**
> MR. SPERDUTI: **There is nobody here to adjudicate who is right and who is wrong.**
> MR. NETTLETON: **That's why I say, sir, why don't you take it to the Board because these witnesses are not going to respond to your questions.**
> MR. SPERDUTI: Then let me put my questions on the record. And then maybe the Board will ask them to respond. [emphasis added]

A second example is when counsel for the Ross Firm landowners and counsel for Hydro One had the following exchange regarding near-term and interim measures:[3]

> MR. ROSS: So I understand, the proposed interim and near-term measures are approximately 200 million in addition to the 630 million that is for the project proper; is that correct?
> MR. NETTLETON: Mr. Ross, I am not sure that those statistics are included in the prefiled application materials.
>
> **I believe there might be information that has been filed in the Hydro One rate case, but that is information that is not part of the application that is the subject matter of the technical conference.** [emphasis added]

[3] Technical Conference Transcript (October 15, 2007), page 169, line 22 to page 170, line 4.

Pollution Probe submits that these exchanges are illustrative of the many examples where Hydro One refused to answer questions because it was not part of Hydro One's prefiled evidence, although the questions clearly fell within the scope of the Issues List. This problem was exacerbated by the fact that Hydro One gave notice that it was not going to provide any undertakings to answer any questions prior to interrogatories.[4]

Pollution Probe submits that Hydro One's very narrow position was erroneous, particularly in light of the Board's past practice with respect to technical conference and Hydro One's previous exchange with the Board at Motions Day. However, as the Board was not present, no avenue existed to feasibly rectify Hydro One's erroneous position, and Pollution Probe submits that a cursory review of the technical conference transcripts reveal that Hydro One chose to aggressively defend its erroneous position throughout the technical conference, which had a very serious impact on the benefit of the technical conference.

The Impact of Hydro One's Technical Conference Approach

Pollution Probe submits that the impact of Hydro One's limited technical conference approach was that the technical conference did not serve as the usual vehicle to better understand and gain information about ***both*** the evidence and issues in order to substantially identify the truly contentious issues and to help focus future interrogatories. Since the result of Hydro One's approach is that the interrogatory process has become broader rather than more scoped (which is the opposite of the intended result of the technical conference), Hydro One should not benefit from its technical conference approach, and the deadline for submitting interrogatories to Hydro One should be substantially postponed.

Pollution Probe submits that one of the general results of Hydro One's approach was that the technical conference became formal and legalistic instead of an informal method to gather information from Hydro One's experts. While Hydro One is entitled to take this approach if it wishes, Pollution Probe submits that Hydro One's approach is neither practical nor conducive to moving the proceeding forward in a reasonable manner, particularly since many steps remain prior to the oral hearings before the Board.

Issues also became apparent with Hydro One's decision to divide the technical conference into two apparently mutually exclusive panels who were unwilling to give reasonable undertakings to provide further information later. This practice stands in contrast to the usual Board practice of using one panel at a technical conference who would answer all questions and provide further information later as necessary. As a result, complications arose here because panellists were not available for both days. For example, when Pollution Probe was left with the impression that it should ask questions about the economics of the project and the alternatives later,[5] but it found out the next day that Hydro One's position was that the questions should have been asked the day before to the panel

[4] See last paragraph of letter dated October 10, 2007 from Gordon M. Nettleton to Board Secretary sent by email at 7:02 pm (Eastern Time).
[5] Technical Conference Transcript (October 15, 2007), pages 48-49.

member from the OPA (even though the questions, such as though about the net present value of locked-in energy in the Bruce area, directly relate to the economic basis for the project as well as alternatives).[6] Pollution Probe was thus unable to better understand and obtain information regarding the economics of the project and the alternatives due to the Hydro One's rigid and formal compartmentalization of the panels.

As result, Pollution Probe further twice requested that a representative of the OPA be brought forward to answer its questions about the economics of the project and the alternatives in order to try and obtain some information, but Hydro One was unwilling to do so. Hydro One instead took the position that the questions could be asked through written interrogatories,[7] which negated the benefit of having a technical conference to allow face-to-face interaction instead of repeated correspondence back and forth regarding the interrogatories and the responses. The net result is that Pollution Probe was unable to ask its significant economic questions about the project and the alternatives (which the Hydro One had notice of) prior to the interrogatory process as a result of Hydro One's formal and legalistic approach.

Pollution Probe further submits that, as part of Hydro One's formal and legalistic approach, Hydro One repeatedly took the position that the questions outside of the prefiled evidence should instead be dealt through written interrogatories (despite Hydro One's previous notice of the questions). Pollution Probe sympathizes with the volume of the questions that Hydro One received, but ultimately it is up to Hydro One as to whether it wishes to participate and respond in manner that either expedites or slows down the overall proceeding. By Hydro One taking a narrow approach to the technical conference and repeatedly informing the intervenors that many questions should instead be dealt with as part of the written interrogatory process,[8] Pollution Probe submits that Hydro One has chosen to act in a manner that will drastically slow the overall proceeding given the repeated correspondence that often occurs during the interrogatory process.

Pollution Probe submits that Board staff's comments aptly summarized the ultimate effect of Hydro One's approach on the technical conference and subsequent interrogatories:[9]

> MR. MILLAR: ... We viewed this process as certainly as an opportunity for Hydro One to get as much off the table as they wanted to, but to the extent that they're not going to answer some of these questions, I am not going to chase them here and we

[6] Technical Conference Transcript (October 16, 2007), pages 43-44.
[7] Technical Conference Transcript (October 16, 2007), pages 44-45.
[8] Pollution Probe submits the following examples are simply illustrative, and Pollution Probe submits that Hydro One's position had an obvious "chilling" effect on the questions intervenors would ask in light of Hydro One's anticipated objection. See *e.g.* Technical Conference Transcript (October 15, 2007) at page 5, line 3; page 56, line 6; page 59, lines 24-25; page 68, line 1; page 71, line 10; page 71, line 19; page 72, line 1; page 72, line 23; page 93, line 21; page 111, line 21; page 112, line 4, page 112, line 27; page 114, line 26; page 115, line 3; page 176, line 19; page 188, lines 7-8, 13; page 196, lines 17-18; and page 201, lines 1-3; Technical Conference Transcript (October 16, 2007) at page 37, line 21; page 39, line 13, page 79, line 4; page 84, line 17; page 90, line 13; page 93, line 20; page 93, line 28; page 96, line 11; page 106, line 2; page 109, line 10; page 110, line 16; page 140, lines 4-5; page 144, line 3; page 147, line 27; page 149, line 4; page 150, line 9, and page 150, line 14.
[9] Technical Conference Transcript (October 15, 2007), page 188, lines 8-13.

will ask them as part of interrogatories.

Pollution Probe submits that the corresponding result is that interrogatories have now unfortunately become broader instead of more scoped in light of Hydro One's approach, and Hydro One should accordingly not benefit from the approach it chose to take with respect to the technical conference.

Mitigating Hydro One's Technical Conference Approach

Pollution Probe submits that, as a result of the Hydro One's technical conference approach, it is prudent for the Board to incorporate mechanisms to help resolve significant disputes between the parties. With respect to the immediate next steps in the proceeding, Pollution submits that an outside facilitator be used with respect to any future technical conference or similar process, and Pollution Probe further submits that the Board should schedule a Motions Day to deal with any potential issues arising from Hydro One's interrogatory responses.

Pollution Probe submits that the use of an outside facilitator in any future technical conferences or similar processes would be very beneficial based on past experience. For example, during this technical conference, counsel for Hydro One at one point sought Board staff's view of the purpose of the technical conference, and Board staff appropriately declined to become involved as that is the role of the Board, not staff, and the parties should try to work it out themselves.[10] However, Pollution Probe submits that it would have been to helpful to have an outside facilitator present who is familiar with Board processes and could actively assist in these regards (e.g. Ken Rosenberg). In addition, an outside facilitator has the additional benefit of avoiding any potential perceptions of bias, unlike if Board staff were to take a more active facilitating role.

Pollution Probe also submits that it is appropriate to schedule a Motions Day with respect to potential issues arising from Hydro One's interrogatory responses, particularly since it became apparent during the technical conference that there will likely be disputes over Hydro One's responses to the interrogatories. The following is an illustrative example of the concerns that became evident at the technical conference:[11]

> MR. SPERDUTI: ... **Is it Hydro One's position that we're going to receive the documentary production that we have requested as part of the IRs?**
> MR. NETTLETON: **No.** Hydro One's position is that the purpose of this proceeding was for Hydro One to present an overview of the prefiled application to facilitate and help parties understand the material that has been filed as part of that prefiled filing. That's what we've done, Mr. Sperduti.
>
> The form of the question that you have asked is in the form of an interrogatory. It's seeking additional information and we're not prepared to respond to that in this proceeding.

---

[10] Technical Conference Transcript (October 16, 2007), page 103, line 16 to page 104, line 28.
[11] Technical Conference Transcript (October 15, 2007), page 112, line 2 to page 113, line 22.

> **Whether we respond to it in other proceedings, namely the interrogatory process, is a debate and is a topic for another day.**
> MR. SPERDUTI: But to the extent that your prefiled material includes a description of alternatives, including the alternatives that you have identified on your slide on page 15, to the extent that your prefiled material includes a description of those alternatives, **we are looking for the backup information, which must be available to support the conclusions that you have reached.**
> **So we are asking for production of the backup material, and I suppose what you're saying is, if we're going to get it, we will get it as part of the IRs, but not today?**
> MR. NETTLETON: **And that is a big "if".**
> [Laughter]
> MR. NETTLETON: The reason I say that, Mr. Sperduti, is the information that Hydro One is relying on is set out in its application for purposes related to the approval that it has sought from the Board. **The information and analysis that it will be providing, if asked, will be in the form of the response that it provides.**
> **This isn't akin to some form of discovery process that you may be used to in respect of court proceedings.**
> MR. SPERDUTI: Mr. Nettleton, **I think it is incumbent on Hydro One to make its case to the Board, and if it is going to take the position that the backup material is not relevant, then I don't know how the conclusions can be justified or supported or accepted by the Board.** But you are right.
> MR. NETTLETON: It's a question of degree, sir.
> MR. SPERDUTI: That will be a debate for another day. **But rest assured that if Hydro One takes the position that they're not going to produce the backup information, that will certainly have to be a matter for the Board to condone or not.** [emphasis added]

Pollution Probe submits this excerpt (as well as other excerpts[12] and Hydro One's general approach to the technical conference) illustrates that it is likely that motions will occur with respect to Hydro One's responses to the interrogatories. Accordingly, as part of the prudent dispute resolution mechanisms that the Board should incorporate into this proceeding, Pollution Probe submits that the Board should now schedule a Motions Day in order to deal with any potential issues that may arise with respect to Hydro One's interrogatory responses.

Pollution Probe notes that these submissions focus on this proceeding's immediate next steps, and they are accordingly not exhaustive. Pollution Probe submits that the Board should consider incorporating other later mechanisms as necessary in order to allow the proceeding to move forward in a reasonable and fair manner.

Conclusion

[12] See *e.g.* Technical Conference Transcript (October 15, 2007) at page 184, line 8 to page 185, line 10.

In conclusion, Pollution Probe thus submits that Hydro One's technical conference approach and actions have consequences for how the remainder of its application should proceed, particularly since Hydro One took the narrow approach that the technical conference was limited to only its prefiled evidence rather than reasonable questions related to the Issues List. In particular, Pollution Probe submits that substantial additional time should be introduced into the process, especially since the interrogatory process has now been necessarily broadened instead of scoped given Hydro One's refusal to answer many questions that it felt should be part of the interrogatory process instead.

We trust that this correspondence provides the Board with Pollution Probe's perspective on the requested postponement, and please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if you wish to discuss this matter further.

Yours truly,

Murray Klippenstein

MK/ba

Encl.

cc: Applicant and Intervenors per Procedural Order #3

Tab 2

KLIPPENSTEINS
BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS
160 JOHN STREET, SUITE 300,
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5V 2E5
TEL: (416) 598-0288
FAX: (416) 598-9520

October 1, 2007

BY COURIER (10 COPIES) AND EMAIL

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
P.O. Box 2319
2300 Yonge Street, Suite 2700
Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4
Fax: (416) 440-7656
Email: boardsec@oeb.gov.on.ca

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: Pollution Probe – Questions for Technical Conference
EB-2007-0050 – Hydro One – Bruce-Milton Transmission Reinforcement Project

Pursuant to Procedural Order #3, please find enclosed Pollution Probe's written questions in advance of and for the technical conference for this matter.

Yours truly,

Basil Alexander

BA/ba

Encl.

cc: Applicant and Intervenors per Procedural Order #3

FILED

EB-2007-0050

Hydro One – Bruce-Milton Transmission Line – Leave to Construct

Pollution Probe – Questions for Technical Conference

October 1, 2007

---

1. (Reference: Ex. B, Tab 1, Sch. 1)

   For each month from January 1984 to the present, please state:

   a. the installed capacity at the Bruce Nuclear Station;
   b. the total monthly output (MWh) of the Bruce Nuclear Station;
   c. the peak hour output (MW) of the Bruce Nuclear Station.

2. (Reference: Ex. B, Tab 3, Sch. 1, p. 2; Figure 1 and Ex. B, Tab 6, Sch. 5, p. 52, Figure 2.31)

   According to Hydro One's Figure 1 (referenced above), interim measures will increase the capacity of the existing Bruce-Milton Line by approximately 400 MW. However, according to the OPA's Figure 2.31 (referenced above), interim measures will increase the capacity of the existing Bruce-Milton Line by approximately 2300 MW.

   a. Please reconcile these two figures.
   b. Is Hydro One planning to implement all of the OPA's proposed interim measures? If no, why not?
   c. By how many MW does the existing Bruce Line need to be increased to meet all the safety and reliability requirements of the Transmission System Code, NPCC and NERC?
   d. If all of the OPA's proposed interim measures are implemented, will Hydro One's transmission system meet all the safety and reliability requirements of the Transmission System Code, NPCC and NERC? If no, why not? And if no, what additional measures would be needed to meet these standards if the proposed new Bruce-Milton Line is not built?
   e. If all of Hydro One's proposed interim measures are implemented, will Hydro One's transmission system meet all the safety and reliability requirements of the Transmission System Code, NPCC and NERC? If no, why not? And if no, what additional measures would be needed to meet these standards if the proposed new Bruce-Milton Line is not built?

3. (References: Ex. B, Tab 4, Sch. 4 and Ex. B, Tab 3, Sch. 1)

Hydro One's discounted cash flow analysis assumes that its proposed new Bruce-Milton Line will have zero impact on the number of MW delivered to the Ontario grid. Is this estimate based on the assumption that the capacity of the existing Bruce transmission system will be approximately 5400 MW? If not, what is the basis for this estimate?

4. (Reference: Ex. B, Tab 4, Sch. 4)

Please provide Hydro One's estimate of the marginal increase in electricity (i.e. in MWh) that will be delivered from the Bruce Nuclear Station and Bruce area wind generation to the Ontario grid for each year from 2012 to 2036 as a result of the construction of the new Bruce-Milton Line.

5. (Reference: Ex. B, Tab 3, Sch. 1, p. 3)

Please provide copies of all Government of Ontario policy statements and directives that Hydro One believes support its assertion that its proposed new line is a non-discretionary project.

6. (Reference: Ex. B, Tab 3, Sch. 1)

For each of the five alternative transmission routes described on pages 4 to 6 of the referenced materials, please provide:

a. maps showing their locations;
b. Hydro One's best estimates of their capital costs; and
c. their impacts on Hydro One's transmission losses relative to Hydro One's proposed route.

7. (Reference: Ex. B, Tab 3, Sch. 1)

For each of the five alternative transmission routes described on pages 4 to 6 of the referenced materials and for Hydro One's proposed route, please provide qualitative and quantitative comparisons of their impacts with respect to reliability and quality of electricity service, including stability and transient stability levels, voltage performance and Loss of Load Expectation projections under normal and post-contingency conditions. Please include as part of these comparisons analyses assuming that:

a. Hydro One's proposed upgrades to the existing Bruce-Milton Line are in place; and
b. The OPA's proposed upgrades to the existing Bruce Line are in place.

8. (Reference: Ex. B, Tab 3, Sch. 1)

With respect to transmission alternatives #2 and #3, please provide copies of the provincial land use policies that support Hydro One's claim that it is not consistent with "provincial land use policy to optimize the use of existing corridors".

9. (Reference: Ex. B, Tab 3, Sch. 1)

Does Hydro One or the OPA believe that the more aggressive promotion of demand response and local distributed generation in southern Ontario is a potential alternative option to meet the safety and reliability requirements of the Transmission System Code, the NPCC and NERC? If no, please explain why not.

10. In Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, page 2 of 5, there is Table 1 titled "Generation, Load and Interconnection Capacities in SW Ontario" (2005):

a. For each of the generation resources listed, please provide the name of each generating unit that is included in each generation resource listed, its in-service date, its projected shut-down date (if any), its summer peak generating capacity, its winter peak generating capacity, its minimum generating level, its primary fuel, its net generation in each of the last three years, and its per-MWH fuel and variable operating cost in each of the last three years.
b. For each of the loads listed, please provide the summer peak load and the winter peak load in each of the past three years, and provide the annual energy consumed by each of the loads in each of the past three years.
c. For each of the interconnections listed: please provide net summer MW and MWH supplied over the interconnection and the direction of the net

supply; please provide net winter MW and MWH supplied over the interconnection and the direction of the net supply; and please explain how winter and summer are defined.

d. What level of generation reserve margin is considered adequate to provide reliable supply in the Province?

e. Please provide a copy of any planning criteria used in the Province to plan for reliable electric generation supply.

11. In Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, page 3 of 5, there is a reference, starting on line 5, to the fact that the transmission facilities in this area are designed and placed to support this concentration of generation capacity, respecting physical constraints such as system and voltage stability, and thermal limits. Please provide a copy of all reliability planning criteria that is used in the planning of the transmission system in the Province.

12. In Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, page 3 of 5, there is a reference, starting on line 15, to 725 MW of wind generation expected to be in service by 2009:

a. If this MW figure reflects something other than nameplate ratings, please describe what it reflects and how it was determined.

b. What capacity value will be attributed to this 725 MW for purposes of determining generation supply adequacy.

c. What annual MWH generation is expected from this 725 MW of wind generation, and how does this generation break down between summer and winter, and between on-peak and off-peak periods? Please include an explanation as to how summer, winter, on-peak, and off-peak are defined.

13. In Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, page 3 of 5, there is a reference, starting on line 27, to 1,000 MW of additional wind generation expected to be in service in the Bruce area:

a. If this MW figure reflects something other than nameplate ratings, please describe what it reflects and how it was determined.

b. What capacity value will be attributed to this 1,000 MW for purposes of determining generation supply adequacy.

c. What annual MWH generation is expected from this 1,000 MW of wind generation, and how does this generation break down between summer and winter, and between on-peak and off-peak periods? Please include an explanation as to how summer, winter, on-peak, and off-peak are defined.

14. In Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, page 5 of 5, there are references, starting on line 12, to applicable reliability standards. Please provide a copy of these standards.

15. In Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, page 5 of 5, there is a reference, starting on line 14, to "the planning assumption that with all remaining circuits in-service, the power system performance should satisfy required criteria and guidelines following the loss of any of the double-circuit lines (first contingency)."

    a. For a double circuit transmission line (two circuits on one set of poles or towers), please confirm that the "loss of any of the double circuit lines" refers to the loss of two circuits?
    b. How long has this planning assumption been used to plan the transmission system in the Province?
    c. Please provide a copy of any available documentation regarding the use of this planning assumption.
    d. Please explain how considering the loss of two transmission lines as a first contingency is consistent with NERC reliability criteria.

16. In Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 3, page 1 of 2, there is a reference, starting on line 5, to Hydro One's Transmission License. Please provide a copy of this License.

17. In Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 3, page 1 of 2, there is a reference, starting on line 5, to the requirements of the Transmission System Code. Please provide a copy of this Code. (Note: If the Transmission System Code is the same Transmission System Code dated July 25, 2005 that is currently available online on the Ontario Energy Board's website through "http://www.oeb.gov.on.ca/html/en/industryrelations/rulesguidesandforms_regulatory.htm" and there are no modifications or additions to the Code, it is sufficient to confirm that this Code is the referenced Code.)

18. In Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 3, page 1 of 2, there is a reference, starting on line 5, to the requirements of various regulatory bodies. Please provide a copy of any such requirements that affect electric transmission system planning, operation, and reliability.

19. In Exhibit B, Tab 6, Schedule 3, Appendix 5, page 16 of 141, there is a reference to rules, criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the IESO, NPCC, and NERC. Please provide a copy of all such rules, criteria, standards, and guidelines that affect electric transmission system planning, operation, and reliability.

20. Please identify the electric load flow model or models used by the OPA to evaluate the need for transmission system reinforcement and used by the OPA to

evaluate the alternatives referenced in Exhibit B, Tab 3, Schedule 1. Please include the version number of any such model.

21. Please identify and discuss any reliability-based limitations in use by the OPA regarding how many electric transmission circuits may be placed within a common right-of-way corridor.

22. Please identify and discuss any reliability-based limitations in use by the OPA regarding how many electric transmission circuits may be placed on a common set of transmission towers.

23. Please specify the actual hourly MW (net) output of each of the Bruce A and Bruce B nuclear power plants during each of the hours during the years 2005, 2006 and 2007.

24. Please provide copies of any assessments of the generation or power levels of any of the Bruce A or Bruce B nuclear power plants during any part or all of the period 2007-2027.

25. Please specify the currently scheduled retirement dates for each of the Bruce A and Bruce B nuclear power plants.

26. a. Please discuss any plans to extend the operating lives of any of the Bruce A or Bruce B nuclear power plants. If there are plans to extend the operating lives of any of these nuclear power plants, please specify which plants and how long the extended operating life is currently planned or expected to be.

    b. Please provide copies of the correspondence between Hydro One and the OPA and Bruce Power, including but not limited to e-mails, concerning the possible extension of the operating lives of any of the Bruce A or Bruce B nuclear power plants or plans for the extension of the operating lives of any of the Bruce A or the Bruce B nuclear power plants.

27. Please provide copies of any studies, assessments or analyses of extending the operating lives of any of the Bruce A or Bruce B beyond their currently scheduled retirement dates that have been prepared by or for Bruce Power, the OPA, or Hydro One.

28. a. Please state whether there are currently any plans to build any new nuclear or non-nuclear power plants at the Bruce A or Bruce B sites or at other locations in the Bruce area. If there plans to build such power plants, please identify the planned new unit(s) and their expected net MW output(s) and scheduled commercial operation dates.

    b. Please provide copies of the correspondence between Hydro One and the OPA and Bruce Power, including but not limited to e-mails, which address or discuss the construction of new generating units at the Bruce A or the Bruce B sites or at other locations in the Bruce Area.

29. Please provide copies of any studies, assessments or analyses of building any new nuclear or non-nuclear power plants at the Bruce A or Bruce B sites or at other locations in the Bruce area that were prepared by or for Hydro One, the OPA or Bruce Power.

30. Referring to page 1 of the November 15, 2006 OPA IPSP Discussion Paper "Integrating the Elements", please provide a copy of the recommended plan that the OPA filed with the Ontario Energy Board in the spring of 2007. (Note: If this plan is the same IPSP filed on August 29, 2007 with the Ontario Energy Board that is currently available online on the OPA's website through "http://www.powerauthority.on.ca/ipsp/Page.asp?PageID=924&SiteNodeID=320 " and there are no modifications or additions, it is sufficient to confirm that this IPSP is the referenced plan, although a CD copy would be appreciated.)

31. Please provide the operating licenses for each of the Bruce A and Bruce B nuclear power plants.

32. Referring to page 45 of the OPA IPSP Discussion Paper "Transmission", please provide a copy of the recent study conducted by the OPA for the IPSP that identified a significant wind generation potential in the Bruce area.

33. Please provide the hourly wind profiles for the Bruce area.

34. Please provide a list of the planned outages of the Bruce A and Bruce B nuclear power plants for the years 2007-2027.

35. Please provide the two most recent Loss of Load Probability (LOLP) or Loss of Load Expectation studies prepared by or for the Ontario Power Authority.

36. Please provide the two most recent Loss of Load Probability (LOLP) or Loss of Load Expectation studies, if any, prepared by or for Hydro One.

37. Referring to Figure 1 at page 4 of 5 of Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, and page 2 of 5 of Exhibit B, Tab 6, Schedule 5, Appendix 2, please provide the expected Bruce Area Generation for each month of the years 2015-2027. Please show this information for future wind generation, committed wind generation, and Bruce Power.

38. Referring to page 3 of 5 of Exhibit B, Tab 6, Schedule 5, Appendix 2, please provide the analyses in which the IESO "assessed these interim measures."

39. Please provide the workpapers and source documents for the discounted cash flow analysis presented in Exhibit B, Tab 4, Schedule 4, pages 1-2.

40. Please provide the workpapers and source documents for the economic analyses presented in Exhibit B, Tab 4, Schedule 4, at pages 3 of 7 through 7 of 7.

41. Please provide a useable electronic copy of the analysis presented in Exhibit B. Tab 4, Schedule 4, pages 1-2.

42. Referring to Exhibit B, Tab 4, Schedule 3, please provide the project economic analyses prepared for each of the alternatives to the Bruce to Milton transmission reinforcement project that have been prepared by or for Hydro One, the IESO, Bruce Power, or the Ontario Power Authority.

43. Please provide copies of all correspondence, including but not limited to e-mails, between Hydro One and the OPA concerning the proposed Bruce to Milton Transmission Reinforcement Project.

44. Please provide copies of all correspondence, including but not limited to e-mails, between Hydro One and the OPA and/or Bruce Power concerning the proposed Bruce to Milton Transmission Reinforcement Project.

KLIPPENSTEINS
BARRISTERS & SOLICITORS
160 JOHN STREET, SUITE 300,
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5V 2E5
TEL: (416) 598-0288
FAX: (416) 598-9520

October 1, 2007

BY COURIER (10 COPIES) AND EMAIL

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
P.O. Box 2319
2300 Yonge Street, Suite 2700
Toronto, Ontario M4P 1E4
Fax: (416) 440-7656
Email: boardsec@oeb.gov.on.ca

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: Pollution Probe – Questions for Technical Conference – Part 2
EB-2007-0050 – Hydro One – Bruce-Milton Transmission Reinforcement Project

Pursuant to Procedural Order #3, please find enclosed Part 2 of Pollution Probe's written questions in advance of and for the technical conference for this matter.

Yours truly,

Basil Alexander

BA/ba

Encl.

cc: Applicant and Intervenors per Procedural Order #3

Hydro One – Bruce-Milton Transmission Line – Leave to Construct

Pollution Probe – Questions for Technical Conference – Part 2

October 1, 2007

---

45. On page 3 of the Ontario Reliability Outlook dated March 2007 (Exhibit B, Tab 6, Schedule 4), it states: "Without new transmission facilities, the IESO will eventually be forced to operate existing facilities near their maximum capabilities, with little margin for unexpected events and requiring complex arrangements to do routine maintenance on critical facilities."

    a. What are the critical facilities as far as the transmission facilities out of the Bruce complex are concerned?
    b. What does routine maintenance include on 500 kV and on 230 kV transmission facilities?
    c. How frequently is this maintenance typically performed?
    d. Which of these routine maintenance items can be accomplished using live-line techniques on properly-designed facilities?
    e. Please describe the types of complex arrangements that would be required in order to permit maintenance if the proposed transmission lines are not installed?
    f. Please describe the live line maintenance that is performed to maintain 500 kV transmission lines and/or to maintain 230 kV transmission facilities in the Province.

46. For the double circuit 500 kV transmission lines in the Province:[1]

    a. Please provide the sustained outage rate per kilometer per year for overhead transmission circuits.
    b. Please provide a breakdown of the causes of sustained outages for overhead transmission lines.
    c. Please provide the average repair time for overhead transmission lines experiencing a sustained outage.
    d. Please provide the momentary outage rate per kilometer mile per year for overhead transmission circuits.
    e. Please provide a breakdown of the causes of momentary outages for overhead transmission lines.

---

[1] If data is not separately available for the double circuit lines, please provide data for all the transmission lines in the 500 kV voltage class.

f. Please provide the definitions of sustained outage and momentary outage used in the data supplied in response to the above.
g. What percentage of the sustained outages affecting a 500 kV transmission circuit on a double circuit transmission line causes both circuits on the line to experience sustained outages?
h. What percentage of the momentary outages affecting a 500 kV transmission circuit on a double circuit transmission line causes both circuits on the line to experience momentary outages?

47. On page 43 of "Discussion Paper 5: Transmission" dated November 13, 2006 (Exhibit B, Tab 6, Schedule 5, Appendix 5), it states that the transmission system connecting the Bruce area to the rest of the transmission system has between 4,700 MW and 5,000 MW of capacity.

a. Please explain how these capacities were determined.
b. Please describe which system conditions result in which of the capacities listed above.
c. Please list the contingencies studied in determining the capacities listed above.
d. What is the critical contingency on this transmission system?
e. Please provide a PSS/E load flow saved case in electronic format that reflects the system configuration and loads used in the determination of the capacities listed above.

48. On page 43 of the "Discussion Paper 5: Transmission" dated November 13, 2006 (Exhibit B, Tab 6, Schedule 5, Appendix 5), it lists the transmission lines that connect the Bruce area to the rest of the system.

a. Please provide the summer normal, summer emergency, winter normal and winter emergency ratings in MVA for each of these lines along with an explanation as to how such emergency ratings are used.
b. If more than one type of emergency rating is used, please provide all ratings along with an explanation of how such ratings are used.

49. On page 46 of the "Discussion Paper 5: Transmission" dated November 13, 2006 (Exhibit B, Tab 6, Schedule 5, Appendix 5), it states that the near term transmission reinforcements in the Bruce area would increase the capability of the Bruce transmission system to about 5,385 MW.

a. Please explain how this capacity was determined.
b. Please list the contingencies studied in determining the capacity listed above.
c. What is the critical contingency on this transmission system?

d. Please provide a PSS/E load flow saved case in electronic format that reflects the system configuration and loads used in the determination of the capacity listed above.

50. For the double circuit 230 kV transmission lines in the Province:[2]

a. Please provide the sustained outage rate per kilometer per year for overhead transmission circuits.
b. Please provide a breakdown of the causes of sustained outages for overhead transmission lines.
c. Please provide the average repair time for overhead transmission lines experiencing a sustained outage.
d. Please provide the momentary outage rate per kilometer mile per year for overhead transmission circuits.
e. Please provide a breakdown of the causes of momentary outages for overhead transmission lines.
f. Please provide the definitions of sustained outage and momentary outage used in the data supplied in response to the above.
g. What percentage of the sustained outages affecting a 230 kV transmission circuit on a double circuit transmission line causes both circuits on the line to experience sustained outages?
h. What percentage of the momentary outages affecting a 230 kV transmission circuit on a double circuit transmission line causes both circuits on the line to experience momentary outages?

51. On page 39 of "Discussion Paper 7: Integrating the Elements" dated November 15, 2006 (Exhibit B, Tab 6, Schedule 5, Appendix 6), Figure 2.15 is a bar graph of the MW of installed nuclear capacity for each year from 2007 through 2027. For each year from 2007 through 2027, please provide the total nuclear capacity and a breakdown of that capacity by nuclear unit, along with a description of whether such unit is considered to "existing", "refurbished", or "new".

---

[2] If data is not separately available for the double circuit lines, please provide data for all the transmission lines in the 230 kV voltage class.