Filed: March 25, 2008 EB-2007-0050 Exhibit C Tab 2 Schedule 42 Page 1 of 4

	Pollution Probe INTERROGATORY #42 List 4
Inter	<u>rogatory</u>
	Exh. B/T 1/S 1. On page 2, Table 1 lists generation resources, loads, and connection capacities in SW Ontario.
Issue	Number 1.0 1.0 Issue: Project Need and Justification
<u>Requ</u>	<u>est</u>
a)	For each of the generation resources listed, please provide:
	i the name of each generating unit that is included in each generation resource listed;
	ii each generating unit's in-service date;
	iii each generating unit's projected shut-down date (if any);
	iv each generating unit's summer peak generating capacity;
	v each generating unit's winter peak generating capacity;
	vi each generating unit's minimum generating level
	vii each generating unit's primary fuel;
	viii each generating unit's net generation in each of the last three years; and ix each generating unit's per-MWH fuel and variable operating cost in each of the last three years.
0)	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 please also provide the annual energy consumed by each of the loads in each of the past three years.
c)	For each of the interconnections listed:
	i please provide net summer MW and MWH supplied over the interconnection and the direction of the net supply;
	ii please provide net winter MW and MWH supplied over the interconnection and the direction of the net supply; and
	iii 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.

43 44

41

Updated: April 10, 2008 EB-2007-0050 Exhibit C Tab 2 Schedule 42 Page 2 of 4

1

Response

3 4 5

a) Please see the supplementary response provided as Attachment A. This response is filed in respect of the Board's Apr. 7, 2008 Order concerning Generation Forecast Information.

6 7 8

b) The winter and summer peak loads for the areas requested are shown in the table below. The loads in referenced table (Exhibit B Tab 1 Schedule 1 page 2 Table 1) are rounded, whereas the loads in the table below are more precise.

10 11

Loads (MW)	20	05	20	06	2007		
Loaus (WW)	Winter	Summer	Winter	Summer	Winter	Summer	
Windsor	800	1075	727	1044	770	893	
Sarnia	731	823	723	785	724	754	
London	573	749	607	756	595	651	
KWCG	1229	1392	1182	1383	1226	1301	
Hamilton	1090	1229	1032	1291	1087	1184	
Woodstock/Ingersoll	155	170	163	180	165	170	
Brantford/Brant	221	261	181	213	181	202	
Niagara	846	1042	915	1087	863	1058	
Other	2085	2052	1765	2229	2148	2183	
Total	7729	8794	7295	8969	7760	8396	

12 13 14

The annual energy consumed by each of the loads in each of the past three years are as follows:

Load	Annual Energy Consumption (MWh)					
	2005	2006	2007			
Windsor	5038584	5028525	5020465			
Sarnia	5134394	5124143	5115931			
London	3762345	3754834	3748816			
KWCG	7428122	7413293	7401411			
Hamilton	7430382	7415548	7403662			
Woodstock/Ingersol	1057867	1055755	1054063			
Brandford/Brant	1124308	1122064	1120265			
Niagara	5752611	5741126	5731924			
Other	15516186	15485208	15460389			
Total	52244800	52140495	52056926			

Filed: March 25, 2008 EB-2007-0050 Exhibit C Tab 2 Schedule 42 Page 3 of 4

c)

1

Michigan Interface								
	Net Scheduled Interchange							
Period	(MWh)	(MW)						
Winter (2004–2005)	-1,748,818	-1,980						
Summer (2005)	-1,478,459	-1,646						
Winter (2005-2006)	-1,273,495	-1,658						
Summer (2006)	-444,272	-1,880						
Winter (2006-2007)	-456,736	-1,674						
Summer (2000)	-433.618	-1.562						

New York Interface

	Net Scheduled Interchange				
Period	(MWh)	(MW)			
Winter (2004–2005)	+2,384,210	+2,264			
Summer (2005)	+1,383,733	+2,194			
Winter (2005-2006)	+2,853,268	+2,246			
Summer (2006)	+2,342,801	+2,006			
Winter (2006-2007)	+1,921,563	+1,994			
Summer (2000)	+2,164,005	+1,900			

3

The winter and summer periods are based on the calendar definition of winter and summer.

567

Note: - (negative) values represents net imports and + (positive) values represents net exports.

8 9 10

11

12

13

d) Generation reserve margins which meet or exceed the NPCC resource adequacy criteria are considered adequate to provide reliable supply in Ontario in the operating timeframe. The applicable criterion is found in NPCC Document A-02 "Basic Criteria for Design and Operation of Interconnected Power Systems". The relevant portion of this document is:

14 15 16

"3.0 Resource Adequacy - Design Criteria

17 18 19

20

21

22

23

Each **Area's** probability (or risk) of disconnecting any **firm load** due to resource deficiencies shall be, on average, not more than once in ten years. Compliance with this criteria shall be evaluated probabilistically, such that the **loss of load expectation** [**LOLE**] of disconnecting **firm load** due to resource deficiencies shall be, on average, no more than 0.1 day per year. This evaluation shall make due allowance for demand uncertainty, scheduled outages and de-ratings, forced

Filed: March 25, 2008 EB-2007-0050 Exhibit C Tab 2 Schedule 42 Page 4 of 4

outages and de-ratings, assistance over interconnections with neighbouring **Areas** and **Regions**, transmission transfer capabilities, and capacity and/or load relief from available operating procedures."

The manner in which the IESO applies this criterion is described in document IMO_REQ_0041, "Ontario Resource and Transmission Assessment Criteria", Section 8, Resource Adequacy Assessment Criterion. For capacity planning purposes, where longer term decisions must be made, additional reserves to cover residual uncertainties and project delays may be appropriate. Also, the IESO does not consider emergency operating procedures for longer term capacity planning to be appropriate because the relief provided by these measures is intended to deal with emergencies rather than as a surrogate resource. Regular triggering of emergency operating procedures rather than developing appropriate resources could lead to the erosion of these emergency operating procedures through overuse. The extent to which all uncertainty is covered becomes an economic decision which should be guided by the NPCC criterion.

e) Applicable planning criteria and relevant links to such documents are discussed in the response to Board Staff Interrogatory 3.2.

Filed: April 10, 2008 EB-2007-0050 Exhibit C Tab 2 Schedule 42 Attachment A Page 1 of 6

Attachment A Supplementary Response to Pollution Probe Interrogatory 42(a)

Pollution Probe Interrogatory 42(a) references a table found in Hydro One's pre-filed application (Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Page 2, Table 1). This Table describes generation resources, loads, and interconnection capacities in all of Southwestern Ontario. Table 1 is an OPA work product and was originally included in its IPSP Discussion Paper #5.

The purpose of Table 1 was to provide a list of existing (i.e., 2005) generating plants in southwestern Ontario as part of an overview of the existing demand/supply situation as existed at the time of preparing the IPSP Discussion Paper #5. Table 1 is not a forecast of generation in southwestern Ontario. The source data used by the OPA in preparing Table 1 comprised only the individual generating plants in each of the listed regions and their nominal generation capacities. The attached Table A provides a more detailed breakdown, by units, of the generating plants identified in the referenced table in Discussion Paper #5. None of the other information requested in the subparts to Interrogatory 42(a) were in the possession of the OPA and thus used for preparing the Table.

Based on the April 7 Decision, Hydro One and the OPA understand that the Board's findings are intended to have further information provided that concerns the source data used by the OPA in preparing its Bruce Area generation forecast (Exhibit B, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Figure 1, Page 4) as revised. In particular what, if any of the information requested in Pollution Probe Interrogatory 42(a) was used by the OPA in preparing its Bruce Area generation forecast.

OPA confirms that the only information requested in Pollution Probe 42(a)(i) through (ix) that has been used for purposes of preparing the Bruce Area generation forecast was the names of the individual generating units in the Bruce the area and their primary fuel (i.e., wind or nuclear). OPA did not, for example, take into account the per-MWH fuel and variable operating costs of the individual generating units in operation in south-western Ontario (or for that matter units specific to the Bruce area) in the past three years for its generation forecast.

The source information OPA has used to prepare its forecast is described in Exhibit B, Tab 6, Schedule 5, Appendix 1 of the Application, and the responses to Board Staff Interrogatory 1.1, and Energy Probe Interrogatories 6 and 21. This source data was also discussed at the Day 1 Technical Conference Presentation (Exhibit KT.1).

In those Responses, OPA has noted that specific and up-to-date capacity and in-service information was used for generators in the Bruce area only.

The in-service dates of other units outside of the Bruce area and their nominal capacities were considered to assist the OPA in the determination of the base case conditions in order to develop study base cases used by the IESO and the OPA. These are shown in Table B.

Specific shutdown dates for the Nanticoke and Lambton coal-fired generation stations were not used for the purposes of developing study base cases. Instead the assumption made was that shut-down would occur by the end of 2014. No minimum generation levels were assumed for Bruce area generation. This is because the Bruce area generation forecast has been predicated upon existing and planned nameplate capacity generation levels. OPA did consider primary fuel sources of Bruce generation and this expressly shown in the generation forecast (i.e. wind and nuclear).

With respect to forecast system generation costs, OPA's generation forecast has used the avoided energy costs in Table 11 of the "Avoided Cost Analysis for the Evaluation of CDM Measures" report by Navigant as indicated in the response to Pollution Probe Interrogatory 49. OPA did not, for example, use marginal unit cost in calculating locked-in energy in this application. Instead, nuclear and wind generation in the Bruce Area was assumed to be dispatched in all cases given well recognized understandings that nuclear and wind generation have, relative to other generation types, low operating costs.

To be helpful, Hydro One, with the assistance of OPA, IESO and OPG, has attempted to address subparts to Interrogatory 42(a). Where available, the most recent information using 2007 data has been provided with respect to (i) – (viii). OPA wishes to be clear, however, that this information was not used by the OPA in preparing Table 1 or in the preparation of its Bruce Area generation forecast. This additional information is attached as Table B.

Generation Unit	Capacity (MW)
BRUCE	
Bruce Unit 3	750
Bruce Unit 4	750
Bruce Unit 5	890
Bruce Unit 6	890
Bruce Unit 7	890
Bruce Unit 8	890
NANTICOKE	
Nanticoke Unit 1	490
Nanticoke Unit 2	490
Nanticoke Unit 3	490
Nanticoke Unit 4	490
Nanticoke Unit 5	490
Nanticoke Unit 6	490
Nanticoke Unit 7	508
Nanticoke Unit 8	497
LAMBTON	
Lambton Unit 1	485
Lambton Unit 2	485
Lambton Unit 3	501
Lambton Unit 4	501
BECK	
Beck 1 - EBUS	350
Beck 1 – FC	50
Beck 2 - G 11,12	193
Beck 2 - G 13,14	174
Beck 2 - G 15,16	175
Beck 2 - G 17,18	193
Beck 2 - G 19,20	193
Beck 2 - G 21,22	181
Beck 2 - G 23,24	181
Beck 2 - G 25,26	193
Beck 2 - PGS G 1,2,3	60
Beck 2 - PGS G 4,5,6	63
SARNIA	
TransAlta Sarnia G861	120
TransAlta Sarnia G601	130
TransAlta Sarnia G871	130
TransAlta Sarnia G891	130
WINDOOD ADEA OAC	
WINDSOR AREA GAS	500
Brighton Beach	580
TransAlta Windsor G 1,2	62
West Windsor G 1,2	97

OTHER	
Bruce A Oil G1	12
Bruce B Oil G1	12
Countryside London Cogeneration Facility	12
Decew Falls G1	72
Decew Falls G2	72
Decew Falls G5-8	23
Dow Chemical Cogen	100
East Windsor	84
Eastview Landfill Gas Energy Plant	3
Erie Shores Wind Farm	99
Great Northern Tri-Gen Facility	12
Hamilton (Digester Gas) Cogeneration	
Facility	2
Imperial Oil Cogen	98
Kingsbridge I Wind Farm	40
Kingsville B-Bus Oil Gen	3
Kingsville Y-Bus Oil Gen	7
Lambton Oil G1	7
Lambton Oil G2	7
Melancthon I Wind Farm	68

Table B – Information Provided by OPA, IESO and OPG

2	I	1	1		2007				-
					2007 Minimum				
			2007 Pea	k Capacity	Generation	Net	t Genera	tion	
Station	In-Service	Shutdown		K Capacity IW)	Level (MW)	146	(MW)	uon	Primary
Station	Date	Date	Winter	Summer	Level (IVIV)	2005	2006	2007	Fuel Type
Bruce A			***************************************		I		2000		J
Unit 1	Sept 1, 1977	Oct 16, 1997	-	=	_	_	_	-	Uranium
Unit 2	Sept 1, 1977	Oct 8, 1995	-	-	-	-	_	_	Uranium
Unit 3	Feb 1, 1978	N/A	750	805	0	772	779	805	Uranium
Unit 4	Jan 18, 1979	N/A	789	750	0	810	805	789	Uranium
Bruce B									
Unit 5	Mar 1, 1985	N/A	847	808	290	796	833	847	Uranium
Unit 6	Sept 14, 1984	N/A	827	874	0	881	833	874	Uranium
Unit 7	Apr 19, 1986	N/A	875	828	0	800	828	875	Uranium
Unit 8	May 22, 1987	N/A	836	827	0	843	857	836	Uranium
Lambton	N. 14.1070		# 00	400	T 6	401	401	5 00	G 1
Unit 1	May 14, 1970	N/A	509	483	0	481	481	509	Coal
Unit 2	Dec. 31, 1969	N/A	487	484	0	491	484	487	Coal
Unit 3 Unit 4	Nov. 6, 1970 Dec. 14, 1970	N/A N/A	500 501	504 488	0	508 502	503 499	504 501	Coal Coal
Ullit 4	Dec. 14, 1970	IN/A	301	400	U	302	499	301	Coai
Nanticoke									
Unit 1	July 5, 1973	N/A	424	457	0	465	476	457	Coal
Unit 2	March 8, 1973	N/A	478	445	0	474	454	478	Coal
Unit 3	Nov. 29, 1973	N/A	483	466	0	476	482	483	Coal
Unit 4	May 9, 1974	N/A	456	457	0	479	483	457	Coal
Unit 5	July 31, 1975	N/A	496	475	0	455	429	496	Coal
Unit 6	Jan. 27, 1977	N/A	455	439	0	481	448	455	Coal
Unit 7	Dec. 21, 1978	N/A	499	500	0	501	506	500	Coal
Unit 8	Sept. 21, 1978	N/A	499	494	0	499	495	499	Coal
Dools									
Beck 1	Unit 1,2, & 4-	N/A	360	338	1	451	388	360	Hydro
Deck 1	1922	IN/A	300	336	1	431	300	300	пушо
	Unit 5- 1923								
	Unit 3, 6, & 7-								
	1924								
	Unit 8 & 9 -								
	1925								
	Unit 10 – 1930								
D 1 2	TT 1: 11 15	NT/A	1.400	1.401	277	1 4 4 2	1.407	1.422	TT 1
Beck 2	Unit 11-17 –	N/A	1433	1421	377	1442	1437	1433	Hydro
	1954, Unit 18-22 –								
	1955,								
	Unit 23-24 –								
	1957,								
	Unit 25-26 –								
	1958								
Beck 2 PGS	1957	N/A	102	107	0	108	107	107	Hydro
Windsor									
Area	1006	NT/A		67	0	70	C 0	7 7	Car
TransAlta	1996	N/A	66	67	0	68	68	67	Gas

			2007 Peak Capacity		2007 Minimum Generation	Ne	t Genera	tion	
Station	In-Service Date	Shutdown Date	Winter (N	(IW) Summer	Level (MW)	2005	(MW) 2006	2007	Primary Fuel Type
West Windsor	May 31, 1996	N/A	129	116	0	128	126	129	Gas
Brighton Beach	Jul 20, 2004	N/A	599	545	0	573	583	599	Gas
TransAlta Sarnia	Mar 27, 2003	N/A	443	405	105	441	408	443	Gas
Other									
Decew Falls	Aug, 1898	N/A	73	146	0	145	146	146	Hydro
Decew ND1	Oct, 1943	N/A	21	22	0	22	22	22	Hydro
Erie Shores	Mar 17, 2006	N/A	98	89	0		98	98	Wind
Amaranth I	Feb 16, 2006	N/A	66	65	0		65	66	Wind
Kingsbridge	May 31, 2006	N/A	38	37	0			38	Wind
Misc.	Various	N/A			0				Various