

700 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario M5G 1X6

Tel: 416-592-5419 Fax: 416-592-8519  
[barbara.reuber@opg.com](mailto:barbara.reuber@opg.com)

May 6, 2010

**VIA COURIER AND RESS**

Ms. Kirsten Walli  
Board Secretary  
Ontario Energy Board  
P.O. Box 2319  
2300 Yonge Street, Suite 2700  
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

**Re: Submissions on the Proposed Amendments to the Transmission System Code, Board File No: EB-2010-0058**

Enclosed, please find two paper copies of Ontario Power Generation Inc.'s (OPG's) submissions in connection with the proposed amendments to the Transmission System Code related to the definition of the term "Supporting Guarantee" in Transmission Connection Agreements.

If there are any questions, please contact me at (416) 592-5419 or Tony Petrella at 416-592-3036.

Yours truly,

[Original signed by]

Barbara Reuber

Encl.

**EB-2010-0058**

**IN THE MATTER OF** section 70.2 of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998*:

**AND IN THE MATTER OF** a Notice of Proposal to Amend a Code – Proposed Amendments to the Transmission System Code.

**Submissions of  
Ontario Power Generation Inc.**

May 6, 2010

The proposed amendments to the Transmission System Code (Code) related to the definition of “Supporting Guarantee” are important to OPG. OPG owns and operates a significant portfolio of electricity generation plants that are connected directly to the IESO-controlled grid. OPG has 39 Transmission Connection Agreements with Hydro One.

OPG has a very strong commitment to safety. Accordingly, OPG supports the Board’s initiative to help ensure a safer work environment and provide greater protection of power system equipment, utility and utility customer staff, and the public. OPG agrees with Hydro One that Transmission System Code issues related to safety should be assigned a high priority and that the current definition of “Supporting Guarantee” requires amendment.

However, OPG has concerns relating to 1) the ability of the proposed amendment to adequately address the issue, and 2) the lack of a Board-approved review process for future amendments to the definition, as detailed below.

### **Adequacy of Proposed Definition**

The main driver for the proposed Code amendment appears to be Hydro One’s concern that the current definition of “Supporting Guarantee” is unclear and therefore could be interpreted a number of ways by transmission customers. Some may interpret the current definition to only require the existence of operating instructions on how the designated equipment could be configured to protect workers. Hydro One interprets the definition to require customers to place their equipment in that configuration and to provide a written guarantee of the state of isolation. According to Hydro One, a written guarantee would provide a safer work environment. OPG agrees with the value of having such a written guarantee for customers and transmitters.

To ensure that a written guarantee be provided, Hydro One recommended that the current definition of “Supporting Guarantee” in the Code be changed to

make it consistent with the meaning given to that term in the “Glossary of Terms” in the document entitled “Electrical Utility Safety Rules” (EUSR), published by the Electrical and Utilities Safety Association of Ontario Incorporated.

The EUSR definition of “Supporting Guarantee” is:

*A Supporting Guarantee is a guarantee issued in support of a Work Permit(s) and/or another Supporting Guarantee(s).*

*It certifies that an isolated or isolated and de-energized condition exists at points under the control of the issuer of the Supporting Guarantee.*

*A Supporting Guarantee can be:*

- 1. a PC10C, PC17B, or PC2 Supporting Guarantee or*
- 2. another type issued by a foreign organization.*

Based on the review of the EUSR definition and OPG's own operating experience, OPG submits that this definition does not actually ensure that a written guarantee is provided. While the electric utility may provide written guarantees as noted in 1 above, customers (which in the EUSR definition, are “foreign organizations”) have the option of using other types of guarantees. These “other types” of guarantees could include the current practice of using a verbal guarantee.

This definition is also unclear in that it references a number of internal Hydro One documents (i.e. PC10C, PC17B, etc.) rather than simply stating what specific commitments are required from parties to provide a “Supporting Guarantee”.

Further, OPG notes that as of January 2010, the Electrical and Utilities Safety Association became the Infrastructure Health and Safety Association.

In summary, OPG submits that this definition should not be adopted since it does not actually ensure that a written guarantee will be provided by customers and it suffers from a lack of clarity.

### **Review Process**

OPG also submits that the use of the EUSR definition is not appropriate on the grounds that under the proposed construct, the Board can not ensure a fair and transparent review process for future amendments to this definition. Adopting the proposed amendment would place the responsibility for this important definition with a forum over which the Board has no jurisdiction and where customers have very little influence. If the Board decides to link the Code definition to the EUSR definition, as amended from time to time, then any changes approved by the Infrastructure Health and Safety Association will automatically be incorporated into the Code. This is problematic since load customers and generators typically are not part of the review and amendment process for this organization.

### **Proposed Definition and Working Group**

OPG has developed an alternative definition (below) for the term “*Supporting Guarantee*” in Appendix 1A and 1B that addresses the issues raised above. It also addresses Hydro One’s stated concern.

*“Supporting Guarantee” is a written guarantee that certifies that an isolated or isolated and de-energized condition exists at points under the control of the Issuer of the Supporting Guarantee.*

In addition, OPG encourages the Board to facilitate establishment of a working group of interested parties to address additional safety improvements to the Code. Issues for consideration should include independent verification of equipment condition following isolation but before guarantee issuance, locking practices, and key control which remain important issues for OPG.

**Conclusion**

OPG does not support the amendment as proposed. OPG believes that the definition proposed by Hydro One does not achieve the desired result of assuring a written guarantee. OPG has proposed an alternative definition that is clearer and more suited to transmission customers. It further recommends the establishment of a working group to address related safety issues in the Code.

OPG commends the Board for moving quickly on this issue. OPG would be pleased to participate in any forum that the Board establishes to further discuss these important safety issues.

All of Which is Respectfully Submitted.

[Original signed by]

Barbara Reuber  
Director, Ontario Regulatory Affairs