



August 23, 2010

Ms. Kirsten Walli  
Board Secretary  
Ontario Energy Board  
P.O. Box 2319, 27th Floor  
2300 Yonge Street  
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: Ontario Power Generation Inc.  
Application Approving Payment Amounts for Prescribed Generating Facilities  
Submission of Additional AMPCO Questions for the Technical Conference  
Board File No. EB-2010-0008

Attached please find AMPCO's additional questions (Part 2) for the Technical Conference.

AMPCO filed six questions on August 19, 2010. Part 2 includes three questions for a total of nine questions filed by AMPCO.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely yours,

*(ORIGINAL SIGNED BY)*

Adam White  
Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario

Copies to: Ontario Power Generation Inc. (via email)  
Intervenors (via email)

**Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario**

[www.ampco.org](http://www.ampco.org)

372 Bay Street, Suite 1702  
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2W9

P. 416-260-0280  
F. 416-260-0442

Ontario Power Generation (OPG) Inc.  
2011-2012 Payment Amounts for  
Prescribed Generating Facilities  
EB-2010-0008

**AMPCO Technical Conference Questions – Part 2**

Question # 7

**Issue 4.5: Are the capital budgets and/or financial commitments for 2011 and 2012 for the nuclear business appropriate and supported by business cases?**

**Ref: Exhibit L/Tab 2/Schedule 17**

In part C of the above noted response, OPG indicates that the schedule for ordering long lead time items is now being developed in concert with the development of OPG's contracting strategies.

Please list the major categories of items that OPG expects will require long lead times and the range of order times that OPG is currently anticipating.

Question # 8

**Issue 6.3: Is the test period Operations, Maintenance and Administration budget for the nuclear facilities appropriate?**

**Ref: Exhibit L/Tab 2/Schedule 22**

In part C of the above noted response, OPG indicates that it does not accept that the Bruce definition of "All In" costs is comparable to the Production Unit Energy Cost (PUEC) definition used by OPG.

Please indicate OPG's view as to the differences between the definitions and whether the Bruce definition results in a finding higher or lower than OPG's finding.

Question # 9

**Issue 6.4: Is the benchmarking methodology reasonable? Are the benchmarking results and targets flowing from those results for OPG's nuclear facilities reasonable?**

**Ref: Exhibit L/Tab 2/Schedule 23**

OPG's reply to part A provides OPG's WANO NPI ranking as compared to other Candus and 15 US PWR stations for the period 2006-2008.

Please provide the numerical results underpinning the rankings and the NPI numerical results achieved by OPG in 2009.