

September 7, 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

AMPCO Interrogatories on Board Staff Evidence

Board File No. EB-2010-0008

Pursuant to the Board's Procedural Order No. 4 dated August 6, 2010, attached please find AMPCO's interrogatories on Board Staff evidence in the above proceeding.

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

372 Bay Street, Suite 1702 Toronto, Ontario M5H 2W9 P. 416-260-0280 F. 416-260-0442

Filed: 2010-09-07 EB-2010-0008

AMPCO Interrogatories – Board Staff Evidence

Page 1 of 2

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

AMPCO Interrogatories on Evidenced Filed by Board Staff

"Update to Report on Methodologies for Setting Ontario Power Generation Payment Amounts" August 30, 2010, Power Advisory LLC.

1 Reference: "Update to Report on Methodologies for Setting Ontario Power Generation 2 Payment Amounts", August 30, 2010, Power advisory LLC. 3 4 Interrogatory # 1 5 6 Please provide the cost to the Board to engage Power Advisory to prepare this report. 7 8 9 Interrogatory # 2 10 11 a) Please provide Power Advisory's opinion as to the appropriateness of OPG's 12 methodology for measuring the effectiveness of the hydro-electric incentive mechanism 13 ordered by the Board in its Decision with Reasons in the EB-2007-0905 proceeding. 14 15 b) How should OPG's response to hydro-electric incentives be best monitored? 16 17 18 Interrogatory #3 19 20 In the proceeding EB-2007-0905, AMPCO filed evidence (Exhibit M Tab 2), that discussed in 21 some detail previous performance incentive schemes applied to OPG, particularly the Market 22 Power Mitigation Agreement (MPMA) and Regulation 53/05. AMPCO's evidence discussed the 23 results of these measures. 24 25 Please provide Power Advisory's view of overall effectiveness and lessons learned from these 26 previous incentive regimes applied to OPG. 27 28 29 Interrogatory # 4 30 31 Please comment on whether and how the Board might encourage OPG to schedule nuclear

production to as closely as possible match the production pattern to the demand pattern.

32

33 34 35

Filed: 2010-09-07

EB-2010-0008

AMPCO Interrogatories – Board Staff Evidence

Page 2 of 2

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

AMPCO Interrogatories on Evidenced Filed by Board Staff

"Update to Report on Methodologies for Setting Ontario Power Generation Payment Amounts" August 30, 2010, Power Advisory LLC.

1	Interrogatory # 5			
2 3	Refere	nce:	"Update to Report on Methodologies for Setting Ontario Power Generation	
4 5			Payment Amounts", August 30, 2010, Power Advisory LLC.	
<i>5</i>			Page 27, Table 4.	
7	Pogard	ing Tabl	a 4 on page 27, please comment on why Power Advisory relied upon non fuel	
8	Regarding Table 4 on page 27, please comment on why Power Advisory relied upon non-fuel operating costs as a benchmark for comparing OPG performance with that of international			
9	peers instead of the combined fuel and non-fuel operating cost measure recommended by			
10	•	ScottMadden, OPG Nuclear 2009 Benchmarking report.		
11	Scottivi	adden, c	or a Nacical 2003 benefitharking report.	
12	Interro	Interrogatory # 6		
13				
14	Refere	nce:	"Update to Report on Methodologies for Setting Ontario Power Generation	
15			Payment Amounts", August 30, 2010, Power Advisory LLC.	
16			Page 29, Section 4.3.2.	
17				
18	On pag	On page 29, the Power Advisory report indicates "Nuclear industry capacity factors have		
19	increased over the past two decades due in part to deregulation and improved asset			
20	management practices as firms had a strong financial incentive to increase production."			
21				
22	a)	Please	identify the jurisdiction or jurisdictions whose experience is noted in this	
23		statem	ent.	
24				
25	b)		indicate whether any Candu operations show indications of improving capacity	
26		factors	over time.	
27				