

EB-2013-0174

Feb 20, 2014

Questions regarding Electricity Facilities and Infrastructure for
Veridian Technical Conference scheduled for Feb 21, 2014

1) ~~Regarding 1.1-Staff-1 Part a)~~

~~Veridian's response to part a) of this question was that age is not the only factor in assessing the condition of substation transformers, breakers and pad mounted transformers.~~

~~Q: Could Veridian clarify, or point staff to where the application explains, what are the assessment factors other than age for substation transformers, breakers and pad mounted transformers?~~

2) Regarding 1.1-Staff-1 Part d)

Veridian's response to part d includes a table (adobe p41) with a heading "#units" and in each row "Reactive". The last row identifies that these are cable faults.

Q: Could Veridian confirm that this includes both failed units and units replaced for asset condition reasons (including forecast for 2013, 2014)?

Q: If yes, then can Veridian indicate how many were replaced as failed units, and how many were replaced on the basis of asset condition assessment?

Ontario Energy Board	
FILE No.	EB-2013-0174
EXHIBIT No.	KT1.1
DATE	Feb 21, 2014
03/99	<i>[Signature]</i>

3) Regarding 1.1-staff-2

In response to part a) (Adobe p42) Veridian indicates that it did communicate with, amongst others PowerStream, including "to discuss ongoing projects" at joint meetings since 2011.

Q1: Can Veridian confirm that the project referred to at E2-T3-S7p17 line 12 and that at 5.1-staff-24 are referring to the same project?

Q2: At the response to 5.1-staff-24 part b) Veridian advises that they were not aware of the PowerStream project. Would Veridian not have been made aware of the project at the utilities joint meetings mentioned in the response to 1.1-staff-2 a)?

Q3: Can therefore the explanation about the uniqueness of projects mentioned in response to 5.1-staff-24 also apply to the question about steps that Veridian would take to avoid duplication, i.e. its response to 1.1-staff-2 part b)

Q3: Can Veridian, perhaps by way of an undertaking, please expand on what is meant by "vehicle to grid component" and "integration of SCADA monitoring" and expand on why these and particularly the "integration of SCADA monitoring" would not already be well understood technologies"?

4) Regarding 4.1-staff-14

Q1: By omitting some items from its response to part a) does Veridian confirm that o/h line, switchpad mounted switchgear and u/g cables are assessed only on the basis of age?

Q2: in response part b), last paragraph, Veridian mentions that their approach is "conservative". Could Veridian comment on the concern that premature replacement, which seems implied, might lead to unnecessary replacement and hence costs?

Q3: Could Veridian perhaps estimate what the upper limit in \$ could be for the conservative approach premature replacement.

5) Regarding 5.1-staff-22 part e)

Q1: Could Veridian please provide more detail on how the 50/50 split was determined, perhaps by undertaking. The Board would want to know if it is on the basis of the number of communication points etc. or investment or whatever? And how this was estimated and how it correlates with the forecasts of connections of Renewable Generators (as postulated by question part f)?

Q2: Does the 50% that Veridian estimates for communication that is applicable to REI enabling facilities recognize that the Board has, per the framework for the determination of Direct benefits (EB-2009-0349) would likely apply a 94% factor rather than 100% of the applicable cost, so is the 94% factor included?

6) Regarding 5.1-staff-24 part d)

Q1: Veridian did not respond directly to the question of whether the S&C Intelliteam" project should be considered as sustainment capital. Can Veridian confirm that they consider it should be considered as renewal capital?

Q2: Veridian, in the response to part b) (row 2 in the table on Adobe p801) describes 2 components of the S&C Intelliteam project. Could Veridian clarify if the cost of only the study relates to the 15% (\$38,827) which is shown allocated in the table response of part a), and that "the investments in the project" is being sought here? Or is it both?

