

**Minutes of the Distribution Systems Code Task Force  
Seventh Meeting – July 7, 1999, 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.**

Location: Ontario Energy Board Offices

**1) Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone and welcomed back Ron LaPier, congratulating him on the addition to his family.

**2) Minutes of Previous Meeting**

Page 2 – Last paragraph change the wording for clarification – Beyond the demarcation point the provision of the service is likely competitive and the LDC may have an “offer to connect”. Rene Gatien will change the previous minutes.

Minutes approved as revised.

**3) Additional Agenda Items – None**

**4) Review of Action Items From Previous Meetings**

John O’Neill – Nothing further (at this time) to report on the Electrical Safety Authority

Tanya Bodell – Summary of Recommendation for “when a building lies along a distribution line” to be discussed today under agenda item #5.

Ken Quesnelle– Strawman revisions to be discussed today under agenda item #6

**5) Final Review of “When a Building Lies Along a Distribution Line”**

Handout document Appendix 7A, Summary of Recommendation: When a Building “Lies Along” a Distribution Line – The Format the Definition Should Take. Tanya noted that there was not much change and the definition should be kept general. This document is now a “final draft” and forms part of the formal record. Any concern to be addressed next meeting.

Handout document Appendix 7B, Summary of Recommendation: The Definition of “Lies Along”. The historical definition from the Public Utilities Act was reviewed and found not very useful. Counsel researched previous court cases and it was found there was no case law that specifically deals with the meaning. The gas industry defines it as property that can be connected with 20 or 30 metres of pipe. Absolute values were rejected as they could prevent distributors from achieving their own economies. The point of demarcation may be property line or meter base and will be addressed at a later date when connection is defined. A vote was held on the recommended definition – results unanimous. This item is done and will be recorded with the summary of recommendations.

*Action: Tanya Bodell to make minor changes. All members to review.*

Discussion was held regarding the posting of appendices on the web-site and it was decided that they would not be posted at this time should conflicts arise as the task force moves forward. Posting part documentation could also create confusion and concern among readers. In future all appendices will be dated “last revised date”.

**6) Review and Recommendation of Recommendation Summaries**

Handout document Appendix 7C, Summary of Recommendations LDC's Obligations: Option number four is an addition to the previous document. The committee discussed the definitions in the memo (Appendix 7E) from Mary Ellen. It was suggested that the definitions should not be circular, i.e. you would have to read two or three other definitions to understand the definition you are reading.

The committee had a wide ranging discussion on the pros and cons of letting LDC's create their own conditions of supply. LDC's will be forced to pick up best practices by way of evolution and PBR which will catch any inefficiency plus raise the bar for best practices. There must be flexibility in the code to show what does work and what does not work. The committee does not want to create an over-bearing regulatory regime. For example the conditions of supply should be a standard format to follow with the LDC filling in the blanks. There was further discussion regarding the required electrical safety standards. We do not want to imply that legislated standards should supercede good engineering standards that may be superior.

*Action: Mary Ellen and Ken will get together to wordsmith recommendations supported by input from committee members and prepare for the next meeting.*

Handout document Appendix 7D, Summary of Recommendations, Customer Obligations: There were similar changes as in 7C in that the OEB standard may be a generic format. Forms of acceptable notification were discussed. For example a residential service layout request could be a simple telephone call from the customer that is logged on a computer. Larger customers would obviously need a more sophisticated submission with the appropriate details. The conditions of supply must define how a customer requests service. The break point for obligations between the customer and the LDC should be the demarcation point. Maintenance and responsibility for equipment beyond the demarcation point should lie with the customer and not the LDC. The customer will be responsible for initiating the process for competitive quotes where applicable.

The committee discussed the impact that an individual customer could have on other customers as far as power quality, safety and reliability (refer to page 4 of the memo from Mary Ellen Suggested Additions to the Background Information). Specifications for equipment that the LDC wants for power quality, safety and reliability must be provided to the customer. There should also be terms for long term ongoing conditions the customer must meet. The LDC needs to protect the integrity of the distribution system. (refer to MDC Final Report page 6A items D,E,F.)

Contestable work from the mainline to the demarcation point could either be done by the LDC or depending on the dollar amount, competitive bids could be requested. Any work from the demarcation point in, would be the responsibility of the customer.

*Action: Committee members review and provide comments to Ken Quesnelle*

7) **Discuss Definitions of Distribute vs. Transmit**

Handout document Appendix 7F, Transmission and Distribution Definitions Clarification: The subgroup thoroughly discussed the definitions of transmission and distribution and felt there would be no value in further defining them as they correspond to the OEB Act 1998. Cost and pricing issues fall outside the scope of the DSC and cannot be dealt with technically.

The committee discussed transmission issues around dedicated feeders and the impact of wheeling through one or more LDC territories. Will there be special licence requirements or specific rates for designated distribution? The issue of joint management of facilities can be dealt with at a later date. Discussion was held around the issue of voltages over 50kV being distribution voltages, e.g. a 230kV tap from a transmission corridor to a LDC transformer station could be considered distribution and included in the distribution licence.

Handout document Appendix 7G, Definition of a Customer: Issues around the difference between the definition of customer and consumer were discussed.

*Action: Committee members review and send comments to Rene Gatién*

8) **Status Report on Generic Conditions of Supply**

Defer to next meeting

*Action: George Mychailenko to contact Darius about menu/template.*

9) **Discuss Issues on System Operation, Maintenance, Upgrades and Replacement**

Handout document Appendix 7H, System Operation, Maintenance, Upgrades and Replacement: There is a California website that publishes regulatory statistics that LDC's must comply with. The standards were developed through a consultant and then put forward for stakeholder consultation. The LDC's have a rigorous reporting process they must follow.

In Ontario the CEA/MEA/OHSC standards could be adopted for use. An outline of prudent operational and maintenance practices could be adopted with a reporting process developed. It would be difficult to dictate best practices before the PBR indices are set. LDC's will produce their own proof of inspection and maintenance against what was planned. A guideline with the elements that should be in a maintenance program should not be too prescriptive. The MEA Distribution Standards Manuals may contain all the necessary elements. K. Henderson, E. Muldoon and J. O'Neill volunteered to assist the subcommittee.

Three possible options for the strawman:

- 10) Prescriptive
- 11) Motherhood Statement
- 12) In between – general direction

*Action: Mary Ellen will distribute document and website address for California solution.*

13) **Distributor Relationships**

Handout document 7I, Relations Between Distributors: Gord Ryckman explained the document as a first pass at identifying the issues. George Mychailenko, Rene Gatien, John Alton volunteered to assist with this subcommittee.

*Action: All committee members asked to submit issues.*

#### 14) Revised Work Plan

Handout document 7J, Distribution System Code Task Force Workplan: It was suggested that the sub-groups should be more formalized. The group discussed whether we would continue with full task force meetings and sub-group meetings in between or should we only have sub-group meetings and full task force meetings only when necessary. It was also noted that the OEB has the ability to arrange conference calls to help save time and cost.

**Next Meeting: July 21<sup>st</sup>, 1999 @ 9:30 am**

Recording Secretary: Kevin Henderson

| <b>Appendices:</b> |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>7A</b>          | Summary of Recommendation: When a Building “Lies Along” a Distribution Line – The Format the Definition Should Take |
| <b>7B</b>          | Summary of Recommendation: The Definition of “Lies Along”   |
| <b>7C</b>          | Summary of Recommendation: LDC’s Obligations (Including minimum design standards)                                   |
| <b>7D</b>          | Summary of Recommendation: Customer Obligations (including minimum design standards)                                |
| <b>7E</b>          | Memo: Feedback with respect to documents distributed in the Distribution System Code task force (“DSC TF”) meetings |
| <b>7F</b>          | Minutes of Meeting: “Transmission and “Distribution” Definitions Clarification                                      |
| <b>7G</b>          | Definition of a “Customer”  |
| <b>7H</b>          | Issue: System Operation, Maintenance, Upgrades & Replacement  |
| <b>7I</b>          | Relations Between Distributors  |
| <b>7J</b>          | Distribution System Code Task Force Workplan  |