

**Minutes of the Distribution Systems Code Task Force
Eighth Meeting - July 21, 1999, 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.**

Location: Ontario Energy Board - 25th Floor, Hearing Room #2

1. Opening Remarks

Ron LaPier indicated that John Alton is not present and, therefore, his term as Chair will begin for the next three months.

2. Review & Approval of Minutes

Item 6 - Change **Final Report page 6A** to **Final Report Appendix 6A-11**.

Moved by Rene Gatién, seconded by Lorne Pasche, that the minutes be adopted as revised.

3. Suggested Additional Agenda Items - None.

4. Review Status of Action Items from Previous Meetings

John O'Neill: Nothing further at this time to report on the Electrical Safety Authority.

Tanya Bodell: made changes to "Lies Along", and will be discussed later.

Mary-Ellen Richardson & Ken Quesnelle: have made changes and will be present when the agenda item comes up

George Mychailenko: contacted Darius to inform him that the Conditions of Service are to be menu/template form.

Mary-Ellen Richardson: has distributed the document to some members but not all.

5. Comments on Revised Work Plan - Tanya Bodell

Tanya presented the Revised Work Plan - (Revised DSC Work Plan (Appendix 8A)).

She noted that the Committee is not that far behind, but this is due in some part to the fact that a number of issues were handed to the RSC. The Committee should start sub-groups in the July/October period. In general, the Committee has moved along well.

It should be noted that there will be structured a skeleton for the draft code.

Page 9 has been changed to show that the October - December period should be used to review the various code sections which should be ready. Page 3 as shown could be the outline of the TOC, more or less. It should be noted that this document is a living document, and as such, it will change.

It was noted that LDC was changed to Distributor. This was done because Distributor is defined in the Act, and LDC is not.

It was questioned as to how, in Section 3, load transfer will be treated.

In Section 3, the work done on load transfers will be done by another group, and this matter will be resolved later.

The Note on Page 4, Section B, has been added, and the transfer of information is to be addressed by the RSC.

The RSC will address customer information only, and not general information, which is left to the DSC to deal with.

Action: Tanya will clarify as to which items are to be handled by the Committee.

On Page 5, will the metering issues be addressed by the RSC, or will stay in DSC? It was indicated that there may be a separate Meter Code, but as yet the Retail Meter Code is not underway. In fact, there has been no final decision to have a Meter Code. The DSC Metering subgroup should meet with the RSC to define who does what. It was further noted that some portion of the Meter Code will have to refer to Measurements Canada.

On page 7, Section K, it was asked what information should be provided to the OEB, since this, too, could figure in the PBR requirements. However, there may be information that the DSC will require which would be additional to the PBR requirements.

It was asked that, in the future, additions and changes to the document be done in italics, and the date of update indicated. The Committee agreed.

6. **Adoption of “When a Building Lies Along a Distribution Line” - Format for Distribution (Final Draft 1) and Definition of “Lies Along” (Final Draft 2)**

Steven Au submitted a court decision (Holmberg et al v. Public Utilities Commission of Sault Ste. Marie, Appendix 8B) dealing with the subject “lies along”. This may change what the Committee has done in relation to “lies along”.

Action: Kirsten will take Appendix 8B to OEB Counsel for an opinion, and also to ask Counsel how it relates to Demarcation and changes that may relate to the customer.

(Draft 1 will be Appendix 8C “When a Building Lies Along a Distribution Line”.)

(Draft 2 will be Appendix 8D “Definition of ‘Lies Along’”.)

In the “Summary of Group Discussion”, a reference is made to cost recovery in a Rates Handbook, but this was not addressed in the Rates Handbook. Change will be made to the Handbook as other Codes are written.

7. **Recommendations Summaries**

a) **Point of Demarcation**

Point of Demarcation for service connection - Appendix 8E.

Items 7 b, c, d, e will depend on the decisions made on this topic.

Ron LaPier made a presentation of the draft Demarcation Proposal, or Point of.

Extensive general discussion was held on the Point of Demarcation.

There is a need to account for the services into the rate base, and may require a change in contributed capital aspect, and the cost be recovered by the utility. Section 6.25 of the HDC Final Report looks at the connection cost and how it should be recovered.

It was noted that the ESA looks for isolated devices at the demarcation point.

The DSC will separate the financial demarcation and the operational demarcation.

Action: Ron will create two proposals for the next meeting.

It was noted that **b, c, d, e** can't continue until the demarcation point is established.

The following definitions were proposed:

An LDC shall be granted operating control of an electrical service up to and including the first isolation point located on or adjacent to the customer property.

“Operating control” shall mean the right to direct the use and operation of the device for the purpose of providing isolation for work protection, but will not imply ownership for repair or maintenance purposes.

These two definitions were accepted by the Committee.

Considerable discussion occurred around the customer expectation when the LDC is called to repair the electric service, and at which point the customer obligation starts and ends.

This should be the Operational Demarcation, and not be part of the financial demarcation.

It was agreed that these definitions are OK from the operational point of view which will be incorporated into the DSC elsewhere, and will be separated from the ownership demarcation point.

The Committee now looked at the ownership issues from the point of demarcation and as the obligation of the LDC, not the customer.

There was discussion on the various scenarios that could occur, based on the point of demarcation at various locations. A point was made that three should be a separation made by customer class.

There was a concern that this may be the very point of ownership by different utilities, which may be difficult for OEB to administer.

A suggestion was made that the point of demarcation must be established by each utility, based on a standard template. It must define ownership and isolation. If the point of demarcation is a property line, then this cost should be unbundled from the overall costs that the utility can collect.

Proposal: All Distributors must specify, in their conditions of supply, the point of demarcation for all classes of customers. The distributor will own and maintain, at their cost, up to the point of demarcation. The customer must have the opportunity to go to market for maintenance of the part of the service that the customer owns.

Kirsten related that Counsel indicated that the building, as used in the Act, is not specifically defined, and that the DSC could make definitions which are in the spirit of the Act, and not specify the exact definition, if reasonable, but if challenged in court, building could mean building.

It was agreed to use point of demarcation in general terms, so that the Committee could proceed with the agenda, and point of demarcation will be left for future discussions.

7. b) **LDC's Obligations** - including minimum design standards, will be Appendix 8F
- c) **Customer's Obligations** - will be Appendix 8G.

Ken Quesnelle indicated that these two will be revised to incorporate the definition of point of demarcating.

In Appendix 8F, under Recommendation, the "accepted industry design standards" be replaced with "good utility practices", and that "good utility practices" be placed in the definition.

In Appendix 8F, under Recommendations, that the fourth bullet be removed and dealt with as a separate item.

7. d) **Process for Connection** - no report to be received.

Action: Ken Quesnelle will revise for next meeting. Members to submit comments.

7. e) **Process for Establishing Charges for Connection**

Action: Ken Quesnelle will revise for next meeting. Members to submit comments.

7. f) **Definitions**

Rene will prepare an issue statement on definitions incorporating committee submissions and new definitions proposed by the Committee.

Action: Rene Gatien will e-mail the new definitions to all members.

7. g) **Maintenance Guidelines**

Minutes of Maintenance sub-committee - Appendix 8H
Summary of Recommendations - Appendix 8I

Mary-Ellen presented the two Appendices.

It was asked which of the three options in Appendix 8I would be taken, so that the Committee can proceed. It was decided by the Committee that the Prescription approach was not one the group would take.

It was suggested that Operation, Maintenance and Inspection be used, and not just Maintenance to align with the Uniform System of Accounts.

There was discussion on the option of Minimalist and Modified.

The Minimalist was not an option, and it was agreed that the Modified Prescription Approach be taken, but it would be viewed with a light-handed approach. The sub-committee will take this approach to complete the report.

8. **Formation of Sub-Groups**

Deferred to the next meeting.

9. **Next Task Force Meeting: Date of the next meeting is Wednesday, August 4.**

Kirsten indicated that they definitely need RSVP's for the month of August, since meeting rooms will be in short supply.

Recording Secretary: George Mychailenko, Brantford Hydro

LISTING OF APPENDICES AS COMPILED:

Appendix 8C	Draft 1 - When a Building Lies Along a Distribution Line
Appendix 8D	Draft 2 - Definition of "Lies Along"
Appendix 8E	Point of Demarcation for Service Connection
Appendix 8F	LDC's Obligations, including Minimum Design Standards
Appendix 8G	Customer's Obligations
Appendix 8H	Minutes of Maintenance Sub-Committee
Appendix 8I	Summary of Recommendations