

**Minutes of the Distribution Systems Code Task Force
Sixth Meeting - June 23, 1999, 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.**

Location: Ontario Energy Board Offices

1. **Opening Remarks:** The Chair welcomed Ron Gayowsky and Terry Stevens to the Committee

2. **Comments on Previous Minutes:**

Page 1 "John Savage will contact the ESA" will be removed as it was John O'Neill that will contact the ESA

Page 3 "Majority" vote was a "unanimous" vote

The June 9 minutes were approved as revised

3. **Additional agenda items:** None

4. **Review status of action items:**

Tanya Bodell had a discussion with Hugh Gleeson, Manger of Planning and Regulation at United Energy, Victoria, Australia on the Explanation of Threshold for Reinforcement in Australia (Appendix 6A). The model being put forward by United Energy is to look at the impact that a new connection has on a feeder. The customer would not be required to cover the cost of the feeder modifications unless the user's demand exceeds 30 percent of the capacity of the feeder. Discussion followed regarding if capacity of the feeder referred to existing capacity or future capacity. The model is based on existing feeder capacity. A question was raised is the connection based on the initial connection versus what happens when the customer upgrade pushes the user demand to more than 30 percent of the feeder. This was unknown.

An alternate approach was to determine a charge based on the expected demand of a customer connection and obtain a per unit connection that catches all customers for their share of connection costs rather than those that are over a threshold.

Kirsten Walli reported on looking at the service territory as defined under the OHSC Distribution license. It has not been issued as yet as the OEB is processing the licenses sequentially. *OHSC's license has been defined as the areas of Ontario that OHSC's lines extend into . . . (Complete definition to come from Kirsten Walli)*

Kirsten Walli also reported on the status of the Rate Handbook. It is expected to be released the week of June 28 on the OEB website.

John O'Neill reported on discussion regarding the ESA. The main areas that the ESA will be inspecting will be work done by utilities as contractors, water heater installations, or new Municipal Street lighting Systems that are to be maintained by other than a utility. It would appear that the distribution system built and operated by the LDC will not fall

under inspection rules. This is an area yet to be determined by the ESA. There was some discussion as to what the appropriate standard of installation should be that governs installation of street lighting systems. John O'Neill will continue to monitor this.

Action: John O'Neill will monitor the changes with ESA

5. **Appendix 6B - Definitions:** Comments were provided on the draft of Definitions for the DSC. "Distribute" definition is too strict since it limits distribution to 50 kV and below and "Transmit" defines only electricity at 50 kV and above. Lisa Brickenden, Darius Vaiciunus, Tanya Bodell, Gord Ryckman and Mike Angemeer will work on improving these definitions and will forward their recommendations to Rene Gatien.

"Consumer" does not address the situation where the consumer of the electricity is not necessarily the customer that interacts with the LDC for payment of an account. Rene Gatien will put forward a definition for "customer".

Relevant definitions will be added as the DSC Task Force develops the Code.

6. **Review revised Summary of Recommendation template on "when a building lies along a distribution line"**. This issue was split into two statements under "Summary of Recommendations: When a Building "Lies Along" a Distribution Line - The Format the Definition Should Take" and under "Summary of Recommendations: When a Building "Lies Along" a Distribution Line - The General Definition".

"The Format the Definition Should Take" captures the discussion around the definition format and the recommendations as a separate document. This is considered as a completed item now and will be submitted by Tanya Bodell as one of the recorded documents as back up to the DSC.

Action by: Tanya Bodell

"The General Definition" was discussed as to what was meant about "lies along", for example a building lies along a distribution line, if the property abuts the distribution line. There was a lengthy discussion on what could be meant by "lies along".

Kirsten Walli noted that Section 55 of the Public Utilities Act states:

"Where there is sufficient supply of the public utility, the corporation shall supply all buildings within the municipality situate upon land lying along the line of any supply pipe, wire or rod . . ."

There appears to be no legal definition of "lies along" nor does there appear to be case law that deals with the area of "lies along". Looking at the "Gas area", the definition of "lies along" is abuts or contiguous and requiring less than 30m of supply of pipe.

The distance from lies along the line was discussed in terms of the gas industry and how it is interpreted under PBR pressures versus the number of connections and how other utilities handle it. There was also discussion regarding the capacity of the connection required and how this is defined. The distance that a customer is from the distribution line may be of less importance than the capacity that a customer requires.

The “point of demarcation” becomes important in that the LDC will probably be responsible for the obligation to connect to the defined demarcation point. Beyond that point there is only an obligation to “offer to connect” and the provision of the service is likely competitive. The discussion also focused on how the costs are applied or recovered by the LDC in providing a connection to the customer.

The Act states that an LDC has an obligation to connect a building that lies along the distribution line. There may be a possibility of someone that owns a building to launch a lawsuit if the LDC does not live up to the obligation to connect.

Definition #2 in the issue statement appears to address a number of concerns if there is a requirement for all LDC’s to have a published Conditions of Supply.

There was a difficulty with “building” being in the obligation to connect. How do we deal with a single building on a property, compared to many buildings on a property (ie a subdivision), or compared to a connection for traffic lights?

After much discussion, Option #2 of Appendix 6D was used as a starting point. The definition is appropriate if we expand on the definition of building or include other connections such as traffic lights or streetlights. The definition should be expanded to “A building or a customer facility . . .” to include other connections as well as generators.

Action: *Tanya Bodell will revise the Summary of Recommendation for the General Definition, to include the recommended definition and Voter Summary*

7. Review and discuss revised strawman of code sections on expansion and connections.

Five documents were handed out, Appendix 6E - 6I based on the document from Appendix 5B

6E	Draft Summary of Recommendations	LDC’s Obligation (Including minimum design Standards)
6F	Draft Summary of Recommendations	Customer Obligations (Including minimum design standards)
6G	Draft Summary of Recommendations	Supply Conditions
6H	Draft Summary of Recommendations	Process (Including tendering if appropriate)
6I	Draft Summary of Recommendations	Process for establishing charges for connection

Discussion of Appendix 6E, LDC’s Obligations (related to the requirement to connect) including minimum design standards.

Concern over the ability of all LDC’s to provide a Conditions of Supply and even more so, the ability of the OEB to review these. The Conditions of Supply should be published

documents for customers to be able to review. If this route is pursued, should there be a process for public notice to revise the document and a limiting time frame before requesting changes? Concern was also expressed that even if a published document exists, is it open for abuse where a customer may not be informed of the Conditions of Supply. It was noted that if a minimum set of conditions is set, then LDC's may be reluctant to game the system if penalties exist under PBR. There was a suggestion that any changes need some form of public review. It was agreed that the OEB should develop and circulate generic Conditions of Supply and that all LDC's must abide by at least the minimum standards set out in these Conditions of Supply. In the event of a customer complaint, the OEB would scrutinize the Conditions of Supply for the LDC.

Discussion on recommendations, Bullet #1, as to whether or not we want to reiterate applicable codes and laws. The issues of safety and complying with applicable laws for minimum design standards came out of original discussions in developing the work plans and a concern for safety and reliability of distribution system.

There was also a desire to ensure that a general minimum standard is met by all utilities.

Action: *Ken Quesnelle will revise bullet number #1 of the Recommendations to incorporate the comments made with regard to industry accepted standards.*

All other comments should be e-mailed to Ken Quesnelle in due time to allow him to revise the document for distribution before the next meeting.

Action: *All members to E-mail further comments to Ken Quesnelle*

Discussion on Appendix 6F, the subtopic of Customer Obligations (including minimum design standards). For these purposes the customer is considered to be the connected customer, owner or occupant of the building (or customer facility) that is connected to the LDC.

A suggestion was made to start tallying the items that should be in the generic Conditions of Supply as they come up in discussion. The Chair requested volunteers for a subgroup to review sample Conditions of Supply and prepare subheadings for a Generic Conditions of Service and Supply. Lorne Pasche, Gord Ryckman, Darius Vaiciunus, John O'Neill and George Mychailenko will be working on this. Darius Vaiciunus will act as a coordinator for this subgroup

The Chair asked all members to review Appendices 6G to 6I before next meeting.

The Chair asked which members had progressed on other parts of the work plan.

C Gord Ryckman has worked on item G.

C Ron Lapier and Ray Payne are working on sub-issue A2.

C Lorne Pasche, Mike Angemeer and Mary-Ellen Richardson are working on Item C.

8. The next meeting is scheduled for July 7, 1999, commencing at 9:30 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

(The recording secretary provided a list of attendees at today's meeting since the committee list was not circulated.)

Recording Secretary: Rene Gatien

Appendices:

6A	Threshold for Reinforcement
6B	Definitions
6C	Draft Summary of Recommendations - When a Building "Lies Along" a Distribution Line - The Format the Definition Should Take
6D	Draft Summary of Recommendations - When a Building "Lies Along" a Distribution Line - The General Definition
6E	Draft Summary of Recommendations - LDC's Obligation (Including minimum design Standards)
6F	Draft Summary of Recommendations - Customer Obligations (Including minimum design standards)
6G	Draft Summary of Recommendations - Supply Conditions
6H	Draft Summary of Recommendations - Process (Including tendering if appropriate)
6I	Draft Summary of Recommendations - Process for establishing charges for connection