| 2 | |
|----|---|
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | DECISION: |
| 17 | The Board has considered the evidence filed in this |
| 18 | proceeding and presented during the hearing today. |
| 19 | There is no disagreement amongst the parties that |
| 20 | Lennox remains needed for reliability reasons. The parties |
| 21 | will be aware, from the last decision regarding Lennox and |
| 22 | from Procedural Order No. 1 issued in this proceeding, that |
| 23 | the Board was concerned about being routinely asked to |
| 24 | approve one-year RMR arrangements for Lennox. Particularly |
| 25 | given that the RMR contract costs are high, the Board |
| 26 | wanted to examine potential savings of multi-year |
| 27 | contracts. |
| 28 | However, the Board is satisfied that the evidence in |

- 1 this proceeding demonstrates that, based on current
- 2 assumptions and expectations, Lennox will no longer be
- 3 required for reliability reasons beyond September 30th,
- 4 2009.
- 5 The Board understands that alternative contractual
- 6 support for Lennox beyond that date is anticipated.
- 7 support would likely be obtained through the OPA and
- 8 justified for reasons of system adequacy, rather than local
- 9 area reliability.
- The Board assumes that the OPA will be diligent in its 10
- 11 consideration of the costs of contracting for supply from
- 12 Lennox in the future.
- 13 The Board accepts that the financial provisions of the
- 14 RMR agreement are structurally the same as those in RMR
- 15 agreements that have previously been approved by the Board.
- 16 In addition, the Board recognizes that the IESO audit
- 17 reports have also determined that the contract costs are
- 18 reasonable.
- 19 The Board, therefore, finds the financial provisions
- 20 to be reasonable.
- 2.1 The Board, therefore, approves the RMR agreement for
- 22 the period October, 1st 2008 to September 30th, 2009 in the
- 23 form filed by OPG in its application.
- 2.4 The Board also takes this opportunity to set out the
- 25 timelines for the submission of cost claims in relation to
- 26 this proceeding. Both AMPCO and CME have been determined
- to be eligible to apply for an award of costs. The process 27
- 28 for dealing with the cost claims will be as follows:

| Τ | First, cost claims are to be illed and served by |
|----|---|
| 2 | January 7th, 2009; second, any objections by OPG must be |
| 3 | filed and served by January 16th, 2009; and, finally, any |
| 4 | responses to objections must be filed and served by January |
| 5 | 23rd, 2009. |
| 6 | An order on cost awards will subsequently be issued by |
| 7 | the Board. |
| 8 | If there are no further matters, I wish you all a |
| 9 | happy holiday and will likely see some of you in the new |
| 10 | year. We are now adjourned. |
| 11 | Whereupon the hearing concluded at 3:27 p.m. |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |