

1 B-36, Replacement Paging System

2 Q. Please provide details on what alternative options NLH has reviewed.
3 Include the comparative CPWs of each alternative option.
4
5

6 A. Three alternatives were considered: maintain the existing system (deferral);
7 replacement with a wired paging system; and use of Hydro's mobile radio
8 system to replace the paging system. CPW analysis was not performed.
9 Alternative 3, use of Hydro's mobile radio system, was the only one that was
10 acceptable as it was the only one that met the technical requirements.
11 Alternatives 1 and 2 were rejected for the reasons stated below.
12

13 1. Deferral is not an acceptable option. The existing system is 35 years
14 old and unreliable. Parts are no longer available. Sound quality is
15 very poor; messages are often unintelligible. Safety is compromised
16 by the inability to transmit understandable messages.
17

18 2. Replacement with a similar fixed paging system is not an acceptable
19 option. Significant areas with no coverage exist, including within the
20 Plant building itself, out buildings, outdoor areas, etc. It would be
21 impractical to design a wired system which covers all the areas of the
22 Holyrood complex – areas such as smoke stacks, roadways, rooftops,
23 confined spaces, and other locations where personnel may need to be
24 contacted would not be covered.
25

26 3. Use of NLH's VHF mobile radio system will provide coverage to
27 virtually all of the Holyrood complex and result in improved safety.
28 Personnel will remain in contact whether climbing the smoke stacks,

- 1 working in confined spaces such as oil tanks, or driving from one
- 2 location to another. This is the only option that will provide a safe,
- 3 reliable communications system covering the entire complex.