

1 Q. Reference: Hydro's Reply, page 7, lines 8-17. Please provide the source documents
2 and a comparison of Hydro's calculations of Replacement Power figures of
3 \$504,610 and \$477,647 referred to in this paragraph.
4
5

6 A. Please refer to Hydro's responses to PR-PUB-NLH-187 and PR-PUB-NLH-189. As
7 indicated in the response to PR-PUB-NLH-129, Hydro provided an estimate of Unit 1
8 vibration related costs using Unit 2 operating time as a proxy. In this estimation,
9 Hydro assumed that Unit 1 could have been run for the same period as Unit 2 was
10 run between January 4, 2014 at 09:05 and January 5, 2014 at 21:27. Unit 2 was
11 restarted at 21:34 hours on January 4, 2014 following the system events earlier in
12 the day. The replacement power figure of \$525,897¹ represents the Unit 1
13 vibration related assigned costs for the entire period from 21:34 hours January 4,
14 2014 to 21:27 hours, January 5, 2014². The replacement power figure of \$477,647
15 is a subset of \$525,897 and represents the assigned costs for January 5, 2014 only,
16 i.e. the period 00:00 hours to 21:27 hours, January 5, 2014.

¹ Note that Hydro had incorrectly stated this as 504,610 in its response to PR-PUB-NLH-129.

² Up to the time of the B1L17 breaker issues.