

Jamie Merrigan Dean A. Porter Cillian D. Sheahan, Q.C. J. Annette Bennett

Edward P. Poole, Q.C., Retired

D. Paul Althouse, Q.C., Retired

Margaret C. Hepditch Robby D. Ash Meredith D. Baker Glen G. Seaborn Melissa May Adam G. Baker Jonathan M. Andrews Toll Free: 1 877 634-3136 E-Mail: info@poolealthouse.ca www.poolealthouse.ca ■ CORNER BROOK
Telephone: 709 634 -3136
Fax: 709 634 8247/9815
Western Trust Building
49-51 Park Street
Corner Brook, NL
Canada A2H 2X1

☐ Happy Valley-Goose Bay Telephone: 709 896-8777 Fax: 709 896-8779 49A Grenfell Street PO Box 1450, Station B Happy Valley-Goose Bay, NL Canada A0P 1E0

September 4, 2014

Via Electronic Mail & Courier

Newfoundland and Labrador Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities 120 Torbay Road P.O. Box 21040 St. John's, NL A1A 5B2

Attention:

Ms. G. Cheryl Blundon

Director of Corporate Services and Board Secretary

Dear Madam:

RE: Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro 2015 Capital Budget Application Requests for Information IC-NLH-01 to IC-NLH-47

Please find enclosed one original and twelve (12) copies of the Requests for Information of the Island Industrial Customers in relation to the above noted Application.

A copy of the letter, together with the enclosure, has been forwarded directly to the parties listed below.

We trust you find the foregoing satisfactory.

Yours very truly,

POOLE ALTHOUSE

Dean-A Porter

DAP/lp Encls.

J:\Clients\25754-61\NLBCPU, ltr #7 (RFI 2015 Capital Budget).doc

cc:

Mr. Geoffrey P. Young, Senior Legal Counsel, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro

Mr. Thomas J. Johnson, O'Dea Earle, Consumer Advocate

Attn: Ms. G. Cheryl Blundon September 4th, 2014 Page 2

Mr. Paul Coxworthy, Stewart McKelvey – Island Industrial Customers Mr. Thomas J. O'Reilly, Q.C., Vale Newfoundland and Labrador Limited Mr. Gerard M. Hayes – Newfoundland Power Inc.



IN THE MATTER OF the *Public Utilities Act*, RSNL 1990, Chapter P-47 (the Act) as amended; and

IN THE MATTER OF an Application by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, for an Order approving: (1) its 2015 capital budget, pursuant to s. 41(1) of the Act; (2) its 2015 capital purchases, and construction projects in excess of \$50,000 pursuant to s. 41(3)(a) of the Act; (3) its leases in excess of \$5,000 pursuant to s. 41(3)(b) of the Act; and (4) its estimated contributions in aid of construction for 2015 pursuant to s. 41(5) of the Act.

REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION OF THE ISLAND INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS GROUP IC-NLH-01 to IC-NLH-47 Issued September 4th, 2014

IN THE MATTER OF the *Public Utilities Act*, RSNL 1990, Chapter P-47 (the Act) as amended; and

IN THE MATTER OF an Application by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, for an Order approving: (1) its 2015 capital budget, pursuant to s. 41(1) of the Act; (2) its 2015 capital purchases, and construction projects in excess of \$50,000 pursuant to s. 41(3)(a) of the Act; (3) its leases in excess of \$5,000 pursuant to s. 41(3)(b) of the Act; and (4) its estimated contributions in aid of construction for 2015 pursuant to s. 41(5) of the Act.

REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION OF THE ISLAND INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS GROUP

SEPTEMBER 4th, 2014

2015 Capital Projects Overview

IC-NLH-1

At page 4 of the 2015 Capital Projects Overview, Hydro outlines that hydraulic plant represents 54.4% of the proposed 2015 Capital Budget for generation, as compared to the previous 5 year average of 36.2%. Does the information provided on page A3 of Appendix A of the 2015 Capital Plan remain Hydro's best information about the share of annual capital budgets for generation that will be represented by hydraulic plant in the upcoming 5 years (2015 – 2019)?

2015 Capital Plan

IC-NLH-2

With reference to the information provided on page A3 of Appendix A of the 2015 Capital Plan regarding the share of annual capital budgets for generation that will be represented by hydraulic plant in the years 2016 – 2019 (and excepting from this inquiry those specific capital projects already identified and cost-estimated in this Application), what specific hydraulic generation facilities on the Island have been identified (even provisionally) for future upgrades, overhauls, or replacements of hydraulic plant, and what amount of

capital expenditure has been allocated in the Capital Plan (even provisionally) to those facilities?

IC-NLH-3

With reference to the information provided on page A3 of Appendix A of the 2015 Capital Plan, Hydro projects that a substantial share of its annual capital budgets for generation will be represented by hydraulic plant in the years 2015 – 2019. Presumably, the major part of this projected expenditure is intended to extend the life of hydraulic plant components on the Island beyond the 2020-2021 timeframe (by which time the reliability of the HVdc transmission system is expected to be "well-established", per page 6 of the Holyrood Overview section of the Application).

Does Hydro intend to retire any hydraulic generation facilities on the Island, at some foreseeable time or milestone after full commissioning of Muskrat Falls, the HVdc transmission system (including the reliability testing period) and the Newfoundland – Nova Scotia transmission link (hereinafter referred to in the following Requests for Information as the "Post-Isolated Island System")?

IC-NLH-4

With reference to the preamble to IC-NLH-3, what factors will Hydro take into consideration, other than supplying power within the Province to Island customers in accordance with the power policy of the Province set out in section 3 of the *Electrical Power Control Act, 1994*, in determining whether each component of the current Island hydraulic plant will continue to be an essential component of the Provincial electrical grid, after full commissioning of the Post-Isolated Island System?

IC-NLH-5

Will any of the hydraulic plant on the Island, at some foreseeable time or milestone after full commissioning of the Post-Isolated Island System, be used to meet commitments or plans of Hydro (or of its parent Nalcor) to supply power to be transmitted outside of the Province?

IC-NLH-6

At page 7 of the 2015 Capital Projects Overview, Hydro states that the retirement of the Hardwoods and Stephenville gas turbines is not expected until 2025 and 2028, respectively. At page 5 of the Capital Plan section of the Application, Hydro states that "These facilities accumulate few operating hours generating electricity but are crucial sources of power and energy during emergencies and system peaks and provide voltage support, especially when operating as synchronous condensers."

Explain, in detail, why and how, after full commissioning of the 100 MW combustion turbine at Holyrood and of the Post-Isolated Island System, and the conversion of Holyrood plant to synchronous

1 condenser mode, these gas turbines will continue to be an 2 essential component of the Provincial electrical grid for the supply 3 of power to Island customers? 4 5 IC-NLH-7 With reference to IC-NLH-6, explain, in detail, what foreseeable 6 "emergency", "system peak", or "voltage support" scenarios, after 7 full commissioning of the 100 MW combustion turbine at Holyrood 8 and of the Post-Isolated Island System, and the conversion of 9 Holyrood plant to synchronous condenser mode, will still need to be 10 addressed by the continued operational status of the Hardwoods 11 gas turbine? 12 13 IC-NLH-8 With reference to IC-NLH-6, explain, in detail, what foreseeable 14 "emergency", "system peak", or "voltage support" scenarios, after 15 full commissioning of the 100 MW combustion turbine at Holyrood and of the Post-Isolated Island System, and the conversion of 16 Holyrood plant to synchronous condenser mode, will still need to be 17 18 addressed by the continued operational status of the Stephenville 19 gas turbine? 20 21 IC-NLH-9 What are the projected capital expenditures, in addition to those 22 applied for or specifically identified in the 2015 Capital Budget 23 Application, to reliably maintain the operational status of the 24 Hardwoods and Stephenville gas turbines until 2025 and 2028, 25 respectively? 26 27 IC-NLH-10 Why was the Hardwoods gas turbine not originally sited at 28 Holyrood? 29 30 IC-NLH-11 With reference to the almost \$2.5 million dollars of 2015 capital 31 expenditure proposed for the 127 MW Cat Arm generation plant (for 32 replacement of ABB Exciter Unit 2, replacement of station service 33 breakers, and refurbishment of the access road), explain why and 34 how, after full commissioning of the Post-Isolated Island System, 35 this generation plant will continue to be an essential component of the Provincial electrical grid to supply power within the Province to 36 37 Island customers? 38 39 IC-NLH-12 With reference to the information provided on page A3 of Appendix 40 A of the 2015 Capital Plan about the share of annual capital 41 budgets for generation that will be represented by hydraulic plant in 42 the years 2016 - 2019, what portion (whether estimated or 43 approximated) of this projected expenditure has been identified for 44 potential upgrades, overhauls, or replacements of hydraulic plant in 45 relation to the Cat Arm generation plant? 46 47 IC-NLH-13 Provide all available statistics, for the period 2009-2014, regarding 48 any interruptions or reductions from its 127 MW rating, in the supply

of power by the Cat Arm generation plant to the Provincial electrical grid, including (if available) the cause for such interruption or reduction.

IC-NLH-14

Provide details of all actual capital expenditures for the period 2009-2014, in relation to the Cat Arm generation plant, including identifying all instances where the actual capital expenditure has exceeded the amount approved, or has not yet been approved, by the Board further to a capital budget application or a supplemental capital expenditure application.

Specifically Assigned Capital Expenditures

IC-NLH-15

Identify any and all capital expenditures proposed by this Application that Hydro intends to seek to have specifically assigned to one or more members of the Island Industrial Customer Group (Corner Brook Pulp and Paper, North Atlantic Refining and Teck Resources).

Project C-5: Replace Interior Coating of Surge Tank 3

IC-NLH-16

At page C-6 of Hydro's 2015 Capital Budget Application, Hydro relates that its consultant "identified significant deterioration of the surge tank and recommended welding repairs, corrosion removal and recoating of the interior of the surge tank and riser". Further, at page 4 of Hydro's Report, found at Volume I, Tab 2, Hydro states that the scope of this Project involves, *inter alia*, the "refurbishing of all interior surfaces including surface preparation and coating of the surge tank and riser interior".

However, the Report of Hydro's consultant, Hatch Ltd., states that the "internal inspection revealed that the coating system of the interior of the tank root, shell bowl and riser is in good condition with some minor localized breakdown" and recommends that Hydro refurbish localized areas of coating breakdown of the interior of the tank shell, bowl and riser and apply a compatible coating system.

Why does Hydro maintain that refurbishment of all interior surfaces, including surface preparation and coating of the surge tank and riser interior, is reasonably justified in light of Hatch's recommendations?

IC-NLH-17

With reference to IC-NLH-16, did Hydro consider only refurbishing only localized areas of coating breakdown followed by the application of a compatible coating system thereto? If yes, why was this option not deemed appropriate by Hydro?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 3 14 15 6 17 8 9 10 11 21 13 14 15 6 17 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 6 17 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 6 17 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 6 17 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 6 17 8 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	IC-NLH-18	With reference to IC-NLH-16, if known, what would be the cost savings of refurbishing only localized areas of coating breakdown (followed by the application of a compatible coating system) as opposed to the refurbishment of all interior surfaces including surface preparation and coating of the surge tank and riser interior?
	IC-NLH-19	If completed, please provide copies of any detailed assessments of the tank interior coating system completed with a certified NACE inspector, as recommend by Hatch Ltd. at page A9 of its Report.
	Project C-9: Reha	abilitate Salmon River Spillway – Bay d' Espoir
	IC-NLH-20	At page 9 of the Hydro's Report found at Volume 1, Tab 4, Hydro notes that the "reliability for all three gates to open when required for spilling is critical" however it appears that only \$50,800.00 in maintenance has been required for the period 2009-2013 and only two major works or upgrades have been carried out since 2009 when the Hatch Report was completed (see Table 1 at page 8 of the Report of Hydro).
		Which of the recommendations contained in Hatch's Report have been implemented since 2009?
	IC-NLH-21	With reference to IC-NLH-20, have all of the "short term" recommendations contained in section 6.6.1 of Hatch's Report been completed to date? If not, which recommendations have been completed and why has Hydro not completed all of the recommendations to date?
	IC-NLH-22	With reference to IC-NLH-20, which of the "medium term" recommendations contained in section 6.6.2 of Hatch's Report have been completed to date?
	IC-NLH-23	As Hydro maintains that the condition assessment study performed by Hatch in 2008-2009 indicated that the Salmon River Spillway had a number of significant deficiencies that needed to be addressed, why has Hydro not addressed such deficiencies in the five (5) year since the Hatch Report was completed?
	Project C-13: Re	place Station Service Breaker – Cat Arm
	IC-NLH-24	Has Hydro investigated the possibility of building an inventory of available parts from sources beyond its current supplier? If not, could this be, in Hydro's opinion, a possible option to defer the need to complete this Project in 2015?
	IC-NLH-25	At page 12 of Hydro's Report at Volume II, Tab 6, Hydro states that:

"Maintenance on the station service systems are performed by both Hydro personnel and external contractors, based on availability of parts and technical experience. Both parts and technical expertise for these breakers and PLC is diminishing."

Is the diminishment of technical expertise due to diminishing expertise of current Hydro staff (i.e. due to retirements, etc.)? If so, could this diminishment of expertise be filled by greater involvement of external contractors? If so, why does Hydro not consider this to be a viable option at present?

Project C-17: Replace ABB Exciter Unit 2 – Cat Arm

IC-NLH-26

At pages 3-4 of Hydro's Report in relation to this Project, Hydro relates that Table 1 lists the quantities of "spare parts in inventory and remaining from those previously removed from Unit 1 exciter". Does Hydro have any other spare parts in inventory beyond those previously removed from Unit 1 Exciter?

IC-NLH-27

At page B9 of Kestrel Power Engineering's Report (Appendix "B" to Volume II, Tab 8), Kestrel Power Engineering states:

"The only alternative to replacement of the excitation system is to retain the existing system and to continue repairs as failures occur. If the excitation system is to be retained, Hydro should begin investigating suitable replacements for those components that are already obsolete."

Has Hydro considered the viability and cost of this alternative? If yes, has Hydro investigated the availability or suitable replacement components? If not, why not?

Project C-29: Upgrade Power Transformers

IC-NLH-28

At page 18 of Hydro's Report found at Volume II, Tab 14, Hydro notes that:

"Section 16 of the latest Federal PCB regulations state that the end-of-use date for equipment containing PCBs that are 500 mg/kg or greater was December 31, 2009. If this date could not be met owners were given an opportunity to apply for an extension up to 2014. Hydro made application in 2010 and received the extension to 2014. The regulations also state that equipment with PCB concentrations from 50 mg/kg to 499 mg/kg have to be out of service by 2015. In addition, Section 5(2) of the PCB Regulations prohibits a release of 1 gram of PCBs from in-use equipment.

1 2 3 4 5 6 regulatory amendment to 2025." 7 8 9 IC-NLH-29 10 11 from Environment Canada regarding its request for a regulatory 12 amendment to 2025? 13 14 IC-NLH-30 15 16 amendment? 17 Project C-37: Perform Wood Pole Line Management Project 18 19 20 IC-NLH-31 21 22 23 24 each of TL201, TL203 and TL218). 25 26 IC-NLH-32 27 28 29 30 region. 31 32 IC-NLH-33 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 IC-NLH-34 43 44 45 46 47 48

Hydro, through CEA, is lobbying Environment Canada to have a regulatory amendment for sealed equipment such as instrument transformers and bushings to allow their use until 2015. Hydro's current budget is based upon receiving a

When, in 2014, does Hydro's extension terminate?

With reference to IC-NLH-28, has Hydro received any response

With reference to IC-NLH-28, how would Hydro's proposed Project

be changed/amended if it does not receive such regulatory

With reference to the "Justification" for the 2015 Wood Pole Management project set out on page 5 of the Tab 15 report, identify the percentage of poles sampled which did not meet the minimum preservative retention level, for each line inspected in 1998 (i.e. for

With reference to the "Justification" for the 2015 Wood Pole Management project set out on page 5 of the Tab 15 report, identify the percentage of poles sampled which did not meet the minimum preservative retention level, for each line inspected in the Central

With reference to the "Justification" for the 2015 Wood Pole Management project set out on page 5 of the Tab 15 report, and Hydro's statement that "Full scale tests of poles at Memorial University since 1999 indicate a 25% reduction of average pole strength over a 35-year period", please provide (a) the number of poles subjected to full scale tests, (b) the specific percentage reduction for each pole tested, (c) correlation between (b) and the age of that pole, and (d) correlation between (b) and (c) and the line/geographical region in which the pole was located.

With reference to the "Justification" for the 2015 Wood Pole Management project set out on page 5 of the Tab 15 report, and Hydro's statement that "Full scale tests of poles at Memorial University since 1999 indicate a 25% reduction of average pole strength over a 35-year period", what is the industry standard for a safe or prudent level of pole strength retention?

With reference to the "Justification" for the 2015 Wood Pole Management project set out on page 5 of the Tab 15 report, and Hydro's statement that "Full scale tests of poles at Memorial University since 1999 indicate a 25% reduction of average pole strength over a 35-year period", is there any evidence of the rate of failure of poles at a specific percentage, or percentage range, of reduction of pole strength?

With reference to the 2015 Wood Pole Line Management project, provide all available statistics of service disruption attributed to pole failure from before, and since, the start of this program in 2004, and including for any pole failure since the start of this program in 2004 whether the pole was located on a line that had been inspected under the WPLM prior to that failure?

Project C-44: Increase Fuel Storage - Rigolet

IC-NLH-37

IC-NLH-38

IC-NLH-39

IC-NLH-40

At page C-44 of the Application, Hydro relates that:

"The increase in fuel storage at the Rigolet Diesel Generating Station is required by the fall of 2014 as it is projected that the existing fuel storage capacity cannot support the nine-month fuel requirement. The increase in forecasted load can mainly be attributed to the construction of a new community center in Rigolet."

When did Hydro become aware of the construction of the new community centre in Rigolet and, therefore, the increased forecast load for the Rigolet Diesel Generating Station?

With reference to IC-NLH-37, if Hydro had completed this Project in 2013 or spring/summer 2014, would the portable 90,800 litre self-dyking fuel tank have been required? If no, why did Hydro delay in seeking Board approval to complete this Project during that period

Does Hydro have any estimate regarding the cost to install the portable 90,800 litre self-dyking fuel tank to meet the fuel storage needs for the winter 2014-2015?

Project C-48: Replace Accommodations and Septic System – Ebbegungaeg

Please provide details regarding the number of staff who stayed in the Ebbengunbaeg site in each year from 2008 to 2013 and the dates of such stays?

Please provide details regarding the number of days employees 1 IC-NLH-41 2 have been transported to/from the site in 2013 and 2014 (to date) 3 via helicopter? 4 5 IC-NLH-42 Please provide details regarding the number of days for each year 6 from 2008 to present when female staff have been present at the 7 site? 8 9 IC-NLH-43 Has Hydro considered whether a six bedroom unit is required or whether a smaller accommodations camp, with double occupancy 10 11 in some bedrooms (if required), would suffice? If yes, are details of 12 the cost of such smaller accommodations camp available? 13 14 Project C-57: Install Automated Meter Reading – Various Sites 15 IC-NLH-44 16 Please provide details, if available, of the cost savings realized in 17 each of the years 2007-2013 relating directly to implementation of 18 this Project to date. 19 20 IC-NLH-45 Table 2: Historical Information, at page 5 of Hydro's Report found at 21 Volume II, Tab 26, shows that from 2007 to 2013-2014, required 22 meter readers have been reduced from 19 to 14. Are these staff 23 still employees of Hydro and, if so, what net savings have been 24 recognized by Hydro as a result of this reduction in required meter 25 readers to date? 26 Proiect C-67: Replace Vehicles and Aerial Devices 27 28 29 IC-NLH-46 Has Hvdro considered increasing its average kilometer 30 replacement criteria (as depicted in Table 1 of Hydro's Report 31 found at Volume II, Tab 29) to more closely align with the criteria of 32 Utility #1 and Utility #2 (as depicted in Table 2 of Hydro's Report 33 found at Volume II, Tab 29) and, if no, why would this not be 34 appropriate? 35 IC-NLH-47 36 If Hydro increased its average kilometer replacement criteria (as 37 depicted in Table 1 of Hydro's Report found at Volume II, Tab 29) 38 to more closely align with the criteria of Utility #1 and Utility #2 (as 39 depicted in Table 2 of Hydro's Report found at Volume II, Tab 29), what savings could Hydro realize regarding its present Application 40 41 for approval in relation to this Project? 42

<u>DATED</u> at Corner Brook, in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, this <u>4</u> day of September, 2014.

POOLE ALTHOUSE

Per:

Dean A. Porter

STEWART MCKELVEY

Per:

Paul L. Coxworthy

TO: The Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities

Suite E210, Prince Charles Building

120 Torbay Road P.O. Box 21040

St. John's, NL A1A 5B2

Attention: Board Secretary

TO: Newfoundland & Labrador Hydro

P.O. Box 12400 500 Columbus Drive St. John's, NL A1B 4K7

Attention: Geoffrey P. Young,

Senior Legal Counsel

TO: Thomas Johnson, Consumer Advocate

O'Dea, Earle Law Offices 323 Duckworth Street St. John's, NL A1C 5X4

TO: Newfoundland Power Inc.

P.O. Box 8910 55 Kenmount Road St. John's, NL A1B 3P6

Attention: Gerard Hayes,

Senior Legal Counsel