IN THE MATTER OF the Electrical Power Control Act, SNL 1994, Chapter E-5.1 (the "EPCA") and the Public Utilities Act RSNL 1990, Chapter P-47 (the "Act") as amended; and their subordinate regulations; and

IN THE MATTER OF an application by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, pursuant to Sections 41(3) of the *Act, for* the approval to upgrade Unit 1 stack breeching facility and to upgrade the fuel oil storage facility at the Holyrood Thermal Generating Station.

PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

PUB NLH 1 to PUB NLH 20

Issued: August 12, 2011

Upgrade Unit 1 Stack Breeching

In evaluating Alternative 3 the annual O&M cost was estimated to be \$49,391, using the average of the 11-year maintenance history of the Unit 1 stack breeching as shown in Table 1, page 9 of the report: "Upgrade Unit 1 Stack Breeching, Holyrood Thermal Generating Station, July 2011".

PUB NLH 1

Included in the maintenance history, for 2006, is a total maintenance cost of \$321,000. Please provide a breakdown of the costs included in this figure.

PUB NLH 2

Why would this total maintenance figure for 2006, which appears to be inconsistent with normal maintenance costs on the Unit 1 Stack Breeching, not be considered an outlier in calculating the average annual cost of maintenance on this unit?

PUB NLH 3

Please calculate, over the same 11-year period, the average annual cost for maintenance of the Unit 1 Stack Breeching to exclude anything other than normal maintenance costs for 2006.

PUB NLH 4

Please re-calculate the CPW of Alternatives 1, 3 and 7 using the re-calculated average annual cost from Request for Information PUB NLH 3.

PUB NLH 5

Please revise Table 2: Cost Benefit Analysis, shown on page 21 of the report, to show the CPW of Alternatives 1, 3 and 7 using the response to Request for Information PUB NLH 4.

PUB NLH 6

Please provide a breakdown of the costs included in each of the alternatives included in Table 2, page 21, of the report, including Alternatives 1, 3 and 7 from the original table and also including the re-calculated Alternatives 1, 3 and 7 found in the revised table filed in response to Request for Information PUB NLH 5.

PUB NLH 7

In Alternatives 2 and 6 NLH estimates the O&M to be \$4,000 per year. Please provide details of what factors are included in this estimate and how the total is determined?

PUB NLH 8

In Alternatives 4 and 5 NLH estimates the O&M to be \$2,000 per year. Please provide details of what factors are included in this estimate and how the total is determined?

1 Refurbishment of the Fuel Oil Storage Facility, Holyrood Thermal Generating Station

- 2 On pages 8 to 11 of the report: "Refurbishment of the Fuel Oil Storage Facility, Holyrood
- 3 Thermal Generating Station, July 2011" NLH provides Figures 1 to 4 that illustrate Holyrood
- Fuel Storage Levels from 2002 to 2005, "when production levels were similar to the forecast for 2015 to 2016".

PUB NLH 9

Since 2015 and 2016 appear, at this point, from a planning perspective, to be the critical years, why would it not be possible for NLH to delay the refurbishment of Tank #3 for one to two years, until there is greater certainty regarding the future of the Holyrood Thermal Generating Station?

PUB NLH 10

Over the period from 1990 to 2010, in which years has there been a concern with regard to tanker traffic as a result of icing blocking the bay?

PUB NLH 11

Over the period from 1990 to 2010, on how many occasions, and for what periods of time, has tanker supply actually been interrupted as a result of the blockage of Conception Bay by ice?

PUB NLH 12

In each of the graphs provided in Figures 1 to 4 of the report, there is at least one period that exceeds three weeks before the replenishment of the storage level of the three tank capability occurs. What are the drivers, including ice, of these delays?

PUB NLH 13

Please provide an explanation of the current system of supply of No. 6 fuel that explains how the order is placed, how the deliveries are scheduled, and how the price is determined.

PUB NLH 14

If the availability of No. 6 fuel were the only factor to be considered over the next two-year period, would it be possible to place orders, schedule deliveries, or change quantities delivered so that the necessary levels can be maintained without the use of Tank #3? Why or why not?

PUB NLH 15

If changes, as required, could be made to the timing or quantity of deliveries, what factors, other than the availability of fuel, would be impacted, and in what way?

1	PUB NLH 16
2 3 4	Please provide charts, similar to those provided in Figures 1 to 4, showing the effect of two tank storage on fuel supply.
5 6 7	PUB NLH 17
8 9 10 11	In Appendix A of the report, page 10 of 248, AITEC recommends, in November 2003, that NLH do a 5-year external inspection of Tank #3 in 2008. Was an external inspection of Tank #3 undertaken in 2008 or at a later date?
12 13	PUB NLH 18
14 15 16	If an external inspection of Tank #3 was undertaken during or after 2008, please provide a summary of the report. If not, please provide the reasons why not.
17	PUB NLH 19
18 19 20 21 22 23	In Appendix A of the report, page 10 of 248, AITEC recommends that NLH "Open the tank in six (6)years, clean the tank and establish a short-term corrosion rate, and if necessary do a complete floor scan and a full API inspection, or at least establish when a full internal is to be done." What action has NLH taken as a result of this recommendation?
24	PUB NLH 20
25 26 27	If NLH has opened and inspected the tank during or after 2009, please provide a summary of the report. If not, please provide the reasons why not.
	DATED at St. John's, Newfoundland this 12 th day of August 2011.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

Original signed by Cheryl Blundon Board Secretary Per