

1 Q. Reference: Automate Generator Deluge Systems Units 3 and 6, Volume I,
2 Section C, Page C-15

3 *“As part of the 2013 Capital Budget, a project entitled Automate Generator*
4 *Deluge Systems Units 5 and 6 was approved by Order No. P.U.4 (2013). However,*
5 *due to unforeseen changes in generating unit outage schedules, Hydro is unable*
6 *to perform that work on Units 5 and 6 in 2013 and the planned installations will*
7 *be completed on Units 4 and 7 instead.”.*

8 Has Hydro sought and received approval from the Board with respect to this change
9 in the project for 2013? If not, in what basis does Hydro believe that this change is
10 justified without the approval of the Board?
11
12

13 A. This project is year two of a four-year program that commenced in 2013 and which
14 was approved by the Board in Order No. P.U. 4(2013). The deluge systems to be
15 replaced in each year are essentially identical so there is no specific importance as
16 to which units’ deluge systems are replaced in a given year of the program. When
17 Hydro first planned the program, it was expected that the deluge systems for Units
18 5 and 6 were going to be replaced in 2013, however, that became impracticable
19 due to outage availabilities so Hydro changed the order in which the deluge systems
20 were to be installed. This is not a change in scope that has any substantive
21 implications for the work that was approved, nor are there any cost implications
22 arising from this change in the sequence of the installations from that originally
23 anticipated. Hydro does not believe that a mere change in the order of the
24 installation of the deluge systems has any meaningful implications as to the
25 substance of the work which was approved and therefore did not apply for the
26 approval of a change in project scope.