

1 *NP-CA-4*

2  
3 **Q. Does Mr. Bowman propose that the reliability standard recommended be**  
4 **applied to Newfoundland Power’s entire service territory as a whole, to particular**  
5 **areas of Newfoundland Power’s service territory, or to individual distribution**  
6 **feeders within Newfoundland Power’s service territory? Explain in detail the basis**  
7 **for Mr. Bowman’s opinion.**

8  
9 **A.** On page 34 of his Pre-filed Evidence, Mr. Bowman references Newfoundland  
10 Power’s approach to reliability assessment and planning (CA-NP 435): “Maintenance of  
11 an acceptable level of electrical system reliability has both a local dimension (i.e.,  
12 specific assets) and a broader system dimension.” On the same page of his Pre-filed  
13 Evidence, Mr. Bowman states “While this represents a reasonable approach to reliability  
14 assessment and planning, the basis for concluding that the broader reliability performance  
15 is now acceptable is not clear, and neither is the basis upon which expenditures are  
16 committed to improve local reliability performance. There are no benchmarks upon  
17 which to assess reliability performance in either case. In particular, what constitutes poor  
18 feeder performance given that broad reliability performance is based on an average of  
19 feeders with both good and poor reliability performance; i.e., is performance that is 3  
20 times, 5 times or 22 times the average considered unacceptable?” Like Newfoundland  
21 Power, Mr. Bowman believes reliability needs to be addressed from both perspectives.  
22 Mr. Bowman leaves the door open to a specific proposal by Newfoundland Power,  
23 stating on page 38, lines 13 – 17 of his Pre-filed Evidence: “I recommend that the  
24 development of the standard be a tri-party effort, led by Newfoundland Power, the  
25 primary distributor in the Province, with input and review by Newfoundland and  
26 Labrador Hydro and the Consumer Advocate”.

27