Q. Please comment on the statement on page 10 of the Teshmont Report regarding transmission line failure rates, which states that "*five years of data was considered insufficient to provide statistically meaningful data for individual lines*". What would be impact of using five year data compared to the data based on a longer historical period?

A. The impact of using data based on a longer historical period would have the potential to improve the accuracy of the probabilities of ac transmission line outages. However, such a refinement would not have an appreciable impact on the results of the relative reliability analysis performed by Teshmont. As noted on page 39 of the report:

> *"While the reliability of the transmission network is improved, the EUE resulting from ac transmission line outages is not material to the comparison of Pre-HVDC and Post-HVDC cases. Rather, this comparison is fundamentally between the reliability of the Holyrood units and the HVDC transmission links…"*

This is due to the fact that the ac transmission line outages result in a small amount of expected unserved energy, as compared to Holyrood units and the Labrador Island Link. As indicated in the report, the expected unserved energy for the Pre-HVdc scenario due to ac transmission line outages is 100.8 MWh/year, as compared to 41.9 MWh/year in the Post-HVdc scenario. This is compared to an expected

unserved energy of 16 GWh/year per year for Holyrood Units[1] and 2.7 GWh/year for the HVdc link.

On the basis of the above, five years of performance data for the ac transmission lines was acceptable for the analysis.

[1] Based on Hydro reliability data