

1 Q. **Reference: Response to Request for Information NP-NLH-051.**

2 The response to Request for Information NP-NLH-051 states on page 2 of 2 at lines
3 3-8:

4 *“The 1996 study which estimated ice loads on the Avalon and Connaigre peninsulas*
5 *was completed almost 15 years prior to the release of the 2010 version of the CSA*
6 *standard, and while Hydro is not in a position to comment on the development of*
7 *the CSA standard, the authors would have had access to the results of the 1996*
8 *study when both the 2010 edition of the standard and the preceding 2006 edition*
9 *were released.”*

10 Has Hydro inquired into the extent to which the Canadian Standards Association
11 investigates local weather data in Canadian jurisdictions to assess the
12 appropriateness of its weather models?

13

14

15 A. The CSA Group, which publishes CSA standards, including CAN/CSA-C22.3 No.
16 60826-10, is accredited by the Standards Council of Canada as a standards
17 development organization. The basis for their accreditation is outlined in
18 documentation published by the Standards Council of Canada.¹

19

20 As noted in the Preface to CAN/CSA-C22.3 No. 60826-10:

21

22 This Standard was reviewed for Canadian adoption by the CSA
23 Subcommittee on Reliability-Based Design of Overhead Lines,
24 under the jurisdiction of the CSA Technical Committee on
25 Overhead Systems and the CSA Strategic Steering Committee on
26 Power Engineering and Electromagnetic Compatibility, and has
27 been formally approved by the Technical Committee. This

¹ Available at http://www.scc.ca/sites/default/files/publications/CAN-P-1-2012_e.pdf.

Standard has been approved as a National Standard of Canada by
the Standards Council of Canada.

The CSA Subcommittee on Reliability-Based Design of Overhead Lines had broad representation from industry, utilities, consultants, and governments, as indicated in Appendix 1. The CSA Technical Committee on Overhead Systems, was similarly composed, as indicated in Appendix 2.

The following electrical utilities were represented on the subcommittee and/or the technical committee:

| Utility | Subcommittee on Reliability Based Design | Technical Committee on Overhead Systems |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Hydro One | M. Bell I. Hathout | M. Bell I. Hathout |
| Toronto Hydro | G.A. Daniell | M. Byrne |
| Hydro Quebec | J.C. Carriere R. Desbiens | J.C. Carriere R. Desbiens |
| SaskPower | | M. Ereth |
| Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro | | T. Gardiner |
| Enmax Power | M. Jaffer | M. Jaffer |
| Enersource Hydro Mississauga | C. Kafel | C. Kafel |
| Manitoba Hydro | Z.J. Kieloch E.H. Wiebe | Z.J. Kieloch |
| Nova Scotia Power | J. A. McFadgen | J.A. McFadgen |
| NB Power | | T. O'Hara |
| Altalink | R. Renwick | R. Renwick |
| BC Hydro /BCTC | A. Zolotoochin | R. Ruge J. Toth |
| EPCOR Distribution | | T. Shmyr |
| Newfoundland Power | T.L. Troke | G. Smith T.L. Troke |
| Hydro Ottawa | R. Williams | R. Williams |

The subcommittee and committee approving the standard had broad industry representation, including from Newfoundland Power.

Local data from Newfoundland and Labrador was available for the Chaine meteorological model used in the Standard, as shown below:

CAN/CSA-C22.3 | No. 60826-10

Design criteria of overhead transmission lines

| Location | Elevation (m) | Latitude | Longitude | Minimum temperature (°C)* | Reference wind speed† (km/h) | Reference ice thickness‡ (mm) | Wet snow thickness§ (mm) |
|----------------------------------|---------------|----------|-----------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Prince Edward Island | | | | | | | |
| Charlottetown | 5 | 46.23 | -63.13 | -22 | 112 | 30 | — |
| Souris | 5 | 46.35 | -62.25 | -21 | 114 | 30 | — |
| Summerside | 10 | 46.40 | -63.78 | -22 | 114 | 30 | — |
| Tignish | 10 | 46.95 | -64.03 | -22 | 122 | 30 | — |
| Newfoundland and Labrador | | | | | | | |
| Argentia | 15 | 47.30 | -53.98 | -14 | 130 | 35 | — |
| Bonavista | 15 | 48.65 | -53.12 | -16 | 140 | 40 | — |
| Buchans | 255 | 48.82 | -56.87 | -27 | 115 | 24 | — |
| Cape Harrison | 5 | 54.78 | -57.95 | -31 | 130 | 35 | — |
| Cape Race | 5 | 46.65 | -53.07 | -13 | 154 | 45 | — |
| Channel-Port aux Basques | 5 | 47.57 | -59.15 | -15 | 133 | 32 | — |
| Corner Brook | 35 | 48.95 | -57.95 | -18 | 111 | 24 | — |
| Gander | 125 | 48.98 | -54.59 | -20 | 117 | 30 | — |
| Grand Bank | 5 | 47.10 | -55.77 | -15 | 130 | 35 | — |
| Grand Falls | 60 | 48.93 | -55.67 | -29 | 100 | 28 | — |
| Happy Valley-Goose Bay | 15 | 53.32 | -60.37 | -32 | 98 | 20 | — |
| Labrador City | 550 | 52.95 | -66.92 | -38 | 95 | 15 | — |
| St. Anthony | 10 | 51.37 | -55.58 | -27 | 138 | 30 | — |
| St. John's | 65 | 47.57 | -52.72 | -16 | 138 | 42 | — |
| Stephenville | 25 | 48.55 | -58.58 | -18 | 114 | 24 | — |
| Twin Falls | 425 | 53.50 | -64.53 | -37 | 95 | 17 | — |
| Wabana | 75 | 47.63 | -52.95 | -17 | 130 | 40 | — |
| Wabush | 550 | 52.92 | -66.87 | -38 | 95 | 15 | — |

To reiterate the point made in Hydro's response to NP-NLH-004, the Labrador-Island Transmission Link has been designed to withstand meteorological loads consistent with a 500-year return period for portions of the line sharing a common corridor on the Avalon Peninsula, as recommended by the CSA standard. Consideration to the previous modelling as presented in Exhibit 85 of the Muskrat

1 Falls Review was also given, and the design loads exceed those as presented in that
2 study. However, no justification can be found to further increase design loads for
3 the Avalon Peninsula by extrapolating a 500-year return period for the loads as
4 presented in Exhibit 85.

5

6 While meteorological loads could have been increased beyond the CSA standard
7 with commensurate increases in project cost and electricity rates, a decision was
8 taken to use the approved Canadian standard as a basis, and to ensure that the line
9 could also withstand loadings as identified in previous studies.