

1 **Q: Re: Review of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Power Supply Adequacy**
2 **and Reliability Prior to and Post Muskrat Falls (“the Liberty Report #2”), p. 86.**

3
4 **Citation:**

5
6 **We explained our opinion on the acceptability of UFLS earlier. Ordinarily,**
7 **we would not consider UFLS to the extent contemplated by Hydro to be**
8 **acceptable. We must acknowledge, however, that the decision to accept**
9 **interruptions upon the loss of the LIL was made knowingly years ago, when**
10 **the consequences were envisioned to be far greater than today. That decision**
11 **was embodied in the choice of the size of Muskrat Falls and the LIL in**
12 **comparison to the load on the IIS. We are unaware of a practical way to**
13 **change that circumstance at this time; hence, a frequency of UFLS consistent**
14 **with bipole trips at least every three years should be, and in fact must be,**
15 **considered acceptable.**

16
17 **When was the decision made to accept such interruptions upon the loss of the**
18 **LIL, and by whom?**

19
20
21 **A. Liberty is unaware of how early project decisions were made, when they were made**
22 **and by whom. It is Liberty’s understanding that, prior to the inclusion of the**
23 **Maritime Link in the project, the contemplated response to a trip of the Labrador**
24 **Island Link was tripping and isolation of the Avalon.**