

- 1 **Q: Reference: *Review of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Power Supply***
2 ***Adequacy and Reliability Prior to and Post Muskrat Falls Final Report, Page 15.***
3
4 *"Any scenario that is beyond N-1 is not designed for by Hydro so that Hydro does*
5 *not design the system to prevent loss of load under N-2 or N-1-1 conditions."*
6
7 **Hydro considers a single pole failure on the Labrador Island Link to be an (N-**
8 **1) contingency and a bipole failure to be an (N-2) contingency. It is also**
9 **recognized that the terrains crossed by the Labrador Island Link are amongst**
10 **the most severe terrains in the world from the point of view of icing and wind.**
11 **Irrespective of Hydro's N-1, N-1-1, and N-2 condition definitions, what does**
12 **Liberty believe to be an appropriate planning criteria for a Labrador Island**
13 **Link bipole failure?**
14
15
16 **A.** All things being equal, Liberty believes that any high probability / high consequence
17 event (such as a bipole failure accompanied by UFLS), should be considered
18 unacceptable, regardless of its classification as N-1, N-2 or anything else. We would
19 also think that a bipole failure resulting from a single credible event (such as a tower
20 failure) represents a single contingency and hence should be considered N-1, not N-
21 2. We also observe that Hydro and other utilities do indeed provide for N-2
22 contingencies when they feel it is appropriate to do so.
23
24 But all things are not equal in this case. The inevitability of loss of load upon a
25 bipole trip was effectively built into the project from the start.