

November 15, 2024

Paul L. Coxworthy Direct Dial: 709.570.8830 pcoxworthy@stewartmckelvey.com

Via Electronic Mail

Newfoundland and Labrador Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities 120 Torbay Road P.O. Box 21040 St. John's, NL A1A 5B2

Attention:

Ms. Jo-Anne Galarneau, Executive Director and Board Secretary

Dear Ms. Galarneau:

Re:

Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro- Reliability and Resource Adequacy Study

Review- IIC Requests for Information

Enclosed please find the Island Industrial Customers Group Requests for Information IIC-NLH-009 to 022 dated November 15, 2024 in relation to the above noted Application.

We trust this is in order.

Yours truly.

Stewart McKelvey

Paul L. Coxworthy

PLC/tas

Enclosures

ecc.

Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities

Jo-Anne Galameau Jacqui Glynn Katie R. Philpott Maureen Greene, KC PUB Official Email

Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro

Shirley Walsh NLH Regulatory Newfoundland and Labrador Board of the Commissioners of Public Utilities Page 2

Newfoundland Power
Dominic Foley
NP Regulatory
Consumer Advocate
Dennis Browne, K.C., Brown Fitzgerald Morgan & Avis
Stephen F. Fitzgerald, Brown Fitzgerald Morgan & Avis
Sarah G. Fitzgerald, Brown Fitzgerald Morgan & Avis
Bernice Bailey, Brown Fitzgerald Morgan & Avis
Labrador Interconnected Group
Senwung Luk, Olthuis Kleer Townshend LLP
Nicholas E. Kennedy, Olthuis Kleer Townshend LLP

1						
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	IN THE MATTER OF the Electrical Power Control Act, 1994, SNL 1994, Chapter E-5.1 ("EPCA") and the Public Utilities Act RSNL 1990, Chapter P-47 ("Act"),as amended and regulations thereunder; and IN THE MATTER OF Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's Reliability and					
10 11	Supply Adequacy S	tuay				
12 13	REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION OF THE ISLAND INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS GROUP					
14			IIC-NLH-009 IIC-NLH-022			
15			ISSUED November 15, 2024			
16 17	IIC-NLH-009		ard to the Island Hydroelectric Supply Refresh Study (October 1, Section 5.0 (pdf pages 21-22) please:			
18 19 20		а	Indicate specific anticipated activities, timing and budgets for each activity stream (e.g., environmental, engineering, hydrological monitoring, consultation).			
21 22 23		b	Provide the expected decision dates when any project(s) are anticipated to move to being "formally considered for expansion planning".			
24 25 26 27 28 29 30		С	Indicate which of the 5 options identified for further study by AtkinsRealis are anticipated to proceed to more detailed review, and which (if any) are already considered screened out. Please indicate any projects that have already been screened out due to "operational requirements" and provide specific details about what operational requirements led to the filtering (e.g., cost, location, seasonality, etc.).			
31 32 33 34 35 36	No.	d	For each of the 5 sites identified for further study, please indicate the current status with respect to hydrological monitoring (e.g., incomplete data, need to extrapolate or interpolate) and the additional hydrological monitoring sites and/or data Hydro is anticipating to have installed to address these weaknesses, along with timelines.			
37 38 39		е	Provide Hydro's response to each of the 9 recommendations for additional work provided by AtkinsRealis at pdf page 213 of the submission (Attachment 1 page 189 of 231).			

40 f Indicate why Gisborne Lake and Piper's Hole did not receive cost 41 estimates in Table 7 (pdf page 18 of 351) and indicate the timing, if 42 any, for expected production of cost estimates. In regard to the Technical Conference #3 presentation, page 47 (Maritime 43 IIC-NLH-010 44 Link – LIL relationship) and the Firm Energy Criteria: 45 Daymark indicated in their March 9, 2024 memo (2024 Resource Plan 46 Appendix A, page 5 of 11): "However as the nature of the analysis is 47 deterministic, it presents worst case scenario conditions and results. To 48 draw more general conclusions, a probabilistic analysis would be 49 informative." 50 Hydro indicates at Technical Conference Presentation 1 that the "critical 51 dry sequence" occurred between 1959 and 1962 (slide 45). 52 Please provide a probability assessment of the firm energy criteria a 53 implications, as described by Daymark. 54 b Please describe in detail how Hydro arrived at an annual firm 55 energy requirement criteria based on a 3 year dry sequence. For 56 example, did Hydro use the situation limited to the worst year of the 57 3 years? Is it based on a sequence of sequential drawdownds of 58 island reservoirs? Please explain the analytical approach. 59 IIC-NLH-011 Hydro indicates at RAP Appendix B: Planning Criteria and Study 60 Methodology, page 8-9 of 57 that: 61 "From an energy perspective, it is also necessary to decouple the two 62 interconnected systems. Further analysis has been completed to define 63 the operational relationship between LIL flow, Island Interconnected 64 System demand, and Maritime Link flow. Under normal system 65 conditions, the amount of energy that can flow over the LIL to the Island is 66 limited by the interdependencies with the Maritime Link and Island load. 67 This interdependence exists because both HVdc links must work together 68 using RAS that will suddenly reduce their power flows (runbacks) to 69 transiently regulate system frequency in the event a contingency occurs 70 on the other HVdc link. This LIL to Maritime Link relationship has less of 71 an impact on the amount of power that can be absorbed on the Island 72 than the amount of UFLS that is available and would be triggered 73 following a bipole trip. The amount of available UFLS is directly 74 proportional to the total Island load. As a result, it is now confirmed that 75 there are restrictions on the amount of energy that is able to flow from 76 Muskrat Falls to the Island, resulting in the recommendation to consider 77 the two regions independently when assessing firm energy requirements." 78 Hydro represents the above relationship in Technical Conference #3 79 presentation slide 47 (Maritime Link (ML) – LIL relationship).

80 81 82		а	Please provide a copy of any third-party reports or analysis commissioned by Hydro related to assessing the limitation represented by the Technical Conference #3 presentation slide 47.
83 84 85 86 87 88		b	Please describe what is meant by "it is now confirmed that there are restrictions on the amount of energy that is able to flow from Muskrat Falls to the Island" and indicate the specific process, timing and form by which Hydro arrived at or received this confirmation. Please provide a copy of any internal reports or memos that document the confirmation process.
89			
90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97	IIC-NLH-012	represence energy all year the enand up	eference to IC-NLH-011, please confirm that absent the limitation sented by the Technical Conference #3 presentation slide 47, the criteria would be easily met with the import capability over LIL in ars of the planning sequence. If not, please provide an analysis of ergy criteria constraint assuming this limitation was not a constraint, odate Table 3 (page 44 of the RAP Overview) assuming this ion was not a constraint.
98 99 100	IIC-NLH-013	of ope	eference to IC-NLH-011, please provide a description of the outcome erating the LIL deliveries to the Island at a level higher than ented in the Technical Conference #3 presentation slide 47
101 102 103		(i) Under normal operating conditions (e.g., no outages) can the higher level of deliveries be achieved? If not, why not, and what would be the consequences?
104 105 106		(i	What types of non-normal outages or system conditions would lead to broader Island issues if the system was operated as described in (i) above.
107 108 109 110 111	IIC-NLH-014	With reference to IC-NLH-011, please provide a copy of any analysis conducted of equipment installation or other mitigation measures considered by Hydro, including cost, to ensure the limitation represented by the Technical Conference #3 presentation slide 47 is resolved or mitigated.	
112 113 114	IIC-NLH-015	partial	eference to IC-NLH-011, would additional UFLS on the Island permit or full resolution of the limitation represented by the Technical rence #3 presentation slide 47?
115 116		(i	i) If yes, how much UFLS is required and why was this not pursued?
117		(ii) If not, why will this not work?
118			

119 120 121 122	IIC-NLH-016	With reference to IC-NLH-011, please indicate any role considered for batteries on the island in mitigating the limitation represented by the Technical Conference #3 presentation slide 47, including by responding to the following:		
123 124		(i) Why is this not a cost effective alternative to help resolve the limitation?		
125 126 127 128		(ii) In scenarios where Hydro has considered batteries as a capacity resource, is their potential contribution to helping meet the energy criteria (by increasing LIL import capability) considered? If yes, how? If not, why not?		
129 130 131 132 133	IIC-NLH-017	With reference to IC-NLH-011, please provide a list of other solutions considered to mitigated the limitation represented by the Technical Conference #3 presentation slide 47 (e.g., flywheels, easily shed pumped storage hydro loads, speed-no-load hydro operation, etc.) and why these are not included in the options being considered?		
134 135 136 137 138	IIC-NLH-018	With reference to IC-NLH-011, Appendix B page 39 of 57 indicates UFLS would be the only mechanism to offset a loss of supply. Would the result of insufficient UFLS in relation to LIL inflow be a larger scale outage? If so, what would be the scale and expected timing and frequency of such an event? (e.g., it appears likely to occur in summer).		
139 140 141 142 143	IIC-NLH-019	Has Hydro conducted any cost-benefit analysis of the cost of adding new wind energy generation to the Island as compared to the number and scale of avoided outages from simply running the LIL above the level indicated in Technical Conference #3 presentation slide 47? If so, please provide the calculations and analysis.		
144 145 146 147 148 149	IIC-NLH-020	In the discussion of CTs (RAP Appendix C, page 40 of 163, section 4.4.2.1.2), Hydro indicates significant need for and benefits of Synchronous Condensers in terms of transient stability, voltage regulation and frequency regulation. If these capabilities are included with the CT, would it mitigate mitigating the limitation represented by the Technical Conference #3 presentation slide 47, and if so, by how much?		
150 151 152 153	IIC-NLH-021	The CT option includes an assumption that 10 days of fuel must be burned off annually (RAP Appendix C, Section 6.2.1.1.6). Is this energy generation from fuel burn off included in the energy criteria assessment? If not, why not? What amount of energy is included in the 10 day burn-off assumption?		
154 155 156	IIC-NLH-022	Daymark indicates in their May 9, 2024 memo (2024 Resource Plan Appendix A, page 4 of 11) that: "Because the flow over the LIL is dependent on Island load, three load scenarios were considered in the analysis."		
157 158 159 160		a Please indicate the testing completed by Daymark of the assumptions regarding the dependence of LIL/ML flow and Island load, related to transiently regulating system frequency. Provide copies of any studies or analysis conducted by Daymark regarding		

161 162		system frequency regulation on the Island system, and the LIL/ML interaction.
163 164 165 166 167 168	b	Please provide Daymark's independent third-party assessment of the responses to the questions posed in IIC-NLH-011 to IC-NLH-020 (above) and whether Daymark had been tasked with assessing each aspect of the limitation represented by the Technical Conference #3 presentation slide 47 prior to completion of Hydro's RAP.
169	DATED at St. John's	, Newfoundland and Labrador, this 15 day of November, 2024.
170		
171 172		POOLE ALTHOUSE
		Dean A. Porter
173		
174 175		COX & PALMER
		Denis J. Fleming
176 177		STEWART MCKELVEY
177		Paul L. Coxworthy

The Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities
Attention: Ms. Jo-Anne Galarneau, Executive Director and
Board Secretary, Ms. Jacqui Glynn, Katie R. Philpott, Maureen
Greene, KC, PUB Official Email

178

Newfoundland & Labrador Hydro

Attention: NLH Regulatory

Newfoundland Power

Attention: Mr. Dominic J. Foley, NP Regulatory

Consumer Advocate

Attention: Dennis M. Browne K.C., Mr. Stephen F. Fitzgerald,

Ms. Sarah G. Fitzgerald, Ms. Bernice Bailey

Labrador Interconnected Group

Attention: Senwung F. Luk, Nicholas E. Kennedy

179

180