

1 **Q. (Reference Application, 4.1 Lookout Brook Hydro Plant Refurbishment)**

- 2 a) What is the payback period for this project?
- 3 b) What is the probability of the plant becoming stranded?
- 4 c) Please provide evidence that this project is needed to supply customers in
- 5 an environmentally responsible manner.
- 6 d) On page 15 it is stated "*Deferring the proposed refurbishment to a future*
- 7 *year would increase the risk of failure of a major Plant component.*" Has
- 8 there been a continuing risk of failure for the past 10 years? How much
- 9 greater is the risk now?
- 10 e) What are the results of the economic analysis if the plant is assumed to
- 11 become obsolete in 2035?

- 12
- 13 A. a) When preparing financial analyses for capital investments, Newfoundland Power
- 14 follows the Provisional Guidelines. The Provisional Guidelines specify lifecycle cost
- 15 evaluations with calculations completed on a net present value basis for projects
- 16 with investment classifications of Renewal.<sup>1</sup> Newfoundland Power does not compute
- 17 payback periods to evaluate projects for inclusion in its capital budget applications.

18

19 The textbook *Principles of Engineering Economy* discusses capital budgeting and the

20 weaknesses of using payback periods, or payout periods, for investment decisions.

21 The textbook states:

22

23 *Except for the special case where funds are so limited that no outlay*

24 *can be made unless the money can be recovered in an extremely*

25 *short time, the payout period is never an appropriate way to compare*

26 *a group of proposed investments. The objection is that the payout*

27 *period fails to give weight to the difference in consequences of*

28 *different investment proposals after the date of the payout.*<sup>2</sup>

29

30 The lifecycle cost analysis of the Lookout Brook hydroelectric generating plant

31 (the "Plant") completed as part of the *2024 Capital Budget Application* shows that

32 the benefits of the Plant's production exceed the cost of production. The analysis

33 shows a net benefit of Plant production between 2.11 ¢/kWh and 2.97 ¢/kWh.<sup>3</sup>

34 Considering the normal production of the Plant is 31.51 GWh, this equates to annual

35 benefits of between approximately \$665,000 and \$936,000.<sup>4</sup>

- 36
- 37 b) Newfoundland Power considers the risk of stranding of the Plant to be very low.
- 38 This is demonstrated by the results of the lifecycle cost analysis and various
- 39 sensitivity analyses included in the *2024 Capital Budget Application*.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the Provisional Guidelines, page 16 of 18.

<sup>2</sup> See *Principles of Engineering Economy, Seventh Edition*, John Wiley & Sons, 1987, pages 562 and 563.

<sup>3</sup> See Newfoundland Power's *2024 Capital Budget Application*, report *4.1 Lookout Brook Hydro Plant Refurbishment*, Appendix A, page 5, Table A-3.

<sup>4</sup> 2.11 ¢/kWh x 31.51 GWh = \$664,861. 2.97 ¢/kWh x 31.51 GWh = \$935,847.

<sup>5</sup> See Newfoundland Power's *2024 Capital Budget Application*, report *4.1 Lookout Brook Hydro Plant Refurbishment*, Appendix A, section 4.0.

1 The need for new sources of generation capacity on the island interconnected  
2 system was described by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro ("Hydro") in its  
3 *Reliability and Resource Adequacy Study - 2022 Update* (the "2022 Update"). In the  
4 2022 Update, filed with the Board on October 3, 2022, Hydro recommends extending  
5 operations of the 490 MW Holyrood Thermal Generating Station ("Holyrood") and  
6 the 50 MW Hardwoods Gas Turbine ("Hardwoods"), potentially through 2030,  
7 because of limited options available to backup the Labrador Island Link due to  
8 reliability concerns.<sup>6</sup> Hydro also stated that the island interconnected system will be  
9 significantly capacity constrained once the Holyrood TGS and Hardwoods are  
10 retired.<sup>7</sup>

11  
12 c) The Plant has been a source of non-emitting renewable electricity generation on the  
13 island interconnected system since 1946. Generation from the Plant, and  
14 Newfoundland Power's other hydro plants, offsets generation from non-renewable  
15 sources of generation, such as Holyrood and Hardwoods, that emit carbon dioxide  
16 emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels. Continued operation of the Plant and  
17 Newfoundland Power's other hydro plants is consistent with the purpose of the  
18 Government of Canada's proposed Clean Electricity Regulations.<sup>8</sup>

19  
20 See part d) of the response to Request for Information CA-NP-014 for additional  
21 information pertaining to recent legislative changes that require power to be  
22 delivered to customers in an environmentally responsible manner, consistent with  
23 least cost reliable service.

24  
25 d) See the response to Request for Information CA-NP-045.

26  
27 Newfoundland Power does not quantify risk increases year over year. It is generally  
28 observed that risk of failure is correlated to equipment age and condition, along with  
29 other factors typically noted in a condition assessment. It has been observed that  
30 the age and condition of the equipment, as described in report *4.1 Lookout Brook  
31 Hydro Plant Refurbishment* indicates, presents an increased risk of major equipment  
32 failure. As noted in the same report, the condition of the asset has degraded  
33 relative to the 2010 assessment and presents an increased risk of failure in  
34 comparison to the refurbishment completed at that time.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Hydro's 2022 Update, Volume III: Long-Term Resource Plan, page 53, lines 14-17.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, page 51, lines 25-27.

<sup>8</sup> See Government of Canada, *Clean Electricity Regulations*, page 1, section 1.

- 1 e) Table 1 provides the economic evaluation results for the scenario requested where  
2 the Plant's production ceases after 2035.

<b>Table 1</b>		
<b>Lifecycle Analysis Results</b>		
	<b>11 Year Levelized Value</b>	<b>Net Benefit</b>
Lifecycle Cost of the Plant	<b>2.37 ¢/kWh</b>	
Cost of Replacement Production (Run-of-River)		
Energy Costs	2.86 ¢/kWh	
Capacity Costs	2.92 ¢/kWh	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.78 ¢/kWh</b>	<b>3.41 ¢/kWh</b>
Cost of Replacement Production (Fully Dispatchable)		
Energy Cost	2.86 ¢/kWh	
Capacity Cost	3.63 ¢/kWh	
<b>Total</b>	<b>6.49 ¢/kWh</b>	<b>4.12 ¢/kWh</b>

- 3 Table 1 shows that the benefits of the Plant's production under the scenario where  
4 production ceases after 2035 will exceed its cost of production by between  
5 3.41¢/kWh and 4.12 ¢/kWh. The large differences between costs and benefits  
6 suggest any reasonable variance in the estimates of the costs and benefits will  
7 support the continued operation of the Plant.