

RFI Log

Revision: August 27, 2012

Item#	Description	Status				
1	HVDC short form specification supplier responses for converter stations Note: The SFTSpecs were provided. Not the responses. These maybe confidential – BC is checking.	Received August 27, 2012				
2	HVDC short form specification supplier responses for synchronous condensers Note: The SFTSpecs were provided. Not the responses. These maybe confidential – BC is checking.	Received August 27, 2012				
3	OPEX cost details (spreadsheet)	Received				
	O&M clarification request The table provides the same information as documented in the CPW Analysis spreadsheet “PLF12 Iter1 CPW Analysis 2012Aug1”. For example, all of the 50 MW CTs listed on the excel spreadsheet have fixed costs of \$551,000 base year 2012 costs. Please provide commentary on how the values are derived. How was the \$551,000 derived for the 50MW CT? How was the \$5.62 per MWh variable cost derived? What is the treatment for the CCGT 170 MW unit?	Received August 24, 2012				
4	PIRA Forecast Details. Document “PIRA Long Term NYH Product Prices May 15, 2012”	Received				
5	Nalcor PUB general presentation (from PUB website)	Received				
6	Topographical Maps (downloaded to Gerry Proteau)	Received				
7	Topographical map of SOBI crossing (for the final report)	Received				
8	Monthly project status report	Received				
9	CPW component cost details confidential status (Referred to C. Bown)					
10	CPW Questions set 1 and 2, now refactored as individual questions.	See Q14 to Q21				
11	Infeed Option treatment of Holyrood. There are a number of cost elements attributed to Holyrood Generating Station in the infeed option summarized below that are not explained nor were documented as such in DG2. There was \$27.3 million allocated to decommissioning costs for Holyrood in DG2. Please explain what these new costs are for and provide source documents supporting these costs.	Received August 31, 2012				
	<table><tr><th>Element</th><th>Year</th><th>In-service (\$000)</th><th>2012 CPW (\$000)</th></tr></table>	Element	Year	In-service (\$000)	2012 CPW (\$000)	
Element	Year	In-service (\$000)	2012 CPW (\$000)			

	<p>Holyrood CP2</p> <p>Holyrood CP3</p> <p>Holyrood CP4</p> <p>Holyrood CP5</p> <p>Holyrood CP5</p> <p>Holyrood CP5</p> <p>Holyrood CP5</p> <p>Holyrood CP5</p> <p>Holyrood CP5</p> <p>Holyrood CP5</p>	<p>HRD</p> <p>HRD</p> <p>HRD</p> <p>HRD</p> <p>HRD</p> <p>HRD</p> <p>HRD</p> <p>HRD</p> <p>HRD</p> <p>HRD</p>	<p>2022</p> <p>2027</p> <p>2032</p> <p>2037</p> <p>2042</p> <p>2047</p> <p>2052</p> <p>2057</p> <p>2062</p> <p>2067</p>	<p>63,632</p> <p>50,495</p> <p>27,740</p> <p>31,427</p> <p>35,592</p> <p>40,308</p> <p>45,650</p> <p>51,699</p> <p>58,550</p> <p>66,308</p>	<p>32,029</p> <p>17,934</p> <p>6,905</p> <p>5,425</p> <p>4,186</p> <p>3,137</p> <p>2,231</p> <p>1,430</p> <p>700</p> <p>12</p>	
12	<p>Insurance costs.</p> <p>In the current CPW analysis you have applied a single insurance rate of 0.03% for all assets, regardless of type. Considering that the equivalent rates used in the DG2 analysis was distinguished by type of asset (0.1% for hydro, 0.125% for CT, and 0% for transmission), please explain and justify your choice of a single 0.03% which is on average 1/4 of the rates used for DG2.</p>					Received August 24, 2012
13	<p>For the wind study, is there a more detailed drawing, or series of drawings) of the subtransmission system then Exhibit 102 (Provincial Generation and Transmission Grid) for the Island of Newfoundland?</p> <p>Received Appendix F NLH Wind Study but this is not exactly what was requested.</p>					Received August 27, 2012
14	<p>CPW Question: Please explain the difference in the fuel prices used in the 'PLF12 Iter1 CPW Analysis 2012Aug1.xlsx' workbook and the PIRA fuel price forecast ('PIRA Long Term NYH Product Prices May 15, 2012.xls') for all relevant fuel types.</p>					Received August 29, 2012
15	<p>CPW Question: provide a brief description on how the 7.0% discount rate was derived.</p>					Received August 24, 2012
16	<p>CPW Question: provide a brief description on how the 7.0% Rate of return on rate base (RORB) was derived.</p>					Received August 24,

		2012
17	CPW Question: provide a brief description on how the 6.25% AFUDC rate was derived.	Received August 24, 2012
18	CPW Question: if not already described in 14, 15, or 16 please discuss any implications of Federal Loan Guarantee on any rates used in the CPW calc.	Received August 29, 2012 Out of Scope!!
19	CPW Question: what is the basis for 2.5% escalation factor (relationship to CE2) for O&M costs?	Received August 24, 2012
20	CPW Question: provide backup for the calculation for LIL HVdc system CPW amount of \$2,188,620,000 contained in the CPW analysis spreadsheet.	Received August 27, 2012
21	CPW Question: provide backup for the calculation of PPA rate of \$65.38/MWh. Please identify volumes, IRR and its derivation, financing, escalation rate and any other factor relevant to its formulation.	Received August 24, 2012
22	Topographical transmission line maps for Labrador	Received
33	<p>Contingency</p> <p>MHI has reviewed the additional information provided by Nalcor on contingency allocation for the Muskrat Falls project. The contingencies for the Muskrat Falls Generating Station (GS) and Labrador Transmission Asset (LTA) come out at 9.0 % and 9.1% respectively, and look reasonable. With this contingency allocation to the GS and LTA, this leaves the Labrador Island Link HVDC facilities with 3.7% (86.48 million/ 2,359 million) for contingency.</p> <p>Please provide support for this level of contingency (86.48 million) for the LIL HVdc transmission facilities.</p>	Received August 22, 2012