

1 Q. Hydro's correspondence dated October 5, 2023, Attachment 1, Midgard Consulting Inc's Report,
2 page 20 of 74, states

3 Beyond the upgrades identified in Table 7 and potential interconnection
4 upgrades it is not anticipated that any further work will be required on the MSH
5 facility to ensure the reliable operation of the plant if its life is extended from
6 2027 to 2030 (or 2034 if the Interconnection of Existing Plants scenario is
7 selected).

8 a) Why was 2034 selected as the year for the replacement of the Mary's Harbour DGS in
9 the interconnection of existing plants alternative (Option 6)?

10 b) Please explain why the same repairs to the same facility will allow the Mary's Harbour
11 DGS to have a service life expectancy that is four years longer for Option 6 when
12 compared to the other alternatives reviewed?

13

14

15 A. a) Option 6, the interconnection of existing diesel generating stations scenario, requires a
16 substantial amount of work, upgrades, and repairs to enable output of the Mary's Harbour
17 Diesel Generating Station's full installed capacity, as required by this alternative. As a result
18 of these upgrades, it was estimated that the life of the Mary's Harbour Diesel Generating
19 Station would be extended until 2034 in Option 6. Given the high net present cost of this
20 alternative in comparison to the other alternatives and its poor performance in the
21 sensitivity analysis, it was deemed unnecessary to more precisely determine the number of
22 years the life of the diesel generating station could be extended.

23 b) Alternative 6 was the only alternative that required upgrades and repairs to enable output
24 of the Mary's Harbour Diesel Generating Station's full installed capacity. The same level of
25 upgrades and repairs to the Mary's Harbour Diesel Generating Station required by Option 6
26 are not required by the other alternatives; as such, the service life of the Mary's Harbour
27 Diesel Generating Station was not extended in the other alternatives.