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|  | (9:08 a.m.) | 1 | start by going back to look at GT-DD-NLH-011, |
|  | MR. JOHN MACISAAC RESUMES STAND, PREVIOUSLY SWORN | 2 | Attachment 1, page 17 of 172, and again IT6, |
|  | HAIRMAN: | 3 | e tender security, and then item one, of |
|  | Q. So before we start, I believe, Mr. MacDouga | 4 | course it says "a tender bond issued by the |
|  | r, you have one matte | 5 | surety company that is licensed to conduct |
|  | MR. MACDOUGALL | 6 | business under the laws of Newfoundland, |
|  | I do, | 7 | acceptable to the owner, in the form set out |
|  | MacIsaac wants to clarify | 8 | in Schedule A, tender submission" and either |
|  | umaresque asked him to look into, | 9 | at "or B , a certified cheque drawn on a |
| 10 | Gray, if we could pull up the tender documen | 10 | chartered bank payable to the owner; or an |
|  | the combustion turbine? For the | 11 | irrevocable letter of credit from a chartered |
| 12 | at's found in the current record | 12 | bank substantially in the form set out in |
|  | H-011, Attachment 1, and Ms. Gray has go | 13 | Schedule A." |
| 14 | to SP-1, which is the specification document | 14 | I would like to go to page 101 of 500 on |
| 15 | within that tender document and Mr. Dumaresque | 15 | the same -- no, sorry, it's GT-DD-NLH-001, |
| 16 | d asked a question as to whether or not the | 16 | page 101 of 500 . Yes, so as you can see |
| 17 | nder document referred to new or used or new | 17 | there, there is a cashier's cheque drawn on a |
| 18 | unused and I would ju | 18 | US bank dated April the 18th, 2014 for 6.4 |
| 19 | he could respond to that questio | 19 | illion dollars. This, Mr. MacIsaac, would |
|  | MR. MACISAAC | 20 | this be the cheque that accompanied the bid by |
|  | A. Yes. Consistent with my stateme | 21 | ProEnergy? |
| 22 | and in line with the second last sentence |  | R. MACISAAC: |
| 23 | th | 23 | . I didn't see the cheque, but I'm supposing |
|  | equipment | 24 | that it is and I think I made it clear |
| 25 | which is consistent with my testimony | 25 | yesterday that the payment came in two pieces |
|  | Page 2 |  | Page 4 |
|  | j | 1 | d if I didn't make myself sufficiently clear |
|  | MR. MACDOUGALL | 2 | in that space, I apologize. But there's -- |
|  | Q. Thank you, Mr. MacIsaac. That was | 3 | and I should step back and provide a bit of |
| 4 | preliminary matter we had, Mr. Chair. | 4 | context first. So the way it works is they |
|  | HAIRMAN | 5 | come in with a guarantee of a surety that can |
|  | Q. So Mr. Dumaresque, I belie | 6 | be in a number of different forms and then |
|  | to you | 7 | they have -- and this is consistent with our |
|  | OSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DANNY DUMARESQUE (CONT'D) | 8 | process on all contracts -- up to 48 hours to |
|  | MR. DUMARESQUE | 9 | deliver that surety. And inside of the 48 |
|  | Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And on that point, | 10 | hours, we had a combination of this certified |
|  | n't know where we disagreed because I | 11 | cheque and cash in our bank that actually |
|  | derstood that Mr. MacIsaac stipulated that | 12 | exceeded the required 9.9 million dollars. So |
|  | e tender was only asking for unuse | 13 | we were in just over ten million dollars, so |
|  | uipment and my point was that it was new and | 14 | we had both the certified cheque and the cash |
| 15 | unused and that's obviously what it was. | 15 | in our bank account within the 48 hours. That |
|  | MR. MACISAAC: | 16 | exceeded the surety requirements and our |
|  | A. Righ | 17 | purchasing group had given us an email that |
|  | . DUMARESQUE | 18 | confirmed the same. So we can, inside of the |
|  | Q. So maybe there was just a misunderstanding | 19 | undertaking, because you asked for an |
| 20 |  | 20 | undertaking in this space, we'll also provide |
|  | R. MACISA | 21 | that email from our purchasing group that |
|  | A. We ju | 22 | confirmed that the surety was in place, sir. |
|  | R. DUMARESQUE |  | MR. DUMARESQUE: |
|  |  | 24 | Q. Yes. Well, as you said yesterday, if you |
|  |  |  | didn't have that, the tender would have been |

rejected and of course, nothing in this previous answer and certainly in the tender document, the instructions and information to tenderers, specified that they had 48 hours after to deliver the tender security. Absolutely not, it was very clear.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. That's our standard process, sir.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. And I've been in business nearly 20 years and bid on government contracts and you open the tender box and the first thing that's looked at is the tender security. Either you have it or you don't, and clearly, absolutely no doubt that on that day of April the 21st, there was no tender document showing a certified cheque on a Canadian bank for ten percent of that contract. It was only the 6.4 million US dollar cheque. At ten percent, it was somewhere around seven million dollars. Why wasn't the tender rejected?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. So we're going to disagree on process. So again, I don't mean to frustrate you by disagreeing, but our process is such that the
respondent comes in, they confirm that they have surety and they have 48 hours to provide surety, and that is our standard process inside of all the contract work that we do. And that's standard process. And we had confirmation in writing back from our purchasing group that inside of that 48 -hour timeframe that the surety was in fact in place.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. Well, I certainly look forward to getting the results of that undertaking.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Sure.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. I would like to now go to the GT-CA-NLH-005 and this is the one where it's more difficult to see, but for -- maybe to make it a little bit easier, you could blow it up and -because the only two columns that I'm going to be looking at is ProEnergy and the PW Power Systems.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Okay.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
A. It's an initial summary checklist, if you will, of the key components of technical compliance that's used to do a binary filtering, either a one or a zero, of compliance to the request of specification that was tendered. And we use it to do an initial ranking, but also to determine compliance and where we have gaps, so that it then points us in the right place. We know
Q. Because as you know, the document on the contract shows that the Wood Group, for example, had no bid security, so obviously that would have been rejected.

## MR. MACISAAC:

A. That's correct. They were disqualified on the basis that the tender security did not arrive within the 48 hours.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. That's right, and then of course, you had the other bid for 143 million, which was obviously off the radar as opposed to the other one. So, could you describe to me what this document is, the two pages that we're now looking at? Page 8 who's first, who's second and who's third type of thing from the outset, but then in addition to that, points to go back and clarify.
(9:15 a.m.)
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Right, okay. Well, I'd like to look at this document and as we go through it, certainly I will look at where there's a difference in the point system that's been allocated to ProEnergy and to PW Power Systems, but I suppose just to make sure that we all understand here, PW Power Systems, are you aware what they bid in, what kind of equipment that they bid on that day?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Pratt and Whitney?

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. PW, yeah.

MR. MACISAAC:
A. Yeah. So they had mobile packs, four units, in at a price of 115.2 million with a combined or consolidated output in its nominal rating of 100 megawatts, sir.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yes, so two things there then maybe you could
confirm. Would this be new equipment or unused equipment?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. New units, sir.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yes, new units and with the manufacturer's warranty?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Yes, sir.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. And also nominal meaning, I guess, as you explained yesterday, 100 megawatts nominal with different ambient temperatures, basically cooler temperatures like we have here would probably generate maybe 110 megawatts. Would that be a fair conclusion?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. There were all identified as being nominal ratings.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yeah.

MR. MACISAAC:
A. So that same logic applies to the unit that we purchased. It's nominal rating is 123.5 .
MR. DUMARESQUE:
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Q. That's right, and the units, the unit that we bought from ProEnergy had a nominal rating of 113 megawatts? Is that correct?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. No, sir, of 123.5

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. A nominal 123.5?

MR. MACISAAC:
A. An ISO nominal rating of 123.5

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. That's not what they advertised obviously, but I'll take your answer. And at this point in time, since we're onto that issue, how many times since we started up the new CT has it reached that level or exceeded it? We would expect to have probably exceeded it?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Yes, we have exceeded it.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. To what level?

MR. MACISAAC:
A. Up around 135, sir.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. And so when you did up this assessment then, of course, was this -- where did this
come from? Was this something that you applied -- we never bought many combustion turbines. I guess we did maybe two or three in the history of Hydro. But where would you have gotten this type of matrix or whatever you classify it as, the technical evaluation? Where would that have come from? Would this be a made-in-Hydro document or would this have come from some other place that design these types of evaluations, technical evaluations?
1 MR. MACISAAC:
A. It's an in-house document, sir.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. It's an in-house document?

MR. MACISAAC:
A. That's correct.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. So if you look at SP-2, which is just the first of the tender submissions which has a weighting of 12 , you look at the number two and then it says that -- no, sorry, number five. I did have a note by number two, but I won't bother because they got equal rating anyway. But number five, the plant start-up time, that is an important piece of
information. On the ProEnergy bid, you gave them the score of one on the basis that the start-up time would be 21 minutes. The PW Power System got zero and it's noted that it couldn't find reference to start-up time. Now we've had various -- we've had testimony here in previous days relating to the start-time. Can you confirm that indeed the plant start-up time for this new generator is indeed 21 minutes?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I'd say that's what's inside the technical specification of how the unit is intended to start.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. We have had other testimony, and I certainly haven't got the ability to show it here, but are you -- now after seeing the unit perform -
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Okay.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. - more about the technical, but as seeing the unit perform and having heard the testimony before, isn't it in fact true that the startup time is closer to 45 minutes than it is to

## $21 ?$

MR. MACISAAC:
A. I don't believe so, sir. I mean, I spent a significant amount of time at site while we were commissioning the unit and we were cautious in early days and for us to start the unit inside of a timeframe that looks like 20 minutes or under 20 minutes is normal.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. Maybe you could give -- provide the information in an undertaking then to provide us with the documented start-up time for this plant? Would you mind providing us with that information?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. We agree.

MS. GLYNN:
Q. Noted on the record.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yes. Now when it comes to the -- I'm just trying to picture how this grading was done and so, you know, was somebody -- could you describe, you know, who was doing this and what kind of environment they were in? I mean, were they inside of a room by themselves
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and they just had this piece of information, document here and this piece of information here and they just looked through it and did -- is that the kind of environment?

MR. MACISAAC
A. There's a peer review step that goes into this as well. So the discipline leads -- so this is done by our project team first.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Right.

MR. MACISAAC:
A. And they go through and they do a first pass through all of the documents and discuss what we have from each of the respondents. Let me back up. I want to start by saying that our good fortune was that we were dealing with four very good companies from the outset, four very good companies, and we got four very good responses.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Well, three really, because one was dismissed, right.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. One was dismissed, but it was a good response. There was some limitations around it, but
otherwise it was a good response. So, we had four good companies right out of the gate, which is a really good place to start. And unfortunately, we had to disqualify one of them for tender security. We then have three good offers and we go down through all of the offers over the course of an extended period of time. Because we combed through them in a lot of detail with the project team that's dedicated to doing this. So to your point, they're inside a room and that's all they're doing is going through and doing the initial rating.

We then bring discipline leads to come and do, and I think I used the terminology before, a bit of a peer review or a sanity check. I think before I said sobriety check and I should have said sanity check. But, do a bit of a sanity check on the initial scoring that has been done by the project team. So there's a bit of a cold-eyes review by senior managers who run the mechanical group, the electrical group, the transmission group, and they come in and go through that binary thinking, a one or a zero, in terms of the
responses that we've got, the completeness of them and if there's any big gaps inside of the responses.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. But the document we have here then is the product of the process, the full process?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. It is, sir.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. So what I'm wondering about is in this situation here, I mean we got 100-115 million dollars on the line, right.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. That's correct.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. And then you say you couldn't find reference to the start-up time, but you knew they would start, so wouldn't somebody check with the other company with brand new units, the latest technology, full manufacturers warranty, and ask them "well, can you identify what the start time is?" Would somebody -- wouldn't that be a prudent to do or a fair thing to do, just ask them if you could tell me whether they can start in ten minutes or ten hours or
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what is it?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Sorry, I'm going to back up for a second, because we have a process in this space and again, I don't want to frustrate you, and I want to make sure that we keep the focus on track. We're dealing with Pratt and Whitney Power Systems and an offer from ProEnergy, right. Both are offering good kit and we know that from the outset. The response from ProEnergy was more complete than the one from Pratt and Whitney Power Systems. The differential from the outset was 15 percent on price and 23 and a half percent by capacity. So, we, after doing the primary filtration, primary ranking, would have spent more of our time ensuring completeness of the offer from ProEnergy without question. So our attention inside of that is to go and look at the most complete offer first, and in this case again it's 15 percent lower and it's 23 and a half percent more capacity, and that is where we spent the majority of our time first is to determine compliance and completeness of that offer, sir.
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MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. But can you answer my question, please. Wouldn't it have been appropriate for somebody in that due diligence process and scrubbing and cleaning to pick up the phone and ask the pW Power Systems, "what is the start-up time on your machine?"
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I hear you. So, I don't know if we did or we didn't have that conversation and I'll check for you, if you like, sir.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. I would appreciate it if you would.

MR. MACISAAC
A. Okay

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. And let's go down to -

MR. KENNEDY:
Q. Is that undertaking?

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. That's an undertaking again.

MS. GLYNN:
Q. Noted on the record.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Number eight in the same SP-2, "warranty
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details and terms". You gave a rating of one from ProEnergy and you also give a rating of one on the PW Power Systems. You say 24 months with qualification. Now so just to be clear, at the close of the tender on April 21 st, you didn't have 24 months. Is that correct?

MR. MACISAAC:
A. I don't believe that's correct, sir. I think consistent with what you see here in front of you that they both responded that they would provide 24 months. That's what I read here.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Well, my reading -- again, I don't want to go to the specific section, but my understanding is it was 12 months and they only get an extension of 12 months on the condition that they become the operator or have some kind of an extra arrangement or something, which you negotiated after.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. That's why it says with qualification, sir.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yeah. And similar to the -
(9:30 a.m.)
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## MR. MACISAAC

A. I want to back up for a second and just add some more in that space. That regardless of who we would have partnered with in the provision of this unit, given the complexity of the unit and the fact that it would be new to our own people, we deemed it prudent to ensure that we had an engagement that went beyond the point of purchase. So that was always our intention was to engage whoever was successful and they all offer it, is to ensure that we had that technical oversight inside of the first two years. It had been prediscussed and agreed internally.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. And as I said earlier, where we -- it might be a moot point to you, but again, the PW Power Systems brand new equipment came with a 24-month manufacturer's warranty versus the warranty that came with ProEnergy. Is that correct?

MR. MACISAAC:
A. Both responses satisfied our request in that space with respect to warranty.
MR. DUMARESQUE

| Page 21 | Page 23 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Q. Just interesting on the point there yesterday, | 1 provide in an undertaking written |
| 2 you said that a manufacturer's warranty starts | documentation of this stretch period? Because |
| not with the birth of the machine but the | 3 this tender was very specific. |
| 4 start up, the in service. | 4 MR. MACISAAC: |
| 5 MR. MACISAAC: | 5 A. Yes. |
| 6 A. It's the date it goes into service typically. | 6 MR. DUMARESQUE: |
| 7 MR. DUMARESQUE: | 7 Q. That you had to have an in-service date of |
| 8 Q. The date it goes into service | 8 December the 6th, and did ProEnergy have an |
| 9 MR. MACISAAC: | 9 in-service date of December the 6th |
| 10 A. It's like when you drive a car off a car lot. | 10 MR. MACISAAC: |
| 11 MR. DUMARESQUE: | 11 A. They did not, sir. |
| 12 Q. Right. | 12 MR. DUMARESQUE: |
| 13 MR. MACISAAC: | 13 Q. What date did they have on their contract? |
| 14 A. Your warranty starts the day you drive it off | 14 MR. MACISAAC: |
| 15 the lot. | 15 A. No, no, on the contract it was clear. |
| 16 MR. DUMARESQUE: | 16 MR. DUMARESQUE: |
| 17 Q. Right. So why doesn't this machine have a | 17 Q. It was clear what? |
| 18 manufacturer's warranty? She only started the | 18 MR. MACIS |
| 19 21st of January. | 19 A. The intent was to have it in service for |
| 20 MR. MACISAAC: | 20 December 7th. The hand over to |
| 21 A. From our perspective, we have the warranty | 21 MR. DUMARESQUE: |
| 22 that we need and it satisfies what was called | 22 Q. So the date that they had - |
| 23 for in the specification. | 23 MR. MACISAAC: |
| 24 MR. DUMARESQUE: | 24 A. The hand over to us. |
| 25 Q. Yes, absolutely, I agree with that, but you do | 25 MR. DUMARESQUE: |
| Page 22 | Page 24 |
| not have the manufacturer's warranty. | 1 Q. The date that they guaranteed by signing the |
| MR. MACISAAC: | 299.8 million dollar contract was December the |
| 3 A. We have the warranty that we need, sir. | 3 7th, 2014? |
| 4 MR. DUMARESQUE: | 4 MR. MACISAAC: |
| 5 Q. Okay. Let's go to SP-4, number two, building | 5 A. Um-hm. |
| 6 enclosure complete ASAP after December 7th | 6 MR. DUMARESQUE: |
| 7 required. And before we get into that one, I | 7 Q. Is that correct? |
| 8 would just like to also at this point deal | 8 Mr. MACISAAC: |
| 9 with the fact that when this tender was put | 9 A. Sir, I'm going to restate that we're agreeing |
| 10 out and on April the 21st when the tenders | 10 in terms of what's in the contract, and I'm |
| 11 were accepted, they were subject to the | 11 trying to provide context in that we knew how |
| 12 condition that the units would be in service | 12 long it was going to take. ProEnergy had said |
| 13 on December the 6th. Is that correct? | 13 to us it was going to be eight months from |
| 14 MR. MACISAAC: | 14 award because they've done a lot of this work |
| 15 A. I'll speak to it again, but I explained | 15 and we were insisting on December and they |
| 16 yesterday that we were providing a stretch | 16 said "you can insist on it". So, the other |
| 17 target in that space to the market from the | 17 side of the coin is for us to walk away and |
| 18 outset and we knew what we had in front of us | 18 say nobody could reach it because the others, |
| 19 and in our first biweekly update to the PUB, | 19 quite frankly, said they would achieve it as |
| 20 the first or the second, we had made it very | 20 well. Right, so you have to look at what you |
| 21 clear that, including our commissioning, the | 21 have and the reality or the practicality of |
| 22 delivery of the plant was intended for the | 22 the responses. They're not going to exclude |
| 23 last week of December. | 23 themselves by saying they won't deliver it on |
| 24 MR. DUMARESQUE: | 24 that date either. |
| 25 Q. Could you please give me an undertaking, | 25 MR. DUMARESQUE: |
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Q. So the bid that was in there then from PW Power Systems, did they guarantee a in-service date?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. The in-service date or the building?

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. What did you say?

MR. MACISAAC:
A. I said the in-service date, sir -

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yes.

MR. MACISAAC:
A. - or the building? Because we were just talking about the building.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. No, no, I know. I said before we go to the building side, the in-service date as a condition of the contract of 115 million dollars, did they indicate to you that they would be able to provide this unit at a certain time?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I'll have to double check the date that they gave us.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
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Q. You will have it confirmed that it was December the 5th that the company, PW Power Systems confirmed they would be able to put their brand new units with two years manufacturer's warranty in place by December the 5th.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Okay. Well, we'll look for you, sir.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yes, thank you very much on that one.

MS. GLYNN:
Q. Excuse me, because there was two undertakings there. One was about the stretch target, and I'm not sure again -
MS. PENNELL:
Q. We got it.

MS. GLYNN:
Q. Okay, so Hydro is clear on what needs to be provided for that.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Yes.

MS. GLYNN:
Q. And the second undertaking is to check for the in-service date for the PW -
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Power Systems. Yeah, thank you.

## MR. MACISAAC:

A. And I want to be clear that the way we characterized it was hand over to us because we still had our own work to do in terms of it going into service.

## MR. DUMARESQUE:

Q. But so how would you classify expressing to the marketplace, people coming to put 10-12 million dollars on the table as a deposit, how would you classify your culture, I guess, for want of a better word, that you specified the in-service date of December the 7th when you really didn't mean it?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. How would I specify or -

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. How would you -

MR. MACISAAC:
A. Characterize?

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. How would you characterize that? Do you think that you mislead the marketplace, for example?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I don't believe so, sir. I think we -

## MR. DUMARESQUE:

Q. Where in this evidence, where in this contract, where in ever in the real world would you say "I want this machine" and you told the Public Utilities Board in an application on April the 7th, "you give us the decision by the end of this month or we're not going to have the unit in place for our peak period of December of 2014". You put the gun to the Public Utilities Board because you had to have the unit in place and in service and that's why you went out and said we're going to pay this money, 100 million dollars plus, for December the 7th. And now you're telling me that you had a stretched time of weeks that you knew starting off that when you told the Public Utilities Board that you wanted it in by December the 7th, you weren't that serious. ChAIRMAN:
Q. Mr. Dumaresque, I think you really got to ask questions rather than making statements. This is cross-examination.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay.

CHAIRMAN:
CHAIRMAN:
Q. Mr. Dumaresque, I think it's kind of unfair to characterize the building as a Taj Mahal. I mean, you're asking questions of the witness. You can put -- as I say in your final position on this matter to the Board, you can say pretty well whatever you want, but I don't think it's accurate to characterize it as a Taj Mahal.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay, thank you. "The building not included in the execution plan", again you know, this is big, big business when you say you get zero, the other gets one, and I would like to know, did you again talk to ProEnergy -- to PW know, did you again talk to ProEnergy -- to PW
Power Systems and say "look, you know, you put in your bid. You put it and accepted the allowance of eight million dollars, the same as the other bidder, but it's not included in your execution plan. Do you intend to build a building?" Would you have talked to them or did you talk to them about that and get the
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building, the Taj Mahal, is now just about finished. So do you think it was appropriate again -
CHAIRMAN: opportunity to place your thoughts obviously and your position on these issues, you know, in argument or conclusion when we wind up the hearing. But right now, this is crossexamination. So if you have specific questions, please put them to the witness.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So the question is: are you satisfied that you were clear to the marketplace when you issued the tender document of December the 7th, in-service date, that that is precisely what you meant?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I am, sir. I am clear.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. And the building enclosure, SP-4.2, the building enclosure complete as soon as possible after December 7th required. You gave ProEnergy a score of one because they said they would have the building also complete by December the 7th. And then, of course, PW Power Systems, again there's a note saying "the building not included in the execution plan". So, as we know now, the
clarification whether they intended to put the building? Because I guess if they intended to put the building -

## MR. MACISAAC:

A. So I would say yes, and I think it's important to appreciate there's context here to and that this wasn't something that was all of a sudden, from the perspective of the information that we had or did not have. There was meetings with all four of these respondents inside of the proposal request that we had in the marketplace before we had publicly tendered. So we would have had discussions around what their intentions were to offer and what they felt they could and could not have delivered. So that it wouldn't be in isolation that we purely looked only at the response. There was meetings and discussions in the weeks leading up to the public tender period where we had met in person with the teams from each of Wood Group, ProEnergy and Pratt and Whitney, where they came to site and viewed the conditions. They also came and met with ourselves here in St. John's and talked through what some of the
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options were that were in the marketplace and what they would be proposing, because we had clearly messaged that we would be publicly tendering this if it received approval from the Public Utilities Board, sir.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. So are you confirming that they -

MR. MACISAAC:
A. So, I think it's important to appreciate that this is not just us looking at the documents. This is us being in a place where we've already been in discussion. We've met face to face. We've talked about what options they would offer and we appreciate what their capabilities are to execute.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yes, so in this case, you sufficiently concluded that they probably couldn't build the building in order to give them zero. They put in for the eight million dollar allowance. Is that what you could conclude from this?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. What we conclude -

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. I mean, how would you give them a zero?
A. What we conclude from it is that they were not including the construction of the building in the timeframe that it was requested. That's what we conclude and that's what's reflected here, sir.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. And the request, to be clear, was as soon as possible after December the 7th, which we now know is May, June, July or whatever, 2015, right.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I would say that the building was substantially complete before June or July, sir.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Right, okay. SP-5, I just want to draw attention to that again. This one is specific on warranty and again, you give both equal weight for two warranty with qualifications. I'm just wondering why there was warranty details and terms identified in SP-2 and again in a separate SP-5? Any particular reason? Any difference between the warranties? MR. MACISAAC:
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A. I don't think I can offer you anything further on the warranty discussion, sir, quite honestly.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. No, I'm just wondering why there's two items for warranty here, you know, not the difference between the manufacturers and your warranty.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I'm sorry, so which line is it you're referring to?
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Well, SP- 2.8 has a warranty details and terms and then SP-5, which is the only -- SP-5.1 it says warranty again, two-year warranty. So I'm just wondering why there would be two lines for warranty?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I don't appreciate the difference of those two. We'll have to confirm that and get back to you.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. No, it's not obvious, so if you don't know it, that's fine.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Okay.

## MR. DUMARESQUE:

Q. We go to SP-7, SP-7.5. This is the exhaust stack, minimum 50 feet high, complete with weather and snow stores. So you gave ProEnergy a one on that one and gave PW Power Systems zero, and identified that there was a shorter stack height and no snow doors. So that would be a critical missing element if it was shorter and had no doors, no snow doors?
(9:45 a.m.)
MR. MACISAAC:
A. It does make a difference. It makes a difference, sir, in terms of your dispersion modelling is directly linked or your emissions and dispersion modelling is directly linked to the height of discharge and so it does make a material difference and it speaks to our permit to operate at site and to be in compliance with the dispersion modelling. So height is an important factor.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay.

MR. MACISAAC:
A. And snow doors is a function of our climate.
Q. Yeah, I understand that one. SP-8.1, the mechanical balance of plant. Obviously there's a lot of things there and you gave a score of one to ProEnergy with the note that "little detail provided in the bid document, but technical clarification confirmed that all items included". So you gave them a one. But then you gave half a point to PW Power Systems because "the piping between the fuel forwarding and filtering skid by NLH". Could you explain what that means?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I couldn't because I don't know it in that level of detail.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yeah.

MR. MACISAAC:
A. So we can confirm for you.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yes, it's not obvious what -- I don't know if they meant to not put any pipe there or what it was, so if you could undertake to provide the explanation of what that comment on SP-8.1 would be?

## MS. GLYNN:

Q. Noted on the record.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. And SP-8.2, again you give the ProEnergy bid one by noting "little detail provided in the bid document, but the technical clarification confirms that all items included". So then you have the redundant AC pumps and filters not provided in the PW Power Systems, but the DC backup is provided. Again, would you care to elaborate on the seriousness of that aspect to be able to deduct them a half a point?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. So we'll undertake another undertaking to confirm that for you.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay.

MS. GLYNN:
Q. Noted on the record.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Then we got SP-9, SP-9.3.

MR. MACISAAC:
A. Okay.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. "Transformer spill containment with drainage
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directed to oil and water separator". Again, you gave ProEnergy one and PW Power Systems zero and you say "containment not noted". I want to go -- I guess, go back to that earlier observation and say, you know, would you have gone to PW Power Systems and say "look, you know, you haven't noted the containment here. Surely you need to contain. It would be a standard thing to do." Would you have gone back and had that type of discussion with them and concluded that they didn't intend to contain in order to give them a zero?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. So, I'm going to provide the same comment that I had earlier on, and it fits in two buckets really. One is that inside of doing the primary ranking that after having received and gone through and peer reviewed, we would have spent the majority of our time determining the completeness of the offer from ProEnergy once we've reached that space. And in the weeks leading up to the public tender response, we had meetings where we talked through scope with all four groups, team on team, where they came in and talked through their scope in what
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they were providing and what they weren't providing and at a certain point, we then took the offers on their face value and did primary ranking and when the difference on price was 15 percent and the difference on capacity was 23 and a half percent, our team then started to focus more heavily on ensuring the completeness of the offer from ProEnergy, sir.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. SP-9.20, we go down there and it says "the site grounding system and generator ground connection" you give a point to ProEnergy, zero to PW Power Systems with the comment "site grounding by NLH". Would you know what that comment meant?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Again, we'll take it as an undertaking.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Take an undertaking, okay.

MS. GLYNN:
Q. Noted on the record.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. On SP-11, on page two of two, number six, it said "all exterior steel shall be hot-dipped galvanized" and you gave ProEnergy one full
point and gave PW Power Systems zero with the comment "exception to galvanize". Do you recall what that exception would be?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Well, what I'm reading from this, and not having been directly involved in the detail, but what I'm taking from this is they took exception to the requirement of galvanizing the steel, sir. That's how I read it, but we'll take that as an undertaking as well to confirm it for you.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yeah. I just made a note -

MS. GLYNN:
Q. Noted on the record. Sorry.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Thank you. I just made a note yesterday when you were explaining the unbelievable overrun on the building that one of the contributing factors to that extra cost was something about the steel.
MR. MACDOUGALL:
Q. Mr. Chair, just before Mr. MacIsaac -- I don't know that there was any reference to an unbelievable overrun. So again, maybe if Mr.

Dumaresque could try and keep some of the qualifiers of the comments, unless they're directly cited from the record.

## CHAIRMAN:

Q. Mr. Dumaresque, you know, I understand rhetorical flourishes. I had one myself once, but I think, you know, this is in the context of cross-examination and I think it's inappropriate and I mean, you know, may God strike me dead, but it's just not the right occasion. You can have -- you will have an opportunity. You can -- you'll have all kinds of opportunity because we do have free speech still left in our society for any rhetorical flourishes you want, but I just don't think that it's the proper context, and I think Mr. -- the gentleman over there is a big boy. He can handle himself, but I just don't think it's -- I just don't think it's appropriate. So I would just ask you to try to --

I get the sense what you wanted from Hydro is every time Pratt and Whitney scored zero and ProEnergy scored one, you want an explanation. That's basically what you're doing and that's a perfectly legitimate -- you
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know, you're entitled to that information. Is that what you want? Because I mean, they can just go down and provide you with explanations on every zero and every one and perhaps save us all some time.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Well -

CHAIRMAN:
Q. But I'm not going -- I'm not trying to make your life unreasonably miserable, let me put it that way.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. No, let me put you at ease, nobody does that to me. So, I want to ask these questions on the detail pertaining to this particular inhouse drafted analysis because clearly at the end of this process, because PW Power Systems scored less was a -- he'll answer, I guess, shortly, but was a factor and I don't know how significant a factor it was in determining whether they should get the contract for 115 million versus 100 million and you know, I just want to have it open and transparent as to exactly what characterized the reason for one getting the full point and the other
getting zero.
CHAIRMAN:
Q. But as I pointed out to you yesterday, there's an RFI process and if the RFIs aren't satisfactory, you can ask more RFIs. I mean, that's the way this process works. These are that's the way this process works. These are
factual matters you're dealing with here now. I mean, they're not -
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yeah, and we -

CHAIRMAN:
Q. Either the information exists or it doesn't, and you know, I mean, my impression is that it
does exist. These questions can be answered. and you know, I mean, my impression is that it
does exist. These questions can be answered.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yes, and that's -- in this case now, there's undertakings that have been put on the record and certainly they will provide the answers I' m sure. So, the question is the increase in the cost from eight million to 20 million on the building, yesterday you indicated that it the building, yesterday you indicated that it
was somewhat due to the change in the spec on the steel. Can you talk about what that meant again?
MR. MACISAAC:
CHAIRMAN:
A. There wasn't a change in the specification of the steel. I believe that the difference being is the extent of engineering work that's done when they responded initially and the engineering finished product producing something that was a more complex design and looking at what we have here for building code requirements in Newfoundland and Labrador would be more demanding than the rest of North America, I would say. The building code in the United States is based on their weather or climatic conditions. The building code here is based on our own, and the difference between the two probably contributed to the building being of heavier design and also more complexity, given the FM requirements in Canada and how demanding they are as well. So it's a function of complexity of the design and also complexity of the build and execution of the work because it's fully integrated to wrapping the building around an ongoing construction project.

## MR. DUMARESQUE:

Q. Thank you. So it's - the only point I was making there is that the exterior steel

```
specification did not get changed from being hot dipped galvanized to something else?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. It did not, sir.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Did not, okay, and so SP-7, 6 and 7, fencing surrounding the unit, again ProEnergy got a full point and the other company got zero, saying fencing not noted. Could you undertake to provide me with the confirmation that you asked them whether they would fence around or not?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Can I offer to respond to any of them that are different between a one and a zero, between ProEnergy and Pratt \& Whitney for you, sir?
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yes, well, we only have one more.

MR. MACISAAC:
A. Oh, okay.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. We only have one more, and that is the building again. To come back to the building on SP-12, and, of course, "The contractor shall carry an 8 million dollar allowance",
exactly what's worded there is what's in the tender document. ProEnergy got a one, but you noted in giving zero to the other company that the building had been excluded from the execution plan, but the allowance was carried. I'm sure you'll tell us why. At the end of it in this case here now, this company got 63 points and ProEnergy got 70.5, a difference of 7.5. Would you tell me what weight you would have given to the issuing of the award on the basis of this scoring?

\section*{MR. MACISAAC:}
A. So it comes down to the completeness of the response. Our confidence in reliability and then, obviously, after that price differential, so again - just so that I'm clear, it's completeness of response and ensuring that the response is in compliance with the specification technically. Then a determination of reliability, which is the step that we took when we dispatched an independent engineer to go and inspect the unit and ensure that it had been properly preserved and stored in compliance with the OEM recommendations. Then once satisfied in
that space, we would have then stepped back and said, all right, here is the price differential and here is the capacity output differential, and this front-end work became an enabler in taking another step in the process. Price was clearly an input, capacity was clearly an input, and inside of the Liberty Prudence Report, they make reference to the fact that the decision to go with 123 megawatt unit was beneficial for customers. (10:00 a.m.)
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yes, and I appreciate that context, but would there have been some kind of a formula that said, okay, we got the lowest tender, we got the higher capacity, we got the better technical score, would you have allocated 10 points and said, okay, one gets 5 , one gets 3 , one gets 2 , or was there any such kind of structure that would have led you to issue the award?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I'll have to go back and check the weighting on - if there is a weighting on taking this piece and then taking the piece that is cost
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        times both the former Vice President of Hydro,
    ```
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        Vice President of Nalcor responsible for
        Hydro, said what they paid for a certain
        component of the package, and yesterday Mr.
        MacIsaac made reference to what they paid for
        a certain component of the package. Of
        course, both of those numbers were wrong, and
        I would like to be able to refer to those
        numbers to illustrate a very, very important
        part of my overall argument and position on
        this transaction by alluding to the - actually
        referring to some of the specific numbers.
        Now what I would be prepared to do is rather
        than talk and point out the actual figures for
        each of the components for the purposes that I
        want, I would be prepared only to deal with
        the allocation of funding - the allocation of
        the bids that referred to the equipment versus
        the installation because there's two different
        contracts that were actually awarded by Nalcor
        and we can clearly confirm that there is a
        difference between the equipment cost and the
        installation cost, and we can certainly talk
        about the two numbers that make up these
        without referring to the line items of how
        much the turbine and the generator and the
transformer, for example, cost. Would that be permissible?
CHAIRMAN:
Q. I'm going to have to - I'm not sure I understood you, but I'm going to have to ask our solicitor.
MS. GLYNN:
Q. Perhaps first we should hear from Hydro whether they have any -

\section*{CHAIRMAN:}
Q. Yes, do you understand Mr. Dumaresque's request, sir?
MR. MACDOUGALL:
Q. I believe so, Mr. Chair, and the initial comments I would have, this information was filed some considerable time ago in a redacted format and a request was made of intervenors to say that it could be shared confidentially with them for their purposes. No one had suggested otherwise, so we're here today some many, many weeks after the information was filed with a request that it now be made public. The information is specific line items referable to contractual filings of information which, of course, in the normal
course would not be released in that it can cause issues with the futurability of Hydro to go out into the marketplace and get figures from suppliers and the like, so there's various confidentiality concerns that we would have to address to deal with this, and it's just coming to light at this moment, so we certainly wouldn't be prepared now to say we can start dealing with what was asked to be dealt with confidentially in the public record.

\section*{CHAIRMAN:}
Q. And I assume this information was kept in the state that it's currently in now because companies requested it, is that the case?
MR. MACDOUGALL:
Q. That's correct - well, I'm not sure if the companies themselves requested it, but it was Hydro's request of the intervenors that this be kept confidential, and again until today no one had indicated any concern whatsoever with that request.

\section*{CHAIRMAN:}
Q. I don't understand, Mr. Dumaresque, why didn't you bring this matter up before, but - do you
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Page 53 & & Page 55 \\
\hline & have any comment? & & out and said what they paid or didn't pay, it \\
\hline & MS. GLYNN: & & was the Vice President of Nalcor. Yesterday \\
\hline 3 & Q. No, Mr. Chair, only that I would reiterate, I & & Mr. MacIsaac said they paid somewhere around \\
\hline & guess, what counsel for Hydro said, is that & 4 & 31 million dollars. \\
\hline & here is a process to be followed if somebody & & MR. MACISAAC: \\
\hline & would like to challenge the confidentiality & & A. I qualified that, sir, by saying "installed". \\
\hline & and that had not been brought up prior to & & MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline 8 & today's proceeding. & & Q. Installed, so they have chosen - Hydro has \\
\hline & MR. MACISAAC: & & chosen to go out there and put out numbers. I \\
\hline 10 & A. And if I could just add, sorry, David, for & 10 & have not put out a number. Both of these \\
\hline 11 & jumping in, but inside the course of normal & 11 & numbers are totally wrong, and I know they're \\
\hline 12 & business and with each of these suppliers, & 12 & wrong and people who have seen these documents \\
\hline 13 & we've signed non-disclosure agreements for & 13 & know they're wrong, but the general public \\
\hline & this very reason, that we don't divulge their & 14 & only know what Hydro has said. So, you know, \\
\hline 15 & ing. & 15 & I am trying to look at how can the general \\
\hline 16 & CHAIRMAN: & 16 & public get to understand the real picture here \\
\hline & Q. They wanted them, is that what you're saying? & 17 & if they are denied the information, but \\
\hline 18 & MR. MACISAAC: & 18 & somebody else, the proponent in this case, is \\
\hline 19 & A. Yes & 19 & cherrypicking what figures they can put out \\
\hline 20 & CHAIRMAN: & 20 & there and they're absolutely wrong. \\
\hline & Q. It's a factor & & MS. GLYNN: \\
\hline 22 & MR. MACISAAC: & 22 & Q. Mr. Dumaresque, I just - as a point of order, \\
\hline 3 & A. It's commonplace that we don't exchange & 23 & the article that you just referred to, th \\
\hline 24 & information until a non-disclosure agreement & 24 & has not been entered onto the record yet. \\
\hline 25 & is in place for that very reason, sir. & 25 & When you provide the documents for - \\
\hline & Page 54 & & Page 56 \\
\hline & CHAIRMAN: & & MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline 2 & Q. I mean, it's a pretty standard matter in these & & Q. Oh, exhibit, sorry, that was part of the \\
\hline 3 & kinds of tenders. & & exhibit. \\
\hline & MR. DUMARESQUE & & MS. GLYNN: \\
\hline & Q. Well, the problem, Mr. Chair, is this & & Q. Exactly. \\
\hline 6 & CHAIRMAN: & & MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline 7 & Q. Well, the problem, Mr. Dumaresque, is that you & & Q. I would like to - maybe I could call that \\
\hline 8 & apparently had this information for quite - & & exhibit. \\
\hline & you knew the state of this information for & & MS. GLYNN: \\
\hline 10 & quite some time, and you didn't avail of an & 10 & Q. Until you enter it through the witness, it's \\
\hline 11 & opportunity to raise the issue that you're & 11 & not part of the official record, it's filed \\
\hline 12 & raising now. & 12 & with the Board. \\
\hline 13 & MR. DUMARESQUE & & MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline & Q. Well, again it' & & Q. Oh, yeah, and I forgot the procedure, so it \\
\hline 15 & CHAIRMAN: & 15 & was part of the exhibit that I put in earlier. \\
\hline 16 & Q. I don't think we can deal with it now & & MS. GLYNN: \\
\hline 17 & MR. DUMARESQUE & 17 & Q. Until you actually cross-examine the witness \\
\hline 18 & Q. Again you didn't let me explain. Since this & 18 & on that document, it doesn't become a part of \\
\hline 19 & information was given to us in confidence, & 19 & the official Board record. So if you would \\
\hline 20 & Hydro, the former Vice President of Hydro, in & 20 & like to present that document the article from \\
\hline 21 & a document that I have filed on September & 21 & The Telegram of September 11th, and question \\
\hline 22 & 11th, 2014, the former Vice President of & 22 & the witness on that document, we can enter it \\
\hline 23 & Nalcor was in the public saying that they paid & 23 & as an Information item, and then it will be \\
\hline 24 & 23 million dollars for the turbine. That is & & provided to all the parties. \\
\hline 25 & on the public record. It's not me that went & & MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \[
\text { Page } 57
\] & Page 59 \\
\hline Q. Well, I guess, first I'd like to, as I said, & 1 A. I think \\
\hline ther it's in the form of your comments, Mr. & 2 MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline Chair, or if you want to take time to make a & 3 Q. So are you confirming today that the actual \\
\hline ruling on it, whether I can refer to these & unit is 23 million - you paid 23 million \\
\hline 5 numbers or not, I'd like to have that dealt & dollars for the actual unit? \\
\hline with first. & 6 MR. MACISAAC: \\
\hline 7 MS . GLYNN: & 7 A. I can't confirm what Mr. Henderson was \\
\hline 8 Q. There would be no question that the number in & referring to inside of his reference to 23 \\
\hline 9 The Telegram article, you would be able to & million dollars. I wasn't in the room, I \\
\hline 10 question the witness on that particular & 10 didn't have context, so-I'm not trying to be \\
\hline 11 number, if you would like to enter that & 11 evasive on the topic, but I know that he would \\
\hline 12 document and have it on the record. & 12 have seen the communication, the information \\
\hline 13 MR. DUMARESQUE: & 13 that was shared inside of the advertisements \\
\hline 14 Q. Okay, well, I'll take your guidance on that & 14 that we talked about yesterday. So I can \\
\hline 15 and, Mr. MacIsaac, I would like to call for & 15 logically get to a place where he would have \\
\hline 16 the document that we filed, The Telegram & 16 said, yes, we've seen that advertisement and \\
\hline 17 article, September 11th. & 17 that's approximately, or around what we paid \\
\hline 18 MS. GLYNN: & 18 for it, along with other things. I can \\
\hline 19 Q. So that would be entered as Information 38. & 19 support that Mr. Henderson did say that \\
\hline 20 MR . DUMARESQUE: & 20 because that's what it says here, and I can \\
\hline 21 Q. Information 38. & 21 understand how he got to a place where he \\
\hline 22 Ms. GLYNN: & 22 would have made that statement because there \\
\hline 23 Q. And if you could give Ms. Kean a second to & 23 would have been information that potentially \\
\hline 24 distribute it. & 24 he would have seen either one of those \\
\hline 25 MR. DUMARESQUE: & 25 advertisements that offered the unit at that \\
\hline Page 58 & Page 60 \\
\hline Q. Mr. MacIsaac, I'd like to draw your attention & price. So I'm not quite sure where you're \\
\hline to page two of this article and paragraph 5, & 2 going. \\
\hline and I would refer you to the - well, I guess, & 3 (10:15 a.m.) \\
\hline I can read part of that, "The cost of the unit & 4 MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline 5 includes a number of things. It's the & 5 Q. Okay. The advertisement that was part of the \\
\hline 6 engineering work, the balance of plant work & previous RFI identified the complete package \\
\hline which is the underground civil works, wiring, & for 23 million dollars by the broker, CFAS \\
\hline and in-feeds", dah, dah, dah. "The actual & Systems, who did not have the right of first \\
\hline 9 unit", in quote, "The actual unit is around 23 & refusal, but the - so it's fair to assume that \\
\hline 10 million". This was the statement made on & 10 it would have been less than that from the \\
\hline 11 September 11th by the Vice President of & 11 people that we ended up buying it from. Two \\
\hline 12 Nalcor, responsible for Hydro, precisely, I & 12 questions. The unit that is specified here \\
\hline 13 guess, the same position you hold today. Do & 13 for 23 million, how would the unit compare to \\
\hline 14 you agree with this - that this unit only cost & 14 the package because as you know from \\
\hline \(15 \quad 23\) million dollars? & 15 yesterday, we outlined from the GTW Handbook, \\
\hline 16 MR. MACISAAC: & 16 that a package would include the turbine, the \\
\hline 17 A. I think you're leaving out part of the & 17 generator, the balance of plant mechanical and \\
\hline 18 sentence, sir. It says, "The actual unit is & 18 electrical, that would be for the complete \\
\hline 19 around 23 million dollars", and then there are & 19 package, and, of course, that complete package \\
\hline 20 a lot of other things that go with that. & 20 was being offered for 23 million dollars. \\
\hline 21 Mr. DUMARESQUE: & 21 Would you agree that the unit that Mr. \\
\hline 22 Q. Yes, that's right, I agree that that's left & 22 Henderson is talking about here, would that be \\
\hline 23 out, but I want to specifically ask you, the & 23 fair to conclude that he's talking about the \\
\hline 24 actual unit is around 23 million. & 24 complete package? \\
\hline 25 MR. MACISAAC: & 25 MR. MACISAAC: \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
A. I would say it's difficult to determine from what's here, and his choice of words, and we know ourselves, based on the work that we did with ProEnergy, that what was in the offering actually excluded pieces that would typically be in a package. There were pieces that weren't included that they then added into their scope of supply, sir.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. That's right, like the step-up transformer? MR. MACISAAC:
A. For example.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. For example. Yesterday -

MR. MACISAAC:
A. For several million dollars, yeah.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. I'm not sure "several". If you want to refer to the document -
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Okay, I take that back.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yeah, I think you should.

MR. MACISAAC:
A. I will.
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MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yesterday in your testimony, you said on page 132, line 9, "That's correct, sir, and I want to make sure that we don't move away from that point just for a second because this is about ensuring that folks understand that customers receive value".
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Uh-hm.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. "Inside of the detailed breakdown that you have been asking for in an undertaking, you will see that line item that we actually paid 31.5 million, something like that".

MR. MACISAAC:
A. Installed, sir.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Installed?

MR. MACISAAC:
A. Installed, and in gas turbine world that you showed us yesterday, the price for that same equipment, the equipment only, was 32 million dollars US.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. So my questions there, I guess, when
```

MR. MACISAAC:

```
A. I'm sorry? Inside the detailed breakdown I'm sorry, what's the question?
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. What detailed breakdown would you have been referring to, because you also go on to say "that line item"?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. So I'll go back to the context that I put that in yesterday where I said - and it's not captured here, but the context that was provided was that in setting up the construct or the structure of the agreed payment schedule, that there were big pieces that made up milestone payments, and that is exactly what I was referring to here, so inside of the breakdown of the construct of the contract, we had deliverables, and you can call them the bigger pieces or the buckets, that we had identified milestone payments against those detailed line items.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Right, so the detailed breakdown, and then you Page 64 say the line items, of course, that would be what we have here?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Not necessarily exactly the same.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. So are you saying then that when you accepted this tender with line item bidding and set up your payment system to pay them, that you made up a different line item scheme?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Potentially, sir, yes.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Potentially?

MR. MACISAAC:
A. Yes, I'd have to check the difference between them, but it's based on deliveries.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Based on deliveries, so for example -

MR. MACISAAC:
A. And percent or work complete.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yes.

MR. MACISAAC:
A. And any inspections that we do to confirm that
that actual amount of work is complete.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & Page 69 \\
\hline & Commissioners \\
\hline & MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline 3 & Q. Well, the document is on the record. It just \\
\hline 4 & happens to be black, I guess, the numbers, \\
\hline 5 & right. \\
\hline 6 & MS. GLYNN: \\
\hline 7 & Q. If you're referring to a document, though, it \\
\hline 8 & needs to be noted on the record which document \\
\hline 9 & you are referring to. \\
\hline 10 & MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline 11 & Q. Yes, okay, it would be GT-PUB-NLH-014, \\
\hline 12 & Attachmen \\
\hline 13 & MS. GLYNN: \\
\hline 14 & Q. Thank you. \\
\hline 15 & MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline 16 & Q. And, of course, this is incredible. How would \\
\hline 17 & you feel if the evidence turns out to show \\
\hline 18 & that this is completely wrong? \\
\hline 19 & MR. MACISAAC: \\
\hline 20 & A. I'm confident, sir, that it's accurate and \\
\hline 21 & fully transparent. I'm fully confident. \\
\hline 22 & MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline 23 & Q. Do you have any suggestion on how we might \\
\hline 24 & comfort the public? I understand the \\
\hline 25 & confidentiality that the customer has asked \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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for.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I believe that that's what this process is for, is to confirm to the public that we've actually delivered value for customers on a reliable piece of generation capacity being added to the network, and if I look at the prudence work that was done by Liberty with a very deep bench, their comment to us inside of their review is that we had a competent team who did a solid job of delivering the project, we had a schedule that was aggressive and we came very close to meeting that, and that from their perspective the most credible source of information on a plant of this type is the Energy Information Association in the United States, and that for the same convention gas turbine that the approximate value that we should have paid for the plant is 131 million dollars US, and we are 15 million dollars, sir, under that price.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. I'm aware of -

MR. MACISAAC:
A. And I'm entirely confident in my information,

Page 71
and I'm entirely confident that we gave customers and rate payers in the province value for money.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. I have no issue with your assessment of Liberty's conclusions, but I will have the questions for them, of course, as to how they reached it, but if I could now take you to the document under - while I'm looking for that, would you agree, as I said yesterday, that you were not obliged to accept any of these tenders, would that be a fair statement?
(10:30 a.m.)
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Our public tender document reserves the right for us to reject any and all offers, sir.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. And specifically it says you do not have to accept the lowest tender, is that correct?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. We can call it up if you like. I think I answered this question yesterday where I said it comes down to technical compliance first to ensure that it's fit for purpose, and then thereafter we then look at price.
Q. The lowest or any other offer not necessarily accepted, something to that effect?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Correct, sir.

6 CHAIRMAN:
Q. That's the one I'm familiar with.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. When you got the offer from ProEnergy when the tender closed on April 21st, and you put into action your due diligence process, knowing months before that this complete package was available for 23 million or nearest offer, did it cross your mind that maybe, you know, we should go and talk to the owners of this machine, this package, considering now that we have a price of 99 million to purchase and install it, a different allocation for installation and equipment, did it occur to you and did you actually take the time in your due diligence process with ProEnergy to discuss whether the price they had offered or they had tendered was a fair price in relation to the world advertising that was taking place around this package, because clearly they were
not the same numbers? Did you do any - did you have any discussions with ProEnergy along those lines?

MR. MACISAAC:
A. We did not, sir, and the basis for not having that conversation is our understanding of the EPC contract, and inside of the EPC contract the fact that they bear the burden, they take on the integration of all of the assets, including the builder's work, plus they assume responsibility for the integration of all the design work as well, so if we were in a different place and time, I don't think our approach would have been different, sir, in that we go to the market and we look for an EPC response that takes on the integration of the mechanical, the electrical, goes beyond buying a specific piece of kit, and it speaks to the integration of the auxiliaries and the integration of all the work, including the design components and making it all work together. We're not a general contractor.
```

MR. DUMARESQUE:

```
Q. Okay, I'm having some difficulty here finding this, but I know, like, the - when you issued
the contracts, GT-DD-NLH-001, Attachment 1, is that the one there? Yes, page 280 of 500 , and before I forget because I'm not sure if we asked it in an undertaking, but would you agree then, Mr. MacIsaac, to provide an undertaking giving us a comparison between the line item tender acceptance document versus the payout, because you're saying earlier that it would not necessarily correspond to the tender document, like, generators -
MR. MACISAAC:
A. It would fully reconcile, sir, in terms of total dollar value, but it may not line up with the spreadsheet that you have.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yeah, and I'd particularly like -

MR. MACISAAC:
A. I think what you're looking for is a reconciliation of our milestone payments and their total value against the original value of the contract?
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. No, that's not what I'm looking for because I was - maybe we might misunderstand each other. What I'm looking for is when I asked you if
you paid out by line item, I assumed you were talking about line item, generator, turbine, transformer, as they were bid in unit price bidding, right. The only three areas where you add a different in that was the building, which you agree and we all agree was open to the allowance, and if there was a problem, which we have -
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Uh-hm.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. And then there was two other items of 2.5 million dollars each on the tender document that said that these were materials for unscheduled additional work, and labour for additional unscheduled work. These were two areas. So there were only three areas really where I would have thought if I was in business that I could possibly get more money than what I would get when I said I'm going to pay \(\$ 10.00\), I'll give you \(\$ 10.00\) for the generator, for example, right, that's what I'm trying to get at. Now maybe, as I said, maybe we're misunderstanding each other, but what I would like to get is we know what came in in
the line items, I would like to be able to get what you paid out. If it doesn't conform to the line items, I'd like you to show me where it doesn't conform.
5 MR. MACDOUGALL:
Q. Mr. Chair, if I could just interject, we did already say that we would provide an undertaking of the explanation of the variance between the contract price and the actual by component, so that undertaking is already on the record, and as Mr. Dumaresque said, he wasn't sure if it was. I believe that is the item, and we could simply add to that undertaking if there's line item discrepancies, that they will be noted where there's a change in line items. I believe the undertaking has already been provided on the record.
JOHNSON, Q.C.:
Q. I think it's page 7 from yesterday.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay, so as you see from this page, Mr. MacIsaac, you have a contract signed on May 16th for the procurement of 100 megawatt combustion turbine generator and auxiliary
equipment for the Holyrood terminal station and I would also then refer you in the same response to page 373 of 500 , and this is a contract between Hydro and ProEnergy for the engineering on-site procurement and construction services for 100 megawatt nominal combustion turbine generator. So as you see, one is for the turbine generator and auxiliary equipment, the equipment, and then you have the engineering on-site procurement and construction, could be classified as installation.
MR. MACISAAC
A. Okay.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Right? So first of all, I'd like to ask why two contracts? You put out a tender for a bid and you got the price of 99.8 million dollars, which seemed to be pretty clear. Why did you do two contracts then to split that award, one to a US company, and the second one to a Canadian subsidiary of ProEnergy Services, why did you do that?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. That was based on advice from our Finance and
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Tax group, and it was in order to ensure that we were tax compliant.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Would you provide an undertaking to give us the documentation on that advice?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Agreed.

MR. MACDOUGALL:
Q. Mr. Chair, likewise, on that item subject yesterday, I'm not sure what advice was given and of what nature. We will take the undertaking, subject to the potential that it may be confidential or otherwise if it's professional advice being given with respect to certain matters.
MS. GLYNN:
Q. Noted on the record.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. So just on that point, you're saying that you did two contracts on the advice of your Finance Department, not on the request of ProEnergy company? They never requested this, did they?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I'm responding to the question, I'm sorry, the
same way, we had advice internally from our Finance and Treasury group, including tax folks, that told us that this was a prudent course of action.
5 MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay, so I'll just ask the specific question, did you have a request from ProEnergy to split the award into two contracts?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I'd have to go back and check, sir, whether we had or had not a direct request. We definitely had the discussion.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay, so you definitely had the discussion with ProEnergy?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. No, we definitely had the discussion internally and had the discussion with ProEnergy about the construction of the contracts.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay, so we're down to -

MR. MACISAAC:
A. And it's important to understand that. I think what you're alluding to is did we have
surety and were rate payers and customers protected all the way through, and, yes, there's a parent agreement here that actually draws in both contracts to a parent understanding to ensure that ProEnergy in the United States, the parent company, was fully responsible.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Well, I would like to get that information as to - I guess, it's the chicken and the egg, did ProEnergy talk first, or you consult your tax department or finance department first.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Yeah.

MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. I'm sure the information will clarify that matter.
MS. GLYNN:
Q. We'll note that as andertaking on the record.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yeah, there is - this is where I'm having trouble finding my document, but there is another - I don't know if you can help me with this, but there is another RFI that gives us a
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & Page 81 & Page 83 \\
\hline 1 & copy of the parent document, the parent & 1 MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline & contract, and in that contract and in that & 2 Q. That would be appreciated, yes, I'm sure we'll \\
\hline & document it is clear that the contract award & 3 find it because it's only a matter of checking \\
\hline & will be split into two, and that indeed the & 4 my RFI. I thought it was in this 001, but \\
\hline 5 & contract for the combustion turbine generator & 5 it's not. Thank you. \\
\hline & and auxiliary equipment will be valued at & 6 CHAIRMAN: \\
\hline 7 & around 54 million dollars. This is not & 7 Q. We shall break. \\
\hline 8 & confidential, this is what's on the public & 8 (10:46 a.m.) \\
\hline & record, that this contract here is 54 million & 9 (RECESS) \\
\hline 10 & dollars for the turbine generator and & 10 (11:23) \\
\hline 11 & auxiliary equipment. The Canadian contract & 11 CHAIRMAN: \\
\hline 12 & for the procurement and construction services, & 12 Q. So back to Mr. Dumaresque, I believe, sir. \\
\hline 13 & the installation, is for 45 million dollars. & 13 MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline 14 & That is the evidence that's on the record & 14 Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I found the \\
\hline 15 & here, not redacted in any way, shape, or form. & 15 document. It was actually in the same RFI \\
\hline & MR. MACDOUGALL: & 16 response, GD-DD-NLH-001, page 1 of 500, dated \\
\hline 17 & Q. Mr. Chair, before a question comes, I'm not & 17 May 16th, 2014, and the contract 2014-57952, \\
\hline 18 & sure if Mr. MacIsaac can speak to those & 18 is actually, as they point out, in three \\
\hline 19 & numbers or not, but we would appreciate it if & 19 parts, and I'd like to refer to Section 2, \\
\hline 20 & Mr. Dumaresque could point to the record on & 20 Item 2, the procurement of the 100 megawatt \\
\hline 21 & these, and he's now talking about contract & 21 combustion turbine generator and auxiliary \\
\hline 22 & specific provisions, he's stating them as & 22 equipment, and this contract covers 54.7 \\
\hline 23 & facts, so it would be very helpful if we could & 23 million dollars. \\
\hline 24 & have it pointed to in the record to make sure & 24 MS. GLYNN: \\
\hline 25 & if Mr. MacIsaac is asked a question, he can & 25 Q. Mr. Dumaresque, if you could just move the mic \\
\hline & Page 82 & Page 84 \\
\hline & read the context and know what's being put to & 1 and make sure that you're speaking into the \\
\hline 2 & him. & 2 mic. \\
\hline & MR. DUMARESQUE: & 3 MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline & Q. I don't know where that went overnight, but it & 4 Q. Okay. \\
\hline 5 & was certainly in this package here that - the & 5 MS. GLYNN: \\
\hline 6 & document was part of the RFI, and the opening & 6 Q. Thank you. \\
\hline 7 & letter of that response clearly indicated that & 7 MR. DUMARESQUE: \\
\hline 8 & the contract - & 8 Q. Is that better? This contract, as it says \\
\hline & CHAIRMAN: & 9 there, covers 54.7 million dollars, and the \\
\hline & Q. Well, Mr. Dumaresque, you've got to provide & 10 second, number 3, the engineering on-site \\
\hline 11 & it. & 11 procurement and construction services, this \\
\hline & MR. DUMARESQUE: & 12 contract is given to the company in Vancouver, \\
\hline & Q. I understand that & 13 the subsidiary of ProEnergy, covering 45 \\
\hline & CHAIRMAN: & 14 million dollars, and I would just ask you \\
\hline & Q. Because he's entitled to know the context & 15 again, Mr. MacIsaac, in light of your \\
\hline & within which the question is being placed. & 16 statement earlier that the package of a \\
\hline & MR. DUMARESQUE: & 17 generator, turbine, mechanical and electrical, \\
\hline & Q. That's right, yes. Anyway, we'll see if that & 18 balance of plant, installed for 31.5 million \\
\hline & goes there - & 19 dollars, do you still stand by that figure? \\
\hline & MS. GLYNN: & 20 MR. MACISAAC: \\
\hline & Q. Mr. Chair, perhaps we could break a couple of & 21 A. So I'm going to answer the question by \\
\hline & minutes early and allow Mr. Dumaresque the & 22 speaking to the portion because I believe what \\
\hline & time to look for his reference. & 23 we're suffering, back to your earlier \\
\hline & CHAIRMAN: & 24 comments, is sometimes we miss one another in \\
\hline 25 & Q. Okay. & 25 communication, and I'm going to answer the \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

    question by speaking to the equipment that is
    between the 31.5 million dollars and the 54
    million dollars. I think that's where we're
    missing one another because there's a lot of
    equipment in that space. Jenny, if you could
    bring that drawing back up that we used
    yesterday that shows the red outline and the
    green outline because I believe a picture is
    worth a thousand words, and there's a lot of
    additional equipment supply in the difference
    between the two, and I think that's where
        we're missing one another.
    MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. I don't agree.
MR. MACDOUGALL:
Q. Mr. Chair, just for the record, this was
Exhibit 3 that's being pulled up.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. So the difference between them, and this is by
no means a comprehensive list, but some of the
bigger pieces, so that the generator, step-up
transformer, is over and above. The 13- 8
switch gear, including unit breaker and fault
current limiter, those are big pieces. The
conversion from natural gas fuel delivery
8

```
        system to a diesel fuel delivery system, all
        the diesel fuel system itself, including the
        tanks, all the gear that goes into the
        pumphouse, the fuel delivery system, the fuel
        heating system, the air inlet system, and the
        heating system for that, the exhaust stack,
        snow doors, the water treatment plant, and the
        water treatment plant is a state of the art
        from GE, it's a reverse osmosis treatment
        plant, and it purifies the water. It's the
        same sort of thing that you'd use for
        desalination from salt water to pure water.
        The FOwI mixing skid which mixes the fuel and
        water together, all the water storage that's
        under the roof line, so you take the purified
        water into a water storage tank and it's then
        pumped across to the fuel mixing skid, and
        that fuel mixing skid is over and above. The
        compressed air system and all the associated
        infrastructure and pipe work that goes with
        that. The SCADA and communications system
        between ECC, all the local control, and the
        local control itself, and two additional
        plants inside the plant, which is the diesel
        plant to support black start, and it's a one
system to a diesel fuel delivery system, all the diesel fuel system itself, including the tanks, all the gear that goes into the pumphouse, the fuel delivery system, the fuel heating system, the air inlet system, and the heating system for that, the exhaust stack, snow doors, the water treatment plant, and the water treatment plant is a state of the art from GE, it's a reverse osmosis treatment plant, and it purifies the water. It's the same sort of thing that you'd use for desalination from salt water to pure water. The FOWI mixing skid which mixes the fuel and water together, all the water storage that's under the roof line, so you take the purified water into a water storage tank and it's then pumped across to the fuel mixing skid, and that fuel mixing skid is over and above. The compressed air system and all the associated infrastructure and pipe work that goes with that. The SCADA and communications system between ECC, all the local control, and the local control itself, and two additional
megawatt diesel plant with its own set of auxiliaries, including fuel, fuel storage, controls, integrated controls back to the balance of plant, another gas turbine plant onto itself, and it's more than a 3 megawatt plant onto itself with its own separate control package, with its own separate fuel storage, and its own separate fuel delivery system, so all of that, sir, is inside of the space between the 31.5 million dollars and the 54 in terms of equipment supply. I did say it's a non-comprehensive list, but I've sat down and looked at the drawing and went to some of my notes trying to speak to the gap between us.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Thank you. I would disagree that the picture is better than a thousand words in this case, and I'd like to go back to GT-PUB-NLH-014, Attachment 1, Page 1 of 1. No, I'm sorry, GT-PUB-NLH-014. Okay, I thought the information was there, but it's not, so that I can't refer to it, but in the description there as opposed to the amounts, that's where I was hoping we could clarify that the components were very
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clear, it was turbine generator and - but, anyway, I won't belabour that any more because, as my counsel has advised me, the Board has the unredacted version and all the intervenors have the unredacted version and I'm sure the unredacted version is what is going to be assessed as you look through the evidence. So, you know, in this case here now we'll leave it to that as to how the components are broken down in the absence of not being able to refer to this information, and I would also acknowledge, Mr. Chairman, that maybe a year ago when I did raise this with your counsel, that I was appraised of a process that I could follow by making a separate submission to you, and at that time both counsel agreed that we would not go that course, so I accept at this stage the confidentiality of those numbers still prevails. So the only final thing that I would have to add to this particular crossexamination is did you in the final stage of this, did you ever ask ProEnergy if they knew the - who the owner was and did it ever cross your mind to talk to the owner, the original
owner of this machine and assess this package and assess the original cost of the unit as a dollar figure that you could refer to in assessing fair market value, for example?
```

(11:30 a.m.)

```
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I think there's a couple of questions inside of that. I think your question was did I ever ask ProEnergy?
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Yeah. Did you ever ask ProEnergy who the owner, original owner was?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. I didn't ask ProEnergy who the owner was. We saw the information in terms of the brokers that were offering it, sir.
MR. DUMARESQUE:
Q. Okay. That's all my questions, Mr. Chairman, for this witness.
CHAIRMAN:
Q. Now, where am I going now. I'm after losing track. To the Commissioners. Madam?
VICE CHAIR WHALEN:
Q. I have no questions. Thank you, Mr. MacIsaac. COMMISSIONER NEWMAN:
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Q. No questions.

Chairman:
Q. №?

COMMISSIONER OXFORD:
Q. No.

Mr. John macisaac, cross-examination by chairman andy
wells
Chairman:
Q. Okay. Just a quick one on the diagram, the drawing of the floor plan we just sort of, you know, we had up, the red and the green. Are you saying the red was 54 million dollars and the green was -- doesn't break down that way?
mr. macisaac:
A. No. No, sir.

Chairman:
Q. Okay.
mr. macisaac:
A. The message and the question from Mr. Dumaresque was specific to the turbine generator package and the portion that is actually the turbine generator package is inside of that red outline.
Chairman:
Q. That's what I mean, yeah.

MR. MACISAAC:
A. And the green represents the entire scope of work.
CHAIRMAN:
Q. Okay.

MR. MACISAAC:
A. So that the red is a subset of the complete scope.
CHAIRMAN:
Q. Okay.

VICE-CHAIR WHALEN:
Q. Could you draw another circle for the 54 million again?
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Right, we could draw another circle or a number of circles that shows all of the pieces of equipment that are within that 54. If that would be helpful, we could do that too.
CHAIRMAN:
Q. I like the principle Ockham's razor. I don't know if you ever heard of that. Simplicity.
MR. MACISAAC:
A. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN:
Q. If simplicity is a sufficient explanation, you don't have to go any further. mR. macisaac:
A. I'm with you on that entirely.
Q. You got any redirect, sir?
mR. John macisaac, re-examination by mr. david macdougall Mr. MACDOUGALL:
Q. I do, Mr. Chair. Not very much. Ms. Gray, if you could pull up Hydro's combustion turbine generation application filed April 10, 2014, and if we could go to the report attached to that at page 34 , the lower right-hand corner, page 34 , and if you can just go up -- yes, if you could go right there, that's terrific.

Mr. MacIsaac, you were dealing with a couple of questions with Board counsel a day or two ago with respect to the AACE class three estimate and I just want to ask you a couple of questions. With respect to the application placed before the Board for the 113 megawatt aftermarket new and unused no synchronous condenser capability, we see there the cost of 118.9 which is the 119 million we've discussing for that piece of equipment, correct?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Page 93 & Page 95 \\
\hline 1 MR. MACISAAC: & 1 MR. MACISAAC: \\
\hline 2 A. That's correct. & 2 A. That's correct. \\
\hline 3 MR. MACDOUGALL: & 3 MR. MACDOUGALL: \\
\hline 4 Q. And if we look directly below that, in Hydro's & 4 Q. And has Hydro had an opportunity to fully vet \\
\hline 5 application, it specifically states "based on & 5 and review all the facts and comments made in \\
\hline 6 the level of input to the estimating process, & 6 that report to date? \\
\hline 7 the estimates used in this report are & 7 MR . MACISAAC: \\
\hline 8 considered class three estimates per the & 8 A. I'd say it's work in progress. \\
\hline 9 Association for the Advancement of Cost & 9 MR. MACDOUGALL: \\
\hline 10 Engineering, AACE, and thus within an accuracy & 10 Q. Thank you. Mr. Chair, those are all my \\
\hline 11 of plus 20 percent to minus 10 percent" and & 11 questions. \\
\hline 12 that's the discussion you had with Board & 12 CHAIRMAN: \\
\hline 13 counsel, correct? & 13 Q. So I think we're adjourned until Monday. \\
\hline 14 MR. MACISAAC: & 14 MS. GLYNN: \\
\hline 15 A. That's correct. & 15 Q. Yes, we are. \\
\hline 16 MR. MACDOUGALL: & 16 CHAIRMAN: \\
\hline 17 Q. So in the actual application that was placed & 17 Q. Okay. \\
\hline 18 before the Board and which other parties had & 18 MS. GLYNN: \\
\hline 19 an opportunity to review, that statement was & 19 Q. And we are finished with Mr. MacIsaac. \\
\hline 20 indicating that the estimates in the table & 20 CHAIRMAN: \\
\hline 21 above were based on that class three estimate, & 21 Q. Pardon? \\
\hline 22 correct? & 22 MS. GLYNN: \\
\hline 23 MR. MACISAAC: & 23 Q. And we are finished with Mr. MacIsaac. \\
\hline 24 A. That's correct. & 24 MR. MACISAAC: \\
\hline 25 MR. MACDOUGALL: & 25 A. Thank you. \\
\hline Page 94 & Page 96 \\
\hline 1 Q. Thank you. Now Mr. Coxworthy asked you a & 1 CHAIRMAN: \\
\hline 2 couple of questions about the timing of the & 2 Q. So you are finito. \\
\hline 3 testing of the CT for black start. Do you & 3 MR. MACISAAC: \\
\hline 4 recall that discussion? & 4 A. Thanks very much. \\
\hline 5 MR. MACISAAC: & 5 CHAIRMAN: \\
\hline 6 A. I do. & 6 Q. Only in so far as these hearings are \\
\hline 7 MR. MACDOUGALL: & 7 concerned. \\
\hline 8 Q. And I just wanted to note for the record, & 8 MR. MACISAAC: \\
\hline 9 during the time period now that the testing & 9 A. Have a good weekend. Thank you. \\
\hline 10 has been deferred, the Holyrood site still has & 10 UPON CONCLUSION AT 11:38 A.M. \\
\hline 11 actual on-site black start capability pursuant & \\
\hline 12 to the eight times two megawatt diesels that & \\
\hline 13 are still in place, correct? & \\
\hline 14 MR. MACISAAC: & \\
\hline 15 A. That's correct, sir. & \\
\hline 16 MR. MACDOUGALL: & \\
\hline 17 Q. Mr. Coxworthy also asked you a couple of & \\
\hline 18 questions regarding the Liberty report on the & \\
\hline 19 March 4 outage. Do you recall that? & \\
\hline 20 MR. MACISAAC: & \\
\hline 21 A. I do. & \\
\hline 22 MR. MACDOUGALL: & \\
\hline 23 Q. And Liberty's report was filed with the Board, & \\
\hline 24 I believe one day before the commencement of & \\
\hline 25 the prudence phase of this hearing? & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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