

1 Q. **Re: GRK-NLH-074**

2 **Preamble:**

3 An analysis is provided to demonstrate that, for the period 2018-2025,  
4 sufficient energy resources are available on the Island to supply full load  
5 throughout the year, even without the LIL.

6 **Please confirm that this analysis does not rely on any capacity or energy from  
7 the Holyrood thermal units.**

8 **Does this mean that, through 2025, the Island power system could be operated  
9 safely and reliably without either LIL or Holyrood? If so, please explain why a)  
10 why the Holyrood thermal units are currently used, and b) why Muskrat Falls  
11 commissioning was not deferred to a later date.**

12

13

14 A. The analysis presented in Hydro's response to GRK-NLH-074 does not rely on  
15 capacity or energy from Holyrood.

16

17 This does not mean that, through 2025, the Island power system could be operated  
18 reliably without either Labrador-Island Link (LIL) or Holyrood.

19

20 Hydro's response to GRK-NLH-074 only deals with energy resources during the  
21 unlikely event of a sustained bipole outage. Besides using energy from island  
22 reserves, emergency imports of energy using the Maritime Link would also be  
23 required. From a capacity point of view, the scenario presented in Hydro's response  
24 to PUB-NLH-217 (no Holyrood or LIL) includes 300 MW of emergency imports, the  
25 use of all island reserves (175 MW), and also 60 MW of interruptible supply, the  
26 sum of which is approximately the net output of Holyrood. Sustained operation in  
27 such a manner would be very costly as the sources of energy would be using

1 expensive stand-by operation. In addition, generation reserves would be very low  
2 during such unlikely emergency situations.

3

4 For sustained long-term reliable operation the Muskrat Falls, the LIL and the  
5 Maritime Link projects have been established as the least cost alternative.