

1 Q. Reference: ESRA Nov. 2016, s. 5.1.2 (pages 17-22); ESRA May 2016,
2 Preamble:
3 In the May 2016 ESRA, Hydro evaluated a number of scenarios, including the fully
4 stressed reference case under both a P50 and a P90 forecast, using DAFOR levels for
5 Holyrood of 10%, 14%, 19% and 24%. In November 2016 ESRA, Table 2 on page 26
6 indicates a DAFOR value of 14% for Holyrood. The accompanying text indicates that
7 these ratings are focused on the near term.

8 Question: Please explain why Hydro no longer sees the need to model various levels
9 of DAFOR for Holyrood.

10
11
12 A. At the time Hydro submitted its Energy Supply Risk Assessment in May 2016, AMEC
13 Foster Wheeler (AMEC) was in the process of assessing the condition of the boiler
14 tubes in all three Holyrood units in response to the reheater tube failures
15 experienced in Winter 2015-16. Given that this assessment was ongoing, Hydro
16 thought it prudent to model a broad range of DAFOR assumptions to ensure a
17 robust supply risk was completed.

18
19 Since that time, the AMEC analysis and additional Babcock and Wilcox analysis has
20 been completed, providing a better understanding of the boiler tube health.

21 Through the results of both of these assessments and a thorough review of recent
22 performance issues, Hydro identified a robust set of parameters resulting in a
23 projected DAFOR of 14% for the study period.

24
25 Further, by modeling and analyzing various levels of DAFOR in its initial Energy
26 Supply Risk Assessment, Hydro developed an understanding of the relationship

- 1 between Holyrood unit availability and the resultant Expected Unserved Energy
- 2 (EUE).