

- 1 **Q: Liberty has suggested (p.28) that in light of concerns over further delays**
2 **Muskrat Falls supply, it makes sense for Hydro to begin the planning process**
3 **for a new CT.**
4
- 5 **(a) Is this CT new in the sense that it is not meant as a replacement for**
6 **Stephenville and Hardwoods but would be a net increment to capacity**
7 **beyond those replacements?**
8 **(b) Why should this new capacity be a CT rather than wind capacity or**
9 **demand mitigation?**
10
- 11
- 12 **A. (a) Please see response to CA-PUB-054.**
13
- 14 The language cited on Page 28 is not intended as a recommendation to
15 immediately start the planning process for a new CT, and Liberty has not made
16 that recommendation. The start of planning for new generation will, of course,
17 become more appropriate when and if further delay in Muskrat Falls supply
18 begins to materialize. On that basis, planning at this time might be considered
19 premature by some. On the other hand, Liberty believes that a new CT will
20 prove necessary in the not-too-distant future and the preliminary planning for
21 such an addition, including siting and sizing, would appear to be a “no regrets”
22 strategy. In any event, we do not see an urgent need to start planning
23 immediately.
24
- 25 **(b) The object of any recommended new capacity pre-Muskrat Falls is to reduce**
26 **the chances of a shortfall in supply. Wind is not suited to meet that objective.**
27 **Please see our response to CA-PUB-056.**
28
- 29 Demand mitigation should always be considered as a source of capacity,
30 although the prospects for acquiring such capacity in the amounts that would
31 be required (>100 MW) are poor. Nevertheless, in pointing to a CT as the
32 likely solution, Liberty did not intend to rule out any other reasonable
33 possibility.