

1 Q. **Reference: 2024 Resource Adequacy Plan**

2 Please explain why a battery energy storage system has been excluded as a potential supply
3 option for the Minimum Investment Required Expansion Plan.

4

5

6 A. Based on analysis performed by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (“Hydro”) as part of the
7 *Reliability and Resource Adequacy Study Review* (“RRA”) proceeding, battery energy storage
8 systems (“BESS”) are emerging as a viable supply solution worthy of further consideration.
9 However, there remain appreciable feasibility concerns surrounding BESS solutions related to
10 capability in emergency scenarios such as an extended outage to the Labrador-Island Link (“LIL”)
11 bipole. Given concerns regarding BESS solutions in the event of a LIL shortfall scenario, such
12 solutions were not included as capacity resources in the Minimum Investment Required
13 Expansion Plan.

14 As part of the RRA proceeding, Hydro has established criteria where it must ensure that rotating
15 outages are manageable in a shortfall scenario. Specifically, capacity shortfalls must be limited
16 to 100 MW or less to ensure that effective load rotation is possible during the outage. Hydro
17 must ensure that capacity solutions can provide reliable supply in such a scenario.

18 For a BESS solution to provide a reliability benefit to the system in the event of an extended
19 outage, Hydro would need to ensure a reasonable state of charge at the onset of the event and
20 the ability to recharge the BESS during an outage. There are feasibility considerations to address
21 with both of these aspects.

22 **Operational Complexities**

23 To ensure the state of charge of a BESS at the onset of the event, Hydro would need to impose
24 operational restrictions where battery banks would need to be fully charged during critical
25 operating periods, such as during extreme weather. However, it would likely be during such
26 periods that supply from the BESS could also be needed for system support on the alternating
27 current system and the level of charge may be reduced. If a bipole outage were to occur

1 unexpectedly, Hydro would still need to ensure the state of charge of the BESS. The capability of
2 the BESS at the onset of a bipole outage would therefore need to be addressed. This is in
3 contrast to a combustion turbine option where specifications would ensure the availability of
4 units at full capacity for the duration of the outage.

5 Hydro would also be faced with feasibility considerations in managing the charge of a BESS
6 solution during an emergency outage scenario and would need to ensure that any additional
7 intervention activity could be effectively executed in concert with many competing priorities.
8 Effective charge management requires a clear sense of forecasted reserves. In an emergency
9 outage scenario, reserve forecasts could be both unreliable and unpredictable.

10 The operation of the Island Interconnected System is dynamic and complex, particularly in
11 emergency situations such as an extended LIL shortfall; tight coordination is required with
12 neighbouring jurisdictions as well as Newfoundland Power Inc. If a BESS were to be operated as
13 a critical capacity solution in such a scenario, the state of charge would be an additional
14 complicating factor that operators would need to manage. Solutions could potentially involve
15 increasing the number of operators; however, Hydro would first need to ensure that the system
16 could be safely and effectively managed in such a case.

17 **Model Assumptions vs. Utility Experience**

18 The practical considerations of the operational complexities described above are in contrast to
19 the Plexos shortfall modeling exercise performed as part of the RRA. While Plexos is an effective
20 tool for long-term expansion planning, operational aspects and utility experience must be
21 considered when focusing on the simulated hourly dispatches for the days and weeks of an
22 emergency shortfall scenario. During these intervals, models cannot fully represent the real-
23 time factors, described above. For example, Plexos simulations have perfect foresight of
24 reserves and employ this advanced knowledge to optimally manage BESS charging and
25 discharging for the duration of the emergency. In this ideal case, study results indicated that
26 there was not an appreciable reliability difference in the capacity contribution of a 47.2 MW
27 combustion turbine and a 47.2 MW BESS. In reality, the operational considerations described
28 above are of critical importance and could have a significant detrimental impact on the
29 effectiveness of a BESS solution as a capacity resource.

1 **Historical Experience**

2 Hydro should also consider historic and catastrophic outage events both domestically and
3 abroad where there were insufficient reserves to meet customer load for several days. With
4 insufficient supply to meet customer loads, there is no capability or opportunity to charge a
5 BESS. In such scenarios, Hydro would need to understand the feasibility considerations of BESS
6 operation once the initial state of charge is depleted.

7 In summary, there are significant feasibility concerns relating to the use of a BESS solution in an
8 emergency scenario. Hydro must ensure that all outages are manageable from a planning and
9 operational standpoint. Capacity solutions must therefore be pragmatic and effective during
10 normal operations and also during the most severe and/or catastrophic circumstances.

11 **Assessment of BESS Feasibility**

12 On the basis of the above, BESS solutions should not be incorporated as capacity resources into
13 the Minimum Investment Required Expansion Plan. However, as a next step, Hydro is
14 undertaking feasibility analyses to assess the operational considerations, benefits and
15 limitations of BESS solutions. A full understanding of these aspects will allow for Hydro to
16 confirm the feasibility of a BESS solution and ensure reliable integration into the provincial
17 power system. If feasibility and reliable operation can be confirmed, Hydro would then be in a
18 position to advance to a front-end engineering design stage.

19 Assessment of the feasibility of BESS solutions will include:

- 20 • Assessment of BESS capability to maintain system frequency and stability in the event
21 of LIL bipole outage;¹ and
- 22 • BESS's role as a capacity resource in meeting the Reference Case Expansion Plan. This
23 will include an ELCC² Study for batteries, wind, solar, and potentially demand response
24 measures to ensure that Hydro appropriately captures how these resource options

¹ Hydro's priority to support system frequency is to expand its under frequency load shedding scheme as per Hydro's response to IC-NLH-014 of this proceeding. This would improve the amount of energy that can be sunk from the LIL to the Island Interconnected System during steady-state operations. Hydro will explore how a BESS could provide further support and further improve energy deliveries over the LIL.

² Effective Load Carrying Capability ("ELCC").

1 complement, or contradict, each other and model the resulting contribution to the
2 Island Interconnected System accordingly.

3 Hydro's intention is to immediately advance the feasibility analysis to ensure a full
4 understanding of BESS solutions and how they could be effectively incorporated into the
5 Reference Case Expansion Plan with the 2026 Resource Adequacy Plan. The ELCC Study is
6 anticipated to begin early in 2025.