

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-14:**

2
3 **With respect to Section 6, it would be useful to understand the impact of the ML on the**
4 **supply adequacy of NSPI.**

5
6 **(a) Please provide details of the methodology used by NSPI to assess supply adequacy.**

7
8 **(b) Please provide all critical assumptions used in the assessment.**

9
10 **(c) Please provide details of how the ML is modeled in the adequacy calculation.**

11
12 **(d) Please provide in tabular form a capacity and energy balance by year with and**
13 **without the Maritime Link for the 35 year Initial Term utilizing the information**
14 **provided in response to McMaster IR-4 and IR-5.**

15
16 **Please include in the above table the supply adequacy assessment i.e. the calculated**
17 **adequacy of supply relative to the NSPI adequacy criteria.**

18
19 **Response IR-14:**

20
21 (a) NS Power load forecasters develop a long term forecast of firm system peak load. This
22 forecast considers the anticipated impacts of Demand Side Management. NS Power
23 accounts for existing capacity and then considers the planning reserve margin of 20
24 percent for each year based on the forecasted firm peak. NS Power considers firm
25 capacity additions in the planning period and makes retirement forecasts based on
26 maintaining the planning reserve margin. Variable generation resources are included, but
27 in the case of wind generation, a 20 percent capacity value has been applied to the
28 installed nameplate capacity. NS Power also considers the transmission service
29 subscription for each wind project as reflected by the project's particular generator
30 interconnection agreements under the OATT. Network Resource Integration Service

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 (NRIS) generators are considered in firm capacity planning because the necessary
2 transmission capacity is available to ensure their full operation in all hours of the year.
3 Energy Resource Integration Service (ERIS) generators are subject to transmission
4 constraints or congestion and are not available in all hours of the year. The capacity
5 associated with ERIS generators is not considered in firm peak resource adequacy
6 calculations.

7
8 (b) For unit capacity data please refer to CanWEA IR-1 Attachment 1.

9
10 ERIS generation projects include Dalhousie Mountain Wind, Glen Dhu Wind, Nuttby
11 Wind, and Port Hawkesbury Biomass (becomes NRIS in 2016).

12
13 Firm peak forecast is included in the Attachment referenced in Part (d).

14
15 Other notes:

- 16
- 17 • Burnside 4 assumed returned to service in 2016.
 - 18
 - 19 • Various CT and CC units are added as new capacity to reflect Strategist modeling
20 outcomes to meet environmental limitations.

21
22 (c) The Maritime Link is represented as a firm capacity addition of 153MW for the firm peak
23 in 2018.

24
25 (d) Please refer to SBA IR-243 Attachment 2 for the load and resource adequacy assessments
26 for each alternative under high and low load.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-15:**

2

3 **In response to McMaster IR-6, NSPML indicated that reliability is increased because of an**
4 **additional inertia. Interconnected systems are inherently more reliable. It follows that a**
5 **strengthened inertia to NB and HQ would also increase reliability if there is adequate**
6 **supply sources in those jurisdictions to provide capacity and energy to NS. Please confirm**
7 **whether NSPML has taken this into account in its assessment of reliability of the**
8 **Alternatives and if yes, how this was evaluated and the results.**

9

10 Response IR-15:

11

12 The assumption is correct. The reliability improvement is dependent upon supply sources being
13 available to provide capacity and energy. The benefit of the second interconnection is limited if it
14 is dependent on the same network that the existing interconnection interfaces with, namely the
15 same grid and same resources. The Maritime Link is an interconnection to new resources and
16 includes development of additional energy and capacity at Muskrat falls. The benefit of the
17 second interconnection to New Brunswick was attributed through the allowance to purchase the
18 full capacity of the inertia, up to 500 MW.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-16:**

2

3 **In response to McMaster IR-6, NSPML stated that the NS-NB intertie would be enhanced**
4 **(without capital investment) by the Maritime Link. Presumably this assertion is based on**
5 **the concept of counter-scheduling on the NS-NB intertie against the Nalcor energy**
6 **scheduled to flow on the NS-NB intertie. Please confirm or explain the rationale for the**
7 **NSPML's assertion.**

8

9 Response IR-16:

10

11 The assessment is correct. The southeast corner of the NB Power system has seen significant
12 increase in load demand from Moncton area growth, exports to Prince Edward Island and
13 occasional exports to Nova Scotia. NB Power serves this region with two 345 kV lines, one
14 230 kV line and some underlying 138 kV transmission. The 345 kV and 138 kV tie lines to Nova
15 Scotia have traditionally operated north to south. If Nalcor exports energy through Nova Scotia
16 into New Brunswick, the NB-NS tie is reversed from its traditional flow pattern. This effectively
17 reinforces the Moncton area providing the basis for the comments. Counter-scheduling
18 opportunities should emerge from this operation. In essence, for each MW flowing out of NS
19 into NB, it is equivalent to reducing the import restriction from NB which exists today.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-17:**

2
3 **In the NSPML response to NSUARB IR-23 it is stated that without the proposed**
4 **modifications at Woodbine, a single transmission contingency at Woodbine would result in**
5 **the loss of the Maritime Link and Point Aconi generation.**

6
7 **(a) Please clarify what single transmission contingency would result in the loss of both**
8 **the Maritime Link and Point Aconi generation.**

9
10 **(b) Please clarify what the proposed 230 kV modifications at Woodbine are. Do they**
11 **include the routing in and out of the Woodbine substation of one (or more) of the**
12 **existing 230 kV transmission lines from Lingan to Port Hastings? If not, please**
13 **provide a detailed explanation.**

14
15 **Response IR-17:**

16
17 (a) There is a single 345 kV circuit from Woodbine to Hopewell (L-8004) which is near the
18 Trenton Generating Station on the mainland. There is a radial 230 kV circuit from
19 Woodbine to the Point Aconi Plant (L-7015). There is a single 230 kV circuit from
20 Woodbine to Lingan (L-7014). Maritime Link (ML) will inject up to 478 MW (500 MW
21 minus ML losses) into Woodbine. If L-8004 is lost then the only system interconnection
22 for the net output of Point Aconi (172 MW) plus ML (478 MW) would be L-7014 back
23 to Lingan. The load on that line would be 650 MW. The summer rating of L-7014 is 404
24 MVA, which would trip on overload, with a net loss of both the ML and Point Aconi. In
25 addition to a fault on L-8004, the same result would occur for single contingencies at
26 Hopewell which trip L-8004 including:

- 27
28 • Loss of L-8004 without a fault
29 • Loss of Hopewell transformer 79N-T81
30 • Fault on Hopewell bus 79N-B81
-

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

- 1 • Fault on Hopewell bus 79N-B61
- 2 • Fault on L-8003 with breaker failure 79N-803
- 3 • Fault on breaker 79N-803
- 4 • Fault on breaker 79N-810
- 5 • Fault on breaker 79N-601
- 6 • Fault on breaker 79N-606
- 7 • Fault on L-6508 with failure of 79N-601
- 8 • Fault on L-6507 with failure of 79N-606

9

10 Note that the [NPCC Glossary of Terms](#) defines a “Single Contingency” as “A single event,
11 which may result in the loss of one or more elements.”

12

13 (b) Yes. The existing 230 kV straight bus at Woodbine will be developed into a breaker and
14 a half configuration and the two 230 kV circuits between Lingan and Port Hastings (L-
15 7011 and L-7012) which currently pass within 300 m of the Woodbine substation will be
16 routed in and out of Woodbine as shown in Figure 3-13 of Appendix 3.01 of the
17 Application.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-18:**

2

3 **In the NSPML response to NSUARB IR-43 it is stated that an intertie from New England**
4 **to South West Nova Scotia was not considered; however, no explanation was provided for**
5 **why it wasn't. Please provide an explanation.**

6

7 Response IR-18:

8

9 Please refer to NSUARB IR-148.

CONFIDENTIAL (Attachment Only)

1 **Request IR-19:**

2

3 **Please provide a single line diagram (or system map) for the NSPI system showing all**
4 **transmission lines, voltages and the line names (e.g. L8004, L6511, etc.). Further, please**
5 **indicate on the single line diagram the Network Upgrades shown in Section 8.2.1 page 144**
6 **line 17 of the Application and any other points of congestion.**

7

8 Response IR-19:

9

10 Please refer to Confidential Attachment 1.

Maritime Link UARB-McMaster IR-19 Attachment 1 REDACTED

UARB-McMaster IR-19

Attachment 1

has been removed due to confidentiality

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-20:**

2

3 **Please provide estimates for the Initial Term of the amount of NS Block and/or**
4 **supplemental energy that is projected to be exported on the NS-NB intertie by NSPI.**

5

6 Response IR-20:

7

8 There are no planned exports of the NS Block/Supplemental Energy during the Initial Term of
9 35 years.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-21:**

2
3 **With respect to Appendix 6.05 WKM Report, the Transmission Reserve Margin on the NS-**
4 **NB intertie is exceptionally high relative to the potential capability of the intertie.**

5
6 **(a) Please provide an explanation of why the TRM is set at this level.**

7
8 **(b) Please provide details of the NSPI and NB Power reserve sharing agreement.**

9
10 **(c) Will the amount of TRM on the NS-NB intertie be impacted by the ML project? If**
11 **yes, please provide details.**

12
13 **(d) Will the amount of TRM on the NS-NB intertie be impacted by anticipated reserve**
14 **sharing agreement between NSPI and NLH? If yes, please provide details.**

15
16 **Response IR-21:**

17
18 (a) The TRM for the NB-NS interface (300MW in Summer and 325MW in Winter) is
19 comprised of two components. A portion (105 MW) of the total TRM for this interface
20 for exports from NB to NS must be set aside to allow NS access to its share of the
21 Maritime reserve requirement. The remaining portion accounts for variances in
22 generation dispatch and the potential overloading of underlying 138 kV transmission in
23 NB for loss of the 345 kV line between Coleson Cove and Salisbury.

24
25 (b) In the *Interconnection Agreement between Nova Scotia Power Incorporated and New*
26 *Brunswick System Operator (NBSO)*, NS Power and the NBSO have agreed to share the
27 reserve requirement for the Maritimes Area on the following basis:

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 “The Ten-Minute Reserve Responsibility, for contingencies within the Maritimes
2 Area, will be shared between the two Parties based on a 12CP [coincident peak]
3 Load-Ratio Share.... Notwithstanding the Load-Ratio Share the maximum that
4 either Party will be responsible for is 100 percent of its greatest, on-line, net
5 single contingency, and,

6
7 NS Power shall be responsible for 50 MW of Thirty-Minute Reserve.”
8

9 NS Power maintains ten minute operating reserve of 171 MW (equivalent to Point Aconi
10 net output when on-line), of which approximately 33 MW is held as spinning reserve on
11 the system. The full 171 MW is provided to NBSO for contingencies in the NBSO
12 balancing area. In return NBSO provides its Load-Ratio Share of the 171 MW (about
13 105 MW) to NS Power for contingencies in Nova Scotia.

14
15 (c) The impact of the ML Project on the TRM of the NB-NS interface is under study by
16 NBSO. No specific impacts have as yet been identified.

17
18 (d) The anticipated NS-NL reserve sharing agreement is intended to have no impact on the
19 TRM of the NB-NS interface.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-22:**

2

3 **With respect to Section 8.2.1 page 145 line 6, it is stated that Nalcor will be billed on an “as**
4 **used” basis.**

5

6 **(a) Please confirm if this should be interpreted to mean that Nalcor will not make**
7 **“reservation” payments but only pay “delivery” charges.**

8

9 **(b) Has any other market participant purchased Point-to-Point service in NS. If yes,**
10 **please provide details of the reservation(s).**

11

12 **Response IR-22:**

13

14 (a) As there is ambiguity in the meaning of “reservation payments” and “delivery charges”,
15 NSPML refers to Step 5 of Section 3.1 of the Scheduling Protocol (attached as
16 Schedule 2 to the NSTUA) to provide clarity regarding the reference to “as used” basis.

17

18 (b) There are no other market participants currently purchasing Firm Point to Point
19 Transmission Service under the NS OATT. Between 2009 and 2010, a number of small
20 short term firm and non-firm reservations were made. These reservations were typically
21 in the amount of 1 MW with durations of less than 10 hours. No reservations have been
22 taken under the NS OATT since May of 2010.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-23:**

2
3 **With respect to Appendix 6.05 WKM Report and the NSPML response to CanWEA IR-54,**
4 **the “Other Import” alternative was based on system reinforcements to provide for**
5 **500 MW of firm import capability on the NS-NB intertie. The explanation given was that a**
6 **345 kV reinforcement had been identified as the preferred option in previous planning**
7 **studies. It is acknowledged that it is difficult to develop “apples to apples” comparisons for**
8 **such divergent alternatives; however, please comment on whether it would be possible to**
9 **reinforce the transmission system to provide approximately 153 MW of firm import**
10 **capability on the NS-NB intertie. If yes, please provide details of how this could be**
11 **accomplished, including the expected cost.**

12
13 **Response IR-23:**

14
15 The existing TTC of the NB-NS interconnection is 405 MW but with no winter firm capability as
16 provided in Figure 2 of Appendix 6.05 of the Application.

17
18 It is the opinion of WKM that one way to increase the firm capability would be to add
19 transmission reinforcements that reduce the TRM from its current winter value of 325 MW yet
20 retain the reserve sharing requirement of 105 MW. Theoretically, this would provide for a
21 potential increase of 220 MW of firm if the contingency related TRM could be eliminated. As
22 explained in response to UARB IR-21(a) the primary contingency behind the TRM is loss of the
23 345 kV line between Coleson Cove and Salisbury. Construction of a parallel 345 kV line at a
24 total cost of about \$250 million (\$200 million initial capital plus \$50 million as NPV of future
25 OM&A and tariff costs over a 45 year life) would eliminate that specific contingency. It would
26 also reduce the TRM but only to a level determined by the next limiting contingency. Operation
27 this past winter indicates that the next contingency could be loss of the 345 kV line between St
28 Andre and Keswick under dispatch conditions with high import from Hydro Quebec and low
29 generation in the Saint John area. There is also an indication that it has been the limiting
30 condition on the NB-NS interconnection at times. Non-firm transactions to Nova Scotia have

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 been curtailed several times throughout January and February under lower load conditions when
2 the flows on the Coleson to Salisbury line were low but the north to south flows were high. This
3 indicates that to reduce the NB-NS TRM any sufficient amount would also likely require
4 addition of a 345 kV line from St Andre to Keswick at a total cost of about \$225 million. This
5 results in a total 2016 npv cost estimate of about \$475 million to achieve a firm transfer increase
6 across the existing interconnection of 150 to 200 MW.

7
8 This issue of north-south flow limitations in NB was not considered in the WKM Energy Report
9 (Appendix 6.05 of the Application) which only focused on the NB-NS and NB-HQ
10 interconnections. Given the experience this winter, it is the opinion of WKM Energy that the
11 costs in the WKM Energy report are low because they should also include an additional cost for
12 the St. Andre to Keswick transmission line of \$225 million.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-24:**

2
3 **In response to McMaster IR-7 NSPML states “... *the Maritime Link provides a second route***
4 ***to access a new market. Even with a reinforced or second interconnection between NS-NB,***
5 ***there is negligible benefit from a strengthening perspective when compared to a connection to***
6 ***a new market. Through the Maritime Link, a second connection completes the electrical loop***
7 ***through Newfoundland and Labrador, Quebec and New Brunswick. For Nova Scotia***
8 ***customers, this means NS Power will be able to purchase energy from a variety of markets***
9 ***either through the ML or the NS-NB intertie.”***

10
11 **(a) Please clarify the reference to a second route to a new market. Presumably the “new**
12 **market” is Newfoundland and Labrador and the first route would be via the HQ**
13 **transmission system. Please confirm or clarify.**

14
15 **(b) Please clarify/expand on the assertion that there are negligible benefits to**
16 **strengthening the NS-NB intertie.**

17
18 **(c) Does NSPML anticipate market and/or reliability benefits from “closing the loop”.**
19 **If yes, please elaborate on the how the anticipated benefits would materialize.**

20
21 **Response IR-24:**

22
23 **(a) Confirmed, the “second route” is the Maritime Link and “to a new market” references the**
24 **Newfoundland and Labrador market. The first route is the existing NS/NB intertie**

25
26 **(b) The NS/NB intertie enhances the electricity connection, but does not provide access to**
27 **any new resources of energy, therefore the negligible nature of the benefit. Please also**
28 **refer to CA/SBA IR-2 (b).**

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 (c) The new energy loop provides increased reliability by providing two access points for
2 energy to enter the NS Power electricity system and access to new sources of energy. The
3 creation of the loop also creates a new access to purchase energy from energy suppliers in
4 that market. Once energy begins to flow through the Maritime Link, it is then possible to
5 negotiate power purchase agreements (PPAs) with interested energy suppliers that would
6 be of benefit to Nova Scotia customers.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-25:**

2
3 **With respect to Section 6.5, page 135, lines 8-13 NSPML indicates that transmission system**
4 **upgrades may be necessary to increase the capability to import and retain 500 MW. As per**
5 **NSDOE IR-8, NSPML has not as yet completed reinforcement studies.**

6
7 **(a) It would be useful if NSPML could present some discussion on why, where and what**
8 **type of transmission system reinforcements are expected to be needed given that**
9 **the system as proposed can import 500 MW albeit with associated export to NB.**

10
11 **Response IR-25:**

12
13 System studies completed to date confirm that the Nova Scotia system can survive Nova Scotia's
14 largest single contingency of 300 MW supply (simultaneous loss of two units at Lingan). If Nova
15 Scotia were to import and retain 500 MW then studies would need to be completed to understand
16 what transmission reinforcements would be required to maintain system stability for the
17 instantaneous loss of 500 MW.

18
19 If 500 MW is being imported and retained in Nova Scotia from the Maritime Link, contingency
20 loss of the Maritime Link instantaneously causes the interconnected system to try to supply the
21 500 MW across the NB-NS tie. This will cause a voltage drop in the Moncton area and the
22 system will separate to maintain stability in New Brunswick. Nova Scotia would then be
23 deficient by the 500 MW and even with Nova Scotia reserves and underfrequency load shedding
24 the system could possibly go unstable.

25
26 When 500 MW is being imported with an associated export to New Brunswick then a
27 requirement of the export is that it is backed up by reserve on the receiving end, outside of Nova
28 Scotia. On contingency loss of the Maritime Link, the export is terminated and backed up
29 external to Nova Scotia with the resultant flow from New Brunswick to Nova Scotia limited to
30 the level that was being retained in Nova Scotia. Through activation of Nova Scotia reserve and

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 reserve sharing agreements with New Brunswick, the Nova Scotia system will remain stable up
2 to 300 MW.

3

4 The type of transmission upgrades required to allow all 500 MW to be retained in Nova Scotia
5 could include installing reactive voltage support in the Moncton area in the form of a Static Var
6 Compensator (SVC), potential line upgrades both in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, potential
7 requirement for the second 345 kV tie to New Brunswick, or possibly additional fast acting
8 generation in Nova Scotia. As mentioned, the studies to determine the most cost effective
9 solution have not yet been completed. The response to NSDOE IR-8 estimates the range of
10 required transmission upgrades to be from \$70 million to \$450 million.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-26:**

2
3 **With respect to the Nova Scotia Transmission Utilization Agreement Section 2.1**

4
5 **(a) Please provide the available amount of Firm Point to Point Transmission Service**
6 **from the Delivery Point to the NS-NB Border at the outset of the Initial Term.**

7
8 **(b) Please provide the maximum value of the “Nalcor Maximum Transmission Capacity**
9 **Level” at the outset of the Initial Term.**

10
11 **(c) Do these values change in the Initial Term? If yes, please provide details of why and**
12 **how they change.**

13
14 **(d) Please comment on the likelihood of the need to reinforce the NSPI transmission**
15 **system in the Initial Term in order to ensure Emera’s/NSPI’s ability to meet its**
16 **obligations to Nalcor to provide the Nalcor Maximum Transmission Capacity.**

17
18 **(e) Based on NSPI’s current transmission development plan, in what year (or range of**
19 **years) are NSPI transmission system reinforcements expected to be needed to meet**
20 **NSPI’s Native Load Customer needs and/or Emera’s/NSPI’s obligations to Nalcor**
21 **to meet the Nalcor Maximum Transmission Capacity Level; what facilities are**
22 **planned/proposed to meet the needed reinforcement; and, what are the associated**
23 **costs to implement the planned reinforcement.**

24
25 **Response IR-26:**

26
27 **(a) 330 MW is the expected amount of Firm Point to Point Transmission Service from the**
28 **Delivery Point to the NS-NB Border to be available at the outset of the Initial Term.**

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

- 1 (b) The maximum capacity value at the outset of the Initial Term remains as per the terms of
2 the NSTUA, with 330 MW of Transmission Facilitation Service available from March
3 through November and 150 MW from December through February.
4
- 5 (c) No, these values are not expected to change during the Initial Term.
6
- 7 (d) Network upgrades will be required to reinforce the NS Power transmission system.
8 Please refer to Section 8.2.1 of the Application.
9
- 10 (e) Please refer to part (d) for transmission reinforcements to meet Nalcor Transmission
11 Capacity. These reinforcements are required to meet the same schedule as the Maritime
12 Link. Please refer to NS Power's 10 Year Outlook provided in SBA IR- 220 for identified
13 transmission reinforcements to meet NS Power's Native Load requirements.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-27:**

2

3 **With respect to the Nova Scotia Transmission Utilization Agreement Section 2.2 (e), Emera**
4 **is obliged to “Redispatch” its generation to relieve system constraints/congestion in order**
5 **to provide the Transmission Facilitation Service. Please provide the results of any analysis**
6 **NSPML has undertaken to forecast the amount of “Redispatch” on an annual basis that**
7 **will be required and the expected cost.**

8

9 **Response IR-27:**

10

11 Please refer to CA/SBA IR-94 Attachment 1 for the details of this study.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-28:**

2
3 **With respect to the Nova Scotia Transmission Utilization Agreement Section and the New**
4 **Brunswick Transmission Utilization Agreement**

5
6 **(a) It would be useful to have historical information (say for the past 10 years)**
7 **regarding the amount of energy exported from NS to NB by NSPI.**

8
9 **(b) What impact does the commitment made to Nalcor have on NSPI's ability to export**
10 **power from NS to NB?**

11
12 **Response IR-28:**

13
14 **(a) The requested historical information is as follows:**

15
16

2003	301 GWh
2004	167 GWh
2005	136 GWh
2006	384 GWh
2007	57 GWh
2008	24 GWh
2009	18 GWh
2010	6 GWh
2011	9 GWh
2012	35 GWh

25

26
27 **(b) The experience in the past six years has shown that there are no significant opportunities**
28 **for commercial energy export from Nova Scotia to New Brunswick. The commitment**
29 **made to Nalcor is not expected to have a material impact on Nova Scotia's export energy**
30 **volume to New Brunswick as Nova Scotia shifts away from carbon based generation.**
31 **Furthermore, the Maritime Link opens another interconnection path which may make it**
32 **easier to secure energy exports during coincident low load and high wind generation**
33 **periods.**

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-29:**

2
3 **With respect to the New Brunswick Transmission Utilization Agreement**

4
5 **(a) Do Bayside Transmission rights have value to the NSPI rate payer – do the rate**
6 **payers have any direct rights associated with the Bayside rights i.e. ownership?**

7
8 **(b) If the Bayside Transmission rights are not made available to Nalcor, Emera must**
9 **buy the energy from Nalcor either at the Delivery Point or at the NS-NB border and**
10 **resell to Nalcor at the NB – Maine border. This will have costs associated with it.**
11 **Are these costs solely on to Emera’s account or do they somehow come back to the**
12 **NS rate payer?**

13
14 **(c) The Bayside transmission rights are subject to the NB Tariff. Are the costs**
15 **associated with these transmission rights solely to the account of Emera or do they**
16 **somehow flow to the NS rate payer?**

17
18 **Response IR-29:**

19
20 **(a) No.**

21
22 **(b) The costs associated with purchasing the energy from Nalcor under the terms of the**
23 **NBTUA are for Emera’s account. Emera will recover from NS Power only the NS Power**
24 **avoided costs.**

25
26 **(c) The costs associated with the Bayside transmission rights are for the account of Bayside**
27 **LP.**

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-30:**

2

3 **After 35 years, ownership of the ML transfers from NSPML to Nalcor. Once the transfer**
4 **of ownership takes place it would be useful to understand what the anticipated status of the**
5 **transmission line will be in terms of regulation, tariffs and control area operation. Please**
6 **advise as to what the status of the ML is anticipated to be, including but not limited to:**

7

8 **(a) Will the transmission line be subject to regulation by the regulatory authorities in**
9 **Newfoundland and Labrador, Nova Scotia, both or neither?**

10

11 **(b) Will the Newfoundland and Labrador transmission system have an OATT?**

12

13 **(c) Will the ML be subject to an OATT?**

14

15 **(d) Will the ML be part of the Newfoundland and Labrador control area or where will**
16 **the control area boundary be set?**

17

18 **Response IR-30:**

19

20 (a) NSPML expects that when the Maritime Link becomes a Nalcor asset it will be regulated in
21 the same manner as other Nalcor assets. The interconnection will continue to remain
22 compliant with interconnection standards applicable to each Nova Scotia and Newfoundland
23 Labrador system operation requirements.

24

25 (b) NSPML is not aware of any decision by Nalcor, the Government of Newfoundland and
26 Labrador or the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities in Newfoundland and Labrador
27 with respect to the application of an OATT.

28

29 (c) See (b) above.

30

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

- 1 (d) After NSPML no longer owns the Maritime Link, it is anticipated that the link will become
2 part of the Newfoundland and Labrador Control area with the boundary set at the 345 kV
3 side of the Maritime Link HVdc converter transformers at Woodbine, Nova Scotia.