

# Manitoba Public Utilities Board

---

## Manitoba Hydro Keeyask and Conawapa NFAT CAC to PE Information Request Responses Public IR's



PROJECT NUMBER:  
132171  
PROJECT CONTACT:  
*Ron Beazer*  
EMAIL:  
[ron.beazer@powereng.com](mailto:ron.beazer@powereng.com)  
PHONE:  
208-288-6632



*PREPARED FOR: MANITOBA PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD  
PREPARED BY: POWER ENGINEERS, INC.*

REVISION HISTORY			
DATE	REVISED BY	REVISION	DESCRIPTION
4-9-2014	MG, BF, PA, GD, RB	0	Issued for Client Use

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CAC TO PE IR 001a.....	1
CAC TO PE IR 001b .....	2
CAC TO PE IR 001c.....	3

1 **CAC TO PE IR 001a**

2 **SUBJECT:** None

3

4 **PREAMBLE:** None.

5

6 **QUESTION:** Did Power Engineers (PE) review the reliability criteria used by Manitoba Hydro to justify  
7 the need/construction of Bipole III?

8

9 **REFERENCE:** PE report, p. 10 - 13.

10

11 **RESPONSE:** No. Our Terms of Reference line items 157, 158 and 159 state that the Bipole III  
12 transmission line and converter station project are not within our scope. Therefore, PE did not review the  
13 reliability criteria used by Manitoba Hydro to justify the need/construction of Bipole III. The Bipole III  
14 for our examination is considered a previously approved project and is not considered part of this  
15 Preferred Development Plan for the NFAT. NFAT Chapter 5, page 28 line 1-3 states

16

17 ‘As a major reliability initiative, Bipole III is being developed with or without new hydro generation.  
18 However, Bipole III will also provide a transmission outlet for a large portion of power from the Keeyask  
19 and Conawapa G.S. should they be developed’.

20

21 Line 5-6 states ‘Upon receipt of the necessary *Environment Act* license, construction is planned to  
22 commence in 2013 with a projected in-service date of October 2017’.

1 **CAC TO PE IR 001b**

2 **SUBJECT:** None

3  
4 **PREAMBLE:** None.

5  
6 **QUESTION:** If yes, what is PE's understanding of the criteria used and will this criteria continue to be  
7 satisfied under the PDP?

8  
9 **REFERENCE:** PE report, p. 10 - 13.

10  
11 **RESPONSE:** See answer to CAC 001a. PE did not review the criteria used to justify BP III. However,  
12 PE did review the Manitoba Hydro 2012 System Report to assess the reliability of the existing system,  
13 which included future facilities including BPIII. The PE report page 10 line 30 – 35 states:

14  
15 'POWER reviewed Manitoba Hydro's 2012 System Performance Assessment that included the existing  
16 system and proposed long term additions out to the year 2022, including Bipole III and Keeyask. This  
17 document addresses system performance and compliance with NERC Transmission Planning Standards  
18 TPL-001-0 through TPL-004-0, MRO and Manitoba Hydro operating criteria. The scope and time frame  
19 of that assessment and proposed plan did not include the integration of the Conawapa generation station  
20 and the NFAT Preferred Plan'.

21  
22 Furthermore, as stated in their NFAT rebuttal, Manitoba Hydro has conducted studies as documented in  
23 the "Integrated Transmission Plan for Keeyask and Conawapa" that demonstrate the system meets the  
24 NERC planning standards.

1 **CAC TO PE IR 001c**

2 **SUBJECT:** None

3

4 **PREAMBLE:** None.

5

6 **QUESTION:** If not, why not given the importance of the HVDC system to the delivery of power under  
7 the PDP?

8

9 **REFERENCE:** PE report, p. 10 - 13.

10

11 **RESPONSE:** See answer to CAC 001b.