

1 Q. **C-27, Tab 12: Additions for Load Isolated Generation Stations - Various**  
2 **Sites; 2013: \$2,040,200; 2014: \$9,357,900**

3 In previous information provided by Hydro to the Board it has been noted that the  
4 cost of installation of fire protection systems in its diesel plants was not cost  
5 effective. The current application is recommending a fire protection system be  
6 installed at the Hopedale plant.

7

8 Is this a change in Hydro's philosophy regarding fire protection in its diesel  
9 plants? If so, please explain the rationale for the change.

10

11 A. Yes, there is a change in Hydro's philosophy regarding fire protection in its diesel  
12 plants. In 2010, the issue of fire protection for isolated Diesel Plants was judged to  
13 be of high concern even after mitigation considerations. As a result Hydro engaged  
14 Hatch in 2011 to complete a review of available fire protection systems and as well  
15 provide a risk ranking matrix to assist in ranking each plant in terms of risk and/or  
16 consequences of a fire. This risk ranking matrix considered such things as  
17 accessibility, how weather affects accessibility, population, plant output,  
18 community fire fighting capability, and replacement cost of plant.

19

20 Hydro's current approach is to consider installation of fire protection systems over  
21 time in remote diesel plants as other generation expansion projects are completed  
22 and with consideration of the risk ranking for the plant in question. A change in  
23 philosophy was made with consideration to a number of factors:

1 (a) Increased Insurance Deductibles:

2 Based on claim statistics Hydro's insurer, FM Global, has significantly increased  
3 the deductible for claims against damages caused by fire at diesel plants. The  
4 deductible has been increased in recent years from \$1 million to \$2 million.

5  
6 (b) Availability of More Cost Effective Fire Protection System:

7 In the past when considering options for fire protection systems for diesel  
8 plants, Hydro found that the only practical fire suppression system available for  
9 this application was a sprinkler system. However, sprinkler systems require a  
10 large supply of water which in most cases is not readily available at Hydro's  
11 remote diesel generation sites. A new fire protection system has become  
12 available and is approved by Hydro's insurer, FM Global. It is a water mist  
13 system that does not require a large water supply and is considered to be cost  
14 effective.

15  
16 (c) Nain Fire Experience in 2008:

17 In late fall of 2008 a fire at the Nain plant caused a large amount of damage and  
18 greatly reduced its generating capability. The diesel plant at Nain, like all other  
19 Hydro diesel plants serving isolated communities at present, does not have an  
20 automatic fire suppression system. The resulting damage caused customers to  
21 be without power for over 35 hours until temporary repairs were made and  
22 mobile generation was transported to the site. Maintaining service during such  
23 conditions was challenging and costly.

24  
25 It was fortunate in this case that the temporary equipment could be delivered  
26 before the winter season commenced and coastal shipping was closed due to  
27 sea ice. To provide emergency temporary generation to isolated communities at  
28 a time of year when road or sea transport is not available would result in

- 1 significantly longer customer outages. The generation equipment would have to
- 2 be airlifted to site or be delivered by a coastal vessel escorted by an icebreaker.
- 3 This would also result in much higher cost to provide the temporary generation.