

# OPTIONS EVALUATION REPORT (OER)



Line 25-92 - Refurb

OER- N2502 revision 1.0

**Ellipse project no(s):**

**TRIM file:** [TRIM No]

**Project reason:** Reliability - To meet overall network reliability requirements

**Project category:** Prescribed - Replacement

## Approvals

<b>Author</b>	Lakshman Ganesharajah	Asset Analyst Network Planning and Operations
<b>Endorsed</b>	Charles Kurniawan	Transmission Lines and Cables Asset Manager
	Debashis Dutta	Asset Analytics & Insights Manager
<b>Approved</b>	Lance Wee	Head of Asset Management
<b>Date submitted for approval</b>	13 October 2021	

## Change history

Revision	Date	Amendment
0	13/10/2021	Initial Issue
1	12/11/2021	Initial Issue

Warning: A printed copy of this document may not be the current version. Please refer to the Wire to verify the current version.

## Executive summary

Line 25/92 is a double circuit, steel tower 330kV transmission line with a route length of 13km. The transmission line is a key part of the network around the Eraring Power Station in the Central Coast region, and its route runs from near Eraring through to field location near Ruttleys Road at Vales Point. There are 39 structures on the line, and its route mainly traverses bushland on the outskirts of urban and semi-urban areas. The line crosses the Sydney to Newcastle railway at Morisset.

Detailed analysis of asset condition information has identified that 38 of the 39 structures on Line 25/92 have condition issues which require rectification to address asset health and maintain appropriate risk levels across the network.

The main drivers of the need to remediate these issues are:

- > Manage network safety risk levels “As-Low-As Reasonably-Practicable” in accordance with the regulation obligations and TransGrid’s business risk appetite. Under the Electricity Supply (Safety and Network Management) Regulation 2014 Section 5 ‘A network operator must take all reasonable steps to ensure that the design, construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning of its network (or any part of its network) is safe’; and
- > Provide economic benefit to consumers through reduction in safety and bushfire risks.

The assessment of the options considered to address the need/opportunity appears in Table 1.

**Table 1 - Evaluated options**

Option	Description	Direct capital cost (\$m)	Network and corporate overheads (\$m)	Total capital cost <sup>1</sup> (\$m)	Weighted NPV (PV, \$m)	Rank
Option A	Remediate all identified condition issues for line components which have experienced greater deterioration and/or reached the end of their functional lives	2.36	0.21	2.57	28.65	2
Option B	Remediate all identified condition issues on the line	3.29	0.30	3.59	51.19	1

The preferred option is Option B, as it has the highest weighted NPV result of the technically and commercially feasible options which were considered. It is therefore recommended that Option B be scoped in detail and progressed from DG1 to DG2.<sup>2</sup>

In consideration of the delivery requirements and the economic benefit NPV analysis for the need, its optimal timing is 2025/2026.

<sup>1</sup> Total capital cost is the sum of the direct capital cost and network and corporate overheads. Total capital cost is used in this OER for all analysis.

<sup>2</sup> DG stands for ‘decision gate’ that forms a part of TransGrids investment decision process.

**Warning: A printed copy of this document may not be the current version. Please refer to the Wire to verify the current version.**

# 1. Need/opportunity

---

Line 25/92 is a double circuit, steel tower 330kV transmission line with a route length of 13km. The transmission line is a key part of the network around the Eraring Power Station in the Central Coast region, and its route runs from near Eraring through to field location near Ruttleys Road at Vales Point. There are 39 structures on the line, and its route mainly traverses bushland on the outskirts of urban and semi-urban areas. The line crosses the Sydney to Newcastle railway at Morisset.

Originally constructed in 1981 as the double circuit 330kV transmission line connecting Eraring and Vales Point, the line is split into two different double circuit sections:

- > Line 25/93: From Structure 2D to 9D (Note Structure 9D is for Line 93 only)
- > Line 25/92: From Structure 10D to 46D

Detailed analysis of asset condition information has identified that 38 of the 39 structures on Line 25/92 have condition issues which require rectification.

The most significant element of concern is the corrosion related deterioration on the towers and foundations. Deterioration, particularly of critical members such as tower legs which cannot be readily replaced, can lead to failure and subsequently compromise structural integrity. Further, corroded fasteners can eventually lead to compromise on the key member connection points on the tower, impacting its structural integrity.

Other issues on the line include:

- > Deterioration of conductor fittings, corona rings and earthwire fittings due to corrosion – failure of the fitting attachment can result in a fallen conductor
- > Deterioration of porcelain insulators which have reached end of life – failure of the fitting attachment can result in a fallen conductor
- > Deterioration on asset components relating to public safety such as climbing deterrents, aerial markers and signage

There is a need to remediate these issues to:

- > Manage network safety risk levels “As-Low-As Reasonably-Practicable” in accordance with the regulation obligations and TransGrid’s business risk appetite. Under the Electricity Supply (Safety and Network Management) Regulation 2014 Section 5 ‘A network operator must take all reasonable steps to ensure that the design, construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning of its network (or any part of its network) is safe.’
- > Provide an economic benefit to consumers through reductions in safety and bushfire risks. The direct impact of asset failure can result in a conductor drop event with potential fire ignition and/or safety hazard consequences to the general public, as evaluated in the associated modelling.

If the condition issues on the line are not addressed in sufficient time, then the asset will operate with increasing risk of failure as it continues to deteriorate. The level of reactive corrective maintenance needed to keep the line operating within required standards may also increase, particularly when asset failures ultimately occur.

Consequently, the proposed project has an economic benefits need, and addressed this need will provide avoided cost savings from reduced in bushfire and safety risk, and maintenance costs that would otherwise occur without refurbishment.

**Appendix B** provides a summary of the number of structures with condition issues within each asset component category. It is based on the Transmission Line Refurbishment Criteria document.

**Warning:** A printed copy of this document may not be the current version. Please refer to the Wire to verify the current version.

## 2. Related needs/opportunities

---

- > Need 00000001350: Line 25/26 and 26 (Single Circuit) Refurbishment
- > Need 000000001407: Line 93 (Single Circuit) Refurbishment
- > Need N2503: Line 25/93 Refurbishment
- > Need N2527: Line 92/93 Refurbishment

## 3. Options

---

The base case for this assessment is a 'do nothing' scenario, where the assets are left in service until they fail and require replacement. In addition to the base case, two remediation options have been considered. Option A involves a targeted program to address components which have experienced the greatest deterioration. Option B involves addressing all identified condition issues on the line.

### 3.1 Base case

It is noted that a 'run to fail' scenario, where the issues are addressed through increased asset monitoring and preventative maintenance tasks, is not a valid base case for this Need. The condition issues on the asset have already been identified through maintenance inspections, and increasing the frequency of inspections to monitor the condition issues will not necessarily address them.

The base case will instead be defined as a 'do nothing' scenario, where the assets are left in service until they fail and require replacement. The replacement cost has been captured in the NPV assessment under financial risk cost.

### 3.2 Options evaluated

Two options in addition to the Base case were evaluated:

**Option A** — Remediate all identified condition issues for line components which have experienced greater deterioration and/or reached the end of their functional lives. [[NOSA-N2502](#), [OFS-N2502A](#)]

Detail of scope can be found in Appendix B.

It is estimated that this option would cost \$2.57 million ± 25% in \$2020-21.

This project is expected to be completed within 24 months following DG1.

**Option B** — Remediate all identified condition issues on the line. [[NOSA-N2502](#), [OFS-N2502B](#)]

Detail of scope can be found in Appendix B.

It is estimated that this option would cost \$3.59 million ± 25% in \$2020-21.

This project is expected to be completed within 25 months following DG1.

Option B will provide efficiency in delivery by addressing all identified condition issues for line components in a single mobilisation whilst reducing bushfire risks on the line.

### 3.3 Options considered and not progressed

The following options were considered but not progressed:

**Table 2 Options considered but not progressed**

Option	Reason for not progressing
Increased inspections	The condition issues have already been identified and cannot be rectified through increased inspections, and therefore is not technically feasible.
Elimination of all associated risk	This can only be achieved through retirement and decommissioning of the associated assets which may lead to reliability issue. Therefore, it is considered not technically feasible.
New transmission line	Due to significant costs of this option, a new double circuit 330 kV transmission line is not considered commercially feasible.
Non-network solutions	TransGrid does not consider non-network options to be commercially and technically feasible to assist with meeting the identified need, as non-network options will not mitigate the environment (bushfire) and safety posed as a result of corrosion-related asset deterioration.

## 4. Evaluation

### 4.1 Commercial evaluation methodology

The economic assessment undertaken for this project includes three scenarios that reflect a central set assumptions based on current information that is most likely to eventuate (central scenario), a set of assumptions that give rise to a lower bound for net benefits (lower bound scenario), and a set of assumptions that give rise to an upper bound on benefits (higher bound scenario).

Assumptions for each scenario are set out in the table below.

**Table 3 Scenario Inputs**

Parameter	Central scenario	Lower bound scenario	Higher bound scenario
Discount rate	4.8%	7.37%	2.23%
Capital cost	100%	125%	75%
Risk cost benefits	100%	75%	125%
<b>Scenario weighting</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>

Parameters used in this commercial evaluation:

**Table 4 Parameters**

Parameter	Parameter Description	Value used for this evaluation
Discount year	Year that dollar values are discounted to	2020/2021

Warning: A printed copy of this document may not be the current version. Please refer to the Wire to verify the current version.

Parameter	Parameter Description	Value used for this evaluation
Base year	The year that dollar value outputs are expressed in real terms	2020/2021 dollars
Period of analysis	Number of years included in economic analysis with remaining capital value included as terminal value at the end of the analysis period.	25 Years
Expected asset life	The useful life of the asset	35 years
ALARP disproportionality	Multiplier of the environmental and safety related risk cost included in NPV analysis to demonstrate implementation of obligation to reduce to ALARP.	Refer to section 4.3 for details.

The capex figures in this OER do not include any real cost escalation.

## 4.2 Commercial evaluation results

The commercial evaluation of the technically feasible options is set out in Table 5. Details appear in Appendix A.

**Table 5 - Commercial evaluation (PV, \$ million)**

Option	Capital Cost PV	Central scenario NPV	Lower bound scenario NPV	Higher bound scenario NPV	Weighted NPV	Ranking
Option A	2.13	25.16	10.70	53.58	28.65	2
Option B	2.97	44.81	19.21	95.92	51.19	1

Based on the commercial analysis, Option B is the preferred option as it yields the highest weighted NPV and is technically and commercially feasible. The main driver of the benefit in the NPV is bushfire risk benefit.

## 4.3 ALARP evaluation

TransGrid manages and mitigates bushfire and safety risk to ensure they are below risk tolerance levels or 'As Low As Reasonably Practicable' ('ALARP'), in accordance with the regulation obligations and TransGrid's business risk appetite. Under the Electricity Supply (Safety and Network Management) Regulation 2014 Section 5 'A network operator must take all reasonable steps to ensure that the design, construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning of its network (or any part of its network) is safe.' TransGrid maintains an Electricity Network Safety Management System (ENSMS) to meet this obligation.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> TransGrid's ENSMS follows the International Organization for Standardization's ISO31000 risk management framework which requires following hierarchy of hazard mitigation approach

In its Network Risk Assessment Methodology, under the ALARP test with the application of a gross disproportionate factor<sup>4</sup>, the weighted benefits are expected to exceed the cost. TransGrid’s analysis concludes that the costs are less than the weighted benefits from mitigating bushfire and safety risks. The proposed investment will enable TransGrid to continue to manage and operate this part of the network to a safety and risk mitigation level of ALARP.

Evaluation of the above options has been completed in accordance with As Low As Reasonably Practicable (ALARP) obligations. The Network Safety Risk Reduction is calculated as 6 x Bushfire Risk Reduction + 6 x Safety Risk Reduction + 0.1 x Reliability Risk Reduction.

Results of the ALARP evaluation are set out in Table 6.

**Table 6 - Reasonably practicable test (\$ million)**

Option	Network Safety Risk Reduction	Annualised Capex	Reasonably Practicable? <sup>5</sup>
A	\$0.61	\$0.15	Y
B	\$1.12	\$0.21	Y

The result of the ALARP evaluation is that both options meet the ALARP threshold.

#### 4.4 Preferred option

The preferred option is Option B, as it has the highest weighted NPV result of all the technically and commercially feasible options considered as part of this need. Option B also meets the ALARP threshold. The optimal delivery date for this option is 2025/2026 based on an optimal timing analysis (see Section 5).

#### Capital and Operating Expenditure

The required capex expenditure is \$3.59 million.

#### Regulatory Investment Test

A regulatory investment test for transmission (RIT-T) is not required as the estimated capital cost for the preferred option is below the threshold of \$6 million.

## 5. Optimal Timing

In consideration of the delivery requirements and the NPV analysis for the need, its optimal timing is 2025/2026

The test for optimal timing of the preferred option has been undertaken. The approach taken is to identify the optimal commissioning year for the preferred option where net benefits (including avoided costs and safety disproportionality tests) of the preferred option exceeds the annualised costs of the option. The commencement year is determined based on the required project disbursement to the meet the commissioning year based on the OFS.

The results of optimal timing analysis is:

- > Optimal commissioning year: 2025/2026
- > Commissioning year annual benefit: \$1.2 million

<sup>4</sup> The values of the disproportionality factors were determined through a review of practises and legal interpretations across multiple industries, with particular reference to the works of the UK Health and Safety Executive. The methodology used to determine the disproportionality factors in this document is in line with the principles and examples presented in the AER Replacement Planning Guidelines and is consistent with TransGrid’s Revised Revenue Proposal 2023/24-2027/28.

<sup>5</sup> Reasonably practicable is defined as whether the annualised CAPEX is less than the Network Safety Risk Reduction.

**Warning: A printed copy of this document may not be the current version. Please refer to the Wire to verify the current version.**

- > Annualised cost: \$0.2 million

Based on the optimal timing, the project is expected to be completed in the 2024-2028 Regulatory Period

## 6. Recommendation

---

The preferred option is Option B, as it has the highest weighted NPV result of all the technically and commercially feasible options considered as part of this need.

It is therefore recommended that this option be scoped in detail, so that it can be progressed from DG1 to DG2. Total project cost is \$3.59 million including an amount of \$0.5 million to progress the project from DG1 to DG2.



## Appendix A – Option Summaries<sup>6</sup>

Project Description		Line 25/92 Refurbishment	
Option Description		Option A - Refurbish components that meet primary condition criteria only	
Project Summary			
Option Rank	2	Investment Assessment Period	25
Asset Life	35	NPV Year	2020/2021
Economic Evaluation			
NPV @ Central Benefit Scenario (PV, \$m)	25.16	Annualised CAPEX @ Central Benefit Scenario (\$m)	Annualised Capex - Standard (Business Case) 0.15
NPV @ Lower Bound Scenario (PV, \$m)	10.70	Network Safety Risk Reduction (\$m)	Network Safety Risk Reduction 0.61
NPV @ Higher Bound Scenario (PV, \$m)	53.58	ALARP	ALARP Compliant? Yes
NPV Weighted (PV, \$m)	28.65	Optimal Timing	Optimal timing (Business Case) 2025
Cost (Central Scenario)			
Total Capex (\$m)	2.57	Cost Capex (PV,\$m)	2.13
Terminal Value (\$m)	0.66	Terminal Value (PV,\$m)	0.17
Risk (Central Scenario)		Pre	Post Benefit
Reliability (PV,\$m)	Reliability Risk (Pre) 1.16	Reliability Risk (Post) 0.85	Pre – Post 0.31
Financial (PV,\$m)	Financial Risk (Pre) 1.28	Financial Risk (Post) 0.91	Pre – Post 0.37
Operational/Compliance (PV,\$m)	Operational Risk (Pre) 0.00	Operational Risk (Post) 0.00	Pre – Post 0.00
Safety (PV,\$m)	Safety Risk (Pre) 0.13	Safety Risk (Post) 0.12	Pre – Post 0.01
Environmental (PV,\$m)	Environmental Risk (Pre) 73.59	Environmental Risk (Post) 47.21	Pre – Post 26.38
Reputational (\$m)	Reputational Risk (Pre) 0.15	Reputational Risk (Post) 0.11	Pre – Post 0.04
<b>Total Risk (PV,\$m)</b>	<b>Total Risk (Pre) 76.31</b>	<b>Total Risk (Post) 49.19</b>	<b>Pre – Post 27.13</b>
OPEX Benefit (PV,\$m)		OPEX Benefit 0.00	
Other benefit (PV,\$m)		Incremental Net Benefit 0.00	
<b>Total Benefit (PV,\$m)</b>		<b>Business Case Total Benefit 27.13</b>	

Commissioning year annual benefit (\$k):

**627.93**

<sup>6</sup> Figures may not add due to rounding

Warning: A printed copy of this document may not be the current version. Please refer to the Wire to verify the current version.

Project Description		Line 25/92 Refurbishment	
Option Description		Option B - Refurbish all asset components identified as having condition issues	
Project Summary			
Option Rank	1	Investment Assessment Period	25
Asset Life	35	NPV Year	2020/2021
Economic Evaluation			
NPV @ Central Benefit Scenario (PV, \$m)	44.81	Annualised CAPEX @ Central Benefit Scenario (\$m)	Annualised Capex - Standard (Business Case) 0.21
NPV @ Lower Bound Scenario (PV, \$m)	19.21	Network Safety Risk Reduction (\$m)	Network Safety Risk Reduction 1.12
NPV @ Higher Bound Scenario (PV, \$m)	95.92	ALARP	ALARP Compliant? Yes
NPV Weighted (PV, \$m)	51.19	Optimal Timing	Optimal timing (Business Case) 2026
Cost (Central Scenario)			
Total Capex (\$m)	3.59	Cost Capex (PV,\$m)	2.97
Terminal Value (\$m)	1.03	Terminal Value (PV,\$m)	0.26
Risk (Central Scenario)	Pre	Post	Benefit
Reliability (PV,\$m)	Reliability Risk (Pre) 1.16	Reliability Risk (Post) 0.61	Pre – Post 0.55
Financial (PV,\$m)	Financial Risk (Pre) 1.28	Financial Risk (Post) 0.47	Pre – Post 0.81
Operational/Compliance (PV,\$m)	Operational Risk (Pre) 0.00	Operational Risk (Post) 0.00	Pre – Post 0.00
Safety (PV,\$m)	Safety Risk (Pre) 0.13	Safety Risk (Post) 0.05	Pre – Post 0.08
Environmental (PV,\$m)	Environmental Risk (Pre) 73.59	Environmental Risk (Post) 27.61	Pre – Post 45.98
Reputational (\$m)	Reputational Risk (Pre) 0.15	Reputational Risk (Post) 0.06	Pre – Post 0.09
<b>Total Risk (PV,\$m)</b>	<b>Total Risk (Pre)</b> 76.31	<b>Total Risk (Post)</b> 28.80	<b>Pre – Post</b> 47.52
OPEX Benefit (PV,\$m)			OPEX Benefit 0.00
Other benefit (PV,\$m)			Incremental Net Benefit 0.00
<b>Total Benefit (PV,\$m)</b>			<b>Business Case Total Benefit</b> 47.52

**Commissioning year annual benefit (\$k):**

**1161.9**

Warning: A printed copy of this document may not be the current version. Please refer to the Wire to verify the current version.

## Appendix B Structures with Condition Issues by Asset Category

Asset Component Category	Cause	Effect	Consequence	No. of Structures	
				Option A	Option B
Conductor Fittings	Corrosion of fittings	Fallen conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	0	27
Corona Rings	Corrosion of corona rings	Fallen conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	0	2
Earthwire Bonding	Poor connection.	Possible transfer potential, earth current and voltage gradient issues	Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death	1	1
Earthwire Fittings	Corrosion of fittings.	Fallen conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	0	3
Foundations	Corrosion of tower legs. Failure of critical members can compromise structural integrity.	Fallen structure and conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	2	2
Groundline steel	Corrosion of steel at groundline. Failure of critical members can compromise structural integrity.	Fallen structure and conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	1	1
Insulator	Porcelain insulators have reached end of serviceable life.	Fallen conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life	9	9

Warning: A printed copy of this document may not be the current version. Please refer to the Wire to verify the current version.

Asset Component Category	Cause	Effect	Consequence	No. of Structures	
				Option A	Option B
	Corrosion of pins.		Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts		
Public Safety – Climbing Deterrents	Deteriorated.	Unauthorised access	Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	22	22
Public Safety – Danger Signs	Deteriorated.	Unauthorised access	Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	32	32
Public Safety – Structure ID Signs	Deteriorated.	Unauthorised access	Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	28	28
Tower Base	Corrosion of tower members. Failure of critical members can compromise structural integrity.	Fallen structure and conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	1	1
Tower Fasteners	Corrosion of nuts and bolts. Loose members can compromise structural integrity.	Fallen structure and conductor	Bushfire resulting in potential loss of property and/or life Safety incident resulting in potential injury or death Line outage with potential network reliability impacts	17	17

Warning: A printed copy of this document may not be the current version. Please refer to the Wire to verify the current version.