

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">LIST OF UNDERTAKINGS</p> <p>1. Undertaking Pg. 86</p>	<p>1 July 11, 2003</p> <p>2 (9:04 a.m.)</p> <p>3 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>4 Q. Before we begin, I think there's been some</p> <p>5 agreement reached amongst counsel with respect</p> <p>6 to argument in this matter and that Ms. Newman</p> <p>7 is ready to put that on the record, please.</p> <p>8 MS. NEWMAN:</p> <p>9 Q. Yes, good morning Mr. Chairman and</p> <p>10 Commissioners. The parties have agreed that</p> <p>11 they'll file written argument on July 23rd,</p> <p>12 that's a Wednesday, by the usual filing time</p> <p>13 of the Board, which is 3 p.m. And that will</p> <p>14 be followed up by oral argument at 9 a.m. on</p> <p>15 Monday, the 28th of July. The parties have</p> <p>16 also agreed that they would be bound by a one</p> <p>17 hour time limit.</p> <p>18 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>19 Q. Very well. Okay, so if everyone is in</p> <p>20 agreement with that we'll pass on by and we'll</p> <p>21 talk about today's schedule. I think it's</p> <p>22 everyone's desire to try and finish this</p> <p>23 matter today as far as the evidence and cross-</p> <p>24 examination is concerned and we're prepared to</p> <p>25 accommodate that in any way we can that's</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 reasonable. So I think what we'll do is we'll</p> <p>2 go till say around 12 noon and see where we</p> <p>3 are and if we need to break for lunch we'll do</p> <p>4 so either 12:30 or 1:00 and then we'll come</p> <p>5 back in an hour and try and finish this</p> <p>6 afternoon, if indeed we need to do that. So</p> <p>7 we'll see how that works. That's all I had to</p> <p>8 say unless anyone had any comment on that in</p> <p>9 terms of their scheduling, their flights or</p> <p>10 whatever. No?</p> <p>11 HUTCHINGS, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. No, it may be that I may leave a little bit</p> <p>13 early in the afternoon and leave it with Ms.</p> <p>14 Andrews because she's going to be dealing with</p> <p>15 the final Panel in any event, Mr. Chair, but</p> <p>16 that won't affect the function of the Board.</p> <p>17 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>18 Q. Okay, thank you, Mr. Hutchings. When we</p> <p>19 finished yesterday, Ms. Greene, you were</p> <p>20 cross-examining Mr. Barreca. Good morning,</p> <p>21 Mr. Barreca.</p> <p>22 MR. BARRECA:</p> <p>23 A. Good morning.</p> <p>24 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>25 Q. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning Mr.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 Barreca.</p> <p>2 MR. BARRECA:</p> <p>3 A. Good morning.</p> <p>4 MR. STEPHEN L. BARRECA CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MAUREEN</p> <p>5 GREENE, Q.C. (CONT'D)</p> <p>6 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>7 Q. I'd like to turn to page 19 of your pre-filed</p> <p>8 evidence dated June 23rd. Actually, first if</p> <p>9 you could look at page 18 where you commence</p> <p>10 your discussion of the east/west microwave</p> <p>11 interconnection.</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. Now that project was approved by the Board for</p> <p>14 2003, is that correct?</p> <p>15 A. That's my understanding.</p> <p>16 Q. My understanding of your evidence is that you</p> <p>17 refer to this project even though it is not up</p> <p>18 for approval in 2004 with respect to the</p> <p>19 documentation that was filed for the project,</p> <p>20 is that correct?</p> <p>21 A. With respect to -</p> <p>22 Q. The documentation that was filed for that</p> <p>23 particular project.</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. If I could turn now then to page 19. If we</p>

Page 5	Page 6
<p>1 look at line 16 on page 19 your conclusion</p> <p>2 there is that of the four alternatives</p> <p>3 considered, microwave was the least expensive,</p> <p>4 is that correct?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>6 Q. I took from your evidence that your area of</p> <p>7 concern was that one alternative was not</p> <p>8 considered and you referred to that beginning</p> <p>9 on line 20, is that correct?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>11 Q. If we turn to page 20 of your evidence, you</p> <p>12 refer to IRUs as a way of purchasing the dark</p> <p>13 fibre, is that correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>15 Q. And the reference there as I understand lines</p> <p>16 1 to 12 on page 20 is the costing for IRUs in</p> <p>17 the United States, is that correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, ma'am, I used cost that I had available</p> <p>19 that were in US dollars and converted them to</p> <p>20 Canadian dollars.</p> <p>21 Q. And based on that evidence, you conclude that</p> <p>22 another lower cost alternative hadn't been</p> <p>23 considered, is that correct?</p> <p>24 A. Well, they considered a dark fibre alternative</p> <p>25 but they were looking at leasing the fibre on</p>	<p>1 a monthly basis and I thought that they should</p> <p>2 possibly look at leasing it on a long term</p> <p>3 basis, using an IRU type of contract.</p> <p>4 Q. And using the pricing from the United States</p> <p>5 which you are familiar with, you suggested</p> <p>6 that the IRU way of getting dark fibre would</p> <p>7 be a cheaper alternative, is that correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, ma'am. Potentially could be a cheaper</p> <p>9 alternative.</p> <p>10 Q. And that is the only reason put forward in</p> <p>11 your evidence for questioning the</p> <p>12 justification for that project.</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Now if you could look, please, at the response</p> <p>15 to NLH-5 where you were asked what was the</p> <p>16 availability of IRUs in Canada, particularly,</p> <p>17 Newfoundland. And I guess the reference to</p> <p>18 the page number had been to your original</p> <p>19 evidence but in your answer you provided that</p> <p>20 you did not know the availability of IRUs in</p> <p>21 Newfoundland, is that correct?</p> <p>22 A. No, ma'am, did not have time to pursue that.</p> <p>23 Q. If we look at the response to NLH-6 where we</p> <p>24 ask you whether you were aware of the pricing</p> <p>25 for IRUs in Canada, particularly,</p>
Page 7	Page 8
<p>1 Newfoundland, and I take from your response</p> <p>2 that again you do not know first, if it's</p> <p>3 available from NLH-5, and then from NLH-6,</p> <p>4 you're not aware of the pricing that would be</p> <p>5 available to Newfoundland Hydro for that</p> <p>6 option.</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. So you wouldn't be surprised if I told you</p> <p>9 that IRUs are not available in Canada or in</p> <p>10 Newfoundland, would you? Because that is the</p> <p>11 information that Hydro has.</p> <p>12 A. Well -</p> <p>13 Q. Based on your answers to NLH-5 and NLH-6.</p> <p>14 A. I would not be surprised if it's not being</p> <p>15 offered as a standard service, however, I do</p> <p>16 not know if that has been pursued, if a long</p> <p>17 term lease as opposed to a monthly lease has</p> <p>18 been pursued.</p> <p>19 Q. And your objection to the project is based on</p> <p>20 your experience in the American market.</p> <p>21 A. I don't know that objection is the right term</p> <p>22 that I used or that--I don't believe that's my</p> <p>23 position that I object to the project, but I</p> <p>24 thought that a monthly leasing of a fibre</p> <p>25 strand would be a very expensive way to</p>	<p>1 proceed.</p> <p>2 Q. And you assumed that a product was available</p> <p>3 here in Newfoundland.</p> <p>4 A. I assumed that it should be pursued.</p> <p>5 Q. And you don't know whether it has or it hasn't</p> <p>6 been.</p> <p>7 A. I do not know that.</p> <p>8 Q. The next project I'd like to refer you to is</p> <p>9 the power line carrier one which begins on</p> <p>10 page 17 of your evidence. Now that is a</p> <p>11 project where there is an amount before the</p> <p>12 Board for 2004, is that correct?</p> <p>13 A. I'm sorry I didn't hear your entire question.</p> <p>14 Q. We just talked about the east/west</p> <p>15 interconnection of the microwave which is not</p> <p>16 before the Board, it was already dealt with by</p> <p>17 the Board, now in the power line carrier, this</p> <p>18 particular one, funds were approved by the</p> <p>19 Board for 2003, is that correct?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And there is a smaller portion before the</p> <p>22 Board now to complete the project in 2004, is</p> <p>23 that correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>25 Q. If you look at line 15 of page 17, I take from</p>

Page 9	Page 10
<p>1 your evidence, particularly line 15, that you</p> <p>2 agree with the replacement of the power line</p> <p>3 carrier?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, based on the description and given the</p> <p>5 fact that most of it has already been replaced</p> <p>6 or--replaced in like kind or replaced with</p> <p>7 portions of the microwave system. The</p> <p>8 remaining portion from the description does</p> <p>9 appear to be warranted.</p> <p>10 Q. If we turn to page 18 where the issue that</p> <p>11 you've raised is the reference to the digital</p> <p>12 PLC technology and the high potential for the</p> <p>13 PLC technology. Now do I understand from your</p> <p>14 lines 4 to 7 that the digital PLC technology</p> <p>15 is not now on the market and will not likely</p> <p>16 be on the market for five to seven years?</p> <p>17 A. No, ma'am.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay, what do you mean then by lines, well,</p> <p>19 particularly, lines 6 and 7 and then I'll take</p> <p>20 you to your responses to some NLH request for</p> <p>21 information.</p> <p>22 A. Digital PLC is commercially available now and</p> <p>23 you can check on the internet and you'll find</p> <p>24 numerous sources for digital systems, as well</p> <p>25 as new generations of analogue systems. What</p>	<p>1 I was pointing out here is that there is a lot</p> <p>2 of research being conducted in PLC technology,</p> <p>3 both analogue, digital and even broadband</p> <p>4 communications over PLC technology. And</p> <p>5 that's what I was referring to here is that</p> <p>6 there is such an increased emphasis on</p> <p>7 research in this area, new found emphasis on</p> <p>8 research in this area, it appears that in the</p> <p>9 next five to seven years we're likely to have</p> <p>10 broadband capability, high speed internet type</p> <p>11 capability over some PLC technology.</p> <p>12 Q. That's not available at the present time?</p> <p>13 A. That is not available at the present time.</p> <p>14 Q. And in your opinion, is not likely to be</p> <p>15 available for five to seven years.</p> <p>16 A. Right. Commercially available. There are</p> <p>17 numerous utilities throughout the world that</p> <p>18 are conducting broadband PLC pilot programs at</p> <p>19 this time or trials.</p> <p>20 Q. Yes, and I'd like now actually to refer to</p> <p>21 that. In NLH-4, the question was to provide</p> <p>22 the information that you relied upon that</p> <p>23 broadband PLC would be available for high</p> <p>24 voltage electrical utility applications,</p> <p>25 because you just mentioned that you believe</p>
Page 11	Page 12
<p>1 that the broadband PLC will be on the market</p> <p>2 in five to seven years and we asked you</p> <p>3 specifically with respect to high voltage</p> <p>4 electrical utility applications which is</p> <p>5 Hydro's needs and I'd just like to refer you</p> <p>6 to part of the answer. Unfortunately, the</p> <p>7 lines aren't numbered. You mention, actually</p> <p>8 at the very last line on the page and you just</p> <p>9 referred to it in your evidence, I believe,</p> <p>10 you mentioned that there are 75 utilities</p> <p>11 conducting broadband PLC pilot projects and</p> <p>12 then the previous bullet above it, you</p> <p>13 attached a presentation, is that correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>15 (9:19 a.m.)</p> <p>16 Q. When you look at the presentation as we have,</p> <p>17 it appears that the pilot projects were all</p> <p>18 being done by distribution utilities, is that</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 A. I don't know that.</p> <p>21 Q. Could I refer you to page 6 of the</p> <p>22 presentation. And there are other references</p> <p>23 in the presentation, I won't take you to them</p> <p>24 all. But if you look at the first bullet,</p> <p>25 refers to the transmitter receiver is coupled</p>	<p>1 to middle voltage, less than 69 kV, which</p> <p>2 would be for distribution utility. Are you</p> <p>3 aware of any pilots that are ongoing for high</p> <p>4 voltage electrical applications which are</p> <p>5 Hydro's requirements?</p> <p>6 A. I don't have any firsthand knowledge of that.</p> <p>7 Q. The next thing I'd like to talk to you about</p> <p>8 is a little bit about your background and your</p> <p>9 experience.</p> <p>10 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>11 Q. I understood from the CV that you have filed</p> <p>12 with your pre-filed evidence, as well as your</p> <p>13 direct evidence yesterday--I think Mr.</p> <p>14 O'Reilly is looking for the CV for me. There</p> <p>15 is another page before that, Mr. O'Reilly. In</p> <p>16 reading, and correct me if I'm wrong, Mr.</p> <p>17 Barreca, but in reading your pre-filed</p> <p>18 evidence as well in listening to you</p> <p>19 yesterday, my understanding is that your</p> <p>20 experience has been primarily in the</p> <p>21 telecommunications industry?</p> <p>22 A. I have more experience in the</p> <p>23 telecommunication industry than any other,</p> <p>24 yes, ma'am.</p> <p>25 Q. And I understand that you worked for Bell</p>

Page 13	Page 14
<p>1 South until 1997, which is a</p> <p>2 telecommunications company.</p> <p>3 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>4 Q. And then when you went with the consulting</p> <p>5 firm for one year from '97 to '98, I believe</p> <p>6 you also mentioned yesterday that that firm is</p> <p>7 a consulting firm in technology change, again</p> <p>8 primarily the telecommunications industry, is</p> <p>9 that correct?</p> <p>10 A. I believe the majority of their work is in</p> <p>11 telecommunications but a significant portion</p> <p>12 of their work are in other industries as well.</p> <p>13 Q. When I looked at the list of your testimony</p> <p>14 and I believe, Mr. O'Reilly, if you can</p> <p>15 continue going with the CV, it is the last two</p> <p>16 pages of the CV. I wanted you to refer to the</p> <p>17 page called "Testimony of Stephen L. Barreca",</p> <p>18 attached to the CV. When I reviewed this</p> <p>19 listing of your testimony, Mr. Barreca, it</p> <p>20 appeared certainly since '99, if not before,</p> <p>21 that your evidence has been primarily with</p> <p>22 respect to property evaluation, is that</p> <p>23 correct?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>25 Q. Would this be the first time that you have</p>	<p>1 consulted or certainly appeared as a witness</p> <p>2 in Canada? You have not listed any Canadian</p> <p>3 experience on your resume, in terms of</p> <p>4 testimony.</p> <p>5 A. No, I have not filed any specific testimony.</p> <p>6 Q. Could we look now at the response to NLH-1,</p> <p>7 please. In NLH-1 we asked you to outline your</p> <p>8 experience in the design and operation of a</p> <p>9 telecommunication system for a Canadian</p> <p>10 electric utility whose primary role is a bulk</p> <p>11 grid owner and operator. And I'd also like--</p> <p>12 because you've addressed NLH-1, 2 and 3 all in</p> <p>13 the one answer, I'd like to look at the last</p> <p>14 paragraph on page 3 of NLH-1. And I believe</p> <p>15 your response to the question indicated that</p> <p>16 you have not been involved in the design or</p> <p>17 the operations of a telecommunications system</p> <p>18 for a Canadian electrical utility or the</p> <p>19 design and operation of a power system</p> <p>20 teleprotection system or the design and</p> <p>21 operation of power line carrier technology in</p> <p>22 high voltage, is that correct?</p> <p>23 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>24 Q. Are you familiar with the nature of Hydro's</p> <p>25 operations in terms of the fact that Hydro</p>
Page 15	Page 16
<p>1 operates as an isolated integrated utility in</p> <p>2 very challenging geographical areas of the</p> <p>3 province?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>5 Q. You are familiar with -</p> <p>6 A. In general, yes, I am.</p> <p>7 Q. When you get into the operation or the design</p> <p>8 operation of the systems, is it true to say</p> <p>9 that someone would need to have knowledge of</p> <p>10 the business operation requirements as well as</p> <p>11 the environment in which they operate?</p> <p>12 A. In terms of -</p> <p>13 Q. Being able to provide an opinion with respect</p> <p>14 to whether something meets the functional</p> <p>15 requirements of the business.</p> <p>16 A. Well I'm not sure how to answer that. I think</p> <p>17 in terms of being able to evaluate the budget</p> <p>18 that they put forth, I don't think you have to</p> <p>19 have intimate knowledge of how a specific type</p> <p>20 of equipment may function, you know, in</p> <p>21 detail, I think, understanding--an</p> <p>22 understanding at a higher level should be</p> <p>23 sufficient. And that was the point that I was</p> <p>24 trying to make in answer to this, is that</p> <p>25 there are so many different aspects of</p>	<p>1 technology and functional requirements, that</p> <p>2 no one individual could possibly understand</p> <p>3 that level of detail. But that that level of</p> <p>4 detail should not be required, you know, to</p> <p>5 review a budget proposal.</p> <p>6 Q. Going back to the first page of your CV,</p> <p>7 please, Mr. O'Reilly. The very last</p> <p>8 paragraph, please, on the page. I see that</p> <p>9 you are a member of the Institute of</p> <p>10 Electrical and Electronic Engineers, is that</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, ma'am, I am.</p> <p>13 Q. Now that particular group has a number of</p> <p>14 different societies I believe they call them.</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. What specific societies are you a member of?</p> <p>17 A. Communication society.</p> <p>18 Q. Is that the only one? Are you a member of the</p> <p>19 Power Applications group, for example, or the</p> <p>20 Industry Applications Group for the electrical</p> <p>21 utilities -</p> <p>22 A. No, ma'am, I'm not. The reason I was thinking</p> <p>23 about it is that one time I was a member of</p> <p>24 the Computer society as well but I'm not sure</p> <p>25 if I stayed in that society, I may have</p>

Page 17	Page 18
<p>1 dropped it last go around.</p> <p>2 Q. Which one was that, I'm sorry, I missed -</p> <p>3 A. Computer society, computing society.</p> <p>4 Q. But your involvement is in the</p> <p>5 telecommunications groupings and not in the</p> <p>6 electrical power?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, ma'am.</p> <p>8 Q. Are you familiar with the Electric Power</p> <p>9 Research Institute?</p> <p>10 A. No, ma'am, I'm not.</p> <p>11 Q. Yesterday you made some comments with respect</p> <p>12 to SCADA to an IP network and you expressed</p> <p>13 some comments or concerns with respect to the</p> <p>14 ability of putting SCADA on an IP network, is</p> <p>15 that correct?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, I did.</p> <p>17 Q. I take it then from your previous answers</p> <p>18 that--first I should ask you, I'm sorry, are</p> <p>19 you familiar with the protocol that has been</p> <p>20 published by the Utility Communications</p> <p>21 Architecture on dealing with SCADA and IP</p> <p>22 platforms for electrical utilities?</p> <p>23 A. No, ma'am, I am not.</p> <p>24 Q. Are you familiar with the protocol established</p> <p>25 by the Electric Power Research Institute for</p>	<p>1 utility communications architecture, for</p> <p>2 putting SCADA systems in IP networks?</p> <p>3 A. No, ma'am, I'm not.</p> <p>4 Q. Are you familiar with the protocol established</p> <p>5 by the IEEE Power Engineering Society for</p> <p>6 having SCADA on IP networks?</p> <p>7 A. No, ma'am, I am not.</p> <p>8 Q. Are you familiar with the fact that there are</p> <p>9 a number of utilities who currently have SCADA</p> <p>10 and IP networks?</p> <p>11 A. No, I'm not. But as I said yesterday, you</p> <p>12 could put it on an IP network, provided that</p> <p>13 you had some kind of guarantee of assurances,</p> <p>14 quality of service, necessary response times</p> <p>15 are met. And I mentioned one way of doing</p> <p>16 that is to put those circuits on an IP network</p> <p>17 that is not going to be in competition with</p> <p>18 other administrative data and other factors.</p> <p>19 But if you're going to change protocols and</p> <p>20 use a different protocol, then you would not</p> <p>21 be using an IP protocol, would you.</p> <p>22 Q. Yes, and I guess you're not familiar with the</p> <p>23 work then that's been done by IEEE showing the</p> <p>24 cost benefits of doing that, particularly</p> <p>25 putting SCADA on IP then, are you?</p>
Page 19	Page 20
<p>1 A. No, I'm not.</p> <p>2 Q. Thank you, that concludes my questions for</p> <p>3 this witness.</p> <p>4 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>5 Q. Okay, thank you, Ms. Greene. Mr. Hayes, do</p> <p>6 you have any questions of this witness?</p> <p>7 MR. HAYES:</p> <p>8 Q. No, I don't, sir.</p> <p>9 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>10 Q. Thank you. Mr. Kennedy.</p> <p>11 MR. KENNEDY:</p> <p>12 Q. Thank you, Chair.</p> <p>13 MR. STEPHEN BARRECA CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MARK KENNEDY</p> <p>14 MR. KENNEDY:</p> <p>15 Q. Mr. Barreca, in your initial report that you</p> <p>16 filed, the one that's revised June 23, 2003.</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Down at line 22 of that page, Mr. O'Reilly.</p> <p>19 Actually, you can scroll right so you start to</p> <p>20 get to 22, yes, that's good. You state, "We</p> <p>21 recognize the difficult challenge the Board</p> <p>22 must overcome. On the one hand it would serve</p> <p>23 no one to micro manage Hydro and on the other</p> <p>24 hand, the Board must meet its legislative</p> <p>25 responsibility to review and approve Hydro's</p>	<p>1 capital program and provide regulatory</p> <p>2 oversight. In this review, I strived to avoid</p> <p>3 second guessing Hydro's decisions and limit my</p> <p>4 comments to issues relating to the Board's</p> <p>5 responsibility for informed judgment." Could</p> <p>6 you give me your general comments first on</p> <p>7 where you see the tide zone between those two</p> <p>8 concepts, one of micro managing which you seem</p> <p>9 to agree is not the role of the Board, to the</p> <p>10 regulatory oversight. And you describe it as</p> <p>11 reviewing and approving a capital program as</p> <p>12 is the subject matter in this hearing. How</p> <p>13 does the Board in an operational sense in its</p> <p>14 own operations arrive at where that spot is in</p> <p>15 a given project. Would you say it's on a</p> <p>16 project by project basis or is it a measure of</p> <p>17 an entire capital project or budget or so on?</p> <p>18 A. That's a very difficult question. It could be</p> <p>19 done on a project by project basis or possibly</p> <p>20 it could be done at a very high level looking</p> <p>21 at the overall capital budget and not</p> <p>22 reviewing specific projects. The benefit of</p> <p>23 that approach in my mind would be that it puts</p> <p>24 more of a burden on Hydro to be responsible</p> <p>25 for the prudence of its individual projects,</p>

Page 21	Page 22
<p>1 which as we've seen from the survey we tried 2 to conduct across Canada that that's typically 3 how most jurisdictions oversee the capital 4 budgeting process of the utilities is not 5 through review and approval of the specific 6 budget, but rather, allowing that issue to be 7 dealt with in a general rate case. Here in 8 Newfoundland it's unique in that there's 9 legislative responsibility or legislative 10 rules that have shifted some of that 11 responsibility to the Board. If you're 12 looking at the budget from a very high level, 13 you know, in totality, then that would be more 14 like the traditional approach of just allowing 15 it to be handled as part of the general rate 16 case process. Whereas if you're going to 17 start looking at it project by project, now I 18 think that that's where we might have some 19 problems or at least the intervenors have some 20 concerns that you can't tell from the 21 individual projects if the prudent thing is 22 being done. And if the Board is going to take 23 a look at the individual projects by project 24 and approve them individually, then the 25 burden, some of the burden or some of the</p>	<p>1 responsibility for the capital budget does 2 indeed shift to the Board, because now they 3 are approving it and so in approval of that, 4 they are giving testament to the economic 5 prudence of the project, at least to some 6 extent. So my opinion is that if you're going 7 to do it project by project, if the Board is 8 going to approve the budget project by 9 project, then we have to have some discipline 10 in regards to how the budgets are classified 11 and documented so that you indeed can make a 12 judgmental decision or an informed judgemental 13 decision as to whether or not it's prudent to 14 proceed with the capital initiative. 15 (9:34 a.m.) 16 Q. I guess, would you agree that there's at least 17 some risk inherent in reviewing Hydro's 18 capital budgets or any utility's capital 19 budgets on a project by project basis of 20 missing the forest because you're staring so 21 closely at the trees? 22 A. Absolutely. 23 Q. I'm wondering if we could just go, Mr. 24 O'Reilly, to the capital budget application 25 itself, Mr. Roberts' direct testimony, page 1,</p>
Page 23	Page 24
<p>1 line 14. Page 1, there you go, line 14, you 2 can just scroll down. Yes, that full 3 paragraph there. Mr. Barreca, this is a 4 description of the capital budget as submitted 5 by Hydro and then it breaks it down by 6 division. It's indicated here in the 7 paragraph that of the 34.5 million dollar 8 budget, line 16, there, approximately 5. 1 9 million or 15 percent of it, and I'm going to 10 abbreviate this paragraph. It's TRO--sorry 11 Hydro's--the thermal and hydro plants, so 12 generation. TRO accounts for 12.2 million or 13 35 percent and general properties is 16. 2 14 million of which 2.4 is for vehicles and then 15 the rest is the communications and IT. Okay. 16 I'm just wondering, would you see as part of 17 an analysis of the budget, it being beneficial 18 to look at the trends or percentages of 19 expenditures in a given area for the utility. 20 So, for instance, is there any rational 21 benefit achievable by looking at the splits 22 inside the budget on a per division basis 23 within a utility like this? 24 A. You mean similar to the way Mr. Roberts has - 25 Q. Yes, would that be helpful, in your view, in</p>	<p>1 an analysis of the budget's overall prudence? 2 A. I think it would be. I think if we just took 3 the classifications that Mr. Roberts has laid 4 out here and you saw historical perspective on 5 what the capital expenditures have been, I 6 think that would be helpful to the Board. If 7 you see one category jump way up or drop way 8 down, that would be a cause for concern and 9 also I think just having the historical 10 perspective there would probably in and of 11 itself result in additional documentation from 12 Hydro when there was a significant change in 13 the trends. 14 Q. So we might see, for instance, that in the 15 case of the telecommunication and IT division, 16 if you will, of the budget, that that could 17 jump in a given year as a result of a special 18 project that Hydro is undertaking, the 19 microwave interconnect or in this case, say 20 the VHF project. 21 A. Yes. 22 Q. So we have to be mindful of that as well when 23 we're looking at even an analysis from a 24 divisional level to determine the 25 reasonability of the budget.</p>

Page 25	Page 26
<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And you used the word "prudence" a number of</p> <p>3 times in your testimony. And there's a</p> <p>4 principal in regulatory oversight, regulatory</p> <p>5 principals of accounting which would imply</p> <p>6 that in certain instances the utility is</p> <p>7 afforded a presumption of prudence when it's</p> <p>8 made its decisions. I'm wondering whether, in</p> <p>9 your view, a utility such as Hydro should be</p> <p>10 given the benefit of the doubt, if you will,</p> <p>11 and that a presumption of prudence apply to</p> <p>12 its decision making, which is reviewable, but</p> <p>13 nonetheless a presumption that they've acted</p> <p>14 in a prudent manner first?</p> <p>15 A. I guess the conflict that I have in my mind</p> <p>16 again deals with the level of review and</p> <p>17 approval authority of this Board. If there</p> <p>18 was no review and approval authority of the</p> <p>19 Board, you know, I would say then by all means</p> <p>20 afford Hydro the presumption of correctness or</p> <p>21 the presumption of prudence. I'm not an</p> <p>22 expert at the legislative responsibilities</p> <p>23 that the Board has here in Newfoundland. If</p> <p>24 there is a presumption that the Board's</p> <p>25 approval is a testament to the prudence of the</p>	<p>1 project, then I think it would not be quite</p> <p>2 appropriate to afford all of the--to afford</p> <p>3 total presumption of prudence to Hydro since</p> <p>4 the Board has to make the decision. But if</p> <p>5 it's more of a review than approval</p> <p>6 responsibility of the Board, then I would lean</p> <p>7 toward giving them the presumption of</p> <p>8 prudence. So I don't know that helps.</p> <p>9 Q. You--I suggest by virtue of the difficulty in</p> <p>10 almost answering that question that it speaks</p> <p>11 to the difficulty of how far down into the</p> <p>12 trenches does the Board get when reviewing</p> <p>13 individual projects?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, it certainly does.</p> <p>15 Q. If we take, for instance, the VHF project,</p> <p>16 it's a particularly technical project?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, sir.</p> <p>18 Q. In its scope and nature?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, I would agree.</p> <p>20 Q. Clearly, trying to second guess as, to put it</p> <p>21 in your words, Hydro's decision making on a</p> <p>22 project such as B-71 would require someone</p> <p>23 with a skill set similar to your own?</p> <p>24 A. It would require someone with a skill set</p> <p>25 beyond my own.</p>
Page 27	Page 28
<p>1 Q. And if it's beyond your own, I'd suggest that</p> <p>2 it's certainly beyond mine. I can't imagine</p> <p>3 it's beyond the Panel's, but--in deference.</p> <p>4 But just foolishly thinking that it might be</p> <p>5 at a moment, clearly that makes it very</p> <p>6 difficult to conduct a meaningful project by</p> <p>7 project detailed technical analysis of</p> <p>8 anything that Hydro puts forward as part of</p> <p>9 its budget application, correct?</p> <p>10 A. I would certainly agree with that. Although,</p> <p>11 I tried not to second guess them, you know,</p> <p>12 certainly to some extent I did. But when I</p> <p>13 did, it was to make a more general point in</p> <p>14 that deals with the project descriptions in</p> <p>15 that the project descriptions, you know, in</p> <p>16 some cases there was essentially no economic</p> <p>17 justification given which, to me, you know,</p> <p>18 you're either going to approve it on blind</p> <p>19 faith, and if that be the case, then maybe we</p> <p>20 shouldn't even be here, none of us. And if</p> <p>21 the Board were to approve Hydro's budget on</p> <p>22 blind faith, perhaps that would be a way to</p> <p>23 shift all the responsibility back to them and</p> <p>24 be more consistent with the rest of the</p> <p>25 jurisdictions in Canada. However, if the</p>	<p>1 Board is going to review, then at least let's</p> <p>2 see some structure and discipline in the</p> <p>3 project, not to get into the details of second</p> <p>4 guessing them as to a central switch versus a</p> <p>5 discriminant switching architecture. I</p> <p>6 certainly don't want to do that. But perhaps</p> <p>7 if we had more consistent and maybe adopt some</p> <p>8 standards regarding the economic analysis</p> <p>9 that's provided, that would give the Board the</p> <p>10 ability to look at it, know exactly what's</p> <p>11 being done or, you know, in a general sense</p> <p>12 see the economics associated with it, afford</p> <p>13 them the presumption of correctness in their</p> <p>14 selection of alternatives in details and go</p> <p>15 ahead and approve the project. But it would</p> <p>16 also give them the ability to perhaps question</p> <p>17 some discretionary projects that are not</p> <p>18 needed to maintain the operations of the</p> <p>19 business, but they do add value to the Company</p> <p>20 and to the consumers of their system. It</p> <p>21 gives them the opportunity to look at those</p> <p>22 and if that happens to be a year when the</p> <p>23 budget is higher than the trends indicate, the</p> <p>24 question, well, maybe can we defer this one.</p> <p>25 Q. So if I gather your evidence correctly and</p>

Page 29	Page 30
<p>1 your position in general, is that your main 2 beef, if you will, with the budget application 3 as proposed, in the manner that it's proposed, 4 is that in some instances the projects cover, 5 as you've described it, both essential and 6 nonessential elements to it, aspects of an 7 overall project that you feel would be easily 8 warranted because of their essential nature 9 involving safety or reliability, for instance, 10 but that there are other aspects of the budget 11 which are more discretionary in nature and 12 that you can't sift between the two of them? 13 There's no way to separate the wheat from the 14 chaff from your perspective, because of the 15 level of documentation provided?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, sir, that's how I felt.</p> <p>17 Q. But in a project like the VHF replacement 18 project, B-71, that's not one of those 19 examples, is it? It's a case of this-- 20 there's no discretionary item in there? If 21 you take the assumption that the VHF systems 22 needs to be replaced, well, then, it's no 23 longer discretionary, so now we're dealing 24 with a particular objective that's being 25 achieved with the whole project?</p>	<p>1 A. That's correct. That one is a concise project 2 dealing with primarily non-discretionary--I 3 say primarily because the aspect of expanding 4 it could be considered discretionary, but we 5 could address that within the same project 6 with separate little, you know, economic 7 analysis or perhaps if it is a significant 8 inconvenience to the line crews maybe even 9 without economic analysis that, you know, we 10 just can't function, you know, with people on 11 the hilltops relaying calls. But that portion 12 of it is a small portion of it and that would 13 be discretionary, but the bulk of the project 14 would not be.</p> <p>15 Q. Just while we're on B-71, I asked one of the 16 Hydro witnesses about the sort of best 17 scenario thinking in the case of a project 18 involving--that's technical in nature, as is 19 B-71, and that you're always chasing the 20 technology, if you will, trying to get the 21 best price to performance ratio at the given 22 moment where you go to tender, where you 23 actually buy. So would you agree with the 24 proposition that in the case of technical 25 projects like B-71 that there needs to be</p>
Page 31	Page 32
<p>1 extra flexibility afforded to the utility so 2 that they can get the best price to 3 performance ratio at the moment that they go 4 to the supplier, that the technology is 5 changing so fast that it requires that 6 flexibility?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, I would agree with that.</p> <p>8 Q. The other question I was going to ask you is 9 that in the case of--again, using B-71, that 10 we're doing a replacement of VHF system, 11 presumably it's going to have--the new system 12 will have a expected life of something similar 13 to the existing ones, say, 15 years. This 14 also creates somewhat of a dilemma, doesn't 15 it, where you're buying technology that is 16 subject to rapid change and yet, what you're 17 buying, because of its size, scope and 18 expense, it's something that you've got to 19 live with for the next 15 years?</p> <p>20 (9:49 a.m.)</p> <p>21 A. Yes. And that's a caution and concern that I 22 personally have with this. But you know, 23 that's not reflective of anything 24 inappropriate on Hydro's part. It's just in 25 general, you know, we do have a lot of things</p>	<p>1 changing in this field, and so exactly what 2 you're saying should be a cause of concern.</p> <p>3 Q. And in that instance if I was Hydro and I was 4 looking at needing to replace my VHF system, 5 leaving everything else to the side, I could 6 try to hedge my risk on technical obsolescence 7 by leasing systems as opposed to buying 8 systems, correct?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, that's a standard consideration that most 10 people--a lot of companies look at, especially 11 in high tech areas where things are changing 12 rapidly.</p> <p>13 Q. That by leasing a system or technology, 14 whatever it is, that I'm now down loading the 15 risk of technical obsolescence on whoever 16 ultimately is the owner of that equipment?</p> <p>17 A. That's correct. And you can structure those 18 leases sometimes so that your leasing 19 capability and functionality as opposed to 20 leasing equipment and then as long as you, the 21 consumer, get the services that you desire, 22 you don't recall care how they accomplish it.</p> <p>23 Q. And so, in the case of where ownership of a 24 technology or a system is being put forward as 25 an objective, as is the case in B-71, that's</p>

Page 33	Page 34
<p>1 something that should be taken into account, 2 that the risk of technical obsolescence is 3 coming with the ownership? 4 A. Yes, sir. 5 Q. Mr. Roberts' testimony included reference to 6 using collars or financial indices for what an 7 appropriate level of a capital budget is. He 8 was cross-examined on this point by counsel 9 for the Industrial Customers. And it's 10 actually--Mr. O'Reilly, it's at page 4 of Mr. 11 Roberts' direct testimony. This is the 12 guideline that he refers to, Mr. Barreca. 13 Right there on line 1, the guideline that has 14 been used for several years is that the 15 capital program should not normally exceed 16 cash flow from operations that consist 17 primarily of net income depreciation and some 18 other non cash items. Then the target for the 19 last couple of years has been to keep our 20 capital expenditures to the level of 21 depreciation, which is 34 million for 2004. 22 He described the depreciation expense being 34 23 million and then that would be the bottom of 24 the range and then top end of the range would 25 be the net income depreciation and then some</p>	<p>1 non cash items? 2 A. Yes. But basically he's saying that the 3 target is to be internally financed. 4 Q. Correct. So would the use of such an indicia- 5 -well, let me ask you this question first. 6 Have you, in your travels, come across 7 utilities or companies in general using 8 similar indices to measure the prudence of its 9 overall capital budget? 10 A. Yes. I think as a general rule of thumb most 11 utilities that I have been acquainted with 12 over the years do consider being internally 13 financed to be an objective. As Mr. Roberts 14 pointed out, it needs to be treated as a rule 15 of thumb. There are other factors that you 16 have to consider, for instance, your past 17 depreciation rates, were they higher than they 18 should be or lower than they should be. And 19 by should be I mean were they higher than what 20 you eventually realized it should be. In 21 other words, I made my economic lives, my 22 depreciation lives, I guess at them that they 23 were--I said--I used a 12 year life and it 24 turned out the life was actually 15. Well, I 25 would have been accruing depreciation more</p>
Page 35	Page 36
<p>1 rapidly than I probably should have been. So 2 those things can influence the level of 3 depreciation, how fast you've been 4 depreciating in the past. And so, you could 5 be in a situation where your current level of 6 depreciation probably should be higher or 7 lower, and so that would influence whether or 8 not you want to--how firm that target should 9 be. In addition, you have to look at growth. 10 If you're in a growing economy requiring the 11 additions of new plant, you would expect that 12 you would out spend your depreciation, 13 assuming your current depreciation level is 14 appropriate and where it should be. Then you 15 would expect that if I'm in a high growth 16 area, that I need to--in all likelihood, I 17 would need to out spend my depreciation to 18 accommodate the new stuff, not just replace 19 the imbedded stuff. And then I think the 20 third factor that comes into play in dealing 21 with that particular target had to do with 22 technological change. If you're in an 23 industry that is facing a major technological 24 change, you may have to greatly exceed your 25 current depreciation levels or your internal</p>	<p>1 financing levels. A power utility does have 2 technological change, as we saw in all these 3 telecommunication projects. The kind of 4 technological change that I'm talking about 5 would be technological change similar to what 6 telecommunication companies faced in the early 7 90s where they had a metallic cable based 8 analog network and they had a move to a fibre 9 optics digital network, and also going from 10 narrow band demand to broadband demand. This 11 meant a major change in all of their 12 infrastructure or the vast majority of their 13 infrastructure, and that put pressure on 14 capital budgeting in that they needed to spend 15 a lot of money. I do know that the telephone 16 companies tried very hard to stay internally 17 financed, but when you're faced with that, I 18 don't know that you can. So there are factors 19 you have to consider in dealing with that 20 particular target, but in general, that is a 21 target that most utilities utilize, certainly 22 all the ones that I'm familiar with utilize, 23 and they treat it as Mr. Roberts suggested, as 24 a rule of thumb. 25 Q. So your example of a disruptive technology</p>

Page 37	Page 38
<p>1 causing stranded assets is not something that</p> <p>2 would necessarily imply (sic.) directly to</p> <p>3 Hydro except insofar as that they do have a</p> <p>4 telecommunications part of their operations,</p> <p>5 for instance?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. I guess, too, that there's in the case of a</p> <p>8 utility like Hydro, which is the main</p> <p>9 generator on the island, that sometimes</p> <p>10 generation projects such as one that's about</p> <p>11 to come on stream, Granite Canal or of such a</p> <p>12 size, that that's going to bring them, from a</p> <p>13 budgetary perspective, way offside of this</p> <p>14 rule of thumb guideline?</p> <p>15 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>16 Q. But generally, you would cotton to the idea of</p> <p>17 using financial indices of some sort in order</p> <p>18 to be able to see whether the budget is coming</p> <p>19 in at a reasonable level?</p> <p>20 A. Yes. I think it would be--it certainly would</p> <p>21 be appropriate to incorporate those type of</p> <p>22 indices into your decision making.</p> <p>23 Q. And is the one that Hydro is using, as</p> <p>24 detailed by Mr. Roberts there at page 4 of his</p> <p>25 testimony, in your view, a reasonable indicia</p>	<p>1 to use, a collar to use?</p> <p>2 A. Yes. In the context at which he said it</p> <p>3 should be considered, I would agree.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. That's all the questions I have, Chair.</p> <p>5 Thank you, Mr. Barreca.</p> <p>6 A. Thank you.</p> <p>7 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>8 Q. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Hutchings,</p> <p>9 anything on redirect?</p> <p>10 MR. STEPHEN BARRECA RE-EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY HUTCHINGS,</p> <p>11 Q.C.</p> <p>12 HUTCHINGS, Q.C.:</p> <p>13 Q. Just a couple of points, Mr. Chair. Mr.</p> <p>14 Barreca, Mr. Kennedy was asking you about the</p> <p>15 VHF project and you indicated that the bulk of</p> <p>16 that project was not in itself discretionary.</p> <p>17 Would the timing of that project be</p> <p>18 discretionary?</p> <p>19 A. Yes. Yes, the timing would be discretionary.</p> <p>20 How you achieve--how you achieve the objective</p> <p>21 would be discretionary in that you'd have to</p> <p>22 consider the alternative seeking the low cost</p> <p>23 or the most efficient alternative. I mean,</p> <p>24 that's a discretionary portion of it. But in</p> <p>25 general, the project is somewhat non-</p>
Page 39	Page 40
<p>1 discretionary in that if it needs to be done,</p> <p>2 it's critical, we have to do it.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Mr. Kennedy was asking you also about</p> <p>4 the notion of the presumption of prudence and</p> <p>5 so on, and you said that that was a concept, I</p> <p>6 think, that you had come across. Have you</p> <p>7 dealt previously with capital budgeting in a</p> <p>8 jurisdiction where the legislation required</p> <p>9 enforcement of the least cost alternative?</p> <p>10 A. I don't think so. However, I do know that in</p> <p>11 some of the jurisdictions that I was involved</p> <p>12 with when I was working at Bell South we were</p> <p>13 required, not by legislation, but by</p> <p>14 regulatory rules issued by the public service</p> <p>15 commissions to do the most economical. And</p> <p>16 so, that's somewhat related to what you're</p> <p>17 talking about. But I haven't worked with a</p> <p>18 jurisdiction that I know of where it was</p> <p>19 mandated that the least cost alternative be</p> <p>20 selected, at least not to my knowledge.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And just getting back to one point that</p> <p>22 Ms. Greene was discussing with you, there was</p> <p>23 reference to the SCADA system which I believe</p> <p>24 Mr. Downton told us was supervisory control</p> <p>25 and data acquisition. Now, is that a system</p>	<p>1 that generates or transmits electrical power</p> <p>2 or is that a communication system?</p> <p>3 A. To my knowledge, it's a communication system.</p> <p>4 Q. Yeah, that's what I thought. Thank you, sir.</p> <p>5 That's all I have, Mr. Chair.</p> <p>6 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>7 Q. Thank you, Mr. Hutchings. Mr. Martin? Mr.</p> <p>8 Powell.</p> <p>9 MR. STEPHEN BARRECA, CROSS-EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER</p> <p>10 DONALD POWELL</p> <p>11 COMMISSIONER POWELL</p> <p>12 Q. I have a couple of comments. Thank you, Mr.</p> <p>13 Barreca. Obviously a person with quite a few</p> <p>14 expertise and skills. Interested--when legal</p> <p>15 counsel was questioning our expertise in</p> <p>16 communications and technology, I was smiling</p> <p>17 to myself because my greatest fame to those</p> <p>18 expertise is that I didn't buy a Beta, I</p> <p>19 bought a VHS. And I have friends of mine that</p> <p>20 keep wondering whether I have some expertise</p> <p>21 that--it's just like trying to pick the stock</p> <p>22 market, I guess, in telecommunications. You</p> <p>23 can get a whole lot of experts to tell you</p> <p>24 where you should go and then after the fact</p> <p>25 you'll know exactly where you're going. My</p>

Page 41	Page 42
<p>1 question, like, the issue on the communication</p> <p>2 thing, this is more of a communication issue</p> <p>3 as opposed to a hydro electrical issue, is it</p> <p>4 not, the VHS (sic.) and--these things are more</p> <p>5 common to the communication industry as</p> <p>6 opposed to the part of providing--all the</p> <p>7 tools of providing least cost electricity.</p> <p>8 But the VH system, they're more of a</p> <p>9 communication issue as opposed to -</p> <p>10 A. Yes, I agree. I agree that they're more a</p> <p>11 communication issue. But as you pointed out,</p> <p>12 they are integrated into the delivery of the</p> <p>13 power services.</p> <p>14 Q. Obtaining a proper analysis of, from our</p> <p>15 perspective, the VHS--VHF system, you would</p> <p>16 seek out people with expertise in</p> <p>17 telecommunication as opposed to experts in</p> <p>18 hydroelectric?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, sir. I think it would certainly be</p> <p>20 prudent to do that.</p> <p>21 (10:04 a.m.)</p> <p>22 Q. The other area there reading through your</p> <p>23 testimony, that I gather the question is more</p> <p>24 of documentation rather than it's right or</p> <p>25 wrong or whether it--it was some question the</p>	<p>1 IRU's, I think, whether they existed, but from</p> <p>2 your perspective of the process in terms of</p> <p>3 documentation?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, sir. My principal point is a</p> <p>5 documentation issue. To be quite frank, I</p> <p>6 don't--I can't make a judgment on any of these</p> <p>7 projects, whether they're right or wrong. My</p> <p>8 main point is that in many of these projects</p> <p>9 that I looked at, I could not tell from the</p> <p>10 documentation if it was a good project or a</p> <p>11 bad one. I could not tell. In some cases</p> <p>12 there was no--very sketchy economic analysis.</p> <p>13 And in some cases I thought they were throwing</p> <p>14 out terms and stuff, internet, integrated</p> <p>15 systems or platforms, whatever, and all that</p> <p>16 sounds wonderful, but where's the beef, you</p> <p>17 know, where's the meat of it, why should I</p> <p>18 approve this expenditure? And in some cases I</p> <p>19 have very difficult--I personally had</p> <p>20 difficulty in trying to see if I was in your</p> <p>21 position, could I approve this or not. That</p> <p>22 was my beef, was primarily documentation.</p> <p>23 Q. Also I think as legal counsel just mentioned,</p> <p>24 that Hydro could have come in here and they</p> <p>25 could have laid down an awful lot of beef, to</p>
Page 43	Page 44
<p>1 use your expression, and it probably only</p> <p>2 would have confused the Panel more than it</p> <p>3 would have helped. So based on your</p> <p>4 experience, is there--and if Hydro is</p> <p>5 anticipating that problem, you know, how much</p> <p>6 sizzle and how much beef you get, would there</p> <p>7 be any group that Hydro could sent that plan</p> <p>8 off to come back and give the Board assurances</p> <p>9 that that's the way to go or is this just one</p> <p>10 of those judgmental things that we rely on</p> <p>11 their best effort and they've done their</p> <p>12 homework?</p> <p>13 A. If I understand your question, you're saying</p> <p>14 is there a group that Hydro could send their -</p> <p>15 Q. Yes.</p> <p>16 A. - project proposal to that could then go and</p> <p>17 evaluate -</p> <p>18 Q. Yeah. As respect to the telecommunication</p> <p>19 part and not the -</p> <p>20 A. No, sir -</p> <p>21 Q. Or would you always have that problem? If we</p> <p>22 could bring in five different experts and we'd</p> <p>23 get five different opinions and then we'd--</p> <p>24 faced with the dartboard mentality in the</p> <p>25 sense of -</p>	<p>1 A. Yes, just confuse the issue even more, yes.</p> <p>2 What I was trying to suggest, with respect, I</p> <p>3 was trying to suggest to the Board was that</p> <p>4 there are a couple of things the Board could</p> <p>5 do that would not necessarily overburden Hydro</p> <p>6 or the Board, especially with a lot of detail</p> <p>7 and minutia, would be to establish some</p> <p>8 classification for budget items. And I used</p> <p>9 the Manitoba, I used their three</p> <p>10 classifications. I think Mr. Roberts,</p> <p>11 although he was answering a different</p> <p>12 question, he has suggested safety is number</p> <p>13 one. I believe next was legal and</p> <p>14 legislative--legal and regulatory compliance,</p> <p>15 followed by maintaining the operations of the</p> <p>16 business. I think the last one, although he</p> <p>17 never put a term on it, I think probably was</p> <p>18 more discretionary, something along those</p> <p>19 lines as far as classification. I think in</p> <p>20 and of itself just having the classification</p> <p>21 is going to improve the documentation. But we</p> <p>22 could argument--augment that with one</p> <p>23 additional clarification in that for some of</p> <p>24 these items that are routine in nature, like</p> <p>25 handling new growth or movement of customers</p>

Page 45	Page 46
<p>1 from one area to another in the normal 2 replacement of the operations we wouldn't--the 3 Board may not require an economic analysis, 4 but maybe a historical track record of 5 movement or growth versus capital 6 expenditures. For safety and maintaining 7 legal and regulatory compliance, you don't 8 have to have an economic analysis that tells 9 you you have to do it, because we know we have 10 to do it. The only thing you have to see is 11 some support for the least cost option that 12 they've selected. And then going down the 13 list to the last one, the discretionary type 14 expenditures where it's not necessary but it 15 does improve the efficiency of the operation 16 in some way, it's additional spending so give 17 us the economic justification for making the 18 additional spending. I think those two 19 things, by having--by subdividing the projects 20 into classifications and then trying to 21 outline the type of justification that the 22 Board would like to see for each 23 classification, that would, in my mind, it 24 would greatly enhance the process without 25 putting you in a position of having to go</p>	<p>1 through all the technical details or examine 2 all the technical details and also allow you 3 not to stray too far into micro managing 4 Hydro's business, which I think would be a 5 mistake. So I think that we can do something 6 that would improve the process significantly 7 without going to the extreme of seeing all the 8 details and having to have consultants like 9 myself hired to come out here and talk to you. 10 It'd be better if you didn't have to do that, 11 and I would hope that going forward you 12 wouldn't have to. 13 Q. It's rare to find a consultant that's trying 14 to talk himself out of a job. One other item 15 there, you mentioned about adding value as an 16 issue, I can't remember what context. When 17 you used adding value, would that sort of be a 18 coverall for increasing efficiency or - 19 A. Yes, sir. In some way, shape or form you are 20 adding value to the corporation by increasing 21 efficiency or improving a process or providing 22 a higher reliability or even providing more 23 services, but in some way adding value to both 24 the Company and the consumers of their 25 services.</p>
Page 47	Page 48
<p>1 Q. Getting back to our telecommunication which 2 is--and the upgrading electric control centre 3 and other IT initiatives that's in this 4 budget, going back to my Beta/VHS, these are 5 sort of decisions sometimes you got to go 6 ahead a few years before you find out whether 7 you've gone down the right path or not. And 8 even then I probably get 100 tapes, another 9 year, I'm not going to be able to play them 10 anyway, so. By the end of the scheme of 11 things, I probably did make the right 12 decision. I should have waited 20 years and I 13 would have been up to date. So, you're always 14 going to have to make those decisions and 15 hopefully if you fall into a hole, it's not 16 too big, but given the market now from what 17 you read and being informed, probably not the 18 level that Hydro is, but low interest rate 19 environment, right time, if you had to spend 20 money beyond your depreciation model Mr. 21 Roberts suggested would be the time, would 22 appear to be the time to be doing this. The 23 tech industry is in a bit of a valley in terms 24 of--there seems to be more sellers or 25 expertise out there looking for--if you're</p>	<p>1 going to venture, you decided you have to make 2 that decision, wouldn't this be the 3 environment, taking the risk on the other side 4 that you probably would get value at a lower 5 cost than you may get, say, three or four 6 years ago when tech was booming and interest 7 rates are higher or should that matter? 8 A. Well, certainly, the interest rate, the timing 9 of a discretionary project, the interest rate 10 will impact that. I know myself I often did 11 economic analysis that solely dealt with the 12 timing of the discretionary project. Do I do 13 it today, tomorrow, five years from now? And 14 if the interest rate change, then the outcome 15 of that analysis would change, moving the 16 project either forward or backward in time. 17 So, the interest rate certainly plays into the 18 timing of discretionary projects. It's a 19 little more difficult in dealing with the 20 technological issue. Certain aspects of 21 telecommunications, the market is certain 22 depressed. There are indications that we're 23 moving out of that, but it's certain depressed 24 or has been for the last three years. 25 However, even though the market for services</p>

Page 49	Page 50
<p>1 has been depressed, the technologies have been</p> <p>2 evolving just as rapidly during the depressed</p> <p>3 period as they did prior to it. So, as far as</p> <p>4 timing to take advantage of technological</p> <p>5 issues, I don't know that this is any better</p> <p>6 time than any other time. It's a tough one</p> <p>7 that you have to deal with. I think, you</p> <p>8 know, the important considerations for a</p> <p>9 utility like Hydro, I think, is don't bet on</p> <p>10 proven technologies. Even to the point that</p> <p>11 you might spend a little bit more. I would</p> <p>12 tend to lean toward getting the newest proven</p> <p>13 technology. And that technology should be in</p> <p>14 service, should be operating at more than just</p> <p>15 one or two places so that you are confident</p> <p>16 that what you buy, even though it may be</p> <p>17 obsolete five years from now, but that what</p> <p>18 I'm buying is going to work and provide the</p> <p>19 functionality I need for the next 15 years or</p> <p>20 whatever the life cycle is going to be. So, I</p> <p>21 think it's a rule of thumb in a utility like</p> <p>22 Hydro, you wouldn't want to get on the leading</p> <p>23 edge. We used to use a term, the bleeding</p> <p>24 edge. If you want to be first with the latest</p> <p>25 and greatest, you're going to pay a price;</p>	<p>1 you're going to pay a price in service; you're</p> <p>2 going to pay a higher price in maintenance</p> <p>3 because the new technology always has bugs;</p> <p>4 you're going to pay a price in cost and other</p> <p>5 factors. So, you don't want to be on the</p> <p>6 bleeding edge, you don't want to be too far</p> <p>7 behind, but you want to buy the latest proven</p> <p>8 technology, I think, is a general rule of</p> <p>9 thumb.</p> <p>10 Q. My VHS system cost me almost \$2,000.00. Thank</p> <p>11 you.</p> <p>12 A. I bought a camera that cost \$1,500.00, it's a</p> <p>13 very nice digital camera and the very next</p> <p>14 year it was a \$1,000.00 cheaper.</p> <p>15 Q. That's all, Chair.</p> <p>16 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CHAIRMAN</p> <p>17 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>18 Q. Okay, thank you, Mr. Powell. Mr. Barreca, in</p> <p>19 relation to the plan of Hydro which is</p> <p>20 basically stated in B71 and the VHF and mobile</p> <p>21 radio system. That is, I guess, primarily the</p> <p>22 reason you're here as opposed to the other</p> <p>23 elements of this budget, would that be a fair</p> <p>24 statement on my part?</p> <p>25 A. I don't know that. I was asked to consider</p>
Page 51	Page 52
<p>1 all the IS&T projects and when they gave me</p> <p>2 the material, the VHS wasn't even mentioned.</p> <p>3 As a matter of fact, I was hesitant to even</p> <p>4 take the assignment, told them they needed to</p> <p>5 go find a consultant with more utility</p> <p>6 experience than myself, but I did agree to</p> <p>7 look it over, over a weekend, and respond back</p> <p>8 to them on the following Monday. And I don't</p> <p>9 recall the VHS project being mentioned at all.</p> <p>10 (10:19 a.m.)</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Well then, that we're on the subject,</p> <p>12 in relation to the project and bearing in mind</p> <p>13 what you're expertise has been, do you have</p> <p>14 any comment in respect of the age of the</p> <p>15 system that Hydro has in place right now and</p> <p>16 the condition of it? Have you any familiarity</p> <p>17 with that at all?</p> <p>18 A. Yes and no, I'm not that familiar with VHS,</p> <p>19 mobile radio systems.</p> <p>20 Q. But you're only familiar with respect to the</p> <p>21 record that we have, the evidence that's been</p> <p>22 -</p> <p>23 A. Yes, I am.</p> <p>24 Q. Yes, you haven't done any examination of the</p> <p>25 system outside of what's taken place here in</p>	<p>1 this room?</p> <p>2 A. No sir, I haven't. It's a telecommunication</p> <p>3 system with switching equipment, controllers,</p> <p>4 repeaters. It's not totally foreign to me.</p> <p>5 You'd be surprised how common the life cycles</p> <p>6 are between this type of equipment and other</p> <p>7 types of telecommunication equipment. So,</p> <p>8 insofar as the age, the equipment is aged,</p> <p>9 there's no doubt about it. It's near at its</p> <p>10 average life expectancy. As I've noted, that</p> <p>11 doesn't necessarily mean that you need to</p> <p>12 replace the whole thing, but then it doesn't</p> <p>13 mean that you don't need to replace the whole</p> <p>14 thing. Certainly you had need to take a look</p> <p>15 at that.</p> <p>16 Q. And when you talk about and this, I think, was</p> <p>17 in response to a question on re-direct by Mr.</p> <p>18 Hutchings, that timing would be discretionary</p> <p>19 in relation to this project. What did you</p> <p>20 mean by that?</p> <p>21 A. What I meant was that we had, in my</p> <p>22 discussions, questioning, earlier I had</p> <p>23 conceded that it appears this is not a</p> <p>24 discretionary project in that it needs to be</p> <p>25 done, but the timing of what needs to be done</p>

Page 53	Page 54
<p>1 is discretionary in the sense of, do I need to 2 replace the whole thing now. Do I need to 3 replace the switching controllers, one or two 4 repeaters now or do I need to replace the 5 whole thing now or maybe not do nothing now 6 and replace the whole thing in 2005. That's 7 what I meant by the timing is somewhat 8 discretionary.</p> <p>9 Q. So, Hydro has determined, in their judgment 10 that the system should be replaced now. Do 11 you have any comment on that decision by 12 Hydro?</p> <p>13 A. I guess my concern would deal with replacing 14 all the repeater equipment, even though the 15 repeaters are near the end of their or at the 16 end of the average life, that doesn't 17 necessarily mean that many of those repeaters 18 could not provide adequate functional service 19 for another ten years. If you're going to 20 totally change the architectures, as they're 21 suggesting may be done, and it forces you to 22 replace all the repeaters, then you're 23 spending all of the money up front. If you 24 were to maintain the same or similar 25 architecture, you could effectively replace</p>	<p>1 the components that are defective now and 2 possibly defer replacement of other components 3 until you had an indication that they needed 4 to be replaced, however long into the future 5 that was going to be. And so in that context, 6 I do have some concerns about the whole thing 7 now. I wasn't convinced in reading it that 8 they had made a case, a strong case for 9 replacing it all now. I just don't know. It 10 may be that that is what needs to be done, I 11 just don't know.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Barreca.</p> <p>13 A. Thank you, sir.</p> <p>14 Q. Ms. Greene, any questions arising?</p> <p>15 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. No, Mr. Chair. Thank you.</p> <p>17 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>18 Q. Mr. Hayes?</p> <p>19 MR. HAYES:</p> <p>20 Q. No, Mr. Chair.</p> <p>21 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>22 Q. Mr. Kennedy?</p> <p>23 MR. KENNEDY:</p> <p>24 Q. No, Chair.</p> <p>25 CHAIRMAN:</p>
Page 55	Page 56
<p>1 Q. Mr. Hutchings?</p> <p>2 MR. HUTCHINGS:</p> <p>3 Q. I have nothing further, thank you, Mr. 4 Chairman.</p> <p>5 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>6 Q. Thank you, Mr. Barreca.</p> <p>7 A. Thank you for allowing me to speak before that 8 Board.</p> <p>9 Q. We appreciate your testimony and it's been 10 very informative and very enlightening and 11 certainly gave us a lot of food for thought.</p> <p>12 A. Thank you, sir.</p> <p>13 Q. Thank you.</p> <p>14 A. I hope I get to come back here perhaps under a 15 better circumstance.</p> <p>16 Q. Thank you. If you stay around for the rest of 17 the week, you might see the caplin rolling 18 down in Middle Cove. That's an experience in 19 itself.</p> <p>20 MS. HENLEY ANDREWS:</p> <p>21 Q. And that much more fog.</p> <p>22 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>23 Q. That's right. It's 10:25, a good place to 24 probably do some kind of assessment of where 25 we are. You have a panel to call consisting</p>	<p>1 of Mr. Reeves and Mr. Martin, both of them are 2 here?</p> <p>3 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>4 Q. Yes.</p> <p>5 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>6 Q. We'll now break for 15 minutes and that will 7 give you an opportunity to set up the room for 8 that. It looks probably that we may very well 9 finish this by 1:30, is that a likelihood or 10 am I being too optimistic.</p> <p>11 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. That's possibly doable, probably doable.</p> <p>13 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>14 Q. Okay.</p> <p>15 MR. KENNEDY:</p> <p>16 Q. If you're not optimistic, Chair, then it's not 17 hope for the rest of us to be.</p> <p>18 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>19 Q. Well, let's aim at that and if we're going to 20 have some difficulty, we'll know about it 21 around 1:00 and then we'll deal with it.</p> <p>22 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. Yes.</p> <p>24 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>25 Q. Thank you. 15 minutes.</p>

Page 57	Page 58
<p>1 (BREAK - 10:25 A.M.)</p> <p>2 (RESUME - 10:44 a.m.)</p> <p>3 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>4 Q. Okay, Ms. Greene, are you ready to proceed?</p> <p>5 I'll swear in the panel.</p> <p>6 MR. FRED MARTIN (SWORN)</p> <p>7 MR. DAVID REEVES (SWORN)</p> <p>8 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>9 Q. Thank you. Ms. Greene.</p> <p>10 EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY MAUREEN GREENE, Q.C.</p> <p>11 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>12 Q. Thank you. Mr. Reeves, what is your current</p> <p>13 position with Hydro and what are the</p> <p>14 responsibilities of that position?</p> <p>15 MR. REEVES:</p> <p>16 A. My current position with Hydro is the Vice-</p> <p>17 president of Transmission and Rural</p> <p>18 Operations. I have responsibility for the</p> <p>19 operations, the engineering and the corporate</p> <p>20 environment as well. Under operations, I have</p> <p>21 responsibility for the three regions which</p> <p>22 span the full province, right from on the</p> <p>23 island and in Labrador, and they have</p> <p>24 responsibility for the transmission lines, the</p> <p>25 distribution lines, the standby generation and</p>	<p>1 the isolated diesel plants.</p> <p>2 Q. How long have you been in your current</p> <p>3 position?</p> <p>4 A. I've been in my current position approximately</p> <p>5 eight years.</p> <p>6 Q. How long have you been with Hydro?</p> <p>7 A. I've been with Hydro in excess of thirty-one</p> <p>8 years.</p> <p>9 Q. And what positions have you held prior to your</p> <p>10 current position?</p> <p>11 A. Back in 1972, when I joined Hydro, I was a</p> <p>12 graduate engineer in a two-year training</p> <p>13 program. I moved to Bay D'Espoir where I</p> <p>14 eventually became the plant superintendent,</p> <p>15 which is the equivalent to manager today,</p> <p>16 where I had responsibility for hydro</p> <p>17 generation. In 1985, I went to Churchill</p> <p>18 Falls as a vice-president of operations and</p> <p>19 engineering. And in 1991, I moved back to St.</p> <p>20 John's as the vice-president of engineering</p> <p>21 and construction, and other duties. And in</p> <p>22 1995, I became in my current position.</p> <p>23 Q. And, Mr. Reeves, you've appeared before this</p> <p>24 Board on a number of occasions? Is that</p> <p>25 correct?</p>
Page 59	Page 60
<p>1 A. That's correct. For a number of Capital</p> <p>2 hearings and also for the last General Rate</p> <p>3 Application.</p> <p>4 Q. And I understand unfortunately this'll be your</p> <p>5 last appearance before the Board, at least for</p> <p>6 Hydro?</p> <p>7 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And that is because you've submitted your -</p> <p>9 A. I've submitted my resignation and I'm retiring</p> <p>10 the end of July.</p> <p>11 Q. And in fact, agreed to extend for this hearing</p> <p>12 at my request.</p> <p>13 A. Yes. I was debating whether it was June, but</p> <p>14 I extended to July.</p> <p>15 Q. When the hearing got postponed. Mr. Martin,</p> <p>16 what is your current position with Hydro?</p> <p>17 MR. MARTIN:</p> <p>18 A. I am currently the Director of Engineering and</p> <p>19 Transmission and Rural Operations.</p> <p>20 Q. And what are the responsibilities of that</p> <p>21 position?</p> <p>22 A. My group is responsible for the design,</p> <p>23 construction, and ongoing technical support of</p> <p>24 all of Hydro's transmission, distribution and</p> <p>25 generation systems, diesel generation. We are</p>	<p>1 also responsible for revenue metering</p> <p>2 activities and corporate drafting services.</p> <p>3 Q. How long have you been in your current</p> <p>4 position?</p> <p>5 A. I've been the Director of Engineering for</p> <p>6 seven and a half years.</p> <p>7 Q. How long have you been with Hydro?</p> <p>8 A. I've been with Hydro almost twenty-nine years.</p> <p>9 Q. And what positions have you held prior to your</p> <p>10 current position?</p> <p>11 A. I started as plant engineer in Bay D'Espoir in</p> <p>12 1971. From there I went to the Protection and</p> <p>13 Control Department in Bishop Falls. From</p> <p>14 there I became plant engineer at the Holyrood</p> <p>15 Thermal Generating Station. I've been the</p> <p>16 Senior Protection and Control Engineer in both</p> <p>17 the operations and engineering divisions. In</p> <p>18 1988, I became the manager of telecontrol, and</p> <p>19 in November, 1995, I took the position of</p> <p>20 Director of Engineering.</p> <p>21 Q. And in August 1 of this year, you will assume,</p> <p>22 be promoted to Mr. Reeves' current position?</p> <p>23 Is that correct?</p> <p>24 A. Please God, I will.</p> <p>25 Q. So the Board will see you on future occasions?</p>

Page 61	Page 62
<p>1 A. I hope so.</p> <p>2 Q. Mr. Reeves, specifically looking at the 2004</p> <p>3 Capital Budget, Mr. O'Reilly, if we could</p> <p>4 bring up page A-1 on the screen, please. On</p> <p>5 page A-1, there's a high level summary of the</p> <p>6 2004 Capital Budget. Mr. Reeves, could you</p> <p>7 indicate what are the areas of responsibility</p> <p>8 shown on page A-1 that you are responsible</p> <p>9 for?</p> <p>10 MR. REEVES:</p> <p>11 A. I have responsibility for the transmission and</p> <p>12 rural operations, a budget of \$12.1 million in</p> <p>13 2004. Also, under general properties, it's</p> <p>14 not broken out here, but it will be later, I</p> <p>15 have responsibility for the vehicles of \$2. 2</p> <p>16 million of the \$16.2 million.</p> <p>17 Q. Now if we turn to page A-2 of the Application,</p> <p>18 is it correct, Mr. Reeves, that you are</p> <p>19 responsible for all the headings shown under</p> <p>20 the main heading of Transmission and Rural</p> <p>21 Operations?</p> <p>22 A. That's correct.</p> <p>23 Q. Totally \$12.1 million, \$12.2 million?</p> <p>24 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Now if we could turn to page A-3? What</p>	<p>1 heading are you responsible for on page A-3,</p> <p>2 Mr. Reeves?</p> <p>3 A. I'm partially responsible under the heading of</p> <p>4 administrative, the \$2.3 million. Vehicles is</p> <p>5 a portion of that of \$2.2 million.</p> <p>6 Q. Mr. Reeves, in section B to the Application,</p> <p>7 project justifications are provided for</p> <p>8 projects over \$50,000 that are in the areas of</p> <p>9 responsibility that we just reviewed. Were</p> <p>10 those project justifications prepared under</p> <p>11 your direction?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, they were.</p> <p>13 Q. And do you accept these as evidence for the</p> <p>14 purposes of the hearing?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>16 Q. Pre-filed evidence was filed for the</p> <p>17 transmission and rural operations panel in May</p> <p>18 of 2003. Do you accept that as your evidence</p> <p>19 for the purpose of this hearing, Mr. Reeves?</p> <p>20 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>21 Q. Mr. Martin, were you involved in the project</p> <p>22 justifications provided in Section B of the</p> <p>23 Application for those projects within</p> <p>24 transmission and rural operations?</p> <p>25 MR. MARTIN:</p>
Page 63	Page 64
<p>1 A. Yes, I was.</p> <p>2 Q. And do you accept those as your evidence for</p> <p>3 the purpose of this hearing?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>5 Q. And similarly, with respect to the pre-filed</p> <p>6 evidence, was this prepared with your input</p> <p>7 and direction?</p> <p>8 A. It was.</p> <p>9 Q. And do you accept this evidence as your</p> <p>10 evidence for the purposes of the hearing?</p> <p>11 A. I do.</p> <p>12 Q. Mr. Reeves, I wonder if you could briefly</p> <p>13 outline what is your role as a vice-president</p> <p>14 of transmission and rural operations in the</p> <p>15 Capital Budget process at Hydro, up to the</p> <p>16 approval stage and then after, once it's</p> <p>17 approved by this Board?</p> <p>18 MR. REEVES:</p> <p>19 A. The Capital Budget process starts in the</p> <p>20 regions and in engineering and also in</p> <p>21 planning with respect to our projects. The</p> <p>22 projects are developed either by asset</p> <p>23 managers or engineers for improvements related</p> <p>24 to reliability, safety, and they bring forward</p> <p>25 those to their regional managers or to the</p>	<p>1 Director of Engineering. It is reviewed at</p> <p>2 that point in time and the information is then</p> <p>3 consolidated and it is reviewed by myself and</p> <p>4 our directors in TRO, and we go through all of</p> <p>5 the projects to determine which ones we will</p> <p>6 bring to management. These are all then</p> <p>7 consolidated as part of the Hydro budget and</p> <p>8 it is presented to management and I, along</p> <p>9 with my staff, support, justify these to</p> <p>10 management, and as I said a second ago, these</p> <p>11 are based on safety, environmental,</p> <p>12 reliability and possibly cost effectiveness,</p> <p>13 if there are any that apply.</p> <p>14 Q. And once the budget is approved, what will be</p> <p>15 your role?</p> <p>16 A. Our role, once the budget is approved, is to</p> <p>17 ensure that these projects are implemented as</p> <p>18 they are recommended and that the dollars are</p> <p>19 spent accordingly as we're approved.</p> <p>20 Q. And Mr. Martin, as director of engineering,</p> <p>21 what role did you play in the preparation of</p> <p>22 the 2004 Capital Budget?</p> <p>23 MR. MARTIN:</p> <p>24 A. In addition to, as Mr. Reeves said, developing</p> <p>25 some of the actual proposals themselves, my</p>

Page 65	Page 66
<p>1 group is responsible for preparing the Capital</p> <p>2 Cost estimates, the cash flow schedules and so</p> <p>3 on, as well as looking at any potential</p> <p>4 alternative there may have been to the</p> <p>5 project. I am then responsible with the</p> <p>6 review of the overall budget package with the</p> <p>7 regional managers and Mr. Reeves prior to it</p> <p>8 going to the management committee for</p> <p>9 approval.</p> <p>10 Q. Turning now then to page A-6 please of the</p> <p>11 Capital Budget application, Mr. O'Reilly.</p> <p>12 There are two projects there under</p> <p>13 transmission. The first, upgrade TL-214 in an</p> <p>14 amount requested for 2004 of \$2.8 million. I</p> <p>15 wonder, Mr. Martin, if you could give a brief</p> <p>16 overview of that project please?</p> <p>17 A. Yes. This is a project that we intend to</p> <p>18 undertake to resolve significant problems that</p> <p>19 we've assessed with transmission line TL-214.</p> <p>20 It's a 138 kV line that goes from Bottom Brook</p> <p>21 Terminal Station to the DoYLES, Port aux</p> <p>22 Basque area. An assessment that was completed</p> <p>23 in 2002 indicated there were problems with the</p> <p>24 original design because of the criteria that</p> <p>25 had been used. This project will resolve</p>	<p>1 those problems by installing mid-span</p> <p>2 structures, looking at putting in extra creep</p> <p>3 insulators in areas where we anticipate salt</p> <p>4 contamination and replacing the CLB insulators</p> <p>5 that we've had a universal problem with in the</p> <p>6 electrical utility industry because of the</p> <p>7 cement growth problem.</p> <p>8 Q. The second project, under the same heading, is</p> <p>9 replace insulators on TL-233 in the amount of</p> <p>10 \$1 million for 2004. Could you please briefly</p> <p>11 describe that project, Mr. Martin?</p> <p>12 A. This is again a project to address the</p> <p>13 insulator growth problem that we've</p> <p>14 experienced with CLB insulators. It's the</p> <p>15 second last of our 230 kV circuits that have</p> <p>16 these insulators installed on them, and it's</p> <p>17 our intention to replace those next year under</p> <p>18 this Capital Budget.</p> <p>19 Q. Turning now to page A-7 of the Application,</p> <p>20 under the heading of Distribution, the first</p> <p>21 project there is provide service extensions in</p> <p>22 the amount of \$1.6 million for 2004. Mr.</p> <p>23 Reeves, could you please briefly outline what</p> <p>24 this project is?</p> <p>25 MR. REEVES:</p>
Page 67	Page 68
<p>1 A. Yes, this is a recurring project that we've</p> <p>2 had in our budget forever, I guess, it's to</p> <p>3 look after the low growth that we have in our</p> <p>4 rural systems. It's for new customers,</p> <p>5 service extensions and street lighting.</p> <p>6 Q. The next one there is upgrade distribution</p> <p>7 systems in the amount of \$1.5 million for</p> <p>8 2004. Is this a similar type project to the</p> <p>9 one you just described on service extensions?</p> <p>10 A. That's correct. This is again a recurring one</p> <p>11 and it's to look after the replacement of</p> <p>12 equipment that we find to be defective during</p> <p>13 our maintenance inspections, either</p> <p>14 deteriorated poles, damaged conductors. It's</p> <p>15 also used after say lightning storms to</p> <p>16 replace transformers which are abnormally--</p> <p>17 sorry, which are replaced due to higher than</p> <p>18 normal failure rates.</p> <p>19 Q. The next project there under distribution is</p> <p>20 pole replacement of just under a million</p> <p>21 dollars for next year, in 2004. Mr. Martin,</p> <p>22 could you describe that project please?</p> <p>23 MR. MARTIN:</p> <p>24 A. Yes. This is a project that's intended to</p> <p>25 replace approximately 250 distribution poles</p>	<p>1 on two of our distribution systems, namely at</p> <p>2 Bottom Waters and the St. Anthony system.</p> <p>3 These have been identified through our</p> <p>4 preventative maintenance program as requiring</p> <p>5 replacement next year, and that's what that</p> <p>6 particular budget proposal covers.</p> <p>7 Q. The last project on that page that I'd like to</p> <p>8 ask you about is the next one, insulator</p> <p>9 replacement for \$945,000 for 2004. Mr.</p> <p>10 Martin, could you describe that project</p> <p>11 please?</p> <p>12 A. Yes. Again, this is a project that's intended</p> <p>13 to replace the CLB problem insulators that we</p> <p>14 have on three distribution systems, namely at</p> <p>15 Bottom Brook, Fleur de Lys and South Brook.</p> <p>16 Q. If we could now please turn to page A-10 of</p> <p>17 the Application? Under the heading of</p> <p>18 administrative, there are two projects</p> <p>19 described as replace vehicles, one for 2003</p> <p>20 and one for 2004. Mr. Reeves, could you</p> <p>21 please give an overview of the vehicle</p> <p>22 replacement program as described there?</p> <p>23 MR. REEVES:</p> <p>24 A. Yes. First of all, I guess, what we call</p> <p>25 2003, this was presented to the Board last</p>

1 year and it was to look after expenditure in
2 2003, this year, for the vehicles that we
3 could tender and purchase in this year. It
4 was also to look after the vehicles that we
5 would tender this year, but because of long
6 delivery times, could not be received until
7 next year. So that's the portion in 2004 of
8 \$1.1 million. So that's the first one. The
9 item which is titled 2004 is the same
10 principle, but what we have in 2004 is the
11 vehicles that we plan to buy next year, the
12 ones that we can tender next year and to buy
13 next year, and the second part of that is in
14 2005 is for the longer delivery vehicles which
15 we will tender for next year and not have
16 delivery until the following year.
17 (10:59 a.m.)

18 Q. So I understood from your answer that because
19 of long delivery times, you have to make a
20 commitment in one year with the vehicle not
21 arriving until the next year? Is that
22 correct?

23 A. That's correct, yes.

24 Q. And what type of vehicles would they be?

25 A. They would be typically our larger vehicles,

1 like our line trucks, which are not off the
2 assembly lines and that type of vehicle.
3 Q. Thank you. That concludes my direct
4 examination of the panel.

5 CHAIRMAN:

6 Q. Okay. Thank you, Ms. Greene. Mr. Hayes?

7 MR. HAYES:

8 Q. I have no questions, Mr. Chair.

9 CHAIRMAN:

10 Q. Thank you. Mr. Hutchings or Ms. Henley
11 Andrews?

12 HUTCHINGS, Q.C.:

13 Q. We'll be splitting this again, Mr. Chair.

14 I'll have a few questions on general matters
15 and Ms. Henley Andrews will be dealing with
16 the last couple of projects involving vehicles
17 that Mr. Reeves just spoke to.

18 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY JOSEPH HUTCHINGS, Q.C.

19 HUTCHINGS, Q.C.:

20 Q. Good morning.

21 MR. MARTIN:

22 A. Good morning.

23 MR. REEVES:

24 A. Good morning.

25 Q. I think Mr. Martin probably spoke to this

1 project and I just have a few questions on
2 B27, and this deals with the issue with the
3 CLB insulators.

4 MR. MARTIN:

5 A. Right.

6 Q. If I understand correctly from the operating
7 experience information that's here, you have a
8 preventative maintenance program which goes
9 out and tests these devices and it is this
10 testing that has shown up the four percent in
11 2000 and six percent in 2001 as defective? Is
12 that correct?

13 A. That is correct.

14 Q. Okay. Have there been any actual failures?

15 A. Of insulators on that line?

16 Q. Yes.

17 A. Yes, there have.

18 Q. Okay. And what does that entail if there is,
19 in fact, a failure?

20 A. If there are individual failures and they're
21 found before they become a problem in a
22 particular insulator stream, there is probably
23 no problem. The problem is if you get a
24 couple of these insulators that fail during
25 switching or lightning or any other high

1 voltage activity, you could have a flash over
2 of the insulator stream and a trip or failure
3 of the line.

4 Q. Okay. And has any such incident occurred to
5 date?

6 A. I'm sure there was incidents that happened.

7 Our performance on that particular line to
8 date has been very good. The budget is based
9 on the fact that we have seen increasing
10 failure rates of individual insulators and
11 we're trying to be proactive here to rectify a
12 problem that we know is going to become a
13 major issue and result in major outages to
14 that line.

15 Q. So in order to have a significant impact from
16 a failure, I take it you would have to have
17 failures in two adjoining insulators? Is that
18 what you're telling me?

19 A. Not necessarily adjoining, no.

20 Q. But close to one another?

21 A. Well, in the string.

22 Q. Okay. And when you say a string, how many
23 insulators are in the string?

24 A. Thirteen insulators. On a 230 kV system,
25 typically there's thirteen insulators in a

Page 73	Page 74
<p>1 string.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And how many insulators are we</p> <p>3 replacing here?</p> <p>4 A. We're replacing approximately 15,000.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. In this project or all -</p> <p>6 A. No, in this project.</p> <p>7 Q. Just in this project?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. So 15,000 insulators and you would have to</p> <p>10 have a failure within a string of thirteen in</p> <p>11 order to cause a significant problem on the</p> <p>12 system, two failures?</p> <p>13 A. Yes. Well, I would say two or more, yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Yes.</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay.</p> <p>17 A. The problem that we've noticed in our</p> <p>18 preventative maintenance program is that we</p> <p>19 are obviously seeing an increasing failure</p> <p>20 rate overall, but we're actually finding</p> <p>21 failed discs now where insulators themselves,</p> <p>22 in strings that we've tested before and</p> <p>23 replaced other discs in. So it is apparent</p> <p>24 that this is becoming an increasingly</p> <p>25 significant problem, and we want to try to be</p>	<p>1 proactive on this before we start tripping</p> <p>2 this 230 kV line unnecessarily.</p> <p>3 Q. Yes. I'm sorry, I didn't quite follow your</p> <p>4 reference to the disc. You say some lines on</p> <p>5 which the insulators have already been</p> <p>6 replaced have shown up -</p> <p>7 A. On some strings. On this particular line, we</p> <p>8 have found insulators that have already failed</p> <p>9 that we've replaced. Other insulators in the</p> <p>10 string that were good at the time, over the</p> <p>11 last five years, they themselves have failed.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay.</p> <p>13 A. In that same string. When I say a disc, I'm</p> <p>14 referring to an individual insulator, in that</p> <p>15 string of insulators.</p> <p>16 Q. So in this group of 50,000 insulators that</p> <p>17 we're talking about -</p> <p>18 A. I'm sorry, it's 15,000.</p> <p>19 Q. - 15,000, I'm sorry, yes, 15,000. In the</p> <p>20 group of 15,000 insulators that we're talking</p> <p>21 about, you have--if your program is correct,</p> <p>22 you're showing a potential, if we have six</p> <p>23 percent, then that's potential of 900</p> <p>24 defective insulators in the 15,000?</p> <p>25 A. That are defective right now?</p>
Page 75	Page 76
<p>1 Q. Yes. Assuming that -</p> <p>2 A. No, not necessarily.</p> <p>3 Q. No.</p> <p>4 A. I can't say that for sure, no.</p> <p>5 Q. No, no. But you did your testing and you came</p> <p>6 up with six percent defective?</p> <p>7 A. Overall.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay.</p> <p>9 A. Out of that sample of about 2,000 insulators</p> <p>10 that we tested.</p> <p>11 Q. Right.</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. So if you applied that percentage to all the</p> <p>14 ones that are being replaced now, you'd have</p> <p>15 potentially 900?</p> <p>16 A. Sure.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. Out of--900 insulators out of 11 or</p> <p>18 1200 strings, I guess, of 13?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, sure.</p> <p>20 Q. So have you worked out the probability of</p> <p>21 there being two defective insulators in a</p> <p>22 string?</p> <p>23 A. No, we have not.</p> <p>24 Q. All right. If we could look for a moment then</p> <p>25 to B29, and this is the project that deals</p>	<p>1 with the protection on the transmission lines</p> <p>2 on the west coast, and we're moving here from</p> <p>3 an electromechanical device to an electronic</p> <p>4 device. Is that fair?</p> <p>5 A. That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Are you aware of other people who</p> <p>7 operate transmission lines in the province</p> <p>8 using the same electromechanical devices on</p> <p>9 their lines?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, and we do as well.</p> <p>11 Q. Yes, okay. And how is it that this project</p> <p>12 now, at this date, has a requirement to</p> <p>13 proceed in the year 2004?</p> <p>14 A. What we've experienced with these 30-year-old</p> <p>15 relays is a problem with calibration. We've</p> <p>16 had, I believe, ten trips, inadvertent trips</p> <p>17 of these relays, misoperation of these relays</p> <p>18 in the last nine years that have resulted in</p> <p>19 outages. We have been having an extensive</p> <p>20 program over the last several years of trying</p> <p>21 to upgrade our protection and control systems</p> <p>22 from the old electromechanical type relays to</p> <p>23 state of the art, solid state or</p> <p>24 microprocessor based relays, and this is an</p> <p>25 ongoing part of that initiative, to try and</p>

Page 77	Page 78
<p>1 keep improving and updating the protection and</p> <p>2 control systems on our network.</p> <p>3 Q. Are you planning to remove the existing ones</p> <p>4 or will you leave those on as backup?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, we will. They will be removed.</p> <p>6 Q. They'll be removed?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Has there been a pattern to these failures</p> <p>9 that you've referred to over the past nine</p> <p>10 years? Are they equally spread out over the</p> <p>11 past number of years?</p> <p>12 A. I honestly can't speak to that. I know we</p> <p>13 have had incidents within the last couple of</p> <p>14 years where we had misoperation of these</p> <p>15 relays. But to give you a feel and a sense</p> <p>16 for exactly when each of these happened, I</p> <p>17 really don't know that.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. So there's no indication that the</p> <p>19 situation is getting worse, is it?</p> <p>20 A. I don't have any information to arrive at that</p> <p>21 conclusion.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Turning to B30, this is the replacement</p> <p>23 of the digital fault recorder in Bay D'Espoir.</p> <p>24 The operating experience simply indicates that</p> <p>25 there are continuing problems with the</p>	<p>1 operation of the unit?</p> <p>2 A. That's right.</p> <p>3 Q. What's been the nature of these problems?</p> <p>4 A. The problem is that this particular technology</p> <p>5 has individual adjustments for each of the</p> <p>6 analog inputs, the voltages and currents into</p> <p>7 the unit, and our experience recently, and</p> <p>8 over the last several years, is that these</p> <p>9 keep continually drifting off calibration.</p> <p>10 The other problem that we've had is numerous</p> <p>11 times when we've required this thing to</p> <p>12 operate, it may operate, it may not. Many</p> <p>13 times when it does operate, we only get</p> <p>14 partial information, either pre-fault, fault</p> <p>15 or post fault, and you need all three bits of</p> <p>16 information to do a proper analysis of the</p> <p>17 system disturbance so that you can try and</p> <p>18 ascertain what happened.</p> <p>19 Q. The next project is B31, which involves the</p> <p>20 motor drive mechanisms on the disconnect</p> <p>21 switches, and I believe we had some of those</p> <p>22 last year as well, didn't we?</p> <p>23 A. We are doing the first phase this year, yes.</p> <p>24 Q. You've identified a potential safety issue</p> <p>25 here with respect to the operation of this</p>
Page 79	Page 80
<p>1 switch. Would these switches be used both for</p> <p>2 live wire and live line and dead line</p> <p>3 switching?</p> <p>4 A. These switches are basically used for the</p> <p>5 isolation of a breaker. So when a breaker is</p> <p>6 taken out of service for maintenance, for</p> <p>7 argument sake, the breaker is tripped to break</p> <p>8 the load.</p> <p>9 Q. Right.</p> <p>10 A. Or de-energize the line, if you will. The</p> <p>11 disconnection on both sides of the switch are</p> <p>12 then--or the breaker, are then opened to</p> <p>13 isolate the breaker, so our personnel can go</p> <p>14 in and work on the breaker in a de-energized</p> <p>15 state. The line is typically taken out of</p> <p>16 service then as well, in the case of a load</p> <p>17 bus. In a ring bus, you could isolate that</p> <p>18 breaker, keep the line in, work on the breaker</p> <p>19 while this line is energized. So they're</p> <p>20 basically used for isolation of breakers, high</p> <p>21 voltage breakers.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. So it is, in fact, the tripping of this</p> <p>23 switch that kills the line? Am I</p> <p>24 understanding that correctly?</p> <p>25 A. No. If you wanted to kill the line, we would</p>	<p>1 not kill the line by just opening a</p> <p>2 disconnect. We would open a breaker.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay.</p> <p>4 A. The line will be isolated by tripping breakers</p> <p>5 and then the breakers themselves would be</p> <p>6 isolated by opening these switches.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. So basically, the switches are used</p> <p>8 essentially for dead line switching?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, if you will, sure.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. So I'm just trying to relate that to</p> <p>11 the degree of potential harm that could result</p> <p>12 to an employee in this situation and I think -</p> <p>13 A. Well, as I said, if a breaker is opened and</p> <p>14 the breaker is isolated, it is possible that</p> <p>15 one side of the switch is energized.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. In the project justification, you refer</p> <p>17 to regular inspections being carried out to</p> <p>18 identify faulty insulators and having them</p> <p>19 replaced prior to in-service failure. You say</p> <p>20 "this practice will not completely eliminate</p> <p>21 the risks associated with manual switching."</p> <p>22 Why does that not completely eliminate the</p> <p>23 risk?</p> <p>24 A. Because, I mean, in the interim of actually</p> <p>25 going in and inspecting the insulator stack</p>

Page 81	Page 82
<p>1 itself, any number of problems could arise</p> <p>2 that could damage the insulator stack, that</p> <p>3 you would not know about until somebody</p> <p>4 actually went in to manually open that</p> <p>5 disconnect, and potentially have the stack</p> <p>6 crash down around your ears.</p> <p>7 Q. So is the safety issue that you've identified</p> <p>8 here simply a physical one in the sense that</p> <p>9 equipment may come loose and harm the operator</p> <p>10 at the time he's doing the switching?</p> <p>11 A. I think it's both. We could potentially have</p> <p>12 an energized stack come down around somebody,</p> <p>13 or you could potentially have just the</p> <p>14 insulator stack fail and then the flying glass</p> <p>15 could come down around you, either one. We</p> <p>16 have had incidents of this, by the way.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. And the motor drive mechanism basically</p> <p>18 allows you to do that from a more remote</p> <p>19 location? Is that-</p> <p>20 A. We would operate it remotely from our control</p> <p>21 room in the terminal station.</p> <p>22 Q. Project B33, replacement of the instrument</p> <p>23 transformers, I take it this is essentially an</p> <p>24 annual allotment. There are half a dozen of</p> <p>25 these things that need to be replaced each</p>	<p>1 year?</p> <p>2 A. It is.</p> <p>3 Q. And that's based on your historical records of</p> <p>4 how this comes about?</p> <p>5 A. That's right.</p> <p>6 Q. Yes, okay. And B35, equally, the surge</p> <p>7 arresters are essentially the same type of</p> <p>8 thing?</p> <p>9 A. Same thing.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Thank you, gentlemen. Those are all</p> <p>11 the questions I have, Mr. Chair.</p> <p>12 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Hutchings. Ms. Henley Andrews.</p> <p>14 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY JANET HENLEY ANDREWS, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 (11:14 a.m.)</p> <p>16 HENLEY ANDREWS, Q.C.:</p> <p>17 Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Reeves, could we</p> <p>18 go to, first of all, to page A--the general</p> <p>19 properties page, which is A-10, and this is</p> <p>20 the vehicle--I'm focusing on the two vehicle</p> <p>21 replacement projects, one of which is called</p> <p>22 the "replace vehicles Hydro system, 2003" and</p> <p>23 the other is "replace vehicles Hydro system,</p> <p>24 2004." Am I correct that with respect to the</p> <p>25 2003 project, the \$1,142,000 that's shown are</p>
Page 83	Page 84
<p>1 funds with respect to vehicles that were</p> <p>2 ordered in 2003 for delivery in 2004?</p> <p>3 MR. REEVES:</p> <p>4 A. That's correct, because of long deliveries.</p> <p>5 Q. And with respect to the "replace vehicle Hydro</p> <p>6 system, 2004" you're asking for approval of</p> <p>7 the entire \$2.262 million?</p> <p>8 A. Basically, we're directly asking for approval</p> <p>9 of the one million eighty-one dollars, with</p> <p>10 the understanding that we will be tendering</p> <p>11 next year for vehicles the following year,</p> <p>12 which will not come in place or we will not</p> <p>13 receive until 2005, and by that time, we</p> <p>14 anticipate having approval for those dollars</p> <p>15 prior to receiving and paying for them.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. But the question that I have is that is</p> <p>17 it anticipated, with respect to the \$1,181,000</p> <p>18 shown for future years -</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. - is it anticipated that they will actually be</p> <p>21 ordered in 2004 or will they be ordered in</p> <p>22 2005?</p> <p>23 A. 2004.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. So once they're ordered, they have to</p> <p>25 be paid for?</p>	<p>1 A. Well, if by some stretch of the imagination,</p> <p>2 the Board did not approve our second</p> <p>3 allotment, we would most likely have to try to</p> <p>4 cancel those and there would be a cancellation</p> <p>5 fee.</p> <p>6 Q. So do you build in potential for cancellation</p> <p>7 into your tender specifications?</p> <p>8 A. Not specifically, no, because we have not had</p> <p>9 a problem, I guess, in getting the two-year</p> <p>10 approval from the Board in this manner. And</p> <p>11 why we did this is that up until a couple of</p> <p>12 years ago, we had trouble with carry overs, as</p> <p>13 you will remember.</p> <p>14 Q. Yes.</p> <p>15 A. And what we are anticipating trying to do here</p> <p>16 is to forecast the actual cash flow, the way</p> <p>17 the vehicles would come in.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. So with respect to the 2003 Capital</p> <p>19 Budget items, the \$1,142,000 that's to be</p> <p>20 spent in 2004, have those vehicles already</p> <p>21 been ordered?</p> <p>22 A. They are currently--we're getting the--as I</p> <p>23 understand it, we're currently getting the</p> <p>24 requisitions ready to order those.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Now I'd like, first of all, to go to</p>

Page 85	Page 86
<p>1 IC-9. Do you have that there?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, I do.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. And if you'd look at page 2 of 2 -</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. - this is the breakdown of projects contained</p> <p>6 in the 2004 Capital Budget where the costs</p> <p>7 would be specifically assigned to one class of</p> <p>8 customers, correct?</p> <p>9 A. That is correct, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. So when I look at vehicles, I can see that</p> <p>11 under Labrador Interconnected, there's</p> <p>12 \$197,000 worth of vehicles in total?</p> <p>13 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>14 Q. I don't see anything for vehicles in Isolated</p> <p>15 Rural?</p> <p>16 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>17 Q. And there's nothing for vehicles in Island</p> <p>18 Interconnected Rural or for Newfoundland</p> <p>19 Power?</p> <p>20 A. No.</p> <p>21 Q. Are there any vehicles associated with the</p> <p>22 Southern Labrador?</p> <p>23 A. L'anse-au-Loup system?</p> <p>24 Q. Yes.</p> <p>25 A. Not that I recall, but I would have to check.</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. Well, could you check that and check</p> <p>2 the dollar value? (UNDERTAKING)</p> <p>3 A. Yes, we can check that, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. So subject to that check that you have to do,</p> <p>5 is it fair to say that only \$197,000 of the</p> <p>6 projects that are at B81 and B82--or B81 and</p> <p>7 B83 is specifically assigned? Everything else</p> <p>8 would be assigned common?</p> <p>9 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Now if you go to page B81 for a moment, you</p> <p>11 have your replacement criteria at the bottom</p> <p>12 of the page?</p> <p>13 A. That's correct.</p> <p>14 Q. And I seem to recall having a fair number of</p> <p>15 questions with respect to the replacement</p> <p>16 criteria at the last hearing, but am I correct</p> <p>17 that this replacement criteria was developed</p> <p>18 by Hydro?</p> <p>19 A. Yes. If my memory serves me right, our</p> <p>20 transportation people in charge of</p> <p>21 transportation, the assets people, I guess,</p> <p>22 went and talked to a lot of the other</p> <p>23 utilities, similar business, and from that we</p> <p>24 developed this criteria, and I guess, it's</p> <p>25 also based on a judgment that we find</p>
Page 87	Page 88
<p>1 ourselves and the environment that we also</p> <p>2 have to service our customers in the winter</p> <p>3 and whatnot, in the cold weather, that we find</p> <p>4 that this is a reasonable criteria.</p> <p>5 Q. So however, with respect to each class of</p> <p>6 vehicle, you've got an age criteria and an</p> <p>7 other criteria?</p> <p>8 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And the other is 150,000 kilometres plus</p> <p>10 maintenance cost and condition of the vehicle?</p> <p>11 A. That's correct, and typically we try to stay</p> <p>12 within those criterias, yes.</p> <p>13 Q. But when I looked back at the 2003 Capital</p> <p>14 Budget, it replaced 28 cars, vans and light</p> <p>15 trucks and 17 line and boom trucks. Does that</p> <p>16 sound about right?</p> <p>17 A. That's correct. That's my numbers.</p> <p>18 Q. And included in those 17 line and boom trucks</p> <p>19 are some of the vehicles that were to be</p> <p>20 ordered in 2003 and delivered in 2004, right?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Now in the areas that are common, like so I'm</p> <p>23 only focused on vehicles that are treated as</p> <p>24 common.</p> <p>25 A. Yes, appreciate that.</p>	<p>1 Q. Are there any locations where there is only</p> <p>2 one car or minivan?</p> <p>3 A. One car or one minivan, in the common areas?</p> <p>4 Q. Yes.</p> <p>5 A. I wouldn't say that there is, off the top of</p> <p>6 my head.</p> <p>7 Q. Now generally speaking, where are these</p> <p>8 vehicles? Are they sort of centralized at the</p> <p>9 various depots that you have across the</p> <p>10 island?</p> <p>11 A. Cars and minivans?</p> <p>12 Q. Yes.</p> <p>13 A. There would be a number of vehicles here in</p> <p>14 St. John's -</p> <p>15 Q. Yes.</p> <p>16 A. - at our head office for people to travel</p> <p>17 either around the City or bring our staff to</p> <p>18 other parts of the province. There would be a</p> <p>19 small number in Whitbourne of cars and</p> <p>20 minivans, probably more minivans than cars, or</p> <p>21 no, probably not, probably there's both,</p> <p>22 because we have technicians that go out and</p> <p>23 they could either take a vehicle or a minivan.</p> <p>24 Q. Yes.</p> <p>25 A. We have them in Bishop Falls. We have them in</p>

Page 89	Page 90
<p>1 Whitbourne. Sorry, Stephenville, and I guess,</p> <p>2 on the common systems, we may have one in Baie</p> <p>3 Verte, but I'm not sure. I'd say mostly there</p> <p>4 are line trucks and pickups and that. There</p> <p>5 may be something there for the technologists.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. And is it fair to say that with respect</p> <p>7 to the cars and the minivans, the primary</p> <p>8 purpose of these is for transporting people</p> <p>9 from one of your offices to another of your</p> <p>10 offices?</p> <p>11 A. That would be a fair assumption, but we also</p> <p>12 use those for our technicians.</p> <p>13 Q. Yes.</p> <p>14 A. And our technicians when they go, they have to</p> <p>15 bring a lot of equipment for testing.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay.</p> <p>17 A. And that would be either say protection and</p> <p>18 control technicians or it may even be some of</p> <p>19 the telecontrol technicians as well, or some</p> <p>20 of the people who are servicing computers.</p> <p>21 Q. And where are those technicians located?</p> <p>22 A. We have technicians in Whitbourne, Bishop</p> <p>23 Falls, Stephenville.</p> <p>24 Q. And St. John's?</p> <p>25 A. St. John's would be the telecontrol</p>	<p>1 technicians, yes, that's right.</p> <p>2 Q. So -</p> <p>3 A. And probably here in St. John's, as well,</p> <p>4 where we have a number of other like</p> <p>5 properties, may use a panel van or a vehicle</p> <p>6 or something to bring some of their</p> <p>7 instruments or whatever.</p> <p>8 Q. And in all of those locations that you've</p> <p>9 mentioned, St. John's, Whitbourne, Bishop</p> <p>10 Falls, and Stephenville, there would be more</p> <p>11 than one car or minivan at any given point in</p> <p>12 time?</p> <p>13 A. I would venture to say there would be more</p> <p>14 than one that we would have in service there.</p> <p>15 Yes, that's right.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Now if we go to IC-36, having replaced</p> <p>17 28 cars, minivans and light trucks in 2003 or</p> <p>18 as part of the 2003 Capital Budget project,</p> <p>19 let's look at it that way, so some of them</p> <p>20 were in 2003, some of them are technically in</p> <p>21 2004. I'm going to ignore that part.</p> <p>22 A. Um-hm.</p> <p>23 Q. So I'm just going -</p> <p>24 A. It's not easy to follow.</p> <p>25 Q. Pardon?</p>
Page 91	Page 92
<p>1 A. It's not easy to follow, and that's why we</p> <p>2 tried to put the dates on it, so it'd be</p> <p>3 easier to follow.</p> <p>4 Q. Yes, and that's good. So when I'm looking at</p> <p>5 IC-36, I'm looking at page 2 of 2, and I'm</p> <p>6 looking at that group called replace vehicles</p> <p>7 2004, page B-83, \$1,081,000.</p> <p>8 A. Yes, I'm there.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. And when I count the number of vehicles</p> <p>10 under that category, I come up with 37.</p> <p>11 A. I haven't counted them, so I'd trust you.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay.</p> <p>13 A. 37, okay.</p> <p>14 Q. And of those 37, four, at the bottom, are</p> <p>15 light trucks?</p> <p>16 A. That's right, category 3000.</p> <p>17 Q. And the remainder of them are cars and mini</p> <p>18 vans or pickups and service vans?</p> <p>19 A. Correct.</p> <p>20 Q. And whether they're in category 1000, the cars</p> <p>21 and mini vans, or in category 2000, which is</p> <p>22 pickups and service vans, the replacement</p> <p>23 criteria that you're utilizing is basically</p> <p>24 the same, five to seven years and 150,000</p> <p>25 kilometres to maintenance and condition?</p>	<p>1 A. That's correct, yes. That's what we normally</p> <p>2 drive our self by.</p> <p>3 Q. So what is the total number in the fleet of</p> <p>4 cars, mini vans, pickups and light trucks?</p> <p>5 A. We have 281 vehicles. Category 1000, 59;</p> <p>6 category 2000, 152; category 3000, 13;</p> <p>7 category 4000, 57.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. And some of those, 59, for example, in</p> <p>9 category 1000, some of those would not be in</p> <p>10 the common group? Do you know how many you</p> <p>11 have -</p> <p>12 A. No, I'm sorry, I don't have that breakdown.</p> <p>13 Q. Okay. And I don't need that.</p> <p>14 A. Okay.</p> <p>15 Q. At least I don't think so. So you have--if we</p> <p>16 go to IC-36 and we look at the very first item</p> <p>17 in the second heading, the "Replace Vehicles</p> <p>18 2004"?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. There is a car from 1995, which would make it</p> <p>21 eight years old?</p> <p>22 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And it's got 127,000 kilometres on it?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Which, by my calculation, is 15,880 kilometres</p>

Page 93	Page 94
<p>1 a year?</p> <p>2 A. Again, I'll take your math.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. But from a usage point of view on a</p> <p>4 vehicle, that's not a lot per year, wouldn't</p> <p>5 you agree?</p> <p>6 A. No.</p> <p>7 Q. You don't agree?</p> <p>8 A. Oh, I agree, that's not a lot, but it's in</p> <p>9 Happy Valley-Goose Bay, which is a very</p> <p>10 restricted area for travel.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Okay. I wasn't--my question was more</p> <p>12 directed at the usage, rather than the</p> <p>13 location of the vehicle, so -</p> <p>14 A. Yeah. But see, what happens in a lot of our</p> <p>15 vehicles is that the usage that you see in</p> <p>16 kilometres is sometimes slanted by where</p> <p>17 they're actually located.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay.</p> <p>19 A. Because when you get down to No. 3, which is</p> <p>20 80,000 kilometres, that's also in Happy</p> <p>21 Valley-Goose Bay.</p> <p>22 Q. No, and I recognize that.</p> <p>23 A. Yes. Because I had these same questions when</p> <p>24 I was getting ready to come on the stand today</p> <p>25 and I was talking to my person in charge of</p>	<p>1 the vehicles. And while they use the</p> <p>2 guideline that you keep referring to and we've</p> <p>3 given you as a guideline, there is also some</p> <p>4 judgment that we have to make in the selection</p> <p>5 of which vehicles we're actually going to</p> <p>6 replace.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. So since you seem to know where each of</p> <p>8 these is -</p> <p>9 A. Well, I don't know where all of them are. I</p> <p>10 know where some of them are.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. And can you tell me, with a reasonable</p> <p>12 degree of certainty, which one of these are</p> <p>13 not common?</p> <p>14 A. I know that the second one is--oh, so which</p> <p>15 are not common?</p> <p>16 Q. Not common.</p> <p>17 A. Okay. I hadn't marked down all of them, but</p> <p>18 like, number one and number three are both in</p> <p>19 Happy Valley.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay.</p> <p>21 A. Okay. And I was doing something like you did,</p> <p>22 looks like you did, is looked at where we--the</p> <p>23 criteria may be in jeopardy.</p> <p>24 Q. Um-hm.</p> <p>25 A. That's the ones I looked at. What else have I</p>
Page 95	Page 96
<p>1 got here? If you go down to the 2486.</p> <p>2 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>3 A. That one there is also in Happy Valley.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay.</p> <p>5 A. If you go to the--there's two, 2452 and 2453</p> <p>6 are also in Happy Valley.</p> <p>7 Q. 2452. The two vans?</p> <p>8 A. Two vans, yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 (11:30 a.m.)</p> <p>11 A. That's correct. That's all I've got in that</p> <p>12 category, actually. The other category, 4409</p> <p>13 is in Fogo, so that wouldn't be on the common</p> <p>14 system.</p> <p>15 Q. Um-hm.</p> <p>16 A. And the last one, 4457 would be in Flower's</p> <p>17 Cove, and that wouldn't be on the common</p> <p>18 system, either. Some of the others may be,</p> <p>19 but I'm not sure. That's only the ones that I</p> <p>20 looked when I was getting ready to get ready</p> <p>21 for the stand.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. If we look at the ones, the replaced</p> <p>23 vehicles in that group that are basically in</p> <p>24 the 1000 and the 2000 and 3000 group?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	<p>1 Q. Of the 37 vehicles that are there, only 12 of</p> <p>2 them have over 150,000 kilometres on them?</p> <p>3 A. At the current time, that's right. But we had</p> <p>4 to account for another year's usage.</p> <p>5 Q. And many of these vehicles are--like, for</p> <p>6 example, if we look at the first one, the</p> <p>7 1226, the 1237, some of these vehicles have</p> <p>8 obviously already been in service for more</p> <p>9 than five to seven years?</p> <p>10 A. That's correct.</p> <p>11 Q. And others have only just been in service for</p> <p>12 five to seven--for five years?</p> <p>13 A. Um-hm.</p> <p>14 Q. Correct?</p> <p>15 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>16 Q. So when you're applying your criteria, is the</p> <p>17 age or the kilometres predominant?</p> <p>18 A. As when I talked to my asset manager, because</p> <p>19 they make the decision as to which vehicles</p> <p>20 should be up for recommendation for</p> <p>21 replacement, they take all things into</p> <p>22 consideration, take the age, they take the</p> <p>23 condition that it's actually in, some vehicles</p> <p>24 that we have may rust a lot, others don't rust</p> <p>25 at all because of where they are in the</p>

Page 97	Page 98
<p>1 environment, and the last one is the actual 2 kilometreage on the vehicles. They take all 3 of those and they may find sometimes that one 4 or more of those vehicles don't meet all the 5 criteria, so they then use judgment. And 6 obviously, we like--we don't want to use 7 judgment any more than we got to. On the same 8 hand, we don't want to replace vehicles any 9 more than we got to just because they met the 10 criteria. If a vehicle is up in Labrador and 11 because it's very--they got a restricted road 12 access, that we don't want to have to replace 13 that--you know, it'll be a lot of time 14 replacement where conversely, you know, where 15 you get a lot of kilometres on a vehicle, you 16 will be replacing them earlier, type thing. 17 So we try to use a little bit of judgment 18 there, as well. 19 Q. But would you agree that the average 20 household--I mean, if you look at your own 21 experience with your personal vehicle, that 22 it's not at all unusual for a vehicle to have 23 20 to 30,000 per year put on it? 24 A. Some, yes, for some households that's correct. 25 I have a car, as well, and I use it for</p>	<p>1 business as well as pleasure, and I put 20 2 plus thousand kilometres on it per year. 3 Q. Um-hm. 4 A. My other car that I have, I put less than 5 20,000 kilometres on a year. 6 Q. Now, if only 12 of the 37 vehicles that are 7 listed here are over 150,000 kilometres, does 8 that mean that judgment has been used with 9 respect to all of the rest? 10 A. What they've looked at is that they look at 11 the average kilometres driven each year, and 12 when it brings them up close to the 13 kilometreage, then that will kick in. You'll 14 see in some of these vehicles here are like a 15 '99, 1266? 16 Q. Um-hm. 17 A. Like, that's got--that's a what, a three year 18 old vehicle? 19 Q. Yeah. 20 A. Divided by three into 100 and - 21 Q. 42,000 kilometres. 22 A. 42,000. So you're going to add another 42,000 23 before we're able to buy it, because it's next 24 year's budget, we're going to be in excess of 25 150,000 kilometres.</p>
Page 99	Page 100
<p>1 Q. Is there any magic to 150,000 kilometres? 2 A. No. Just that what we find, or what we--our 3 assets people have found is that if you tried 4 to extend the life of a vehicle beyond a 5 reasonable amount, either an age or driven, 6 you will get into a lot of maintenance costs. 7 Q. And - 8 A. And we try to avoid, on the end or close to 9 the end of the service life of a vehicle, 10 having to spend a lot of dollars on it just to 11 keep it in service because we're not buying a 12 new one until next year. 13 Q. In the capital budget explanation that you 14 have provided at B-81 and B-82 as well as B-83 15 and B-84? 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. There's no information contained in there on 18 maintenance costs, is there? 19 A. No, there's not. 20 Q. Or any historical information on what 21 maintenance costs have been with respect to 22 vehicles over 150,000 kilometres, for example? 23 A. No, there's not. 24 Q. And no comparison to type of information 25 versus maintenance costs on vehicles that are</p>	<p>1 more than seven years old? 2 A. We haven't given that evidence, no. 3 Q. So how do we know that it's more economical to 4 replace these vehicles than to keep them? 5 A. We've done a study, as I indicated earlier on, 6 with the other utilities to see what other 7 utilities are doing. We've also--our asset 8 people have looked at the average they get out 9 of the vehicles before they run into major 10 expenses and they've made a judgment call or 11 developed this criteria which we use. 12 Q. But, how do you know that the information that 13 you got from other utilities shows a least 14 cost option? 15 A. The only way that I guess you could find a 16 least cost if after you retire the vehicle, 17 whether you've had to spend a lot of money on 18 it or not. Some vehicles, I guess, as we've 19 all experienced, some vehicles you get have 20 very little maintenance, others have a lot of 21 maintenance. And I guess what we try to go on 22 is the average for the vehicles that we 23 purchase and for the average use that we give 24 our vehicles. 25 Q. Do you keep track of your maintenance costs on</p>

Page 101	Page 102
<p>1 your 1000 category vehicles versus your 2000,</p> <p>2 your 3000 and your 4000?</p> <p>3 A. We keep maintenance costs on each vehicle that</p> <p>4 we have.</p> <p>5 Q. So, over the years Hydro has had a lot of</p> <p>6 vehicles, right?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, we have.</p> <p>8 Q. So you have a lot of historical information as</p> <p>9 to what average maintenance costs would be for</p> <p>10 vehicles in various years of use or various</p> <p>11 numbers of kilometres if you choose to put it</p> <p>12 together, right?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, if there was benefit in doing. But in</p> <p>14 doing the development of criteria they have</p> <p>15 used this information, to the best of their</p> <p>16 ability, to develop a criteria whereby they</p> <p>17 think, from what the analysis that they done,</p> <p>18 that we are going least cost for our</p> <p>19 customers.</p> <p>20 Q. But that information is not here?</p> <p>21 A. No, that information is not here, and some of</p> <p>22 it is judgment, as well.</p> <p>23 Q. Now, when we look at the bottom of IC-36?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. We've got the category 4000 vehicles, is that</p>	<p>1 right?</p> <p>2 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>3 Q. And those vehicles, the criteria is seven to</p> <p>4 nine years and 200,000 kilometres?</p> <p>5 A. That is correct.</p> <p>6 Q. When I look at those numbers that are provided</p> <p>7 on page 2 of 2 of IC-36, there are two</p> <p>8 vehicles that are fairly close to the 200, 000</p> <p>9 kilometre, which is 4407 from 1991 and 4428</p> <p>10 from 1995?</p> <p>11 A. That's correct.</p> <p>12 Q. But none of the vehicles are over 200, 000</p> <p>13 kilometres, right?</p> <p>14 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And several of the vehicles--well, two of the</p> <p>16 vehicles, 4442 and 4457 aren't even seven</p> <p>17 years old?</p> <p>18 A. That's correct.</p> <p>19 Q. Although, '97 will be seven--the one 4442 will</p> <p>20 be seven years old by 2004?</p> <p>21 A. Um-hm.</p> <p>22 Q. So again, can I assume that a considerable</p> <p>23 amount of judgment had been utilized with</p> <p>24 respect to deciding that these vehicles are to</p> <p>25 be replaced?</p>
Page 103	Page 104
<p>1 A. There is some judgment in it, yes, that's</p> <p>2 correct. But it's also taken in consideration</p> <p>3 the criteria. You can't always--because of</p> <p>4 our usage, you can't always meet all the</p> <p>5 criteria that you have set, whether it's age</p> <p>6 or distance driven.</p> <p>7 Q. Now, from a system perspective, from a</p> <p>8 maintenance of the system perspective all the</p> <p>9 category 4000 vehicles are used for system</p> <p>10 repair or system upgrade, they're directly</p> <p>11 related to the system, correct?</p> <p>12 A. That's correct. They're either line trucks or</p> <p>13 heavy trucks used for hydro generation or the</p> <p>14 like.</p> <p>15 Q. And would all of the light trucks fall into</p> <p>16 that category?</p> <p>17 A. The ones that are here would--in the 2004</p> <p>18 budget, would be--fall into the line truck</p> <p>19 category, yes, or a 3000.</p> <p>20 Q. What about the pickups, what are they used</p> <p>21 for?</p> <p>22 A. Pickups could be used for, it would be mostly</p> <p>23 service staff that would use those.</p> <p>24 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>25 A. Some construction, as well.</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. Now would--are pickups usually located</p> <p>2 in St. John's, Whitbourne, Bishop's Falls and</p> <p>3 Stephenville?</p> <p>4 A. The ones that we would have in St. John's</p> <p>5 would be primarily to do with the services,</p> <p>6 like the engineering service and that where we</p> <p>7 have capital projects that they look after.</p> <p>8 There may be a pickup for the IS&T I'm not</p> <p>9 sure, but there may be one, but they also</p> <p>10 would be located in Whitbourne and Bishop</p> <p>11 Falls and Stephenville, yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And any other places where pickups would be</p> <p>13 located within the common -</p> <p>14 A. Baie Verte, I guess. I think part of that</p> <p>15 loop around the--the second loop, the 138 is</p> <p>16 also common, so there would be a pickup there,</p> <p>17 as well.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. But at all of these sites that we've</p> <p>19 talked about, there's more than one vehicle</p> <p>20 available?</p> <p>21 A. There could be more than one vehicle available</p> <p>22 for the--if there's--in the sites that we're</p> <p>23 talking about, there would be more than one</p> <p>24 crew, as well, so yes, there would be more</p> <p>25 than one vehicle.</p>

Page 105	Page 106
<p>1 Q. Okay. Now, if a vehicle, let's take a car as</p> <p>2 an example, if a car--if there's no car</p> <p>3 available in St. John's when somebody needs to</p> <p>4 travel from St. John's, let's say, to</p> <p>5 Whitbourne or St. John's to Holyrood, how do</p> <p>6 they get there?</p> <p>7 A. If there's no car available, typically the</p> <p>8 staff out of St. John's here does have some</p> <p>9 flexibility in the schedules that they do if</p> <p>10 there's no cars available, so what they would</p> <p>11 most likely to is to reschedule to a time when</p> <p>12 there is a car available. If there is an</p> <p>13 emergency, then what they will do if there's</p> <p>14 no car available, they'll look for a truck or</p> <p>15 look for anything that is mobile to go.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay.</p> <p>17 A. If they had to go.</p> <p>18 (11:44 a.m.)</p> <p>19 Q. And will people occasionally use their own</p> <p>20 vehicles?</p> <p>21 A. Not so much here in St. John's, but we do have</p> <p>22 some people use their own vehicles here in St.</p> <p>23 John's, but -</p> <p>24 Q. What about other locations?</p> <p>25 A. Not so much in the maintenance part. I'm</p>	<p>1 thinking, like, in the meter readers where we</p> <p>2 do provide a limited number of vehicles for</p> <p>3 our meter readers who are fulltime. But,</p> <p>4 where they're not fulltime--but, you know,</p> <p>5 here again, this is in the rural area, not the</p> <p>6 common area, so this wouldn't apply to you</p> <p>7 people.</p> <p>8 Q. That's right.</p> <p>9 A. Okay. But normally for the common areas where</p> <p>10 we have our--our employees would not use their</p> <p>11 own vehicles to do their work.</p> <p>12 Q. And have you ever had to rent a car or a mini</p> <p>13 van or a pickup?</p> <p>14 A. Yes. Matter of fact, in many discussions with</p> <p>15 our assets people, our transportation assets</p> <p>16 people we try to maintain our fleet and with</p> <p>17 the understanding that there may be certain</p> <p>18 times of the year where we may have to rent</p> <p>19 some type of vehicle to get a--if there's a</p> <p>20 certain critical schedule that needs to be on</p> <p>21 the go, then we will sometimes rent, either</p> <p>22 short term or long term just to get us over</p> <p>23 that bind.</p> <p>24 Q. So if a vehicle in category 1000 or 2000 group</p> <p>25 is out of service, there are alternative?</p>
Page 107	Page 108
<p>1 A. In some locations, that's right.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. And in which locations would there not</p> <p>3 be alternatives?</p> <p>4 A. Like, for instance, I'm not sure how readily</p> <p>5 available a rent a car is in Whitbourne, Baie</p> <p>6 Verte.</p> <p>7 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>8 A. Okay.</p> <p>9 Q. But they are in Stephenville, they are in St.</p> <p>10 John's -</p> <p>11 A. I assume that they're available in</p> <p>12 Stephenville. Bishop Falls they would be</p> <p>13 available, but they would be available from</p> <p>14 either Grand Falls or the airport in Gander.</p> <p>15 Not that convenient, but.</p> <p>16 Q. And some of the uses for the vehicles, there's</p> <p>17 also some flexibility in terms of timing of</p> <p>18 the use of the vehicle?</p> <p>19 A. For some of the non-critical services, that's</p> <p>20 correct.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay.</p> <p>22 A. Where you're talking cars, in particular.</p> <p>23 Q. Yeah.</p> <p>24 A. But once you go above that, if you build very</p> <p>25 much flexibility trying to rely on other</p>	<p>1 parties to provide vehicles, then what will</p> <p>2 suffer in some cases will be reliability.</p> <p>3 Q. And that's why I'm focusing on cars, mini vans</p> <p>4 and pickups and not on light trucks and heavy</p> <p>5 trucks.</p> <p>6 A. Yeah. You have to realize, as well, like,</p> <p>7 pickups, for instance, sometimes what happens</p> <p>8 is that if we got a crew out there in their</p> <p>9 big vehicle and need a piece of equipment to</p> <p>10 do a repair, rather than bring that big one</p> <p>11 back, they'll probably--you know, the</p> <p>12 supervisor will probably go out in the pickup</p> <p>13 that they have and bring out the equipment to</p> <p>14 them.</p> <p>15 Q. Yeah. But you have more than--I mean, based</p> <p>16 upon this list here, and that's just the ones</p> <p>17 proposed to be replaced in 2004, you've got</p> <p>18 more than one pickup at most locations with</p> <p>19 the possible exception of Baie Verte?</p> <p>20 A. We have more than one pickup, but every pickup</p> <p>21 has a function to carry out.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. Those are all my questions. Thank you.</p> <p>23 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>24 Q. Thank you, Ms. Henley Andrews. Mr. Kennedy?</p> <p>25 MR. DAVID REEVES AND MR. FRED MARTIN, CROSS-EXAMINATION</p>

Page 109	Page 110
<p>1 BY MR. MARK KENNEDY</p> <p>2 MR. KENNEDY:</p> <p>3 Q. Thank you, Chair. Gentlemen, I just have</p> <p>4 three small areas I wanted to cover. The</p> <p>5 first one was relating to some of your rural</p> <p>6 operations. And we can use as the launching</p> <p>7 pad for that project, B-48. And B-48 is the</p> <p>8 replacement of a transformer in Rigolet. I'm</p> <p>9 not sure who wants to handle the question.</p> <p>10 But, Mr. Reeves, you were a participant in</p> <p>11 Hydro's 2001 general rate application?</p> <p>12 MR. REEVES:</p> <p>13 A. That's correct.</p> <p>14 Q. And there was some evidence lead during that</p> <p>15 hearing concerning the growth rates being</p> <p>16 experienced by Hydro in some of its rural</p> <p>17 isolated communities?</p> <p>18 A. That's right, yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you recall that?</p> <p>20 A. I recall some parts of it, yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And I think the--if I could fairly summarize</p> <p>22 the evidence, that there were, in many cases,</p> <p>23 an experienced level of fairly significant</p> <p>24 growth and demand in energy use in some of</p> <p>25 these small rural communities. Would you</p>	<p>1 accept that or -</p> <p>2 A. Yeah. And we have evidence filed here today</p> <p>3 where you can see some of that, actually.</p> <p>4 Q. And the evidence you're referring to, is that</p> <p>5 in reply to P.U.B. 16 or -</p> <p>6 A. P.U.B. 16, that's correct.</p> <p>7 Q. Yeah. Let's just have a look at that, then.</p> <p>8 And P.U.B. 16 has got an attachment, there is</p> <p>9 it on our screen, operating load forecast for</p> <p>10 the Hydro rural systems, 2002 to 2007. The</p> <p>11 only thing is I couldn't really find a chart</p> <p>12 in here which would have shown the sort of--</p> <p>13 you have systems peaks, right, in Table 7? If</p> <p>14 we could just go to Table 7?</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. And now, if I recall correctly, there's--yeah,</p> <p>17 it's a load growth summary on Table 10,</p> <p>18 actually, is probably as good a place to go as</p> <p>19 any.</p> <p>20 A. That's right.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And so the--am I looking at the right</p> <p>22 spot if I look at that Labrador isolated row?</p> <p>23 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. So these are your rural diesel supplied</p> <p>25 locations, correct?</p>
Page 111	Page 112
<p>1 A. That's correct, yes, in Labrador.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay.</p> <p>3 A. With the exception L'Anse-au-Loup which is</p> <p>4 down right below that.</p> <p>5 Q. Just above it, you mean?</p> <p>6 A. Just below that. Oh, Labrador less L'Anse-au-</p> <p>7 Loup.</p> <p>8 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. Table 10.</p> <p>10 MR. KENNEDY:</p> <p>11 Q. Table 10 I'm looking at.</p> <p>12 A. Okay. I'm sorry. I got you. Sorry.</p> <p>13 Q. Got me?</p> <p>14 A. Yes, I have.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Yeah, because L'Anse-au-Loup is broken</p> <p>16 out in Table 10.</p> <p>17 A. Yes, it is, yes.</p> <p>18 Q. And that's, I assume, because at one point it</p> <p>19 was, as we know, converted over from being an</p> <p>20 isolated to being interconnected, correct?</p> <p>21 A. We still consider it to be an isolated system</p> <p>22 because we buy secondary energy from Hydro</p> <p>23 Quebec.</p> <p>24 Q. Right. What years was that took place?</p> <p>25 A. That took place, trusting memory now, that</p>	<p>1 would be the mid '90s, probably '95, '96.</p> <p>2 Q. Right.</p> <p>3 A. I'm not sure of the date, but somewhere around</p> <p>4 that.</p> <p>5 Q. And the rate structure -</p> <p>6 A. Probably a bit later than that, actually.</p> <p>7 Q. I'm sorry. And the rate structure for L'Anse-</p> <p>8 au-Loup was adjusted accordingly, correct?</p> <p>9 A. There was a hearing whereby the Board ruled</p> <p>10 that even though it was an isolated system and</p> <p>11 the fact that we were able to buy secondary</p> <p>12 energy from Hydro Quebec, we would charge</p> <p>13 interconnected rates to our customers there.</p> <p>14 Q. Right. But as we know, the Labrador isolated</p> <p>15 group has a preferential rate afforded to it?</p> <p>16 A. Pardon me?</p> <p>17 Q. The -</p> <p>18 A. Labrador -</p> <p>19 Q. - Labrador isolated group.</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Receive a 700 lifeline block allotment?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay.</p> <p>24 A. They do that, yes. All of our isolated</p> <p>25 systems are like that.</p>

Page 113	Page 114
<p>1 Q. And that, in effect, means that the users pay 2 less than true cost, correct?</p> <p>3 A. That is correct.</p> <p>4 Q. All right. And with the exception of the 5 L'Anse-au-Loup figures, do you agree with me 6 that the growth rates being experienced in 7 your Labrador isolated territory far exceed 8 any of the growth rates being experienced 9 anywhere else in Hydro's operations?</p> <p>10 A. L'Anse-au-Loup is up 4.2 but we just talked 11 about that one there. Labrador east is 3.5 12 percent over the six year period, and Labrador 13 isolated is 3.3 percent. So it's among the 14 higher ones, yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Right. And I guess when the topic came up in 16 the 2001 GRA, it was indicated that Hydro was 17 aware of these higher growth rates being 18 experienced in its rural isolated systems and 19 was monitoring it, I think, was the way that 20 it was put. Is there--can you provide any 21 update on what, if anything, Hydro has done by 22 way of attempting to govern the--or put a 23 governor on the growth being experienced in 24 the rural isolated system?</p> <p>25 A. I guess the most that we attempt to do, I</p>	<p>1 guess we find--like, whether a new fish plant 2 would go in there or not, it's difficult for 3 Hydro to determine whether that should go 4 there or not. We normally don't have say in 5 that. Where Hydro tries to do its best is for 6 the customers that we have primarily are 7 Domestic and General Service customers, is 8 that they use their energy wisely. And we 9 have a program which we recently kicked there, 10 I guess, earlier this year which is called 11 Hydro Wise, and again, there's information 12 filed on that program, as well.</p> <p>13 Q. And the Hydro Wise program, you'd consider 14 that to be a form of DSM, I take it, would 15 you?</p> <p>16 A. Somewhat, yes. But it's really intended to 17 educate our customers on the wise use of 18 electricity, yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Right. So in response to P.U.B.--or I guess 20 initially in furtherance of your application 21 on Project B-48, replacing the substation 22 transformer at Rigolet, there was a Demand 23 Side Management Analysis completed and offered 24 by Newfoundland Power, correct--or Hydro, 25 sorry?</p>
Page 115	Page 116
<p>1 A. That's correct, that's correct, yes. It's 2 attached--say it's B-50.</p> <p>3 Q. And if we could, ultimately that analysis 4 demonstrated to Hydro that there was no demand 5 side solution to--economic solution to 6 replacing the transformer at this time. Is 7 that -</p> <p>8 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And there was further details provided about 10 the individual calculations in response to 11 P.U.B. 18, but the question I--one of the 12 questions I had was in this calculation you've 13 got load forecast predictions for 2004 to 14 2007, correct?</p> <p>15 A. That's correct.</p> <p>16 Q. And if I have it right, you've got Domestic 17 Customers have a load forecast year over year 18 increase of 2.3 percent?</p> <p>19 A. I'll have to trust your math.</p> <p>20 Q. Okay. Would you consider that to be--in light 21 of the fact that it seems to be a higher 22 growth rate than being experienced in, 23 according to Table 10 of the document we were 24 just looking at, higher growth rates than 25 what's being experienced in most of your</p>	<p>1 territory?</p> <p>2 A. If I can take you to page 29 of IC--or P.U.B. 3 16?</p> <p>4 Q. Sure.</p> <p>5 A. That's the page that gives the explanations 6 for the low growth in Rigolet. And not all of 7 the--like, the first item here, they said that 8 there is a possible shrimp plant extension 9 going in there. We have not factored that 10 into our calculation. But you will see that 11 there is a new 14 lot subdivision going in 12 there, there's a new store announced and 13 there's also work being done on some of the 14 buildings there. So this would account for 15 the load growth that we've got there.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. But I was following Domestic Customers. 17 They would be general service, wouldn't they?</p> <p>18 A. Okay. They would be--yeah, Domestic Customers 19 would just be the households, that's correct, 20 yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Yeah. So regardless of the fish plant and the 22 14 lots--well, I guess the 14 lot subdivision 23 would be Domestic, correct?</p> <p>24 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>25 Q. The store, though, that ACOA is sponsoring and</p>

Page 117	Page 118
<p>1 net loft (phonetic) building, for instance,</p> <p>2 they're all general service?</p> <p>3 A. They would be general service, that's correct,</p> <p>4 yeah.</p> <p>5 Q. So year over year increases among your</p> <p>6 Domestic Customers of 2.4 percent when the</p> <p>7 experience of the Company overall is much</p> <p>8 lower -</p> <p>9 A. It's lower than that, that's correct, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And in turn, that's what, in this case, in</p> <p>11 Rigolet, driving the requirement for</p> <p>12 replacement of a transformer?</p> <p>13 A. That's correct, yes.</p> <p>14 Q. So does that concern Hydro, at all, is there</p> <p>15 any Company based initiative or policy to try</p> <p>16 to see what can be done about these higher</p> <p>17 than--higher growth rate?</p> <p>18 A. I guess other than try to ensure that our</p> <p>19 customers are fully educated about the cost of</p> <p>20 electricity, how they can save electricity,</p> <p>21 give them tips and that, you're really getting</p> <p>22 into--I think if you go outside that, you're</p> <p>23 into socioeconomic issues which, I guess, we</p> <p>24 find difficult to take up.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And in the case of the DSM calculation</p>	<p>1 that you performed shown on B-50, if I gather</p> <p>2 correctly, the focus was on the Domestic hot</p> <p>3 water load control, is that correct?</p> <p>4 A. That's the one that they used for comparison</p> <p>5 because it's the cheapest one.</p> <p>6 Q. Right.</p> <p>7 A. And if you can't meet that one, you can't meet</p> <p>8 the ones above it.</p> <p>9 (11:59 a.m.)</p> <p>10 Q. Well, I understood from, again, from the</p> <p>11 previous document on your rural forecast,</p> <p>12 there's a chart here showing the percentage of</p> <p>13 customers using--where is that? There we go.</p> <p>14 Table 3. That in the case of your Domestic</p> <p>15 Customers for Labrador diesel you'll see it</p> <p>16 over the second-last column, less than five</p> <p>17 percent of those use electric heat. So</p> <p>18 demand side initiatives on electric heat is</p> <p>19 not going to generate any gains, correct?</p> <p>20 A. That's right, yeah.</p> <p>21 Q. So in the case of the Labrador diesel you have</p> <p>22 to focus on hot water or cooking, I guess,</p> <p>23 pretty much?</p> <p>24 A. Um-hm.</p> <p>25 Q. Or tell them to unplug their TV's, which is</p>
Page 119	Page 120
<p>1 unlikely?</p> <p>2 A. Because the way the prices are, people are not</p> <p>3 normally into those other than electric--or</p> <p>4 hot water heat or whatever.</p> <p>5 Q. Right. So there's not a whole lot of</p> <p>6 opportunity in these rural communities to</p> <p>7 achieve demand side management initiatives to</p> <p>8 forego growth?</p> <p>9 A. No. Other than a we say here. Like, I think</p> <p>10 in one of our sites before we did some</p> <p>11 florescent lighting and we also did some cover</p> <p>12 up of the hot water tanks. So there's not a</p> <p>13 lot of other opportunities, no.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. The next project I just want to discuss</p> <p>15 with you was the TL-214 upgrades. I believe</p> <p>16 you had some questions on that already, which</p> <p>17 is Project B-25. Now, here we go. Thank you,</p> <p>18 Mr. O'Reilly. As is indicated in the first</p> <p>19 sentence, it says, "This project for 2004 is</p> <p>20 the continuation of a project which the Board</p> <p>21 has approved funds for 2003." And then</p> <p>22 they're detailed as per filing there of</p> <p>23 \$110,700, correct?</p> <p>24 A. Correct.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And 78,000 of that 110 was for</p>	<p>1 engineering?</p> <p>2 A. That's correct.</p> <p>3 Q. And I take it that the idea here, as has been</p> <p>4 discussed in previous witnesses, is that with</p> <p>5 this approval of \$110,700 in 2003 that the</p> <p>6 objective was for--or intent was for Hydro to</p> <p>7 go out and perform this engineering so that it</p> <p>8 could get a firmer fix on exactly what it was</p> <p>9 going to do in 2004 by way of the actual</p> <p>10 upgrade, is that correct?</p> <p>11 A. That's correct.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. And I see by the revised F-6 in capital</p> <p>13 budget application--thank you, Mr. O'Reilly.</p> <p>14 Right on the ball there today. You'll see</p> <p>15 transmission, the last one there, upgrade TL-</p> <p>16 214, P.U.B. approved budget, 2003, 111. So</p> <p>17 that's just a round. And then 2003</p> <p>18 expenditures to May 31, 72,000?</p> <p>19 A. That's right.</p> <p>20 Q. So, can I take it from that, that much of the</p> <p>21 engineering work has already been completed as</p> <p>22 proposed on the TL214 upgrade?</p> <p>23 A. What we have done to date or to the end of May</p> <p>24 is basically finalize design concepts. We</p> <p>25 made another site visit, actually flown again,</p>

Page 121	Page 122
<p>1 TL214 to finalize our design concepts and had</p> <p>2 started the initial design and specifications</p> <p>3 for materials and so on. More or less</p> <p>4 planning for the project, if you will.</p> <p>5 Q. The reason I ask is because there's reference</p> <p>6 made in your B25 project description, it's</p> <p>7 actually referenced on page B26 how this was</p> <p>8 under the project specification that a full</p> <p>9 report on this upgrade was filed with the</p> <p>10 Board as part of it's 2003 budget application,</p> <p>11 Section G, Appendix 3. And I gave Mr.</p> <p>12 O'Reilly a heads up that this was a document</p> <p>13 that I was going to quickly refer to. I was</p> <p>14 wondering if you could pull it up. Yes. In</p> <p>15 that document that was filed, there was an</p> <p>16 estimate made at that time of how much the</p> <p>17 project was going to cost at the time you</p> <p>18 sought the approval for the 2003 funds.</p> <p>19 A. Correct.</p> <p>20 Q. And the number that you sought approval for</p> <p>21 was the same number that you now have in B25,</p> <p>22 correct, \$2,836,200.00?</p> <p>23 A. That is correct.</p> <p>24 Q. So, there hasn't been any adjust made in that</p> <p>25 figure from the 2003 budget application to the</p>	<p>1 2004 budget application?</p> <p>2 A. That's correct.</p> <p>3 Q. Now, if we just go to--and I just pick this as</p> <p>4 an example--part of the upgrade involved in</p> <p>5 TL214 requires that an alternate power source</p> <p>6 be obtained because you need to take this line</p> <p>7 out of service which you're upgrading it,</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A. Right.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. And if we go to, it's page 18 actually,</p> <p>11 Mr. O'Reilly and just scroll to the bottom,</p> <p>12 yes, alternative power supply. And it reads,</p> <p>13 all solutions will result in additional cost</p> <p>14 for power generation while TL214 is out of</p> <p>15 service. The estimated cost of alternative</p> <p>16 power is \$754,258.00. And that being booked,</p> <p>17 I presume, to the \$2,836,200.00.</p> <p>18 A. That actual number has not.</p> <p>19 Q. The alternative power supply figure of</p> <p>20 \$754,258.00, that's not part of your two</p> <p>21 million eight?</p> <p>22 A. That particular number is not, no.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay.</p> <p>24 A. The number that we have in the budget now, if</p> <p>25 I can refer you back to B25 or, I'm sorry,</p>
Page 123	Page 124
<p>1 yes, B25, you will see on the line engineering</p> <p>2 there for 2004 of \$570,000.00.</p> <p>3 Q. Yes.</p> <p>4 A. With an asterisk that indicates below that,</p> <p>5 that includes the cost of alternative</p> <p>6 generation. That's where we put that money.</p> <p>7 Q. Right.</p> <p>8 A. That estimate is now roughly \$520,000.00.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay.</p> <p>10 A. The problem there was in the original estimate</p> <p>11 we had included taxes against a rental of the</p> <p>12 diesel generators we were going to use and we</p> <p>13 also have, we understand now, there will be a</p> <p>14 credit against the energy produced from those</p> <p>15 diesels as an offset to the potential running</p> <p>16 of Holyrood. So, because we have proposed</p> <p>17 (inaudible - coughing) into the system, we're</p> <p>18 going to be basically credited with that</p> <p>19 energy on the incremental cost of generation</p> <p>20 of Holyrood.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay.</p> <p>22 A. But again in reviewing the entire estimate and</p> <p>23 looking at our exposures and risks there with</p> <p>24 regards to how this load profile is actually</p> <p>25 going to work, when we determine it's going to</p>	<p>1 be done, looking at the Rose Blanche plant,</p> <p>2 the diesels at Port aux Basques, the mobile</p> <p>3 gas turbine at Grand Bay. There are still</p> <p>4 some issues there that we're trying to resolve</p> <p>5 with our sister utility of Newfoundland Power</p> <p>6 and our own planning people, we felt the</p> <p>7 estimate was still in that same order that we</p> <p>8 said we had previously.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Because the curiosity, of course, is</p> <p>10 that, yes, your fuel charge is what you had</p> <p>11 estimated it to be at the time you sought</p> <p>12 approval for 2003 expenditure, was 754. It's</p> <p>13 now been lowered, as you indicated to 520.</p> <p>14 A. Right.</p> <p>15 Q. But the total budget figure is -</p> <p>16 A. Is the same.</p> <p>17 Q. - exactly the same.</p> <p>18 A. It is exactly the same. I can change it if</p> <p>19 you wish, but our planners and engineers and</p> <p>20 reviewed this again and we are satisfied that</p> <p>21 that is still a reasonable estimate to execute</p> <p>22 this project.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. So, it's just a coincidence that</p> <p>24 happens to be exactly the same or is it that</p> <p>25 you took part of that budget and rolled it</p>

Page 125	Page 126
<p>1 into another contingency fund in case, you</p> <p>2 know, you saved money here, 250 roughly or</p> <p>3 220, that you may lose that 220 somewhere</p> <p>4 else. So, is that booked into another line</p> <p>5 item of your budget, is it -</p> <p>6 A. It's not booked into another line item.</p> <p>7 Again, we're reviewed it and we're satisfied</p> <p>8 that overall this project, as estimated now is</p> <p>9 similar to what we or the same actually of</p> <p>10 what we presented last year.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Counsel for the Industrial Customers</p> <p>12 was asking you some questions about vehicles.</p> <p>13 I'm just wondering generally if Hydro has had</p> <p>14 completed recently a fleet optimization study</p> <p>15 by a third party?</p> <p>16 A. Not by a third party. However, we are doing</p> <p>17 one internally right now. And earlier this</p> <p>18 year we started a two phase approach, I guess,</p> <p>19 one was types of vehicles that we actually use</p> <p>20 for the lighter vehicle and also some of our</p> <p>21 heavy equipment. And the other one is the</p> <p>22 number of vehicles that we currently have.</p> <p>23 So, the conclusion of those is coming fairly</p> <p>24 soon.</p> <p>25 Q. Would you consider a, sort of, outside the box</p>	<p>1 opinion on your fleet optimization? There's a</p> <p>2 number of companies, I know, that specialize</p> <p>3 in that very thing.</p> <p>4 A. Yes. One of the things that we're looking at</p> <p>5 is the line trucks, for instance, is the type</p> <p>6 of vehicle that we're actually using and right</p> <p>7 now, similar to, I guess, other utilities,</p> <p>8 we're probably using two vehicles, one to</p> <p>9 place poles and lift transformers and what</p> <p>10 not. And we're using another to life the line</p> <p>11 work up on the pole. There is a truck out</p> <p>12 there now which is, I think it's called a</p> <p>13 material handler and I think if you look</p> <p>14 around the city here, you'll see Newfoundland</p> <p>15 Power has gone to a number of those as well.</p> <p>16 We're looking at replacing some of our</p> <p>17 vehicles with those. The difficulty is, is</p> <p>18 that they're fairly expensive and a lot of our</p> <p>19 rural areas, it may be cheaper to stay with</p> <p>20 what we have, rather than go with one of these</p> <p>21 more expensive units.</p> <p>22 Q. Yes.</p> <p>23 A. So, we are currently looking at that. So,</p> <p>24 that's one example of what we're looking at.</p> <p>25 Q. Sure, but there's no initiative on the books,</p>
Page 127	Page 128
<p>1 so to speak, to obtain the device or services</p> <p>2 of opinion of an outside consultant regarding</p> <p>3 your own fleet optimization?</p> <p>4 A. Not at this point in time, no.</p> <p>5 Q. Now, the last question is actually going to be</p> <p>6 a bit of a switch up and this has to do with a</p> <p>7 question I asked, it's a topic near and dear</p> <p>8 to my heart, Chair, with your indulgence. It</p> <p>9 relates to something called the Dark Skies</p> <p>10 Initiative and I can actually the capital</p> <p>11 budget to trigger this. It won't be but a</p> <p>12 moment. And we can use B39 just so we can</p> <p>13 talk about it, surrounding a topic, B39,</p> <p>14 members of the panel, is service extension</p> <p>15 project for all service areas. It falls under</p> <p>16 the TRO budget in their distribution aspect.</p> <p>17 Project description is, this project is an</p> <p>18 annual allotment based on past expenditures to</p> <p>19 provide service connections including street</p> <p>20 lights to new customers. So, what I'd like to</p> <p>21 do, I gave your counsel a copy of an article</p> <p>22 out of a Discover magazine. What I found was</p> <p>23 that the photocopy of the picture that's in</p> <p>24 the article doesn't really do justice. So,</p> <p>25 what I decided to do was buy some magazines so</p>	<p>1 that members of the panel could look at the</p> <p>2 actual--I have one for the panel too actually.</p> <p>3 You all owe me \$8.50. There are other good</p> <p>4 articles in there too, but -</p> <p>5 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>6 Q. Yes, I noticed.</p> <p>7 MR. KENNEDY:</p> <p>8 Q. The magazines are tabbed to the article</p> <p>9 itself, Chair.</p> <p>10 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>11 Q. This advertisement that keeps popping out is</p> <p>12 not part of this, is it?</p> <p>13 MR. KENNEDY:</p> <p>14 Q. No. By way of explanation, members of the</p> <p>15 panel, the Dark Skies Initiative is an effort</p> <p>16 growing in popularity, I might add in North</p> <p>17 America in particular addressing concerns</p> <p>18 about light pollution. And this article</p> <p>19 explains the down side to poor design in</p> <p>20 lighting, that it can affect your health by</p> <p>21 affecting your ceratium rhythm, it affects</p> <p>22 environment by affecting wildlife, birds, our</p> <p>23 moth population is decreasing dramatically</p> <p>24 apparently, but it also has an economic angle</p> <p>25 as well and I wanted to explore that with the</p>

Page 129	Page 130
<p>1 panel members, but the picture itself, I 2 think, speaks volumes about--people assume 3 that in Newfoundland, we're in the dark and we 4 don't have to worry about light pollution, but 5 I think if you look at the map and this is the 6 reason why I handed out the magazines 7 themselves because it doesn't show up on the 8 photocopy that well, is that St. John's and 9 surrounding area and I believe the second 10 light right next to it would be Mount Pearl 11 are like two headlights staring at you. And 12 that's a direct result of poor ambient 13 lightening that spills out up where we don't 14 need the lighting instead of down which is 15 what the intention is. So, I can start my 16 questions now with the panel members. In 17 reply to PUB 13, gentlemen, you indicated that 18 Hydro was unaware of the Dark Skies 19 Initiative. Can I ask you whether you're now 20 aware of the Dark Skies Initiative? 21 A. I'm more of the aware of the Skies issues 22 right now, yes. 23 Q. And can I ask you, in areas where Hydro is 24 responsible for street lighting, can I ask you 25 what you typically use in your street lights</p>	<p>1 at the present moment. Do you use high 2 pressure sodium or low pressure sodium. 3 MR. MARTIN: 4 A. We use high pressure sodium. 5 Q. And are you aware that high pressure sodium 6 causes the loss our sky scape, night scape in 7 particular and that low pressure sodium bulbs 8 would not? 9 A. I wasn't until you brought this article to our 10 attention. 11 Q. Okay. And were you aware that low pressure 12 sodium bulbs use less energy? 13 A. Yes, I was. 14 Q. And so, were you aware that the City of 15 Calgary, for instance, as indicated in the 16 article, by switching to lower wattage street 17 lighting bulbs is, at a cost of four and a 18 half million dollars for capital, saving 1.3 19 million in electricity each year? 20 A. Not until you brought it to our attention. 21 Q. Okay. And would Hydro, in light of the 22 information it has now, commit itself to, at 23 least, exploring the possibility of designing 24 a street lighting program and other lighting, 25 where appropriate to take into account of the</p>
Page 131	Page 132
<p>1 considerations of the Dark Skies Initiatives? 2 A. I think that's a question for Mr. Reeves. 3 Personally speaking, I would yes, we would 4 certainly be prepared to look at it. 5 MR. REEVES: 6 A. Yes, we would. 7 Q. What would be - 8 MR. MARTIN: 9 A. I might just want to clarify that, is that you 10 have to realize that a lot of our areas are 11 rural areas where the lighting intensity is 12 probably not at severe as into an urban 13 setting here like St. John's and this is why 14 on the map that you've passed out, you can 15 also pick other services are in Newfoundland 16 and Labrador, they're the ones that do not 17 have lights, because we do not have the same 18 intensity of lights, okay, because population 19 is not so severe. 20 Q. Sure, but you can make out and I think as 21 counsel for one of the parties indicated, was 22 astounded that some aspects of our province 23 are still lit up which you would have 24 otherwise considered to be so rural and 25 isolated that they wouldn't so up on a map</p>	<p>1 like this. For instance, St. Anthony is a 2 beacon there up on your Northern Peninsula. I 3 believe that's inside Hydro's territory. 4 A. Yes, but there's only one exception to that 5 and that's probably as most utilities do, when 6 they have a substation, okay, where we have a 7 terminal of a line, we normally design our 8 lights so that they do point up so that we can 9 what is overhead. So, when the line workers 10 go in, in the middle of the night to do 11 trouble calls, that they can actually see the 12 lights and see the equipment that's there. 13 And that's why in the middle of Labrador you 14 can Churchill Falls. I suspect that that's 15 the switch yard in Churchill Falls. 16 Q. Okay. So, in certain times it's unavoidable 17 because of safety considerations. 18 A. Yes, exactly. 19 Q. But you'd agree with me that in many cases, 20 for normal street lighting requirements that a 21 low pressure sodium bulb is a perfectly 22 reasonable solution. 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. And would, in actual fact save whatever two or 25 municipality is footing the bill for those</p>

Page 133	Page 134
<p>1 street lights.</p> <p>2 A. Yes, if there are savings to be got, they</p> <p>3 should be getting them.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. That's all the questions I have, Chair.</p> <p>5 Thank you very much gentlemen.</p> <p>6 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>7 Q. Okay, thank you, Mr. Kennedy. Do you have re-</p> <p>8 direct, Ms. Greene.</p> <p>9 MR. KENNEDY:</p> <p>10 Q. We'll need to put that as an exhibit, Chair,</p> <p>11 so Exhibit No. 3.</p> <p>12 MS. HENLEY ANDREWS:</p> <p>13 Q. It's going in as to its existence, but not as</p> <p>14 to the truth of its content?</p> <p>15 MR. KENNEDY:</p> <p>16 Q. Yes, I won't be calling the author of the</p> <p>17 report.</p> <p>18 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>19 Q. Exhibit 3. Okay, I think we need a break at</p> <p>20 this point in time for 10 or 15 minutes and we</p> <p>21 then will come back and hopefully we can</p> <p>22 finish before 1:30. Thank you.</p> <p>23 (BREAK - 12:17 P.M.)</p> <p>24 (RESUME - 12:37 P.M.)</p> <p>25 CHAIRMAN:</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay, Ms. Greene.</p> <p>2 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. Mr. Chair, I have no re-direct arising from</p> <p>4 cross-examination, but we are in a position to</p> <p>5 respond to the undertaking provided to Ms.</p> <p>6 Henley Andrews during the cross-examination.</p> <p>7 And that related to IC36 and Ms. Henley</p> <p>8 Andrews asked us to advise whether any of the</p> <p>9 vehicles that were listed in IC 36, page 2 of</p> <p>10 2 were to be used in the L'anse-au-Loup</p> <p>11 system. Mr. Reeves, have you been able to</p> <p>12 determine the answer to that question over the</p> <p>13 break?</p> <p>14 MR. REEVES:</p> <p>15 A. Yes, I've checked with our assets people in</p> <p>16 transportation and there is one vehicle on</p> <p>17 this page which is for L'anse-au-Loup and it's</p> <p>18 under the first category.</p> <p>19 Q. When you say first category, you mean replaced</p> <p>20 vehicles, 2003?</p> <p>21 A. 2003, yes. And it's the last vehicle</p> <p>22 actually, vehicle 4438, that one is being</p> <p>23 purchased for L'anse-au-Loup.</p> <p>24 Q. Thank you, Mr. Chair, that concludes what I</p> <p>25 wanted to do.</p>
Page 135	Page 136
<p>1 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>2 Q. Thank you, Ms. Greene. Any questions,</p> <p>3 Commissioner Powell.</p> <p>4 COMMISSIONER POWELL:</p> <p>5 Q. Just a couple of short ones, Mr. Chair. Just</p> <p>6 one little note. On the dials upgrade you're</p> <p>7 doing, if memory serves correct, a couple of</p> <p>8 years ago Newfoundland Power did an upgrade,</p> <p>9 had their line down that way, I guess, were</p> <p>10 you aware of it and any thought of, sort of,</p> <p>11 combining the initiatives at the same time in</p> <p>12 terms of saving?</p> <p>13 MR. MARTIN:</p> <p>14 A. I'm not aware of any upgrade that Newfoundland</p> <p>15 Power did. A year or two ago we did so some</p> <p>16 upgrades to our 69 kV transmission line from</p> <p>17 Doyles to Port aux Basques, TL215. We</p> <p>18 replaced some wood pole structures there.</p> <p>19 Q. The only reason I mention that, we had a tour</p> <p>20 of the Rose Blanche facility and when we were</p> <p>21 coming up, they were talking about they were</p> <p>22 upgrading their lines all the way up the south</p> <p>23 west coast because they were moving them from</p> <p>24 the road bed for environment purposes and they</p> <p>25 talked about their problems with salt and</p>	<p>1 various things.</p> <p>2 A. I'm not familiar with those upgrades, I'm</p> <p>3 sorry.</p> <p>4 Q. B83, there was just an item there that struck</p> <p>5 me as being--in your corporate overhead, the</p> <p>6 things, the cost use of funds. 2004, you have</p> <p>7 51,000 on a million dollar supply item and in</p> <p>8 2005, you're projecting a supply item of less</p> <p>9 than a million dollars, 259,000. Do you have</p> <p>10 a significant contingency value built in</p> <p>11 there. Why would you put it there?</p> <p>12 MR. REEVES:</p> <p>13 A. We have about, it's around a ten or less</p> <p>14 percentage of contingency--if my memory serves</p> <p>15 me right and what is, is that as we discussed</p> <p>16 with the Industrial Customers, because of the</p> <p>17 criteria the way that it is, we try to get as</p> <p>18 long out of vehicles as we can, but there may</p> <p>19 be one that fails in service or we may have an</p> <p>20 accident that we had to replace the vehicle</p> <p>21 and that's why that contingency is a bit</p> <p>22 large.</p> <p>23 Q. So, when we see the 2004 budget, that 250 may</p> <p>24 shrink which will be more -</p> <p>25 A. It may or may not because you can't predict</p>

Page 137	Page 138
<p>1 these things.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. So, the type of vehicle 2005 can be</p> <p>3 significant?</p> <p>4 A. 2005 would be the larger vehicles, the line</p> <p>5 trucks.</p> <p>6 Q. Okay. Do you, as a policy, have time logs for</p> <p>7 your vehicles' use?</p> <p>8 A. Do we--sorry?</p> <p>9 Q. Have a time log system or some system to see</p> <p>10 what, you know -</p> <p>11 A. On the truck itself or the vehicle itself?</p> <p>12 Q. All vehicles, what each vehicle is being used</p> <p>13 for in terms of -</p> <p>14 A. On the--to answer your question specifically,</p> <p>15 I guess, we do not on all of our vehicles, no.</p> <p>16 We don't have any electronic equipment or do</p> <p>17 we keep a daily log of our vehicles either.</p> <p>18 Q. I'm thinking more of a daily log as opposed to</p> <p>19 -</p> <p>20 A. No, like a line truck that we would have to</p> <p>21 put a line crew, you know, they'd be working</p> <p>22 on lines all the time. So, we don't have a</p> <p>23 book in the truck that tells where they went</p> <p>24 on a particular job. My recollection is that</p> <p>25 we don't have that.</p>	<p>1 Q. Okay. Your speciality vehicles, do you do any</p> <p>2 sharing with Newfoundland Power?</p> <p>3 A. We have an arrangement with Newfoundland Power</p> <p>4 that in the eventuality that either one or the</p> <p>5 other parties got a major outage or whatever</p> <p>6 or a special requirement, that we have a</p> <p>7 mechanism in place where we can share, yes.</p> <p>8 Q. The 281 vehicles, just a quick and dirty</p> <p>9 calculation, that works out to 3.5 to 4</p> <p>10 employees for every vehicle.</p> <p>11 A. Well, when you consider that a lot of our</p> <p>12 vehicles, like the 3s and 4000s, I guess, and</p> <p>13 even some of the, a lot of the 2000s, that</p> <p>14 there'd be one, maximum of two people in those</p> <p>15 vehicles. Like a technician would use a panel</p> <p>16 van to go into a site. A lot of cases, they</p> <p>17 would go by themselves. Many of our line</p> <p>18 trucks would only have two people on them.</p> <p>19 So, that would drive the ratio down.</p> <p>20 Q. Do you have any idea how this would compare</p> <p>21 with other utilities or does that -</p> <p>22 A. No, to be honest, I don't have that off the</p> <p>23 top of my head, no. I'd be surprised if it's</p> <p>24 much different because most other utilities,</p> <p>25 for line crew, like on distribution, they</p>
Page 139	Page 140
<p>1 would typically have a two-person crew.</p> <p>2 Transmission line crews, typically are six</p> <p>3 people, but you'd have less crews in</p> <p>4 transmission. The most crews that we would</p> <p>5 have is distribution crews.</p> <p>6 Q. As far as personal use of vehicle, the</p> <p>7 liability would be--liability insurance</p> <p>8 questions would be--you using your own vehicle</p> <p>9 for company -</p> <p>10 A. Well, yes, liability is covered for myself,</p> <p>11 yes.</p> <p>12 Q. We were talking about replacing a transformer</p> <p>13 in Rigolet, the media has been carrying--</p> <p>14 Petites is doing a Harbour Deep, is there any</p> <p>15 savings that Hydro can get from that for,</p> <p>16 capital budget in terms of equipment that they</p> <p>17 won't have to buy now, because they'll be able</p> <p>18 to transfer.</p> <p>19 A. Very little of it, I would say, because</p> <p>20 Petites, if I remember correctly, it's</p> <p>21 probably a community that's been there for</p> <p>22 quite a while and we've been servicing for</p> <p>23 quite a while and much of the equipment is</p> <p>24 probably at the end of its useful life anyway.</p> <p>25 We may be able to transfer some of it, but not</p>	<p>1 a lot of it. If I can just indicate, when we</p> <p>2 decommissioned Harbour Deep a couple of years</p> <p>3 ago, I think we were only able to use one of</p> <p>4 the diesels because the rest were at the end</p> <p>5 of their useful life.</p> <p>6 Q. That's all my questions, Chair.</p> <p>7 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>8 Q. Thank you, Mr. Powell.</p> <p>9 COMMISSIONER POWELL:</p> <p>10 Q. Good retirement, Mr. Reeves.</p> <p>11 A. Thank you very much.</p> <p>12 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>13 Q. Mr. Reeves, I had a couple of questions and</p> <p>14 really they had to do with your vehicle</p> <p>15 policy. But before I get into that one, if</p> <p>16 you would go to B84 and B82. There's a</p> <p>17 contingency included in both and that is in</p> <p>18 the case of 82, it's three forty one nine and</p> <p>19 in the case of 84, it's 310,400. Would you</p> <p>20 explain why that is there?</p> <p>21 A. When I said the contingency percentages to Mr.</p> <p>22 Powell was around 10 percent, actually it's a</p> <p>23 little bit higher than that. The notes that I</p> <p>24 got here in my file. Why we put a contingency</p> <p>25 is for a number of reasons. One is that the</p>

Page 141	Page 142
<p>1 prices that we would be charged could be off, 2 but that's really probably more--we have a 3 better handle on that one because the prices 4 of vehicles don't go up that great. I guess 5 why we put a contingency in there is that if 6 we have accidents on our own vehicles, we are 7 self insured and if the vehicle is written 8 off, we would have to replace that vehicle. 9 Also, if there are high maintenance items in a 10 particular year, we might consider--you know, 11 if a vehicle, say, required--it was close to 12 the end of its service life and going to be 13 replaced next year, we may even consider 14 moving it up a year or something. But that is 15 the oddity, rather than the - 16 Q. I wonder, because there is a contingency of a 17 million dollars allowed normally in the 18 budget, and you've applied to have that 19 approved again for 2004. Would you expect 20 that an example like you just gave, the 21 replacement of a vehicle, would be able to be 22 covered by that contingency and the conditions 23 that apply to that contingency? 24 A. It possibly could, but what we've done in the 25 past, rightly or wrongly, is that we carry</p>	<p>1 that contingency in our vehicles and 2 typically, we have, in the past, used fairly 3 close to all of our money on our vehicles. 4 Q. You mean the contingency? 5 A. The contingency as well, yes. Whether it's a 6 price escalation or whether it's a failure of 7 vehicles in service. 8 Q. Yes. I'm having a bit of difficulty wondering 9 why it's necessary to have the contingency in 10 respect of the vehicles as opposed say to the 11 insulators that we talked about earlier, \$2 12 million, you know. Can you explain the 13 difference, why there is a need to have a 14 contingency here? 15 A. Most of our projects, we do carry a small 16 amount of contingency. It can vary, you know, 17 depending on the--I guess on the - 18 Q. Yes, and which is normally covered in that, I 19 suppose, that item called corporate overhead, 20 et cetera, and contingency? 21 A. That's correct, yes. 22 Q. Yes. I just wondered why, in the case of the 23 vehicles, it seemed to be a higher amount than 24 normal. That's all. 25 A. Yes.</p>
Page 143	Page 144
<p>1 Q. But you say each year you've been - 2 A. My recollection - 3 Q. - your experience is that you use it up? 4 A. - my recollection is that we've been spending 5 fairly close to the money that we've requested 6 for vehicles. 7 Q. If it's something that happens regularly every 8 year, I just wonder why it still can't--you 9 know, it still - 10 A. Well, the trouble is - 11 Q. - it still has the name contingency attached 12 to it. 13 A. Yes. I guess, the trouble is that we, from 14 earlier on, we went through the review and we 15 can tell you exactly what vehicle we plan to 16 replace next year, due to mileage, condition 17 and whatnot and we try to do that at least 18 one, if not two years in advance, depending on 19 the timing that we got. So that's fairly 20 rigid. But the other ones are the ones that 21 we are basically, you know, we don't know 22 what's going to happen. You know, this is-- 23 right now, this is July. This budget is for 24 next year. If we have a vehicle involved in 25 an accident next year, then we'll have to do</p>	<p>1 something with that one. 2 Q. Okay, that explains it. I'm not sure I agree 3 with it, but that explains it. Just go to B 81 4 and keep your finger in B83. At the very last 5 paragraph, you start describing category and 6 one and 2000 vehicles being replaced with an 7 average age of six years and 150, 000 8 kilometres. And if you look up at the table 9 those numbers seem to match the numbers on 10 their age and other. 11 A. Um-hm. 12 Q. Now, when you go to 3000, the average age of 13 11 years and 100,000 kilometres. 14 A. Um-hm. 15 Q. And the same with respect to 4000, an average 16 age of 10 years and 200,000 kilometres, my 17 question is what is the difference between 18 that statement and what the information is 19 that, sort of, comes through from the table. 20 A. Well, the one that's really off line there, I 21 guess, is the light trucks where we kept the 22 vehicles for an average 11 years. And what it 23 is, is that we were replacing two trucks there 24 for the Bishop Falls site actually. One is in 25 transportation which is 12 years old and the</p>

Page 145	Page 146
<p>1 other one is a salt truck which is ten years</p> <p>2 old. So, because I think, I guess, the use</p> <p>3 that they got, we were able to keep the</p> <p>4 longer.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. So, the statement you have in the last</p> <p>6 paragraph is in relation to the purchases that</p> <p>7 you intend to do this year?</p> <p>8 A. For the vehicles -</p> <p>9 Q. The statements in the table are in relation to</p> <p>10 the fleet.</p> <p>11 A. Are in relation--and these are the guidelines</p> <p>12 that we use. And what's in the paragraph is,</p> <p>13 for the vehicles being replaced under this</p> <p>14 project.</p> <p>15 Q. Ms. Henley Andrews was asking you some</p> <p>16 questions about the maintenance and so on, and</p> <p>17 one of the factors that I thought you might</p> <p>18 have thrown in there, in your answer, is the</p> <p>19 increase in maintenance that comes about as a</p> <p>20 result of more than one driver being--or using</p> <p>21 a particular vehicle. Now I don't know what</p> <p>22 your experience has been. I know I asked you</p> <p>23 that question, I think, before and I don't</p> <p>24 recall the answer. But it is a significant</p> <p>25 factor, in terms of what impact it has on</p>	<p>1 maintenance?</p> <p>2 A. Probably does, yes. It most definitely does,</p> <p>3 I would say.</p> <p>4 Q. So most of your vehicles that are out in the</p> <p>5 field, would they be driven by more than one</p> <p>6 person?</p> <p>7 A. The majority of them would be. Some of the</p> <p>8 ones, like if we got one technician in an area</p> <p>9 like--or two technicians in an area, it might</p> <p>10 be two drivers on a particular vehicle, like a</p> <p>11 panel van or something. Line trucks, the</p> <p>12 heavy line trucks, we may have a designated</p> <p>13 driver or two, but other than that, like fleet</p> <p>14 vehicles, whoever -</p> <p>15 Q. Yes.</p> <p>16 A. - requires a vehicle will use them.</p> <p>17 (12:52 p.m.)</p> <p>18 Q. So the vehicle is not assigned to a person in</p> <p>19 all cases? It's sometimes assigned to a</p> <p>20 location?</p> <p>21 A. A location, and there are some vehicles which</p> <p>22 we would say, I'm going to use the word,</p> <p>23 loosely assigned, like to a front line</p> <p>24 supervisor, where they might have three or</p> <p>25 four crews out. That person would be using</p>
Page 147	Page 148
<p>1 the same vehicle all the time.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you have a fleet manager?</p> <p>3 A. We have what we call an asset manager, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And is he responsible for more than your</p> <p>5 vehicles?</p> <p>6 A. Is he responsible for more than the vehicles?</p> <p>7 Q. Like is he responsible for fixed plant as</p> <p>8 well? What I'm wondering is if you have a</p> <p>9 person--you know, you have a fleet of 281, I</p> <p>10 think it is -</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. - which is a considerable size.</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. And there wouldn't be many fleets in</p> <p>15 Newfoundland greater than that in number.</p> <p>16 There are some, of course. But there's a fair</p> <p>17 number of dollars tied up in those vehicles</p> <p>18 and I'm just wondering about your approach,</p> <p>19 you know, Hydro's approach to taking care, if</p> <p>20 you like, of that asset or those assets?</p> <p>21 A. Up until, I guess, the late 90s, we were</p> <p>22 probably a little looser managed of our fleet</p> <p>23 then, like the different areas have more</p> <p>24 control of their vehicles. With the asset</p> <p>25 manager, he works more closely with each</p>	<p>1 section, whether it's in hydro generation or</p> <p>2 thermal generation or the three regions which</p> <p>3 I have to work with the labour managers, who</p> <p>4 primarily their staff that run the vehicles.</p> <p>5 So he would be involved in the selection of</p> <p>6 vehicles, trying to get consensus amongst the</p> <p>7 users of the vehicles, and also, he would have</p> <p>8 access to all the maintenance costs on each</p> <p>9 vehicle and even if there's particular</p> <p>10 problems on a particular vehicle, he will deal</p> <p>11 with the user and he'll have the general</p> <p>12 knowledge of the other vehicles in the fleet</p> <p>13 which are like that one. So we try to</p> <p>14 consolidate as much as we can without taking</p> <p>15 away the responsibility of the day-to-day</p> <p>16 operations of the vehicle for the particular</p> <p>17 region.</p> <p>18 Q. All of your maintenance, purchasing, is all</p> <p>19 done in-house, isn't it?</p> <p>20 A. That's correct. We do have a PHH card,</p> <p>21 whereby we buy our--we purchase our gas</p> <p>22 through PHH cards, and also, that's used to</p> <p>23 track the expenses of our vehicles, but</p> <p>24 normally, we would manage the replacement or</p> <p>25 parts on vehicles or whatever and the purchase</p>

Page 149	Page 150
<p>1 of vehicles.</p> <p>2 Q. Have you looked at going outside? Have you</p> <p>3 talked to any of the companies out there that</p> <p>4 do this, that do your vehicle or your fleet</p> <p>5 maintenance as a business? There is one that</p> <p>6 I can't recall the name of, but I think it's</p> <p>7 used by Newfoundland Power.</p> <p>8 A. I'm not sure, from talking to--I can't</p> <p>9 remember either. But my recollection is that</p> <p>10 they do a lot of their maintenance in-house as</p> <p>11 well, but we have not passed over the full</p> <p>12 control of our fleet to a third party, you're</p> <p>13 right, and we have looked at it, I guess,</p> <p>14 generally in the past, but we haven't hired on</p> <p>15 a consultant or anybody to review it, in my</p> <p>16 recollection.</p> <p>17 Q. But not only have you not handed it over to a</p> <p>18 third party, if I recall what you said a few</p> <p>19 minutes ago, you haven't deemed it to be</p> <p>20 important enough to assign the responsibility</p> <p>21 of fleet operations to a particular person</p> <p>22 exclusively?</p> <p>23 A. Well, I must have misstated myself then,</p> <p>24 because we have--all of our fleet now is under</p> <p>25 the one person, which is the asset manager,</p>	<p>1 which is actually located in Bishop Falls, our</p> <p>2 largest location, I guess. He coordinates all</p> <p>3 the purchasing of our vehicles. He</p> <p>4 coordinates the -</p> <p>5 Q. Yes.</p> <p>6 A. - the repairs, all that kind of stuff, but</p> <p>7 what he doesn't have responsibility for, if</p> <p>8 he's got a vehicle say in Happy Valley, and it</p> <p>9 runs into problems tomorrow morning, the</p> <p>10 people in Happy Valley has some authority to</p> <p>11 go out and get that piece of equipment fixed.</p> <p>12 If it's a major fix, then they get back to</p> <p>13 assets before they spend any amount of</p> <p>14 dollars, because it may be a common problem.</p> <p>15 It may be one that got to make a different</p> <p>16 decision on.</p> <p>17 Q. What else does that person in Bishop Falls do?</p> <p>18 A. Right now, I think his primary role is</p> <p>19 vehicles.</p> <p>20 Q. But what else does he do? You say primary.</p> <p>21 A. Prior to '99--I'm here thinking, I think prior</p> <p>22 to '99, he had responsibility for the civil</p> <p>23 section, but he doesn't have that right now.</p> <p>24 If I'm not mistaken, he's got the--that's his</p> <p>25 full responsibility. He's got a very small</p>
Page 151	Page 152
<p>1 support staff of one person.</p> <p>2 Q. When you declare that a vehicle is no longer</p> <p>3 useful to you and you're going to replace it,</p> <p>4 what do you do with the vehicle? What's your</p> <p>5 policy in terms of disposal?</p> <p>6 A. We usually have--several times a year, we have</p> <p>7 an auctioneer come in and we auction off our</p> <p>8 vehicles.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you salvage or do you make use of the</p> <p>10 equipment that's contained on some of these</p> <p>11 specialty vehicles?</p> <p>12 A. Yes. Matter of fact, on some of our line</p> <p>13 trucks, we will reuse the boom for several</p> <p>14 chassis.</p> <p>15 Q. So they'll outlast, say, the life of the</p> <p>16 vehicle itself?</p> <p>17 A. Of the chassis, yes.</p> <p>18 Q. In normal circumstances, yes. Just one more</p> <p>19 question, Mr. Reeves. What portion of the</p> <p>20 fleet are you proposing to replace this year,</p> <p>21 either in terms of dollars or in terms of</p> <p>22 numbers of vehicles? I just want to get some</p> <p>23 fix on--because it seems to be that this</p> <p>24 amount occurs annually, doesn't it?</p> <p>25 A. Yes, it does. And I just did it straight on</p>	<p>1 numbers. We have 281 and we're replacing 44</p> <p>2 vehicles in 2004, so that's about 15 percent.</p> <p>3 Q. And that's normal?</p> <p>4 A. That's about on par, I think, yes.</p> <p>5 Q. Yes.</p> <p>6 A. If I remember correctly.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Any questions arising, Ms. Greene?</p> <p>8 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>9 Q. No, Mr. Chairman, thank you.</p> <p>10 HENLEY ANDREWS, Q.C.:</p> <p>11 Q. Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions</p> <p>12 arising.</p> <p>13 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>14 Q. Yes. I'm going to get to you.</p> <p>15 HENLEY ANDREWS, Q.C.:</p> <p>16 Q. Okay.</p> <p>17 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>18 Q. Mr. Hayes, do you have any questions arising?</p> <p>19 MR. HAYES:</p> <p>20 Q. No, Mr. Chair.</p> <p>21 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. I'm looking at the order that I have</p> <p>23 here. I guess I'm reading from the wrong</p> <p>24 list, and that's my problem, and I guess</p> <p>25 that's why you interrupted me, Ms. Henley</p>

Page 153	Page 154
<p>1 Andrews.</p> <p>2 HENLEY ANDREWS, Q.C.:</p> <p>3 Q. No. In fact, that's not correct. I was just</p> <p>4 afraid you weren't coming to me at all.</p> <p>5 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>6 Q. I will. Matter of fact, I'm about ready now.</p> <p>7 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>8 Q. I think I'm supposed to have been last on</p> <p>9 this.</p> <p>10 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>11 Q. Yes, you're last.</p> <p>12 HENLEY ANDREWS, Q.C.:</p> <p>13 Q. Yes, I know that.</p> <p>14 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>15 Q. So you can ask me again.</p> <p>16 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>17 Q. Yes. So Ms. Henley Andrews, you carry on.</p> <p>18 It's a good thing it's Friday.</p> <p>19 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>20 Q. And we're almost at the end.</p> <p>21 RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION BY JANET HENLEY ANDREWS, Q.C.</p> <p>22 HENLEY ANDREWS, Q.C.:</p> <p>23 Q. There are just three things arising out of the</p> <p>24 questions, and that is, in answer to the</p> <p>25 Chairman's questions, you said that if you</p>	<p>1 have accidents, you're self-insured on your</p> <p>2 vehicles?</p> <p>3 A. For the vehicle damage themselves, that's</p> <p>4 correct, yes. That's my recollection.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. So you don't carry -</p> <p>6 A. The liability we cover with an outside party,</p> <p>7 but the vehicles themselves, my recollection</p> <p>8 is that we self-insure ourselves.</p> <p>9 Q. So you can't carry any collision?</p> <p>10 A. How is collision covered? Glass and that, no.</p> <p>11 All we cover for our vehicles, and I stand to</p> <p>12 be corrected, is liability.</p> <p>13 Q. And is that based upon a study of a cost</p> <p>14 benefit with respect to the insurance versus</p> <p>15 replace--versus self-insurance?</p> <p>16 A. I'm not aware that there was one done, but</p> <p>17 that's not my area of expertise, I'm sorry.</p> <p>18 Q. And the second thing is the Chairman suggested</p> <p>19 to you that--or asked you your opinion as to</p> <p>20 whether having more than one driver has a</p> <p>21 significant impact on maintenance, and I</p> <p>22 thought your answer was that it might. Was</p> <p>23 that correct?</p> <p>24 A. My answer would only be subjective at this</p> <p>25 point in time, and I guess, most of our</p>
Page 155	Page 156
<p>1 vehicles are multi-driver vehicles, so I just</p> <p>2 know my own car at home, that if there's more</p> <p>3 than one vehicle driver, then normally, your</p> <p>4 maintenance could be higher, yes.</p> <p>5 Q. It -</p> <p>6 A. That's just a subjective comment on my part.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. So Hydro hasn't done a study that</p> <p>8 indicates that its vehicle life or its vehicle</p> <p>9 maintenance is higher as a result of the</p> <p>10 number of drivers on any given class of</p> <p>11 vehicles?</p> <p>12 A. No, we have not, and I really don't see the</p> <p>13 intent of doing that, because it just would</p> <p>14 not suit our business. We could not assign</p> <p>15 particular individuals to drive vehicles. We</p> <p>16 would need more vehicles.</p> <p>17 Q. And if we go to the last question that was</p> <p>18 asked, in terms of the percentage of vehicles</p> <p>19 that are being replaced in 2004, while it's</p> <p>20 true that it's 15 percent overall, wouldn't</p> <p>21 you agree that if you looked at each</p> <p>22 subcategory, which is the 1000, the 2000, the</p> <p>23 3000 and the 4000, that, for example, if you</p> <p>24 take the 3000 level vehicles, which are shown</p> <p>25 on IC-36, page 2 of 2, there is four of them,</p>	<p>1 four light trucks that are mentioned?</p> <p>2 A. That's correct.</p> <p>3 Q. Out of a total of 13?</p> <p>4 A. 13, yes.</p> <p>5 Q. So that's roughly 30 percent of the light</p> <p>6 trucks?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. So the percentages for the different</p> <p>9 categories may be different than the 15</p> <p>10 percent that -</p> <p>11 A. That's correct. That depends on their service</p> <p>12 life.</p> <p>13 Q. Those are my questions. Thank you.</p> <p>14 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>15 Q. Thank you, Ms. Henley Andrews. Mr. Kennedy?</p> <p>16 MR. KENNEDY:</p> <p>17 Q. Nothing arising, Chair.</p> <p>18 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>19 Q. Nothing arising. Ms. Greene?</p> <p>20 GREENE, Q.C.:</p> <p>21 Q. Before we concluded today, Mr. Chair, I do</p> <p>22 have the responses to two undertakings that I</p> <p>23 can file at this time.</p> <p>24 CHAIRMAN:</p> <p>25 Q. You have nothing arising, I gather.</p>

1 GREENE, Q.C.:

2 Q. No, sorry. I'm too anxious to finish, I
3 guess. No, sorry, Mr. Chair. Moved on to the
4 next point.

5 CHAIRMAN:

6 Q. Okay.

7 GREENE, Q.C.:

8 Q. We have three undertakings that are
9 outstanding, and the secretary has passed--or
10 the Clerk has passed around a list of the
11 undertakings. So I will use that list in
12 responding. The first one that is indicated,
13 with no response, is undertaking No. 28, which
14 arose from questions by Mr. Hayes and it
15 related to the escalation factor used in the
16 calculation of the mobile radio replacement
17 project, and which related to the escalation
18 factor of 1.8 percent. So I do have a written
19 response to that to distribute at this time.
20 So this is a response to Undertaking 28.

21 CHAIRMAN:

22 Q. After you've had a look at those, I'll give
23 you an opportunity if there are any questions
24 that you have, for clarification purposes
25 anyway.

1 have that ready for today, but I will file it
2 next week, assuming that we can get that from
3 Mr. Cook. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That
4 completes our responses to the undertakings,
5 except for Undertaking No. 30.

6 CHAIRMAN:

7 Q. Okay. Are there any questions arising from
8 the information contained in those last three
9 or last two undertaking?

10 GREENE, Q.C.:

11 Q. Now the only thing I should point out is these
12 arose from the previous panel. Mr. Martin and
13 Mr. -

14 CHAIRMAN:

15 Q. Sure, it was, yes.

16 GREENE, Q.C.:

17 Q. - Mr. Martin and Mr. Reeves were not involved
18 in the preparation of the information.

19 CHAIRMAN:

20 Q. No.

21 MR. HAYES:

22 Q. I have one observation, Mr. Chair, and I just
23 wonder if maybe Ms. Greene could clarify, and
24 I just read the undertaking which was U-28, in
25 response to my question, and at the end, it

1 GREENE, Q.C.:

2 Q. The next undertaking is Undertaking No. 31,
3 which related to the cost of the Think Centre
4 S50 and we had undertaken yesterday to file a
5 copy of the website page from IBM, as well as
6 a setting out of the cost for the Hydro
7 product versus the same product at the IBM
8 website, and I have a copy of that to
9 circulate at this time.

10 CHAIRMAN:

11 Q. That was No. 31, you said?

12 GREENE, Q.C.:

13 Q. That was No. 31, Mr. Chair. And I just notice
14 that the paper clip did not go through all of
15 the copies. I have sufficient copies here,
16 it's just, as I said, for some reason--oh,
17 thank you, Barbara--the paper clip is on the
18 bottom, not on the top, for half of them.
19 Sorry. I have more copies, Barbara, if you
20 need them. So Mr. Chair, our records would
21 indicate that that leaves one undertaking
22 outstanding, which is Undertaking No. 30,
23 which is to provide a CV with respect to
24 Custom Services Electronics, Mr. Norman Cook
25 of that company, and we have been unable to

1 gives a range of escalation rates of 1.9 to
2 1.4 percent, and that's a descending order, so
3 I just wondered if there might have been a
4 typo or if that really, in fact, is it?

5 GREENE, Q.C.:

6 Q. No, there are different percentages each year,
7 and I don't think it's actually done
8 chronologically, is my memory from our
9 discussions last night, Mr. Hayes. This was
10 actually prepared by Mr. Downton and Mr.
11 Dunphy, and they just did it to illustrate
12 that there is a different escalation factor
13 each year that Hydro analyses, and during that
14 period of time, that was the range for that
15 period of time.

16 MR. HAYES:

17 Q. No, my only point was that I would have
18 thought that that might have been expressed
19 1.4 to 1.9, so I just wondered if it didn't
20 mean to say 1.9 to 2.4 or something like that.

21 GREENE, Q.C.:

22 Q. No, the actual numbers are 1.4 to 1.9.

23 MR. HAYES:

24 Q. All right.

25 CHAIRMAN:

Page 161

Page 162

1 Q. Maybe the same person that put the clips on
 2 the bottom of the pages.
 3 GREENE, Q.C.:
 4 Q. It wasn't me last night, sir.
 5 CHAIRMAN:
 6 Q. Okay. Anything else, Ms. Greene?
 7 GREENE, Q.C.:
 8 Q. No. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. That
 9 concludes what Hydro wanted to provide.
 10 CHAIRMAN:
 11 Q. Okay. I'd like to thank the panel for their
 12 contribution, and I wish you well, Mr. Reeves,
 13 in your retirement, and I wish you success in
 14 your new appointment, Mr. Martin.
 15 MR. MARTIN:
 16 A. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 17 MR. REEVES:
 18 A. Thank you.
 19 CHAIRMAN:
 20 Q. This concludes the evidence and cross-
 21 examination portion of the hearing. We've
 22 already agreed on the dates for written
 23 argument and oral argument, and I'd like to
 24 thank all counsel for their cooperation and
 25 their contributions. We will await, I guess,

1 the arrival of the July 28th date, and having
 2 said that, we'll adjourn, and we did it on
 3 time too. Look at that. Amazing how much
 4 speed you can make at the end of the week.
 5 Upon conclusion at 1:15 p.m.

Page 163

1 CERTIFICATE
 2 I, Judy Moss, do hereby certify that the
 3 foregoing is a true and correct transcript in the
 4 matter of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, 2004
 5 Capital Budget Application, heard before the Board
 6 of Commissioners of Public Utilities, Prince
 7 Charles Building, St. John's, Newfoundland and
 8 Labrador on the 11th day of July, A.D., 2003 and
 9 was transcribed by me to the best of my ability by
 10 means of a sound apparatus.
 11 Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador
 12 this 11th day of July, A.D., 2003
 13 Judy Moss