

1 Q. Re: Pre-filed Testimony of Mr. P. Bowman, page 39, lines 6-11:

2 "The CA evidence also does not address the fact that, absent the pilot project,
3 CBPP is effectively economically incented (by way of NLH's contract and rate
4 design) to operate its hydro generation in a manner that was inefficient, and to
5 purchase excess quantities of power from Hydro ("non-firm" power) than was
6 unnecessary under a properly structured rate as the pilot project provides."

7 Please confirm that CA Energy's evidence does recommend that, jointly with
8 termination of the pilot project, a new contract with precisely the incentive
9 properties that Mr. Bowman describes be offered by Hydro to CBPP.
10 (Reference Hydro's 2017 General Rate Application, Exhibit 13, page 21, lines
11 6-11).

12 A. Confirmed.

13 It is not clear however that the timing to be achieved will permit seamless
14 coordination for the test years if Hydro's proposal in the GRA is adopted.
15 Further, there is no guarantee the parties will come to agreement on a new
16 solution. Absent confirmation of such continuity, cancelling of the pilot project
17 appears premature.