

- 1 **Q. (Reference NLH-NP-020 and NLH-NP-021, page A-15 of Application) Benefits are**
2 **listed under "Marginal Capacity Cost" for years that include 2023, 2034 and 2036 but**
3 **these are years for which Attachment C shows there would be significant capital**
4 **expenditures on the plant.**
- 5 a) **Would plant output in those years be affected or even halted for a time as the**
6 **work is done?**
- 7 b) **If so, should not the marginal capacity cost figures for those years be adjusted**
8 **downward? If they have not been adjusted then please provide the revised**
9 **figures.**
- 10 c) **Please calculate the levelized value of capacity benefits (described as**
11 **"Levelized Value of Capacity" in the table on page A-15) assuming that the**
12 **plant becomes stranded at the end of 2041 and production ceases thereafter.**
13 **Please ensure any appropriate adjustment based on the response to (b) is**
14 **incorporated in this calculation. Please provide the detailed calculations in an**
15 **Excel file.**
- 16
- 17 A. a) See response to Request for Information CA-NP-162, part a).
18
- 19 b) The reduced production will be during the non-winter period. As a result, there
20 will be minimal to no impact on the value of capacity.¹
21
- 22 c) See response to Request for Information CA-NP-161, footnote 2.

¹ The marginal capacity costs used in the run of river scenario includes a small cost of 1.39 \$/MWh suggesting there may be some risk that there is a capacity shortfall in the non-winter period. Based on that marginal cost, the cost of the reduced production (13.8 GWh) would amount to \$17,400 ($17,400 = 13.8 \text{ GWh} \times 1.39 \text{ \$/MWh} \times 1000$). This cost was included in the impact of the cost of spill included in response to Request for Information CA-NP-161, footnote 2 and response to Request for Information CA-NP-162, part b).