October 21, 2015 2 (9:05 a.m.) 1 Criteria, our firm energy levels were close to the firm load levels, and we went through the A Q. So there are no preliminary matters, so we're 5 going to go right to Mr. Johnson for his 6 cross-scandination. 6 Cross-scandination. 7 MR PAUL HUMPHRIES 7 MR PAUL HUMPHRIES 8 MR ROBENTMOULTON 8 MR PAUL STRATTON 9 Discarding level of confort in that probably, and the other conflicting picce, I guess, when we look at - not everyone uses a P90 load forecast. A lot of utilities 10 MR RAIL STRATTON 9 Cutting into the reserve in the event that we'd get to the lower probability load 12 JOHNSON, Q.C. 13 JOHNSON, Q.C. 14 Could start of by discussing a moment or two the P50 versus P90 in demand forecasting, and as you get recall extending the members of the panel. Tom Johnson, Consumer 15 Advocate. Some questions this morning if I 16 Could start of by discussing a moment or two the P50 versus P90 in demand forecasting, and as you get recall extending the members of the panel that the P50 demand of forecast essentially means that you could be 21 above your peak demand forecast 50 percent of the time or below it 50	October 21, 2015	Iulti-Page	NL Hydro GRA
1 Corbore 21, 2015 2 (9:05 a.m.) 3 (1) 1 (1)			
2 9.05 s.m.) 3 CHAIR. 4 Q. So there are no preliminary matters, so we're going to go right to Mr. Johnson for his cores-examination. 5 GOING SEARCH STATTON 15 MR. PAUL HUMPHRIES 17 MR. PAUL HUMPHRIES 18 MR. ROIRER MOULTON 29 MR. PAUL STRATTON 10 MR. KEVIN GOLLIBING 11 GROSS PANAMANTON BY JOHNSON, Q.C.: 11 GROSS PANAMANTON BY JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 13 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 14 Mr. Johnson for his dependent of the property of the time or below it 50 percent of the dependent only be about a 10 percent probability that 25 you would be above the peak demand forecast, 2 would be have the peak demand forecast, 2 would be have the peak demand forecast, 2 would be above the peak demand forecast, 2 would be above the peak demand forecast, 2 would be have the peak demand forecast, 2 would be above the peak demand forecas		-	
3 those periods. I guess, with no difficulty, so compound in the roserve in the event that ower taking a level of comfort in that roapin to go right to Mr. Johnson for his cross-examination. 7 Min Paul, HMMHRIS 8 NR ROBERT MOULTON 9 MR. PAUL, STRATTON 10 MR. REYN GOLLEING 11 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 OGNOG morning, Commissioners. Good morning, the members of the panel. Tom Johnson, Consumer 13 Advocate. Some questions this morning if I could start off by discussing a moment or two the peck oversus P90 in demand forecasting, and the special power of the P50 versus P90 in demand forecasting, and the oversus P90 in demand forecasting, and the explained that with P90 there would to only be above the peak demand forecast, would that be correct? 1 or I guess below the peak demand forecast, would that be correct? 3 MR, HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially right? 9 MR, HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 OININSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the essentially right? 9 MR HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 OININSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the established of the peak demand forecast, would have a bearing, I seemed to take the essentially right? 15 MR, HUMPHRIES: 16 A. Yes, essentially. 17 MR, HUMPHRIES: 18 A. Yes, that's correct. 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other demand sources? 10 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the essentially right? 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 OININSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the essentially right? 13 A. Yesh, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 MR HUMPHRIES: 15 OHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the essentially right? 16 C. Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro would not have reviewed and the period. 17 MR, HUMPHRIES: 18 A. It may, it may, yes. 18 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other demanded that the period. 20 Good morning, Commissioners. Good morning		2	
4 that - again we were taking a level of comfort going to go right to Mr. Johnson for his 6 cross-examination. 5 or going to go right to Mr. Johnson for his 6 cross-examination. 7 NR. PAULHUMPHIRES 7 NR. PAULHUMPHIRES 8 NR. ROBLET MOULTON 9 MR. PAUL STRATTON 9 Collection of the condition of the conditio		3	-
5 going to go right to Mr. Johnson for his 6 cross-examination. 7 MR. PAUL HUMPHRIES 8 MR. ROBERT MOULTON 9 MR. PAUL HUMPHRIES 8 MR. ROBERT MOULTON 10 MR. KEVIN GOULDING 11 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY JOHNSON, Q.C: 13 Q. Good morning, Commissioners. Good morning, Members of the panel. Tom Johnson, Consumer 14 members of the panel. Tom Johnson, Consumer 15 Advocate. Some questions this morning if I 16 could start off by discussing a moment or two 17 the P59 versus P50 in demand forecasting, and a syou'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 18 Stratton who indicated that the P50 demand for forecast and the lower unavailability. or higher unavailability or higher unavailability or higher unavailability or higher unavailability or higher unavailability. 22 and he explained that with P50 there would 24 only be about a 10 percent of the time, 23 you would be above the peak demand forecast, 2 would that be correct? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 OINISON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro had been using P50 forever, is that 8 essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, csemitally. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, wou know, it seemed to take the evidence that Hydro that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro wondering by Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro rispeak demand forecast and that would have a bearing, I and that would fish to be isolated, that's correct. 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that historically if we go back to the 2002 period, we went through a generation reserve level at that that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 21 defended that the pornal in the probability of the peak demand forecast and the lower unavailability, or higher unavailability, or higher unavailability, or some part of the time of the bine or helow it. 50 percent of the time, 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 23 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 24 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I suppose, on the reasonable mass of them settling on a P50,			
6 piece, I guess, when we look at - not everyone uses a P90 load forecast. A lot of utilities still use a P50 and they bank on the fact of cutting into the reserve in the event that we dig get to the lower probability load situation, and that works fine as well as long as you got confidence in your generation availability. It think that's the other compounding factor that we got into in the January 2014 period, our actual generation availability was lower than we had been the P50 versus P90 in demand forecasting, and as your "ill reall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 19 Stratton who indicated that the P50 demand of forecast sesentially means that you could be 21 above your peak demand forecast 50 percent of the time, you would be above the peak demand forecast, 2 would that be correct? 1 or I guess below the peak demand forecast, would that be correct? 2 or I guess below the peak demand forecast, would that be correct? 3 INR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 7 Page 2 1 or I guess below the peak demand forecast, would that be correct? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the eavent through a percention reserve level at that methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro knew, that P50 meant that you were above your peak demand forecast half the time? 10 MR. HUMPHRIES: 11 A. Yes, that's correct. 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the eavent through a generation reserve level at that time that was comparable to what we were going gloing through in the 2013/2014 time period. 12 going through in the 2013/2014 time period.			-
7 MR. PALL HUMPHRIES 8 MR. ROBERT MOLITON 9 MR. PALL STRATTON 10 MR. KEVIN GOULDING 11 CROSS_EXAMINATION BY JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 13 Q. Good morning, Commissioners. Good morning, 14 members of the panel. Tom Johnson, Consumer 15 Advocate. Some questions this morning if I 16 could start off by discussing a moment or two 16 the Pool wersus P90 in demand forecasting, and 18 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 19 Stratton who indicated that the P50 demand 20 forecast sesentially means that you could be 21 above your peak demand forecast 50 percent of 22 the time or below it 50 percent of the time, 23 and he explained that with P90 there would 24 only be about a 10 percent probability at 25 you would be above the peak demand forecast, 2 would that be correct? 2 To I guess below the peak demand forecast, 2 would be above the peak demand forecast, 2 would be a correct? 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them 5 settling on a P50, would it? 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them 6 settling on a P50, would it? 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them 6 settling on a P50, would on that would be a portangent by the point of the part of the part of the part of th			
8 MR.ROBERT MOULTON 9 MR. PAUL STRATTON 9 Unifosolouping 10 MR. REVIN GOULDING 11 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 13 availability. 1 think that's the other compounding factor that we got into in the savilability of the past			
9 cutting into the reserve in the event that 10 MR KEVIN GOULDING 11 CROSS FXAMINATION BY JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 13 Q. Good morning, Commissioners. Good morning, 14 members of the panel. Tom Johnson, Consumer 15 Advocate. Some questions this morning if I 16 could start off by discussing a moment or two 17 the P50 versus P90 in demand forecasting, and 18 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 19 Stratton who indicated that the P50 demand 20 forecast essentially means that you could be 21 above your peak demand forecast 50 percent of 22 the time or below it 50 percent of the time, 23 and he explained that with P90 there would 24 only be about a 10 percent probability that 25 you would be above the peak demand forecast, 27 would that be correct. 28 A Yes, that's correct. 29 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 29 MR. HUMPHRIES: 30 A. Ye, sesentially. 31 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 41 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 32 events of early January 2014 for that 33 essentially right? 42 MR. HUMPHRIES: 43 A Vesa, that's correct. 44 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 45 suppose, on the reasonableness of them 46 settling on a P50, would it? 47 MR. HUMPHRIES: 48 A. It may, it may, yes. 49 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 49 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 50 MNSON, Q.C.: 51 OOHNSON, Q.C.: 52 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 53 the wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 54 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 55 Tother of the time? 56 A Yes, essentially right? 57 MR. HUMPHRIES: 58 A. It may, it may, yes. 59 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 59 MR. HUMPHRIES: 60 A. Yes, seemed to take the 61 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 62 Pace as they could count on perhaps other 63 A. It hink a lot of it was the fact that 64 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 65 very that the time or bight in the 2013/2014 time period. 65 very the first that we'd get to the lower probability that 66 very the first that we'd get to the lower probability that 67 very the first that the we'd get			
10 MR REVIN GOULDING 10 we'd get to the lower probability load 11 cROSS-FEXAMINATION BY JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 as a you got confidence in your generation 12 dothnson, Q.C.: 12 as a you got confidence in your generation 13 availability. I think that's the other 15 Advocate. Some questions this morning if I 15 January 2014 period, our actual generation 16 could start off by discussing a moment or two 16 availability 16 availability 16 availability 17 the product 18 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 18 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 18 stratton who indicated that the P50 demand 17 planning on, and so it was a double effect of 18 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 18 the higher forecast and the lower 18 unavailability 18			¥
11 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 JOINSON, Q.C.: 13 Q. Good morning, Commissioners. Good morning, 13 and you got confidence in your generation 14 members of the panel. Tom Johnson, Consumer 14 compounding factor that we got into in the 15 Advocate. Some questions this morning if I 16 could start of by discussing a moment or two 16 availability. I think that vis the other 17 the P50 versus P90 in demand forecasting, and 18 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 18 Stratton who indicated that the P50 demand 17 planning on, and so it was a double effect of 18 the higher forecast and the lower 19 unavailability; or higher unavailability; or hig			_
12 OHNSON, Q.C.: 13 Q. Good morning, Commissioners. Good morning, 14 members of the panel. Tom Johnson, Consumer 15 Advocate. Some questions this morning if I 16 16 16 17 16 17 17 17			- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
13 Q. Good morning. Commissioners. Good morning, 14 members of the panel. Tom Johnson, Consumer 15 Advocate. Some questions this morning if 1 15 Advocate. Some questions this morning if 1 16 could start off by discussing a moment or two 16 could start off by discussing a moment or two 17 the P50 versus P90 in demand forecasting, and 18 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 18 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 19 Stratton who indicated that the P50 demand 17 planning on, and so it was a double effect of 18 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 19 planning on, and so it was a double effect of 19 demand forecast essentially means that you could be 20 sorry, that put us in the situation that we actually got in in January 2014. 20 your peak demand forecast 50 percent of 21 above your peak demand forecast 50 percent of 21 above your peak demand forecast 50 percent of 21 above your peak demand forecast, 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 23 OHNSON, Q.C.: 24 only be about a 10 percent probability that 24 might still use a P50 methodology, I take it 25 you would that be correct? 25 A. No, they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct. 26 A. Yes, that's correct, 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I SolPhSON, Q.C.: 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 JUPPOSE, on the reasonableness of them settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the events of early January 2014 for that methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro you had to play with selfitle above your peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you reference here this morning about historically if we go back to the 2002 period, we wen			_
14 members of the panel. Tom Johnson, Consumer 14 compounding factor that we got into in the 15 Advocate. Some questions this morning if 1 16 could start off by discussing a moment or two 16 the P50 versus P90 in demand forecasting, and 17 survailability was lower than we had been 17 the P50 versus P90 in demand forecasting, and 18 the higher forecast and the lower unavailability, or higher unavailability, or higher unavailability, osorry, that put us in the situation that we 20 sorry, that put us in the situation that we actually got in in January 2014. 20 Johnson, Q.C.: 20 Johnson, Q.C.: 21 or I guess below the peak demand forecast, 22 would that be correct? 23 MR. HUMPHRIES: 24 No., they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct. 25 Johnson, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I suppose, on the reasonableness of them settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 3 Johnson, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I suppose, on the reasonableness of them settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 2 A. No, they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct. 3 Johnson, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 Johnson, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 10 Johnson, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 10 Johnson, Q.C.: 10 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 10 Johnson, Q.C.: 10 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 10 Johnson, Q.C.: 11 Johnson, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the events of early January 2014 for that methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 14 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 Johnson, Q			
15 Advocate. Some questions this morning if I 16 could start off by discussing a moment or two 17 the P50 versus P90 in demand forecasting, and 28 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 29 Stratton who indicated that the P50 demand 20 forecast essentially means that you could be 21 above your peak demand forecast 50 percent of 22 the time or below it 50 percent of the time, 23 and he explained that with P90 there would 24 only be about a 10 percent probability that 25 you would be above the peak demand forecast, 2 would that be correct? 3 MR. HILMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 7 had been using P50 forever, is that 8 essentially right? 9 MR. HILMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 think a lot of it was the fact that 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 25 Johnson, Loc: 26 Johnson, Q.C.: 27 Johnson, Q.C.: 28 Johnson, Q.C.: 29 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 30 Johnson, Q.C.: 40 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 40 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 41 Johnson, Q.C.: 41 Johnson, Q.C.: 42 MR. HUMPHRIES: 43 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 44 Johnson, Q.C.: 45 Johnson, Q.C.: 46 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 47 Johnson, Q.C.: 40 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you reference here this morning about historically in the period. 40 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you reference here this morning about historically in the period. 41 Johnson, Q.C.: 42 Johnson, Q.C.: 43 Johnson, Q.C.: 44 Q. Right, and that w	_		
16 could start off by discussing a moment or two 17 the P50 versus P90 in demand forecasting, and 18 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 19 Stratton who indicated that the P50 demand 20 forecast essentially means that you could be 21 above your peak demand forecast 50 percent of 22 the time or below it 50 percent of the time, 23 and he explained that with P90 there would 24 only be about a 10 percent probability that 25 you would be above the peak demand forecast, 2 would that be correct? 2 would that be correct? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro had been using P50 forever, is that essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 16 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 12 events of early January 2014 for that 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 16 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 25 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 26 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 27 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 28 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 28 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 29 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 21 Q. In reference to the othe other jurisdictions that the scatually got in in January 2014. 29 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 30 Q. In reference to the other jurisdictions that well and the twe	-		
17 the P50 versus P90 in demand forecasting, and as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 18 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 20 forecast essentially means that you could be above your peak demand forecast 50 percent of the time, 22 and he explained that with P90 there would 23 and he explained that with P90 there would 24 only be about a 10 percent probability that 25 you would be above the peak demand forecast, 2 would that be correct? 21 and the time or below it 50 percent of the time, 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 22 OL And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 15 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 23 And been using P50 forever, is that 28 essentially right? 24 A Yes, that's correct. 36 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 17 had been using P50 forever, is that 28 essentially right? 39 MR. HUMPHRIES: 40 A. Yes, essentially. 41 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 51 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 29 events of early January 2014 for that 30 events of early January 2014 for that 31 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 32 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 40 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 41 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 32 that it methat was comparable to what we were 24 more that time that was comparable to what we were 24 more that time that was comparable to what we were 24 more that time that was comparable to what we were 24 more that time that was comparable to what we were 25 more that approach knowing as the fact that 4 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 32 methat approach has a plantage of the time on the situation that we a testually got in in January 2014. 18 the higher forecast and the lower in unavailability, on Jie unavailability. 24 Johnson, Q.C.: 25 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 26 A. No, they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct.	-		• •
18 as you'll recall yesterday, I think it was Mr. 19 Stratton who indicated that the P50 demand 20 forecast essentially means that you could be 21 above your peak demand forecast 50 percent of 22 the time or below it 50 percent of the time, 23 and he explained that with P90 there would 24 only be about a 10 percent probability that 25 you would be above the peak demand forecast, 2 would that be correct? 2 or I guess below the peak demand forecast, 2 would that be correct? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 7 had been using P50 forever, is that 8 essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 this im the wava comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 18 the higher forecast and the lower 19 unavailability, or higher unavailability, ostry, that put us in the situation that we 21 actually got in in January 2014. 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 23 Q. In reference to the other jurisdictions that 24 might still use a P50 methodology, I take it 25 these would be not isolated systems? Page 2 1 MR. HUMPHRIES: 2 A. No, they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct. 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them 6 settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 characteristic probable of the work of the probable of th	I		
19 Stratton who indicated that the P50 demand 20 forecast essentially means that you could be 20 sorry, that put us in the situation that we 21 actually got in in January 2014.	1		
20 forecast essentially means that you could be 21 above your peak demand forecast 50 percent of 22 the time or below it 50 percent of the time, 23 and he explained that with P90 there would 24 only be about a 10 percent probability that 25 you would be above the peak demand forecast, Page 2 1 or I guess below the peak demand forecast, 2 would that be correct? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I suppose, on the reasonableness of them settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the events of early January 2014 for that methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro knew, that P50 meant that you were above your peak demand forecast half the time? 10 MR. HUMPHRIES: 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the events of early January 2014 for that historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 21 that time that was comparable to what we were going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 20 Sorry, that put us in the situation that we actually got in in January 2014. 21 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 23 Q. In reference to the other jurisdictions that might still use a P50 methodology, I take it these would be not isolated systems? Page 2 1 MR. HUMPHRIES: 2 A. No, they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct. 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I suppose, on the reasonableness of them settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other demand sources? 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you ref	1		_
21 above your peak demand forecast 50 percent of the time or below it 50 percent of the time, and he explained that with P90 there would 23 and he explained that with P90 there would 24 only be about a 10 percent probability that 25 you would be above the peak demand forecast, 25 would that be correct? 2 would that be correct? 2 would that be correct. 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I suppose, on the reasonableness of them 6 settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the events of early January 2014 for that methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 21 JOHNSON in the 2013/2014 time period. 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 23 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I suppose, on the reasonableness of them 6 settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you reference here this morning about historically back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you went through without difficulty, and I took porate the system reasonably with as little as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 2002?			* -
the time or below it 50 percent of the time, and he explained that with P90 there would only be about a 10 percent probability that you would be above the peak demand forecast, Page 2 or I guess below the peak demand forecast, would that be correct? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro had been using P50 forever, is that 8 essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 the time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 23 Q. In reference to the other jurisdictions that might still use a P50 methodology, I take it these would be not isolated systems? Page 2 1 MR. HUMPHRIES: 2 A. No, they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct. 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them 6 settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 16 reference here this morning about historically 17 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 18 went through a generation reserve level at 29 the time that was comparable to what we were 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 21 that time that was comparable to what we were 22 domegawatts of reserve. Is that around 23 that time that was comparable to what we were			· -
and he explained that with P90 there would only be about a 10 percent probability that you would be above the peak demand forecast, Page 2 or I guess below the peak demand forecast, would that be correct? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Yes, that's correct. JOHNSON, Q.C.: A. Yes, that's correct, had been using P50 forever, is that essentially right? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Yes, essentially. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Yes, essentially. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. It may, it may, yes. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro knew, that P50 meant that you were above your peak demand forecast, A. I think a lot of it was the fact that historically if we go back to the 2002 period, MR. HUMPHRIES: A. I think a lot of it was the fact that historically if we go back to the 2002 period, that time that was comparable to what we were demand sour explains and I'm you mentioned that - you said, we know we can operate the system reasonably with back in approach that approach by Without difficulty, and I took from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, you mentioned that - you said, we know we can operate the system reasonably with as little as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around the margin that you had to play with back in 2002?		1	
Page 2 1 or I guess below the peak demand forecast, 2 would that be correct? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 7 had been using P50 forever, is that 8 essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast, 24 might still use a P50 methodology, I take it these would be not isolated systems? Page 2 1 MR. HUMPHRIES: 2 A. No, they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct. 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I suppose, on the reasonableness of them 6 settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 24 might still use a P50 methodology, I take it these would be not isolated systems? 2 A. No, they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct. 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them 6 settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you	_		
Page 2 1 or I guess below the peak demand forecast, would that be correct? 2 would that be correct? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro had been using P50 forever, is that essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the events of early January 2014 for that methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro for that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro hard that display that peak demand forecast half the time? 10 MR. HUMPHRIES: 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the events of early January 2014 for that methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just has been used to take it Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro has been used to take it Hydro has been using P50 forever, is that events of early January 2014 for that methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just has been used to take the events of early January 2014 for that methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just has been used to take the event that you were above your peak demand forecast half the time? 15 MR. HUMPHRIES: 16 A. Yes, that's correct. 16 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I suppose, on the reasonableness of them settling on a P50, would it? 16 MR. HUMPHRIES: 17 MR. HUMPHRIES: 18 A. It may, it may, yes. 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other demand sources? 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you reference here this morning about historically back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you went through without difficulty, and I took from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, you mentioned that - you said, we know we can operate the system reasonably with as little as 200 megawatts of reserve. Is that around the margin that you h		1	*
Page 2 1 or I guess below the peak demand forecast, 2 would that be correct? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 7 had been using P50 forever, is that 8 essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 24 MR. HUMPHRIES: 2 A. No, they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct. 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them 6 settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 10 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 16 reference here this morning about historically 16 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 17 went through without difficulty, and I took 18 from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, 19 you mentioned that - you said, we know we can 20 operate the system reasonably with as little 21 as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 22 that time that was comparable to what we were 23 the functional form the evidence of the solution of the margin that you had to play with back in 24 2002?			
1 MR. HUMPHRIES: 2 A. No, they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct. 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 7 had been using P50 forever, is that 8 essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast, 2 A. No, they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct. 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them 6 settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 16 reference here this morning about historically 17 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 18 went through without difficulty, and I took 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 19 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 16 reference here this morning about historically 17 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 18 went through without difficulty, and I took 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 24 2002?			<u> </u>
2 would that be correct? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 7 had been using P50 forever, is that 8 essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 2 A. No, they wouldn't be isolated, that's correct. 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them 6 settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you reference here this morning about historically back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you went through without difficulty, and I took from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, you mentioned that - you said, we know we can operate the system reasonably with as little 22 as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around the margin that you had to play with back in 2002?		_	_
3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 7 had been using P50 forever, is that 8 essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 11 reference here this morning about historically 15 were through a generation reserve level at 16 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 17 point was the fact that 18 peak demand foreast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 11 reference here this morning about historically 15 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 16 from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, 17 you mentioned that - you said, we know we can 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 mr. HUMPHRIES: 20 And, I guess, you're going back - you 21 reference here this morning about historically 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 24 2002?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	
4 A. Yes, that's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 7 had been using P50 forever, is that 8 essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that itme that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 4 Q. Right, and that would have a bearing, I 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them 8 settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 16 reference here this morning about historically 17 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 18 went through without difficulty, and I took 19 from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, 20 you mentioned that - you said, we know we can 21 operate the system reasonably with as little 22 as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 24 2002?			•
5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 7 had been using P50 forever, is that 8 essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 5 suppose, on the reasonableness of them 6 settling on a P50, would it? 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 16 reference here this morning about historically 17 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 18 went through without difficulty, and I took 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 19 G. A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 20 you mentioned that - you said, we know we can 21 operate the system reasonably with as little 22 as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 24 2002?		1	, 2
6 Q. And I understand from the evidence that Hydro 7 had been using P50 forever, is that 8 essentially right?	1		
7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 A. It may, it may, yes. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you reference here this morning about historically back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you went through without difficulty, and I took from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, you mentioned that - you said, we know we can operate the system reasonably with as little as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around the margin that you had to play with back in 2002?		1	* *
8 essentially right? 9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 16 reference here this morning about historically 17 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 18 went through without difficulty, and I took 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 19 from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 26 A. It may, it may, it may, yes. 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 16 reference here this morning about historically 17 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 18 went through without difficulty, and I took 19 operate the system reasonably with as little 20 as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 21 the margin that you had to play with back in 22 going through in the 2013/2014 time period.	•	1	_
9 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 16 reference here this morning about historically 17 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 18 went through without difficulty, and I took 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 19 from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 25 Interval A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 16 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 18 We HUMPHRIES: 19 Grand A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you reference here this morning about historically back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you went through without difficulty, and I took from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, you mentioned that - you said, we know we can operate the system reasonably with as little as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around that time that was comparable to what we were 23 the margin that you had to play with back in 2002?		1	
10 A. Yes, essentially. 11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 10 Q. Because they could count on perhaps other 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 16 reference here this morning about historically back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 18 went through without difficulty, and I took 19 from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, 20 you mentioned that - you said, we know we can 21 operate the system reasonably with as little 22 as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period.		1	
11 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 11 demand sources? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 16 reference here this morning about historically 17 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 18 went through without difficulty, and I took 19 from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, 20 you mentioned that - you said, we know we can 21 operate the system reasonably with as little 22 as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 26 demand sources? 27 MR. HUMPHRIES: 28 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 29 A. I demand sources? 29 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I guess, you're going back - you 20 reference here this morning about historically 20 went through without difficulty, and I took 20 you mentioned that - you said, we know we can 21 operate the system reasonably with as little 22 as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 23 the margin that you had to play with back in 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period.		1	· -
12 Q. And, I guess, you know, it seemed to take the 13 events of early January 2014 for that 14 methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just 15 wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed 16 that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro 17 knew, that P50 meant that you were above your 18 peak demand forecast half the time? 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you 16 reference here this morning about historically 17 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 18 went through without difficulty, and I took 19 from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, 20 you mentioned that - you said, we know we can 21 operate the system reasonably with as little 22 as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 25 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 26 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 27 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 28 A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. 29 A. I guess, you're going back - you 20 reference here this morning about historically 20 back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you 20 you mentioned that - you said, we know we can 21 operate the system reasonably with as little 22 as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 23 the margin that you had to play with back in 24 2002?	1	1	
events of early January 2014 for that methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro knew, that P50 meant that you were above your peak demand forecast half the time? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. I think a lot of it was the fact that historically if we go back to the 2002 period, we went through a generation reserve level at that time that was comparable to what we were going through in the 2013/2014 time period. A. Yeah, there's a likelihood they could, yes. Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you reference here this morning about historically back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you went through without difficulty, and I took from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, you mentioned that - you said, we know we can operate the system reasonably with as little as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around the margin that you had to play with back in 2002?		1	
methodology to be reviewed, and I'm just wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro knew, that P50 meant that you were above your peak demand forecast half the time? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. I think a lot of it was the fact that historically if we go back to the 2002 period, we went through a generation reserve level at that time that was comparable to what we were going through in the 2013/2014 time period. MR. HUMPHRIES: I4 JOHNSON, Q.C.: I5 Q. And, I guess, you're going back - you reference here this morning about historically back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you went through without difficulty, and I took from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, you mentioned that - you said, we know we can operate the system reasonably with as little as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around the margin that you had to play with back in 2002?	1	1	
wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro knew, that P50 meant that you were above your peak demand forecast half the time? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. I think a lot of it was the fact that historically if we go back to the 2002 period, we went through a generation reserve level at going through in the 2013/2014 time period. Wondering why Hydro would not have reviewed that eviewed that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro reference here this morning about historically back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you went through without difficulty, and I took from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, you mentioned that - you said, we know we can operate the system reasonably with as little as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around the margin that you had to play with back in 2002?	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
that approach knowing, as I take it Hydro knew, that P50 meant that you were above your peak demand forecast half the time? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. I think a lot of it was the fact that historically if we go back to the 2002 period, we went through a generation reserve level at we went through in the 2013/2014 time period. Mreference here this morning about historically back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you went through without difficulty, and I took from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, you mentioned that - you said, we know we can operate the system reasonably with as little as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around the margin that you had to play with back in 20 2002?	1		· -
knew, that P50 meant that you were above your peak demand forecast half the time? NR. HUMPHRIES: A. I think a lot of it was the fact that historically if we go back to the 2002 period, we went through a generation reserve level at that time that was comparable to what we were going through in the 2013/2014 time period. back in 2002, the levels of reserve that you went through without difficulty, and I took from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, you mentioned that - you said, we know we can operate the system reasonably with as little as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around the margin that you had to play with back in 2002?		1	
peak demand forecast half the time? 18 went through without difficulty, and I took 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 19 from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 18 went through without difficulty, and I took 19 from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, 20 you mentioned that - you said, we know we can 21 operate the system reasonably with as little 22 as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 23 the margin that you had to play with back in 24 2002?		1	
19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 20 A. I think a lot of it was the fact that 21 historically if we go back to the 2002 period, 22 we went through a generation reserve level at 23 that time that was comparable to what we were 24 going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 19 from your evidence yesterday, Mr. Humphries, 20 you mentioned that - you said, we know we can 21 operate the system reasonably with as little 22 as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around 23 the margin that you had to play with back in 24 2002?	•	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
A. I think a lot of it was the fact that historically if we go back to the 2002 period, we went through a generation reserve level at that time that was comparable to what we were going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 20 you mentioned that - you said, we know we can operate the system reasonably with as little as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around the margin that you had to play with back in 24 2002?	_	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
historically if we go back to the 2002 period, we went through a generation reserve level at that time that was comparable to what we were going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 21 operate the system reasonably with as little as 20 megawatts of reserve. Is that around the margin that you had to play with back in 24 2002?			
we went through a generation reserve level at that time that was comparable to what we were going through in the 2013/2014 time period.		1	· ·
that time that was comparable to what we were going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 23 the margin that you had to play with back in 24 2002?	-	1	*
going through in the 2013/2014 time period. 24 2002?			_
	I -		
		1	

0	ctober 21, 2015 Mult	i-Pa	-Page [™] NL Hydro GRA
	Page 5		Page 7
1	A. I don't know exactly what we would have had in	1	load hours standard, as you put it, migrating
2	those periods.	2	back to, I think the North American standard
3	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	3	of 2.5, and we're presently at 2.8?
4	Q. But, you know, when you compare -	4	4 MR. HUMPHRIES:
5	MR. HUMPHRIES:	5	5 A. Well, I think the North American standard
6	A. We wouldn't have planned to be down there even	6	6 right now is about 2.4 in general, but not
7	in 2002. We would have to be into some	7	7 everyone uses this LOLH indicator, and the
8	contingency situations before you got down to	8	8 more general is a loss of load of 1 day in 10
9	20 megawatts, but what I was referring to	9	years, and that can correlate to 2.4 hours.
10	yesterday based on our experience in January	10	That's system dependent that we do an analysis
11	2014, particularly January 2nd and 3rd before	11	11 to determine.
12	we got into the storm event and we were having	12	12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
13	the generation shortfall alone, you know, we	13	Q. So we have - you indicated the term yesterday
14	were down to a level of 20 megawatts reserve	14	"migrating back", but we were never on the
15	and able to maintain the system integrity.	15	North American -
16	That's what I was referring to yesterday.	16	16 MR. HUMPHRIES:
17	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	17	17 A. Yeah, well, I - we would migrate to, not back
18	Q. Okay.	18	18 to.
19	MR. HUMPHRIES:	19	19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
20	A. I'm not sure we were ever down to a situation	20	20 Q. Okay, and you stated that you definitely would
21	where we tested that before.	21	21 think that the planning criteria for meeting
22	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	22	the energy requirements of the island will
23	Q. Right, so is that the practice at Hydro to	23	change, and at what time do you think Hydro
24	settle on a certain approach and not review it	24	24 will be in a position to settle on new
25	for many, many years?	25	25 planning criteria for both capacity and
	Page 6		Page 8
1	MR. HUMPHRIES:	1	
2	A. No, I don't think it's necessarily the	2	2 MR. HUMPHRIES:
3	approach. I mean, you know, our whole process	3	3 A. We hope to be there by the end of 2016.
4	was reviewed a number of times and quite	4	4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
5	recently, I guess, through the Muskrat Falls	5	5 Q. You're on track for that, are you?
6	review process. Our overall generation	6	6 MR. HUMPHRIES:
7	methodology, our forecasting methodology, was	7	A. Yes, yeah, we have a - we're going through the
8	reviewed and validated by both - Navigant	8	8 process now of - well, technically the
9	reviewed it and as well Manitoba Hydro through	9	9 interconnections have been validated, we're in
10	the process, and signed off on it as being	10	an exercise now with the Atlantic provinces to
11	reasonable, I think, based on the system that	11	identify what reserve sharing arrangements are
12	we have.	12	out there and the ability to be able to direct
13	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	13	that to the island. So that would be a
1		1	

Q. But you clearly would not be comfortable with 14 15 reverting to that standard in light of the

events of January 2014? 16

17 MR. HUMPHRIES:

18 A. Not between now and interconnection. At post-19 interconnection, I think we'll reassess where

20 we are.

21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

22 Q. There was also a discussion yesterday having

23 to do with the loss of load hours criterion,

24 and you indicated, Mr. Humphries, that you 25

could see with the interconnection the loss of

new generation planning criterion. 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Mr. Goulding, if I could turn to you for a few moments. You were yesterday describing a 18 19 situation whereby in August of this year Hydro was exposed to an outage to one of the major 20 21 lines coming into the Avalon Peninsula, and 22 why was there an exposure to an outage to one

significant factor that would play into our

23 of the major lines, can you elaborate on that?

24 MR. GOULDING:

14

15

25 A. There wasn't any particular exposure to the

October 21, 2015 M	ulti-Page ^{IM} NL Hydro GRA
Pag	e 9 Page 11
line. I would say that there would have been	that how it would work, or it would run
2 an exposure to the Avalon if we did lose the	2 continuously during the -
3 line. It was at a time that we were	3 MR. GOULDING:
4 undergoing a total planned outage at Holyrood.	4 A. It would run throughout the day. A
5 Ordinarily we would have required that a unit	5 characteristic, I guess, with the loads during
6 be operating such that in the event that we	6 the summertime is that they're flat. Once
7 did lose one of the major lines into the	7 they're up to our peak values, they tend to
8 Avalon, the unit would be there and ready to	8 stay there.
9 respond to offload the remaining transmission	9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
line. So the point was, I guess, to mitigate	10 Q. I see.
that exposure, we operated the CT during	11 MR. GOULDING:
periods of the day when the load was highest	12 A. So while we would have certainly seeked
and when we were exposed to an outage - where	opportunities to take the CT off during the
we would have been exposed in the event of an	day if our load got down below our - if the
outage to one of the major lines.	load got down below a point that we could have
16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	reliably taken the CT off. It actually turns
17 Q. And you say "where you would have been exposed	out that during the summertime once our load
to an outage", and why would the exposure	is up there, it tends to stay up there, so
arise? I think I might be missing that.	that's why we would have been operating, say,
20 MR. GOULDING:	20 at minimum 12 hours per day.
21 A. Well, there's a number of reasons, I guess,	21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
22 why a transmission line can trip or experience	22 Q. So what happened then for Hydro no longer to
23 an outage. The primary one, I guess, is	be in a position where it had to run the CT,
24 adverse weather, wind, a thunderstorm activity	what changed in August?
25 that would impact on the line itself. There	25 MR. GOULDING:
Page	10 Page 12
could also be issues with the terminal	
2 equipment on either end of the line as well.	1 A. I guess, the actual change came about in 2 March. We had a -
3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
4 Q. I see, and so then the running of the CT, the	4 Q. No, no, excuse me, so that we don't go down
5 new CT, was meant to guard against something	5 the wrong tangent.
6 untoward happening?	6 MR. GOULDING:
7 MR. GOULDING:	7 A. Okay, sorry.
8 A. That's correct.	8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
9 (9:15 a.m.)	9 Q. The CT was run in August to meet a perceived
10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	need. What was it in August that got sorted
11 Q. I see, and at the time all the Holyrood units	out so that you no longer needed to run the
were off on planned maintenance?	12 CT?
13 MR. GOULDING:	13 MR. GOULDING:
14 A. That's correct.	14 A. Oh, I'm sorry. What happened is at the end of
15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	the total plant outage at Holyrood, there
16 Q. And so the CT was run for a considerable	would have been a Holyrood unit available to
period in August, I take it?	be run, so we would have started up the
18 MR. GOULDING:	18 Holyrood unit again.
19 A. It would have been ran from the time of, say,	19 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
20 the start of the morning peak to the end of	20 Q. Okay, okay, and do you know - can you provide
the evening peak, so perhaps at minimum 12	21 an undertaking as to how many hours the CT did
22 hours a day.	22 run in August in order to meet the needs that
23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	23 you're describing?
1	24 MR. GOULDING:
1	
and then go off, and then come back on, is	25 A. Yes.

October 21, 2015 Mult	ti-Page TM NL Hydro GRA
Page 13	Page 15
1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	break point of running the CT versus running
2 Q. And also the cost that was incurred for doing	2 an extra Holyrood unit, and you said that
3 that?	3 Hydro uses 12 hours of CT operation as the
4 MR. GOULDING:	4 break point, and I took from what you were
5 A. Sure.	5 saying yesterday that if there's a period
6 MS. GLYNN:	6 where Hydro would be operating the CT for more
7 Q. Noted on the record.	7 than 12 hours, then you would turn on the
8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	8 Holyrood unit instead, and then you added "if
9 Q. I take it that ordinarily it would have been a	9 one was available, of course".
Holyrood unit that would be doing the work	10 MR. GOULDING:
that the CT was asked to do?	11 A. That's correct.
12 MR. GOULDING:	12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
13 A. That's correct. Like I mentioned in my	Q. And I'm just wondering - first of all, I take
testimony yesterday, we have certain levels of	it that if this unit had been available in
15 Avalon load where it's more economic to	15 Holyrood this past summer in August, Hydro
operate a Holyrood unit rather than the CT.	would not have chosen to use the CT, right?
17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	17 MR. GOULDING:
18 Q. Right.	18 A. If the unit was available, then we would have
19 MR. GOULDING:	stayed the same course that we did for the
20 A. Like, when we're in a place where we foresee	remainder of the summer and operate that unit,
21 that we'd operate a CT more than 12 hours per	21 but there is -
day, then we would operate a Holyrood unit.	22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	23 Q. And why would you have stayed the course then?
24 Q. I see, but typically - let's say this coming	24 MR. GOULDING:
25 August, if the Holyrood units are running, you	25 A. Because it would have been more economic to
Page 14	Page 16
1 would use the Holyrood unit, not the CT,	operate the unit versus the CT.
2 right?	2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
3 MR. GOULDING:	3 Q. Yes, right, and why couldn't the Holyrood unit
4 A. That's correct.	4 have been available in August?
5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	5 MR. GOULDING:
6 Q. And what Holyrood unit is typically employed	6 A. Because there is a certain amount of
7 to deal with the summer load?	7 maintenance that's required at the Holyrood
8 MR. GOULDING:	8 plant every year that requires that all units
9 A. It would vary, I guess, depending on their	9 be shut. There's a lot of assets out there
maintenance schedule. Typically, although	that are common to all units that require that
it's not firm and fast, ordinarily Unit 3	all units be shut such that they can be
would be available during the summertime	maintained and made ready for the upcoming
13 operation.	period where the operation at Holyrood is
14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	starting to ramp up.
15 Q. Would it be possible to provide an undertaking	15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
indicating what it would have cost to have a	Q. So are you telling me that there's no way for
17 Holyrood unit running instead to do the work	17 Hydro to avoid a planned shutdown of all three
that the CT did?	units in the summertime in Holyrood?
19 MR. GOULDING:	19 MR. GOULDING:
20 A. Yes.	20 A. There's no way to avoid a total plant outage
21 MS. GLYNN:	as there is maintenance that requires that all
22 Q. Noted on the record.	22 units be turned off simultaneously.
23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
Q. Mr. Goulding, you mentioned yesterday that	Q. All the same time?
25 Hydro has a trigger built around an economic	25 MR. GOULDING:

October 21, 2015 N	/Iuiti-l	Page ^{IM} NL Hydro GRA
Pag	e 17	Page 19
1 A. Yes.		to run the CT in August at Holyrood?
2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:		2 MR. GOULDING:
3 Q. But how did Hydro manage in other summers	s,	3 A. Yes, that decision would have certainly been
4 didn't they have a unit available for any		4 made through our area. The difference this
5 purpose?		5 August, I guess, as opposed to previous
6 MR. GOULDING:		6 summers would have been again our learnings
7 A. We would have had a unit available for most -		from our March 4th event where we would have -
8 there would have still been times during a		8 we wouldn't have ran our gas turbines during
9 total plant outage that for a period a unit		9 the total plant outage of previous summers.
would not have been available.	1	The gas turbine would have been available and
11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	1	ready, but we wouldn't have started the unit
12 Q. Just to understand that, Hydro schedules the	1	2 until we got into an outage that required it.
maintenance, right?	1	3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
14 MR. GOULDING:	1	4 Q. So you're running it just in case?
15 A. That's correct.	1	5 MR. GOULDING:
16 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	1	6 A. That's correct.
17 Q. And this was planned maintenance that was	1	7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
going on in August?	1	8 Q. And is there a lack of confidence in the
19 MR. GOULDING:	1	9 ability to turn this CT on and off and get it
20 A. That's correct.	2	going in a reasonable period of time?
21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	2	21 MR. GOULDING:
Q. When all three were down?	2	A. It's not a lack of confidence. I guess, like,
23 MR. GOULDING:	2	a part of this learning and where we are, is
24 A. Uh-hm.	2	we don't operate the systems such that a
25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	2	single element outage, such as a transformer -
Pag	e 18	Page 20
1 Q. And are you saying that it would be impossible		1 I'm sorry, a transmission line or a generator
to have one ready while there's planned		2 outage is going to result in a customer
maintenance going on on the other two units?		impact, so we have the CT on in advance now to
4 MR. GOULDING:		4 respond to it.
5 A. I don't say it's impossible. I'm not - I'm		5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
6 not overly familiar with what goes on inside		6 Q. I see, and is that a utility practice followed
7 the Holyrood plant in terms of their		7 elsewhere to take that type of action?
8 maintenance activities, but I can speak to the		8 MR. GOULDING:
9 fact that during previous summers, there were		9 A. I don't know what research was actually done
periods that - although there were periods	1	in our area, but certainly, you know, I would
during that summer that all three units would	1	expect that most jurisdictions would not
not have been available because there are	1	2 operate their power system such that they're
activities that they undertake that requires	1	3 exposed to an N-1 outage. Now other
that all three units be made unavailable.	1	4 jurisdictions may have other ways to respond
15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	1	to it. Like, where we're isolated, we don't
16 Q. Okay, so who's knowledgeable about what's	$ _1$	have the opportunity here to draw on our
doable and not as regards Holyrood maintenance		7 neighbours, and, you know, other jurisdictions
of the units?		8 may have a transmission system that's robust
19 MR. GOULDING:		enough to withstand a single element outage,
20 A. I would say the most knowledgeable would be	I	so I would expect that most jurisdictions
21 the folks inside the Holyrood plant		would operate in the same vein, but in terms
themselves.	2	of how they respond, whether it's standby or
23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	2	reserve sharing arrangements, that sort of
Q. I see. Did you all or members of your panel,	2	thing, I don't know.
any one of you, have input as to the decision	2	25 (9:30 a.m.)

O	ctober 21, 2015 Mu	lti-Page	NL Hydro GRA
	Page 2	21	Page 23
1		1	basically mirrors the protocol that was
2	Q. You indicated that Hydro has, I guess, made a	2	already in place for island reserves. So in
3	calculation of an assessment that there is a	3	that there's a step by step sequence that our
4	12 hour break point, and when was this studied	4	ECC operators follow in the event that there's
5	and settled upon as being the break point?	5	reserve issues on the Avalon. So they would
6	MR. GOULDING:	6	follow that sequence and as part of that
7	A. That would have been following the March 4th	7	sequence would be the start up of our standby
8	event that we undertook a review, and at that	8	on the Avalon.
9	point we realized that it was prudent to start	9 JO	HNSON, Q.C.:
10	our standby units in advance of outages that	10	Q. So if there is something in writing on that,
11		11	can that be provided as well?
12	did is we took a typical load shape during the	12 MI	R. GOULDING:
13	period of, say, three unit operation, two	13	A. Yes, we can file certainly that instruction.
14	unit, one unit, and what we did is we -	14 JO	HNSON, Q.C.:
15	there's a certain threshold in this imposed on	15	Q. All right.
16	that load shape that we determined, you know,	16 MS	S. GLYNN:
17	it would be more economic to operate a CT	17	Q. Noted on the record.
18		18 JO	HNSON, Q.C.:
19	Holyrood unit, and that threshold is now our -	19	Q. Thank you very much. I think this was you as
20	the point that we determine and we have daily	20	well yesterday, Mr. Goulding, and that was a
21	reliability meetings where we have a one week	21	discussion about recovering variances in costs
22	outlook on our load and reserves, and part of	22	incurred in connection with the fuel cost
23	our reliability assessment is to assess the	23	associated with operating the CT. Do you
24	Avalon reserves. So at that point, we advise	24	recall a discussion of there being a
25	our gas turbine folks if we need to operate	25	\$500,000.00 band, etc, and Newfoundland Power
	Page 2	22	Page 24
1	4 . 1	1	asked you for undertakings as to how long it
2	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	2	would take you to get up to \$500,000.00, etc,
3	Q. So in terms of the - there's been an actual	3	and Mr. O'Brien questioned what incentive
4	calculation done supporting the 12 hour rule,	4	would Hydro be left with other than the
5	if you will?	5	\$500,000.00, what incentive it would be left
6	MR. GOULDING:	6	with to dispatch resources more efficiently,
7	A. There has been load flows done, yes.	7	you know, once you hit the \$500,000. 00
8	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	8	threshold, and I think in your reply you
9	Q. Okay, and could Hydro file that analysis	9	mentioned that Hydro has a least cost mandate,
10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10	etc, etc, but I take it that would not be to
11	that break point was arrived at?	11	say that you would disagree that the actual
1	-	1	

12 MR. GOULDING:

13 A. I think that can be filed.

14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

Q. Thank you.

16 MS. GLYNN:

17 Q. Noted on the record.

18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

Q. Okay, and has Hydro, like, actually 19 established a policy that's been reduced to 20 21 writing as regards when the CT is to be used? 22 MR. GOULDING: A. We have - again I go back to our March 4th 23

24 event. Part of the learnings there were we 25 developed a protocol for Avalon reserves that

this mechanism other than the \$500,000. 00 13 exposure? 14 15 MR. GOULDING: A. I think the financial exposure is certainly 16 17 taken away. 18 JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Yeah. 19 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 A. I speak for the operators of the power system, 22 like, we do have a mandate to operate our power system as reliably and economic as is 23 24 possible, so certainly we would - even in 25 light of a deadband, a deferral account, we

financial incentive is taken away by way of

October 21, 2015 Multi		ti-P	age TM NL Hydro GRA
	Page 2	5	Page 27
1	would still have our daily reliability	1	
2	assessments and we would still have a keen eye		MR. HUMPHRIES:
3	out towards what's the best way to reliably	2	A. That's correct.
4	meet our criteria, and what's the most	3	JOHNSON, Q.C.:
5	economic way, and this is why we went down the	4	
6	road of developing these thresholds or levels	5	
7	of load on the Avalon that guide us to	6	MR. HUMPHRIES:
8	economically operate the system.	7	A. Well, it would be a part of the asset owner, a
9	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	8	
10	Q. And customers are paying you guys to actually	9	
11	go through analysis like that, manage those	10	when it can adequately be tested.
12	considerations presently, right?	11	JOHNSON, Q.C.:
13	MR. GOULDING:	12	Q. Okay, and the asset owner is Hydro?
14	A. That's correct. It's essentially a cost of	13	MR. HUMPHRIES:
15	reliably operating the power system. I would	14	A. Yes.
16	say that it's really - it's a different	15	JOHNSON, Q.C.:
17	generating unit, but it's not a lot different	16	Q. And is that a big process to get that testing
18	than where we've been, say, in the last five	17	and proving done?
19	or six years or seven years since we've had	18	MR. HUMPHRIES:
20	Holyrood reduced to minimum operation. You	19	A. Well, it's turned into a bit of a process this
21	know, for all intents and purposes, the driver	20	summer because in order to test it, (a) we
22	for operating Holyrood units, although there	21	needed a unit in Holyrood to be able to test,
23	may be portions of the energy that would have	22	
24	been required to augment our hydro generation	23	that we've had this year, the opportunities
25	and storages, you know, the primary driver for	24	were limited to have a unit available that we
	Page 2	6	Page 28
1	operating Holyrood units for the last six or	1	
2	seven years has been from a reliability	2	that because to full test the unit, we need to
3	standpoint as well. So that has added to	3	put isolations on the system to ensure that
4	increased fuel costs that have flowed through	4	there was no support coming from the system to
5	the RSP as well.	5	start the turbine, and so that involved
6	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	6	opening certain 230 kV transmission lines and
7	Q. Yeah, but I take it, and I just want to	7	theoretically putting the system at a level of
8	clarify, that the financial incentive in the	8	exposure. We were in a situation through most
9	financial sense is not there with the deferral	9	of the summer where we had one unit running at
10	account beyond the \$500,000.00?	10	Holyrood and the other two out on maintenance.
11	MR. GOULDING:	11	
12	A. I speak from an operating perspective -	12	
13	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	13	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
14	Q. I understand.	14	•
1	MR. GOULDING:	15	E
16	A. And we would certainly maintain our mandate to	16	· ·
17	make sure that the right units are on at the	17	
18	right time, and that would ultimately make	18	
19	sense from a financial perspective as well.	19	E I
1	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	20	· ·
21	Q. Just turning for a second to black start, Mr.	21	
22	Humphries, and I think this would be more for	22	1 &
23	you. You indicated yesterday that the intent	23	
24	of the new 123 megawatt CT unit is to provide black start, but you indicated that has not	24	1
25	orack start, but you mulcated that has not	25	Unit 2 was coming back, and that window was

Page 29 Page 31 Q. Okay, and, I guess, the plan all along in lined up, all our maintenance schedules or 1 outage schedules lined up for it to happen, terms of - there was discussion yesterday 2 2 about planned additions of a 50 megawatt unit and then we ran into - the bottom line is we 3 3 got to September 25th and Unit 2 was not over a number of - referenced in a number of 4 4 available to come back. It was five or six reports. Was that always assumed by Hydro to 5 5 days late coming back, so then we had to make also have black start capability and to be 6 6 7 a decision of - because the 25th window was situated -7 8 scheduled around certain transmission elements 8 MR. HUMPHRIES: coming back and taking others out to finish A. Yes, well, back in 2011/2012, I guess, when 10 the winter preparedness maintenance, so I had 10 the whole issue of black start became a problem at Holyrood, the plan was that we knew to make the decision to defer that maintenance 11 11 we were going to be buying this new combustion 12 or defer the black start test, because when 12 turbine and whether it was 50 megawatts or 123 Unit 2 came back, actually got back ready to 13 13 start, which was just very recently, the megawatts, it would ultimately serve as a 14 14 transmission system had equipment out there, black start source as well. 15 15 16 and we could no longer take the risk of doing 16 (9:45 a.m.) the test. 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 18 JOHNSON, O.C.: Q. Right, okay. 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 O. So what's the current assessment as to when this can be -Q. Mr. Humphries, you referred yesterday to 20 20 changes in load requirements. You referenced 21 MR. HUMPHRIES: 21 Newfoundland Power's latest GRA filing in that 22 A. Well, we're still looking for a window, but 22 the opportunity of getting a window between regard in terms of their load? 23 23 now and the spring is limited. 24 MR. HUMPHRIES: 24 A. Yes. 25 JOHNSON, Q.C.: Page 30 Page 32 Q. Right, yes, okay. 1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 MR. HUMPHRIES: Q. And you also indicated that Vale's load was A. It's very high risk. changed, but you didn't elaborate on that. 3 Could you elaborate on what degree of change 4 JOHNSON, O.C.: 4 Q. Okay, so sometime probably late spring or and in what direction? summer? 6 MR. HUMPHRIES: 6 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: 7 A. Well, both Newfoundland Power and Vale loads A. Hopefully, it will be in the spring as units 8 are in a downward direction. Newfoundland 8 start to come down at Holyrood again. Power's load is approximately 20 to 25 9

19

25

10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

11 Q. And, I guess, is there any reason to think

that it won't be able to provide black start 12

13 capability?

14 MR. HUMPHRIES:

A. Not that we're aware of. It's just that we 15

haven't been able to test it. 16

17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

Q. And, I guess, that would cancel out - once 18

19 that's been proven and tested, that would

cancel out the value of the eight 2 megawatt

diesel units as regards a black start 21

22 function?

23 MR. HUMPHRIES:

24 A. Yes.

20

25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

megawatts lower in the 2017/2018 time frame 10

11 that we have the concern about, I guess, for

reserve levels. With Vale, we're seeing -12

they're just finishing up the first year of 13

the three year ramp up, and the indications 14

are that they're finding that they are 15

achieving higher production levels at lower 16

loads than they initially anticipated, so the 17

ramp up is still going to continue over the 18

next two years, but effectively at the end of

the day the full load of the plant will be in 20

the range of 25 megawatts, 20/25 megawatts 21

lower than we had previously anticipated, and 22

through the ramp up period, particularly 23

through '16 and the first quarter of '17, 24

we're close to 30 megawatts below where we had

<u>Oc</u>	tober 21, 2015 Mul	ti-P	Page	NL Hydro GRA
	Page 33	3		Page 35
1	anticipated we would have been previously.	1	1 MR. MOULTON:	
2	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	2	2 A. No.	
3	Q. Okay. In terms of Vale's situation, now	3	3 MR. STRATTON:	
4	they're looking at achieving higher production	4	4 A. No.	
5	levels at the lower loads, to what degree is	5	5 MR. HUMPHRIES:	
6	Hydro involved with Vale in the early stages	6	6 A. I'm personally not aware.	
7	of arriving at a forecast in these regards	7	7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	
8	that can be relied upon, so that you're not	8	8 Q. Nobody is, okay. Just on this	deferral
9	seeing this change happen sort of	9	9 account for the fuel conversion fa	actor, Hydro
10	unexpectedly?	10	has never had such a deferral acc	count and we
11	MR. HUMPHRIES:	11	know that Holyrood has a genera	ting life span
12	A. No, no, we get regular forecast updates from	12	ahead of it that's, you know, aft	er 40 odd
13	Vale, and through the ramp up period on a	13	years is coming to a close, and	what's the
14	monthly basis they notify us what their	14	4 need now or the impetus after all	these years
15	anticipated power and order will be, and, you	15	of not having deferral account,	, but now
16	know, we had been moving along on a path	16	suddenly Hydro requires one?	
17	consistent with - pretty well consistent for	17	7 MR. GOULDING:	
18	the past twelve months, I guess, but just very	18	8 A. I guess, in the past five to six ye	ars since
19	recently, last week, we got our latest update	19	9 our last GRA, we have seen a s	ignificant
20	and we got this indication that there's going	20	decline in Holyrood fuel conve	ersion rate
21	to be a change, right, but we do have a	21	because of a number of factor	rs that I
22	forecast of anticipated ramp up out through	22	mentioned earlier. So, yes, the ex	xposure has
23	the 2018 period.	23	certainly come to the forefront in	n the last
24	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	24	few years, and in particular, in th	e last two
25	Q. I guess, what I was getting at more so along	25	years or so, where there's been a	large impact
	Page 3 ²	1		Page 36
1	the lines of, you know, is Hydro much involved	1	to Hydro's bottom line because of	of the lower
2	in the front end in terms of evaluating the	2	2 fuel conversion rate relative to	the test
3	reasonableness of the what they feel they're	3	year. So certainly if the last two	years are
4	going to be putting on the system, you know,	4	an indication, then we wouldn'	t want this
5	when they - because this is obviously a	5	5 exposure even to the limited hor	izon that we
6	significant or appears to be a significant	6	6 expect to have remaining at Holy	rood.
7	decrease from what had been expected	7	7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	
8	initially?	8	8 Q. But to put that somewhat in per	spective, I
9	MR. HUMPHRIES:	9	9 mean, you talk about changes i	n the fuel
10	A. Yeah, you know, we have open communications	10	o conversion factor relative to test	year, but,
11	with them and we can only base it on the	11	, , ,	
12	information they're providing us. We can't	12	, ,	
13	get in and go an analysis on what's going on	13	1	
14	inside the plant and what equipment is coming	14	E	-
15	on and those types of things.	15		
16	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	16	\mathcal{C}	ith the test
17	Q. Yes, okay. Mr. Goulding, in relation to the	17	, and the second	
18	fuel conversion factor at Holyrood, Mr.		8 MR. GOULDING:	
19	O'Brien asked whether you were aware of any	19	•	
20	other jurisdictions with such a deferral	20	3 1	
21	account, and you indicated that you were not,	21	3	· ·
22	and just to ask, I don't know if there's other	22	1 1	
23	members of the panel who might be able to	23	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
24	indicate whether they would be aware of	24	3	ast years.
25	jurisdictions with such a deferral account?	25	25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	

Page 37 Page 39 o. Yes. that's a forecast and things do change. You 1 2 MR. GOULDING: 2 know, like, we want to see our hydraulic generation higher than our forecast because A. But I can speak, you know, from an operations 3 perspective, and we keep track of the fuel that obviously then affects the rate payer, we 4 4 conversion rates for our monthly and annual 5 5 save on fuel. reports, and we track variances and certainly, 6 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 7 you know, we have seen a significant decline Q. Yes, I understand that, but I thought it was 7 in that rate over the last, say, since 2009. common ground that we are, in fact, expecting 8 8 Holyrood to be used for energy needs more so 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. And you referenced a number of factors that 10 in 2015, 2016, 2017, than we have been, say, 10 in 2010, 2011, 2012, isn't that true? have come to the forefront that has increased 11 11 12 the exposure to Hydro, and, I guess, would 12 MR. GOULDING: 13 some of those factors have to do with over the A. That's correct. past recent years a less reliance on Holyrood, 14 14 JOHNSON, O.C.: so it's not operating as much, would that be o. Yes. 15 15 16 right? 16 MR. GOULDING: 17 MR. GOULDING: A. And because of the higher energy needs, we are 17 forecasting a fuel efficiency factor that's 18 A. It's not operating as much from an energy 18 perspective because, you know, like, with our higher than what we would have experienced in 19 19 mix of our own generation plus the purchases, the past five years. 20 20 and the introduction of new power purchases, 21 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 21 22 then we haven't had to rely on Holyrood as 22 Q. And, I guess, my point being that you're now much from an energy perspective, but certainly entering into a period with Holyrood usage 23 23 from a reliability perspective, we have been that is more representative of how Holyrood 24 24 relying on Holyrood as much, if not more, with used to be used, you know, prior to the last, 25 25 Page 38 Page 40 the growth of load on the Avalon, and from a say, four or five years ago? 1 1 2 reliability perspective, although the units 2 MR. GOULDING: 3 are on, we are able to reduce the unit load to 3 A. That's correct. its minimum, which makes sense from a fuel 4 4 JOHNSON, O.C.: 5 expense standpoint, but because we are Q. Yes. operating it at minimum with all things being 6 MR. GOULDING: 6 7 equal, Holyrood unit is more efficient at A. That's correct. higher levels of loading, so all this is where 8 8 JOHNSON, O.C.: the issue is. Q. There was a reference as well yesterday, and I think this is for Mr. Humphries, of money had 10 JOHNSON, O.C.: 10 11 Q. But, I guess, would you agree that Holyrood is 11 been allocated in the test year to engage a now going to be entering into a phase of more consultant to advise Hydro on generation 12 12 use, more increased use for energy adequacy requirements post-2018? 13 13 requirements, more representative of periods 14 MR. HUMPHRIES: 14 prior to the last three or four years, would 15 A. Yes, that's correct. that be correct? 16 JOHNSON, O.C.: 16 17 MR. GOULDING: 17 Q. And, I guess, we touched on some of that A. Certainly in our test year, we have - I guess, discussion earlier here this morning in terms 18 18 19 we have normalized the hydrology. We've of when you're going to be pitching on new 19 normalized our hydraulic generation, such that standards, etc. but I take it the consultant 20 20 it's based on, for all intents and purposes, has not yet been engaged and, I guess, I would 21 21 average in-flows. We've used average power observe that this amount of money was expected 22 22 purchases and then the level of production to be spent at least as far back as November 23 23 requirement from Holyrood then would fall out of 2014 when Hydro made its amended filing, 24 24

25

and now we're in practically November 2015,

of that to meet the balance of the load, but

25

October 21, 2015 Page 41 Page 43 and there's been no consultant engaged, and, I A. Not at this point, no. 1 2 guess, I'm not getting the sense that there's 2 (10:00 a.m.) a very good chance that Hydro will actually be 3 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: billed and expending money on this consultant Q. All right, and I'm just interested in whether 4 4 for this amount of money. Would that be a or not, using five more recent years versus 5 5 fair gathering? years that go back further period, whether we 6 6 7 MR. HUMPHRIES: would - would it be reasonable to think that 7 the more recent period, five years, would be 8 A. Like I said yesterday, there's a hope we're 8 going to start to engage this customer this more indicative of transmission losses, say, 9 10 year, and definitely the work will definitely 10 in the test year? flow over into 2016. The work will be done 11 MR. STRATTON: 11 12 and the scope of the work, the intent is it 12 A. I think Kevin might be help us out. I mean, the data that I work from is historically 13 will be a consultant that provides the 13 software that we use and the intent is to get based. It's not forward looking in the sense 14 14 of what's going to change in our system and direction from them on the proper way to model 15 15 16 the system in an interconnected environment where the energy is going to come from on a 16 and the proper inputs for it, so we will be production basis. What affects losses will be 17 17 generating the inputs obviously through 2016, the amount of energy that we - what affects it 18 18 but there's some upfront work that we could greatly would be how much production is out of 19 19 move forward this year in actually getting the Holyrood which is close to the load centre, 20 20 models to start to put those together. and how much hydraulic energy is produced, and 21 21 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 22 how much of that energy has to be transmitted from the stations out in central and Bay 23 Q. Those are -23 24 MR. HUMPHRIES: d'Espoir into the Avalon. I mean, that's why 24 A. But it is late, yes, I agree, it is late. ultimately it greatly affects the loss rates. 25 Page 42 Page 44 1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. How much money has been set aside or allocated Q. Yes. I guess, I wasn't - I think what I was 2 3 getting at whether the more recent experience 3 for that?

- 4 MR. MOULTON:
- A. I think the sum is about \$70,000.00.
- 6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

8

- Q. Okay, all right. There was transmission 7
 - loses, there was some discussion of that
- 9 yesterday, and I understand the filing
- reflects looking at an average of transmission 10
- 11
- losses over a ten year period. I'd be correct
- in that? 12
- 13 MR. STRATTON:
- 14 A. Yes, the losses that were used in the GRA test
- 15 year forecast would have been a ten year
- average loss rate. 16
- 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
- Q. Yes, and, I guess, there was a question 18
- 19 yesterday, and I think an undertaking to
- determine whether Hydro had always been using, 20
- you know, the ten year approach, and I know 21
- it's under an undertaking, but I'm wondering 22
- is there any further information on that this 23
- 24 morning?
- 25 MR. STRATTON:

- would be more indicative of what can be 4
- expected by way of transmission losses?
- 6 MR. HUMPHRIES:
- A. Can I just -
- 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
- Q. Yeah.
- 10 MR. HUMPHRIES:
- 11 A. What do you mean by the more recent
- experiences? 12
- 13 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

17

19

25

- Q. Say, a five year average versus -14
- 15 MR. HUMPHRIES:
- A. Yeah, but, I mean, when we look at the five
 - years, I think, you know, on a our actual
- generation mix of Holyrood versus Bay d'Espoir 18
 - has not changed significantly in those periods
- that we and as Mr. Stratton has said, you 20
- know, the losses, the transmission losses, are 21
- 22 greatly affected by use from Holyrood, and two
- factors; (a) whether Holyrood just having 23
- Holyrood on providing voltage support reduces 24
 - losses, and obviously Holyrood is supplying -

	111-1 aş	ge NL Hydro GKA
Page 4	15	Page 47
the more load it supplies, the lower the	1	know, there's been quite a focus on the winter
2 losses as well. When we look through the past	2	readiness piece and the reporting and bringing
3 five years, I wouldn't expect the difference	3	some, as I would term it, some discipline to
4 to be material. There may be some small	4	it. Has this been has that been helpful to
5 differences, but I wouldn't expect it to be	5	the folks at Hydro in terms of, I guess,
6 material.	6	bringing a discipline to the winter readiness
7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	7	issue?
8 Q. As between the five and the ten?	8 N	MR. HUMPHRIES:
9 MR. HUMPHRIES:	9	A. I think so, yes. You know, it's I go back
10 A. Yes.	10	to my planning background, I guess, and Mr.
11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	11	Stratton from a forecasting perspective, we
12 Q. Just maybe if Hydro wouldn't mind producing an	12	always this issue of when winter really
undertaking indicating what the differences	13	starts and when you can expect winter to
would be between the five and the ten. We	14	happen, we probably went through a period
have the ten obviously in reply to NP-297.	15	where December, January, you're into late
16 MS. GLYNN:	16	January, early February before winter really
17 Q. Noted on the record.	17	started and load started to increase, but
18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	18	there was always knowledge that it can happen
19 Q. As regards winter readiness, Mr. Humphries, I	19	in December, and you know, I think the events
20 know there's going to be some undertakings	20	of 2014 obviously just settled that home and
21 filed in response to Mr. O'Brien's questions	21	so there is just there is a new discipline
22 arising out of the report that was discussed	22	of being prepared and ensure that December 1st
23 with you yesterday, but I guess just to ask	23	is December 1st.
you I guess the rather blunt question, do		OHNSON, Q.C.:
25 customers in your judgment have anything to be	25	Q. Yes, yeah. So there's as you sit there
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Page 4		Page 48
1 concerned with in terms of winter readiness	1	today, there's nothing that would make you
1 concerned with in terms of winter readiness 2 come December 1st?	1 2	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights
1 concerned with in terms of winter readiness 2 come December 1st? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES:	1 2 3	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red
1 concerned with in terms of winter readiness 2 come December 1st? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so.	1 2 3 4	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December?
1 concerned with in terms of winter readiness 2 come December 1st? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	1 2 3 4 5 M	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES:
1 concerned with in terms of winter readiness 2 come December 1st? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the	1 2 3 4 5 M	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now.
1 concerned with in terms of winter readiness 2 come December 1st? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the 7 winter readiness file as it were?	1 2 3 4 5 M	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now.
1 concerned with in terms of winter readiness 2 come December 1st? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the 7 winter readiness file as it were? 8 MR. HUMPHRIES:	1 2 3 4 5 M	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to
1 concerned with in terms of winter readiness 2 come December 1st? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the 7 winter readiness file as it were? 8 MR. HUMPHRIES: 9 A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as	1 2 3 4 5 M 6 7 J	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the
1 concerned with in terms of winter readiness 2 come December 1st? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the 7 winter readiness file as it were? 8 MR. HUMPHRIES: 9 A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as 10 we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly	1 2 3 4 5 N 6 7 J 8	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that
1 concerned with in terms of winter readiness 2 come December 1st? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the 7 winter readiness file as it were? 8 MR. HUMPHRIES: 9 A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as 10 we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly 11 meetings on progress, but when we get into the	1 2 3 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what
1 concerned with in terms of winter readiness 2 come December 1st? 3 MR. HUMPHRIES: 4 A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the 7 winter readiness file as it were? 8 MR. HUMPHRIES: 9 A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as 10 we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly 11 meetings on progress, but when we get into the 12 actual detail of the milestones on the various	1 2 3 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be
concerned with in terms of winter readiness come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked	1 2 3 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the
concerned with in terms of winter readiness come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked at yesterday, I don't have a direct line of	1 2 3 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the generation not happening on time or the links
concerned with in terms of winter readiness come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked at yesterday, I don't have a direct line of sight on that, other than the fact that	1 2 3 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12 13	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the generation not happening on time or the links not being on time and how power is going to be
concerned with in terms of winter readiness come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked at yesterday, I don't have a direct line of	1 2 3 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the generation not happening on time or the links
concerned with in terms of winter readiness come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked at yesterday, I don't have a direct line of sight on that, other than the fact that through the review, we're still advised that, you know, the in-service or completion dates	1 2 3 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the generation not happening on time or the links not being on time and how power is going to be
concerned with in terms of winter readiness come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked at yesterday, I don't have a direct line of sight on that, other than the fact that through the review, we're still advised that, you know, the in-service or completion dates are either on target or not. So I do not have	1 2 3 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the generation not happening on time or the links not being on time and how power is going to be sourced? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, what we agreed on to this stage is that
concerned with in terms of winter readiness come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked at yesterday, I don't have a direct line of sight on that, other than the fact that through the review, we're still advised that, you know, the in-service or completion dates are either on target or not. So I do not have the level of exposure and knowledge, I guess,	1 2 3 4 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 M	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the generation not happening on time or the links not being on time and how power is going to be sourced? MR. HUMPHRIES:
concerned with in terms of winter readiness come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked at yesterday, I don't have a direct line of sight on that, other than the fact that through the review, we're still advised that, you know, the in-service or completion dates are either on target or not. So I do not have	1 2 3 4 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 M 18	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the generation not happening on time or the links not being on time and how power is going to be sourced? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, what we agreed on to this stage is that
concerned with in terms of winter readiness come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked at yesterday, I don't have a direct line of sight on that, other than the fact that through the review, we're still advised that, you know, the in-service or completion dates are either on target or not. So I do not have the level of exposure and knowledge, I guess,	1 2 3 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 M 18 19	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the generation not happening on time or the links not being on time and how power is going to be sourced? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, what we agreed on to this stage is that we will provide these annual updates between
concerned with in terms of winter readiness come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked at yesterday, I don't have a direct line of sight on that, other than the fact that through the review, we're still advised that, you know, the in-service or completion dates are either on target or not. So I do not have the level of exposure and knowledge, I guess, that Mr. Henderson would have, get on a day-	1 2 3 4 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 M 18 19 20	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the generation not happening on time or the links not being on time and how power is going to be sourced? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, what we agreed on to this stage is that we will provide these annual updates between now and 2018 and obviously if these updates
concerned with in terms of winter readiness come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked at yesterday, I don't have a direct line of sight on that, other than the fact that through the review, we're still advised that, you know, the in-service or completion dates are either on target or not. So I do not have the level of exposure and knowledge, I guess, that Mr. Henderson would have, get on a day- to-day basis from his direct reports who are	1 2 3 4 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 M 18 19 20 21	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the generation not happening on time or the links not being on time and how power is going to be sourced? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, what we agreed on to this stage is that we will provide these annual updates between now and 2018 and obviously if these updates reflect an area of concern, yes, we will
come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked at yesterday, I don't have a direct line of sight on that, other than the fact that through the review, we're still advised that, you know, the in-service or completion dates are either on target or not. So I do not have the level of exposure and knowledge, I guess, that Mr. Henderson would have, get on a day-to-day basis from his direct reports who are actually executing the winter readiness work.	1 2 3 4 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 M 18 19 20 21 22 23	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the generation not happening on time or the links not being on time and how power is going to be sourced? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, what we agreed on to this stage is that we will provide these annual updates between now and 2018 and obviously if these updates reflect an area of concern, yes, we will develop contingency plans or identify the
come December 1st? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. To my knowledge now, no, I do not think so. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. No, and this how engaged are you in the winter readiness file as it were? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, I think I get regular updates, and as we said yesterday, we have daily and weekly meetings on progress, but when we get into the actual detail of the milestones on the various portions of work, like the schedule we looked at yesterday, I don't have a direct line of sight on that, other than the fact that through the review, we're still advised that, you know, the in-service or completion dates are either on target or not. So I do not have the level of exposure and knowledge, I guess, that Mr. Henderson would have, get on a day-to-day basis from his direct reports who are actually executing the winter readiness work.	1 2 3 4 4 5 M 6 7 J 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 M 18 19 20 21 22 23	today, there's nothing that would make you think that we're going to see the green lights on those various assets turned yellow or red before December? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Not that I'm aware of right now. OHNSON, Q.C.: Q. As regards contingency planning in relation to a delay in the Muskrat Falls generation or the links there was some discussion of that yesterday, and does Hydro intend to file what the contingency plan would be that can be relied upon in the event of, you know, the generation not happening on time or the links not being on time and how power is going to be sourced? MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Well, what we agreed on to this stage is that we will provide these annual updates between now and 2018 and obviously if these updates reflect an area of concern, yes, we will develop contingency plans or identify the plans for mitigating those shortfalls.

October 21, 2015 Mult	ti-Page TM NL Hydro GRA
Page 49	Page 51
1 MR. HUMPHRIES:	1 Q. Certainly.
2 A. But you know, the recent update that we filed	2 MR. GOULDING:
3 in September, again while it met the criteria	3 A. Okay. Jenny, are you able to call up Table 4
4 at the time that we'd set, it was pretty lean	4 of exhibit no, I'm sorry, Table 8 of
5 out to the interconnection date and we did	5 Exhibit 4?
6 express some concern around that and the	6 MS. GRAY:
7 consideration of the black start diesels. The	7 Q. Yes.
8 new information that we've gotten just this	8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
9 week, sort of we backed off a little bit on	9 Q. You obviously read the transcript from Mr.
that, you know, the pressure is off, but	10 Henderson.
things can change and we know that, and so we	11 MR. GOULDING:
will be monitoring and looking at what these	12 A. So I guess we filed our our latest report
mitigations and contingency plans will be, but	regarding the benefits of this agreement was
14 as I said, we still anticipate the	filed with our Amended GRA Application and
interconnections happening in 2017 and if they	it's probably version two or three, I guess.
happen, we do have a firm ability of 100	So, just some background. We -
megawatts there and that would bridge us	17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
through a number of years, if it had to. But	Q. So what is this document, just for the record?
19 yes, it's always on our minds and we're always	19 MR. GOULDING:
20 looking at it.	20 A. Oh, I'm sorry, this is the benefits table
21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	21 that's in Exhibit 4 of the GRA application
Q. Just I want to ask about the there was some	that's related to the analysis of the piloted
discussion that I had with Mr. Henderson and I	agreement with Corner Brook Pulp and Paper.
think at the time some of it was deferred to	So, this agreement started in 2009. The
you, Mr. Humphries. That had to do with the	25 premise of the agreement was to provide with -
Page 50	
supply agreement with Corner Brook Pulp and	1 - to provide Corner Brook Pulp and Paper the
2 Paper and the energy the system energy	2 opportunity to more efficiently utilize their
3 savings that are arising from that	generation and the idea being, I guess, prior
4 arrangement.	4 to the agreement, Corner Brook Pulp and Paper
5 MR. HUMPHRIES:	5 used to operate its generation at Deer Lake
6 A. Yes.	6 Power to essentially follow mill load because
7 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	7 any time that their power consumption from
8 Q. And I think the system energy savings that	8 Hydro went over their scheduled power on
9 were said to be arising were in the vicinity	9 order, it would be subject to non-firm rates
of about \$520,000. Is that your understanding	and the non-firm rate was basically determined
11 as well?	by the highest cost power source, which was,
12 MR. HUMPHRIES:	for all intents and purposes, Holyrood. So
13 A. Yes. I'll refer to Mr. Goulding on that.	this agreement gave or gives Corner Brook Pulp
14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	and Paper a credit for the generation and that
15 Q. Okay.	credit, added to their power on order, is meant to match their total mill load.
16 MR. HUMPHRIES:17 A. He has the data and the information on that.	
	So following the agreement, Corner Brook
18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	Pulp and Paper is no longer incurring non-firm
19 Q. Oh, he has the data, yeah.	power costs for levels of power from Hydro
20 MR. GOULDING:21 A. There's a lot of information out there in RFIs	20 that's above their power on order and then
	because they don't have to chase or follow
now on this agreement. I was wondering if I	22 mill load, then that gives them the
could take the opportunity just to step down	opportunity to operate their units at their
24 through it, just the Coles notes version.	24 most efficient points. From a system
25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	25 perspective, it makes sense to better utilize

Page 53 Page 55 the resources that are out there in the end to Q. One-year number, yes. 1 2 minimize what's required from Holyrood. 2 MR. GOULDING: A. Whereas the 3.875 was the five-year to six-3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 3 Q. And from a system perspective, I take it there 4 year number. are system energy savings? 5 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 MR. GOULDING: Q. Right. And in terms of the savings that 6 A. That's correct. Corner Brook Pulp and Paper will have annually 7 in 2016 and 2017, could we turn to CA-NLH-059? 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 8 Q. And what are they on an annual basis? 9 MS. GRAY: 10 MR. GOULDING: O. Revision 1, Mr. Johnson? 10 A. In our last review, we got some data and it's 11 11 JOHNSON, O.C.: outlined in this report. We estimate the 12 12 Q. Yes, please. Okay, just come on down a little system energy savings from the improved bit more. Bit more, sorry. 13 13 utilization as about 3.6 gigawatt hours 14 14 MS. GRAY: annually. Q. Sorry, bit more? 15 15 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. And what's that in money savings? Q. Yeah. Okay. So as I understand it, costs 17 17 with the pilot agreement are on the left and 18 MR. GOULDING: 18 then costs without the pilot agreement are on 19 A. Well, this is where this table, I guess, 19 the right, and in 2016, Corner Brook Pulp and should help to explain things. So, we were 20 20 basically asked to provide an analysis of the Paper's total cost with the pilot agreement 21 21 savings since the implementation of the would be 3.2 million, but without the pilot 22 22 agreement. So, really the Holyrood fuel costs agreement, 3.8, and roughly the same in 2017? 23 23 reduction, that 3.875 million dollars, that is 24 MR. GOULDING: 24 the savings identified corresponding to that A. That's correct. 25 Page 54 Page 56 3.6 gigawatt hours annually. 1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 1 2 (10:15 a.m.) Q. So their savings are 590 odd thousand annually? 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 3 Q. Could I just refer you to CA-288 for a moment? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 MR. GOULDING: A. That's correct. A. Yes. 6 6 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 7 JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. So more than the system energy savings? Q. Just line 21. Actually, starting at line 18. 8 MR. GOULDING: 8 Indicates "the table below outlines the A. That's correct. If we could go back to Table 9 potential for annual savings in fuel costs 8, I can probably explain how the to's and 10 10 11 based on 2014 actual fuel consumption prices 11 fro's come there. and most Hydro's most recent price forecast, 12 12 JOHNSON, Q.C.: March 2015, for the years 2015 to '17. As 13 Q. Sure, yeah. indicated, there has been a modest reduction 14 14 MR. GOULDING: 15 of potential savings to approximately \$520,000 A. So under the same context, the base case 15 savings projected to 2016 and 2017 year would annually. 16 16 represent those fuel savings that are there 17 MR. GOULDING: 17 and they would be passed on to all rate payers A. That's correct. 18 through the RSP, but in the sensitivity case, 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 Q. Okay. So just put that number into context this is where the benefit would shift to 20 20 with the 3.7 million dollar number you just 21 Corner Brook Pulp and Paper from the other 21 22 referred to. 22 rate payers and this is where this number, I guess, in that, how that number in that 23 MR. GOULDING: 23 A. This here would be your one-year number. previous RFI is derived. An aspect of this 24 24 25 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 25 agreement is it allows Corner Brook Pulp and

Page 57 Page 59 Paper to avoid non-firm energy costs. incurred non-firm power purchases prior to 2 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 this agreement. Q. Right. 3 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 3 4 MR. GOULDING: Q. So are you saying that the savings that Corner A. So to determine what that sensitivity is, we Brook Pulp and Paper is enjoying through this 5 5 went back and looked at their non-firm power arrangement are not picked up by other 6 6 use for the five years prior to the agreement customers? 7 7 and it was in the order of 3.5 gigawatt hours. 8 8 MR. GOULDING: So, if they were avoiding non-firm power costs A. To the extent that their avoided non-firm 10 but they're able to purchase this energy at 10 energy doesn't exceed their firm energy firm rates, then that firm energy, the extra savings. So in the analysis that we've done 11 11 firm energy that they're buying at firm rates here for the past five years, even under the 12 12 sensitivity case, there were still benefits to 13 would now flow through the RSP. So that would 13 offset most of the benefit from the improved 14 14 all rate payers. water utilization. So that number that you've 15 JOHNSON, O.C.: 15 16 quoted there of \$620,000 benefit to Corner 16 Q. As regards the -- there's two capacity Brook Pulp and Paper, that's in light of being agreements as well that have been entered into 17 17 able to buy energy at firm rates that they with Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and they were 18 18 would have ordinarily bought at non-firm discussed to some degree with Mr. Henderson, 19 19 as you're no doubt aware, and through these 20 rates. 20 agreements, Corner Brook Pulp and Paper will 21 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 21 22 Q. The number I referred to is 590,000. 22 be receiving annually about 1.4 million dollars. I think that's the number. Is that 23 MR. GOULDING: 23 A. Yes, I'm sorry. familiar to you? 25 MR. GOULDING: 25 JOHNSON, Q.C.: Page 58 Page 60 Q. Yes, okay. And so the savings, just so I can 1 A. That is, I guess in terms of the fixed 1 2 understand that, the savings that Corner Brook 2 payments, there's -- the schedule that's set 3 Pulp and Paper enjoys of 590,000, will that be 3 out is \$28 per kilowatt winter, so the fixed made up by other customers on the system? payment works out to be about 1.68 million and 4 4 5 MR. GOULDING: 5 then there's a variable payment as well,

depending on how much we call upon them and 6

7 use them.

8 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

9 Q. Okay. And how will this arrangement work --

and I don't know if this is your question, Mr. 10

11 Goulding, or Mr. Humphries. How will this

arrangement work during a system emergency or 12

13 an event on the system that needs -

14 MR. GOULDING:

15 A. Yeah, I can certainly speak from an operations

16 perspective.

17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

18 Q. Okay.

22

25

19 MR. GOULDING:

20 A. As I've indicated previously, we have daily

21 meetings, daily reliability assessment

meetings and we have a one-week window where

we have our load forecasts, we have our 23

24 generation availability laid out for the

entire week, and we assess things from an

A. It's in part made up by the fuel savings that 6

7 have been -- that have arisen from their

improved water utilization and as long as this

9 energy that they're buying at firm rates

doesn't exceed the improved water utilization, 10

11 then there's still a net positive impact to

the RSP and the benefit would be shared by all 12

13 rate payers.

14 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

Q. Okay.

8

20

25

16 MR. GOULDING:

17 A. And that was the hard part, I guess, about

doing this analysis is trying to predict what 18

19 their non-firm power use would have been

because it depends on a number of factors,

such as outages to their units, whether 21

22 they're on a forced or a planned sense. If

they have issues at their intakes, such as 23

icing, if they have low water levels, there's 24

various reasons why they would have, say,

<u>Oc</u>	tober 21, 2015 Mul	tı-Page	NL Hydro GRA
	Page 6	1	Page 63
1	Avalon perspective and a total island	1	alternatives we would have to get additional
2	perspective. So, if we see and aligned	2	capacity if we had to add capacity, we're
3	with this, we have a protocol or instruction	3	talking something that's in the range of
4	T001 that our operators use, I guess, to deal	4	\$1,000 a kilowatt and we don't have the
5	with any reserve issues or generation issues	5	ability to be able to have that for only four
6	on the system. So, if during our daily	6	months. And the rates we have negotiated are
7	assessment we foresee a need that we're at a	7	comparable with rates that we paid back in the
8	point where our generation reserves are low	8	'90s for the interruptible feed with Abitibi.
9	enough that we would need to call on Corner	9	So it is a good value to customers.
10	Brook Pulp and Paper, then we would certainly	10 JOH	HNSON, Q.C.:
11	give them as much advance notice as we can,	11 (Q. When Mr. Henderson was on the stand on
12	but under the terms of the agreement, the only	12	September 24th, I asked him whether the
13	requirement is a 15-minute notice, but we	13	arrangement with respect to Corner Brook Pulp
14	would certain endeavour, you know, to give	14	and Paper providing capacity assistance was
15	them as much of a heads up as we can.	15	consistent with Corner Brook Pulp and Paper's
16	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	16	water rights and he didn't he indicated
17	Q. Okay. And then, I guess, you monitor Corner	17	that he didn't know the details of those, of
18	Brook Pulp and Paper's performance then during	18	their water rights and we were advised
19	that emergency situation?	19	subsequently in an undertaking, Undertaking
20	MR. GOULDING:	20	38, that Hydro has no role in monitoring the
21	A. We would. Once we do our assessment, you	21	activities of Corner Brook Pulp and Paper with
22	know, like we're basically a bunch of system	22	respect to water rights granted by the Crown.
23	operation engineers that's outside our ECC	23	And I don't know if you're familiar with that
24	area. So once we do our assessment, we would	24	undertaking?
25	certainly give Corner Brook Pulp and Paper a	25 (10):30 a.m.)
	Page 62	2	Page 64
1	heads up that we may need them and we would		a. HUMPHRIES:
2	give our operators a heads up as well and at	2 /	A. Yes, I am.
3	that point, they are to follow the	3 JOH	HNSON, Q.C.:
4	instructions in T001. So one of those	4 (Q. Okay. And so does this mean, Mr and the
5	instructions, as we get far enough into our	5	undertaking is there on the screen there now.
6	reserve issue, is to call on Corner Brook Pulp	6	It says "Hydro is not a party to the water
7	and Paper and the way it works is they drop	7	rights of mother nature granted rights from
8	load at their mill and make generation from	8	the Crown in right of the Province. Hydro is
9	Deer Lake Power available to the grid. So at	9	not party to this agreement or instrument and
10	that point, we do have real time indications	10	has no role in monitoring the activities of
11	on what the net transfer is, say from Deer	11	Corner Brook Pulp and Paper with respect to
12	Lake Power to us. So then, we have an idea	12	water rights." And so does this mean, Mr.
13	then, you know, that they have dropped the	13	Humphries, that Hydro is not in a position to
14	required amount of load.	14	say whether the agreements it has reached with
15	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	15	Corner Brook Pulp and Paper as regards to
16	Q. How do you folks assess how other customers	16	capacity assistance and, for that matter, the
17	benefit from the arrangement, relative to the	17	pilot supply agreement are consistent with
18	cost that they're paying for it?	18	their water rights?
19	MR. GOULDING:	19 MR	A. HUMPHRIES:
20	A. Yeah, I think that's probably more in Paul's	20	A. I'm not in a position to say about that.
	area, Mr. Humphries.	21 JOH	HNSON, Q.C.:
21			
22	MR. HUMPHRIES:		Q. Okay. The arrangement with Corner Brook Pulp
- 1	MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Yeah. From the perspective, I guess, of what we're paying, the \$28 per kilowatt for the	22 (23	Q. Okay. The arrangement with Corner Brook Pulp and Paper as regards the CoGeneration, now I take it that there is a Government directive

in relating to the CoGen arrangement with

25

winter season, in comparison to what

Page 65 1 Corner Brook Pulp and Paper? 2 MR. GOILDING: 3 A. Thar's correct. 4 JOHNSON, QC: 5 O. It's not on the record in this proceeding. I 6 wonder if Hydro could undertake to file that? 7 MR. YOILNG: 8 Q. To file what? Could you repeat that question? 9 Sorry. 10 JOHNSON, QC: 11 Q. The Government directive in relation to Corner 12 Brook CoGeneration. 13 MR. YOUNG: 14 Q. There's an exemption order on the LPCA web 15 page. Is that what you're referring to? 16 JOHNSON, QC: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the FPCA web page? 18 MR. YOUNG: 19 Q. Yeah. 20 JOHNSON, QC: 21 Q. Okay. 22 MR. YOUNG: 23 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 PILLOO that up. 27 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook Pulp and Paper ralaring to power purchases 15 Unitson, QC: 25 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook Pulp and Paper ralaring to power purchases 15 Unitson, QC: 16 Q. War. 17 JOHNSON, QC: 18 JOHNSON, QC: 29 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and through the reply to Canata from the story of the state of the story of the state of the story of the state of the story of th	October 21, 2015 M	Iulti-Page [™] NL Hydro C	<u> GRA</u>
1 Corner Brook Pulp and Paper? 2 MR. GOLT DING: 3 A. That's correct. 4 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 5 Q. It's not on the record in this proceeding. I 6 wonder if Hydro could undertake to file that? 7 MR. YOLNG: 8 Q. To file what? Could you repeat that question? 8 Q. To file what? Could you repeat that question? 9 Sorry. 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 11 Q. The Government directive in relation to Corner 12 Brook CoGeneration. 13 MR. YOUNG: 13 Q. There's an exemption order on the EPCA web 15 page. Is that what you're referring to? 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR. YOUNG: 19 Q. Yeah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Wah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Wah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. Wah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 11 Q. Wah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. Yesh. 21 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Q. Yesh. 22 MR. YOUNG: 13 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 15 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 16 MR. GOLLDING: 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 18 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 Q. Yesh. 21 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 Q. Yesh. 22 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 Q. Yesh. 21 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 Q. Yesh. 2	Page	Pag	ge 67
3 A That's correct. 4 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 5 Q. I's not on the record in this proceeding. I 6 wonder if Hydro could undertake to file that? 7 MR, YOUNG: 8 Q. To file what? Could you repeat that question? 9 Sorry. 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 11 Q. The Government directive in relation to Corner 12 Brook CoGeneration. 13 MR, YOUNG: 14 Q. There's an exemption order on the EPCA web 15 page. Is that what you're referring to? 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR, YOUNG: 19 Q. Yeah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 21 Q. Okay. 22 MR, YOUNG: 23 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 I I'll look that up. 26 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that would be that it would	_		
3 A That's correct. 4 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 5 Q. I's not on the record in this proceeding. I 6 wonder if Hydro could undertake to file that? 7 MR, YOUNG: 8 Q. To file what? Could you repeat that question? 9 Sorry. 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 11 Q. The Government directive in relation to Corner 12 Brook CoGeneration. 13 MR, YOUNG: 14 Q. There's an exemption order on the EPCA web 15 page. Is that what you're referring to? 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR, YOUNG: 19 Q. Yeah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 21 Q. Okay. 22 MR, YOUNG: 23 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 I I'll look that up. 26 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that would be that it would			
4 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 5 Q. It's not on the record in this proceeding. I 6 wonder if Hydro could undertake to file that? 7 MR, YOUNG: 8 Q. To file what? Could you repeat that question? 9 Sorry. 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 11 Q. The Government directive in relation to Corner 12 Brook CoGeneration. 13 MR, YOUNG: 14 Q. There's an exemption order on the EPCA web 15 page. Is that what you're referring to? 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR, YOUNG. 19 Q. Veah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 11 Q. Okay. 22 MR, YOUNG. 23 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 24 Q. Okay. 25 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the record, Mr. Young? 11 MR, YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under record, Mr. Young? 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that would be that it would not be, for a couple of reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay arrangements similar to wind, similar to wind, similar to adecision about it. I think the costs that in flow from it are proper consideration for the decision about it. I think the costs that in flow from it are proper consideration for the Board to know about and for the Consumer Advocate to ask about, but the particular way it works. 4 Mr. Young.	3 A. That's correct.		
5 Q. It's not on the record in this proceeding. I 6 wonder if Hydro could undertake to file that? 7 MR. YOUNG: 8 Q. To file whit? Could you repeat that question? 9 Sorry. 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Q. The Government directive in relation to Corner 12 Brook CoGeneration. 13 MR. YOUNG: 13 MR. YOUNG: 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR. YOUNG: 19 Q. Yeah. May you're referring to? 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR. YOUNG: 19 Q. Yeah. 19 Web yeah. 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 Q. Yeah. 19 Web yeah. 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 Q. Yeah. 19 Web yeah. 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 Q. Yeah. 19 Web yeah. 19 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 Q. Yeah. 19 Web yeb yeb yeb yeb yeb yeb yeb yeb yeb y	4 JOHNSON, Q.C.:		
6 wonder if Hydro could undertake to file that? 7 MR. YOUNG: 9 Sorry. 9 10 OHNSON, Q.G.: 11 Q. The Government directive in relation to Corner 12 Brook CoGeneration. 12 13 MR. YOUNG: 14 14 Q. There's an exemption order on the EPCA web 15 page. Is that what you're referring to? 16 JOINSON, Q.G.: 17 16 JOINSON, Q.G.: 16 discuss that. 17 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web 19 page. Is that what you're referring to? 16 JOINSON, Q.G.: 17 18 MR. YOUNG: 18 MR. YOUNG: 19 Q. Yeah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.G.: 20 JOHNSON, Q.G.: 21 Q. Okay. 22 MR. YOUNG: 22 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases under that exemption? 21 Q. Okay. 1 wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 22 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that would be that it would not be, for a couple of reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases and ceision about it. I. I think the costs that 17 outside the Board's value of this discussion, there has been—this has come up before in discussions with Board staff and the before in discussions with Board tand the details of the 2Q. Vean. 10 to it. They did before on one occasion I spoke to their solicitor about it. So I think it is only proper that I speak to be to. If they have a position, it needs to be considered also. So we will have a chance to discuss that. 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 18 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA-NLE-285—if we could get that up? Yeah, if you could scroll down a bit. Keep on scrolling there. If you look at the bottom column there or the bottom box, purchases from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper rale to be to bottom box, purchases from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper rale to be to bottom box, purchases from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper rale to be to be purchased, from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper rale under take-or-pay arrangements similar to wind, similar to Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a		5 MR. YOUNG:	
7 MR, YOUNG: 8 Q. To file what? Could you repeat that question? 9 Sorry. 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 12 Brook CoGeneration. 13 MR, YOUNG: 14 Q. There's an exemption order on the EPCA web page. 15 MR YOUNG: 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR, YOUNG: 19 Q. Yeah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 21 Q. Okay. 22 MR, YOUNG: 23 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 J'Ill look that up. 26 Age repeated by the repeated by t		6 O. Yeah. And just for the Board's value of this	
8 Q. To file what? Could you repeat that question? 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 11 Q. The Government directive in relation to Corner 12 Brook CoGeneration. 13 MR. YOUNG: 14 Q. There's an exemption order on the FPCA web 15 page. Is that what you're referring to? 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR. YOUNG: 19 Q. Yeah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 20 Q. Yeah. 21 Imight be able to answer that in a moment. 25 I'll look that up. Page 66 1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously an an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases under that exemption? 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 MR. GOULDING: 5 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. Oke're going to have to take that under advisement. My first blush answer of that would be that it would not be, for a couple of reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper rand to develop a devisement. My first blush answer of that would be that it would not be, for a couple of reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper rand to develop a flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 24 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside — I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 25 this number the tere is noticution in the generation output as well. So this number of years ago, and I believe to to. It. They did before on none occasion I 2 to it. They did before on none occasion I 2 to it. They did before on none occasion I 2 to it. They did before on none occasion I 2 to it. They did before on none occasion I 2 to it. They did before on none occasion I 2 to it. They did before on none occasion I 2 to it. They did before on none occasion I 2 to it. They did before on none occasion I 2 to it. They did before on none occasion I 2 to it. They did before on none occasion I 2 to it. They	1		
9 Sorry. 10 JOHNSON, Q.C: 11 Q. The Government directive in relation to Corner 12 Brook CoGeneration. 13 MR, YOUNG: 15 page. Is that what you're referring to? 16 JOHNSON, Q.C: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR, YOUNG. 18 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA- 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR, YOUNG. 19 Q. Veah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C: 21 Q. Okay. 22 MR, YOUNG: 23 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 I'll look that up. 26 I JOHNSON, Q.C: 27 Q. Ves, no problem. I take it there is obviously an a agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases under that exemption? 26 MR, GOULDING: 27 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and coften paper may the vounder of the advisement. My first blush answer of that would be that it would not be, for a couple of reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay arrangements. Si jurisdiction to make a decision about it. I think the costs that if the power and the details of the calculations and paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the m	8 O. To file what? Could you repeat that question?		
10 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 10 Corner Brook Pulp and Paper may take exemption to lt. They did before on one occasion 1 to lt. They did before in the solution, in leeds to be considered also. So we will have a position, it needs to be considered also. So we will have a position, it needs to be considered also. So we will have a chance to discuss that. 17 to lt. They did before a positive part 1 to lt. They did before a positive part 1 to lt. They did before a possible part 1 to lt. They did before a possible part 1 to lt. They did before a possible part 1 to lt. They did before a possible part 1 to list	1 .	9 Board a number of years ago, and I believe	
11 Q. The Government directive in relation to Corner 12 Brook CoGeneration. 12 Brook CoGeneration. 12 Spoke to their solicitor about it. So I think 13 MR, YOUNG: 14 Q. There's an exemption order on the EPCA web 15 page. Is that what you're referring to? 15 considered also. So we will have a chance to discuss that. 16 discuss that. 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR, YOUNG: 18 Q. Okay, Lunderstand through the reply to CA-NL-1285 - if we could get that up? Yeah, if 20 you could scroll down a bit. Keep on 21 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 22 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 23 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 24 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 25 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 26 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 27 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 28 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 column there or the bottom box, purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and CoGen 29 column there or the bottom box, purchased from Corner Brook 29 column there	·		
12 Brook CoGeneration. 13 MR YOUNG: 14 Q. There's an exemption order on the EPCA web 14 Dinnson, Q.C.: 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR. YOUNG: 18 Q. Okay. Lunderstand through the reply to Capton order on the EPCA web page? 18 MR. YOUNG: 18 Q. Okay. Lunderstand through the reply to Capton order on the EPCA web page? 18 NLH-285 - if we could get that up? Yeah, if you wish, you can carry on your questions. 20 you could seroll down a bit. Keep on scrolling there. If you look at the bottom 22 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 23 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 I'll look that up. Page 66 1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 4 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 4 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 5 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that would be that it would not be, for a couple of reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper might take issue with that, and it is outside the Board's purisdiction to make a decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way it works and the details of the calculations 21 may be outside — I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 24 change it. The Board			
13 MR, YOUNG: 14 Q. There's an exemption order on the EPCA web 15 page. Is that what you're referring to? 15 considered also. So we will have a chance to 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 16 discuss that. 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 18 Q. Okay. 19 Q. Yeah. 19 Q. Yeah. 19 Q. Yeah. 19 Q. Yeah. 19 Q. Handle, Young: 18 Q. Okay. 19 Q. Handle, Young: 18 Q. Okay. 19 Q. Handle, Young: 18 Q. Okay. 19 Q. Handle, Young: 19 Q. Han		-	
14 Q. There's an exemption order on the EPCA web page. Is that what you're referring to? 15 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR, YOUNG: 18 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA- 19 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA- 19 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA- 19 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA- 19 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA- 19 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA- 19 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA- 19 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA- 19 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA- 19 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA- 19 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA- 19 Q. Okay. I wou could scroll down a bit. Keep on scrolling there. If you look at the bottom column there or the bottom box, purchases from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and CoGen 11 11 11 12 12 13 14 14 15 15 15 15 15 15	13 MR. YOUNG:		
15 page. Is that what you're referring to? 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 O.Yesh. 19 Q. Yeah. 19 Q. Yeah. 19 You you could scroll down a bit. Keep on scrolling there. If you look at the bottom you could scroll down a bit. Keep on scrolling there. If you look at the bottom column there or the bottom box, purchases from corner Brook Pulp and Paper and CoGen purchases. Was est that there is assumed to be purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and CoGen purchases. Was est that there is assumed to be purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases of under that exemption? 19 Way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt hours like a constant figure through those years? 19 MR. YOUNG: 10 Way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt hours like a constant figure through those years? 10 Way of this CoGen arrangement between Hydro and Corner Brook Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases of the purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 10 Way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt hours like a constant figure through those years? 10 Way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt hours like a constant figure through those years? 10 Way of this CoGen arrangement had be that it would not be, for a couple of the second, Mr. Young? 10 Way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt hours like a constant figure through those years? 10 Way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt hours like a constant figure through those years? 10 Way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt hours like a constant figure through those years? 10 Way of this code arrangement had the would be that it would not be, for a couple of the second with the particular way a constant figure through those years? 10 Way of this code arrangement with the details of the account of the consumer of that would not be, for a couple of the last figure through those years? 10 Way of this code arrangement with the details of the account of th	Q. There's an exemption order on the EPCA web		
16 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 17 Q. Yes, yeah. Oh, it's on the EPCA web page? 18 MR. YOUNG: 18 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA. 19 Q. Yeah. 19 Vou could scroll down a bit. Keep on scrolling there. If you look at the bottom column there or the bottom box, purchases from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and CoGen purchased, way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt hours for each of 2015, 2016 and 2017. 20 Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously a gargement between Hydro and Corner Brook Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases under that exemption? 4 A. That's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 7 A. That's correct. 7 DINISON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the record, Mr. Young? 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details of the agreement, our purchases with Corner arangements similar to wind, similar to Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a forecast going forward, there's been a we've taken the last, the average of the last five years and the reason being, I guess, through the development, so at Corner Brook Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. 24 Change it. The Board has no opportunity to 24 Change it. The Board has no opportunity to 25 Change it. The Board has no opportunity to 26 Change it. The Board has no opportunity to 27 Change it. The Board has no opportunity to 28 Change it. The Board has no opportunity to 28 Change it. The Board has no opportunity to 28 Change it. The Board has no opportunity to 28 C	-		
17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 18 MR. YOUNG: 18 Q. Okay. I understand through the reply to CA-		16 discuss that.	
18 MR. YOUNG: 19 Q. Yeah. 19 Q. Yeah. 20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 21 Q. Okay. 22 MR. YOUNG: 23 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 I'll look that up. 26 Page 66 27 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 28 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 29 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 29 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 30 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 40 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 51 under that exemption? 41 A. That's correct. 42 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the record, Mr. Young? 43 A. That's correct. 44 D. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the record, Mr. Young? 45 Q. We're going to have to take that under advisement. My first blush answer of that would be that it would not be, for a couple of reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay arrangement, our purchases with Corner Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay arrangements similar to wind, similar to would be that it would not be, for a couple of reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay arrangements similar to wind, similar to five development, so at Corner Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay arrangements similar to wind, similar to we've taken the last, the average of the last five years and the reason being, I guess, through the development, so at Corner Brook Pulp and Paper are with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. 41 Change it. The Board has no opportunity to 20 Soak in the potton box. purchases from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and CoGen purchases we see that there is assumed to be purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper with the shate in the particular way 21 thours for each of 2015, 2016 and 2017. 29 Q. Okay. I anderstand through		17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	
19 NLH-285—if we could get that up? Yeah, if you could scroll down a bit. Keep on 21 Q. Okay. 22 MR. YOUNG: 22 Scrolling there. If you look at the bottom 22 Column there or the bottom box, purchases from 23 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 I'll look that up. 26 Page 68 I JOHNSON, Q.C.: 27 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 28 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 25 under that exemption? 27 A. That's correct. 28 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 38 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 39 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 39 This purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper, by 30 A. That's correct. 30 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details 30 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 30 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 31 Grecast going forward, there's been a 32 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 21 I works and the details of the calculations 32 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 tworks and the details of the calculations 32 Angular berost that we're seeing here, that's 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's 32 Angular by 10 Angular base and 10 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 24 tworks and the details of the calculations 34 Angular base and 10 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 25 tworks and the details of the calculations 34 Angular base continued to a 34 A	1		
20 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 21 Q, Okay. 22 MR, YOUNG: 23 Q, If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 I'll look that up. Page 66 1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 Q, Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 MR, GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q, Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 25 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 26 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 27 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 28 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 29 Column there or the bottom box, purchases from 20 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 21 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 24 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 25 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 26 Column there or the bottom box, purchases from 27 Comer Brook Pulp and Paper and CoGen 28 purchases (the there is assumed to be 29 purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper, by 20 way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt 20 hours for each of 2015, 2016 and 2017. 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. That's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Okay. And why does Hydro assume that it'll be 20 purchasing the 51.1 gigawatt hours like a 21 constant figure through those years? 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess	19 Q. Yeah.		
21 Q. Okay. 22 MR. YOUNG: 23 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 I'll look that up. 26 Page 66 1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 scrolling there. If you look at the bottom column there or the bottom box, purchases from 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 25 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 26 Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and CoGen purchases, we see that there is assumed to be purchases, we see that there is assumed to be purchased, from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper, by Page 68 1 Way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt hours for each of 2015, 2016 and 2017. 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. That's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. And why does Hydro assume that it'll be purchased, from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay arrangement, single from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay arrangement similar to wind, similar to 4 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 forecast going forward, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at through the development, so at Corner Brook 17 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper with the shutdo			
22 MR. YOUNG: 23 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions. 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 I'll look that up. Page 66 1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. W're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside — I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 25 column there or the bottom box, purchases from 26 Corner Brook Pulp and Paper a colome Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and Cogen 26 purchases, we see that there is assumed to be 27 purchases, we see that there is assumed to be 28 purchases, we see that there is assumed to be 29 purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper, by 24 count and Paper, by 25 purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper as che that ender and Paper, by 26 purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and Cogle. 2			
23 Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and CoGen 24 I might be able to answer that in a moment. 25 I'll look that up. Page 66 1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 Corner Brook Pulp and Paper and CoGen 25 purchases, we see that there is assumed to be purchased, Frup and Paper, by Page 68 1 way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt 2 hours for each of 2015, 2016 and 2017. 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. That's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. And why does Hydro assume that it'll be purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay a constant figure through those years? 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details 11 of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 forecast going forward, there's been a we've taken the last, the average of the last 16 five years and the reason being, I guess, 17 through the development, so at Corner Brook 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook 19 plup and Paper with the shutdown of two of 19 their four paper machines, there's been a 19 reduction in the internal steam requirements			
24	23 Q. If you wish, you can carry on your questions.	_	
Page 66 1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about, but the particular way 21 it works and the details of the calculations 22 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 25 purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper arrangement, 51 gigawatt 1 way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt 1 hours for each of 2015, 2016 and 2017. 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. That's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Okay. And why does Hydro assume that it'll be purchasing the 51.1 gigawatt hours like a constant figure through those years? 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay arrangements similar to wind, similar to Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a forecast going forward, there's been a reduction in the reason being, I guess, through the development, so at Corner Brook Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 15 Torcast going forward, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well.	I might be able to answer that in a moment.	purchases, we see that there is assumed to be	
1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 10 way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt hours for each of 2015, 2016 and 2017. 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. That's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Okay. And why does Hydro assume that it'll be purchasing the 51.1 gigawatt hours like a constant figure through those years? 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper under take-or-pay arrangements similar to wind, similar to Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a forecast going forward, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and Paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well.		25 purchased from Corner Brook Pulp and Paper, by	
1 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 10 way of this CoGen arrangement, 51 gigawatt hours for each of 2015, 2016 and 2017. 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. That's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Okay. And why does Hydro assume that it'll be purchasing the 51.1 gigawatt hours like a constant figure through those years? 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper under take-or-pay arrangements similar to wind, similar to Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a forecast going forward, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and Paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well.	Page	2 66 Pas	ge 68
2 Q. Yes, no problem. I take it there is obviously 3 an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook 4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 MR. GOULDING: 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 2 hours for each of 2015, 2016 and 2017. 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. That's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Okay. And why does Hydro assume that it'll be purchasing the 51.1 gigawatt hours like a constant figure through those years? 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a forecast going forward, there's been a 15 we've taken the last, the average of the last through the development, so at Corner Brook Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's	_		-
an agreement between Hydro and Corner Brook Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases under that exemption? 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that would be that it would not be, for a couple of reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper might take issue with that, and it is Outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a Recision about it. I think the costs that Paper might take issue with the constant figure through those years? 9 MR. GOULDING: 0 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper might take issue with that, and it is Outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a Recision about it. I think the costs that Recision about it. I think the cos			
4 Pulp and Paper relating to power purchases 5 under that exemption? 6 MR. GOULDING: 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 4 A. That's correct. 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Okay. And why does Hydro assume that it'll be 7 purchasing the 51.1 gigawatt hours like a 6 constant figure through those years? 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details 11 of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 forecast going forward, there's been a 16 we've taken the last, the average of the last 17 five years and the reason being, I guess, 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 19 their four paper machines, there's been a 19 reduction in the internal steam requirements 20 their four paper machines, there's been a 21 reduction in the generation output as well. 22 so this number that we're seeing here, that's			
5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 Board to know about and for the Consumer 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Okay. And why does Hydro assume that it'll be 7 purchasing the 51.1 gigawatt hours like a 2 constant figure through those years? 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details 11 of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 forecast going forward, there's been a 16 we've taken the last, the average of the last 17 five years and the reason being, I guess, 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 20 their four paper machines, there's been a 21 reduction in the internal steam requirements 22 at the mill and this has also led to a 23 reduction in the generation output as well. 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's			
6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 Gourd to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 6 Q. Okay. And why does Hydro assume that it'll be 7 purchasing the 51.1 gigawatt hours like a 8 constant figure through those years? 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details 11 of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 forecast going forward, there's been a 16 we've taken the last, the average of the last 17 five years and the reason being, I guess, 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 20 their four paper machines, there's been a 21 reduction in the internal steam requirements 22 at the mill and this has also led to a 23 reduction in the generation output as well. 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's			
7 A. That's correct. 8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 7 purchasing the 51.1 gigawatt hours like a 8 constant figure through those years? 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details 11 of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 forecast going forward, there's been a 16 we've taken the last, the average of the last 17 five years and the reason being, I guess, 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 20 their four paper machines, there's been a 21 reduction in the internal steam requirements 22 at the mill and this has also led to a 23 reduction in the generation output as well. 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's			be
8 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 constant figure through those years? 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details 11 of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 forecast going forward, there's been a 16 we've taken the last, the average of the last 17 five years and the reason being, I guess, 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook 19 Fulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 25 Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 26 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details 11 of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 forecast going forward, there's been a 16 we've taken the last, the average of the last 17 five years and the reason being, I guess, 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 20 their four paper machines, there's been a 21 reduction in the internal steam requirements 22 at the mill and this has also led to a 23 reduction in the generation output as well. 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's	7 A. That's correct.		
9 Q. Okay. I wonder if that can be filed for the 10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 29 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details 11 of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 forecast going forward, there's been a 16 we've taken the last, the average of the last 17 five years and the reason being, I guess, 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 20 their four paper machines, there's been a 21 reduction in the internal steam requirements 22 at the mill and this has also led to a 23 reduction in the generation output as well. 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's			
10 record, Mr. Young? 11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details 11 of the agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 forecast going forward, there's been a 16 we've taken the last, the average of the last 17 five years and the reason being, I guess, 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 20 their four paper machines, there's been a 21 reduction in the internal steam requirements 22 at the mill and this has also led to a 23 reduction in the generation output as well. 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's			
11 MR. YOUNG: 12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 10 fthe agreement, our purchases with Corner 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 forecast going forward, there's been a 16 we've taken the last, the average of the last 17 five years and the reason being, I guess, 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 20 their four paper machines, there's been a 21 reduction in the internal steam requirements 22 at the mill and this has also led to a 23 reduction in the generation output as well. 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's		10 A. Well, I guess without getting into the details	
12 Q. We're going to have to take that under 13 advisement. My first blush answer of that 14 would be that it would not be, for a couple of 15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 10 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 12 Brook Pulp and Paper are under take-or-pay 13 arrangements similar to wind, similar to 14 Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a 15 forecast going forward, there's been a 16 we've taken the last, the average of the last 17 five years and the reason being, I guess, 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 20 their four paper machines, there's been a 21 reduction in the internal steam requirements 22 at the mill and this has also led to a 23 reduction in the generation output as well. 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's	1		
advisement. My first blush answer of that would be that it would not be, for a couple of reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper might take issue with that, and it is outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a decision about it. I think the costs that flow from it are proper consideration for the Board to know about and for the Consumer Advocate to ask about, but the particular way amay be outside I mean, the Board can't change it. The Board has no opportunity to Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a forecast going forward, there's been a we've taken the last, the average of the last five years and the reason being, I guess, through the development, so at Corner Brook Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. So this number that we're seeing here, that's	12 Q. We're going to have to take that under	_	
would be that it would not be, for a couple of reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and Paper might take issue with that, and it is outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a decision about it. I think the costs that flow from it are proper consideration for the Board to know about and for the Consumer Advocate to ask about, but the particular way it works and the details of the calculations may be outside I mean, the Board can't change it. The Board has no opportunity to Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a forecast going forward, there's been a Algonquin Power unit, and to develop a forecast going forward, there's been a the we've taken the last, the average of the last five years and the reason being, I guess, through the development, so at Corner Brook Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. So this number that we're seeing here, that's	1		
15 reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and 16 Paper might take issue with that, and it is 17 outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a 18 decision about it. I think the costs that 19 flow from it are proper consideration for the 20 Board to know about and for the Consumer 21 Advocate to ask about, but the particular way 22 it works and the details of the calculations 23 may be outside I mean, the Board can't 24 change it. The Board has no opportunity to 15 forecast going forward, there's been a 16 we've taken the last, the average of the last 17 five years and the reason being, I guess, 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook 19 Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of 20 their four paper machines, there's been a 21 reduction in the internal steam requirements 22 at the mill and this has also led to a 23 reduction in the generation output as well. 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Paper might take issue with that, and it is outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a decision about it. I think the costs that flow from it are proper consideration for the Board to know about and for the Consumer Advocate to ask about, but the particular way it works and the details of the calculations may be outside I mean, the Board can't change it. The Board has no opportunity to 16 we've taken the last, the average of the last five years and the reason being, I guess, through the development, so at Corner Brook Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. So this number that we're seeing here, that's	reasons. One, I think Corner Brook Pulp and	forecast going forward, there's been a	
outside the Board's jurisdiction to make a decision about it. I think the costs that flow from it are proper consideration for the Board to know about and for the Consumer Advocate to ask about, but the particular way it works and the details of the calculations may be outside I mean, the Board can't change it. The Board has no opportunity to five years and the reason being, I guess, through the development, so at Corner Brook Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. So this number that we're seeing here, that's	1		
decision about it. I think the costs that flow from it are proper consideration for the Board to know about and for the Consumer Advocate to ask about, but the particular way it works and the details of the calculations may be outside I mean, the Board can't change it. The Board has no opportunity to 18 through the development, so at Corner Brook Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. So this number that we're seeing here, that's			
flow from it are proper consideration for the Board to know about and for the Consumer Advocate to ask about, but the particular way it works and the details of the calculations may be outside I mean, the Board can't change it. The Board has no opportunity to Pulp and Paper with the shutdown of two of their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. So this number that we're seeing here, that's	· ·		í.
Board to know about and for the Consumer Advocate to ask about, but the particular way it works and the details of the calculations may be outside I mean, the Board can't change it. The Board has no opportunity to 20 their four paper machines, there's been a reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. So this number that we're seeing here, that's			
Advocate to ask about, but the particular way it works and the details of the calculations may be outside I mean, the Board can't change it. The Board has no opportunity to 21 reduction in the internal steam requirements at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. 23 So this number that we're seeing here, that's			
it works and the details of the calculations may be outside I mean, the Board can't change it. The Board has no opportunity to 22 at the mill and this has also led to a reduction in the generation output as well. So this number that we're seeing here, that's	Advocate to ask about, but the particular way		
change it. The Board has no opportunity to 24 So this number that we're seeing here, that's	it works and the details of the calculations	at the mill and this has also led to a	
	may be outside I mean, the Board can't	reduction in the generation output as well.	
25 direct that. 25 essentially their past five-year average and	change it. The Board has no opportunity to	So this number that we're seeing here, that's	
	25 direct that.	essentially their past five-year average and	

0	ctober 21, 2015 Mi	ılti-l	Page '	NL Hydro GRA
	Page	69		Page 71
1			1	actual metering data and download of data
2	JOHNSON, Q.C.:		2	that's done by our industrial billing group,
3			3	but we provide an oversight role, I guess, to
4			4	verify this data and we also check the
5			5	invoices as well.
6				YOUNG:
7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Mr. Johnson, don't mean to interrupt. This
8			8	might be a useful time for me to interject. I
			9	just looked at the web page and the
10			0	regulations, there's two exemption orders with
11		1		respect to this arrangement. The first is 95
12			2	and the way it's shown in numbers,
13		1		Newfoundland and Labrador Regulation 95/00.
14		1		That's for 2000. And the other one is 96,
15		1		subsequent, 2000. And that's easily found on
16		1		the web page.
17				NSON, Q.C.:
18		1		Okay. I thought that it was the subject of a
19		1		directive, but it's -
20				YOUNG:
21	^	2		No, it's just those exemption orders.
22				NSON, Q.C.:
23		2		Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Young. Is
24		2		there any system benefit that comes from
25		2	5	buying this energy from Corner Brook Pulp and
	Page	70		Page 72
1			1	Paper?
2				GOULDING:
1	JOHNSON, Q.C.:			. I guess it's like all our power purchases.
4			4	When we issued requests for proposals for new
5			5	generation sources, there would have been a
1	MR. GOULDING:		6	need identified at that time. So we entered
1 7			7	into a number of longer term power purchase
8			8	agreements in the order of 20 to 25 years to
9			9	purchase energy from other sources with the
10		1	0	end goal to minimize Holyrood and also to meet
11	they generated during the month and also	1	1	the system peaking demands as well. There are
12	there's another item there relating to the	1	2	times, and as we noted in an RFI response,
13	energy rate as well. It wouldn't be a whole	1	3	that we have high water levels and that, on
14	lot of detail there to verify, except that we	1	4	its own merit, would reduce Holyrood. So that
15	would check against previous months and from	1	5	would certainly take away from some of the
16	time to time, there are adjustments made in	1	6	benefit of power purchases, but in the long
17	future months invoices that I assume reflect	1	7	haul, there would have been a benefit
18	the fact that they may have been late	1	8	identified from these extra power sources.
19	developing their inventory cost.	1	9 JOH	NSON, Q.C.:
20	JOHNSON, Q.C.:	2		. At the time they were entered?
21	· ·	2		GOULDING:
22		2		. That's correct.
23	MR. GOULDING:			NSON, Q.C.:
24	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2		But I take it that the arrangement with the
25	operations engineer planning that oversees the	2	5	CoGen now is not something that in an existing

October 21, 2015	Multi-Pa	nge The NL Hydro GRA
	Page 73	Page 75
sense is providing system benefit?	1	after discussing the matter with Mr. Henderson
2 MR. GOULDING:	2	and Mr. Fagan. Mr. Humphries, when Hydro
3 A. Really, it depends on the rate of the CoG		undertook construction of the Vale connection
4 energy. If it's offsetting Holyrood, then		facility, did you have anything to do with
or the rate of any power source, if it's	5	that arrangement?
6 offsetting Holyrood, the time that you're	-	MR. HUMPHRIES:
7 using Holyrood for energy purposes, ther		A. Yes, at the time, upfront, the upfront
8 would be a benefit.	8	planning for determination of the requirements
9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	9	to serve the load, discussions with the
10 Q. But right now, it's not even the	10	customer on the level of redundancy they would
arrangement is not even sensitive to the dr		expect. I was involved in all of those.
in prices for oil that's consumed at Holyro	_	JOHNSON, Q.C.:
is it?	13	Q. Okay. And I guess at the time, who was in
14 MR. GOULDING:	14	charge of this file, in terms of dealing with
	15	Vale on them coming on?
15 A. No, it is reflective of the inventory that's		_
in Corner Brook Pulp and Paper's tanks.		MR. HUMPHRIES:
guess the one takeaway from this undertal	_	A. I think Mr. Henderson probably went through
here is that we're still using the 2015 price		the process of how new industrial customers
So we don't have what their expectation is		are dealt with and at the time, we through
20 2016. So that may go down accordingly.	20	the initial contact, I guess shortly after the
21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	21	initial contact, I became involved and for a
Q. May the 2015 test year price go down as v		period of time led the charge, I would think,
or the 2015 test year cost go down as well		with the customer on determining the technical
better particulars are obtained from Corn		requirements, landing on single line diagrams,
25 Brook Pulp and Paper as to the cost of the	eir 25	the scope of work that needed to be done for
	Page 74	Page 76
1 fuel inventory?	1	the interconnection and the cost estimates and
2 MR. GOULDING:	2	at that stage then, it moved to a function
3 A. I can't say if it would go up or down. It	3	where our operations and rates group would
4 would depend on where they foresee th	eir 4	have gotten into the details of contract
5 inventory prices being in 2016. But we we	ould 5	arrangements and those types of things.
6 certainly have an idea of where those cos	sts 6	JOHNSON, Q.C.:
7 are going, a better idea.	7	Q. So you refer to cost estimates, and so cost
8 (10:45 a.m.)	8	estimates would have been provided to Vale for
9 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	9	both capital and operation maintenance costs?
10 Q. And how many more years is left in th	ne 10	MR. HUMPHRIES:
agreement? Do you know that?	11	A. I would have only been involved in the capital
12 MR. GOULDING:	12	costs.
13 A. We entered into it there is an RFI on that	13	JOHNSON, Q.C.:
We entered into it in 2000. They came in		Q. Okay. Who would have been involved on the O&M
operation, I recall, in 2002. Jenny, are you	ı 15	side?
able to call up NP-002?		MR. HUMPHRIES:
17 MS. GRAY:	17	A. Again anchoring back to what Mr. Henderson
18 Q. Yes.	18	said, at that time, there were discussions
19 MR. GOULDING:	19	with Vale on the methodology of our how O&M
20 A. Okay. So there is a 20-year term. It	20	was treated in our rates and as for whether
21 actually starts in January of 2003.	21	there were the actual costs were communicated
22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	22	to them or who did it, I'm not aware and I
23 Q. Okay. I just want to turn to another topic		think there was an undertaking on that issue.
for a moment, being specifically assigned		I'm not sure what the outcome of whether there
just to fill in some questions I was left with		was actually a dollar value communicated to
1		•

October 21, 2015 Multi	i-Page [™] NL Hydro GR
Page 77	Page 7
them or not. I'm not aware.	1 generation facility?
2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	2 MR. GOULDING:
Q. Do you know whether Hydro's connections	3 A. Yes, certainly when I was manager and at
procedure are generally consistent with that	4 various lower levels as well.
used elsewhere, Mr. Humphries?	5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
6 MR. HUMPHRIES:	6 Q. Okay. So basically right on up through your
A. I think they're generally consistent. I'm	7 career with them?
sure there are differences, but I think	8 MR. GOULDING:
they're generally consistent.	9 A. That's correct.
O JOHNSON, Q.C.:	10 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
Q. There's been minutes filed of Joint Utility	11 Q. Okay, all right. And do you have a role in
2 meeting. Are you familiar with Joint Utility	your now that you're with Hydro, of going
meetings?	to these meetings or in relation to these
4 MR. HUMPHRIES:	14 meetings?
A. Mr. Goulding more so is than I. I just -	15 MR. GOULDING:
5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	16 A. No. I don't have a role now. I generally
Q. I saw him grabbing the mic.	know that they're taking place, but typically
3 MR. HUMPHRIES:	now my manager would attend and there's an ECC
A. That was my cue.	supervisor as well that's he'd be more
MR. GOULDING:	20 abreast, I guess, of day-to-day operations or
A. Oh, sorry.	of the power system, so he would attend.
JOHNSON, Q.C.:	22 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
Q. Mr. Goulding, go ahead.	23 Q. So systems has a place at the table?
4 MR. GOULDING:	24 MR. GOULDING:
5 A. Okay. Joint utility meetings, I guess they've	25 A. That's correct.
Page 78	
been arranged and taking place for quite a	1 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
long time now and I can't say for how long. I	2 Q. Yeah, okay. Can I refer you to May 2013 joint
know I've experienced them well, no, I	utilities meeting? That's those minutes in
should say I've only experienced them from the	4 Undertaking 40, page I had page 11 of the
ž •	
Power, but they're normally arranged through	6 the top line there, these come out of the
other folks in our group. They would	7 joint utilities meeting of May 15, 2013 and
basically pick the meeting time or date and	8 there's no need to remove what you have there
time. Who attends is you know, in my	9 on the screen, but I see, just for the record,
experience, it would have been the large	on page one it indicates there was two Vale
industrial customers. There's some power	representatives, two Nalcor representatives, a
purchasers, some people that represented in	Newfoundland Power representative, two NARL
the power purchase agreements that we had on	representatives, and regrets sent by one
the system. There would have been Hydro and	person from Nalcor, one person from ENAL and
Newfoundland Power as well. These meetings	one from Star Lake Hydro, one from Corner
would have taken place normally in May, May of	Brook Pulp and Paper, one from Fermeuse Wind
each year, and we followed a standard agenda.	In any event, this was hosted by Vale at the
3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	Long Harbour Processing Plant on May 15th.
Q. Okay. So you would attend them, would you,	And one of the group actions there is to
when you were with Deer Lake Power?	obtain an forward to Vale the long-term
1 MR. GOULDING:	21 maintenance plan for the Long Harbour

23

24

25

Goulding?

transmission line and terminal station to assist in long-term coordination of plant

outages with Vale. You see that, Mr.

Q. You would have? When you were -- is that when

you were the manager of the Deer Lake Power

22

24

25

A. I would have.

23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

October 21, 2015	Multi-Page TM	NL Hydro GRA
Pa	ge 81	Page 83
1 MR. GOULDING:	-	age six, it references Vale, and I
2 A. Yes, I do.	_	and that this is in connection with a
3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	3 discussi	ion regarding action items, perhaps
4 Q. Yes. And so, was this do you know if this		planned generation and transmission
5 was borne out of a request from Vale and		. In any event, Vale indicating they
6 whether or not this material or this	_	planned outages and Vale talked about
7 information was provided?	I	ng supply between T1 and T2 as there is
8 MR. GOULDING:		em with the distribution transformers,
9 A. I'm not quite sure of the details, but I would		complete a transient analysis of
say that it was probably borne out of a	I	tion system. Feeder breakers have
request from Hydro. We would want to sched		oltage trips. And then there's an
our maintenance on the transmission line and	I	tem, someone has to follow up with
the terminal station at a time when they're		address any concerns with terminal
also down, such that there's only one line		operation, et cetera. And are you
serving their plant, so our maintenance		with the issues that were being
activities would occur at a time that they are		nced as reported by Vale?
down as well.	17 MR. GOULDIN	
18 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	18 A. No, I d	on't recall what these issues were.
19 Q. I see. And do you know whether that long-te		re two transformers that provide the
20 maintenance plan was ever provided?		to the Vale plant and, you know, it
21 MR. GOULDING:		that there would have been a need or
22 A. I don't know.		issue between switching back and forth
23 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	I	n these transformers. So I'm not if
24 Q. Okay. Could you undertake to check wheth	er 24 that wo	uld have been an internal issue, but
25 that has been well, was provided to Vale	25 that's al	ll the detail that I would know on it.
p.	ge 82	Page 84
and if so, to provide it to us as part of an	1 JOHNSON, Q.	•
2 undertaking along with any updates that migh		And when there is an issue like this
3 have been made to it?	3 that's b	eing reported here, then it's Hydro's
4 MR. GOULDING:	I	ry to look after the issue for Vale?
5 A. Sure.	5 MR. GOULDIN	NG:
6 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	6 A. Sure. A	Anything that would, you know, occur
7 Q. Is that fine, Mr. Young?	7 outside	their plant certainly. In the
8 MR. YOUNG:	8 internal	analysis studies, like the one that
9 Q. I think so. It's somewhat granular, but we'll	9 they've	referenced here, that would likely be
see if we can find it.	10 done by	them, but I'm not certain where this
11 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	11 one her	e was going.
12 Q. Thank you.	12 JOHNSON, Q.0	
13 MS. GLYNN:	13 Q. I see. N	Mr. Chairman, it's around 11, so I'll
14 Q. Noted on the record.	14 -	
15 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	15 CHAIRMAN:	
16 Q. Thank you. And can I refer you to the	16 Q. All righ	
17 September 2014 minutes at page six? And		EAK - 11:00 a.m.)
won't get you to interrupt what's on the		SUME - 11:38 a.m.)
19 screen, Jennifer, but just for the record,	19 CHAIRMAN:	
this was a meeting held September 18th, 201		Johnson, sir, we're back to you.
at Hydro Place, attended by Deer Lake Powe		
22 two representatives of Newfoundland Power		e the two undertakings first, Mr. Chair.
Vale and two other, two representatives of	23 CHAIRMAN:	Dag
Nalcor. I won't tell you about who regretted		n sorry, yes. Beg your pardon.
not being there.	25 MS. PENNELL	<i>:</i> :

Multi-Page TM October 21, 2015 NL Hydro GRA Page 85 Page 87 Q. We have Undertaking No. 57, which is Hydro's Q. Okay. I understand from a discussion during 1 1 2 12-month rolling report on generation, which 2 the break that Hydro is looking at filing a was filed with the Board last week. And supplemental capital application pertaining to 3 3 Undertaking 61, which provides the current this issue. Do you have any awareness of 4 4 that? 5 status of Hardwoods. 5 6 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 MR. GOULDING: A. If it's the issue -- and it's not really Q. Okay, gentlemen, just to follow up on this 7 discussion pertaining to the issues with 8 8 clear, but there is a transformer, one of the two transformers is out of service. It has Vale's terminal station. Just at the bottom 9 10 of page six of those September 18, 2014 10 been since last winter, last -- I recall it minutes indicates that there's a -- I presume occurred around February. 11 11 a Hydro official blacked out is to follow up 12 12 JOHNSON, Q.C.: with Vale to address any concerns with the Q. Okay. So you're aware of the application that 13 terminal station operation. And what position will be soon filed? 14 14 -- I mean, I don't know how sensitive the name 15 15 MR. GOULDING: 16 is. I'm not particularly interested in the 16 A. I'm aware that there is a pending application, name, I suppose, but what position would be 17 17 yes. tasked to follow up? 18 18 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 19 MR. GOULDING: Q. Yes, okay. A. I would expect that whoever would have 20 MR. GOULDING: 20 represented Hydro at this meeting, so it would 21 21 A. But I'm not -22 be my manager, a manager of system operations. 22 MR. HUMPHRIES: 23 23 JOHNSON, Q.C.: A. Not clear that that's related to this. Q. Okay, all right. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 O'REILLY, Q.C.: A. Yeah, I'm not clear that this issue here is Page 86 Page 88 related to that transformer. Q. Probably in the witness protection program. 1 2 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 2 CHAIRMAN: Q. I see, okay. And I just want to go back a 3 Q. Yeah, that's what I thought too, Mr. O'Reilly. 3 little bit, just to get a better I was wondering what was going on. 4 4 5 understanding, and this pertains to the events 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: of August 2015 when that CT unit was run out Q. Yeah, so what's -- well, who is it? 6 7 at the Holyrood facility, and there was 7 MR. GOULDING: discussion yesterday regarding this exposure A. It's Bob Butler, Robert Butler. 8 to an outage on one of the major transmission 9 9 JOHNSON, Q.C.: lines. Now, I just want to be clear, was Q. Okay. Thank you. 10 10 11 CHAIRMAN: 11 there any planned maintenance going on on a Q. What do they call it, redacted, is it? That transmission line coming into the Avalon at 12 12 the fancy word you guys use? 13 the same time? 13 14 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 14 MR. GOULDING: A. During that time, I guess our exposure was --15 O. Yeah. 15 our weakest links, I would say, are the two 16 CHAIRMAN: 16 lines that go from Bay D'Espoir to Sunnyside, 17 Q. Redacted. 17 so there wouldn't have been any planned 18 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 18 maintenance to either one of those lines 19 Q. Redacted. And do you have any knowledge about 19 during that period that I'm aware of. these problems? Have they been ongoing for 20 20

21 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

talking about there?

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. And so the linkage of this exposure to

lines, just to be clear, what exactly are you

an outage on one of the major transmission

Vale down there with that terminal station?

A. Yeah, I'm not aware right now what these

21

23

24

22 MR. GOULDING:

25 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

issues were.

Page 89	Page 91
1 MR. GOULDING:	overload on the remaining line and then we
2 A. In terms of an outage?	would have started Hardwoods.
3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	3 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
4 Q. That happened in August. You indicated	4 Q. And just again, in my understanding, and I'm
5 yesterday that there was an exposure?	5 sorry if I'm asking you to repeat this, but I
6 MR. GOULDING:	6 want to understand. Is there any way to avoid
7 A. There was no particular event, like an eminent	7 all three units of Holyrood being down at the
8 event that would have caused a trip, but any	8 one time in the summer period?
9 time that we are exposed to the fact that if	9 MR. GOULDING:
we lose one element on our power system,	10 A. Again, this speaks to the detail of what goes
that's going to result in a customer outage,	on in terms of maintenance inside the plant.
then we are guarding against that. So, the	12 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
issue would have been during that period if we	13 Q. Right.
didn't have the CT on and one of those lines	14 MR. GOULDING:
tripped for whatever reason, whether it be	15 A. But from my understanding, there is a period,
adverse weather, terminal station equipment,	normally it's two weeks, and we do try to the
line contact even, you know, like then we	extent that we can, we try and minimize this
needed the CT on to be able to avoid an	period, but there is a period that requires
overload on the other major line.	that all units be off and in a code state, I
20 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	20 would say, in order that they can perform
21 Q. Okay. And so in let's say the summer prior,	21 maintenance on their common systems inside the
22 we still had the transmission lines obviously	22 Holyrood plant. But again, I won't say that
coming into the Sunnyside terminal station.	23 I'm an expert on what goes on inside the plant
24 We'll take that as given. So how would Hydro	24 during that period. But certainly, during my
25 have dealt with the exposure to outage in say	25 time here, there's always been a requirement
1	
Page 90	Page 92
the summer of 2014?	1 for a total plant outage.
1 the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.)	1 for a total plant outage. 2 JOHNSON, Q.C.:
1 the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING:	 for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay.
1 the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014?	1 for a total plant outage. 2 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 3 Q. Okay. 4 MR. HUMPHRIES:
1 the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	1 for a total plant outage. 2 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 3 Q. Okay. 4 MR. HUMPHRIES: 5 A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I
the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that	 for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned.
the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that 7 matter.	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period
 the summer of 2014? (11:45 a.m.) MR. GOULDING: A. The exposure in 2014? JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that matter. MR. GOULDING: 	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to
 the summer of 2014? (11:45 a.m.) MR. GOULDING: A. The exposure in 2014? JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that matter. MR. GOULDING: A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit 	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we
 the summer of 2014? (11:45 a.m.) MR. GOULDING: A. The exposure in 2014? JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that matter. MR. GOULDING: A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The 	1 for a total plant outage. 2 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 3 Q. Okay. 4 MR. HUMPHRIES: 5 A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I 6 guess, because I know you're concerned. 7 You're going back. We went through a period 8 coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to 9 that where we went through periods where we 10 had no operation at Holyrood for the full
1 the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that 7 matter. 8 MR. GOULDING: 9 A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit 10 and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The 11 difference is we wouldn't have started	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on
1 the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that 7 matter. 8 MR. GOULDING: 9 A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit 10 and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The 11 difference is we wouldn't have started 12 Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on the Avalon were lower and we were able to do
1 the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that 7 matter. 8 MR. GOULDING: 9 A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit 10 and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The 11 difference is we wouldn't have started 12 Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that 13 period. We would have held it in a standby	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on the Avalon were lower and we were able to do that, and while there still may have been
1 the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that 7 matter. 8 MR. GOULDING: 9 A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit 10 and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The 11 difference is we wouldn't have started 12 Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that 13 period. We would have held it in a standby 14 mode and then when there was a trip in a line	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on the Avalon were lower and we were able to do that, and while there still may have been small exposures to a loss at certain hours in
the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that 7 matter. 8 MR. GOULDING: 9 A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit 10 and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The 11 difference is we wouldn't have started 12 Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that 13 period. We would have held it in a standby 14 mode and then when there was a trip in a line 15 and customers were impacted, then we would	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on the Avalon were lower and we were able to do that, and while there still may have been small exposures to a loss at certain hours in that period, it wasn't as significant as it is
the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that 7 matter. 8 MR. GOULDING: 9 A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit 10 and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The 11 difference is we wouldn't have started 12 Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that 13 period. We would have held it in a standby 14 mode and then when there was a trip in a line 15 and customers were impacted, then we would 16 react and start Hardwoods.	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on the Avalon were lower and we were able to do that, and while there still may have been small exposures to a loss at certain hours in that period, it wasn't as significant as it is today, because the loads on the Avalon are
the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that 7 matter. 8 MR. GOULDING: 9 A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit 10 and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The 11 difference is we wouldn't have started 12 Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that 13 period. We would have held it in a standby 14 mode and then when there was a trip in a line 15 and customers were impacted, then we would 16 react and start Hardwoods. 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.:	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on the Avalon were lower and we were able to do that, and while there still may have been small exposures to a loss at certain hours in that period, it wasn't as significant as it is today, because the loads on the Avalon are higher and we ultimately, we took the risk.
the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that 7 matter. 8 MR. GOULDING: 9 A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit 10 and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The 11 difference is we wouldn't have started 12 Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that 13 period. We would have held it in a standby 14 mode and then when there was a trip in a line 15 and customers were impacted, then we would 16 react and start Hardwoods. 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 18 Q. I see. I see, okay. So then Hardwoods, at	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on the Avalon were lower and we were able to do that, and while there still may have been small exposures to a loss at certain hours in that period, it wasn't as significant as it is today, because the loads on the Avalon are higher and we ultimately, we took the risk. We would take a customer outage rather than
the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that 7 matter. 8 MR. GOULDING: 9 A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit 10 and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The 11 difference is we wouldn't have started 12 Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that 13 period. We would have held it in a standby 14 mode and then when there was a trip in a line 15 and customers were impacted, then we would 16 react and start Hardwoods. 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 18 Q. I see. I see, okay. So then Hardwoods, at 19 the time that you would have called upon	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on the Avalon were lower and we were able to do that, and while there still may have been small exposures to a loss at certain hours in that period, it wasn't as significant as it is today, because the loads on the Avalon are higher and we ultimately, we took the risk. We would take a customer outage rather than run the generation in advance to prevent the
the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that 7 matter. 8 MR. GOULDING: 9 A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit 10 and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The 11 difference is we wouldn't have started 12 Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that 13 period. We would have held it in a standby 14 mode and then when there was a trip in a line 15 and customers were impacted, then we would 16 react and start Hardwoods. 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 18 Q. I see. I see, okay. So then Hardwoods, at 19 the time that you would have called upon 20 Hardwoods, I take it that neither of the three	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on the Avalon were lower and we were able to do that, and while there still may have been small exposures to a loss at certain hours in that period, it wasn't as significant as it is today, because the loads on the Avalon are higher and we ultimately, we took the risk. We would take a customer outage rather than run the generation in advance to prevent the outage. So since March 4th, we've made the
the summer of 2014? (11:45 a.m.) MR. GOULDING: A. The exposure in 2014? JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that matter. MR. GOULDING: A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The difference is we wouldn't have started Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that period. We would have held it in a standby mode and then when there was a trip in a line and customers were impacted, then we would react and start Hardwoods. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. I see. I see, okay. So then Hardwoods, at the time that you would have called upon Hardwoods, I take it that neither of the three units at Holyrood would be operable?	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on the Avalon were lower and we were able to do that, and while there still may have been small exposures to a loss at certain hours in that period, it wasn't as significant as it is today, because the loads on the Avalon are higher and we ultimately, we took the risk. We would take a customer outage rather than run the generation in advance to prevent the outage. So since March 4th, we've made the change to run the generation in advance to
the summer of 2014? (11:45 a.m.) MR. GOULDING: A. The exposure in 2014? JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that matter. MR. GOULDING: A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The difference is we wouldn't have started Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that period. We would have held it in a standby mode and then when there was a trip in a line and customers were impacted, then we would react and start Hardwoods. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. I see. I see, okay. So then Hardwoods, at the time that you would have called upon Hardwoods, I take it that neither of the three units at Holyrood would be operable?	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on the Avalon were lower and we were able to do that, and while there still may have been small exposures to a loss at certain hours in that period, it wasn't as significant as it is today, because the loads on the Avalon are higher and we ultimately, we took the risk. We would take a customer outage rather than run the generation in advance to prevent the outage. So since March 4th, we've made the change to run the generation in advance to prevent a customer outage in the event of
the summer of 2014? 2 (11:45 a.m.) 3 MR. GOULDING: 4 A. The exposure in 2014? 5 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 6 Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that 7 matter. 8 MR. GOULDING: 9 A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit 10 and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The 11 difference is we wouldn't have started 12 Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that 13 period. We would have held it in a standby 14 mode and then when there was a trip in a line 15 and customers were impacted, then we would 16 react and start Hardwoods. 17 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 18 Q. I see. I see, okay. So then Hardwoods, at 19 the time that you would have called upon 20 Hardwoods, I take it that neither of the three 21 units at Holyrood would be operable? 22 MR. GOULDING: 23 A. That's the exposure. When neither unit is	1 for a total plant outage. 2 JOHNSON, Q.C.: 3 Q. Okay. 4 MR. HUMPHRIES: 5 A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I 6 guess, because I know you're concerned. 7 You're going back. We went through a period 8 coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to 9 that where we went through periods where we 10 had no operation at Holyrood for the full 11 summer, and that was because of the loads on 12 the Avalon were lower and we were able to do 13 that, and while there still may have been 14 small exposures to a loss at certain hours in 15 that period, it wasn't as significant as it is 16 today, because the loads on the Avalon are 17 higher and we ultimately, we took the risk. 18 We would take a customer outage rather than 19 run the generation in advance to prevent the 20 outage. So since March 4th, we've made the 21 change to run the generation in advance to 22 prevent a customer outage in the event of 23 these first contingency failures.
the summer of 2014? (11:45 a.m.) MR. GOULDING: A. The exposure in 2014? JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Or any summer prior to the CT, for that matter. MR. GOULDING: A. Sure. We would have still had a standby unit and in that case, it was Hardwoods. The difference is we wouldn't have started Hardwoods or operated Hardwoods during that period. We would have held it in a standby mode and then when there was a trip in a line and customers were impacted, then we would react and start Hardwoods. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. I see. I see, okay. So then Hardwoods, at the time that you would have called upon Hardwoods, I take it that neither of the three units at Holyrood would be operable?	for a total plant outage. JOHNSON, Q.C.: Q. Okay. MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Mr. Johnson, just to clarify a little, I guess, because I know you're concerned. You're going back. We went through a period coming up through '13 and '14 and prior to that where we went through periods where we had no operation at Holyrood for the full summer, and that was because of the loads on the Avalon were lower and we were able to do that, and while there still may have been small exposures to a loss at certain hours in that period, it wasn't as significant as it is today, because the loads on the Avalon are higher and we ultimately, we took the risk. We would take a customer outage rather than run the generation in advance to prevent the outage. So since March 4th, we've made the change to run the generation in advance to prevent a customer outage in the event of

Octo	ober 21, 2015 Mult	i-Pag	ye TM NL Hydro GRA
	Page 93	3	Page 95
1	welcome words. Mr. Humphries, refer to	1	did you first know of Corner Brook Pulp and
2	Hydro's regulated activities evidence at page	2	Paper shutting down the paper machine in
3	2.60, starting at line three. The material	3	November?
4	indicates or states that "in 2008, electricity	4 M	IR. HUMPHRIES:
5	requirements on the Island Interconnected	5	A. I think as Mr. Henderson indicated in his
6	system declined by 2.3 percent relative to the	6	testimony, we knew about it at about the same
7	2007 test year, primarily because of reduced	7	time that everyone else did.
8	consumption at CBPP. CBPP's number one paper	8 JC	OHNSON, Q.C.:
9	machine was shut down in November 2007." And	9	Q. Yeah, okay. And could I refer you to the
10	as I went through the joint utility minutes	10	March '09 minutes?
11	that were provided in Undertaking 40, and	11 M	IS. GRAY:
12	these are the June 8th, 2007 minutes were the	12	Q. May of '09, Mr. Johnson?
13	minutes that I reviewed, I didn't see any	13 JC	OHNSON, Q.C.:
14	mention from Deer Lake Power or any heads up	14	Q. I'm sorry, May. My writing is leaves to be
15	on the shut down of the number one paper	15	desired. And actually, before going there, I
16	machine. And I think you could probably	16	should have referred you first, pardon me, to
17	confirm that as well in those minutes?	17	lines seven to eight of 2.60. Yeah. Or
18 M	IR. HUMPHRIES:	18	actually, starting line five. In 2009, there
19	A. So which minutes did you say?	19	was a further decline in electrical
20 до	OHNSON, Q.C.:	20	requirements of 2.9 percent relative to 2008
21	Q. Oh, I'm sorry, the June 8th, 2007 minutes.	21	due to the closure of the Grand Falls
22 M	IR. HUMPHRIES:	22	newsprint mill in February of '09 and the
23	A. Okay.	23	shutdown of number four paper machine at CBPP
24 JC	OHNSON, Q.C.:	24	in March of 2009. And when did you first have
25	Q. And just I didn't see any reference there.	25	notice, Mr. Humphries, of the March ' 09
	Page 94		Page 96
\int_{1}^{∞}	MR. HUMPHRIES:	1	shutdown of number four?
2	A. Yeah, and I haven't been through the minutes		IR. HUMPHRIES:
3	in detail, but I accept.	3	A. Again, it would have been just a short period
1 -	OHNSON, Q.C.:	4	before the actual shutdown.
5	Q. Yeah, okay, and I notice at page two, if we	5 10	DHNSON, Q.C.:
6	just go to page two of those minutes for a	6	Q. Okay. And now finally, if I could turn your
7	second, please, that at the bottom there	7	attention to those minutes of May 2009, May
8	you'll see "NARL is planning a partial plant	8	12th, page eight. There's reference there
9	shutdown for September/October that will	9	under Deer Lake/Corner Brook Pulp and Paper,
10	reduce consumption by seven to ten megawatts	10	number four PM, and I take it that's paper
11	for approximately 25 days. A similar shutdown	11	machine, back on May 17th, expect purchase
12	will take place in the spring of 2008." So	12	power to average back at 28 megawatts after
13	this would be a meeting where you'd be told	13	startup. Power on order at 36 megawatts
1.4	shout shutdowns soming? Would that he the	13	startup. Tower on order at 30 megawatis

16 MR. HUMPHRIES:

expectation?

14

15

17 A. Yes, and then there would be an effort then to try to coordinate all the outage schedules 18 19 around the customers' planned outages as well, so to minimize impact and be able to complete 20 21 as much work as we could on our equipment 22 while their equipment is down and not 23 requiring load.

about shutdowns coming? Would that be the

24 JOHNSON, Q.C.:

Q. Right, okay. And so to your knowledge, when 25

14 should be reduced to 32 megawatts for 2010. 15

And so that's what the advice that Hydro was receiving as of May, and I guess that paper 16

17 machine, did that come back on subsequently,

number four? 18

19 MR. STRATTON:

A. I don't know if the specific machine would 20 21 have come back on.

22 MR. GOULDING:

A. I can probably comment. From what I recall, 23 24 the paper machine was shut in March with the 25 intention to idle the machine at that time.

Page 97 Page 99 Q. But I mean, you know, in general, you know, The longer term status was not known. I guess 1 1 2 they had to -- and why it was shut, it may 2 having heard his evidence and having said what have been because of an inventory adjustment. you just said, is there anything in particular 3 3 that you think "you know what, I don't agree So at the time of this meeting, the intent was 4 4 probably to start that unit back up again on with that and here's why"? 5 5 6 May 17th, but the evidence would suggest that 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 once it was shut in March that it didn't A. No, I won't take any strong objection. You know, he's made recommendations, I guess, 8 restart. 8 towards what an appropriate station service 9 JOHNSON, O.C.: 9 Q. Yes, okay. All right. Those are my questions 10 factor is with respect to two things, I guess, 10 for the panel. Thank you very much. the variable frequency drives that are in 11 11 service out there now which will have a net 12 CHAIRMAN: 12 Q. So Mr. Coxworthy, I think we're over to you. effect on reducing station service, plus he 13 had some thoughts on what that base station 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PAUL COXWORTHY 14 service rate should be as well. 15 MR. COXWORTHY: 15 16 Q. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And Mr. 16 MR. COXWORTHY: Goulding, my impression was that you've been Q. Sure. So as you are aware, in Hydro's 17 17 answering the questions with respect to the evidence, and I'm referring to page 275, 18 18 fuel conversion rate in Holyrood. I just want Volume 1, in Section 2, regulated activities, 19 19 to confirm that I should be directing my line 16, and Hydro is proposing a station 20 20 questions in that regard to yourself? service factor in this general rate 21 21 22 MR. GOULDING: 22 application of 6.6 percent applied to gross energy production, and I just want to contrast 23 A. That's correct. 23 that, if I can, with Mr. Bowman's evidence. 24 MR. COXWORTHY: 24 Q. Are you familiar with the evidence that's been And this would be at page 26 of Mr. Bowman's 25 Page 100 Page 98 filed on behalf of the Island Industrial evidence, as filed on June 4th, 2015. 1 1 2 Customers by Patrick Bowman in relation to the 2 MS. GRAY: Holyrood conversion factor? 3 Q. Sorry, Mr. Coxworthy, what was the page again? 3 4 MR. GOULDING: 4 MR. COXWORTHY: A. Yes. Q. It's at page 26, Ms. Gray, thank you, of his pre-filed testimony, at the bottom of page --6 MR. COXWORTHY: 6 Q. So you've reviewed it? 7 I'm sorry, at line three. So Mr. Bowman, based on his analysis, indicates that the 8 MR. GOULDING: 8 A. Yeah, I was here at the time. I was in the station service should be on the order of --9 back of the room. factor should be on the order of 5.85 percent, 10 10 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 11 and that's even before taking into account the variable fan drive project, just based on his Q. Okay. So you heard his evidence? 12 12 analysis of past trends. So do you agree or 13 MR. GOULDING: 13 not agree with that analysis? A. Yeah, and hats off to Mr. Bowman. He 14 14 15 certainly appears to have a good understanding 15 MR. GOULDING: of the issues there certainly. A. He's presented an analysis, I guess, that 16 16 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 17 shows a correlation between station service Q. And I hope I don't let him down in terms of my and plant load. So he's gone back through a 18 18 19 questioning based on his work. Do you take period. I think it may have been a ten-year 19 exception then or disagree with any of his period or longer. And the analysis would 20 20 conclusions? And I'll take you through some suggest that there is a correlation. We've 21 21 picked a five-year window to make sure that we 22 of them. 22 capture all of the most recent changes, but 23 MR. GOULDING: 23 you know, he has indicated that in that five-24 A. Okay, sure. 25 MR. COXWORTHY: 25 year window, there is no year, I guess, that

there would have been a load expectation that we've forecast in our test year. 3 (12:00 p.m.) 4 MR.COXWORTHY: 5 Q. For 2015 or for that matter for after that? 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. I guess at thing with the a approach is there is a straight line correlation approach. The concern I would have, I guess, is the points that define that line that are close to what we're — to our forecast for 2015 would have happened at least ten years ago. So, there are other factors that that may have to weigh in there. Changes, say, since 2004 that may have increased or decreased station service requirements. J. MR. COXWORTHY: 18 Q. The going to ask you, first of all, what are some of those other factors that cause you that concern? You say that there might have been other factors that aren't captured in the ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman has looked at, a ten-year picture. 2 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me 1 concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they cause me 1 correlation approach. The concern I would have, I guess, is the points that define that line that are close to what we're — to our forecast for 2015 would have happened at least ten years ago. So, there are other factors 13 ten years ago. So, there are other factors 14 that may have to weigh in there. Changes, 15 say, since 2004 that may have increased or 16 decreased station service requirements. 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 Q. I'm going to ask you, first of all, what are 19 some of those other factors that cause you a daded out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would on have a certain amount of station service draw a some discell plant out there as well that would on have a certain amount of station service draw a wall. 10 MR. COXWORTHY: 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 11 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6,	Page 101	Page 103
3 anything more to it than that? 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. For 2015 or for that matter for after that? 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. I guess a thing with the 8 approach is there is a straight line 9 correlation approach. The concern I would 10 have, I guess, is the points that define that 11 line that are close to what we're — to our 12 forecast for 2015 would have happened at least ten years ago. So, there are other factors 13 ten years ago. So, there are other factors 13 ten years ago. So, there are other factors 14 that may have increased or 16 decreased station service requirements. 17 some of those other factors that cause you 20 that concern? You say that there might have 21 been other factors that aren't captured in the 21 ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman 15 As looked at, a ten-year picture. 21 MR. GOULDING: 22 MR. GOULDING: 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A Sure, sure. I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 20 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 25 MR. GOULDING: 25 MR. GOULDING: 26 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. GOULDING: 28 MR. GOULDING: 29 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDING:	there would have been a load expectation that	1 Q. This is your gut feeling? I don't want to be
A MR. GOULDING: So	2 we've forecast in our test year.	2 too glim, but I mean, you know, is there
5 Q. For 2015 or for that matter for after that? 6 MR. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. I guess a thing with the approach is there is a straight line correlation approach. The concern I would have, I guess, is the points that define that line that are close to what we're — to our correlation approach. The concern I would have happened at least ten years ago. So, there are other factors that may have to weigh in there. Changes, say, since 2004 that may have increased or decreased station service requirements. 13 ten years ago. So, there are other factors say, since 2004 that may have increased or decreased station service requirements. 14 that may have increased or decreased station service requirements. 15 Q. I'm going to ask you, first of all, what are some of those other factors that cause you that concern? You say that there might have liben other factors that aren't captured in the point that I don't know that they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they cause me Page 102 Concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the five lines that would introduce a new additional station service draw as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is	3 (12:00 p.m.)	anything more to it than that?
6 A. R. GOULDING: 7 A. That's correct. I guess a thing with the 8 approach is there is a straight line 9 correlation approach. The concern I would 1 have, I guess, is the points that define that 11 line that are close to what we're — to our 12 forecast for 2015 would have happened at least 14 that may have to weigh in there. Changes, 15 say, since 2004 that may have increased or 16 decreased station service requirements. 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 19 some of those other factors that cause you 19 that concern? You say that there might have 21 been other factors that aren't captured in the 22 ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman 23 has looked at, a ten-year picture. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they aren't known 26 to nick to as short a time proind as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we chose to stick to as short a time period as we did there to capture all the most recent in chauges. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 MR. GOULDING: 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Loan't give you those numbers. 26 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. COXWORTHY: 28 MR. GOULDING: 29 A. Loan't give you those numbers. 29 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. Loan't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 21 Q. So there's been no analysis? 22 MR. GOULDING: 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 MR. GOULDING: 26 A. No.	4 MR. COXWORTHY:	4 MR. GOULDING:
7 A That's correct. I guess a thing with the approach is there is a straight line ocorelation approach. The concern I would 10 have, I guess, is the points that define that 11 line that are close to what we're - to our 12 forecast for 2015 would have happened at least 13 ten years ago. So, there are other factors 14 that may have to weigh in there. Changes, 15 say, since 2004 that may have increased or 16 decreased station service requirements. 16 say, since 2004 that may have increased or 16 decreased station service requirements. 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 Q. I'm going to ask you, first of all, what are 19 some of those other factors that cause you 10 that concern? You say that there night have 21 been other factors that aren't captured in the 12 ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman 23 has looked at, a ten-year picture. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that they aren't known 4 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think a about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 22 M. R. GOULDING: 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. I can't give you those numbers. 24 MR. GOULDING: 26 A. I can't give you those numbers. 27 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. GOULDING: 28 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 21 Q. So there's been no analysis? 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 25 MR. GOULDING: 26 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. GOULDING: 28 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDIN	5 Q. For 2015 or for that matter for after that?	5 A. No, just that I don't know what these recent
s approach is there is a straight line ocorrelation approach. The concern I would have, I guess, is the points that define that II line that are close to what we're — to our to forecast for 2015 would have happened at least ten years ago. So, there are other factors that may have to weigh in there. Changes, is say, since 2004 that may have increased or decreased station service requirements. 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 Q I'm going to ask you, first of all, what are some of those other factors that cause you that concern? You say that there might have been other factors that at men't captured in the ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman has looked at, a ten-year picture. 28 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No.	6 MR. GOULDING:	6 changes would be doing to the station service
o correlation approach. The concern I would have, I guess, is the points that define that 11 line that are close to what we're to our 12 forecast for 2015 would have happened at least 13 ten years ago. So, there are other factors 14 that may have to weigh in there. Changes, 15 say, since 2004 that may have increased or 16 decreased station service requirements. 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 O, I'm going to ask you, first of all, what are 19 some of those other factors that cause you 20 that concern? You say that there might have 21 been other factors that aren't captured in the 22 ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman 23 has looked at, a ten-year picture. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that they aren't known 3 a well. 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that tou're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A Loril give you those numbers. 21 MR. GOULDING: 21 MR. GOULDING: 22 MR. GOULDING: 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 25 MR. GOULDING: 25 MR. GOULDING: 26 A Loril give you those numbers. 27 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. GOULDING: 28 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 20 A Loril give you those numbers. 21 MR. Coxworthy: 20 Q. So there's been no analysis? 21 MR. Coxworthy: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 MR. GOULDING: 26 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. GOULDING: 28 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 MR. Coxworthy: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 MR. GOULDING: 26 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. Goulding when you think about those? 28 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDI	7 A. That's correct. I guess a thing with the	factor, so that's the reason why, I guess, we
10	8 approach is there is a straight line	8 chose to stick to as short a time period as we
11 fine that are close to what we're to our forecast for 2015 would have happened at least 12 to years ago. So, there are other factors that may have to weigh in there. Changes, 14 that may have to weigh in there. Changes, 15 say, since 2004 that may have increased or 15 decreased station service requirements. 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 Q. I'm going to ask you, first of all, what are 19 some of those other factors that cause you 19 that concern? You say that there might have 21 been other factors that aren't captured in the 21 ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman has looked at, a ten-year picture. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me 25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me 27 point that I don't know that they aren't known 18 new diesel plant out there as well that would 6 introduce a new additional station service draw as well. 19 MR. COXWORTHY: 10 they cause me concern to the 19 have a certain amount of station service draw as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 11 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 that the black there's a 15 hould be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. GOULDING: 21 A. No. 24 A. No. 24 extent that the black start diesels were in the 24 A. No. 24 extent that the black start diesels were in 19 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 A. No. 24 extent that the black start diesels were in 19 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 extent that the black start diesels were in 19 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 extent that the black start diesels were in 19 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 extent that the black start diesels were in 19 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 extent that the black start diesels were in 19 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 exte	9 correlation approach. The concern I would	9 did there to capture all the most recent
12 forecast for 2015 would have happened at least ten years ago. So, there are other factors 13 that the recent history has reflected a load - 14 that may have to weigh in there. Changes, 15 say, since 2004 that may have increased or 16 decreased station service requirements. 16 greater factor impacting on the station service acrows over the concern? You say that there might have 21 been other factors that cause you 22 that concern? You say that there might have 21 been other factors that aren't captured in the 22 ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman 3 has looked at, a ten-year picture. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me 26 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me 27 load and I think that the black been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, 28 added out there with respect to heat tracing, 29 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 29 have a certain amount of station service draw 21 as well. 20 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think a about those? 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. GOULDING: 22 MR. GOULDING: 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 24 extent that the black start diesels were in 15 that the recent history has reflected a load - 14 but the recent history has reflected a load - 14 lou had cannot foul to alou and the sation service of the greater factor impacting on the station service factors and the diesel? 19 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Until we quantify the heat tracing and the diesel? 20 A. Until we quantify the heat tracing and the diesel? 20 A. Until we quantify the heat tracing and the diesel? 21 diesel - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. When is that going to happen, Mr. Goulding? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe 28 MR. GOULDING: 26 A. Until we quantified for this 3 there now. 27 MR. C	have, I guess, is the points that define that	10 changes.
ten years ago. So, there are other factors that may have to weigh in there. Changes, spice 2004 that may have increased or decreased station service requirements. 16	line that are close to what we're to our	11 MR. COXWORTHY:
14 that may have to weigh in there. Changes, 15 say, since 2004 that may have increased or 16 decreased station service requirements. 16 greater factor impacting on the station 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 Q. I'm going to ask you, first of all, what are 19 some of those other factors that cause you 20 that concern? You say that there might have 21 been other factors that acren't captured in the 22 ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman 23 has looked at, a ten-year picture. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me 20 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads 4 added out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 6 introduce a new additional station service 1 load and I think that the black - there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw 4 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 5 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 5 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that cause you thas about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe 20 Page 104 1 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 9 general rate application if these were factors which would have 10 indicated if you went back up to higher 11 may 10 might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service 12 MR. GOULDING: 18 MR. GOULDING: 19 MR. GOULDING: 19 MR. GOULDING: 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 20 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would have 10 information, I guess because I would 10 information, I guess and this was done in 10 information, I guess and this was done in 10 information, I guess and this w	forecast for 2015 would have happened at least	12 Q. Would it be fair to say though that the fact
15 say, since 2004 that may have increased or decreased station service requirements. 16 decreased station service requirements. 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 Q. I'm going to ask you, first of all, what are some of those other factors that cause you that concern? You say that there might have been other factors that aren't captured in the ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman has looked at, a ten-year picture. 21 been other factors that aren't captured in the ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman has looked at, a ten-year picture. 22 MR. GOULDING: 23 has booked at, a ten-year picture. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that they aren't known a dod out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service of load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw who as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast which would have impact of those factors? When we contrast who who. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what has about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Until we quantify the heat tracing and the diesel? 22 MR. GOULDING: 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe 26 MR. GOULDING: 3 Q. When is that going to happen, Mr. Goulding? 4 MR. GOULDING: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. 6 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors in that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service factor? 10 MR. GOULDING: 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitud	ten years ago. So, there are other factors	that the recent history has reflected a load -
16 decreased station service requirements. 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 Q. I'm going to ask you, first of all, what are some of those other factors that cause you that concern? You say that there might have been other factors that aren't captured in the 22 ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman has looked at, a ten-year picture. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me Page 102 1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads 4 added out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 6 introduce a new additional station service 7 load and I think that the black there's a 8 new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw 10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 1 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 5 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 8 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Until we quantify the heat tracing and the 21 diesel - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. When is that going to happen, Mr. Goulding? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe 26 MR. GOULDING: 26 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is	that may have to weigh in there. Changes,	- a low load factor, lower than if you looked
17 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 Q. I'm going to ask you, first of all, what are 19 some of those other factors that cause you 20 that concern? You say that there might have 21 been other factors that aren't captured in the 22 ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman 23 has looked at, a ten-year picture. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me Page 102 1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads 4 added out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 6 introduce a new additional station service 7 load and I think that the black there's a 8 new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw 10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. COXWORTHY: 20 Q. So there's been no analysis? 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 Q. When is that going to happen, Mr. Goulding? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe 21 there now. 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 4 MR. GOXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period, that historicall record in the station service inflowed the case in that the priod prior to the five-year period, that historical record in the station service improvements, based on that historical record in the station service improvements, based on that historical record in the station service improvements, based on that historical record in the station service improvements, based on that this thore-year average, but the information,	say, since 2004 that may have increased or	over a ten-year period, isn't that a much
18 Q. I'm going to ask you, first of all, what are some of those other factors that cause you that concern? You say that there might have 21 been other factors that aren't captured in the 22 ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman 23 has looked at, a ten-year picture. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Sure, sure, I don't know that they cause me Page 102 1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads 4 added out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 6 introduce a new additional station service 7 load and I think that the black there's a 8 new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw 10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 15 that period prior to the five-year period, that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I din't knee tracing and the diesel? 21 diesel - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. When is that going to happen, Mr. Goulding? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe Page 102 1 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this 9 general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using that these low load factors which would have indicated — if you went back up to higher 1 load factors, as was historically the case in that the prior to the five-year period, that historical record in the station service information, I guess — because I would 1 have did the five-year average, but the information, I guess — and this was done in November of 2014, so I wouldn't — and to the	decreased station service requirements.	greater factor impacting on the station
that concern? You say that there might have been other factors that aren't captured in the been other factors that aren't captured in the 22 ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman has looked at, a ten-year picture. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me Page 102 1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads 4 added out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 6 introduce a new additional station service 7 load and I think that the black there's a 8 new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw as well. 10 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast 4 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 5 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 15 that period prior to the five-year period, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 10 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe 26 MR. GOULDING: 26 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that it 1 there now. 26 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. COXWORTHY: 28 MR. GOULDING: 29 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that it 10 minute of the 10 mi	17 MR. COXWORTHY:	service factor than either one of those two,
that concern? You say that there might have been other factors that aren't captured in the ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman lass looked at, a ten-year picture. MR. GOULDING: MR. GOULDING: A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me Page 102 concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. COXWORTHY: 10 A. Until we quantify the heat tracing and the diesel - 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. When is that going to happen, Mr. Goulding? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe Page 102 4 MR. GOULDING: 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 4 MR. GOULDING: 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that in impact of those factors? When we contrast that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period, where otherwise you had these low load factors which would have indicated if you went back up to higher that period prior to the five-year period, that period prior to the five-year period, that period prior to the five-year period, that historical record in the station service factor? MR. GOULDING: 2 A. I can't give you those numbers. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 2 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would have information, I guess and this was done in November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the extent that the black start diesels were in	Q. I'm going to ask you, first of all, what are	the heat tracing and the diesel?
been other factors that aren't captured in the ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman has looked at, a ten-year picture. MR. GOULDING: MR. GOULDING: Toncern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: MR. GOULDING: MR. GOULDING: MR. GOULDING: MR. GOULDING: MR. GOULDING: MR. COXWORTHY: MR. GOULDING: MR. COXWORTHY: MR. GOULDING: MR. GOU	some of those other factors that cause you	19 MR. GOULDING:
ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman has looked at, a ten-year picture. MR. GOULDING: A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me Page 102 concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would so well. MR. COXWORTHY: O, Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. COXWORTHY:	20 that concern? You say that there might have	20 A. Until we quantify the heat tracing and the
23 MR. GOULDING: 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me Page 102 1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads 4 added out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 6 introduce a new additional station service 7 load and I think that the black there's a 8 new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw 10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 8 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 Q. When is that going to happen, Mr. Goulding? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe 26 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe 27 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe 28 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe 29 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe 20 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that it impact is. 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this 9 general rate application if these were factors 10 that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had 12 these low load factors which would have 13 indicated if you went back up to higher 14 load factors, as was historically the case in 15 that period prior to the five-year period, 16 that you might expect improvements, based on 17 that historical record in the station service 18 factor? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. GOULDING: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. Goulding: 24 A. No.	been other factors that aren't captured in the	21 diesel -
24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me Page 102 1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads 4 added out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 6 introduce a new additional station service 7 load and I think that the black there's a 8 new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw 10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 8 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe Page 102 1 there now. 24 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is impact in the black of this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had the selow load factors which would have indicated if you went back up to higher load factors, as was historically the case in that period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service factor? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact impact is general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had these low load factors, as was historically the case in that period prior to the five-year	ten-year, and I agree, that's what Mr. Bowman	22 MR. COXWORTHY:
25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me Page 102 1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads 4 added out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 6 introduce a new additional station service 7 load and I think that the black there's a 8 new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw 10 as well. 11 MR.COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 8 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR.COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe Page 104 1 there now. 2 MR.COXWORTHY: 4 MR.GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. 7 MR.COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this 16 impact is. 7 MR.COXWORTHY: 10 that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had 12 these low load factors which would have 13 indicated if you went back up to higher 14 load factors, as was historically the case in 15 that period prior to the five-year period, 16 that you might expect improvements, based on 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would 24 have did the five-year average, but the 25 information, I guess and this was done in 26 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 27 extent that the black start diesels were in	has looked at, a ten-year picture.	Q. When is that going to happen, Mr. Goulding?
Page 102 1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads 4 added out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 6 introduce a new additional station service 7 load and I think that the black there's a 8 new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw 10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 8 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. Page 104 1 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is impact is. 6 impact is. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had these low load factors which would have indicated if you went back up to higher load factors, as was historically the case in that period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service 18 factor? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 24 extent that the black start diesels were in	24 MR. GOULDING:	24 MR. GOULDING:
1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads 4 added out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 6 introduce a new additional station service 7 load and I think that the black there's a 8 new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw 10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that 6 impact is. 6 MR. COXWORTHY: 9 general rate application if these were factors 10 that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had 12 these low load factors which would have 13 indicated if you went back up to higher 14 load factors, as was historically the case in 15 that period prior to the five-year period, 16 that you might expect improvements, based on 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 A. No. 24 extent that the black start diesels were in	25 A. Sure, sure. I don't know that they cause me	25 A. I don't have an expectation of the timeframe
1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads 4 added out there with respect to heat tracing, 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 6 introduce a new additional station service 7 load and I think that the black there's a 8 new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw 10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that 6 impact is. 6 MR. COXWORTHY: 9 general rate application if these were factors 10 that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had 12 these low load factors which would have 13 indicated if you went back up to higher 14 load factors, as was historically the case in 15 that period prior to the five-year period, 16 that you might expect improvements, based on 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 A. No. 24 extent that the black start diesels were in		
point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would sa well. MR. COXWORTHY: 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had these low load factors which would have impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. GOULDING: A I can't give you those numbers. A MR. GOULDING: A Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would have did the five-year average, but the information, I guess and this was done in November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the extent that the black start diesels were in	Page 102	Page 104
to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would sawell. MR. COXWORTHY: R. COXWORTHY: C. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. A. Well yes, quantify what that impact is. A. Well yes, quantify what that impact is. A. Well yes, q		_
4 MR. GOULDING: 5 for instance, on the fuel lines that would 6 introduce a new additional station service 7 load and I think that the black there's a 8 new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw 10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 10 general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had these low load factors which would have indicated if you went back up to higher load factors, as was historically the case in that period prior to the five-year period, that period prior to the five-year period, that period prior to the five-year period, that prior prior to the five-year period, that period prior to the five-year period, that prior prior to the five-year period, that prior	1 concern, but they cause me concern to the	1 there now.
for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw sawell. MR. COXWORTHY:	1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known	1 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY:
introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would shave a certain amount of station service draw as well. In MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. COXWORTHY: In this five-year period where otherwise you had the period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service factors? MR. COXWORTHY: In this five-year period where otherwise you had the period prior to the five-year period, that period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service factor? MR. GOULDING: MR. GOULDING: A. I can't give you those numbers. MR. COXWORTHY: In this five-year period where otherwise you had the period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service factor? MR. GOULDING: MR. GOULDING: A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would have did the five-year average, but the information, I guess and this was done in November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the extent that the black start diesels were in	1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads	1 there now.2 MR. COXWORTHY:3 Q. Is it going to be quantified?
8 new diesel plant out there as well that would 9 have a certain amount of station service draw 10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 Q. So there's been no analysis? 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 28 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this 9 general rate application if these were factors 10 that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had 12 these low load factors which would have 13 indicated if you went back up to higher 14 load factors, as was historically the case in 15 that period prior to the five-year period, 16 that you might expect improvements, based on 17 that historical record in the station service 18 factor? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would 21 have did the five-year average, but the 22 information, I guess and this was done in 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No.	1 concern, but they cause me concern to the 2 point that I don't know that they aren't known 3 to me. I know that there have been loads 4 added out there with respect to heat tracing,	1 there now.2 MR. COXWORTHY:3 Q. Is it going to be quantified?4 MR. GOULDING:
9 have a certain amount of station service draw 10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 29 general rate application if these were factors 10 that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had 12 these low load factors which would have 13 indicated if you went back up to higher 14 load factors, as was historically the case in 15 that period prior to the five-year period, 16 that you might expect improvements, based on 17 that historical record in the station service 18 factor? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would 21 have did the five-year average, but the 22 information, I guess and this was done in 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 24 extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would	 there now. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Is it going to be quantified? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that
10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? 13 indicated if you went back up to higher load factors, as was historically the case in that period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service about those? 18 factor? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No.	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service	 there now. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Is it going to be quantified? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is.
10 as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had 12 these low load factors which would have 13 indicated if you went back up to higher 14 load factors, as was historically the case in 15 that period prior to the five-year period, 16 that you might expect improvements, based on 17 that historical record in the station service 18 factor? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 24 extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a	 there now. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Is it going to be quantified? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. MR. COXWORTHY:
12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 21 these low load factors which would have 13 indicated if you went back up to higher 14 load factors, as was historically the case in 15 that period prior to the five-year period, 16 that you might expect improvements, based on 17 that historical record in the station service 18 factor? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would 21 have did the five-year average, but the 22 information, I guess and this was done in 23 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would	 there now. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Is it going to be quantified? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this
12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the 13 impact of those factors? When we contrast 14 what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it 15 should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, 16 those two factors that you're talking about, 17 what's the order of magnitude when you think 18 about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 21 these low load factors which would have 13 indicated if you went back up to higher 14 load factors, as was historically the case in 15 that period prior to the five-year period, 16 that you might expect improvements, based on 17 that historical record in the station service 18 factor? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would 21 have did the five-year average, but the 22 information, I guess and this was done in 23 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw	 there now. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Is it going to be quantified? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors
what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. GOULDING: A. I can't give you those numbers. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. So there's been no analysis? MR. GOULDING: November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well.	 there now. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Is it going to be quantified? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using
should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. GOULDING: A. I can't give you those numbers. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. So there's been no analysis? MR. GOULDING: November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY:	1 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that 6 impact is. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this 9 general rate application if these were factors 10 that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had
those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. GOULDING: A. I can't give you those numbers. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. So there's been no analysis? MR. GOULDING: MR. GOULDING: 16 that you might expect improvements, based on 17 that historical record in the station service 18 factor? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would 21 have did the five-year average, but the 22 information, I guess and this was done in 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 25 extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. MR. COXWORTHY:	1 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that 6 impact is. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this 9 general rate application if these were factors 10 that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had 12 these low load factors which would have
those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. GOULDING: A. I can't give you those numbers. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. So there's been no analysis? MR. GOULDING: MR. GOULDING: 16 that you might expect improvements, based on 17 that historical record in the station service 18 factor? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would 21 have did the five-year average, but the 22 information, I guess and this was done in 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 25 extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast	1 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that 6 impact is. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this 9 general rate application if these were factors 10 that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had 12 these low load factors which would have 13 indicated if you went back up to higher
18about those?18factor?19MR. GOULDING:19MR. GOULDING:20A. I can't give you those numbers.20A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would21MR. COXWORTHY:21have did the five-year average, but the22Q. So there's been no analysis?22information, I guess and this was done in23MR. GOULDING:23November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the24A. No.24extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it	1 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had these low load factors which would have indicated if you went back up to higher load factors, as was historically the case in
19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 29 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would 21 have did the five-year average, but the 22 information, I guess and this was done in 23 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6,	1 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that 6 impact is. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this 9 general rate application if these were factors 10 that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had 12 these low load factors which would have 13 indicated if you went back up to higher 14 load factors, as was historically the case in 15 that period prior to the five-year period,
20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 20 A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would have did the five-year average, but the information, I guess and this was done in November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about,	1 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that 6 impact is. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this 9 general rate application if these were factors 10 that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using 11 this five-year period where otherwise you had 12 these low load factors which would have 13 indicated if you went back up to higher 14 load factors, as was historically the case in 15 that period prior to the five-year period, 16 that you might expect improvements, based on
21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 21 have did the five-year average, but the 22 information, I guess and this was done in 23 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. If MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think	1 there now. 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 3 Q. Is it going to be quantified? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had these low load factors which would have indicated if you went back up to higher load factors, as was historically the case in that period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service
21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 21 have did the five-year average, but the 22 information, I guess and this was done in 23 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 24 extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those?	there now. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Is it going to be quantified? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had these low load factors which would have indicated if you went back up to higher load factors, as was historically the case in that period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service factor?
22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 25 information, I guess and this was done in 26 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the 27 extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? 19 MR. GOULDING:	there now. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Is it going to be quantified? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had these low load factors which would have indicated if you went back up to higher load factors, as was historically the case in that period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service factor? MR. GOULDING:
23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. No. 25 November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the extent that the black start diesels were in	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. If MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. GOULDING: A. I can't give you those numbers.	there now. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Is it going to be quantified? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had these low load factors which would have indicated if you went back up to higher load factors, as was historically the case in that period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service factor? MR. GOULDING: A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would
	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. GOULDING: A. I can't give you those numbers.	there now. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Is it going to be quantified? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had these low load factors which would have indicated if you went back up to higher load factors, as was historically the case in that period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service factor? MR. GOULDING: A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would have did the five-year average, but the
25 MR. COXWORTHY: 25 service at that time, I'm not aware, but I	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. If MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? MR. GOULDING: A. I can't give you those numbers. MR. COXWORTHY:	there now. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Is it going to be quantified? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had these low load factors which would have indicated if you went back up to higher load factors, as was historically the case in that period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service factor? MR. GOULDING: A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would have did the five-year average, but the information, I guess and this was done in
	concern, but they cause me concern to the point that I don't know that they aren't known to me. I know that there have been loads added out there with respect to heat tracing, for instance, on the fuel lines that would introduce a new additional station service load and I think that the black there's a new diesel plant out there as well that would have a certain amount of station service draw as well. 11 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 Q. Can you give us any order of magnitude of the impact of those factors? When we contrast what Mr. Bowman is saying, which is that it should be 5.85 percent as opposed to 6.6, those two factors that you're talking about, what's the order of magnitude when you think about those? 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I can't give you those numbers. 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. So there's been no analysis? 23 MR. GOULDING:	there now. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Is it going to be quantified? MR. GOULDING: A. Well, we should, yes, quantify what that impact is. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Sure. Why wasn't it quantified for this general rate application if these were factors that weighed in Hydro's mind towards using this five-year period where otherwise you had these low load factors which would have indicated if you went back up to higher load factors, as was historically the case in that period prior to the five-year period, that you might expect improvements, based on that historical record in the station service factor? MR. GOULDING: A. Sure, they weren't, I guess because I would have did the five-year average, but the information, I guess and this was done in November of 2014, so I wouldn't and to the

00	ctober 21, 2015 Mult	i-Pa	nge [™] NL Hydro GRA
	Page 105		Page 107
1	wouldn't have factored in any specific changes	1	MR. GOULDING:
2	only to take the last five-year average.	2	A. Fuel price, quantity.
3	MR. COXWORTHY:	3	MR. COXWORTHY:
4	Q. Going back to the evidence, Hydro's evidence	4	Q. And quantity.
5	at page 275, Section 2, regulated activities,	5	MR. GOULDING:
6	and the improvement in the conversion rate to	6	A. So that forecast would certainly have our most
7	6.07 kilowatt hours per barrel. That	7	recent outlook on the fuel conversion
8	evidence, as I understand it, takes into	8	performance for 2015. There's a number of
9	account not just the five-year regression	9	factors that would be built into that. One is
10	analysis on the five years of previous	10	the I guess the Holyrood schedule that, you
11	experience, but also the anticipated future	11	know, as we've stated is not quite as
12	experience in 2015 and onwards with respect to	12	optimistic as what it would have been in the
13	higher production requirements, and I'm	13	fall of last year. There's a number of other
14	paraphrasing the evidence here on this page.	14	components as well that have affected fuel
15	MR. GOULDING:	15	conversion rate.
16	A. That's correct.	16	MR. COXWORTHY:
17	MR. COXWORTHY:	17	Q. And again, I'm going to ask you, what other
18	Q. And also the expected efficiencies that would	18	factors? Other than the heat tracing and the
19	be enabled by the new CT?	19	diesel unit at Holyrood?
20	MR. GOULDING:	20	MR. GOULDING:
21	A. That's correct.	21	A. Well, station service load would be one factor
22	MR. COXWORTHY:	22	that impacts on our net fuel conversion rate.
23	Q. So that 6.07, to the extent that the higher	23	The average loading on the units is another
24	production requirements have not changed?	24	factor.
25	MR. GOULDING:	25	MR. COXWORTHY:
	Page 106		Page 108
1	A. That's correct. That's still where we are on	1	Q. And that's going up?
2	the test year forecast basis.	2	MR. GOULDING:
3	MR. COXWORTHY:	3	A. Up, up or down.
4	Q. But in your evidence yesterday, I believe in	4	MR. COXWORTHY:
5	response to Mr. O'Brien, you suggested that	5	Q. Up compared to the last five years that are
6	perhaps the usage of the new CT, while still	6	used for the -
7		7	MR. GOULDING:
8	the same level of efficiencies as been	8	A. In our test year, it certainly would have been
9	originally anticipated?	9	up compared to the last five years. In
10	MR. GOULDING:	10	actuality, I don't know where it is compared
11	A. That's correct. That's correct.	11	to the last five years, but it would certainly
12	MR. COXWORTHY:	12	be lower than our test year because of
13	Q. And has that been quantified in terms of the	13	favourable hydrology, plus in addition,
14	impact on the 6.07?	14	there's more minimum operating hours as well
15	MR. GOULDING:	15	which would lead to lower average loading.
16	A. No. No, we have not quantified it. We have	16	MR. COXWORTHY:
17	put forth a new forecast that I understand	17	Q. So are you referring to and this is in
18	<u>^</u>	18	response to the questions from Mr. O'Brien
19		19	to in the summer months running one of the
20	MR. COXWORTHY:	20	Holyrood units because the load is flat?
21	Q. A new forecast of what, if you may?	21	MR. GOULDING:
22	MR. GOULDING:	22	A. That's correct.
23	A. Fuel, fuel forecast.	23	MR. COXWORTHY:
1.		۱	

25

Q. Is that what you're referring to and when you

say that the actual experience perhaps would

Q. So this is for fuel price?

24 MR. COXWORTHY:

October 21, 2015	Multi-Page	NL Hydro GRA
	Page 109	Page 111
be different than what was forecast for 201	5? 1 MR. GOULDING:	-
2 MR. GOULDING:	2 A. Yeah, like when -	
3 A. That's correct. In our 2015 test year, we	3 MR. COXWORTHY:	
4 hadn't envisioned running a Holyrood unit	or, 4 Q. I'm sorry, in this filin	ng that's going to be
5 you know, we would have envisioned shu	_	
down a unit in June and back on again i		
7 probably September or so, but in actual		it is on at a minimum
8 because of our learnings from the March e		
9 and our review of our reliability criteria, w		2.7.4.0.0.5
would have operated Holyrood unit rig		the -
throughout the summer months, with t	_	
exception of the total planned outage.	12 A. That's 40 percent.	
13 MR. COXWORTHY:	13 MR. COXWORTHY:	
Q. When you say right through the summer m		2
you were planning on not having any un		
1		
17 MR. GOULDING:	17 MR. COXWORTHY:	maning of during True
18 A. In our test year forecast.		running at during June
19 MR. COXWORTHY:	19 and July?	
Q. In your test year, thank you. And you're		
21 saying that the actual experience was that i		
June you did run it?	22 MR. COXWORTHY:	160 634 6 11 1
23 MR. GOULDING:	_	age 169 of Mr. Goulding's
24 A. That's correct.		rday, from October 20th,
25 MR. COXWORTHY:	25 line 12? So Mr. O'B	rien was asking you about
1	Page 110	Page 112
1 Q. In July you did run it?	1 the regression analys	is that was done and I
2 MR. GOULDING:		s more than just taking
3 A. In July, we ran it.	3 an average five years	s fuel conversion factors
4 MR. COXWORTHY:	4 and averaging out.	There's more to it than
5 Q. And August, I think we know all three un	its 5 that? Is that -	
6 were down.	6 MR. GOULDING:	
7 MR. GOULDING:	7 A. That's correct. The	last time the fuel
8 A. In August, all three units were down.	8 conversion rate was s	set was back in 2004 and
9 MR. COXWORTHY:	9 at that time, it was a	a reverse approach in
10 Q. So that didn't change?	that we averaged it	t was probably a weighted
11 MR. GOULDING:	11 average of the previo	ous five years. In 2007,
12 A. No.	the same fuel conver	rsion rate carried over,
13 MR. COXWORTHY:	which at the time, the	e loads were still fairly
Q. So we're talking about two months where	it 14 high.	
ran, where a unit ran?	15 MR. COXWORTHY:	
16 MR. GOULDING:	Q. At sort of the level to	hat we're expecting to
17 A. That's correct.	see for 2015 and 201	
18 MR. COXWORTHY:	18 MR. GOULDING:	,
19 Q. Where it wouldn't have otherwise. And		test year, we went to
20 much of an impact do you expect that to h		d it's an approach that
on the overall year average load?		ernally for a forecast of
22 MR. GOULDING:		gression analysis which
23 A. I can't quantify that right now.	takes into account,	~
24 MR. COXWORTHY:		es inputs such as the
25 Q. But it will be in this forecast?	_	unit and in this case, we
2. 200 to the first forecast.	25 Chipoeted foud on the	

October 21, 2015 Mul	ti-Page ^M NL Hydro GRA
Page 11	Page 115
also used the expected heating content of the	1 factors, or for that matter, any factors at
2 fuel as well.	all that were taken into account that weren't
3 MR. COXWORTHY:	3 taken account in the earlier weighted average
4 Q. Of the Holyrood fuel.	4 approach. I think that Mr. Goulding has
5 MR. GOULDING:	5 indicated that the expected BTU content in the
6 A. To give us a more forward view on where our	6 Holyrood fuel has been taken into account and
7 fuel conversion performance would fall out.	7 that wouldn't necessarily have been taken into
8 If we had just used a weighted average say of	8 account, at least not directly, in the
9 our last five years in this case where our	9 weighted average approach, and also, I think
fuel conversion performance was low, it	10 you've indicated that the higher load
11 wouldn't have been reflective on our test	expectation, based on the previous five years,
12 year.	has been taken into account. So what I was
13 MR. COXWORTHY:	wondering was whether any other factors other
14 Q. And in my understanding, the regression	than those would have been added, compared to
analysis is turning out a better result than	the weighted average approach that was used
would have been the case using the old?	16 before?
17 MR. GOULDING:	17 MR. GOULDING:
18 A. Yes.	18 A. Those were the only two factors added. They
19 MR. COXWORTHY:	19 would have been these two would certainly
20 Q. When I say better result, a better result from	20 have the most bearing on where fuel efficiency
21 the point of view of, well, I guess, everyone,	21 falls out.
but certainly from the customers.	22 MR. COXWORTHY:
23 MR. GOULDING:	23 Q. This is where I want to go to the variable fan
24 A. Sure.	24 drive project and we filed yesterday some
25 MR. COXWORTHY:	25 material from the 2013 capital budget in
Page 11	Page 116
1 Q. In terms of fuel conversion rate. So, it does	relation to that project. If we need to turn
2 have this this regression analysis does	2 to it, you know, certainly we can, and
3 look forward in terms of looking at factors	3 certainly if you feel you have a need to turn
4 other than just the last five years experience	4 to it. But as I understood what was filed in
or whatever time period you're looking at?	5 relation to the 2013 capital budget, it was
6 MR. GOULDING:	6 expected that those variable fan drives, that
7 A. That's correct.	7 project would be completed in 2014. Would you
8 MR. COXWORTHY:	8 agree that that was the expectation at that
9 Q. Okay. Anything else other than that that the	9 time?
regression analysis took into account? And	10 MR. GOULDING:
11 you're turning to Mr. Stratton. He's the	11 A. That's correct.
fellow with the statistics background and I	12 MR. COXWORTHY:
understand regression analysis is an area of	13 Q. And that hasn't turned out that way? Is that
statistics or a tool of statistics. I don't	14 correct?
know if Mr. Stratton can add anything to that.	15 MR. GOULDING:
16 (12:15 p.m.)	16 A. From my understanding, there was two units
17 MR.STRATTON:	that were put in service with the new variable
18 A. The regression is forward looking and it's	speed drives when their annual maintenance
19 taking it's applying explanatory factors in	ended in 2014. They would have started up
20 the history to project what that would be in	with these new variable frequency drives in
21 the future. Can you repeat your question one	21 2014. The final unit, unit two, when it was
22 more time?	started this October, it also had the new
23 MR. COXWORTHY:	variable frequency drives.
Q. Well, I just wanted to determine whether there	24 MR. COXWORTHY:
25 were any other factors, forward looking	25 Q. So they're all up and running now, in

October 21, 2015	Multi-Page TM	NL Hydro GRA
P	nge 117	Page 119
accordance to what was expected in the cap		luction of the Holyrood fuel
2 budget filing?	2 conversion fac	•
3 MR. GOULDING:	3 MR. COXWORTHY:	
4 A. They are.	4 Q. The net conver	rsion rate?
5 MR. COXWORTHY:	5 MR. GOULDING:	
6 Q. Late, but otherwise performing the function	6 A. Exactly. So th	ere's a table Jenny, if you
7 that the capital budget application indicated	7 could please c	all it up in the capital
8 they would?	8 budget applica	tion that was -
9 MR. GOULDING:	9 MS. GLYNN:	
10 A. They're performing the functions. Some of	he 10 Q. Mr. Coxworth	y, do you want these entered onto
data, I understand, may be preliminary at th	s 11 the record?	
point in quantifying the benefits, but they	12 MR. COXWORTHY:	
certainly are all in service.	13 Q. Yes, I'm sorry	, thank you.
14 MR. COXWORTHY:	14 MS. GLYNN:	
15 Q. Well certainly in the capital budget	15 Q. Both documen	ts?
application, one of the selling points, if I	16 MR. COXWORTHY:	
can put it that way, for approval was that	17 Q. Yes.	
this was a project that would pay for itself	18 MS. GLYNN:	
19 within a year.	19 Q. I think we can	enter them all as one.
20 MR. GOULDING:	20 MR. COXWORTHY:	
21 A. That's correct.	21 Q. I think so. The	y're all from the 2013 capital
22 MR. COXWORTHY:	budget, even th	nough they were separated out.
23 Q. And so are you able to say, based on even t	e 23 MS. GLYNN:	
preliminary experience, has that occurred?	24 Q. Perfect. So the	ey'll go in as Information #17.
25 MR. GOULDING:	25 MR. COXWORTHY:	
P	ige 118	Page 120
1 A. Based on preliminary experience, and I nee		
2 take you back, I guess, to the application an	-	
3 some -	3 A. So when the c	apital budget application was
4 MR. COXWORTHY:	I	elieve in August of 2012, this
5 Q. The capital budget application?	5 was the operati	ing regime that was envisioned
6 MR. GOULDING:	6 for the units.	
7 A. Yes, yeah.	7 MR. COXWORTHY:	
8 MR. COXWORTHY:	8 Q. Yeah.	
9 Q. Okay.	9 MR. GOULDING:	
10 MR. GOULDING:	10 A. And I could t	ake - and really if you go
11 A. And some understanding, I guess, of how the	ese 11 through, this re	epresents a gross average load
benefits are derived. There's two big	12 expectation of	about 88 megawatts. So the
there's two large forced draft fan motors or	benefit that wa	as in this application would
each of the Holyrood units and prior to the	14 have been der	ived and stated based on this
variable frequency drive installation, they	operating regir	ne because the lower the load
would have always been at full speed, full	16 expectation or	the unit, the larger the
load regardless of what the unit loading was	benefit, so in to	erms of the impact in terms of
So, the benefit of the variable frequency	I	pective, we were forecasting
drives is they're able to step back the load	1	of 117 megawatts.
on the motors when the load on the unit is	20 MR. COXWORTHY:	
reduced. So thereby, there are energy saving	gs 21 Q. Instead of 88?	
which translate into a station service saving		
22 as well and whom we've massumed an a not	I	wigh the preliminary data gave

24

25

A. Yes, and although the preliminary data says

this load point does indicate savings of 7 to

8 kilowatt hours per barrel, from a test year

23

24

25

as well and where we're measured on a net fuel

conversion rate, then any savings or any

reduction in station service energy would also

Page 121 Page 123 perspective it would have to be lower because rate and average loading. 1 2 we're going in with a higher average loading, 2 MR. COXWORTHY: and the analysis that we've done, and again 3 Q. I take your point. How about in relation, 3 it's very limited at this point, is that the though, to those two months in 2015, June and 4 4 benefit is in the order of 4 to 5 kilowatt July when you've run at the 40 percent MCR, 5 5 hours per barrel. wouldn't the variable fan drives have improved 6 6 7 MR. COXWORTHY: the performance from a fuel efficiency point 7 8 O. Instead of the 8, and there's been an RFI 8 of view of those two units, and would otherwise have been the case? response that quantifies it as 8, but you're 9 10 saying based on actual experience, you would 10 MR. GOULDING: revise that to 4 or 5? A. That's correct. 11 11 12 MR. GOULDING: 12 MR. COXWORTHY: A. 4 to 5, and certainly we would have to reflect Q. And has that been taken into account, or will 13 the fact, you know, from a test year 14 14 it be taken into account in terms of the perspective, all three variables we address station service factor? 15 15 16 haven't been in service for the entire year as 16 MR. GOULDING: 17 well. A. It wasn't taken into account in our test year 17 because the status of the project was still 18 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 O. Have or have not? 19 somewhat unknown at the time. We didn't have the data to quantify the benefits. 20 MR. GOULDING: 20 21 A. We would have had two in service to start the 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 year and the third one was -22 Q. Is it any more unknown than the expected heat content, BTU content, in the Holyrood fuel? 23 23 MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Nonetheless, you could project, couldn't you, 24 the impact of the third unit based on A. At the time that we developed the forecast, it 25 Page 124 Page 122 experience with the other two that have been would have been unknown because we didn't have 1 1 2 on? 2 any experience data in the fall of 2014, but 3 MR. GOULDING: 3 now that we have the data and we see the A. We could have projected it for future years, benefits, you know, I certainly would caution 4 4 5 5 with going with the full 7 to 8 kilowatt hour 6 MR. COXWORTHY: per barrel benefit based on the load that we 6 7 Q. And would there have been anything wrong with 7 expect to be running on the unit, but we 8 taking that into account in, for instance, the 8 certainly see an area for improvement there. regression analysis? 9 MR. COXWORTHY: 10 MR. GOULDING: 10 Q. So even allowing for that, that perhaps the 8 11 A. The regression -11 kilowatt per hour barrel is too high based on 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 actual experience, and perhaps the better 13 Q. Even if it's 4 or 5 instead of 8 in terms of 13 number is 4 or 5, is there any reason why now the favourable impact, why wouldn't that be 14 14 at this stage the station service factor taken into account in the regression analysis? 15 15 couldn't be revised to take into account the 16 MR. GOULDING: favourable impact from the variable fan drive 16 17 A. Well, in the regression analysis itself, it 17 project? forecasts - it's outside of the station 18 18 MR. GOULDING: 19 service impact. The regression analysis 19 A. No. To the extent that we need to have forecasts gross unit efficiency. 20 20 another review of the data, it was all very 21 21 MR. COXWORTHY: preliminary, but based on what we've seen, o. Yeah. certainly we do an area for improvement there. 22 22 23 MR. GOULDING: 23 MR. COXWORTHY: 24 A. So the major factors that would have impacted 24 O. And when will that be - when could it be on the gross efficiency is the fuel heating 25 25 recalculated?

October 21, 2015	Multi-Page M NL Hydro GR
I	Page 125
1 MR. GOULDING:	1 GRA. It's probably happened more frequently
2 A. I expect that perhaps at the end, or if we do	2 through -
3 revise our fuel forecast at some before the	3 MR. COXWORTHY:
4 end of this -	4 Q. Oh, more frequently?
5 MR. COXWORTHY:	5 MR. GOULDING:
6 Q. General rate application?	6 A. Through revised -
7 MR. GOULDING:	7 MR. COXWORTHY:
8 A. Then we would certainly - yeah.	8 Q. So when is the last - did you participate in
9 MR. COXWORTHY:	9 the production of this document?
10 Q. So we may see a revised station service fac	or 10 MR. GOULDING:
based on that?	11 A. Sure.
12 MR. GOULDING:	12 MR. COXWORTHY:
13 A. That's correct.	Q. When was the last one prepared?
14 MR. COXWORTHY:	14 MR. GOULDING:
15 Q. Turning again to page 169 of Mr. Gouldin	g's 15 A. The last one would have been in preparation
evidence from yesterday, there was a refere	for our 2015 forecast update.
at line 23, this was in response to a question	
from Mr. O'Brien in relation to the regress	on 18 Q. So can you tell me when that was?
analysis and how Hydro goes about gathe	ing 19 MR. GOULDING:
20 the data or the information to assist with	20 A. It was roughly around June, May or June, I
that, there was a reference to a hydro therm	l 21 recall.
split, something that as I understood it from	22 MR. COXWORTHY:
your evidence was done annually?	Q. And for what period would that cover?
24 MR. GOULDING:	24 MR. GOULDING:
25 A. It's done - would do it probably spring an	25 A. That would have taken in actuals to the point
I	Page 126
1 fall. Now we've sort of gotten off track from	n in time that it was done, plus the remainder
2 that schedule now due to GRA filings, bu	2 of the year in forecast months.
3 ordinarily when Mr. Stratton develops his l	ad 3 MR. COXWORTHY:
4 forecast, that would feed into what we cal	4 Q. For 2015?
5 hydro thermal split.	5 MR. GOULDING:
6 MR. COXWORTHY:	6 A. That's correct.
7 Q. And is this a discreet document, this hydr	
8 thermal split, is it reduced down to a paper	8 Q. I'd like to request an undertaking for that
9 document?	9 particular document, the June hydro thermal
10 MR. GOULDING:	split schedule, a spreadsheet, as I understand
11 A. Yeah, it's a spreadsheet document, basicall	
table, with monthly line items of where v	
expect our energy to come from in any gi	
month and at the end your energy and load	
to match.	15 Q. Noted on the record.
16 MR. COXWORTHY:	16 MR. COXWORTHY:
Q. And you've indicated that the past practice	
to do it twice a year, spring and fall?	Information 15 and 16 yesterday some monthly
19 MR. GOULDING:	power reports, and I don't recall now, Mr.
20 A. That's correct.	Goulding, whether the questions about it were
21 MR. COXWORTHY:	directed to you or directed to Mr. Humphries
22 Q. And this year, though, you've indicated	or perhaps others, but you're familiar with
perhaps that didn't happen?	23 these monthly power reports?
24 MR. GOULDING:	24 MR. GOULDING:
25 A. For the last - say, since we embarked on the	25 A. Yes, I am. Page 125 Page 12

Multi-Page TM October 21, 2015 NL Hydro GRA Page 129 Page 131 1 MR. COXWORTHY: 1 MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Are they related - those are actuals, am I Q. It didn't appear to me that this was a filing with the Board. I may be incorrect in that correct? 3 3 4 MR. GOULDING: regard, or at least not a filing in this 4 proceeding, these two monthly reports, or for A. Those are actuals. 5 5 that matter any of these monthly reports? 6 MR. COXWORTHY: 6 Q. As opposed to forecasts? 7 MR. GOULDING: 8 MR. GOULDING: A. No. that's correct. A. That's correct. 9 MR. COXWORTHY: 10 MR. COXWORTHY: 10 Q. You said that there are some external filing purposes behind this. Are you aware whether -Q. And is there any connection between those and 11 11 the hydro thermal split analysis we just 12 12 MR. GOULDING: 13 talked about? A. Yeah, these reports go external. There's a 14 (12:30 p.m.) number of stakeholders. I know when I was at 14 15 MR. GOULDING: Deer Lake, I would have gotten it. 15 16 A. I guess, they're a measure in the end of how 16 MR. COXWORTHY: good our forecasts were. 17 17 Q. Okay. 18 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 MR. GOULDING: 19 Q. Okay, so when we see the spreadsheet pursuant A. So the industrial customers - I assume that to the undertaking up to June, will that give Newfoundland Power gets this as well. 20 20 us the same information as the monthly power 21 21 MR. COXWORTHY: report in terms of actuals up to June, and, 22 22 Q. With respect to the - you were asked some yes, please turn to Information 15 to remind questions by Mr. O'Brien regarding the 23 23 us all of what the detail is there? deferral account for energy supply prices? 24 25 MR. GOULDING: 25 MR. GOULDING: Page 130 Page 132 A. It would generally give you the same type of A. That's correct. 1 information. Like, we don't - in our hydro 2 2 MR. COXWORTHY: thermal split, we don't break out the station 3 3 Q. And one of the things that's intended to be service load from our generating plants, so captured there, correct me if I'm mistaken, is 4 4 5 our hydro thermal split only works on a net the impact of the fuel conversion factor? load basis. If we could scroll down there. 6 MR. GOULDING: 6 7 Jenny. A. That's correct. 8 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 MR. COXWORTHY: Q. So it wouldn't have this granular sort of 9 Q. So in other words, if it's set at a level that detail? results - that is not correct, and should have 10 10 11 MR. GOULDING: 11 been set a level that would have been more A. No, but it would have the generation favourable to customers, that will be captured 12 12 production from each of our plants. It would 13 13 in that deferral account? have the energy purchases from each of our 14 14 MR. GOULDING: energy purchase arrangements. It would also 15 A. That's correct. It is a two way account. have our standby generation as well. 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 16 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 17 Q. That's right, and vice versa. Q. And what's Hydro's purpose in generating this 18 18 MR. GOULDING: 19 document on a monthly basis, I would A. That's correct.

20 MR. COXWORTHY:

deferral account?

Q. Absolutely, and one of the factors that you've spoken about is the heat content or the BTU

content in Holyrood fuel as being an

uncertainty that would be captured by that

21

22

23

24

25

- 20 understand?
- 21 MR. GOULDING:
- 22 A. That's correct. Well, essentially it's a
- statistical report that we use to keep track
- of our generation and loads. So this here is
- 25 reported both internally and externally.

Page 129 - Page 132

October 21, 2015 Multi-		[ulti-]	Pag	nge [™] NL Hydro GRA
	Page	133		Page 135
1	MR. GOULDING:		1 N	MR. COXWORTHY:
2	A. That's correct.		2	Q. Even higher than that?
3	MR. COXWORTHY:		3 N	MR. GOULDING:
4	Q. And in the evidence of Hydro that I referred		4	A. That's correct.
5	to earlier, and this is at page 275, Section 2		5 N	MR. COXWORTHY:
6	of the regulated activity section of the		6	Q. But the fuel heating content that is being
7	application at line - actually, it's the next		7	factored in for the purposes of arriving at
8	page, page 276, and there it was noted that,		8	the 607, that isn't even the spec heat
9	"Improvements in the fuel heating content are		9	content?
10	not anticipated". So this was - you'll recall	1	10 N	MR. GOULDING:
11	from our earlier discussion, this was a	1	11	A. It turns out that what we spec is five year
12	discussion of the factors that were taken into	1	12	average.
13	account in the regression analysis, so the	1	13 N	MR. COXWORTHY:
14	possibility of fuel heating content, BTUs	1	14	Q. Okay, is that just by coincidence?
15	improving content, that was not taken into	1	15 N	MR. GOULDING:
16	account in the regression analysis?	1	16	A. It is, but at the time, like - I don't know
17	MR. GOULDING:	1	17	where we were with this fuel spec, but I did
18	A. What we used at that time in the regression	1	18	check and this specification is basically
19	analysis for forward perspective was the last	1	19	bringing us up to our five year average.
20	five year average because the indications at	2	20 1	MR. COXWORTHY:
21	that time that there were not many areas for	2	21	Q. Mr. O'Brien asked if there had been any
22	improvements in this area.	2	22	studies by Hydro to identify whether there's a
23	MR. COXWORTHY:	2	23	direct correlation between the BTU content of
24	Q. In the BTU content of the fuel?	2	24	the fuel and the fuel efficiency factor, and I
25	MR. GOULDING:	2	25	believe your answer was no?
	Page	134		Page 136
1	A. That's correct. Now Mr. Henderson did quote		1 N	MR. GOULDING:
1 2			2	A. There's none that I'm aware of. There would
3	our fuel spec, we did specify a higher -		3	be some internal monitoring. There's a system
4	MR. COXWORTHY:		4	inside the plant that the operators use to
5	Q. This is at page 90 and 91 of the September		5	track the performance of the units.
6	23rd evidence, yes, and I was going to go to		6 N	MR. COXWORTHY:
7	that.		7	Q. Has there been any effort within Hydro to
8	MR. GOULDING:		8	correlate that information?
9	A. Sure, okay.		9 N	MR. GOULDING:
10	MR. COXWORTHY:	1	10	A. I'm not aware of any.
11	Q. Thank you.	1	11 N	MR. COXWORTHY:
12	MR. GOULDING:	1	12	Q. So is it just anecdotal? Again I don't want
13	A. There was - the improvement was not large. I	1	13	to be glib, but is it just anecdotal that
14		1	14	there is a relationship within Hydro between
15	BTUs per barrel up to 6.4 million, so on a	1	15	the BTU content and the fuel efficiency
16		1	16	factor?
17	opportunity wasn't there for it.	1	17 N	MR. GOULDING:
18	MR. COXWORTHY:	1	18	A. Again I don't know that I'm the one to speak
19	Q. When you say the opportunity wasn't there for		19	with. That's more or less the internal -
20		2	20 I	MR. COXWORTHY:
21	content is in the spec and to say the	2	21	Q. Is anyone else on this panel able to speak to
22	opportunity is not there for it, I'll ask you	2	22	that issue?
23	to explain what you mean by that?	2	23 1	MR. HUMPHRIES:
24	MR. GOULDING:	2	24	A. No.
25	A. The opportunity to specify a higher value.	2	25 I	MR. STRATTON:
_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

October 21, 2015	Multi-Pa	nge TM NL Hydro GRA
	Page 137	Page 139
1 A. No.	1	how did you see those being disposed of in
2 MR. MOULTON:		terms of what factors would be taken into
3 A. No.	3	account in deciding how that deferral account
4 MR. COXWORTHY:	4	balance should be disposed of, and that
5 Q. Who would be the person who might be		questioning starts at line 24, page 139, and
11.07 10	6	this was in relation to in this case - as I
6 qualified? 7 MR. GOULDING:	7	said, it wasn't in relation to the fuel
8 A. I think it would have probably been t		conversion, at least not directly, it was in
operations panel. I guess, in terms -	9	relation to the issue of the running of the
operations panel. I guess, in terms - 10 MR. COXWORTHY:		gas turbines and how that might impact on that
	10	deferral account, and at line 14 on page 140
	11	* *
12 MR. GOULDING:	12	you say that one of the factors that you'd
13 A. That's correct. In terms of the correlation	·	expect the Board to take into account is a
I guess, between fuel heating content and		summary report of when the gas turbines were
energy output, the fuel heating content		ran and maybe even what the circumstances
also a measure of the energy in the fuel a		were, so that would be a factor that the Board
the kilowatt hours out is also energy, so		could take into account in deciding how a
would only stand to reason that the me		deferral account balance should be disposed
energy that you put into a process, the m		of?
energy that you get out of a process.		MR. GOULDING:
21 MR. COXWORTHY:	21	A. Yes, I really can't assume what the Board will
22 Q. And as a general principle of, I'm going		ask for, but -
say a word like "heat dynamics", but m	*	MR. COXWORTHY:
that's not the right term, sure, but in term		Q. Hydro is not proposing - I guess, what I'm
of that actually being a measured impa	act, 25	doing here is I'm contrasting this to the RSP,
	Page 138	Page 140
1 measured in any sort of systematic way, that	t 1	which has defined mechanisms which, you know,
2 hasn't been done internally at Hydro?	2	if it's allowed to run the way it's intended
3 MR. GOULDING:	3	to run, pretty much dictates how funds will be
4 A. I don't know of it.	4	disposed of.
5 MR. COXWORTHY:	5	MR. GOULDING:
6 Q. And you're indicating there might be someo	one 6	A. That's correct.
7 who could say more?	7	MR. COXWORTHY:
8 MR. GOULDING:	8	Q. Without having to look outside the RSP rules
9 A. That's correct.	9	as to what factors might need to be taken into
10 MR. COXWORTHY:	10	account, and as I understand these deferral
11 Q. With respect to your evidence yesterday, and	d 11	accounts, they certainly don't have that level
again I believe in response to some questions		of internal rules that we know in advance will
from Mr. O'Brien, you were asked about how		apply to how these balances will be disposed.
deferral account would work in relation to an		Certainly that's what I took as the thrust of
specifically in relation to this Holyrood -	15	Mr. O'Brien's question as he was trying to
16 I'm sorry, not in relation to the Holyrood	16	determine in relation to the running of the
fuel conversion rate, but actually in relation	17	gas turbines, seeing as we're not going to
to another issue. Pardon me for just a second		have those internal rules in the deferral
19 here. At page 139 of Mr. Goulding's evidence		account, what are the factors - you know, when
20 of yesterday, and Mr. O'Brien starting at line		Hydro comes to you, as I expect they will at
21 4 was asking you about the deferral account,		the time of an application to dispose of these
in particular the \$500,000.00 band or	, 22	balances, what are the factors, or if Hydro
23 threshold that would apply, and Mr. O'Brien		internally doesn't come to you, it'll be RFIs
24 was asking you in practice, you know, if	24	perhaps directed to Hydro that you'll be asked
25 amounts do accrue in this deferral account,	25	to respond to, and you've identified one of
amounts do acerde in ans deferrar account,		to respond to, and you we identified one of

Page 141 1 the issues in relation to the gas turbines. I 2 wanted to ask the same question in relation to 3 the field conversion factor in terms of to the 4 extent balances accrue in that deferral 5 account in relation to the fuel conversion 6 factor, and that factor differing from test 7 year, what factors do you think the Board 8 should be taking into account in deciding how 9 that aspect of the balances in the deferral 10 account should be disposed of? 11 A. Teally can't presume what the Board would 12 A. I really can't presume what the Board would 13 ask for. There are -it may follow the same 14 format as our current RSP, really can't 15 assume what the Board will ask for. 16 MR. COXWOKTHY: 17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the 18 actual experience in terms of fuel content, 19 BTU content, I'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel 20 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in 21 the test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 be taken into account? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 25 account is actually disposed of, I can't 3 comment on that. 4 MR. COXWOKTHY: 5 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and a it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of of higher heat content, and if that happens, that fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 14 fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence, You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 17 turn to his evidence, You know, a higher heat 18 turn to his evidence, You know, a higher heat 19 contract if it's below spec, Hydro - 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COWDLING: 22 MR. COULDING: 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that distinct the experience of the content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence, You know, a higher heat 16 turn to his evidence, You know, a higher heat 17 to - and I think the relationship is under 18 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro	October 21, 2015 Multi-		i-P	Pag	nge [™] NL Hydro G	FRA
the issues in relation to the gas turbines, I wanted to ask the same question in relation to the fuel conversion factor in terms of to the catent balances accrue in that deferral account in relation to the fuel conversion factor, and that factor differing from test year, what factors doy ou think the Board should be taking into account in deciding how that aspect of the balances in the deferral account should be disposed of? If MR. GOULDING: If MR. GOULDING: A I really can't presume what the Board would ask for. There are - it may follow the same format as our current RSP, really can't sasume what the Board will ask for. If MR. COXWORTHY: If MR. COXWORTHY: If MR. COXWORTHY: If MR. GOULDING: A That's correct. If MR. GOULDING: A That's correct. If MR. COXWORTHY: If WR. COXWORTHY: If WR. GOULDING: A That's correct. If WR. COXWORTHY: If WR. COXWORTHY: If WR. GOULDING: A That's a factor that ought to be taken into account? If WR. GOULDING: A That's a factor that will influence on the actual fuel performance. Whether or not it Page 142 Should be taken into account into how this account is actually disposed of, I can't account for higher heat content, and if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, but if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, hut if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, hut if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, hut if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, hut if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a		Page 141			Page	143
2 wanted to ask the same question in relation to 3 the fuel conversion factor in terms of to the 4 extent balances accrue in that deferral 5 account in relation to the fuel conversion 6 factor, and that factor differing from test 7 year, what factors do you think the Board 8 should be taking into account in deciding how 9 that aspect of the balances in the deferral 10 account should be disposed of? 11 MR. GOULDING: 12 A. I really can't presume what the Board would 13 ask for. There are - it may follow the same 14 format as our current RSP, I really can't 15 assume what the Board will ask for. 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the 18 actual experience in terms of fuel content, 18 BTU content, I'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel 20 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in 21 the test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 be taken into account? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 25 account is actually disposed of, I can't 26 comment on that. 26 A. That's a factor that open the 27 comment on that. 28 MR. COXWORTHY: 29 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and 29 in the test year, is that a factor that content, and if that happens, 29 the point, toh, but if that happens, 29 the point, toh, but if that happens, 20 the leis going to cost us more too. We can 29 the logic to cost us more too. We can 29 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro - 20 MR. COXWORTHY: 20 Q. In terms of if't below spec, Hydro - 21 MR. COULDING: 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COULDING: 22 DAR. COWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of it's below spec, Hydro - 24 MR. COXWORTHY: 25 Q. In terms of it's below spec, Hydro - 26 MR. COXWORTHY: 26 Q. In terms of it's below spec, Hydro - 27 MR. COLUDING: 28 A. GOULDING: 39 A. Cha's active impact of what happens, that contract if it's below spec, Hydro - 29 MR. COXWORTHY: 30 Q. That's below spec, Hydro - 31 MR. COXWORTHY: 31 Q. And the customers know how that's going to be 32 MR. COXWORTHY: 33 Q. In terms of it's below spec, Hydro - 34	1			1		
the fuel conversion factor in terms of to the extent balances accrue in that deferral a account in relation to the fuel conversion factor, and that factor differing from test year, what factors do you think the Board should be taking into account in deciding how that aspect of the balances in the deferral account should be disposed of? 11 MR GOULDING: 12 A I really can't presume what the Board would ask for. There are -it may follow the same format as our current RSP. I really can't assume what the Board will ask for. 15 assume what the Board will ask for. 16 MR COXWORTHY: 17 O, So, for instance, if you were asked should the actual experience in terms of fuel content, B BTU content, I'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel as opposed to what's projected or forecast in 21 the test year, is that a factor that ought to be taken into account into how this actual fuel performance. Whether or not it 18 AR COXWORTHY: 25 MR GOULDING: 25 MR GOULDING: 26 MR COXWORTHY: 3 comment on that. 4 Q Sure, sure. The point I want to make is if there's that price impact, depending on the fire's that price impact, of pure in the Sarourable impact on the same of the COXWORTHY: 10 Q. A rathat's correct. 11 MR GOULDING: 12 MR GOULDING: 13 MR GOULDING: 14 A That's correct. 15 MR GOULDING: 15 MR COXWORTHY: 16 Q Because the RSP rules define that. 17 MR GOULDING: 18 A (Uh-hm. 19 MR COXWORTHY: 20 Q. It want to contrast that, though, with the 21 impact of a different area and effect on the fuel efficiency factor. 21 That's not going - well, it's going to be 2 the effect on the fuel efficiency factor. 22 MR GOULDING: 23 That's not going - well, it's going to be 3 that, whether it's a favourable or unfavourable impact on the eustomers? 24 MR GOULDING: 25 M	2		2	2 (_	
5 account in relation to the fuel conversion 6 factor, and that factor differing from test 7 year, what factors do you think the Board 8 should be taking into account in deciding how 9 that aspect of the balances in the deferral 10 account should be disposed of? 11 MR, GOULDING: 9 A. That's correct. 10 MR, COXWORTHY: 11 MR, GOULDING: 12 work? 13 MR, GOULDING: 13 ask for. There are -it may follow the same 14 format as our curnern Rsp. treally can't 15 assume what the Board will ask for. 16 MR, COXWORTHY: 17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the 18 actual experience in terms of fuel content, 19 BTU content, 17 m sorry, in the Holyrood fuel 20 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in 21 the test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 be taken into account? 23 MR, GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that ought to 25 account is actually disposed of, I can't 2 account is actually disposed of, I can't 2 account is actually disposed of, I can't 3 for the things I want to contrast here, and 6 it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point, the whave a contract for 9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity of for higher heat content, and if that happens, that 4 content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro 22 MR, COXWORTHY: 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro 22 MR, COXWORTHY: 22 NG, Dorner of the United States of the other 23rd evidence, 20 MR, COXWORTHY: 22 NG, Dorner of the United States of the other 23rd evidence of the United States of the	3				•	
5 account in relation to the fuel conversion 6 factor, and that factor differing from test 7 year, what factors do you think the Board 8 should be taking into account in deciding how 9 that aspect of the balances in the deferral 10 account should be disposed of? 11 MR. GOULDING: 12 A. I really can't presume what the Board would 13 ask for. There are - it may follow the same 14 format as our current RSP, I really can't 15 assume what the Board will ask for. 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the 18 actual experience in terms of fuel content, 19 BTU content, Tim sorry, in the Holyrood fuel 10 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in 11 the test year, is that a factor that ought to 12 be taken into account? 13 MR. GOULDING: 14 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 15 account is actually disposed of, I can't 15 account is actually disposed of, I can't 16 comment on that. 17 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the 18 point that, sure, we have a contract for 19 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 19 for higher heat content, and if that happens, that 10 to - and I think the relationship is under 10 to - and I think the relationship is under 11 to - and I think the relationship is under 12 to - and I think the relationship is under 13 that COXWORTHY: 14 A. That's correct. 15 MR. COXWORTHY: 15 Q. D. or fit the tist you were asked should the 18 actual cusperione in terms of fuel content, 19 BTU content, that 'A. That's correct. 15 MR. COXWORTHY: 16 Q. Because the RSP rules define that. 17 MR. GOLIDING: 18 A. Uh-hm. 19 MR. COXWORTHY: 20 Q. I want to contrast that, though, with the 21 impact of a different BTU content in terms of 22 the effect on the fuel efficiency factor. 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that ought to 25 of the things I want to contrast here, and 26 it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the 27 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the 28 on the deferral account is actually disposed	4	extent balances accrue in that deferral	4	4	Q. Sure, sure. The point I want to make is if	
7 the RSF? 8 should be taking into account in deciding how that aspect of the balances in the deferral account should be disposed of? 11 MR. GOULDING: 12 A. I really can't presume what the Board would ask for. There are - it may follow the same format as our current RSP, I really can't. 15 assume what the Board will ask for. 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the actual experience in terms of fuel content. 18 actual experience in terms of fuel content. 19 BTU content, I'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel as opposed to what's projected or forecast in the test year, is that a factor that ought to be taken into account? 18 A. That's a factor that ought to account is actually disposed of, I can't comment on that. 19 A. That's a factor that will influence on the account is actually disposed of, I can't comment on that. 19 A. WR. COXWORTHY: 20 C. I want to contrast that, though, with the impact of a different BTU content in terms of what happens next in terms of the deferral account. 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 22 MR. GOULDING: 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the account is actually disposed of, I can't comment on that. 25 A. Wash, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 26 A. WR. GOULDING: 27 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 28 MR. GOULDING: 39 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 30 A. GOWORTHY: 31 A. That's correct. 31 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 31 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 32 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 34 A. GOULDING: 35 A. Yeah. I don't know of that level of detail in the deferral account. 36 A. Uh-hm. 37 A. D. Han't so oreet. 38 MR. GOULDING: 39 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDIN	5	account in relation to the fuel conversion	4	5	-	
7 the RSF? 8 should be taking into account in deciding how that aspect of the balances in the deferral account should be disposed of? 11 MR. GOULDING: 12 A. I really can't presume what the Board would ask for. There are - it may follow the same format as our current RSP, I really can't. 15 assume what the Board will ask for. 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the actual experience in terms of fuel content. 18 actual experience in terms of fuel content. 19 BTU content, I'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel as opposed to what's projected or forecast in the test year, is that a factor that ought to be taken into account? 18 A. That's a factor that ought to account is actually disposed of, I can't comment on that. 19 A. That's a factor that will influence on the account is actually disposed of, I can't comment on that. 19 A. WR. COXWORTHY: 20 C. I want to contrast that, though, with the impact of a different BTU content in terms of what happens next in terms of the deferral account. 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 22 MR. GOULDING: 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the account is actually disposed of, I can't comment on that. 25 A. Wash, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 26 A. WR. GOULDING: 27 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 28 MR. GOULDING: 39 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 30 A. GOWORTHY: 31 A. That's correct. 31 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 31 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 32 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 34 A. GOULDING: 35 A. Yeah. I don't know of that level of detail in the deferral account. 36 A. Uh-hm. 37 A. D. Han't so oreet. 38 MR. GOULDING: 39 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDIN	6	factor, and that factor differing from test	1	6		
that aspect of the balances in the deferral account should be disposed of? 11 MR, GOULDING: 12 A. I really can't presume what the Board would ask for. There are - it may follow the same is format as our current RSP, I really can't assume what the Board will ask for. 15 assume what the Board will ask for. 16 MR, COXWORTHY: 17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the actual experience in terms of fuel content, in sorry, in the Holyrood fuel as opposed to what's projected or forecast in the test year, is that a factor that ought to be taken into account? 23 MR, GOULDING: 23 MR, GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the actual fuel performance. Whether or not it 25 MR, GOXWORTHY: 26 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point, oh, but if that happens, that there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, but if that happens, that fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can that the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can that the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us m	7		7	7	-	
10 MR_COXWORTHY: 11 MR_GOULDING: 12 A. I really can't presume what the Board would 13 ask for. There are -it may follow the same 14 format as our current RSP, I really can't 15 assume what the Board will ask for. 16 MR_COXWORTHY: 17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the 18 actual experience in terms of fuel content, 19 BTU content, I'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel 20 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in 21 the test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 be taken into account? 23 MR_GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 25 actual fuel performance. Whether or not it 26 what happens then, none of that is defined 27 acount is actually disposed of, I can't 28 comment on that. 4 MR_COXWORTHY: 29 (J. want to contrast that, though, with the impact of a different BTU content in terms of the effect on the fuel efficiency factor. 17 That's not going - well, it's going to be captured in the deferral account, but in terms of what happens next in terms o	8	should be taking into account in deciding how	8	8 N	MR. GOULDING:	
11 MR. GOULDING:	9	that aspect of the balances in the deferral	و	9	A. That's correct.	
12 A. I really can't presume what the Board would 13 ask for. There are -it may follow the same 14 format as our current RSP, Treally can't 15 assume what the Board will ask for. 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 19 BTU content, I'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel 20 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in 21 the test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 be taken into account? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 25 account is actually disposed of, I can't 26 cament on that. 27 Page 142 28 should be taken into account into how this 29 account is actually disposed of, I can't 30 comment on that. 40 MR. COXWORTHY: 50 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and 6 it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 70 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the 8 point that, sure, we have a contract for 9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 10 for higher heat content, and if that happens, 11 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 12 content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 13 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 14 content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 16 that where is the expectation that that should have 17 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays 18 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays 19 less. 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 22 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 the efficiency but he efficiency but he deferral account. 25 the deferral account. 26 that, whether it's a favourable in pact on the customers? 27 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 28 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 29 MR. GOULDING: 30 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding.	10	account should be disposed of?	10	0 N	MR. COXWORTHY:	
13 ask for. There are - it may follow the same format as our current RSP, I really can't to assume what the Board will ask for. 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the actual experience in terms of fuel content, I'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel as opposed to what's projected or forecast in to test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 be taken into account? 22 MR. GOULDING: 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that ought to 25 be taken into account? 25 MR. GOULDING: 26 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 26 account is actually disposed of, I can't 3 comment on that. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 O. One of the things I want to contrast here, and 6 it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for 9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 10 for higher heat content, and if that happens, that 11 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 16 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 17 to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. Humphries in relation to your role as part of the Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that hat end that contract if it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. GOULDING: 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 Unit may for business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that hat he posed to one of the other 24 panel members, and if that's the case - but 70 June 17 turns of the mached the point of the panel members, and if that's the case - but 70 June 17 turns of the mached the point of the panel members, and if that's the case - but 70 June 17 turns of the mached the point of the panel members, and if that's the case - but 70 June 17 turns of the mached the point of the panel members, and if that's the case - but 70 June 17 turns of the mached	11	MR. GOULDING:	11	1	Q. And the customers know how that's going to	
14 A. That's correct. 15 assume what the Board will ask for. 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the actual experience in terms of fuel content, 19 BTU content, 1'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel 20 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in 21 the test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 be taken into account? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 25 acrount is actually disposed of, I can't 3 comment on that. 25 A MR. GOULDING: 26 A MR. GOULDING: 27 That's not going - well, it's going to be 24 captured in the deferral account, but in terms of what happens then, none of that is defined 24 captured in the deferral account, but in terms of what happens next in terms of what happens then, none of that is defined 25 account is actually disposed of, I can't 3 comment on that. 28 A MR. GOWWORTHY: 29 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for 9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 10 for higher heat content, and if that happens, 11 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 12 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 13 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 17 to - and I think the relationship is under 18 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 19 turn to his evidence, You know, a higher heat 19 turn to his evidence, You know, a higher heat 19 turn to his evidence, You know, a higher heat 19 turn to his evidence, You know, a higher heat 19 turn to his evidence, You know, a higher heat 19 turn to his evidence, You know, a higher heat 19 turn to his evidence, You know, a	12	A. I really can't presume what the Board would	12	2	work?	
15 MR. COXWORTHY: 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the actual experience in terms of fuel content, 19 BTU content, 1°m sorry, in the Holytorod fuel 20 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in the test year, is that a factor that ought to 21 the test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 be taken into account? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the actual fuel performance. Whether or not it 25 actual fuel performance. Whether or not it 26 account is actually disposed of, I can't 2 account is actually disposed of, I can't 3 comment on that. 26 MR. COXWORTHY: 27 AMR. GOULDING: 28 AMR. GOULDING: 29 AMR. GOULDING: 20 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 24 captured in the deferral account, but in terms of what happens then, none of that is defined 2 that, whether it's a favourable or 3 unfavourable impact on the customers? 3 Comment on that. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and 6 it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for 4 Holytood fuel that allows for the opportunity 5 for higher heat content, and if that happens, that 5 fuer lise going to cost us more too. We can 14 fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 16 fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 17 to - and I think the relationship is under 18 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed to the fuel efficiency but he 18 fuel before a defined that. 18 A. Uh-hm. 19 MR. GOULDING: 19 MR. GOULDING: 20 That's going to cont in terms of the effect on the fuel efficiency fator. That's not edifficiency fator. That's not of that happens, 18 MR. GOULDING: 20 That's now of that level of detail in the deferral account. 21 MR. GOULDING: 22 MR. GOULDING: 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 That's he case - but 19 MR. GOULDING: 26	13	ask for. There are - it may follow the same	13	3 N	MR. GOULDING:	
16 MR. COXWORTHY: 17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the 18 actual experience in terms of fuel content, 19 BTU content, I'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel 20 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in 21 the test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 be taken into account? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 25 actual fuel performance. Whether or not it 26 actual fuel performance. Whether or not it 27 acomment on that. 28 MR. COXWORTHY: 29 That's not going - well, it's going to be 29 captured in the deferral account, but in terms 20 of what happens then, none of that is defined 21 in terms of what happens next in terms of 22 that, whether it's a favourable or 23 unfavourable impact on that. 24 MR. COXWORTHY: 25 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and 26 it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 27 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the 28 point that, sure, we have a contract for 29 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 29 for higher heat content, and if that happens, 20 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 21 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 22 to the feet on the fuel efficiency factor. 23 That's not going - well, it's going to be 24 captured in the deferral account, but in terms 25 of what happens next in terms of 26 that, whether it's a favourable or 27 unfavourable impact on the customers? 28 MR. GOULDING: 29 A. I. Hon't know that level of detail in the 29 deferral account. 20 A. I. Hon't know that level of detail will be 20 a Comment on that that should have 21 a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he 22 a favourable impact on fuel efficiency 29 that content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 29 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 29 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 29 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 29 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 29 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 29 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 29 turn to his e	14	format as our current RSP, I really can't	14	4	A. That's correct.	
17 Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the actual experience in terms of fuel content, I'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel 20 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in the test year, is that a factor that ought to 21 the test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 be taken into account? 22 the effect on the fuel efficiency factor. 23 MR. GOULDING: 23 That's not going - well, it's going to be 24 captured in the deferral account, but in terms of 25 of what happens then, none of that is defined 26 account is actually disposed of, I can't 27 comment on that. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 28 quantity disposed of, I can't 29 defends a five whether of this September 23rd evidence, is he made the 29 point that, sure, we have a contract for 29 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 20 for higher heat content, and if that happens, 11 there's the expectation that that should have 21 a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he 30 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 30 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 31 think the relationship is under 32 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 34 fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 35 furnity turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 36 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 36 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 37 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 38 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 39 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 39 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 39 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 39 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 39 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 39 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 39 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 39 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 39 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 39 function fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 39 function fuel in the deferral account. 30 function	15	assume what the Board will ask for.	15	5 M	MR. COXWORTHY:	
18 actual experience in terms of fuel content, 19 BTU content, 1°m sorry, in the Holyrood fuel 20 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in 21 the test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 the testen into account? 23 MR. GOULDING: 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 25 actual fuel performance. Whether or not it 25 doubt be taken into account into how this 26 account is actually disposed of, I can't 27 comment on that. 28 should be taken into account into how this 29 account is actually disposed of, I can't 30 comment on that. 30 comment on that. 31 in terms of what happens next in terms of 32 that, whether it's a favourable or 33 unfavourable impact on the customers? 34 MR. GOULDING: 35 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 39 corry, I missed the last part of your answer. 39 MR. GOULDING: 30 Corry, I missed the last part of your answer. 30 C. Than's not going a well, it's going to be 24 captured in the deferral account, but in terms of what happens then, none of that is defined 26 that, whether it's a favourable or 30 unfavourable impact on the customers? 30 Coulding: 30 Coulding account in terms of 30 Coulding account, but in terms of 30 Captured in the deferral account, but in terms of 40 that, whether it's a favourable or 31 unfavourable impact on the customers? 30 Coulding account in terms of 40 that, whether it's a favourable or 32 Coulding account in terms of 50 that, whether it's a favourable or 33 unfavourable impact on the customers? 34 MR. GOULDING: 30 Corry, I missed the last part of your answer. 34 MR. GOULDING: 30 Corry, I missed the last part of your answer. 34 MR. GOULDING: 30 Corry, I missed the last part of your answer. 35 Corry, I missed the last part of your answer. 36 Coulding I'd like to move on 40 to 30 Coulding I'd like to move on 40 to 30 Coulding I'd like to move on 40 Coulding I'd like to move	16	MR. COXWORTHY:	16	6	Q. Because the RSP rules define that.	
19 BTU content, I'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel 20 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in 21 the test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 be taken into account? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 25 actual fuel performance. Whether or not it 26 should be taken into account into how this 27 a comment on that. 28 MR. COXWORTHY: 30 Q. I want to contrast that, though, with the impact of a different BTU content in terms of the effect on the fuel efficiency factor. 29 That's not going - well, it's going to be captured in the deferral account, but in terms of what happens then, none of that is defined Page 142 In the test year, is that a factor that ought to the effect on the fuel efficiency factor. 29 That's not going - well, it's going to be captured in the deferral account, but in terms of what happens then, none of that is defined Page 144 In the test year, is that a factor that ought to the effect on the fuel efficiency factor. 29 That's not going - well, it's going to be captured in the deferral account, but in terms of what happens ten, none of that is defined Page 144 In the COXWORTHY: 30 Q. No of the things I want to contrast here, and it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for 9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity for higher heat content, and if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have 11 a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, but if that happens, that fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 12 a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he included in the deferral account. 19 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 21 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 22 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on to a different BTU content in terms of the twelf or what happens hex. In terms of what happens hex. In terms of what hap	17	Q. So, for instance, if you were asked should the	17	7 M	MR. GOULDING:	
20 as opposed to what's projected or forecast in the test year, is that a factor that ought to 22 be taken into account? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 25 actual fuel performance. Whether or not it 25 account is actually disposed of, I can't 2 account is actually disposed of, I can't 3 comment on that. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and 6 it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 7 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for 9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 10 for higher heat content, and if that happens, that 11 there's the expectation that that should have 12 a favourable impact on the customers? 13 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays 18 less. 14 MR. GOULDING: 15 Q. David the test year, is that a factor that ought to 2 the effect on the fuel efficiency factor. 16 That's not going - well, it's going to be 2 captured in the deferral account, but in terms of what happens then, none of that is defined 1 in terms of what happens next in terms of what happens then, none of that is defined 2 that, whether it's a favourable or unfavourable impact on the customers? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 11 I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to	18	actual experience in terms of fuel content,	18	8	A. Uh-hm.	
the test year, is that a factor that ought to be taken into account? MR.GOULDING: A. That's a factor that will influence on the actual fuel performance. Whether or not it Page 142 should be taken into account into how this a account is actually disposed of, I can't a comment on that. MR.COXWORTHY: Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity for higher heat content, and if that happens, that there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he tit was done by Mr. Denote the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he too there's the expectation that that should have to content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can too and I think the relationship is under to - and I think the relationship is under to - and I think the relationship is under that contract if it's below spec, Hydro - 20 MR. GOULDING: MR.GOULDING: 21 A. That's not going - well, it's going to be captured in the deferral account, but in terms of what happens then, none of that is defined Page 142 1 in terms of what happens next in terms of that, whether it's a favourable or unfavourable impact on the customers? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 11 Included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 15 Humphries in relation to your role as part of the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien asked you some questions about this yesterday. 16 MR. GOULDING: 17 Hask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have	19	BTU content, I'm sorry, in the Holyrood fuel	19	9 M	MR. COXWORTHY:	
be taken into account? That's not going - well, it's going to be A. That's a factor that will influence on the actual fuel performance. Whether or not it Page 142 should be taken into account into how this account is actually disposed of, I can't comment on that. MR. COXWORTHY: Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity for higher heat content, and if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he included in the deferral account. MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: One of the things I want to contrast here, and it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity for higher heat content, and if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency by the included in the deferral account. MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COYWORTHY: MR. COYWORTHY: MR. GOULDING: A If it's below spec, Hydro - MR. GOULDING: MR. GOULDING: A If it's below spec, Hydro - MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COYWORTHY: M	20	as opposed to what's projected or forecast in	20	.0	Q. I want to contrast that, though, with the	
23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the 25 actual fuel performance. Whether or not it 26 Page 142 1 should be taken into account into how this 2 account is actually disposed of, I can't 3 comment on that. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and 6 it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 7 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the 8 point that, sure, we have a contract for 9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 10 for higher heat content, and if that happens, that 11 a made the point, oh, but if that happens, that 12 a favourable impact on the customers? 13 MR. GOULDING: 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the 6 deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be 11 included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. That's not going - well, it's going to be 14 captured in the deferral account, but in terms of what happens then, none of that is defined 1 in terms of what happens next in terms of that, whether it's a favourable or 1 unfavourable impact on the customers? 4 MR. GOULDING: 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the 6 deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be 11 included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 14 to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 15 Humphries in relation to your role as part of 16 the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien 17 asked you some questions about this yesterday. 18 Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge 19 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 19 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 19 question that he posed to one of the other 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Q. In terms	21	the test year, is that a factor that ought to	21	.1	impact of a different BTU content in terms of	
24 A. That's a factor that will influence on the actual fuel performance. Whether or not it 25 of what happens then, none of that is defined Page 142 1 should be taken into account into how this 2 account is actually disposed of, I can't 3 comment on that. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and 6 it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 7 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the 8 point that, sure, we have a contract for 9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 10 for higher heat content, and if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have 12 a favourable impact on the customers? 11 merve's the expectation that that should have 13 made the point, oh, but if that happens, that 14 fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed 17 to - and I think the relationship is under 18 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays 19 less. 10 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 Panel members, and if that's he case - but 11 lask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	22	be taken into account?	22	2	the effect on the fuel efficiency factor.	
25 actual fuel performance. Whether or not it Page 142 1 should be taken into account into how this account is actually disposed of, I can't account is actually disposed of, I can't account is actually disposed of, I can't account in that. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity for higher heat content, and if that happens, that a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, but if that happens, that fuel is going to cost us more too. We can the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can to - and I think the relationship is under that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays less. 2 manuel fuel performance. Whether or not it account into how this account in the fuel is going to cost us more too. We can to - and I think the relationship is under that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays less. 2 manuel fuel performance. Page 144 In in terms of what happens next in terms of that, whether it's a favourable or unfavourable impact on the customers? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 14 Humphries in relation to your role as part of the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien asked you some questions about this yesterday. Mr. O'Brien asked you some questions about this yesterday. Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that he posed to one of the other	23	MR. GOULDING:	23	3	That's not going - well, it's going to be	
Page 142 1 should be taken into account into how this 2 account is actually disposed of, I can't 3 comment on that. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and 6 it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 7 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the 8 point that, sure, we have a contract for 9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 10 for higher heat content, and if that happens, 11 there's the expectation that that should have 12 a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he 13 made the point, oh, but if that happens, that 14 fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed 16 content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed 17 to - and I think the relationship is under 18 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays 19 less. 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of what happens next in terms of 2 that, whether it's a favourable or 3 unfavourable impact on the customers? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be 11 included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 14 to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 15 Humphries in relation to your role as part of 16 the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien 17 asked you some questions about this yesterday. 18 Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge 19 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 18 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 19 question that he posed to one of the other 20 panel members, and if that's the case - but 21 I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of 24 MR. GOULDING:	24	A. That's a factor that will influence on the	24	4	captured in the deferral account, but in terms	
should be taken into account into how this account is actually disposed of, I can't comment on that. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity for higher heat content, and if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, but if that happens, that fuel is going to cost us more too. We can turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed to - and I think the relationship is under to - and I think the relationship is under less. MR. GOULDING: 1 In terms of what happens next in terms of 2 that, whether it's a favourable or 3 unfavourable impact on the customers? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 14 to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed 17 to - and I think the relationship is under 18 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays 19 less. 19 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 20 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 21 question that he posed to one of the other 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 26 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. COXWORTHY: 28 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 29 MR. GOULDING: 28 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 29 MR. GOULDING: 30 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 4 the deferral account. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. Thank you, Mr. Gou	25	actual fuel performance. Whether or not it	25	.5	of what happens then, none of that is defined	
should be taken into account into how this account is actually disposed of, I can't comment on that. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity for higher heat content, and if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, but if that happens, that fuel is going to cost us more too. We can turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed to - and I think the relationship is under to - and I think the relationship is under less. MR. GOULDING: 1 In terms of what happens next in terms of 2 that, whether it's a favourable or 3 unfavourable impact on the customers? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 14 to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed 17 to - and I think the relationship is under 18 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays 19 less. 19 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 20 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 21 question that he posed to one of the other 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 26 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. COXWORTHY: 28 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 29 MR. GOULDING: 28 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 29 MR. GOULDING: 30 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 4 the deferral account. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. Thank you, Mr. Gou		Page 142			Page	144
2 account is actually disposed of, I can't comment on that. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity for higher heat content, and if that happens, the there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, but if that happens, that furn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost us more too. We can to - and I think the relationship is under to - and I think the relationship is under less. 2 that, whether it's a favourable or unfavourable impact on the customers? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. Humphries in relation to your role as part of the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien asked you some questions about this yesterday. 14 MR. GOULDING: 15 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 16 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 18 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 19 MR. COXWORTHY: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 14 Humphries in relation to your role as part of the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien asked you some questions about this yesterday. 15 MR. GOULDING: 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 MR. COXWORTHY: 19 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 10 A. I don't know of that	1	•		1		
3 comment on that. 4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and 6 it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 7 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the 8 point that, sure, we have a contract for 9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 10 for higher heat content, and if that happens, 11 there's the expectation that that should have 12 a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he 13 made the point, oh, but if that happens, that 14 fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed 17 to - and I think the relationship is under 18 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays 19 less. 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 3 unfavourable impact on the customers? 4 MR. GOULDING: 5 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 17 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 19 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 10 A. I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 11 deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 14 to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 15 Humphries in relation to your role as part of 16 the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien 17 asked you some questions about this yesterday. 18 Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge 19 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 20 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 21 question that he posed to one of the other 22 panel members, and if that's the case - but 23 I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of 24 MR. GOULDING:	2	account is actually disposed of, I can't	2	2		
4 MR. COXWORTHY: 5 Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and 6 it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 7 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the 8 point that, sure, we have a contract for 9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 10 for higher heat content, and if that happens, 11 there's the expectation that that should have 12 a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he 13 made the point, oh, but if that happens, that 14 fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed 17 to - and I think the relationship is under 18 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays 19 less. 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 panel members, and if that's the case - but 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know that level of detail in the deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 11 La don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 14 to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 15 Humphries in relation to your role as part of 16 the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien 17 asked you some questions about this yesterday. 18 Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge 19 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 20 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 21 question that he posed to one of the other 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING:	3	comment on that.	3	3	unfavourable impact on the customers?	
it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91 of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity for higher heat content, and if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, but if that happens, that fuel is going to cost us more too. We can turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed to - and I think the relationship is under to - and I think the relationship is under that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays less. Mr. GOULDING: 6 deferral account. 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 14 to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 15 Humphries in relation to your role as part of 16 the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien 17 asked you some questions about this yesterday. 18 Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge 19 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 20 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 GROWAGE HY: 26 DROWAGE HY: 27 DROWAGE HY: 28 Q. SORTY, I missed the last part of your answer. 29 MR. GOULDING: 20 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be 11 included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 14 to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 15 Humphries in relation to your role as part of 16 the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien 17 asked you some questions about this yesterday. 18 Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge 19 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 20 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 21 question that he posed to one of the other 22 panel members, and if that's	4	MR. COXWORTHY:	4	4 N	MR. GOULDING:	
of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the point that, sure, we have a contract for Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity for higher heat content, and if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, but if that happens, that fuel is going to cost us more too. We can turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays less. Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that he posed to one of the other 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 8 Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer. 9 MR. GOULDING: 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 14 to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 15 Humphries in relation to your role as part of 16 the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien 17 asked you some questions about this yesterday. 18 Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge 19 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 20 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 21 question that he posed to one of the other 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 MR. GOULDING: 26 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. COXWORTHY: 28 Q. In terms of BTU content? 29 MR. COXWORTHY: 29 MR. GOULDING: 20 Day out charge out any of 21 your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	5	Q. One of the things I want to contrast here, and	4	5	A. Yeah, I don't know that level of detail in the	
8 point that, sure, we have a contract for 9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 10 for higher heat content, and if that happens, 11 there's the expectation that that should have 12 a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he 13 made the point, oh, but if that happens, that 14 fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed 17 to - and I think the relationship is under 18 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays 19 less. 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be 11 included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 14 to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 15 Humphries in relation to your role as part of 16 the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien 17 asked you some questions about this yesterday. 18 Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge 19 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 20 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 26 Dusiness, or it may have been, in fairness, a 27 I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of 28 your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	6	it was done by Mr. Henderson at page 90 and 91	1	6	deferral account.	
9 Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity 10 for higher heat content, and if that happens, 11 there's the expectation that that should have 12 a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he 13 made the point, oh, but if that happens, that 14 fuel is going to cost us more too. We can 15 turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat 16 content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed 17 to - and I think the relationship is under 18 that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays 19 less. 20 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 panel members, and if that's the case - but 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 29 MR. GOULDING: 20 MR. GOULDING: 21 a. I don't know of that level of detail will be 10 A. I don't know of that level of detail will be 11 included in the deferral account. 12 MR. COXWORTHY: 13 Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on 14 to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. 15 Humphries in relation to your role as part of 16 the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien 17 asked you some questions about this yesterday. 18 Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge 19 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 20 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 21 question that he posed to one of the other 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 MR. GOULDING: 26 MR. GOULDING: 27 MR. GOULDING: 28 MR. GOULDING: 8 MR. GOULDING: 9 MR. GOULDING:	7	of his September 23rd evidence, is he made the	7	7 N	MR. COXWORTHY:	
for higher heat content, and if that happens, there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, but if that happens, that fuel is going to cost us more too. We can turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed to - and I think the relationship is under to - and I think the relationship is under less. Mr. GOULDING: MR. GOULDING: A. I don't know of that level of detail will be included in the deferral account. MR. COXWORTHY: Double It included in the deferral account. MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: Double It included in the deferral account. MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: Double It included in the deferral account. MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: Double It included in the deferral account. MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTH	8	point that, sure, we have a contract for	1	8	Q. Sorry, I missed the last part of your answer.	
there's the expectation that that should have a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, but if that happens, that fuel is going to cost us more too. We can turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed to - and I think the relationship is under that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays less. Mr. O'Brien asked you some questions about this yesterday. Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that that should have included in the deferral account. MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORTHY: Shoulding. I'd like to move on to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. Humphries in relation to your role as part of the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien asked you some questions about this yesterday. Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that he posed to one of the other question that he posed to one of the other panel members, and if that's the case - but I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	9	Holyrood fuel that allows for the opportunity	و	9 N	MR. GOULDING:	
a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he made the point, oh, but if that happens, that fuel is going to cost us more too. We can turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed to - and I think the relationship is under that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays less. MR. COXWORTHY: MR. COXWORT	10	for higher heat content, and if that happens,	10	0	A. I don't know of that level of detail will be	
made the point, oh, but if that happens, that fuel is going to cost us more too. We can turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed to - and I think the relationship is under that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays less. Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that he posed to one of the other panel members, and if that's the case - but I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the Nalcor lines, as part of to a different area and perhaps start with Mr. Humphries in relation to your role as part of the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien asked you some questions about this yesterday. Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that he posed to one of the other panel members, and if that's the case - but I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	11	there's the expectation that that should have	11	1	included in the deferral account.	
fuel is going to cost us more too. We can turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed to - and I think the relationship is under that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays less. Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that he posed to one of the other lines of the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien asked you some questions about this yesterday. Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that he posed to one of the other panel members, and if that's the case - but I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	12	a favourable impact on fuel efficiency, but he	12	2 M	MR. COXWORTHY:	
turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed to - and I think the relationship is under that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays less. Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that he posed to one of the other panel members, and if that's the case - but I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of	13	made the point, oh, but if that happens, that	13	3	Q. Thank you, Mr. Goulding. I'd like to move on	
to - and I think the relationship is under that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays less. Mr. O'Brien asked you some questions about this yesterday. Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that he posed to one of the other panel members, and if that's the case - but I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	14	fuel is going to cost us more too. We can	14	4	to a different area and perhaps start with Mr.	
to - and I think the relationship is under that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays less. Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that he posed to one of the other panel members, and if that's the case - but I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	15	turn to his evidence. You know, a higher heat	15	5	Humphries in relation to your role as part of	
that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays less. Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charge out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that he posed to one of the other panel members, and if that's the case - but I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	16	content fuel is going to cost more, as opposed	16	6	the Nalcor leadership team, and Mr. O'Brien	
19 less. 19 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 20 MR. GOULDING: 20 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 29 out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of 20 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a 21 question that he posed to one of the other 22 panel members, and if that's the case - but 23 I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of 24 your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	17	to - and I think the relationship is under	17	7	asked you some questions about this yesterday.	
20 MR. GOULDING: 21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 20 business, or it may have been, in fairness, a question that he posed to one of the other panel members, and if that's the case - but I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	18	that contract if it's below spec, Hydro pays	18	8	Mr. O'Brien asked you whether you ever charg	ge
21 A. If it's below spec, Hydro - 22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 21 question that he posed to one of the other 22 panel members, and if that's the case - but 23 I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of 24 your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	19	less.	19	9	out any of your time to other Nalcor lines of	
22 MR. COXWORTHY: 23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 25 panel members, and if that's the case - but I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	20	MR. GOULDING:	20	.0	business, or it may have been, in fairness, a	
23 Q. In terms of BTU content? 24 MR. GOULDING: 23 I'll ask it of you. Do you charge out any of your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	21	A. If it's below spec, Hydro -	21	.1	question that he posed to one of the other	
24 MR. GOULDING: 24 your time, Mr. Humphries, as part of the	22	MR. COXWORTHY:	22	.2	panel members, and if that's the case - but	
	23	Q. In terms of BTU content?	23	.3	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
25 A. Hydro pays less, but that lower price is 25 Nalcor leadership team to other Nalcor lines	24	MR. GOULDING:	24	.4	*	
	25	A. Hydro pays less, but that lower price is	25	.5	Nalcor leadership team to other Nalcor lines	

October 21, 2015 Multi		age ML Hydro GRA
	Page 145	Page 147
1 of business?	1	A. Both, Lower and Upper.
2 MR. HUMPHRIES:	2	MR. COXWORTHY:
3 A. A very small amount.	3	Q. Sure, okay, where you might be called upon and
4 MR. COXWORTHY:	4	what are you being called upon to do in those
5 Q. And that, I think, was the sort of answer	we 5	circumstances when you're - this is outside
6 heard from other panel members, but it of	does 6	
7 happen?	7	or there maybe I'm misunderstanding that?
8 MR. HUMPHRIES:	8	MR. HUMPHRIES:
9 A. It does happen, yes.	9	A. Yeah, it would be outside. Some of the things
10 MR. COXWORTHY:	10	that are going on particularly possibly in the
11 Q. We've heard there's time sheets that a	re 11	
completed, and is that done - when you do	o it, 12	
is that how it's recorded?	13	
14 MR. HUMPHRIES:	14	MR. COXWORTHY:
15 A. Yes, it is.	15	Q. So you don't charge them out to the Lower
16 MR. COXWORTHY:	16	
Q. And can you give us - if it's a small, if it'	s 17	MR. HUMPHRIES:
not something that doesn't happen very o		A. No.
can you give me an example of where the		MR. COXWORTHY:
20 happened?	20	Q. Or any of the other - you charge it out
21 MR. HUMPHRIES:	21	directly to Nalcor?
22 A. Well, through the Nalcor leadership team	there 22	MR. HUMPHRIES:
may be portions of a meeting that I determ		A. Now I do. In my previous role, it would go
of my own assessment that's not Hydro re		* *
25 There may be - occasionally there might l	be an 25	executive, they go to Nalcor.
	Page 146	Page 148
issue that I would get involved with wi	_	MR. COXWORTHY:
2 Churchill Falls, for argument sake, and		
would charge that, and for the most part.		
4 think those would be -	,	
5 MR. COXWORTHY:	5	sort of stuff gets charged to Nalcor?
6 Q. So these are the monthly meetings that yo	ou're 6	MR. HUMPHRIES:
7 referring to?	7	-
8 MR. HUMPHRIES:		MR. COXWORTHY:
9 A. Yes.	9	
10 MR. COXWORTHY:		MR. HUMPHRIES:
11 Q. So there might be a discreet part of tha		
meeting that's relating to issues other that		MR. COXWORTHY:
13 Hydro?	13	
14 MR. HUMPHRIES:	14	
15 A. Sure.	15	
16 MR. COXWORTHY:		MR. HUMPHRIES:
Q. Or at least directly to Hydro, and you wo	ould 17	A. Yes, I would have.
charge that time out to Nalcor?		MR. COXWORTHY:
19 MR. HUMPHRIES:	19	
20 A. Yes, it goes to Nalcor.	20	
21 MR. COXWORTHY:	21	could go to the footnote at the bottom, and
22 Q. And then there are other sometimes disc	creet 22	_
projects like Churchill Falls - you're	23	
referring to Lower Churchill?	24	entities that were added to Nalcor's legal
25 MR. HUMPHRIES:	25	entity structure in 2014, and I'm not going to

Page 149 Page 151 1 MR. HUMPHRIES: 1 recite them all, but I think some of them, 2 maybe all of them are in relation to the A. Well, right now when you look at the ready for integration role that's here, and that's now a 3 Muskrat Falls project and the Maritime link, 3 and the associated projects. First of all, Hydro role, the bulk of that, is Hydro, this 4 4 is a separate business unit there that the 5 I'll ask you have you done any work, provided 5 any advice, services in relation to any of people in this business unit, they're over 6 6 these? embedded in the Lower Churchill Project, they 7 7 may end up charging out portions of their time 8 MR. HUMPHRIES: 8 to the project, and that would be based on if A. Yes. I have. 9 10 there were a request from the project team to 10 MR. COXWORTHY: provide information or support that's directly 11 Q. And if you do, does that get charged to Nalcor 11 related to the project development, there 12 or is that -12 13 MR. HUMPHRIES: would be a charge out. The actual integration 13 work, that's all being captured now in that 14 A. The majority of that would be Nalcor. There 14 business unit. That wasn't always the case. may be exceptions that's Hydro related. 15 15 16 MR. COXWORTHY: 16 In the earlier stage, we would have significantly charged out time towards the Q. How do you decide when to make an exception to 17 17 charge to Nalcor and not to charge to Nalcor? project. 18 18 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: 19 MR. COXWORTHY: A. Well, after - I guess, I keep a daily Q. So why did that change, why did it change from 20 20 charging the time out to Nalcor to not? 21 schedule, meeting schedules, and after I do an 21 22 assessment myself, I make a note whether 22 MR. HUMPHRIES: 23 that's 100 percent Nalcor, or if there were 23 A. Well, it's - I think it's the evolution of the some Hydro involvement. It's my own judgment project and the development. The earlier 24 24 involvement were all, for the most part, 25 used in that. 25 Page 152 Page 150 activities that these Hydro employees were 1 MR. COXWORTHY: 1 Q. And I don't know that we need to go to it, 2 providing to allow the project people to do perhaps we do, PUB-NLH-409, sets out sort of what they had to do to build and construct the 3 3 project. Now we're getting more into the the tree for your group? 4 4 5 MR. HUMPHRIES: 5 interconnection type issues that are outside of the scope of the actual project. A. Yes. 6 6 7 MR. COXWORTHY: 7 MR. COXWORTHY: Q. And would other persons within that group also Q. And can you help me in understanding what the 8 8 be charging in time to Nalcor in relation to 9 difference is between those two aspects of the 9 work being done by those entities on page 5 of work beyond what you've just said, perhaps as 10 10 11 Mr. Rolph's Report? 11 an example? 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 A. There is - yes, there would be a small amount, 13 A. Well, other than one, there's a scope of work that's defined for the Lower Churchill 14 yes. 14 Project, and then there are integration items 15 MR. COXWORTHY: 15 Q. When you say "small amount", are you able above and beyond that that are not in the 16 16 I'll give you some context. When we were 17 17 project scope. speaking to, for instance, the HROE panel, 18 18 MR. COXWORTHY: 19 they were able to sort of give a percentage in Q. And the scope of work for the Lower Churchill 19 terms of 50 percent of time spent on Project you're referring to, where would we 20 20 integration as opposed to perhaps on smoothing find that scope, the scope that you would 21 21 else, so in very broad terms, when you say "a refer to to decide whether something was Hydro 22 22 small amount of time", in terms of your time, interface work as opposed to Lower Churchill 23 23 can you give us any order of magnitude in 24 24 scope of work? 25 terms of percentage of time? 25 MR. HUMPHRIES:

Page 153 Page 155 Integration, who was formerly our Manager of 1 A. There is a basis of design document for the 1 2 Lower Churchill Project, and that would cover 2 Transmission Planning, and so the bulk of the integration issues are around the transmission 3 the work items that are included in the 3 planning function and the system operation 4 overall project estimate, and so we would rely 4 5 back - fall back on that. 5 function. So the two managers remaining in system operations and transmission planning 6 MR. COXWORTHY: 6 still continue to support Mr. Thomas in his O. And how would that distinction between the 7 7 8 Lower Churchill scope of work and what I'll 8 activities. call Hydro interface work as distinguished 9 MR. COXWORTHY: 9 10 from it, how would that have been communicated Q. And correct me if I'm mischaracterizing this, 10 but obviously the Manager of Ready for 11 to other people within the systems operations 11 12 and planning tree on PUB-NLH-409? 12 Integration is a relatively new position? 13 MR. HUMPHRIES: 13 MR. HUMPHRIES: 14 A. Well, these people that if they are completing 14 A. It's a new position. 15 MR. COXWORTHY: 15 activities that are related to the Lower 16 Churchill scope of work, they do have work 16 Q. So has some of the integration work that was being done by the other two managers sort of orders that they can charge it back to. 17 17 migrated to that group? 18 MR. COXWORTHY: 18 19 Q. So they would go by whatever work order number 19 MR. HUMPHRIES: A. Yes, it has. 20 they're working on? 20 21 MR. HUMPHRIES: 21 MR. COXWORTHY: 22 A. Yes, that's right. 22 O. But that doesn't mean that those other two 23 23 MR. COXWORTHY: managers don't do any integration support any Q. And they're completing time sheets as well? 24 25 MR. HUMPHRIES: 25 MR. HUMPHRIES: Page 154 Page 156 A. Yes. A. That's correct. 1 2 MR. COXWORTHY: 2 MR. COXWORTHY: Q. Again referring to PUB-NLH-409, and looking at 3 3 Q. Mr. Chair, we are going to move on to another the ling of management just below your area of questioning, but it's another area of 4 4 5 yourself, Mr. Humphries, the four managers, 5 questioning in respect to an entirely can you explain to me - and I see with two of different area, discreet area, and I'm going 6 6 them, in addition to manager system 7 7 to ask my colleague, Mr. Porter, to spell me 8 operations, there are also integration 8 and pursue that particular line of 9 support. Is that integration support this 9 questioning. Hydro interface with the project or is it 10 10 CHAIRMAN: 11 something different? 11 Q. Certainly. 12 MR. HUMPHRIES: 12 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PORTER: 13 A. Yes, and there's a bit of an evolution there. 13 MR. COXWORTHY: If you go back in early 2012/2103 time frame, Q. Thank you, Mr. Chair. You'll be glad to know 14 14 15 the Manager for Ready for Integration didn't this should be relatively short. My interest, 15 exist, and the Manager of System Operations 16 I guess, is quickly reviewing how the Corner 16 17 and the Manager of Transmission Planning had 17 Brook Pulp and Paper, the O & M charge related an integration support in their titles as 18 18 to the Corner Brook Pulp and Paper frequency 19 well, and they were providing - and at that 19 converter is calculated, I guess, and further time they were probably doing - their level of 20 20 how the anticipated O & M charge is involvement was higher, they were providing 21 21 communicated to the industrial customers, such 22 more of this project type support. As we've 22 as Corner Brook Pulp and Paper. I understand moved through the project development and we 23 from the issues list that this panel is tasked 23 24 get into the real integration, we formed this 24 with addressing the frequency converter, and 25 separate group with the Manager of Ready for 25 when Mr. Coxworthy, I guess, back on September

October 21, 2015 Page 157 Page 159 24th asked Mr. Darren Moore if anyone was 1 MR. PORTER: 1 specifically assigned to liaise with, 2 Q. Okay, so six years as plant manager, okay. communicate with, and deal with Corner Brook And I think you said at page 8 that all 3 3 Pulp and Paper issues, Mr. Moore advised that aspects of operations, including safety and 4 4 the systems operations group had direct environment to operations and maintenance 5 5 accountability to liaise with the industrial would have been within your purview. 6 6 7 customers. Is there anybody within your group 7 A. That's correct. that's specifically assigned to deal with 8 8 MR. PORTER: Corner Brook Pulp and Paper? Q. Okay, and that's essentially the role now 10 MR. HUMPHRIES: 10 filed by Mr. Larry Marks, is that correct? A. Well I guess there are two levels of interface 11 MR. GOULDING: 11 with, from this group with the industrial 12 12 A. That's correct. Now Mr. Marks, he has a duel customers. One would be through system 13 role, I guess, he's overseeing--again I don't 13 operations, Mr. Goulding's group, they would know if I should be speaking for Mr. Marks, 14 14 interface on almost a day-to-day type basis, but he's overseeing the operation, the energy 15 15 16 operationally. And as well, Mr. Stratton also 16 operations in Deer Lake, as well as the energy interfaces and communicates with the operations down at the mill as well. 17 17 industrial customers on a regular basis to get 18 MR. PORTER: 18 updates on load forecasting information, 19 Q. Okay, so when you were in your role, I guess, changes in loads and those types of questions. at Deer Lake Power as plant manager, would you 20 20 21 MR. PORTER: have dealt with the issues related to the 21 22 Q. Okay, I'm interested in Mr. Goulding's 22 frequency converter? perspective because I think he brings a--he 23 23 MR. GOULDING: has a unique perspective on this issue, given A. Yes, that's correct. 24 his, I guess, work history. So I understand, 25 25 MR. PORTER: Page 160 Page 158 Mr. Goulding, from yesterday that you joined Q. Okay. So can you tell me now from your 1 1 Deer Lake Power in '95. 2 2 experience, what goes into the O&M charge, in broad strokes, for the frequency converter at 3 MR. GOULDING: 3 Corner Brook Pulp & Paper? A. That's correct. 4 5 MR. PORTER: 5 MR. GOULDING: Q. And then in 2001, you became the plant A. Again, I can't speak to the specifics of the 6 6 7 manager? 7 calculation. 8 MR. GOULDING: 8 MR. PORTER: A. That's correct, I may have said 2001, but in Q. Okay. reading my notes after, I should have said 10 MR. GOULDING: 10 11 2003, so that should be corrected. 11 A. But I understand that there is an O&M component and there's probably a depreciation 12 MR. PORTER: 12 component as well. 13 Q. That's fine. And then I understand you held 13 that position until 2009 when you rejoined 14 MR. PORTER: 14 15 Hydro? Q. Okay. 16 MR. GOULDING: 16 MR. GOULDING: 17 A. That's correct. 17 A. But I know when I first got to Deer Lake, I can't really comment on what our level of 18 MR. PORTER: 18 Q. Okay. So 2009, that would have been after the specifically assigned charges were at that 19 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

22 them as plant manager? 23 MR. GOULDING: 24 A. That would be from 2003 to 2009 as plant

20

21

manager. 25

last GRA, so for 14 years, you worked with

Deer Lake Power and so that would be six of

time, but they were certainly fairly low and

hadn't been a lot of expenditure that was

specifically assigned assets, and then it was

for a time after, I guess, again I'm getting

associated with the Corner Brook Pulp & Paper

that was basically a reflection that there

Oc	October 21, 2015 Mult		age TM	NL Hydro GRA
	Page 161			Page 163
1	lost in the timelines, but there would have	1	MR. 0	GOULDING:
2	been, say, I'm going to say from 2001 to 2009,	2	A.	That's correct.
3	there would have been a fair amount of	3	MR. I	PORTER:
4	expenditure required at that unit. It was in	4	Q.	In trying to calculate and even trying to
5	service for almost 40 years at the time as a	5		envision what the O&M -
6	rotating unit. Now it certainly would have	6	MR. (GOULDING:
7	required that amount of expenditure at that	7	A.	And in anticipation, I guess, of this
8	period.	8		question, I tried to find some correspondence,
9	MR. PORTER:	9		like I did request from Hydro and I can't find
10	Q. Sure. So let me take you back to, you know,	10		the correspondence, an estimate of what the
11	back to your career, I guess, as the plant	11		specifically assigned charge would be and I do
12	manager. Did anyone at Hydro approach you to	12		recall an estimate in the order of one million
13	explain, look, this is what your O&M is going	13		dollars at that time. Now I wouldn't have
14	to be, this is how it's going to be	14		been primarily dealing with this, in 2006
15	calculated, this is, you know, this is what	15		there was a power and energy manager appointed
16	you can expect? Do you recall any	16		at the mill.
17	conversations with Hydro in that regard?	17	MR. I	PORTER:
18	MR. GOULDING:	18	Q.	Is that Dave MacDonald?
19	A. I do recall that, you know, the O&M was a	19	MR. 0	GOULDING:
20	reflection on the age of the asseton the	20	A.	Yes, that is correct, now he would have been
21	level of expenditure to the asset, so I knew	21		the one that was frontline, per se, on the
22	that, you know, that it was low up until the	22		higher level talks with Hydro around that
23	time that the refurbishment program began and	23		unit.
24	I knew that Hydro was about to embark upon a	24	MR. I	PORTER:
25	refurbishment plan and I knew that that would	25	Q.	Okay.
	Page 162			Page 164
1	impact on specifically assigned charges in the	1	MR. 0	GOULDING:
2	end.	2	A.	So I'm assuming that a lot of this detail and
3	MR. PORTER:	3		a lot of this correspondence and discussion is
4	Q. Right, but I guess specifically my question	4		probably gone with him now, so he's no longer
5	is: did anyone from Hydro drop into the plant	5		with Corner Brook Pulp & Paper.
6	or pick up the phone and call you and say,	6		PORTER:
7	look, this is what your O&M is likely to be,	7		So on an ongoing basis is your group, like who
8	this is how it's calculated, this will get	8		liaises with the industrial customer group on
9	thrown into the pot?	9		the O&M issue, on an ongoing basis, is that
10	MR. GOULDING:	10		you or is that -
11	A. Hydro met with us, I guess, and I recall in			GOULDING:
12	2005 and that meeting was to basically roll	12		We are and I think it was in the previous
13	out the refurbishment plan. There were a	13		testimony, there is a move afoot now I guess
14	number of parties involved and going by memory	14		to establish and when the customer service
15	here now, but we would have been aware of what	15		panel appears, they will be able to give you
16	•	16		more detail on this, but there is a move to
	MR. PORTER:	17		establish like key managers or key account
18	Q. What the expenditure would be?	18		managers or key representatives and the
	MR. GOULDING:	19		industrial customers will fall in this area,
20	A. Uh-hm.	20		so I would expect that that person would be in
	MR. PORTER:	21		charge of relaying, you know, any information related to specifically assigned charges
22 23	Q. But I guess now I'm walking through to the O&M expense and I'm trying to get toI'm trying	22 23		certainly.
23				PORTER:
25		25		Okay. That would be great. I want to turn to
23	what wit. wants is going unough.	123	<u>Ų</u> .	Oxay. That would be great. I want to turn to

Oc	tober 21, 2015 Mult	i-P	age NL Hydro GRA
	Page 165		Page 167
1	IC-144 and I won't belabour this point too	1	MR. PORTER:
2	long, Mr. Goulding, because I understand that	2	Q. Yes. And if we turn to attachment 2 and if we
3	the actual calculation is outside your purview	3	actually go to page 3 of attachment 2, so this
4	probably, butin this RFI, I guess we had,	4	
5	the ICs had requested how many staff positions	5	
6	has Hydro budgeted for operating and	6	
7	maintenance activities at the Corner Brook	7	
8	frequency converter, the budgets for salaries	8	guess this is what the industrial customers
9	and supplies and I guess the response was that	9	are left with in trying to figure out what the
10	Hydro does not specifically budget staff	10	O&M cost is and what it's comprised of, and if
11	positions or supplies to Corner Brook	11	you look across from the second line, there is
12	frequency converter, the maintenance positions	12	\$164,400 which solely with the assistance of
13	for Corner Brook frequency converter are	13	Mr. Patrick Bowman, I was able to ascertain
14	included within the business unit for terminal	14	the FTEs and the supplies and maintenance
15	stations and the supplies are included within	15	cost, that's the 164,400. Below that, the
16	the generation interconnected business unit,	16	administrative and general overheads, if I
17	that also includes Stephenville and Hardwood's	17	total those up with other, it adds up to
18	gas turbines. I guess that led to IC-145.	18	1 2 1
19	MS. GRAY:	19	percent. Do you have any understanding of
20	Q. Revision 1, Mr. Porter?	20	whether simply Hydro allots 100 percent on top
21	MR. PORTER:	21	of the actual salaries and the maintenance
22	Q. Revision 1. And basically what we wanted to	22	
23	know is how had the cost for staffing,	23	3 1 2
24	maintenance or supplies changed since the last	24	factor of 100 percent gets thrown on top?
25	GRA and you'll note in the reply that there	25	MR. GOULDING:
	Page 166		Page 168
1	had been no change in the maintenance staff	1	A. The calculations that are built in here are
2	FTEs in the terminal station business group,	2	outside my area.
3	so that hasn't changed and with respect to	3	MR. PORTER:
4	maintenance materials and supplies, there's a	4	Q. Are outside your scope. Okay, is there any
5	table that shows that since 2007, in the 2015	5	explanation given to the industrial customers
6	test year it's only up, you know, a fairly	6	to your knowledge, because your group has the
7	modest amount, is the entire maintenance	7	direct accountability to liaise with the
8	materials and supplies for the generation	8	industrial customers, that would explain this
9	interconnected business unit. So we see a	9	in any form that they might understand? Is
10	very slight increase in the material and	10	that done at present to your knowledge?
11	supplies and none to the maintenance staff	11	MR. GOULDING:
12	FTEs, but Corner Brook Pulp & Paper's O&M	12	7 1
13	charge is increasing by 134 percent. Can you	13	•
14	explain how an industrial customer will be	14	•
15	able to square that circle? I mean, that is a	15	1
16	-	16	0 11
1	MR. GOULDING:		MR. PORTER:
18	A. Only to the extent that I understand from	18	
19	reading the past testimony that the O&M is not		MR. GOULDING:
20	a reflection of actual maintenance charges.	20	••
1	MR. PORTER:		MR. PORTER:
22	Q. Okay, so that leads me to the final, I guess,	22	
23	piece of the puzzle. If we go to IC-NLH-87 -	23	
1	MS. GRAY:	24	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
25	Q. Revision 1, Mr. Porter?	25	that there is, you know, some calculation such

Page 169 Page 171 as this that -CERTIFICATE 2 MR. GOULDING: 2 I, Judy Moss, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true A. I would have understood, you know, that the 3 and correct transcript of a hearing in the matter of maintenance component of it wasn't necessarily 4 Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's General Rate 4 tied to actual experience. 5 5 Application heard on the 21st of October, A.D., 2015 6 MR. PORTER: 6 before the Commissioners of the Public Utilities Board, 7 St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador and was transcribed o. Okay. 7 8 MR. GOULDING: 8 by me to the best of my ability by means of a sound A. And the fact that there was a new plant being 9 apparatus. installed, that that was going to correlate 10 Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador 10 into a lower O&M component. 11 this 21st day of October, A.D., 2015 11 12 MR. PORTER: 12 Judy Moss Q. Okay. Does this issue ever come up at any of 13 the joint utility meetings that you've ever 14 attended, does this issue -15 16 MR. GOULDING: A. Specifically assigned charges, I don't recall 17 specifically assigned charges, but we 18 certainly would have talked about, you know, 19 any capital expenditures that are planned. 20 21 MR. PORTER: 22 Q. Capital expenditures, okay. 23 MR. GOULDING: A. That's correct. 25 MR. PORTER: Page 170 Q. Okay, that's fine, I have no further 1 questions. 2 3 MR. COXWORTHY: Q. No further questions. 5 O'REILLY, Q.C.: Q. Mr. Chairman, I have some questions, I'm not 7 going to be lengthy, but I don't think I'm going to get finished in 15 minutes and I 8 9 understand that there are others here that are going to have questions, so we're not going to 10 11 finish -12 CHAIRMAN: Q. So are you saying we'll adjourn now, sir? 13 14 O'REILLY, Q.C.: Q. If that's the wish of the panel, yes. 16 CHAIRMAN: 17 Q. We are adjourned. 18 Upon concluding at 1:15 p.m.

6 [2] 69:10,16

15-minute[1] 61:13 -#-#17_[1] 119:24 -\$-**\$1,000** [1] 63:4 **\$164,400** [1] 167:12 **\$28** [2] 60:3 62:24 **\$500.000.00** [7] 23:25 24:2,5,7,13 26:10 138:22 **\$520,000** [2] 50:10 54:15 **\$620,000**[1] 57:16 **\$70,000.00** [1] 42:5 -&-**&** [7] 156:17,20 160:4,23 164:5 166:12 167:6 _'-**'09** [4] 95:10,12,22,25 **13** [1] 92:8 **14** [1] 92:8 **'16**[1] 32:24 **17** [2] 32:24 54:13 **'90s** [1] 63:8 **'95** [1] 158:2 -1-**1** [6] 7:8 55:10 99:19 165:20,22 166:25 **1.4** [1] 59:22 **1.68** [1] 60:4 **10** [2] 1:24 7:8 **100** [5] 49:16 149:23 167:18,20,24 **10:00** [1] 43:2 **10:15** [1] 54:2 **10:30** [1] 63:25 **10:45** [1] 74:8 **11** [2] 80:4 84:13 **117** [1] 120:19 **11:00** m 84:17 **11:38** [1] 84:18 **11:45** [1] 90:2 **12** [8] 10:21 11:20 13:21 15:3,7 21:4 22:4 111:25 **12-month** [1] 85:2 **123** [2] 26:24 31:13 **12:00** [1] 101:3 **12:15** [1] 114:16 **12:30** [1] 129:14 **12:45** [1] 143:2 12th [1] 96:8 **134** [1] 166:13 **139** [2] 138:19 139:5 **14** [2] 139:11 158:20

15th (11 80:18 **16** [2] 99:20 128:18 **164,400** [1] 167:15 **169** [2] 111:23 125:15 **17th** [2] 96:11 97:6 **18** [2] 54:8 85:10 18th [1] 82:20 1:15_[1] 170:18 **1st** [3] 46:2 47:22,23 -2-**2** [10] 28:13,25 29:4,13 30:20 99:19 105:5 133:5 167:2,3 **2.3** [1] 93:6 **2.4** [2] 7:6,9 **2.5** [1] 7:3 **2.60** [2] 93:3 95:17 **2.8** m 7:3 **2.9** [1] 95:20 **20** [5] 4:22 5:9,14 32:9 72:8 **20-year** [1] 74:20 **20/25** [1] 32:21 2000 [3] 71:14,15 74:14 **2001** [3] 158:6,9 161:2 **2002** [5] 2:21 4:17,24 5:7 74:15 **2003** [3] 74:21 158:11,24 2004 [2] 101:15 112:8 **2005** [1] 162:12 2006 [1] 163:14 **2007** [6] 93:7,9,12,21 112:11 166:5 **2008** [3] 93:4 94:12 95:20 **2009** [9] 37:8 51:24 95:18 95:24 96:7 158:14,19,24 161:2 **2010** [2] 39:11 96:14 **2011** [1] 39:11 2011/2012 [1] 31:9 **2012** [2] 39:11 120:4 2012/2103 [1] 154:14 2013 [6] 80:2,5,7 115:25 116:5 119:21 **2013/2014** [1] 2:24 **2014** [20] 2:13 3:15,21 5:11 6:16 40:24 46:25 47:20 54:11 82:17.20 85:10 90:1,4 104:23 116:7,19,21 124:2 148:25 **2015** [25] 1:1 39:10 40:25 54:13,13 68:2 69:10 73:18.22.23 88:6 100:1 101:5.12 105:12 107:8 109:1,3 112:17 123:4 127:16 128:4 166:5 171:5 **2016** [13] 8:3 39:10 41:11 41:18 55:8.20 56:16 68:2 69:11,13 73:20 74:5

112:17 **2017** [6] 39:10 49:15 55:8 55:23 56:16 68:2 **2017/2018** [1] 32:10 2018 [2] 33:23 48:20 20th [1] 111:24 **21** [2] 1:1 54:8 21st [2] 171:5,11 **23** m 125:17 **230** [1] 28:6 **23rd** [2] 134:6 142:7 **24** [1] 139:5 **24th** [2] 63:12 157:1 **25** [4] 32:9,21 72:8 94:11 25th [3] 28:24 29:4,7 **26** [2] 99:25 100:5 26th [1] 28:24 **275** [3] 99:18 105:5 133:5 **276** [1] 133:8 **28** [1] 96:12 **2nd** [1] 5:11 -3-**3**_[3] 14:11 28:13 167:3 **3.2** [1] 55:22 **3.5** [1] 57:8 **3.6** [2] 53:14 54:1 **3.7** [1] 54:21 **3.8** [1] 55:23 **3.875** [2] 53:24 55:3 **30** [1] 32:25 32[1] 96:14 **36** [1] 96:13 **38** [1] 63:20 3rd [1] 5:11 -4-**4**[9] 51:3,5,21 121:5,11 121:13 122:13 124:13 **40** [7] 35:12 80:4 93:11 111:10,12 123:5 161:5 **46** [1] 69:4 4th [5] 19:7 21:7 22:23 92:20 100:1 -5-**5** [7] 121:5,11,13 122:13 124:13 148:19 150:10 **5.85** [2] 100:10 102:15 **50** [5] 1:21,22 31:3,13 150:20 **51** [1] 68:1 **51.1** m 68:7 **57** [1] 85:1 **590** [1] 56:2

590,000 [2] 57:22 58:3

-6-

6.07 [3] 105:7,23 106:14 **6.3** [1] 134:14 **6.4** [1] 134:15 **6.6** [2] 99:22 102:15 **607** [1] 135:8 **61** [1] 85:4 **69** [1] 69:11 -7-7 [2] 120:24 124:5 **70** [1] 111:8 -8-**8** [9] 51:4 56:10 120:25 121:8,9 122:13 124:5,10 159:3 **88** [2] 120:12,21 8th [2] 93:12,21 -9-**90** [2] 134:5 142:6 **91** [2] 134:5 142:6 **93** [1] 69:10 **95** [1] 71:11 **95/00** (1) 71:13 **96** [1] 71:14 **99** [1] 167:18 **9:05** [1] 1:2 9:15[1] 10:9 9:30 [1] 20:25 **9:45** [1] 31:16 -A-**A.D** [2] 171:5,11 **a.m** [11] 1:2 10:9 20:25 31:16 43:2 54:2 63:25 74:8 84:17,18 90:2 **ability** [5] 8:12 19:19 49:16 63:5 171:8 **Abitibi** [1] 63:8 able 1241 5:15 8:12 27:21 30:12,16 34:23 38:3 51:3 57:10,18 63:5 65:24 74:16 89:18 92:12 94:20 117:23 118:19 136:21 150:16,19 164:15 166:15 167:13 above [5] 1:21,25 2:17 52:20 152:16 **abreast** [1] 79:20 **Absolutely** [1] 132:21 **accept** [1] 94:3 accordance [1] 117:1 **according** [1] 168:16 accordingly [1] 73:20 account [49] 24:25 26:10 34:21,25 35:9,10,15 100:11 105:9 112:23 114:10 115:2,3,6,8,12

122:8,15 123:13,14,17

124:15 131:24 132:13,15 132:25 133:13,16 138:14 138:21,25 139:3,3,11,13 139:17,18 140:10,19 141:5.8.10.22 142:1.2 143:24 144:6,11 164:17 accountability [2] 157:6 168:7 **accounts** [1] 140:11 **accrue** [2] 138:25 141:4 **achieving** [2] 32:16 33:4 **action** [3] 20:7 83:3,12 actions [2] 80:5,19 **activities** [12] 18:8,13 63:21 64:10 81:16 93:2 99:19 105:5 152:1 153:15 155:8 165:7 **activity** [2] 9:24 133:6 actual [23] 3:15 12:1 22:3 24:11 44:17 46:12 54:11 71:1 76:21 96:4 108:25 109:7.21 121:10 124:12 141:18,25 151:13 152:6 165:3 166:20 167:21 169:5 **actuality** [1] 108:10 actuals [4] 127:25 129:2 129:5,22 add [2] 63:2 114:15 added [7] 15:8 26:3 52:15 102:4 115:14,18 148:24 **addition** [3] 28:1 108:13 154:7 **additional** [3] 63:1 69:9 102:6 **additions** [1] 31:3 address [3] 83:13 85:13 121:15 **addressing** [1] 156:24 adds [1] 167:17 **adequacy** [1] 40:13 adequately [1] 27:10 **adjourn** [1] 170:13 **adjourned** [1] 170:17 adjustment [1] 97:3 adjustments [1] 70:16 administrative [1] 167:16 **advance** [6] 20:3 21:10 61:11 92:19.21 140:12 **adverse** [2] 9:24 89:16 advice [2] 96:15 149:6 **advise** [2] 21:24 40:12 **advised** [3] 46:16 63:18 157:4 **advisement** [2] 66:13 67:3 **Advocate** [2] 1:15 66:21 **affected** [2] 44:22 107:14 **affects** [4] 39:4 43:17,18

43:25

afoot[1] 164:13

again [24] 3:4 12:18 19:6

140 [1] 139:11

170:8

15 [4] 80:7 128:18 129:23

22:23 30:9 49:3 76:17 91:4,10,22 96:3 97:5 100:3 107:17 109:6 121:3 125:15 136:12,18 138:12 154:3 159:13 160:6.25

against [3] 10:5 70:15 89:12

age [1] 161:20 **agenda** [1] 78:17 **ago** [3] 40:1 67:9 101:13 **agree** [7] 38:11 41:25 99:4 100:13,14 101:22 116:8

agreed [1] 48:18 agreement [23] 50:1,22 51:13,23,24,25 52:4,13 52:17 53:23 55:18.19.21 55:23 56:25 57:7 59:2 61:12 64:9,17 66:3 68:11 74:11

agreements [6] 59:17 59:21 64:14 72:8 78:13 168:14

ahead [2] 35:12 77:23 **Algonquin** [1] 68:14 **aligned** [1] 61:2 **allocated** [2] 40:11 42:2 allots [1] 167:20 **allow** [1] 152:2 **allowed** [1] 140:2 **allowing** [1] 124:10 156:6 164:19 168:2

allows [2] 56:25 142:9 **almost** [3] 157:15 161:5

167:18 **alone** [1] 5:13 **along** [4] 31:1 33:16,25

82:2 alternatives [1] 63:1 **always** [9] 31:5 42:20 47:12,18 49:19,19 91:25

118:16 151:15 amended [2] 40:24 51:14 **American** [3] 7:2,5,15 **amount** [13] 16:6 40:22

41:5 43:18 62:14 102:9 145:3 150:13,16,23 161:3 161:7 166:7

amounts [1] 138:25 **analysis** [33] 7:10 22:9 25:11 34:13 51:22 53:21 58:18 59:11 83:9 84:8 100:8,13,14,16,20 102:22 105:10 112:1,22 113:15 114:2,10,13 121:3 122:9 122:15,17,19 125:19 129:12 133:13,16,19

anchoring [1] 76:17 anecdotal [2] 136:12,13 **annual** [6] 37:5 48:19 53:9 54:10 69:6 116:18

annually [7] 53:15 54:1 54:16 55:7 56:3 59:22 125:23

answer [5] 65:24 66:13 135:25 144:8 145:5

answering [1] 97:18 **anticipate** [1] 49:14 anticipated [9] 32:17 32:22 33:1,15,22 105:11 106:9 133:10 156:20

anticipation [1] 163:7 **apparatus** [1] 171:9 appear [1] 131:2

application [18] 51:14 51:21 87:3,13,16 99:22 104:9 117:7,16 118:2,5 119:8 120:3,13 125:6 133:7 140:21 171:5

applied [2] 70:2 99:22 **apply** [2] 138:23 140:13 **applying** [1] 114:19 **appointed** [1] 163:15 appreciate [1] 67:2

approach [13] 2:16 5:24 6:3 42:21 101:8,9 112:9 112:20,20 115:4,9,15 161:12

approaching [1] 2:25 appropriate [1] 99:9 **approval** [1] 117:17 **approved** [1] 168:16 area [18] 19:4 20:10 36:23 48:21 61:24 62:21 70:24 114:13 124:8,22 133:22 144:14 156:4,4,6

areas [1] 133:21 **argument** [1] 146:2 arise [1] 9:19

arisen [1] 58:7 arising [3] 45:22 50:3,9

arranged [2] 78:1,6 arrangement [14] 50:4

59:6 60:9,12 62:17 63:13 64:22,25 68:1 69:7 71:11 72:24 73:11 75:5

arrangements [5] 8:11 20:23 68:13 76:5 130:15 arranging [1] 27:8

arrived [2] 22:10,11 **arriving** [2] 33:7 135:7

ascertain [1] 167:13 **aside** [1] 42:2

aspect [2] 56:24 141:9 aspects [2] 152:9 159:4

assess [3] 21:23 60:25 62:16

assessment [9] 21:3,23 29:19 60:21 61:7,21,24 145:24 149:22

assessments [1] 25:2 **asset** [5] 27:7,8,12 161:20

161:21 assets [3] 16:9 48:3 160:24

assigned [12] 74:24 157:2,8 160:19,24 162:1 163:11 164:22 167:5

168:15 169:17,18 assist [2] 80:23 125:20 **assistance** [3] 63:14

64:16 167:12 **associated** [3] 23:23

149:4 160:23 **assume** [5] 68:6 70:17

131:19 139:21 141:15 **assumed** [3] 31:5 67:24 69:13

assuming [1] 164:2 **Atlantic** [1] 8:10 attachment [2] 167:2,3 attend [3] 78:19 79:18

attended [2] 82:21 169:15

79:21

attends [1] 78:9 **attention** [1] 96:7 **augment** [1] 25:24

August [18] 8:19 10:17 11:24 12:9,10,22 13:25 15:15 16:4 17:18 19:1.5 28:15 88:6 89:4 110:5.8 120:4

availability [3] 3:13,16 60:24

available [14] 12:16 14:12 15:9.14.18 16:4 17:4,7,10 18:12 19:10 27:24 29:5 62:9

Avalon [16] 8:21 9:2,8 13:15 21:24 22:25 23:5 23:8 25:7 28:17 38:1 43:24 61:1 88:12 92:12 92:16

average [26] 38:22,22 42:10,16 44:14 68:16,25 96:12 104:21 105:2 107:23 108:15 110:21 112:3,11 113:8 115:3,9 115:15 120:11.19 121:2 123:1 133:20 135:12,19

averaged [1] 112:10 **averaging** [1] 112:4 avoid [5] 16:17,20 57:1 89:18 91:6

avoided [1] 59:9 avoiding [1] 57:9 aware [18] 30:15 34:19

34:24 35:6 48:6 59:20 76:22 77:1 86:23 87:13 87:16 88:20 99:17 104:25 131:11 136:2,10 162:15

awareness [1] 87:4 away [3] 24:12,17 72:15

-B-

backed [1] 49:9 **background** [3] 47:10 51:16 114:12

balance [3] 38:25 139:4 139:18

balances [4] 140:13,22 141:4,9

band [2] 23:25 138:22 **bank** [1] 3:8

barrel [8] 69:11,12 105:7 120:25 121:6 124:6,11 134:15

base [3] 34:11 56:15 99:14

based [20] 5:10 6:11 38:21 43:14 54:11 98:19 100:8,12 104:16 115:11 117:23 118:1 120:14 121:10.25 124:6.11.21 125:11 151:9

basis [14] 33:14 36:15 43:17 46:21 53:9 106:2 130:6,19 134:16 153:1 157:15,18 164:7,9

Bav [3] 43:23 44:18 88:17 bearing [2] 4:4 115:20 became [3] 31:10 75:21 158:6

Beg [1] 84:24 **began** [1] 161:23 **behalf** [1] 98:1 **behind** [1] 131:11 **belabour** [1] 165:1

below [10] 1:22 2:1 11:14 11:15 32:25 54:9 142:18 142:21 154:4 167:15

benefit [15] 56:20 57:14 57:16 58:12 62:17 71:24 72:16,17 73:1,8 118:18 120:13,17 121:5 124:6

benefits [7] 51:13,20 59:13 117:12 118:12 123:20 124:4

best [2] 25:3 171:8 better [9] 52:25 73:24 74:7 88:4 113:15,20,20 124:12 137:5

between [16] 6:18 29:23 45:8,14 48:19 66:3 83:7 83:22,23 100:17 129:11 135:23 136:14 137:14 152:9 153:7

beyond [3] 26:10 152:10 152:16

big [2] 27:16 118:12 billed [1] 41:4 **billing** [2] 70:8 71:2 bit [8] 27:19 49:9 55:13 55:13,15 67:20 88:4 154:13

black [13] 26:21,25 27:5 28:21 29:12 30:12,21 31:6,10,15 49:7 102:7 104:24

blacked [1] 85:12 **blunt** [1] 45:24 **blush** [1] 66:13 **Board** [16] 66:20,23,24 67:8,9 85:3 131:3 139:13 139:16,21 141:7,12,15 168:16,22 171:6 **Board's** [2] 66:17 67:6

Bob [1] 86:8 borne [2] 81:5,10 **bottom** [8] 29:3 36:1 67:21,22 85:9 94:7 100:6 148:21

bought [1] 57:19 Bowman [6] 98:2.14 100:7 101:22 102:14 167:13

Bowman's [2] 99:24.25 **box** [2] 67:22 167:6 **break** [9] 15:1,4 21:4,5 22:10,11 84:17 87:2 130:3

breakers [1] 83:10 **bridge** [1] 49:17 **bringing** [3] 47:2,6

135:19 **brings** [1] 157:23

broad [2] 150:22 160:3 Brook [56] 50:1 51:23 52:1,4,13,17 55:7,20 56:21,25 57:17 58:2 59:5 59:18,21 61:10,18,25 62:6 63:13,15,21 64:11 64:15,22 65:1,12 66:3 66:15 67:10,23,25 68:12 68:18 69:15,17,20 71:25 73:16,25 80:16 95:1 96:9 156:17,18,22 157:3,9 160:4,23 164:5 165:7,11 165:13 166:12 167:5

BTU [11] 115:5 123:23 132:22 133:24 134:20 135:23 136:15 141:19 142:23 143:6,21

BTUs [2] 133:14 134:15 **budget** [10] 115:25 116:5 117:2,7,15 118:5 119:8 119:22 120:3 165:10

budgeted [1] 165:6 budgets [2] 112:22 165:8 **build** [1] 152:3 **built** [3] 14:25 107:9

168:1 **bulk** [2] 151:4 155:2 **bunch** [1] 61:22 **business** [11] 144:20

145:1 148:9,15 151:5,6 151:15 165:14,16 166:2 166:9 Butler [2] 86:8,8

buy [1] 57:18 **buying** [4] 31:12 57:12 58:9 71:25

-C-

CA [1] 67:18 CA-288_[1] 54:4 CA-NLH-059 [1] 55:8 **calculate** [1] 163:4 **calculated** [5] 156:19 161:15 162:8 167:23 168:16

calculation [6] 21:3 22:4 160:7 165:3 167:4 168:25 calculations [2] 66:22 168:1 cancel [2] 30:18,20 capability [3] 27:5 30:13 31:6 capacity [7] 7:25 59:16

63:2,2,14 64:16 111:14 **capital** [14] 76:9,11 87:3 115:25 116:5 117:1,7,15 118:5 119:7,21 120:3 169:20.22

capture [2] 100:23 103:9 **captured** [7] 101:21 132:4,12,24 143:6,24 151:14

career [2] 79:7 161:11 **carried** [1] 112:12 **carry** [1] 65:23 **case** [13] 19:14 56:15,19 59:13 90:10 104:14 112:25 113:9,16 123:9 139:6 144:22 151:15

caused [1] 89:8 caution [1] 124:4 CBPP [2] 93:8 95:23

CBPP's [1] 93:8 **central** [1] 43:23

centre [1] 43:20

certain [11] 5:24 13:14 16:6 21:15,18 28:6 29:8 61:14 84:10 92:14 102:9

certainly [48] 11:12 19:3 20:10 23:13 24:16,24 26:16 35:23 36:3,20,23 37:6,23 38:18 51:1 60:15 61:10,25 70:9 72:15 74:6 79:3 84:7 91:24 98:15 98:16 107:6 108:8,11 113:22 115:19 116:2,3 117:13,15 121:13 124:4 124:8,22 125:8 140:11 140:14 156:11 160:20 161:6 164:23 168:23 169:19

CERTIFICATE [1]

certify [1] 171:2 **cetera** [2] 69:12 83:14 **Chair** [5] 1:3 84:22 97:16 156:3.14

Chairman [12] 84:13 84:15,19,23 86:2,11,16 97:12 156:10 170:6,12 170:16

chance [2] 41:3 67:15 **change** [14] 7:23 12:1 32:4 33:9,21 39:1 43:15 49:11 66:24 92:21 110:10 151:20,20 166:1

changed [6] 11:24 32:3 44:19 105:24 165:24 166:3

changes [8] 31:21 36:9 100:23 101:14 103:6,10

105:1 157:20 **characteristic** [1] 11:5 **charge** [20] 69:19,24 75:14,22 144:18,23 146:1 146:18 147:15,20 149:18

75:14,22 144:18,23 146:3 146:18 147:15,20 149:18 149:18 151:13 153:17 156:17,20 160:2 163:11 164:21 166:13

charged [6] 147:13 148:4 148:5,14 149:11 151:17

charges [8] 160:19 162:1 164:22 166:20 167:5 168:15 169:17,18

charging [3] 150:9 151:8 151:21

chase [1] 52:21 **check** [4] 70:15 71:4 81:24 135:18

chose [1] 103:8 **chosen** [1] 15:16

Churchill [12] 146:2,23 146:24 147:16,24 151:7 152:14,19,23 153:2,8,16

circle [1] 166:15 circumstances [2] 139:15 147:5

clarify [2] 26:8 92:5

clause [1] 168:14 **clear** [5] 87:8,23,25

88:10,24 **clearly** [1] 6:14

close [5] 3:1 32:25 35:13 43:20 101:11

closure [1] 95:21 **code** [1] 91:19

CoGen [8] 64:25 67:23 68:1 69:7,15 70:2 72:25 73:3

CoGeneration [2] 64:23 65:12

coincidence [1] 135:14

Coles [1] 50:24

colleague [1] 156:7 **column** [1] 67:22

combination [1] 27:8 **combustion** [1] 31:12

combustion [1] 31: **comfort** [1] 3:4

comfortable [1] 6:14

coming [14] 8:21 13:24 28:4,25 29:6,9 34:14 35:13 36:14 75:15 88:12 89:23 92:8 94:14

comment [4] 46:24 96:23 142:3 160:18

commercial [1] 147:11 Commissioners [2] 1:13 171:6

common [3] 16:10 39:8 91:21

communicate [1] 157:3 **communicated** [4] 76:21,25 153:10 156:21

communicates [1] 157:17

communications [1] 34:10

comparable [2] 2:23 63:7

compare [1] 5:4 **compared** [4] 108:5,9 108:10 115:14

comparison [1] 62:25 **complete** [2] 83:9 94:20 **completed** [2] 116:7 145:12

completing [2] 153:14 153:24

completion [1] 46:17 **component** [4] 160:12 160:13 169:4,11

components [1] 107:14 compounding [1] 3:14 comprised [1] 167:10 computed [1] 69:9

concern [7] 32:11 48:21 49:6 101:9,20 102:1,1

concerned [2] 46:1 92:6 concerns [2] 83:13 85:13 concluding [1] 170:18 conclusions [1] 98:21 confidence [3] 3:12 19:18.22

confirm [2] 93:17 97:20 **conflicting** [1] 3:5 **connection** [4] 23:22 75:3 83:2 129:11

connections [1] 77:3 considerable [1] 10:16 consideration [2] 49:7 66:19

considerations [1] 25:12

considered [1] 67:15 **consistent** [7] 33:17,17 63:15 64:17 77:4,7,9

constant [1] 68:8 **construct** [1] 152:3

construction [1] 75:3 **consultant** [5] 40:12,20 41:1,4,13

consumed [1] 73:12 **Consumer** [2] 1:14

66:20 **consumption** [4] 52:7 54:11 93:8 94:10

contact [3] 75:20,21 89:17

content [24] 113:1 115:5 123:23,23 132:22,23 133:9,14,15,24 134:21 135:6,9,23 136:15 137:14 137:15 141:18,19 142:10 142:16,23 143:6,21

context [3] 54:20 56:15 150:17

contingency [6] 5:8 48:8 48:12,22 49:13 92:23

continue [2] 32:18 155:7 continuously [1] 11:2 contract [3] 76:4 142:8 142:18

contrast [4] 99:23 102:13 142:5 143:20 **contrasting** [1] 139:25

conversations [1]

161:17 **conversion** [28] 34:18 35:9,20 36:2,10,15,19 37:5 97:19 98:3 105:6 107:715 22 112:3 8 12

37:5 97:19 98:3 105:6 107:7,15,22 112:3,8,12 113:7,10 114:1 118:24 119:2,4 132:5 138:17 139:8 141:3,5

converter [7] 156:19,24 159:22 160:3 165:8,12 165:13

coordinate [1] 94:18 coordination [1] 80:23 Corner [55] 50:1 51:23 52:1,4,13,17 55:7,20 56:21,25 57:16 58:2 59:4 59:18,21 61:9,17,25 62:6 63:13,15,21 64:11,15,22 65:1,11 66:3,15 67:10 67:23,25 68:11,18 69:14 69:17,20 71:25 73:16,24 80:15 95:1 156:16,18,22 157:3,9 160:4,23 164:5 165:7,11,13 166:12 167:5

Corporation [1] 147:16 **correct** [84] 2:2,4 4:2 10:8,14 13:13 14:4 15:11 17:15,20 19:16 25:14 27:2 38:16 39:13 40:3,7 40:15 42:11 53:7 54:18 55:25 56:5,9 65:3 66:7 68:4 72:22 79:9,25 97:23 101:7 105:16.21 106:1 106:11,11 108:22 109:3 109:24 110:17 111:16,21 112:7 114:7 116:11,14 117:21 123:11 125:13 126:20 128:6 129:3,9 130:22 131:8 132:1,4,7 132:10,15,19 133:2 134:1 135:4 137:13 138:9 140:6 143:9,14 148:7 155:10 156:1 158:4,9,17 159:7 159:10,12,24 163:2,20 169:24 171:3

corrected [1] 158:11 **correlate** [3] 7:9 136:8 169:10

correlation [5] 100:17 100:21 101:9 135:23 137:13

correspondence [4] 163:8,10 164:3 168:13 corresponding [1]

cost [27] 13:2 14:16 23:22 24:9 25:14 52:11 55:21 62:18 69:6,9,10,13,14 69:16,25 70:19 73:23,25 76:1,7,7 142:14,16

165:23 167:7,10,15 **costs** [16] 23:21 26:4 52:19 53:23 54:10 55:17 55:19 57:1,9 66:18 69:20 74:6 76:9,12,21 167:7

count [1] 4:10 couple [1] 66:14 course [4] 15:9,19,23 106:18

cover [2] 127:23 153:2 **Coxworthy** [169] 97:13 97:14,15,24 98:6,11,17 98:25 99:16 100:3,4 101:4,17 102:11,21,25 103:11.22 104:2.7 105:3 105:17,22 106:3,12,20 106:24 107:3,16,25 108:4 108:16,23 109:13,19,25 110:4,9,13,18,24 111:3 111:9,13,17,22 112:15 113:3,13,19,25 114:8,23 115:22 116:12,24 117:5 117:14.22 118:4.8 119:3 119:10,12,16,20,25 120:7 120:20 121:7,18,23 122:6 122:12.21 123:2.12.21 124:9,23 125:5,9,14 126:6,16,21 127:3,7,12 127:17,22 128:3,7,16 129:1,6,10,18 130:8,17 131:1,9,16,21 132:2,8 132:16,20 133:3,23 134:4 134:10,18 135:1,5,13,20 136:6.11.20 137:4.10.21 138:5,10 139:23 140:7 141:16 142:4,22 143:3 143:10,15,19 144:7,12 145:4,10,16 146:5,10,16 146:21 147:2.14.19 148:1 148:8,12,18 149:10,16 150:1,7,15 151:19 152:7 152:18 153:6,18,23 154:2 155:9,15,21 156:2,13,25 170:3

credit [2] 52:14,15 **criteria** [6] 3:1 7:21,25 25:4 49:3 109:9

criterion [2] 6:23 8:15 cross-examination [4] 1:6.11 97:14 156:12

Crown [2] 63:22 64:8 CT [34] 9:11 10:4,5,16 11:13,16,23 12:9,12,21 13:11,16,21 14:1,18 15:1 15:3,6,16 16:1 19:1,19 20:3 21:17 22:1,21 23:23 26:24 88:6 89:14,18 90:6

105:19 106:6 **cue**[1] 77:19

current [3] 29:19 85:4 141:14

customer [12] 20:2 21:11 28:22 41:9 75:10,23 89:11 92:18,22 164:8,14 166:14

customers [24] 25:10 45:25 58:4 59:7 62:16 63:9 69:6 75:18 78:11 90:15 98:2 113:22 131:19

132:12 143:11 144:3 156:21 157:7,13,18 164:19 167:8 168:5,8 **customers'** [1] 94:19 **cutting** [1] 3:9

-D-

d'Espoir [3] 43:24 44:18 88:17

daily [7] 21:20 25:1 46:10 60:20,21 61:6 149:20

Darren [1] 157:1 **data** [14] 43:13 50:17,19 53:11 71:1,1,4 117:11

120:23 123:20 124:2,3 124:20 125:20 **date** [2] 49:5 78:8

Dated [1] 171:10 **dates** [1] 46:17

Dave [1] 163:18

Dave [1] 163:18

day-to-day [2] 79:20 157:15

days [2] 29:6 94:11 deadband [1] 24:25

deal [4] 14:7 61:4 157:3 157:8

dealing [2] 75:14 163:14 **dealings** [1] 147:11

dealt [3] 75:19 89:25 159:21

December [6] 46:2 47:15,19,22,23 48:4

decide [2] 149:17 152:22 **deciding** [3] 139:3,17 141:8

decision [5] 18:25 19:3 29:7,11 66:18

decline [3] 35:20 37:7 95:19

declined [1] 93:6 **decrease** [1] 34:7

decreased [1] 101:16

Deer [16] 52:5 62:9,11 78:5,20,25 82:21 93:14 96:9 131:15 158:2,21 159:16,20 160:17 168:24

defer [2] 29:11,12

deferral [23] 24:25 26:9 34:20,25 35:8,10,15 131:24 132:13,25 138:14 138:21,25 139:3,11,18 140:10,18 141:4,9 143:24 144:6,11

deferred [1] 49:24 **define** [2] 101:10 143:16

defined [3] 140:1 143:25 152:14

definitely [3] 7:20 41:10 41:10

degree [3] 32:4 33:5 59:19

delay [1] 48:9

delve [1] 36:23

demand [7] 1:17,19,21 1:25 2:1,18 4:11

demands [1] 72:11 **depend** [1] 74:4

dependent [1] 7:10 **depending** [3] 14:9 60:6 143:5

depreciation [1] 160:12 **derived** [3] 56:24 118:12 120:14

describing [2] 8:18 12:23

design [1] 153:1 **desired** [1] 95:15

detail [11] 46:12 70:14 83:25 91:10 94:3 129:24 130:10 144:5,10 164:2 164:16

details [**5**] 63:17 66:22 68:10 76:4 81:9

determination [1] 75:8 **determine** [7] 7:11 21:20 42:20 57:5 114:24 140:16 145:23

determined [2] 21:16 52:10

determining [2] 69:19 75:23

develop [2] 48:22 68:14 **developed** [3] 22:25 120:4 123:25

developing [2] 25:6 70:19

development [4] 68:18 151:12,24 154:23

develops [1] 126:3 **diagrams** [1] 75:24

dictates [1] 140:3 diesel [5] 30:21 102:8

103:18,21 107:19 **diesels** [2] 49:7 104:24

difference [4] 19:4 45:3 90:11 152:9

differences [3] 45:5,13 77:8

different [7] 25:16,17 109:1 143:21 144:14 154:11 156:6

differing [1] 141:6 **difficulty** [2] 3:3 4:18

direct [7] 8:12 46:14,21 66:25 135:23 157:5 168:7

directed [3] 128:21,21 140:24

directing [1] 97:20 **direction** [3] 32:5,8

41:15

directive [3] 64:24 65:11 71:19

directly [7] 115:8 139:8 146:17 147:21,24 148:15

disagree [2] 24:11 98:20

discipline [3] 47:3,6,21 **discreet** [4] 126:7 146:11 146:22 156:6

discuss [1] 67:16 discussed [3] 36:22 45:22 59:19

discussing [2] 1:16 75:1 discussion [16] 6:22 23:21,24 31:2 40:18 42:8 48:10 49:23 67:7 83:3 85:8 87:1 88:8 133:11

discussions [3] 67:8 75:9 76:18

133:12 164:3

dispatch [1] 24:6 **dispose** [1] 140:21 **disposed** [7] 139:1,4,18 140:4,13 141:10 142:2

distinction [1] 153:7 distinguished [1] 153:9

distribution [2] 83:8,10 **doable** [1] 18:17

document [8] 51:18 126:7,9,11 127:9 128:9 130:19 153:1

documents [1] 119:15 **doesn't** [5] 58:10 59:10 140:23 145:18 155:22

dollar [2] 54:21 76:25 **dollars** [3] 53:24 59:23 163:13

done [22] 20:9 22:4,7 27:17 41:11 59:11 71:2 75:25 84:10 104:22 112:1 121:3 125:23,25 128:1 138:2 142:6 145:12 149:5 150:10 155:17 168:10

double [1] 3:17 **doubt** [1] 59:20

down [33] 5:6,8,14,20 11:14,15 12:4 17:22 25:5 30:9 50:23 55:12 67:20 73:20,22,23 74:3 81:14 81:17 86:21 91:7 93:9 93:15 94:22 95:2 98:18 108:3 109:6 110:6,8 126:8 130:6 159:17

download [1] 71:1 downward [1] 32:8 draft [1] 118:13

draw [2] 20:16 102:9 **drive** [4] 100:12 115:24

drive [4] 100:12 115:2 118:15 124:16 **driver** [2] 25:21,25

drives [7] 99:11 116:6 116:18,20,23 118:19 123:6

drop [3] 62:7 73:11 162:5 **dropped** [1] 62:13 **due** [3] 95:21 106:18 126:2

duel [1] 159:12 **during** [26] 9:11 11:2,5 11:13,17 14:12 17:8 18:9 18:11 19:8 21:12,18 22:1 60:12 61:6,18 70:11 87:1 88:15,20 89:13 90:12 91:24,24 111:18 134:2 **dynamics** [1] 137:23

-E-

early [5] 2:13 33:6 46:25 47:16 154:14 easily [1] 71:15

ECC [3] 23:4 61:23 79:18 **economic** [6] 13:15 14:25 15:25 21:17 24:23

economically [1] 25:8 effect [3] 3:17 99:13 143:22

25.5

effectively [1] 32:19 **efficiencies** [3] 105:18 106:7,8

efficiency [9] 39:18 115:20 122:20,25 123:7 135:24 136:15 142:12 143:22

efficient [2] 38:7 52:24 efficiently [2] 24:6 52:2 effort [2] 94:17 136:7 eight [3] 30:20 95:17 96:8 either [4] 10:2 46:18 88:19 103:17

elaborate [3] 8:23 32:3 32:4

electrical [1] 95:19 electricity [1] 93:4 element [3] 19:25 20:19 89:10

elements [2] 28:16 29:8 elsewhere [2] 20:7 77:5 embark [1] 161:24 embarked [1] 126:25 embedded [1] 151:7 Emera [1] 147:12 emergency [2] 60:12 61:19

eminent [1] 89:7 employed [1] 14:6 employee [1] 78:5 employees [1] 152:1 enabled [1] 105:19 ENAL [1] 80:14 end [14] 8:3 10:2,20 12:14 32:19 34:2 53:1 72:10 125:2 4 126:14

72:10 125:2,4 126:14 129:16 151:8 162:2 endeavour [1] 61:14

ended [1] 116:19 energy [50] 3:1 7:22 8:1 25:23 37:18,23 38:13 39:9,17 43:16,18,21,22 50:2,2,8 53:5,13 56:7 57:1,10,11,12,18 58:9 59:10,10 70:2,9,13 71:25 72:9 73:4,7 99:23 118:21 118:25 126:13,14 130:14 130:15 131:24 137:15,16 137:17,19,20 159:15,16 163:15

engage [2] 40:11 41:9 **engaged** [3] 40:21 41:1 46:6

engineer [1] 70:25 engineers [1] 61:23 enjoying [1] 59:5 enjoys [1] 58:3 ensure [2] 28:3 47:22 enter [1] 119:19 entered [7] 59:17 72:6 72:20 74:13,14 119:10

128:17 **entering** [2] 38:12 39:23 **entire** [3] 60:25 121:16

166:7 entirely [1] 156:5 entities [2] 148:24

entities [2] 148:24 150:10 **entitled** [1] 167:4

entity [1] 148:25 **environment** [2] 41:16 159:5

envision [1] 163:5 **envisioned** [3] 109:4,5 120:5

EPCA [2] 65:14,17 **equal** [1] 38:7

equipment [6] 10:2 29:15 34:14 89:16 94:21 94:22

essentially [8] 1:20 2:8 2:10 25:14 52:6 68:25 130:22 159:9

establish [2] 164:14,17 **established** [1] 22:20 **estimate** [4] 53:12 153:4 163:10,12

estimates [3] 76:1,7,8 **et** [2] 69:11 83:14 **etc** [5] 23:25 24:2,10,10

40:20 **evaluating** [1] 34:2

evening [1] 10:21 **event** [16] 3:9 5:12 9:6 9:14 19:7 21:8 22:24 23:4 48:13 60:13 80:17 83:5 89:7,8 92:22 109:8

events [5] 2:13 6:16 46:25 47:19 88:5

evidence [25] 2:6 4:19 93:2 97:6,25 98:12 99:2 99:18,24 100:1 105:4,4 105:8,14 106:4 111:24 125:16,23 128:17 133:4 134:6 138:11,19 142:7 142:15

evolution [2] 151:23 154:13

exactly [4] 5:1 88:24 112:19 119:6

October 21, 2015 **example** [2] 145:19 152:11 **exceed** [2] 58:10 59:10 **except** [1] 70:14 **exception** [3] 98:20 109:12 149:17 **exceptions** [1] 149:15 excess [1] 2:25 excuse [1] 12:4 **executing** [1] 46:22 **executive** [1] 147:25 **exemption** [5] 65:14 66:5 67:10 71:10,21 **exercise** [1] 8:10 **exhibit** [3] 51:4,5,21 **exist** [1] 154:16 existing [1] 72:25 **expect** [18] 20:11,20 36:6 45:3,5 47:13 75:11 85:20 96:11 104:16 110:20 124:7 125:2 126:13 139:13 140:20 161:16 164:20 expectation [9] 73:19 94:15 101:1 103:25 115:11 116:8 120:12,16 142:11 **expected** [10] 34:7 40:22 44:5 105:18 112:25 113:1 115:5 116:6 117:1 123:22 **expecting** [2] 39:8 112:16 **expending** [1] 41:4 expenditure 6 160:22 161:4,7,21 162:16,18 **expenditures** [2] 169:20 169:22 **expense** [2] 38:5 162:23 **experience** [20] 5:10 9:22 44:3 78:10 105:11 105:12 108:25 109:21 112:24 114:4 117:24 118:1 121:10 122:1 124:2 124:12 141:18 160:2

162:24 169:5 experienced [4] 39:19 78:3,4 83:16 experiences [1] 44:12 expert [1] 91:23 **explain** [7] 53:20 56:10 134:23 154:6 161:13 166:14 168:8 **explained** [1] 1:23 explanation [1] 168:5 **explanatory** [1] 114:19 **exposed** [6] 8:20 9:13 9:14,17 20:13 89:9 **exposure** [21] 8:22,25 9:2,11,18 24:14,16 28:8 35:22 36:5,20 37:12 46:19 88:8,15,22 89:5

extent [7] 59:9 91:17 104:24 105:23 124:19 141:4 166:18 **external** [2] 131:10,13 **externally** [1] 130:25 extra [3] 15:2 57:11 72:18 **eye** [1] 25:2 -Ffacility [3] 75:4 79:1

fact [10] 2:20 3:8 18:9 39:8 46:15 70:18 89:9 103:12 121:14 169:9 **factor** [32] 3:14 8:14 34:18 35:9 36:10 39:18 98:3 99:10,21 100:10 103:7,14,16,17 104:18 107:21,24 119:2 123:15 124:14 125:10 132:5 135:24 136:16 139:16 141:3,6,6,21,24 143:22 167:24

factored [2] 105:1 135:7 **factors** [32] 35:21 37:10 37:13 44:23 58:20 101:13 101:19,21 102:13,16 104:9.12.14 107:9.18 112:3 114:3,19,25 115:1 115:1,13,18 122:24 132:21 133:12 139:2,12 140:9,19,22 141:7

Fagan [1] 75:2 **failures** [1] 92:23 **fair** [4] 41:6 103:12 112:17 161:3

fairly [3] 112:13 160:20 166:6

fairness [1] 144:20 **fall** [8] 38:24 107:13 113:7 124:2 126:1,18 153:5 164:19

falls [7] 6:5 48:9 95:21 115:21 146:2,23 149:3 **familiar** [7] 18:6 59:24

63:23 77:12 83:15 97:25 128:22

fan [6] 100:12 115:23 116:6 118:13 123:6 124:16

fancy [1] 86:13 far [2] 40:23 62:5 **fast** [1] 14:11

favourable [6] 108:13 122:14 124:16 132:12 142:12 144:2

February [3] 47:16 87:11 95:22

feed [2] 63:8 126:4 **Feeder** [1] 83:10 **feeling** [1] 103:1

fellow [1] 114:12 **Fermeuse** [1] 80:16 few [2] 8:17 35:24

figure [2] 68:8 167:9 **figures** [1] 70:5 **file** [7] 22:9 23:13 46:7 48:11 65:6,8 75:14 **filed** [14] 22:13 45:21

49:2 51:12,14 66:9 77:11 85:3 87:14 98:1 100:1 115:24 116:4 159:10

filing [10] 31:22 40:24 42:9 87:2 106:18 111:4 117:2 131:2,4,10

filings [1] 126:2 **fill** [1] 74:25 **final** [3] 92:25 116:21

166:22

finally [1] 96:6 **financial** [5] 24:12,16 26:8,9,19

finding [1] 32:15 **fine** [4] 3:11 82:7 158:13 170:1

finish [2] 29:9 170:11 **finished** [1] 170:8 **finishing** [1] 32:13

firm [11] 3:1,2 14:11 49:16 57:11,11,12,12,18 58:9 59:10

first [14] 15:13 28:11 32:13,24 66:13 71:11 84:22 92:23 95:1,16,24 101:18 149:4 160:17

five [29] 25:18 29:5 35:18 39:20 40:1 43:5,8 44:14 44:16 45:3,8,14 57:7 59:12 68:17 95:18 100:24 105:10 108:5,9,11 112:3 112:11 113:9 114:4 115:11 133:20 135:11,19

five-year [8] 55:3 68:25 100:22 104:11,15,21 105:2.9

fixed [3] 36:19 60:1,3 **flat** [2] 11:6 108:20

flow [3] 41:11 57:13 66:19

flowed [1] 26:4 flows [1] 22:7

focus [1] 47:1

folks [5] 18:21 21:25 47:5 62:16 78:7

follow [10] 23:4,6 52:6 52:21 62:3 83:12 85:7 85:12,18 141:13

followed [2] 20:6 78:17 **following** [2] 21:7 52:17 **footnote** [2] 148:21,23 **forced** [2] 58:22 118:13

forecast [35] 1:20,21,25 2:1,18 3:7,18 33:7,12,22 39:1,3 42:15 54:12 68:15 69:1,11,12 101:2,12 106:2,17,21,23 107:6 109:1,18 110:25 112:21 123:25 125:3 126:4 127:16 128:2 141:20

forecasting [6] 1:17 6:7 39:18 47:11 120:18 157:19

forecasts [5] 60:23 122:18,20 129:7,17

forefront [2] 35:23 37:11

foregoing [1] 171:2 **foresee** [3] 13:20 61:7 74:4

forever [1] 2:7 form [1] 168:9 **format** [1] 141:14 **formed** [1] 154:24 formerly [1] 155:1

forth [2] 83:22 106:17 forward [10] 41:20 43:14 68:15 69:1 80:20 113:6 114:3,18,25 133:19

found [1] 71:15 **four** [9] 38:15 40:1 63:5 68:20 95:23 96:1,10,18 154:5

frame [2] 32:10 154:14 frequency [12] 99:11 116:20,23 118:15,18 156:18,24 159:22 160:3 165:8,12,13

frequently [2] 127:1,4

fro's [1] 56:11 front [1] 34:2 **frontline** [1] 163:21 **FTEs** [3] 166:2,12 167:14 **fuel** [74] 23:22 26:4 34:18 35:9,20 36:2,9,15 37:4

38:4 39:5,18 53:23 54:10 54:11 56:17 58:6 69:10 69:11,13,16,20 74:1 97:19 102:5 106:23,23 106:25 107:2,7,14,22 112:3,7,12 113:2,4,7,10 114:1 115:6,20 118:23 119:1 122:25 123:7,23 125:3 132:5,23 133:9,14 133:24 134:3 135:6.17 135:24,24 136:15 137:14 137:15,16 138:17 139:7 141:3,5,18,19,25 142:9 142:12,14,16 143:22

full [6] 28:2 32:20 92:10 118:16,16 124:5

function [6] 30:22 70:8 76:2 117:6 155:4,5

functions [1] 117:10 **funds** [1] 140:3 future [4] 70:17 105:11 114:21 122:4

-G-

gas [8] 19:8,10 21:25 139:10,14 140:17 141:1 165:18

gathering [2] 41:6 125:19 general [9] 7:6,8 99:1

99:21 104:9 125:6 137:22 167:16 171:4

generally [5] 77:4,7,9 79:16 130:1

generated [1] 70:11 **generating** [5] 25:17 35:11 41:18 130:4,18

generation [33] 2:22 3:12,15 5:13 6:6 8:15 25:24 37:20 38:20 39:3 40:12 44:18 48:9,14 52:3 52:5.14 60:24 61:5.8 62:8 68:23 72:5 79:1 83:4 85:2 92:19,21 130:12,16,24 165:16 166:8

generator [1] 20:1 **gentlemen** [1] 85:7 **gigawatt** [5] 53:14 54:1 57:8 68:1.7

given [4] 89:24 126:13 157:24 168:5

glad [1] 156:14 glib [1] 136:13 **glim** [1] 103:2

GLYNN [12] 13:6 14:21 22:16 23:16 45:16 82:13 84:21 119:9,14,18,23 128:14

goal [1] 72:10 goes [6] 18:6 91:10,23 125:19 146:20 160:2

gone [2] 100:18 164:4 **good** [6] 1:13,13 41:3

63:9 98:15 129:17 **goodness** [1] 36:11

Goulding [287] 1:10 8:17 8:24 9:20 10:7,13,18 11:3,11,25 12:6,13,24 13:4,12,19 14:3,8,19,24 15:10,17,24 16:5,19,25 17:6,14,19,23 18:4,19 19:2,15,21 20:8 21:6 22:6,12,22 23:12,20 24:15,20 25:13 26:11,15 34:17 35:17 36:18 37:2 37:17 38:17 39:12,16 40:2.6 50:13.20 51:2.11 51:19 53:6,10,18 54:5 54:17,23 55:2,24 56:4,8 56:14 57:4,23 58:5,16 59:8,25 60:11,14,19 61:20 62:19 65:2 66:6 68:3,9 69:22 70:6,23 72:2,21 73:2,14 74:2,12 74:19 77:15,20,23,24 78:21 79:2,8,15,24 80:25 81:1,8,21 82:4 83:17 84:5 85:19 86:7,22 87:6 87:15,20,24 88:14 89:1 89:6 90:3,8,22 91:9,14 96:22 97:17,22 98:4,8 98:13,23 99:6 100:15 101:6,24 102:19,23 103:4 103:19,23,24 104:4,19 105:15,20,25 106:10,15 106:22 107:1.5.20 108:2 108:7,21 109:2,17,23

89:25 90:4,23,25

express [1] 49:6

exposures [1] 92:14

110:2,7,11,16,22 111:1 111:6,11,15,20 112:6,18 113:5,17,23 114:6 115:4 115:17 116:10,15 117:3 117:9.20.25 118:6.10 119:5 120:2,9,22 121:12 121:20 122:3,10,16,23 123:10.16.24 124:18 125:1,7,12,24 126:10,19 126:24 127:5,10,14,19 127:24 128:5,12,20,24 129:4,8,15,25 130:11,21 131:7,12,18,25 132:6,14 132:18 133:1,17,25 134:8 134:12,24 135:3,10,15 136:1,9,17 137:7,12 138:3,8 139:20 140:5 141:11,23 142:20,24 143:8,13,17 144:4,9,13 158:1,3,8,16,23 159:11 159:23 160:5,10,16 161:18 162:10,19 163:1 163:6,19 164:1,11 165:2 166:17 167:25 168:11,19 169:2.8.16.23

Goulding's [5] 111:23 125:15 138:19 157:14,22

Government [2] 64:24 65:11

GRA [9] 31:22 35:19 42:14 51:14,21 126:2 127:1 158:20 165:25

127:1 158:20 165:25 **grabbing** [1] 77:17

Grand [1] 95:21 **Grant** [1] 148:20

granted [2] 63:22 64:7 granular [2] 82:9 130:9

Gray [9] 51:6 55:9,14 74:17 95:11 100:2,5 165:19 166:24

great [1] 164:25 greater [1] 103:16 greatly [3] 43:19,25 44:22

green [1] 48:2 **grid** [1] 62:9

168:6

gross [4] 99:22 120:11 122:20,25

ground [1] 39:8 **group** [18] 70:7 71:2 76:3 78:7 80:5,19 150:4,8 154:25 155:18 157:5,7 157:12,14 164:7,8 166:2

growth [1] 38:1 guard [1] 10:5 guarding [1] 89:12 guess [103] 2:1,12 3:3,6 4:15 6:5 9:10,21,23 11:5 12:1 14:9 19:5,22 21:2 30:11,18 31:1,9 32:11 33:18,25 35:18 36:21,23 37:12 38:11,18 39:22 40:17,21 41:2 42:18 44:2 45:23,24 46:19 47:5,10 51:12,15 52:3 53:19 56:23 58:17 60:1 61:4

61:17 62:23 68:10,17

69:3,18 70:7 71:3 72:3 73:17 75:13,20 77:25 79:20 88:15 92:6 96:16 97:1 99:8,10 100:16,25 101:7,10 103:7 104:20 104:22 107:10 112:23 113:21 118:2,11 129:16 137:9,14 139:24 149:20 156:16,19,25 157:11,25 159:13,19 160:25 161:11 162:4,11,22 163:7 164:13 165:4,9,18 166:22 167:8

guide [1] 25:7 **gut** [1] 103:1 **guys** [2] 25:10 86:13

-H-

half [1] 2:18 happening [3] 10:6 48:14 49:15

Harbour [2] 80:18,21 **hard** [1] 58:17

Hardwood's [1] 165:17 Hardwoods [8] 85:5 90:10,12,12,16,18,20 91:2

hats [1] 98:14 haul [1] 72:17 he'd [1] 79:19 heads [4] 61:15 62:1,2

93:14 **heard** [5] 98:12 99:2 145:6,11 171:5

hearing [1] 171:3 **heat** [11] 36:15 102:4 103:18,20 107:18 123:22

103:18,20 107:18 123:22 132:22 135:8 137:23 142:10,15

heating [7] 113:1 122:25 133:9,14 135:6 137:14 137:15

held [3] 82:20 90:13 158:13

help [3] 43:12 53:20 152:8

helpful_[1] 47:4 **Henderson**_[12] 46:20 49:23 51:10 59:19 63:11 75:1,17 76:17 95:5 134:1 137:11 142:6

hereby [1] 171:2 **high** [4] 30:3 72:13 112:14 124:11

higher [21] 3:18,19 32:16 33:4 38:8 39:3,17,19 92:17 104:13 105:13,23 115:10 121:2 134:3,25 135:2 142:10,15 154:21 163:22

highest [2] 9:12 52:11 historical [1] 104:17 historically [4] 2:21 4:16 43:13 104:14

history [3] 103:13 114:20 157:25

hit [1] 24:7

Holvrood [82] 9:4 10:11 12:15,16,18 13:10,16,22 13:25 14:1,6,17 15:2,8 15:15 16:3,7,13,18 18:7 18:17,21 19:1 21:19 25:20,22 26:1 27:21 28:10 30:9 31:11 34:18 35:11,20 36:6 37:14,22 37:25 38:7,11,24 39:9 39:23.24 43:20 44:18.22 44:23,24,25 52:12 53:2 53:23 69:13 72:10,14 73:4,6,7,12 88:7 90:21 91:7,22 92:10 97:19 98:3 107:10,19 108:20 109:4 109:10 113:4 115:6 118:14 119:1 123:23 132:23 138:15.16 141:19 142:9

home [1] 47:20 hope [3] 8:3 41:8 98:18 Hopefully [1] 30:8 horizon [1] 36:5 hosted [1] 80:17 hour [4] 21:4 22:4 124:5 124:11

hours [20] 6:23 7:1,9 10:22 11:20 12:21 13:21 15:3,7 53:14 54:1 57:8 68:2,7 92:14 105:7 108:14 120:25 121:6 137:17

HROE [1] 150:18 Humphries [116] 1:7 2:3 2:9,19 4:1,7,12,19,25 5:5 5:19 6:1,17,24 7:4,16 8:2 8:6 26:22 27:1,6,13,18 29:21 30:2,7,14,23 31:8 31:20,24 32:6 33:11 34:9 35:5 40:10,14 41:7,24 44:6,10,15 45:9,19 46:3 46:8 47:8 48:5,17 49:1 49:25 50:5,12,16 60:11 62:21,22 64:1,13,19 75:2 75:6,16 76:10,16 77:5,6 77:14,18 87:22 92:4 93:1 93:18,22 94:1,16 95:4 95:25 96:2 128:21 136:23 144:15.24 145:2.8.14.21 146:8,14,19,25 147:8,17 147:22 148:6,10,16,22 149:8,13,19 150:5,12 151:1,22 152:12,25 153:13.21.25 154:5.12 155:13,19,25 157:10

hydraulic [3] 38:20 39:2

hydro [102] 2:6,15,16 5:23 6:9 7:23 8:19 11:22 14:25 15:3,6,15 16:17 17:3,12 21:2 22:9,19 24:4,9 25:24 27:12 31:5 33:6 34:1 35:9,16 36:13 37:12 40:12,24 41:3 42:20 45:12 47:5 48:11 52:8,19 63:20 64:6,8,13 65:6 66:3 67:2 68:6 70:4 70:21 75:2 78:14 79:12 80:15 81:11 82:21 85:12 85:21 87:2 89:24 96:15 99:20 125:19,21 126:5,7 128:9 129:12 130:2,5 133:4 135:22 136:7,14 138:2 139:24 140:20,22 140:24 142:18,21,25 145:24 146:13,17 149:15 149:24 151:4,4 152:1,22 153:9 154:10 158:15 161:12,17,24 162:5,11 163:9,22 165:6,10 167:20

Hydro's [11] 36:1 54:12 77:3 84:3 85:1 93:2 99:17 104:10 105:4 130:18 171:4

hydrology [2] 38:19 108:13

-I-

IC-144 [1] 165:1 IC-145 [1] 165:18 IC-NLH-87 [1] 166:23 icing [1] 58:24 ICs [1] 165:5

idea [5] 52:3 62:12 74:6 74:7 167:22

identified [4] 53:25 72:6 72:18 140:25

identify [3] 8:11 48:22 135:22

idle [1] 96:25 immediately [1] 143:6 impact [22] 9:25 20:3 35:25 58:11 94:20 102:13 104:6 106:14 110:20 120:17 121:25 122:14,19 124:16 132:5 137:25 139:10 142:12 143:5,21 144:3 162:1

impacted [2] 90:15 122:24

impacting [1] 103:16 impacts [1] 107:22 impetus [1] 35:14 implementation [1] 53:22

imposed [1] 21:15 impossible [2] 18:1,5 impression [1] 97:17 improved [6] 53:13 57:14 58:8,10 123:6 134:20

improvement [4] 105:6 124:8,22 134:13

104:16 133:9,22 improving [1] 133:15 in-flows [1] 38:22 in-service [1] 46:17 incentive [4] 24:3 5 12

improvements [3]

incentive [4] 24:3,5,12 26:8 included [4] 144:11

153:3 165:14,15 **includes** [1] 165:17

including [1] 159:4 incorrect [1] 131:3 increase [2] 47:17 166:10 increased [4] 26:4 37:11

38:13 101:15 increasing [1] 166:13 incurred [3] 13:2 23:22 59:1

incurring [1] 52:18 indicate [3] 34:24 120:24 134:2

indicated [20] 1:19 6:24 7:13 21:2 26:23,25 32:2 34:21 54:14 60:20 63:16 89:4 95:5 100:24 104:13 115:5,10 117:7 126:17 126:22

indicates [5] 54:9 80:10 85:11 93:4 100:8

indicating [5] 14:16 45:13 83:5 138:6 148:13

indication [2] 33:20 36:4 indications [3] 32:14 62:10 133:20

indicative [2] 43:9 44:4 indicator [1] 7:7 individually [1] 70:21 industrial [15] 71:2 75:18 78:11 98:1 131:19 156:21 157:6,12,18 164:8

164:19 166:14 167:8

168:5,8

influence [1] 141:24 information [17] 34:12 42:23 49:8 50:17,21 81:7 104:22 119:24 125:20 128:18 129:21,23 130:2 136:8 151:11 157:19 164:21

initial [2] 75:20,21 input [1] 18:25 inputs [3] 41:17,18 112:24

inside [7] 18:6,21 34:14 91:11,21,23 136:4

installation [1] 118:15 installed [1] 169:10 instance [4] 102:5 122:8 141:17 150:18

instead [5] 14:17 15:8 120:21 121:8 122:13

instruction [2] 23:13

instructions [2] 62:4,5 instrument [1] 64:9 intakes [1] 58:23

integration [15] 147:11 150:21 151:3,13 152:15 154:8,9,15,18,24 155:1 155:3,12,16,23

integrity [1] 5:15 intend [1] 48:11 intended [2] 132:3 140:2

intent - margin **NL Hydro GRA**

October 21, 2015 **intent** [4] 26:23 41:12,14 97:4 **intention** [1] 96:25 intents [3] 25:21 38:21 52:12 interconnected [4] 41:16 93:5 165:16 166:9 interconnection is 6:18,19,25 49:5 76:1 152:5 interconnections [2] 8:9 49:15 **interest** [1] 156:15 **interested** [3] 43:4 85:16 157:22 **interface** [5] 152:23 153:9 154:10 157:11,15 **interfaces** [1] 157:17 **interject** [1] 71:8 internal [7] 68:21 83:24 84:8 136:3,19 140:12,18 internally [4] 112:21 130:25 138:2 140:23 interrupt [2] 71:7 82:18 interruptible [1] 63:8 **introduce** [1] 102:6 introduction [1] 37:21 inventory [9] 69:17,18 69:21,25 70:19 73:15 74:1,5 97:3 invoice [1] 70:10 invoices [2] 70:17 71:5 involved [9] 28:5 33:6 34:1 75:11,21 76:11,14 146:1 162:14 151:25 154:21 **island** [6] 7:22 8:13 23:2 61:1 93:5 98:1 **isolated** [3] 3:25 4:2 20:15

involvement [3] 149:24

isolations [1] 28:3

issue [23] 31:10 38:9 47:7 47:12 62:6 66:16 76:23 83:22,24 84:2,4 87:4,7 87:25 89:13 136:22 138:18 139:9 146:1 157:24 164:9 169:13,15

issued [1] 72:4

issues [17] 10:1 23:5 58:23 61:5,5 83:15,18 85:8 86:24 98:16 141:1 146:12 152:5 155:3 156:23 157:4 159:21

it'll [2] 68:6 140:23

item [2] 70:12 83:12

items [4] 83:3 126:12 152:15 153:3

itself [3] 9:25 117:18 122:17

-J-

January [9] 2:13 3:15 3:21 5:10,11 6:16 47:15

47:16 74:21 **Jennifer** [1] 82:19 **Jenny** [4] 51:3 74:15

119:6 130:7 iob [1] 84:4

John's [2] 171:7,10

Johnson [212] 1:5,11,12 1:14 2:5,11 3:22 4:3,9 4:14 5:3.17.22 6:13.21 7:12.19 8:4.16 9:16 10:3 10:10,15,23 11:9,21 12:3 12:8,19 13:1,8,17,23 14:5,14,23 15:12,22 16:2 16:15,23 17:2,11,16,21 17:25 18:15.23 19:13.17

20:5 21:1 22:2,8,14,18 23:9,14,18 24:18 25:9 26:6.13.20 27:3.11.15 29:18,25 30:4,10,17,25 31:17,19 32:1 33:2,24 34:16 35:7 36:7,25 37:9

38:10 39:6,14,21 40:4,8 40:16 41:22 42:1,6,17 43:3 44:1,8,13 45:7,11

45:18 46:5,23 47:24 48:7 48:24 49:21 50:7,14,18 50:25 51:8,17 53:3,8,16 54:3,7,19,25 55:5,10,11 55:16 56:1.6.12 57:2.21

57:25 58:14 59:3,15 60:8 60:17 61:16 62:15 63:10 64:3,21 65:4,10,16,20 66:1,8 67:1,17 68:5 69:2

70:3,20 71:7,17,22 72:19 72:23 73:9,21 74:9,22 75:12 76:6,13 77:2,10 77:16,22 78:18,23 79:5 79:10,22 80:1 81:3,18

81:23 82:6,11,15 84:1 158:20 165:24 84:12,20 85:6,23 86:5,9 86:14,18,25 87:12,18 88:2,21 89:3,20 90:5,17

93:24 94:4,24 95:8,12 95:13 96:5 97:9 joined [1] 158:1

91:3,12 92:2,5,24 93:20

joint [7] 77:11,12,25 80:2 80:7 93:10 169:14

judgment [2] 45:25 149:24

Judy [2] 171:2,12 July [4] 110:1,3 111:19 123:5

June [13] 93:12,21 100:1 109:6.16.22 111:18 123:4 127:20,20 128:9 129:20 129:22

jurisdiction [1] 66:17 jurisdictions [7] 3:23 20:11,14,17,20 34:20,25

-K-

keen [1] 25:2 **keep** [4] 37:4 67:20 130:23 149:20 **Kevin** [2] 1:10 43:12 **kev** [3] 164:17,17,18

kilowatt [9] 60:3 62:24

63:4 105:7 120:25 121:5 124:5,11 137:17

knew [6] 2:17 31:11 95:6 161:21,24,25

knowing [1] 2:16 **knowledge** [7] 46:4,19 47:18 86:19 94:25 168:6 168:10

knowledgeable [2] 18:16,20

known [2] 97:1 102:2 kV [1] 28:6

-L-

Labrador [4] 71:13 171:4,7,10

lack [2] 19:18,22

laid [1] 60:24

Lake [16] 52:5 62:9,12 78:5,20,25 80:15 82:21 93:14 131:15 158:2.21 159:16,20 160:17 168:24

Lake/Corner [1] 96:9 landing [1] 75:24

large [5] 35:25 78:10 118:13 134:13,16

larger [1] 120:16

Larry [1] 159:10 **last** [33] 25:18 26:1 28:23 33:19 35:19,23,24 36:3 37:8 38:15 39:25 53:11 68:16,16 85:3 87:10,10 105:2 107:13 108:5.9.11 112:7 113:9 114:4 126:25 127:8,13,15 133:19 144:8

late [7] 29:6 30:5 41:25 41:25 47:15 70:18 117:6

latest [3] 31:22 33:19 51:12

lead [1] 108:15 **leadership** [4] 144:16 144:25 145:22 147:6

leads [1] 166:22

lean [1] 49:4 **learning** [1] 19:23

learnings [3] 19:6 22:24 109:8

least [7] 24:9 40:23 101:12 115:8 131:4 139:8 146:17

leaves [1] 95:14

led [3] 68:22 75:22 165:18 **left** [6] 24:4,5 55:18 74:10 74:25 167:9

legal [1] 148:24 **lengthy** [1] 170:7

less [4] 37:14 136:19 142:19,25

level [18] 2:22 3:4 5:14 28:7 38:23 46:19 75:10 106:8 112:16 132:9,11 140:11 144:5,10 154:20 160:18 161:21 163:22

levels [14] 3:1,2 4:17 13:14 25:6 32:12,16 33:5 38:8 52:19 58:24 72:13 79:4 157:11

liaise [3] 157:2,6 168:7 **liaises** [1] 164:8

life [1] 35:11

light [3] 6:15 24:25 57:17 **lights** [1] 48:2

likelihood [1] 4:13 likely [2] 84:9 162:7

limited [4] 27:24 29:24

36:5 121:4 line [39] 9:1,3,10,22,25

10:2 20:1 29:3 36:1 46:14 54:8,8 75:24 80:6 80:22 81:12,14 88:12 89:17,19 90:14 91:1 93:3 95:18 99:20 100:7 101:8 101:11 111:25 125:17 126:12 133:7 138:20 139:5,11 148:9,15 156:8 167:11

lined [2] 29:1,2 **lines** [17] 8:21,23 9:7,15 28:6 34:1 88:10,17,19 88:24 89:14,22 90:25 95:17 102:5 144:19,25

ling [1] 154:4 link [1] 149:3 linkage [1] 88:22 **linked** [1] 69:16

links [3] 48:10,14 88:16 **list** [1] 156:23

load [63] 3:2,7,10 6:23 7:1,8 9:12 11:14,15,17 13:15 14:7 21:12,16,22 22:7 25:7 28:22 31:21 31:23 32:2,9,20 38:1,3 38:25 43:20 45:1 47:17 52:6,16,22 60:23 62:8 62:14 75:9 94:23 100:18 101:1 102:7 103:13,14 104:12,14 107:21 108:20 110:21 111:8,8 112:25 115:10 118:17,19,20 120:11,15,24 124:6 126:3 126:14 130:4,6 157:19

loading [6] 38:8 107:23 108:15 118:17 121:2 123:1

loads [11] 11:5 32:7,17 33:5 92:11,16 102:3 112:13 120:19 130:24 157:20

LOLH [1] 7:7 LOLHs[1] 2:25 long-term [3] 80:20,23 81:19

longer [8] 11:22 12:11 29:16 52:18 72:7 97:1 100:20 164:4

look [12] 3:6 44:16 45:2 65:25 67:21 84:4 114:3 140:8 151:2 161:13 162:7 167:11

looked [5] 46:13 57:6 71:9 101:23 103:14

looking [12] 29:22 33:4 42:10 43:14 49:12,20 87:2 114:3,5,18,25 154:3

lose [4] 9:2,7 89:10 90:24

loses [1] 42:8

loss [6] 6:23,25 7:8 42:16 43:25 92:14

losses [9] 42:11.14 43:9 43:17 44:5,21,21,25 45:2

lost [1] 161:1

low [7] 58:24 61:8 103:14 104:12 113:10 160:20 161:22

lower [29] 3:10,16,18 32:10.16.22 33:5 36:1 45:1 79:4 92:12 103:14 108:12,15 120:15 121:1 142:25 146:24 147:1,15 147:24 151:7 152:14,19 152:23 153:2,8,15 169:11

-M-

M [2] 156:17,20 **MacDonald** [1] 163:18 **machine** [9] 93:9,16 95:2 95:23 96:11,17,20,24,25

machines [1] 68:20 **magnitude** [3] 102:12

102:17 150:24 maintain [2] 5:15 26:16

maintained [1] 16:12 **maintenance** [39] 10:12 14:10 16:7,21 17:13,17 18:3,8,17 27:22 28:10 28:14,18 29:1,10,11 76:9 80:21 81:12,15,20 88:11 88:19 91:11.21 116:18 159:5 165:7,12,24 166:1 166:4,7,11,20 167:7,14 167:21 169:4

major [9] 8:20,23 9:7,15 88:9,23 89:19 90:24

majority [1] 149:14 makes [2] 38:4 52:25 manage [2] 17:3 25:11 management [2] 147:16 154:4

manager [19] 78:25 79:3 79:18 85:22,22 154:7,15 154:16,17,25 155:1,11 158:7.22.25 159:2.20 161:12 163:15

managers [6] 154:5 155:5,17,23 164:17,18

mandate [3] 24:9,22 26:16

Manitoba [1] 6:9 March [12] 12:2 19:7 21:7 22:23 54:13 92:20 95:10,24,25 96:24 97:7 109:8

margin [1] 4:23

Maritime [1] 149:3 Marks [4] 159:10,12,14 162:25

match [2] 52:16 126:15 **material** [7] 45:4,6 81:6 93:3 115:25 166:10 167:22

materials [2] 166:4,8 matter [7] 64:16 75:1 90:7 101:5 115:1 131:6 171:3

matters [1] 1:4 maximum [1] 111:14 may [42] 4:8,8 20:14,18 25:23 45:4 62:1 66:23 67:10 70:18 73:20,22 78:16,16 80:2,5,7,18 92:13 95:12,14 96:7,7 96:11,16 97:2,6 100:19 101:14,15 106:21 117:11 125:10 127:20 131:3 141:13 144:20 145:23,25 149:15 151:8 158:9

MCR [1] 123:5

mean [18] 6:3 36:9,11,12 43:12,24 44:11,16 64:4 64:12 66:23 71:7 85:15 99:1 103:2 134:23 155:22 166:15

means [2] 1:20 171:8 meant [3] 2:17 10:5 52:16

measure [2] 129:16 137:16

measured [3] 118:23 137:25 138:1

mechanism [1] 24:13 **mechanisms** [1] 140:1

meet [5] 12:9,22 25:4 38:25 72:10

meeting [14] 7:21 77:12 78:8 80:3,7 82:20 85:21 94:13 97:4 145:23 146:12 147:6 149:21 162:12

meetings [11] 21:21 46:11 60:21,22 77:13,25 78:15 79:13,14 146:6 169:14

megawatt [3] 26:24 30:20 31:3

megawatts [17] 4:22 5:9 5:14 31:13,14 32:10,21 32:21,25 49:17 94:10 96:12,13,14 111:8 120:12 120:19

members [5] 1:14 18:24 34:23 144:22 145:6

memory [1] 162:14 mention [1] 93:14 mentioned [5] 4:20

mentioned [5] 4:20 13:13 14:24 24:9 35:22

merit [1] 72:14 met [2] 49:3 162:11 metering [2] 70:8 71:1 methodology [8] 2:14 3:24 6:7,7 76:19 168:18 168:20,23

mic [1] 77:17 might [20] 3:24 9:19 34:23 43:12 65:24 66:16 71:8 82:2 101:20 104:16 106:7 137:5 138:6 139:10 140:9 145:25 146:11 147:3 148:14 168:9

147:3 148:14 168:9 migrate [1] 7:17 migrated [1] 155:18 migrating [2] 7:1,14 milestones [1] 46:12 mill [8] 52:6,16,22 62:8 68:22 95:22 159:17 163:16

million [8] 53:24 54:21 55:22 59:22 60:4 134:14 134:15 163:12

mind [2] 45:12 104:10 minds [1] 49:19 minimize [4] 53:2 72:10 91:17 94:20

minimum [7] 10:21 11:20 25:20 38:4,6 108:14 111:7

minutes [16] 77:11 80:3 80:5 82:17 85:11 93:10 93:12,13,17,19,21 94:2 94:6 95:10 96:7 170:8

mirrors [1] 23:1 mischaracterizing [1] 155:10

missed [1] 144:8 missing [1] 9:19 mistaken [1] 132:4 misunderstanding [1] 147:7

mitigate [1] 9:10 mitigating [1] 48:23 mitigations [1] 49:13 mix [2] 37:20 44:18

mode [1] 90:14 **model** [1] 41:15

models [1] 41:21 modest [2] 54:14 166:7

moment [5] 1:16 54:4 65:24 69:5 74:24

moments [1] 8:18

money [6] 40:10,22 41:4 41:5 42:2 53:17

monitor [2] 61:17 69:24 monitoring [4] 49:12 63:20 64:10 136:3

month [3] 69:25 70:11 126:14

monthly [11] 33:14 37:5 126:12 128:18,23 129:21 130:19 131:5,6 146:6 147:6

months [10] 33:18 63:6 70:15,17 108:19 109:11 109:14 110:14 123:4 128:2

Moore [2] 157:1,4

morning [8] 1:13,13,15 4:16 10:20,24 40:18 42:24

Moss [2] 171:2,12 most [16] 17:7 18:20 20:11,20 25:4 28:8 52:24 54:12,12 57:14 100:23 103:9 107:6 115:20 146:3 151:25

mother [1] 64:7 motors [2] 118:13,20 MOULTON [4] 1:8 35:1 42:4 137:2

move [5] 41:20 144:13 156:3 164:13,16

moved [2] 76:2 154:23 moving [1] 33:16 MD STD A TTON:

MR.STRATTON [1] 114:17

Ms [22] 13:6 14:21 22:16 23:16 45:16 51:6 55:9 55:14 74:17 82:13 84:21 84:25 95:11 100:2,5 119:9,14,18,23 128:14 165:19 166:24

Muskrat [3] 6:5 48:9 149:3

-N-

N-1 [1] 20:13

Nalcor [22] 80:11,14 82:24 144:16,19,25,25 145:22 146:18,20 147:13 147:21,25 148:5,9 149:11 149:14,18,18,23 150:9 151:21

Nalcor's [1] 148:24 name [2] 85:15,17 NARL [2] 80:12 94:8 nature [1] 64:7 Navigant [1] 6:8 necessarily [3] 6:2 115:7

169:4 **need** [17] 12:10 21:25

28:2 35:14 61:7,9 62:1

72:6 80:8 83:9,21 116:1
116:3 118:1 124:19 140:9
150:2

needed [4] 12:11 27:21 75:25 89:18

needs [5] 12:22 39:9,17 60:13 67:14

negotiated [1] 63:6 **neighbours** [1] 20:17 **neither** [2] 90:20,23

net [7] 58:11 62:11 99:12 107:22 118:23 119:4 130:5

never [2] 7:14 35:10 **new** [24] 7:24 8:15 10:5 26:24 31:12 37:21 40:19 47:21 49:8 72:4 75:18 102:6,8 105:19 106:6,17 106:19,21 116:17,20,22 155:12,14 169:9 Newfoundland [12] 23:25 31:22 32:7,8 71:13 78:15 80:12 82:22 131:20 171:4,7,10

newsprint [1] 95:22 **next** [4] 28:22 32:19 133:7 144:1

NLH-285 [1] 67:19 Nobody [1] 35:8 non-firm [10] 52:9,10 52:18 57:1,6,9,19 58:19 59:1,9

none [3] 136:2 143:25 166:11

Nonetheless [1] 121:24 normalized [2] 38:19 38:20

normally [3] 78:6,16

North [3] 7:2,5,15 note [2] 149:22 165:25 noted [9] 13:7 14:22 22:17 23:17 45:17 72:12 82:14 128:15 133:8

notes [2] 50:24 158:10 **nothing** [1] 48:1 **notice** [4] 61:11,13 94:5 95:25

notify [1] 33:14 **November** [5] 40:23,25 93:9 95:3 104:23

now [58] 6:18 7:6 8:8,10 20:3,13 21:19 29:24 33:3 35:14,15 38:12 39:22 40:25 46:4,25 48:6,20 50:22 57:13 64:5,23 72:25 73:10 78:2 79:12 79:16,18 86:23 88:10 96:6 99:12 104:1 110:23 116:25 124:3,13 126:1,2 128:19 134:1 147:23 151:2,3,14 152:4 159:9 159:12 160:1 161:6 162:15,22,24 163:13,20 164:4,13 170:13

NP-002 [1] 74:16 NP-297 [1] 45:15 number [35] 6:4 9:21 28:13,16 31:4,4 35:21 37:10 49:18 54:20,21,24 55:1,4 56:22,23 57:15 57:22 58:20 59:23 67:9 68:24 72:7 93:8,15 95:23 96:1,10,18 107:8,13 124:13 131:14 153:19

numbers [2] 71:12 102:20

162:14

-0-

O [2] 156:17,20 O&M [16] 74:24 76:14 76:19 160:2,11 161:13 161:19 162:7,22 163:5 164:9 166:12,19 167:7 167:10 169:11 **O'Brien** [14] 24:3 34:19 106:5 108:18 111:25 125:18 128:17 131:23 135:21 138:13,20,23 144:16.18

O'Brien's [2] 45:21 140:15

O'Reilly [4] 85:25 86:3 170:5,14

objection [1] 99:7 **observe** [1] 40:22

obtain [1] 80:20

obtained [1] 73:24 **obviously** [12] 34:5 39:4 41:18 44:25 45:15 47:20 48:20 51:9 66:2 89:22 112:2 155:11

occasion [1] 67:11 occasionally [1] 145:25 occur [2] 81:16 84:6 occurred [2] 87:11 117:24

October [5] 1:1 111:24 116:22 171:5,11

odd [2] 35:12 56:2 **off** [13] 1:16 6:10 10:12 10:25 11:13,16 16:22 10:19 40:0 10 01:10

19:19 49:9,10 91:19 98:14 126:1 **official** [1] 85:12

offload [1] 9:9 offset [1] 57:14 offsetting [2] 73:4,6 often [1] 145:18 oil [1] 73:12 old [1] 113:16 once [8] 11:6,17 24:7 30:18 61:21,24 97:7

148:2

one [58] 8:20,22 9:7,15 9:23 15:9 18:2,25 21:14 21:21 28:9 35:16 62:4 66:15 67:11 71:14 73:17 80:10,13,14,15,15,16,19 81:14 84:8,11 87:8 88:9 88:19,23 89:10,14 90:24 91:8 93:8,15 103:17 107:9,21 108:19 114:21 117:16 119:19 121:22 127:13,15 132:3,21 136:18 139:12 140:25 142:5 144:21 152:13 157:13 163:12,21

one-week [1] 60:22 one-year [2] 54:24 55:1 ongoing [3] 86:20 164:7 164:9

onto [1] 119:10 onwards [2] 105:12 109:16

109:16 open [1] 34:10 opening [1] 28:6 operable [2] 90:21,24 operate [15] 4:21 13:16 13:21,22 15:20 16:1

operated - price NL Hydro GRA

19:24 20:12,21 21:17,25 24:22 25:8 52:5,23

operated [3] 9:11 90:12 109:10

operating [16] 9:6 11:19 15:6 23:23 25:15,22 26:1 26:12 37:15,18 38:6 108:14 120:5,15 165:6 167:6

operation [13] 14:13 Ī5:3 16:13 21:13 25:20 61:23 74:15 76:9 83:14 85:14 92:10 155:4 159:15

operationally [1] 157:16

operations [20] 27:9 37:3 60:15 70:7,25 76:3 79:20 85:22 137:9 148:3 153:11 154:8,16 155:6 157:5,14 159:4,5,16,17

operators [5] 23:4 24:21 61:4 62:2 136:4

opportunities [2] 11:13 27:23

opportunity [14] 20:16 28:11,12,23 29:23 50:23 52:2,23 66:24 134:17,19 134:22,25 142:9

opposed [7] 19:5 102:15 129:7 141:20 142:16 150:21 152:23

optimistic [1] 107:12 **order** [19] 12:22 27:20 33:15 52:9,15,20 57:8 65:14 72:8 91:20 96:13 100:9.10 102:12.17 121:5 150:24 153:19 163:12

orders [3] 71:10,21 153:17

ordinarily [5] 9:5 13:9 14:11 57:19 126:3

originally [1] 106:9 otherwise [4] 104:11 110:19 117:6 123:9

ought [1] 141:21

outage [29] 8:20,22 9:4 9:13,15,18,23 12:15 16:20 17:9 19:9,12,25 20:2,13,19 21:11 29:2 88:9.23 89:2.11.25 92:1 92:18,20,22 94:18 109:12

outages [6] 21:10 58:21 80:24 83:5,6 94:19

outcome [1] 76:24 **outlined** [1] 53:12

outlines [1] 54:9

outlook [2] 21:22 107:7

output [2] 68:23 137:15 outside [12] 61:23 66:17

66:23 84:7 122:18 140:8 147:5,9 152:5 165:3 168:2.4

overall [3] 6:6 110:21 153:4

overheads [1] 167:16 overload [2] 89:19 91:1 overly [1] 18:6 oversee [1] 70:8 **overseeing** [2] 159:13 159:15

oversees [1] 70:25 oversight [1] 71:3

own [4] 37:20 72:14 145:24 149:24

owner [3] 27:7,8,12

-P-

p.m [5] 101:3 114:16 129:14 143:2 170:18

P50 [7] 1:17,19 2:7,17 3:8,24 4:6

P90 [3] 1:17,23 3:7

page [35] 65:15,17 71:9 71:16 80:4,4,10 82:17 83:1 85:10 93:2 94:5,6 96:8 99:18,25 100:3,5,6 105:5,14 111:23 125:15 133:5,8,8 134:5 138:19 139:5,11 142:6 148:19 150:10 159:3 167:3

paid [1] 63:7

panel [12] 1:14 18:24 34:23 97:11 136:21 137:9 144:22 145:6 150:18 156:23 164:15 170:15

panels [1] 36:22

paper [54] 50:2 51:23 52:1,4,14,18 55:7 56:21 57:1,17 58:3 59:5,18,21 61:10.25 62:7 63:14.21 64:11,15,23 65:1 66:4 66:16 67:10,23,25 68:12 68:19.20 69:15 72:1 73:25 80:16 93:8,15 95:2 95:2,23 96:9,10,16,24 126:8 156:17,18,22 157:4 157:9 160:4,23 164:5 167:6

Paper's [7] 55:21 61:18 63:15 69:18,21 73:16 166:12

paragraph [1] 69:8 paraphrasing [1] 105:14

pardon [3] 84:24 95:16 138:18

part [14] 19:23 21:22 22:24 23:6 27:7 58:6,17 82:1 144:8,15,24 146:3 146:11 151:25

partial [1] 94:8 participate [1] 127:8 particular [8] 8:25 35:24 66:21 89:7 99:3 128:9 138:22 156:8

particularly [4] 5:11 32:23 85:16 147:10

particulars [1] 73:24 parties [1] 162:14 party [2] 64:6,9 **passed** [1] 56:18

past [13] 15:15 33:18 35:18 36:22,24 37:14 39:20 45:2 59:12 68:25 100:13 126:17 166:19

path [1] 33:16 Patrick [2] 98:2 167:13

PAUL [3] 1:7,9 97:14 **Paul's** [1] 62:20

pay [1] 117:18

payer [1] 39:4 payers [4] 56:18,22 58:13 59:14

paying [3] 25:10 62:18 62:24

payment [2] 60:4,5 **payments** [1] 60:2

pays [2] 142:18,25

peak [7] 1:21,25 2:1,18 10:20,21 11:7

peaking [1] 72:11 **pending** [1] 87:16

Peninsula [2] 8:21 28:17 **PENNELL** [1] 84:25

people [5] 78:12 151:6 152:2 153:11,14

per [13] 11:20 13:21 60:3 62:24 69:10,12 105:7 120:25 121:6 124:6.11 134:15 163:21

perceived [1] 12:9

percent [18] 1:21,22,24 93:6 95:20 99:22 100:10 102:15 111:10.12 123:5 149:23 150:20 166:13 167:18,19,20,24

percentage [3] 134:16 150:19,25

Perfect [1] 119:24 **perform** [1] 91:20

performance [7] 61:18 107:8 113:7,10 123:7 136:5 141:25

performing [2] 117:6 117:10

perhaps [16] 4:10 10:21 67:2 83:3 106:6 108:25 124:10,12 125:2 126:23 128:22 140:24 144:14 150:3.21 152:10

period [39] 2:21,24 3:15 10:17 15:5 16:13 17:9 19:20 21:13 32:23 33:13 33:23 39:23 42:11 43:6 43:8 47:14 75:22 88:20 89:13 90:13 91:8,15,18 91:18,24 92:7,15 96:3 100:19,20 103:8,15 104:11,15,15 114:5 127:23 161:8

periods [10] 3:3 5:2 9:12 18:10.10 21:18 22:1 38:14 44:19 92:9

person [4] 80:14,14 137:5 164:20

personally [1] 35:6

persons [1] 150:8 **perspective** [21] 26:12 26:19 36:8 37:4,19,23 37:24 38:2 47:11 52:25 53:4 60:16 61:1.2 62:23 120:18 121:1,15 133:19

157:23,24 **pertaining** [2] 85:8 87:3 **pertains** [1] 88:5 **phase** [1] 38:12 **phone** [1] 162:6 pick [2] 78:8 162:6 **picked** [2] 59:6 100:22 **picture** [1] 101:23 **piece** [3] 3:6 47:2 166:23 **pilot** [5] 55:18,19,21,22

64:17 **piloted** [1] 51:22 **pitching** [1] 40:19

place [8] 13:20 23:2 78:1 78:16 79:17,23 82:21 94:12

plan [7] 31:1,11 48:12 80:21 81:20 161:25 162:13

planned [15] 5:6 9:4 10:12 16:17 17:17 18:2 31:3 58:22 83:4,6 88:11 88:18 94:19 109:12 169:20

planning [16] 3:17 7:21 7:25 8:15 47:10 48:8 70:25 75:8 94:8 109:15 148:3 153:12 154:17 155:2,4,6

plans [3] 48:22,23 49:13 plant [30] 12:15 16:8,20 17:9 18:7,21 19:9 32:20 34:14 80:18,23 81:15 83:20 84:7 91:11,22,23 92:1 94:8 100:18 102:8 136:4 158:6.22.24 159:2 159:20 161:11 162:5 169:9

plants [2] 130:4,13 **play** [2] 4:23 8:14 **plus** [4] 37:20 99:13 108:13 128:1

PM [1] 96:10 point [29] 9:10 11:15 15:1,4 21:4,5,9,20,24 22:11 27:1 28:18 39:22 43:1 61:8 62:3,10 102:2 113:21 117:12 120:24 121:4 123:3,7 127:25 142:8,13 143:4 165:1

points [3] 52:24 101:10 117:16

policy [1] 22:20 Porter [33] 156:7,12 157:21 158:5,12,18 159:1 159:8,18,25 160:8,14 161:9 162:3,17,21 163:3 163:17,24 164:6,24 165:20.21 166:21.25 167:1 168:3,17,21 169:6

169:12,21,25

portions [4] 25:23 46:13 145:23 151:8

posed [1] 144:21

position [11] 7:24 11:23 64:13,20 67:14 85:14,17 148:2 155:12,14 158:14

positions [3] 165:5,11 165:12

positive [1] 58:11 **possibility** [1] 133:14 **possible** [2] 14:15 24:24 **possibly** [1] 147:10

post [1] 6:18

post-2018 [1] 40:13

pot [1] 162:9 **potential** [2] 54:10,15

power [54] 20:12 23:25 24:21,23 25:15 32:7 33:15 37:21 38:22 48:15 52:6,7,8,11,15,19,19,20 57:6,9 58:19 59:1 62:9 62:12 66:4 68:14 72:3,7 72:16,18 73:5 78:6,11 78:13,15,20,25 79:21 80:12 82:21,22 89:10 93:14 96:12.13 128:19

128:23 129:21 131:20 158:2,21 159:20 163:15 168:24 Power's [2] 31:22 32:9 practically [1] 40:25

practice [4] 5:23 20:6 126:17 138:24 **pre-filed** [1] 100:6

precisely [1] 167:18 **predict** [1] 58:18 preliminary [6] 1:4 117:11.24 118:1 120:23 124:21

premise [1] 51:25 **preparation** [1] 127:15 **prepared** [2] 47:22 127:13

preparedness [1] 29:10 **present** [1] 168:10 **presented** [1] 100:16 **presently** [2] 7:3 25:12 **President** [1] 148:3 pressure [1] 49:10

pretty [3] 33:17 49:4 140:3

presume [2] 85:11

141:12

prevent [2] 92:19,22 **previous** [12] 18:9 19:5 19:9 56:24 70:15 105:10 112:11.23 115:11 147:23 148:14 164:12

previously [3] 32:22 33:1 60:20

price [8] 54:12 69:16 73:18,22 106:25 107:2 142:25 143:5

prices - reported NL Hydro GRA

prices [4] 54:11 73:12 74:5 131:24 primarily [2] 93:7 163:14 primary [2] 9:23 25:25 principle [1] 137:22 probability [2] 1:24 3:10 problem [3] 31:11 66:2 83:8 problems [1] 86:20

problems [1] 86:20 procedure [1] 77:4 proceeding [2] 65:5 131:5

process [9] 6:3,6,10 8:8 27:16,19 75:18 137:19 137:20

Processing [1] 80:18 **produced** [1] 43:21 **producing** [3] 45:12 106:7,7

production [10] 32:16 33:4 38:23 43:17,19 99:23 105:13,24 127:9 130:13

program [2] 86:1 161:23 progress [1] 46:11 project [27] 100:12 114:20 115:24 116:1,7 117:18 121:24 123:18 124:17 149:3 151:7,9,10 151:12,18,24 152:2,4,6 152:15,17,20 153:2,4 154:10,22,23

projected [3] 56:16 122:4 141:20

projects [2] 146:23 149:4 **proper** [4] 41:15,17 66:19 67:13

proposals [1] 72:4 proposing [2] 99:20 139:24

protection [1] 86:1 **protocol** [3] 22:25 23:1 61:3

proven [2] 27:1 30:19 **provide** [12] 12:20 14:15 26:24 30:12 48:19 51:25 52:1 53:21 71:3 82:1 83:19 151:11

provided [7] 23:11 76:8 81:7,20,25 93:11 149:5

provides [2] 41:13 85:4 **providing** [7] 34:12 44:24 63:14 73:1 152:2 154:19.21

Province [1] 64:8 provinces [1] 8:10

proving [2] 27:4,17 prudent [1] 21:9 PUB-NLH-409 [3]

150:3 153:12 154:3

Public [1] 171:6 **Pulp** [52] 50:1 51:23 52:1 52:4,13,18 55:7,20 56:21 56:25 57:17 58:3 59:5 59:18,21 61:10,18,25 62:6 63:13,15,21 64:11 64:15,22 65:1 66:4,15 67:10,23,25 68:12,19 69:15,17,20 71:25 73:16 73:25 80:16 95:1 96:9 156:17,18,22 157:4,9 160:4,23 164:5 166:12 167:6

purchase [7] 57:10 69:15 72:7,9 78:13 96:11 130:15

purchased [1] 67:25 **purchasers** [1] 78:12 **purchases** [14] 37:20,21 38:23 59:1 66:4 67:22 67:24 68:11 69:6,14 70:2 72:3,16 130:14

purchasing [1] 68:7 **purpose** [2] 17:5 130:18 **purposes** [6] 25:21 38:21 52:12 73:7 131:11 135:7 **pursuant** [1] 129:19

pursue [1] 156:8 **purview** [2] 159:6 165:3

put [10] 3:20 7:1 28:3 36:8 41:21 54:20 106:17 116:17 117:17 137:19

putting [3] 28:7,22 34:4 **puzzle** [1] 166:23

-O-

Q.C [208] 1:11,12 2:5,11 3:22 4:3,9,14 5:3,17,22 6:13.21 7:12.19 8:4.16 9:16 10:3,10,15,23 11:9 11:21 12:3,8,19 13:1,8 13:17,23 14:5,14,23 15:12,22 16:2,15,23 17:2 17:11,16,21,25 18:15,23 19:13,17 20:5 21:1 22:2 22:8,14,18 23:9,14,18 24:18 25:9 26:6.13.20 27:3.11.15 29:18.25 30:4 30:10,17,25 31:17,19 32:1 33:2,24 34:16 35:7 36:7,25 37:9 38:10 39:6 39:14.21 40:4.8.16 41:22 42:1,6,17 43:3 44:1,8,13 45:7,11,18 46:5,23 47:24 48:7,24 49:21 50:7,14 50:18,25 51:8,17 53:3,8 53:16 54:3,7,19,25 55:5 55:11,16 56:1,6,12 57:2 57:21,25 58:14 59:3,15 60:8,17 61:16 62:15 63:10 64:3,21 65:4,10 65:16,20 66:1,8 67:1,17 68:5 69:2 70:3,20 71:17 71:22 72:19.23 73:9.21 74:9,22 75:12 76:6,13 77:2,10,16,22 78:18,23 79:5,10,22 80:1 81:3,18 81:23 82:6,11,15 84:1 84:12 85:6,23,25 86:5,9 86:14,18,25 87:12,18 88:2,21 89:3,20 90:5,17

91:3,12 92:2,24 93:20 93:24 94:4,24 95:8,13 96:5 97:9 170:5,14

qualified [1] 137:6 **quantified** [4] 104:3,8 106:13,16

quantifies [1] 121:9 **quantify** [4] 103:20 104:5 110:23 123:20

quantifying [1] 117:12 quantity [2] 107:2,4 quarter [1] 32:24 questioned [1] 24:3 questioning [5] 98:19 139:5 156:4,5,9

questions [17] 1:15 45:21 65:23 74:25 97:10 97:18,21 108:18 128:20 131:23 138:12 144:17 157:20 170:2,4,6,10

quickly [1] 156:16 **quite** [5] 6:4 47:1 78:1 81:9 107:11

quote [1] 134:1 **quoted** [1] 57:16

-R-

ramp [6] 16:14 32:14,18 32:23 33:13,22

ran [7] 10:19 19:8 29:3 110:3,15,15 139:15

range [2] 32:21 63:3 rate [33] 35:20 36:2,15 36:16,19 37:8 39:4 42:16 52:10 56:18,22 58:13 59:14 70:1,13 73:3,5 97:19 99:15,21 104:9 105:6 107:15,22 112:8 112:12 114:1 118:24 119:4 123:1 125:6 138:17 171:4

rates [12] 37:5 43:25 52:9 57:11,12,18,20 58:9 63:6 63:7 76:3,20

rather [3] 13:16 45:24 92:18

reached [1] 64:14 **react** [1] 90:16

read [1] 51:9 readiness [6] 45:19 46:1

reading [2] 158:10 166:19

46:7.22 47:2.6

ready [10] 9:8 16:12 18:2 19:11 29:13 147:11 151:2 154:15,25 155:11

real [2] 62:10 154:24

realized [1] 21:9 really [11] 25:16 47:12 47:16 53:23 73:3 87:7 120:10 139:21 141:12,14 160:18

reason [7] 30:11 36:20 68:17 89:15 103:7 124:13 137:18

reasonable [3] 6:11 19:20 43:7

reasonableness [2] 4:5 34:3

reasonably [1] 4:21 reasons [3] 9:21 58:25 66:15

reassess [1] 6:19 recalculated [1] 124:25 receiving [2] 59:22 96:16

recent [12] 37:14 43:5,8 44:3,11 49:2 54:12 100:23 103:5,9,13 107:7

recently [3] 6:5 29:14 33:19

recite [1] 149:1 recommendations [1] 99:8

record [14] 13:7 14:22 22:17 23:17 45:17 51:18 65:5 66:10 80:9 82:14 82:19 104:17 119:11 128:15

recorded [1] 145:13 recovering [1] 23:21 red [1] 48:3

redacted [3] 86:12,17 86:19

reduce [4] 38:3 69:14 72:14 94:10

reduced [7] 22:20 25:20 69:12 93:7 96:14 118:21 126:8

reduces [1] 44:24 reducing [1] 99:13 reduction [6] 53:24 54:14 68:21,23 118:25 119:1

redundancy [1] 75:10 refer [8] 50:13 54:4 76:7 80:2 82:16 93:1 95:9 152:22

reference [7] 3:23 4:16 40:9 93:25 96:8 125:16 125:21

referenced [4] 31:4,21 37:10 84:9

references [1] 83:1 **referred** [5] 31:20 54:22 57:22 95:16 133:4

referring [10] 5:9,16 65:15 99:18 108:17,24 146:7,24 152:20 154:3

reflect [4] 48:21 70:17 119:1 121:13

reflected [3] 70:1 103:13 143:1

reflection [3] 160:21 161:20 166:20

reflective [2] 73:15 113:11

reflects [1] 42:10 refurbishment [3] 161:23,25 162:13 **regard** [4] 31:23 97:21 131:4 161:17

regarding [4] 51:13 83:3 88:8 131:23

regardless [1] 118:17 **regards** [9] 18:17 22:21 30:21 33:7 45:19 48:8 59:16 64:15,23

regime [2] 120:5,15 regression [17] 105:9 112:1,22 113:14 114:2 114:10,13,18 122:9,11 122:15,17,19 125:18 133:13,16,18

regrets [1] 80:13 regretted [1] 82:24 regular [4] 33:12 36:14 46:9 157:18

regulated [4] 93:2 99:19 105:5 133:6

Regulation [1] 71:13 **regulations** [1] 71:10 **rejoined** [1] 158:14 **related** [11] 51:22 87:23 88:1 129:2 145:24 149:15 151:12 153:15 156:17 159:21 164:22

relating [4] 64:25 66:4 70:12 146:12

relation [24] 34:17 48:8 65:11 79:13 98:2 116:1 116:5 123:3 125:18 138:14,15,16,17 139:6,7 139:9 140:16 141:1,2,5 144:15 149:2.6 150:9

relationship [2] 136:14 142:17

relative [5] 36:2,10 62:17 93:6 95:20

relatively [2] 155:12 156:15

relaying [1] 164:21 reliability [8] 21:21,23 25:1 26:2 37:24 38:2 60:21 109:9

reliably [4] 11:16 24:23 25:3,15

reliance [1] 37:14 relied [2] 33:8 48:13 rely [2] 37:22 153:4 relying [1] 37:25 remainder [2] 15:20 128:1

remaining [4] 9:9 36:6 91:1 155:5

remind [1] 129:23 remove [1] 80:8

repeat [3] 65:8 91:5 114:21

reply [4] 24:8 45:15 67:18 165:25

report [10] 45:22 51:12 53:12 85:2 129:22 130:23 139:14 148:20,20 150:11 **reported** [3] 83:16 84:3

Index Page 10

October 21, 2015 130:25 **reporting** [1] 47:2 reports [8] 31:5 37:6 46:21 128:19,23 131:5,6 131:13 **represent** [1] 56:17 representative [3] 38:14 39:24 80:12 representatives 161 80:11.11.13 82:22.23 164:18 **represented** [2] 78:12 **represents** [1] 120:11 request [5] 81:5,11 128:8 151:10 163:9 **requested** [1] 165:5 requests [1] 72:4 **require** [1] 16:10 required [8] 9:5 16:7 19:12 25:24 53:2 62:14 161:4.7 requirement [3] 38:24 61:13 91:25 **requirements** [12] 7:22 31:21 38:14 40:13 68:21 75:8,24 93:5 95:20 101:16 105:13,24 requires [5] 16:8,21 18:13 35:16 91:18 **requiring** [1] 94:23 research [1] 20:9 reserve [11] 2:22 3:9 4:17,22 5:14 8:11 20:23 23:5 32:12 61:5 62:6 reserves [5] 21:22,24 22:25 23:2 61:8 resources [2] 24:6 53:1 respect [13] 63:13,22 64:11 71:11 97:18 99:10 102:4 105:12 131:22 138:11 148:23 156:5 166:3 respond [5] 9:9 20:4,14 20:22 140:25 response [9] 36:13 45:21 72:12 106:5 108:18 121:9 125:17 138:12 165:9 responsible [1] 27:4 restart [2] 28:12 97:8 result [6] 20:2 21:11 89:11 113:15,20,20 results [1] 132:10 **RESUME** [1] 84:18

reverse [1] 112:9

reverting [1] 6:15

6:8.9 93:13 98:7

revised [3] 124:15

125:10 127:6

review [7] 5:24 6:6 21:8

46:16 53:11 109:9 124:20

reviewed [7] 2:14,15 6:4

reviewing [1] 156:16

revise [2] 121:11 125:3

Revision [4] 55:10 165:20,22 166:25 **RFI** [5] 56:24 72:12 74:13 121:8 165:4 **RFIs** [2] 50:21 140:23 **right** [44] 1:5 2:8 4:4 5:23 7:6 13:18 14:2 15:16 16:3 17:13 23:15 25:12 26:17,18 30:1 31:18 33:21 37:16 42:7 43:4 48:6 55:6,20 57:3 64:8 73:10 79:6,11 84:16 85:24 86:23 91:13 94:25 97:10 109:10,14 110:23 132:17 137:24 148:11 151:2 153:22 162:4 168:22 **rights** [7] 63:16,18,22 64:7,7,12,18 risk [4] 28:22 29:16 30:3 92:17 road [1] 25:6 Robert [2] 1:8 86:8 robust [1] 20:18 **role** [12] 63:20 64:10 71:3 79:11,16 144:15 147:23 151:3,4 159:9,13,19 roles [1] 148:14 roll[1] 162:12 rolling [1] 85:2 **Rolph's** [2] 148:19 150:11 room[1] 98:10 **rotating** [1] 161:6 roughly [2] 55:23 127:20 RSP [10] 26:5 56:19 57:13 58:12 139:25 140:8 141:14 143:1,7,16 rule [1] 22:4 rules [4] 140:8,12,18 143:16 **run** [17] 10:16 11:1,4,23 12:9,11,17,22 19:1 88:6 92:19,21 109:22 110:1 123:5 140:2,3 running [15] 10:4 13:25 14:17 15:1,1 19:14 28:9 108:19 109:4,16 111:18 116:25 124:7 139:9 140:16 -Ssafe [1] 28:20 safety [1] 159:4

sake [1] 146:2 **salaries** [2] 165:8 167:21 save [1] 39:5 **savings** [23] 50:3,8 53:5 53:13,17,22,25 54:10,15 55:6 56:2,7,16,17 58:1,2 58:6 59:4,11 118:21,22 118:24 120:24 **saw** [1] 77:17 **Savs** [4] 64:6 69:8 120:23 168:14

schedule [8] 14:10 46:13 60:2 81:11 107:10 126:2 128:10 149:21 scheduled [2] 29:8 52:8 schedules [5] 17:12 29:1 29:2 94:18 149:21 scheduling [1] 28:19 scope [12] 41:12 75:25 152:6,13,17,19,21,21,24 153:8,16 168:4 screen [3] 64:5 80:9 82:19 **scroll** [2] 67:20 130:6 **scrolling** [1] 67:21 se [1] 163:21 season [1] 62:25 second [5] 26:21 69:7 94:7 138:18 167:11 **section** [4] 99:19 105:5 133:5.6 **see** [33] 6:25 10:4,11 11:10 13:24 18:24 20:6 39:2 48:2 61:2 67:24 69:3.8 70:4 80:9.24 81:19 82:10 84:13 88:3 90:18,18 93:13,25 94:8 112:17 124:3,8 125:10 129:19 139:1 154:6 166:9 seeing [4] 32:12 33:9 68:24 140:17

seeked [1] 11:12 segue [1] 69:4 **selling** [1] 117:16 **sense** [9] 26:9.19 38:4 41:2 43:14 52:25 58:22 67:4 73:1 sensitive [2] 73:11 85:15 sensitivity [3] 56:19 57:5 59:13 **sent** [1] 80:13 separate [2] 151:5 154:25 **separated** [1] 119:22 **September** [12] 28:24 28:24 29:4 49:3 63:12 82:17,20 85:10 109:7 134:5 142:7 156:25 September/October [1] 94:9 **sequence** [3] 23:3,6,7 **serve** [2] 31:14 75:9 **service** [32] 28:17,21 87:9 99:9,12,13,15,21 100:9,17 101:16 102:6,9 103:6,17 104:17,25 107:21 116:17 117:13 118:22,25 121:16,21 122:19 123:15 124:14 125:10 130:4 161:5 164:14 168:13 **services** [1] 149:6 **serving** [1] 81:15 **set** [7] 36:19 42:2 49:4 60:2 112:8 132:9,11 **sets** [1] 150:3

soon [1] 87:14

settle [2] 5:24 7:24 **settled** [2] 21:5 47:20 **settling** [1] 4:6 **seven** [4] 25:19 26:2 94:10 95:17 **shape** [2] 21:12,16 **shared** [1] 58:12 **sharing** [2] 8:11 20:23 155:17 **sheets** [2] 145:11 153:24 **shift** [1] 56:20 **short** [3] 96:3 103:8 156:15 73:5 **shortfall** [1] 5:13 **shortfalls** [1] 48:23 **shortly** [1] 75:20 72:18 **showing** [1] 22:10 span [1] 35:11 **shown** [1] 71:12 **shows** [2] 100:17 166:5 **shut** [7] 16:9,11 93:9,15 96:24 97:2,7 **shutdown** [7] 16:17 159:14 68:19 94:9,11 95:23 96:1 96:4 **shutdowns** [1] 94:14 **shutting** [2] 95:2 109:5 **side** [3] 76:15 78:5 147:12 148:15 168:12 **sight** [1] 46:15 **signed** [1] 6:10 **significant** [6] 8:14 34:6 34:6 35:19 37:7 92:15 significantly [2] 44:19 151:17 **similar** [3] 68:13,13 94:11 **simply** [2] 167:20,23 **spell** [1] 156:7 simultaneously [1] 16:22 single [3] 19:25 20:19 75:24 **sit** [1] 47:25 **situated** [1] 31:7 **situation** [7] 3:11,20 5:20 8:19 28:8 33:3 128:10 129:19 61:19 **situations** [1] 5:8 **six** [10] 25:19 26:1 29:5 35:18 55:3 82:17 83:1 **St** [2] 171:7,10 85:10 158:21 159:2 **slight** [1] 166:10 166:1.11 **small** [7] 45:4 92:14 145:3,17 150:13,16,23 **smoothing** [1] 150:21 124:14 151:16 **software** [1] 41:14 **stages** [1] 33:6 **solely** [1] 167:12 **solicitor** [1] 67:12 **someone** [3] 70:4 83:12 138:6 7:5 78:17 **sometime** [1] 30:5 **sometimes** [1] 146:22 somewhat [3] 36:8 82:9 123:19 **standpoint** [2] 26:3 38:5

Star [1] 80:15

start [27] 1:16 10:20 21:9 23:7 26:21,25 27:5,22 28:5,19,21 29:12,14 30:9 30:12,21 31:6,10,15 41:9 41:21 49:7 90:16 97:5 104:24 121:21 144:14 **started** [9] 12:17 19:11 47:17,17 51:24 90:11 91:2 116:19,22 **starting** [5] 16:14 54:8 93:3 95:18 138:20

starts [3] 47:13 74:21 139:5

startup [1] 96:13 state [1] 91:19 **states** [1] 93:4

station [29] 80:22 81:13 83:14 85:9,14 86:21 89:16,23 99:9,13,14,20 100:9.17 101:16 102:6.9 103:6.16 104:17 107:21 118:22,25 122:18 123:15 124:14 125:10 130:3 166:2

stations [2] 43:23 165:15 **statistical** [1] 130:23 **statistics** [3] 114:12,14 114:14

status [3] 85:5 97:1 123:18

stay [2] 11:8,18 **stayed** [2] 15:19,23

steam [1] 68:21 **step** [4] 23:3,3 50:23

118:19 **Stephenville** [1] 165:17

stick [1] 103:8

still [20] 3:8,24 17:8 25:1 25:2 29:22 32:18 46:16 49:14 58:11 59:13 73:18 89:22 90:9 92:13 106:1 106:6 112:13 123:18 155:7

storages [1] 25:25 storm [1] 5:12 **straight** [1] 101:8

Stratton [14] 1:9.19 35:3 42:13,25 43:11 44:20 47:11 96:19 114:11,15 126:3 136:25 157:16

strokes [1] 160:3 strong [1] 99:7

structure [1] 148:25 **studied** [1] 21:4

studies [2] 84:8 135:22

stuff [1] 148:5

subject [2] 52:9 71:18 **subsequent** [1] 71:15

subsequently [2] 63:19 96:17

such [15] 9:6 16:11 19:24 19:25 20:12 34:20,25 35:10 38:20 58:21,23 81:14 112:24 156:21 168:25

suddenly [1] 35:16 **suggest** [2] 97:6 100:21 **suggested** [1] 106:5 **sum** [1] 42:5 summary [1] 139:14

summer [15] 14:7 15:15 15:20 18:11 27:20 28:9 30:6 89:21 90:1,6 91:8 92:11 108:19 109:11,14

summers [4] 17:3 18:9 19:6,9

summertime [4] 11:6 11:17 14:12 16:18

Sunnyside [2] 88:17 89:23

supervisor [1] 79:19 supplemental [1] 87:3 **supplies** [10] 45:1 165:9 165:11.15.24 166:4.8.11 167:14.22

supply [5] 50:1 64:17 83:7,20 131:24

supplying [1] 44:25 support [9] 28:4 44:24 151:11 154:9,9,18,22 155:7,23

supporting [1] 22:4 suppose [2] 4:5 85:17 **switching** [2] 83:7,22 system [48] 4:21 5:15 6:11 7:10 20:12.18 24:21 24:23 25:8,15 27:9 28:3 28:4,7,16 29:15 34:4 41:16 43:15 50:2,8 52:24 53:4,5,13 56:7 58:4 60:12,13 61:6,22 70:7 70:24 71:24 72:11 73:1 78:14 79:21 83:10 85:22 89:10 93:6 136:3 154:7 154:16 155:4,6 157:13

systematic [1] 138:1

systems [7] 3:25 19:24 79:23 91:21 148:3 153:11 157:5

-T-

T001 [2] 61:4 62:4 **T1** [1] 83:7 **T2** [1] 83:7 table [10] 51:3,4,20 53:19 54:9 56:9 79:23 119:6 126:12 166:5 **take-or-pay** [1] 68:12 **takeaway** [1] 73:17 takes [2] 105:8 112:23 taking [9] 3:4 29:9 78:1 79:17 100:11 112:2 114:19 122:8 141:8 talks [1] 163:22 tangent [1] 12:5 tanks [1] 73:16

target [1] 46:18

tasked [3] 70:22 85:18

team [4] 144:16,25 145:22 151:10

technical [1] 75:23 technically [1] 8:8 telling [1] 16:16

ten [8] 42:11,15,21 45:8 45:14,15 94:10 101:13

ten-year [4] 100:19 101:22,23 103:15

tend [1] 11:7

tends [1] 11:18 term [6] 7:13 47:3 72:7 74:20 97:1 137:24

terminal [11] 10:1 80:22 81:13 83:13 85:9,14 86:21 89:16,23 165:14 166:2

terms [42] 18:7 20:21 22:3 31:2,23 33:3 34:2 36:14 40:18 46:1 47:5 55:6 60:1 61:12 75:14 89:2 91:11 98:18 106:13 114:1,3 120:17,17 122:13 123:14 129:22 137:9,13 137:24 139:2 141:3.18 142:23 143:21,24 144:1 144:1 150:20,22,23,25 168:22

test [34] 27:20,21 28:1,2 29:12.17 30:16 36:2.10 36:16 38:18 40:11 42:14 43:10 69:10 73:22,23 93:7 101:2 106:2 108:8 108:12 109:3,18,20 112:19 113:11 120:18.25 121:14 123:17 141:6.21 166:6

tested [4] 5:21 27:1,10 30:19

testimony [6] 13:14 95:6 100:6 134:2 164:13 166:19

testing [2] 27:4,16 thank [16] 22:15 23:19 71:23 82:12,16 86:10 97:11,16,16 100:5 109:20 119:13 120:1 134:11 144:13 156:14

themselves [1] 18:22 theoretically [1] 28:7 thereby [1] 118:21 **thermal** [7] 125:21 126:5 126:8 128:9 129:12 130:3

they've [3] 77:25 84:9 92:25

third [2] 121:22,25 **Thomas** [1] 155:7 **Thornton** [1] 148:20 **thought** [3] 39:7 71:18

thoughts [1] 99:14 thousand [1] 56:2 **three** [15] 16:17 17:22 18:11,14 21:13 32:14 38:15 51:15 90:20 91:7 93:3 100:7 110:5,8 121:15

threshold [4] 21:15,19 24:8 138:23

thresholds [1] 25:6 through [49] 2:22,24 3:2 4:18 6:5,9 8:7 19:4 25:11 26:4 28:8 32:23,24 33:13 33:22 41:18 45:2 46:16 47:14 49:18 50:24 56:19 57:13 59:5,20 67:18 68:8 68:18 75:17,19 78:6 79:6 92:7.8.9 93:10 94:2 98:21 100:18 109:14 120:11 127:2,6 143:1 145:22 154:23 157:13 162:22,25

throughout [2] 11:4 109:11

thrown [2] 162:9 167:24 thrust [1] 140:14 thunderstorm [1] 9:24 tied (1) 169:5 **timeframe** [1] 103:25 timelines [11 161:1 times [4] 6:4 17:8 28:15

72:12 **titles** [1] 154:18 to's [1] 56:10 to-day [1] 46:21 today [2] 48:1 92:16 together [1] 41:21 **Tom** [1] 1:14

too [5] 86:3 103:2 124:11 142:14 165:1

took [6] 4:18 15:4 21:12 92:17 114:10 140:14

tool [1] 114:14 **top** [4] 80:6 167:6,20,24 topic [2] 74:23 92:25 **total** [11] 9:4 12:15 16:20

17:9 19:9 52:16 55:21 61:1 92:1 109:12 167:17 touched [1] 40:17

towards [4] 25:3 99:9 104:10 151:17

tracing [4] 102:4 103:18 103:20 107:18

track [6] 8:5 37:4,6 126:1 130:23 136:5

transcribed [1] 171:7 **transcript** [2] 51:9 171:3 transfer [1] 62:11

transformer [3] 19:25 87:8 88:1

transformers [4] 83:8 83:19,23 87:9

transient [1] 83:9 **translate** [1] 118:22 transmission [24] 9:9 9:22 20:1,18 28:6,20 29:8,15 42:7,10 43:9 44:5,21 80:22 81:12 83:4 88:9,12,23 89:22 154:17

155:2,3,6

transmitted [1] 43:22 treated [1] 76:20

start - under **NL Hydro GRA**

tree [2] 150:4 153:12 **trends** [1] 100:13

tried [1] 163:8

trigger [1] 14:25 **trip** [3] 9:22 89:8 90:14

tripped [1] 89:15

trips[1] 83:11 **true** [2] 39:11 171:2

try [4] 84:4 91:16,17 94:18

trying [7] 58:18 140:15 162:23,23 163:4,4 167:9

turbine [5] 19:10 21:25 28:1,5 31:13

turbines [6] 19:8 139:10 139:14 140:17 141:1 165:18

turn [14] 8:17 15:7 19:19 55:8 74:23 96:6 111:23 116:1.3 129:23 142:15 148:19 164:25 167:2

turned [4] 16:22 27:19 48:3 116:13

turning [4] 26:21 113:15 114:11 125:15

turns [2] 11:16 135:11 twelve [1] 33:18

twice [1] 126:18

two [47] 1:16 18:3 21:13 28:10 32:19 35:24 36:3 44:22 51:15 59:16 68:19 71:10 80:10,11,12 82:22 82:23.23 83:19 84:22 87:9 88:16 91:16 94:5,6 99:10 102:16 103:17 110:14 115:18,19 116:16 116:21 118:12,13 121:21 122:1 123:4.8 131:5 132:15 152:9 154:6 155:5 155:17,22 157:11

type [5] 20:7 130:1 152:5 154:22 157:15

types [3] 34:15 76:5 157:20

typical [1] 21:12 **typically** [4] 13:24 14:6 14:10 79:17

-U-

Uh-hm [3] 17:24 143:18 162:20

ultimately [4] 26:18 31:14 43:25 92:17

unavailability [2] 3:19 3:19

unavailable [1] 18:14 **uncertainty** [1] 132:24

under [15] 42:22 56:15 59:12 61:12 66:5,12 67:3 68:12 69:7.9 80:5 83:4 83:11 96:9 142:17

156:23

undergoing [1] 9:4 understand [28] 2:6 17:12 26:14 39:7 42:9 55:17 58:2 67:18 69:3 83:2 87:1 91:6 105:8 106:17 114:13 117:11 128:10 130:20 140:10 147:6 156:22 157:25 158:13 160:11 165:2 166:18 168:9 170:9

understood [4] 116:4 125:22 168:24 169:3

undertake [3] 18:13 65:6 81:24

undertaking [19] 12:21 14:15 42:19,22 45:13 63:19,19,24 64:5 69:4 73:17 76:23 80:4 82:2 85:1,4 93:11 128:8 129:20

undertakings [3] 24:1 45:20 84:22

undertook [2] 21:8 75:3 unexpectedly [1] 33:10 unfavourable [1] 144:3 unique [1] 157:24

unit [68] 9:5,8 12:16,18
13:10,16,22 14:1,6,11
14:17 15:2,8,14,18,20
16:1,3 17:4,7,9 19:11
21:13,14,14,19 25:17
26:24 27:21,24 28:2,9
28:13,25 29:4,13 31:3
38:3,7 68:14 88:6 90:9
90:23 97:5 107:19 109:4
109:6,10 110:15 111:7
112:25 116:21,21 118:17
118:20 120:16 121:25
122:20 124:7 151:5,6,15
161:4,6 163:23 165:14
165:16 166:9

units [33] 10:11 13:25 16:8,10,11,18,22 18:3 18:11,14,18 21:10 25:22 26:1,17 30:8,21 38:2 52:23 58:21 90:21 91:7 91:19 107:23 108:20 109:15 110:5,8 116:16 118:14 120:6 123:8 136:5

unknown [3] 123:19,22 124:1

untoward [1] 10:6 up [57] 11:7,18,18 12:17 16:14 23:7 24:2 28:19 29:1,2 32:13,14,18,23 33:13,22 51:3 58:4,6 59:6 61:15 62:1,2 65:25 67:7,19 69:5 74:3,16 79:6 83:12 85:7,12,18 92:8 93:14 97:5 104:13 108:1,3,3,5,9 116:19,25 119:7 129:20,22 134:15 135:19 151:8 161:22 162:6 166:6 167:17,17 169:13

upcoming [1] 16:12 **update** [3] 33:19 49:2 127:16

updates [6] 33:12 46:9

48:19,20 82:2 157:19 **upfront** [3] 41:19 75:7,7 **Upper** [1] 147:1 **usage** [2] 39:23 106:6 **used** [15] 22:21 38:22 39:9,25,25 42:14 52:5 69:1 77:5 108:6 113:1,8 115:15 133:18 149:25

useful [1] 71:8 **uses** [4] 3:7 7:7 15:3 112:24

using [8] 2:7 42:20 43:5 73:7,18 104:10 112:21 113:16

utilities [4] 3:7 80:3,7 171:6

utility [6] 20:6 77:11,12 77:25 93:10 169:14 **utilization** [4] 53:14

57:15 58:8,10 **utilize** [2] 52:2,25

-V-

Vale [24] 32:7,12 33:6 33:13 75:3,15 76:8,19 80:10,17,20,24 81:5,25 82:23 83:1,5,6,13,16,20 84:4 85:13 86:21

Vale's [3] 32:2 33:3 85:9 validated [2] 6:8 8:9 value [5] 30:20 63:9 67:6 76:25 134:25

values [1] 11:7 **variable** [12] 60:5 99:11 100:12 115:23 116:6,17 116:20,23 118:15,18 123:6 124:16

variables [1] 121:15 variances [2] 23:21 37:6

various [4] 46:12 48:3 58:25 79:4

vary [1] 14:9 vein [1] 20:21 verifies [1] 70:5 verify [3] 70:9,14 71:4 versa [1] 132:17

version [2] 50:24 51:15 **versus** [6] 1:17 15:1 16:1 43:5 44:14,18

vice [2] 132:17 148:2 vicinity [1] 50:9

view [3] 113:6,21 123:8 voltage [2] 44:24 83:11 Volume [1] 99:19

-W-

walking [1] 162:22 water [11] 57:15 58:8,10 58:24 63:16,18,22 64:6 64:12,18 72:13

ways [1] 20:14 **weakest** [1] 88:16

weather [2] 9:24 89:16 web [4] 65:14,17 71:9,16 week [6] 21:21 22:1 33:19 49:9 60:25 85:3 weekly [1] 46:10 weeks [1] 91:16 weigh [1] 101:14 **weighed** [1] 104:10 weighted [5] 112:10 113:8 115:3,9,15 **welcome** [1] 93:1 **whack** [1] 36:16 Whereas [1] 55:3 whereby [1] 8:19 **whole** [3] 6:3 31:10 70:13 wind [3] 9:24 68:13 80:16 window [10] 27:9 28:19 28:23,25 29:7,22,23 60:22 100:22,25

windows [1] 27:22 winter [13] 29:10 45:19 46:1,7,22 47:1,6,12,13 47:16 60:3 62:25 87:10

wish [2] 65:23 170:15 **within** [9] 117:19 136:7 136:14 150:8 153:11 157:7 159:6 165:14,15

without [5] 4:18 55:19 55:22 68:10 140:8

withstand [1] 20:19 witness [1] 86:1 wonder [2] 65:6 66:9

wondering [6] 2:15 15:13 42:22 50:22 86:4 115:13

word [2] 86:13 137:23 words [2] 93:1 132:9 worked [1] 158:20

works [6] 3:11 60:4 62:7 66:22 67:4 130:5 **writing** [3] 22:21 23:10

writing [3] 22:21 23:10 95:14

wrong [2] 12:5 122:7

-Y-

year [54] 8:19 16:8 27:23 32:13,14 36:3,10,17 38:18 40:11 41:10,20 42:11,15,15,21 43:10 44:14 55:4 56:16 69:10 73:22,23 78:17 93:7 100:25,25 101:2 106:2 107:13 108:8,12 109:3 109:18,20 110:21 112:19 113:12 117:19 120:18,25 121:14,16,22 123:17 126:18,22 128:2 133:20 135:11.19 141:7.21 166:6 years [47] 5:25 7:9 25:19 25:19 26:2 32:19 35:13 35:14,18,24,25 36:3,12 36:21,24 37:14 38:15 39:20 40:1 43:5.6.8 44:17 45:3 49:18 54:13

57:7 59:12 67:9 68:8,17 72:8 74:10 101:13 105:10 108:5,9,11 112:3,11 113:9 114:4 115:11 122:4 158:20 159:2 161:5

yellow [1] 48:3

yesterday [33] 1:18 4:19 5:10,16 6:22 7:13 8:18 13:14 14:24 15:5 23:20 26:23 31:2,20 40:9 41:8 42:9,19 45:23 46:10,14 48:11 88:8 89:5 106:4 111:24 115:24 125:16 128:18 138:11,20 144:17 158:1

yet [1] 40:21

Young [12] 65:7,13,18 65:22 66:10,11 67:5 71:6 71:20,23 82:7,8

yourself [2] 97:21 154:5