	5, 2021		NP 2022-2023 General Rate Application
	Page 1		Page 3
1	(10:00 a.m.)	1	CHAIR:
2	CHAIR:	2	Q. Thank you, sirs. Newfoundland and Labrador
3	Q. Now, we're going to try this. We're not	3	Hydro?
4	socially distanced up here, so I get to take	4	MS. WALSH:
5	my mask off and the rest have to keep theirs	5	Q. Good morning, it's Shirley Walsh, regulatory
6	on. Good morning, everybody. I'd like to	6	counsel for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro
7	welcome everyone to the pre-hearing	7	and with me is Kevin Fagan.
8	conference for Newfoundland Power's 2022,	8	CHAIR:
9	2023 General Rate Application. My name is	9	Q. Thank you. Welcome everybody. So the
10	Darlene Whalen, I'm the Chair and CEO of the	10	purpose of our pre-hearing conference this
11	Board and I will be the presiding member for	11	morning is to assist with the organization
12	this proceeding. Other Board members	12	and planning for the public hearing of
13	joining me on the panel are, starting from	13	Newfoundland Power's application. This
I	my left, your right, Christopher Pike,	14	includes identifying the intervenors,
14	• • • •	15	
15	Commissioner with the Board; Dwanda Newman,		setting the schedule and addressing other
16	Commissioner and Vice-Chair; and John	16	procedural matters. I'd like to now turn to
17	O'Brien, Commissioner. We also have	17	Board counsel to ask that she enter the
18	assisting us at the side table Maureen	18	matter and confirm issuance of appropriate
19	Greene, our hearing counsel; Jackie Glynn,	19	public notice and any other agenda items you
20	our Board counsel; and Cheryl Blundon, our	20	wish to proceed with immediately following,
21	Board secretary sitting at the back. This	21	you can carry on.
22	pre-hearing conference is being recorded	22	MS. GLYNN:
23	under the supervision of the Board secretary	23	Q. Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning to the
24	and will be transcribed and distributed	24	panel and to the parties. On May 27th, 2021
25	electronically following the proceeding.	25	the Board received a General Rate
	Page 2		Page 4
1	Before we move the agenda for this morning,	1	Application from Newfoundland Power to
2	I'd like to ask the parties seated before us	2	establish new rates for its customers.
3	to identify themselves and on whose behalf	3	Newfoundland Power is requesting that the
4	you're appearing for the purposes of the	4	Board approve, among other things, an
I -	a Ta Tana Tana Tana Tana Tana Tana Tana		Board approve, among other unings, an
5	record and we will start with the Applicant.	5	overall average increase in current
6	record and we will start with the Applicant. MR. O'BRIEN:	5 6	
1	MR. O'BRIEN:		overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March
1	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners,	6 7	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was
6 7	MR. O'BRIEN:	6 7 8	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published
6 7 8	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic	6 7	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province
6 7 8 9 10	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland	6 7 8 9 10	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was
6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic	6 7 8 9 10 11	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power. CHAIR:	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power. CHAIR: Q. Welcome Mr. Foley to your first proceeding I	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of interventions was June 23rd, 2021 and the
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power.  CHAIR: Q. Welcome Mr. Foley to your first proceeding I understand?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of interventions was June 23rd, 2021 and the Board has received notice of two Intervenor
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power. CHAIR: Q. Welcome Mr. Foley to your first proceeding I understand? MR. FOLEY:	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of interventions was June 23rd, 2021 and the Board has received notice of two Intervenor submissions, one from the Consumer Advocate
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power. CHAIR: Q. Welcome Mr. Foley to your first proceeding I understand? MR. FOLEY: Q. Yes, thank you.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of interventions was June 23rd, 2021 and the Board has received notice of two Intervenor submissions, one from the Consumer Advocate and one from Newfoundland and Labrador
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power.  CHAIR: Q. Welcome Mr. Foley to your first proceeding I understand?  MR. FOLEY: Q. Yes, thank you. CHAIR:	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of interventions was June 23rd, 2021 and the Board has received notice of two Intervenor submissions, one from the Consumer Advocate and one from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Counsel for these Intervenors have
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power.  CHAIR: Q. Welcome Mr. Foley to your first proceeding I understand?  MR. FOLEY: Q. Yes, thank you.  CHAIR: Q. You're welcome. Consumer Advocate?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of interventions was June 23rd, 2021 and the Board has received notice of two Intervenor submissions, one from the Consumer Advocate and one from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Counsel for these Intervenors have just been introduced. We have just reached
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power.  CHAIR: Q. Welcome Mr. Foley to your first proceeding I understand?  MR. FOLEY: Q. Yes, thank you.  CHAIR: Q. You're welcome. Consumer Advocate?  MR. FITZGERALD:	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of interventions was June 23rd, 2021 and the Board has received notice of two Intervenor submissions, one from the Consumer Advocate and one from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Counsel for these Intervenors have just been introduced. We have just reached agreement on the schedule of dates.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power.  CHAIR: Q. Welcome Mr. Foley to your first proceeding I understand?  MR. FOLEY: Q. Yes, thank you.  CHAIR: Q. You're welcome. Consumer Advocate?  MR. FITZGERALD: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair. It's Steve	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of interventions was June 23rd, 2021 and the Board has received notice of two Intervenor submissions, one from the Consumer Advocate and one from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Counsel for these Intervenors have just been introduced. We have just reached agreement on the schedule of dates. Following the process of recent general rate
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power.  CHAIR: Q. Welcome Mr. Foley to your first proceeding I understand?  MR. FOLEY: Q. Yes, thank you.  CHAIR: Q. You're welcome. Consumer Advocate?  MR. FITZGERALD: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair. It's Steve Fitzgerald appearing on behalf of the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of interventions was June 23rd, 2021 and the Board has received notice of two Intervenor submissions, one from the Consumer Advocate and one from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Counsel for these Intervenors have just been introduced. We have just reached agreement on the schedule of dates. Following the process of recent general rate reviews the schedule will include two rounds
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power.  CHAIR: Q. Welcome Mr. Foley to your first proceeding I understand?  MR. FOLEY: Q. Yes, thank you.  CHAIR: Q. You're welcome. Consumer Advocate?  MR. FITZGERALD: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair. It's Steve Fitzgerald appearing on behalf of the Consumer Advocate, Mr. Dennis Browne.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of interventions was June 23rd, 2021 and the Board has received notice of two Intervenor submissions, one from the Consumer Advocate and one from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Counsel for these Intervenors have just been introduced. We have just reached agreement on the schedule of dates. Following the process of recent general rate reviews the schedule will include two rounds of requests for information, filing of
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>MR. O'BRIEN:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power.</li> <li>CHAIR:</li> <li>Q. Welcome Mr. Foley to your first proceeding I understand?</li> <li>MR. FOLEY:</li> <li>Q. Yes, thank you.</li> <li>CHAIR:</li> <li>Q. You're welcome. Consumer Advocate?</li> <li>MR. FITZGERALD:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Madam Chair. It's Steve Fitzgerald appearing on behalf of the Consumer Advocate, Mr. Dennis Browne.</li> <li>BROWNE, Q.C.:</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of interventions was June 23rd, 2021 and the Board has received notice of two Intervenor submissions, one from the Consumer Advocate and one from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Counsel for these Intervenors have just been introduced. We have just reached agreement on the schedule of dates. Following the process of recent general rate reviews the schedule will include two rounds of requests for information, filing of expert reports, followed by another round of
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. O'BRIEN: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioners, Liam O'Brien, outside counsel for Newfoundland Power and with me is Dominic Foley, internal counsel for Newfoundland Power.  CHAIR: Q. Welcome Mr. Foley to your first proceeding I understand?  MR. FOLEY: Q. Yes, thank you.  CHAIR: Q. You're welcome. Consumer Advocate?  MR. FITZGERALD: Q. Good morning, Madam Chair. It's Steve Fitzgerald appearing on behalf of the Consumer Advocate, Mr. Dennis Browne.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	overall average increase in current electricity rates of 0.8 percent as of March 1st, 2022. Notice of the application was placed on the Board's website and published in newspapers throughout the province starting on June 12th, 2021. The notice was published in The Telegram and The Westcoast Wire. The deadline for filing of interventions was June 23rd, 2021 and the Board has received notice of two Intervenor submissions, one from the Consumer Advocate and one from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Counsel for these Intervenors have just been introduced. We have just reached agreement on the schedule of dates. Following the process of recent general rate reviews the schedule will include two rounds of requests for information, filing of

	, 2021	NP 2022-2023 General Rate Application			
	Page 5		Page 7		
1	negotiation discussions before the hearing.	1	procedure, very similar to the rules that		
2	The dates and the order of the witnesses for	2	this Board uses, except if you see at—or		
3	the hearing will be determined at a later		you'll see at Section 14(d) it says, "A		
4			response to an information request must		
5	5 discussed further. As I just mentioned we		identify the appropriate individual in the		
6	do have agreement on the schedule of dates	5 6	cover letter who can be contacted for		
7			information related to the information		
8	order.	8	request responses and where a response to an		
9	The Rules of Procedure have been	9	individual question is responded to by		
10	circulated to the parties and discussed by	10	persons other than the party to whom the		
11	counsel. They are consistent with the rules	11	information request is directed, i.e.		
12	that have been used by the Board on its most	12	consultant expert or other third party, as		
13	recent hearings. The Consumer Advocate has	13	part of the response identify where the		
14	proposed a change to Section 6(e) which	14	appropriate person responding to that		
15	Newfoundland Power, I understand, does not	15	question." So I don't think that's a big		
16	agree with, so I would ask that counsel	16	leap of change, I don't think, you know, if		
17	provide their position on this suggested	17	the Board adopted a similar identification		
18	change to the panel and we would start with	18	process that it would inflict any hardship		
19	the Consumer Advocate, please.	19	on Newfoundland Power or Hydro in the case		
20	MR. FITZGERALD:	20	of their applications. You know, the		
21	Q. Thank you. Where would we be without a bit	21	situation that we've encountered in the past		
22	of controversy to start. Yesterday I had	22	is if we're at a, once the hearing commences		
23	communicated with Board counsel regarding	23	on the 23rd and we ask a question of a		
24	the proposed change to the information	24	witness and that witness indicates, oh well,		
25	request format. This topic has come up in	25	so and so is better off answering that than		
	Page 6		Page 8		
1	the past, I believe we discussed it with	1	I, then we're in a situation where, you		
2	Newfoundland Power's previous counsel, Mr.	2	know, the hearing is already commenced, we		
3	Hayes, sometime ago at a technical				
1 2					
4	conference and it's also reappeared	3 4	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to		
	•	3	have so and so may not be available. It		
4	conference and it's also reappeared	3 4	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to		
4 5	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget	3 4 5	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents		
4 5 6	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report,	3 4 5	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the		
4 5 6 7	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their	3 4 5 6 7	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that		
4 5 6 7 8	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you	3 4 5 6 7 8	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets		
4 5 6 7 8 9	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just for example, this morning, not to clutter	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and there's, I'm assuming, a team that puts the		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just for example, this morning, not to clutter you up too early, I have procedural rules	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and there's, I'm assuming, a team that puts the information together and I'm assuming		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just for example, this morning, not to clutter you up too early, I have procedural rules from B.C., I'd like to just refer to these	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and there's, I'm assuming, a team that puts the information together and I'm assuming there's a team leader, so that fact exists,		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just for example, this morning, not to clutter you up too early, I have procedural rules from B.C., I'd like to just refer to these briefly.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and there's, I'm assuming, a team that puts the information together and I'm assuming there's a team leader, so that fact exists, I'm assuming and I don't think it would be		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just for example, this morning, not to clutter you up too early, I have procedural rules from B.C., I'd like to just refer to these briefly.  CHAIR:  Q. Thanks, Steve. Cheryl can take the ones for the panel.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and there's, I'm assuming, a team that puts the information together and I'm assuming there's a team leader, so that fact exists, I'm assuming and I don't think it would be great hardship from the outset for the person who is proponing the evidence, identify themselves. So that's essentially		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just for example, this morning, not to clutter you up too early, I have procedural rules from B.C., I'd like to just refer to these briefly.  CHAIR:  Q. Thanks, Steve. Cheryl can take the ones for the panel.  MR. FITZGERALD:	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and there's, I'm assuming, a team that puts the information together and I'm assuming there's a team leader, so that fact exists, I'm assuming and I don't think it would be great hardship from the outset for the person who is proponing the evidence,		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just for example, this morning, not to clutter you up too early, I have procedural rules from B.C., I'd like to just refer to these briefly.  CHAIR:  Q. Thanks, Steve. Cheryl can take the ones for the panel.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. And I'm just providing this for illustrative	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and there's, I'm assuming, a team that puts the information together and I'm assuming there's a team leader, so that fact exists, I'm assuming and I don't think it would be great hardship from the outset for the person who is proponing the evidence, identify themselves. So that's essentially our submission this. I don't think it deviates from any sort of accepted practice		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just for example, this morning, not to clutter you up too early, I have procedural rules from B.C., I'd like to just refer to these briefly.  CHAIR:  Q. Thanks, Steve. Cheryl can take the ones for the panel.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. And I'm just providing this for illustrative purposes. This is, these are the rules that	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and there's, I'm assuming, a team that puts the information together and I'm assuming there's a team leader, so that fact exists, I'm assuming and I don't think it would be great hardship from the outset for the person who is proponing the evidence, identify themselves. So that's essentially our submission this. I don't think it deviates from any sort of accepted practice in other jurisdictions and I think the B.C.		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just for example, this morning, not to clutter you up too early, I have procedural rules from B.C., I'd like to just refer to these briefly.  CHAIR:  Q. Thanks, Steve. Cheryl can take the ones for the panel.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. And I'm just providing this for illustrative purposes. This is, these are the rules that were referred to in a Fortis B.C. Energy	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and there's, I'm assuming, a team that puts the information together and I'm assuming there's a team leader, so that fact exists, I'm assuming and I don't think it would be great hardship from the outset for the person who is proponing the evidence, identify themselves. So that's essentially our submission this. I don't think it deviates from any sort of accepted practice in other jurisdictions and I think the B.C. example is pretty clear. So that's our		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just for example, this morning, not to clutter you up too early, I have procedural rules from B.C., I'd like to just refer to these briefly.  CHAIR:  Q. Thanks, Steve. Cheryl can take the ones for the panel.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. And I'm just providing this for illustrative purposes. This is, these are the rules that were referred to in a Fortis B.C. Energy case back in 2016. I understand these are	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and there's, I'm assuming, a team that puts the information together and I'm assuming there's a team leader, so that fact exists, I'm assuming and I don't think it would be great hardship from the outset for the person who is proponing the evidence, identify themselves. So that's essentially our submission this. I don't think it deviates from any sort of accepted practice in other jurisdictions and I think the B.C. example is pretty clear. So that's our submission, we think that should be an		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just for example, this morning, not to clutter you up too early, I have procedural rules from B.C., I'd like to just refer to these briefly.  CHAIR:  Q. Thanks, Steve. Cheryl can take the ones for the panel.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. And I'm just providing this for illustrative purposes. This is, these are the rules that were referred to in a Fortis B.C. Energy case back in 2016. I understand these are the current rules that BCUC employs and if	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and there's, I'm assuming, a team that puts the information together and I'm assuming there's a team leader, so that fact exists, I'm assuming and I don't think it would be great hardship from the outset for the person who is proponing the evidence, identify themselves. So that's essentially our submission this. I don't think it deviates from any sort of accepted practice in other jurisdictions and I think the B.C. example is pretty clear. So that's our submission, we think that that should be an adjustment made to the Rules of Procedure.		
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	conference and it's also reappeared somewhat, this issue in the Midgard Report, which I know relates to capital budget hearings, but pursuant to their jurisdictional scan, it appears that, you know, there is an identification of a party who is providing response to an RFI and just for example, this morning, not to clutter you up too early, I have procedural rules from B.C., I'd like to just refer to these briefly.  CHAIR:  Q. Thanks, Steve. Cheryl can take the ones for the panel.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. And I'm just providing this for illustrative purposes. This is, these are the rules that were referred to in a Fortis B.C. Energy case back in 2016. I understand these are	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	have so and so may not be available. It would be better, I think, we'd submit, to have full disclosure of who the proponents are going to be of the evidence prior to the hearing starting. Now, I'm assuming that for every issue that Newfoundland Power sets forward, every segment of their evidence, if you will, it's organized, obviously, and there's, I'm assuming, a team that puts the information together and I'm assuming there's a team leader, so that fact exists, I'm assuming and I don't think it would be great hardship from the outset for the person who is proponing the evidence, identify themselves. So that's essentially our submission this. I don't think it deviates from any sort of accepted practice in other jurisdictions and I think the B.C. example is pretty clear. So that's our submission, we think that should be an		

July 6	, 2021		NP 2022-2023 General Rate Application
	Page 9		Page 11
1	or the panel have any questions?	1	CHAIR:
2	CHAIR:	2	Q. So you want that identification, yes. Any
3	Q. So you're proposing that where a party	3	questions or –
4	directs an RFI to Newfoundland Power, so for	4	COMMISSIONER O'BRIEN:
5	example CAMP, Owen (phonetic).	5	Q. No.
6	MR. FITZGERALD:	6	CHAIR:
7	Q. Yes.	7	Q. Newfoundland Power, would you like to give
8	CHAIR:	8	us your –
9	Q. And Newfoundland Power responds to that	9	MR. O'BRIEN:
10	information request, you would like to have	10	Q. I would. Just to pick up on that last
11	the identification of the person that's	11	point, I would assume that would be the case
12	answering that specific information request?	12	anyway, any question that's responded to by
13	MR. FITZGERALD:	13	someone other than Newfoundland Power,
14	Q. Yes, and I'm assuming it would be either the	14	Newfoundland Power would identify who is
15	leading of that particular segment of the	15	responding to that and Newfoundland Power
16	evidence or whomever, I don't know who it	16	wouldn't necessarily adopt that response
17	will be, but yes.	17	without notifying the parties as to who
18	CHAIR:	18	prepared that response. But in the normal
19	Q. And you put forward BCUC, so that E where it	19	course of things, I think what's being
20	says "where a response to an individual	20	requested here is a little bit different
21	questions is responded to by persons other	21	than what I heard yesterday and what I heard
22	than the party to whom the information	22	yesterday was to provide the individual's
23	request is directed, i.e. a consultant,	23	names, whoever prepared the RFI so they can
24	expert", I read that as, for example if	24	be subject to cross-examination and to me,
25	there's an information request filed, put to	25	that's something a little bit different than
	Page 10		Page 12
1	Newfoundland Power which is responded to by	1	what I am hearing today in terms of
2	one of their experts or someone who is not	2	providing a name as to who prepared the RFI
3	within the company, does that –	3	as a team leader, that's somewhat different
4	MR. FITZGERALD:	4	in that Newfoundland Power, the GRA itself
5	Q. That's the way I read it as well.	5	has a number of components and Newfoundland
6	CHAIR:	6	Power will present witnesses on each
7	Q. Okay. And the person responding to that	7	component as essentially a team leader for
8	question within—from that outside, from that	8	each component to adopt the evidence put
9	other party other than someone within	9	forward, there's pre-filed evidence and the
10	Newfoundland Power, is that the way that –	10	RFIs, so as far as notification, the parties
11	MR. FITZGERALD:	11	will receive notification when they hear the
12	Q. Yes, I guess in the case, I suppose if it	12	names of the witnesses to testify and I
13	was, for example, the cost of capital	13	mean, there's no subterfuge here when it
14	expert, well then we would know who that is,	14	comes to that and I think each, like the
15	but if it was like Liberty or a Midgard or	15	Consumer Advocate is aware of how these
16	something like that, than that type of	16	things proceed and have proceeded in the
17	consultant, then we would –	17	past. The idea of naming the individuals
18	CHAIR:	18	makes it a little bit difficult where
19	Q. I would assume, for example, cost of capital	19	responding to a RFI is a process, it's not
20	questions posed on the cost of capital in	20	just one individual responding to it.
21	Newfoundland Power's application would be	21	There's a number of people involved and it's
22	responded to, perhaps, by Mr. Aucoin who is	22	an iterant process and to say here's the
23	their –	23	group of individuals that responded to it,
l .	MR. FITZGERALD:	24	take your pick and you chose who you put on
24	WIR. TITZGERUED.		take your pick and you chose who you put on
25	Q. Right, in that case, yes.	25	the stand, I don't think that's appropriate

	2021		NP 2022-2023 General Rate Application
	Page 13		Page 15
1	and Newfoundland Power would certainly be in	1	information related to the information
2	a position to tell the Consumer Advocate who	2	request responses, that will be, I think
3	is going to testify and provide evidence and	3	what we do normally which is a singular
4	adopt those RFIs in each component, so I	4	contact person. If there are questions with
5	don't see why there's any necessity to make	5	respect to the RFI responses, they can then
6	a change and to say there's a jurisdictional	6	be processed through that person; and in (e)
7	scan that suggests that this is what's done	7	if the response to an individual question is
8	out there, I don't think that's the case	8	responded to by persons other than the
9	either. That's not really consistent with	9	party, and we view the party as being either
10	what we understand to be consistent	10	Newfoundland Power or Newfoundland Hydro, as
11	practice, regulatory practice. There may be	11	the case may be, identifying if there is
12	technical conferences where an individual is	12	somebody other than that organization that's
13	provided as a project leader on a particular	13	answering, and we have done that. I think,
14	component where it's appropriate to have	14	for example in our cost of service
15	them come forward and provide answers to	15	proceeding we had some RFIs, we had an
16	questions, that sort of thing, but I think	16	external consultant who was answering some
17	it's in the hands of the applicant to put	17	of them and we identified that the answer
18	forth their witnesses and I don't think the	18	was from that external consultant. So I
19	naming of individuals on that RFI provides	19	think we already do comply with the rules as
20	any source of assistance to the Board or the	20	B.C. has set out and I think it would be
21	parties. If there's a response that's	21	onerous and I'm not sure much of a value add
22	lacking and there's no further RFI process	22	if we were to provide the identity of all
23	to delve into that, there's a Motions Day to	23	the people who contributed to an RFI
24	address that kind of thing, if that's a	24	response. I think that the witness lists
25	concern. So I really don't think there's a	25	and the issues lists are certainly
	Page 14		Page 16
	1 "8" 1 1		1 age 10
1	need for a change in the procedure as being	1	transparent for that purpose.
1 2	<u> </u>	1 2	-
1	need for a change in the procedure as being		transparent for that purpose.
2	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.	2	transparent for that purpose. (10:15 a.m.)
2 3	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here. CHAIR:	2 3	transparent for that purpose. (10:15 a.m.) CHAIR:
2 3 4	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:	2 3 4 5 6	transparent for that purpose. (10:15 a.m.) CHAIR: Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to – MR. FITZGERALD:
2 3 4 5	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our	2 3 4 5	transparent for that purpose. (10:15 a.m.) CHAIR: Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to –
2 3 4 5	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:	2 3 4 5 6	transparent for that purpose. (10:15 a.m.) CHAIR: Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to – MR. FITZGERALD:
2 3 4 5 6 7	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	transparent for that purpose. (10:15 a.m.) CHAIR: Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to – MR. FITZGERALD: Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	transparent for that purpose. (10:15 a.m.) CHAIR: Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to – MR. FITZGERALD: Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.)  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to –  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.)  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to –  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.)  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to –  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional scan, I think we're all familiar with the Midgard Report to a certain extent, but one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter, it could be across a number of teams	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.)  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to –  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional scan, I think we're all familiar with the Midgard Report to a certain extent, but one of the questions that they had asked each
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter, it could be across a number of teams depending on the question that's being asked	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.)  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to –  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional scan, I think we're all familiar with the Midgard Report to a certain extent, but one of the questions that they had asked each jurisdiction was are information requests
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter, it could be across a number of teams depending on the question that's being asked and then through the review process, so we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.)  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to –  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional scan, I think we're all familiar with the Midgard Report to a certain extent, but one of the questions that they had asked each
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter, it could be across a number of teams depending on the question that's being asked and then through the review process, so we view the RFIs as being responses from the organization as a whole. And we would view, as Newfoundland Power said, our witness	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.)  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to —  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional scan, I think we're all familiar with the Midgard Report to a certain extent, but one of the questions that they had asked each jurisdiction was are information requests and responses sworn into evidence and subject to cross-examination? That was a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter, it could be across a number of teams depending on the question that's being asked and then through the review process, so we view the RFIs as being responses from the organization as a whole. And we would view, as Newfoundland Power said, our witness lists to be the people who could speak to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.) CHAIR: Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to – MR. FITZGERALD: Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional scan, I think we're all familiar with the Midgard Report to a certain extent, but one of the questions that they had asked each jurisdiction was are information requests and responses sworn into evidence and subject to cross-examination? That was a question that was put to Utilities. B.C.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter, it could be across a number of teams depending on the question that's being asked and then through the review process, so we view the RFIs as being responses from the organization as a whole. And we would view, as Newfoundland Power said, our witness lists to be the people who could speak to all of the issues that we have provided	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.) CHAIR: Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to – MR. FITZGERALD: Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional scan, I think we're all familiar with the Midgard Report to a certain extent, but one of the questions that they had asked each jurisdiction was are information requests and responses sworn into evidence and subject to cross-examination? That was a question that was put to Utilities. B.C. said yes, IR responses go into evidence, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter, it could be across a number of teams depending on the question that's being asked and then through the review process, so we view the RFIs as being responses from the organization as a whole. And we would view, as Newfoundland Power said, our witness lists to be the people who could speak to all of the issues that we have provided evidence upon in an application. With	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.)  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to —  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional scan, I think we're all familiar with the Midgard Report to a certain extent, but one of the questions that they had asked each jurisdiction was are information requests and responses sworn into evidence and subject to cross-examination? That was a question that was put to Utilities. B.C. said yes, IR responses go into evidence, and can be cross-examined. Alberta, same thing,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter, it could be across a number of teams depending on the question that's being asked and then through the review process, so we view the RFIs as being responses from the organization as a whole. And we would view, as Newfoundland Power said, our witness lists to be the people who could speak to all of the issues that we have provided evidence upon in an application. With respect to the rules, the B.C. rules, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.)  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to —  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional scan, I think we're all familiar with the Midgard Report to a certain extent, but one of the questions that they had asked each jurisdiction was are information requests and responses sworn into evidence and subject to cross-examination? That was a question that was put to Utilities. B.C. said yes, IR responses go into evidence, and can be cross-examined. Alberta, same thing, all hearings, intervenors are able to cross-
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter, it could be across a number of teams depending on the question that's being asked and then through the review process, so we view the RFIs as being responses from the organization as a whole. And we would view, as Newfoundland Power said, our witness lists to be the people who could speak to all of the issues that we have provided evidence upon in an application. With respect to the rules, the B.C. rules, the way I read these, I think this is what we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.) CHAIR: Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to – MR. FITZGERALD: Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional scan, I think we're all familiar with the Midgard Report to a certain extent, but one of the questions that they had asked each jurisdiction was are information requests and responses sworn into evidence and subject to cross-examination? That was a question that was put to Utilities. B.C. said yes, IR responses go into evidence, and can be cross-examined. Alberta, same thing, all hearings, intervenors are able to cross-examine evidence. Manitoba information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter, it could be across a number of teams depending on the question that's being asked and then through the review process, so we view the RFIs as being responses from the organization as a whole. And we would view, as Newfoundland Power said, our witness lists to be the people who could speak to all of the issues that we have provided evidence upon in an application. With respect to the rules, the B.C. rules, the way I read these, I think this is what we are already doing. So for example, in (d)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.) CHAIR: Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to – MR. FITZGERALD: Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional scan, I think we're all familiar with the Midgard Report to a certain extent, but one of the questions that they had asked each jurisdiction was are information requests and responses sworn into evidence and subject to cross-examination? That was a question that was put to Utilities. B.C. said yes, IR responses go into evidence, and can be cross-examined. Alberta, same thing, all hearings, intervenors are able to cross-examine evidence. Manitoba information requests are sworn into evidence, are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	need for a change in the procedure as being requested here.  CHAIR:  Q. Thank you. Does Hydro wish to weigh in on this one?  MS. WALSH:  Q. Sure. Similar to Newfoundland Power, our view with respect to RFIs is that it is a process where a number of people within the organization, you know, have input into those RFIs. In terms of the subject matter, it could be across a number of teams depending on the question that's being asked and then through the review process, so we view the RFIs as being responses from the organization as a whole. And we would view, as Newfoundland Power said, our witness lists to be the people who could speak to all of the issues that we have provided evidence upon in an application. With respect to the rules, the B.C. rules, the way I read these, I think this is what we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	transparent for that purpose.  (10:15 a.m.) CHAIR: Q. Thank you, Ms. Walsh. Mr. Fitzgerald, do you want to – MR. FITZGERALD: Q. Yes, it wasn't suggested that we would need the names of all those who are collaborating on a response, it's just the person who is going to adopt and be responsible for the information. You, as for the jurisdictional scan, I think we're all familiar with the Midgard Report to a certain extent, but one of the questions that they had asked each jurisdiction was are information requests and responses sworn into evidence and subject to cross-examination? That was a question that was put to Utilities. B.C. said yes, IR responses go into evidence, and can be cross-examined. Alberta, same thing, all hearings, intervenors are able to cross-examine evidence. Manitoba information

	, 2021		NP 2022-2023 General Rate Application
	Page 17		Page 19
1	public record and are subject to cross-	1	suggestion, was that, you know, that section
2	examination; same thing in New Brunswick,	2	would change to say a party providing
3	PEI, Nova Scotia, so it's not a foreign	3	response to an RFI shall identify the person
4	practice. Practically speaking, I suppose	4	or persons who can speak to the information
5	we can do it this way, we can ask an RFI and	5	provided in the response, in the response
6	then in the RFI say, "Please identify the	6	itself, and where directed by the Board, the
7	individual within your organization who can	7	party shall make that person or persons
8	best speak to this." And I mean, at that	8	available for cross-examination. So it's a
9	point, what is the answer going to be?	9	very simple request. If we ask, you know,
10	Would the answer from the utility be, "No,	10	what are the, you know, load forecasts or,
11	sorry, we're not going to tell you who that	11	you know, how is this determined and who is
12	is right now." Because if we ask it, why	12	the best person within the utility can
13	wouldn't we be entitled to know. So, you	13	answer this. And I'm assuming there would
14	know, we're not trying to be complicated	14	be a team of people who would come up with
15	here at all, we're trying to streamline the	15	that, but there would be one person who
16	process. These RFIs or the responses aren't	16	would finally sign off and say, "yes, that's
17	orphans, they're owned and someone has to	17	correct, we can stand by this evidence."
18	own them and the Board maintains	18	MR. O'BRIEN:
19	jurisdiction to allow cross-examination or	19	Q. Madam Chair, I would like to address that.
20	not, we have to not forget that, so you	20	CHAIR:
21	know, any kind of abuse of utility witnesses	21	Q. Sure.
22	wouldn't occur; there's a check on that. SO	22	MR. O'BRIEN:
23	what is the, again, I don't think the	23	Q. In terms of talking hardship, we do have to
24	hardship has been addressed. I don't see	24	look at efficiencies here as well, I think,
25	this as creating any difficulty whatsoever	25	and if we're going to have, for example,
1 23	this as creating any annearty whatsoever	22	and if we re going to have, for example,
	Dogo 19		
1	Page 18	1	Page 20
1 2	for the Utilities.	1	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and
2	for the Utilities. CHAIR:	2	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that
2 3	for the Utilities. CHAIR: Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your	2 3	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond
2 3 4	for the Utilities. CHAIR: Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.	2 3 4	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions
2 3 4 5	for the Utilities. CHAIR: Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald. MR. FITZGERALD:	2 3 4 5	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one
2 3 4 5 6	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –	2 3 4 5 6	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now
2 3 4 5 6 7	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on – CHAIR:	2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on – CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on – CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify who drafted the RFI, who would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who can speak to the components of the case and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify who drafted the RFI, who would be responsible for it when it gets to hearing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who can speak to the components of the case and adopt the pre-file evidence and the RFIs and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify who drafted the RFI, who would be responsible for it when it gets to hearing stage or, I mean, I'm not hearing that you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who can speak to the components of the case and adopt the pre-file evidence and the RFIs and if need be, have a panel that can do that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify who drafted the RFI, who would be responsible for it when it gets to hearing stage or, I mean, I'm not hearing that you suggest the RFIs are not part of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who can speak to the components of the case and adopt the pre-file evidence and the RFIs and if need be, have a panel that can do that, but that's the choice, should be the choice
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify who drafted the RFI, who would be responsible for it when it gets to hearing stage or, I mean, I'm not hearing that you suggest the RFIs are not part of the evidence.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who can speak to the components of the case and adopt the pre-file evidence and the RFIs and if need be, have a panel that can do that, but that's the choice, should be the choice of the utility, not the choice of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify who drafted the RFI, who would be responsible for it when it gets to hearing stage or, I mean, I'm not hearing that you suggest the RFIs are not part of the evidence.  MR. FITZGERALD:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who can speak to the components of the case and adopt the pre-file evidence and the RFIs and if need be, have a panel that can do that, but that's the choice, should be the choice of the Consumer Advocate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify who drafted the RFI, who would be responsible for it when it gets to hearing stage or, I mean, I'm not hearing that you suggest the RFIs are not part of the evidence.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 20 under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who can speak to the components of the case and adopt the pre-file evidence and the RFIs and if need be, have a panel that can do that, but that's the choice, should be the choice of the utility, not the choice of the Consumer Advocate.  MR. FITZGERALD:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify who drafted the RFI, who would be responsible for it when it gets to hearing stage or, I mean, I'm not hearing that you suggest the RFIs are not part of the evidence.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. No.  CHAIR:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who can speak to the components of the case and adopt the pre-file evidence and the RFIs and if need be, have a panel that can do that, but that's the choice, should be the choice of the utility, not the choice of the Consumer Advocate.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. To that, I mean, I'm assuming that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on – CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify who drafted the RFI, who would be responsible for it when it gets to hearing stage or, I mean, I'm not hearing that you suggest the RFIs are not part of the evidence.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. No.  CHAIR:  Q. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who can speak to the components of the case and adopt the pre-file evidence and the RFIs and if need be, have a panel that can do that, but that's the choice, should be the choice of the utility, not the choice of the Consumer Advocate.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. To that, I mean, I'm assuming that the witness list that the utility is going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify who drafted the RFI, who would be responsible for it when it gets to hearing stage or, I mean, I'm not hearing that you suggest the RFIs are not part of the evidence.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. No.  CHAIR:  Q. Okay.  MR. FITZGERALD:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who can speak to the components of the case and adopt the pre-file evidence and the RFIs and if need be, have a panel that can do that, but that's the choice, should be the choice of the utility, not the choice of the Consumer Advocate.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. To that, I mean, I'm assuming that the witness list that the utility is going to present is developed at some point and that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on – CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify who drafted the RFI, who would be responsible for it when it gets to hearing stage or, I mean, I'm not hearing that you suggest the RFIs are not part of the evidence.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. No.  CHAIR:  Q. Okay.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. I guess, you know, I was asked yesterday,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who can speak to the components of the case and adopt the pre-file evidence and the RFIs and if need be, have a panel that can do that, but that's the choice, should be the choice of the utility, not the choice of the Consumer Advocate.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. To that, I mean, I'm assuming that the witness list that the utility is going to present is developed at some point and that witness list must derive, I would think,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	for the Utilities.  CHAIR:  Q. I'm still a bit confused on what your specific ask is, Mr. Fitzgerald.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. If there is some information, say on –  CHAIR:  Q. No, I understand—what are you asking the change, what are you asking to be the change that we make to the procedural rules? You wish us to specifically have Newfoundland Power, in this case, specifically identify who drafted the RFI, who would be responsible for it when it gets to hearing stage or, I mean, I'm not hearing that you suggest the RFIs are not part of the evidence.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. No.  CHAIR:  Q. Okay.  MR. FITZGERALD:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	under the finance heading a hundred RFIs and you have 18 people as part of that responding to different RFIs, if we respond by saying "yes, in answer to your questions here are the 18 people who did it, each one responded to a different RFI". Is it now that they be subject to cross-examination on each of their RFIs? If that's what is being suggested, I think there's an efficiency problem here that we run into. The normal course is to allow the utility to present its case and to put forth an individual who can speak to the components of the case and adopt the pre-file evidence and the RFIs and if need be, have a panel that can do that, but that's the choice, should be the choice of the utility, not the choice of the Consumer Advocate.  MR. FITZGERALD:  Q. To that, I mean, I'm assuming that the witness list that the utility is going to present is developed at some point and that

July 6	, 2021		NP 2022-2023 General Rate Application
	Page 21		Page 23
1	witness list—if the witness list is provided	1	Q. Well all hypothetical, I guess. Does either
2	at the end, presumably that witness list	2	one of counsel sitting here from the Board's
3	came from the organizational efforts to	3	perspective want to weigh in or you will
4	identify which individual, in which	4	leave it with us?
	•		
5	department, is coming forward. So I guess	5	MS. GLYNN:
6	we're asking for, you know, can we know who	6	Q. We can leave it with the panel. I would
7	the witnesses are prior to the witness list	7	just state that it is certainly an issue
8	being presented?	8	that has been raised in the guideline review
9	MR. O'BRIEN:	9	which is currently under consideration by
10	Q. So you want the witness list ahead of the	10	the panel as well.
11	RFIs then? There's a schedule for that, I	11	CHAIR:
12	think.	12	Q. Okay. I think I understand your ask, Mr.
13	MR. FITZGERALD:	13	Fitzgerald. We have the transcript as well,
14	Q. No, well I guess, I think that, you know,	14	•
15	far be it for me to understand the inner	15	as well. Does anyone else want to weigh in
16	workings of Newfoundland Power when they're	16	on this before we close that matter? All
17	preparing for a GRA, but I'm assuming that	17	done, good. Is there anything else that we
18	there would be a team meeting on a	18	need to deal with today, Ms. Glynn?
19	particular issue and a response would be	19	MS. GLYNN:
20	forthcoming from that team, someone, someone	20	Q. No, we are ready to proceed with the
21	in a leadership role would say "Yes, this is	21	application. We have the Intervenors
22	the correct information, we are going with	22	identified, we have the schedule agreed to
23	this. This is the information." Now,	23	and the Rules of Procedure with one slight
24	whether there is 18—I'd be surprised if	24	
I	=		1
there's 18 leaders on that, but maybe there			CHAIR:
25		25	CHAIR:
	Page 22		Page 24
1	Page 22 are, but I would think in the general chunks	1	Page 24 Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order
1 2	Page 22 are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there	1 2	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would
1 2 3	Page 22 are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if	1 2 3	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the
1 2 3 4	Page 22 are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification	1 2 3 4	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on
1 2 3	Page 22 are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to	1 2 3	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the
1 2 3 4	Page 22 are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to	1 2 3 4	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 22 are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it	1 2 3 4 5	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 22 are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 22 are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you. MR. O'BRIEN:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 22 are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN: Q. I would just have to say the witness list	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 22 are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN: Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those and who is best to familiarize them with all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those and who is best to familiarize them with all of the responses, so to say that upfront I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those and who is best to familiarize them with all of the responses, so to say that upfront I think is difficult and I think the way the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those and who is best to familiarize them with all of the responses, so to say that upfront I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those and who is best to familiarize them with all of the responses, so to say that upfront I think is difficult and I think the way the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those and who is best to familiarize them with all of the responses, so to say that upfront I think is difficult and I think the way the suggested wording reads suggests that what	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those and who is best to familiarize them with all of the responses, so to say that upfront I think is difficult and I think the way the suggested wording reads suggests that what may happen here is that each time there's an RFI that the Consumer Advocate wishes to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.  Upon conclusion at 10:25 a.m.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those and who is best to familiarize them with all of the responses, so to say that upfront I think is difficult and I think the way the suggested wording reads suggests that what may happen here is that each time there's an RFI that the Consumer Advocate wishes to speak to a particular individual on, we're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.  Upon conclusion at 10:25 a.m.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those and who is best to familiarize them with all of the responses, so to say that upfront I think is difficult and I think the way the suggested wording reads suggests that what may happen here is that each time there's an RFI that the Consumer Advocate wishes to speak to a particular individual on, we're going to have an application to the Board to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.  Upon conclusion at 10:25 a.m.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those and who is best to familiarize them with all of the responses, so to say that upfront I think is difficult and I think the way the suggested wording reads suggests that what may happen here is that each time there's an RFI that the Consumer Advocate wishes to speak to a particular individual on, we're going to have an application to the Board to have that individual testify and I think	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.  Upon conclusion at 10:25 a.m.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those and who is best to familiarize them with all of the responses, so to say that upfront I think is difficult and I think the way the suggested wording reads suggests that what may happen here is that each time there's an RFI that the Consumer Advocate wishes to speak to a particular individual on, we're going to have an application to the Board to have that individual testify and I think that that's an efficiency issue that the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.  Upon conclusion at 10:25 a.m.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	are, but I would think in the general chunks of information that comes forward, there would be one point person and in the RFI if we ask, you know, what is the justification for this load forecast, who is the best to speak to it? You know, anyway, I leave it to you.  MR. O'BRIEN:  Q. I would just have to say the witness list itself is an itinerant process as well, I think, and ultimately that's dependent on how many RFIs, what types of questions, who is best to put up to respond to all of those and who is best to familiarize them with all of the responses, so to say that upfront I think is difficult and I think the way the suggested wording reads suggests that what may happen here is that each time there's an RFI that the Consumer Advocate wishes to speak to a particular individual on, we're going to have an application to the Board to have that individual testify and I think	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. Okay, so we will issue the procedural order shortly in the next couple of days, I would expect. We will have to wait to get the transcript to make sure that we are clear on the Consumer Advocate's ask and the responses. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn for today and Motions Day is October 2nd, might be the earliest we see you unless something comes up in the interim. Thank you so much.  Upon conclusion at 10:25 a.m.

July 0, 2021	Ni 2022-2023 General Rate Application
Page 25	
CERTIFICATE	
I, Judy Moss, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript in the matter of Newfoundland Powe Inc. 2022 – 2023 General Rate Application, Pre-hearing Conference, heard on the 6th day of July, 2021 before the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador and was transcribed by me to the best of my ability by means of a sound apparatus.	
Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador this 7th day of July, 2021	
Judy Moss	

# Α

**Able -** 16:21, 23:14 **Abuse -** 17:21 Accepted - 8:19 **Across - 14:12** Add - 15:21 Address - 13:24, 19:19 Addressed - 17:24 Addressing - 3:15 Adjourn - 24:7 Adjustment - 8:23 **Adopt -** 11:16, 12:8, 13:4, 16:10, 20:14 **Adopted -** 7:17 **Advocate -** 2:18, 2:22, 2:25, 4:15, 5:13, 5:19, 12:15, 13:2, 20:18, 22:19 Advocate's - 24:5 Against - 22:24 **Agenda -** 2:1, 3:19 **Agree -** 5:16 Agreed - 23:22 Agreement - 4:19, 5:6 **Ahead -** 21:10 **Alberta -** 16:20 **Allow -** 17:19, 20:11 **Among -** 4:4 **Anyway -** 11:12, 22:6 Appearing - 2:4, 2:21, 2:24 **Appears -** 6:8 Applicant - 2:5, 13:17 Application - 1:9, 3:13, 4:1, 4:7, 10:21, 14:20, 22:21, 23:21 Applications - 7:20 Appointed - 2:24 Appropriate - 3:18, 7:5, 7:14, 12:25, 13:14, 14:24 Approve - 4:4 Aren't - 17:16 **Assist -** 3:11 Assistance - 13:20 Assisting - 1:18 Aucoin - 10:22 Available - 8:3, 19:8

Average - 4:5

**Aware - 12:15** 

В

Back - 1:21, 6:22, 23:14 **BCUC -** 6:23, 9:19 **Big -** 7:15 Bit - 5:21, 11:20, 11:25, 12:18, 18:3 **Blundon - 1:20 Board -** 1:11, 1:12, 1:15, 1:20, 1:21, 1:23, 3:17, 3:25, 4:4, 4:14, 5:12, 5:23, 7:2, 7:17, 13:20, 17:18, 19:6, 22:21, 22:24 **Board's -** 4:8, 23:2 Browne - 2:22. 2:23, 2:24 Brunswick - 17:2 Budget - 6:6

С **CAMP - 9:5** Can - 3:21, 6:16, 7:6, 11:23, 14:25, 15:5, 16:20, 17:5, 17:7, 19:4, 19:12, 19:17. 20:13. 20:15, 21:6, 23:6 **Capital -** 6:6, 10:13, 10:19, 10:20 Carry - 3:21 Case - 6:22, 7:19, 10:12, 10:25, 11:11, 13:8, 15:11, 18:12, 20:12, 20:13 **CEO -** 1:10 **Certain -** 16:13 Certainly - 13:1, 15:25, 23:7 **CHAIR -** 1:2, 1:10, 1:16, 2:7, 2:12, 2:17, 2:20, 3:1, 3:8, 3:23, 6:15, 9:2, 9:8, 9:18, 10:6, 10:18, 11:1, 11:6, 14:3, 16:3, 18:2, 18:7, 18:20, 19:19, 19:20, 22:25, 23:11, 23:25 **Change -** 5:14, 5:18, 5:24, 7:16, 13:6, 14:1, 18:9,

19:2

**Check - 17:22** Cheryl - 1:20, 6:16 Choice - 20:16, 20:17 **Chose - 12:24** Christopher - 1:14 **Chunks - 22:1** Circulated - 5:10 **Close - 23:16 Clutter -** 6:11 **Collaborating - 16: Come -** 5:25, 13:15, 19:14 Comes - 12:14, 22:2, 24:9 **Coming - 21:5** Commenced - 8:2 Commences - 7:22 Commissioner - 1: 15, 1:16, 1:17, 11:4 Commissioners -

**Communicated - 5 Company - 10:3** 

**Comply - 15:19** Component - 12:7, 12:8, 13:4, 13:14 Components - 12:

Complicated - 17:1

2:7

:23

5, 20:13 Concern - 13:25 Conclusion - 24:11 Conference - 1:8, 1:22, 3:10, 6:4

Conferences - 13: 12

**Confirm - 3:18** Confused - 18:3 Consideration - 23 -9

Consistent - 5:11, 13:9, 13:10 Consultant - 7:12, 9:23, 10:17, 15:16, 15:18

**Consumer - 2:18**, 2:22, 2:25, 4:15, 5:13, 5:19, 12:15, 13:2, 20:18, 22:19, 24:5

**Contact - 15:4** Contacted - 7:6, 14:25 Contributed - 15:2 3 Controversy - 5:22 Cost - 10:13, 10:19, 10:20, 15:14 Counsel - 1:19, 1:20, 2:8, 2:10, 3:6, 3:17, 4:17, 5:11, 5:16, 5:23, 6:2, 23:2 Couple - 24:2 Course - 11:19,

20:11 Cover - 7:6, 14:25 Creating - 17:25 Cross - 11:24, 16:17, 16:20, 16:21, 16:24, 17:1,

17:19, 19:8, 20:7 **Current -** 4:5, 6:23 Currently - 23:9

Customers - 4:2

D Darlene - 1:10 **Date - 5:4** Dates - 4:19, 5:2, 5:6 **Day -** 13:23, 24:8 **Days - 24:2** Deadline - 4:12 **Deal - 23:18 Delve - 13:23 Dennis -** 2:22, 2:24 **Department - 21:5** Dependent - 22:11 **Derive - 20:23** Determined - 5:3, 19:11 Developed - 20:22 Deviates - 8:19

20:6 **Difficult** - 12:18, 22:16 Difficulty - 17:25

Directed - 7:11.

**Different - 11:20**,

11:25, 12:3, 20:3,

9:23, 19:6 Directs - 9:4 Disclosure - 8:5 Discussions - 5:1 Distanced - 1:4 Distributed - 1:24

Dominic - 2:9 **Don't -** 7:15, 7:16, 8:14, 8:18, 9:16, 12:25, 13:5, 13:8,

13:18, 13:25, 17:23, 17:24 **Drafted - 18:13 Dwanda -** 1:15

Ε Each - 12:6, 12:8,

12:14, 13:4, 16:14, 20:5, 20:8, 22:18 Earliest - 24:8 **Early -** 6:12 Efficiencies - 19:2 Efficiency - 20:9, 22:23 **Efforts -** 21:3 Electricity - 4:6 Electronically - 1:2 **Employs -** 6:23 Encountered - 7:2 **Energy -** 6:21 **Enter -** 3:17 Entered - 5:7 **Entitled - 17:13** Essentially - 8:17, 12:7 Establish - 4:2 Established - 20:2

Everybody - 1:6, Everyone - 1:7 Evidence - 8:6, 8:9, 8:16, 9:16, 12:8, 12:9, 13:3, 14:20, 16:16, 16:19, 16:22, 16:23, 18:17, 19:17, 20:14 Examination - 11:2 4, 16:17, 16:24,

20:7 **Examine - 16:22** Examined - 16:20 **Example -** 6:11, 8:21, 9:5, 9:24, 10:13, 10:19,

17:2, 17:19, 19:8,

14:23, 15:14, 19:25 **Except -** 7:2 **Exists - 8:13** 

**Expect - 24:3 Expert -** 4:23, 7:12, 9:24, 10:14

Experts - 10:2

Explored - 5:4 **Extent -** 16:13 **External - 15:16**, 15:18

## F

**Fagan - 3:7** 

Familiarize - 22:14 **Far -** 12:10, 21:15 File - 20:14 Filed - 9:25, 12:9 **Filing -** 4:12, 4:22 **Finally -** 19:16 Finance - 20:1 First - 2:13 FITZGERALD - 2:1 9, 2:21, 5:20, 6:18, 9:6, 9:13, 10:4, 10:11, 10:24, 16:4, 16:6, 18:4, 18:5, 18:18, 18:22, 20:19, 21:13, 23:13 Foley - 2:10, 2:13, 2:15 Followed - 4:23 Following - 1:25, 3:20, 4:20 Forecast - 22:5 Forecasts - 19:10 **Foreign - 17:3** Forget - 17:20 **Format -** 5:25 Forth - 13:18, 20:12 Forthcoming - 21: **Fortis -** 6:21

# G

Further - 5:5, 13:22

Forward - 8:9,

21:5, 22:2

**Full -** 8:5

9:19, 12:9, 13:15,

Gathering - 20:24 General - 1:9, 3:25, 4:20, 22:1 Get - 1:4, 24:3 **Gets -** 18:14 Give - 11:7 **Glynn -** 1:19, 3:22, 8:24, 23:5, 23:18, 23:19 Go - 16:19, 23:24 **Going -** 1:3, 8:6, 13:3, 16:10, 17:9,

21:22, 22:21 Good - 1:6, 2:7, 2:20, 3:5, 3:23, 23:17 **GRA -** 12:4, 21:17 **Greene -** 1:19 **Group - 12:23** Guess - 10:12, 18:23, 21:5, 21:14, 23:1 Guideline - 23:8 **Guys -** 8:25

17:11, 19:25, 20:21,

# Н

Hands - 13:17 Hardship - 7:18, 8:15, 17:24, 19:23 **Haves - 6:3** Heading - 20:1 **Hear - 12:11** Heard - 11:21 **Hearing -** 1:7, 1:19, 1:22, 3:10, 3:12, 5:1, 5:3, 7:22, 8:2, 8:7, 12:1, 18:14, 18:15 **Hearings -** 5:13, 6:7, 16:21

**Here's -** 12:22 **Hundred - 20:1 Hydro -** 3:3, 3:6, 4:17, 7:19, 14:4,

15:10

Hypothetical - 23:1

# ı

**I'd -** 1:6, 2:2, 3:16, 6:13, 21:24 Identification - 6:9, 7:17, 9:11, 11:2 Identified - 15:17. 23:22 Identifying - 3:14, 15:11 Identity - 15:22 Illustrative - 6:19 **I'm -** 1:10, 6:19, 8:7, 8:11, 8:12, 8:14, 9:14, 15:21, 18:3, 18:15, 19:13, 20:20, 21:17

Immediately - 3:20

Individual's - 11:22

Increase - 4:5

**Inflict - 7:18** 

Internal - 2:10 Intervenor - 4:14 Intervenors - 3:14, 4:17, 16:21, 23:21 Interventions - 4:1 Introduced - 4:18 **IR -** 16:19 Issuance - 3:18 **Issue -** 6:5, 8:8, 21:19, 22:23, 23:7, 24:1 **Issues -** 5:4, 14:19, 15:25 Items - 3:19 Iterant - 12:22 Itinerant - 22:10 **It's -** 2:20, 3:5, 6:4, 6:24, 8:10, 12:19, 12:21, 13:14, 13:17, 16:9, 17:3, 19:8

Inner - 21:15

**Input -** 14:10

Interim - 24:10

# J

**Jackie - 1:19** 

John - 1:16 **Joining -** 1:13 **June -** 4:10, 4:13 Jurisdiction - 16:1 5, 17:19 Jurisdictional - 6:8 , 13:6, 16:11 **Jurisdictions - 8:2** 

Justification - 22:4

**Kevin - 3:7** 

L

Labrador - 3:2, 3:6, 4:16 **Lacking - 13:22 Later - 5:3** Leader - 8:13, 12:3, 12:7, 13:13 **Leaders -** 21:25 Leadership - 21:21 **Leading -** 9:15 **Leap -** 7:16 **Leave -** 22:6, 23:4, 23:6

**Letter -** 7:6, 14:25 Liam - 2:8 **Liberty -** 10:15 List - 20:21, 20:23, 21:1, 21:2, 21:7, 21:10, 22:9 Lists - 14:18, 15:24, 15:25 Load - 19:10, 22:5 **Look -** 6:24, 19:24

### M

Madam - 2:7, 2:20, 3:23, 19:19 **Maintains - 17:18** Make - 13:5, 18:10, 19:7, 24:4 **Manitoba -** 16:22 Many - 22:12 March - 4:6 Mask - 1:5 **Matters - 3:16 Maureen - 1:18 Meeting - 21:18 Member - 1:11 Members - 1:12** Midgard - 6:5, 10:15, 16:13 Morning - 1:6, 2:1, 2:7, 2:20, 3:5, 3:11, 3:23. 6:11 Motions - 13:23, 24:7 Move - 2:1 Much - 15:21, 24:10

## Ν

Names - 11:23, 12:12, 16:8 **Naming - 12:17**, 13:19 Necessity - 13:5 Negotiation - 5:1 **New -** 4:2, 17:2 Newfoundland - 1: 8, 2:9, 2:10, 3:2, 3:6, 3:13, 4:1, 4:3, 4:16, 5:15, 6:2, 7:19, 8:8, 9:4, 9:9, 10:1, 10:10, 10:21, 11:7, 11:13, 11:14, 11:15, 12:4, 12:5, 13:1, 14:7, 14:17, 15:10, 18:11, 21:16 **Newman - 1:15** 

Newspapers - 4:9 Normal - 11:18, 20:10 Normally - 15:3 **Notice -** 3:19, 4:7, 4:10, 4:14 Notification - 12:1 0. 12:11 Notifying - 11:17 Nova - 17:3

### 0

O'brien - 1:17, 2:6, 2:8, 11:4, 11:9, 19:18, 19:22, 21:9, 22:8 Occur - 17:22 **October - 24:8** One - 4:15, 4:16, 10:2, 12:20, 14:5, 16:13, 19:15, 20:5, 22:3, 23:2, 23:23 Onerous - 15:21 Ones - 6:16 **Ontario -** 16:24 Order - 5:2, 5:8, 24:1 Organization - 3:1 1, 14:10, 14:16, 15:12, 17:7 Organizational - 2 Organized - 8:10 **Orphans - 17:17** Outset - 8:15 Owen - 9:5 Own - 17:18

# Owned - 17:17

Panel - 1:13, 3:24, 5:18, 6:17, 9:1, 20:15, 23:6, 23:10 Parties - 2:2, 3:24, 5:10, 11:17, 12:10, 13:21 **Party -** 6:9, 7:10, 7:12, 9:3, 9:22, 10:9, 15:9, 19:2, 19:7 Past - 6:1, 7:21, 12:17 **PEI - 17:3** People - 12:21, 14:9, 14:18, 15:23, 19:14, 20:2, 20:5

Left - 1:14

Percent - 4:6 **Perhaps - 10:22 Period -** 4:25 Person - 7:14, 8:16, 9:11, 10:7, 15:4, 15:6, 16:9, 19:3, 19:7, 19:12, 19:15. 22:3 Persons - 7:10, 9:21, 15:8, 19:4, 19:7 Perspective - 23:3 **Pick -** 11:10, 12:24 Pike - 1:14 **Placed -** 4:8, 16:25 Planning - 3:12 **Posed -** 10:20 **Position -** 5:17, 13:2 Power - 2:9, 2:11, 4:1, 4:3, 5:15, 7:19, 8:8, 9:4, 9:9, 10:1, 10:10, 11:7, 11:13, 11:14, 11:15, 12:4, 12:6, 13:1, 14:7, 14:17, 15:10, 18:12, 21:16 Power's - 1:8, 3:13, 6:2, 10:21 Practically - 17:4 **Practice -** 6:25. 8:19, 13:11, 17:4 **Pre -** 1:7, 1:22, 3:10, 12:9, 20:14 **Prepared - 11:18**, 11:23, 12:2 Preparing - 21:17 **Present - 12:6**, 20:11, 20:22 Presented - 21:8 Presiding - 1:11 Presumably - 21:2 Previous - 6:2 **Prior -** 8:6, 21:7 **Problem - 20:10** Procedural - 3:16, 5:7, 6:12, 18:10, 24:1 Procedure - 5:9, 7:1, 8:23, 14:1, 23:23 **Proceed -** 3:20. 12:16, 23:20 Proceeded - 12:16 Processed - 15:6 **Project - 13:13** Proponents - 8:5

Proponing - 8:16 **Proposed -** 5:14, 5:24, 18:24 Proposing - 9:3 **Provide -** 5:17, 11:22, 13:3, 13:15, 15:22 **Provided -** 13:13. 14:19, 19:5, 21:1 **Provides - 13:19 Providing -** 6:10, 6:19, 12:2, 19:2 Province - 4:9 **Public -** 3:12, 3:19, 17:1 Published - 4:8, 4:11 Pursuant - 6:7 **Puts -** 8:11

# R

**Raised - 23:8** 

Rate - 1:9, 3:25, 4:20 Rates - 4:2, 4:6 Reached - 4:18 **Reads -** 22:17 Ready - 23:20, 23:24 Reappeared - 6:4 **Receive - 12:11** Received - 3:25, 4:14 **Recent -** 4:20, 5:13 Recorded - 1:22 Referred - 6:21 Regulatory - 3:5, 13:11 **Report -** 6:5, 16:13 **Reports - 4:23**, 4:24 **Request - 4:24.** 5:25, 7:4, 7:8, 7:11, 9:10, 9:12, 9:23, 9:25, 15:2, 19:9, 23:24 Requested - 11:20, 14:2 Requesting - 4:3 Requests - 4:22, 16:15, 16:23, 16:25 **Respect -** 14:8, 14:21, 15:5 **Respond - 20:3**, 22:13 Responded - 7:9, 9:21, 10:1, 10:22,

11:12, 12:23, 15:8, 20:6 Responding - 7:14 , 10:7, 11:15, 12:19, 12:20, 20:3 Responds - 9:9 **Response -** 6:10, 7:4. 7:8. 7:13. 9:20. 11:16, 11:18, 13:21, 15:7, 15:24, 16:9, 19:3, 19:5, 21:19 Responses - 7:8, 14:15, 15:2, 15:5, 16:16, 16:19, 17:16, 22:15, 24:6 Responsible - 16:1 0, 18:14 Reviews - 4:21 **RFI -** 6:10, 9:4, 11:23, 12:2, 12:19, 13:19, 13:22, 15:5, 15:23, 17:5, 17:6, 18:13, 19:3, 20:6, 22:3, 22:19 Rfis - 12:10, 13:4, 14:8, 14:11, 14:15, 15:15, 17:16, 18:16, 20:1, 20:3, 20:8, 20:14, 21:11, 22:12 **Role -** 21:21 **Round - 4:23 Rounds -** 4:21 **Rules -** 5:9, 5:11, 6:12, 6:20, 6:23, 6:25, 7:1, 8:23, 14:21, 15:19, 18:10, 23:23 **Run -** 20:10, 22:24 S Scan - 6:8, 13:7,

16:12 Schedule - 3:15, 4:19, 4:21, 5:6, 21:11, 23:22 Scotia - 17:3 Seated - 2:2 Secretary - 1:21, 1:23 See - 7:2, 7:3, 13:5, 17:24, 24:9 Segment - 8:9, 9:15 Service - 15:14 **Setting -** 3:15 **Shall -** 19:3, 19:7 **Shirley - 3:5 Shortly - 24:2 Side -** 1:18 **Sign -** 19:16 **Similar -** 7:1, 7:17, 14:7 **Simple - 19:9** Singular - 15:3 **Sirs -** 3:2 **Sitting -** 1:21, 23:2 Situation - 7:21, 8:1 **Slight - 23:23** Socially - 1:4 Somewhat - 6:5, 12:3 **Source -** 13:20 Specific - 9:12, 18:4 Specified - 4:25 **Stage -** 18:15 Stand - 12:25, 19:17 Start - 2:5, 5:18, 5:22 **Starting - 1:13**, 4:10, 8:7 State - 23:7 **Steve -** 2:20, 6:16 Streamline - 17:15 Submission - 8:18, 8:22 Submissions - 4:1 Subterfuge - 12:13 Suggested - 5:17, 16:7, 20:9, 22:17 Suggestion - 18:25 . 19:1 Suggests - 13:7, 22:17 Supervision - 1:23 **Suppose - 10:12**, 17:4 Surprised - 21:24 **Sworn -** 16:16, 16:23

### Т

Table - 1:18 Team - 8:11, 8:13, 12:3, 12:7, 19:14, 21:18, 21:20 Teams - 14:12 Technical - 6:3,

13:12 Telegram - 4:11 Terms - 12:1, 14:11, 19:23 **Thanks -** 6:16 **That's -** 7:15, 8:17, 8:21, 9:11, 10:5, 11:12, 11:25, 12:3, 12:25, 13:8, 13:9, 13:21, 13:24, 14:13, 15:12, 19:16, 20:8, 20:16, 22:11, 22:23 **Theirs** - 1:5 There's - 4:25, 8:11, 8:13, 9:25, 12:9, 12:13, 12:21, 13:5, 13:6, 13:21, 13:22, 13:23, 13:25, 17:22, 20:9, 21:11, 21:25, 22:18 **These -** 4:17, 6:13, 6:20, 6:22, 6:25, 12:15, 14:22, 17:16 They're - 17:17. 21:16 **Third -** 7:12 **Time -** 4:25, 22:18 **Today -** 12:1, 23:18, 24:7 **Topic -** 5:25 Transcribed - 1:24 **Transcript - 23:13.** 24:4 Transparent - 16:1 Turn - 3:16

# U

Two - 4:14, 4:21

**Types -** 22:12

Unless - 24:9 Upfront - 22:15 Used - 5:12 Uses - 7:2 Utilities - 16:18, 18:1 Utility - 17:10, 17:21, 19:12, 20:11, 20:17, 20:21

# ٧

Value - 15:21 Vice - 1:16 View - 14:8, 14:15, 14:16, 15:9

**Set - 15:20** 

**Sets -** 8:8

July 6, 2021		NP 2022-2023 G	eneral Rate Application
W			
<b>Wait -</b> 24:3			
<b>WALSH -</b> 3:4, 3:5,			
14:6, 16:4			
<b>Wasn't -</b> 16:7			
Website - 4:8			
<b>We'd -</b> 8:4			
Weigh - 14:4, 23:3,			
23:15			
Welcome - 1:7,			
2:13, 2:18, 3:9			
We're - 1:3, 7:22,			
8:1, 16:12, 17:11,			
17:14, 17:15,			
19:25, 21:6, 22:20			
Westcoast - 4:11			
We've - 7:21			
Whalen - 1:10			
What's - 11:19,			
13:7			
Whatsoever - 17:2			
5 Whale 14:16			
Whole - 14:16			
<b>Will -</b> 1:11, 1:24,			
2:5, 4:21, 5:3, 5:7,			
8:10, 9:17, 12:6,			
12:11, 15:2, 22:24,			
23:3, 23:14, 24:1,			
24:3, 24:7			
Wire - 4:12			
Wish - 3:20, 14:4,			
18:11			
Wishes - 22:19			
Witness - 7:24,			
14:17, 15:24,			
20:21, 20:23, 21:1,			
21:2, 21:7, 21:10,			
22:9			
Witnesses - 5:2,			
12:6, 12:12, 13:18,			
17:21, 21:7			
Wording - 18:24,			
22:17			
Workings - 21:16			
<b>Wouldn't -</b> 11:16,			
17:13, 17:22			
V			
Υ			
Yesterday - 5:22,			
11:21, 11:22, 18:23			
You'll - 7:3			
<b>You're -</b> 2:4, 2:18,			
9:3			
J.J			