

Office of the Consumer Advocate

PO Box 23135
Terrace on the Square
St. John's, NL Canada
A1B 4J9

Tel: 709-724-3800
Fax: 709-754-3800

September 20, 2022

Board of Commissions of Public Utilities
120 Torbay Road, P.O. Box 2140
St. John's, NL A1A 5B2

**Attention: G. Cheryl Blundon, Director of
Corporate Services / Board Secretary**

Dear Ms. Blundon:

Re: Newfoundland Power's 2023 Capital Budget Application

Further to the above-captioned, enclosed are the Consumer Advocate's Requests for Information numbered CA-NP-128 to CA-NP-179.

If you have any questions regarding the enclosed, please contact the undersigned at your convenience.

Yours truly,



Dennis Browne, KC
Consumer Advocate

Encl.
/bb

cc **Newfoundland & Labrador Hydro**
Shirley Walsh (ShirleyWalsh@nlh.nl.ca)
Michael Ladha (MichaelLadha@nlh.ca)
NLH Regulatory (NLHRegulatory@nlh.nl.ca)

Newfoundland Power Inc.
Dominic J. Foley (dfoley@newfoundlandpower.com)
Lindsay Hollett (lholllett@newfoundlandpower.com)
Liam O'Brien (lobrien@curtisdawe.com)
NP Regulatory (regulatory@newfoundlandpower.com)

Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities
Jacqui Glynn (jglynn@pub.nl.ca)
PUB Official Email (ito@pub.nl.ca)

IN THE MATTER OF the *Public Utilities Act*,
(the “Act”); and

IN THE MATTER OF capital expenditures
and rate base of Newfoundland Power Inc.; and

IN THE MATTER OF an Application by
Newfoundland Power Inc. for an order pursuant
to Sections 41 and 78 of the Act for a total of
\$123.5 million annually:

- (a) approving single-year 2023 capital
expenditures in the amount of \$93,292,000;
- (b) approving multi-year projects with capital
expenditures of \$10,483,000 in 2023 and
\$10,645,000 in 2024; and
- (c) fixing and determining a 2021 rate base of
\$1,202,946,000.

**CONSUMER ADVOCATE
REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION
CA-NP-128 to CA-NP-179**

Issued: September 20, 2022

- 1 CA-NP-128 (Reference PUB-NP-007) The NPV analyses in Table 1 and Table 2 of
 2 Attachment A imply that the cumulative NPVs of the two alternatives for
 3 street lighting replacement become equal sometime in 2041.
 4 a) Please confirm that from 2041 to 2055, the avoided electricity costs used
 5 in those analyses are based on the 2040 value of marginal costs from the
 6 Marginal Cost Study Update-2021 escalated by the Conference Board
 7 of Canada forecast of the GDP deflator.
 8 b) What evidence does NP possess to support the conjecture that marginal
 9 cost after 2041 to 2055 will increase at the same rate as the GDP deflator
 10 forecast?
 11 c) For the years 2023 to 2040 inclusive, please provide a table containing
 12 the annual values of CBOC's GDP deflator forecasts and the estimated
 13 marginal cost of energy and of transmission/capacity from the Marginal
 14 Cost Study Update-2021. Also include in that table, the annual
 15 percentage change in the forecast GDP deflator and each of the two
 16 marginal costs. Based on those figures please provide the correlation
 17 coefficient between the annual percentage changes in the forecast GDP
 18 deflator and the annual percentage changes in each marginal cost.
 19 d) Did NP consider the potential impact that the end of the Churchill Falls
 20 contract in 2041 could have on marginal costs and therefore on avoided
 21 electricity costs in that year and to 2055? Did NP consider any other
 22 alternative way to develop forecasts of avoided cost beyond 2040 other
 23 than using the percentage increases in the forecasts of the GDP deflator?
 24 e) In PU-36 (1998-1999) the GDP deflator was authorized for forecasting.
 25 Please provide any further studies that were undertaken in reference to
 26 this GDP deflator.
 27
- 28 CA-NP-129 (Reference PUB-NP-007) Regarding the choice of discount rate in the NPV
 29 calculations:
 30 a) Why did NP choose a discount rate of 5.81% for the years 2023 to 2055?
 31 b) What was the yield on the most recent NP debt issue, when was that
 32 debt issued and for how long?
 33 c) Has NP obtained any forecasts of interest rates from the Conference
 34 Board of Canada, financial advisors or other forecasters for the years
 35 2023 to 2055? If so, please provide same.
 36 d) If NP's average cost of capital were to increase in 2023 by two
 37 percentage points and if the project were approved, what would be the
 38 impact on rates for street lighting?
 39 e) Has NP's average cost of capital ever exceeded 5.81%? If so, when and
 40 by how much?
 41
- 42 CA-NP-130 (Reference PUB-NP-007) Please provide sensitivity analysis for Tables 1
 43 and 2 by recalculating NPVs (and provide the spreadsheets) under the
 44 following scenarios:

- 1 a) Assume discount rates of 6.5%, 7%, 7.5%, 8% and 8.5%.
 2 b) Assume the avoided electricity cost for 2041 is 50% lower than used in
 3 PUB-NP-007 for that year and similarly for 2042 to 2055. Calculate the
 4 NPVs under this assumption in combination with discount rates of
 5 5.81% and each of those listed in (a).
 6 c) Please indicate the year in which the cumulative NPV of the two
 7 alternatives become equal for each of scenarios considered in a) and b).
 8

9 CA-NP-131 (Reference PUB-NP-007) What would be the impacts from 2023 to 2055
 10 of each of the two LED Street Lighting Replacement alternatives on
 11 Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's revenue due to the reduced electricity
 12 consumption on the island integrated system?
 13

14 CA-NP-132 (Reference PUB-NP-008) It is stated "*No, the proposed 2023 capital
 15 expenditures for the Electric Vehicle Charging Network are not contingent
 16 on the approval of Newfoundland Power's 2021 Electrification,
 17 Conservation and Demand Management Application (the "2021 ECDM
 18 Application").*"

- 19 a) Are 2023 capital expenditures for the electric vehicle charging network
 20 contingent only on approval of the 2023 Capital Budget Application?
 21 b) If the ECDM program is not approved by the Board, how will this
 22 impact the programs and costs included in the 2023 Capital Budget
 23 Application?
 24

25 CA-NP-133 (Reference PUB-NP-009 and PUB-NP-011) It is stated "*The revised
 26 estimate of \$594,000 for three DCFC charging stations in 2023 reflects the
 27 Company's actual experience with the construction of charging stations
 28 since the 2021 Plan was filed in December 2020. The original estimate
 29 provided in the 2021 Plan was approximately \$150,000 per station. Actual
 30 costs have been approximately \$200,000 per charging station.*"

- 31 a) Please confirm that the revised estimate for the charging stations is
 32 approximately 33% greater than the cost approved by the Board.
 33 b) How does this cost increase impact the economics of the ECDM
 34 program including the estimated impact on rates?
 35 c) What is the degree of accuracy of the estimated rate mitigation benefits
 36 stemming from the electrification program including the timing of such
 37 benefits?
 38 d) Please re-evaluate the rate mitigation effect with the higher costs of
 39 charging stations and any other available information updates and use
 40 discounts rates of 6.5%, 7.5% and 8.5% in the NPV calculation. Please
 41 provide a spreadsheet of the calculations.
 42 e) What impact does the increase in gasoline and diesel prices have on the
 43 economic analysis of the electrification program? Do higher gasoline

- 1 and diesel prices accelerate EV adoption and increase the probability of
 2 free ridership?
 3
- 4 CA-NP-134 (Reference PUB-NP-010) If Newfoundland Power determines that a
 5 charger site requires expansion owing to high usage rates, why does it
 6 believe that the business case remains too weak for the private sector to
 7 undertake the charger expansion?
 8
- 9 CA-NP-135 (Reference PUB-NP-016) It is stated “*Ongoing rate design and load*
 10 *research studies will inform the business case for AMI technology when it*
 11 *is developed.*”
 12 a) Please explain how these studies will be used to inform the AMI
 13 business case.
 14 b) Has Newfoundland Power considered meter replacement/new meters
 15 programs similar to the approach being used in the LED street lighting
 16 program; i.e., all new and replacement meters would include AMI
 17 technology?
 18 c) Are there other reasons for proceeding with AMI? For example, fairness
 19 in the rate design, giving customers a measure of control over their
 20 electricity bills, etc? Further, the response to NLH-NP-021 states “*As*
 21 *the Company does not currently utilize Advanced Metering*
 22 *Infrastructure, loading on individual sections of distribution line can*
 23 *only be approximated by the modeling software, and must be verified in*
 24 *the field*”.
 25 d) Did Dunsky in fact allude to other reasons why AMI might be pursued
 26 earlier than 2030?
 27
- 28 CA-NP-136 (Reference PUB-NP-018) Is the proposed asset management review driven
 29 by the requirements set out in the Board’s Provisional Capital Budget
 30 Application Guidelines? If not, what steps is Newfoundland Power taking
 31 to gain the data and information necessary to meet the requirements set out
 32 in the Provisional Capital Budget Application Guidelines such as
 33 quantification of the reliability and risk mitigation benefits arising from a
 34 project?
 35
- 36 CA-NP-137 (Reference PUB-NP-024)
 37 a) Please confirm that if the Board approves the proposed 2023
 38 transmission line rebuild program, the program will be completed with
 39 the exception of five lines to be rebuilt by 2028.
 40 b) What are Newfoundland Power’s plans with respect to transmission line
 41 rebuilds following 2028?
 42
- 43 CA-NP-138 (Reference NLH-NP-009(c), CA-NP-089 and CA-NP-093) It is stated
 44 (NLH-NP-009(c)) “*Newfoundland Power estimates that its annual capital*

1 *expenditures over the next five years would be reduced by approximately*
 2 *\$26 million annually if the replacement and refurbishment of electrical*
 3 *system assets remained consistent with historical investment levels.”*
 4

- 5 a) Will expenditures for the renewal classification increase by roughly \$34
 6 million (79%), from \$43 million in 2022 to \$77 million in 2025 (Section
 7 3.2 of Capital Plan)?
 8 b) Please reproduce the graph in CA-NP-093 showing the renewal
 9 category only.
 10 c) What is the justification for this cost increase?
 11 d) Is the identification of aging equipment a relatively new experience?
 12 When did Newfoundland Power first determine that its assets are aging?
 13 e) What role will the asset management review play in the determination
 14 of costs in the renewal classification going forward?
 15 f) Has Newfoundland Power undertaken any actions to offset these
 16 expenditures and maintain current levels of capital spending?
 17 g) Will the asset management review proposed by Newfoundland Power
 18 be a similar exercise to that performed by Liberty in 2014?
 19 h) Will customers be consulted and take part in the asset management
 20 review?
 21 i) What is the expected cost of the asset management review and in what
 22 year is it expected to inform costs in the renewal classification?
 23

24 CA-NP-139 (Reference NLH-NP-031) It is stated “*The 2022 inspections determined*
 25 *that the line had deteriorated to the point that 253 of 490 poles on the line*
 26 *required replacement. In addition, 61 structures were identified as either*
 27 *having deteriorated insulators, crossarms, or hardware deficiencies.”*
 28 Please provide corresponding data for the inspections undertaken in each of
 29 the previous 10 years, together with any reports and documentation.
 30

31 CA-NP-140 (Reference NLH-NP-033) It is stated “*In Newfoundland Power’s view, a*
 32 *replacement generator would not provide any additional benefits sufficient*
 33 *to justify these added costs. The plant’s efficiency would not necessarily*
 34 *improve and the expected remaining service life would not change*
 35 *materially.”* What is the typical water conversion efficiency of hydro
 36 generator technology today versus when the Mobile Hydro Plant was
 37 commissioned?
 38

39 CA-NP-141 (Reference CA-NP-004) It is stated “*The Company views both capital*
 40 *budget caps and capital budget envelopes as arbitrary limits on capital*
 41 *expenditures and notes that neither are best practice in jurisdictions with*
 42 *cost of service regulation such as Newfoundland and Labrador.”*
 43 a) Did Midgard recommend that the Board approve “arbitrary” capital
 44 budget envelopes? What exactly did Midgard recommend with respect

to capital budget envelopes? Please provide references from the Midgard report.

- b) Did Midgard recommend that the Board have the flexibility to approve either capital budget envelopes or individual projects? Is Newfoundland Power opposed to the Board having greater flexibility in its decision-making?
- c) Does Newfoundland Power believe that the Board has the expertise to manage Newfoundland Power's assets. Does Newfoundland Power want the Board to manage its assets?
- d) Was Midgard aware that the province is a cost of service jurisdiction? Please provide references in the Midgard report indicating that Midgard did not know that NL is a cost of service jurisdiction.
- e) Did Midgard recommend performance-based regulation in the province?
- f) Does Newfoundland Power believe that capital budget envelopes are best practice in jurisdictions with performance-based regulation?

CA-NP-142 (Reference CA-NP-013) What changes did Newfoundland Power make to its asset management plan and practices in response to the Board's Provisional Capital Budget Application Guidelines?

CA-NP-143 (Reference CA-NP-015(vii)) Please identify the peer group used to benchmark Newfoundland Power performance on customer satisfaction.

CA-NP-144 (Reference CA-NP-016)

- a) Please provide survey questions and responses concerning customer trade-offs between service improvements (e.g., SAIDI and SAIFI), costs and rate impacts.
- b) Please provide survey questions and responses relating to customer ability and willingness to pay for electricity service.
- c) Has Newfoundland Power informed ratepayers in their surveys of the relevance of SAIDI and SAIFI and their significance in deciding projects and how Newfoundland Power's SAIDI and SAIFI numbers compare with other Canadian utilities?

CA-NP-145 (Reference CA-NP-018) The questions in the RFI include: 1) At what unit cost system reliability and risk profile would be improved by a proposed project, 2) If the ratepayer values the improvement in system reliability and risk reduction more than the project cost, and 3) How cost effective the proposed improvements in system reliability and risk reduction are compared to other budget items proposed and other alternatives that are available. Were any of these questions addressed in the 2023 Capital Budget Application? Is it a requirement of the Provisional Capital Budget Application Guidelines that these questions be addressed?

- 1 CA-NP-146 (Reference CA-NP-029) Please file a copy for the record.
2
- 3 CA-NP-147 (Reference CA-NP-030)
4 a) Please confirm that in Newfoundland Power’s opinion, the Board does
5 not have the authority to take into consideration rate impacts on
6 customers at times when customers are experiencing financial distress.
7 b) Please confirm that Newfoundland Power does not take into account
8 such considerations when it files its capital budgets and general rate
9 applications.
10 c) Please confirm that regulation should replicate the effects of a
11 competitive market in markets where competition does not exist.
12
- 13 CA-NP-148 (Reference CA-NP-031) It is stated “*The topic of integrated resource*
14 *planning is ongoing as part of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro’s*
15 *Reliability and Resource Adequacy Study review, of which Newfoundland*
16 *Power is a participant.*” Does Newfoundland Power perform integrated
17 resource planning for its distribution system?
18
- 19 CA-NP-149 (Reference CA-NP-034)
20 a) How are inflation and supply chain issues expected to impact the
21 accuracy of Newfoundland Power’s estimates in 2023?
22 b) (Reference Hydro Application, 2022 Capital Expenditures Overview,
23 Appendix A) Of 17 projects/programs in 2022, 13 of Hydro's projects
24 have variances between the Board-approved budget amounts and the
25 total budget expenditures and forecast. It is understood that the
26 variances are in part owing to supply chain issues and inflation. On the
27 other hand, Newfoundland Power shows 2022 capital expenditure
28 variances in only 1 of 11 projects/programs (see Newfoundland Power
29 2023 Capital Budget Application, 2022 Capital Expenditure Status
30 Report). Why is Hydro able to judge the impacts of supply chain and
31 inflation issues to date in 2022 when Newfoundland Power is not?
32
- 33 CA-NP-150 (Reference CA-NP-042) Please confirm that Newfoundland Power did ***not***
34 discuss with the customer alternative means for improving the reliability of
35 supply to the hospital.
36
- 37 CA-NP-151 (Reference CA-NP-045, Footnote 3) It is stated “*Investigate the installation*
38 *of downstream feeder reclosers for the purpose of improving distribution*
39 *SAIFI and SAIDI indices, in addition for reducing cold load pick up*
40 *difficulties, with priorities given to feeders based on installation costs*
41 *versus anticipated avoided customer interruptions.*”
42 a) Has Newfoundland Power proposed the addition of reclosers on the
43 basis of SAIDI and SAIFI improvements as recommended by Liberty?

b) In the response to NLH-NP-014 is Newfoundland Power stating that it is *not* justifying installation of reclosers on the basis of improved reliability performance or cost reduction?

CA-NP-152

(Reference CA-NP-046(d)) It is stated “*An increase in customer rates due to electrification initiatives would be minimal over the near term, with a forecast increase of 0.006 ¢/kWh in the first year of implementing the 2021 Plan, representing an average annual customer bill increase of approximately \$1.17 for a residential customer with electric heating.*” Given the “minimal” rate impact, and the benefits to Newfoundland Power’s shareholder deriving from the gain in sales revenue owing to the ECDM program, why is Newfoundland Power’s shareholder not taking on this cost in the 2022 through 2025 timeframe?

CA-NP-153

(Reference CA-NP-049) If Newfoundland Power were to forego this work in 2023, would the level of reliability on the system continue to exceed the Canadian average? More specifically, does this program need to be done annually? Would there be savings if done every other year?

CA-NP-154

(Reference CA-NP-055) Why are 8 inspections completed annually rather than 6 or 4 or 1? How did Newfoundland Power decide that “8” inspections were required? Please provide a description of these inspections and if reports were documented? What would the cost of this program be in 2023 if the number of inspections was reduced?

CA-NP-155

(Reference CA-NP-065(c)) Please confirm that Newfoundland Power is promoting accelerated EV adoption in the province, but is not adding EVs to its own fleet until it gains experience with EVs and monitors trends in the EV market.

CA-NP-156

(Reference CA-NP-069) It is stated “*Yes, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (“Hydro”) has information on customer trade offs between cost and reliability through their digital engagement process in 2018 as part of its Reliability and Resource Adequacy Study.*”

- a) Specifically, what questions were posed to customers during this engagement relating to trade-offs between service improvements and cost, and customer willingness to pay?
- b) What were the findings of this initiative relating to customer trade-offs between cost and service improvements, and customer willingness to pay?
- c) How has this information been incorporated in Newfoundland Power’s 2022 and 2023 Capital Budget Applications?
- d) Please file for the record a copy of the report documenting the results of this process.

- 1 CA-NP-157 (Reference CA-NP-078) It is stated “*A white paper entitled “Worst*
 2 *Performing Feeders” released by Electricity Canada in 2015, suggests that*
 3 *within the industry one common methodology used to identify Worst*
 4 *Performing Feeders is based on feeder reliability metrics exceeding the*
 5 *corporate average by 300%.”*
- 6 a) It is understood that this methodology is used to **identify** worst-
 7 performing feeders, but is it also used in the industry as a basis for taking
 8 action to improve reliability performance on such feeders?
- 9 b) Does Newfoundland Power subscribe to this methodology? If not, to
 10 what methodology does Newfoundland Power subscribe?
- 11
- 12 CA-NP-158 (Reference CA-NP-087) It is stated “*the replacement of a reasonably*
 13 *reliable feeder with a new feeder would carry a high cost and provide no*
 14 *material benefit for customers.”*
- 15 a) Please confirm that such a project would provide a reliability benefit.
- 16 b) Please define “material benefit”.
- 17 c) Please quantify the “material benefit” of each project in the 2023 Capital
 18 Budget Application that has a reliability component.
- 19
- 20 CA-NP-159 (Reference CA-NP-095) It is stated “*As such, annual variances greater*
 21 *than 10% and \$100,000 for 2022 projects and programs are typically not*
 22 *known at that time.”* What then is the value and purpose of this report?
- 23
- 24 CA-NP-160 (Reference CA-NP-098) In Table 1 of Attachment A it is indicated that
 25 LED Street Lighting Replacement Alternative 2 would have an advantage
 26 over Alternative 1 equal to a 20-year NPV of \$4.9 million. NP’s response
 27 to PUB-NP-007 implies a 32-year NPV of \$4.6 million advantage. Please
 28 clarify which is the more accurate figure.
- 29
- 30 CA-NP-161 (Reference CA-NP-098) In Table 1 of Attachment A, the NPV for the three
 31 alternatives regarding Transmission Line 55L are given.
- 32 a) Please provide the Excel spreadsheet calculations of those NPVs.
- 33 b) Please estimate the NPVs based on a discount rate of 6.5%, of 7.5% and
 34 of 8.5% and provide Excel spreadsheets showing the calculations.
- 35
- 36 CA-NP-162 (Reference CA-NP-104) It is stated “*Newfoundland Power does not capture*
 37 *data related to customer complaints about reliability by feeder.”*
- 38 a) Why not? Do customers place a high level of importance on reliability?
 39 Is tracking customer complaints about reliability inconsistent with
 40 Newfoundland Power’s mandate?
- 41 b) Please provide the detailed step-by-step process followed when a
 42 customer files a complaint with either Newfoundland Power or the
 43 Board.

- 1 c) Please provide the detailed step-by-step process followed when a
2 customer files a dispute against Newfoundland Power.
3 d) Please file a summary list of complaints/disputes for each of the past 10
4 years including a description of the complaint/dispute and any action
5 taken.
6

7 CA-NP-163 (Reference CA-NP-107) Please confirm that Dunsky did not assess the cost
8 effectiveness of dynamic rates as they relate to this particular project.
9

10 CA-NP-164 (Reference CA-NP-112) It is stated "*the economic cost of replacing lost*
11 *production if the project were to be deferred to 2024 is \$700,000.*" Please
12 confirm that this is an estimate of the value of capacity and energy from
13 Sandy Brook in 2024 rather than the risk-adjusted cost of a failure if the
14 project were to be deferred by a year.
15

16 CA-NP-165 (Reference CA-NP-115, footnote 3) What percentage of the windings at
17 Sandy Brook have failed in the past 10 years? What are the outage rates for
18 the Sandy Brook hydro plant in each of the past 10 years?
19

20 CA-NP-166 (Reference CA-NP-119) It is stated "*The loss of a year of production from*
21 *the Mobile Hydro Plant resulting from an unplanned failure is*
22 *approximately \$1.2 million.*" Please confirm that this is an estimate of the
23 value of capacity and energy from the Mobile hydro plant in 2024 rather
24 than the risk-adjusted cost of a failure if the project were to be deferred by
25 a year.
26

27 CA-NP-167 (Reference CA-NP-121) What are the outage rates for the Mobile hydro
28 plant in each of the past 10 years?
29

30 CA-NP-168 (Technical Conference – Issue 1) For the years 2005 to 2020 please provide
31 a table containing annual values for: the GDP deflator, NP's price index
32 using the same base year as the GDP deflator, actual capital expenditure by
33 NP, actual capital expenditure by NP expressed in real terms using the GDP
34 deflator, and actual capital expenditure expressed in real terms using NP's
35 price index.
36

37 CA-NP-169 (Technical Conference – Issue 2) With respect to the proposed transmission
38 line 55L rebuild project, it is stated in the application "*in 2017 customers*
39 *experienced an outage of approximately 4.5 hours due to a severe wind*
40 *storm*" and "*Customers experienced a similar outage due to a wind storm*
41 *in 2020*".
42

- 43 a) Please confirm that these 2 events resulted in 1.7 million customer
44 minutes of outage (850,000 minutes of customer outage per event), and
that this compares to 10 million minutes of outage over the past 20 years,

or 500,000 minutes of customer outage per year, or 147 minutes of outage per customer per year (based on 3400 customers).

- b) Are outages to Line 55L included in Newfoundland Power's system SAIDI/SAIFI statistics?
- c) Are the 2 referenced wind storms judged to be severe storms for the purposes of calculating SAIDI/SAIFI statistics?
- d) Would the rebuilt line maintain continuity of supply during such wind storms?
- e) Are "hotline work methods using specialized resources" common industry practice in such circumstances? What "specialized resources" are utilized?
- f) Please provide the step-by-step process and timeline followed to restore power supply during the 4.5 hour outage resulting from the severe wind storm in 2017.
- g) Please provide the step-by-step process and timeline followed to restore power supply during the wind storm of 2020.
- h) Please identify the severity of any damages to 55L due to the recent post-tropical storm Hurricane Earl and what, if any, outages were experienced.

21 CA-NP-170

(Technical Conference – Issue 2) With respect to the proposed transmission line 55L rebuild project, it is understood that maintenance expenditures since 2018 have been \$30,000/year. Please provide maintenance expenses from 2010 forward?

26 CA-NP-171

(Technical Conference – Issue 2) With respect to the proposed transmission line 55L rebuild project, how will Newfoundland Power dispose of old poles? Is this cost/estimated included in the economic assessment and, if so, provide particulars?

31 CA-NP-172

(Technical Conference – Issue 2) With respect to the proposed transmission line 55L rebuild project, it is stated in the application "*The inspections [in 2022] determined that 253 of 490 poles on the line (52%) are deteriorated to the point where replacement is required. In addition, 61 structures were identified as either having deteriorated insulators, deteriorated crossarms or hardware deficiencies.*"

- a) How many poles have been replaced since the last inspection? In the past year? In the past 5 years?
- b) How many outages have occurred since the last inspection?
- c) At what percentage of deteriorated poles does NP decide the entire line should be replaced?
- d) When a pole is replaced, does this also include replacement of all cross-arms and insulators?

- 1 e) Are the deteriorated poles in concentrated clusters or are they evenly
2 distributed throughout the line?

3
4 CA-NP-173

(Reference Technical Conference Issue 3).

- 5 a) What is the purpose of the risk matrix?
6 b) Does the risk matrix show relative priorities of projects and a priority
7 ranking of these projects?
8 c) Does the matrix quantify the risk associated with project deferral?
9 d) Does NP use its risk matrix for decision-making? In particular, does it
10 eliminate any capital projects based on an application of the matrix?
11 e) Why are the weights assigned to probabilities for the matrix not
12 proportionate to the underlying probabilities? For example, a
13 project/program with a probability of 5% is assigned a value of 1 but a
14 project/program with a probability of 80%, which is 16 times higher, is
15 assigned a weight of 4, which is just 4 times higher.
16 f) Why are the weights assigned to consequence values for the matrix not
17 proportionate to the underlying values when those underlying values can
18 be expressed in numerical terms? For example, a project/program with
19 an NPV of \$50,000 is assigned a value of 2 but one with a NPV of
20 \$750,000, which is 15 times larger, is assigned a value of 4, which is
21 only twice as much as 2.
22 g) Would Newfoundland Power use the risk matrix to prioritize projects to
23 be completed if the Board were to approve a capital budget envelope in
24 an amount that is less than that requested?

25
26 CA-NP-174

(Reference Technical Conference Issue 3 relating to financial aspects of
27 projects such as pay-back periods).

- 28 a) Does Newfoundland Power do both economic and financial analyses
29 when it analyzes a capital project? For example, has Newfoundland
30 Power determined a pay-back period for any of the projects proposed in
31 the 2023 CBA? Are pay-back periods relevant in light of government
32 initiatives relating to a carbon-free society and the potential for stranded
33 assets; i.e., continued use of diesel generation?
34 b) Does NP consider any project that has a positive net present value a
35 good investment for customers even if the payback period is more than
36 20 years into the future?
37 c) Please confirm that in the assessment of alternatives relating to
38 transmission line 55L, "Alternative 1 – Address Existing Deficiencies"
39 the upfront cost is about \$7.5 million while the upfront cost of the
40 favored Alternative 3 – "Rebuild in New Right-of-Way" is \$10.6
41 million. What weighting did NP give to this fact in its economic
42 assessment of the line rebuild?
43 d) Considering that outcomes are more and more uncertain the further into
44 the future that technology improves over time, would it not be

1 worthwhile for Newfoundland Power to have a pay-back period
 2 criterion for projects in addition to the NPV criterion? Otherwise, how
 3 does NP adjust NPVs for the uncertainty associated with long-lived
 4 project with large up-front capital cost?

- 5 e) Please provide pay-back periods of other Canadian utilities undertaking
 6 similar projects.

7
 8 CA-NP-175

(Reference Technical Conference Issue 6)

- 9 a) According to NLH-NP-014, over the past 5 years, SAIDI performance
 10 has been 47% of the Canadian average and SAIFI performance has been
 11 84% of the Canadian average. Please confirm that this performance
 12 reflects NP's target reliability when making decisions on planning and
 13 operating its power system.
 14 b) Please confirm that the basis for NP's reliability performance strategy
 15 is NP's customer surveys.
 16 c) Please confirm that NP's customer surveys do not ask customers about
 17 the value they place on reliability of supply. If this is not confirmed,
 18 please identify questions in the survey that assess customer trade-offs
 19 between cost and reliability.
 20 d) Did Hydro's digital engagement initiative attempt to gain this
 21 information? Does NP use the results of this initiative in any way to
 22 inform its planning and operation decisions?

23
 24 CA-NP-176

(Reference Technical Conference Issue 6) For the: 1) proposed addition of
 25 closers project, 2) the transmission line 55L rebuild project, and 3) the
 26 refurbishment of feeder SUM-01 project, please provide the following:

- 27 a) Historic SAIDI and SAIFI figures for customers served by these
 28 facilities for each of the past 10 years.
 29 b) All complaints from customers served by these facilities for each of the
 30 past 10 years.
 31 c) Feedback received when customers were contacted about the projects,
 32 specifically feedback relating to willingness to pay and trade-offs
 33 between improved reliability and cost.
 34 d) Project cost estimates consistent with the requirements set out in the
 35 Provisional Capital Budget Application Guidelines.
 36 e) The forecast improvement in reliability performance (quantified)
 37 resulting from each of the projects.
 38 f) The expected risk (quantified) of deferring each of the projects by one
 39 or two years.
 40 g) Historic maintenance costs on these lines for each of the past 10 years.
 41 h) The expected improvement in operating costs resulting from each of the
 42 projects.
 43 i) The payback period for the recommended alternative relative to
 44 continuing to maintain existing assets.

- 1 CA-NP-177 (Reference Technical Conference Issue 6). CA-NP-045, Footnote 3 states
 2 (statement attributed to Liberty) “*Investigate the installation of downstream*
 3 *feeder reclosers for the purpose of improving distribution SAIFI and SAIDI*
 4 *indices, in addition for reducing cold load pick up difficulties, with*
 5 *priorities given to feeders based on installation costs versus anticipated*
 6 *avoided customer interruptions.*” Please provide the analysis recommended
 7 by Liberty, and more specifically, provide the analysis of SAIDI and SAIFI
 8 performance improvements and installation costs versus anticipated
 9 avoided customer interruptions.
 10
- 11 CA-NP-178 (Reference Technical Conference Issue 7) PUB-NP-016 states “*Ongoing*
 12 *rate design and load research studies will inform the business case for AMI*
 13 *technology when it is developed.*”
 14 a) What details can NP provide with respect to the proposed study of
 15 meters in terms of timing and scope?
 16 b) It has been stated that there is no business case for AMI before 2030
 17 (Dunsky). Why is NP proposing to undertake this study now?
 18 c) Is AMI inevitable given the high penetration levels of electric heat,
 19 upcoming EV charger demand and other changes going on in the
 20 industry, if for no other reason than to ensure the fairness of the rate
 21 structure?
 22 d) The response to NLH-NP-021 states “*As the Company does not*
 23 *currently utilize Advanced Metering Infrastructure, loading on*
 24 *individual sections of distribution line can only be approximated by the*
 25 *modeling software, and must be verified in the field*”. How much would
 26 AMI reduce such costs?
 27
- 28 CA-NP-179 (Reference Technical Conference Issue 9)
 29 a) Can NP confirm that the purpose of its 2023 CBA proposal for more EV
 30 charging stations is to encourage more consumption of excess energy
 31 from Muskrat Falls?
 32 b) Can NP confirm that excess energy from the Muskrat Falls project will
 33 be reliably available throughout 2023 on the island integrated system?
 34 c) For a vehicle model that is available with a gasoline engine as well as
 35 an all-electric version (e.g., a Ford F-150) what is the current cost of a
 36 full charge using a fast charger at one of NP’s charging stations and
 37 what is the resulting range? How many litres of gasoline would the
 38 gasoline counterpart need in order to cover the same range, and at what
 39 cost at current gasoline prices?
 40 d) Has NP considered setting the price of charges either to reflect the actual
 41 cost of its charging stations or to reflect the cost of equivalent coverage
 42 by a gasoline vehicle as per (c) above? If the price is not set in relation
 43 to cost, how does NP set the price of electricity at its charging stations?

- 1 e) To the extent that NP's charging stations do not cover cost, what will be
2 the cost to NP ratepayers of covering NP's losses over time including
3 any compensation for the time value of money?
4 f) Has NP considered the risk that hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles could
5 overtake electric vehicles and thereby strand charging station assets?
6 Did Dunsky allude to hydrogen fuel cell vehicles in its report or in
7 correspondence with Newfoundland Power over the course of its study?
8 Does Newfoundland Power plan to enter the market to service fuel-cell
9 vehicles as well?
10 g) In its estimation of the rate mitigation effect of increased electricity
11 consumption due to EVs has NP taken into account the offsetting effect
12 of reduced electricity consumption due to its accelerated LED Street
13 Lighting Replacement plan?

DATED at St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, this 20th day of September, 2022.

Per:



Denis Browne, KC
Consumer Advocate

Terrace on the Square, Level 2, P.O. Box 23135
St. John's, Newfoundland & Labrador A1B 4J9

Telephone: (709) 724-3800

Telecopier: (709) 754-3800

Email: dbrowne@bfma-law.com