- Q. (Reference Application Schedule B, page iii) It is stated "The Assessment of Alternatives sections discuss only those alternatives the Company has identified as relevant, and are provided for projects and programs in excess of \$1 million, with the exception of expenditures classified as Access".
  - a) What criteria has Newfoundland Power used to determine if an alternative is "relevant"? Are environmental impacts one such criterion?
  - b) Are behind the meter alternatives such as distributed generation, rate design, etc. considered "relevant"?
  - c) How has Newfoundland Power incorporated future trends in its assessment? Specifically, has Newfoundland Power considered sensitivity studies relating to shorter asset lifespans in the event that new environmentally sensitive options become available in, for example, the next 5 years?
- A. a) Newfoundland Power determines whether an alternative is relevant based on whether it could reasonably be expected to meet an identified requirement at the lowest possible cost.

In certain instances, the alternatives listed in the Provisional Guidelines may not be available to meet a particular requirement. For example, opportunities to extend the useful life of an asset may not be relevant for capital projects that represent new additions to the Company's property, such as the addition of automated downline reclosers.

In other instances, it may be obvious that one alternative is orders of magnitude more costly than another. For example, mobile generation could be used as an alternative strategy to offload peak demand on the overloaded sections of distribution feeders. However, this alternative would not be identified as relevant on the basis of excessive cost.

Environmental impacts are considered when assessing alternatives where relevant. For example, in the case of transmission line rebuild projects, the selection of a right-of-way would depend on the locations of any environmentally sensitive areas such as watersheds.

b) Behind the meter alternatives, such as distributed generation, rate design or other non-wires alternatives, may or may not be considered relevant depending on whether it could reasonably be expected to meet an identified requirement at the lowest possible cost. For example, the non-wires alternative of battery storage was considered for the proposed *Feeder Additions for Load Growth* project, but was deemed not viable due to excessive cost.<sup>1</sup>

For additional discussion on the Company's approach to non-wires alternatives, see the response to Request for Information CA-NP-101.

See the 2023 Capital Budget Application, report 1.2 Feeder Additions for Load Growth.

c) Yes, the Company considers future trends in assessing alternatives. For example, the *Mobile Hydro Plant Refurbishment* project is accompanied by an economic analysis and sensitivity analyses to confirm that continued operation of the plant would provide an economic benefit for the Company's customers. The economic analysis is based on expected future trends in marginal costs. Additionally, the sensitivity analyses for the project include a scenario where the economic value of the plant's production is reduced to zero upon termination of the Churchill Falls contact in 2041 which, in effect, represents a shortening of the plant's service life. In all scenarios, continued operation of the Mobile Hydro Plant was confirmed to provide an economic benefit for Newfoundland Power's customers.<sup>2</sup>

Newfoundland Power did not identify any instances where proposed capital projects could be exposed to risk of shorter asset lives due specifically to environmental considerations. However, the Company would assess the potential risks to its customers if such considerations were to arise in the future.

.

See the 2023 Capital Budget Application, report 4.2 Mobile Hydro Plant Refurbishment.