

1 **Q. Reference: *Fair Return and Capital Structure for Newfoundland Power (NP)*,
2 Evidence of Laurence D. Booth, April 2024, page 100, lines 7-10.**
3

4 ***“Finally, the Board and the Government of Newfoundland (sic) and Labrador have
5 tools to manage any rate shock should the cost of power from Hydro increase
6 significantly, such as changing the depreciation rate, reducing the +/- 0.40% band
7 around the allowed ROE, and changing to a more efficient capital structure.”***
8

9 **a) Please detail the supporting analysis completed by Dr. Booth that compares the
10 scope of rate increases stemming from the Muskrat Falls Project with the rate
11 mitigating effects of changes in the depreciation rate, narrowing the ROE band,
12 and reducing Newfoundland Power’s equity thickness by 5%.**
13

14 **b) What is Dr. Booth’s understanding of the ability of the Government of
15 Newfoundland to change the recovery period of costs associated with the
16 Muskrat Falls Project and whether agreements, such as the Muskrat Falls Power
17 Purchase Agreement, place limitations on any such ability? Please explain.**
18

19 **c) In Dr. Booth’s opinion, is there a risk that cost recovery associated with the
20 Muskrat Falls Project could place increased pressure on customers’ ability to
21 pay?**
22

23 **d) In Dr. Booth’s opinion, is manipulating Newfoundland Power’s capital structure
24 in order to mitigate costs associated with the Muskrat Falls Project consistent
25 with the fair return standard and the stand-alone principle?**
26

27 **A. a) Dr. Booth is simply stating that in his judgement Boards and governments have a
28 variety of tools available to mitigate rate shock, which is part of the regulatory
29 compact in Canada. This judgment has been confirmed by the measures
30 subsequently announced by the provincial government and Newfoundland and
31 Labrador Hydro.**
32

33 **b) The legislation under which NP is regulated is provincial and determined by the
34 Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, so that ultimately it is the provincial
35 government’s ability that is the matter of concern. Dr. Booth judges this ability to
36 be extensive.**
37

38 **c) It is Dr. Booth’s judgement that any increase in electricity prices will cause some
39 deterioration in demand. However, compared to earlier periods, where fossil fuels
40 were more competitive, Dr. Booth does not judge that any loss in demand is beyond
41 the forecasting ability of NP’s financial staff.**

- 1 d) Dr. Booth is not doing what the question states. He is simply stating that if the
2 Board judges NP to be a normal T&D utility like other T&D Canadian utilities, as
3 does Dr. Booth, then operating with 40% common equity satisfies the fair return
4 standard. To believe otherwise would question the legitimacy of other regulatory
5 boards, such as the Alberta Utilities Commission and the Ontario Energy Board.