# NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR HYDRO SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF PAUL R. HAMILTON

1	Q.	What is the purpose of this supplen	nentary evidence?	)	
2					
3	Α.	The purpose of this supplementary	evidence is to file	revisions to my pre	-filed
4		evidence to reflect the changes in r	ates for the variou	s customer classes	5
5		resulting from the revised 2002 Cos	st of Service study	filed by Mr. Brickh	ill.
6		Revised evidence, pages 9 to 13, a	ind revised pages	in Schedules I. III a	and
7		IV are attached I have also prepare	ed the following ta	hle to provide a	
, 0		The attached. That's also prepare			م م ما
8		companson of the percentage incre	eases by rate class	s based on the revi	sea
9		2002 study and the pre-filed 2002 s	study.		
10					
11		Comparison of Perc	centage Revenue	Changes	
12		Based or	n Full Year 2002		
13					
14			Pro-filed	Revision	
15		Newfoundland Power	6.7%	6.6%	
16		Industrial			
10		- firm	10.4%	8.5%	
17		- non-firm	29.9%	29.9%	
10		- wneeling	7.1%	-2.9%	
10		Rural Island Interconnected	3.7%	3.6%	
19		Rural Isolated Systems	0 70/	0.00/	
20		Non-government	3.7%	3.6%	
20			20.0%	20.0%	
21		Rural Labrador Interconnected	3.170	3.0%	
22		Domestic	1.7%	2.7%	
23		GS 2.1 0 – 10 kW	-15.2%	-15.2%	
04		GS 2.2 10 – 100 kW	-28.6%	-8.6%	
24		GS 2.3 110 – 1000 kVA	-24.1%	-13.4%	
25		GS 2.4 Over 1000 kVA	-34.4%	-15.4 %	
26		Street & Area Lighting	15.8%	15.8%	
20		Labrador Interconnected Total	-13.1%	-4.9%	
27		CFB Goose Bay – Secondary	0.0%	0.0%	
28		ΙΟΤΑΙ	6.1%	6.1%	

1		The average increase to Hydro Interconnected and Isolated Systems
2		customers is reduced from an increase of 3.68% to an increase of 3.62%
3		based on our estimate of Newfoundland Power's resulting pass through
4		increase in its retail rates. This revised increase, however, has not been
5		reflected in the revenue figures used in the Revised 2002 Cost of Service
6		study as such a change will require several iterations to adjust for the
7		impacts on the deficit and interest expense calculations. These adjustments
8		will be reflected in the detailed update to be submitted in late October to
9		reflect the actual costs up to the end of August 2001.
10		
11		
12	Q.	Does this conclude this supplementary evidence?
13		
14	A.	Yes.

# Newfoundland & Labrador Hydro

# Pre-filed Evidence of P. R. Hamilton

Revisions – Oct. 3, 2001

Page 9	Table 2 Lines 8 & 10				
Page 10	Lines 5 & 6 Table 3 Lines 18 & 26				
Page 11	Line 1				
Page 12	Line 21 Line 28 Reference to Rate 3.1 in Happy Valley/Goose Bay added				
Page 13	Lines 15 & 20				
Schedule I	Pages 1, 3, 4, 9, 11 (Proposed Rates only)				
Schedule III	Changed Ra	tes			
Schedule IV	Page 1 Page 2 Page 3 Page 4 Page 5 Page 6 Page 7 Page 8 Page 9	Revised Table Changed "Page 2 of 8" to "Page 2 of 9" Revised Table Revised Table New Table Changed "Page 5 of 8" to "Page 6 of 9" Changed "Page 6 of 8" to "Page 7 of 9" Changed "Page 7 of 8" to "Page 8 of 9" Revised Table			

	Existing Rates	Proposed Rates	Change \$	Change %
Newfoundland Power	\$200,369,992	\$213,607,660	\$13,237,668	6.6%
Industrial				
- firm	45,266,225	49,112,361	\$3,846,136	8.5%
- non-firm	293,393	381,121	\$87,728	29.9%
- wheeling	6,490	6,300	(\$190)	-2.9%
Rural Island Interconnected	30,517,104	31,639,918	1,122,814	3.7% *
Rural Isolated Systems				
Non-government	4,500,581	4,666,055	165,474	3.7% *
Government	680,603	816,722	136,119	20.0%
L'Anse au Loup	1,095,800	1,136,125	40,325	3.7% *
Rural Labrador Interconnected				
Domestic	5,613,755	5,766,932	153,177	2.7%
GS 2.1 0 - 10 kW	256,118	217,095	-39,023	-15.2%
GS 2.2 10 - 100 kW	2,027,972	1,853,605	-174,367	-8.6%
GS 2.3 110 - 1000 kVA	2,632,106	2,280,106	-352,000	-13.4%
GS 2.4 Over 1000 kVA	1,244,216	1,052,653	-191,563	-15.4%
Street & Area Lighting	140,495	162,693	22,198	15.8%
Labrador Interconnected Total	\$11,914,662	\$11,333,084	-\$581,578	-4.9%
CFB Goose Bay - Secondary	2,991,483	2,991,483	0	0.0%
Total	\$297,636,333	\$315,690,829	\$ 18,054,496	6.1%

# Table 2 Revision = 0 Comparison of Revenue at Existing and Proposed Rates Based on Full Year 2002

\* Original estimated increase resulting from Newfoundland Power's subsequent pass-through hearing.

1 The proposed rates are summarized in Schedule I and will be discussed 2 together with the impacts on customer's annual costs by system and 3 customer group. Rural rates that will be set as a result of NP's pass-through 4 hearing are not included in Schedule I.

5

6 Q. Please describe the proposed rate for NP.

7

A. Hydro proposes a rate of 47.95 mills per kWh effective January 1, 2002.
The firming up charge for secondary energy from Corner Brook Pulp and
Paper Limited is 10.89 mills per kWh as shown on Schedule 1.4 of the 2002
COS Study.

Q. Please describe the proposed rates to be charged Island Industrial
 Customers.

3

A. Hydro proposes a firm service rate effective January 1, 2002 comprised of a
demand charge of \$6.77 per kW of billing demand per month and an energy
charge of 22.79 mills per kWh plus the appropriate specifically assigned
charge as outlined in the following table.

9 10

8

Table 3

Industrial Customer Specifically Assigned Charges

	Annual Amount
ACI – Grand Falls	\$ 156,478
ACI – Stephenville	91,123
Corner Brook Pulp and Paper	108,850
North Atlantic Refining	177,364

11

12 For Industrial Customers taking firm service, we also propose a rate for non-13 firm service. This rate is comprised of a demand charge of \$1.50 per kW and 14 a variable energy charge based on the calculation outlined on Page 3 of the 15 proposed Schedule of Rates attached as Schedule A to the Application. It 16 should be noted that the RSP does not apply to the non-firm service rate. In 17 addition, Hydro currently wheels energy for Abitibi-Consolidated. The 18 proposed rate for this wheeling on Hydro's transmission grid is 6.30 mills per 19 kWh.

20

Q. Please describe the proposed rates for Island Interconnected Rural andL'Anse au Loup System customers.

23

A. Hydro has not designed specific rates for these customers, as the rates
charged by NP will apply. We estimate the increase to NP will result in an
average increase to their customers of 3.62%. We have however included

- the original allowance for an increase of 3.68% in the 2002 revenue from
   these customers.
- 3

Hydro currently offers fewer options for Street and Area Lighting service than
are listed on the current rate sheet. A revised listing of the options that
Hydro offers is shown on Page 8 of Schedule A to the Application. The rates
themselves will continue to reflect those charged by NP.

8

9 Q. Please describe the rates Hydro is proposing for Isolated Rural Systems
10 customers effective January 1, 2002.

11

12 Α. Hydro has not designed specific rates for these customers, with the 13 exception of Government rate classes. Rather we have included the 14 estimated additional revenue in the 2002 COS based on an average 15 increase of 3.68% on all rate components. The final rates will reflect the 16 relevant NP rate for the lifeline portion of the rates while the other 17 components will receive the average overall change in NP's rates resulting 18 from this application.

19

A revised rate sheet for Street and Area Lighting Service is shown on Page 9 of Schedule A to the Application to reflect the options currently offered by Hydro similar to that outlined above. The rates themselves will continue to reflect those charged by NP.

24

The proposed rates effective January 1, 2002 for government agencies and departments are summarized in Schedule I. These rates were developed by increasing each component of the existing Isolated Rural Systems rates by 20% consistent with our rate design guideline to limit the level of increase to each rate class to 20%. Schedule II provides an analysis of the impacts on customers' annual costs resulting from this rate change. It should be noted

- that even though each component was increased approximately 20%, the
   increases range from approximately 19% to 21% due to rounding.
- 3

Q. Please explain the rates Hydro is proposing for the Labrador InterconnectedSystem customers.

6

7 Α. As indicated earlier Hydro is proposing to move to one set of rates for the 8 Labrador Interconnected System consistent with having one COS for the 9 System. As a starting point, a set of rates for Labrador was designed based 10 on the existing rate categories in the Island Interconnected System. Rates 11 were developed to provide the revenue requirement from each rate class 12 based on the target recovery levels indicated earlier in my evidence. These 13 rates, other than for Street and Area Lighting, are summarized in Schedule III. 14

15

16 A set of firm service rates was designed for 2002 that would move towards 17 this long-term structure. As outlined in Mr. Brickhill's evidence, revenue from 18 secondary sales in Labrador has been credited in the COS study to the 19 other regulated rate classes on the Labrador Interconnected System. This 20 revenue has reduced the revenue requirement for 2002 and resulted in an 21 average overall decrease for Labrador retail rates of 4.9% from existing 22 rates. These proposed rates, outlined in Schedule I, reflect the 2002 COS 23 Study results.

24

While it was not possible at this time to develop a single rate for either rate class across the System, we were able to develop similar rates for Happy Valley/Goose Bay and the Labrador City/Wabush areas with some components the same. With the exception of Rate 3.1 in Happy Valley/Goose Bay, we were able to consolidate the rates in each of these areas into a single set of rates based on the proposed rate classes for each area. The move to one set of rates will require several interim steps.

12

1 The changes in rate categories and rate structures will cause different 2 impacts on customers depending on the area in which a customer resides 3 and the rate at which the customer is currently billed. Therefore analyses 4 have been prepared for each area.

5

6 Schedule I summarizes the proposed rates effective January 1, 2002. Pages 7 3 to 7 outline the rates for the Happy Valley/Goose Bay area while Pages 8 8 to 12 outline the proposed rates for the Labrador City/Wabush area. 9 Schedule IV shows the impacts of proposed rates, except Street and Area 10 Lighting rates, for each area by rate class based on customer usage 11 patterns in 2000. While customer's specific usage patterns tend to vary from 12 year to year the analyses provide a good indication of the range of impacts 13 customers may experience.

14

Schedule IV, Pages 1 to 5 show the impacts on customers in the Happy
Valley/Goose Bay area. Most customers in this area will experience
reductions because their existing rates are generally higher than the
proposed rates identified in Schedule I.

19

Pages 6 to 9 of Schedule IV show the impacts on customers in the Labrador City/Wabush area. The range of impacts is quite broad because of the wide range of existing rate classes and rate structures. For example the Domestic class increases range from 3% to 193%. The latter reflects an annual increase of \$38 because the customer used very little energy so the increase is due primarily to the increase in the basic customer charge from \$1.15 to \$3.75 per month.

27

In addition, the prompt payment discount has been expanded to all rate
 classes and is the same as on the Island Interconnected System. Minimum
 monthly charges and alternate energy rates similar to those on the Island
 Interconnected System are being proposed for all General Service rates.

## Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Comparison of Existing and Proposed Rates Island Interconnected System

Schedule I Page 1 of 12 P. R. Hamilton Revision - Oct. 3, 2001

	Existing Rates	Proposed Rates	
Newfoundland Power			
Firm Service	4.531 ¢ per kWh	4.795 ¢ per kWh	
HST Credit	(\$123,083) per month	-	
Secondary Firming up Charge	1.040 ¢ per kWh	1.089 ¢ per kWh	
Island Industrial			
Firm Service			
Demand Charge	\$7.36 per kW per month	\$6.77 per kW per month	
Energy Charge	1.934 ¢ per kWh	2.279 ¢ per kWh	
Non-Firm Service			
Interuptible A			
Demand Charge	\$7.36 per kW per month	\$1.50 per kW per month	
Energy Charge	1.934 ¢ per kWh	Fuel-based rate	
Emergency Power			
Demand Charge	-	\$1.50 per kW per month	
Energy Charge	Fuel-based rate	Fuel-based rate	
Exceptional Power			
Demand Charge	\$7.36 per kW per month	\$1.50 per kW per month	
Energy Charge	Fuel-based rate	Fuel-based rate	
Wheeling	0.649 ¢ per kWh	0.630 ¢ per kWh	

## Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Comparison of Existing and Proposed Rates Happy Valley-Goose Bay Area

Schedule I Page 3 of 12 P. R. Hamilton Revision - Oct. 3, 2001

	Existing Rates	Proposed Rates
Domestic	1.1A	1.1H
Basic Customer Charge	\$6.00 per month	\$7.00 per month
Energy Charge		
- First 600 kWh	4.100 ¢ per kWh	-
- Excess kWh	3.300 ¢ per kWh	-
- All kWh	-	3.250 ¢ per kWh
Minimum Monthly Charge	\$6.00	\$7.00
Prompt Payment Discount	10% - Maximum \$1	1.50% - Minimum \$1
<u>G.S. 0 - 10 kW</u>	2.1A	2.1H
Basic Customer Charge	\$9.10 per month	\$9.10 per month
Energy Charge	5.400 ¢ per kWh	3.220 ¢ per kWh
Minimum Monthly Charge		
- Single Phase	\$9.10	\$9.10
- Three Phase	\$20.00	\$20.00
Prompt Payment Discount	10% - Maximum \$1	1.50% - Minimum \$1
<u>G.S. 10 - 100 kW</u>	2.2A	2.2H
Demand Charge		
- Regular	\$3.85 per kW of Annual Peak	\$2.00 per kW of Current Month Demand
<ul> <li>Churches and Schools</li> </ul>	\$1.87 per kW of Annual Peak	\$2.00 per kW of Current Month Demand
Energy Charge		
<ul> <li>First 100 kWh per kW</li> </ul>	5.600 ¢ per kWh	-
<ul> <li>Excess kWh</li> </ul>	2.900 ¢ per kWh	-
- All kWh	-	3.050 ¢ per kWh
Maximum Monthly Charge	10.750 ¢ per kWh	6.800 ¢ per kWh; not less than the Minimum Charge
Minimum Monthly Charge	\$1.25 per kW of Annual Peak	\$1.05 per kW of Annual Peak
- Three Phase	\$1.25 per kW of Annual Peak	\$1.05 per kW of Annual Peak; not less than \$20.00
Prompt Payment Discount		
- Regular	25.000 ¢ per kW of Billing Demand	1.50% - Minimum \$1
- Churches and Schools	12.000 ¢ per kW of Billing Demand	1.50% - Minimum \$1

# Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Comparison of Existing and Proposed Rates Happy Valley-Goose Bay Area (continued)

Schedule I Page 4 of 12 P. R. Hamilton Revision - Oct. 3, 2001

	Existing Rates	Proposed Rates
G.S. 110 kVA and over	2.3A	2.3H < 1000 kVa
Demand Charge	\$3.50 per kVA of Annual Peak	\$1.85 per kVA of Current Month Demand
Energy Charge		
- First 150 kWh per kVA; Maximum 90,000kWh	3.750 ¢ per kWh	-
- Excess kWh	2.100 ¢ per kWh	-
- All kWh	-	2.950 ¢ per kWh
Maximum Monthly Charge	10.750 ¢ per kWh (if < 350 kVA)	6.800 ¢ per kWh; not less than the Minimum Charge
Minimum Monthly Charge		
<ul> <li>For Annual Peak &lt; 350 kVA</li> </ul>	\$1.25 per kVA of Annual Peak	\$1.05 per kVA of Annual Peak
- For Annual Peak ≥ 350 kVA	\$3.50 per kVA of Annual Peak	\$1.05 per kVA of Annual Peak
Prompt Payment Discount	-	1.50% - Maximum \$500
G.S. 1000 kVA and over	(See 2.3A above)	2.4H
Demand Charge	-	\$1.70 per kVA of Current Month Demand
Energy Charge	-	2.50 ¢ per kWh
Maximum Monthly Charge	-	6.800 ¢ per kWh; not less than the Minimum Charge
Minimum Monthly Charge	-	\$1.05 per kVA of Annual Peak
Prompt Payment Discount	-	1.50% - Maximum \$500
Electric Heating G.S.	3.1A	3.1H
Demand Charge	\$2.35 per kVA of Annual Peak	\$2.00 per kVA of Current Month Demand
Energy Charge	2.100 ¢ per kWh	2.50 ¢ per kWh
Maximum Monthly Charge	10.750 ¢ per kWh	6.800 $\phi$ per kWh; not less than the Minimum Charge
Minimum Monthly Charge	\$1.25 per kVA of Annual Peak	\$1.05 per kVA of Annual Peak
		1.50% - Minimum of \$1; Maximum of \$500
All-Electric G.S.	3.2A	
Demand Charge	\$3.50 per kVA of Annual Peak	
Energy Charge		
<ul> <li>First 120 kWh per kVA; Maximum 22,000kWh</li> </ul>	3.700 ¢ per kWh	
- Excess kWh	2.100 ¢ per kWh	
Minimum Monthly Charge	\$3.50 per kVA of Annual Peak	Applicable General Service Rate
- Single Phase	\$10.00	Based on Load Characteristics
- Three Phase	\$20.00	
Alternate Rate if less than 350 kVA	10.750 ¢ per kWh	
Minimum Monthly Charge	\$1.25 per kVA of Annual Peak	
- Single Phase	\$10.00	
- Three Phase	\$20.00	

## Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Comparison of Existing and Proposed Rates Labrador City Area (continued)

Schedule I Page 9 of 12 P. R. Hamilton Revision - Oct. 3, 2001

	Existing Rates	Proposed Rates
<u>G.S. 110 - 1000 kVA</u>		2.3W
Demand Charge	-	\$1.85 per kVA of Current Month Demand
Energy Charge	-	1.500 ¢ per kWh
Maximum Monthly Charge	-	6.800 ¢ per kWh; not less than the Minimum Charge
Minimum Monthly Charge	-	\$1.05 per kVA of Annual Peak
Prompt Payment Discount	-	1.50% - Maximum \$500
G.S. 1000 kVA and over		2.4W
Demand Charge	-	\$1.70 per kVa of Current Month Demand
Energy Charge	-	1.400 ¢ per kWh
Maximum Monthly Charge	-	6.800 ¢ per kWh; not less than the Minimum Charge
Minimum Monthly Charge	-	\$1.05 per kVA of Annual Peak
Prompt Payment Discount	-	1.50% - Maximum \$500
Street and Area Lighting		4.1W
Installed after December 31, 2001		Monthly Rates
		Sentinel/
		Standard
100 W	-	\$7.11
150 W	-	\$9.09
250 W	-	\$10.36
400 W	-	\$13.70
Wood Poles	-	\$3.00
Installed as of December 31, 2001	Labrador City Rate	4.11W
	Monthly Rates	Monthly Rates
	Sentinel/	Sentinel/
High Pressure Sodium	Standard	Standard
150 W	\$1.15	\$2.65
Wood Poles	-	\$3.00

### Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Comparison of Existing and Proposed Rates Wabush Area (continued)

Schedule I Page 11 of 12 P. R. Hamilton Revision - Oct. 3, 2001

	Existing Rates	Proposed Rates
G.S. 100 kW and over (Three Phase)	2.3	2.3W 110 kVA - 1000 kVA
Demand Charge	\$2.19 per kW of Current Demand	\$1.85 per kW of Current Month Demand
Energy Charge		
- First 150 kWh per kW	2.402 ¢ per kWh	-
- Excess kWh	1.333 ¢ per kWh	-
- All kWh	-	1.500 ¢ per kWh
Maximum Monthly Charge	6.450 ¢ per kWh	6.800 ¢ per kWh; not less than the Minimum Charge
Minimum Monthly Charge	\$1.15 per kW of Current Demand	\$1.05 per kW of Annual Peak
Prompt Payment Discount	-	1.50% - Maximum \$500
G.S. 1000 kVA and over	(See 2.3 above)	2.4W
Demand Charge	-	\$1.70 per kW of Current Month Demand
Energy Charge		
- First 150 kWh per kW	-	-
- Excess kWh	-	-
- All kWh	-	1.400 ¢ per kWh
Maximum Monthly Charge	-	6.800 ¢ per kWh; not less than the Minimum Charge
Minimum Monthly Charge	-	\$1.05 per kW of Annual Peak
Prompt Payment Discount	-	1.50% - Maximum \$500
G.S. All-Electric (Single Phase)	3.2	
Demand Charge	\$1.33 per kW of Current Month Demand	
Energy Charge		
<ul> <li>First 150 kWh per kW</li> </ul>	4.324 ¢ per kWh	Applicable General Service Rate
- Excess kWh	1.333 ¢ per kWh	Based on Load Characteristics
Maximum Monthly Charge	6.800 ¢ per kWh	
Minimum Monthly Charge	\$1.15 per kW of Current Month Demand	
	\$4.95 Minimum	
G.S. All-Electric 0 - 100 kW (Three Phase)	3.2A	
Demand Charge	\$2.19 per kW of Current Demand	
Energy Charge		
<ul> <li>First 150 kWh per kW</li> </ul>	2.402 ¢ per kWh	Applicable General Service Rate
- Excess kWh	1.333 ¢ per kWh	Based on Load Characteristics
Maximum Monthly Charge	6.450 ¢ per kWh	
Minimum Monthly Charge	\$1.15 per kW of Current Demand	
	\$9.90 Minimum	

Schedule III P.R. Hamilton Revision – Oct. 3, 2001

# Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Labrador Interconnected System Long-Term Rate Structures

<b>Domestic</b> Basic Customer Charge Energy Charge – All kWh Minimum Monthly Charge	\$8.45 per Month 2.24¢ per kWh \$8.45
General Service 0 – 10 kW Basic Customer Charge Energy Charge – All kWh Minimum Monthly Charge - Single phase - Three phase	\$9.60 per Month 3.87¢ per kWh \$9.60 \$19.20
<b>General Service 10 – 100 kW</b> Demand Charge Energy Charge – All kWh Minimum Monthly Charge -Three phase	\$2.20 per kW 1.95¢ per kWh \$19.20
<b>General Service 110 – 1000 kVA</b> Demand Charge Energy Charge – All kWh	\$1.85 per kVA 1.40¢ per kWh
General Service 1000 kVA and Over Demand Charge Energy Charge – All kWh	\$1.65 per kVA 1.30¢ per kWh

Schedule IV Page 1 of 9 P. R. Hamilton Revision – Oct. 3, 2001

#### Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Impact of Proposed Rates on Annual Electricity Costs Happy Valley-Goose Bay Domestic Rate 1.1H

		Percentage Change in Annual Costs				
Change in Annual Costs (\$)	-14% to -10%	-10% to -5%	-5% to 0%	0% to 20%	20% to 40%	Total
-115 to -80 -80 to -40 -40 to 0 0 to 12 12 to 25	2.14% 0.78%	65.17% 3.67%	2.32% 20.71% 1.57%	3.53% 0.07%	0.04%	2.32% 88.02% 6.02% 3.53% 0.11%
Total:	2.92%	68.84%	24.60%	3.60%	0.04%	100.00%
Each number i combination of	Each number in the body of the table represents the proportion of customers with the combination of percent range at the top and dollar range to the left.					

Notes: (1) The average number of customers for 2000 was 3,367. (2) This analysis is based on 2000 usage patterns.

Schedule IV Page 2 of 9 P. R. Hamilton Revision – Oct. 3, 2001

#### Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Impact of Proposed Rates on Annual Electricity Costs Happy Valley-Goose Bay General Service 2.1H

			Percentage Change in Annual Costs									
Change in Annual Costs (\$)			-57% to -30%	-30% to 0%	0% to 20%	20% to 30%	30% to 40%	Total				
-1,400 -700 0 80 160	to to to to	-700 0 80 160 240	2.39% 31.58%	48.33% 0.48%	0.48% 10.05% 3.35%	2.39%	0.96%	2.39% 80.38% 10.53% 5.74% 0.96%				
Total:		33.97%	48.80%	13.88%	2.39%	0.96%	100.00%					
Each nu	Each number in the body of the table represents the proportion of customers with the											

combination of percent range at the top and dollar range to the left.

Notes: (1) The average number of customers for 2000 was 258. (2) This analysis is based on 2000 usage patterns.

Schedule IV Page 3 of 9 P. R. Hamilton Revision – Oct. 3, 2001

#### Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Impact of Proposed Rates on Annual Electricity Costs Happy Valley-Goose Bay General Service 2.2H

			Percentage Change in Annual Costs								
Change Cos	e in Annua sts (\$)	al -56% to -40%	-40% to -20%	-20% to -0%	-0% to 7%	7% to 14%	Total				
-2,900 -2,000 -1,000 0	to -2,0 to -1,0 to to 1,0	00 0.71% 00 1.06% 0 0.71%	1.77% 5.65% 19.08%	0.71% 8.13% 52.65%	7.77%	1.06%	3.18% 14.84% 72.44% 8.83%				
1,000 	to 2,0	15 <b>2.47%</b>	26.50%	61.48%	7.77%	0.71%	0.71%				

Notes:(1) The average number of customers for 2000 was 312.<br/>(2) This analysis is based on 2000 usage patterns.

Schedule IV Page 4 of 9 P. R. Hamilton Revision – Oct. 3, 2001

#### Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Impact of Proposed Rates on Annual Electricity Costs Happy Valley-Goose Bay General Service 2.3H

Change in Annual Costs (\$)			-50% to -35%	-35% to -20%	-20% to -5%	-5% to 0%	0% to 2%	Total
-21,000 -15,000 -10,000 -5,000 0	to to to to	-15,000 -10,000 -5,000 0 1,900	3.13% 3.13% 3.13%	3.13% 12.50% 21.88%	12.50% 31.25%	6.25%	3.13%	3.13% 3.13% 28.13% 62.50% 3.13%
Total:			9.38%	37.50%	43.75%	6.25%	3.13%	100.00%

Notes: (1) The average number of customers for 2000 was 41. (2) This analysis is based on 2000 usage patterns.

#### Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Impact of Proposed Rates on Annual Electricity Costs Happy Valley-Goose Bay General Service 3.1H

			Percentage Change in Annual Costs								
Change in Annual Costs (\$)			-9% to -6%	-6% to -3%	-3% to 0%	0% to 3%	3% to 6%	Total			
-310 -200 -100 0 100	to to to to	-200 -100 0 100 4,500	22.22%		22.22% 33.33%	11.11%	11.11%	22.22% 22.22% 33.33% 11.11% 11.11%			
Total:			22.22%	0.00%	55.56%	11.11%	11.11%	100.00%			
Each number in the body of the table represents the proportion of customers with the combination of percent range at the top and dollar range to the left.											

Notes: (1) The average number of customers for 2000 was 9. (2) This analysis is based on 2000 usage patterns.

Schedule IV Page 6 of 9 P. R. Hamilton Revision – Oct. 3, 2001

#### Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Impact of Proposed Rates on Annual Electricity Costs Labrador City/Wabush Domestic 1.1W

			Percentage Change in Annual Costs								
Change in Annual Costs (\$)			3% to 20%	20% to 50%	50% to 100%	100% to 150%	150% to 193%	Total			
6 53 100 147 194	to to to to	53 100 147 194 241	19.10% 7.05% 39.13% 4.83% 0.08%	14.43% 12.44%	2.01%	0.50%	0.42%	36.46% 19.50% 39.13% 4.83% 0.08%			
Total:		70.20%	26.87%	2.01%	0.50%	0.42%	100.00%				

Notes: (1) The average number of customers for 2000 was 4,250. (2) This analysis is based on 2000 usage patterns.

Schedule IV Page 7 of 9 P. R. Hamilton Revision – Oct. 3, 2001

#### Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Impact of Proposed Rates on Annual Electricity Costs Labrador City/Wabush General Service 2.1W

				Percentage Change in Annual Costs							
Change in Annual Costs (\$)			-36% to -20%	-20% to 0%	0% to 20%	20% to 50%	50% to 1150%	Total			
-230 -115 0 75 150	to to to to	-115 0 75 150 245	2.63% 1.75%	14.91%	21.93% 3.51% 0.88%	7.89% 7.02% 1.75%	14.91% 19.30% 3.51%	2.63% 16.67% 44.74% 29.82% 6.14%			
Total:		4.39%	14.91%	26.32%	16.67%	37.72%	100.00%				
Each nu	Each number in the body of the table represents the proportion of customers with the										

combination of percent range at the top and dollar range to the left.

Notes: (1) The average number of customers for 2000 was 154. (2) This analysis is based on 2000 usage patterns.

Schedule IV Page 8 of 9 P. R. Hamilton Revision – Oct. 3, 2001

#### Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Impact of Proposed Rates on Annual Electricity Costs Labrador City/Wabush General Service 2.2W

				Percentage Change in Annual Costs							
Change in Annual Costs (\$)			-43% to -23%	-23% to 0%	0% to 10%	10% to 20%	20% to 58%	Total			
-2,200 -1,100 0 250 500	to to to to	-1,100 0 250 500 1,000	2.95% 25.74%	0.42% 53.16%	11.81% 2.95%	0.84% 0.42% 1.27%	0.42%	3.38% 78.90% 13.08% 3.38% 1.27%			
Total:			28.69%	53.59%	14.77%	2.53%	0.42%	100.00%			
Each nu	Each number in the body of the table represents the proportion of customers with the										

Notes: (1) The average number of customers for 2000 was 271. (2) This analysis is based on 2000 usage patterns.

Schedule IV Page 9 of 9 P. R. Hamilton Revision – Oct. 3, 2001

#### Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Impact of Proposed Rates on Annual Electricity Costs Labrador City/Wabush General Service 2.3W

			Percentage Change in Annual Costs								
Change in Annual Costs (\$)			-36% to -24%	-24% to -12%	-12% to 0%	0% to 4%	4% to 8%	Total			
-7,900 -5,200 -2,500 0 900	to to to to	-5,200 -2,500 0 900 1,800	1.61% 1.61%	1.61% 4.84% 16.13%	1.61% 3.23% 38.71%	16.13% 1.61%	6.45% 6.45%	4.84% 8.06% 56.45% 22.58% 8.06%			
Total:			3.23%	22.58%	43.55%	17.74%	12.90%	100.00%			
Each nu	Each number in the body of the table represents the proportion of customers with the										

Notes: (1) The average number of customers for 2000 was 68. (2) This analysis is based on 2000 usage patterns.