Q. RSP - Reference PUB-59, PUB-53 and IC-193,
a) Provide detailed explanation for PUB-59 2001 (showing all calculations, assumptions, data, and sources for data derived from earlier COS studies or other sources) to explain each row for "Revised COS" and for "Cost Difference" (at page 12 for 2001).
b) PUB-59 for 2001 shows various interest rates (at page 1 "interest rate 8.40\% annually @ 8.11\% monthly" and at page 10 "Interest = balance * $8.55 \%$ from Jan to Dec 2001"). Please explain the basis for each interest number, and the rationale for suing (sic) these different numbers.
c) PUB-59 for 2002, under Fuel Variation at page 4, shows 2002 Forecast Barrels that are less than the forecast barrels consumed for 2002 shown at IC-24 (as well as Grant Thornton (sic) report dated August 15, 2001, Exhibit 6-2). Please explain the difference and confirm that it relates only to removal of forecast non-firm No. 6 Fuel requirements.
d) Confirm that PUB-59 2002 Summary Report should be adjusted to reflect 2002 Labrador Interconnection allocations - please provide adjusted Summary Report table, if this is required.
e) PUB-53 and IC-193 provide RSP forecasts for 2002 through 2005 assuming base oil prices reset in 2002 at $\$ 25 / \mathrm{bbl}$ and $\$ 15 / \mathrm{bbl}$ respectively. Confirm that these responses assume no adjustment to 2002 Revenue Requirement or rates as set out in the Hydro Application, and that the Revenue Variance (as part of Load Variance) for 2002 through 2005 assume mill rates as currently applied for. Explain the rational for this assumption. Provide adjusted responses for PUB-53 and IC-193 assuming that the NP and IC mill rates are adjusted to reflect the rebased oil prices at levels different than assumed in the Hydro Application - set out in detail the basis for the adjusted mill rate calculations.
A. a) Response to follow.
b) Hydro's annual embedded cost of debt for 2001 is $8.4 \%$ and due to compounding, this translates into a monthly rate of $8.11 \%$. The interest rate shown on page 10 for 2001 should have been $8.4 \%$ and not 8.55\%.
c) The difference in barrels shown in PUB-59 2002 page 4 of 13 and the forecast barrels shown in IC-24 of 11,142 is due to the removal of forecast non-firm No. 6 fuel requirements.
d) The summary report in PUB-59 2002 should have included the Labrador Interconnection and a revised summary report is attached.
e) Response to follow.

