

1 Q. Please provide a cost benefit analysis (in dollars) of the poles purchased
2 from Aliant?

3

4

5 A. Please see attached documents which were filed as Schedule "C" and
6 Exhibits 1 and 2 of Hydro's 2002 *Ex Parte* Application for approval of the
7 purchase of Aliant's joint-use support structures.

Support Structures Purchase versus Lease Financial Analysis

Introduction

Hydro's alternatives with respect to the support structures which are owned by Aliant and used jointly by Hydro and Aliant are:

1. purchase from Aliant; or
2. lease, pay attachment charges to third party.

The alternative of maintaining the status quo is not available as these assets are currently in use providing electrical service to Hydro's customers, and Aliant has made known its intention to divest itself of these assets.

Methodology

Hydro has prepared a net present value (NPV) analysis (Exhibit 1) to determine which of the two alternatives represents the least cost to its customers. The incremental cashflows were discounted using Hydro's proposed long-term weighted average cost of capital, over a 10 year timeframe, which represents the initial term of the Support Structures Purchase Agreement.

The purchase price of \$3,569,840, for the 7688 support structures to be acquired represents the net book value of those assets. Hydro will receive incremental revenue from Aliant and cable television companies in respect of their attachments on these support structures as well as 11,532 support structures which Hydro currently owns.

If the agreement is not renewed at the end of the 10-year term, Aliant will be required to purchase a proportion of support structures at net book value at that time, i.e. the terminal value. Given the difficulties in forecasting beyond a 10-year timeframe, this amount is included in the analysis as a proxy for the minimum benefit that Hydro would negotiate upon renewal.

Hydro has also prepared an incremental revenue requirement (Exhibit 2) to demonstrate the impact of this transaction. The incremental changes in revenues include cable attachment fees, and rentals from Aliant that will now be paid to Hydro. On the expense side, Hydro will have additional financing charges, depreciation expense, and maintenance costs associated with ownership of these additional support structures. The result of this analysis is a projected average decrease in revenue requirement of \$148,614 per year, or approximately 0.05% of the annual revenue requirement, which would tend to reduce electricity rates.

Assumptions

Inflation

The analysis assumes that costs associated with support structures will escalate at a rate of 2% per year, based on the Gross Domestic Product - Implicit Chain Price Index for Canada ("GDP-ICPI") published by Statistics Canada.

Depreciation

Hydro depreciates support structures over 30 years, so for purposes of determining the net book value and therefore the financing costs associated with the transaction, a depreciation rate of 3.33% of the original capital cost was used.

Discount Rate

Net incremental cashflows under each alternative were discounted to account for the time value of money. The discount rate used is 8.5% which represents Hydro's long-term weighted average cost of capital over a wide range of capital structures and a normal, commercial rate of return on equity, as proposed during Hydro's most recent Rate Hearing.

Operating Expenses

The analysis assumes that the incremental operating expenses associated with the support structures being purchased is \$65,000 per year, consisting of vegetation control, maintenance, administration, and engineering costs, based on analysis of recent experience.

Pole Installation and Replacement

The analysis assumes that the rate of installation will be similar to recent historical experience of 2% per year. Of that number, approximately half will be replacements and half will be new installations.

Pole Installation Cost

The analysis assumes that the installation cost, which currently averages \$1400 per structure, will increase by 2% per year.

Cable Attachment Revenue

The analysis assumes that cable attachment fee, which averages \$5.25 per support structure in service, will increase at a rate of 1% per year and that the number of attachments will grow proportionally with the overall growth in the number of support structures.

Aliant Rental Rate

The analysis includes revenue from Aliant at escalating rental rates over the life of the 10-year agreement. The initial rental rate is \$28.80, which will then be escalated based on the GDP-ICPI.

Alternative Rental Rate

The analysis assumes that Hydro would be able to attach to poles owned by a third party at a rate of \$59.20 per pole. This is based on the rental charges negotiated between Aliant and Newfoundland Power Inc. in conjunction with the sale of Aliant's support structures in Newfoundland Power's service territory. In that transaction, Newfoundland Power's annual cost per joint-use pole was determined to be \$98.00 for 2001, 40% of which was allocated to telecommunications and the remaining 60% to electrical use. This rate was to escalate over the life of that agreement.

Sensitivities

Sensitivity analyses was performed on certain key assumptions:

	<u>NPV – Purchase</u>	<u>NPV – Lease</u>
Base Case	\$ 1,030,128	(\$ 387,157)
Increase maintenance to \$100,000	\$ 771,434	(\$ 387,157)
Change discount rate to 7.5%	\$ 1,325,985	(\$ 402,667)

Conclusion

The least cost option, under a range of financial assumptions, to continue to access the support structures currently owned by Aliant and jointly used by Hydro to provide electrical service to Hydro's customers is to purchase these support structures from Aliant.

[illegible]