

1 Q. With regard to the report entitled *Review of the Operation of the Rate*
2 *Stabilization Plan dated June 30, 2006* (page 16), it is stated “with NP’s end
3 block rate based on the average cost of No. 6 fuel, NP’s net load variation
4 will be small”. The discussion on page 23 shows a difference of 3.9
5 cents/kWh between the average all-energy IC rate and the incremental cost
6 of Holyrood production:
7

8 a. Does this suggest that the end block rate for the ICs should likewise
9 be based on the average cost of No. 6 fuel?

10 b. Would such a change in the IC rate design be consistent with the
11 recommendation in the report entitled *Implications of Marginal Cost*
12 *Results for Class Revenue Allocation and Design* dated July 2006?

13 c. Would such a change in the IC rate design negate the need for the
14 load variation clause in the RSP?
15
16

17 A. With regard to the report entitled *Review of the Operation of the Rate*
18 *Stabilization Plan (RSP) dated June 30, 2006* (page 16), where it is stated
19 “with NP’s end block rate based on the average cost of No. 6 fuel, NP’s net
20 load variation will be small”:
21

22 a. The above comment is not a suggestion or indication that the same
23 rate structure should apply to the Industrial Customer class. While
24 some of the same principles may be appropriate, there are other
25 considerations as discussed below.
26

27 b. While such a change would be consistent with the marginal cost study
28 recommendations, it may raise additional issues. For instance, each

1 Industrial Customer has a different level of consumption. If the block
2 sizes are set on the class level, some customers may never pay a
3 second block charge, regardless of fluctuations in energy
4 consumption. If different blocks are specified for each customer, the
5 load variation of one customer may create a large impact on the class
6 load variation. Therefore before embarking on such changes to
7 Industrial Customers' rates, careful consideration must be given to the
8 impacts caused by each customer.

- 9
- 10 c. The need for a load variation provision would have to be examined in
11 conjunction with any Industrial Customer rate design change.
12 Consideration would have to be given to the impact of monthly
13 consumption fluctuations due to planned or unplanned shutdowns for
14 machinery maintenance or labour disruptions. This variability may
15 increase the likelihood of a load variation being calculated using the
16 first-block energy rate, which will likely differ significantly from test
17 year fuel costs. In the case of NP's load variation results, it should be
18 noted that since implementation of the two-block structure, NP's
19 monthly consumption has consistently exceeded the first block.