1 2	NLH 28 CA 2006 NLH General Rate Application
3	Page 1 of 1
4	
5	
6	
7	Q: (a) Is Dr. Cannon aware that this Board considered the implications of variations in the
8	embedded cost of debt on Newfoundland Power's Automated Adjustment
9	Mechanism during Newfoundland Power's 2003 General Rate Application and
10	subsequently ordered (page 67 of its Order PU 19 (2003)) that "NP will be required
11	to modify the schedule filed as part of its annual return that calculates the embedded
12	cost of debt to identify specifically the causes of variations in the actual embedded
13	cost of debt from the cost forecast for the test year period"?
14	
15	(b) Is Dr. Cannon aware that Hydro proposed a similar filing requirement as part of its
16	proposed Automatic Adjustment Mechanism (Exhibit MGB-1)?
17	
18 19	
20	
21	
22	A: (a) Yes, Dr. Cannon is aware of this and has expressed no objection to it – which is
23	understandable since he is not presently involved in evaluating Newfoundland
24	Power's activities or proposals. As a general rule, the more information the Board
25	has available to it, the better it can perform its duties.
26	, 1
27	(b) Yes, Dr. Cannon is aware of this and, again, he expressed no objection to it. The
28	referenced filing requirement does not, however, in any way reduce the desirability
29	of his proposal, and will provide the same "comfort" to Hydro, the Board, and to
30	Hydro's customers under Dr. Cannon's proposal as it is intended to provide under
31	the Company's proposal.