

1 **Q. Further to Newfoundland Power’s response to NLH-NP-014 which states:**

2
3 *"The impact on Newfoundland Power’s 2016 financial results of approval of deferred*
4 *recovery on an interim basis is that such an approval would not provide Newfoundland*
5 *Power with a reasonable opportunity to earn a just and reasonable return for 2016*
6 *within the meaning of Section 80 of the Act."*

7
8 **Please explain how approval of deferred costs on an interim basis, in accordance**
9 **with Section 75 of the Public Utilities Act, that are subject to further review by the**
10 **Board prior to granting final cost recovery to Newfoundland Power would remove**
11 **the opportunity for Newfoundland Power to earn a just and reasonable return for**
12 **2016 within the meaning of Section 80 of the Act.**

13
14 **A.** Section 75 of the *Public Utilities Act* (the “Act”) provides that the Board may make an
15 interim order approving a schedule of *rates, tolls and charges* submitted by a public
16 utility upon the terms and conditions that it may decide. Section 75 of the Act does not
17 provide for the approval of *costs* on an interim basis. Furthermore, there is no provision
18 in the Act which governs the deferral of costs on an *interim* basis. Given this,
19 Newfoundland Power is uncertain as to how deferral on an interim basis would
20 practically work and still be consistent with the prospective nature of utility regulation in
21 the province.¹

22
23 For this reason, the Application does not seek approval of deferred costs on an interim
24 basis with cost recovery to be addressed in a subsequent process. In Newfoundland
25 Power’s view, such an approach would not be consistent with the prospective nature of
26 utility regulation in the Province.²

27
28 Section 80 (1) of the Act provides that a public utility is “entitled to earn annually” a just
29 and reasonable return on its rate base. For that entitlement to be meaningful practically
30 requires that the utility be accorded a reasonable opportunity to earn its allowed return.

31
32 As stated in the majority opinion of the Newfoundland and Labrador Court of Appeal in a
33 stated case presented by the Board in 1996:

34
35 “Although the utility is “entitled” by s. 80 of the Act to have the Board determine
36 a just and reasonable rate of return based on appropriate predictive techniques and
37 methodologies, it is not “entitled”, in the sense of being guaranteed, to that rate of
38 return. The utility therefore takes the risk that its chosen management techniques
39 and the future economic climate may not yield its expected success. Although
40 some of the activities of the utility are regulated within the framework of the

¹ For further information on the reasons why Order No. P.U. 58 (2014) does not provide additional clarity on this matter, see the response to Request for Information NLH-NP-074.

² See the response to Request for Information PUB-NP-006, pages 2-3 and NLH-NP-066.

1 statutory objectives, the utility nevertheless remains subject to business risks and
2 the effects of management decisions...

3
4 The corollary of this position is that the utility must be accorded a degree of
5 managerial flexibility in decision-making in order to be able to minimize the risks
6 to which it must respond.”³
7

8 These considerations underscore the importance of prospective rate making to the
9 entitlement of Newfoundland Power to an opportunity to earn a just and reasonable return
10 in a given year. To the extent that utility regulation operates retrospectively, as opposed
11 to prospectively, it can deprive management of the flexibility to respond to the risks to
12 which the utility is exposed.
13

14 The current regulatory agenda before the Board illustrates some of the hazards associated
15 with deferring costs for which recovery is uncertain. Hydro’s current general rate
16 application (“Hydro’s current GRA”) will consider, among other things, the
17 appropriateness of Hydro’s recovery of approximately \$56 million associated with 2014
18 costs and a forecast 2015 net income deficiency of approximately \$68 million. It is likely
19 that the Order on Hydro’s current GRA which will determine the appropriate level of
20 recovery of this approximate \$124 million associated with 2014 and 2015 will not be
21 issued until 2016. This is not consistent with the prospective nature of rate regulation in
22 Newfoundland and Labrador and, in Newfoundland Power’s view, is not desirable from a
23 regulatory perspective.

³ See Stated Case, paragraphs 31-32.