

1 **Q. In NP's 2008 test year forecast, NP projected a labour productivity improvement of**
2 **\$531,000 to offset a \$1,002,000 forecast labour cost increase for 2007 (f) to 2008 (f)**
3 **(reference Reply to CA-NP-47 in 2008 GRA). Please show how NP actually did with**
4 **respect to its projected labour productivity improvement and explain specifically**
5 **how these results were achieved.**

6
7 A. Table 1 details actual 2008 operating labour costs relative to 2008 test year operating
8 labour costs excluding non-regulated costs.
9
10

Table 1
Operating Labour
2008 Actual versus 2008 Test Year
(\$000s)

	2008 Test Year	2008 Actual	Difference
Operating Labour	28,305	28,454	149

11
12
13 2008 Actual labour costs were \$149,000, or approximately 0.5%, higher than forecast for
14 the 2008 Test Year. Details concerning this variation are found in Attachment A to the
15 response to Request for Information CA-NP-102.
16

17 The principal influences on actual versus forecast 2008 labour costs include lower than
18 planned operating maintenance in Substations, increased hiring of Apprentice Powerline
19 Technicians, and increased corporate focus on customer conservation.