| 0 | ctober 26, 2009 | Multi | i-Pa | age | ¹ NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|----|---|--------|------|-------|---|
| | | Page 1 | | | Page 3 |
| 1 | (9:00 a.m.) | U U | 1 | KELL | .Y, Q.C. |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN: | | 2 | Q. | Okay. Now perhaps you could provide an |
| 3 | Q. Are there preliminary procedural matters? | | 3 | | overview of your report and how you intend |
| 4 | Well then, I guess, Mr. Kelly, it's over to | | 4 | | wish to explain your report for the Board? |
| 5 | you. | | 5 | MR. A | ABOUD: |
| 6 | 5 KELLY, Q.C. | | 6 | A. | I shall do that, thank you. So if I may, I'd |
| 7 | Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the | | 7 | | like to describe the report in four steps. |
| 8 | next witness will be Mr. Karl Aboud of the Hay | | 8 | | The first step is something that I'll call job |
| 9 | Group and his report has been previously | | 9 | | comparison or job evaluation. That's the |
| 10 | filed. We had, in the letter, proposed to | | 10 | | manner by which we compare jobs to the market. |
| 11 | mark it as Exhibit 11 to be included in Volume | | 11 | | The second step will be a discussion of the |
| 12 | 2, but it can be marked in any fashion the | | 12 | | market, the comparator group, why we chose the |
| 13 | Board considers appropriate. | | 13 | | comparator group that we did choose. The |
| 14 | MS. GLYNN: | | 14 | | third step will be what we'll call percentile |
| 15 | Q. We'll mark that as Exhibit KA-1. | | 15 | | level, the statistical level that we match |
| 16 | 5 KELLY, Q.C. | | 16 | | against to the market, and then the fourth |
| 17 | Q. KA-1, thank you, and Mr. Aboud is ready to be | | 17 | | step will be a discussion of the results of |
| 18 | sworn, Mr. Chairman. | | 18 | | the report specifically Table 2 on page seven. |
| 19 | MR. KARL ABOUD, SWORN, EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY IAN KELI | LY, | 19 | | So if that's okay with everyone, I'll go |
| 20 |) Q.C. | | 20 | | through that four-step process and that will |
| 21 | KELLY, Q.C. | | 21 | | describe the report findings. |
| 22 | Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Comerford, if we | | 22 | KELL | .Y, Q.C. |
| 23 | could turn to Appendix A of the report first? | | 23 | Q. | Okay. If you could begin then with the |
| 24 | Mr. Aboud, you are the National Director of | | 24 | | methodology? |
| 25 | Hay Group Canada's Reward Consulting Practice? | | 25 | MR. A | ABOUD: |
| | | Page 2 | | | Page 4 |
| 1 | MR. ABOUD: | - | 1 | A. | So the methodology, thank you, is a |
| 2 | A. Yes, sir, I am. | | 2 | | methodology called job evaluation. So Hay |
| 3 | KELLY, Q.C. | | 3 | | uses an evaluation tool, not surprisingly |
| 4 | Q. And you've prepared this report on an | | 4 | | called the Hay Method of Job Evaluation, to |
| 5 | executive compensation review for Newfoundla | and | 5 | | compare jobs to the market and to determine |
| 6 | Power, dated September 21st, 2009? | | 6 | | the competitive pay of jobs to the market. |
| 7 | MR. ABOUD: | | 7 | | The method of job evaluation is one that |
| 8 | A. I have. | | 8 | | recognizes all the component elements of a job |
| 9 | KELLY, Q.C. | | 9 | | and puts a point score to them, so that when |
| 10 | Q. And do you adopt the report as your evidence | | 10 | | we compare jobs of the same points to other |
| 11 | in this proceeding? | | 11 | | jobs in the database, we know we're comparing |
| 12 | MR. ABOUD: | | 12 | | to jobs of comparable skill, effort and |
| 13 | 3 A. I do. | | 13 | | challenge. |
| 14 | KELLY, Q.C. | | 14 | | Now that's not the only way to compare |
| 15 | Q. Your qualifications are set out there in | | 15 | | jobs to the market. The other common method |
| 16 | Appendix A, and I understand they include a | | 16 | | is something called title match, but to use |
| 17 | Masters of Business Administration from the | | 17 | | title match means you're not adjusting for the |
| 18 | University of Western Ontario in 1982? | | 18 | | differences in companies and their jobs to |
| 19 | MR. ABOUD: | | 19 | | your own jobs. So when you do title match, |
| 20 | A. Correct. | | 20 | | there have to be three important conditions. |
| 21 | KELLY, Q.C. | | 21 | | One is that you have to have an inventory of |
| 22 | Q. Okay. When did you join the Hay Group? | | 22 | | common organizations. They have to do the |
| 23 | B MR. ABOUD: | | 23 | | same thing. They have to be of the same size. |
| 24 | A. I joined Hay Group in 1990, so it's been just | | 24 | | They have to have similar ownership. They |
| 25 | about 20 years. | | 25 | | have to have a similar geographical footprint. |

| October 26, 2009 | | Multi-Page TM | | NP's 2010 General Rate Application | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|-------|---|--|
| | Р | age 5 | | Page 7 | |
| 1 | So your comparator group has to be a like | 1 | MR. A | BOUD: | |
| 2 | group. Secondly, the condition is their data | 2 | A. | So in the database, in Hay's 2009 database, | |
| 3 | have to be available to use and thirdly, their | 3 | | there are 532 organizations, all with current | |
| 4 | composition of jobs has to be comparable to | 4 | | points and current pay values for the jobs in | |
| 5 | your own, so that when you finally title match | 5 | | the database. You can cut, slice and dice | |
| 6 | your CEO to the inventory of CEOs in the | 6 | | that database in any manner that you'd like. | |
| 7 | market, you know you have a comparable | 7 | | Our cut for Newfoundland Power was to suggest | |
| 8 | inventory of jobs. Very difficult to title | 8 | | the index called commercial industrial | |
| 9 | match well, so that the boards of directors, | 9 | | organizations. So those are organizations | |
| 10 | any regulator of concern, can honestly say | 10 | | whose business sector is industrial oriented, | |
| 11 | we're doing a proper match. Because, if that | 11 | | that being chemical, pharmaceutical, natural | |
| 12 | was a very easy thing to do and if the | 12 | | resource utility, and the commercial part of | |
| 13 | inventory of jobs was available, we wouldn't | 13 | | that definition means private sector | |
| 14 | do job evaluation. We would absolutely do | 14 | | ownership, not government ownership. So we've | |
| 15 | title match, but because it's so hard to meet | 15 | | excluded the public sector, the government | |
| 16 | those conditions, we go to job evaluation. | 16 | | owned organizations and we've excluded the | |
| 17 | So job evaluation is a representation of | 17 | | financial sector organizations, banks and | |
| 18 | the skill, effort, responsibilities of a job | 18 | | insurance, and we're left with 292 commercial | |
| 19 | translated into a point score. Once we've | 19 | | industrial organizations. | |
| 20 | translated a job into a point score, we can | 20 | | So the natural question is why thatand | |
| 21 | compare jobs of similar points into our | 21 | | those organizations, by the way, are spread | |
| 22 | database, knowing that all those important | 22 | | out across the country. So the natural | |
| 23 | nuances of company differences and job | 23 | | question is why that group as opposed to some | |
| 24 | differences have been accounted for because | 24 | | other. Firstly, the industrial set includes, | |
| 25 | we're comparing to jobs of similar evaluation. | 25 | | as I said, varieties of sectors and some | |
| | Р | age 6 | | Page 8 | |
| 1 | So that's what we've done. | | S | ectors are naturally richer payers, sectors | |
| 2 | We've measured the job content of each of | 2 | 1 | ike mining or real estate development, and | |
| 3 | the Newfoundland Power jobs and their job | b 3 | S | some sectors are naturally lower payers, | |
| 4 | evaluation points are illustrated on the | 4 | s | ectors like retail and forestry. The broad | |
| 5 | screen in front of us, which I believe is page | 5 | r | niddle contains most of the business sectors. | |
| 6 | three of the report. So the president of | 6 |] | The manufacturers would be average payers. | |
| 7 | Newfoundland Power's score is 2448 points; | the 7 | τ | Jtilities, in fact, are average payers. | |
| 8 | vice-president engineering at 1708; the vice- | 8 | S | Service organizations are average payers. So | |
| 9 | president of finance at 1500 points; the vice- | 9 | V | ve have a broad spectrum of types of payers. | |
| 10 | president consumer and corporate affairs at | 10 | V | We haven't just chosen high paying sectors, | |
| 11 | 1418; and regulatory and general counsel at | 11 | r | nor just low. In fact, the assembly of so | |
| 12 | 1418. So what we're now doing is pricing the | e 12 | r | nany organizations suggests that it's a | |
| 13 | job to jobs of comparable points in our | 13 | r | eflection of the Canadian industrial | |
| 14 | database. Our database is of many hundreds | of 14 | 1 | andscape. Most large organizations would | |
| 15 | organizations of many hundreds of thousands | of 15 | C | choose to price to such a perspective. They | |
| 16 | jobs. So when we go to price the pay | 16 | ŀ | know that they gain executive talent and they | |
| 17 | competitiveness of the president, it's not on | 17 | 1 | ose executive talent to a business of any | |
| 18 | a CEO to CEO basis, but rather on a 2448 point | t 18 | S | ector. If we were talking about not the | |
| 19 | to 2448 point basis, and that way we know | 19 | e | executive jobs, if we were talking about a | |
| 20 | we're comparing the jobs of comparable skill | , 20 | C | elerical job, we might likely choose pay | |
| 21 | effort, responsibility. | 21 | ١ | values from more locally located | |
| 22 | KELLY, Q.C. | 22 | (| organizations, but when we're talking about | |
| 23 | Q. Okay. Now perhaps next then is to explain the | ne 23 | e | executive jobs, these people are typically | |
| 24 | comparator group that you use and how that | t 24 | t | ransferable anywhere across the country and | |
| 25 | works. | 25 | t | o any type of organization in the country. | |

| October 26, 2009 Mult | | | Page | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|--|----------|--------|--|
| | P | age 9 | | Page 11 |
| 1 | So it is extremely common that most large | | 1 | broad Canadian index. So that's why we have. |
| 2 | organizations in Canada price their executive | 2 | 2 (9 | :20 a.m.) |
| 3 | talent to a broad Canadian index of | 3 | 3 KE | ELLY, Q.C. |
| 4 | organizations and that's what we've done here | 2. | 4 | Q. Okay. Next, perhaps you could explain the |
| 5 | The reason that weso that's why we | 4 | 5 | percentile level and where you've positioned |
| 6 | price to a broad index. The reason why we | 6 | 6 | Newfoundland Power? |
| 7 | excluded the public sector organizations is | 7 | 7 MI | R. ABOUD: |
| 8 | that public sector has a different pay | 8 | 8 | A. So, thank you, any of our executive job |
| 9 | principle than private sector, and I'm not | 9 | 9 | points, we have a couple of executive scored |
| 10 | debating right or wrong. I'm just saying that | 10 | 0 | at 1418 points. These 292 organizations will |
| 11 | public sector salaries are absolutely lower. | 11 | 1 | offer many comparable observations at the 1418 |
| 12 | The public sector short term incentives are | 12 | 2 | point level. We could have 200 comparable |
| 13 | noticeably lower, and the public sector long | 13 | 3 | observations at 1418 points. You rank those |
| 14 | term incentives are virtually non-existent. | 14 | 4 | in descending order and the natural question |
| 15 | So if you are a private sector organization, | 15 | 5 | is well, which of those 200 observations do |
| 16 | as Newfoundland Power is, it would not help | 16 | 6 | you choose to set your salary midpoint for |
| 17 | your efforts to attract, retain and motivate | 17 | 7 | your 1418 point job. Do you set a very high |
| 18 | senior executive talent if your pricing | 18 | 8 | the highest payer, a middle payer, a low |
| 19 | mechanism was to the public sector. So we | 19 | 9 | payer? Who's to say at what statistical level |
| 20 | excluded the public sector organizations. | 20 | 0 | or at what percentile you choose the data? |
| 21 | Again, coming back to the Canadian | 21 | 1 | An example of a high statistical level is |
| 22 | perspective, there isn't that much regional | 22 | 2 | stereotypically the 75th percentile. That's a |
| 23 | differentiation, if there is any at all, for | 23 | 3 | level at which fully 75 percent of |
| 24 | executive jobs across the country. It used to | 24 | 4 | observations are less than and only 25 are |
| 25 | be that Toronto and Vancouver paid more at th | ne 25 | 5 | higher than. So that's a pretty high level of |
| | Pa | ge 10 | | Page 12 |
| 1 | executive levels. Most other cities paid | 1 | 1 | pay. Conversely, the 25th percentile, 25 |
| 2 | less. As Montreal's pharmaceutical industry | 2 | 2 | percent of the observations are less, 75 |
| 3 | grew, as Albertan energy sector grew, as | 3 | 3 | percent are lower so that's a pretty low level |
| 4 | otheras mining grew in Saskatchewan, and o | f 4 | 4 | of pay. So the natural start point is let's |
| 5 | the last two years, the province with the | 4 | 5 | look at the middle. Let's look at the 50th |
| 6 | second highest salary increases has been | 6 | 6 | percentile, the level at which half the |
| 7 | Newfoundland. So as all regions of the | 7 | 7 | observations are less and half the |
| 8 | country have grown, there is virtually no | 8 | 8 | observations are more, as a mechanism to set |
| 9 | regional differentiation for executive jobs of | 9 | 9 | our base salary standard or our base salary |
| 10 | large companies. So it's natural to take the | 10 | 0 | midpoint and unless we've got reasons to vary |
| 11 | Canadian index, as opposed to just the local | 11 | 1 | from the average, let's set our pay principles |
| 12 | index for executive jobs. | 12 | 2 | relative to the average. Now we have |
| 13 | So that's why we chose the commercial | 13 | 3 | suggested setting pay principles relative to |
| 14 | industrial Canadian market. Even if we had | 14 | 4 | the average. So let me discuss why that is. |
| 15 | wanted to choose a more local market, even if | 15 | 5 | We've already discussed stereotypical |
| 16 | we had wanted to have chosen a market of the | e 16 | 6 | sectors that pay high and low. Real estate |
| 17 | four eastern provinces, our database of 292 | 17 | 7 | pays high. Retail pays low. Utilities pays |
| 18 | commercial industrials doesn't nave enough | 18 | 8 | medium. But that's not the only reason we're |
| 19 | depth and breadth of organizations to provide | 19 | 9 | choosing the P50 level. You can describe a |
| 20 | value data for a private sector utility. So | 20 | 1 | now payer via a number of attributes. A low |
| $ ^{21}_{22}$ | methomatically statistically to shapes a | | 1 ว | high labour intensive structure. Device by |
| $\begin{vmatrix} 22\\ 22 \end{vmatrix}$ | manification, statistically, to choose a | | ∠ 2 | for their biggest most dominant eveness item |
| 23 | Maritimes so we couldn't have had we wants | $ ^{23}$ | 5 1 | and they have to be very careful on how they |
| 25 | to but the right thing to do was to choose a | 24 | + 5 | manage nave to be very calculation now uncy |
| 145 | to, but the right thing to do was to choose a | 2. | 5 | manage pay. They would typically not be a |

| October 26, 2009 Multi | | | ^M NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|------------------------|--|--------|---|
| | Page | 13 | Page 15 |
| 1 | high payer. Or an organization where the time | 1 | given the business sector they're in, the life |
| 2 | it takes to train people to be competent is a | 2 | cycle that they're at, we believe that the |
| 3 | very short time period. It's not a highly | 3 | proper percentile at which to price to the all |
| 4 | skilled work force. They would not be a high | 4 | Canadian industrial market is at the middle, |
| 5 | payer. An organization that has high turnover | 5 | the P50. |
| 6 | is not a high payer. They're not going to | 6 KEL | LY, Q.C. |
| 7 | invest in people so as to lose those people to | 7 Q. | . Okay. Let's turn next then and look at the |
| 8 | the competition. Those organizations would | 8 | particular compensation analysis that you did, |
| 9 | not be a high payer. An organization early in | 9 | and I understand that's largely set out at |
| 10 | its life cycle where it's trying to retain its | 10 | page seven. |
| 11 | cash to continue the long term success of | 11 MR. | ABOUD: |
| 12 | business would not be a high payer. | 12 A. | . It's set out on page seven, Table 2. Thank |
| 13 | On the other end of the spectrum, the | 13 | you. So Table 2 is a composite of the levels |
| 14 | discussion of who's a high payer, capital | 14 | of market pay illustrated by the P75, the P50, |
| 15 | intensive industry. Payroll is not a big item | 15 | the P25. So we've gone through a long |
| 16 | on the expense, on the P&L and they need | 16 | discussion that rationalizes why P50 and yet, |
| 17 | absolutely top talent to manage that huge | 17 | we've also illustrated P75 and P25 and that's |
| 18 | portfolio of assets. So capital intensive | 18 | just for informative purposes. You get to see |
| 19 | industries would be high payers. High skilled | 19 | how much richer a P75 value is and how much |
| 20 | sectors, high payers. An organization well | 20 | lower a P25 value is. But the variance row, |
| 21 | into its life cycle such that it can afford to | 21 | where we say NP versus P50 is obviously the |
| 22 | pay competitive compensation, higher payer. | 22 | Newfoundland Power values as a ratio to the |
| 23 | So there's a stereotypical description of what | 23 | market's P50. |
| 24 | makes a high payer, what makes a low payer, | 24 | So let me go across these columns so we |
| 25 | and I have no reason to say from that that | 25 | understand what the data illustrate, and if I |
| | Page | 14 | Page 16 |
| 1 | Newfoundland Power should be a low payer. I'm | n 1 | may, I'll use the president and CEO as the |
| 2 | willing to say it should be a medium payer. | 2 | illustrative example. The president's salary |
| 3 | Some might even say from that it could be | 3 | is 370,000. The P50 level of market salaries |
| 4 | higher than P50, but I think P50 is the right | 4 | is 356,100. The president's salary is 3.9 |
| 5 | level. | 5 | percent higher than the market's P50. I'm |
| 6 | The last perspective that T II offer in | 6 | going to move one column to the right. Total |
| 17 | terms of why P50 of not is whether of not you | | cash is the addition of base salary plus |
| 8 | The four types of compensation are base | 8 | target bonus. Now we don't show you the |
| 9 | solary short torm incentive long torm | 9 | showing you the sum. So target total cash is |
| | incentive stock options and a whole package | 10 | base salary plus target bonus Target bonus |
| | of non-cash items and that nackage includes | 12 | is the bonus, you earn if all performance |
| 12 | your benefits, your perquisites, your pension | 12 | conditions occur exactly as planned. If |
| 13 | and your time off So of those four main | 13 | performance is below plan or above plan your |
| 15 | nackages salary short term incentive long | 15 | bonus payout may be below or above target but |
| 16 | term incentive non-cash if you're missing | 16 | this analysis assumes performance at plan for |
| 17 | one of them the most typical one to miss is | 17 | both Newfoundland Power and for the market |
| 18 | long term incentives, but you want to be P50 | 18 | There will be an additional bonus which will |
| 19 | on an all-in basis. Of the other three | 19 | bring the salary up to a total cash level of |
| 20 | elements, one of them has to be at a premium | 20 | 518,000 for the president, which by the way is |
| 21 | to make up for a shortfall in the one you're | 21 | inclusive of a 40 percent bonus, so 518 is 370 |
| 22 | missing, long term incentives. Newfoundland | 22 | plus 40 percent, and the market goes up from a |
| 23 | Power is not missing any of the four items. | 23 | salary of 356 to a total cash of 540. That |
| 24 | They have them all. So given that they have | 24 | bonus percent is, I think, 52 percent. So |
| 25 | the whole inventory of compensation elements. | 25 | it's higher than 40 percent. So what we see |

| 0 | ctober 26, 2009 | Multi-Page TM | | age | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|----|--|---------------------------------|----|-------|--|
| | Pa | ge 17 | | | Page 19 |
| 1 | happen, and we see this happen for every job | 0 | 1 | | and for Newfoundland Power, the binomial |
| 2 | at Newfoundland Power, is whatever is their | | 2 | | assumed value of annual grants for the |
| 3 | variance in the salary column, 3.9 percent, | | 3 | | president is 227,300. For the market P50 is |
| 4 | that variance becomes less competitive on a | | 4 | | 198,500. So the long term incentive value at |
| 5 | total cash basis because Newfoundland Power's | | 5 | | Newfoundland Power is above that of the |
| 6 | target bonuses are less than the market's | | 6 | | market. So when we look at the total direct |
| 7 | target bonuses, so the chief executive has now | | 7 | | column, we see that where the incumbent was |
| 8 | gone from a competitive position of four | | 8 | | minus 4.1 percent to the market's total cash, |
| 9 | percent above the market to effectively four | | 9 | | they have now risen to .9 percent above the |
| 10 | percent below the market on a total cash. | | 10 | | market on a total direct basis. |
| 11 | So we're going to keep going to the | | 11 | KELL | Y, Q.C. |
| 12 | right, if we may. We're going to add the next | | 12 | Q. | As I understand it, that's not an actual cash |
| 13 | element called long term incentive to get to | | 13 | | amount received in the year? |
| 14 | accumulative value called total direct. So | | 14 | MR. A | BOUD: |
| 15 | total direct is plus the value of long term | | 15 | А. | That is not. Thank you. That is not the cash |
| 16 | incentives when added to total cash to equal | | 16 | | amount. The cash amount received this year |
| 17 | total direct. Long term incentive is a bit of | | 17 | | for stock awards ten years ago could be the |
| 18 | a trickier vehicle to value. Organizations | | 18 | | value that those awards have hopefully risen, |
| 19 | have all kinds of long term incentive | | 19 | | possibly fallen, and the incumbent's decision |
| 20 | programs. Newfoundland Power has the market's | | 20 | | on when to cash out. So actual received value |
| 21 | most traditional long term incentive program | | 21 | | is based on incumbent decisions of historical |
| 22 | and that is called stock options. So we have | | 22 | | grants. This is an analysis of the future |
| 23 | to value the future expected cash flow impact | | 23 | | value of this year's grants present valued |
| 24 | of an option granted today, discount that back | | 24 | | back to today. |
| 25 | to present and that discounted value is the | | 25 | KELL | Y, Q.C. |
| | Pa | ge 18 | | | Page 20 |
| 1 | value shown in the long term incentive colum | ın. | 1 | Q. | How does that enable you to compare between |
| 2 | (9:30 a.m.) | | 2 | | companies then? |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN: | | 3 | MR. A | BOUD: |
| 4 | Q. Kind of like a DCF, ain't it? | | 4 | A. | So most companies have stock options and the |
| 5 | KELLY, Q.C. | | 5 | | mechanics of the tool, the binomial |
| 6 | Q. You're learning fast, Mr. Chairman. | | 6 | | distribution tool, are the same, but companies |
| 7 | MR. ABOUD: | | 7 | | will have different vesting provisions. They |
| 8 | A. That's exactlyyes, absolutely, that's | | 8 | | will have different terms of their options. |
| 9 | exactly what it is, and then the magic is on | | 9 | | They'll have different prices at which they |
| 10 | what parameters are you forecasting future | | 10 | | offer options. So even within those that have |
| 11 | cash values, and so there are renowned | | 11 | | stock options, we have to use the tool to |
| 12 | economic models. The very first one was | | 12 | | uniquely value the product. But companies |
| 13 | called Black Shoals and the newest one is | | 13 | | have different products for long term |
| 14 | called Binomial distribution. We now use | | 14 | | incentives. Some will have full value |
| 15 | binomial distribution. So we are valuing | | 15 | | restricted shares. Some will have phantom |
| 16 | current grants, future values, discounted to | | 16 | | unit. Some will have effectively a long term |
| 17 | present on an annualized basis and by that I | | 17 | | version of their short term incentive plan. |
| 18 | mean one organization may only grantissu | e | 18 | | It's a cash-based plan for the achievement of |
| 19 | grants once every five years. Another | | 19 | | three-year objectives rather than the short |
| 20 | organization might issue grants every year. | | 20 | | term incentive plan as a cash-based plan for |
| 21 | Well, that one that issues once every five | | 21 | | the achievement of one year performance |
| 22 | years, we don't give them zero values four | | 22 | | objectives. |
| 23 | years and a massive value in the fifth year. | | 23 | | So all of those different plans have to |
| 24 | We average that mega grant over the five | | 24 | | be valued unique to their structure. The |
| 25 | years. So annual present value of LTI grants | | 25 | | binomial distribution or any model will allow |

| Page 21 | Dago 23 |
|--|--------------|
| | rage 23 |
| 1 us to recognize and commonize the value of any 1 expense. Can you give us a sense of | the |
| 2 different kind of long term incentive plan 2 proportion borne by rate payers? | |
| 3 from our clients. 3 MR. ABOUD: | |
| 4 KELLY, Q.C. 4 A. The math is relatively easy. If we take | the |
| 5 Q. Okay. Now, in this jurisdiction, long term 5 881 all in president's value and we redu | ice the |
| 6 incentive or the stock options are treated as 6 227 LTI from it, you get a number that' | 6 60 |
| 7 a non-regulated expense, as you've indicated 7 something, 650 something. That num | ber, by |
| 8 on page six. So I think we can move on then 8 coincident, this is coincident, so this is | S |
| 9 to the next one. 9 coincidental, it's very similar to the P | 25 |
| 10 MR. ABOUD: 10 total REM value of the market at 650. S | So by |
| 11 A. Right. So, I mean, I thought it waspersonal 11 coincidental calculation, the rate pay | /er |
| 12 opinion, I thought it was somewhat gracious of 12 covers the cost of the president at the 2 | .5th |
| 13 the company to show long term incentive 13 percentile of the market. So maybe som | e might |
| because, I mean, it's not a rate payers issue, 14 say good deal for the rate payer, but th | at's |
| 15 so but it's illustrated anyways to get a 15 the way the math works. | |
| 16reflection of total compensation.16KELLY, Q.C. | |
| 17 So to go between the second to last 17 Q. Okay. Can you give us your overall s | ummary |
| 18column and the last column is to add the18and conclusions then? | |
| 19 package of non-cash compensation 19 MR. ABOUD: | |
| 20 opportunities, and again, non-cash is the sum 20 A. Okay, so if weand I think they a | re |
| 21 of four things and they are the standard 21 summarized on page two, if we could, | Mike, |
| 22 medical, dental, disability benefits. They 22 please? So they are to say that it's | |
| 23 are the perquisites, which the biggest one is 23 reasonable that we use the broad Car | adian |
| 24 company cars. They are retirement or pension 24 industrial market as our comparator g | roup. |
| 25 and they are time off, vacation and statutory 25 It's reasonable that we price it P50 of t | hat |
| Page 22 | Page 24 |
| 1 holidays. So the sum of all that non-cash 1 market to compare compensation compe | titiveness |
| 2 package, when added to total direct, becomes a 2 of our executives and importantly, and r | naybe I |
| 3 cumulative value we call total remuneration. 3 could have discussed this a bit more on | page |
| 4 The total remuneration value for the president 4 two, the variances that we saw on Table | 2 are |
| 5 is 881,000. For the market, it's 882,000. 5 the type of variances that I expect to see | all |
| 6 The president's variance to market is almost 6 the time. The fact that we've set pa | У |
| 7 non-existent. The president is 1 percent 7 standards to certain principles, they bein | g a |
| 8 below market. So it suggests thatwell, it 8 broad industrial market at the P50, doe | sn't |
| 9 suggests that the president went from a long 9 suggest that we're going to price eve | ery |
| 10 term incentive-sorry, a total direct position 10 executive exactly to those standards. | we |
| 11 that was 9 above market to a total REM 11 would always expect that incumbent sp | ecific |
| 12 position that s.1 below market. It suggests 12 pay is reflective of incumbent performant | ice and |
| 13 the president's non-cash package must be very 13 incumbent years of service. So we would similar to the merket's non-cash package | a never |
| 14 similar to the market's hon-cash package. 14 expect that you re going to have exactly | spot |
| 15 Now the valuation of the four subitents of 15 on the market numbers. We expect to | 11 |
| 16 non-cash, benefits, perquisites, time off and 16 variances and the variances I see for a | |
| 17 pension, there are complications in those 17 continuits, for an rows on rable 2, are early a calculations. I'll go into that discussion 18 within the norms that I see. In fact, if | SILY |
| 10 if you'd like but this illustration suggests 10 anything they would be a bit conservation | ve in |
| 20 that the cumulative non-cash package of the 20 their lack of significant variance | v C 111 |
| 20 that the cumulative non-cash package of the 20 then lack of significant validice. 21 president is equal to the market because the 21 . There is Live just come to understand | я |
| 22 total direct variance is similar to the total 22 principle at Newfoundland Power's s | , " alarv |
| 23 REM variance | nal |
| 24 KELLY, O.C. 24 circumstances no executive salary sho | ild be |
| 25 Q. Okay. Now the LTI value is a non-regulated 25 more than ten percent above the ma | rket |

| 0 | October 26, 2009 Multi- | | -Page TM | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|----|---|---------|---------------------|--|
| |] | Page 25 | | Page 27 |
| 1 | standard. For a private sector organization, | C | 1 (9:45 | a.m.) |
| 2 | that is very conservative. In my experience, | , | 2 MR. A | ABOUD: |
| 3 | a private sector organization would typically | y | 3 A. | We lookin part, yes. We certainly looked |
| 4 | say we don't want to pay an executive mo | re | 4 | atwhen we do any piece of work, we start |
| 5 | than 20 percent salary above standard and h | ere | 5 | from what is, but we also reflect back to core |
| 6 | you folks are using a pay principle of ten | | 6 | principles. So concurrently, we're saying is |
| 7 | percent above standard. In fact, if there's a | | 7 | it right in and of itself. We're also saying |
| 8 | trend, private sector organizations have | | 8 | how similar is it of current reports. We're |
| 9 | pushed 20 percent up to 25 percent. They a | re | 9 | doing both at the same time. |
| 10 | not going to incur the risk of losing a key | | 10 EARL | E, Q.C.: |
| 11 | contributor role for the sake of five or ten | | 11 Q. | As I understand it, the decision to use the |
| 12 | thousand dollars when it would cost 50 to |) | 12 | Canadian commercial industrial index as a |
| 13 | 100,000 dollars of recruitment fees to replace | ce | 13 | comparator group, that's one that has existed |
| 14 | a person and the huge risk of business | | 14 | for a number of years? |
| 15 | continuance when a senior executive leaves | is | 15 MR. A | ABOUD: |
| 16 | far too important to constrain someone's | | 16 A. | It is. It has existed for a number of years. |
| 17 | salary to only ten percent above standard. Se | 0 | 17 EARL | E, Q.C.: |
| 18 | the fact that you have a ten percent above | | 18 Q. | And similarly, the decision to position at the |
| 19 | standard, I think, is a pretty conservative | | 19 | 50th percentile, that has existed for a number |
| 20 | principle, and none of your people exceed the | nat | 20 | of years? |
| 21 | principle. | | 21 MR. A | ABOUD: |
| 22 | So all in, I think the variance | | 22 A. | It has, yes. |
| 23 | percentages are conservative. I think the pay | / | 23 EARL | E, Q.C.: |
| 24 | principles are sound. There's nothing in | | 24 Q. | Now if we could go to page three of your |
| 25 | Table 2 that would suggest, from my | | 25 | report? You have indicated you didn't call |
| |] | Page 26 | | Page 28 |
| 1 | experience, that is untoward. | | 1 | it, as it's called in your report, a point |
| 2 | KELLY, Q.C. | | 2 | score system, but same meaning, I take it. |
| 3 | Q. Thank you, Mr. Aboud. Those are my questions, | | 3 | You indicated that there was a point score |
| 4 | Mr. Chairman. | | 4 | developed for the positions. So the point |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN: | | 5 | scores we see in Table 1, would those have |
| 6 | Q. Mr. Johnson. | | 6 | been done for this report? |
| 7 | MR. JOHNSON: | | 7 MR. A | ABOUD: |
| 8 | Q. Mr. Earle will be questioning Mr. Aboud, Mr. | | 8 A. | Yes, and thank you for that question. This is |
| 9 | Chairman. | | 9 | what I meant by we used historical reports and |
| 10 | MR. KARL ABOUD, CROSS-EXAMINATION BY RANDELL EARLE, Q | Q.C. | 10 | we came back to first principles. So we do |
| 11 | EARLE, Q.C.: | | 11 | certainly look at historical reports and these |
| 12 | Q. Good morning, Mr. Aboud. | | 12 | are the old points, but concurrently for this |
| 13 | MR. ABOUD: | | 13 | review, we re-scored the jobs to ensure that |
| 14 | A. Good morning. | | 14 | the points of record are still valid as |
| 15 | EARLE, Q.C.: | | 15 | points. So concurrently we did first |
| 16 | Q. How long has Hay Group had a relationship with | | 16 | principles, and we looked at old material, and |
| 17 | Newfoundland Power? | | 17 | they were the same. |
| 18 | MR. ABOUD: | | 18 EARL | E, Q.C.: |
| 19 | A. I'm trying to give you the exact year, but | | 19 Q. | So what would the variance have been between |
| 20 | it's been many. So I'm going to assume ten, | | 20 | preexisting points scores and the present? |
| 21 | but I don't know for sure. | | 21 MR. A | ABOUD: |
| 22 | EARLE, Q.C.: | | 22 A. | They are the same. These are the preexisting |
| 23 | Q. So would it be fair to say that this report | | 23 | points scores and they are the points |
| 24 | that you have presented is in fact a review of | | 24 EARL | E, Q.C.: |
| 25 | existing practice? | | 25 Q. | So the points scores haven't changed? |

| October 26, 2009 Multi- | | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|--|---|---|
| | Page 29 | Page 31 |
| 1 MR. ABOUD: | | o maximum. Whatever organization or |
| 2 A. The point scores haven't changed from the | e last 2 g | government that we can think of in the world |
| 3 review. | 3 a | s being the biggest most challenging, most |
| 4 EARLE, O.C.: | 4 c | complex job that exists, if you were to add |
| 5 0. Now let me see if I can be sure we have a | good 5 t | wo of those companies together, it becomes |
| 6 understanding, and if we go to page 10 |). 6 t | pigger still. So the points in the points |
| 7 Appendix B. These are all the factors at p | age 7 c | an be come as high as the situation warrants. |
| 8 10? | 8 5 | So there is no maximum, but more to your |
| 9 MR. ABOUD: | 9 0 | uestion, how do we determine what the points |
| 10 A. Those are all the factors we used for this | 10 s | core should be |
| 11 review. They are eight, and I'm counting | the 11 EARLE. | . O.C.: |
| 12 sub-bullets, not the major headings. They | are 12 0. 7 | That wasn't my question. |
| 13 eight of the twelve sub-factors. There ar | e 13 MR. AB | OUD: |
| 14 four additional sub-factors in the broad | 14 A. (| Draw, so there is no maximum. |
| 15 spectrum of the HAY Job Evaluation Syste | m. and 15 EARLE | 0.C.: |
| 16 they are the sub-factors incorporating wor | king 16 O | Av question is how do you determine the |
| 17 conditions. They are point scores that | 17 r | naximum? |
| 18 recognize how heavy are the things we li | ft 18 MR AB | OID. |
| 19 what is the risk of injury, to what degree to | 10 MeV | There is no maximum. |
| 20 all your senses have to be paying attention | n 20 EARLE | 00. |
| 21 and to what degree you go home at his | wht $21 0 7$ | There is no maximum? |
| 22 frustrated There is a mental stress piece | 22 MR AB | OUD: |
| 23 EARLE O.C.: | 23 A. | No. |
| 24 0. You wouldn't use those for executives? | 24 EARLE | 0.C.: |
| 25 MR. ABOUD: | 25 O. I | s that true in all your evaluation scheme |
| | Daga 20 | Page 22 |
| 1 A Put that's the principle While we do seen | rage 50 | rage 32 |
| A. But that s the principle. While we do score | | |
| 2 executives on mose points in terms of | | JUD: |
| 5 establishing true internal equity of all jobs | 5 A. 1 | tes, absolutely, there is there is no |
| 4 In the company, those four factors were added | 4 0 | isht sub factore. There is no total points |
| 5 because of pay equity legislation. Not all | 5 e | agni sub-factors. There is no total points |
| 6 companies in Canada are mandated to me pay | | maximum that the biggest most complex job that |
| / equity, not all companies have the working | / r | uns the biggest most complex company or |
| 8 conditions component in their evaluations. So | 8 g | overnment in the world can have. |
| 9 when we re using the tool to price executives | 9 EARLE, | Q.C.: |
| 10 to the market, the common perspective is on | 10 Q. I | and s not the question. Is that true for all |
| 11 the eight sub-factors because not all | 11 y | our evaluation schema? Like, I m familiar |
| executives in all companies are scored on the | 12 V | vin your schema being used for industrial |
| 13 IOUT SUD-TACTORS. | 13 J | bos, and I ve seen maximum points on your |
| 14 EARLE, Q.C.: | 14 1 | natices associated for know now with a |
| 15 Q. My question is these are the factors that you | | articular job. |
| 16 Used for the Newfoundiand Power executives a | 16 MR. ABC | JUD: |
| 17 MR. ABOUD: | 17 A. J | nere's no maximum know now point for a job. |
| 18 A. These are them, yes. | 18 EARLE, | Q.C.: New So I take it the "know how" though |
| 19 EAKLE, Q.C.: | ointa 20 | JKay. 50, I take II, the Know now, though, |
| 20 Q. Okay. Now now do we get to the maximum p | $\frac{20}{1}$ m | nust de associated with the job. |
| 21 101 any given factor? How do we decide now | | JUD: |
| 22 many points should be anocated to a factor | $\begin{vmatrix} 22 & A. \\ 22 & L \end{vmatrix}$ | be the most important factor, yas |
| | | o no most important factor, yes. |
| 25 A Good question They're firstly there is | 24 EAKLE, | y.c But for instance if the President of |
| 120 11 , 0000 question, 1100 10^{-1} 11300 , 1010 13 | 140 U. I | sur, for instance, if the instability of |

| 00 | October 26, 2009 Multi- | | -Page [™] | | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---------------|--|------------|--------------------|--------|--|
| | | Page 33 | | | Page 35 |
| 1 | Newfoundland Power happens to be a n | obel | 1 | | of our benchmark data |
| | laureate in literature, it may not while he | 00001 | 2 | FARIF | |
| | may be very knowledgeable, he may not of | fera | 2 | 0 | Okay then Mr Aboud what I wanted to |
| | lot to the job? | | 1 | Q. | understand the benchmark before Lunderstand |
| | MR ABOUD | | + 5 | | what you do with the benchmark. So how do you |
| | A That's a good point. We don't measure t | ho | 5 | | let's take "know how" and let's go to |
| | A. That is a good point. We don't measure t | ine iho | 7 | | communicating and influencing skills |
| | needs of the job and assume the incumbent | hag | / | | |
| | these "know how" needs | llas | 0 | MK. A | Source |
| 9 | LIDSE KNOW HOW HEEDS. | | 9 10 | A. | |
| | EARLE, Q.C.: | т | 10 | EARLE | b, Q.C.: |
| | Q. So let's go down to unough these points. | 1 | 11 | Q. | Now that's something that I think commonsense |
| 12 | mean, ii there are no maximums, do you na | ive a | 12 | | tells us that every executive should have. |
| 13 | Denchmark ? | | 13 | | How do we develop, now do we get a benchmark |
| 14 | MR. ABOUD: | | 14 | | that says that a position which involves a lot |
| 15 | A. That's the basis by which the evaluations a | re | 15 | | of communication with the public, a lot of |
| 16 | done is benchmarking, but there are no |) | 16 | | communications with government leaders, |
| 17 | maximums. | | 17 | | opinion leaders, how do we get a benchmark |
| 18 | EARLE, Q.C.: | | 18 | | that says somebody who requires a lot of this |
| 19 | Q. And how is the benchmark constructed? | | 19 | | in their job gets 100 points, 150 points, or |
| 20 | MR. ABOUD: | | 20 | | 75 points for that job? Excuse me, 1 |
| 21 | A. Sure. So in our database of 500, and I thin | ĸ | 21 | | shouldn't say somebody, a job which requires |
| 22 | I said 32 organizations, and 292 industrial | •.1 | 22 | | 1ť? |
| 23 | commercials, we have 292 CEO evaluations | s with | 23 | MR. Al | BOUD: |
| 24 | all those evaluations known in terms of th | e, | 24 | А. | So if we coming back to the fact that we |
| 25 | company s business model, the company | iy s | 25 | | nave eight factors and you re talking about |
| | | Page 34 | | | Page 36 |
| 1 | revenue size, the company's geographica | ıl 🛛 | 1 | | the third one, communication and influencing |
| 2 | footprint, the company's ownership, and so | we | 2 | | skills, we have scaled definitions of degrees |
| 3 | have all that benchmark data. As well, we | e | 3 | | of all of these factors, be they technical |
| 4 | have international benchmark standards | 5 | 4 | | depth, managerial breadth, communication |
| 5 | obviously way beyond Canada of how w | e've | 5 | | skills, or any of the others, we read the |
| 6 | evaluated CEOs in all kinds of companies a | nd | 6 | | definitions that align to our scale and we say |
| 7 | all kinds of geographies. So when we consid | ler | 7 | | for communications, this job score is |
| 8 | the CEO in any organization, Newfoundla | nd | 8 | | communication level 3, which, in fact, it |
| 9 | Power, we say to ourself what is the | | 9 | | does. Communications level 3 is the highest of |
| 10 | complexity of the business of transmitting | | 10 | | the communications scale, and it says not just |
| 11 | energy. We're not generating energy, we'r | re | 11 | | it must communicate, but it must influence and |
| 12 | transmitting energy. What is the revenue siz | ie 🛛 | 12 | | impact people to work in a way to the best |
| 13 | with and without the transfer costs of buying | g | 13 | | interest of the organization. So there's a |
| 14 | the raw product from the producer, so what | is | 14 | | lot of impact and influence, whether it's to |
| 15 | the value-added and what is the gross reven | ue, | 15 | | internal constituents or external |
| 16 | and what are the assets of the company. Wh | nat | 16 | | constituents. So it gets level 3 human |
| 17 | is the ownership of the company. In this | | 17 | | relation skills, and level 3 human relation |
| 18 | case, it's a private sector, the COE reports | | 18 | | skills will start the process of adding to the |
| 19 | to a Board of Directors. What is the employ | ee | 19 | | point score. |
| 20 | base, is the company unionized. That adds | to | 20 | EARL | E, Q.C.: |
| 21 | the degree of complexity. So we consider a | 11 | 21 | Q. | So level 3 communication skills, how man |
| 22 | those factors, we map them to all of our | | 22 | | points does that give you for an executive? |
| $ ^{23}$ | benchmark references, and we conclude go | oing | 23 | MR. A | |
| $ ^{24}_{27}$ | through the evaluation scoring system that | L I | 24 | А. | I nere is no answer to that. I his is not a |
| 125 | this job deserves 2448 points relative to all | | 25 | | point factor system. This is a point |

| October 26, 2009 | | Multi-Page TM | | | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|--|--|--------------------------|---------|-------|--|
| | P | Page 37 | | 0 | Page 39 |
| $\begin{vmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{vmatrix}$ | relativity system. What level 3 does is it adds three more steps of points to whateve | r | 1 | | that areas of the chart are nowhere near 400, they are much closer to 900. A job would have |
| 3 | the "know how" points are that time | <u>,</u> | 2 | | to score less technical breadth Instead of |
| | EARLE OC: | | 1 | | G it would be E to get to your 400 example |
| 5 | O Well at some point in time you managed | to | - 5 | | It would have to score less managerial |
| 6 | give the position of President and CEO of | 10 | 5 | | breadth kind of level 3 not 4 and it could |
| | Newfoundland Power 2448 points? | | 7 | | score the same human relation skills if it's a |
| | MP AROUD: | | / Q | | regional manager that has to have human |
| | A Right | | 0 | | relations level 3 That regional manager |
| 10 | $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A}$ | | 9 10 | | F33 could score 400 points |
| 11 | O How do your level 3 communication a | nd | 11 | FARE | E O C · |
| 12 | influencing skills your whatever level | iiu | 12 | 0 | Mr Aboud I don't think you're getting my |
| 12 | thinking challenge your whatever level | | 12 | Q. | question so I'm going to see if I can start |
| 11 | freedom to act how do they translate into | | 17 | | you at a point. If you have a job that |
| 15 | numbers? | | 14 | | requires none of the items under "know how" |
| 15 | MR ABOUD: | | 15 | | theoretical |
| 17 | A If you look at - we'll talk about the three | | 17 | MR A | BOUD. |
| 18 | subsets of "know how". If you look at | | 18 | Δ | Right |
| 19 | practical technical or the depth of | | 10 | FARE | F O C · |
| $ _{20}$ | technical skill the incumbent has to have at | nd | 20 | 0 | The points associated would be zero right? |
| $ _{21}^{20}$ | you read all our definitions of that scale. | 10 | 21 | MR. A | BOUD: |
| 22 | we're assigning the job level G technical | | 22 | A | More so. There wouldn't be a job, but |
| $ _{23}^{}$ | skill. On management breadth, we're assign | ning | 23 | | technically, yes. |
| $ _{24}^{-2}$ | the job level 4 skillset to manage across a | | 24 | EARL | E O C · |
| 25 | business, and in human relation skills, we'v | e | 25 | 0. | So my question is how do you get to the point |
| | F | Daga 38 | - | | Page 40 |
| 1 | already said we're assigning the job level 3 | age 50 | 1 | | of saving that you know these various levels |
| | human relation skills. When you intersect a | | 1 2 | | and you say they intersect at 900 but by a |
| | three dimensional grid level G level A and | | 2 | | simple scaling evercise, you could change that |
| | level 3 you get to a cell that has a point | | | | to half right? |
| | value in it. That point value is 920 points | | - - | MR A | ROUD. |
| 6 | and those are the "know how" points for the | | 6 | Δ | Mathematically you can have anything but we |
| | President of Newfoundland Power | | 7 | 11. | would never have assigned those points to the |
| 8 | EARLE OC: | | , 8 | | CEO of Newfoundland Power. |
| 9 | O So you essentially establish a three | | 9 | EARL | E O C · |
| 10 | dimensional matrices? | | 10 | 0. | So how do we get to the point that a point of |
| 11 | MR. ABOUD: | | 11 | Ċ. | intersection is worth 900 versus 400? |
| 12 | A. For the "know how", yes. | | 12 | MR. A | BOUD: |
| 13 | EARLE. O.C.: | | 13 | A. | So imagine these grids that in some cases are |
| 14 | O. For the "know how". | | 14 | | three dimensional, in some cases are two |
| 15 | MR. ABOUD: | | 15 | | dimensional, have scaling down the sides, |
| 16 | A. And the point of intersection is 920 "know | | 16 | | scaling across the top, sub-scaling human |
| 17 | how" points, and then we start adding the | | 17 | | relation skills, and all those scalings have |
| 18 | points to ultimately get to 2448. | | 18 | | definition, and as you get deeper technicals, |
| 19 | EARLE, Q.C.: | | 19 | | broader managerials, the point scales get |
| 20 | Q. And how does "know how" result in a 900 versu | 15 | 20 | | higher because the job is simply responsible |
| 21 | a 400 point score at that point of | | 21 | | for things that are more challenging and |
| 22 | intersection? | | 22 | | tougher to do. So as you go wider on the |
| 23 | MR. ABOUD: | | 23 | | scales, the points become higher. The |
| 24 | A. Sure. So if a job scores, I think I said, | | 24 | | challenge is to determine where on the scale |
| 25 | level G, level 4, level 3, the point values in | | 25 | | the job best fits, but to our earlier |

| Page 41 Page 41 1 discussion, we've got in Canada hundreds of 2 So in "know how", if you are an organization that, I'll use my client, Hydro One, which is an organization similar to Newfoundland Power, and obviously an organization you folks know. 3 thousands of henchmark references. We are correlate this job in therms of your 5 an organization similar to Newfoundland Power, and obviously an organization you folks know. 5 description of the role into the words of our 5 years age Hydro one was incorporated with 6 6 print tool, and we say to ourself 7 ontario Power, The same amount of power was 7 7 ontario Power, and obviously an organization, similar to 7 hydro too rel so ny a part of what Ontario Hydro 7 10 definitions of the grid. where have we scored 10 was. So the fact that the organization 7 hydro too rel, similar to 7 13 think this job is best reflected as a G43 920. 15 that, Til samsission organization. There's less 16 technical challenge is the technical 17 14 EAREL, O.C. 20 So essentially your point score is a position 16 relative, tochnical 16 relative, tochnical 17 17 BA. That would be correct. Imean, it's a bigger 17 in transmission organization. There's less 16 tochnicalega fat integration. 17 tochnicalega fa | October 26, 2009 Multi-I | | -Page ^{TN} | ⁴ NP's 2010 General Rate Application | |
|--|---|---|---------------------|---|--|
| 1 discussion, we've got in Canada hundreds of benchmark references, we description of the role into the works. We description of the role into the works of our description of the role into the works of our grid. We benchmark (his job to the many description of the role into the works of our description of the role into the works of our description of the role into the works of our definitions of the grid, where have we scored in generally similar jobs. We bring those two think this job is best reflected as a G43 920. So in "know how", if you are an organization years ago Pydro one was nincorporated with donario Power. The same amount of power was generated, but the vertical integration of was. So the fact that the corganization has into this this job is best reflected as a G43 920. 14 FARF, Q.C.: 14 East reflected as a G43 920. 15 Q. So essentially your point score is a position is of contex. 15 New foundated Power, reduces the technical challenge of running the company. It's not a generator and a transmitter, it's just a transmission organization. There's less to consequence of problem solving, the factors on the page called thinking challenge is a measure of how complex are the decision syou make. We don't as much care about their pure risk; if 23 17 TAR ABOLD: 14 East refrained this generation, similar to incorporate the risk that's associated with 3 18 A That would be correct. 20 14 14 21 A That would be correct. 20 21 14 23 Q. Yeah, okay, Now if we go to these factors. 3 24 24 | | | Page 41 | | Page 43 |
| 2 benchmark references, internationally ithat, I'll use my client, Hydro One, which is, an organization similar to Newfoundland Power, and obviously an organization out folks know, 3 thousands of benchmark references. We and obviously an organization you folks know, 4 correlate this job to the many and obviously an organization out folks know, 7 thousands of reference jobs we've already secored in our tool, and we say to ourself 8 secored in our tool, and we say to ourself 9 9 where does it hest offine relative to our 0 10 definitions of the grid, where have we scored 10 11 generated, but the vertical integration has 1ess vertical integration has 12 think this job is best reflected as a G43 920. 13 13 than knis job is best reflected as a G43 920. 13 14 FAREL, QC: 14 14 FAREL, QC. 15 16 relative to all other similar jobs? 17 17 MR. ABOUD: 11 11 18 A. That would be correct. 14 14 21 (10:00 am.) <td< td=""><td>1</td><td>discussion we've got in Canada hundred</td><td>s of</td><td>1</td><td>So in "know how" if you are an organization</td></td<> | 1 | discussion we've got in Canada hundred | s of | 1 | So in "know how" if you are an organization |
| 3 thousands of benchmark references. We an organization similar to Newfoundland Power, 4 correlate this job in terms of your an organization similar to Newfoundland Power, 6 grid. We benchmark this job to the many and obviously an organization similar to Newfoundland Power, 7 thousands of reference jobs we've already generated, but the vertical integration, off 9 where does it best define relative to our 9 10 definitions of the grid, where have we scored 11 11 this togoether and we say to ourself, we 12 13 Q. So essentially your point score is a position 14 16 relative to all other similar jobs? 13 17 MK. ABOUD: 14 18 A. That would be correct. 16 11 Textsmission organization There's less 12 IO000 am.) 21 12 FANE AOU: 18 13 obta chart mash that, but that would be 19 14 EARLE, QC: 10 15 O. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors, a wood rea boout their pure risk, if | 2 | benchmark references, internationally | | 2 | that. I'll use my client. Hydro One, which is |
| 4 correlate this job in terms of your 4 and obviously an organization you folks know, years ago Hydro one was incorporated with 5 description of the role into the words of our 5 years ago Hydro one was incorporated with 7 thousands of reference jobs we've already 5 off reference jobs we've already 7 8 scored in our tool, and we say to ourself, we 10 Ontario Power. The same amount of power was 10 definitions of the grid, where have we scored 10 Wast. So the fact that the organization in has 12 think this job is best reflected as a G43 920. 14 chart that the organization. Similar too 14 correct. 14 generator and a transmitter, it's just a thas a whole. So it's not a much charlenge of running the company. It's not a 15 O. So cassentially your point score is a position 15 transmission organization. There's less 16 transmission organization, and the company of the reference inter's less that would be correct. 10 21 O. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors. 10 the were to score a job for 23 O. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors. Page 42 what I mean by that. If you are the President and CB0 of a software company a | 3 | thousands of benchmark references. | Ne | 3 | an organization similar to Newfoundland Power. |
| 5 description of the role into the works of our 5 years ago Hydro one was incorporated with 6 grid. We benchmark this job to the many the same amount of power the same amount of power was 8 scored in our tool, and we say to ourself 6 9 where does it best define relative to our 10 10 definitions of the grid, where have we scored 11 11 generally similar jobs. We bring those two 11 12 A. That would be correct. I mean, it's a bigger 13 13 A. That would be correct. I mean, it's a bigger 14 14 EARLE, QC: 14 13 A. That would be correct. I mean, it's a bigger 14 14 Contario and a transmitter, it's just a transmission organization. There's less 16 correct. 10 17 MK. ABOUD: 14 18 A. That would be correct. 17 17 MK. ABOUD: 18 18 and Croo a as offware 14 19 the sums of problem solving, the factor on the give most points in the corpany. Failure, because there's been a huge 14 and Croo fa a software compaura cona | 4 | correlate this job in terms of your | | 4 | and obviously an organization you folks know. |
| 6 grid. We benchmark this job to the many thousands of reference jobs we've already s cored in our tool, and we say to ourself 6 Ontario power generation, a big company called Ontario Power. The same amount of power was generated, but the vertical integration of 9 where does it best define relative to our definitions of the grid, where have we scored it generally similar jobs. We bring those two things together and we say to ourself, we this job is best reflected as a G43 920. Yes to the fact that the organization has 14 DARLE, Q.C.: 12 Newfoundland Power, reduces the technical chaltee of running the company. It's not a generator and a transmitter, it's just a 15 Q. Soessentially your point score is a position to correct. 14 Chaltee of the generation and a transmitter, it's just a 16 relative to all other similar jobs? 15 transmission organization. There's less 16 correct. Interms of problem solving, the factor on the generator and a transmitter, it's just a 17 MA ABOUD: 10 that would be correct. 11 the ecisions you make. We 23 0. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors. 24 bub we're recognizition, and meabaric does something theat, disaster happens. We don't the prime risk; if 24 what I mean by that. If you are the President s offware product can be wonderful for the s offware product can be wonderful for the 25 </td <td>5</td> <td>description of the role into the words of ou</td> <td>ır</td> <td>5</td> <td>years ago Hydro one was incorporated with</td> | 5 | description of the role into the words of ou | ır | 5 | years ago Hydro one was incorporated with |
| 7 ihousands of reference jobs we've already 7 Ontario Power. The same amount of power was generated, but the vertical integration of 9 where does it best define relative to our 9 Hydro One is only a part of what Ontario Hydro One is only ante is whet was a bat decision on the part on the terms of problem solving. It is not a methewer a bat of eccentre, is the what would be correct. It mean, it's a bigger the decision is on the mater of the decision is not a mack care a poin for correct. 10 It EXRLE, QC: 10 <td>6</td> <td>grid. We benchmark this job to the main</td> <td>ny</td> <td>6</td> <td>Ontario power generation, a big company called</td> | 6 | grid. We benchmark this job to the main | ny | 6 | Ontario power generation, a big company called |
| 8 scored in our tool, and we say to ourself 9 generated, but the vertical integration of 9 where does it best define relative to our 9 Hydro One is only a part of what Ontario Hydro 10 definitions of the grid, where have we scored 10 Name So the fact that the organization has 11 generatly similar jobs. We bring those two 11 Newfoundland Power, reduces the technical 12 things together and we say to ourself, we 11 Newfoundland Power, reduces the technical 13 think this job is best reflected as a G43 920. 12 Newfoundland Power, reduces the technical 14 teXBLE, Q.C.: 14 ressentially your point score is a position 15 transmission organization. There's less 16 relative to all other similar jobs? 15 transmission organization portical integration. 16 technical challenge in a masure of 10 the would you tell us which factors incorporate 10 10 the were to score a job for 25 risk taking, and let me give you an example of 11 word to an airplane mechanic, because if the 2 and CEO of a software company and you're in 14 the usiness of bringing out a new 14 word to an airplan | 7 | thousands of reference jobs we've alread | dy | 7 | Ontario Power. The same amount of power was |
| 9where does it best define relative to our definitions of the grid, where have we scored it generally similar jobs. We bring those two things together and we say to ourself, we think this job is best reflected as a G43 920.Hydro One is only a part of what Ontario Hydro was. So the fact that the organization has challenge of running the company. It's not a generator and a transmitter, it's just a transmission organization. There's less technical challenge in being half of a company than a whole. So it's not as much pure risk, but we're recognizing vertical integration.17MR. ABOUD:1518A. That would be correct. I mean, it's a bigger of correct.1619definition than that, but that would be correct.1710correct.2011(10:00 a.m.)2112EAKLE, QC:2214would you tell us which factors incorporate the software company. All you re the President 222150. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors, the business of bringing out new software to and CEO of a software company and you're in the business of bringing out new software to product, a big success in bringing out a we software product can be wonderful for the 61816example, we might give most points in the world to an airphane mechanic, because if the airphanems. We don't heast associated with 111811the job?1112MK ABOUD:1213A. We incorporate your definition of risk in 141314different ways than I think you're defining 151515neasured on what if it performs bad | 8 | scored in our tool, and we say to ourself | | 8 | generated, but the vertical integration of |
| 10definitions of the grid, where have we scored10was. So the fact that the organization has11generally similar jobs. We bring those two12was. So the fact that the organization has13think this job is best reflected as a G43 920.13less vertical integration, similar to14EARLE, Q.C.14generator and a transmitter, it's just a15or So essentially your point score is a position15transmission organization. There's less16relative to all other similar jobs?16transmission organization. There's less17MR ABODD:16than a whole. So it's not as much pure risk,18A. That would be correct.16the factor on the19definition than that, but that would be10In terms of problem solving, the factor on the21locorrect.20page called thinking challenge is a measure of21(10:00 a.m.)21how complex are the decision, som thing terrible24would you tell us which factors incorporate2325risk taking, and let me give you an example of2326risk taking, and let me give you are heresident1427would you tell us which factors incorporate2428would ecorpony. Failure, because there's been a huge730the business of bringing out a new55software product can be wonderful for the66company. Failure, because there's been a huge77upfront development investment, can be a7 <td>9</td> <td>where does it best define relative to our</td> <td></td> <td>9</td> <td>Hydro One is only a part of what Ontario Hydro</td> | 9 | where does it best define relative to our | | 9 | Hydro One is only a part of what Ontario Hydro |
| 11 generally similar jobs. We bring those two 11 less vertical integration, similar to 12 think this job is best reflected as a G43 920. 11 less vertical integration, similar to 14 EARLE, Q.C.: 14 generally your point score is a position 16 relative to all other similar job? 16 relative to all other similar job? 16 technical challenge in seing half of a company. 17 MR, ABOUD: 17 than a whole. So it's not as much pure risk, 18 but we're recognizing vertical integration. 11 technical challenge in seing half of a company. 19 definition than that, but that would be 19 10 terns of problem solving, the factor on the 20 correct. 20 correct. 21 10:00 a.m.) 21 21 Q. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors, 22 20 on't as much care about their pure risk; if 23 Q. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors, 23 oon ras much care about their pure risk; if 24 would you tell us which factors incorporate 24 happens. If we were to score a job for 2 and CEO of a software company and you're in 1 meas | 10 | definitions of the grid, where have we score | red | 10 | was. So the fact that the organization has |
| 12 thing stogether and we say to ourself, we 12 Newfoundland Power, reduces the technical 13 think this job is best reflected as a G43 920. 14 generator and a transmitter, it's just a 14 EARLE, Q.C.: 14 generator and a transmitter, it's just a 16 relative to all other similar jobs? 16 17 MK. ABOUD: 17 than a whole. So it's not as much pure risk, if 18 A. That would be correct. I mean, it's a bigger 18 but we're recognizing vertical integration. 19 definition than that, but that would be 10 In terms of problem solving, the factor on the 20 correct. 20 page called thinking challenge is a measure of 21 (10:00 a.m.) 21 how complex are the decisions you make. We 23 Q. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors, 23 you make a bad decision, something terrible 24 would you tell us which factors incorporate 24 happens. We don't believe a job for 25 risk taking, and let me give you an example of 25 consequence of error, our term for your 24 products, a big success in bringing out a new 5 software product can be wonderful for the <td>11</td> <td>generally similar jobs. We bring those tw</td> <td>vo</td> <td>11</td> <td>less vertical integration, similar to</td> | 11 | generally similar jobs. We bring those tw | vo | 11 | less vertical integration, similar to |
| 13 think this job is best reflected as a G43 920. 13 challenge of running the company. It's not a generator and a transmitter, it's just a transmission organization. There's less 16 example, we might give most on the generator and a transmitter, it's is not a most organization. There's less 17 MR. ABOUD: 16 transmission organization. There's less 18 A. That would be correct. I mean, it's a bigger 18 but we're recognizing vertical integration. 19 definition than that, but that would be 19 In terms of problem solving, the factor on the 20 correct. 20 page called thinking challenge is a measure of 21 how complex are the decisions you make. We 22 consequence of error, our term for your 23 O. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors, 24 4 would you tell us which factors incorporate 24 4 would you tell us which factors incorporate 24 14 would you tell us which factors incorporate 24 15 us and CEO of a software company and you're in 3 airplane mechanic, because if the 3 the business of bringing out new software 4 happens. If we were to score al job for | 12 | things together and we say to ourself, w | e | 12 | Newfoundland Power, reduces the technical |
| 14 EARLE, Q.C.: 14 generator and a transmitter, it's just a 15 Q. So essentially your point score is a position 16 relative to all other similar jobs? 16 relative to all other similar jobs? 16 technical challenge in being half of a company 17 MR. ABOUD: 17 than a whole. So it's not as much pure risk, 18 A. That would be correct. I mean, it's a bigger 18 but we're recognizing vertical integration. 19 definition than that, but that would be 19 In terms of problem solving, the factor on the 20 correct. 20 page called thinking challenge is a measure of 21 10:00 a.m.) 21 how complex are the decisions you make. We 23 Q. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors, 23 you make a bad decision, something terrible 24 would you tell us which factors incorporate 25 happens. If we were to score a job for 25 ord a software company and you're in 3 airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster 3 and CEO of a software company and you're in 3 airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster 4 products, a big success in bringing out a new 4 ha | 13 | think this job is best reflected as a G43 920 | 0. | 13 | challenge of running the company. It's not a |
| 15 Q. So essentially your point score is a position 15 transmission organization. There's less 16 relative to all other similar jobs? 16 technical challenge in being half of a company 17 MR. ABOUD: 17 than a whole. So it's not as much pure risk, 19 definition than that, but that would be 19 In terms of problem solving, the factor on the 19 definition than that, but that would be 19 In terms of problem solving, the factor on the 20 orrect. 20 page called thinking challenge is a measure of 21 (10:00 a.m.) 21 how complex are the decisions you make. We 24 would you tell us which factors incorporate 24 you make a bad decision, something terrible 24 what I mean by that. If you are the President 25 consequence of error, our term for your 25 software product can be wonderful for the 2 world to an airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster 3 uproducts, a big success in bringing out a new 4 believe a job should be measured assuming it 5 software product can be wonderful for the 5 measured assuming it measured assuming it 9 | 14 EARI | LE, Q.C.: | | 14 | generator and a transmitter, it's just a |
| 16relative to all other similar jobs?16technical challenge in being half of a company17 MR. ABOUD:17than a whole. So i's not as much pure risk,18A. That would be correct.1819definition than that, but that would be1920correct.2021 (10:00 a.m.)2121 (10:00 a.m.)2122 EARLE, Q.C.:2224would you tell us which factors incorporate2425risk taking, and let me give you an example of2526correct, and let me give you an example of2527risk taking, and let me give you an example of2528would you tell us which factors incorporate241what I mean by that. If you are the President2would to an airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster2and CEO of a software company. Failure, because there's been a huge3airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster3upfront development investment, can be a7performs as expected. So we don't measure4different ways than I think you're defining10roble were your making big decisions10incorporate the risk that's associated with11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR. ABOUD:12of the decision, are you making big decisions13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in13or measured assure fish wat sore more14different ways than I think you're defining15roble were your making smaller15 <td>15 Q.</td> <td>So essentially your point score is a position</td> <td>n</td> <td>15</td> <td>transmission organization. There's less</td> | 15 Q. | So essentially your point score is a position | n | 15 | transmission organization. There's less |
| 17MR. ABOUD:17than a whole. So it's not as much pure risk,18A. That would be correct.In terms of problem solving, the factor on the20correct.2021(h0:00 a.m.)2122EARLE, Q.C.:2123Q. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors,2124would you tell us which factors incorporate2225risk taking, and let me give you an example of2226risk taking, and let me give you are example of2327Page 42Page 421what I mean by that. If you are the President22and CEO of a software company and you're in33the business of bringing out new software34products, a big success in bringing out new software35software product can be wonderful for the56company. Failure, because there's been a huge77upfront development investment, can be a88distart. So tha's risk bachaviour. Tell me89where in your factors for an organization you915risk. Ithink if we learnt anything from the1016newspapers as of cecent months, we don't want1117to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take18high risk situations. I think that's how1819take more risk, therefore, we're going to give more points if you2012say we're going to give more points if you2013A. We incorporate | 16 | relative to all other similar jobs? | | 16 | technical challenge in being half of a company |
| 18 A. That would be correct. Imean, it's a bigger 18 but we're recognizing vertical integration. 19 definition than that, but that would be 19 In terms of problem solving, the factor on the 20 correct. 20 how complex are the decisions you make. We 21 (10:00 a.m.) 21 how complex are the decisions you make. We 22 AcARLE, Q.C.: 20 don't as much care about their pure risk; if 23 Q. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors, 23 you make a bad decision, something terrible 24 would you tell us which factors incorporate 24 happens. If we were to score a job for 25 risk taking, and let me give you an example of 25 consequence of error, our term for your 2 definition than that, but that would be measured souther in your factors for an organization you 9 world to an airplane mechanic, because if the 3 the business of bringing out new software 4 happens. We don't believe a job should be measured on what if it performs badly. We 6 company. Failure, because there's been a huge 7 performs as expected. So we don't measure 7 upfront development investment, can be a 8 6 co | 17 MR. 4 | ABOUD: | | 17 | than a whole. So it's not as much pure risk, |
| 19definition than that, but that would be correct.19In terms of problem solving, the factor on the page called thinking challenge is a measure of how complex are the decisions you make. We don't as much care about their pure risk; if you make a bad decision, something terrible happens. If we were to score a job for 2525Page 42Page 421what I mean by that. If you are the President a dn CEO of a software company and you're in 3Page 421what I mean by that. If you are the President a dn CEO of a software company and you're in software products, a big success in bringing out new software software products, a big success in bringing out a new s1example, we might give most points in the world to an airplane mechanic, because if the airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster7upfront development investment, can be a s disaster. So tha's risk behaviour. Tell me 97performs as expected. So we don't measure the sit is faces and problem solving, and in accountability, again 1111the job?11this is't exactly risk. We measure the size of the decisions, are you making smaller 1414different ways than I think you're definition 1513or small decisions. All else being the same, the bigger decisions. All else being the same, the bigger decisions. So we measure | 18 A. | That would be correct. I mean, it's a bigge | er | 18 | but we're recognizing vertical integration. |
| 20correct.20page called thinking challenge is a measure of21 (10:00 a.m.)21how complex are the decisions you make. We22 EARLE, Q.C.:20don't as much care about their pure risk; if23Q. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors,21don't as much care about their pure risk; if24would you tell us which factors incorporate22don't as much care about their pure risk; if24would you tell us which factors incorporate24happens. If we were to score a job for25consequence of error, our term for yourPage 421what I mean by that. If you are the President1example, we might give most points in the2usfaster. So tha's risk behaviour. Tell me3airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster4products, a big success in bringing out a new4happens. We don't believe a job should be5software product can be wonderful for the5measured on what if it performs badly. We6company. Failure, because there's been a huge7performs as expected. So we don't measure7upfront development investment, can be a7performs as expected. So we don't measure8disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me8consequence of risk, but we measure how9where in your factors for an organization you9complex are the challenges that it faces and10incorporate the risk that's associated with11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12M. Me incorporate your definition of risk in | 19 | definition than that, but that would be | | 19 | In terms of problem solving, the factor on the |
| 121 (10:00 a.m.)11how complex are the decisions you make. We22 EARLE, Q.C.:22don't as much care about their pure risk; if23Q. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors,23you make a bad decision, something terrible24would you tell us which factors incorporate25consequence of error, our term for your25risk taking, and let me give you an example of25consequence of error, our term for your24what I mean by that. If you are the President1example, we might give most points in the3the business of bringing out new software3airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster4products, a big success in bringing out a new4happens. We don't believe a job should be5software product can be wonderful for the5measured on what if it performs badly. We6company. Failure, because there's been a huge7performs as expected. So we don't measure7upfront development investment, can be a7performs as expected. So we don't measure8disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me8consequence of risk, but we measure how9where in your factors for an organization you9complex are the challenges that it faces and10incorporate the risk that's associated with11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR. ABOUD:12of the decisions, and in accountability, again13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in13or small decisions. All else being the same,1 | 20 | correct. | | 20 | page called thinking challenge is a measure of |
| 22EARLE, Q.C.:22don't as much care about their pure risk; if23Q. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors,23you make a bad decision, something terrible24would you tell us which factors incorporate24happens. If we were to score a job for25risk taking, and let me give you an example of25consequence of error, our term for your24what I mean by that. If you are the President1example, we might give most points in the3the business of bringing out new software3airplane mechanic, because if the4products, a big success in bringing out a new5software product can be wonderful for the5software product can be wonderful for the5measured on what if it performs badly. We6company. Failure, because there's been a huge7performs as expected. So we don't measure7upfront development investment, can be a7performs as expected. So we don't measure8disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me8consequence of risk, but we measure how9where in your factors for an organization you9complex are the challenges that if faces and10incorporate your definition of risk in11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in13rsk. I think if we learnt anything from the14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions. All else being the same,14the was an economic meltdown. So we don't19 <tr< td=""><td>21 (10:0</td><td>00 a.m.)</td><td></td><td>21</td><td>how complex are the decisions you make. We</td></tr<> | 21 (10:0 | 00 a.m.) | | 21 | how complex are the decisions you make. We |
| 23 Q. Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factors, 23 you make a bad decision, something terrible 24 would you tell us which factors incorporate 24 happens. If we were to score a job for 25 risk taking, and let me give you an example of 25 consequence of error, our term for your 24 what I mean by that. If you are the President 1 example, we might give most points in the 2 world to an airplane mechanic, because if the 3 airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster 4 products, a big success in bringing out a new 4 happens. We don't believe a job should be 5 software product can be wonderful for the 5 measured on what if it performs badly. We 6 company. Failure, because there's been a huge 6 believe a job should be measured assuming it 7 upfront development investment, can be a 8 consequence of risk, but we measure how 9 where in your factors for an organization you 9 complex are the challenges that if faces and 10 incorporate way than I think you're defining 11 this isn't exactly risk. We measure he size 12 MR ABOUD: 13 A. We incorporate your definition of risk in 13 | 22 EARI | .E, Q.C.: | | 22 | don't as much care about their pure risk; if |
| 24 would you tell us which factors incorporate 24 happens. If we were to score a job for 25 risk taking, and let me give you an example of 25 consequence of error, our term for your Page 42 1 what I mean by that. If you are the President 1 example, we might give most points in the 2 and CEO of a software company and you're in 3 the business of bringing out anew software 4 arglane mechanic, because if the 3 the business of bringing out a new software product can be wonderful for the 5 measured on what if it performs badly. We 6 company. Failure, because there's been a huge 7 performs as expected. So we don't measure 8 disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me 9 consequence of risk, but we measure how 9 where in your factors for an organization you 9 consequence of risk, but we measure how 10 incorporate the risk that's associated with 10 problem solving, and in accountability, again 11 the job? 11 this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size 10 13 A. We incorporate your definition of risk in 13 or small decisions. All else being the same, 14 different wa | 23 Q. | Yeah, okay. Now if we go to these factor | rs, | 23 | you make a bad decision, something terrible |
| 25risk taking, and let me give you an example of25consequence of error, our term for yourPage 421what I mean by that. If you are the President1example, we might give most points in the2and CEO of a software company and you're in2world to an airplane mechanic, because if the3the business of bringing out new software3airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster4products, a big success in bringing out a new4happens. We don't believe a job should be5software product can be wonderful for the5measured on what if it performs badly. We6company. Failure, because there's been a huge6believe a job should be measured assuming it7upfront development investment, can be a7performs as expected. So we don't measure8disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me8consequence of risk, but we measure how9where in your factors for an organization you9complex are the challenges that it faces and10incorporate the risk that's associated with10problem solving, and in accountability, again11the job?11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR. ABOUD:12of the decisions, All else being the same,14different ways than I think you're defining1416newspapers as of recent months, we don't want1517to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take1718high risk situations. I think that's how18 <t< td=""><td>24</td><td>would you tell us which factors incorpora</td><td>ate</td><td>24</td><td>happens. If we were to score a job for</td></t<> | 24 | would you tell us which factors incorpora | ate | 24 | happens. If we were to score a job for |
| Page 42Page 421what I mean by that. If you are the President1example, we might give most points in the2and CEO of a software company and you're in2world to an airplane mechanic, because if the3the business of bringing out new software3airplane mechanic, because if the4products, a big success in bringing out a new4happens. We don't believe a job should be5software product can be wonderful for the5measured on what if it performs badly. We6company. Failure, because there's been a huge6believe a job should be measured assuming it7upfront development investment, can be a7performs as expected. So we don't measure8disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me8complex are the challenges that it faces and9where in your factors for an organization you9complex are the challenges that it faces and10incorporate the risk that's associated with10problem solving, and in accountability, again11the job?11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR ABOUD:12of the decision, are you making big decisions13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in13or small decisions. All else being the same,14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions you make score more15risk. I think if we learnt anything from the15points than if you're making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want | 25 | risk taking, and let me give you an exampl | e of | 25 | consequence of error, our term for your |
| 1what I mean by that. If you are the President1example, we might give most points in the2and CEO of a software company and you're in3airplane mechanic, because if the3the business of bringing out new software3airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster4products, a big success in bringing out a new4happens. We don't believe a job should be5software product can be wonderful for the5measured on what if it performs badly. We6company. Failure, because there's been a huge7performs as expected. So we don't measure7upfront development investment, can be a7performs as expected. So we don't measure8disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me8consequence of risk, but we measure how9where in your factors for an organization you9complex are the challenges that it faces and10incorporate the risk that's associated with10problem solving, and in accountability, again11the job?11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR ABOUD:12of the decisions. All else being the same,14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions you make score more15risk. I think if we learnt anything from the15points than if you're making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want17exactly risk because you shouldn't measure18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't< | | | Page 42 | | Page 44 |
| 2and CEO of a software company and you're in2world to an airplane mechanic, because if the3the business of bringing out new software3airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster4products, a big success in bringing out a new4happens. We don't believe a job should be5software product can be wonderful for the5measured on what if it performs badly. We6company. Failure, because there's been a huge6believe a job should be measured assuming it7upfront development investment, can be a7performs as expected. So we don't measure8disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me9complex are the challenges that it faces and9where in your factors for an organization you9complex are the challenges that it faces and10incorporate the risk that's associated with10problem solving, and in accountability, again11the job?11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR ABOUD:12of the decision, are you making big decisions13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in13or small decisions. All else being the same,14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions you make score more15risk. I think if we learnt anything from the15points than if you're making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want16decisions. So we measure - again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take18risk when you d | 1 | what I mean by that. If you are the Preside | nt | 1 | example, we might give most points in the |
| 3the business of bringing out new software3airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster4products, a big success in bringing out a new3airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster4believe a job should bemeasured on what if it performs badly. We6company. Failure, because there's been a huge6believe a job should be measured assuming it7upfront development investment, can be a7performs as expected. So we don't measure8disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me8consequence of risk, but we measure how9where in your factors for an organization you9complex are the challenges that it faces and10incorporate the risk that's associated with10problem solving, and in accountability, again11the job?11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR. ABOUD:12of the decisions. All else being the same,14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions you make score more15risk. I think if we learnt anything from the15points than if you're making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want16decisions. So we measure - again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take17exactly risk because you shouldn't18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't19there was an economic meltdown. So we don't20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the | 2 | and CEO of a software company and you' | re in | 2 | world to an airplane mechanic, because if the |
| 4products, a big success in bringing out a new4happens. We don't believe a job should be5software product can be wonderful for the5measured on what if it performs badly. We6company. Failure, because there's been a huge6believe a job should be measured assuming it7upfront development investment, can be a7performs as expected. So we don't measure8disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me8consequence of risk, but we measure how9where in your factors for an organization you9complex are the challenges that it faces and10incorporate the risk that's associated with10problem solving, and in accountability, again11the job?11this in't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR. ABOUD:12of the decisions. All else being the same,14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions you making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want16decisions. So we measure again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take17exactly risk because you shouldn't measure18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't19there was an economic meltdown. So we don't20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the21take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay21business, challenge of the decisions, and size22you more if you put the company in potential22of the decisions. | 3 | the business of bringing out new softwa | re | 3 | airplane mechanic does something bad, disaster |
| 5software product can be wonderful for the 65measured on what if it performs badly. We believe a job should be measured assuming it performs as expected. So we don't measure for an organization you7upfront development investment, can be a disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me 96believe a job should be measured assuming it performs as expected. So we don't measure to some don't measure performs as expected. So we don't measure to some disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me 98disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me 98consequence of risk, but we measure how 99where in your factors for an organization you 109complex are the challenges that it faces and 1010incorporate the risk that's associated with 1110problem solving, and in accountability, again 1111the job?11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size 1212MR. ABOUD:12of the decisions. All else being the same, 1414different ways than I think you're defining 1514the bigger decisions you make score more 1515risk. I think if we learnt anything from the 1615points than if you're making smaller 1616newspapers as of recent months, we don't want 1716decisions. So we measure again it's not 1717to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take 1817exactly risk because you shouldn't measure 1818high risk situations. I think that's how 1918risk when you determine you shouldn't 1920say | 4 | products, a big success in bringing out a ne | ew | 4 | happens. We don't believe a job should be |
| 6company. Failure, because there's been a huge6believe a job should be measured assuming it7upfront development investment, can be a7performs as expected. So we don't measure8disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me8consequence of risk, but we measure how9where in your factors for an organization you9complex are the challenges that it faces and10incorporate the risk that's associated with10problem solving, and in accountability, again11the job?11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR. ABOUD:12of the decision, are you making big decisions13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in13or small decisions. All else being the same,14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions you make score more15risk. I think if we learnt anything from the15points than if you're making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want16decisions. So we measure again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take17exactly risk because you shouldn't measure18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't20say we're going to give more points if you20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the21take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay21business, challenge of the decisions, and size22you more if you put the company in potential23risk. | 5 | software product can be wonderful for the | he | 5 | measured on what if it performs badly. We |
| 7upfront development investment, can be a disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me 97performs as expected. So we don't measure ensure how9where in your factors for an organization you 109consequence of risk, but we measure how 910incorporate the risk that's associated with 1110problem solving, and in accountability, again 1111the job?11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR. ABOUD:12of the decision, are you making big decisions13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in 1413or small decisions. All else being the same, 1414different ways than I think you're defining 1514the bigger decisions you make score more 1516newspapers as of recent months, we don't want 1616decisions. So we measure again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take 1817exactly risk because you shouldn't measure 1818high risk situations. I think that's how 2018risk when you determine you shouldn't 2021take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay 2221business, challenge of the decisions, and size 2223long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we 2423risk.2424do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not 2524EARLE, QC:25necessrily Lwouldn't define it as rick25024Collrisk rake my example and look at | 6 | company. Failure, because there's been a | huge | 6 | believe a job should be measured assuming it |
| 8disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me8consequence of risk, but we measure how9where in your factors for an organization you9complex are the challenges that it faces and10incorporate the risk that's associated with10problem solving, and in accountability, again11the job?11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR. ABOUD:12of the decision, are you making big decisions13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in13or small decisions. All else being the same,14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions you make score more15risk. I think if we learnt anything from the15points than if you're making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want16decisions. So we measure again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take17exactly risk because you shouldn't measure18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't19there was an economic meltdown. So we don't20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the21take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay21business, challenge of the decisions, and size22you more if you put the company in potential22of the decisions. None of those are exactly23long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we24colcol24do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not24EARLE, Q.C.:< | 7 | upfront development investment, can be | e a | 7 | performs as expected. So we don't measure |
| 9where in your factors for an organization you9complex are the challenges that it faces and10incorporate the risk that's associated with10problem solving, and in accountability, again11the job?11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR. ABOUD:12of the decision, are you making big decisions13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in13or small decisions. All else being the same,14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions you make score more15risk. I think if we learnt anything from the15points than if you're making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want16decisions. So we measure again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take17exactly risk because you shouldn't measure18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't19there was an economic meltdown. So we don't20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the21take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay21business, challenge of the decisions, and size22you more if you put the company in potential22of the decisions. None of those are exactly23long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we23risk.24do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not24EARLE, Q.C.:25necesserily L would't define it as risk25O | 8 | disaster. So that's risk behaviour. Tell me | e | 8 | consequence of risk, but we measure how |
| 10incorporate the risk that's associated with10problem solving, and in accountability, again11the job?11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR. ABOUD:12of the decision, are you making big decisions13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in13or small decisions. All else being the same,14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions you make score more15risk. I think if we learnt anything from the15points than if you're making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want16decisions. So we measure again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take17exactly risk because you shouldn't measure18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't19there was an economic meltdown. So we don't20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the20say we're going to give more points if you21business, challenge of the decisions, and size22you more if you put the company in potential22of the decisions. None of those are exactly23long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we23risk.24do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not24EARLE, Q.C.:25necessarily Lwouldn't define it as risk24Mell let's take my example and look at | 9 | where in your factors for an organization y | /ou | 9 | complex are the challenges that it faces and |
| 11the job?11this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size12MR. ABOUD:12of the decision, are you making big decisions13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in13or small decisions. All else being the same,14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions you make score more15risk. I think if we learnt anything from the15points than if you're making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want16decisions. So we measure again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take17exactly risk because you shouldn't measure18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't19there was an economic meltdown. So we don't20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the20say we're going to give more points if you20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the21take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay21business, challenge of the decisions, and size22you more if you put the company in potential22of the decisions. None of those are exactly23long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we23risk.24do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not24EARLE, Q.C.:25necessarily Lwouldn't define it as rick25026well let's take my example and look at | 10 | incorporate the risk that's associated with | 1 | 10 | problem solving, and in accountability, again |
| 12 MR. ABOUD:12of the decision, are you making big decisions13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in13or small decisions. All else being the same,14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions you make score more15risk. I think if we learnt anything from the14the bigger decisions you make score more16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want16decisions. So we measure again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take17exactly risk because you shouldn't measure18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't19there was an economic meltdown. So we don't19encourage people to take risk when you set20say we're going to give more points if you20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the21take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay21business, challenge of the decisions, and size22you more if you put the company in potential22of the decisions. None of those are exactly23long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we23risk.24do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not250Well25necessarily I wouldn't define it as risk250Well | 11 | the job? | | 11 | this isn't exactly risk. We measure the size |
| 13A. We incorporate your definition of risk in different ways than I think you're defining risk. I think if we learnt anything from the newspapers as of recent months, we don't want to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take high risk situations. I think that's how 1913or small decisions. All else being the same, the bigger decisions you make score more points than if you're making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take high risk situations. I think that's how 1914the bigger decisions. All else being the same, the bigger decisions you make score more points than if you're making smaller17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take high risk situations. I think that's how there was an economic meltdown. So we don't 2016exactly risk because you shouldn't measure encourage people to take risk when you set 2020say we're going to give more points if you 2120pay, but rather we measure complexity of the 2122you more if you put the company in potential 2322of the decisions. None of those are exactly 2323long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we 2423risk.24do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not24EARLE, Q.C.:25necessarily Lwouldy't define it as risk250Well | 12 MR. / | ABOUD: | | 12 | of the decision, are you making big decisions |
| 14different ways than I think you're defining14the bigger decisions you make score more15risk. I think if we learnt anything from the15points than if you're making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want16decisions. So we measure again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take17exactly risk because you shouldn't measure18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't19there was an economic meltdown. So we don't19encourage people to take risk when you set20say we're going to give more points if you20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the21take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay21business, challenge of the decisions, and size22you more if you put the company in potential22of the decisions. None of those are exactly23long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we23risk.24do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not24A more if you put the company in potential25necessarily I wouldn't define it as rick25026well let's take my example and look at | 13 A. | We incorporate your definition of risk in | n | 13 | or small decisions. All else being the same, |
| 15Fisk. I think if we learnt anything from the15points than if you re making smaller16newspapers as of recent months, we don't want16decisions. So we measure again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take16exactly risk because you shouldn't measure18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't19there was an economic meltdown. So we don't19encourage people to take risk when you set20say we're going to give more points if you20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the21take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay21business, challenge of the decisions, and size22you more if you put the company in potential22of the decisions. None of those are exactly23long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we23risk.24do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not24EARLE, Q.C.:25necessarily I wouldn't define it as risk250 | 14 | different ways than I think you re defining | ıg | 14 | the bigger decisions you make score more |
| 16hewspapers as of recent months, we don't want16decisions. So we measure again it's not17to emphasize enhancing pay for people to take17exactly risk because you shouldn't measure18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't19there was an economic meltdown. So we don't19encourage people to take risk when you set20say we're going to give more points if you20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the21take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay21business, challenge of the decisions, and size22you more if you put the company in potential22of the decisions. None of those are exactly23long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we23risk.24do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not24EARLE, Q.C.:25necessarily I wouldn't define it as risk250 | 15 | risk. I think if we learnt anything from the | | 15 | points than if you re making smaller |
| 17to emphasize eminancing pay for people to take17exactly fisk because you shouldn't measure18high risk situations. I think that's how18risk when you determine you shouldn't19there was an economic meltdown. So we don't19encourage people to take risk when you set20say we're going to give more points if you20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the21take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay21business, challenge of the decisions, and size22you more if you put the company in potential22of the decisions. None of those are exactly23long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we23risk.24do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not24EARLE, Q.C.:25necessarily I wouldn't define it as risk250 | 10 | newspapers as of recent months, we don't | want | 10 | decisions. So we measure again it shot |
| 18Ingit fisk situations. If think that s now18fisk when you determine you shouldn't19there was an economic meltdown. So we don't19encourage people to take risk when you set20say we're going to give more points if you20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the21take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay20pay, but rather we measure complexity of the22you more if you put the company in potential22of the decisions. None of those are exactly23long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we23risk.24do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not24EARLE, Q.C.:25necessarily I wouldn't define it as risk250 | 10 | high risk situations. I think that's how | lake | 1/ | rick when you determine you shouldn't |
| say we're going to give more points if you take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay you more if you put the company in potential long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not necessarily - Lwouldn't define, it as risk | 10 | there was an according maltdown. So we | don't | 18 | nsk when you determine you shouldn't |
| 20 say we're going to give more points in you 21 take more risk, therefore, we're going to pay 22 you more if you put the company in potential 23 long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we 24 do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not 25 necessarily - Lwouldn't define it as risk 26 pay, but rather we measure complexity of the 21 business, challenge of the decisions, and size 22 of the decisions. None of those are exactly 23 risk. 24 25 necessarily - Lwouldn't define it as risk 25 necessarily - Lwouldn't define it as risk | 20 | say we're going to give more points if w | | 19 | neounage people to take fisk when you set |
| 21 take more fisk, therefore, we regoing to pay 22 you more if you put the company in potential 23 long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we 24 do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not 25 necessarily Lwouldn't define it as risk 26 Nell let's take my example and look at | 20 | say we re going to give more points II yo | Ju av | 20 | business challenge of the decisions and size |
| 22 you more if you put the company in potential 23 long term jeopardy. We don't do that, but we 24 do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not 25 necessarily Lwouldn't define it as risk 26 Note of the decisions. Note of those are exactly 27 risk. 28 EARLE, Q.C.: 29 Note of the decisions. Note of those are exactly 29 Note of the decisions. Note of those are exactly 20 Note of those are exactly 21 In the decisions. Note of those are exactly 22 In the decisions. Note of those are exactly 23 risk. 24 EARLE, Q.C.: 25 O Well let's take my example and look at | $\begin{vmatrix} 21\\22 \end{vmatrix}$ | vou more if you put the company in poter | ay tial | 21 | of the decisions. None of those are exactly |
| do incorporate the challenge of a job, but not necessarily Lwouldn't define it as risk 25 Nethoday Lwouldn't define it as risk 25 Nethoday Lwouldn't define it as risk 25 Nethoday Lwouldn't define it as risk | | long term jeonardy. We don't do that but | we | 22 | rick |
| 2^{2+} as meorporate the channenge of a job, but not 2^{2+} EARLE, Q.C | $\begin{bmatrix} 23\\ 24 \end{bmatrix}$ | do incorporate the challenge of a job but r | not | 23 24 FADI | FOC: |
| 12. Incompanity - I would fully interview. $12.$ OF WOLL IN STAKE IN CAUTOR AND INFORMATION | 25 | necessarily I wouldn't define it as risk | | 25 O | Well, let's take my example and look at |

| Oc | tober 26, 2009 Mult | i-Pa | ige "" | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|----|--|------|--------|--|
| | Page 45 | | | Page 47 |
| 1 | accountability and nature of impact. Wouldn't | 1 | | intensive, they have a massive amount of |
| 2 | nature of impact incorporate the fact that a | 2 | | assets for which one person is responsible. |
| 3 | job requires making decisions which can lead | 3 | | and they need the absolute most blue chip |
| 4 | to very high profit or very large loss by a | 4 | | person they can find in the world to open that |
| 5 | company? | 5 | | mine on time, to standard, and to produce the |
| 6 | MR. ABOUD: | 6 | | product they expect, so they'll pay whatever |
| 7 | A. Well, that might be someone's interpretation | 7 | | they have to pay, but they're paying it |
| 8 | of the words "nature of impact", but that's | 8 | | because they're capital intensive and pay is a |
| 9 | not the mechanics of the HAY tool subsection | 9 | | meaningless item on their PNL statement. |
| 10 | called "nature of impact". It is not that. | 10 | | They're not paying it or they shouldn't be |
| 11 | EARLE. O.C.: | 11 | | paving it because we want someone who's going |
| 12 | O. And are you telling us that because you don't | 12 | | to make the most high risk decisions possible. |
| 13 | want people to be paid on the basis of risk | 13 | | and consequently we have major banks going |
| 14 | taking, that you don't account for this? | 14 | | bankruptcy. They won't pay because of risk. |
| 15 | MR. ABOUD: | 15 | | they'll pay because of the job challenge. |
| 16 | A No. I'm not saving that. I'm saving to | 16 | | though. |
| 17 | properly score a job, you do not give it more | 17 | EARI | E.O.C.: |
| 18 | points because the nature of it making a | 18 | 0. | Speaking of the percentile level, isn't that - |
| 19 | decision that causes disaster is an | 19 | χ. | - because you indicated that mining generally |
| 20 | expectation of the job You don't score a | 20 | | pays high retail generally pays low That is |
| 21 | consequence of error but when you're pricing | 21 | | a landscape, that is essentially established |
| 22 | a job to the market if there is a business | 22 | | irrespective of people like HAY Group right? |
| 23 | sector that pays high for risk like investment | 23 | MR A | NBOUD. |
| 24 | banking actually my background we as | 24 | Δ | Oh absolutely yes |
| 25 | investment bankers, as capital market bankers. | 25 | EARI | E.O.C.: |
| | | | | D 40 |
| 1 | Page 40 | | 0 | Page 48 |
| | would not set our pay market to be the | | Q. | So where companies put their employees |
| | commercial industrial index. We would set our | | | decision. You only evaluate it? |
| | pay market to be investment banking or capital | | | decision. You only evaluate it? |
| | differential than the bread in best in best in best in | 4 | MR. A | ABOUD: |
| 5 | differently than the broad industrial sector, | 5 | А. | My goodness, that couldn't be well, truly |
| 6 | but my points as an investment banker wouldn't | 6 | | the decision is the Board or the Committee of |
| 7 | necessarily score more than my points as a | 7 | | the Board, and then it's the company to |
| 8 | regional manager of a company that sells paper | 8 | | implement it, both hopefully using HAY as |
| 9 | products. Just because I have a riskier | 9 | | assistance in the background, but, yes. |
| 10 | position, I wouldn't score more points, but I | 10 | EARL | E, Q.C.: |
| 11 | might get paid more if I priced to the | 11 | Q. | Now you indicated that you can slice and dice |
| 12 | investment banking market. | 12 | | your data to come up with just about any kind |
| 13 | EARLE, Q.C.: | 13 | | of sample that a client would want, correct? |
| 14 | Q. Okay. Would it be fair to say that within the | 14 | MR. A | ABOUD: |
| 15 | commercial industrial industries that a | 15 | A. | Correct. |
| 16 | position that has more risk, like mining, | 16 | EARL | E, Q.C.: |
| 17 | would be ranked in a higher position? | 17 | Q. | So, for instance, for a database for |
| 18 | MR. ABOUD: | 18 | | comparison, you could create a database, a |
| 19 | A. There's a correlation between risk and pay, | 19 | | sub-base, out of your 532 for companies having |
| 20 | but there's not a cause/effect relationship. | 20 | | sales less than a billion dollars? |
| 21 | So the fact that there's a correlation, mining | 21 | MR. A | ABOUD: |
| 22 | has higher pay, mining has higher risk, | 22 | А. | Correct, yes. |
| 23 | doesn't lead to the assumption that higher | 23 | EARL | E, Q.C.: |
| 24 | risk equals higher pay. The reason mining has | 24 | Q. | Or companies having a book value less than 2 |
| 25 | higher pay is that they're very capital | 25 | | billion dollars? |

| October 26, 2009 Mul | ti-Page [™] NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|--|
| Page 49 | Page 51 |
| 1 MR. ABOUD: | 1 are only 35 who are head officed in the |
| 2 A. Sure. | 2 Maritimes. |
| 3 EARLE, Q.C.: | 3 EARLE, Q.C.: |
| 4 Q. And you could create an Atlantic utility | 4 Q. Obviously, I'm not familiar enough with |
| 5 database, right? | 5 Atlantic Canada to pick out 35, but I think |
| 6 MR. ABOUD: | 6 you would agree with me that there are a lot |
| 7 A. In theory, as long as there's enough | 7 more than 35 substantial businesses with Chief |
| 8 observations to support it, ves. | 8 Executive Officers and Presidents in the |
| 9 EARLE, O.C.: | 9 commercial industrial sector in Atlantic |
| 10 0. And likewise a Canadian utilities database? | 10 Canada, right? |
| 11 MR. ABOUD: | 11 MR. ABOUD: |
| 12 A. Yes. | 12 A. I'm sure that's true. So we don't have |
| 13 EARLE O.C.: | 13 Irvings, we don't have McCains, we don't have |
| 14 0 Or an Atlantic Canada regional database? | 14 Sobevs in the database their empire |
| 15 MR ABOUD | 15 FARLE OC: |
| 16 A Ves that's true | 16 O Now you've got this Canadian industrial |
| 17 FAPLE OC | 10 Q. Now you've get this Canadian industrial |
| 17 EARLE, Q.C | 17 commercial subset, and looking at your table |
| 10 Atlantic Canada database Vou thought it | 10 figures skew higher in the top 50th |
| 19 Atlantic Canada database. Tou thought it | ngures skew higher in the top 50th |
| 20 Inight hot work statistically? | 20 percentile, is that confect? |
| 21 MR. ABOUD: | 21 MR. ABOUD: |
| 22 A. Conect. | A. The data values would be well, as |
| 23 EARLE, Q.C.: | 23 Infustratively, P75 is in the top half, P25 is |
| 24 Q. Now that really is a problem of the data that | 24 In the bottom hall, so, yes, the values of P75 |
| | 25 are nonceably higher than F25. |
| Page 50 | Page 52 |
| | |
| I MR. ABOUD: | 1 EARLE, Q.C.: |
| 2 A. I think it's a reality of the economic | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? 4 MR. ABOUD: |
| 1 MR. ABOUD: 2 A. I think it's a reality of the economic 3 landscape of Canada. 4 EARLE, Q.C.: 5 Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. EARLE, Q.C.: |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? MR. ABOUD: |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. Right. | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. Right. EARLE, Q.C.: | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. EARLE, Q.C.: |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. Right. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. Right. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you don't have enough companies providing you with | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. MR. ABOUD: |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. Right. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you don't have enough companies providing you with data? | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. MR. ABOUD: A. So the range of pay at P10 would likely be |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. Right. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you don't have enough companies providing you with data? MR. ABOUD: | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. MR. ABOUD: A. So the range of pay at P10 would likely be about 20 percent less than that of P25. The |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. Right. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you don't have enough companies providing you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. That's a shared problem. Not enough provide | EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. MR. ABOUD: A. So the range of pay at P10 would likely be about 20 percent less than that of P25. The range of P90 would likely be about 25 percent |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. Right. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you don't have enough companies providing you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. That's a shared problem. Not enough provide us, but in absolute there are not enough. | 1 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? 4 MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. 6 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? 8 MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. 11 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. 13 MR. ABOUD: A. So the range of pay at P10 would likely be about 20 percent less than that of P25. The range of P90 would likely be about 25 percent higher than P75. I don't know what the |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. 4 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. Right. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you don't have enough companies providing you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. That's a shared problem. Not enough provide us, but in absolute there are not enough. | 1 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? 4 MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. 6 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? 8 MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. 11 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. 13 MR. ABOUD: A. So the range of pay at P10 would likely be about 20 percent less than that of P25. The range of P90 would likely be about 25 percent 17 higher than P75. I don't know what the absolute value of P100 or P1 are, but there |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. 4 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. Right. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you don't have enough companies providing you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. That's a shared problem. Not enough provide us, but in absolute there are not enough. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. I mean, looking at the companies here, you do | 1 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? 4 MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. 6 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? 8 MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. 11 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. 13 MR. ABOUD: A. So the range of pay at P10 would likely be about 20 percent less than that of P25. The range of P90 would likely be about 25 percent 17 higher than P75. I don't know what the absolute value of P100 or P1 are, but there 19 would be noticeable variability as you go from |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. 4 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. Right. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you don't have enough companies providing you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. That's a shared problem. Not enough provide us, but in absolute there are not enough. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. I mean, looking at the companies here, you do not have a lot of them that operate in | 1 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? 4 MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. 6 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? 8 MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. 11 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. 13 MR. ABOUD: A. So the range of pay at P10 would likely be about 20 percent less than that of P25. The range of P90 would likely be about 25 percent 17 higher than P75. I don't know what the absolute value of P100 or P1 are, but there 19 would be noticeable variability as you go from P1 to P100 in terms of dollar value, |
| A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. Right. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you don't have enough companies providing you with data? MR. ABOUD: A. That's a shared problem. Not enough provide us, but in absolute there are not enough. EARLE, Q.C.: Q. I mean, looking at the companies here, you do not have a lot of them that operate in Newfoundland? | 1 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? 4 MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. 6 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? 8 MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. 11 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. 13 MR. ABOUD: A. So the range of pay at P10 would likely be about 20 percent less than that of P25. The range of P90 would likely be about 25 percent higher than P75. I don't know what the absolute value of P100 or P1 are, but there would be noticeable variability as you go from P1 to P100 in terms of dollar value, noticeable variability. |
| 1 MR. ABOUD: A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. 4 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? 9 MR. ABOUD: A. Right. 11 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you don't have enough companies providing you with data? 15 MR. ABOUD: A. That's a shared problem. Not enough provide us, but in absolute there are not enough. 18 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. I mean, looking at the companies here, you do not have a lot of them that operate in Newfoundland? 22 MR. ABOUD: | 1 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? 4 MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. 6 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? 8 MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not 2 zero. 11 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. 13 MR. ABOUD: A. So the range of pay at P10 would likely be about 20 percent less than that of P25. The range of P90 would likely be about 25 percent higher than P75. I don't know what the absolute value of P100 or P1 are, but there would be noticeable variability as you go from P1 to P100 in terms of dollar value, noticeable variability. 22 EARLE, Q.C.: |
| 1 MR. ABOUD: A. I think it's a reality of the economic landscape of Canada. 4 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of your report, these are companies which agreed to provide you with data? 9 MR. ABOUD: A. Right. 11 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you don't have enough companies providing you with data? 15 MR. ABOUD: A. That's a shared problem. Not enough provide us, but in absolute there are not enough. 18 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. I mean, looking at the companies here, you do not have a lot of them that operate in Newfoundland? 22 MR. ABOUD: A. Well, we have I don't know specifically | 1 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? 4 MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. 6 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? 8 MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not 2 zero. 11 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. 13 MR. ABOUD: A. So the range of pay at P10 would likely be about 20 percent less than that of P25. The range of P90 would likely be about 25 percent 17 higher than P75. I don't know what the 18 absolute value of P100 or P1 are, but there 19 would be noticeable variability as you go from P1 to P100 in terms of dollar value, P2 EARLE, Q.C.: P3 O. But would it be fair to say that there's a bit |
| 1 MR. ABOUD: 2 A. I think it's a reality of the economic 3 landscape of Canada. 4 EARLE, Q.C.: 5 Q. Well, isn't it true that if we look at the 6 companies listed on pages 11 through 13 of 7 your report, these are companies which agreed 8 to provide you with data? 9 MR. ABOUD: 10 A. Right. 11 EARLE, Q.C.: 12 Q. So your problem in Atlantic Canada is that you 13 don't have enough companies providing you with 14 data? 15 MR. ABOUD: 16 A. That's a shared problem. Not enough provide 17 us, but in absolute there are not enough. 18 EARLE, Q.C.: 19 Q. I mean, looking at the companies here, you do 20 not have a lot of them that operate in 21 Newfoundland? 22 MR. ABOUD: 23 A. Well, we have I don't know specifically 24 about Newfoundland. There are hundreds of | 1 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yes, the range P50 to P75 is higher than the range P50 to P25, right? 4 MR. ABOUD: A. By mathematical definition, absolutely, yes. 6 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. Yeah, what is the range zero to 100? 8 MR. ABOUD: A. The proper definition would be 1 to 100, not zero. 11 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. 1 to 100. 13 MR. ABOUD: A. So the range of pay at P10 would likely be about 20 percent less than that of P25. The range of P90 would likely be about 25 percent higher than P75. I don't know what the absolute value of P100 or P1 are, but there would be noticeable variability as you go from P1 to P100 in terms of dollar value, noticeable variability. 2 EARLE, Q.C.: Q. But would it be fair to say that there's a bit of a clustering below the P50 down to, say. |

| October 26, 2009 Multi | | i-Page TM | | NP's 2010 General Rate Application | |
|---|--------|----------------------|-------|--|--|
| Pa | age 53 | | | Page 55 | |
| 1 MR. ABOUD: | 0 | 1 | | median. On a big database, it typically | |
| 2 A. Actually, it would be the opposite. The more | re 🛛 | 2 | | doesn't necessarily matter, but I don't have | |
| 3 you go to the outer edges of the piece, the | | 3 | | them in front of me. | |
| 4 more you have those extremely low payir | ng | 4 | KELL | Y, Q.C.: | |
| 5 outliers and extremely high paying outliers, | | 5 | Q. | In terms of an undertaking, Mr. Chairman, I | |
| 6 so in a private sector organization where | | 6 | | don't know that that materially adds anything | |
| 7 they're getting a million stock options a | | 7 | | to the Board's understanding or analysis. If | |
| 8 year, you could see a value at P100. Where | e | 8 | | it's something the Board wishes, we'll take it | |
| 9 the P75 value is 1.2 million, you might see a | ι | 9 | | under consideration, but it's a question for | |
| 10 value of 5 million because as you get to the | | 10 | | the Board. | |
| 11 extremes of the percentiles, you start to see | | 11 | EARL | E, Q.C.: | |
| 12 the outliers. That's why we don't like to | | 12 | Q. | Excuse me | |
| 13 play at the extremes because we're being | | 13 | CHAIF | RMAN: | |
| 14 influenced by outlier pay. We like to play in | | 14 | Q. | What would the value be of an average here? I | |
| 15 the middle because all the outlier impact has | ; | 15 | | mean, if I'm making a million bucks, you're | |
| been diluted and we have a more stable valu | ıe | 16 | | only making a buck, I mean, the average salary | |
| 17 in P50 than we do the | | 17 | | is \$500,000.00. That doesn't tell me | |
| 18 EARLE, Q.C.: | | 18 | | anything. I'd rather be making 500 grand now, | |
| 19 Q. That's why, Mr. Aboud, when I asked you | the | 19 | | but, I mean | |
| 20 question, I said clustering between the P15 | | 20 | MR. A | BOUD: | |
| 21 level and the P50 level? | | 21 | А. | Mr. Chair, if I may, what concerns us about | |
| 22 MR. ABOUD: | | 22 | | averages, and this is back to, sir, your | |
| A. No, 15 is outlier territory. | | 23 | | question about the outlying data. Averages | |
| 24 EARLE, Q.C.: | | 24 | | are, by definition, an average of all | |
| 25 Q. So even at the 15 percentile, you're an | | 25 | | observations, and if there are extreme low or | |
| Pa | age 54 | | | Page 56 | |
| 1 outlier in terms of lowness? | 0 | 1 | | high paying outliers, they impact the math of | |
| 2 MR. ABOUD: | | 2 | | the calculation of average. The median is the | |
| 3 A. Oh, absolutely, yes. | | 3 | | value on a list of all observations in | |
| 4 EARLE, O.C.: | | 4 | | descending order. That's right in the middle. | |
| 5 O. So where does | | 5 | | It's not impacted by the extravagantly low or | |
| 6 MR. ABOUD: | | 6 | | high outliers. So median is a more stable | |
| 7 A. You can be. | | 7 | | number. In a monster list in a very large | |
| 8 EARLE, Q.C.: | | 8 | | database, the outliers, unless they're | |
| 9 Q. Now I thought I heard you say that the | | 9 | | extraordinarily high outliers, will not impact | |
| 10 positioning of Newfoundland Power was at | the | 10 | | the average to be much different than median. | |
| 11 average, but they're at the median, aren't | | 11 | | So normally those two numbers are similar. | |
| 12 they? | | 12 | | This database is sufficiently large that | |
| 13 MR. ABOUD: | | 13 | | having the average data slight percentage | |
| 14 A. They're at the median. | | 14 | | variance different than the P50, probably | |
| 15 EARLE, Q.C.: | | 15 | | higher than P50, not lower, but certainly | |
| 16 Q. So what is what are the average salaries in | 1 | 16 | | nowhere close to P75, would be a statistic | |
| 17 your sample for the positions that you | | 17 | | that, in my opinion, isn't necessary, so | |
| provided us at page 7, and if you don't have | | 18 | | that's what the average is. | |
| 19 them off the top of your head, Mr. Kelly, we | e'd | 19 | EARL | E, Q.C.: | |
| be happy enough to receive an undertaking. | | 20 | Q. | Mr. Chairman, we agree that the average is | |
| 21 MR. ABOUD: | | 21 | - | amongst the least salient derivations that can | |
| A. And we don't have them off the top, and wit | th a | 22 | | come from this, but there are some so we | |
| big database, they're generally close to P50. | | 23 | | can dispense with that, but there are some | |
| 24 There is a statistical there is a | | 24 | | other manifestations of this data that we | |
| 25 definitional difference between average and | d b | 25 | | would like to see, in particular, Mr. Aboud, | |

| October 26, 2009 | Aulti-Pa | age | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|----------|--------|--|
| Pag | e 57 | | Page 59 |
| 1 where would Newfoundland Power fit in you | ur 1 | | determinants of that job's point value, and |
| 2 sample in terms of book value of the company | ? 2 | | the point value, therefore, is adjusted by |
| 3 MR. ABOUD: | 3 | | company size, by revenue. When we compare this |
| 4 A. Sorry, I don't know. | 4 | | job's presidential points to other job's |
| 5 EARLE, Q.C.: | 5 | | points, revenue has been the difference in |
| 6 Q. But you can find that out? | 6 | | revenue has already been mitigated. So we |
| 7 MR. ABOUD: | 7 | | care about revenue, we measure revenue, but I |
| 8 A. I can certainly find out your book value, but | 8 | | can't tell you what the ranking of, I think |
| 9 the relative positioning of book value to the | 9 | | it's 516 million, is in terms of percentile |
| 10 book values of broad orgs, we don't collect | 10 | | terms relative to all revenues. In part, it |
| 11 book value as a statistical metric in our | 11 | | matters less because the revenue differentials |
| 12 organization, so I couldn't tell you where it | 12 | | have been accounted or in the point |
| 13 sits relative to. | 13 | | differentials. |
| 14 EARLE, Q.C.: | 14 | EARLE | , Q.C.: |
| 15 Q. So you can't tell us anything about the size | 15 | Q. | Well, Mr. Aboud, would you agree with me that |
| 16 of the companies in your sample? | 16 | | it is a relevant point factor for the |
| 17 MR. ABOUD: | 17 | | evaluation of a CEO position? |
| 18 A. Size is one of the factors we measure again, | 18 | MR. AI | BOUD: |
| 19 but book value is not the applicable metric of | 19 | А. | Yes, absolutely. |
| 20 size. | 20 | EARLE | , Q.C.: |
| 21 EARLE, Q.C.: | 21 | Q. | Okay, and would you also agree that if you had |
| 22 Q. I believe I did hear you say that you do | 22 | | a company that is stagnant in its revenue |
| collect the sales/revenue figure? | 23 | | growth or has very small revenue growth, that |
| 24 MR. ABOUD: | 24 | | you would expect that relative to the entire |
| 25 A. Absolutely, sir. | 25 | | sample, which in Canada, you know, companies |
| Pag | e 58 | | Page 60 |
| 1 EARLE, Q.C.: | 1 | | have generally seen quite expanding revenues, |
| 2 Q. Can you tell us where Newfoundland Power would | 1 2 | | that this would be an indicator for reduced |
| 3 sit amongst your sample in terms of | 3 | | points on the part of that Chief Executive? |
| 4 sales/revenue? | 4 | MR. A | BOUD: |
| 5 MR. ABOUD: | 5 | А. | No, I do not agree that the rate of revenue |
| 6 A. So your revenue is in the area of between 5 | 6 | | growth is a point factor. If the rate of |
| 7 and 600 million dollars? | 7 | | revenue growth is indicative of organizational |
| 8 EARLE, Q.C.: | 8 | | complexities, the resulting complexities are |
| 9 Q. Very close to 5. | 9 | | measured in points, but the coincidental |
| 10 MR. ABOUD: | 10 | | factor of revenue growth as opposed to revenue |
| 11 A. Very close to 5. We have revenue of the | 11 | | absolute, revenue growth is not a factor in |
| 12 organizations of Appendix C that would be from | 12 | | our point determination. |
| 13 100 million, much smaller, to many billion, | 13 | EARL | E, Q.C.: |
| 14 much larger. Where it sits relative to the | 14 | Q. | So the fact that a company is now a lot |
| 15 rank order of broad orgs, honestly I don't | 15 | | smaller in terms of revenue relative to your |
| 16 know. | 16 | | sample than it was ten years ago does not |
| 17 EARLE, Q.C.: | 17 | | impact your point system? |
| 18 Q. I guess, what percentile? | 18 | MR. A | BOUD: |
| 19 MR. ABOUD: | 19 | A. | Oh, of course it does, because the missing |
| 20 A. And I don't know because it's just something | 20 | | part of the discussion is if the premise is |
| 21 I've not done, but the recognition of revenue | 21 | | this company's revenues have been stagnant and |
| 22 is very important, so I don't want to imply I | 22 | | the database revenues have increased, the |
| 23 don't care. When we evaluate all the jobs in | 23 | | points provided to the CEOs of those other |
| 24 the database, all the other CEOs, that | 24 | | companies, whose revenues have been going up, |
| 25 company's revenue becomes one of the main | 25 | | their points have been getting higher over the |

| October 26, 2009 Multi-Pa | | ¹ NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|------------------|--|
| р | age 61 | Page 63 |
| 1 vears, and, therefore the relative positioning | 1 | dollars would be to the 40th percentile of the |
| 2 of a stagnant company's revenue, assuming | ng 2 | market? So the people so we're looking at |
| 3 that's reflective of this company, and I don' | t 3 | a range. We include P25 and P50. P40 is |
| 4 know that, it will proportionally be a lower | 4 | 3/5ths above P25 and 2/5ths below P50, so it's |
| 5 percentile in the ranking of revenues than it | 5 | a bit it's a bit closer to the P50 than it |
| 6 was before because the others have gone up | and 6 | is to P25. We can eyeball visually that to say |
| 7 their points have gone up, but this job's | 7 | that P40 for the CEO's salary could be a |
| 8 points would stay the same. | 8 | number like 340, but I don't have that data in |
| 9 EARLE, Q.C.: | 9 | front of me. |
| 10 Q. Did you tell us that the relative position | 10 EARL | E, Q.C.: |
| 11 points-wise of the President and CEO, and th | e 11 Q. | Could you undertake to supply that, Mr. Kelly? |
| 12 other positions within the Newfoundland Po | wer 12 KELL | Y, Q.C.: |
| 13 executive group have not changed, that they | 're 13 Q. | Again, Mr. Chairman, not unless it's going to |
| 14 in the same relative position towards | 14 | be of utility to the Board. I mean, we could |
| 15 MR. ABOUD: | 15 | end up with streams of numbers and broken down |
| 16 A. From the last time we did the revenue, yes. | 16 | to what degree. The question is not what is |
| 17 EARLE, Q.C.: | 17 | it at any particular level. The question is |
| 18 Q. In respect of your overall sample? | 18 | this is the pay policy that Newfoundland Power |
| 19 MR. ABOUD: | 19 | follows. The question is, is it a reasonable |
| 20 A. Yes, sir, they're the same as they were the | 20 | pay policy, and unless the information that's |
| 21 last time we did the work. | 21 | requested is going to materially assist the |
| 22 EARLE, Q.C.: | 22 | Board in that process and that analysis, I'm |
| 23 Q. And when was the last time you did it? | 23 | not prepared to simply provide undertakings to |
| 24 MR. ABOUD: | 24 | provide this stream of data or that stream of |
| 25 A. A year ago, there was a very summary | 25 | data, and some other stream of data. So we'll |
| Р | age 62 | Page 64 |
| 1 commentary on executive price comparis | on. 1 | take guidance from the Board as to whether out |
| 2 There's been degrees of intensity of the wor | [*] k 2 | of any of these requests that any of them are |
| 3 we've done. I'm going to call the last time | 3 | of material assistance to the Board. |
| 4 we did the work less intensive, but it was a | 4 EARL | .E, Q.C.: |
| 5 year ago. | 5 Q. | Well, with respect, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kelly |
| 6 EARLE, Q.C.: | 6 | hasn't provided an undertaking yet. He's |
| 7 Q. And so I recall that HAY Group was befor | re 7 | successfully resisted them all to date this |
| 8 the Board in the 1998 hearing. How many ti | mes 8 | morning. This is all relative, and surely |
| 9 would you have done this type of reevaluati | on 9 | it's of assistance to the Board to know what a |
| 10 over that period of time? | 10 | relative position of 40 percentile would |
| 11 MR. ABOUD: | 11 | translate to in dollars as compared to the |
| 12 A. Well, we would have looked at the points ev | very 12 | S0th percentile. |
| 13 time we issued a report, and I know we issu | ed 13 CHAI | RMAN: |
| 14 a report in 98 , in 04 , in 07 , and in 09 , | 14 Q. | well, I don't understand why it would be |
| 15 and now. So I would think the jobs have be | en 15 | relevant. |
| 16 looked at at least six times over that time | 16 EARL | E, Q.C.: |
| | 17 Q. | |
| 18 EARLE, Q.C.: | | KMAN: I don't understand why it would be relevant |
| 19 Q. Could you ten us, MI. Aboud, and again if y | 700 19 Q. | |
| 20 can t up this by way of a figure off the top 21 of your head where these positions in the | | ی, پری You don't understand why it would be relevant? |
| 22 table at page 7 would be if they were at the | | RMAN. |
| 22 alloc at page 7 would be, if they were at the 23 40th percentile? | 22 CHAI | Well I mean they're saying they're using 50 |
| 24 MR ABOUD | 23 - 2. | nercentile and you're saving you want the |
| 25 A. What the dollar value how the comparati | ve 25 | data for 40 percent. Is that what vou're |

| 00 | Dctober 26, 2009 Multi-Page™ | | ge TM | NP's 2010 General Rate Application | |
|---|--|--|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| | Pa | ge 65 | | | Page 67 |
| 1 | saving? | 0 | 1 | | return on equity is not fair to the rate |
| 2 | EARLE, O.C.: | | 2 | | payer, then, yes, the rate payers are picking |
| 3 | 0. That's correct. | | 3 | | up an excessive amount of the overall |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN: | 2 | 4 | | compensation, but that's a separate issue. |
| 5 | 0. Sure how is that going to help me determine - | : | 5 E | EARLE | E. O.C.: |
| 6 | I'll speak for me, how is that going to help | | 6 | 0. | Uh-hm. |
| 7 | me determine whether the President's salary | is [,] | 7 (| CHAIR | MAN: |
| 8 | reasonable or not? I mean. I can't | | 8 | 0. | What do your lawyers call it, ceteris paribus. |
| 9 | EARLE O.C.: | | 9 | x . | all other considerations aside. |
| 10 | 0. Well, we think that the positioning on the | 10 | 0 F | EARLE | E. O.C.: |
| 11 | 50th percentile is too high, that it's putting | 1 | 1 | 0. | Uh-hm. |
| 12 | the company and the particular sample whic | h 12 | 2 (| CHAIR | MAN: |
| 13 | we'll get to in a position that doesn't | 13 | 3 | 0. | You have to assume in the absence of other |
| 14 | reflect by any means the relative size of this | 14 | 4 | | considerations that the rate payers are |
| 15 | company, the growth of the company, and the | ne 1 | 5 | | picking up 25 percent of the tab. |
| 16 | security of the company. | 10 | 6 E | EARLE | E. O.C.: |
| 17 | (10:30 a.m.) | 1 | 7 | 0. | It's not 25 percent of the tab. They're |
| 18 | VICE-CHAIR WHALEN: | 18 | 8 | | picking up at the 25th percentile, which is |
| 19 | O. But you must be taking the position on the | 19 | 9 (| CHAIR | 2MAN: |
| 20 | basis of the actual numerical number then? | 20 | 0 | 0. | Okay, I'm sorry, all right, yes. |
| 21 | EARLE. O.C.: | 2 | 1 E | EARLE | E. O.C.: |
| 22 | O. Pardon? | 22 | 2 | 0. | Which is different. |
| 23 | VICE-CHAIR WHALEN: | 23 | 3 (| CHAIR | XMAN: |
| 24 | 0. Are you actually looking at it on the basis of | 24 | 4 | 0. | Yes, okay, yes. |
| 25 | numerical values themselves? | 2 | 5 E | EARLE | E. O.C.: |
| | Pa | ge 66 | | | Page 68 |
| | | | 1 | 0 | I guess it's your decision Mr. Chair whether |
| | C. Ves. it's a numerical value | | י ר | Q. | we get the 40th percentile information or not |
| | Q. 105, it's a numerical value. | | 2 2 (| | we get the 40th percentile information of not. |
| | O But 25 I mean we're only concerned from | a . | л с Л | | I mean it's not going to help me you know |
| | equilatory perspective. As Lunderstand it | a | 4 5 | Q. | I'm not I don't know what the other two |
| 6 | from what you said sir 25 percent of the | - | 5 6 F | FADIE | = 0.000 |
| | compensation falls to the rate payers is that | | 7 | | Okay Mr Chair Mr Aboud let's go to page |
| | correct? Did L hear you say that? | | / Q | Q. | four Could you look at your three bullets |
| | MD ADOUD: | | 0 | | there Would you agree with me that your first |
| 10 | MR. ABOOD. | 1(| 2 0 | | two bullets would be equally valid if your |
| | A. I said that if we take out the ETI value of 227000 from the "all in" value of 881 | 1 | 1 | | indices was a sample of privately owned US |
| $ _{12}^{11}$ | thousand the remaining the resulting | 1' | 2 | | corporations that used HAY Group services? |
| 12 | 650'ish thousand impacts the rate paver and | 13 | 2 3 N | | |
| $ _{14}^{13}$ | by coincidence, that value is very similar to | 1. | 3 F 4 | Δ | Ves that's true |
| 15 | the P25 value of the market. So to that | 14 | - 5 F | A. FARIF | |
| 16 | position sir we could say that the rate | 1. | 6 | | Yeah These first two bullets really don't go |
| 17 | payer is paying a P25 level of pay the | 17 | 7 | Q. | to the choice of the sample so much as the |
| 18 | shareholder is nicking up the differential to | 19 | 8 | | integrity of the sample correct |
| 10 | get the incumbent to P50 of the market | 10 | 0 0 1 | MR AI | |
| 20 | FARLE OC: | 21 | 0 | Δ | The second bullet goes to the choice and the |
| $\begin{vmatrix} 20 \\ 21 \end{vmatrix}$ | 0 You'd swear that the rate paver wasn't paving | σ $\left \frac{2}{2} \right $ | 1 | л. | first hullet goes to the integrity |
| $\begin{vmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 $ | the return on equity | $b \begin{vmatrix} 2 \\ \gamma' \end{vmatrix}$ | 2 F | EARIF | E O C · |
| $\begin{vmatrix} 2^{2} \\ 2^{3} \end{vmatrix}$ | CHAIRMAN: | 2 | 3 | 0 | Well, surely if there was a sample of mixed |
| $\begin{vmatrix} 23 \\ 24 \end{vmatrix}$ | 0. No, but yes but then one has to assume | 2 | 4 | ×. | public and private, that would go to the |
| 25 | that the return on equity is fair. If the | 2 | 5 | | integrity of the sample, would it not? |

| October 26, 2009 Mul | ti-Page [™] | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|----------------------|---|
| Page 6 |) | Page 71 |
| 1 MR. ABOUD: | 1 MR. ABO | DUD: |
| 2 A. Perhaps I'm not understanding the difference | 2 A. B | ut the wrong thing to do would be to base a |
| 3 between choice and integrity, but our choice | 3 bi | usiness to base pay principles on the |
| 4 was to exclude public sector, so that in my | 4 cc | bincidence of what has happened. We've got |
| 5 opinion is a matter of sample selection. | 5 to | base pay principles on the likelihood of |
| 6 EARLE, Q.C.: | 6 at | tract, retain, motivate executive talent |
| 7 Q. In any event, as you've indicated, those would | 7 re | lative to a broader spectrum of orgs than |
| 8 apply to privately owned businesses in the | 8 ju | st Fortis, and if that's the right pay |
| 9 United States? | 9 pi | rinciple, and it is, we should compare |
| 10 MR. ABOUD: | 10 ou | urselves to a sector well beyond what does |
| 11 A. In any country, yes. | 11 Fe | ortis pay. We should compare to a sector |
| 12 EARLE, Q.C.: | 12 th | at is broad Canadian. |
| 13 Q. As long as there were customers who paid it? | 13 EARLE, | Q.C.: |
| 14 MR. ABOUD: | 14 Q. W | That about if your policy is to promote from |
| 15 A. Yes, absolutely true. | 15 W | ithin, to recruit to your executive group |
| 16 EARLE, Q.C.: | 16 fr | om the junior management ranks. Doesn't |
| 17 Q. Now your third bullet seems to me to go very | 17 th | at say that your competitive positioning |
| 18 strongly to the choice of indices. Could you | 18 sh | nould be for the junior management group? |
| 19 tell us what tests you have done to determine | 19 MR. ABC | DUD: |
| 20 the extent to which Newfoundland Power has | 20 A. I 1 | think it argues more the opposite. I think |
| 21 over the past ten years actually competed with | 21 it | argues more to what I was saying because if |
| 22 organizations across the breadth and depth of | 22 ye | our intent is to build from within, recruit |
| 23 business sectors across Canada for executive | 23 fr | om within, your first priority is to |
| 24 talent? | 24 at | tract, retain, motivate the people who are |
| 25 MR. ABOUD: | 25 th | ere. You won't keep them if your pay |
| Page 70 |) | Page 72 |
| 1 A. We haven't looked at the organizations from | 1 sta | andards are below the national standard |
| 2 which and to which the five executives were | 2 be | ecause if you're out in Fortis Alberta, |
| 3 recruited or past versions of executives have | 3 yo | ou're leaving the organization if it doesn't |
| 4 left to. So the fact that by coincident your | 4 pa | ay the standard. If you're at Fortis |
| 5 executives, I think I'm going out on a bit | 5 O | ntario, you're leaving the organization if it |
| 6 of a lack of knowledge basis, your executives | 6 do | besn't pay the standard. So the core |
| 7 are more transferable from the Fortis | 7 m | echanism by which to be competitive and keep |
| 8 operating businesses than they are from other | 8 yo | our people for future development within |
| 9 organizations outside of Fortis. So your | 9 Fo | ortis is to pay to the national standard, but |
| 10 reflective market has been Fortis operating by | 10 th | en if your business culture is we want to |
| 11 the coincidence of the executives that | 11 en | acourage succession planning from within, |
| 12 currently are in place in those jobs is | 12 w. | hich is a noble business culture, I think |
| 13 coincidence, you could have just as easily, I | 13 it' | s the right business culture, then do it, |
| 14 suspect, in all my other organizations, they | 14 bu | it the only way those people have stayed with |
| 15 could just as easily have lost or gained | 15 th | e company from the genesis of them joining |
| 16 senior executives from businesses of any | 16 th | e company is that the company had |
| 17 sector. By coincidence, I don't think your | 17 cc | ompetitive national pay standards. So you |
| 18 current inventory of executives have recently | 18 ne | eed that if you want to do succession |
| 19 come or gone to other sectors, but they've | 19 pl | anning and recruit from within. |
| 20 come or gone from within the Fortis family. | 20 EARLE, Q | 9.C.: |
| 21 EARLE, Q.C.: | 21 Q. W | Vell, Mr. Aboud, Newfoundland Power positions |
| 22 Q. So your aware that there is a high degree of | 22 its | self for non-executive management to compete |
| 23 what looks to us, with our eyes, as transfers | 23 W | ith Atlantic Canada, which is at the 25th |
| in and out of Newfoundland Power to other | 24 pe | ercentile. |
| 25 Fortis operations of executive talent? | 25 MR. ABO | UD: |

| October 26, 2009 Mult | | TM NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|--|--------------|---|
| | Page 73 | Page 75 |
| 1 A. Are you telling me that? 2 EARLE, Q.C.: | | spread their wings in another Fortis company for a while, that on the executive level we |
| 4 HAY Group are the people who do it? | ause 3 4 | national industrial indices, and it seems to me there's a bit of a disconnect there? |
| 6 A But there is no regional differentiation the | t GMD | |
| 7 says Maritimes pays P25 to the broad mar | ket 7 | Δ Sorry the question is should there be a |
| 8 FARLE OC: | | disconnect or my opinion of the disconnect? |
| 9 0. Well, I'm looking at a question and ans | ver 9 EA | RLE. O.C.: |
| 10 that were given in respect of an earlier rat | | O. Am I wrong in saving that there's a |
| 11 hearing, a 2008 rate hearing, and the ques | tion 11 | disconnection? No doubt you'll tell me why |
| 12 goes | 12 | I'm wrong, given who's paying you, but |
| 13 KELLY, Q.C.: | 13 KE | LLY, Q.C.: |
| 14 Q. Hopefully, it's being provided, Mr. Chair | man. 14 | Q. Well, now that's inappropriate. |
| 15 The witness should be afforded the oppor | tunity 15 MR | . ABOUD: |
| 16 to have it. | 16 | A. You're not wrong that an organization could be |
| 17 EARLE, Q.C.: | 17 | quite rightly say to itself, and I think I |
| 18 Q. Can CA-NP-339, to the 2008 GRA be brough | nt up? 18 | inferred this in an earlier question, that if |
| 19 Have you got that, Mr. Aboud? | 19 | we tier our jobs I don't mean to insult |
| 20 MR. ABOUD: | 20 | anyone's job, but the lower tier of jobs are |
| 21 A. I do. | 21 | clerical/secretarial, that an organization |
| 22 EARLE, Q.C.: | 22 | might price those jobs to a more |
| 23 Q. It says, "Newfoundland Power bases | its 23 | geographically local market. The next tier of |
| 24 managerial compensation design on mark | et data. 24 | jobs is supervisory, and the next tier of jobs |
| 25 Please provide the market data referred to | for 25 | is professional/technical. The next tier of |
| | Page 74 | Page 76 |
| 1 2006 and 2007 that was used to provide | the 1 | jobs is managerial, and the last tier of jobs |
| 2 average base increases of 3.6 and 3.6 in ea | ach 2 | is executive. By the time you move through |
| 3 of 2006 and 2007", and the answer is | , 3 | those tiers, and I'll go through those tiers |
| 4 "Newfoundland Power uses the services | of HAY 4 | one by one, if you'd like. As you move |
| 5 Group, a management consultancy, to co | onduct 5 | through those tiers, it is not surprising that |
| 6 its salary and total cash compensation rev | iew 6 | an organization will change its pay philosophy |
| 7 for managerial employees. The Company | aims to 7 | on how to set competitive values for the jobs. |
| 8 be competitive with Atlantic Canadian uti | lity 8 | So in the lower tier, it might set localized |
| 9 companies. Due to the low number | of 9 | pay, at the top tier it would more typically, |
| 10 participants within Atlantic Canada, HAY | Group 10 | as with Newfoundland Power, set broad Canadian |
| 11 recommends a larger comparative group, | 1.e. 11 | standards as its market, and as you go up |
| 12 all Canadian utilities for the review, | 12 | through the tierings, there's a tier in the |
| 13 recognizing the pay differential for Atlant | 1C 13 | middle called professional technical. To a |
| 14 Canada is comparable to the 25th percent | | utility, that's where a lot' of the engineers |
| 15 the hatohal market . Now I leanze these | | are. Other than the fact that they finght be |
| 17 MP AROUD: | 10 | aside for the moment, the rate, competitive |
| 17 MR. Ab00D. | 17 | positioning for technical professional might |
| 19 FARLE OC: | 10 | be an engineering market, but across Canada |
| 20 0 But it seems to me that at your entry leve | 1 20 | because these people could be lost or gained |
| 21 Newfoundland Power finds it satisfactory | to be 21 | into any engineering environment across the |
| 22 on the Atlantic Canada level but when | it 22 | country. So as you move through these tiers |
| comes to executives who seem to be lar | gely 23 | it's not unreasonable that you change your pay |
| recruited from the nursery of Newfound | land 24 | principles to reflect the required level of |
| 25 Power, albeit they might get to go out at | nd 25 | competitiveness. |

| October 26, 2009 | Multi-Page TM NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|---|
| Pag | ge 77 Page 79 |
| 1 EARLE, Q.C.: | 1 competitive on pay. I'm not sure if that's |
| 2 Q. Mr. Aboud, do you think it says anything abo | ut 2 the right direction. |
| 3 the notion that it's important for | 3 EARLE, Q.C.: |
| 4 Newfoundland Power to compete nationally | for 4 Q. But now you're talking about what you should |
| 5 executives, that when you go through their | 5 pay as opposed to what you need to pay. |
| 6 executive team over the last number of years, | 6 MR. ABOUD: |
| 7 you can't find anyone who hasn't either been | 7 A. You need to be competitive in pay, and after |
| 8 previously employed by a Fortis company or | a 8 that, your ability to attract, retain, and |
| 9 local Newfoundland company? | 9 motivate is the other four things, but you |
| 10 MR. ABOUD: | 10 need to be competitive as a start point. |
| 11 A. So, with respect, I don't know the | 11 EARLE, Q.C.: |
| 12 individual's backgrounds to say I'm sure that | 12 Q. But you need to be competitive in the market |
| is the case, but again I would say that it's | 13 that you're drawing your employees from, don't |
| 14 coincidental and not the dominant factor by | 14 you, Mr. Aboud? |
| 15 which we should set our comparative group | , 15 MR. ABOUD: |
| 16 which for the executives, I'll not repeat what | 16 A. You need to be competitive to the market that |
| 17 I've been suggesting, I think our suggested | 17 you might draw your employees from, as well as |
| approach is right, but coincidentally if | 18 do draw your employees from. |
| 19 that's what has happened with incumbents to | D 19 EARLE, Q.C.: |
| 20 date, it may well be the case with my utility | 20 Q. There's not much point in Newfoundland Power |
| 21 clients Hydro One, Ontario Power Generation | n, 21 being competitive wage-wise in a market where |
| 22 Ontario Power Authority, the big generator ar | ad 22 someone is not going to be able to come here |
| 23 the big transmitter in Ontario, that's not the | 23 for the job, whether it's by immigration |
| 24 case. They have moved not from within their | r 24 reasons, or whether the economy of that part |
| 25 organization, but they've come in and gone or | ut 25 of the world is so different? |
| Pag | ge 78 Page 80 |
| 1 to other organizations. | 1 MR. ABOUD: |
| 2 EARLE, Q.C.: | 2 A. So we would I agree, we would never include |
| 3 Q. Mr. Aboud, how long does it have to happen | n 3 American references in the comparative group |
| 4 with an organization before people like HAY | 4 for Newfoundland Power. We would never |
| 5 Group would say, no, this is not just a | 5 although we would include American references |
| 6 coincidence, there's something about your | 6 for the Chief Executive Officer of Royal Bank, |
| 7 situation in terms of recruiting and retention | 7 but we would never do it for Newfoundland |
| 8 that indicates this is where you'll get your | 8 Power. |
| 9 people? | 9 EARLE, Q.C.: |
| 10 MR. ABOUD: | 10 Q. Even though the Royal Bank has never had a |
| 11 A. There are five reasons why someone leaves a | a 11 Chief Executive Officer who hasn't gone into |
| 12 firm, and pay is one of them, but it's the | 12 the bank, as my late father-in-law used to |
| 13 least important of the five. The other five | 13 say? |
| 14 are your relationship with your boss, your | 14 MR. ABOUD: |
| 15 relationship with your peers, your pride in | 15 A. The Royal Bank's current Chief Executive is |
| the company's brand, and your belief that the | the head of their Capital Markets Group, so |
| 17 company is allowing you to develop your | 17 you would have to know very aggressive pay |
| 18 skillset as a person. If Newfoundland Power | 18 principles to keep that person interested. |
| 19 does those other four things very well, such | 19 EARLE, Q.C.: |
| 20 that people don't want to leave, I'm not sure | 20 Q. Thank you, Mr. Aboud. |
| that because of that, and that's an assumption | 21 MR. ABOUD: |
| 22 on my part, I'm not sure because of that we | 22 A. Pleasure. Thank you. |
| 23 should now say let's reduce levels of pay | 23 CHAIRMAN: |
| because we're so well managed people aren' | t Q. So you guys are finished? |
| going to leave, so we don't need to be | 25 MR. SIMMONS: |

| October 26, 2009 Multi-Pa | | -Page TM NP's 2010 General Ra | | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|---------|--|--------|--|
| | Page 81 | | | Page 83 |
| 1 0. I have no questions. Thank you, Mr. Chai | rman. | 1 | | in Ontario, as I'm sure you folks know, the |
| 2 CHAIRMAN: | | 2 | | Minister of Energy has issued executive |
| 3 O. I think it's a good time to take a break. | | 3 | | compensation guidelines on executive pay, that |
| 4 Take a break and come back in half an h | our. | 4 | | the principles of executive pay must be these |
| 5 Is that fair? | | 5 | | that are set out. That's public sector. |
| 6 MS. GLYNN: | | 6 | | Again, as I said earlier. I'm not talking |
| 7 O. I think Newfoundland Power might | | 7 | | right or wrong, it's unique to the public |
| 8 CHAIRMAN: | | 8 | | sector that those are the definitions of which |
| 9 O. Oh. ves. veah. vou guys. I'm sorry. Excus | se me. | 9 | | those companies work under. A private sector |
| 10 KELLY, O.C.: | 1 | 10 | | company, in my opinion, should not have to |
| 11 0. Because then we could stand down the w | itness. | 11 | | abide by decisions of a public sector company |
| 12 CHAIRMAN: | 1 | 12 | | in pay principle, so, yes, the jobs are akin. |
| 13 O. Just one quick question. When you're d | oing 1 | 13 | | but the pay principles are so different, while |
| 14 these estimates on the value of the stock | s 1 | 14 | | we wish we could compare Newfoundland Power to |
| 15 you're using a kind of DCF kind of a ha | ive 1 | 15 | | those others we can't in terms of pay |
| 16 you got any information on the interest ra | tes 1 | 16 | | comparability |
| 17 you might be using on that? | | 17 ' | VICE-C | THAIR WHAI EN |
| 18 MR ABOUD | 1 | 18 | 0 | Liust had one question perhaps follow-up |
| 19 A Oh boy that's a real technical question | 1 | 19 | Q٠ | depending on the answer does the HAY Group |
| 20 CHAIRMAN. | 2 | 20 | | nerform the same services for other Atlantic |
| 21 0 Well there's been a lot of discussion arou | ind 2 | 21 | | utilities like NB Power Nova Scotia Power |
| 22 here of discount rates for | 2 | 22 | | Maritime Electric? |
| 23 MR ABOUD | 2 | 73 1 | MR AF | ROUD. |
| 24 A And I I'm sorry I'm going to apology | ze 2 | 23 1 | Δ | Nova Scotia Power all the Fortis entities in |
| 25 I'm not our distribution modeller I don | 't 2 | 25 | | the Maritimes and Fortis Inc. so Maritime |
| | Daga 92 | | | Dogo 94 |
| 1 I have what interest rate the used to discount | rage o2 | 1 | | Flagt of |
| 1 Know what interest fate the used to discount 2 the cosh flows. Lknow how consistive interest | | 1 | | the only utilities in the four eastern |
| 2 the cash hows. I know how sensitive interest | | 2 | | me only utilities in the four eastern |
| 3 rates are to you. If I mout by a point or | | 3 | | provinces that we do this work. |
| 4 so, I in going to get stapped. So I can lind | | 4 | VICE- | CHAIR WHALEN: |
| 5 Out, but nonestry 1 | | 5 | Q. | the D5 0 stendard for the new be the same |
| 6 CHAIRMAN: | | 0 | | standard used in the other Atlantic utilities |
| Q. Can you yean, that's line. Can you just | | / | | or does that D50 number level yery? |
| 8 get that information, and the other quick | . 1 | 8 | | or does that P50 humber level vary? |
| 9 question is, when you talk about Newfoundiat | na | 91 | MR. A | BOUD: Lean't small, for News Section Derver because |
| 10 Power being privately owned, 1 mean, there s | | 10 | А. | I can't speak for Nova Scotta Power because |
| 11 no risk nere, though. Why isn't Newfoundian | 10 I | 11 | | to It is the standard that we're talking |
| 12 Power more akin to, say, NewToundland Hyd | | 12 | | to. It is the standard that we le taiking |
| 13 than it is akin to Shoppers Drug Mart? | 1 | 13 | | Inc. and all of its subsidiaries work under |
| 14 MR. ABOUD: | 1 | 14 | | and those are, the inventory of utilities in |
| A. It is functionally more akin to my chent, | 1 | 15 | | the Maritimes with which we deal |
| 16 Hydro One, a distributor. It is more akin to | 1 | 10 | | |
| 17 a generator like Hydro, or another of my | 1 | 1/ | VICE- | Could you avtend your enciger to your clients |
| 18 chents, Ontario Power Gen, than it is a | 1 | 18 | Q. | Ludro Optorio Ludro? |
| 19 retailer like Shoppers. So it's more akin to | | 19 | | |
| 20 that in terms of the types of jobs that are | 2 | 20 I 11 | мк. А | DUUD: Sura So Ontario Undro is mandated by |
| 21 Innerent in the company, but where it isn't | 2 | 21 | А. | provincial deepend Hydro One and ODC communication |
| 22 akin to Hydro One, OPG, NewToundland Hydr | 0, 18 | 22 | | provincial decree. Hydro One, and OPG, soffy, |
| 25 una une pay principies of those companies are | | 23 | | the D50 of the industrial monitor or an "all |
| 24 public sector pay principles. I don't know | 2 | 24 25 | | ine r 50 of the moustrial market on an all |
| 123 une registrative direction in Newtoundland, but | ı [2 | 23 | | in Dasis, salary, Dollus, non-cash, which they |

| Oc | October 26, 2009 Multi | | i-Page [™] | | ¹ NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|----------|--|-----------|---------------------|--------|--|
| | | ge 85 | | | Page 87 |
| 1 | don't have any of sorry, non-cash and LTI. | 5 | 1 | | of the mining index and be at 500, you can be |
| 2 | which they don't have an of, but the | | 2 | | at P90 of the retail sector and be at 500, so |
| 3 | composition of the market must be 50 percent | i | 3 | | the discussion of the rate comparator group |
| 4 | weighted public sectors orgs and 50 percent | | 4 | | and its matching percentile have to be done as |
| 5 | weighted private sector orgs. So we haven't | | 5 | | a duality because a mix of high/low payers and |
| 6 | done that in this, but we've actually, | | 6 | | low/high percentiles can get to the same |
| 7 | thank you for the question. The rest of the | | 7 | | dollar values different ways. So if we're |
| 8 | pay principles comply, except for that one | | 8 | | talking a big index, we typically say P50. If |
| 9 | that says because we're government owned, w | ve | 9 | | we were a gold miner, though, and the gold |
| 10 | want our comparative market to be 50 percent | t | 10 | | miner said I want a price to the all Canadian |
| 11 | weighted each way. So that's the only | | 11 | | industrial index, we would be saying a P |
| 12 | condition different in theirs than yours, but | | 12 | | higher than 50, if that's your index, but if |
| 13 | it is P50 "all in", salary, bonus, non-cash, | | 13 | | you're a gold miner, we would say your index |
| 14 | and LTI. They don't have any non-cash, Hydro |) | 14 | | should be the gold mining companies to which |
| 15 | One, or OPG. Therefore, the debate is, and | | 15 | | you should pay P50. We're playing with |
| 16 | here's an issue that the Minister of Energy | | 16 | | numbers, I'm afraid. |
| 17 | wrote in his report, and we're not sure how to | | 17 | (11:0 |)0 a.m.) |
| 18 | extricate ourselves from it. If you don't | | 18 | CHAI | RMAN: |
| 19 | have one of the pay elements, if you don't | | 19 | Q. | Okay, thank you. We'll take a break until |
| 20 | have LTI, then one of the other elements must | | 20 | | 11:30 then. |
| 21 | be higher than its respective P50 for your | | 21 | KELL | .Y, Q.C.: |
| 22 | "all in" value to maintain P50, and the | | 22 | Q. | Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 23 | Minister is now saying, I I'm putting words | | 23 | - | (RECESS) |
| 24 | in his mouth, I didn't really mean that any | | 24 | (11:3 | 30 a.m.) |
| 25 | element could also more than P50 when I said | 1 | 25 | CHAI | RMAN: |
| | Pa | 9e 86 | | | Page 88 |
| $ _1$ | the "all in" must be P50. but mathematically | 5000 | 1 | 0. | So I guess we're back to you, sir, are we? |
| $ _2$ | it must. So there's a bit of a dilemma going | | 2 | MR. KI | |
| | on in terms of that report, and the Arnett | | 3 | 0. | Back to me again. Mr. Chairman. The next |
| 4 | Report, and the impact of setting salaries for | | 4 | ×. | witness is Mr. Garv Smith. and the witness is |
| 5 | Hydro One and OPG, because they're not goil | ng | 5 | | ready to be sworn. |
| 6 | to be getting LTI in the near future. | -6 | 6 | MR. G/ | ARY SMITH (SWORN) EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY IAN KELLY, |
| | VICE-CHAIR WHALEN: | | 7 | 0.C. | |
| 8 | O So it's still - P50 is just a comparator. The | | 8 | MR. KI | RI I V· |
| 9 | definition of the comparative group is set out | | 9 | 0. | Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Mr. Smith, you are |
| 10 | for vou essentially? | | 10 | ×. | the Vice President. Engineering and |
| 11 | MR_ABOUD: | | 11 | | Onerations, of Newfoundland Power? |
| 12 | A. Exactly so. ves. | | 12 | MR. SM | ЛГН: |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN: | | 13 | A. | Yes, that is correct. |
| 14 | O. Like, is the P50 pretty well standard in this | | 14 | MR. KF | ELLY: |
| 15 | kind of exercise? Any time I've been expose | d | 15 | Q. | And would vou please summarize your |
| 16 | to it. that's what that's what the | | 16 | | multifications for the Board? |
| 17 | whoever is doing the work for you, they alwa | vs | 17 | MR. SM | линин |
| 18 | sav. well. we take P50. | <i>J~</i> | 18 | A. | I graduated from Memorial University in 1984 |
| 19 | MR. ABOUD: | | 19 | | with a Bachelor of Electrical Engineering and |
| 20 | A You start at P50. you honestly do. If you are | | 20 | | I'm a member of the Association of |
| 21 | a high paver, if you are a gold miner, you can | | 21 | | Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of |
| 22 | get to the same dollar value let's say | | 22 | | Newfoundland and Labrador. |
| 23 | we're striving for a dollar value of | | 23 | MR. KF | |
| $ _{24}$ | \$500.000.00. You can be P75 of the all | | 24 | 0. | And Lunderstand this is your first time |
| 25 | industrial index and be at 500, you can be P50 | 0 | 25 | | testifying before this Board? |

| October 26, 2009 | Aulti-Pag | ge [™] NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|-----------|--|
| Pag | ge 89 | Page 91 |
| 1 MR. SMITH: | 1 | energy conservation and efficiency |
| 2 A. Yes, that is correct. | 2 | partnership. This will help ensure a |
| 3 MR. KELLY: | 3 | consistent and coordinated approach in the |
| 4 Q. Mr. Smith, you'll speak to the customer | 4 | delivery of conservation programs. The |
| 5 operations section of the pre-filed evidence. | 5 | expanded energy conservation program is being |
| 6 Do you adopt Section 2, Customer Operation | s, 6 | promoted jointly by the two utilities under |
| 7 as your testimony in this matter? | 7 | the Take Charge banner. The Take Charge |
| 8 MR. SMITH: | 8 | Program has been promoted through radio and |
| 9 A. Yes, I do. | 9 | newspaper advertising since last fall. |
| 10 MR. KELLY: | 10 | In last September of this year, we |
| 11 Q. Are there any changes you wish to make to the | e 11 | launched a new television advertising |
| 12 pre-filed testimony in exhibits at this time? | 12 | campaign. The goal of this campaign is to |
| 13 MR. SMITH: | 13 | increase customer awareness and participation |
| 14 A. No. | 14 | prior to the upcoming heating season. |
| 15 MR. KELLY: | 15 | We expect the new programs will evolve |
| 16 Q. Mr. Smith, I'm going to ask you to address | 16 | over time. We will assess the effectiveness |
| 17 four matters. One is the expanded | 17 | by monitoring participation and conducting |
| 18 conservation program; two, workforce | 18 | market research. By staying in touch with our |
| 19 management; three, investment in the | 19 | customers and participating retail and trade |
| 20 electrical system; and four, whether | 20 | allies, we will be able to identify any need |
| 21 operational cost reductions and efficiencies | 21 | for adjustments in the program. This will |
| should be considered, so those four matters. | 22 | help ensure the programs continue to meet |
| 23 Let's begin by reviewing for the Board, | 23 | customer expectations and objectives. |
| 24 Newfoundland Power's expanded energy | y 24 | The expanded conservation program |
| 25 conservation program, please | 25 | accounts for an increase of \$1.9 million and |
| Pag | ge 90 | Page 92 |
| 1 MR. SMITH: | 1 | costs to be recovered in 2010 rates, however, |
| 2 A. Certainly. Our expanded energy conservation | n 2 | the economic benefit for customers are |
| 3 program is being carried out as a joint | 3 | expected to be greater than the additional |
| 4 initiative with Newfoundland and Labrador | 4 | cost. The energy conservation benefit is |
| 5 Hydro. It was officially launched in November | er 5 | reduced production at Holyrood. Our customers |
| 6 of 2008. The program includes new incentive | e 6 | will save approximately \$295,000 per year as a |
| 7 rebates for both domestic and general service | 7 | result of our 2010 expenditure. On that |
| 8 customers. The program for domestic custom | ers 8 | basis, the payback for our customers is a |
| 9 provides rebates for Energy Star windows, as | 9 | little over six years. |
| 10 well as thermostats and insulation. The | 10 N | /R. KELLY: |
| 11 program for general service customers promoted | tes 11 | O. Mr. Smith, next would you describe |
| 12 high efficiency lighting. Newfoundland Powe | er 12 | Newfoundland Power's approach to workforce |
| 13 is providing customers with energy | 13 | management? |
| 14 conservation information for many years. This | s 14 N | AR. SMITH: |
| 15 has given us a level of expertise and energy | 15 | A. Newfoundland Power's workforce requirements |
| 16 conservation. By leveraging our existing | 16 | can change substantially from one year to the |
| 17 capabilities and partnering with Newfoundland | d 17 | next, based on changes in the amount and type |
| 18 and Labrador Hydro, we are able to deliver the | e 18 | of work to be done. For example, in 2007, the |
| 19 expanded program in a least cost manner. This | s 19 | company completed the refurbishment of the |
| 20 is in line with our customers' expectations. | 20 | Rattling Brook Hydro Plant. This was the |
| 21 It is consistent with our regulatory | 21 | largest single capital project in the |
| 22 obligations and is consistent with the | 22 | company's history. With such a big increase |
| 23 Provincial Government's energy plan. | 23 | in work in one year, significant workforce |
| 24 Newfoundland Power and Hydro are also | 24 | changes were required to get this job done. |
| 25 participating in the Provincial Government's | 25 | Newfoundland Power maintains a flexible |
| | 1 | |

| 0 | Detober 26, 2009 Multi-Page ^{TN} | | age [™] NP's 2010 General Rate Application | | |
|----|--|------|---|--|--|
| | Pag | e 93 | | Page 95 | |
| 1 | workforce structure. This structure is built | 1 | | journevperson status, the development of job | |
| 2 | around a highly skilled core workforce, which | 2 | • | planning and leadership skills requires | |
| 3 | is supplemented with both temporary and | 3 | | additional training and years of experience. | |
| 4 | contract labour. This allows the company to | 4 | | The powerline technician trade is the | |
| 5 | address short-term variations in work in a | 5 | | largest skill component of Newfoundland | |
| 6 | least cost manner. | 6 | | Power's workforce. The company is practically | |
| 7 | The other aspect of managing work is | 7 | | required to recruit and train its own | |
| 8 | efficiency. In recent years, we have been | 8 | | powerline technicians. To ensure that we have | |
| 9 | able to improve efficiency through | 9 | | enough qualified individuals to replace those | |
| 10 | organizational changes, process improvement | 10 | | who will retire, we have been increasing the | |
| 11 | and the use of technology. Efficiency | 11 | | number of apprentice powerline technicians. | |
| 12 | improvement is central to the way we manage | 12 | | This is causing modest increases in operating | |
| 13 | work. | 13 | | costs. Between 2007 and 2010, we have | |
| 14 | MR. KELLY: | 14 | | increased the number of apprentices from 11 to | |
| 15 | Q. Would you comment on the company's plan to | 15 | | 26. Maintaining apprentices at this level | |
| 16 | address workforce demographics? | 16 | | over the next five years or so will ensure | |
| 17 | MR. SMITH: | 17 | | continuity in the skilled trade. | |
| 18 | A. Workforce demographics is currently | 18 | MR. KI | ELLY: | |
| 19 | challenging for all, virtually all businesses. | 19 | Q. | The third area relates to investments in the | |
| 20 | Newfoundland Power has been considering | 20 | | electrical system. Would you please comment | |
| 21 | workforce demographics for quite some time. | 21 | | on that issue? | |
| 22 | In the next several years, a significant | 22 | MR. SM | MITH: | |
| 23 | number of Newfoundland Power employees in the | 23 | А. | Yes. One notable change is a reduction in the | |
| 24 | core skill jobs will be eligible to retire. | 24 | | investment required to address reliability | |
| 25 | These skills of the engineers, technologists | 25 | | concerns. Can we please go to Graph 2-1 on | |
| | Pag | e 94 | | Page 96 | |
| 1 | and powerline technicians are critical to the | 1 | р | age 2-7 of the evidence? This graph shows | |
| 2 | provision of safe and reliable electrical | 2 | tl | he company's SAIDI and SAIFI. That is the | |
| 3 | service. Transferring these skills and | 3 | d | luration and frequency of outages. The graph | |
| 4 | knowledge to a new generation of employees | 4 | S | hows an improving trend in reliability in the | |
| 5 | requires hands-on training. Training | 5 | 1 | ast ten years. The reliability of the | |
| 6 | employees on the job tends to reduce | 6 | e | lectrical system is primarily influenced by | |
| 7 | productivity and increase costs. To manage | 7 | tl | he condition of the assets. Over the last | |
| 8 | workforce demographics, the company must | t 8 | n | umber of years, Newfoundland Power's | |
| 9 | recruit and train employees in many aspects of | 9 | e | lectrical system has been improved through | |
| 10 | the business. For some employees such as | 10 | r | efurbishment and replacement of deteriorated | |
| 11 | meter readers or customer service | 11 | a | ssets. Newfoundland Power believes service | |
| 12 | representatives, this may take a relatively | 12 | r | eliability experienced by our customers is | |
| 13 | short period of time, say six months. | 13 | с | urrently satisfactory on an overall basis. | |
| 14 | For powerline technicians, however, the | 14 | E | Even though reliability has improved on a | |
| 15 | time horizon for training is much longer. | 15 | S | ystem wide basis, capital expenditure will | |
| 16 | Powerline technicians are required to work in | 16 | с | ontinue to be required to replace | |
| 17 | close proximity to the high voltage system. | 17 | d | leteriorated plant, however, expenditures on | |
| 18 | The hazardous nature of the work requires | 18 | ta | arget reliability programs, such as the | |
| 19 | hands-on training. The training progresses | 19 | d | listribution reliability initiative, should be | |
| 20 | over a number of years from the energized work | k 20 | 10 | ower in the foreseeable future. | |
| 21 | to high voltage work. The powerline | 21 | | While reliability related spending as a | |
| 22 | technician training program consists of an | 22 | p | ercentage of overall capital spending is | |
| 23 | initial year of education followed by a four- | 23 | d | ecreasing, capital investment related to | |
| 24 | year apprenticeship. While a powerline | 24 | с | ustomer growth is increasing. This is | |
| 25 | technician is qualified upon achieving | 25 | p | particularly evident in the northeast Avalon, | |

| Octo | ber 26, 2009 | Multi-Page ^T | ^M NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|--|---|---|--|
| | Pa | age 97 | Page 99 |
| 1 | which has experienced strong economic growth | 1 | years 1998, 2003 and 2008. There are four |
| 2 | in recent years. It is the primary reason why | 2 | levels of load shown in each graph. The |
| 3 | capital expenditures have increased above what | 3 | number of transformers loaded to less than 50 |
| 4 | was forecast in 2007, about \$37 million higher | 4 | percent is shaded in blue, between 50 percent |
| 5 | by the end of 2010. | 5 | and 80 percent is shaded in red, between 80 |
| 6 | Customer growth impacts the electrical | 6 | percent and 100 percent is shaded in green, |
| 7 | system in two ways. First, the company is | 7 | and greater than 100 percent of capacity is |
| 8 | required to expand the distribution system to | 8 | shaded in purple. |
| 9 | hook up additional customers. Second, an | 9 | The column on the left shows that one- |
| 10 | increase in the amount of electricity used by | 10 | quarter of the transformers on the northeast |
| 11 | customers requires the company to add system | 11 | Avalon were loaded to greater than 80 percent |
| 12 | capacity. | 12 | of their capacity in 1998. This is the |
| 13 | Can we please go to Graph 2-2 on page 2- | 13 | section in green on top of the column. The |
| 14 | 10 of the evidence? This graph shows the | 14 | middle column shows 2003. There is no |
| 15 | total capital investment related to customer | 15 | material change in the number of transformers |
| 16 | growth. In the pre-filed evidence we refer to | 16 | loaded to greater than 80 percent. This is in |
| 17 | this as customer growth capital. This has two | 17 | spite of load growth experienced between 1998 |
| 18 | components, growth and customers shown in blue | 18 | and 2003. We were able to accommodate the |
| 19 | and growth and load shown in red. The | 19 | load growth by transferring load from the more |
| 20 | customer growth component represents the cost | 20 | heavily loaded transformers to transformers |
| 21 | of connecting customers. The load growth | 21 | that had capacity available. Dealing with |
| 22 | component represents the cost of adding | 22 | capacity in this way is generally cheaper than |
| 23 | capacity to the system. | 23 | buying new transformers. The transformers |
| 24 | Customer growth requires Newfoundland | 24 | with the additional capacity are represented |
| 25 | Power to extend the distribution system. This | 25 | mainly by the red portion of the columns. The |
| | Pa | age 98 | Page 100 |
| 1 | involves capital expenditures for poles, | 1 | amount of red therefore indicates the relative |
| 2 | wires, distribution transformers, service | 2 | flexibility the company has to transfer load. |
| 3 | wires and meters necessary to connect | 3 | Now let's look at the column on the right, |
| 4 | customers. The load growth component | 4 | which is 2008. This column shows two-thirds |
| 5 | associated with additional customers and | 5 | of the power transformers loaded to greater |
| 6 | changes in energy consumption has an | 6 | than 80 percent. As we can see, there's a lot |
| 7 | accumulative effect. This will lead to | 7 | less red in the 2008 column. This indicates |
| 8 | increased capital spending on power | 8 | less flexibility to transfer load off the more |
| 9 | transformers and distribution feeder | 9 | heavily loaded transformers onto transformers. |
| 10 | configuration. | 10 | Practically this means we will need to add new |
| 11 | As Graph 2-2 shows, expenditures related | 11 | transformers as load continues to grow. |
| 12 | to customer growth will continue to range | 12 (11:4 | 45 a.m.) |
| 13 | between 15 and \$20 million beyond 2010. T | he 13 | A specific example on the immediate |
| 14 | graph also shows significant capital | 14 | horizon is the Southlands residential area. |
| 15 | expenditures for load growth beginning in | 15 | Engineering analysis indicates that all |
| 16 | 2010. The load growth expenditure are main | ly 16 | available options to transfer load have been |
| 17 | to purchase new power transformers. To | 17 | exhausted. For this reason, an additional |
| 18 | explain this, I will take you through Graph 2- | 18 | transformer will soon be required to service |
| 19 | J. This month shares a share in th | 19 | growth in this area. As you can see from |
| 20 | inis graph snows a change in the | $\begin{vmatrix} 20\\ 21 \end{vmatrix}$ | Graph 2-3, the options for transferring load |
| $\begin{vmatrix} 21\\ 22 \end{vmatrix}$ | on the northeast Auglon in the last for warr | | on the northeast Avalon are running out. This |
| $\begin{vmatrix} 22 \\ 22 \end{vmatrix}$ | Each column shows the number of news | $ \frac{22}{22} $ | transformers in the part several vector |
| 23 | transformers in a given year that most a | | u ansionmers in me next several years. |
| 24 | certain load criteria. Columns correspond the | 24 MR. | The Finally Mr Smith the Consumer Advacate here |
| 145 | contain toad enterna. Columnis represent the | 125 Q | . I many, with simul, the Consumer Advocate lias |

| 0 | October 26, 2009 | Multi-Pag | ge [™] NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|--|----------------|--|
| Γ | Р | age 101 | Page 103 |
| | 1 raised an issue as follows, whether | 1 | program. Considered on that basis, the |
| | 2 operational cost reductions and efficiencie | s 2 | forecast productivity improvement for the test |
| | 3 should be considered. Can I get you to | 3 | year is similar to what was actually achieved |
| | 4 comment on this issue, please? | 4 | in 2008. But this is not the full picture of |
| | 5 MR. SMITH: | 5 | Newfoundland Power's cost efficiency in the |
| | 6 A. Yes. An important consideration is wheth | ner 6 | test year. |
| | 7 the operating forecast reflects an appropria | te 7 | In 2010, the company will deliver the |
| | 8 balance between cost and service. Efficien | icy 8 | expanded portfolio of energy conservation |
| | 9 is not just about cutting costs. Our cost | 9 | programming. We will do this while |
| 1 | 10 management efforts are focused on the ove | rall 10 | maintaining existing service to customers, |
| 1 | 11 impacts of cost and service. For example, | if 11 | while only adding six new employees. The |
| 1 | 12 we were to delay hiring the apprentice | 12 | additional work associated with the expanded |
| 1 | 13 powerline technicians, we could avoid add | ling 13 | program will exceed the capacity of those six |
| 1 | 14 cost now, however, this would have a nega | tive 14 | employees. To do this extra work and meet the |
| 1 | 15 impact on the company's ability to provid | de 15 | test year labour forecast, we will need to be |
| 1 | 16 service in the long term. Each year, | 16 | efficient in our business. We will find these |
| 1 | 17 Newfoundland Power is required to serve | e a 🛛 17 | efficiencies as we do in other areas of our |
| 1 | 18 growing number of customers and to opera | ite and 18 | business, by making change in our organization |
| 1 | 19 maintain a growing electrical system. We r | nust 19 | and improving processes. We have already |
| 2 | all keep pace with customer expectations | s. 20 | started to do this. |
| 2 | Each year we got approximately 100 kilom | neters 21 | For example, we will be required to |
| 2 | of new line. With more line to maintain an | nd 22 | respond to additional and more complex |
| 2 | 23 more meters to read and more customers | to 23 | inquiries related to energy conservation. The |
| 2 | serve, the cost of service will tend to | 24 | call centre will handle conservation calls in |
| 2 | increase unless we find more efficient way | s to 25 | addition to the normal work. The call centre |
| F | р | age 102 | Page 104 |
| | 1 operate. At Newfoundland Power, it is always | avs 1 | training has been completed to accommodate |
| | 2 our goal to achieve sustainable cost | 2 | these changes. Similarly, our area offices |
| | 3 efficiencies for the long term. When this is | 3 | across the island are getting more involved |
| | 4 achieved, customers benefit. I believe our | 4 | with energy conservation. For example, staff |
| | 5 record has been very good in this regard. Fo | or 5 | in the area offices are currently visiting and |
| | 6 example, since 2004, the number of custom | ners 6 | establishing relationships with building |
| | 7 has increased by 7.6 percent. Inflation has | 7 | supply retailers. These retailers are on the |
| | 8 increased by 12.4 percent, and this compare | es 8 | front line of delivering the Energy Star |
| | 9 to an increase in Newfoundland Power' | S 9 | window and insulation rebate programs for our |
| | 10 controllable operating cost of 4.5 percent. | 10 | customers. With these and other changes, we |
| | 11 Over this same period, we have continued | to 11 | are positioning ourselves to deliver the |
| | 12 maintain a good safety record and the | 12 | expanded program in a least cost manner, and |
| | 13 reliability of service has improved. We hav | re 13 | to do this without compromising delivery of |
| | 14 also maintained a high level of customer | 14 | safe and reliable service to customers. I |
| | 15 satisfaction. | 15 | believe this is a good example of the balance |
| | 16 Another way of looking at cost efficiency | / 16 | between cost and service. as I mentioned |
| | 17 is to consider labour productivity. Can we | 17 | earlier. |
| | 18 please go to CA-NP-104? In this response we | 2 18 | To conclude my comments on this issue. |
| | 19 estimated a forecast productivity improvement | ent 19 | the test year operating forecast presented in |
| | in the test year to be \$337.000. This is the | 20 | the application is reasonable and further |
| | 21 difference between the test vear labour | 21 | operating cost reductions would not be |
| | 22 forecast and a proforma labour forecast Th | e 22 | appropriate. |
| | 23 proforma labour forecast includes salary | 23 N | AR. KELLY: |
| | 24 increases and additional 2010 costs associat | $\frac{1}{24}$ | O. Thank you, Mr. Smith. Those are my questions. |
| 2 | 25 with the apprentices and the conservation | 25 | Mr. Chairman. |

| October 26, 2009 | | Multi-Page TM | | age TM | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|------------------|---|--------------------------|-----|-------------------|--|
| | Ι | Page 105 | | | Page 107 |
| 1 | CHAIRMAN: | 0 | 1 | Q. | Okay. And could you just indicate to us as to |
| 2 | Q. Mr. Johnson | | 2 | | how and why each of you and this, Mr. Delaney, |
| 3 | MR. GARY SMITH, CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. THOMAS JOHN | SON | 3 | | ended up changing positions? |
| 4 | MR. JOHNSON: | | 4 | MR. S | SMITH: |
| 5 | Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Mr. | | 5 | A. | Well, I don't know if I'd exactly characterize |
| 6 | Smith. Thank you for that overview. Mr. | | 6 | | it that way. In 2008, I was certainly looking |
| 7 | Smith, perhaps we could just start back at the | | 7 | | for an opportunity to get back to St. John's, |
| 8 | beginning comment in your direct regarding | | 8 | | and in 2008 expressed that to my boss at the |
| 9 | your background. I understand you're a | | 9 | | time, who was Carl Smith in Fortis Alberta. |
| 10 | graduate of Memorial from 1984 with electrical | | 10 | | Through a period of a few months, I came to |
| 11 | engineering. Correct? | | 11 | | the realization that Phonse Delaney was also |
| 12 | MR. SMITH: | | 12 | | looking to move out of Newfoundland Power to |
| 13 | A. Yes, that is correct. | | 13 | | seek other opportunities, so that provided me |
| 14 | MR. JOHNSON: | | 14 | | an opportunity to come back to Newfoundland |
| 15 | Q. Yeah. And just if you could sort of walk us | | 15 | | Power. |
| 16 | up through what your experience has been, | | 16 | MR. J | OHNSON: |
| 17 | professional, professionally. | | 17 | Q. | And, Mr. Smith, I'd like to turn first to the |
| 18 | MR. SMITH: | | 18 | | labour forecast which Newfoundland Power has |
| 19 | A. I started work with Newfoundland Power in 1984 | | 19 | | prepared in this case, which is at Volume 2 of |
| 20 | in the Distribution Group. I progressed over | | 20 | | the materials. In particular, if I could draw |
| 21 | a number of years through Planning, through | | 21 | | your attention to Schedule B of that filing, |
| 22 | Design and through other areas of the company. | | 22 | | and in particular page 1 of 2 of it. |
| 23 | In 1997, I took an operating role with the | | 23 | MR. S | MITH: |
| 24 | company in Clarenville and was there until | | 24 | A. | Was it Schedule A you mentioned or B? |
| 25 | 1999, basically running operations in the | | 25 | MR. J | OHNSON: |
| | Ι | Page 106 | | | Page 108 |
| 1 | Clarenville office. In 1999, I left | | 1 | Q. | B, sir. The line I'm just going to ask you |
| 2 | Newfoundland Power and went to work | with | 2 | | about appears towards the bottom, Michael, if |
| 3 | Maritime Electric in Prince Edward Island | l. In | 3 | | you could go down further. Yeah, Rechargeable |
| 4 | that role I was Manager of T&D Operation | ns, and | 4 | | and Recoverable, 4.445 million. I take it |
| 5 | in 2004 I took a position with Fortis Alber | ta | 5 | | that this, this is a number made up of things |
| 6 | in Calgary and assumed the position of V | lice | 6 | | such as monies that would be received back |
| 7 | President of Operations and Engineering. | | 7 | | from Newfoundland Power from customers |
| 8 | MR. JOHNSON: | | 8 | | directly for direct services to the customers, |
| 9 | Q. And you held that position with Fortis Alt | berta | 9 | | for instance, would it? |
| 10 | up until the summer of '08? | | 10 | MR. S | |
| | MR. SMITH: | | 11 | A. | Yes, I think that would be correct. |
| 12 | A. That is correct. I left Fortis Alberta in | | 12 | MR. J | OHNSON: |
| 13 | 2008. | | 13 | Q. | And would it also include momes back from |
| 14 | MR. JOHNSON: | orina | 14 | | miter-armate rabour charges? |
| 15 | Q. Okay. MI. Ludiow had mulcated to the he that Mr. Phones. Deleney had seen, the br | anng | 15 | MR. S | Liust need one moment |
| 10 | lights of the west coast and decided to go a | to | 10 | A. | I just need one moment. |
| 11 | Alberta I don't know why he didn't keet | n on | 17 | | Sure no problem Mr Smith I might be able |
| 10 | going to B C for the cost but in any even | t I | 10 | Q. | to help. Page 2 footnote number 3 |
| $ _{20}^{1}$ | take it you were holding that job when he | saw | 20 | MR S | MITH. |
| $ _{21}^{20}$ | the bright lights? | Jutt | 20 | Δ | Yes, this is the footnote. I was looking for |
| 22 | MR. SMITH: | | 2.2 | 11. | Thank you. |
| $ _{23}^{-2}$ | A. That is correct. I was Vice President of | | 23 | MR. J | OHNSON: |
| 24 | Operations at Fortis Alberta at that time. | | 24 | 0. | Yeah, I thought so, which simply it indicates |
| 25 | MR. JOHNSON: | | 25 | | that in addition to capital and operating |

| October 26, 2009Multi-Page TM NP's 2010 General Rate Ap | NP's 2010 General Rate Application | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| Page 109 | Page 111 | |
| 1 requirements, there are labour requirements 1 A. That is correct. | C | |
| 2 for Rechargeable and Recoverable items and 2 MR. JOHNSON: | | |
| 3 these include labour associated with material 3 Q. Yes. And I take it that insofar as these | e | |
| 4 handling, i.e. stores and vehicle service 4 staff charges would incorporate charges | s to | |
| 5 centre labour costs which are recharged as 5 other utilities for storm-related recover | rv | |
| 6 overhead and offset (inaudible-coughing) and 6 work, that none of these would inclu | ide | |
| 7 it also includes customer job and third party 7 anything other than a cost basis. There w | vould | |
| 8 provisioning services and inter-affiliate 8 be no mark-up, for instance, right? | | |
| 9 labour charges. That's where we were both 9 MR. SMITH: | | |
| 10 going to go. 10 A. In terms of efforts with storm response. | we do | |
| 11 MR. SMITH: 11 charge that out at the fully distributed co | ost | |
| 12 A. That is correct. That's the note I was | | |
| 13 looking for. 13 MR. JOHNSON: | | |
| 14 MR. JOHNSON: 14 O. Yes. | | |
| 15 O. Okay. And how did you come up with the 15 MR SMITH: | | |
| 16 forecast going back to Schedule B for a 16 A - for storm response. That is correct | | |
| 17 second? How did you come up with the forecast 17 MR JOHNSON: | | |
| for Rechargeable and Recoverable? | fully | |
| 19 MR SMITH | runy | |
| 20 A This forecast would have been prepared similar 20 (12.00 n m) | | |
| 20 12.00 pint.) | | |
| 22 basically looking at historical costs and 22 A For our storm assistance such as is indic | ated | |
| 22 doing a trending from historical costs I 23 here for the Turks and Caicos that would | ld be | |
| believe that's the basis of how these numbers 24 correct | iu de | |
| 25 would be calculated 25 MR IOHNSON: | | |
| Page 110 | Page 112 | |
| 1 MP_IOUNSON: | v the | |
| 2 O Okay And in particular, then just focusing 2 powerline technician work but any coord | y une dination | |
| in on the inter-corporate or affiliate | hy | |
| 4 charges sir could Lturn your attention to 4 administrative staff? | Uy | |
| 5 CAND 140 Attachment A? Mr Smith I'll wait 5 MP SMITH | | |
| 6 for you to 6 A The only exception I would I believe i | it's | |
| 7 MB SMITH | | |
| 7 MK. SMITH. 7 If the for the Turks and Calcos is there was | rt and | |
| o MB JOHNSON. | | |
| 9 MR. JOHNSON. 9 Tot those in particular, the 1.2 mark-up of the fully distributed cost | was | |
| 10 Q. Okay. And so here now we've just rocused on 10 applied to the fully distributed cost. | | |
| 11 the inter-armate charges, and I think that 11 MR. JOHNSON: | la thay | |
| that we see there. Would that he your 12 would have played in relation to that? | le they | |
| 15 that we see there. Would that be your 15 would have played in relation to that? | | |
| 14 Understanding as well? 15 MD SMITH | or who | |
| 15 MR. SMITH: 16 A You're in Table 12 16 would have coordinated the effort f | or who | |
| 10 A. Fourie in Fabre 1? | or the | |
| 17 MR. JOHNSON: 17 New Johnson: 18 Fortis Group of Companies He's our p | | |
| 10 MR SMITH | d has | |
| 19 MR. SMITH: 19 On the West Coast of Newfoundiand and 20 A Logo the Staff Charges line was | u llas | |
| 20 A. 1 See the Start Charges line, yes. 20 provided that follow or three times in 21 MP JOHNSON. | | |
| 21 Wix, JOHNSON. 22 O Ves So included in that Staff Charges line 22 O Ves So included in that Staff Charges line 22 I baliave we did mark it up by 1.2 parent | шу, ont | |
| 22 Q. 165. SO included in that Start Charges line 22 I believe, we did mark it up by 1.2 perce | | |
| A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A | | |
| 24 for work done for the Fortis affiliates? 24 0 And so if then just no need to go there 1 | but | |

| October 26, 2009 | Multi-Page | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|--|--|---|
| | Page 113 | Page 115 |
| 1 about Rechargeable and Recoverable, if the | at 1 | for six and seven days. We believe those type |
| 2 amount is based on historicals, that amount | is 2 | of outages will no longer be acceptable and |
| 3 not capturing any mark-up. I think it's just | 3 | that in future, if we look to having to do |
| 4 to state the obvious except that example that | 4 | major power restoration, it's very likely we |
| 5 vou just gave. | 5 | would want to bring utility staff in from |
| 6 MR. SMITH: | 6 | other companies. |
| 7 A. That would be correct. | 7 | The final point that I'd like to make |
| 8 MR. JOHNSON: | 8 | along that regard, and again that would |
| 9 Q. Okay. And I guess the question that I have | is 9 | benefit our customers, when other utilities |
| 10 the Consumer's Advocate here in this provin | nce 10 | comes here, of course one of the first things |
| 11 is in what fashion or how does Newfoundla | and 11 | you're trying to do is get on the ground |
| 12 Power's customers benefit from Newfound | lland 12 | running quickly. When we bring staff in from |
| 13 Power personnel undertaking repair and | 13 | other Fortis companies, if they were available |
| 14 construction work for Fortis at cost in these | 14 | to help at that time, those staff understand |
| 15 various localities? | 15 | our safety rules, they understand our work |
| 16 MR. SMITH: | 16 | methods, they understand our practices, so |
| 17 A. When Newfoundland Power provides assista | ance to 17 | when they land here, they get on the ground |
| 18 other utilities for storm relief, certainly | 18 | very quickly in terms of providing restoration |
| 19 we've provided an RFI which indicates we' | ve 19 | effort for our customers. So I look at it on |
| 20 been doing this on three occasions now for | r 20 | two or three different fronts and I do believe |
| 21 other Fortis companies, but we'd also provid | le 21 | our customers benefit from this relationship |
| 22 this service for other utilities if we were | 22 | and this ability and I do believe it provides |
| able to do so. When a request comes to | 23 | benefit for our customers. |
| 24 Newfoundland Power to provide assistance | from 24 MR | . JOHNSON: |
| 25 another utility, we certainly take that very | 25 (| Q. With respect to the notion of getting practice |
| | Page 114 | Page 116 |
| 1 seriously. We recognize customers some | ewhere 1 | on skills and reconstructing, like Turks and |
| 2 are without power for a long period of ti | me. 2 | Caicos and the Caribbean, I trust that we are |
| 3 So when we look at where we are at t | hat 3 | on the same page that you would acquire these |
| 4 particular time in our business, we do do | our 4 | skills whether or not you were charging at |
| 5 best to provide assistance to others. The | way 5 | cost or mark-up, right? |
| 6 it benefits our particular customers is on | two 6 MR | . SMITH: |
| 7 or three fronts. First of all of course, whe | n 7 A | A. Certainly when the people are there practising |
| 8 our employees go to these events, they g | et a 8 | their skills and helping out, if they're at |
| 9 chance to practice their own skills and | d 9 | fully distributed cost or at a mark-up, the |
| 10 abilities in major storm restoration efforts | s. 10 | knowledge transfer would be no different. |
| Another way that we benefit is that our c | osts 11 MR | . JOHNSON: |
| 12 are put through as a fully distributed cos | t, 12 (| Q. Yeah. And I take it you referred to |
| 13 which really means that our customers a | ren't 13 | Newfoundland living, or Newfoundland and |
| 14 in any way paying for this effort. Finally | r I 14 | Labrador being in a climate that poses its |
| 15 would like to bring to the attention of th | e 15 | challenges, and nobody would disagree with |
| 16 Board that we do live in one of the wor | rst 16 | that, but I take it it would be fair comment |
| 17 environments in Atlantic Canada, and | most 17 | on my part that we would look to line crews |
| 18 assured in all of Canada. That particula | ar 18 | and technicians who are used to dealing with |
| 19 environment will require us on times to a | also 19 | those adverse winter conditions, not a crew |
| 20 look for assistance from other utilities. | 20 | who would live in tropical climes. Wouldn't |
| 21 Although we haven't had to do that in re | cent 21 | that be fair? |
| 22 years, 1984 wasn't that long ago. In 1984 | 4 we 22 MR | . SMITH: |
| had customers without electricity for five | e and $\begin{vmatrix} 23 \end{vmatrix}$ | A. No, I wouldn't necessarily agree with that. |
| six weeks and as recent as 1994 we have | d a 24 | Certainly when we have outages and we have |
| 25 significant outage where we had custome | ers off 25 | disturbances on our system, we do work closely |

| Oct | ober 26, 2009 Multi- | | NP's 2010 General Rate Application | |
|------|--|---------|--|--|
| | Pa | ige 117 | Page 119 | |
| 1 | with Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. As ye | ou 1 | employees from Nova Scotia Power, they would | |
| 2 | say, they're down the street. They're the | 2 | have differences in those practices and | |
| 3 | closest. If it comes to bigger events and | 3 | procedures. The terminologies would be | |
| 4 | bigger outages, as we've had in the past, as I | 4 | different, even down to the type of forms you | |
| 5 | said earlier, the line staff with these other | 5 | would fill out to create protection zones | |
| 6 | utilities within Fortis do understand the | 6 | would be different, but the employees within | |
| 7 | safety rules, the work methods, the type of | 7 | the Fortis Group have a very common approach | |
| 8 | equipment. Things are fairly commonized | 8 | to this, so they could fit in very easily, | |
| 9 | across the companies, so when they come here | 9 | very quickly, and get on the ground running. | |
| 10 | to work, they're best equipped to get on the | 10 | So although the plane flight might be a little | |
| 11 | ground running and do it quickly. In terms of | 11 | longer, when they get here I think they would | |
| 12 | the difference in environmental conditions, I | 12 | be more effective. | |
| 13 | don't see that as a negative at all. These | 13 MR | . JOHNSON: | |
| 14 | employees come here with the proper | 14 | Q. Mr. Smith, in fairness, from the safety point | |
| 15 | motivation, to want to help our customers, so | 15 | of view, and I think there's no disagreement, | |
| 16 | the difference in climate, I don't see it as | 16 | the importance of safety, but I'm trying to | |
| 17 | an issue at all. | 17 | assess your view. Now, if you take the | |
| 18 N | IR. JOHNSON: | 18 | Bonavista ice storm, for instance. Do you | |
| 19 | Q. But, Mr. Smith, I can see the analogy with | 19 | think it's optimal in a Bonavista ice storm | |
| 20 | Fortis Alberta's people, okay, but I'm having | 20 | situation where you got ice on poles, | |
| 21 | some difficulty, to be honest with you, with | 21 | insulators, winds whipping off the North | |
| 22 | the idea that we would look to crews who are | 22 | Atlantic, hail going sideways, to think that | |
| 23 | trained and work in the tropical areas of | 23 | that would be from a safety point of view okay | |
| 24 | we'd use those as a go-to source. I'm having | 24 | to have tropical lines crews coming up? Would | |
| 25 | difficulty thinking that we would actually do | 25 | that be optimal or less than optimal in your | |
| | Pa | ge 118 | Page 120 | |
| 1 | that at the end of the day. I mean, there is | 1 | view from a safety point of view? | |
| 2 | no track history of us ever reaching to this | 2 MR | . SMITH: | |
| 3 | area of the world for help at times of need, | 3 | A. As I said earlier, I think it would be the | |
| 4 | is there? | 4 | most optimal way to do it. I do know of a | |
| 5 N | IR. SMITH: | 5 | little bit of experience in this regard. When | |
| 6 | A. In terms of certainly in recent times, we | 6 | I was at Maritime Electric we did have a crew | |
| 7 | haven't brought any of the employees up from | 7 | come up from one of the Caribbean utilities to | |
| 8 | the Turks and Caicos and Caribbean to help, | 8 | share in looking at work methods and | |
| 9 | but certainly these employees when they come | 9 | practices. They came up in the middle of | |
| 10 | here, as I've said, their plane flight to get | 10 | January and, yes, they were effective and, | |
| 11 | here may be a few hours longer than, say, | 11 | yes, the proper techniques were followed and | |
| 12 | somebody from Nova Scotia Power, but once th | ey 12 | the work got done, so I don't see the | |
| 13 | do get here, their knowledge and experience of | 13 | difference in climate as being a problem in | |
| 14 | the way Newfoundland Power does it work and | d 14 | terms of people getting to work quickly and | |
| 15 | its standards and its equipment, they would | 15 | understanding the rules. | |
| 16 | fit in very quickly and very easily and will | 16 MF | . JOHNSON: | |
| 17 | get off the ground running. In these type of | 17 | Q. Your example wasn't an exigent circumstance. | |
| 18 | events, one of the things that you're mostly | 18 | They just came up for training. | |
| 19 | concerned about is the safety of the | 19 MR | . SMITH: | |
| 20 | employees. When you bring them in and there' | s 20 . | A. They came up in training purposes, yes, but I | |
| 21 | electrical wires on the ground, they need to | 21 | would say the environmental conditions were no | |
| 22 | understand the different procedures you have | 22 | different, and again, I could just reiterate | |
| 23 | inside your company to create isolation points | 23 | that I don't think it would be a negative | |
| 24 | and grounding, to provide protection for | 24 | thing, I think it would be a positive thing, | |
| 25 | workers. As I said, if we were to bring in | 25 | the fact that they have the similar knowledge | |

| October 26, 2009 | Multi-Page | e [™] NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|--|---------------|---|
| | Page 121 | Page 123 |
| 1 and experience and the procedures th | at our 1 | getting into a description of Fortis Turks and |
| 2 employees use here. | 2 | Caicos, the regulated electric operations, and |
| 3 MR. JOHNSON: | 3 | I'm just referring you down to third, three |
| 4 Q. Do you see why one might want to | consider 4 | paragraphs down where they say, "In early |
| 5 issues of reciprocity when it come | s to 5 | September 2008, the Turks and Caicos Islands |
| 6 determining what is a fair and reaso | nable 6 | were struck by Tropical Storm Hanna, followed |
| 7 approach to charge other utilities? In | other 7 | by Hurricane Ike, a category four hurricane |
| 8 words, I don't have so much of a prob | lem with 8 | which caused major damage to the utility's |
| 9 Newfoundland Hydro being helped of | ut at cost, 9 | transmission distribution systems on south |
| 10 or even not cost, in the sense that on | the 10 | Caicos, with lesser damage occurring on north |
| 11 very next week we could find oursely | ves with 11 | Caicos and middle Caicos. Providenciales, the |
| 12 the shoe on the other foot and need that | at type 12 | company's major service territory and home to |
| 13 of help, so it's the reciprocity to me th | at is 13 | 80 percent of its customers were spared a |
| 14 a driving consideration. Do you | see 14 | direct hit. Generation facility sustained |
| 15 reciprocity as being relevant to what is | s fair 15 | minimal impact as a result of the hurricane. |
| and reasonable in terms of what we sh | nould be 16 | The Fortis Emergency Response Network," all in |
| 17 charging utilities that have not traditio | nally 17 | caps, "consisting of more than 60 employees |
| 18 helped us? | 18 | throughout the Fortis Group of Companies, |
| 19 MR. SMITH: | 19 | assisted Fortis Turks and Caicos with its |
| 20 A. When those utilities come to help New | vfoundland 20 | restoration efforts and by the end of October |
| 21 Power, I would expect them to do th | e same, 21 | electricity had been restored." So my |
| 22 that is charge the fully distributed cost | when 22 | question is, this would be a formalized |
| they come here. | 23 | response network that Fortis has instituted |
| 24 MR. JOHNSON: | 24 | that's referred to in these corporate filings? |
| 25 Q. Okay. But the fact that there's never b | been a 25 MI | R. SMITH: |
| | Page 122 | Page 124 |
| 1 history of it, that doesn't change y | our 1 | A. The way I would characterize it for you is |
| 2 analysis of it? | 2 | that each of the companies in the Fortis Group |
| 3 MR. SMITH: | 3 | would have a list of employees who have been |
| 4 A. In terms of the history, that doesn't ch | nange 4 | asked a question, if such an event came up in |
| 5 it, no. Again, we could have a winter | r this 5 | Alberta, in Maritime Electric, in the |
| 6 year where we could have a major sto | orm event 6 | Caribbean, would you be willing and able to |
| 7 and knock down powerlines of a sig | nificant 7 | go, subject to the timing of it of course. So |
| 8 quantity. When those employees com | ne here, I 8 | the list would include employees who have said |
| 9 would expect to pay them no more the | han the 9 | yes to that invitation and those employees |
| 10 fully distributed cost. | 10 | would be on a list of those ready and willing |
| 11 MR. JOHNSON: | 11 | to go, so to speak. |
| 12 Q. You're familiar, I take it, Mr. Smith, | with 12 MI | R. JOHNSON: |
| 13the Fortis Emergency Response Netwo | ork? 13 | Q. Okay. And what is theis there a benefit, |
| 14 MR. SMITH: | 14 | Mr. Smith, to Fortis' shareholders from having |
| 15 A. That's terminology, I guess. I know y | what we 15 | this Fortis Emergency Response Network? |
| do in terms of helping other utilities. | 16 MI | R. SMITH: |
| 17 MR. JOHNSON: | 17 | A. I think it's, I characterize it differently. |
| 18 Q. Yes. If I could refer you, sir, to CA-58 | , and 18 | I would say it's a benefit to the customers of |
| 19 in particular I'm looking for the Fo | rtis 19 | these utilities. As I said earlier, we |
| 20 report from 2008. | 20 | certainly would provide this service to any of |
| 21 MR. SMITH: | 21 | the Fortis subsidiaries, but we would do the |
| A. 2008, you mentioned? | 22 | same thing if Nova Scotia Power called |
| 23 MR. JOHNSON: | 23 | tomorrow and said they had a major event, they |
| 24 Q. Yes, sir. And I wonder could you turn | n to page 24 | needed our help. We would go to the same list |
| 25 16 of that particular report? Under, th | ey're 25 | of employees and go through the same process |

| Oct | ober 26, 2009 | Multi-Pag | ge [™] | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|------|--|-----------|-----------------|--|
| | Page | e 125 | | Page 127 |
| 1 | of trying to provide assistance at that time, | 1 | | sales growth. The rate of growth is expected |
| 2 | if we could. So I don't look at this network | 2 | | to be lower in 2009 due to the impact of the |
| 3 | that we've created as being exclusive just to | 3 | | global economic downturn." This is the part, |
| 4 | Fortis. It would be available to any utility. | 4 | | "The corporation's operations in the Caribbean |
| 5 1 | MR. JOHNSON: | 5 | | are exposed to hurricane risk. Fortis uses |
| 6 | Q. I don't, I don't quibble, Mr. Smith, with the | 6 | | external insurance to help mitigate the impact |
| 7 | notion that at the end of the day we're trying | 7 | | on its operations of potential damage and |
| 8 | to get the power on and life back to normal | 8 | | related business interruption associated with |
| 9 | for the residents and customers, okay? I | 9 | | hurricane." So would it not be fair to say |
| 10 | think that's common ground. But my question | on 10 | | that the Fortis Emergency Response Network, of |
| 11 | has to do with what benefits accrue to the | 11 | | which Newfoundland Power is an active member, |
| 12 | Fortis shareholders by virtue of the Fortis | 12 | | actually helps mitigate the effects of |
| 13 | Emergency Response Network, and in particu | ılar 13 | | potential damage and related business |
| 14 | the presence and full participation of | 14 | | interruption associate with the hurricanes? |
| 15 | Newfoundland Power's personnel in that | 15 N | AR. SI | MITH: |
| 16 | network. | 16 | А. | I don't look at it that way, to be honest with |
| 17 1 | MR. SMITH: | 17 | | you. The way I look at it is that there's |
| 18 | A. Again I don't know if I could characterize it | 18 | | customers out there that are in the dark, they |
| 19 | as a benefit to the shareholder. When our | 19 | | don't have electricity, and when the call |
| 20 | employees go, they are charged out at the | 20 | | comes, if we can provide assistance to those |
| 21 | fully distributed cost. That's what's in our | 21 | | customers without negatively impacting our |
| 22 | policy and guidelines that we've practised for | 22 | | customers, then I think that's the reasonable |
| 23 | many years. Certainly the policy and practice | 23 | | thing to do. As I mentioned earlier, I would |
| 24 | has been in front of the Board before. So the | 24 | | expect the same from the Turks and Caicos |
| 25 | way I look at it, as long as we recover our | 25 | | utility. If we have customers in the dark and |
| | Page | e 126 | | Page 128 |
| 1 | fully distributed cost, our customers are in | 1 | | we need assistance, I would expect them to |
| 2 | no way negatively impacted. | 2 | | come here to help us on the same basis. |
| 3 1 | MR. JOHNSON: | 3 N | /R. J0 | DHNSON: |
| 4 | Q. If I could turn you to page 25 of this | 4 | Q. | Yeah, I understand that, but having now |
| 5 | document under the Management Discussion | and 5 | | explored this issue a bit further with you and |
| 6 | Analysis. Yes, I'm referring now to the | 6 | | having brought you to a discussion in the MD&A |
| 7 | second paragraph, Mr. Smith. They say, | 7 | | of Fortis' book, Fortis' report, it seems to |
| 8 | "Regulated assets in the Caribbean region as a | a 8 | | my reading that there is a benefit to Fortis |
| 9 | percentage of the corporation's total | 9 | | shareholders, and I just wonder whether you |
| 10 | regulated assets were ten percent at December | r 10 | | would now, having read that, concur with that |
| 11 | 31st, 2008," and in parentheses, "(December | · 11 | | view? |
| 12 | 31st, 2007, 8 percent). The regulated rate of | 12 N | AR. S | MITH: |
| 13 | return on rate base assets, ROA, achieved in | 13 | А. | I think there's a benefit to our customers. I |
| 14 | the Caribbean is higher than that achieved in | 14 | | think there's a benefit to the Turks and |
| 15 | Canada. The higher return is correlated with | 15 | | Caicos' customers in our ability to respond |
| 16 | increased operating risks associated with | 16 | | quickly to provide service. That's what I |
| 17 | local economic and political factors and | 17 | | really believe. |
| 18 | weather conditions; however, the allowed ROI | ES 18 N | /R. J0 | OHNSON: |
| 19 | at Caribbean Utilities and Belize Electricity | 19 | Q. | Do you see where I could conclude, reading |
| 20 | were lowered in 2008 due to negotiation of ne | ew 20 | | that sentence, that the Fortis uses external |
| 21 | licenses at Caribbean Utilities and the impact | 21 | | insurance to help mitigate the impact on its |
| 22 | of a regulatory rate decision at Belize | 22 | | operations of potential damage and related |
| 23 | Electricity. Economic growth has been strong | g 23 | | business interruption associated with |
| 24 | in the corporation service territories in the | 24 | | hurricane," that it would be a fair reading on |
| 25 | Caribbean, positively impacting customer and | d 25 | | my part to say, yes, and also the Fortis |

| 00 | ctober 26, 2009 | Multi- | Page | ⁴ NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---------------|--|----------|----------|---|
| | | Page 129 | | Page 131 |
| 1 | Emergency Response Network also hel | ps to | 1 | rate of Belize Electricity effective July 1st, |
| 2 | mitigate the impact, which is of direct | | 2 | '08." Then it goes on to say, and this is |
| 3 | benefit to shareholders of Fortis? Would | you | 3 | what I want to focus on, "Partially offsetting |
| 4 | see where I could reasonably conclude that | at? | 4 | the above factors were: (1) a decrease in the |
| 5 | MR. SMITH: | | 5 | value-added delivery component of the average |
| 6 | A. Again, I can't comment, I don't think, on | the | 6 | electricity rate of Belize effective July 1st, |
| 7 | way you might conclude it. I can just te | 11 | 7 | '08; (2) a 3.25 percent reduction in basic |
| 8 | you from my perspective when I do these | types | 8 | electricity rates and the elimination of the |
| 9 | of assistance and when we're able to do it | ., I | 9 | hurricane cost recovery surcharge," in quotes, |
| 10 | just look at it from the customer's | 1 | 10 | "CRS at Caribbean Utilities effective January |
| 11 | perspective, and again, as long as we're r | iot 1 | 11 | 1st, '08, and under the terms of the company's |
| 12 | negatively impacting our customers, I do | think | 12 | new T&D license; and (3) revenue loss of |
| 13 | it's the right thing to do. | 1 | 13 | approximately \$2 million at Fortis Turks and |
| 14 | MR. JOHNSON: | 1 | 14 | Caicos due to Hurricane Ike." And as I read |
| 15 | Q. So in your advising the Board as to what | you | 15 | thatfirst of all, do you have any |
| 16 | think is fair and appropriate, you have no | ot 1 | 16 | familiarity with the hurricane cost recovery |
| 17 | considered the existence of the sharehold | der | 17 | surcharge, the CRS that's referred to there? |
| 18 | benefit to Fortis, in your analysis? | 1 | 18 MR. 3 | SMITH: |
| 19 | MR. SMITH: | 1 | 19 A. | No, I do not. |
| 20 | A. I really haven't done an analysis on this | | 20 MR. | IOHNSON: |
| 21 | Again, maybe my approach is very simp | listic 2 | 21 Q. | Would you agree as a mathematical matter that |
| 22 | and my approach again, as I've said befor | e, is | 22 | to the extent that the Belize customers, or |
| 23 | simply our ability to respond when there | e's 2 | 23 | the Turks and Caicos customers, Belize in this |
| 24 | people in the dark and there's powerlines | on 2 | 24 | instance, are shielded from the market cost of |
| 25 | the ground. At that particular time, if we | re | 25 | the services being provided to them at their, |
| | | Page 130 | | Page 132 |
| 1 | able to respond and not negatively impact | our | 1 | at the time of these hurricanes, that their |
| 2 | customers, then I think it's the right thing | 5 | 2 | surcharge is lower than what it otherwise |
| 3 | to do. | | 3 | would be? |
| | MR. JOHNSON: | a | 4 MR. S | MITH: |
| 5 | Q. The bottom of page 34, Mr. Smith, unde | r the | 5 A. | Again, I don't know the nature of this |
| 6 | paragraph, "Revenue," which is right at t | ine | 6 | surcharge and so I really couldn't comment. |
| 7 | bottom, it indicates that, Revenue increas | sed | 7 MR. J | OHNSON: |
| 8 | 101 million over the previous year, howe | ver, | 8 Q. | Just speak about, in terms of operational |
| 19 | annual revenue for 08 includes the two | /0 | 9 | impact for a moment, Mr. Smith. We saw in |
| | Contribution and approximate \$6 m | illion I | 10 | previous, when we previously looked at this |
| | favourable impact of foreign currents | | 11 | with Mr. Ludiow, that Hurricane Ivan, which |
| $ _{12}^{12}$ | translation due to the weekening of the | y I | 12 | hours expanded by Newfoundland Dower personnel |
| 13 | Canadian dollar against the US dollar ve | or I | 15 | in that offert, and that's borne out. I think |
| 14 | over year " et cetera. You go on to say | ai . | 14 | it's CA NR 260. And yeah there you have the |
| 16 | "Excluding the two additional months | , of | 15 | hreakdown 16.984 for Hurricane Ivan in '04 |
| 17 | contribution for Caribbean Utilities an | d l | 17 | 5 220 hours for Fortis Turks and Caicos And |
| 18 | favourable impact of foreign currence | v | 18 | how would Newfoundland Power operationally |
| 19 | translation, revenue increased year over y | ear. | 19 | cope with a request for the type of manpower |
| 20 | primarily due to: (1) the full flow through | of | 20 | that it ended up giving to the Caribbean |
| $ _{21}^{-5}$ | higher fuel and oil costs to customers a | t la | 21 | Utility situation in 2004? |
| 22 | Caribbean Utilities under the terms of the | ne | 22 MR. S | MITH: |
| $ _{23}^{-2}$ | company's new T&D license: (2) electr | icity | 23 A. | It's difficult for me to comment on 2004. as I |
| 24 | sales growth; and (3) an increase in the co | ost | 24 | was not with Newfoundland Power at the time. |
| 25 | of power component of the average electr | icity | 25 | I can speak generally when we react to these |

| 0 | ctober 26, 2009 | Multi-P | 'age 🎬 | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|--|--|--|--------|--|
| | Ι | Page 133 | | Page 135 |
| | 1 requests, how we do try to position oursel | lf, 1 | | difference, geography of your service |
| | 2 especially in relation to the Turks and Cai | $\cos 2$ | | territory, and your ability to take staff out |
| | 3 item that's here, but in terms of the | 3 | | of certain places versus others. For example, |
| 4 | 4 Caribbean Utilities one, I wasn't with th | e 4 | | when we looked at the Turks and Caicos |
| 4 | 5 company, so it's a little hard for me to | 5 | | incident, we certainly had a fair bit of |
| 6 | 6 speak. | 6 | i | pressures on the Northeast Avalon. |
| | 7 MR. JOHNSON: | 7 | | particularly St. John's that year. So when we |
| 8 | 8 O. Well, let's put it this way, if we say | 8 | | looked at could we send people, in the St. |
| 9 | 9 hypothetically that a similar event has | 9 |) | John's area we have approximately 50 line |
| 10 | happened in 2004, and we are dealing. I t | ake 10 | | staff, so we intentionally just made sure we |
| 11 | 1 it, you'll agree, with a very hurricane pror | ie 11 | | just took one person out of the St. John's |
| 12 | 2 area of the world, right? | 12 | | pool of linemen to send away. It was our way |
| 13 | 3 MR. SMITH: | 13 | | of kind of trying to make sure we weren't |
| 14 | 4 A. Yes, they do have hurricanes in the Carib | bean. 14 | | negatively impacting service on the Avalon in |
| 15 | 5 ves. | 15 | | a very busy time on the Avalon. |
| 16 | 6 MR. JOHNSON: | 16 | MR. J | OHNSON: |
| 17 | 7 O. They're prone to them? | 17 | 0. | I take it that it's a truism that something |
| 18 | 8 MR. SMITH: | 18 | τ. | gives here when Newfoundland Power has to |
| 19 | A. I don't know if I'd say prone to them. I d | 0 19 | | respond down there operationally? |
| 20 | have a piece of information in my head, and | nd I 20 | MR. S | MITH: |
| $ _{21}$ | think it's correct that the one in Turks and | 1 21 | Α. | I don't think it's a matter of something needs |
| 2 | 2 Caicos was the first hurricane they had se | en 22 | | to give. You certainly need to look at the |
| 2 | in over 50 years or 100 years. I believe. S | 0 23 | | work and try to find ways of getting the work |
| 24 | 4 I think they happen in general in the area | 24 | | done. I know that when we looked at this |
| 2 | 5 but in terms of affecting specific utilities. | , 25 | | particular issue in the fall of 2008 when the |
| F | | 2000 124 | | Page 126 |
| | I I think that may make it man of a union | rage 154 | | Fage 150 |
| | I I I IIIIK IIIAI IIIAY IIIAKE II IIIOTE OFA UIIIq | | | to find work of actting the work done. Unrow |
| | 2 Uning. | | | the twhen we looked at this particular issue |
| | MR. JOHNSON: | 0 | | in the fall of 2008 when the request same, we |
| | Q. went, hypotheticany, T mean, if we had | a 4 | • | did look at the work that we had and could we |
| | Coicos on the Coribbeen Utilities needs | | | bring in contract labour to help while these |
| | 5 Calcos of the Calibbean Outlines neede | |) | bring in contract fabour to help while these |
| | another 17,000 hours, what would happen | Virte / | | that we looked at and one of the decisions |
| | 8 ground here in New Jound and Power in or | | | that we looked at and one of the decisions |
| | 9 accommodate that? | 9 | | |
| | 0 MR. SMITH: | 10 11 | MR. J | And the use of contract lebour I take it that |
| | A. In terms of generally what we do whe | | Q. | And the use of contract labour, I take it that it's assumed that the contract labour you |
| | 2 request comes in from a utility to provid | e 12 | | it's assumed that the contract labour you |
| | assistance, we would look at our own w | OFK 13 | | would retain in order to fill any gap, that |
| | 4 requirements first, and we would look at v | vnere 14 | | would be charged at market rate, correct? |
| | 5 we are in the construction season, and it we | ve 15 | MR. S | MIIH: |
| | b were able to send employees away, we v | vouid 16 | А. | well, the contract labour that we would use |
| | / nave to look at ways to backfilling here | · 17 | | would be contracts that we would already have |
| | 8 locally to make sure our own work got d | one. 18 | | in place with contractors, and so what we |
| | 9 One of the things that you would look | 11 19 | | would simply do was use those tender prices |
| $ ^{20}$ | uoing, of course, is contracting labour. If | 20 | | unat we already have and just bring in |
| $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ - \end{bmatrix}$ | you send your employees away, can you b | 1 mg m 21 | | Automation and a second |
| | 2 Iocal contract labour to supplement you | $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{\mu} \\ \mathbf{d} \\ \mathbf{or} \end{array}$ | | one of the things that you would have to do, |
| $ ^2$ | workforce so that work doesn't get delaye | u Or 23 | | or course, is priorie these contractors to make |
| 24 | service is in any way compromised. The | uner 24 | | sure they had labour available to bring in. |
| 125 | b uning that you would do is try to look at th | e 25 | | i nen, of course, you just want to make sure |

| Oc | tober 26, 2009 Mult | i-Pa | age 🖱 | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|----------|--|------|--------|--|
| | Page 137 | | | Page 139 |
| 1 | that those prices are no more than your own | 1 | | and do it for you. Of course, our own |
| 2 | labour prices. | 2 | | employees would have done that work, but, of |
| 3 | MR. JOHNSON: | 3 | | course, our own employees also had to do a |
| 4 | 0. But they're I don't think there will be a | 4 | | much broader perspective of work in general. |
| 5 | dispute on this but fundamentally whether | 5 | | So our own employees have to do energize work |
| 6 | established through tender you know | 6 | | they have to do transmission work they have |
| | Newfoundland Power is paying a market price | | | to do substation work. So at any particular |
| | what the market will bear for the services | | | point in time yes they would do the |
| | that it substitutes for those that are now | 0 | | subdivision work that the contractor could do |
| | deployed elsewhere Wouldn't that he true? | 10 | | but certainly in the run of a year they had to |
| | MD SMITH | 10 | | do a lot more work than just that |
| | MR. SMITH. | 11 | MD I | ounson. |
| 12 | A. The labour that we would use through these | 12 | MK. J | Could Livet go back now Mr. Smith to |
| 13 | and my point of being comfortable is to make | 13 | Q. | Evhibit 2 of the company's amonded |
| 14 | and my point of being connortable is to make | 14 | | exhibit 2 of the company's amended |
| 15 | sure that labour and that way our sustamore | 15 | | application, and I want to focus for a moment |
| 10 | own labour, and that way our customers | 10 | | on your total labour line, which is your line |
| | wouldn't be in any way negatively impacted. | 1/ | | number 4. Th wait for you to |
| 18 | MR. JOHNSON: | 18 | MR. S | MITH: Lhove Exhibit 2 |
| 19 | Q. Is tendered fabour not market is that less | 19 | A. | Thave Exhibit 2. |
| 20 | than market or market? | 20 | MR. J | Ofference the state of the stat |
| 21 | MR. SMITH: | 21 | Q. | Okay, thank you, sir, and we have the total $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 22 | A. It would be the local market, yes. | 22 | | labour line of \$50,749,000.00, and as we see, |
| 23 | MR. JOHNSON: | 23 | | that's made up of regular, standby, temporary, |
| 24 | Q. Okay. I guess a consumer might fairly ask the | 24 | | and overtime, and I take it that we re on the |
| 25 | question, Mr. Shifun, that If we could have a | 25 | | same page, that these figures would only be in |
| | Page 138 | | | Page 140 |
| 1 | repeat of, say, a Fortis Turks and Caicos | 1 | | respect of Newfoundland Power's internal |
| 2 | event where 5,000 hours were expended down | 2 | | labour force costs, right? |
| 3 | there, or if we could have a repeat of a | 3 | MR. S | MITH: |
| 4 | 17,000 hour event, a consumer might say | 4 | A. | Yes, that would be correct. |
| 5 | wouldn't that be some sort of indication that | 5 | MR. JO | DHNSON: |
| 6 | maybe we don't need all of what the complement | 6 | Q. | And further, that these would represent |
| 7 | is here if when we need to not use these | 7 | | operating, not capital labour costs, right? |
| 8 | people, we manage a way around it. What would | 8 | MR. S | MITH: |
| 9 | be your response to that type of observation? | 9 | А. | That is correct. |
| 10 | (12:30 p.m.) | 10 | MR. JO | DHNSON: |
| 11 | MR. SMITH: | 11 | Q. | And so when Newfoundland Power would contract |
| 12 | A. Again my response to that in terms of my own | 12 | | our for a service, say, whether it be |
| 13 | personal ability to respond with my own | 13 | | vegetation management or vehicle maintenance, |
| 14 | knowledge would again go back to the Turks and | 14 | | or oil testing, building maintenance, I think |
| 15 | Caicos incident. The contract labour that we | 15 | | these being all things that you typically |
| 16 | brought in to supplement their own workforce | 16 | | would contract out for, that these labour |
| 17 | while these individuals were away is very | 17 | | components would be found in lines below the |
| 18 | limited in what they can do. Basically, this | 18 | | total labour line, would that be right? |
| 19 | contract labour goes into subdivisions and is | 19 | MR. S | MITH: |
| 20 | able to run the wires between the poles and | 20 | A. | Yes, that would be correct. |
| 21 | hang the insulators. It's a very basic form | 21 | MR. JO | DHNSON: |
| 22 | ot our line construction. So this contract | 22 | Q. | Okay, and so just keep in mind the |
| 23 | labour when you bring it in, if you have that | 23 | | \$30,749,000.00 for a moment, and if we go over |
| $ ^{24}$ | type of work in the chit to be done in the | 24 | | to volume 2, Tab 1, of your labour forecast, |
| 25 | future, then that contract labour can come in | 25 | | and in particular, Schedule B. |

| October 26, 2009 | Multi-Page | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|------------|---|
| | Page 141 | Page 143 |
| 1 MR. SMITH: | | we provide the numbers. In terms of how we |
| 2 A. Yes. | 2 | arrive at the numbers, I guess we just follow |
| 3 MR. JOHNSON: | 3 | a general way that we build our budgets, and |
| 4 Q. We see on the bottom towards the bo | ttom, 4 | that tends to run off your most recent years |
| 5 the 2010 forecast workforce operating, th | nat's 5 | actual, and then you adjust it for inflation, |
| 6 \$29,109,000.00, but I take it the reason the | nat 6 | these types of things, and you come up with a |
| 7 there's a difference between the 29,109, | and 7 | forecast of what your budget would be. |
| 8 your total forecast labour of \$30,749,000 | 0.00 8 MR | R. JOHNSON: |
| 9 is that the figure of 29 does not include | e 9 | Q. So we're back on Exhibit 2 now, and we see our |
| 10 overtime. Would that be right? | 10 | overtime line has been pretty constant, at |
| 11 MR. SMITH: | 11 | about 1.6 million dollars over the 2007 to |
| 12 A. Yes, that would be correct. | 12 | 2010 forecast year, and I'm curious as to why |
| 13 MR. JOHNSON: | 13 | we would anticipate that it would be up again |
| 14 Q. And so there's no analysis in this labo | ur 14 | consistent with those previous levels, given |
| 15 forecast document of how you arrived a | it the 15 | the fact that we you know, we continue to |
| 16 overtime amount. The only analysis we | have is 16 | have expended money on, you know, capital |
| 17 how you arrived at your regular wages, | would 17 | expenditures for things such as reliability, |
| 18 that be accurate? | 18 | and the fact as well that we have an |
| 19 MR. SMITH: | 19 | increasingly larger pool of staff to do |
| 20 A. What Schedule B does in this whole la | ibour 20 | necessary work during regular hours. For |
| 21 forecast document, it puts in perspective | the 21 | instance, as I think you know, the number of |
| 22 FTE calculation. | 22 | powerline technicians in the company, while |
| 23 MR. JOHNSON: | 23 | that has stayed fairly flat from '07 to '10, |
| 24 Q. Yeah. | 24 | there's a lot more apprentices in the system |
| 25 MR. SMITH: | 25 | at the present time. So what would be your |
| | Page 142 | Page 144 |
| 1 A. That's what this document does. It doe | sn't 1 | comment as to why the overtime number would be |
| 2 really speak to how the operating budget | would 2 | so consistent with previous times? |
| 3 have been built. It just simply looks at h | OW 3 MR | . SMITH: |
| 4 our internal labour fits into the budget. | 4 . | A. The overtime number that you see on this line, |
| 5 MR. JOHNSON: | 5 | and as you mentioned earlier, is the operating |
| 6 Q. Okay, but so if we're looking for a | n 6 | overtime. The vast majority of this money |
| 7 analysis of how you arrive at your over | time 7 | would be used to respond to trouble calls. In |
| 8 estimate, there's no point in looking in h | ere, 8 | the run of a year we have approximately 10,000 |
| 9 you've got to look somewhere else? | 9 | calls from our customers to provide assistance |
| 10 MR. SMITH: | 10 | of different forms. Some of that could be |
| 11 A. That would be correct. | 11 | somebody without power, it could be a report |
| 12 MR. JOHNSON: | 12 | of a downed wire, it could be a report of many |
| 13 Q. Okay, and I think the labour overtime fig | gure 13 | different things. What you see here is a |
| 14 that we've seen from Exhibit 2 a few mo | oments 14 | trending of that cost. There's no doubt over |
| ago, I think that was 1.64 million in 20 | 10 15 | the years we've spent a lot of money on our |
| 16 forecast? | 16 | distribution system, and as that graph we saw |
| 17 MR. SMITH: | 17 | before, we have made improvements in our SAIDI |
| 18 A. Yes, that's correct. | 18 | and SAIFI. That is the duration of outages. |
| 19 MR. JOHNSON: | 19 | Most of that work was done on what we call the |
| 20 Q. Okay. Would it be possible in future fili | ngs 20 | trunk part of the system, and, of course, off |
| 21 to reference, such as in your labour forec | ast, 21 | that system there's many laterals and many |
| 22 how you arrived at your assumptions a | s to 22 | service wires. What we continue to respond to |
| 23 overtime? | 23 | with most of our trouble calls are smaller |
| 24 MR. SMITH: | 24 | events away from the trunk system. So |
| A. Like any of these line items in our foreca | ist, 25 | although you see an improvement in overall |

| 00 | ctober 26, 2009 Mult | i-P | Pag | ge^{TM} NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|---|---|------------|--|
| | Page 145 | | | Page 147 |
| 1 | reliability because the trunk system has been | 1 | 1 | think a short term goal would be overtime? |
| | approved we continue to get calls from our | 2 | 2 м | MR_SMITH |
| 2 | customers to respond to trouble, calls on the | 3 | 2 101 | A In terms of overtime I think the forecast we |
| | laterals and that's really what drives this | | 5 1 | provided here would be what we believe is a |
| | line here. It's responding to trouble calls | 4 | + | reasonable amount for overtime. That's what |
| 3 | an the laterals of the system primerily | 3 |) (| reasonable amount for overtime. That's what |
| 6 | on the laterals of the system primarily. | 6 | э — | you see in the forecast here. |
| 1 | MR. JOHNSON: | 1 | / M | MR. JOHNSON: |
| 8 | Q. So you are anticipating no significant | 8 | 3 | Q. But like in years beyond 2010, would you |
| 9 | difference in the company having the request | 9 |) | anticipate that number to improve? |
| 10 | for these than you've seen in the past? | 10 |) M | MR. SMITH: |
| 11 | MR. SMITH: | 11 | 1 | A. It's a difficult thing to say. We will work |
| 12 | A. Again we look to this line and we try to make | 12 | 2 | our best to improve this line, but, of course, |
| 13 | sure we find efficiencies in this line. The | 13 | 3 | you have to remember this line is a function |
| 14 | way you can find efficiencies with trouble | 14 | 4 | of the weather. If we have a lot of windy |
| 15 | calls has to do with a process that we have in | 15 | 5 | weather, a lot of trouble calls, then this |
| 16 | our call centre. When a customer calls in and | 16 | 6 | line can tend to fluctuate with that also, but |
| 17 | they report a trouble call, we will go through | 17 | 7 | we will do our best to bring stability to this |
| 18 | that incident with that customer to try to | 18 | 8 | line, but in terms of forecasting it out |
| 19 | determine do we need to respond now, is it | 19 | 9 | beyond what we've shown here, that would be a |
| 20 | possibly an inside trouble, is it possibly a | 20 | 0 | little bit of a challenge at this time. |
| 21 | wire down from a telephone company or a cable | 21 | 1 CI | CHAIRMAN: |
| 22 | TV company So we believe we can make some | 22 | 2 | 0 It's a known unknown |
| 23 | progress in that particular area of screening | 23 | - зм | MR_SMITH |
| $ _{24}^{23}$ | trouble calls to try and find a way of keeping | 23 | 1 | A I would agree sir it's a known unknown |
| 25 | this overtime flat, at less than inflation | 27 | т 5 М | MR_IOHNSON: |
| 25 | | 23 | <u> </u> | |
| | Page 146 | | | Page 148 |
| 1 | MR. JOHNSON: | 1 | 1 | Q. Sir, could I just direct your attention to CA- |
| 2 | Q. How long has the company been screening the | 2 | 2 | NP-106, and I bring this up, Mr. Smith, |
| 3 | trouble calls in the fashion that you just | 3 | 3 | because it does show tend to show, at least |
| 4 | described? | 4 | 4 | from my observation, a remarkably stable |
| 5 | MR. SMITH: | 5 | 5 | situation in terms of your skilled |
| 6 | A. This is something that's been in our company, | 6 | 5 | tradespeople, and this table gets at from the |
| 7 | I would say, for several years, but in terms | 7 | 7 | period '05 to '09, the number of regular |
| 8 | of what we've been doing and some of the | 8 | 8 | employees who left the company other than by |
| 9 | conversations I've had with control room | 9 | 9 | retirement or death through those years, and |
| 10 | operators, I do believe we can get a little | 10 | 0 | would you agree that is a pretty stable |
| 11 | better in this area, and by doing that, we can | 11 | 1 | picture relative to other utilities? |
| 12 | avoid some of this overtime. | 12 | 2 M | MR. SMITH: |
| 13 | MR. JOHNSON: | 13 | 3 | A. The conclusion I would draw looking at that |
| 14 | O. And when is that improvement expected to | 14 | 4 | table is that 7 and 8 have more retirements in |
| 15 | manifest itself? | 15 | 5 | it than 5 and 6 did. |
| 16 | MR. SMITH: | 16 | 6 M | MR. JOHNSON: |
| 17 | A Effectively we've already started this in | 17 | 7 | O These are other than by retirement or death |
| 18 | terms of conversations with our control room | 18 | , 8 M | MR_SMITH |
| 10 | operators and that process is already | 10 | 9 9 | A Oh I'm sorry |
| 20 | started and I continue to talk to the | 20 | Эмл | MR IOHNSON |
| $\begin{vmatrix} 20 \\ 21 \end{vmatrix}$ | operators and talk to the manager of this | $\begin{vmatrix} 20\\ 21 \end{vmatrix}$ | ייי 1 | O Veah |
| $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$ | perticular group, and we continue to look for | | י איז ר | Z. I Call. |
| $\begin{vmatrix} 22\\ 22 \end{vmatrix}$ | particular group, and we continue to look for ways of improving it | $\begin{vmatrix} 22\\ 22 \end{vmatrix}$ | ∠ 1VI 2 | MIX. SMITH. A Veah I would agree this indicates the |
| $\begin{bmatrix} 23\\ 24 \end{bmatrix}$ | ways of improving it. | 23 |) 1 | A. I call, I would agree units indicates the |
| $ ^{24}$ | MK. JOHNSON: | 24 | + - | stability in our workforce and that in / and 8 |
| 25 | Q. Do you have a figure in mind as to where you | 25 | 3 | a tew more employees left the company than |

| Oc | tober 26, 2009 N | /Iulti-P | age | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|----|--|----------|----------|--|
| | Page | 149 | | Page 151 |
| 1 | occurred in 5 and 6, for reasons other than | 1 | | call them. I'm in CA-NP-111 there, Michael. |
| 2 | retirement or death, as you said, but there is | 2 | 2 | It's Footnote 1, that an apprentice powerline |
| 3 | an increase in 7 and 8 relative to 5 and 6. | 3 | ; | technician hired in '06 would be come a |
| 4 | MR. JOHNSON: | 4 | Ļ | journeyperson powerline technician in the test |
| 5 | Q. But in terms of the grand scheme of things, | 5 | i | year 2010, etc, right, and then I note in |
| 6 | from your knowledge of other utilities, we're | 6 | i | Footnote 2 that says according to the |
| 7 | doing a pretty good job in the sense of not | 7 | , | International Brotherhood of Electrical |
| 8 | many people are leaving us? | 8 | 5 | Workers, they've observed that it takes ten |
| 9 | MR. SMITH: | 9 |) | years to become a well-rounded powerline |
| 10 | A. I would agree with that in general speaking, | 10 |) | technician. So - and I guess my question goes |
| 11 | yes. | 11 | | to the issue what it entails when you're |
| 12 | (12:45 p.m.) | 12 | | taking on a young apprentice and they have to |
| 13 | MR. JOHNSON: | 13 | | go through block 1, block 2, block 3, and |
| 14 | Q. And if you could turn, sir, to CA-NP-111, and | 14 | | block 4, because I understand that there's a |
| 15 | I always perk up when I get a three page | 15 | i | productivity hit that the company takes when |
| 16 | answer from Newfoundland Power, and this o | one 16 | i | we're talking about young apprentices. Would |
| 17 | sort of got my attention. The question was in | 17 | | that be true? |
| 18 | reference to page 213 of the amended | 18 | MR. S | MITH: |
| 19 | application when it stated that, "Part of the | 19 | A. | Yes, as part of doing the on-the-job hands on |
| 20 | forecast increase in Newfoundland Power's | 20 |) | training, there is a slowdown effect of |
| 21 | workforce through 2010 is attributable to the | 21 | | providing that training at the job site, and |
| 22 | need to address workforce demographics, | 22 | 2 | you could refer to that as a negative |
| 23 | primarily the aging workforce. Please explain | 23 | 1 | productivity, yes. |
| 24 | what this statement means and how it relates | 24 | MR. JO | OHNSON: |
| 25 | specifically to Newfoundland Power's 2010 | 25 | Q. | Yeah, like at line 20 on page 2 of 3, it |
| | Page | 150 | | Page 152 |
| 1 | labour cost forecast", and I know that the | 1 | | indicates, "The apprentice powerline |
| 2 | previous table that we dealt with didn't | 2 | 2 | technician is less productive than a fully |
| 3 | concern retirement, I'm aware of that, but I | 3 | ; | qualified powerline technician". I don't |
| 4 | would like to just bring your attention to | 4 | ļ | think that would be surprising, right, and |
| 5 | line 42 on the first page where the company | 5 | i | then there's a further productivity issue at |
| 6 | indicates under the category of apprentice | 6 | 5 | lines 22 to 23 where it says, "In addition, |
| 7 | powerline technician that, "Over the five year | 7 | , | the supervision of the apprentice also impacts |
| 8 | period from '04 to '08, the company has hired | 8 | } | the productivity of the supervising powerline |
| 9 | an average of 7 apprentice powerline | 9 |) | technician". So just elaborate on that a |
| 10 | technicians per year, and over the five year | 10 |) | little bit, Mr. Smith, for us in terms of the |
| 11 | period, '09 to 2013, the company plans to hire | 11 | | effect on the supervisory people? |
| 12 | an average of 8 per year", and then it goes on | 12 | MR. S | MITH: |
| 13 | to say, "Apprentice employment at this level | 13 | А. | So the way this trending would occur, |
| 14 | will be necessary for the foreseeable future | 14 | | especially when you get to blocks 3 and 4, |
| 15 | to ensure continuity in the skilled trade", | 15 | i | which is more the operating component of the |
| 16 | and then it says, "The increase in hiring of | 16 | <u>,</u> | work, these individuals get into more how to |
| 17 | apprentices is attributable to the lead time | 17 | 1 | operate the system, how to respond to trouble |
| 18 | required in response to anticipated | 18 | | calls, and how to deal with faults and |
| 19 | retirements", and then it goes on to give the | 19 |) | electrical shorts on the system, so to speak. |
| 20 | average annual attrition rate of 8 powerline | 20 |) | So when you get to that part of the |
| 21 | technicians being anticipated over the period | 21 | | progression of the apprenticeship program, |
| 22 | from '09 to 2013, and I noticed as well that | 22 | 2 | there's basically two individuals in the |
| 23 | in page two of 13, that Footnote 1 gave us an | 23 | | truck. One is the supervising journeyman |
| 24 | indication of how long it takes for an | 24 | | lineman and the other is the apprentice. So |
| 25 | apprentice to become a journeyperson, as you | 25 | i | when going out to do a typical job, and it |

| October 26, 2009 | Multi | -Pa | age TM | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|--|----------|-----|-------------------|--|
| F | Page 153 | | | Page 155 |
| 1 could simply be a job where there's ar | 1 | 1 | Q. | CA-NP-107. This is page 2 of 3, I think, |
| 2 underground fault on a cable, as part of do | ing | 2 | | Michael. Just for clarity, leave that on the |
| 3 that job the supervising powerline technici | an | 3 | | screen, but the question that was posed that |
| 4 needs to instruct the journeyperson in term | ns | 4 | | elicited this response was, "Please provide |
| 5 of the hazards to look for, how to plan an | d | 5 | | the number, title, and location of positions |
| 6 organize the job. That would be an example | le of | 6 | | which Newfoundland Power has publicly |
| 7 the productivity slowdown, so to speak | κ, | 7 | | advertised over each of the years 2007 to |
| 8 through the on-the-job training. | | 8 | | date, as well as the amount of time elapsed |
| 9 MR. JOHNSON: | | 9 | | from advertisement to the filling of the |
| 10 Q. Okay, and if I could turn you to 108 for a | a | 10 | | positions, together with the number of |
| 11 moment, sir, I notice this is a table that | | 11 | | qualified applications received for each |
| 12 shows a number of unsolicited job application | tions | 12 | | position", and I just refer you to the first |
| 13that Newfoundland Power currently has or | n file | 13 | | powerline technician position that I see |
| 14 from prospective employees, and I note th | hat | 14 | | there, it's in the second grouping of there |
| 15 under the linesperson operations, you've set | een | 15 | | we have it, just up from the there we are, |
| 16 a fairly significant increase of unsolicited | | 16 | | right there, see that. |
| 17 applications to your company; 41 for th | ie | 17 | MR. S | MITH: |
| 18 period '06 to June '07, and 85 from July ' | 08 | 18 | A. | Yes. |
| 19 to June '09. Now would that be inclusive | of | 19 | MR. JO | DHNSON: |
| 20 journeypersons as well as apprentices, or | do | 20 | Q. | And I take it that there was two positions |
| 21 you know that, Mr. Smith? | | 21 | | that Newfoundland Power had to fill, and you |
| 22 MR. SMITH: | | 22 | | received 12 applicants for those positions, 12 |
| A. I would suggest to you this is people tryin | g | 23 | | qualified applicants? |
| 24 to get into the journeyperson trade mos | t 1 | 24 | MR. S. | MITH: |
| 25 likely. I haven t seen this data, but I would | a | 25 | А. | res. |
| F | Page 154 | | | Page 156 |
| 1 be very surprised if it included very man | у | 1 | MR. JO | HNSON: |
| 2 journeypersons looking for work with t | he | 2 | Q. | And then you ended up filling the first |
| 3 company. | | 3 | | position in 68 days, and the second position, |
| 4 MR. JOHNSON: | 41 | 4 | | 86 days? |
| 5 Q. Could you pernaps get back to us on what | the | 5 | MR. SN | AITH: |
| 6 number of journeypersons are included in | that | 6 | A. | Yes. |
| ⁷ 85, just to bring a bit more clarity to it? | | / | MR. JO | HNSON: |
| 8 KELLI, Q.C.: | | 8 | Q. | and do you know was this around town of some |
| 9 Q. Just for clarity, you re fooking for a | | 10 | MD CN | |
| 11 MP JOHNSON | | 10 | MIK. SN | I couldn't tall you where these positions |
| $\frac{11}{12} \text{O} \text{Ves sir}$ | | 11 | А. | were |
| 12 Q. $103, 511$ | | 12 | MP IO | WEIC. |
| 14 0 As to what categories they would fall into | , | 14 | MK. JO | And then to keep on coming down, you see into |
| 15 MR IOHNSON | • | 15 | Q. | the next grouping and I'm looking at the |
| 16 0 Yes | | 16 | | powerline technician New West Valley Again |
| 17 KELLY OC: | | 17 | | one position, one applicant, 37 days to fill. |
| 18 0. I think we can do that, Mr. Chair. Let the | 2 | 18 | | and further down again. powerline technician |
| 19 record show now I've fulfilled an undertak | king | 19 | | Deer Lake, this is June of '08, advertised in |
| 20 today, or given one. | J | 20 | | The Telegram, and Western Star, and HRDC. one |
| 21 CHAIRMAN: | | 21 | | position number of positions, one; three |
| 22 Q. Very impressed, sir. | | 22 | | qualified applicants, 21 days to fill. I |
| 23 KELLY, Q.C.: | | 23 | | guess, Mr. Smith, there's other examples |
| 24 Q. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. | | 24 | | within that, but I won't go all the way |
| 25 MR. JOHNSON: | | 25 | | through. I know there's another one in |

| Oct | ober 26, 2009 | Multi-P | age | ^M NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|----------|--|---------|---------|---|
| | Pa | ge 157 | | Page 159 |
| 1 | Clarenville on the next page, February of '0 | 9. 1 | | the best way to deal with that is to hire |
| 2 | in the second grouping there right where the | e 2 | 2 | apprentices, train them, and have them ready. |
| 3 | arrow is. There was one position, ten | 3 | 3 MR. | JOHNSON: |
| 4 | qualified applicants, 58 days to fill, and I | 4 | t Q | . I take it this CA-NP-107 would indicate that |
| 5 | guess what I'm getting at is you've indicated | d 5 | 5 | the last time that Newfoundland Power |
| 6 | that where there's a big lead time with the | 6 | 5 | advertised for a powerline technician was |
| 7 | apprentices to get them up and running to m | eet 7 | 7 | February '09 in relation to Clarenville. |
| 8 | the demographic challenge that your utility | / 8 | 3 | Would that be |
| 9 | has, and I think all utilities have to a | 9 | MR. | SMITH: |
| 10 | certain degree, and I'm trying to get a sense | 10 |) A | . Yes, this looks like the most recent time we |
| 11 | of why Newfoundland Power, as a way | of 11 | | would have advertised. |
| 12 | balancing the considerations, has landed or | n 12 | 2 MR. | JOHNSON: |
| 13 | the idea of being so heavy with the | 13 | 3 Q | . And what sort of profile are you is the |
| 14 | apprentices as opposed to selecting | 14 | ł | company experiencing in terms of the |
| 15 | experienced people who can join the force a | as 15 | 5 | journeypersons who are applying? Is there a |
| 16 | needed. | 16 | 5 | sort of stereotypical journeyman profile that |
| 17 N | AR. SMITH: | 17 | 7 | we can discuss? |
| 18 | A. Our approach with the retirement of the | 18 | 3 MR. | SMITH: |
| 19 | powerline technician trade is we look into the | ne 19 |) A | . Well, with some of these positions here, I |
| 20 | future and between 2010 and 2014, | 20 |) | believe part of what we've done, actually, is |
| 21 | approximately one quarter of our journeyper | rson 21 | | to hire some Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro |
| 22 | linemen will either be 65 years old, or reach | 22 | 2 | journeypersons, and in doing that, we've in |
| 23 | age 60, with a 95 combination in their | 23 | 3 | turn placed some pressure on their business |
| 24 | pension, which is basically an unrestricted | 24 | ļ | because in turn they end up with some |
| 25 | pension. We believe we have a significan | t | | |
| | Pa | ge 158 | | Page 160 |
| 1 | retirement issue to deal with in the next five | 1 | l | vacancies. I do believe some of these hires |
| 2 | years in our business. We have had some | 2 | 2 | are simply that, we advertise a position, and |
| 3 | success in hiring journeypersons in limited | 3 | 3 | Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro journeyperson |
| 4 | fashion for the last number of years, but | 4 | ļ | would have applied for these jobs. So in |
| 5 | certainly to continue on an approach to say | 5 | 5 | terms of a typical demographic, it's very |
| 6 | that in the next five years we're going to be | 6 | 5 | limited in that we're the only two utilities |
| 7 | able to hire 31 journeypersons off the street, | 7 | 7 | in the province that have this particular |
| 8 | so to speak, we don't believe that's a | 8 | 3 | trade, and so when you post, it tends to be |
| 9 | realistic way to plan for the future. We | 9 |) | one of our employees leaving to go there, or |
| 10 | believe we need to train our apprentices and | 10 |) | one of their employees leaving to come here. |
| 11 | have them ready, and that's the more secure | e 11 | | That's typical of what could happen. |
| 12 | way of bringing supply to this. The whole | 12 | 2 MR. J | IOHNSON: |
| 13 | journeyperson trade issue is really a national | 13 | 3 Q | . Do you notice that most of these |
| 14 | issue across the country. I know I can speak | 14 | ŀ | advertisements are in local publications like |
| 15 | firsthand to it when I was in Alberta. When I | 15 | 5 | The Telegram or the Western Star, posting at |
| 16 | joined Fortis Alberta, we had six apprentices | 16 | 5 | the College of the North Atlantic, HRDC. Is |
| 17 | in our business, and when I left in 2008 we | 17 | 7 | there any advertisements aimed at |
| 18 | had 86, and it was simply a function of very | 18 | 3 | journeypersons who are probably originally |
| 19 | difficult to hire journeypersons in this | 19 |) | from Newfoundland, but went out to Western |
| 20 | trade. So I have seen a lot of pressures in | 20 |) | Canada? |
| 21 | terms of our ability to hire journeypersons. | 21 | MR. S | SMITH: |
| $ ^{22}$ | we have had some success, limited success v | with 22 | 2 A | . Generally speaking, I do believe we advertise |
| 23 | these numbers here, but in terms of where w | e 23 | 3 | beyond just this media that's listed here, but |
| 24 | need to go in the future, we have a | 24 | ŀ | that would be subject to check. Generally |
| 25 | significant issue to deal with and we believe | 25 | 5 | speaking, though, there would be a very |

Page 157 - Page 160

| 00 | ctober 26, 2009 | Multi- | Page ^T | ^M NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---------------|--|-------------|----------------------|---|
| | | Page 161 | | Page 163 |
| 1 | limited pool of journeypersons that woul | d | 1 0 | We'll do that Mr Chairman |
| | again we're looking at trying to fill a voi | d | 2 CHA | IRMAN. |
| 3 | of approximately 31 people in the next f | ïve | 3 0 | Mr. Kelly is on a roll |
| | vears. So the answer to your specific que | stion | 4 MR | IOHNSON. |
| 5 | is I'm not completely sure but I do belie | ve | 5 0 | Just to go back into your labour forecast for |
| 6 | we do advertise beyond just these media | types | 5 Q 6 | a moment Mr Smith in Volume 2 page 1 at |
| | here | lypes | 7 | the bottom of Footnote 2 the statement is |
| | (1:00 n m) | | 8 | made that for the period from 1993 through |
| | MR IOHNSON | | 9 | 2005 Newfoundland Power's workforce declined |
| | O Can L just refer you to Table 2-11 of yo | 11 r | 10 | significantly as a result of a series of six |
| | labour cost breakdown in your application | n and | 11 | early retirement programs Currently |
| | in particular Liust want to draw your | | 12 | workforce levels are considered to be broadly |
| 12 | attention on this page to Ecotrote 56 wh | ere | 12 | consistent with least cost customer service |
| | it indicates that negotiated wage rate | | 13 | delivery over the long term and what is meant |
| 14 | increases for skilled trades total 5.1 perce | nt 1 | 14 | by "broadly consistent" over the long term? I |
| 15 | in 200 and 5 percent in 2010 and I draw | | 16 | wasn't quite sure what was being conveyed |
| 10 | attention to it because that figure 5.1 wa | s II | 17 | there |
| $ _{10}^{1/}$ | 6.2 percent in the original filing, and could | | 1/ 10 1/17 | |
| 10 | vou just explain why it changed? | | | I think it just refers to that it's not |
| $ _{20}^{17}$ | MR SMITH | | ю 20 | necessarily an exact number or an exact thing |
| $ _{21}^{20}$ | A. I don't know the exact reason why it char | nged. | 21 | It's something that has a little bit of |
| 22 | but 5.1 is the correct number I couldn' | t | 22 | variation around it That it's broadly |
| $ _{23}^{}$ | explain that. | | 23 | consistent to me would simply mean that. |
| 24 | MR. JOHNSON: | | 24 MR. | JOHNSON: |
| 25 | Q. Because I think the old numbers for | if 2 | 25 Q | . And as we've seen, there has been a growth in |
| | - | Page 162 | | Page 164 |
| | you'll go up to Table 2.11. I don't think | 1 age 102 | 1 | ETE's over the past number of years. I think |
| | there was any change between your 2 OPE co | lumn | 1 2 | in 2007 is was 627 ETEs 2008 628 '09 641 |
| | that we see in this present Table 2.11 and | luiiii | 2 | and 2010 forecast 651 and would you think |
| | the previous 2 09E and L would have though | t | 3 | that we are at a high watermark now for ETEs |
| | that there would be a change by virtue of the | l. | т 5 | at Newfoundland Power relative to what we can |
| 6 | assumption of the increase going down from | 63 | 6 | expect as we move out from 2010? |
| | percent to 5.1 percent? | | 7 MR | SMITH |
| 8 | MR_SMITH: | | 8 A | I think if we look into the future. I think |
| 9 | A. I think what it tells me is that the 5.1 | | 9 | the future will tell us what the workforce |
| 10 | percent is the correct number that was used | 1 | 10 | needs to be. In terms of where we are today. |
| 111 | above, and, in fact, when we go from 2008 to |) | 11 | I do believe that we feel the overall number |
| 12 | 2009. the overall increase as a | | 12 | of people that we have in that FTE analysis |
| 13 | representation of the full workforce, would be | e | 13 | when you get to 2010 is approximately where we |
| 14 | 4.07 percent. I believe that there's other | | 14 | should be at a sustainable level for a period |
| 15 | footnotes with that, and certainly that number | · 1 | 15 | of time. That number, of course, as is |
| 16 | hasn't changed in this filing. It's just that | 1 | 16 | indicated here, will have some fluctuations, |
| 17 | this particular number here did change. | 1 | 17 | depending if work changes, but to say it's |
| 18 | MR. JOHNSON: | 1 | 18 | "broadly consistent", I think that would be |
| 19 | Q. Maybe again, not to break the record for | 1 | 19 | fair. |
| 20 | undertakings, but if we could have an | 2 | 20 MR. | JOHNSON: |
| 21 | explanation as to why it went from 6.3 to 5.1, | 2 | 21 Q | . So you think we should be around that number |
| 22 | and whether it was typos. If it was typos, | 2 | 22 | for a period of time. How long before you |
| 23 | fine, but if not, to indicate how the | 2 | 23 | think it should be coming down from that |
| 24 | calculation why it didn't change. | 2 | 24 | level? |
| 25 | KELLY, O.C.: | 2 | 25 MR. | SMITH: |

| Oc | tober 26, 2009 | Multi-F | Page | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|--|---|---------------------|-----------|--|
| | | Page 165 | | Page 167 |
| 1 | A. I think that's a function of retirements. A | As i | 1 | able to retire with no impact on your pension? |
| 2 | I mentioned before, we've had to increas | e our | 2 MR. S | SMITH: |
| 3 | number slightly right now to deal with | the | 3 A. | Yes, I believe that's the criteria to have a |
| 4 | demographics and dealing with in the fu | uture 4 | 4 | non-reduced pension. |
| 5 | alignment who will retire. That's result | ing f | 5 MR. J | OHNSON: |
| 6 | in us hiring a few extra apprentices right | ht (| 6 Q. | And note 4 is off to the right hand side, and |
| 7 | now, but if you think about it from an ov | erall | 7 | to see note 4 we got to flip the page to get |
| 8 | perspective, the work is really what dicta | ites 8 | 8 | the explanation which is on page 2 of 2, and |
| 9 | the workforce. What we are practically of | doing 9 | 9 | the explanation in note 4 is that, "In 2010, |
| 10 | right now as we bring more apprentices | on is 10 | 0 | there are twelve employees eligible to retire. |
| 11 | that we use a little bit less contract labou | r. 11 | 1 | The 2010 labour reduction for retirement is |
| 12 | That's the valve that we use in our busin | iess 12 | 2 | 322,000. The 2010 reduction FTEs of three |
| 13 | to make sure we don't over staff, so to sp | peak. 13 | 3 | reflects the timing of the forecast |
| 14 | So although that number is about where | it will 14 | 4 | retirements", and what is the is the |
| 15 | be, there may be some continued fluctua | itions 15 | 5 | assumption that they all retire at the very |
| 16 | depending on work that may show up | o, or 16 | 6 | end of the year? Is that the assumption |
| 17 | additional pressures because of demogra | phics 17 | 7 | that's taking place there? |
| 18 | and other line items, but again what you | need 18 | 8 MR. S | SMITH: |
| 19 | to look at overall is the overall amount | of 19 | 9 A. | I believe the way we do this for 2010 would be |
| 20 | work that we do is really a function of t | he 20 | 0 | looking at the actual time during the year |
| 21 | work itself, and the FTEs, the internal | . 21 | 1 | where they would hit their eligibility, and in |
| 22 | employees are just a part of that. | 22 | 2 | addition to that a discussion with the |
| 23 | MR. JOHNSON: | 23 | 3 | employees involved just to sort out their |
| 24 | Q. If we took the lead time that was necessa | iry to 24 | 4 | timing and what they have in mind. So I don't |
| 25 | have these apprentices become fully fle | dged 25 | 5 | believe it is necessarily the end of the year. |
| | | Page 166 | | Page 168 |
| 1 | journeypersons with a good working know | owledge | 1 | I think it's tailored to when people are |
| 2 | in the company, sort of out of the equat | ion 2 | 2 | scheduling to retire. |
| 3 | for a moment, could we get by with the p | present 3 | 3 MR. J | OHNSON: |
| 4 | complement of journeypersons who are | engaged 4 | 4 Q. | Just look on note 5 there. It says, "Only 6 |
| 5 | now with the company? | | 5 | of the 12 retiring employees will be replaced |
| 6 | MR. SMITH: | 6 | 6 | in 2010. The remaining six employees are |
| 7 | A. Again as I said before, I think the position | on 7 | 7 | forecast to retire at year end, and will not |
| 8 | we take to hire apprentices sets us up to | be 8 | 8 | be replaced in 2010. Only three of the six |
| 9 | able to provide service to our customers | and 9 | 9 | employees retiring at year end 2010 will be |
| 10 | to be assured that those apprentices will | be 10 | 0 | replaced in 2011". So that would mean, would |
| | trained and ready to go, so to speak. I | he 11 | 1 | it not, that we're assuming that they all |
| 12 | offset that we use right now is simply to | nave 12 | 2 | retire at year end? |
| 13 | less contract labour on. So that would be | the 13 | 3 MR. S | MITH: |
| 14 | way I would look at it. | 12 | 4 A. | Yes, that would be correct. |
| 15 | MR. JOHNSON: | | 5 MR. J | And if Leould turn you to number 114 CAND |
| 10 | Q. If you turn to Schedule B of the intern forecast and we see under for adjustm | al 10 | ο Q. 7 | 114 I guess the first thing I would observe |
| 10 | for 2010 on the left we see employ | | 0 | and this table sets out the total regular |
| 10 | retirement which is footnoted and 322 | $\frac{10}{100}$ | 0 | employees reaching age 65 or age 60 with a 95 |
| 20 | and then that translates into 3 ETES and t | ben $2($ | 2 N | vear combination and actual retirement so it |
| $\begin{vmatrix} 20 \\ 21 \end{vmatrix}$ | Footnote 17 confirms what you've indi | cated 2 | 1 | compares the people the number of people |
| $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 22 \end{bmatrix}$ | that retirement estimates are based up | 0n | 2 | who meet that test and those who've actually |
| $\frac{1}{23}$ | employees reaching age 65 or who have | reached 2 | - | retired. You see in 2009 that there's three |
| 24 | age 60, with the combination of 95 years | s. of $\frac{2}{2}$ | 4 | who've actually already retired is that |
| 25 | age, plus service, so these people would | 1 be 2: | 5 | right? |

| Oc | ctober 26, 2009 | Multi-Pa | ige " | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|----|---|-----------------|-------|--|
| | Pa | age 169 | | Page 171 |
| 1 | MR. SMITH: | 1 | | for '09? |
| 2 | A. That is correct. | 2 | MR. S | MITH: |
| 3 | MR. JOHNSON: | 3 | A. | I think it's more of a matter of those who are |
| 4 | Q. And the other thing I noticed about this is | 4 | | eligible to retire and the particular point |
| 5 | that in the last well, '07, '08, and | 5 | | they are in their career and in their life. |
| 6 | well, certainly I can't speak for '09 because | e 6 | | To say that that trend will repeat with two |
| 7 | it's not complete yet, but '07 and '08, | 7 | | years data, I don't think I could necessarily |
| 8 | there's actually more who retired than met | the 8 | | agree to that. |
| 9 | test that you had anticipated? | 9 | MR. J | OHNSON: |
| 10 | MR. SMITH: | 10 | Q. | Is it equally likely that it will repeat as it |
| 11 | A. Yes, that is correct. | 11 | | won't? |
| 12 | MR. JOHNSON: | 12 | MR. S | MITH: |
| 13 | Q. Is there any reason to think that given that | 13 | Α. | I don't know. |
| 14 | past experience, that that may not also be the | ne 14 | (1:15 | p.m.) |
| 15 | case in '09? | 15 | MR. J | OHNSON: |
| 16 | MR. SMITH: | 16 | Q. | Could I direct you to the GT Report, the Grant |
| 17 | A. Would you repeat that again? | 17 | | Thornton Financial Consultants Report. In |
| 18 | MR. JOHNSON: | 18 | | particular, I'm referring to page 35, and in |
| 19 | Q. As we see in '07 and '08, you had numbers | who 19 | | particular still, line 14, where Grant |
| 20 | were people who were total age 65, or ag | ge 20 | | Thornton observed that, "The 2009 contractor |
| 21 | 60 with 95 year combination, and in '07 the | ere 21 | | costs are lower than 2008 due to lower |
| 22 | was just seven meeting that test, but nine | 22 | | forecast customer connections, 43,096 versus |
| 23 | actually retired. So more than met the test | 23 | | 46,025. The 2010 contractor costs are higher |
| 24 | actually retired, and I take it that what | 24 | | than 2009 primarily due to an expected |
| 25 | Newfoundland Power is assuming will ha | uppen 25 | | contractor price increase as a result of the |
| | Pa | age 170 | | Page 172 |
| 1 | this time around is that exactly the same | 1 | | contract renewal in 2010, partially offset by |
| 2 | amount of people who meet the test for | ۲ 2 | | a reduction in customer connections over 2009, |
| 3 | retirement will retire, and I'm getting at | 3 | | 38,064 versus 43,096". Am I this was |
| 4 | isn't that a conservative assumption, given | 1 4 | | filed, of course, back in July on the basis of |
| 5 | the fact that in '07 and '08 more people that | n 5 | | the original application. Do I understand |
| 6 | just met the test retired? | 6 | | with the update that customer connections are |
| 7 | MR. SMITH: | 7 | | expected to be down in both '09 and '10 from |
| 8 | A. I think what this RFI tells me is that so far | 8 | | those forecast in this report? |
| 9 | about half of what was forecast to retire thi | s 9 | MR. S | MITH: |
| 10 | year have already retired. What the finish | . 10 | A. | Sorry, your question again was? |
| 11 | point on that answer is in terms of what this | s 11 | MR. J | OHNSON: |
| 12 | RFI tells me, I don't know. So in other | 12 | Q. | Whether the customer connections are expected |
| 13 | words, will the other four people retire this | 13 | | to be down further in '09 and 2010 from those |
| 14 | year; certainly the hit that criteria, and it | 14 | | assumed in the Grant Thornton Report? |
| 15 | would be fair to assume that they would, b | ut 15 | MR. S | MITH: |
| 16 | whether or not they are, I can't tell you from | n 16 | А. | The timing of the Grant Thornton Report is |
| 17 | this RFI. | 17 | | what I'm trying to get straight in my mind. |
| 18 | MR. JOHNSON: | 18 | | When we did our refile of our application in |
| 19 | Q. When I read the record I'm going to ge | t 19 | | September, we did increase our distribution |
| 20 | trustrated if I haven't asked you this follow | 20 | | tunction line, when you look at Table 2-12, |
| 21 | question, because what I have in mind, M | I r . 21 | | and I believe one of the reasons we did this |
| 22 | Smith, is if in $\frac{100}{100}$ and $\frac{100}{1000}$ more than more | re 22 | | revision was to reflect an increase in |
| 23 | people retired, actually retired, than those | 23 | | customer work in 2009 above what we thought it |
| 24 | who met your retirement test in '0/ and '0 | 8, 24 | | was earlier in the year. So I think relative |
| 25 | why would that not be a reasonable assumption | otion 25 | | to our original application in the GRA, |

| October 26, 2009 | Multi-Page ^T | ^M NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|--|--------------------------------|---|
| | Page 173 | Page 175 |
| relative to then our 2009 forecast of cu | istomer 1 | We didn't put a further adjustment there for |
| 2 connections has increased. So I don't l | know if 2 | increases in the number of customers we're |
| 3 I could tie it back to Grant Thornton for | or you. 3 | serving. As I said in my direct, we believe |
| 4 MR. JOHNSON: | 4 | these are things that the company will find |
| 5 Q. Well, I'm getting at fundamentally | , what 5 | other efficiencies in our business to recoup |
| 6 I'm getting at is whether to the extent | that 6 | those, otherwise that would be increases in |
| 7 there were a reduction in the expe | cted 7 | cost. |
| 8 connections in '09 and '10 relative to | what 8 MR. | JOHNSON: |
| 9 Grant Thornton assumed, to the exter | it that 9 Q | I'll leave that for the time being to digest |
| 10 there were, whether these operational s | savings 10 | what you've said. Let me ask you a question |
| 11 had been reflected in the new filing, an | nd the 11 | then regarding the basis for saying that the |
| 12 specific reason I ask that is that I don't | t see 12 | expected contractor price will increase in |
| 13 a difference between the operational e | expense 13 | 2010 over 2009, and what's that based on? |
| 14 numbers in the new Exhibit 2 versus | the old 14 MR. | SMITH: |
| 15 Exhibit 2. | 15 A | . We did our pole contract two, three, or four |
| 16 MR. SMITH: | 16 | months ago, I can't remember exactly, and when |
| 17 A. What this is referring to here, of cours | e, is 17 | this document was done, the contracts hadn't |
| 18 customer connections for new houses, | which is 18 | been let or the awards done. Since then that |
| 19 a capital part of our business. | 19 | has happened and we did see an increase in our |
| 20 MR. JOHNSON: | . 20 | contractor prices to do capital work, and I |
| 21 Q. So any changes would not show u | ıp ın 21 | think that's what this note is trying to |
| 22 operational savings? | 22 | indicate that this was coming, and since this |
| 23 MR. SMITH: | | was put together we did do our contracts, and |
| A. No, this work here would be on the c | capital 24 | there was an increase in our contract labour. |
| 25 part of our business. | 25 MR. | JOHNSON: |
| | Page 174 | Page 176 |
| 1 MR. JOHNSON: | 1 Q | . Okay, partially offset by the reduced number |
| 2 Q. But would there not also be a "knoch | c down" 2 | of connections? |
| 3 effect on operating expense if the num | iber of 3 MR. | SMITH: |
| 4 connections went down? | 4 A | . That's correct. |
| 5 MR. SMITH: | of the | JOHNSON: |
| 6 A. On, I see what you ie saying. In terms | | multi year ragime that the Board referred to |
| / IUUIE: | | in its order in BU 22 2007 Mr. Smith you're |
| 0 0 Ves | 8 | familiar with what I'm talking about in terms |
| 10 MR SMITH | 10 | of the Board's reference there are you how |
| 11 A Well the way to best talk about that is | when 11 | they referred to us having a multi-year cost |
| 12 we build our operating budget, we build | Id it off | of service regulatory regime in this province? |
| 13 our most recent actuals. So when we b | wilt the 13 MR. | SMITH: |
| 14 operating budget for '09 and '10, we b | uilt it 14 A | I'm certainly not overly familiar with it. |
| 15 off 2008. So in 2008, we had a certain | number 15 | I've read a little bit of information in Mr. |
| 16 of customers on our system. When we | e forecast 16 | Todd's information, but I certainly don't |
| 17 out from 2008 our operating costs, w | e don't 17 | consider myself in any way to be an expert or |
| 18 put in an extra amount to deal with inc | reases 18 | overly familiar with this multi-year |
| in the number of our customers, for ex | ample. I 19 | regulatory regime, no. |
| 20 referred to this earlier in my direct. | So 20 MR. | JOHNSON: |
| 21 when we forecast operating costs, it's | simply 21 Q | . Do you know enough about it to answer me |
| 22 a reflection of what it was in 2008. | This 22 | whether or not one of the supposed benefits of |
| 23 moves out into 2009. It's adjusted | for 23 | a multi-year regime is reduced regulatory |
| 24 inflation, it's adjusted for the conserva | ation 24 | costs? |
| program, and it's adjusted for appren | tices. 25 MR | SMITH: |

| October 26, 2009 | Multi-Page TM | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|---------------------------------|---|
| Pa | nge 177 | Page 179 |
| 1 A. Yes, I would agree that I've read that | 1 MR. SMITH: | C C |
| 2 information with that, yes. | 2 A. The 2 | 010 cost? |
| 3 MR. JOHNSON: | 3 MR. JOHNSC | N: |
| 4 Q. And I take it Newfoundland Power has fore | cast 4 Q. Yeah | |
| 5 third party costs in 2010 for this GRA of | 5 MR. SMITH: | |
| 6 \$750,000, right? | 6 A. No, I | don't believe that's correct. |
| 7 MR. SMITH: | 7 MR. JOHNSO | N: |
| 8 A. For this particular GRA, yes. | 8 Q. So the | ere's nothing in the test year for cost |
| 9 MR. JOHNSON: | 9 of cap | vital for this GRA? |
| 10 Q. Yes, and also Newfoundland Power has for | ecast 10 MR. SMITH: | |
| 11 to spend \$350,000 on its own legal fees fo | r 11 A. For th | iis particular GRA? |
| 12 this GRA, being 175 in '09 and 175 in 2010 |)? 12 MR. JOHNSO | N: |
| 13 Would that be right? | 13 Q. Yeah. | |
| 14 MR. SMITH: | 14 MR. SMITH: | |
| 15 A. I don't know those numbers off the top of the | my 15 A. No, I | don't believe so. |
| 16 head, no. | 16 MR. JOHNSC | N: |
| 17 MR. JOHNSON: | 17 Q. If you | i'd just go back to CA-NP-141, and in |
| 18 Q. CA-NP-138. | 18 partic | ular, Table 2? We have consultant fees |
| 19 KELLY, Q.C.: | 19 of \$25 | 50,000 in 2010F. |
| 20 Q. Wrong assumption in the question, Mr | 20 MR. SMITH: | |
| 21 Chairman. | 21 A. Yes. | |
| 22 CHAIRMAN: | 22 MR. JOHNSC | N: |
| 23 Q. Umm? | 23 Q. But y | ou're saying that that's none of that |
| 24 KELLY, Q.C. | 24 is attr | ibutable to this hearing? |
| 25 Q. Wrong assumption in the question. | 25 MR. SMITH: | C C |
| Pa | age 178 | Page 180 |
| 1 MR. COMERFORD: | 1 A. To the | e best of my knowledge, the 2010 costs |
| 2 Q. Is it 148? | 2 that a | re in the schedule are not for this GRA. |
| 3 MR. JOHNSON: | 3 MR. JOHNSC | DN: |
| 4 Q. 138. So it just bears out what I was talking | 4 Q. Okay | , and what are they in relation to, a |
| 5 about regarding regulatory GRA legal fees i | n 5 furthe | r GRA that would be filed in 2010? |
| 6 those two columns, not meaning to spend t | ime 6 MR. SMITH: | |
| 7 there. And as well, if I could turn you to | 7 A. The n | umbers that are in 2010 would relate to |
| 8 CA-NP-141, Table 3? Table 3 purports to sho | ow 8 the po | ossibility of a GRA in 2010 for 2011. |
| 9 the portion of costs from 2009 forecast | 9 There | 's also the possibility of a Newfoundland |
| 10 attributable to this hearing as regards the | 10 and L | abrador Hydro GRA. There's potentially |
| 11 cost of capital consultant, that's 150,000. | 11 the n | eed for cost of capital experts. |
| 12 right? | 12 regula | atory accounting experts or even rates |
| 13 MR. SMITH: | 13 exper | ts. There's also the possibility, of |
| 14 A. Yes, I see that in Table 3, yeah. | 14 course | e, that further work on the automatic |
| 15 MR. JOHNSON: | 15 adjust | ment formula or other cost of capital |
| 16 0. Just for '09. And then if we could go to CA | - 16 issues | and finally. I believe there's also |
| 17 NP-135? | 17 the pc | ssibility that there will be work in |
| 18 CHAIRMAN: | 18 fact m | hore than a possibility, there actually |
| 19 0. What do they make an hour? | 19 will h | be work in terms of the Industrial |
| 20 MR JOHNSON: | 20 Custo | mer Rate Stabilization Plan that will |
| 21 0. You see cost of capital expert just handy to | $21 \qquad 0$ | in 2010. So those would be the types of |
| 22 vourwell it was there Right cost of | 22 things | s that that money would be identified for |
| capital expert, 100 000 in 2010 I take it | 23 for 20 | 10. |
| 24 that at least part of that number would be in | 24 MR IOHNSC | N: |
| relation to this GRA? | 25 0. Could | I we receive a breakdown of the number |

| October 26, 2009 | Multi-Pag | nge [™] NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|--|---------------|---|
| | Page 181 | Page 183 |
| 1 from Table 2, 2010F, that would | be 1 N | MR. JOHNSON: |
| 2 attributable to a Newfoundland Power f | iled GRA 2 | Q. Yes. |
| 3 in 2010? | 3 K | KELLY, Q.C. |
| 4 KELLY, Q.C. | 4 | Q. We'll take that under advisement, Mr. |
| 5 0. Well, if there's anything more we can p | provide, 5 | Chairman. |
| 6 Mr. Chairman. | 6 1 | MR. JOHNSON: |
| 7 MR. JOHNSON: | 7 | O. Thank you. And I guess, Mr. Smith, in |
| 8 0. Well, the number, the forecast number i | is - 8 | addition to some of these hard expenses that |
| 9 KELLY, O.C. | 9 | are attributable to a GRA that you would have |
| 10 O. Can the Consumer Advocate be a lo | t more 10 | hours of staff taken up with this case. Have |
| 11 specific as to exactly what he's asking u | us to 11 | you developed an estimate of the cost of that, |
| 12 try to break out? | 12 | in terms of the amount of hours dedicated to |
| 13 MR. JOHNSON: | 13 | this case? |
| 14 O. I'll try, Mr. Chairman. The witness | has 14 N | MR. SMITH: |
| 15 indicated that the 2010F number, as sho | own for 15 | A. The way we look at our staff, even for this |
| 16 consultant fees in Table 2 of CA-NP-14 | 1. is 16 | particular GRA here, there's no really |
| 17 meant to reflect assumptions as to a nur | nber of 17 | estimate done for that. We simply work to |
| 18 regulatory proceedings that may be s | poing 18 | produce the information that's required. We |
| 19 forward, whether it be some sort of co | st of 19 | use the staff that we have in house, and we |
| 20 capital hearing on the formula, whether | r it's 20 | prioritize the work and we do the best we can |
| 21 Hydro's GRA, and whether it's their ow | 'n GRA. 21 | to fulfil the requirements of the GRA. So |
| 22 So presumably they made an assessme | nt as to 22 | there would be no firm estimate in our labour |
| 23 what each of those would be costing, ar | nd so I 23 | forecast for next year to work on a GRA. It |
| 24 was looking for a breakdown of what | t that 24 | simply would be our normal labour in our |
| 25 number would be. That's all. | 25 | company to provide the information and work on |
| | Page 182 | Page 184 |
| 1 KELLY, Q.C. | 1 | it as required. |
| 2 Q. It's a broad level estimate, Mr. Chairma | an, but 2 N | MR. JOHNSON: |
| 3 subject to that constraint, we'll see wha | t we 3 | Q. Okay, and forgetting about the forecast for |
| 4 can provide some breakdown ofesse | ntially 4 | 2010, give us some sort of sense as to what it |
| 5 what I understand my friend to be askin | ng for 5 | meant in 2009 in terms of the amount of hours |
| 6 is a breakdown of the \$250,000 ite | em. 6 | spent preparing for this proceeding? |
| 7 Confirmed? | 7 N | MR. SMITH: |
| 8 MR. JOHNSON: | 8 | A. I don't think I could give you an estimate of |
| 9 Q. Confirmed, and as well, the legal fe | es, 9 | the number of hours. Certainly it takes a |
| 10 similarly. I'd like to know what's be | ing 10 | fair bit of effort on the part of the company |
| 11 assumed for legal fees for a 2010 GRA. | 11 | to put together a GRA application and again, |
| 12 KELLY, Q.C. | 12 | the way we do that is we use our in-house |
| 13 Q. In fact, the responses that have already | been 13 | employees and it's a matter of prioritizing. |
| 14 provided as to a breakdown for legal | fees 14 | It's a matter of working late hours and long |
| 15 relation to Mobile, et cetera, and I thin | nk 15 | days to put together the information that's |
| 16 that's in one of the other RFIs. | 16 | required. |
| 17 MR. JOHNSON: | 17 N | MR. JOHNSON: |
| 18 Q. But to the extent that legal fees number | ts is 18 | Q. Because the effort happens considerably before |
| 19 assuming a further engagement for | a 19 | the actual filing date, doesn't it? |
| 20 Newfoundland Power GRA that they're | going to 20 N | MR. SMITH: |
| be filing in 2010, I think that that would | l be 21 | A. Well, for this GRA, we would have started on |
| 22 useful to have. | 22 | it certainly before we put the application in |
| 23 KELLY, Q.C. | 23 | in June, yes. |
| 24 Q. So you're looking for consultant line | and 24 N | MR. JOHNSON: |
| 125 legal lees line? | 25 | Q. MIT. Chairman, we re at that 1:30 time, and I |

| October 26, 2009 | Multi-Page TM | NP's 2010 General Rate Application |
|---|--|------------------------------------|
| don't anticipate being much longer with Smith, but I think I might benefit from see the transcript to see what else needs to be covered off with the gentleman. CHAIRMAN: Q. So you'd like us to break now so you car MR. JOHNSON: Q. Yes, that would be good. CHAIRMAN: Q. Okay. Is that okay with everybody? KELLY, Q.C. Q. Satisfactory, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN: Q. All right. We're adjourned until tomor morning at 9:00. Is that correct? MR. JOHNSON: ADJOURNED TO OCTOBER 27, 2009 AT 9:00 CERTIFICATE I, Judy Moss, hereby certify that the foregoin | Page 185 n Mr. seing be n - Trow) A.M. ng is | |
| a true and correct transcript in the matter of Newfoundland Power's 2010 General Rate Appl heard on the 26th day of October, A.D., 2009 bef Commissioners of the Public Utilities Board, Printiphere Charles Building, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador and was transcribed by me to the best of my ability by means of a sound apparatus. Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador this 26th day of October, A.D., 2009. Judy Moss | Page 186 ication fore nce nd of : | |

Multi-PageTM

\$1.9 - ability NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| | 10.00 | 0/5/1 | | 522 - a ta ta |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|--|
| | 10:00 [1] 41:21 | 2/5ths [1] 63:4 | 3 [24] 36:8,9,16,17,21 | 532 [2] 7:3 48:19 |
| -\$- | 10:30 [1] 65:17 | 20 [5] 2:25 25:5,9 52:15 | 3/:1,11 38:1,4,25 39:6,9 | 540 [1] 16:23 |
| \$1.9 m 91·25 | 11 [3] 1:11 50:6 95:14 | 151:25 | 98:19 108:19 130:24 | 56 [1] 161:13 |
| \$7 [1] 121.12 | 114 [2] 168:16.17 | 200 [2] 11:12,15 | 151.12 151.15,25 152.14 | 58 (1) 157:4 |
| ¢2 [1] 151.15 | 11:00 rt1 87:17 | 2003 [3] 99:1,14,18 | 3 25 121 7 | |
| 520 [1] 98:13 | 11.30 (2) 87.20 24 | 2004 [6] 102:6 106:5 | 5.25 [1] 131:7 | -6- |
| \$250,000 [2] 179:19 | 11.30 [2] 87.20,24 | 132:12,21,23 133:10 | 3.6 [2] 74:2,2 | -0- |
| | 11:45[1] 100:12 | 2005 [1] 163:9 | 3.9 [2] 16:4 17:3 | 6 [4] 148:15 149:1,3 168:4 |
| \$29,109,000.00 [1] | 12 [3] 155:22,22 168:5 | 2006 [2] 74.1 3 | 3/5ths [1] 63:4 | 6.3 [3] 161:18 162:6,21 |
| | 12.4 [1] 102:8 | 2007 [10] 74:1 3 02:18 | 31 [2] 158:7 161:3 | 60 [5] 123:17 157:23 |
| \$295,000 [1] 92:6 | 12:00 [1] 111:20 | 95.13 97.4 126.12 143.11 | 31st [2] 126:11,12 | 166:24 168:19 169:21 |
| \$30,749,000.00[3] | 12:30 [1] 138:10 | 155:7 164:2 176:8 | 32 [1] 33:22 | 600 [1] 58:7 |
| 139:22 140:23 141:8 | 12:45 [1] 149:12 | 2008 [25] 73.11 18 90.6 | 322,000 [2], 166.19 | 627 [1] 164:2 |
| \$337,000 [1] 102:20 | 13 [2] 50:6 150:23 | 99:1 100:4.7 103:4 | 167:12 | 628 [1] 164:2 |
| \$350,000 [1] 177:11 | 138 (1) 178.4 | 106:13 107:6,8 122:20 | 34 [1] 130:5 | 641 [1] 164:2 |
| \$37 [1] 97:4 | 14 (1) 171.10 | 122:22 123:5 126:11,20 | 340 (1) 63.9 | 65 (4) 157:22 166:23 |
| \$500,000.00 [2] 55:17 | 1419 (1) 171.19 | 135:25 136:4 158:17 | 35 cm 51 1 5 7 171 10 | 168.19 169.20 |
| 86:24 | 1410[6] 0:11,12 11:10 | 162:11 164:2 171:21 | 35 [4] 51:1,5,7 171:18 | 650 (2) 23:7 10 |
| \$6 [1] 130:11 | 11.11,13,17 149 | 174:15,15,17,22 | 356 [1] 16:23 | 650 ² ³ ab sec (6.12) |
| \$750.000 [1] 177:6 | | 2009 [17] 2:6 7:2 127:2 | 356,100 [1] 16:4 | 050 ISH [1] 66:13 |
| 4.60 ,000 [1] 17/10 | 15 [3] 53:23,25 98:13 | 162:12 168:23 171:20,24 | 37 [1] 156:17 | 651 [1] 164:3 |
| | 150 [1] 35:19 | 1/2:2,23 1/3:1 1/4:23 | 370 [1] 16:21 | 660 [1] 23:6 |
| | 150,000 [1] 178:11 | 175:15 176:9 164:5 | 370,000 [1] 16:3 | 68 [1] 156:3 |
| '04 [3] 62:14 132:16 | 1500 [1] 6:9 | 2010 (47) 02-1 7 05-12 | 38.064 m 172:3 | |
| 150:8 | 16 [1] 122:25 | 2010[47] 92:1,795:15 97.5 98.13 16 102.24 | | -7- |
| '05 [1] 148:7 | 16.984 (1) 132.16 | 103.7 141.5 142.15 | | 7 51.19 54.19 62.22 |
| '06 [2] 151:3 153:18 | 17 (1) 166.21 | 143:12 147:8 149:21,25 | | 1/1/1/2011/00/2110/02:22 |
| '07 [10] 62:14 143:23 | 17 [1] 100.21 17 000 (a) 122.12 124.7 | 151:5 157:20 161:16 | 4 [10] 37:24 38:3,25 39:6 | 7 6 ray 102.7 |
| 153:18 169:5,7,19,21 | 138.4 | 164:3,6,13 166:18 167:9 | 139:17 151:14 152:14 | 7.0[1] 102:7 |
| 170:5,22,24 | 1708 (1) 6.9 | 167:11,12,19 168:6,8,9 | 167:6,7,9 | 75 [3] 11:23 12:2 35:20 |
| '08 [14] 106:10 130:9 | 1700 [1] 0.8 | 171:23 172:1,13 175:13 | 4.07 [1] 162:14 | 75th [1] 11:22 |
| 131:2,7,11 150:8 153:18 | | 1//:5,12 1/8:23 1/9:2 | 4.1 [1] 19:8 | |
| 156:19 169:5,7,19 170:5 | 198,500 [1] 19:4 | 180.1,3,7,8,21,23 181.3 | 4.445 [1] 108:4 | |
| 170:22,24 | 1982 [1] 2:18 | 2010F (2), 170,10,181,1 | 4.5 [1] 102:10 | 8 [6] 126:12 148:14.24 |
| 109 [18] 62:14 148:7 | 1984 [5] 88:18 105:10,19 | 181.15 | 40 [5] 16:21,22,25 64:10 | 149:3 150:12,20 |
| 150:11,22 153:19 157:1 | 114:22,22 | 2011 [2] 168-10 180-8 | 64:25 | 80 [6] 99:5.5.11.16 100:6 |
| 169.15 171.1 172.7 13 | 1990 [1] 2:24 | 2011 [2] 108.10 180.8 | 400 [5] 38:21 39:1,4,10 | 123:13 |
| 173:8 174:14 177:12 | 1993 [1] 163:8 | 2013 [2] 150:11,22 | 40:11 | 85 [3] 153:18 154:7,10 |
| 178:16 | 1994 [1] 114:24 | 2014 [1] 157:20 | 40th [3] 62:23 63:1 68:2 | 86 [2] 156.4 158.18 |
| '10 [4] 143:23 172:7 | 1997 [1] 105:23 | 21 [1] 156:22 | 41 [1] 153:17 | 881 [2] 23:5 66:11 |
| 173:8 174:14 | 1998 [4] 62:8 99:1.12.17 | 213 [1] 149:18 | 42 m 150:5 | 881 000 (1) 22:5 |
| '98 [1] 62:14 | 1999 [2] 105:25 106:1 | 21st [1] 2:6 | 43 096 [2] 171.22 172.3 | 881,000 [1] 22.5 |
| | 1.00 (1) 161.9 | 22 [1] 152:6 | 16 025 (1) 171.22 | 882,000 [1] 22:5 |
| | 1.15 171 14 | 227 [1] 23:6 | 40,023 [1] 171:23 | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 1:15[1] 1/1:14 | 227.000 [1] 66:11 | | |
| 1 [2] 22:7,12 | 1:30[1] 184:25 | 227.300 [1] 19:3 | | 900 [4] 38:20 39:2 40:2 |
| .9 [2] 19:9 22:11 | Ist [3] 131:1,6,11 | 23 [1] 152:6 | 5 [9] 53:10 58:6,9,11 | 40:11 |
| | | 21/18 [c] 6:7 19 10 24:25 | 148:15 149:1,3 161:16 | 920 [3] 38:5,16 41:13 |
| | -2- | 37.7 38.18 | 168:4 | 95 [4] 157:23 166:24 |
| 1 [12] 28:5 52:9.12 107:22 | 2 [34] 1:12 3:18 15:12.13 | 25 [0] 11:24 12:1 25:0 | 5,000 [1] 138:2 | 168:19 169:21 |
| 110:16 130:20 131:4 | 24:4,17 25:25 48:24 89:6 | 52:16 66:4.6 67:15.17 | 5,220 [1] 132:17 | 9:00 [3] 1:1 185:15,18 |
| 140:24 150:23 151:2,13 | 97:13 98:18 107:19,22 | 126:4 | 5.1 [6] 161:15,17,22 | 9:20 [1] 11:2 |
| 163:6 | 108:19 130:23 131:7 | 25th [5] 12:1 23:12 67:18 | 162:7,9,21 | 9:30 ft1 18:2 |
| 1.2 [3] 53:9 112:9,22 | 139:14,19 140:24 142:14 | 72:23 74:14 | 50 [10] 25:12 64:23 85:3 | 9.45 [1] 27.1 |
| 1.6 [1] 143:11 | 143:9 151:0,13,25 155:1 | 26 (1) 95:15 | 85:4,10 87:12 99:3,4 | |
| 1.64 [1] 142:15 | 173:15 179.18 181.1 16 | 26th [2] 186.3.9 | 133:23 135:9 | |
| 10 [3] 29:6.8 97:14 | 2-09F (2), 162:2 4 | 27 [1] 185.18 | 500 [5] 33:21 55:18 86:25 | |
| 10.000 [1] 144.8 | 2 0 1 $102.2,4$ | 20 (1) 103.10 | 8/:1,2 | A.D [2] 186:3,9 |
| 100 rol 35.10 57.7 0 17 | 4-1 [1] 95:25 | 47 [1] 141:9 20 100 1 41 7 | 50th [6] 12:5 27:19 51:19 | a.m [10] 1:1 11:2 18:2 |
| 58:13 99:6.7 101.21 | 2-11 [3] 161:10 162:1,3 | 27,107 [1] 141:/ | 04:12:05:11 75:3 | 27:1 41:21 65:17 87:17 |
| 133:23 | <i>Z</i>-1<i>Z</i> [1] 172:20 | 292 [5] 7:18 10:17 11:10 | 516[1] 59:9 | 87:24 100:12 185:18 |
| 100.000 [2] 25:13 178:23 | 2-2 [2] 97:13 98:11 | 55:22,25 | 518 [1] 16:21 | abide [1] 83:11 |
| 101 m 130.8 | 2-3 [1] 100:20 | | 518,000 [1] 16:20 | abilities [1] 114:10 |
| 108 (1) 152.10 | 2-7 [1] 96:1 | -3- | 52 [1] 16:24 | ability [9] 79:8 101:15 |
| 100[1] 133.10 | | | | - |

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

| Multi-Page TM | |
|--------------------------|--|
|--------------------------|--|

able - awards NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| | | | | a all Rate Applicatio |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 115:22 128:15 129:23 | acquire [1] 116:3 | 132:5 138:12,14 143:13 | 161:4 170:11 176:21 | 47:2 96:7,11 126:8,10 |
| 135:2 138:13 158:21 | act 111 37:14 | 145:12 156:16,18 161:2 | anticipate [3] 143:13 | 126:13 |
| 186:7 | active (1) 127.11 | 162:19 165:18 166:7 | 147:9 185:1 | assigned [1] 40:7 |
| able [15] 79:22 90:18 | | 169:17 172:10 184:11 | anticinated (2) 150-18 | assigning (2) 27-22-23 |
| 91:20 93:9 99:18 108:18 | actual [7] 19:12,20 65:20 | against [2] 3:16 130:14 | 150.21 160.0 | 38.1 |
| 113:23 124:6 129:9 130:1 | 143:5 167:20 168:20 | 30P [8] 157·23 166·23 24 | anticipating (1) 145.9 | 90.1 occiet res (2:21 |
| 134:16 138:20 158:7 | 184:19 | 166.25 168.19 19 169.20 | anucipating [1] 145:8 | assist [1] 63:21 |
| 166:9 167:1 | actuals [1] 174:13 | 169:20 | anyone's [1] 75:20 | assistance [14] 48:9 64:3 |
| Aboud [145] 1:8.17.19 | add [5] 17:12 21:18 31:4 | aggressive (1) 80.17 | anyways [1] 21:15 | 64:9 111:22 113:17,24 |
| 1:24 2:1,7,12,19,23 3:5 | 97:11 100:10 | | apologize [1] 81:24 | 114:5,20 125:1 127:20 |
| 3:25 7:1 11:7 15:11 18:7 | added [3] 17:16 22:2 | aging [1] 149:23 | apparatus (1) 186.7 | 128:1 129:9 134:13 144:9 |
| 19:14 20:3 21:10 23:3 | 30:4 | ago [8] 19:17 43:5 60:16 | apparatus [1] 100.7 | assisted [1] 123:19 |
| 23:19 26:3,8,10,12,13 | adding [5] 36:18 38:17 | 61:25 62:5 114:22 142:15 | | associate [1] 127:14 |
| 26:18 27:2,15,21 28:7 | 97:22 101:13 103:11 | 175:16 | Appendix [4] 1:23 2:16 | associated [11] 32:14,20 |
| 28:21 29:1,9,25 30:17 | addition (6) 16.7 103.25 | agree [16] 51:6 56:20 | 29:7 58:12 | 39:20 42:10 98:5 102:24 |
| 30:24 31:13,18,22 32:2 | 108:25 152:6 167:22 | 59:15,21 60:5 68:9 80:2 | applicable [1] 57:19 | 103:12 109:3 126:16 |
| 32:16,21 33:5,14,20 35:3 | 183:8 | 116:23 131:21 133:11 | applicant [1] 156:17 | 127:8 128:23 |
| 35:8,23 36:23 37:8,16 | additional (15) 16:18 | 147:24 148:10,23 149:10 | applicants [4] 155:22 | Association [1] 88:20 |
| 38:11,15,23 39:12,17,21 | 29.14 92.3 95.3 97.9 | 1/1:8 1//:1 | 155:23 156:22 157:4 | assume [5] 26:20 33:8 |
| 40:5,12 41:17 42:12 45:0 | 98.5 99.24 100.17 102.24 | agreed [1] 50:7 | application [10] 104.20 | 66.24 67.13 170.15 |
| 43:13 40:16 47:23 46:4 | 103:12.22 130:10.16 | aimed [1] 160:17 | 139:15 149:19 161:11 | assumed (c) 10:2 105:6 |
| 40.14,21 49.1,0,11,13 | 136:21 165:17 | aims [1] 74:7 | 172:5,18,25 184:11,22 | 136·12 172·14 173·9 |
| 51.21 52.4 8 13 53.1 19 | address 151 89.16 93.5 | ain't 11 18.4 | 186:2 | 182.11 |
| 53:22 54:2.6.13.21 55:20 | 93:16 95:24 149:22 | airnlan a (1) 44-2 2 | applications [3] 153:12 | 96511106 (1) 16:16 |
| 56:25 57:3.7.17.24 58:5 | adde 121 34.20 37.2 55.6 | | 153:17 155:11 | assumes [1] 10:10 |
| 58:10.19 59:15.18 60:4 | auus [5] 54.20 57.2 55.0 | akin [7] 82:12,13,15,16 | applied 121 112.10 160.4 | assuming [5] 44:6 61:2 |
| 60:18 61:15,19,24 62:11 | adjourned [2] 185:14 | 82:19,22 83:12 | applicu [2] 112.10 100.4 | 168:11 169:25 182:19 |
| 62:19,24 66:9 68:7,13 | 185:18 | albeit [1] 74:25 | apply [1] 69:8 | assumption [9] 46:23 |
| 68:19 69:1,10,14,25 71:1 | adjust [1] 143:5 | Alberta [10] 72:2 106:5 | applying [1] 159:15 | 78:21 162:6 167:15,16 |
| 71:19 72:21,25 73:5,19 | adjusted [4] 59:2 174:23 | 106:9,12,18,24 107:9 | apprentice [11] 95:11 | 170:4,25 177:20,25 |
| 73:20 74:17 75:6,15 77:2 | 174:24,25 | 124:5 158:15,16 | 101:12 150:6,9,13,25 | assumptions [2] 142:22 |
| 77:10 78:3,10 79:6,14 | adjusting [1] 4:17 | Alberta's [1] 117:20 | 151:2,12 152:1,7,24 | 181:17 |
| 79:15 80:1,14,20,21 | adjustment [2] 175:1 | Albertan [1] 10:3 | apprentices [18] 95:14 | assured [2] 114:18 |
| 81:18,23 82:14 83:23 | 180:15 | align 11 36:6 | 95:15 102:25 143:24 | 166:10 |
| 84:9,20 86:11,19 | adjustments [2] 91:21 | alignmont in 165.5 | 150:17 151:16 153:20 | Atlantic [16] 49:4,14,19 |
| above [16] 16:14,15 17:9 | 166:17 | | 157:7,14 158:10,16 159:2 | 50:12 51:5,9 72:23 74:8 |
| 19:5,9 22:11 24:25 25:5 | Administration (1) | all-in [1] 14:19 | 165:6,10,25 166:8,10 | 74:10,13,22 83:20 84:7 |
| 25:7,17,18 63:4 97:3 | 2.17 | allies [1] 91:20 | 1/4:25 | 114:17 119:22 160:16 |
| 131:4 102:11 1/2:23 | administrative | allocated [1] 30:22 | apprenticeship [2] | Attachment [1] 110:5 |
| absence [1] 67:13 | | allow [1] 20:25 | 94:24 152:21 | attention [9] 29:20 |
| absolute [4] 47:3 50:17 | adopt (2) 10 20.6 | allowed (1) 126.18 | approach [9] 77:18 91:3 | 107:21 110:4 114:15 |
| 52:18 60:11 | | allowing (1) 79.17 | 92:12 119:7 121:7 129:21 | 148:1 149:17 150:4 |
| absolutely [11] 5:14 9:11 | adverse [1] 116:19 | | 129:22 157:18 158:5 | 161:13,17 |
| 13:17 18:8 32:3 47:24 | advertise [3] 160:2,22 | allows [1] 93:4 | appropriate [4] 1:13 | attract [4] 9:17 71:6,24 |
| 52:5 54:3 57:25 59:19 | 161:6 | almost [1] 22:6 | 101:7 104:22 129:16 | 79:8 |
| 69:15 | advertised [4] 155:7 | along [1] 115:8 | approved [1] 145:2 | attributable 61 149:21 |
| acceptable [1] 115:2 | 156:19 159:6,11 | always [4] 24:11 86:17 | approximate [1] 130:11 | 150:17 178:10 179:24 |
| accommodate [3] 99:18 | advertisement [1] 155:9 | 102:1 149:15 | area [13] 58.6 95.19 | 181:2 183:9 |
| 104:1 134:9 | advertisements [2] | amended [2] 139:14 | 100:14.19 104:2.5 118:3 | attributes [2] 12:20 33:7 |
| according 11 151:6 | 160:14.17 | 149:18 | 133:12.24 135:9 145:23 | attrition (1) 150.20 |
| account (1) 45.14 | advertising 121 91.9 11 | American (2) 80.3 5 | 146:11 156:9 | A with opitation 77.00 |
| | advisoment (1) 192.4 | amongst (2) 56:21 59:2 | areas [4] 39:1 103:17 | |
| <i>A</i> 4:10 45:1 | | amongst [2] 56:21 58:5 | 105:22 117:23 | automatic [1] 180:14 |
| 44.10 45.1 | advising [1] 129:15 | amount [19] 19:13,16,16 | argues (2) 71:20.21 | available [9] 5:3,13 14:8 |
| accounted [2] 5:24 | Advocate [3] 100:25 | 43:747:167:392:17 | A mott w 96.2 | 49:25 99:21 100:16 |
| 59:12 | 113:10 181:10 | 97:10 100:1 113:2,2 | Arnett [1] 86:3 | 115:13 125:4 136:24 |
| accounting [1] 180:12 | affairs [1] 6:10 | 141:10 147:5 155:8 | arrive [2] 142:7 143:2 | Avalon [7] 96:25 98:22 |
| accounts [1] 91:25 | affecting [1] 133:25 | 183.12 184.5 | arrived [3] 141:15,17 | 99:11 100:21 135:6,14 |
| accrue [1] 125:11 | affiliate m 110.3 | analogy (g) 117.10 | 142:22 | 135:15 |
| accumulative [2] 17:14 | affiliates (2) 110.23 24 | | arrow [1] 157:3 | average [24] 8:6,7,8 |
| 98:7 | afford w 12.21 | analysis [14] 15:8 16:16 | aside [2] 67:9 76:17 | 12:11,12,14 18:24 54:11 |
| accurate n 141.18 | | 19:22 55:7 65:22 100:15 | aspect III 93.7 | 54:16,25 55:14,16,24 |
| achiava 11 102.2 | attorded [1] 73:15 | 122:2 120:0 129:18,20 | aspect 11 04.0 | 56:2,10,13,18,20 74:2 |
| achieved == 102 + 102.2 | afraid [1] 87:16 | 141.14,10 142:/ 104:12 | | 130:25 131:5 150:9,12 |
| acnieved [4] 102:4 103:3 | again [32] 9:21 21:20 | annual [4] 18:25 19:2 | assembly [1] 8:11 | 150:20 |
| 120:13,14 | 44:10,16 57:18 62:19 | 130:9 150:20 | assess [2] 91:16 119:17 | averages [2] 55:22,23 |
| achievement [2] 20:18 | 63:13 77:13 83:6 88:3 | annualized [1] 18:17 | assessment [1] 181:22 | avoid [2] 101:13 146:12 |
| 20:21 | 115:8 120:22 122:5 | answer [9] 36:24 73:9 | assets [8] 13:18 34:16 | awards [3] 19:17.18 |
| achieving [1] 94:25 | 125:18 129:6,11,21,22 | 74:3 83:19 84:18 149:16 | | |
| | | | | |

Multi-PageTM

aware - change NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| | | | NF S 2010 Gen | eral Kate Applicatio |
|--|---|--|---|--------------------------------|
| 175:18 | 33:19 34:3,4,23 35:1,4,5 | boy [1] 81:19 | CA-NP-111 [2] 149:14 | 77:24 107:19 169:15 |
| aware [2] 70:22 150:3 | 35:13,17 41:2,3,6 | brand [1] 78:16 | 151:1 CA_NP_138 (1) 177.19 | 183:10,13 |
| awareness [1] 91:13 | 33:16 | breadth [6] 10:19 36:4 | CA-INI -130[1] 177:18 CA-INP-141 [2] 178:8 | cases [2] 40:15,14 |
| away [6] 134:16,21 135:12 136:7 138:17 | benefit [17] 92:2,4 102:4 | break (61, 81.3, 4, 87.19 | 179:17 181:16 | 16:19,23 17:5,10,16,23 |
| 144:24 | 113:12 114:11 115:9,21 | 162:19 181:12 185:6 | CA-NP-149 [1] 110:5 | 18:11 19:8,12,15,16,20 |
| | 115:23 124:13,18 125:19 | breakdown [8] 132:16 | CA-NP-269 [1] 132:15 | 74:6 82:2 |
| -B- | 128.8,13,14 129.3,18 | 154:10 161:11 180:25 | CA-NP-339 [1] 73:18 | cash-based [2] 20:18,20 |
| B [9] 29:7 107:21,24 | benefits [6] 14:13 21:22 | 181:24 182:4,6,14 | cable [2] 145:21 153:2 | categories [1] 154:14 |
| 108:1 109:16 112:25 | 22:16 114:6 125:11 | bring $[12]$ 100:10,21 | Caicos [20] 111:23 112:7 | category [2] 125:7 150:0 |
| 140:25 141:20 166:16 | 176:22 | 114:15 115:5,12 118:20 | 116:2 118:8 123:2,5,10 | caused (1) 123.8 |
| D.C [1] 106:19 Bachalan (1) 89:10 | Dest [13] 36:12 40:25 41:9 41:13 114:5 117:10 | 118:25 134:21 136:6,20 | 131:14,23 132:17 133:2 | Causes [1] 45.19 |
| backfilling (1) 134-17 | 147:12,17 159:1 174:11 | 136:24 138:23 147:17 | 133:22 134:6 135:4 138:1 | causing [1] 95:12 |
| hackground 131 45.24 | 180:1 183:20 186:6 | hringing [3] 47.3 4 | 138:15 Coices? 120:15 | cell [1] 38:4 |
| 48:9 105:9 | better [1] 146:11 | 158:12 | Calcos ² [1] 128:15 | central [1] 93:12 |
| backgrounds [1] 77:12 | between [21] 20:1 21:17 | broad [15] 8:4,9 9:3,6 | calculation (4) 23:11 | centre [4] 103:24,25 |
| bad [2] 43:23 44:3 | 58:6 69:3 95:13 98:13 | 11:1 23:23 24:8 29:14 | 56:2 141:22 162:24 | 109:5 145:16 |
| badly [1] 44:5 | 99:4,5,17 101:8 102:21 | 46:5 57:10 58:15 71:12 | calculations [1] 22:18 | CEO [11] 5:6 6:18,18 |
| balance [2] 101:8 104:15 | 104:16 138:20 141:7 | broader [3] 40:19 71:7 | Calgary [1] 106:6 | 40:8 42:2 59:17 61:11 |
| balancing [1] 157:12 | hevond (7) 34.5 71.10 | 139:4 | calls [13] 103:24 144:7,9 | CEO's [1] 63:7 |
| bank [3] 80:6,10,12 | 98:13 147:8,19 160:23 | broadly [4] 163:12,15 | 144:23 145:2,3,5,15,16 | CEOs [4] 5:6 34:6 58:24 |
| Bank's [1] 80:15 | 161:6 | 163:22 164:18 | 143:24 140:3 147:13 | 60:23 |
| banker [1] 46:6 | big [11] 13:15 42:4 43:6 | broken [1] 63:15 | campaign [2] 91:12,12 | certain [5] 24:7 98:25 |
| Dankers [2] 45:25,25 | 44:12 54:23 55:1 77:22 | Brook [1] 92:20 Protherhood (1) 151.7 | Canada [21] 9:2 30:6 | 135:3 15/:10 1/4:15 |
| Janking [3] 45:24 40:5 46:12 | bigger [5] 31:641:18 | brought (4) 72.10 119.7 | 34:5 41:1 49:14,19 50:3 | 56:15 57:8 90:2 107:6 |
| bankruptcy [1] 47:14 | 44:14 117:3,4 | 128:6 138:16 | 50:12 51:5,10 59:25 | 113:18,25 116:7,24 118:6 |
| banks [2] 7:17 47:13 | biggest [5] 12:23 21:23 | buck [1] 55:16 | 76:19 114:17,18 126:15 | 118:9 124:20 125:23 |
| banner [1] 91:7 | 31:3 32:6,7 | bucks [1] 55:15 | 160:20 | 162:15 169:6 170:14 |
| bargaining [1] 76:16 | Dillion [3] 48:20,25 58:13 | budget [5] 142:2,4 143:7 | Canada's [1] 1:25 | 176:14,16 184:9,22 |
| base [11] 12:9,9 14:9 16:7 | 19:1 20:5.25 | 174:12,14 | Canadian [17] 8:13 9:3 | CERTIFICATE [1] |
| 16:11 34:20 71:2,3,5 | bit [19] 17:17 24:3,19 | budgets [1] 143:3 | 23:23 27:12 49:10 51:16 | 185:19 |
| hased (5), 19:21 92:17 | 52:23 63:5,5 70:5 75:5 | Duild [4] /1:22 143:3 | 71:12 74:8,12 76:10 | certify [1] 185:20 |
| 113:2 166:22 175:13 | 86:2 120:5 128:5 135:5 | building [3] 104:6 | 87:10 130:14 | ceteria [2] 130:15 182:15 |
| bases [1] 73:23 | 163:21 165:11 176:15 | 140:14 186:5 | capabilities [1] 90:17 | Chair 141 55:21 68:1 7 |
| basic [2] 131:7 138:21 | 184:10 | built [4] 93:1 142:3 | 98:21 99:7.12.21.22.24 | 154:18 |
| basis [21] 6:18,19 14:19 | Black [1] 18:13 | 174:13,14 | 103:13 | Chairman [60] 1:2,7,7 |
| 17:5 18:17 19:10 33:15 | block [4] 151:13,13,13 | Dullet [3] 68:20,21 69:17 | capital [31] 13:14,18 | 1:18,22 18:3,6 26:4,5,9 |
| 84:25 92:8 96:13,15 | 151:14 blocks (1) 152:14 | business (2) 2:17 7:10 | 45:25 46:3,25 47:8 80:16 | 64:13.18.22 65:4 66:3 |
| 103:1 109:24 111:7 128:2 | blue [3] 47·3 97·18 99·4 | 8:5,17 13:12 15:1 25:14 | 97:15,17 98:1,8,14 | 66:23 67:7,12,19,23 68:3 |
| 1/2:4 1/5:11 boor (1) 127.9 | Board [21] 1.13 3.4 | 33:25 34:10 37:25 42:3 | 108:25 109:21 140:7 | 73:14 80:23 81:1,2,8,12 |
| bears (1) 178.4 | 34:19 48:6,7 55:8,10 | 44:21 45:22 69:23 71:3 | 143:16 1/3:19,24 1/5:20 | 87:22.25 88:3.9 104:25 |
| become [4] 40:23 150:25 | 62:8 63:14,22 64:1,3,9 | 103:18 114:4 127:8,13 | 180:11,15 181:20 | 105:1,5 147:21 154:21 |
| 151:9 165:25 | 88:10,25 89:25 114:10 | 128:23 158:2,17 159:23 | caps [1] 123:17 | 154:24 163:1,2 177:21 |
| becomes [4] 17:4 22:2 | 186:4 | 165:12 173:19,25 175:5 | captured [1] 110:12 | 182:2 183:5 184:25 185:5 |
| 31:5 58:25 | Board's [2] 55:7 176:10 | DUSINESSES [5] 51:7 69:8 | capturing [1] 113:3 | 185:9,12,13 |
| begin [2] 3:23 89:23 | boards [1] 5:9 | busy [1] 135:15 | care [3] 43:22 58:23 59:7 | challenge [11] 4:13 |
| beginning [2] 98:15 | Bonavista [2] 119:18,19 | buying [2] 34:13 99:23 | career [1] 171:5 | 37:13 40:24 42:24 43:13 |
| behaviour (1) 42:8 | bonus [11] 16:8,9,11,11 | | careful [1] 12:24 | 147:20 157:8 |
| belief [1] 78:16 | 85:13 | -C- | Caribbean [18] 116:2 | challenges [2] 44:9 |
| believes [1] 96:11 | bonuses [2] 17:6,7 | C _[1] 58:12 | 126:14,19,21,25 127:4 | 116:15 |
| Belize [6] 126:19,22 | book [8] 48:24 57:2,8,9 | CA [2] 148:1 178:16 | 130:11,17,22 131:10 | challenging [3] 31:3 |
| 131:1,6,22,23 | 57:10,11,19 128:7 | CA-58 [1] 122:18 | 132:20 133:4,14 134:6 | chance (1) 11/-0 |
| below [9] 16:14,15 17:10 | borne [2] 23:2 132:14 | CA-NP [1] 168:16 | Call [1] 107.9 | change [14] 40.3 76.6 23 |
| 140:17 | DOSS [2] 78:14 107:8 | CA-NP-104 [1] 102:18 | Cars _[1] 21.24 | 92:16 95:23 98:20 99:15 |
| benchmark [13] 33:13 | Dottom [7] 51:24 108:2 130:5 7 141:4 4 163:7 | CA-NP-107 [2] 155:1 | Case [8] 34·18 77·13 20 | 103:18 122:1,4 162:2,5 |
| 1 | | 1.J.7.4 | | 102.17,24 |

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

Multi-Page[™]

changed - correlate NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| | | | NI 52010 Gen | стаг кате Аррисаної |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| changed [6] 28:25 29:2 | coincidental [4] 23:9 | 175:4 183:25 184:10 | concept [1] 176:6 | 179:18 181:16 182:24 |
| 61:13 161:19,21 162:16 | 23:11 60:9 77:14 | company's [17] 33:25 | concern [2] 5:10 150:3 | Consultants [1] 171:17 |
| changes [9] 89:11 92:17 | coincidentally [1] 77:18 | 33:25 34:1,2 48:2 58:25 | concerned [2] 66:4 | Consulting [1] 1:25 |
| 92:24 93:10 98:6 104:2 | collect [2] 57:10,23 | 00:21 01:2 /8:10 92:22 | 118:19 | consumer [5] 6:10 |
| changing (1) 107.3 | College [1] 160:16 | 130:23 131:11 139:14 | concerns [2] 55:21 95:25 | 100:25 137:24 138:4 |
| characterize (4) 107.5 | column [14] 16:6 17:3 | comparability III 83:16 | conclude [5] 34:23 | 181:10 |
| 124.1 17 125.18 | 18:1 19:7 21:18,18 98:23 | comparable [8] 4:12 5:4 | 104:18 128:19 129:4,7 | Consumer's [1] 113:10 |
| charge [5] 91.7 7 111.11 | 99:9,13,14 100:3,4,7 | 5:7 6:13,20 11:11,12 | conclusion [1] 148:13 | consumption [1] 98:6 |
| 121:7.22 | columns (5) 15.24 24.17 | 74:14 | conclusions [1] 23:18 | contains [1] 8:5 |
| charged [2] 125:20 | 98:25 99:25 178:6 | comparative [6] 62:25 | concur [1] 128:10 | content [1] 6:2 |
| 136:14 | combination [4] 157:23 | 74:11 77:15 80:3 85:10 | concurrently [3] 27:6 | continuance [1] 25:15 |
| charges [10] 108:14 | 166:24 168:20 169:21 | 86:9 | 28:12,15 | continue [10] 13:11 |
| 109:9 110:4,11,12,20,22 | Comerford [2] 1:22 | comparator [8] 3:12,13 | condition [3] 5:2 85:12 | 91:22 96:16 98:12 143:15 |
| 110:23 111:4,4 | 178:1 | 5:1 0:24 23:24 27:13 86:8 87:3 | 90:7 | 144:22 145:2 146:20,22 |
| charging [2] 116:4 | comfortable [1] 137:14 | compare [11] 3:10 4:5 | Conditions [9] 4:20 5:16 16:13 29:17 30:8 116:19 | continued (2) 102.11 |
| | coming [6] 9:21 35:24 | 4:10.14 5:21 20:1 24:1 | 117:12 120:21 126:18 | 165:15 |
| Charles [1] 186:5 | 119:24 156:14 164:23 | 59:3 71:9,11 83:14 | conduct in 74:5 | continues [11, 100:11 |
| chart [1] 39:1 | 175:22 | compared [1] 64:11 | conducting m 91:17 | continuity [2] 95:17 |
| cheaper [1] 99:22 | comment [9] 93:15 | compares [2] 102:8 | configuration (11 98.10 | 150:15 |
| check [1] 160:24 | 95:20 101:4 105:8 116:16 | 168:21 | Confirmed [2] 182.7 9 | contract [17] 93:4 134:22 |
| chemical [1] 7:11 | commentary (1) 62.1 | comparing [3] 4:11 5:25 | confirms (1) 166.21 | 136:6,11,12,16 138:15 |
| chief [6] 17:7 51:7 60:3 | commentary [1] 02.1 | 6:20 | connect (1) 08:2 | 138:19,22,25 140:11,16 |
| 80:6,11,15 | comments [1] 104.18 | comparison [3] 3:9 | connecting (1) 07-21 | 165:11 166:13 172:1 |
| chip [1] 47:3 | 7.18 10.13 18 27.12 46.2 | 48:18 62:1 | connecting [1] 9/:21 | 1/5:15,24 |
| chit [1] 138:24 | 46:15 51:9,17 | compensation [14] 2:5 | 172.2 6 12 173.2 8 18 | |
| choice [5] 68:17,20 69:3 | commercials 11 33:23 | 13:22 14:8,9,25 15:8 | 174:4 176:2 | CONTRACTOR [6] 139:9 |
| 69:3,18 | Commissioners [1] | 73:24 74:6 83:3 | consequence [3] 43:25 | contractors (4) 136-18 |
| Choose [8] 3:13 8:15,20 | 186:4 | compete [2] 72:22 77:4 | 44:8 45:21 | 136:21.23 137:13 |
| choosing (1) 12:10 | Committee [1] 48:6 | competed III 69:21 | consequently [1] 47:13 | contracts [3] 136:17 |
| chose [2] 3:12 10:13 | common [6] 4:15,22 9:1 | competent III 13:2 | conservation [16] 89:18 | 175:17,23 |
| chose [2] 5.12 10.15 | 30:10 119:7 125:10 | competition [1] 13:8 | 89:25 90:2,14,16 91:1,4 | contribution [2] 130:10 |
| chosen [2] 8:10 10:10 | commonize [1] 21:1 | competitive [16] 4:6 | 91:5,24 92:4 102:25 | 130:17 |
| 120.17 134.5 | commonized [1] 117:8 | 13:22 17:4,8 71:17 72:7 | 103:8,23,24 104:4 174:24 | contributor [1] 25:11 |
| circumstances (1) 24.24 | commonsense [1] 35:11 | 72:17 74:8 76:7,17 79:1 | 25·2 19 23 170·4 | control [2] 146:9,18 |
| cities [1] 10.1 | communicate [1] 36:11 | 79:7,10,12,16,21 | consider (5) 34:7 21 | controllable [1] 102:10 |
| Clarenville (4) 105.24 | communicating [1] | competitiveness [3] | 102:17 121:4 176:17 | conversations [2] 146:9 |
| 106:1 157:1 159:7 | 35:7 | 6:1/24:1/6:25 | considerably [1] 184:18 | 146:18 |
| clarity [3] 154:7.9 155:2 | communication [6] | complement [2] 138:6 | consideration [3] 55:9 | Conversely [1] 12:1 |
| clerical m 8:20 | 35:15 36:1,4,8,21 37:11 | complete (1) 160.7 | 101:6 121:14 | conveyed [1] 163:16 |
| clerical/secretarial m | Communications [4] | completed (2) 02:10 | considerations [3] 67:9 | coordinated [2] 91:3 |
| 75:21 | 35.10 30.7,9,10 | 104.1 | 67:14 157:12 | 112:16 |
| client [3] 43:2 48:13 | 10.10 20.2 4 6 12 30.6 7 | completely III 161.5 | considered [5] 89:22 | coordination [1] 112:2 |
| 82:15 | 30:12 31:5 34:6 48:1,19 | complex [6] 31.4 32.6 7 | 101:3 103:1 129:17 | cope [1] 132:19 |
| clients [4] 21:3 77:21 | 48:24 50:6,7,13,19 57:16 | 43:21 44:9 103:22 | 105:12 | core [4] 27:5 72:6 93:2 |
| 82:18 84:18 | 59:25 60:24 74:9 82:23 | complexities [2] 60:8,8 | considering [1] 95:20 | 93:24 |
| climate [3] 116:14 | 83:98/:14112:18113:21 | complexity [3] 34:10,21 | | Corporate [2] 6:10 |
| 11/:16 120:13 | 124:2 | 44:20 | Consistent [9] 90:21,22 | cornoration (1) 126.24 |
| climes [1] 116:20 | company [69] 5:23 21:13 | complications [1] 22:17 | 163:15.23 164:18 | corporation's pl 126.0 |
| CIOSE [6] 54:23 56:16 58:9 | 21:24 30:4 32:7 34:16 | comply [1] 85:8 | consisting [1] 123:17 | 127:4 |
| closely 1111112.12 | 34:17,20 42:2,6,22 43:6 | component [9] 4:8 30:8 | consists (1) 94:22 | corporations [1] 68:12 |
| closery [1] 110.25 | 43:13,16 45:5 46:8 48:7 | 95:5 97:20,22 98:4 | constant (1) 143:10 | correct [40] 2:20 41:18 |
| closet [2] 39.2 03.3 | 65:12.15.15.16 72:15.16 | 130:25 131:5 152:15 | constituents [2] 36:15 | 41:20 48:13,15,22 49:22 |
| clustoring (2) 52-24 | 72:16 74:7 75:1 77:8,9 | components [2] 97:18 | 36:16 | 51:20 65:3 66:8 68:18 |
| 53:20 | 78:17 82:21 83:10,11 | 140.17 | constrain [1] 25:16 | 88:13 89:2 105:11,13 |
| coast [2] 106.17 112.19 | 92:19 93:4 94:8 95:6 | composition res 5.4 | constraint [1] 182:3 | 100:12,25 108:11 109:12 |
| COE [1] 34·18 | 97:7,11 100:2 103:7 | 85·3 | constructed [1] 33:19 | 136:14 140:4,9,20 141:12 |
| coincidence is 66.14 | 143:22 145:9,21,22 146:2 | compromised 111 | construction [3] 113:14 | 142:11,18 161:22 162:10 |
| 70:11,13,17 71:4 78:6 | 146:6 148:8,25 150:5,8 | 134:24 | 134:15 138:22 | 168:14 169:2,11 176:4 |
| coincident [3] 23:8.8 | 150:11 151:15 153:17 | compromising 111 | consultancy [1] 74:5 | 1/9:6 185:15 186:1 |
| 70:4 | 154:3 159:14 166:2,5 | 104:13 | consultant [4] 178:11 | |

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

Multi-PageTM

correlated - early NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| | | | NI 8 2010 Gene | a a Rate Application |
|--|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| correlated [1] 126:15 | 97:21 98:4,5 101:18,23 | define [2] 41:9 42:25 | 20:9,13,23 21:2 42:14 | 46:23 55:2,17 65:13 |
| correlation [2] 46:19 | 102:4,6 103:10 104:10 | defining [1] 42:14 | 56:10,14 67:22 74:16 | 71:16 72:3,6 122:1,4 |
| 46:21 | 104:14 108:7,8 113:12 | definition [8] 7:13 40:18 | 79:25 83:13 85:12 87:7 | 134:23 142:1 184:19 |
| cost [54] 23:12 25:12 | 114:1,6,13,23,25 115:9 | 41:19 42:13 52:5.9 55:24 | 115:20 116:10 118:22 | dollar [7] 52:20 62:25 |
| 89:21 90:19 92:4 93:6 | 115:19,21,23 117:15 | 86:9 | 119:4,6 120:22 144:10 | 86:22,23 87:7 130:14,14 |
| 97:20,22 101:2,8,9,11 | 125:15 124:18 125:9 | definitional [1] 54:25 | | dollars [8] 25:12,13 |
| 101:14,24 102:2,10,16 | 128:13.15 129:12 130:2 | definitions 151 36:2.6 | differential [2] 66:18 | 48:20,25 58:7 63:1 64:11 |
| 103:5 104:12,16,21 | 130:21 131:22,23 137:16 | 37:21 41:10 83:8 | differentialare 50.11 | 143:11 |
| 106:19 111:7,11 112:10 | 144:9 145:3 166:9 174:16 | degree 6 29:19.21 | 50:12 | domestic [2] 90:7,8 |
| 121.9 10 22 122.10 | 174:19 175:2 | 34:21 63:16 70:22 157:10 | differentiation and 0.22 | dominant [2] 12:23 |
| 125:21 126:1 130:24 | customers' [1] 90:20 | degrees [2] 36:2 62:2 | 10:0 72:6 | 77:14 |
| 131:9,16,24 144:14 150:1 | cut [2] 7:5,7 | Delanev (3) 106.16 107.2 | 10.9 75.0 | done [25] 6:1 9:4 28:6 |
| 161:11 163:13 175:7 | cutting [11, 101:9 | 107:11 | 124:17 | 33:16 58:21 62:3,9 69:19 |
| 176:11 178:11,21,22 | cycle (3) 13:10:21:15:2 | delay (1) 101.12 | 124.17 | 85:6 87:4 92:18,24 |
| 179:2,8 180:11,15 181:19 | | delayed (1) 134.23 | 147:11 158:10 | 110:24 120:12 129:20 |
| 183:11 | | deliver (1) 154.25 | difficulture: 117.21.25 | 134.18 135.24 130.2 |
| costing [1] 181:23 | -D- | 104.11 | difficulty [2] 117:21,25 | 159:20 175:17.18 183:17 |
| costs [22] 34:13 92:1 94:7 | damage [5] 123:8,10 | delivering (4) 104.9 | algest [1] 175:9 | doubt [2] 75.11 144.14 |
| 95:13 101:9 102:24 109:5 | 127:7,13 128:22 | | dilemma [1] 86:2 | down [22] 33:11 40:15 |
| 109:22,23 111:19 114:11 | dark [3] 127:18,25 | delivery [4] 91:4 104:13 | diluted [1] 53:16 | 52.24 63.15 81.11 108.3 |
| 150:21 140:2,7 171:21 | 129:24 | 151:5 105:14 | dimensional [4] 38:3 | 117:2 119:4 122:7 123:3 |
| 177.5 178.9 180.1 | data [23] 5:2 10:20 11:20 | demographic [2] 157:8 | 38:10 40:14,15 | 123:4 135:19 138:2 |
| counsel (1) 6.11 | 15:25 34:3 35:1 48:12 | | direct [16] 17:14,15,17 | 145:21 156:14,18 162:6 |
| counting w 20.11 | 49:24 50:8,14 51:22 | demographics [7] 93:16 | 19:6,10 22:2,10,22 105:8 | 164:23 172:7,13 174:2,4 |
| | 55:25 50:15,24 05:8,24 63:25 25 64:25 73:24 25 | 95:18,21 94:8 149:22 | 108:8 123:14 129:2 148:1 | downed [1] 144:12 |
| Country [8] 7:22 8:24,25 | 153.25 171.7 | dontol (1) 21.22 | 1/1:16 1/4:20 1/5:3 | downturn [1] 127:3 |
| 9:24 10:8 09:11 70:22 158·14 | database [23] 4:11 5:22 | dental [1] 21:22 | direction [2] 79:2 82:25 | draw [6] 79:17,18 107:20 |
| couple (11.11.0 | 6:14.14 7:2.2.5.6 10:17 | depending [3] 83:19 | directly [1] 108:8 | 148:13 161:12,16 |
| | 33:21 48:17,18 49:5,10 | doployed w 127.10 | Director [1] 1:24 | drawing [1] 79:13 |
| Course [15] 60:19 114:7 | 49:14,19 51:14 54:23 | | directors [2] 5:9 34:19 | drives [1] 145:4 |
| 136.23 25 139.1 3 144.20 | 55:1 56:8,12 58:24 60:22 | depth [4] 10:19 36:4 | disability [1] 21:22 | driving 11 121.14 |
| 147:12 164:15 172:4 | date [4] 64:7 77:20 155:8 | 37:19 09:22 | disagree 11 116:15 | Drug (1) 82.13 |
| 173:17 180:14 | 184:19 | derivations [1] 56:21 | disagreement | duality (1) 97.5 |
| covered [1] 185:4 | dated [2] 2:6 186:8 | descending [2] 11:14 | 119:15 | duality [1] 87:5 |
| covers [1] 23:12 | days [7] 115:1 156:3,4 | 50:4 | disaster [3] 42:8 44:3 | 130.13 20 131.14 171.21 |
| create [4] 48:18 49:4 | 156:17,22 157:4 184:15 | describe [4] 3:7,21 12:19 | 45:19 | 171:24 |
| 118:23 119:5 | DCF [2] 18:4 81:15 | described in 146.4 | disconnect [3] 75:5,8,8 | duration [2] 96:3 144:18 |
| created [1] 125:3 | deal [8] 23:14 84:16 | description in 12.22 | disconnection [1] 75:11 | during [2] 143.20 167.20 |
| crew [2] 116:19 120:6 | 152:18 158:1,25 159:1 | description [3] 13:23 | discount [3] 17:24 81:22 | uuiiiig [2] 145.20 107.20 |
| crews [3] 116.17 117.22 | 165:31/4:18 | 41.5 125.1 dosomvos (1) 24.25 | 82:1 | |
| 119:24 | dealing [4] 99:21 116:18 | deserves [1] 34:25 | discounted [2] 17:25 | -12- |
| criteria [3] 98:25 167:3 | | design [2] 73:24 105:22 | 18:16 | E [1] 39:4 |
| 170:14 | dealt [1] 150:2 | deteriorated [2] 96:10 | discuss [2] 12:14 159:17 | E33 [1] 39:10 |
| critical [1] 94:1 | death [3] 148:9,17 149:2 | | discussed [2] 12:15 24:3 | Earle [116] 26:8,10,11 |
| CROSS-EXAMINATION | debate [1] 85:15 | determinants [1] 59:1 | discussion [12] 3:11.17 | 26:15,22 27:10,17,23 |
| [2] 26:10 105:3 | debating [1] 9:10 | determination [1] 60:12 | 13:14 15:16 22:18 41:1 | 28:18,24 29:4,23 30:14 |
| CRS [2] 131:10.17 | December [2] 126:10 | determine [9] 4:5 31:9 | 60:20 81:21 87:3 126:5 | 30:19 31:11,15,20,24 |
| culture (3) 72.10 12 13 | 126:11 | 31:16 40:24 44:18 65:5 | 128:6 167:22 | 35.10 36.20 37.4 10 38.8 |
| cumulative (2) 22:2 20 | decide [1] 30:21 | 65:7 69:19 145:19 | dispense [1] 56:23 | 38:13.19 39:11.19.24 |
| | decided [1] 106:17 | determining [1] 121:6 | dispute [1] 137:5 | 40:9 41:14,22 44:24 |
| | decision [10] 19:19 27:11 | develop [2] 35:13 78:17 | distributed [9] 111:11 | 45:11 46:13 47:17,25 |
| currency [2] 130:12,18 | 27:18 43:23 44:12 45:19 | developed [2] 28:4 | 111:19 112:10 114:12 | 48:10,16,23 49:3,9,13 |
| current [6] 7:3,4 18:16 | 48:3,6 68:1 126:22 | 183:11 | 116:9 121:22 122:10 | 49:17,23 50:4,11,18 51:3 |
| 27:8 70:18 80:15 | decisions [12] 19:21 | development [4] 8:2 | 125:21 126:1 | 51:15 52:1,0,11,22 55:18 |
| Customer [27] 89:4,6 | 43:21 44:12,13,14,16,21 | 42:772:895:1 | distribution [14] 18:14 | 56:19 57:5.14.21 58:1.8 |
| 91:13,23 94:11 90:24 97:6 15 17 20 24 98:12 | 44:22 45:3 47:12 83:11 | dice [2] 7:5 48:11 | 18:15 20:6,25 81:25 | 58:17 59:14,20 60:13 |
| 101:20 102:14 109:7 | 130:8 | dictates [1] 165:8 | 90:19 97:8,25 98:2,9 | 61:9,17,22 62:6,18 63:10 |
| 126:25 145:16,18 163:13 | aeclined [1] 163:9 | difference [11] 54:25 | 105.20 125.9 144.10 | 64:4,16,20 65:2,9,21 |
| 171:22 172:2,6,12,23 | decrease [1] 131:4 | 59:5 69:2 102:21 117:12 | distributor 11 82.16 | 66:1,20 67:5,10,16,21 |
| 173:1,18 180:20 | decreasing [1] 96:23 | 11/:16 120:13 135:1 | disturbance in 116.25 | 0/:25 68:6,15,22 69:6 |
| customer's [1] 129:10 | decree [1] 84:22 | 141:/ 143:9 1/3:13 | document in 126.5 | 72.20 73.2 8 17 22 74.10 |
| customers [58] 69:13 | dedicated [1] 183:12 | uniferences [4] 4:18 5:23 | uocument [5] 126:5 | 75:9 77:1 78:2 79:3.11 |
| 90:8,8,11,13 91:19 92:2 | deeper [1] 40:18 | difformt on 0.8.20.7.0 | doom?t = 10.10.24.9 | 79:19 80:9,19 |
| 92:5,8 96:12 97:9,11,18 | Deer 11 156-19 | uniereni [24] 9:8 20:7,8 | uucsii i [14] 10:18 24:8 | early 131 13.9 123.4 |

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

Multi-PageTM

earn - fees NP's 2010 General Rate Application

163:11 earn [1] 16:12 166:18 easily [5] 24:17 70:13,15 118:16 119:8 eastern [2] 10:17 84:2 easy [2] 5:12 23:4 economic [8] 18:12 42:19 50:2 92:2 97:1 126:17,23 127:3 economy [1] 79:24 edges [1] 53:3 education [1] 94:23 184:13 Edward [1] 106:3 effect [4] 98:7 151:20 152:11 174:3 effective [5] 119:12 72:11 120:10 131:1,6,10 effectively [3] 17:9 20:16 146:17 effectiveness [1] 91:16 effects [1] 127:12 efficiencies [7] 89:21 156:2 101:2 102:3 103:17 145:13,14 175:5 efficiency [8] 90:12 91:1 93:8,9,11 101:8 102:16 103:5 efficient [2] 101:25 103:16 effort [10] 4:12 5:18 6:21 112:8.16 114:14 115:19 132:14 184:10.18 efforts [5] 9:17 101:10 111:10 114:10 123:20 eight [5] 29:11,13 30:11 32:5 35:25 either [3] 77:7 134:5 157:22 elaborate [1] 152:9 elapsed [1] 155:8 electric [6] 83:22 84:1 106:3 120:6 123:2 124:5 electrical [12] 88:19 89:20 94:2 95:20 96:6.9 97:6 101:19 105:10 118:21 151:7 152:19 114:19 electricity [11] 97:10 114:23 123:21 126:19,23 127:19 130:23,25 131:1 131:6.8 114:17 element [2] 17:13 85:25 elements [5] 4:8 14:20 14:25 85:19,20 elicited [1] 155:4 eligibility [1] 167:21 eligible [3] 93:24 167:10 118:15 171:4 elimination [1] 131:8 elsewhere [1] 137:10 Emergency [6] 122:13 123:16 124:15 125:13 127:10 129:1 152:14 emphasize [1] 42:17 empire [1] 51:14 41:15 47:21 86:10 182:4

employed [1] 77:8 employee [2] 34:19 employees [46] 48:1 74:7 79:13,17,18 93:23 94:4,6,9,10 103:11,14 114:8 117:14 118:7.9.20 119:1,6 121:2 122:8 123:17 124:3,8,9,25 125:20 134:16,21 139:2 139:3,5 148:8,25 153:14 160:9,10 165:22 166:23 167:10,23 168:5,6,9,19 employment [1] 150:13 enable [1] 20:1 encourage [2] 44:19 end [12] 13:13 63:15 97:5 118:1 123:20 125:7 159:24 167:16,25 168:7 168:9,12 ended [3] 107:3 132:20 energize [1] 139:5 **energized** [1] 94:20 energy [20] 10:3 34:11 34:11,12 83:2 85:16 89:24 90:2,9,13,15,23 91:1.5 92:4 98:6 103:8 103:23 104:4,8 engaged [1] 166:4 engagement [1] 182:19 engineering [8] 6:8 76:19,21 88:10,19 100:15 105:11 106:7 engineers [3] 76:14 88:21 93:25 **enhancing** [1] 42:17 ensure [6] 28:13 91:2.22 95:8,16 150:15 entails [1] 151:11 entire [1] 59:24 entities [1] 83:24 entry [1] 74:20 environment [2] 76:21 environmental [2] 117:12 120:21 environments [1] equal [2] 17:16 22:21 equally [2] 68:10 171:10 equals [1] 46:24 equation [1] 166:2 equipment [2] 117:8 equipped [1] 117:10 equity [6] 30:3,5,7 66:22 66:25 67:1 error [2] 43:25 45:21 especially [2] 133:2 essentially [5] 38:9

establish [1] 38:9 established [2] 47:21 137:6 establishing [2] 30:3 104:6 estate [2] 8:2 12:16 estimate [6] 142:8 182:2 183:11,17,22 184:8 estimated [1] 102:19 estimates [2] 81:14 166:22 et [2] 130:15 182:15 etc [1] 151:5 evaluate [2] 48:3 58:23 evaluated [1] 34:6 evaluation [15] 3:9 4:2 4:3,4,7 5:14,16,17,25 6:4 29:15 31:25 32:11 34:24 59:17 evaluations [4] 30:8 33:15,23,24 event [9] 69:7 106:19 122:6 124:4,23 132:12 133:9 138:2,4 events [5] 112:21 114:8 117:3 118:18 144:24 everybody [1] 185:10 evidence [5] 2:10 89:5 96:1 97:14.16 evident [1] 96:25 evolve [1] 91:15 exact [4] 26:19 161:21 163:20,20 exactly [13] 16:13 18:8,9 24:10,14 44:11,17,22 86:12 107:5 170:1 175:16 181:11 EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF [2] 1:19 88:6 example [18] 11:21 16:2 39:4 41:25 44:1,25 92:18 100:13 101:11 102:6 103:21 104:4,15 113:4 120:17 135:3 153:6 174:19 examples [1] 156:23 exceed [2] 25:20 103:13 except [3] 24:23 85:8 113:4 **exception** [1] 112:6 exceptional [1] 24:23 **excessive** [1] 67:3 **exclude** [1] 69:4 excluded [4] 7:15,16 9:7 9:20 **Excluding** [1] 130:16 exclusive [1] 125:3 **Excuse** [3] 35:20 55:12 81:9 executive [38] 2:5 8:16 8:17,19,23 9:2,18,24 10:1,9,12 11:8,9 17:7 24:10.24 25:4.15 32:22 35:12 36:22 51:8 60:3

61:13 62:1 69:23 70:25 71:6,15 75:2 76:2 77:6 80:6,11,15 83:2,3,4 **executives** [17] 24:2 29:24 30:2,9,12,16,23 70:2,3,5,6,11,16,18 74:23 77:5,16 exercise [2] 40:3 86:15 exhausted [1] 100:17 Exhibit [8] 1:11,15 139:14,19 142:14 143:9 173:14.15 exhibits [1] 89:12 exigent [1] 120:17 existed [3] 27:13,16,19 existence [1] 129:17 existing [3] 26:25 90:16 103:10 exists [1] 31:4 expand [1] 97:8 expanded [9] 89:17,24 90:2.19 91:5.24 103:8 103:12 104:12 expanding [1] 60:1 expect [13] 24:5,11,14 24:15 47:6 59:24 73:3 91:15 121:21 122:9 127:24 128:1 164:6 **expectation** [1] 45:20 expectations [3] 90:20 91:23 101:20 expected [10] 17:23 44:7 92:3 127:1 146:14 171:24 172:7,12 173:7 175:12 expended [3] 132:13 138:2 143:16 expenditure [3] 92:7 96:15 98:16 expenditures 171 96:17 97:3 98:1,11,15 100:22 143:17 expense [6] 12:23 13:16 21:7 23:1 173:13 174:3 expenses [1] 183:8 expensive [1] 137:15 experience [8] 25:2 26:1 95:3 105:16 118:13 120:5 121:1 169:14 **experienced** [4] 96:12 97:1 99:17 157:15 experiencing [1] 159:14 expert [3] 176:17 178:21 178:23 expertise [1] 90:15 experts [3] 180:11,12,13 explain [7] 3:4 6:23 11:4 98:18 149:23 161:19,23 explanation [3] 162:21 167:8,9 explored [1] 128:5 exposed [2] 86:15 127:5 expressed [1] 107:8 extend [2] 84:18 97:25

extent [5] 69:20 131:22

173:6,9 182:18 **external** [3] 36:15 127:6 128:20extra [3] 103:14 165:6 174:18 extraordinarily [1] 56:9 extravagantly [1] 56:5 extreme [1] 55:25 extremely [3] 9:1 53:4 53:5 extremes [2] 53:11,13 extricate [1] 85:18 eyeball [1] 63:6 eyes [1] 70:23 -F-

faces [1] 44:9 **facility** [1] 123:14 fact [23] 8:7,11 24:6,18 25:7.18 26:24 35:24 36:8 43:10 45:2 46:21 60:14 70:4 76:15 120:25 121:25 143:15,18 162:11 170:5 180:18 182:13

factor [10] 30:21,22 32:23 36:25 43:19 59:16 60:6,10,11 77:14

factors [13] 29:7,10 30:4 30:15 34:22 35:25 36:3 41:23.24 42:9 57:18 126:17 131:4

Failure [1] 42:6 fair [17] 26:23 46:14 52:23 66:25 67:1 81:5 116:16,21 121:6,15 127:9 128:24 129:16 135:5 164:19 170:15 184:10 fairly [4] 117:8 137:24 143:23 153:16 fairness [1] 119:14 fall [4] 91:9 135:25 136:4 154:14 fallen [1] 19:19 falls [1] 66:7

familiar 6 32:11 51:4 122:12 176:9,14,18 **familiarity** [1] 131:16 family [1] 70:20 far [3] 12:23 25:16 170:8 fashion [4] 1:12 113:11 146:3 158:4

fast [1] 18:6 father-in-law [1] 80:12 fault [1] 153:2 faults [1] 152:18 **favourable** [2] 130:12 130:18 February [2] 157:1 159:7

feeder [1] 98:9 fees [10] 25:13 177:11 178:5 179:18 181:16

Multi-PageTM

few - hereby NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| | | | NI 5 2010 Gene | er af Kate Application |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 182:9,11,14,18,25 | followed [3] 94:23 | fronts [2] 114:7 115:20 | giving [1] 132:20 | grow [1] 100:11 |
| few [5] 107:10 118:11 | 120:11 123:6 | frustrated [2] 29:22 | global [1] 127:3 | growing [2] 101:18,19 |
| 142:14 148:25 165:6 | follows [2] 63:19 101:1 | 170:20 | GLYNN [2] 1:14 81:6 | grown [1] 10:8 |
| fifth [1] 18:23 | foot [1] 121:12 | FTE [2] 141:22 164:12 | go-to [1] 117:24 | growth [29] 59:23,23 |
| figure [6] 57:23 62:20 | footnote [8] 108:19,21 | FTE's [1] 164:1 | goal [3] 91:12 102:2 | 60:6,7,10,11 65:15 96:24 |
| 141:9 142:13 146:25 | 150:23 151:2,6 161:13 | FTEs [5] 164:2,4 165:21 | 147:1 | 97:1,6,16,17,18,19,20 |
| 161:17 | 163:/ 166:21 | 166:20 167:12 | goes [9] 16:22 68:20,21 | 97:21,24 98:4,12,15,16 |
| figures [2] 51:19 139:25 | footnoted [1] 166:19 | fuel [1] 130:21 | 73:12 131:2 138:19 | 99:17,19 100:19 120:23 |
| file [2] 30:6 153:13 | footnotes [1] 162:15 | fulfil [1] 183:21 | 150:12,19 151:10 | GT (1) 171.16 |
| filed [4] 1:10 172:4 180:5 | footprint [2] 4:25 34:2 | fulfilled [1] 154:19 | gold [5] 86:21 87:9,9,13 | GLASS [12] 1/1.10 |
| 181:2 | force [3] 13:4 140:2 | full [5] 20:14 103:4 | 87:14 | 88:1 113:9 122:15 137:24 |
| filing [6] 107:21 161:18 | 157:15 | 125:14 130:20 162:13 | gone [8] 15:15 17:8 61:6 | 143:2 151:10 156:23 |
| 102:10 175:11 182:21 | forecast [45] 97:4 101:7 | fully [12] 11:23 111:11 | 80:11 | 157:5 168:17 183:7 |
| filings [2] 123.24 142.20 | 102:19,22,22,25 103:2 | 111:18 112:10 114:12 | good [14] 23.14 26.12 14 | guidance [1] 64:1 |
| fill (7) 110.5 136.13 | 109:16.17.20.21 140:24 | 116:9 121:22 122:10 | 29:5 30:25 33:6 81:3 | guidelines [2] 83:3 |
| 155:21 156:17.22 157:4 | 141:5,8,15,21 142:16,21 | 165:25 | 102:5,12 104:15 105:5 | 125:22 |
| 161:2 | 142:25 143:7,12 147:3,6 | function (5) 147.13 | 149:7 166:1 185:8 | guys [2] 80:24 81:9 |
| filling [2] 155:9 156:2 | 149:20 150:1 163:5 164:3 | 158:18 165:1.20 172:20 | goodness [1] 48:5 | |
| final (1) 115:7 | 166:1/16/:13 168:/ | functionally [1] 82:15 | gosh [1] 32:22 | -H- |
| finally [4] 5:5 100:25 | 174:16.21 177:4.10 178:9 | fundamentally [2] | government [6] 7:14,15 | hail 11 119:22 |
| 114:14 180:16 | 181:8 183:23 184:3 | 137:5 173:5 | 31:2 32:8 35:16 85:9 | half 181 12:6 7 40:4 43:16 |
| finance [1] 6:9 | forecasting [2] 18:10 | future [18] 17:23 18:10 | Government's [2] | 51:23.24 81:4 170:9 |
| financial [2] 7:17 171:17 | 147:18 | 18:16 19:22 72:8 86:6 | 90:23,25 | hand (1) 167:6 |
| findings [1] 3.21 | foregoing [1] 185:20 | 96:20 115:3 138:25 | GRA [24] 73:18 172:25 | handle (1) 103.24 |
| finds (1) 74.21 | foreign [2] 130:12,18 | 142:20 150:14 157:20 | 177:5,8,12 178:5,25 | handling [1] 109.24 |
| fine [2] 82.7 110.8 162.23 | foreseeable [2] 96:20 | 158:9,24 164:8,9 165:4 | 1/9:9,11 180:2,5,8,10 | hands (1) 151.10 |
| finish (1) 170-10 | 150:14 | 1/4./ | 183:9.16.21.23 184:11 | hands_on (2) 04.5 10 |
| finished (1) 80.24 | forestry [1] 8:4 | | 184:21 | handy (1) 179.01 |
| firms (1) 70, 12, 102, 22 | forgetting [1] 184:3 | -0- | gracious [1] 21:12 | hanuy [1] 178:21 |
| firm [2] 78:12 183:22 | form [1] 138:21 | G [4] 37:22 38:3,25 39:4 | graduate [1] 105:10 | Hang[1] 138:21 |
| 111'SU [21] 1:23 3:8 18:12 28:10 15 68:9 16 21 | formalized [1] 123:22 | G43 [1] 41:13 | graduated [1] 88:18 | hanna [1] 123:6 |
| 71:23 88:24 97:7 107:17 | forms [2] 119:4 144:10 | gain [1] 8:16 | grand [2] 55:18 149:5 | nappy [1] 54:20 |
| 114:7 115:10 131:15 | formula [2] 180:15 | gained [2] 70:15 76:20 | grant 18:18:24 171:16 | hard [3] 5:15 133:5 183:8 |
| 133:22 134:14 150:5 | 181:20 | gap [1] 136:13 | 171:19 172:14,16 173:3 | Hay [19] 1:8,25 2:22,24 |
| 155:12 156:2 168:17 | Fortis [54] 70:7,9,10,20 | Gary [3] 88:4,6 105:3 | 173:9 | 4:2,4 20:10 29:15 45:9 |
| firsthand [1] 158:15 | 70:25 71:8,11 72:2,4,9 | Gen [1] 82:18 | granted [1] 17:24 | 68:12 73:4 74:4,10 78:4 |
| firstly [2] 7:24 30:25 | 75:177:883:24,2584:13 | general [8] 6:11 90:7,11 | grants [7] 18:16,19,20 | 83:19 |
| fit [3] 57:1 118:16 119:8 | 106:5,9,12,24 107:9 | 133:24 139:4 143:3 | 18:25 19:2,22,23 | Hay's [1] 7:2 |
| fits [2] 40:25 142:4 | 110:25,24 112:18 115:14 | 149:10 186:2 | graph [12] 95:25 96:1,3 | hazardous [1] 94:18 |
| five [15] 18:19,21,24 | 119:7 122:13,19 123:1 | generally [10] 41:11 | 97:13,14 98:11,14,18,20 | hazards [1] 153:5 |
| 25:11 70:2 78:11,13,13 | 123:16,18,19,23 124:2 | 47:19,20 54:23 60:1 | 99:2 100:20 144:16 | head [6] 51:1 54:19 62:21 |
| 95:16 114:23 150:7,10 | 124:15,21 125:4,12,12 | 160:22.24 | greater [5] 92:3 99:7,11 | 80:16 133:20 177:16 |
| flot (a) 142-22 145-25 | 127:5,10 128:8,20,25 | generated [1] 43.8 | 99.10 100.3 | headings [1] 29:12 |
| flad gad (1) = 165.25 | 129.5,18 151.15 152.17 | generating [1] 34.11 | grow (2) 10:2.2.4 | hear [2] 57:22 66:8 |
| flowibility on 100.2.8 | Fortis' [3] 124.14 128.7 | generation [4] 43.6 | giew[3] 10:5,5,4 | heard [2] 54:9 186:3 |
| florrible cu 02.25 | 128:7 | 77:21 94:4 123:14 | grid [3] 58:5 41:0,10 | hearing [7] 62:8 73:11 |
| Hexible [1] 92:25 | forward [1] 181:19 | generator [3] 43:14 | grids [1] 40:13 | 73:11 106:15 178:10 |
| Hight [2] 118:10 119:10 | found [1] 140:17 | 77:22 82:17 | gross [1] 34:15 | 179:24 181:20 |
| flip [1] 167:7 | four [25] 3.7 10.17 14.9 | genesis [1] 72:15 | ground [9] 115:11,17 | heating [1] 91:14 |
| flow [2] 17:23 130:20 | 14:14,23 17:8,9 18:22 | gentleman [1] 185:4 | 11/:11 118:1/,21 119:9 | heavily [2] 99:20 100:9 |
| flows [1] 82:2 | 21:21 22:15 29:14 30:4 | geographical [2] 4:25 | grounding (1) 118:24 | heavy [2] 29:18 157:13 |
| fluctuate [1] 147:16 | 30:13 68:8 78:19 79:9 | 34:1 | group (27) 1:0 25 2:22 | held [1] 106:9 |
| fluctuations [2] 164:16 | 84:2 89:17,20,22 94:23 | geographically [1] | 2:24 3:12.13 5:1.2 6:24 | help [18] 9:16 65:5,6 68:4 |
| 165:15 | 99:1 123:7 170:13 175:15 | 75:23 | 7:23 23:24 26:16 27:13 | 91:2,22 108:19 115:14 |
| focus [2] 131:3 139:15 | four-step [1] 3:20 | geographies [1] 34:7 | 47:22 49:25 61:13 62:7 | 117:15 118:3,8 121:13 |
| focused [2] 101:10 | 10017111[1] 3:16 | geography [1] 135:1 | 68:12 71:15,18 73:4 74:5 | 121:20 124:24 127:6 |
| 110:10 | Ireeaom [1] 37:14 | Geoscientists [1] 88:21 | /4:10,11 77:15 78:5 80:3 | helped (2) 121.0 10 |
| IOCUSING [1] 110:2 | Irequency [1] 96:3 | given [11] 14:24 15:1 | 105:20 112:18 119:7 | helping (2) 121:9,10 |
| Tolks [3] 25:6 43:4 83:1 | triend [1] 182:5 | 30:21 73:10 75:12 90:15 | 123:18 124:2 146:22 | helps (2) 110:8 122:16 |
| follow [2] 143:2 170:20 | front [5] 6:5 55:3 63:9 | 98:24 143:14 154:20 | grouping [3] 155:14 | herps [2] 127:12 129:1 |
| 1 tollow up to 02.10.04.5 | 104:8 125:24 | 109:13 1/0:4 | 156.15 157.2 | nereby [1] 185:20 |

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

$\boldsymbol{Multi-Page}^{^{\mathrm{TM}}}$

high - jobs NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| | | | | and have application |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| high [36] 8:10 11:17,21 | 86:5 90:5,18,24 92:20 | 21:6,13 22:10 90:6 | 180:19 | 127:14 128:23 |
| 11:25 12:16,17,22 13:1 | 117:1 121:9 159:21 160:3 | incentives [6] 9:12,14 | industrials [1] 10:18 | intersect [2] 38:2 40:2 |
| 13:4,5,6,9,12,14,19,19 | 180:10 | 14:18,22 17:16 20:14 | industries [2] 13:19 | intersection [3] 38:16 |
| 15:20,24 51:7 42:18 45:4 | Hydro's [1] 181:21 | incident [3] 135:5 138:15 | 46:15 | 38:22 40:11 |
| 56:6,9 65:11 70:22 86:21 | hypothetically [2] | 145:18 | industry [2] 10:2 13:15 | inventory [7] 4:21 5:6,8 |
| 90:12 94:17,21 102:14 | 133:9 134:4 | include [10] 2:16 63:3 | inferred [1] 75:18 | 5:13 14:25 70:18 84:15 |
| 164:4 | | 80:2,5 108:13 109:3 | inflation [4] 102:7 143:5 | invest [1] 13:7 |
| high/low [1] 87:5 | -1- | included (5) 1,11 84.1 | 145:25 174:24 | investment [10] 42:7 |
| higher [26] 11:25 13:22 | i.e [2] 74:11 109:4 | 110.22 154.1 6 | influence [2] 36:11,14 | 45:23,25 46:3,6,12 89:19 |
| 14:4 16:5,25 40:20,23 | IAN [2] 1:19 88:6 | includes 61 7.24 14.12 | influenced [2] 53:14 | 95:24 90:25 97:15 |
| 40:17,22,22,23,24,25 | ice [3] 119:18,19,20 | 90:6 102:23 109:7 130:9 | 96:6 | investments [1] 95:19 |
| 60:25 85:21 87:12 97:4 | idea [2] 117:22 157:13 | inclusive [2] 16:21 | influencing [3] 35:7 | involved on 104 2 112 0 |
| 126:14,15 130:21 171:23 | identified [1] 180:22 | 153:19 | 30:1 37:12 | 167.23 |
| highest [3] 10:6 11:18 | identify [1] 91:20 | incorporate [6] 41:24 | 1110111121011 [12] 63:20 68:2 81:16 82:8 90:14 | involves (2) 35.14 98.1 |
| 36:9 | Ike [2] 123:7 131:14 | 42:10,13,24 45:2 111:4 | 133:20 176:15.16 177:2 | irrespective [1] 47.22 |
| highly [2] 13:3 93:2 | illustrate [1] 15:25 | incorporated [1] 43:5 | 183:18,25 184:15 | Irvings (1) 51.13 |
| hire [7] 150:11 158:7,19 | illustrated [4] 6:4 15:14 | incorporating [1] 29:16 | informative [1] 15:18 | island (2) 104/2 106/2 |
| 158:21 159:1,21 166:8 | 15:17 21:15 | increase [22] 91:13,25 | inherent [1] 82:21 | Islande (1) 122.5 |
| hired [2] 150:8 151:3 | illustration [1] 22:19 | 92:22 94:7 97:10 100:22 | initial [1] 94:23 | Islanus [1] 125:5 |
| hires [1] 160:1 | illustrative [1] 16:2 | 101:25 102:9 150:24 | initiative [2] 90:4 96:19 | ISUIALIUII [I] 118:25 |
| hiring [4] 101:12 150:16 | illustratively [1] 51:23 | 162:6,12 165:2 171:25 | injury [1] 29:19 | ISSUE [19] 18:18,20 21:14 67:4 85:16 95:21 101:1 |
| 158:3 165:6 | imagine [1] 40:13 | 172:19,22 175:12,19,24 | inquiries [1] 103:23 | 101:4 104:18 117:17 |
| DISTOFICAL [5] 19:21 28:9 | immediate [1] 100:13 | increased [10] 60:22 | inside [2] 118:23 145:20 | 128:5 135:25 136:3 |
| 28:11 109:22,25 | immigration [1] 79:23 | 95:14 97:3 98:8 102:7,8 | insofar (1) 111.3 | 151:11 152:5 158:1,13 |
| historicals [1] 113:2 | impact [24] 17:23 36:12 | 126:16 130:7,19 173:2 | instance (7) 32:25 48:17 | 158:14,25 |
| 122.1 4 | 36:14 45:1,2,8,10 53:15 | increases [8] 10:6 74:2 | 108:9 111:8 119:18 | issued [3] 62:13,13 83:2 |
| hit (4) 123.14 151.15 | 56:1,9 60:17 86:4 101:15 | 95:12 102:24 101:15 | 131:24 143:21 | ISSUES [3] 18:21 121:5 |
| 167:21 170:14 | 123:15 120:21 127:2,6 | increasing (2) 95.10 | Instead [1] 39:3 | 180:10 |
| holding [1] 106:20 | 130:18 132:9 167:1 | 96:24 | instituted [1] 123:23 | 11em [6] 12:23 13:15 16:9 47:9 133:3 182:6 |
| holidays [1] 22:1 | impacted [3] 56:5 126:2 | increasingly [1] 143:19 | instruct [1] 153:4 | items (6) 14.12 23 30.15 |
| Holvrood [1] 92:5 | 137:17 | incumbent [9] 19:7,21 | insulation [2] 90:10 | 109:2 142:25 165:18 |
| home [2] 29:21 123:12 | impacting [4] 126:25 | 24:11,12,13 33:7,8 37:20 | 104:9 | itself [6] 16:9 27:7 72:22 |
| honest [2] 117:21 127:16 | 127:21 129:12 135:14 | 66:19 | insulators [2] 119:21 | 75:17 146:15 165:21 |
| honestly [5] 5:10 58:15 | impacts [4] 66:13 97:6 | incumbent's [1] 19:19 | 138:21 | Ivan [2] 132:11,16 |
| 82:5 84:11 86:20 | | incumbents [1] 77:19 | insuit [1] 75:19 | |
| hook [1] 97:9 | | incur [1] 25:10 | 128.21 | J- |
| hopefully [3] 19:18 48:8 | imply [1] 58:22 | index [14] 7:8 9:3,6 10:11 | integration (2) 43.8 11 | January [2] 120:10 |
| 73:14 | Importance [1] 119:16 | 10:12 11:1 27:12 46:2 | 43:18 | 131:10 |
| horizon [2] 94:15 100:14 | 1mportant [8] 4:20 5:22 | indicate (4) 107.1 150.4 | integrity [4] 68:18.21 | jeopardy [1] 42:23 |
| hour [3] 81:4 138:4 | 78:13 101:6 | 162:23 175:22 | 68:25 69:3 | job [69] 3:8,9 4:2,4,7,8 |
| 178:19 | importantly (1) 24:2 | indicated [13] 21:7 27:25 | intend [1] 3:3 | 5:14,16,17,18,20,23 6:2 |
| nours [11] 118:11 132:13 | impressed [1] 154:22 | 28:3 47:19 48:11 49:18 | intensity [1] 62:2 | 6:3,13 8:20 11:8,17 17:1 |
| 143:20 183:10.12 184:5 | improve [3] 93:9 147:9 | 69:7 106:15 111:22 157:5 | intensive [6] 12:22 13:15 | 32:20.22 33:4.8 34:25 |
| 184:9,14 | 147:12 | 164:16 166:21 181:15 | 13:18 47:1,8 62:4 | 35:19,20,21 36:7 37:22 |
| house [1] 183:19 | improved [3] 96:9,14 | Indicates [11] 78:8 100:1 | intent [1] 71:22 | 37:24 38:1,24 39:2,14 |
| houses [1] 173:18 | 102:13 | 130:7 148:23 150:6 152:1 | intentionally [1] 135:10 | 39:22 40:20,25 41:4,6 |
| HRDC [2] 156:20 160:16 | improvement [6] 93:10 | 161:14 | inter-affiliate [3] | 44:4.6 45:3.17.20.22 |
| huge [3] 13:17 25:14 42:6 | 93:12 102:19 103:2 | indication [2] 138:5 | 108:14 109:8 110:11 | 47:15 75:20 79:23 92:24 |
| human [7] 36:16,17 | improvements [1] | 150:24 | inter-corporate [1] | 94:6 95:1 106:20 109:7 |
| 37:25 38:2 39:7,8 40:16 | 144:17 | indicative [1] 60:7 | interest (4) 36.13 81.16 | 149:7 151:21 152:25 |
| hundreds [4] 6:14,15 | improving [3] 96:4 | indicator [1] 60:2 | 82:1,2 | ioh's 1/1 59.1 4 4 61.7 |
| 41:1 50:24 | 103:19 146:23 | indices [4] 68:11 69:18 | interested [1] 80:18 | iobs [45] 3:10 4:5 6 10 |
| 123:15 127:5 9 128:24 | in-house [1] 184:12 | | internal [6] 30:3 36:15 | 4:11.12.15.18.19 5:4.8 |
| 131:9,14,16 132:11.16 | inappropriate [1] 75:14 | individual's [1] 77:12 | 140:1 142:4 165:21 | 5:13,21,25 6:3,13,16,20 |
| 133:11,22 | inaudible-coughing | 138·17 152·16 22 | 166:16 | 7:4 8:19,23 9:24 10:9,12 |
| hurricanes [3] 127:14 | [1] 109:6 | industrial 12210,22 | international [2] 34:4 | 28:13 30:3 32:13 41:7 |
| 132:1 133:14 | Inc [2] 83:25 84:14 | 7:19,24 8:13 10:14 15:4 | 151:/ | 70:12 75:19,20.22.24.24 |
| Hydro [26] 43:2,5,9,9 | incentive [17] 14:10,11 | 23:24 24:8 27:12 32:12 | internationally [1] 41:2 | 76:1,1,7 82:20 83:12 |
| 77:21 82:12,16,17,22,22 84·19 19 21 22 23 85·14 | 14:15,10 17:13,17,19,21 | 33:22 46:2,5,15 51:9,16 | interpretation [1] 45:7 | 93:24 160:4 |
| 01.17,17,21,22,23 03.14 | 10.1 17.7 20.17,20 21.2 | / 5:4 84:24 86:25 8/:11 | Interruption [3] 127:8 | |

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

| John's [6] 107:7 135:7,9 | 54:19 55:4 63:11,12 64:5 | leaders [2] 35:16,17 |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| 135:11 186:5,8 | 73:13 75:13 81:10 87:21 | leadership [1] 95:2 |
| Johnson [138] 26:6,7 | 88:2,0,8,14,23 89:3,10 | learning [1] 18:6 |
| 105:2,3,4,14 106:8,14 | 100.24 104.23 154.8 13 | learnt [1] 42:15 |
| 100:25 107:10,25 108:12 | 154:17.23 162:25 163:3 | least [9] 56:21 62:16 |
| 110.9 17 21 111.2 13 17 | 177:19,24 181:4,9 182:1 | 78:13 90:19 93:6 104:12 |
| 111:25 112:11.23 113:8 | 182:12,23 183:3 185:11 | 148:3 163:13 178:24 |
| 115:24 116:11 117:18 | key [1] 25:10 | leave [4] 78:20,25 155:2 |
| 119:13 120:16 121:3,24 | kilometers [1] 101:21 | 175:9 |
| 122:11,17,23 124:12 | kind [8] 18:4 21:2 39:6 | leaves [2] 25:15 78:11 |
| 125:5 120:5 128:5,18 | 48:12 81:15,15 86:15 | leaving [5] 72:3,5 149:8 |
| 132:7 133:7.16 134:3 | 135:13 | 160:9,10 |
| 135:16 136:10 137:3,18 | kinds [3] 17:19 34:6,7 | left [9] 7:18 70:4 99:9 |
| 137:23 139:12,20 140:5 | knock [2] 122:7 174:2 | 106:1,12 148:8,25 158:17 |
| 140:10,21 141:3,13,23 | knowing [1] 5:22 | 100:18 |
| 142:5,12,19 143:8 145:7 | knowledge [9] 70:6 94:4 | 182.9 11 14 18 25 |
| 148:16.20 149:4.13 | 116:10 118:13 120:25 | legislation (1) 30.5 |
| 151:24 153:9 154:4,11 | 138:14 149:6 166:1 180:1 | logislative 11 82.25 |
| 154:15,25 155:19 156:1 | knowledgeable [1] 33:3 | logg ray, 10:2 11:24 12:2 |
| 156:7,13 159:3,12 160:12 | known [3] 33:24 147:22 | 12.7 17.4 6 39.3 5 43.11 |
| 161:9,24 162:18 163:4 | 147:24 | 43:15 48:20.24 52:15 |
| 166:15 167:5 168:3.15 | | 59:11 62:4 99:3 100:7,8 |
| 169:3,12,18 170:18 171:9 | -L/- | 119:25 137:19 145:25 |
| 171:15 172:11 173:4,20 | labour [53] 12:22 93:4 | 152:2 165:11 166:13 |
| 174:1,8 175:8,25 176:5 | 102:17,21,22,23 103:15 | lesser [1] 123:10 |
| 1/6:20 1//:3,9,1/ 1/8:3 | 10/:18 108:14 109:1,3,5 | letter [1] 1:10 |
| 179:22 180:3.24 181:7 | 136:11.12.16.21.24 137:2 | level [51] 3:15,15 11:5 |
| 181:13 182:8,17 183:1,6 | 137:12,13,15,16,19 | 11:12,19,21,23,25 12:3 |
| 184:2,17,24 185:7,16 | 138:15,19,23,25 139:16 | 12:0,19 14:5 10:5,19 36:8 9 16 17 21 37:1 11 |
| join [2] 2:22 157:15 | 139:22 140:2,7,16,18,24 | 37:12,13,22,24 38:1,3,3 |
| joined [2] 2:24 158:16 | 141:8,14,20 142:4,13,21 | 38:4,25,25,25 39:6,9 |
| joining [1] 72:15 | 165:11 166:13 167:11 | 47:18 53:21,21 63:17 |
| joint [1] 90:3 | 175:24 183:22,24 | 66:17 74:20,22 75:2 |
| jointly [1] 91:6 | Labrador [10] 88:22 | 102.14 150.13 164.14 24 |
| journeyman [2] 152:23 | 90:4,18 116:14 117:1 | 182:2 |
| 159:16 | 159:21 160:3 180:10 | levels [7] 10:1 15:13 40:1 |
| journeyperson [8] 95:1 | 180:0,8 | 78:23 99:2 143:14 163:12 |
| 150:25 151:4 153:4,24 | IACK [2] 24:20 /0:6 | leveraging [1] 90:16 |
| 157:21 158:13 160:3 | Lake [1] 156:19 | license [2] 130:23 131:12 |
| 153.20 154.2 6 158.3 7 | land [1] 115:17 | licenses [1] 126:21 |
| 158:19,21 159:15,22 | landcono (m. 9.14.47.21 | life [5] 13:10,21 15:1 |
| 160:18 161:1 166:1,4 | 50.3 | 125:8 171:5 |
| Judy [2] 185:20 186:10 | large (61 8·14 9·1 10·10 | lift [1] 29:18 |
| July [4] 131:1,6 153:18 | 45:4 56:7,12 | lighting [1] 90:12 |
| 1/2:4 | largely [2] 15:9 74:23 | lignts [2] 106:17,21 |
| June [4] 153:18,19 | larger [3] 58:14 74:11 | likelinood [1] 71:5 |
| iunior 121 71.16 18 | 143:19 | IIKELY [6] 8:20 52:14,16 |
| jurisdiction (1) 21.5 | largest [2] 92:21 95:5 | likewise (1) 49.10 |
| Jurisurenon [1] 21.5 | last [19] 10:5 14:6 21:17 | limited [5] 138.18 158.3 |
| -K- | 62:3 76:1 77:6 91:9.10 | 158:22 160:6 161:1 |
| KA-1 (2) 1.15 17 | 96:5,7 98:22 158:4 159:5 | line [34] 90:20 101:22,22 |
| Karl $_{12}$ 1.8 19 26.10 | 169:5 | 104:8 108:1 110:12,20 |
| keen [8] 17:11 71:25 72:7 | late [2] 80:12 184:14 | 110:22 112:23 110:17 |
| 80:18 101:20 106:18 | laterals [3] 144:21 145:4 | 139:16,16,22 140:18 |
| 140:22 156:14 | 143:0 | 142:25 143:10 144:4 |
| keeping [1] 145:24 | launcheu [2] 90:5 91:11 | 145:5,12,13 147:12,13 |
| Kelly [58] 1:4,6,16,19,21 | laureate [1] 33:2 | 14/:16,18 150:5 151:25 |
| 2:3,9,14,21 3:1,22 6:22 | lawyers [1] 67:8 | 182:24,25 |
| 11:3 15:6 18:5 19:11,25 | 1620 [6] 45:3 46:23 98:7 | lineman [1] 152:24 |
| 21.4 22.24 23:10 20:2 | 130.17 137:0 103:24 | |

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

John's - market NP's 2010 General Rate Application

Multi-PageTM

| 111 5 2 010 UCIN | and Rate Application |
|--|------------------------------|
| linemen [2] 135:12 | 66:10 85:1,14,20 86:6 |
| 157:22 | Ludlow [2] 106:15 |
| lines [3] 119:24 140:17 | 132:11 |
| 152:6 | |
| linesperson [1] 153:15 | -M- |
| list [6] 56:3,7 124:3,8,10 | |
| 124:24 | magic [1] 18:9 |
| listed [2] 50:6 160:23 | main [2] 14:14 58:25 |
| literature m 33:2 | maintain [4] 85:22 |
| live (2) 114:16 116:20 | 101:19,22 102:12 |
| living (1) 116.12 | maintained [1] 102:14 |
| | maintaining [2] 95:15 |
| 1080 [15] 97:19,21 98:4 | 103:10 |
| 98:13,10,23 99:2,17,19 | maintains [1] 92:25 |
| loaded (c) 00:2 11 16 20 | maintenance [2] 140:13 |
| 100.5 9 | 140:14 |
| 100.5,9 | major [8] 29:12 47:13 |
| 77.9 126.17 134.22 | 114:10 115:4 122:6 123:8 |
| 137.13 22 160.14 | 123:12 124:23 |
| localities III 113-15 | majority [1] 144:6 |
| localized 11 76.9 | makes [2] 13:24,24 |
| $\mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}} + \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}} + \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{a}} = $ | man [1] 36:21 |
| locally [2] 8:21 134:18 | manage [6] 12:25 13:17 |
| located [1] 8:21 | 37:24 93:12 94:7 138:8 |
| location [1] 155:5 | managed [2] 37:5 78:24 |
| longer [5] 94:15 115:2 | management [10] 37.23 |
| 118:11 119:11 185:1 | 71:16.18 72:22 74:5 |
| look [42] 12:5,5 15:7 19:6 | 89:19 92:13 101:10 126:5 |
| 27:3 28:11 37:17,18 | 140:13 |
| 44:25 50:5 68:8 100:5 | manager [8] 39:8,9 46:8 |
| 117.22 125.2 25 127.16 | 106:4 112:15,15,18 |
| 127:17 129:10 134:13.14 | 146:21 |
| 134:17,19,25 135:22 | managerial [5] 36:4 |
| 136:1,5 142:9 145:12 | 39:5 73:24 74:7 76:1 |
| 146:22 153:5 157:19 | managerials [1] 40:19 |
| 164:8 165:19 166:14 | managers [2] 112:8,12 |
| 108.4 172.20 183.15 | managing [1] 93:7 |
| 62.12 16 70.1 132.10 | mandated [2] 30:6 84:21 |
| 135.4 8 24 136.3 8 | manifest [1] 146:15 |
| looking [23] 50:19 51:17 | manifestations [1] |
| 63:2 65:24 73:9 102:16 | 56:24 |
| 107:6,12 108:21 109:13 | manner [5] 3:10 7:6 |
| 109:22 120:8 122:19 | 90:19 93:6 104:12 |
| 142:6,8 148:13 154:2,9 | manpower [1] 132:19 |
| 156:15 161:2 167:20 | manufacturers [1] 8:6 |
| 181:24 182:24 | map [1] 34:22 |
| IOOKS [3] 70:23 142:3 | Maritime 151 83.22.25 |
| | 106:3 120:6 124:5 |
| lose [2] 8:1/13:/ | Maritimes 61 10:24 |
| losing [1] 25:10 | 50:25 51:2 73:7 83:25 |
| loss [2] 45:4 131:12 | 84:16 |
| lost [2] 70:15 76:20 | mark [3] 1:11,15 112:22 |
| low [14] 8:11 11:18 12:3 | mark-up [5] 111:8 112:9 |
| 12:16,17,20,20 13:24 | 113:3 116:5,9 |
| 14:1 47:20 53:4 55:25 | marked [1] 1:12 |
| JU.J /4:9 | market [65] 3:10,12,16 |
| | 4:5,6,15 5:7 10:14,15,16 |
| 10wer [14] 8:3 9:11,13 | 15:4,14 16:3,17,22 17:9 |
| 12.5 15:20 50:15 01:4 | 17:10 19:3,6,10 22:5,6,8 |
| 132:2 171:21.21 | 22:11,12,21 23:10,13,24 |
| lowered (1) 126.20 | 45.25 46.1 3 12 63.2 |
| 10 where [1] = 120.20 | 66:15.19 70:10 73:7.24 |
| I TI roy 10.05 00.05 00 f | 73:25 74:15 75:23 76:11 |
| 18:25 22:25 23:6 | 76:19 79:12,16,21 84:24 |

Index Page 9

Multi-PageTM

market's - number NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| 85:3,10 91:18 131:24 | medical [1] 21:22 | mix [1] 87:5 | 79:12,16 91:20 100:10 |
|--|---|--|----------------------------------|
| 136:14 137:7,8,19,20,20 | medium [2] 12:18 14:2 | mixed [1] 68:23 | 103:15 108:16 112:24 |
| 137:22 | meet [7] 5:15 91:22 98:24 | Mobile [1] 182:15 | 118:3,21 121:12 128:1 |
| market's [6] 15:23 16:5 | 103:14 157:7 168:22 | model [2] 20:25 33:25 | 135:22 138:0,7 145:19 |
| 17:6,20 19:8 22:14 | 170:2 | modeller [1] 81:25 | 180:11 |
| markets [2] 46:4 80:16 | meeting [1] 169:22 | models (1) 18:12 | needed [3] 124:24 134:6 |
| Mart [1] 82:13 | mega [1] 18:24 | modest (1) 95:12 | 157:16 |
| massive [2] 18:23 47:1 | meltdown [1] 42:19 | moment (8) 76.17 | needs [6] 33:8,9 135:21 |
| Masters [1] 2:17 | member [2] 88:20 | 108:16 132:9 139:15 | 153:4 164:10 185:3 |
| match [8] 3:15 4:16,17 | 127:11 | 140:23 153:11 163:6 | negative [4] 101:14 |
| 4:19 5:5,9,11,15 | Memorial [2] 88:18 | 166:3 | 117:13 120:23 151:22 |
| matching [1] 87:4 | 105:10 | moments [1] 142:14 | negatively [6] 126:2 |
| material [4] 28:16 64:3 | mental [1] 29:22 | money [4] 143:16 144:6 | 127:21 129:12 130:1 |
| 99.15 109.5 motoriolly (2) 55.6 | mentioned [6] 104:16 | 144:15 180:22 | nagotistad (1) 161.14 |
| 63.21 | 107:24 122:22 127:25 | monies [2] 108:6,13 | negotiateu [1] 101:14 |
| naterials 11 107·20 | met (4) 160-8 23 170-6 | monitoring [1] 91:17 | |
| math [2] 23.4 15 56.1 | 170:24 | monster [1] 56:7 | NELWOFK [9] 122:13 |
| nath [5] 25.4,15 50.1 | meter [1] 94:11 | months [6] 42:16 94:13 | 125:13.16 127:10 129:1 |
| 131:21 | meters [2] 98:3 101:23 | 107:10 130:10,16 175:16 | never [7] 24:13 40:7 80:2 |
| nathematically | method [3] 4·4 7 15 | Montreal's [1] 10:2 | 80:4,7,10 121:25 |
| 10:22 40:6 86:1 | methodology (3) 3.24 | morning [5] 26:12,14 | new [18] 42:3,4 90:6 |
| matrices [2] 32:14 38:10 | 4:1,2 | 64:8 105:5 185:15 | 91:11,15 94:4 98:17 |
| matter 191 55:2 69:5 89:7 | methods [3] 115:16 | NIOSS [2] 185:20 186:10 | 99:23 100:10 101:22 |
| 131:21 135:21 171:3 | 117:7 120:8 | MOSU [25] 8:5,14 9:1 10:1 | 103:11 126:20 130:23 |
| 184:13,14 186:1 | metric [2] 57:11,19 | 31:3.3 32:6.7.23 44:1 | 173:18 |
| matters [4] 1:3 59:11 | Michael [3] 108:2 151:1 | 47:3,12 114:17 120:4 | newest (1) 18:13 |
| 89:17,22 | 155:2 | 143:4 144:19,23 153:24 | Newfoundland [124] |
| maximum [10] 30:20 | middle [10] 8:5 11:18 | 159:10 160:13 174:13 | 2:5 6:3,7 7:7 9:16 10:7 |
| 31:1,8,14,17,19,21 52:0 | 12:5 15:4 53:15 56:4 | mostly [1] 118:18 | 11:6 14:1,22 15:22 16:17 |
| navimums (2) 33.12 | 76:13 99:14 120:9 123:11 | motivate [4] 9:17 71:6 | 17:2,5,20 19:1,5 24:22 |
| 33:17 | 12:10 | /1:24 /9:9 | 20:17 30:16 33:1 34:8 |
| may [17] 3:6 16:1.15 | might (24) 8:20 14:3 | | 50:21.24 54:10 57:1 58:2 |
| 17:12 18:18 33:2,3,3 | 18:20 23:13 44:1 45:7 | moutn [1] 85:24 | 61:12 63:18 69:20 70:24 |
| 55:21 77:20 94:12 118:11 | 46:11 49:20 53:9 74:25 | move [7] 16:6 21:8 76:2 | 72:21 73:23 74:4,21,24 |
| 134:1 165:15,16 169:14 | 75:22 76:8,15,18 79:17 | 70.4,22 107.12 104.0 | 76:10 77:4,9 78:18 79:20 |
| $\mathbf{MoCoins} = 51.12$ | 81:7,17 108:18 119:10 | moved [1] 77.24 | 82.22 25 83.14 88.11 22 |
| | 121:4 129:7 137:24 138:4 | MS (2) 1:14 81.6 | 89:24 90:4,12,17,24 |
| MDXA [I] 128:0 | Mike (1) 23.21 | WIS [2] 1:14 81:0 | 92:12,15,25 93:20,23 |
| Hean [22] 18:18 21:11 21:14 33:12 41:18 42:1 | million [16] 53:7.9.10 | 176:18 23 | 95:5 96:8,11 97:24 |
| 50:19 55:15,16,19 63:14 | 55:15 58:7,13 59:9 91:25 | must (12) 22.13 32.20 | 101:17 102:1,9 103:5 |
| 64:23 65:8 66:4 68:4 | 97:4 98:13 108:4 130:8 | 36:11.11 65:19 83:4 85:3 | 107:18 108:7 112:17.19 |
| 75:19 82:10 85:24 118:1 | 130:11 131:13 142:15 | 85:20 86:1,2 94:8 101:19 | 113:11,12,17,24 116:13 |
| 134:4 163:23 168:10 | 143:11 | | 116:13 117:1 118:14 |
| meaning [2] 28:2 178:6 | mind [5] 140:22 146:25 | -N- | 121:9,20 125:15 127:11 |
| meaningless [1] 47:9 | mine (1) 47:5 | national [7] 1:24 72:1.9 | 135:18 137:7 140:1.11 |
| means [7] 4:17 7:13 | $\min_{i=1}^{1} \frac{47.5}{96.21} = 0.010$ | 72:17 74:15 75:4 158:13 | 149:16,20,25 153:13 |
| 149.24 186.7 | 87.13 | nationally [1] 77:4 | 155:6,21 157:11 159:5 |
| meant [4] 28.9 163.14 | minimal (1) 123.15 | natural [6] 7:11,20,22 | 159:21 160:3,19 163:9 |
| 181:17 184:5 | mining (a) 8.2 10.4 | 10:10 11:14 12:4 | 164:5 169:25 177:4,10 |
| measure [11] 33:6,7 | 46:16,21,22,24 47:19 | naturally [2] 8:1,3 | 186:5,8 |
| 43:20 44:7,8,11,16,17 | 87:1,14 | nature [8] 45:1,2,8,10 | newspaper [1] 91:9 |
| 44:20 57:18 59:7 | Minister [3] 83:2 85:16 | 45:18 46:4 94:18 132:5 | newspapers [1] 42:16 |
| measured [4] 6:2 44:5,6 | 85:23 | NB [1] 83:21 | next [22] 1:8 6:23 11:4 |
| 60:9 | minus [1] 19:8 | near [2] 39:1 86:6 | 15:7 17:12 21:9 75:23 |
| nechanic [2] 44:2,3 | miss [1] 14:17 | necessarily [7] 42:25 | 75:24,25 88:3 92:11,17 |
| nechanics [2] 20:5 45:9 | missing [4] 14:16,22,23 | 46:/ 55:2 116:23 163:20 | 93:22 95:16 100:23 |
| nechanism [3] 9:19 | 60:19 | 107.23 171.7 necessary 151 56.17 00.2 | 158:1.6 161:3 183:23 |
| 12.0 12.1 madie 121 160.02 161.6 | mitigate [4] 127:6,12 | 143:20 150:14 165:24 | night (1) 29:21 |
| modian [2] 100:25 101:0 | 120.21 129:2 mitigated in 50.6 | need [27] 13:16 47.3 | nine [1] 169.22 |
| 56:2.6.10 | 11111gawu [1] 59:0 | 72:18 78:25 79:5,7,10 | nobel [1] 33:1 |

noble [1] 72:12 **nobody** [1] 116:15 non-cash [13] 14:12,16 21:19,20 22:1,13,14,16 22:20 84:25 85:1,13,14 non-executive [1] 72:22 non-existent [2] 9:14 22:7 **non-reduced** [1] 167:4 non-regulated [2] 21:7 22:25 none [5] 25:20 39:15 44:22 111:6 179:23 nor [1] 8:11 normal [3] 103:25 125:8 183:24 **normally** [1] 56:11 norms [1] 24:18 **north** [3] 119:21 123:10 160:16 **northeast** [5] 96:25 98:22 99:10 100:21 135:6 notable [1] 95:23 **note** [8] 109:12 151:5 153:14 167:6,7,9 168:4 175:21 nothing [4] 25:24 111:18 111:18 179:8 **notice** [2] 153:11 160:13 noticeable [2] 52:19,21 noticeably [2] 9:13 51:25 noticed [2] 150:22 169:4 notion [3] 77:3 115:25 125:7 Nova [6] 83:21,24 84:10 118:12 119:1 124:22 **November** [1] 90:5 now [51] 3:2 4:14 6:12 6:23 12:12 16:8 17:7 18:14 19:9 21:5 22:15 22:25 27:24 29:5 30:20 35:11 41:23 48:11 49:24 51:16 54:9 55:18 60:14 62:15 69:17 74:15 75:14 78:23 79:4 85:23 100:3 101:14 110:10 113:20 119:17 126:6 128:4,10 137:9 139:13 143:9 145:19 153:19 154:19 164:4 165:3,7,10 166:5 166:12 185:6 nowhere [2] 39:1 56:16 **NP** [1] 15:21 NP-106 [1] 148:2 NP-135 [1] 178:17 nuances [1] 5:23 number [63] 12:20 23:6 23:7 27:14,16,19 56:7 63:8 65:20 74:9 77:6 84:8 93:23 94:20 95:11 95:14 96:8 98:23 99:3 99:15 101:18 102:6 105:21 108:5,19 139:17 143:21 144:1,4 147:9

Multi-PageTM

organizations [30] 4:22 16:3,5 19:3 23:25 24:8 164:1 169:14 148:7 153:12 154:6 155:5 18:18,21 20:21 21:9,23 27:13 36:1 43:2,5,9 47:2 52:2,3,24 53:17,21 54:23 155:10 156:21 158:4 6:15 7:3,9,9,16,17,19,21 pay [72] 4:6 6:16 7:4 8:20 161:22 162:10,15,17 57:18 58:25 66:24 76:4 8:8,12,14,22 9:2,4,7,20 56:14,15 63:3,4,5 66:19 9:8 12:1,4,11,13,16,22 163:20 164:1,11,15,21 76:4 77:21 78:12 81:13 10:19,23 11:10 13:8 84:6,8,24 85:13,21,22 12:25 13:22 15:14 24:6 82:16.22 83:18 84:22 17:18 25:8 33:22 58:12 85:25 86:1.8.14.18.20 165:3,14 168:16,21 174:3 24:12 25:4.6.23 30:5.6 174:15,19 175:2 176:1 85:8,15,19,20 86:5 89:17 69:22 70:1,9,14 78:1 86:25 87:8,15 42:17,21 44:20 46:1,3 92:16,23 95:23 99:9 178:24 180:25 181:8,8 organize [1] 153:6 **P75** [10] 15:14,17,19 46:19,22,24,25 47:6,7,8 181:15,17,25 184:9 108:16 112:7.15 114:16 51:23,24 52:2,17 53:9 47:14,15 52:14 53:14 orgs [5] 57:10 58:15 71:7 115:10 118:18 120:7 numbers [15] 24:15 56:16 86:24 63:18,20 66:17 71:3,5,8 85:4,5 121:4 133:4,21 134:19 37:15 56:11 63:15 87:16 **P90** [2] 52:16 87:2 71:11,25 72:4,6,9,17 oriented [1] 7:10 135:11 136:7,8,22 149:16 109:24 143:1.2 158:23 74:13 76:6.9.23 78:12 pace [1] 101:20 152:23 154:20 156:17,17 original [3] 161:18 172:5 161:25 169:19 173:14 78:23 79:1,5,5,7 80:17 156:20.21.25 157:3.21 172:25 package [7] 14:11,12 82:23,24 83:3,4,12,13 177:15 180:7 182:18 160:9,10 172:21 176:22 21:19 22:2,13,14,20 originally [1] 160:18 83:15 84:6 85:8,19 87:15 **numerical** [3] 65:20,25 182:16 packages [1] 14:15 otherwise [2] 132:2 122:9 66:2 **Ontario** [13] 2:18 43:6,7 page [36] 3:18 6:5 15:10 175:6 payback [1] 92:8 nursery [1] 74:24 43:9 72:5 77:21,22,23 15:12 21:8 23:21 24:3 ourself [4] 34:9 41:8,12 payer [23] 11:18,18,19 82:18 83:1 84:19,21,23 27:24 29:6,7 43:20 51:18 133:1 12:20,21 13:1,5,6,9,12 -0-54:18 62:22 68:7 96:1 onto [1] 100:9 13:14,22,24,24 14:1,2 ourselves [4] 71:10 97:13 107:22 108:19 objectives [3] 20:19,22 open [1] 47:4 23:11,14 66:13,17,21 85:18 104:11 121:11 116:3 122:24 126:4 130:5 91:23 67:2 86:21 operate [5] 50:20,25 outage [1] 114:25 139:25 149:15,18 150:5 **obligations** [1] 90:22 101:18 102:1 152:17 payers [14] 8:1,3,6,7,8,9 outages [5] 96:3 115:2 150:23 151:25 155:1 13:19,20 21:14 23:2 66:7 observation [2] 138:9 operating [21] 70:8,10 116:24 117:4 144:18 157:1 161:13 163:6 167:7 67:2.14 87:5 148:4 95:12 101:7 102:10 167:8 171:18 outer [1] 53:3 104:19,21 105:23 108:25 paying [13] 8:10 29:20 observations [10] 11:11 pages [1] 50:6 outlier [4] 53:14,15,23 109:21 126:16 140:7 47:7,10,11 53:4,5 56:1 11:13,15,24 12:2,7,8 54:1 paid [5] 9:25 10:1 45:13 141:5 142:2 144:5 152:15 66:17,21 75:12 114:14 49:8 55:25 56:3 outliers [7] 53:5,5,12 46:11 69:13 137:7 174:3,12,14,17,21 observe [1] 168:17 56:1,6,8,9 paper [1] 46:8 operational [6] 89:21 payout [1] 16:15 observed [2] 151:8 outlying [1] 55:23 paragraph [2] 126:7 101:2 132:8 173:10,13 Payroll [1] 13:15 171:20 173:22 130:6 outside [1] 70:9 pays [8] 12:17,17,17 **obvious** [1] 113:4 operationally [2] paragraphs [1] 123:4 overall [12] 23:17 61:18 45:23 46:4 47:20,20 73:7 obviously [4] 15:21 34:5 132:18 135:19 67:3 96:13,22 101:10 parameters [1] 18:10 peers [1] 78:15 43:4 51:4 operations [13] 70:25 144:25 162:12 164:11 Pardon [2] 64:17 65:22 pension [7] 14:13 21:24 occasions [1] 113:20 88:11 89:5,6 105:25 165:7,19,19 parentheses [1] 126:11 22:17 157:24,25 167:1,4 occur [3] 16:13 152:13 106:4,7,24 123:2 127:4 overhead [1] 109:6 paribus [1] 67:8 people [42] 8:23 13:2.7.7 180:21 127:7 128:22 153:15 overly [2] 176:14,18 25:20 36:12 42:17 44:19 part [22] 7:12 27:3 43:9 occurred [1] 149:1 operators [3] 146:10,19 overtime [15] 139:24 45:13 47:22 63:2 71:24 59:10 60:3,20 78:22 146:21 occurring [1] 123:10 141:10,16 142:7,13,23 72:8,14 73:4 76:20 78:4 79:24 116:17 127:3 **OPG** [4] 82:22 84:22 October [4] 123:20 143:10 144:1,4,6 145:25 78:9,20,24 116:7 117:20 128:25 144:20 149:19 85:15 86:5 185:18 186:3.9 146:12 147:1,3,5 120:14 129:24 135:8 151:19 152:20 153:2 opinion [6] 21:12 35:17 136:7 138:8 149:8 152:11 **off** [18] 14:14 21:25 22:16 overview [2] 3:3 105:6 159:20 165:22 173:19,25 153:23 157:15 161:3 54:19,22 62:20 100:8 56:17 69:5 75:8 83:10 178:24 184:10 own [16] 4:19 5:5 95:7 164:12 166:25 168:1.21 114:25 118:17 119:21 opportunities [2] 21:20 114:9 134:13,18 137:1 partially [3] 131:3 172:1 168:21 169:20 170:2,5 143:4 144:20 158:7 167:6 107:13 137:16 138:12,13,16 176:1 170:13,23 174:12,15 177:15 185:4 **opportunity** [3] 73:15 139:1,3,5 177:11 181:21 participants [1] 74:10 per [3] 92:6 150:10,12 offer [4] 11:11 14:6 20:10 107:7.14 owned [5] 7:16 68:11 participating [2] 90:25 percent [55] 11:23 12:2 33:3 opposed [5] 7:23 10:11 69:8 82:10 85:9 91:19 12:3 16:5,21,22,24,24 office [1] 106:1 60:10 79:5 157:14 ownership [5] 4:24 7:14 participation [3] 91:13 16:25 17:3,9,10 19:8,9 officed [1] 51:1 **opposite** [2] 53:2 71:20 7:14 34:2,17 91:17 125:14 22:7 24:25 25:5,7,9,9,17 Officer [2] 80:6,11 optimal [4] 119:19.25 particular [33] 15:8 25:18 52:15,16 64:25 119:25 120:4 -P-**Officers** [1] 51:8 32:15 56:25 63:17 65:12 66:6 67:15,17 85:3,4,10 option [1] 17:24 107:20,22 110:2 112:9 99:4,4,5,6,6,7,11,16 offices [2] 104:2,5 **P**_[1] 87:11 100:6 102:7,8,10 112:22 options [10] 14:11 17:22 112:15 114:4,6,18 122:19 officially [1] 90:5 **P&L**[1] 13:16 122:25 125:13 129:25 123:13 126:10,12 131:7 20:4,8,10,11 21:6 53:7 offset [4] 109:6 166:12 p.m [5] 111:20 138:10 135:25 136:3 139:7 161:15,16,18 162:7,7,10 100:16,20 172:1 176:1 149:12 161:8 171:14 140:25 145:23 146:22 162:14 order [6] 11:14 56:4 offsetting [1] 131:3 160:7 161:12 162:17 P1 [2] 52:18,20 percentage [3] 56:13 58:15 134:8 136:13 176:8 171:4,18,19 177:8 179:11 **oil** [2] 130:21 140:14 96:22 126:9 **P10**^[1] 52:14 organization [31] 8:25 179:18 183:16 old [5] 28:12,16 157:22 percentages [1] 25:23 P100 [3] 52:18,20 53:8 9:15 12:21 13:1,5,9,20 particularly [2] 96:25 161:25 173:14 percentile [27] 3:14 11:5 18:18,20 25:1,3 31:1 **P15** [2] 52:25 53:20 135:7 on-the-job [2] 151:19 34:8 36:13 42:9 43:1,3,4 11:20,22 12:1,6 15:3 P25 [14] 15:15,17,20 23:9 partnering [1] 90:17 43:10.15 53:6 57:12 72:3 23:13 27:19 47:18 51:20 153:8 51:23,25 52:3,15 63:3,4 72:5 75:16,21 76:6 77:25 partnership [1] 91:2 53:25 58:18 59:9 61:5 once [4] 5:19 18:19,21 63:6 66:15,17 73:7 78:4 84:11 103:18 62:23 63:1 64:10,12,24 party [2] 109:7 177:5 118:12 P40 [2] 63:3,7 65:11 67:18 68:2 72:24 organizational [2] 60:7 past [7] 69:21 70:3 one [72] 4:7.21 14:17.17 P50 [42] 12:19 14:4,4,7 74:14 75:3 87:4 93:10 14:20,21 16:6 18:12,13 112:21 117:4 145:10 14:18 15:5,14,16,21,23 percentile-wise [1] 48:2

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

Index Page 11

numbers - percentile-wise

NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| Mu | lti-F | Page TM |
|------|--------|--------------------|
| TATE | LIVI A | uge |

percentiles - public NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| percentiles [2] 53:11 | 33:6 36:19,25,25 37:5 | 79:20 80:4,8 81:7 82:10 | presumably [1] 181:22 |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| 87:6 | 38:4,5,16,21,21,25 39:14 | 82:12,18 83:14,21,21,24 | pretty [7] 11:25 12:3 |
| perform [1] 83:20 | 59:1.2.12.16 60:6.12.17 | 92:25 93:20 23 96:11 | 25:19 86:14 143:10 |
| performance [5] 16:12 | 79:10,20 82:3 115:7 | 97:25 98:8,17,23 100:5 | nravious (2, 120.9 |
| 10.14,10 20.21 24.12 | 119:14,23 120:1 137:14 | 100:22 101:17 102:1 | 132:10 143:14 144:2 |
| performs [2] 44.3,7 | 139:8 142:8 170:11 171:4 | 105:19 106:2 107:12,15 | 150:2 162:4 |
| 11.4 69.2 83.18 105.7 | points [60] 4:10 5:21 6:4 | 113.13 17 24 114.2 115.4 | previously [3] 1:9 77:8 |
| 154:5 | 28.12 14 15 20 23 23 25 | 118:12,14 119:1 121:21 | 132:10 |
| period [15] 13:3 62:10 | 30:2,20,22 31:6,6,9 32:4 | 124:22 125:8 127:11 | price [15] 6:16 8:15 9:2 |
| 62:17 94:13 102:11 | 32:5,13 33:11 34:25 | 130:25 132:13,18,24 | 9:6 15:3 23:25 24:9 30:9 |
| 107:10 114:2 148:7 150:8 | 35:19,19,20 36:22 37:2 | 134.8 135.18 157.7 | 137.7 171.25 175.12 |
| 164.14.22 | 39.10 20 40.7 23 42.20 | 153:13 155:6,21 157:11 | priced (1) 46.11 |
| nerk $(11, 149.15)$ | 44:1,15 45:18 46:6,7,10 | 159:5 164:5 169:25 177:4 | prices [5] 20.9 136.19 |
| permisites [3] 14.13 | 59:4,5 60:3,9,23,25 61:7 | 177:10 181:2 182:20 | 137:1,2 175:20 |
| 21:23 22:16 | 61:8 62:12 118:23 | Power's [17] 6:7 17:5 | pricing [3] 6:12 9:18 |
| person [6] 25:14 47:2,4 | points-wise [1] 61:11 | 24:22 89:24 92:12,15 | 45:21 |
| 78:18 80:18 135:11 | pole [1] 175:15 | 113:12 125:15 140:1 | pride [1] 78:15 |
| personal [2] 21:11 | poles [3] 98:1 119:20 | 149:20,25 163:9 186:2 | primarily [6] 96:6 |
| 138:13 | 138:20 noligy (2,18 20 71,14 | powerline [26] 94:1,14 | 112:17 130:20 145:6 |
| personnel [3] 113:13 | policy [5] 63:18,20 /1:14 | 94:16,21,24 95:4,8,11 | 149:23 1/1:24 |
| 125:15 132:13 | nolitical 11 126.17 | 101:13 112:2 143:22 | Dringo (pr. 106.2.106.4 |
| 9:22 14:6 30:10 66:5 | pool 31 135.12 143.19 | 150:7,9,20 131:2,4,9 | Prince [2] 106:3 186:4 |
| 129:8,11 139:4 141:21 | 161:1 | 156:16,18 157:19 159:6 | 25.6 20 21 30.1 71.9 |
| 165:8 | portfolio [2] 13:18 103:8 | powerlines [2] 122:7 | 83:12 |
| phantom [1] 20:15 | portion [2] 99:25 178:9 | 129:24 | principles [16] 12:11,13 |
| pharmaceutical [2] | posed [1] 155:3 | practical [1] 37:19 | 24:7 25:24 27:6 28:10 |
| 7:11 10:2 | poses [1] 116:14 | practically [3] 95:6 | 28:16 71:3,5 76:24 80:18 |
| philosophy [1] 76:6 | position [30] 17:8 22:10 | 100:10 165:9 | 82:23,24 83:4,13 85:8 |
| phone [1] 136:23 | 22:12 27:18 35:14 37:6 | practice [5] 1:25 26:25 | prioritize [1] 183:20 |
| Phonse [2] 106:16 | 41:15 46:10,16,17 59:17 | nractices (3) 115:16 | prioritizing [1] 184:13 |
| 10/:11 | 61:10,14 64:10 65:13,19 | 119:2 120:9 | priority [1] /1:23 |
| pick[1] 51:5 | 155:12,13 156:3,3,17,21 | practised [1] 125:22 | private [12] 7:13 9:9,15 10:20 25:1 3 8 34:18 |
| 67:15.18 | 157:3 160:2 166:7 | practising [1] 116:7 | 53:6 68:24 83:9 85:5 |
| nicture [2] 103·4 148·11 | positioned [1] 11:5 | pre-filed [3] 89:5,12 | privately [3] 68:11 69:8 |
| piece [4] 27.4 29.22 53.3 | positioning [7] 54:10 | 97:16 | 82:10 |
| 133:20 | 57:9 61:1 65:10 71:17 | preexisting [2] 28:20 | problem [9] 43:19 44:10 |
| place [3] 70:12 136:18 | 70:10 104:11 | 28:22 | 49:18,24 50:12,16 108:18 |
| 167:17 | 61:12 62:21 72:21 107:3 | preliminary [1] 1:3 | nrocodural (1) 1.2 |
| placed [1] 159:23 | 155:5,10,20,22 156:11 | premise [1] 60:20 | procedures $[1]$ 1.5 |
| places [1] 135:3 | 156:21 159:19 | premium [1] 14:20 | 119:3 121:1 |
| plan [13] 16:14,14,16 | positive [1] 120:24 | prepared [4] 2:4 63:23 | proceeding [2] 2:11 |
| 20:17,18,20,20 21:2 | positively [1] 126:25 | nrongring (1) 184.6 | 184:6 |
| 180:20 | possibility [5] 180:8,9 | $\mathbf{presence}_{11} 125.14$ | proceedings [1] 181:18 |
| plane [2] 118:10 119:10 | 180:13,17,18 | present [8] 17:25 18:17 | process [7] 3:20 36:18 |
| planned [1] 16:13 | possible [2] 4/:12 142:20 | 18:25 19:23 28:20 143:25 | 63:22 93:10 124:25 |
| planning [4] 72:11,19 | POSSIDIY [3] 19:19 | 162:3 166:3 | 145:15 146:19 |
| 95:2 105:21 | nost [1] 160.8 | presented [2] 26:24 | processes [1] 103:19 |
| plans [2] 20:23 150:11 | posting (1) 160.15 | 104:19 | produce [2] 47:5 183:18 |
| plant [2] 92:20 96:17 | potential [4] 42.22 127.7 | president [20] 6:6,9,10 | producer [1] 34:14 |
| play [2] 53:13,14 | 127:13 128:22 | 0:17 10:1,20 19:3 22:4,7 | 42.5 47.6 |
| played [1] 112:13 | potentially [1] 180:10 | 38:7 42:1 61:11 88:10 | production III 92.5 |
| playing [1] 87:15 | power [109] 2:6 6:3 7:7 | 106:7,23 | productive [1] 52:2 |
| Pleasure [1] 80:22 | 9:16 11:6 14:1,23 15:22 | president's [6] 16:2,4 | productivity rol 94.7 |
| plus [5] 16:7,11,22 17:15 | 16:17 17:2,20 19:1,5 | 22:6,13 23:5 65:7 | 102:17,19 103:2 151:15 |
| 166:25 | 37:7 38:7 40:8 43:3.6.7 | presidential [1] 59:4 | 151:23 152:5,8 153:7 |
| PINL [1] 47:9 | 43:7,12 54:10 57:1 58:2 | Presidents [1] 51:8 | products [3] 20:13 42:4 |
| point [50] 4:9 5:19,20 | 61:12 63:18 69:20 70:24 | pressure [1] 159:23 | 46:9 |
| 28:1,3,4 29:2,17 32:17 | 72:21 73:23 74:4,21,25 | pressures [3] 135:6 | protessional [4] 76:13 |
| | 1 10.10 11.4,21,22 10.10 | 1.00.20 100.17 | 10.10 00.21 103.17 |

professional/technical [1] 75:25 professionally [1] 105:17 **profile** [2] 159:13,16 profit [1] 45:4 proforma [2] 102:22,23 program [18] 17:21 89:18,25 90:3,6,8,11,19 91:5.8.21.24 94:22 103:1 103:13 104:12 152:21 174:25 programming [1] 103:9 programs [7] 17:20 91:4 91:15,22 96:18 104:9 163:11 progress [1] 145:23 **progressed** [1] 105:20 **progresses** [1] 94:19 **progression** [1] 152:21 project [1] 92:21 promote [1] 71:14 promoted [2] 91:6,8 promotes [1] 90:11 prone [3] 133:11,17,19 proper [5] 5:11 15:3 52:9 117:14 120:11 **properly** [1] 45:17 **proportion** [1] 23:2 proportionally [1] 61:4 proposed [1] 1:10 **prospective** [1] 153:14 **protection** [2] 118:24 119:5 provide [25] 3:2 10:19 50:8,16 63:23,24 73:25 74:1 101:15 113:21,24 114:5 118:24 124:20 125:1 127:20 128:16 134:12 143:1 144:9 155:4 166:9 181:5 182:4 183:25 provided [10] 54:18 60:23 64:6 73:14 107:13 112:20 113:19 131:25 147:4 182:14 **Providenciales** [1] 123:11 provides [3] 90:9 113:17 115:22 **providing** [4] 50:13 90:13 115:18 151:21 **province** [4] 10:5 113:10 160:7 176:12 provinces [2] 10:17 84:3 **provincial** [3] 84:22 90:23,25 **provision** [1] 94:2 provisioning [1] 109:8 provisions [1] 20:7 **proximity** [1] 94:17 PU-32 [1] 176:8 public [17] 7:15 9:7,8,11

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

Index Page 12

9:12,13,19,20 35:15

68:24 69:4 82:24 83:5,7

Multi-PageTM

publications - response NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| 83:11 85:4 186:4 | |
|--|------------------|
| publications [1] 160:14 | |
| publicly [1] 155:6 | radio |
| purchase [1] 98:17 | raised |
| pure [2] 43:17.22 | |
| nurnle 11 99.8 | RAND! |
| nurnorts (1) 178.8 | 63.3 98 |
| purposes (2) 15:18 | rank (2) |
| 120.20 | ronkod |
| nushed (1) 25.9 | ronkin |
| nut [10] 42:22 48:1 | nonlia |
| 114:12 133:8 174:18 | |
| 175:1,23 184:11,15,22 | rate [29] |
| puts [2] 4:9 141:21 | 66.21 6 |
| putting [2] 65:11 85:23 | 73:11 7 |
| r gri | 126:12, |
| -0- | 131:6 1. |
| $\frac{\mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{x}}$ | 161:14 |
| Q.C [156] 1:0,10,20,21 $2:3 \ 9 \ 14 \ 21 \ 3:1 \ 22 \ 6:22$ | rates [6] |
| 11:3 15:6 18:5 19:11.25 | 92:113 |
| 21:4 22:24 23:16 26:2 | rather [|
| 26:10,11,15,22 27:10,17 | 44:20 5 |
| 27:23 28:18,24 29:4,23 | rauo [1] |
| 30:14,19 31:11,15,20,24 | rationa |
| 35.10 36.20 37.4 10 38.8 | Kattlin |
| 38:13,19 39:11,19,24 | raw [1] 1 |
| 40:9 41:14,22 44:24 | re-scor |
| 45:11 46:13 47:17,25 | reach [1 |
| 48:10,16,23 49:3,9,13 | reacheo |
| 51:15 52:1.6.11.22 53:18 | reachin |
| 53:24 54:4,8,15 55:4,11 | 166:23 |
| 56:19 57:5,14,21 58:1,8 | react [1] |
| 58:17 59:14,20 60:13 | read [8] |
| 63.12 64.4 16 20 65.2 9 | 101:25 |
| 65:21 66:1,20 67:5,10 | readers |
| 67:16,21,25 68:6,15,22 | reading |
| 69:6,12,16 70:21 71:13 | roodv |
| 72:20 73:2,8,13,17,22 | 124.10 |
| 79.3 11 19 80.9 19 81.10 | 166:11 |
| 87:21 88:7 154:8,13,17 | real [3] |
| 154:23 162:25 177:19,24 | realisti |
| 181:4,9 182:1,12,23 | reality |
| 183:3 185:11 | realizat |
| qualifications [2] 2:15 | realize |
| aualified (7) 04:25 05:0 | really |
| 152:3 155:11.23 156:22 | 68:16 8 |
| 157:4 | 128:17 |
| quantity [1] 122:8 | 142:2 14 |
| quarter [2] 99:10 157:21 | 105:20 |
| questioning [1] 26:8 | 13.25 4 |
| questions [3] 26:3 81:1 | 141:6 10 |
| 104:24 | 173:12 |
| quibble [1] 125:6 | reasona |
| quick [2] 81:13 82:8 | 23:25 6 |
| quickly [7] 115:12,18 | 121:6,1 |
| 117:11 118:16 119:9 | 170.23 |
| 120:14 128:16 | reason |
| quite [4] 60:1 75:17 | 79:24 14 |
| 75.21 105.10 auotos (g. 121.0 | rehate |
| Yuues [1] 151:9 | rabatas |

-R-1 91:8 1 101:1 ELL [1] 26:10 52:2,3,7,14,16 12 11:13 58:15 [1] 46:17 **g** [2] 59:8 61:5 1] 71:16 21:14 23:2,11 0:5,6 66:7,13,16 7:1,2,14 73:10 6:17 82:1 87:3 13.22 127:1 131:1 36:14 150:20 180:20 186:2 81:16,22 82:3 1:8 180:12 [4] 6:18 20:19 5:18 15:22 lizes [1] 15:16 g [1] 92:20 34:14 red [1] 28:13 157:22 **d** [1] 166:23 **1g** [3] 118:2 168:19 132:25 36:5 37:21 128:10 131:14 176:15 177:1 **s** [1] 94:11 g [3] 128:8,19,24 6] 1:17 88:5 158:11 159:2 8:2 12:16 81:19 c [1] 158:9 [1] 50:2 tion [1] 107:11 [1] 74:15 4] 48:2 49:24 5:24 114:13 129:20 132:6 45:4 158:13 165:8 183:16 [11] 9:5,6 12:18 6:24 97:2 100:17 61:21 169:13 able [10] 23:23 3:19 65:8 104:20 6 127:22 147:5 ably [1] 129:4 **S** [5] 12:10 78:11 49:1 172:21 [1] 104:9 ebates [2] 90:7,9

receive [2] 54:20 180:25 received [6] 19:13,16,20 108:6 155:11,22 recent [9] 42:16 93:8 97:2 114:21,24 118:6 143:4 159:10 174:13 recently [1] 70:18 **RECESS** [1] 87:23 **Rechargeable** [4] 108:3 109:2.18 113:1 **recharged** [1] 109:5 reciprocity [3] 121:5,13 121:15 recognition [1] 58:21 recognize [3] 21:1 29:18 114:1 recognizes [1] 4:8 recognizing [2] 43:18 74:13 **recommends** [1] 74:11 reconstructing [1] 116:1 record [6] 28:14 102:5 102:12 154:19 162:19 170:19 recoup [1] 175:5 recover [1] 125:25 Recoverable [4] 108:4 109:2,18 113:1 recovered [1] 92:1 recovery [3] 111:5 131:9 131:16 recruit [5] 71:15,22 72:19 94:9 95:7 recruited [2] 70:3 74:24 recruiting [1] 78:7 **recruitment** [1] 25:13 red [5] 97:19 99:5.25 100:1,7 reduce [3] 23:5 78:23 94:6 reduced [4] 60:2 92:5 176:1,23 **reduces** [1] 43:12 **reduction** [6] 95:23 131:7 167:11,12 172:2 173:7 **reductions** [3] 89:21 101:2 104:21 reevaluation [1] 62:9 refer [5] 97:16 122:18 151:22 155:12 161:10 **reference** [4] 41:7 142:21 149:18 176:10 **references** [5] 34:23 41:2,3 80:3,5 **referred** [7] 73:25 116:12 123:24 131:17 174:20 176:7,11 **referring** [4] 123:3 126:6 171:18 173:17 refers [1] 163:19 refile [1] 172:18

reflect [5] 27:5 65:14 76:24 172:22 181:17 reflected [2] 41:13 173:11 reflection [3] 8:13 21:16 174:22 reflective [3] 24:12 61:3 70:10 reflects [2] 101:7 167:13 refurbishment [2] 92:19 96:10 regard [3] 102:5 115:8 120:5**regarding** [3] 105:8 175:11 178:5 regards [1] 178:10 regime [4] 176:7,12,19 176:23 region [1] 126:8 regional [7] 9:22 10:9 39:8,9 46:8 49:14 73:6 regions [11 10:7 regular [5] 139:23 141:17 143:20 148:7 168:18 regulated [4] 123:2 126:8,10,12 **regulator** [1] 5:10 regulatory [10] 6:11 66:5 90:21 126:22 176:12 176:19,23 178:5 180:12 181:18 reiterate [1] 120:22 relate [1] 180:7 related [8] 96:21,23 97:15 98:11 103:23 127:8 127:13 128:22 relates [2] 95:19 149:24 relation [12] 36:17,17 37:25 38:2 39:7 40:17 112:13 133:2 159:7 178:25 180:4 182:15 relations [1] 39:9 relationship [5] 26:16 46:20 78:14,15 115:21 relationships [1] 104:6 relative [25] 12:12,13 34:25 41:9,16 57:9,13 58:14 59:10,24 60:15 61:1,10,14 64:8,10 65:14 71:7 100:1 148:11 149:3 164:5 172:24 173:1.8 relatively [2] 23:4 94:12 relativity [1] 37:1 relevant [5] 59:16 64:15 64:19,21 121:15 reliability [11] 95:24 96:4,5,12,14,18,19,21 102:13 143:17 145:1 reliable [2] 94:2 104:14 relief [1] 113:18 **REM** [3] 22:11,23 23:10 remaining [2] 66:12 168:6

remarkably [1] 148:4 **remember** [2] 147:13 175:16 remuneration^[2] 22:3 22:4 **renewal** [1] 172:1 **renowned** [1] 18:11 repair [1] 113:13 **repeat** [6] 77:16 138:1,3 169:17 171:6,10 replace [3] 25:13 95:9 96:16 **replaced** [3] 168:5,8,10 **replacement** [1] 96:10 report [31] 1:9,23 2:4,10 3:3,4,7,18,21 6:6 26:23 27:25 28:1,6 50:7 62:13 62:14 85:17 86:3,4 122:20.25 128:7 144:11 144:12 145:17 171:16,17 172:8,14,16 reports [4] 27:8 28:9,11 34:18 represent [2] 98:25 140:6 representation [2] 5:17 162:13 representatives [1] 94:12 **represented** [2] 76:16 99:24 **represents** [2] 97:20,22 request [6] 113:23 132:19 134:12 136:1,4 145:9 **requested** [1] 63:21 requests [2] 64:2 133:1 **require** [1] 114:19 required [14] 76:24 92:24 94:16 95:7,24 96:16 97:8 100:18 101:17 103:21 150:18 183:18 184:1,16 requirements [5] 92:15 109:1,1 134:14 183:21 requires [9] 35:18,21 39:15 45:3 94:5,18 95:2 97:11,24 research [1] 91:18 **residential** [1] 100:14 residents [1] 125:9 resisted [1] 64:7 resource [1] 7:12 **respect** [6] 61:18 64:5 73:10 77:11 115:25 140:1 **respective** [1] 85:21 **respond** [11] 103:22 128:15 129:23 130:1 135:19 138:13 144:7,22 145:3,19 152:17 responding [1] 145:5 **response** [14] 102:18 111:10,16 122:13 123:16 123:23 124:15 125:13

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

Index Page 13

127:10 129:1 138:9,12

$\boldsymbol{Multi-Page}^{^{\mathrm{TM}}}$

responses - smaller NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| | | | | a Rait Application |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 150:18 155:4 | 152:4 155:16 157:2 165:3 | 112:25 132:9 144:16 | selecting [1] 157:14 | showing [1] 16:10 |
| responses [1] 182:13 | 165:6,10 166:12 167:6 | says [12] 24:23 35:14,18 | selection [1] 69:5 | shown [6] 18:1 97:18,19 |
| responsibilities [1] 5:18 | 108:25 177:0,15 178:12 | 36:10 73:7,23 77:2 85:9 | sells [1] 46:8 | 99:2 147:19 181:15 |
| responsibility [1] 6:21 | rightly (1) 75.17 | 150:16 151:6 152:6 168:4 | send [4] 134:16,21 135:8 | shows [11] 96:1,4 97:14 |
| responsible [2] 40:20 | risen (2) 10:0 18 | Scale [4] 36:6,10 37:21 | 135:12 | 98:11,14,20,23 99:9,14 |
| 47:2 | risk (20) 25.10 14 20.10 | scaled (1) 36.2 | senior [3] 9:18 25:15 | side (1) 167:6 |
| rest [1] 85:7 | 41:25 42:8.10.13.15.18 | scales (2) 40.10 23 | /0:16 | sides (1) 40.15 |
| restoration [4] 114:10 | 42:21,25 43:17,22 44:8 | scaling [2] 40.17,25 | Sense [5] 23:1 121:10 | sideways (1) 110.22 |
| 115:4,18 123:20 | 44:11,17,18,19,23 45:13 | scalings [1] 40.17 | Senses [1] 29·20 | significant [10] 24.20 |
| restored [1] 123:21 | 45:23 46:16,19,22,24 | schedule (8) 107.21.24 | sensitive (1) 82.20 | 92:23 93:22 98:14 114:25 |
| restricted [1] 20:15 | riskier (1) 46.9 | 109:16 112:25 140:25 | sentence [1] 128.20 | 122:7 145:8 153:16 |
| 123.15 163.10 171.25 | risks (1) 126.16 | 141:20 166:16 180:2 | senarate [1] 67.4 | 157:25 158:25 |
| resulting 131 60.8 66.12 | ROA [1] 126.13 | scheduling [1] 168:2 | September 141 2:6 91:10 | significantly [1] 163:10 |
| 165:5 | ROEs ₁₁₁ 126:18 | schema [3] 32:1,11,12 | 123:5 172:19 | similar [19] 4:24,25 5:21 |
| results [1] 3:17 | role 171 25.11 41.5 105.23 | scheme [2] 31:25 149:5 | series [1] 163:10 | 5:25 22:14,22 23:9 27:8 |
| retail [5] 8:4 12:17 47:20 | 106:4 112:3,12,20 | score [22] 4:9 5:19,20 6:7 | seriously [1] 114:1 | 66:14 103:3 109:20 |
| 87:2 91:19 | roll [1] 163:3 | 28:2,3 30:1 31:10 36:7 | serve [2] 101:17,24 | 112:21 120:25 133:9 |
| retailer [1] 82:19 | room [2] 146:9,18 | 30:19 38:21 39:3,5,7,10 41:15 43:24 44:14 45:17 | service [32] 8:8 24:13 | similarly [3] 27:18 104:2 |
| retailers [2] 104:7,7 | row [1] 15:20 | 45:20 46:7,10 | 90:7,11 94:3,11 96:11 | 182:10 |
| retain [6] 9:17 13:10 | rows [1] 24:17 | scored [4] 11:9 30:12 | 98:2 100:18 101:8,11,16 | SIMMONS [1] 80:25 |
| 71:6,24 79:8 136:13 | Royal [3] 80:6,10,15 | 41:8,10 | 101:24 102:13 103:10 | simple [1] 40:3 |
| retention [1] 78:7 | rules [3] 115:15 117:7 | scores [7] 28:5,20,23,25 | 123:12 124:20 126:24 | simplistic [1] 129:21 |
| retire [13] 93:24 95:10 | 120:15 | 29:2,17 38:24 | 128:16 134:24 135:1,14 | simply [14] 40:20 63:23 |
| 165:5 107:1,10,15 168:2 | run [4] 138:20 139:10 | scoring [1] 34:24 | 140:12 144:22 163:13 | 108:24 129:25 150:19 |
| 171:4 | 143:4 144:8 | Scotia [6] 83:21,24 84:10 | 166:9,25 1/6:12 | 163:23 166:12 174:21 |
| retired [9] 168:23,24 | running [8] 43:13 100:21 | 118:12 119:1 124:22 | SET VICES [7] 08:12 74:4 83:20 108:8 109:8 131:25 | 183:17,24 |
| 169:8,23,24 170:6,10,23 | 105:25 115:12 117:11 | screen [2] 0:5 155:5 | 137:8 | single [1] 92:21 |
| 170:23 | runs (1) 32.7 | 145:25 | serving [1] 175:3 | sit [1] 58:3 |
| retirement [14] 21:24 | 1 uns [1] 52.7 | Season (2) 91.14 134.15 | set [19] 2:15 7:24 10:23 | site [1] 151:21 |
| 148:9,17 149:2 150:5 | -S- | second [10] 3.11 10.6 | 11:16,17 12:8,11 15:9 | sits [2] 57:13 58:14 |
| 166:19,22 167:11 168:20 | Sofo (2) 04-2 104-14 | 21:17 68:20 97:9 109:17 | 15:12 24:6 44:19 46:1,2 | situation [5] 31:7 78:7 |
| 170:3,24 | Sale [2] 94:2 104:14 | 126:7 155:14 156:3 157:2 | 70:7,8,10 77:15 85:5 86:9 | 119:20 132:21 148:5 |
| retirements [4] 148:14 | 117:7 118:19 119:14.16 | Secondly [1] 5:2 | sets [2] 166:8 168:18 | situations [1] 42:18 |
| 150:19 165:1 167:14 | 119:23 120:1 | section [3] 89:5,6 99:13 | setting [2] 12:13 86:4 | SIX [12] 21:8 62:16 92:9 |
| retiring [2] 168:5,9 | SAIDI [2] 96:2 144:17 | sector [37] 7:10,13,15,17 | seven [5] 3:18 15:10.12 | 115:1 158:16 163:10 |
| return [5] 66:22,25 67:1 | SAIFI [2] 96:2 144:18 | 8:18 9:7,8,9,11,12,13,15 | 115:1 169:22 | 168:6,8 |
| revenue (28) 34.1 12 15 | sake [1] 25:11 | 25:1.3.8 34:18 45:23 | several [3] 93:22 100:23 | size [10] 4:23 34:1,12 |
| 58:6,11,21,25 59:3,5,6,7 | salaries [4] 9:11 16:3 | 46:4,5 51:9 53:6 69:4 | 146:7 | 44:11,21 57:15,18,20 |
| 59:7,11,22,23 60:5,7,10 | 54:16 86:4 | 70:17 71:10,11 82:24 | shaded [4] 99:4,5,6,8 | 59:3 65:14 |
| 60:10,11,15 61:2,16 | salary [25] 10:6 11:16 | 83:5,8,9,11 85:5 87:2 | shall [1] 3:6 | SKEW [1] 51:19 |
| 130:0,7,9,19 131:12 | 12:9,9 14:10,15 16:2,4,7 | 8.4 5 10 12.16 13.20 | share [1] 120:8 | SKIII [7] 4:12 5:18 6:20 37:20 23 93:24 95:5 |
| 60:21.22.24 61:5 | 24:24 25:5,17 55:16 63:7 | 69:23 70:19 85:4 | shared [1] 50:16 | skilled [7] 13:4.19 93:2 |
| review [7] 2:5 26:24 | 65:7 74:6 84:25 85:13 | secure [1] 158:11 | shareholder [3] 66:18 | 95:17 148:5 150:15 |
| 28:13 29:3,11 74:6,12 | | security [1] 65:16 | shareholders (4) 124.14 | 161:15 |
| reviewing [1] 89:23 | Sales [3] 48:20 127:1 | see [50] 15:18 16:25 17:1 | 125:12 128:9 129:3 | skills [18] 35:7 36:2,5,17 |
| revision [1] 172:22 | sales/revenue (2) 57.23 | 19:7 24:5,15,16,18 28:5 | shares [1] 20:15 | 36:18,21 37:12,25 38:2 |
| Reward [1] 1:25 | 58:4 | 29:5 39:13 53:8,9,11 | shielded [1] 131:24 | 95:2 114:9 116:1,4,8 |
| RFI [5] 110:8 113:19 | salient [1] 56:21 | 110:20 117:13,16,19 | Shoals [1] 18:13 | skillset [2] 37:24 78:18 |
| 170:8,12,17 | sample [15] 48:13 54:17 | 120:12 121:4,14 128:19 | shoe [1] 121:12 | slapped [1] 82:4 |
| RFIs [1] 182:16 | 57:2,16 58:3 59:25 60:16 | 129:4 139:22 141:4 143:9 | Shoppers [2] 82:13,19 | slice [2] 7:5 48:11 |
| richer [2] 8:1 15:19 | 61:18 65:12 68:11,17,18 | 144:4,13,25 147:0 155:15 | short [8] 9:12 13:3 14:10 | slight [1] 56:13 |
| right [51] 9:10 10:25 14:4 | 08:23,23 09:3 | 166:17,18 167:7 168:23 | 14:15 20:17,19 94:13 | slightly [1] 165:3 |
| 37:9 39:18:20 40.4 47.22 | satisfaction 11 10215 | 169:19 173:12 174:6 | 147:1 | slowdown [2] 151:20 |
| 49:5 50:10 51:10 52:3 | sausiacuvii [1] 102:15 | 175:19 178:14,21 182:3 | snort-term [1] 93:5 | 153:7 |
| 56:4 67:20 71:8 72:13 | 96:13 185:12 | 105.5 Seeing (1) 185.2 | snortiali [1] 14:21 | small [3] 10:23 44:13 |
| 77:18 79:2 83:7 100:3 | save [1] 92:6 | seek 11 107.12 | SNORTS [1] 152:19 | 59:23 |
| 130:2,6 133:12 140:2.7 | savings [2] 173:10.22 | Seem [1] 74.73 | SNOW [8] 16:8 21:13 148:3 3 154:10 165:16 | smaller [4] 44:15 58:13 |
| 140:18 141:10 151:5 | saw [5] 24:4 106:20 | Sectit [1] / 7 .23 | 173:21 178:8 | 00.13 177.23 |

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

Smith - thank NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| | | | | ci ai Kate Applicatio |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| Smith [164] 88:4,6,9,12 | 50:23 149:25 | stocks [1] 81:14 | supervision [1] 152:7 | 94:16 95:8,11 101:13 |
| 88:17 89:1,4,8,13,16 | spectrum [4] 8:9 13:13 | stores [1] 109:4 | supervisory [2] 75:24 | 116:18 143:22 150:10,21 |
| 90:1 92:11,14 93:17 | 29:15 71:7 | storm [9] 111:10,16,22 | 152:11 | techniques [1] 120:11 |
| 95.22 100.25 101.5 | spend [2] 177:11 178:6 | 113:18 114:10 119:18,19 | supplement [2] 134:22 | technologists [1] 93:25 |
| 106:11.22 107:4.9.17.23 | spending [3] 96:21,22 | 122:6 123:6 | 138:16 | technology [1] 93:11 |
| 108:10,15,18,20 109:11 | 98:8 | storm-related [1] 111:5 | supplemented [1] 93:3 | Telegram [2] 156:20 |
| 109:19 110:5,7,15,19,25 | spent [2] 144:15 184:6 | straight [1] 172:17 | supply [3] 63:11 104:7 | 160:15 |
| 111:9,15,21 112:5,14 | spite [1] 99:17 | stream [3] 63:24,24,25 | 158:12 | telephone [1] 145:21 |
| 113:6,16 116:6,22 117:19 | spot [1] 24:14 | streams [1] 63:15 | support [1] 49:8 | television [1] 91:11 |
| 121.19 122.3 12 14 21 | spread [2] 7:21 75:1 | street [2] 117:2 158:7 | supposed [1] 176:22 | telling [2] 45:12 73:1 |
| 123:25 124:14,16 125:6 | St [6] 107:7 135:7,8,11 | stress [1] 29:22 | surcharge [4] 131:9,17 | tells [4] 35:12 162:9 |
| 125:17 126:7 127:15 | 186:5,8 | striving [1] 86:23 | 132:2,6 | 170:8,12 |
| 128:12 129:5,19 130:5 | stability [2] 147:17 | strong [2] 97:1 126:23 | surely [2] 64:8 68:23 | temporary [2] 93:3 |
| 131:18 132:4,9,22 133:13 | 148:24 | strongly III 69.18 | surprised [1] 154:1 | 139:23 |
| 135:18 134:10 135:20 | Stabilization [1] 180:20 | struck (11, 123.6 | surprising [2] 76:5 | ten [14] 19:17 24:25 25:6 |
| 138:11 139:13.18 140:3 | stable [4] 53:16 56:6 | structure [5] 12:22 | 152:4 | 25:11,17,18 26:20 60:16 |
| 140:8,19 141:1,11,19,25 | 148:4,10 | 20:24 24:23 93:1.1 | surprisingly [1] 4:3 | 69:21 96:5 98:22 126:10 |
| 142:10,17,24 144:3 | staff [17] 104:4 110:12 | sub-base (1) 48.19 | suspect [1] 70:14 | tond in 100.22 101.24 |
| 145:11 146:5,16 147:2 | 110:20,22 111:4 112:4 | sub-hullets (1) 29.12 | sustainable [2] 102:2 | 147.16 148.3 |
| 147:10,25 148:2,12,18 | 115:5,12,14 117:5 155:2 | sub-factors (4, 20-13 | 164:14 | tender (2) 136-10 137-6 |
| 152:10.12.153:21.22 | 183:10.15.19 | 29:14.16 30:11.13 32:5 | sustained [1] 123:14 | tendered (2) 127:12 10 |
| 155:17,24 156:5,10,23 | stagnant [3] 59.22 60.21 | sub-scaling 11 40:16 | swear [1] 66:21 | tenderen 04.6 142.4 |
| 157:17 159:9,18 160:21 | 61:2 | subdivision (1) 130.0 | sworn [4] 1:18,19 88:5,6 | 160.8 |
| 161:20 162:8 163:6,18 | stand (1) 81:11 | subdivisions (1) 139.10 | system [29] 28:2 29:15 | term (22) 0.12 14 12.11 |
| 164:7,25 166:6 167:2,18 | standard [17] 12:9 21:21 | subitoms (1) 22:15 | 34:24 36:25 37:1 60:17 | 14:10.10.15.16.18.22 |
| 170.22 171.2 12 172.9 | 25:1,5,7,17,19 47:5 72:1 | subiceties 124.7.160.24 | 89:20 94:17 95:20 96:6 | 17:13,15,17,19,21 18:1 |
| 172:15 173:16,23 174:5 | 72:4,6,9 84:6,7,12,13 | 182.3 | 96:9,15 97:7,8,11,23,25 | 19:4 20:13,16,17,20 21:2 |
| 174:10 175:14 176:3,8 | 86:14 | subsection (1) 45.0 | 144:16.20.21.24 145:1.6 | 21:5,13 22:10 32:4 42:23 |
| 176:13,25 177:7,14 | standards [7] 24:7,10 | subsection [1] +5.7 | 152:17,19 174:16 | 43:25 101:16 102:3 147:1 |
| 178:13 179:1,5,10,14,20 | 34:4 72:1,17 76:11 | subset [1] 51.17 | systems [1] 123:9 | terminologies (1) 110.2 |
| 1/9:23 180:0 185:7,14 | 118.15 | Subsets [1] 57:18 | | ter minologies [1] 119:5 |
| 1 184.7 /01 185.7 | atondby in 120.02 | anhaidianiaa an 04.14 | | tominal arres 100.15 |
| 184:7,20 185:2 Sobeys (1) 51:14 | standby [1] 139:23 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 | - T - | terminology [1] 122:15 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial (1) 51:7 | - T - T&D (2), 106:4, 130:23 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [m] 12:4 27:4 26:18 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantial [1] 02:16 | -T- T&D _[3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [2] 47:11 78:11 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 09:21 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15.17 140:24 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12 13 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhare [3] 114:1 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3 25 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3.22.22 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 Soon [1] 100:18 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 179:8 9:14 170:19 191:1 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11 18 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9.24 84:22 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored up 168:1 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistic [1] 56:16 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:10 183:12 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistic [1] 56:16 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8 15 184:9 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistic [1] 56:16 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistic [1] 56:16 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistic [1] 56:16 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 |
| 184:7,20 185:2 Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 79:22 somewhat [1] somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhat [1] 10:18 sorry [10] 22:10 soirry [10] 22:10 sort [9] 105:15 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 source [1] 117:24 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 status [1] 95:1 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 source [1] 117:24 south [1] 123:9 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 status [1] 95:1 statutory [1] 21:25 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 suggested [2] 12:13 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 target [9] 16:8,9,10,11 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 test [15] 102:20 21 103:2 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 source [1] 117:24 south [1] 123:9 Southlands [1] 100:14 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 status [1] 95:1 statutory [1] 21:25 stay [1] 61:8 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 suggested [2] 12:13 77:17 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 target [9] 16:8,9,10,11 16:11,15 17:6,7 96:18 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 test [15] 102:20,21 103:2 103:6,15 104:19 151:4 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 source [1] 117:24 south [1] 123:9 Southlands [1] 100:14 spared [1] 123:13 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 status [1] 95:1 statutory [1] 21:25 stay [1] 61:8 stayed [2] 72:14 143:23 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 suggested [2] 12:13 77:17 suggesting [1] 77:17 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 target [9] 16:8,9,10,11 16:11,15 17:6,7 96:18 team [1] 77:6 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 test [15] 102:20,21 103:2 103:6,15 104:19 151:4 168:22 169:9,22,23 170:2 |
| 184:7,20 185:2 Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 someone [3] 47:11 79:22 somewhat [1] somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhat [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 south [1] 123:9 Southlands [1] Southlands [1] 100:14 spared [1] speak [15] 65:6 84:10 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 status [1] 95:1 statutory [1] 21:25 stay [1] 61:8 stayed [2] 72:14 143:23 staying [1] 91:18 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 suggested [2] 12:13 77:17 suggesting [1] 77:17 suggest [5] 8:12 22:8,9 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 target [9] 16:8,9,10,11 16:11,15 17:6,7 96:18 team [1] 77:6 technical [10] 36:3 37:19 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 test [15] 102:20,21 103:2 103:6,15 104:19 151:4 168:22 169:9,22,23 170:2 170:6,24 179:8 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 source [1] 117:24 south [1] 123:9 Southlands [1] 100:14 spared [1] 123:13 speak [15] 65:6 84:10 89:4 124:11 132:8,25 149:17 159:13 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 status [1] 95:1 statutory [1] 21:25 stay [1] 61:8 stayed [2] 72:14 143:23 staying [1] 91:18 step [4] 3:8,11,14,17 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 suggested [2] 12:13 77:17 suggesting [1] 77:17 suggests [5] 8:12 22:8,9 22:12,19 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 target [9] 16:8,9,10,11 16:11,15 17:6,7 96:18 team [1] 77:6 technical [10] 36:3 37:19 37:20,22 39:3 43:12,16 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 test [15] 102:20,21 103:2 103:6,15 104:19 151:4 168:22 169:9,22,23 170:2 170:6,24 179:8 testifying [1] 88:25 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 source [1] 117:24 south [1] 123:9 Southlands [1] 100:14 spared [1] 123:13 speak [15] 65:6 84:10 89:4 124:11 132:8,25 133:6 142:2 152:19 153:7 158:8 14 165:13 166:11 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 status [1] 95:1 statutory [1] 21:25 stay [1] 61:8 stayed [2] 72:14 143:23 staying [1] 91:18 step [4] 3:8,11,14,17 steps [2] 3:7 37:2 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 suggested [2] 12:13 77:17 suggesting [1] 77:17 suggests [5] 8:12 22:8,9 22:12,19 sum [4] 16:10 21:20 22:1 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 target [9] 16:8,9,10,11 16:11,15 17:6,7 96:18 team [1] 77:6 technical [10] 36:3 37:19 37:20,22 39:3 43:12,16 76:13,18 81:19 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 test [15] 102:20,21 103:2 103:6,15 104:19 151:4 168:22 169:9,22,23 170:2 170:6,24 179:8 testifying [1] 88:25 testimony [2] 89:7,12 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhare [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 source [1] 117:24 south [1] 123:9 Southlands [1] 100:14 spared [1] 123:13 speak [15] 65:6 84:10 89:4 124:11 132:8,25 133:6 142:2 152:19 153:7 158:8,14 165:13 166:11 169:6 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 status [1] 95:1 statutory [1] 21:25 stay [1] 61:8 stayed [2] 72:14 143:23 staying [1] 91:18 step [4] 3:8,11,14,17 stereotypical [3] 12:15 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 suggested [2] 12:13 77:17 suggesting [1] 77:17 suggests [5] 8:12 22:8,9 22:12,19 sum [4] 16:10 21:20 22:1 32:4 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 target [9] 16:8,9,10,11 16:11,15 17:6,7 96:18 team [1] 77:6 technical [10] 36:3 37:19 37:20,22 39:3 43:12,16 76:13,18 81:19 technically [1] 39:23 technical [10] 39:23 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 test [15] 102:20,21 103:2 170:6,24 179:8 testifying [1] 88:25 testimony [2] 89:7,12 testing [1] 140:14 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 source [1] 117:24 south [1] 123:9 Southlands [1] 100:14 spared [1] 123:13 speak [15] 65:6 84:10 89:4 124:11 132:8,25 133:6 142:2 152:19 153:7 158:8,14 165:13 166:11 169:6 speaking [4] 47:18 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 status [1] 95:1 statutory [1] 21:25 stay [1] 61:8 stayed [2] 72:14 143:23 staying [1] 91:18 step [4] 3:8,11,14,17 stereotypical [3] 12:15 13:23 159:16 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 suggested [2] 12:13 77:17 suggesting [1] 77:17 suggests [5] 8:12 22:8,9 22:12,19 sum [4] 16:10 21:20 22:1 32:4 summarize [1] 88:15 summarize [1] 88:15 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 target [9] 16:8,9,10,11 16:11,15 17:6,7 96:18 team [1] 77:6 technical [10] 36:3 37:19 37:20,22 39:3 43:12,16 76:13,18 81:19 technicals [1] 40:18 to b | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 territories [1] 126:24 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 test [15] 102:20,21 103:2 103:6,15 104:19 151:4 168:22 169:9,22,23 170:2 170:6,24 179:8 testifying [1] 88:25 testimony [2] 89:7,12 testing [1] 140:14 tests [1] 69:19 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 source [1] 117:24 south [1] 123:9 Southlands [1] 100:14 spared [1] 123:13 speak [15] 65:6 84:10 89:4 124:11 132:8,25 133:6 142:2 152:19 153:7 158:8,14 165:13 166:11 169:6 speaking [4] 47:18 149:10 160:22,25 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 status [1] 95:1 statutory [1] 21:25 stay [1] 61:8 stayed [2] 72:14 143:23 staying [1] 91:18 step [4] 3:8,11,14,17 stereotypical [3] 12:15 13:23 159:16 stereotypically [1] | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 suggested [2] 12:13 77:17 suggesting [1] 77:17 suggests [5] 8:12 22:8,9 22:12,19 sum [4] 16:10 21:20 22:1 32:4 summarized [1] 23:21 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 target [9] 16:8,9,10,11 16:11,15 17:6,7 96:18 team [1] 77:6 technical [10] 36:3 37:19 37:20,22 39:3 43:12,16 76:13,18 81:19 technicals [1] 40:18 technicals [1] 40:18 technicals [1] 94:22,25 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 test [15] 102:20,21 103:2 103:6,15 104:19 151:4 168:22 169:9,22,23 170:2 170:6,24 179:8 testifying [1] 88:25 testinony [2] 89:7,12 testing [1] 140:14 tests [1] 69:19 thank [25] 1:7,17,22 3:6 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 source [1] 117:24 south [1] 123:9 Southlands [1] 100:14 spared [1] 123:13 speak [15] 65:6 84:10 89:4 124:11 132:8,25 133:6 142:2 152:19 153:7 158:8,14 165:13 166:11 169:6 speaking [4] 47:18 149:10 160:22,25 specific [6] 24:11 100:13 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 statutory [1] 21:25 stay [1] 95:1 statutory [1] 21:25 stay [1] 61:8 stayed [2] 72:14 143:23 staying [1] 91:18 step [4] 3:8,11,14,17 stereotypical [3] 12:15 13:23 159:16 stereotypically [1] 11:22 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 suggested [2] 12:13 77:17 suggesting [1] 77:17 suggests [5] 8:12 22:8,9 22:12,19 sum [4] 16:10 21:20 22:1 32:4 summarize [1] 88:15 summarize [1] 88:15 summarize [1] 23:21 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 target [9] 16:8,9,10,11 16:11,15 17:6,7 96:18 team [1] 77:6 technical [10] 36:3 37:19 37:20,22 39:3 43:12,16 76:13,18 81:19 technicals [1] 40:18 technicals [1] 40:18 technicals [1] 94:22,25 95:4 112:2 150:7 151:3 151:4 10 152:2 3 9 153:3 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 test [15] 102:20,21 103:2 103:6,15 104:19 151:4 168:22 169:9,22,23 170:2 170:6,24 179:8 testifying [1] 88:25 testimony [2] 89:7,12 testing [1] 140:14 tests [1] 69:19 thank [25] 1:7,17,22 3:6 4:1 11:8 15:12 19:15 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 source [1] 117:24 south [1] 123:9 Southlands [1] 100:14 spared [1] 123:13 speak [15] 65:6 84:10 89:4 124:11 132:8,25 133:6 142:2 152:19 153:7 158:8,14 165:13 166:11 169:6 speaking [4] 47:18 149:10 160:22,25 specific [6] 24:11 100:13 133:25 161:4 173:12 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 status [1] 95:1 statutory [1] 21:25 stay [1] 61:8 stayed [2] 72:14 143:23 staying [1] 91:18 step [4] 3:8,11,14,17 steps [2] 3:7 37:2 stereotypical [3] 12:15 13:23 159:16 stereotypically [1] 11:22 still [4] 28:14 31:6 86:8 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 suggested [2] 12:13 77:17 suggesting [1] 77:17 suggests [5] 8:12 22:8,9 22:12,19 sum [4] 16:10 21:20 22:1 32:4 summarize [1] 88:15 summarize [1] 88:15 summarize [1] 23:21 summarize [1] 23:21 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 target [9] 16:8,9,10,11 16:11,15 17:6,7 96:18 team [1] 77:6 technical [10] 36:3 37:19 37:20,22 39:3 43:12,16 76:13,18 81:19 technicals [1] 40:18 technicals [1] 40:18 technicals [1] 94:22,25 95:4 112:2 150:7 151:3 151:4,10 152:2,3,9 153:3 155:13 156:16,18 157:19 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 test [15] 102:20,21 103:2 103:6,15 104:19 151:4 168:22 169:9,22,23 170:2 170:6,24 179:8 testifying [1] 88:25 testimony [2] 89:7,12 testing [1] 140:14 tests [1] 69:19 thank [25] 1:7,17,22 3:6 4:1 11:8 15:12 19:15 26:3 28:8 80:20,22 81:1 85:7 87:19 22 88:0 |
| Sobeys [1] 51:14 software [3] 42:2,3,5 solving [2] 43:19 44:10 someone [3] 47:11 78:11 79:22 somewhat [1] 21:12 somewhere [2] 114:1 142:9 soon [1] 100:18 sorry [10] 22:10 57:4 67:20 75:7 81:9,24 84:22 85:1 148:19 172:10 sort [9] 105:15 138:5 149:17 159:13,16 166:2 167:23 181:19 184:4 sound [2] 25:24 186:7 source [1] 117:24 south [1] 123:9 Southlands [1] 100:14 spared [1] 123:13 speak [15] 65:6 84:10 89:4 124:11 132:8,25 133:6 142:2 152:19 153:7 158:8,14 165:13 166:11 169:6 speaking [4] 47:18 149:10 160:22,25 specific [6] 24:11 100:13 133:25 161:4 173:12 181:11 | standby [1] 139:23 Star [4] 90:9 104:8 156:20 160:15 start [9] 12:4 27:4 36:18 38:17 39:13 53:11 79:10 86:20 105:7 started [5] 103:20 105:19 146:17,20 184:21 state [1] 113:4 statement [3] 47:9 149:24 163:7 States [1] 69:9 statistical [5] 3:15 11:19 11:21 54:24 57:11 statistically [2] 10:22 49:20 status [1] 95:1 statutory [1] 21:25 stay [1] 61:8 stayed [2] 72:14 143:23 staying [1] 91:18 step [4] 3:8,11,14,17 steps [2] 3:7 37:2 stereotypical [3] 12:15 13:23 159:16 stereotypically [1] 11:22 still [4] 28:14 31:6 86:8 171:19 | subsidiaries [2] 84:14 124:21 substantial [1] 51:7 substantially [1] 92:16 substation [2] 98:21 139:7 substitutes [1] 137:9 success [5] 13:11 42:4 158:3,22,22 successfully [1] 64:7 succession [2] 72:11,18 such [11] 8:15 13:21 78:19 92:22 94:10 96:18 108:6 111:22 124:4 142:21 143:17 sufficiently [1] 56:12 suggest [4] 7:7 24:9 25:25 153:23 suggested [2] 12:13 77:17 suggesting [1] 77:17 suggests [5] 8:12 22:8,9 22:12,19 sum [4] 16:10 21:20 22:1 32:4 summarize [1] 88:15 summarize [1] 88:15 summarize [1] 23:21 summarize [1] 106:10 sumervising [2] 152:8 | -T- T&D [3] 106:4 130:23 131:12 tab [3] 67:15,17 140:24 table [25] 3:18 15:12,13 24:4,17 25:25 28:5 51:17 62:22 110:16 148:6,14 150:2 153:11 161:10 162:1,3 168:18 172:20 178:8,8,14 179:18 181:1 181:16 tailored [1] 168:1 takes [5] 13:2 150:24 151:8,15 184:9 taking [5] 41:25 45:14 65:19 151:12 167:17 talent [8] 8:16,17 9:3,18 13:17 69:24 70:25 71:6 target [9] 16:8,9,10,11 16:11,15 17:6,7 96:18 team [1] 77:6 technical [10] 36:3 37:19 37:20,22 39:3 43:12,16 76:13,18 81:19 technicals [1] 40:18 technical [17] 94:22,25 95:4 112:2 150:7 151:3 151:4,10 152:2,3,9 153:3 155:13 156:16,18 157:19 159:6 | terminology [1] 122:15 terms [53] 14:7 20:8 30:2 33:24 41:4 43:19 52:20 54:1 55:5 57:2 58:3 59:9 59:10 60:15 78:7 82:20 83:15 86:3 111:10 115:18 117:11 118:6 120:14 121:16 122:4,16 130:22 131:11 132:8 133:3,25 134:11 138:12 143:1 146:7,18 147:3,18 148:5 149:5 152:10 153:4 158:21,23 159:14 160:5 164:10 170:11 174:6 176:9 180:19 183:12 184:5 terrible [1] 43:23 territories [1] 126:24 territory [3] 53:23 123:12 135:2 test [15] 102:20,21 103:2 103:6,15 104:19 151:4 168:22 169:9,22,23 170:2 170:6,24 179:8 testifying [1] 88:25 testimony [2] 89:7,12 testing [1] 140:14 tests [1] 69:19 thank [25] 1:7,17,22 3:6 4:1 11:8 15:12 19:15 26:3 28:8 80:20,22 81:1 85:7 87:19,22 88:9 104:24 105:5,6 108:22 |

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

Multi-PageTM

theirs - view NP's 2010 General Rate Application

| | | | NI 5 2010 Gene | er af Kate Application |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 185:17 | top [10] 13:17 40:16 | tropical [4] 116:20 | understand [23] 2:16 | 127:25 132:21 134:12 |
| theirs [1] 85:12 | 51:19,23 54:19,22 62:20 | 117:23 119:24 123:6 | 15:9,25 19:12 24:21 | 157:8 |
| themselves [1] 65:25 | Toronto (1) 0:25 | trouble [11] 144:7,23 | 64.21 66.5 88.24 105.9 | utility's [1] 123:8 |
| theoretical [1] 39:16 | totol (24) 16:6 10 10 22 | 146:3 147:15 152:17 | 115:14,15,16 117:6 | utilization [1] 98:21 |
| theory [1] 49:7 | 17:5.10.14.15.16.17 19:6 | truck [1] 152:23 | 118:22 128:4 151:14 | |
| therefore [5] 42:21 59:2 | 19:8,10 21:16 22:2,3,4 | true [12] 30:3 31:25 32:10 | 172:5 182:5 | - V - |
| 61:1 85:15 100:1 | 22:10,11,22,22 23:10 | 49:16 50:5 51:12 68:14 | undertake [1] 63:11 | vacancies [1] 160:1 |
| thermostats [1] 90:10 | 32:4,5 74:6 97:15 126:9 | 69:15 112:7 137:10 | undertaking [5] 54:20 | vacation [1] 21:25 |
| tney ve [3] 70:19 77:25 | 161:15 168:18 169:20 | 151:17 186:1 | undertakings (2) 63.23 | valid [3] 10:20 28:14 |
| thinking 131 37.13 43.20 | touch [1] 91:18 | truism [1] 135:17 | 162:20 | 68:10 Vollovan 156.16 |
| 117:25 | tougher [1] 40:22 | truny [1] 48:5 | union [1] 76:16 | values [1] 156:16 |
| third [7] 3:14 36:1 69:17 | towards [3] 61:14 108:2 | LFUIIK [3] 144:20,24 | unionized [1] 34:20 | valuation [1] 22:15 |
| 95:19 109:7 123:3 177:5 | 141:4 | trust (116:2 | unique [3] 20:24 83:7 | 17:15.18.23.25 18:1.23 |
| thirdly [1] 5:3 | town [1] 156:8 | try [9] 133:1 134:25 | 134:1 | 18:25 19:2,4,18,20,23 |
| THOMAS [1] 105:3 | track [1] 118:2 | 135:23 136:1 145:12,18 | uniquely [1] 20:12 | 20:12,14 21:1 22:3,4,25 |
| Thornton [6] 171:17,20 | trade [9] 91:19 95:4,17 | 145:24 181:12,14 | unit [1] 20:16 | 23:5,10 38:5,5 48:24 |
| 172:14,16 173:3,9 | 150:15 153:24 157:19 | trying [12] 13:10 26:19 | United [1] 69:9 | 55:14 56:3 57:2,8,9,11 |
| 1000gnt [7] 21:11,12 | trades (1) 161.15 | 115:11 119:16 125:1,7 | units [1] 76:16 | 57:19 59:1,2 62:25 66:2 |
| 172:23 | tradesneonle 11 148.6 | 161:2 172:17 175:21 | University [2] 2:18 | 66:10,11,14,15 81:14 |
| thousand [3] 25:12 | traditional (1) 17.21 | Turks [18] 111:23 112:7 | 88:18 | 85:22 86:22,23 |
| 66:12,13 | traditionally 11 121.17 | 116:1 118:8 123:1,5,19 | unknown [2] 147:22,24 | 131.5 |
| thousands [3] 6:15 41:3 | train [5] 13.2 94.9 95.7 | 127:24 128:14 131:13,23 | 63·13 20 101·25 | valued [2] 19.23 20.24 |
| 41:7 | 158:10 159:2 | 132:17 135:2,21 134:5 | unreasonable (1) 76:23 | values [13] 7:4 8:21 |
| three [22] 4:20 6:6 14:19 | trained [2] 117:23 | turn [14] 1:23 15:7 | unrestricted (1) 157:24 | 15:22 18:11,16,22 38:25 |
| 40:14 68:8 89:19 112:20 | 166:11 | 107:17 110:4 122:24 | unsolicited [2] 153:12 | 51:22,24 57:10 65:25 |
| 113:20 114:7 115:20 | training [13] 94:5,5,15 | 126:4 149:14 153:10 | 153:16 | 76:787:7 |
| 123:3 149:15 156:21 | 94:19,19,22 95:3 104:1 | 159:23,24 166:16 168:16 | untoward [1] 26:1 | valuing [1] 18:15 |
| 16/:12 168:8,23 1/5:15 | 153:8 | turnover [1] 13.5 | up [45] 14:21 16:19,22 | |
| through (22) 2:20 15:15 | transcribed [1] 186:6 | $TV_{[1]}$ 145:22 | 25:9 48:12 60:24 61:6,7 | variability (2) 52-10-21 |
| 33:11 34:24 50:6 76:2.3 | transcript [2] 185:3 | twelve [2] 29:13 167:10 | 73:18 76:11 97:9 105:16 | variance $[10]$ 15:20 17:2 |
| 76:5,12,22 77:5 91:8 | 186:1 | two [28] 10:5 23:21 24:4 | 106:10 107:3 108:5 | 17:4 22:6.22.23 24:20 |
| 93:9 96:9 98:18 105:16 | transfer [5] 34:13 100:2 | 31:5 40:14 41:11 56:11 | 109:15,17 112:22 118:7 | 25:22 28:19 56:14 |
| 105:21,21,22 107:10 | 100:8,16 116:10 | 68:5,10,16 74:16 89:18 | 119:24 120:7,9,18,20 | variances [4] 24:4,5,16 |
| 136:21 137:6,12 145:17 | 70.7 | 91:6 97:7,17 112:8,20 | 143:6,13 148:2 149:15 | 24:16 |
| 148:9 149:21 151:13 | transferring 131 94.3 | 150:23 152:22 155:20 | 155:15 156:2 157:7 | variation [1] 163:22 |
| 153:8 156:25 163:8 | 99:19 100:20 | 160:6 171:6 175:15 178:6 | 159:24 162:1 165:16 | variations [1] 93:5 |
| throughout [1] 123:18 | transfers [1] 70:23 | two-thirds [1] 100:4 | uncoming (1) 01.14 | varieties [1] 7:25 |
| tie [1] 173:3 | transformer [2] 98:21 | type [12] 8:25 24:5 62:9 | upcoming[1] 91.14 | various [2] 40:1 113:15 |
| 75.25 76.1 8 9 12 | 100:18 | 92:1/115:111/:/118:1/ | unfront (1) 42.7 | vary [2] 12:10 84:8 |
| tierings [1] 76.12 | transformers [16] 98:2 | 138:9,24 | used [14] 9.24 28.9 29.10 | vast [1] 144:0 |
| tiers [4] 76:3.3.5.22 | 99:20.20.23.23 100:5.9 | types [8] 8:9 14:8,9 82:20 | 30:16 32:12 68:12 74:1 | vegetation [1] 140.15 |
| times [7] 62:8.16 112:20 | 100:9,11,23 | 129:8 143:6 161:6 180:21 | 80:12 82:1 84:7 97:10 | 140:13 |
| 114:19 118:3,6 144:2 | translate [2] 37:14 64:11 | typical [4] 14:17 152:25 | 116:18 144:7 162:10 | version [1] 20:17 |
| timing [4] 124:7 167:13 | translated [2] 5:19,20 | 160:5,11 | userul [1] 182:22 | versions [1] 70:3 |
| 167:24 172:16 | translates [1] 166:20 | 25.3 55.1 76.9 87.8 | uses [4] 4:3 /4:4 12/:5 128:20 | versus [7] 15:21 38:20 |
| title [7] 4:16,17,19 5:5,8 | translation [2] 130:13 | 140:15 | using 61 25.6 30.9 48.8 | 40:11 135:3 171:22 172:3 |
| 5:15 155:5 today (n. 17:24 10:24 | 130:19 | typos [2] 162:22,22 | 64:23 81:15,17 | 173:14 |
| 154:20 164:10 | transmission [3] 43:15 | | utilities [35] 8:7 12:17 | vertical [3] 43:8,11,18 |
| Todd's [1] 176:16 | transmitter (2) /3.1/ | -U- | 49:10 74:12 83:21 84:2 | vesting [1] 20:7 |
| together [6] 31:5 41:12 | 77:23 | Uh-hm [2] 67:6,11 | 84:7,15 91:6 111:5 | via [1] 12:20 |
| 155:10 175:23 184:11,15 | transmitting [2] 34:10 | ultimately [1] 38:18 | 117:6 120:7 121:7,17,20 | vice [5] 6:8,9 88:10 106:6 |
| tomorrow [2] 124:23 | 34:12 | Umm [1] 177:23 | 122:16 124:19 126:19,21 | VICE-CHAIR 161 |
| 185:14 | treated [1] 21:6 | under [14] 39:15 55:9 | 130:11,17,22 131:10 | 65:18,23 83:17 84:4,17 |
| too [2] 25:16 65:11 | trend [3] 25:8 96:4 171:6 | 83:9 84:14 91:6 122:25 | 149:6 157:9 160:6 186:4 | 86:7 |
| LOOK [4] 105:23 106:5 | trending [3] 109:23 | 126:5 130:5,22 131:11 | utility [14] 7:12 10:20 | vice-president [1] 6:8 |
| tool $[7]$ 4.3 20.5 6 11 | 144:14 152:13 | 183:4 | 49:4 63:14 74:8 76:14 | view [6] 119:15,17,23 |
| 30:9 41:8 45:9 | | underground [1] 153:2 | 77:20 113:25 115:5 125:4 | 120:1,1 128:11 |

Discoveries Unlimited Inc., Ph: (709)437-5028

| — | - | 1 | i | ** |
|--|----------------------------------|---|---|----|
| virtually [3] 9:14 10:8 | wonder [2] 122:24 128:9 | | | |
| 93:19 | wonderful [1] 42:5 | | | |
| virtue [2] 125:12 162:5 | words [5] 41:5 45:8 | | | |
| visiting [1] 104:5 | 85:23 121:8 170:13 | | | |
| visually [1] 63:6 | workers [2] 118:25 | | | |
| void [1] 161:2 | 151:8 | | | |
| voltage [2] 94:17,21 | workforce [23] 89:18 | | | |
| Volume [4] 1:11 107:19 | 92:12,15,23 93:1,2,16 | | | |
| 140:24 163:6 | 93:18,21 94:8 95:6 | | | |
| | 134.25 138.10 141.5 | | | |
| -W- | 162:13 163:9.12 164:9 | | | |
| | 165:9 | | | |
| | works [2] 6:25 23:15 | | | |
| wage-wise[1] 79:21 | world [7] 31:2 32:8 44:2 | | | |
| wages [1] 141:17 | 47:4 79:25 118:3 133:12 | | | |
| walt [2] 110:5 139:17 | worst [1] 114:16 | | | |
| walk [1] 105:15 | worth [1] 40:11 | | | |
| warrants [1] 31:7 | wrong [9] 9:10 10:21 | | | |
| watermark [1] 164:4 | 71:2 75:10,12,16 83:7 | | | |
| ways [8] 42:14 87:7 97:7 | 177:20,25 | | | |
| 101:25 134:17 135:23 | wrote [1] 85:17 | | | |
| 130:2 140:23 | | | | |
| weakening [1] 130:13 | -Y- | | | |
| weather [3] 126:18 | vear [52] 18:20 23 19:13 | | | |
| 14/:14,15 | 19:16 20:21 26:19 53:8 | | | |
| | 61:25 62:5 91:10 92:6 | | | |
| weeks [1] 114:24 | 92:16,23 94:23,24 98:24 | | | |
| weighted [3] 85:4,5,11 | 101:16,21 102:20,21 | | | |
| well-rounded [1] 151:9 | 103.3,0,13 104.19 122.0 | | | |
| west [3] 106:17 112:19 | 139:10 143:12 144:8 | | | |
| | 150:7,10,10,12 151:5 | | | |
| Western [4] 2:18 156:20 | 167:16,20,25 168:7,9,12 | | | |
| 100:15,19 | 168:20 169:21 170:10,14 | | | |
| WHALEIN [6] 65:18,23 | 1/2:24 1/9:8 183:23 | | | |
| whinning (1) 110-21 | year's [1] 19:23 | | | |
| who'yo (a) 169.22 24 | years [49] 2:25 10:5 | | | |
| who ve [2] 108:22,24 | 24.13 27.14 16 20 43.5 | | | |
| WHOIE [5] 14:11,25 43:17 141:20 158:12 | 60:16 61:1 69:21 77:6 | | | |
| wide (1) 06:15 | 90:14 92:9 93:8,22 94:20 | | | |
| | 95:3,16 96:5,8 97:2 | | | |
| willing (2), 14:2, 124:6, 10 | 98:22 99:1 100:23 105:21 | | | |
| winning [3] 14:2 124:0,10 | 114:22 125:25 155:25,25 | | | |
| | 148:9 151:9 155:7 157:22 | | | |
| windows [1] 90:9 | 158:2,4,6 161:4 164:1 | | | |
| winds [1] 119:21 | 166:24 171:7 | | | |
| windy [1] 147:14 | yet [3] 15:16 64:6 169:7 | | | |
| wings [1] 75:1 | young [2] 151:12,16 | | | |
| winter [2] 116:19 122:5 | | | | |
| wire [2] 144:12 145:21 | -Z- | | | |
| wires [5] 98:2,3 118:21 138:20 144:22 | Zero [4] 18:22 39:20 52:7 | | | |
| wish [3] 3:4 83:14 89:11 | 32:10 70000 (1) 110:5 | | | |
| wishes [1] 55:8 | LUIICS [1] 119:3 | | | |
| within [17] 20:10 24:18 | | | | |
| 46:14 49:18 61:12 70:20 | | | | |
| 71:15,22,23 72:8,11,19 | | | | |
| 74:10 77:24 117:6 119:6 | | | | |
| 150:24 without [6] 34.13 104.13 | | | | |
| 114:2,23 127:21 144:11 | | | | |
| witness [6] 1:8 73:15 | | | | |
| 81:11 88:4,4 181:14 | | | | |
| | | | | |