| 1  | Q. | Reference: Evidence on Rate Stabilization Plan – Surplus Refund Plan                          |
|----|----|---|
| 2  |    | Please provide an explanation that could explain to Customer A why no refund is               |
| 3  |    | being provided in the following circumstances given the RSP Surplus amount                    |
| 4  |    | accumulated over the period January 2007 to August 31st, 2013.                                |
| 5  |    | Customer A owns a fish plant that operated continuously for the period January                |
| 6  |    | 2007 to December 2012. Due to changes in the industry, Customer A shut down                   |
| 7  |    | operations completely in December 2012 to complete renovations on the facility to             |
| 8  |    | be able to process a different product. Customer A reopened the facility in January           |
| 9  |    | 2014. However Customer A had no usage in 2013.  |
| 10 |    |   |
| 11 |    |   |
| 12 | A. | Based on the assumption that the hearing into the matter of the NP RSP Surplus is             |
| 13 |    | completed and after having received all the evidence and hearing all the parties'             |
| 14 |    | arguments, Board approval is received to refund customer's based on Hydro's                   |
| 15 |    | proposed methodology, an explanation to customers could be comprised of the                   |
| 16 |    | following points:   |
| 17 |    | • Since 1986, RSP amounts have always been collected from, or paid to,                        |
| 18 |    | customers who are currently on the system [Evidence, page 8];                                 |
| 19 |    | <ul> <li>RSP rules give primary consideration to rate class rather than</li> </ul>            |
| 20 |    | individual customers [Evidence, page 9];  |
| 21 |    | <ul> <li>In 2003, a similar size RSP balance (\$115 million) was owing from retail</li> </ul> |
| 22 |    | customers and was collected over future consumption and not from                              |
| 23 |    | customers who had benefited from the fuel usage [Evidence, page 10];                          |
| 24 |    | <ul> <li>A refund based on historical consumption over a seven-year period</li> </ul>         |
| 25 |    | would likely be time consuming and costly and reduce the amount to                            |
| 26 |    | be paid to customers [Evidence, page 11];   |

## Page 2 of 2

| 1  | <ul> <li>There is no accurate method to refund customers since even using</li> </ul>  |
|----|---|
| 2  | historical consumption it will likely be determined that some                         |
| 3  | customers have left the system and will not be able to be located                     |
| 4  | [Evidence, page 12];  |
| 5  | <ul> <li>In every known instance in other jurisdictions having a fuel</li> </ul>      |
| 6  | mechanism, variances are collected from or refunded to customers                      |
| 7  | based on future consumption [Lummus, page 3];   |
| 8  | <ul> <li>In 2001 and 2003 Newfoundland Power provided rebates to customers</li> </ul> |
| 9  | based on a prospective basis [Lummus, page 3]; and                                    |
| 10 | The refund methodology was the subject of a public hearing process                    |
| 11 | and has been approved by the Board.   |
| 12 |   |
| 13 | Since Newfoundland Power has the vast majority of retail customers in the             |
| 14 | Province, Hydro anticipates that a coordinated effort between Newfoundland            |
| 15 | Power and Hydro to develop appropriate customer information and a                     |
| 16 | communication plan once a refund methodology and time frame has been                  |
| 17 | approved by the Board.  |