| 1 | Q. | Further to the response to Requests for Information SR-NP-NLH-042, did Hydro's |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | experience in distributing the Wabush refund to customers provide any assistance |
| 3 | | in developing Hydro's proposal to refund the Newfoundland Power RSP Surplus? In |
| 4 | | the response, please explain how the experiences gained from disposition of the |
| 5 | | Wabush refund are reflected in the Newfoundland Power RSP Surplus refund |
| 6 | | proposal. |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | A. | When reviewing past refund practices in Newfoundland and Labrador, as described |
| 10 | | in the Supplemental Evidence filed by Lummus Consultants as part of the current |
| 11 | | filing, the Wabush experience was considered. On Page 7 of the Lummus Evidence, |
| 12 | | it is stated "This case is supportive of Hydro's proposed refund method in that it |
| 13 | | recognizes the administrative difficulties that would be encountered in going back |
| 14 | | from 1989 to 2001 in order to achieve perfect equity among customers." |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | The experience gained from the disposition of the Wabush refund highlights the |
| 17 | | importance of proactively communicating to customers the options considered by |
| 18 | | the Board, the reasons for the decision and its finality. Please also refer to Hydro's |
| 19 | | response to SR-NP-NLH-063. |