

1    **Q.    [InterGroup Consultants Evidence, page 36, line 30 to page 37, line 16]**

2            **In Order No. P.U. 47 (2014), the Board approved Hydro's proposal to revise its**  
3            **Utility Rate, on an interim basis, to include a revised calculation of billing demand**  
4            **to reflect a curtailable credit for the period December 1, 2014 to March 31, 2015.**

5            **Please explain how approval on a final basis of the interim changes to Hydro's**  
6            **Utility Rate in Order No. P.U. 47 (2014) would impact each of the issues raised by**  
7            **InterGroup in this section of its testimony.**

8    **A.**

9            A decision by the Board to crystallize the credit to NP via its rate schedule (whether  
10           these loads were curtailed or not) would eliminate the recommendations at page 26 line  
11           34 to page 37 line 16 (which propose an alternative, preferred solution).

12           Such a decision would not change the recommendations at page 37 lines 17-27  
13           regarding the treatment of NP's Curtailable Load in the Cost of Service study. This is  
14           because the PUB did not provide any direction in its order with respect to approaches to  
15           including the Curtailable Load in the Cost of Service study.

16           Please see response to NLH-IC-10 for a further discussion of the issues involved.