

1 Q. In your Expert's report in Section 4: Industrial Customer Second Block Energy Rate,
2 page 16, you recognized that a second block energy rate set at marginal cost of
3 energy sends a price signal to customers to conserve electric energy. However, due
4 to Vale's load ramping up, you agree with Hydro that a second block not be
5 implemented for industrial customers. Do you agree that a single energy rate of 5.15
6 cents per kWh, if the marginal cost of energy is 15.37 cents per kWh, would provide
7 for the implementation of economically perverse energy price signals for all industrial
8 customers at this time and at least for the next several years? Please provide a
9 detailed explanation of your response.

10 A. As explained in PUB-V-002, I do not believe that a two block rate would be
11 economically efficient for new industrial customers which are starting up their
12 operations. When all industrial customers are at a stable production level, I believe
13 that a two block energy rate should be considered. I do note that the 2015 cost of
14 service (COS) lists the industrial firm energy rate at 5.15 ¢/kWh and the demand rate
15 at \$8.38/kW/month. (Exhibit 13, 2015 COS, Schedule 1.3, page 1 of 1, line 2).
16 Typically, the load factor (LF) for an industrial customer is high, in the range of 85%.
17 This means that in order for the energy to increase, the demand must also increase.
18 At these rates, the demand increase is 1.35¢/kWh¹, so the total cost for an extra
19 kWh of energy is 6.50¢.

20 At about the same time that all the industrial customers are in stable operation, the
21 Labrador in-feed will be coming on line. Although a marginal cost of energy has not
22 been completed for this scenario, the estimated generation cost at the time of the
23 Muskrat Falls review was 7.6 ¢/kWh (Muskrat Falls Review – Exhibit 36, page 2 of 2,
24 second paragraph). The difference between the marginal cost and the industrial
25 energy rate will diminish substantially.

¹ Calculation: (1 kW * \$8.38/kW/month * 12 months/yr * 100 ¢/\$) / (1 kW * 8760 hrs/year * 0.75 (LF))
= 1.35 ¢/kWh

1 Implementing a two block rate for the two industrial customers (CBPP and NARL) with
2 a stable production rate would not result in a transparent, easy to understand rate
3 and may be impossible to implement given the complexity of the rate stabilization
4 plan. Simplicity and understandability is one of Bonbright's attributes of a sound rate
5 structure².

² Reference: "Principles of Public Utility Rates", Bonbright, Danielsens, Kamerschen, 1988, page 384, item 9.