Q.	Mcshane Evidence –
----	--------------------

1	Q.	Mcsł	shane Evidence –			
2 3		a.	Can Ms. McShane review her answers to the information requests she			
4			provided to the Consumer Advocate in May this year and indicate whether			
5			she would change any of her answers and if so provide the changed response			
6		b.	Can Ms. McShane provide a concordance between her current testimony and			
7			that filed for the 2012 Cost of Capital Application, that is, provide a table			
8			showing in each case how her recommended ROE was determined and the			
9			values used and the basic macroeconomic and financial factors used to derive			
10			her estimates. At a minimum this should include:			
11			a) Ms. McShane's use of a forecast long Canada bond yield			
12			b) A forecast of an A bond yield cost.			
13			c) Key macroeconomic factors, such as GDP growth etc.			
14			d) Her financial parameters such as relative risk (beta) coefficients,			
15			market risk premium, flotation cost allowance etc.			
16			e) The values used for her DCF risk premium and direct DCF estimates			
1/ 10		_	etc.			
18		c.	If the Board decided to continue with a variation of its KOE adjustment model how would Mg. MaShana recommand they adjust the ovisting BOE			
19 20			model?			
20 21			model:			
$\frac{21}{22}$	А	а	Ms_McShane's responses to the RFIs in the 2012 Cost of Capital Proceeding			
23		u	were based on the information and data she had at the time. She has reviewed her			
24			responses to those RFIs in that context, and is not aware of any changes that			
25			would be warranted.			
26						
27		b.	The requested concordance is attached as "CA-NP-365 b Attachment 1.xls".			
28						
29		c.	The persistently unsettled capital markets, the abnormally low long-term Canada			
30			bond yields and the unstable relationships between the utility cost of equity and			
31			Government bond yields make it difficult to construct an ROE automatic			
32			adjustment mechanism at this time that would successfully capture changes in the			
33			utility cost of equity. She recommends that the PUB adopt a constant ROE until			
34			Newfoundland Power's next GRA and re-consider at that time whether a formula			
35			should be re-implemented and how it should be constructed.			

Requested Concordance

CA-NP-365b

		<u>March 2012</u>		September 2012	
Equity Risk Premium Tests:					
Forecast 30-Year Canada bond yield	3.25%-3.5%		3.50%		
Forecast Long-Term A rated Utility Bond yield	4.80%		5.05%		
Risk-Adjusted Market Risk Premium Test:					
Market Risk Premium		8.0%		8.0%	
Relative Risk Adjustment		0.65-0.70		0.65-0.70	
Bare Bones Cost of Equity		8.8%		8.9%	
DCF Based Cost of Equity:					
Constant Growth:					
One variable (Long-term Gov't bond yields)		9.6%		9.6%	
Two variable (Long-term Gov't bond yields and spreads)		9.6%		9.7%	
One variable (Utility Bond Yields)		9.1%		9.3%	
Three-Stage Growth :					
One variable (Long-term Gov't bond yields)		9.6%		9.6%	
Two variable (Long-term Gov't bond yields and spreads)		9.6%		9.6%	
One variable (Utility Bond Yields)	9.4%			<u>9.5%</u>	
DCF-Based Risk Premium Test Result:		9.5%		9.5%	
Historic Utility Risk Premium:					
Utility Risk Premium over Forecast long Canada	6.75%			6.75%	
Utility Cost of Equity		10.0%-10.25%		10.25%	
Average of Risk Premium Tests (Before Financing Flexibility)		9.5%		9.6%	
DCF Cost of Equity Tests:	Average	<u>Median</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Median</u>	
U.S. Utilities:					
Constant Growth:					
Analysts' Forecasts	9.4%	9.3%	9.4%	9.4%	
Sustainable Growth	8.7%	8.6%	8.8%	8.5%	
Three-Stage:	4.00/		1.00/		
GDP Growth Rate	4.9%		4.9%		
Infee-Stage Growth	9.2% 9.1%		9.2% 9.1%		
U.S. Utilities DCF	9.0%		9.1%		
Canadian Utilities:					
Constant Growin	11 70/	11 60/	11.20/	10.00/	
Analysis Forecasis	11./%	11.0%	11.2%	10.9%	
<u>Infee-Stage</u> CDD Grouth		1 10/	4.5	20/	
Three Stage Growth	8 704	4.470 Q Q0/	9 50/	970 970/	
Canadian Utilities DCF	10 25%		0.570 0.770		
Canadian United DCF		0.5%		9.070	
DCF: US and Canadian Utilities		9.370		9.4%	
(Equal Weight to Disk Promium and DCF)		9.5%	9.5	0 70	
(Equal Weight to KISK Freihlund and DUF) Financing Flavibility		0.5% 1.5%		1.6%	
r mancing r textolity Decommonded DOF		0.3%-1.3% 10 59/		10.5%	
Alternative Annuage	L	10.5 /0	10.	570	
Rick Dramium and DCE "Data Danas Cost"		0 50/		0.5%	
Financing Flevibility	9. <i>3</i> % 0.5%		9.5%		
Thialong Flexibility Markat Recod Tasts DOF		0.3% 10.0%		0.3% 10.0%	
Comparable Farnings		11 25%-12 0%		11 0%-12 0%	
Alternative Approach ROE:		10.5%		5%	
75%/25% market based tests/ Comparable Earnings			200		
г					