

1 Q. Reference: Refurbish Generation Unit – Snook’s Arm, Volume I, Section D,
2 Page D-51

3 *“There have been no replacements of major components on the generating unit.*
4 *In 2006 the wooden stave penstock was replaced with a steel penstock, the total*
5 *cost of the penstock replacement was \$ 2.2 million dollars.”*

6 Using a net present value analysis, what was the levelized cost of energy (¢ per kWh
7 basis) over a 50 year term for the life extension of Snook’s Arm hydro plant brought
8 about by the replacement of the penstock in 2006.

9

10

11 A. Please refer to Hydro’s response to NP-NLH-020.

12

13 Also, as noted in Hydro’s response to NP-NLH-018 Attachment 1 (*Report Addendum*
14 *- Snook’s Arm Wood Stave Penstock - Update of Economic Analysis - July 14 2005*)
15 and NP-NLH-018 Attachment 2 (*Snook’s Arm Wood Stave Penstock – Evaluation,*
16 *Recommendation and Estimated Cost for Replacement – January 26 2004*), this
17 project was not justified on the basis of comparisons of levelized cost of energy, but
18 on the basis of cumulative present worth (CPW) analysis of alternatives.