

1 Q. Nalcor's Submission to the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities with respect
2 to the Reference from the Lieutenant-Governor in Council on the Muskrat Falls
3 Project p. 27 of 159 states:

4
5 "Nalcor has not directly considered a sensitivity case to gauge the impact of CDM
6 on the CPW for the Interconnected Island alternative because, in such an instance,
7 NLH would have opportunities to monetize any conserved energy through short
8 term sales into regional export markets."

9
10 The Terms of Reference and Reference Question specifically states:

11
12 "The Board shall assume that any power from the Projects which is in excess of the
13 needs of the Province is not monetized or utilized."

14
15 Could Nalcor indicate the sensitivity of the CPW under various Energy Conservation
16 Scenarios? For example: Upper Achievable Estimate of 951 GWh, Lower Achievable
17 Estimate of 556 GWh, and 750 GWh per year by 2031, as per p.26 of 159 of the
18 submission. Please indicate the change in PPA rate of Muskrat Falls sourced energy,
19 as a result of conservation.

20
21 A. Nalcor has provided representative CDM sensitivity analyses in its Submission to the
22 Board for 375 GWh and 750 GWh by 2031. The CPW preferences of \$1,711 million
23 and \$1,283 million respectively are presented in Table 29 Revision 1 in Nalcor's
24 Submission.

25
26 As indicated in Nalcor's response to PUB-Nalcor-149, annual payments under the
27 PPA were assumed not to change in Nalcor's DG2 analysis.