1	Q.	Documentation is requested on which modules of Ventyx Strategist Software we			
2		used to derive the CPW? Please identify the 'objective functions' used as input and			
3		the parameters and weights given to each of the objective functions. If more than			
4		one module was used, please elaborate on how these objectives are tied together.			
5		What sensitivities were run relative to the base case and what were the results of			
6		the sensitivity runs? Please explain how the transmission capabilities, transfer			
7		limits and any system operating constraints were factored into the model.			
8					
9					
10	A.	The Ventyx Strategist modules used to derive the CPW were:			
11		(1) Load Forecast Adjustment (LFA)			
12		(2) Generation and Fuel (GAF)			
13		(3) Capital Expenditure and Recovery (CER)			
14		(4) PROVIEW (PRV)			
15		Please see CE- 50 (Strategist Module Documentation) for more detail.			
16					
17		The chosen resource plans (generation expansion plans) were selected on the			
18		minimization of revenue requirement, modeled as the "minimization of utility cost"			
19		objective function. As there was only one objective function used, its weighting			
20		was 100 per cent. There were no objectives tied together as only one objective			
21		function was used.			
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					

Sensitivities were run on capital, fuel and load and the results are summarized in the table below. Details of the sensitivities are provided in Exhibit 43.

3

1

2

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR HYDRO 2010 Generation Expansion Analysis

	Cumulative Present Worth (\$ M)			
	Isolated Island	Labrador Interconnection	Difference	Base Case Difference
Base Case: October 2010	8,810	6,652	2,158	
Fuel Sensitivities:				
Fuel Costs Decreased by 44%	6,134	6,134	(0)	(2,158)
Fuel Costs: PIRA Low	6,221	6,100	120	(2,038)
Fuel Costs: PIRA High	12,822	7,348	5,474	3,316
Fuel Costs: May 2011 Forecast	9,695	6,889	2,806	648
Capital Sensitivities:				
Labrador-Island Link Capital Costs Adjusted by +25%	8,810	7,050	1,760	(398)
Muskrat Falls Capital Costs Adjusted by +25%	8,810	7,229	1,581	(577)
Muskrat Falls and LIL Capital Costs Adjusted by +25%	8,810	7,627	1,183	(975)
Load Sensitivites:				
Annual Load Decrease of 880 GWh	6,625	6,624	1	(2,157)
Reduce Annual Percentage Load Growth by 50% post 2014	7,380	6,628	752	(1,406)

4 5

In general, transmission capabilities, transfer limits and any system operating
constraints were not directly factored into the model. However, the transmission
capabilities and transfer limits for the HVdc link connecting Muskrat Falls to the

9 Island grid were modeled.