

1 Q. Certain proposed RSP changes, such as changes to the load variation component,
2 will ultimately impact Newfoundland Power and its customers. Given the lack of
3 evidence Hydro has provided with the Application related to these forecast impacts,
4 is it reasonable for the Board to approve the proposals on the Application on an
5 *interim* (as opposed to *final*) basis?
6
7

8 A. Hydro's proposed change to existing RSP rules relates to an alternate sharing
9 methodology advocated by Hydro for the load variation component of the plan.
10 Hydro has filed its recommended sharing of the load variation, including supporting
11 analysis, a number of times with the Board. Hydro's June 2006 RSP Report was filed
12 with the Board on June 30, 2006, again on June 30, 2009 and also on July 30, 2013
13 as part of the current RSP filing. This report includes a principled recommendation
14 of sharing the load variation component of the RSP proportionately among
15 customer classes based on energy, that is, in the same manner as the Cost of
16 Service treatment which was approved in February 1993.
17

18 There is also a new proposed section added to the RSP rules, Section E: RSP Surplus,
19 the purpose of which is to implement the Orders in Council of Government.
20 The evidence required to support these additional clauses in the RSP rules is
21 included in Hydro's filing.
22

23 Furthermore, please see the responses to PUB-NLH-1 and PUB-NLH-2 for Hydro's
24 position on interim approval.