

1 Q. Please compare the results obtained in PUB-NLH-17 to those obtained in Vale-NLH-
2 4.

3

4

5 A. Please see the attached schedules. The difference between the class allocation to
6 NP and the IC using the proposed RSP methodology compared with the Cost of
7 Service is a result of the allocation of the other Test Year energy costs. Using the
8 Cost of Service study, the assumed load changes for each scenario reallocate these
9 other Test Year costs, while the RSP does not.

Comparison of PUB-NLH-17 to V-NLH-4
Scenario (i): Current forecast load for both NP and IC for 2014 to 2016

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Line No		Sales Variance (kWh) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 1, Col B	Firm Energy Rate (\$/kWh)	Increase (Decrease) in Revenue (\$) Col A x Col B	Existing Methodology		Proposed Methodology		Cost of Service Increase (Decrease) in Revenue Requirement (\$) V-NLH-4 Attachment 2, Col C
					Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 1, Col F	Total Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class (\$) Col C + Col D	Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 1, Col G	Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class Before Rural Deficit (\$) Col C + Col F	
2014									
1	Utility	145,900,000	0.10400	15,173,600	10,568,691	25,742,291	29,704,604	44,878,204	45,307,573
2	Industrial Customers	191,200,000	0.04782	9,143,184	24,591,744	33,734,928	3,102,833	12,246,017	13,332,197
2015									
3	Utility	198,200,000	0.10400	20,612,800	14,357,193	34,969,993	50,478,249	71,091,049	71,739,178
4	Industrial Customers	363,900,000	0.04782	17,401,698	46,804,057	64,205,755	6,730,143	24,131,841	26,217,962
2016									
5	Utility	264,100,000	0.10400	27,466,400	19,130,852	46,597,252	72,620,995	100,087,395	100,532,210
6	Industrial Customers	551,200,000	0.04782	26,358,384	70,894,191	97,252,575	11,895,246	38,253,630	41,821,196

Comparison of PUB-NLH-17 to V-NLH-4

Scenario (ii): 100 GHW load reduction for IC for 2014 to 2016 and current forecast load for NP for 2014 to 2016

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Line No		Sales Variance (kWh) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 1, Col B	Firm Energy Rate (\$/kWh)	Increase (Decrease) in Revenue (\$) Col A x Col B	Existing Methodology		Proposed Methodology		Cost of Service
					Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 2, Col F	Total Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class (\$) Col C + Col D	Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 2, Col G	Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class Before Rural Deficit (\$) Col C + Col F	Increase (Decrease) in Revenue Requirement (\$) V-NLH-4 Attachment 3, Col C
2014									
1	Utility	145,900,000	0.10400	15,173,600	10,568,691	25,742,291	19,119,976	34,293,576	34,384,310
2	Industrial Customers	91,200,000	0.04782	4,361,184	11,729,953	16,091,137	1,664,113	6,025,297	6,825,143
2015									
3	Utility	198,200,000	0.10400	20,612,800	14,357,193	34,969,993	40,439,208	61,052,008	61,487,800
4	Industrial Customers	263,900,000	0.04782	12,619,698	33,942,266	46,561,964	4,693,531	17,313,229	18,978,555
2016									
5	Utility	264,100,000	0.10400	27,466,400	19,130,852	46,597,252	63,114,765	90,581,165	90,953,769
6	Industrial Customers	451,200,000	0.04782	21,576,384	58,032,400	79,608,784	9,260,797	30,837,181	33,847,457

Comparison of PUB-NLH-17 to V-NLH-4

Scenario (iii): 100 GHW load reduction for NP for 2014 to 2016 and current forecast load for IC for 2014 to 2016

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Line No		Sales Variance (kWh) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 1, Col B	Firm Energy Rate (\$/kWh)	Increase (Decrease) in Revenue (\$) Col A x Col B	Existing Methodology		Proposed Methodology		Cost of Service Increase (Decrease) in Revenue Requirement (\$) V-NLH-4 Attachment 4, Col C
					Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 3, Col F	Total Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class (\$) Col C + Col D	Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 3, Col G	Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class Before Rural Deficit (\$) Col C + Col F	
2014									
1	Utility	45,900,000	0.10400	4,773,600	3,324,900	8,098,500	23,520,122	28,293,722	29,074,529
2	Industrial Customers	191,200,000	0.04782	9,143,184	24,591,744	33,734,928	2,500,384	11,643,568	12,134,924
2015									
3	Utility	98,200,000	0.10400	10,212,800	7,113,403	17,326,203	44,363,601	54,576,401	55,708,373
4	Industrial Customers	363,900,000	0.04782	17,401,698	46,804,057	64,205,755	6,018,798	23,420,496	24,757,982
2016									
5	Utility	164,100,000	0.10400	17,066,400	11,887,061	28,953,461	66,554,166	83,620,566	84,681,112
6	Industrial Customers	551,200,000	0.04782	26,358,384	70,894,191	97,252,575	11,090,820	37,449,204	40,120,114

Comparison of PUB-NLH-17 to V-NLH-4

Scenario (iv): 100 GHW load increase for IC for 2014 to 2016 and current forecast load for NP for 2014 to 2016

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Line No		Sales Variance (kWh) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 1, Col B	Firm Energy Rate (\$/kWh)	Increase (Decrease) in Revenue (\$) Col A x Col B	Existing Methodology Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 4, Col F	Total Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class (\$) Col C + Col D	Proposed Methodology Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 4, Col G	Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class Before Rural Deficit (\$) Col C + Col F	Cost of Service Increase (Decrease) in Revenue Requirement (\$) V-NLH-4 Attachment 5, Col C
2014									
1	Utility	145,900,000	0.10400	15,173,600	10,568,691	25,742,291	39,982,186	55,155,786	55,876,485
2	Industrial Customers	291,200,000	0.04782	13,925,184	37,453,535	51,378,719	4,872,920	18,798,104	20,221,214
2015									
3	Utility	198,200,000	0.10400	20,612,800	14,357,193	34,969,993	60,235,231	80,848,031	81,666,317
4	Industrial Customers	463,900,000	0.04782	22,183,698	59,665,848	81,849,546	9,070,901	31,254,599	33,806,646
2016									
5	Utility	264,100,000	0.10400	27,466,400	19,130,852	46,597,252	81,868,987	109,335,387	109,815,836
6	Industrial Customers	651,200,000	0.04782	31,140,384	83,755,982	114,896,366	14,807,521	45,947,905	50,112,260

Comparison of PUB-NLH-17 to V-NLH-4

Scenario (v): 100 GHW load increase for NP for 2014 to 2016 and current forecast load for IC for 2014 to 2016

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Line No		Sales Variance (kWh) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 1, Col B	Firm Energy Rate (\$/kWh)	Increase (Decrease) in Revenue (\$) Col A x Col B	Existing Methodology		Proposed Methodology		Cost of Service Increase (Decrease) in Revenue Requirement (\$) V-NLH-4 Attachment 6, Col C
					Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 5, Col F	Total Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class (\$) Col C + Col D	Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 5, Col G	Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class Before Rural Deficit (\$) Col C + Col F	
2014									
1	Utility	245,900,000	0.10400	25,573,600	17,812,482	43,386,082	35,919,814	61,493,414	61,605,245
2	Industrial Customers	191,200,000	0.04782	9,143,184	24,591,744	33,734,928	3,687,805	12,830,989	14,492,454
2015									
3	Utility	298,200,000	0.10400	31,012,800	21,600,984	52,613,784	56,624,621	87,637,421	87,838,256
4	Industrial Customers	363,900,000	0.04782	17,401,698	46,804,057	64,205,755	7,421,501	24,823,199	27,634,707
2016									
5	Utility	364,100,000	0.10400	37,866,400	26,374,642	64,241,042	78,719,795	116,586,195	116,454,113
6	Industrial Customers	551,200,000	0.04782	26,358,384	70,894,191	97,252,575	12,677,819	39,036,203	43,473,983

**Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro
Comparison of PUB-NLH-17 to V-NLH-4**

**V-NLH-5
Attachment 6**

Scenario (vi): 100 GHW load increase for both NP and IC for 2014 to 2016

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Line No		Sales Variance (kWh) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 1, Col B	Firm Energy Rate (\$/kWh)	Increase (Decrease) in Revenue (\$) Col A x Col B	Existing Methodology		Proposed Methodology		Cost of Service
					Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 6, Col F	Total Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class (\$) Col C + Col D	Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 6, Col G	Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class Before Rural Deficit (\$) Col C + Col F	Increase (Decrease) in Revenue Requirement (\$) V-NLH-4 Attachment 7, Col C
2014									
1	Utility	245,900,000	0.10400	25,573,600	17,812,482	43,386,082	46,145,484	71,719,084	72,035,517
2	Industrial Customers	291,200,000	0.04782	13,925,184	37,453,535	51,378,719	5,527,787	19,452,971	21,546,537
2015									
3	Utility	298,200,000	0.10400	31,012,800	21,600,984	52,613,784	66,339,467	97,352,267	97,642,734
4	Industrial Customers	463,900,000	0.04782	22,183,698	59,665,848	81,849,546	9,820,605	32,004,303	35,370,047
2016									
5	Utility	364,100,000	0.10400	37,866,400	26,374,642	64,241,042	87,934,487	125,800,887	125,630,235
6	Industrial Customers	651,200,000	0.04782	31,140,384	83,755,982	114,896,366	15,637,651	46,778,035	51,894,155

Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro
Comparison of PUB-NLH-17 to V-NLH-4

V-NLH-5
Attachment 7

Scenario (vii): 100 GHW load reduction for both NP and IC for 2014 to 2016

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Line No		Sales Variance (kWh) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 1, Col B	Firm Energy Rate (\$/kWh)	Increase (Decrease) in Revenue (\$) Col A x Col B	Existing Methodology		Proposed Methodology		Cost of Service Increase (Decrease) in Revenue Requirement (\$) V-NLH-4 Attachment 8, Col C
					Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 7, Col F	Total Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class (\$) Col C + Col D	Load Variation (\$) PUB-NLH-17 Attachment 7, Col G	Increase (Decrease) to Customer Class Before Rural Deficit (\$) Col C + Col F	
2014									
1	Utility	45,900,000	0.10400	4,773,600	3,324,900	8,098,500	12,876,243	17,649,843	17,999,806
2	Industrial Customers	91,200,000	0.04782	4,361,184	11,729,953	16,091,137	1,140,557	5,501,741	5,808,199
2015									
3	Utility	98,200,000	0.10400	10,212,800	7,113,403	17,326,203	34,276,281	44,489,081	45,323,373
4	Industrial Customers	263,900,000	0.04782	12,619,698	33,942,266	46,561,964	4,048,124	16,667,822	17,678,338
2016									
5	Utility	164,100,000	0.10400	17,066,400	11,887,061	28,953,461	57,009,547	74,075,947	74,985,910
6	Industrial Customers	451,200,000	0.04782	21,576,384	58,032,400	79,608,784	8,510,247	30,086,631	32,286,601