

1 **Q. (response to CA-NP 65) "Based upon the limited information provided it appears**  
2 **that reliability performance for the two utilities is similar", and "It appears to**  
3 **Newfoundland Power that the development of the Delaware Standard was a specific**  
4 **and considered regulatory response to a perceived risk (i.e., underinvestment) to**  
5 **distribution reliability which resulted from industry restructuring in the State of**  
6 **Delaware." Given that NP performance is similar to Delaware, are additional**  
7 **expenditures by NP to improve reliability performance justified? Does NP believe**  
8 **that there is a point at which additional expenditures on reliability improvements**  
9 **may exceed the value consumers place on improved reliability or does NP have**  
10 **information that its customers are willing to spend any amount for reliability**  
11 **improvement? If so, please provide the information.**

12  
13 A. Newfoundland Power observes that Delmarva Power's 2006 *transmission and*  
14 *distribution* capital costs of \$86 million were well in excess of Newfoundland Power's  
15 *total* 2006 capital costs.<sup>1</sup>

16  
17 The majority of Newfoundland Power's annual capital expenditure is required to replace  
18 aging plant which is at the end of its useful service life although the expenditure will  
19 have a general tendency to improve overall system reliability.

20  
21 Additional capital expenditures by Newfoundland Power, such as those undertaken under  
22 the Distribution Reliability Initiative, are aimed at targeted improvement in distribution  
23 reliability performance and will continue to be proposed where justified to ensure  
24 reasonable reliability levels for Newfoundland Power's customers.<sup>2</sup>

25  
26 While Newfoundland Power expects that customers are not "...willing to spend any  
27 amount for reliability improvement...", it expects that targeted capital expenditure on  
28 distribution feeders exhibiting forced outages far above the system average will continue  
29 to be justified based upon sound engineering analysis and the reasonable expectations of  
30 the customers served by those feeders.<sup>3</sup>

31  
32 Please refer to the responses to CA-NP-68 and CA-NP-69.

---

<sup>1</sup> This observation indicates the caution required in direct comparisons to the cost/reliability relationship in Delaware with that in Newfoundland as is implied by this request for information. Newfoundland Power does not intend it to imply that the fact that Delmarva Power expends significantly more on transmission and distribution justifies any greater, or different, expenditure by Newfoundland Power.

<sup>2</sup> All such expenditures require the prior approval of the Board under the provisions of the *Public Utilities Act*. Section 3 (b) (ii) of the *Electrical Power Control Act, 1994* requires electrical facilities to be managed and operated in a manner that results in *equitable* consumer access to power.

<sup>3</sup> The poorest performing distribution feeders in Newfoundland Power's system currently exhibit forced outages 3 to 5 times the system average.