

1 Q. (Re: Pre-filed Testimony of P. Bowman and H. Najmidinov, page 37, lines 23  
2 to 27). Please explain how a marginal cost based rate or a two block rate  
3 would be made obsolete by the Labrador in-feed, and how such rate  
4 designs would exacerbate rate pressures if the rates were designed to  
5 collect the same revenue requirement.

6 A. In practical terms, the current GRA seeks to impose rate increases on the  
7 industrial customers, over the period from 2013 to 2015, that range from  
8 approximately 60% to 120%<sup>1</sup>. This degree of increase is, under any reasonable  
9 definition, unacceptable rate shock and would lead to significant cost pressures  
10 for each of the industrial customers compared to past and current experience.  
11 While the concurrent implementation of a two block rate based on Holyrood  
12 marginal cost (17.6 cents/kW.h) would not increase the overall cost pressures, it  
13 would be expected to increase the incentives and pressures on the customers to  
14 find measures, possibly extraordinary measures, to reduce loads.

15 Under the current rate design, an industrial customer operating at an 85% load  
16 factor faces a practical marginal cost of 6.253 cents/kW.h<sup>2</sup>. As provided by Hydro  
17 in response to CA-NLH-033, the marginal cost of energy following a Labrador  
18 infeed could fall to the 5.4 cents/kW.h level [compared to 17.6 cents/kW.h in  
19 2013] after interconnection is completed and Holyrood generation would no  
20 longer be the incremental cost for the system.

21 The implementation of a two block rate, as a short-term solution at this time,  
22 would act as a price signal in concert with the current rate pressures to incent  
23 behavior (including potentially long-term commitments) that would be  
24 economically inefficient within a short period of time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix E and F of the Hydro's July 30, 2013 RSP filing.

<sup>2</sup> Please see PUB-IC-3.