

1 Q. (Reference Schedule 1, page 6) It is stated “*Hydro considered the following alternatives: Project*
2 *deferral; and Construct and install Ultra-Fast DCFCs.*” Why is the “do nothing” alternative not
3 included in the analysis? Specifically, please provide a benefit-cost analysis for the project where
4 the alternative is not doing it.

5
6
7 A. This project is 90% funded by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador (“Government”),
8 consistent with their Climate Change Mitigation Action Plan.¹ Ratepayers will not be required to
9 fund this project.

10 If Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (“Hydro”) was unable to proceed with this project, it is
11 reasonable to assume that the Government would seek another partner to deliver charging
12 infrastructure to meet its stated Climate Change Mitigation objectives. Hydro’s involvement
13 ensures this project can proceed with the least impact on the electrical system as discussed in
14 Hydro’s response to PUB-NLH-007 of this proceeding; therefore, Hydro did not consider a “do
15 nothing” alternative as a viable alternative.

¹ See Hydro’s response to CA-NLH-011 of this proceeding.