Date: 10/6/2010 12:47:11 PM From: "Collins, Gerard"

To: "Thompson, Robert", "Parsons, Paul O", "Newhook, Vanessa"

Cc: "Bown, Charles W." Subject: RE: Data Access

Robert

We will amend the list of questions to reflect the focused comparison.

Gerard

From: Thompson, Robert
Sent: October 6, 2010 12:27 PM
To: Parsons, Paul O; Newhook, Vanessa
Cc: Collins, Gerard; Bown, Charles W.
Subject: RE: Data Access

Thanks. The questions look to be comprehensive. However, I don't think you need to interrogate all the cases. Case 1 and one other case (whichever one is the MF/Island Link/spill case) are the only two cases that need to be examined. This allows us to focus directly in on the comparison between lowest cost isolated Island case and the barebones Island Link case.

Robert

From: Parsons, Paul O

Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 2010 11:49 AM **To:** Thompson, Robert; Newhook, Vanessa

Cc: Collins, Gerard **Subject:** FW: Data Access

Hello again,

In the interest that you may not be able to open email attachments with Blackberries, the info request/questions are copied and pasted below.

Paul

Information Request / Questions:

- 1. For Cases 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C:
 - a) Please provide more case description including the schedule of new supply and further detail on the cost estimates for new generation and transmission infrastructure. As well, can Nalcor provide information related to potential costs variances for generation and transmission. How recent are the cost estimates for the case scenarios?
 - b) Please provide the applicable load forecast with assumptions. Also, provide the load forecast table with schedule of new supply and retirements.
 - c) In this analysis, were options to decrease demand through conservation and energy efficiency taken into account (may offset some of the need for new power)? If so, can Nalcor provide more discussion on how this was considered and incorporated into the scenarios?
 - d) Please provide more detail on the approach, analysis and calculations in support of the case scenarios results (reported on Slides 12-16) including operational data, costs (capital, operating and variable costs including transmission tariffs/costs and fuel costs where applicable), market and financial inputs & parameters, any other input assumptions and all other necessary cash flows, revenue requirements and financial/project analysis in support of the case scenarios results.
 - e) On Slide 13, can Nalcor clarify the output parameter "CPW" (cumulative present worth?) and its calculation? Clarification on the parameter "Bump Value" and its calculation. Clarification on the parameter "Cost-out to Lingan", its calculation and interpretation.
 - On Slide 13, can Nalcor clarify the units in the output table? Is it million Cdn\$?
 - g) On Slide 13, are these unleveraged project level NPV results and what investments (both generation & transmission?) have been included in the calculation? What are the project IRRs for these scenarios? Can the IRRs and NPVs be provided for both generation and transmission investments? (related to 1d request above)
 - h) Can Nalcor outline if and how it has incorporated the impact of any federal and/or provincial environmental mitigation strategies in its load forecast and supply analysis?

2. For Case 1:

- a) Have other future Island isolated supply scenario options (offshore natural gas, Island hydro, any others) been considered and analyzed and, if so, can Nalcor provide the inputs, analysis and results for comparison to the case scenarios presented.
- b) Can Nalcor break out the fuel costs component in the revenue requirement analysis for the isolated island case scenario?
- c) What are the crude oil price and fuel oil price assumptions? What is the probability associated with this oil price forecast? Is there an alternate(s) including lower oil price scenarios that have been considered and if so, can Nalcor provide the inputs, analysis and results?
- d) Given the long time horizons, does the oil price/fuel costs outlook contain any leveling off/consideration to account for new generation technologies, reduced consumption, etc. Is there a reasonable improved technology case (with reduced costs and improved efficiencies) that has been (or could be) considered for the Island isolated scenario given the long term horizon of the analysis? If so, can Nalcor provide the inputs, analysis and results?
- e) In this analysis, were options/technologies to improve dispatchability of intermittent sources taken into account, which if available, may offset some of the need for new power?
- f) In this analysis, were options to decrease demand through conservation and energy efficiency taken into account (may offset some of the need for new power)? If so, can Nalcor provide more discussion on how this was considered and incorporated into the scenarios?
- g) Could there be benefit in considering the construction of a Maritime link for purposes of purchasing power (and selling power) to Nova Scotia, but no connection to Labrador.

CIMFP Exhibit P-01062

- h) How recent are the cost estimates for the various projects in this isolated island scenario?
- 3. For Cases 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C:
 - a) Please provide detail regarding the allocation of generation and transmission costs between NL ratepayer revenue requirements and export.
 - b) How are transmission costs recovered from various parties utilizing the transmission infrastructure (Infeed, export and shared)? What are the applicable transmission tariffs and how are these applied in each of these cases?
 - c) Clarify the difference between conventional Island Link and VSC Island Link? When would one be considered appropriate to build and employ over the other option? What are the advantages/disadvantages of each?
 - d) To what extent do Island Link scenarios eliminate/reduce the need for Holyrood (or a similar type facility) on the Island system? To what extent may thermal generation still be a component of Island generation with an Infeed?
- 4. For Case 3:
 - a) Please clarify the case description as Slide 12 reports the A & B cases the same as Case 2 although overall the case is described as having "remaining product sold non-firm via HQTE." Maybe a typo. Can Nalcor confirm the case description and that the analysis accurately reflects the appropriate case description?
- 5. Case 4:
 - a) Clarify assumption "Maritime sales made at 15% below avoided cost"? What avoided cost is the basis for this price calculation?
 - b) Please clarify the Island resources built and employed in each of these three scenarios to meet any Island demand beyond Infeed supply?

From: Parsons, Paul O

Sent: October 6, 2010 11:33 AM

To: Thompson, Robert; Newhook, Vanessa

Cc: Collins, Gerard Subject: RE: Data Access

Hello Robert & Vanessa.

Please see attached for a draft list of info request/questions related to analysis. If you have an opportunity, we would certainly appreciate your review and comments. Robert, we believe we have captured your questions but please let us know as well.

We haven't heard from Rob & Paul yet but anticipate that we could send the list when they are available and discuss.

Thank you and let us know if you wish to discuss.

Paul

Paul Parsons
Manager, Energy Market Research & Evaluation
Energy Economics Division
Department of Natural Resources
Government of Newfoundland & Labrador
t 709 729 5728
f 709 729 2508
e paulparsons@gov.nl.ca

From: Thompson, Robert Sent: October 5, 2010 4:43 PM

To: Parsons, Paul O; Newhook, Vanessa; Collins, Gerard

Subject: RE: Data Access

When asking questions on what options went into the Isolated Island scenario, pls enquire whether the following were taken into account:

- 1. options/technology to improve dispatchability of intermittent sources, thereby offsetting the need for new capacity;
- 2. options to decrease demand through conservation and energy efficiency, thereby offsetting the need for new capacity;
- 3. building a Maritime link for purposes of purchasing power (and selling power) to Nova Scotia, but no connection to Labrador.

Also ask: a) how recent the cost estimates for the various projects in the isolated island scenario; and b) given the long time horizons, whether the price forecast for oil contains a leveling off to account for new generation technologies, reduced consumption, etc., because a constant escalator to 2041 might be a questionable assumption.

Robert

From: Parsons, Paul O

Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2010 11:15 AM

To: Thompson, Robert; Newhook, Vanessa; Collins, Gerard

Subject: RE: Data Access

Thank you Robert.

Paul

From: Thompson, Robert Sent: October 5, 2010 10:57 AM

To: Parsons, Paul O; Newhook, Vanessa; Collins, Gerard

Subject: FW: Data Access

From: DSturge@nalcorenergy.com [mailto:DSturge@nalcorenergy.com]

Sent: Tuesday, October 05, 2010 10:39 AM

To: Thompson, Robert **Subject:** Re: Data Access

Robert; I spoke to Rob Hull. He will look at Paul Humphries schedule and set something up - won't be today though as Paul Humphries is at AEG meetings.

Derrick

Derrick F. Sturge Vice-President, Finance & CFO Nalcor Energy t: (709) 737-1292 c: (709) 690-2545

This Email was sent from a Blackberry wireless handheld. The Email, including attachments, is confidential and proprietary. If you are not the intended recipient, any redistribution or copying of this message is prohibited. If you have received this Email in error, please notify us immediately by return Email, and delete this Email message.

From: "Thompson, Robert" [rthompson@gov.nl.ca]

Sent: 10/05/2010 10:31 AM NDT

To: Derrick Sturge Subject: Data Access

Derrick

Gerard Collins (gerardcollins@gov.nl.ca) and Paul Parsons (paulparsons@gov.nl.ca) can be reached by Rob Hull and Paul Humphries at the earliest available time to start their analysis. Thanks.

Robert

"This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender."