

- 1 **Q. With reference to lines 14 through 17 on page 14 of Mr. Brockman’s Pre-Filed**  
2 **Evidence (August 5, 2019), please discuss whether in Mr. Brockman’s view plant**  
3 **vintage and valuation issues will need to be addressed in future COS studies beyond**  
4 **the current proceeding, and if so, how does Mr. Brockman recommend these issues**  
5 **be addressed if the equivalent peaker method is adopted.**  
6
- 7 A. In Mr. Brockman’s opinion, plant vintage is not an issue in relation to the application of  
8 the equivalent peaker method to the Muskrat Falls Project, since it is a plant of current  
9 vintage. As noted in the response to Request for Information IC-NP-002, valuation can  
10 be determined by the Board based on a consideration of the evidence on the record of the  
11 proceeding.  
12
- 13 It is Mr. Brockman’s view that, once the Board has determined the facility costs to be  
14 used in the determination of the demand and energy split of Muskrat Falls Project costs,  
15 there will be no need to revisit the calculation for the Muskrat Falls assets in future cost  
16 of service studies.  
17
- 18 If, at a future time, Hydro is required to build another baseload generating facility, a  
19 similar exercise would be required at that time to calculate values for application of the  
20 equivalent peaker method to the planned facility. The values applicable to the Muskrat  
21 Falls assets would remain unchanged.