Q. Did Newfoundland Power's evaluation of the Pierre's Brook refurbishment give consideration to the contract for purchases from Muskrat Falls? If not, why not?

A. No.

The Power Purchase Agreement, dated November 29, 2013, between Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro ("Hydro") and Muskrat Falls Corporation, a Nalcor affiliate (the "Muskrat PPA"), became publicly available on June 26th, 2014. Newfoundland Power filed its 2015 Capital Budget Application with the Board on June 26th, 2014.

The Muskrat PPA was not publicly available within a timeframe which enabled Newfoundland Power to give consideration to it in its evaluation of the refurbishment of the Company's Pierre's Brook hydroelectric generating plant (the "Pierre's Brook Plant").

Newfoundland Power has considered the Muskrat PPA. In Newfoundland Power's view, the Muskrat PPA should not have material influence on decision-making associated with the proposed refurbishment of the Pierre's Brook Plant for a number of reasons.

The Muskrat PPA itself does not appear to provide a significant additional degree of certainty to the future cost of service to customers associated with the Muskrat Falls development. For the reasons described in the response to Request for Information NLH-NP-007, the forecast cost of the proposed refurbishment of the Pierre's Brook Plant of 4.87¢/kWh over 50 years appears to be consistent with least cost supply to the Island Interconnected System following commissioning of Muskrat Falls.

At the May 20th, 2014 meeting of the Hydro-Newfoundland Power Inter-Utility Planning and Reliability Committee (the "Planning Committee"), the proposed refurbishment of the Pierre's Brook hydroelectric generating plant was discussed. At that time Hydro's representatives would have been aware of the terms of the Muskrat PPA. The Planning Committee did not indicate that the Muskrat PPA should have any material impact on proceeding with the proposed refurbishment.¹

In the past, Hydro has chosen to treat non arm's-length affiliate supply relationships differently for commercial purposes and cost of service purposes. For example, Hydro agreed with Nalcor Energy to pay 4¢/kWh for energy produced from the former AbitibiBowater facilities.² For cost of service purposes, however, Hydro reflected approximately 45% of the cost of energy produced by Nalcor Energy under this agreement as a demand cost.³ So, the manner in which Muskrat Falls production will be

In fact, the cost of refurbishment of the Pierre's Brook Plant was indicated by the Planning Committee to "...compare favourably..." to "...the expected range on the future cost of supply." See the response to Request for Information NLH-NP-007, page 5, lines 4-5.

See the response to Request for Information V-NLH-004 filed in Hydro's 2013 General Rate Application.

See the response to Request for Information NP-NLH-136 filed in Hydro's 2013 General Rate Application.

Page 2 of 2

1	reflected in the cost of service to be paid by customers on the Island Interconnected
2	System may not fully reflect the terms of the Muskrat PPA.
3	
4	Finally, Newfoundland Power observes that Hydro has maintained that after commercial
5	arrangements relating to the Muskrat Falls development are finalized, a marginal cost
6	study would be required to determine Hydro's future marginal cost of demand and
7	energy. ⁴ To Newfoundland Power's knowledge, no such marginal cost study has been
8	performed.
9	
10	Independent engineering assessment has indicated that refurbishment of the Pierre's
11	Brook Plant is now required to ensure its continued operation. The refurbishment and
12	continued operation of the Pierre's Brook Plant will cost 4.87¢/kWh over a 50-year
13	period. Based upon this, the proposed refurbishment appears consistent with the future
14	least cost provision of electrical service to the customers of Newfoundland Power.

See the response to Request for Information CA-NLH-033 filed in Hydro's 2013 General Rate Application.