## Reference from the Lieutenant-governor in Council On the Muskrat Falls Project (the "Muskrat Falls Review") REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

| 1        | CA/KPL-Nalcor-186              | Consumer Question: Within the 2011 AGM meeting NALCOR presented                       |
|----------|--------------------------------|---|
| 2        |                                | a slide of Muskrat Falls Cash Flow. (Reference Slide 32 of                            |
| 3        | http://www.nalcore             | nergy.com/assets/agm%202011%20muskrat%20falls%20presentation%20ed%20martin%20june%202 |
| 4        |                                | 2.pdf ) This appears to match the MF PPA as used within the CPW                       |
| 5        |                                | analysis, summarised within Exhibit 99. Within the Proposed                           |
| 6        |                                | Purchase Agreement for the Muskrat Falls infeed scenario the                          |
| 7        |                                | returns/profit/dividends are deferred to the end of the project. Although             |
| 8        |                                | this has been done to lower the initial rate for the NL consumer, it also             |
| 9        |                                | defers the profit element to the end of the economic review period.                   |
| 10       |                                | Using the discount rate of 8%, this back loading of the equity return, will in        |
| 11       |                                | fact lower the Cumulative Present Worth. The question for NALCOR is                   |
| 12       |                                | to provide clarity if the proposed model for the MF PPA will have a lower             |
| 13       |                                | CPW compared to a conventional COS model as normally used by                          |
| 14       |                                | utilities, and as employed within the isolated island alternative. If there is        |
| 15       |                                | a difference, NALCOR is requested to provide the CPW for the                          |
| 16       |                                | internconnected island for both (i) COS arrangement, and (ii) the model               |
| 17       |                                | currently proposed. The latter is currently the reference case.                       |
| 18       |                                |   |
| 19       |                                |   |
| 20       |                                | in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, this 3 <sup>nd</sup> day of February,   |
| 21       | 2012.                          |   |
| 22       |                                |   |
| 23<br>24 |                                | Thomas Johnson  |
| 25       |                                | Consumer Advocate   |
| 26       |                                | 323 Duckworth Street  |
| 27       |                                | St. John's, NL A1C 5X4  |
| 28       |                                | Telephone: (709)726-3524  |
| 29       |                                | Facsimile: (709)726-9600  |
| 30       |                                | Email: tjohnson@odeaearle.ca  |
| 31       |                                |   |
| 32       | clf:\oe\consumer advocate\musk | rat falls\rfi (11th).rtf  |