Q. Please identify all public policy initiatives, directives and decisions that influence the CPW analysis of the two alternatives under review.

A. The following public policy initiatives, directives, and decisions are relevant to the CPW analysis of the two alternatives under review:

Public Policy:	Install pollution controls on Holyrood in the event that Muskrat Falls/Gull Island and the Labrador Island Link do not proceed.
Source:	Government of Newfoundland and Labrador Energy Plan
Impact:	Capital cost of scrubbers and electrostatic precipitators (ESP's) included in Island Isolated alternative. Holyrood production adjusted for energy for scrubbers and ESP's. 2% sulfur heavy fuel oil used for Holyrood fuel supply for remaining life of plant.
Public Policy:	GHG Restrictions on Large Final Emitters
Source:	Government of Canada Greenhouse Gas Framework
Impact:	No cost for carbon associated with Holyrood GHG emissions in either alternative. Holyrood units will be permitted to operate unfettered from a carbon emissions perspective until they retired. No cap on GHG emission intensity for combined cycle or gas turbine emissions in either alternative. As the Isolated Island alternative is heavily influenced by thermal production, this

		assumption benefits the Isolated Island alternative more than the Labrador Interconnected alternative.
	Public Policy:	Hydro's return on equity is to be commensurate with that of other Canadian regulated utilities.
	Source:	Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
	Impact:	Long term weighted average cost of capital (WACC) for Hydro regulated assets used in CPW analysis was 8.0%.
	Public Policy:	Tshash Petapen Agreement with Innu Nation
	Source:	Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
	Impact:	Costs associated with the implementation of the Lower Churchill Impacts and Benefits Agreement with the Innu of Labrador has been included in project costs.