Page 1 of 1

1 Q: Reference: "Embedded and Marginal Cost of Service Review," The Brattle Group May 3, 2019, Exhibit II at pp. 15-16

 The Brattle Group Report states: "We agree that the generation facilities at Muskrat Falls should be-functionalized as generation. Concerning the LIL and the LTA, however, we believe that it is more appropriate to functionalize them as transmission."

a) Please confirm that Manitoba Hydro's Open Access Transmission Tariff conforms to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission criteria, but excludes the costs of its very large HVdc facilities from Open Access Transmission Tariff charges as these facilities are viewed as generation-related in its cost of service methodology.

b) Does The Brattle Group disagree with the cost of service approach followed in Manitoba? If yes, please explain why.

A. a) We cannot make a legal determination with regard to whether Manitoba Hydro's OATT conforms to FERC's criteria for open access.

b) The Brattle Group has reviewed Manitoba Hydro's cost of service approach. Its cost of service has been performed under circumstances which differ from that of Hydro. The Manitoba Public Utility Board views the HVDC lines as merely extensions of Manitoba Hydro's northern generation since they are entirely radial and asserts that flows will be unidirectional. This differs from the FERC's position on what should be included as part of the transmission system. See our response to LAB-PUB-001. Manitoba Hydro has not functionally separated its generation activities from its transmission activities except for its power marketing activities. Our understanding is that NLH has functionally separated generation and transmission and has formed the NLSO. The LTA and LIL in conjunction with Muskrat Falls generation constitute a transmission system which provides a means to connect to electricity markets outside of Newfoundland and Labrador through two separate interconnection paths.