Page 1 of 1

| 1 | Q. | (Reference response to CA-NLH-6) The response indicates that Hydro "advised the |
|----|----|---|
| 2 | | Provincial Government and Nalcor of its deferral account proposal". It does not |
| 3 | | indicate that either party agreed to the proposal. Is it accurate to say that neither |
| 4 | | Nalcor nor the Government has endorsed Hydro's proposed rate mitigation |
| 5 | | mechanism that significantly over-collects revenues in the years leading up to |
| 6 | | Muskrat Falls? |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | A. | There has been no correspondence between the parties that indicates |
| 10 | | disagreement with Hydro's application for its proposed Off-Island Purchases |
| 11 | | Deferral Account. |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | Please refer to Hydro's response CA-NLH-042. Hydro considers its approach to |
| 14 | | determining its Test Year revenue requirements to be reasonable for establishing |
| 15 | | customer rates that are fair, consistent with intergenerational equity principles and |
| 16 | | consistent with the objective of providing customer rate stability. |