

The Public Utilities Board

400 – 330 Portage Avenue
WINNIPEG MB R3C 0C4

“APPENDIX I”

INTERVENOR REQUEST FORM

1. Application Re: Manitoba Hydro's Cost of Service Methodology Review
Application and Rate Related Matters
2. Name of Requesting Party: Manitoba Metis Federation ('MMF')
3. Address of Requesting Party: 300-150 Henry Avenue
WINNIPEG MB R3B 0J7
Attention: Marci Riel and Tiffany Monkman
4. Phone Number: Business: 204-586-8474
Residence: _____
Fax Number: 204-947-1816
5. Contact Person or Persons: Jessica Saunders & Terrance DeLaronde
D'Arcy & Deacon LLP
6. Address: c /o D'Arcy & Deacon LLP, Barristers & Solicitors
2200 – One Lombard Place, WINNIPEG MB R3B 0X7
7. Phone Number: Business: (204) 942-2271
Email: jsaunders@darcydeacon.com
tdelaronde@darcydeacon.com
Fax Number: (204) 943-4242
8. State reasons for the proposed intervention.

10. Will you be applying for costs under Board Order No. 163/87:

Yes X No

11. Comments and other information

The MMF proposes to intervene in the Cost of Service Methodology Review Application portion of the hearings on more of a watching brief. The MMF would arrange to have junior counsel attend hearings, review all relevant documentation, ask questions of panels/witnesses where appropriate and prepare and provide final argument.

For a number of months leading up to these hearings, the MMF has actively participated in working groups related to Cost of Service, Bill Affordability and DSM. The MMF would like the opportunity to expand on what has been discussed in these hearings and work with a consultant skilled in Cost Allocation and Rate Design in order to issue-scope and assist in focusing the MMF's intervention.

As noted in #8 above, there will be distinct issues faced by all-electric customers. These issues will be of particular interest to the MMF. We are aware CAC and MKO may have similar interests and we are proposing to consider these issues in part. We anticipate involvement in rate design considerations, particularly, Residential Conservation Rates, the specifics of which we expect to confirm once we have had the opportunity to discuss this further with a consultant. If it would be helpful to the Board and if there is no duplication with other interveners' evidence – we would propose to call evidence in this area.

Accordingly, the MMF would propose the involvement of one consultant that would, on cost of service, (1) act as a general consultant assisting in the MMF's review of the Application, Minimum Filing Requirements (MFRs), Information Requests; and on rate related matters, (2) review rate related evidence and provide evidence in the area of Residential Conservation Rates.