Order No. 115/26

MANITOBA HYDRO

2025 INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLAN
AND MAJOR NEW FACILITIES REVIEW

MANITOBA ECO-NETWORK AND ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENCE
APPLICATION TO REVIEW & VARY ORDER 100/26

July 30, 2026

BEFORE: Robert Gabor, K.C., Chair
Marilyn Kapitany, B.Sc.(Hon), M.Sc., Vice-Chair
Hugh Grant, Ph.D., Member
Kim Sharman, Member
Kurt Simonsen, BSc., M.N.R.M., Member

Table of Contents

1.0 Executive Summary 3

2.0 Background 4

3.0 MEED's Application to Review and Vary 5

3.1 MEED's Position 5

3.2 Manitoba Hydro's Position 6

3.3 Board Findings 6

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT: 8

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Order dismisses Manitoba Eco-Network and Environmental Defence's ("MEED") application to review and vary Order 100/26, in which the Public Utilities Board ("Board") denied MEED's request to order Manitoba Hydro re-run its model with updated combustion turbine and battery storage assumptions.

2.0 BACKGROUND

The Board is engaged in a public review of Manitoba Hydro's 2025 Integrated Resource Plan ("IRP") jointly with a public review of Manitoba Hydro's proposed major new gas turbine facilities. The Board is conducting this joint review process pursuant to Orders in Council 12/2026 and 88/2026, sections 16(3) and 38.1 of *The Manitoba Hydro Act*, CCSM c H190, and the Board's related practice directions.

In Order 100/26, the Board adjudicated the Consumers Coalition and MEED's request to file affidavit evidence of Mr. Jason Rioux regarding his recent experience conducting battery energy storage installations in Canada. Through its submissions respecting the participation of Mr. Rioux, MEED maintained its May 27, 2026 request for a further response to information request MEED/MH II-12d.

MEED/MH II-12d asked Manitoba Hydro to re-run its optimization model using the more recent costs for battery storage and combustion turbine assumptions contained in Mr. Rioux's affidavit.

In Order 100/26, the Board approved Mr. Rioux's participation as a Presenter, and declined MEED's request to order Manitoba Hydro to perform a new computer model run with the updated information in Mr. Rioux's affidavit. In doing so, the Board relied on information provided by Manitoba Hydro in response to the motions following Round 1 information requests respecting the time required to complete model runs. The Board found that the results of any new model run, even if available on an expedited basis, could not be adequately tested or analyzed prior to the beginning of the hearing.

On July 13, 2026, MEED submitted an application to review and vary the Board's decision in Order 100/26 not to order Manitoba Hydro to re-run its model with updated gas turbine generation and battery storage assumptions. On July 20, 2026, and as part of its rebuttal evidence, Manitoba Hydro responded to MEED's application. On July 24, 2026, MEED provided its reply.

3.0 MEED'S APPLICATION TO REVIEW AND VARY

3.1 MEED's Position

MEED submits that an order to re-run the model is warranted based on new information about the time and effort to re-run the model that was not before the Board when it issued Order 100/26.

MEED submits that at the March 2026 Technical Conference, Manitoba Hydro confirmed that it takes only a relatively short time to re-run the model with updated inputs, and that the vast majority of time involves waiting for the computing processes to be completed. The actual person-hours could be in the range of an hour. In light of this information, MEED submits that there is no reason for Manitoba Hydro to decline to re-run its model based on time and effort. In its reply, MEED notes that it is seeking to rely on the Technical Conference transcript, not to impeach the technical conference witnesses, but for the truth of its contents, which was the intention and understanding communicated before and during the technical conference.

In addition and in the alternative, MEED proposes that Manitoba Hydro divert its resources from efforts to respond to the Board's orders relating to MEED/MH I-1 a-b to re-run its model based on updated costs for battery storage and gas generation information. MEED submits that the information from the input and output spreadsheets is now less helpful to MEED, given the oral hearing is soon to begin and the evidence deadline has passed. However, MEED submits that a re-running of the model is worth the time and effort.

MEED submits that battery storage is one of the most viable alternatives to cost-effectively defer the need date and decision date on gas-fired generation, or to avoid the need altogether. MEED views that re-running the model based on the latest assumptions regarding battery storage and gas-fired generation would be highly relevant to what MEED describes as the most important and financially impactful issue in this hearing. MEED suggests that a re-running of the model can take place within a week, and filed in time for the relevant Manitoba Hydro panel, which begins testifying on August 4, 2026.

3.2 Manitoba Hydro's Position

Manitoba Hydro submits that MEED's application should be dismissed.

Manitoba Hydro submits that, regardless of the specific number of hours it would take Manitoba Hydro's subject matter experts to model the requested run, in making its decision not require Manitoba Hydro to re-run its model, the Board reasonably took into account the variety of time constraints on Manitoba Hydro before the commencement of the oral hearing. Manitoba Hydro further submits, as noted on page 12 of Order 100/26, the Board accepted that even if the results of any new model run were available, they "could not be adequately tested or analysed prior to beginning of the hearing."

However, in Volume 1 of Manitoba Hydro's Rebuttal Evidence, Manitoba Hydro has provided updated information regarding battery storage resources and related analysis. Manitoba Hydro states that this evidence is available to assist the Board in its consideration of the issues raised in this proceeding.

Manitoba Hydro also submits that MEED inappropriately included a reference from the Technical Conference transcript in its application, which the Board's counsel advised parties would be prepared as a reference tool for participants, but not to enter the transcript on the record of the proceeding. Manitoba Hydro therefore requests that the Board not consider the excerpt included on page 2 of MEED's application.

3.3 Board Findings

The Board dismisses MEED's application to review and vary the Board's decision in Order 100/26 not to order Manitoba Hydro re-run its model with updated combustion turbine and battery storage assumptions.

While the Board acknowledges the additional information provided by MEED about the time and effort for Manitoba Hydro to run its model, the Board continues to recognize the demands on parties at the current stage of this proceeding. As the oral hearing has commenced, the Board recognizes that the results of any new model run could not be adequately tested or analyzed.

The Board reiterates that it finds that updated assumptions respecting resource option costs and timelines and the effects of these assumptions on Manitoba Hydro's recommended development plan are relevant in this proceeding. The Board notes the updated information regarding battery storage resources and related analysis provided by Manitoba Hydro can be tested by parties during the course of their cross-examination of both Manitoba Hydro witnesses and Mr. Rioux.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

1. The application of MEED to review and vary Order 100/26 is dismissed.

Board decisions may be appealed in accordance with the provisions of Section 58 of *The Public Utilities Board Act*, or reviewed in accordance with Section 58 of the Board's Rules of Practice and Procedure. The Board's Rules may be viewed on the Board's website at www.pubmanitoba.ca.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD

"Robert Gabor, K.C."
Panel Chair

"Rachel McMillin, B.Sc., MPA"
Secretary

Certified a true copy of Order No. 115/26
issued by The Public Utilities Board

R McMillin

Secretary