

REQUESTOR NAME: **BC Sustainable Energy Association and Sierra Club of British Columbia**

INFORMATION REQUEST ROUND NO: 4

TO: **B.C. Hydro**

DATE: **May 14, 2012**

PROJECT NO: **3698640**

APPLICATION NAME: **Dawson Creek/Chetwynd Area Transmission Project**

4.41.0 Topic: BCSEA-SCBC IR3

Reference: Exhibit C8-6, BCSEA-SCBC IR#3; Exhibit B-25; Exhibit B-22, Supplemental Evidence; Exhibit B-27; Exhibit A-28, Order G-56-12

In Exhibit C8-6, BCSEA-SCBC made its Round 3 IRs to BC Hydro, numbered 3.33 to 3.40.

In Exhibit B-25, BC Hydro listed intervenor and staff IRs it saw as either outside the proper scope of the proceeding or answered in the Supplemental Evidence (Exhibit B-22). BC Hydro addressed BCSEA-SCBC IR 3.33.1, 3.33.2 and 3.33.3, each of which BC Hydro said were out of scope. BC Hydro did not list BCSEA-SCBC IRs 3.34 to 3.40 as being either out of scope or answered in the Supplemental Evidence.

In Exhibit B-27, BC Hydro lists intervenor and staff Third Round IRs that it commits to answering. The list does not include any of BCSEA-SCBC's IRs 3.34 to 3.40.

In Order G-56-12 (Exhibit A-28), the Commission issued a scoping determination in this proceeding.

- 4.41.1 For each of BCSEA-SCBC IRs 3.34 to 3.40, please provide either an answer, an explanation of why BC Hydro considers the question out of scope in light of Order G-56-12, or a reference to where the question is answered in the Supplementary Evidence.

4.42.0 Topic: Scope of proceeding

Reference: Exhibit B-22, Supplemental Evidence; Exhibit B-25; Exhibit A-28 Scoping Decision;

In Order G-56-12 [Exhibit A-28], the Commission ruled on BC Hydro's submissions regarding the scope of the proceeding.

- 4.42.1 Please parse the Commission's scoping decision in Order G-56-12 and indicate whether each element is consistent with, or different than, BC Hydro's submissions regarding the proper scope of the proceeding.

- 4.42.2 In light of the Commission's scoping decision, are there any intervenor or staff Round 3 IRs that BC Hydro had previously considered out of scope that now should be considered within scope? If so, please list them and provide answers.

4.43.0 Topic: GHG emissions reductions

Reference: Exhibit B-1, s.2.61; : Exhibit A-28 Scoping Decision

In the original application, BC Hydro argued that the Project would have a favourable impact on BC's GHG emissions reduction targets, per *CEA*, subsection 2(g), and on encouraging the switching from one kind of energy source or use to another that decreases greenhouse gas emissions in British Columbia, per *CEA*, subsection 2(h).

In IR 3.33.2, BCSEA-SCBC asked:

“Does BC Hydro agree that, other things being equal, the DCAT project would be more likely to be determined to be in the public interest if there was some assurance that the natural gas production electrical load would be comprised of the most efficient machinery reasonably possible? If not, please explain why not?”

BC Hydro's April 17, 2012 letter (Exhibit B-25) explains its view that BCSEA-SBCC IR 3.33.2 is out of scope (and as follows:

“BC Hydro has set out its objections to investigating the use to which the electricity will be put in the context of this application in the March 23rd Letter at page 5 under the heading End Use Rates. BC Hydro has outlined the efforts it has made to introduce its new customers to its power smart programs in SE Questions 19, 27, 32, 41 and 51.”

The March 23, 2012 letter (Exhibit B-22) includes the following under the heading End Use Rates:

“BC Hydro's rates and the terms and conditions of service do not distinguish between customers based on the use to which power is put. ...

BC Hydro has not assessed the economic, environmental and social benefits or costs resulting from the proposed activities of the DCAT Project customers except as they relate to the government's energy objectives. ...”

Order G-56-12 states in point 4 on page 7 of 9: “...Any questions relating to the application of the *CEA* to the DCAT project is [sic] appropriate and necessary for a CPCN application.”

- 4.43.1 Please explain BC Hydro's current position regarding how the Project would affect BC's Energy Objectives regarding GHG emissions reductions (*CEA*, subsection 2(g)) and fuel-switching to reduce GHG emissions (*CEA*, subsection 2(h)).
- 4.43.2 Has this position changed since the Application was filed? If so, please explain.
- 4.43.3 Please confirm that in the original application, BC Hydro's analysis of the impact of the Project on GHG emissions reductions is based primarily on the comparative GHG emissions of the customers to be served by the Project with and without the Project. If not, please explain.

- 4.43.4 Please reconcile the GHG consequences analysis in s.2.6.1 of the Application with BC Hydro's position in Exhibits B-22 and B-27 objecting to investigating the use to which the electricity will be put in the context of this application. If the to-be-served customers' use of the electricity is not relevant to the review of the Project then how is the alternative in which the to-be-served customers do not use electricity relevant?