Richard T. Landale
14952 – 95A Avenue
Surrey,
British Columbia.
V3R 7T6

October 21st. 2015

Ms. Laurel Ross
Acting Commission Secretary and Director
British Columbia Utilities Commission
Sixth Floor,
900 Howe Street
Vancouver,
British Columbia
V6Z 2N3

Dear Ms. Ross,

Re: BCUC Procedural Conference & Regulatory Timetable 2016-17
ICBC 2016 Regulatory Requirement Application,
Project # 3698890 BCUC

This letter is in response to the BCUC Acting Commission Secretary October 20th 2016 Exhibit A7

As a Registered Intervener in this hearing, **I am most disturbed** (*I having spent several nights overtaken by the events leading to this Procedural Conference*), especially, first by Mr. Fred Weisberg TREAD, exhibit C5-3 dated October 18th. 2016, followed by Mr. Michael Seaborn BCOAPO, exhibit C3-3 dated October 19th 2016. Further I had an informal telephone conversation on October 18th with a BCUC Staff member that in summary convinced me there were no reason for my concern regarding the absence of one of the Commission Panel members, or to the Commission Panel accepting my letter attached to my Information Request #1, exhibit C2-2 dated September 26th 2016. Then yesterday Ms. Ross sends her letter setting out the conclusion (draft conclusion) to Procedural Conference with a Draft Regulatory Timetable with Options A or B and some procedural conference conditions and scope limitations.

As noted in my letter of September 26th, I affirm the general view given therein, and continue to urge now the remaining two Commissioners that will be present at the Procedural Conference on October 28th. 2016, to balance between Oral Hearing Presentations and Written submissions, including another second Information Request round, intervener evidence and final argument.

That said, I consider the proposed Procedural Conference limits set out by Ms. Ross letter is completely unfair, biased and restrictive to interveners at large. Limiting the scope, content and intervener oral presentations to the Commission Panel (two not three) completely circumvents the very nature of the British Columbian Utilities Commission tribunal mandate of open, fair and unbiased hearings, which includes Procedural Conferences.

As in past Procedural Conferences I have attended all three Commissioners have attended the conferences. This affords the Commissioners (Tribunal), Interveners, the Applicant, and various representative Counsel members to “HEAR” oral presentations that go well beyond words. Every participant gets to see and hear the “SPOKEN” word, with all the assertions, nuances, body language, the general demeanor of the speaker before the Commission Panel has in delivering his/her oral presentation.

It is completely unsatisfactory to rely on proceeding transcripts. These only record the spoken word, which maybe accurate, the transcript misses the entire oral presentation impact, with emphasis added. As an example of my meaning, I tend to be polite, yet will add humour, vocal and visual animation, move a little around the lectern, and sometimes pause to breath. How does that get translated into a procedural transcript, it does not. The reason I present myself in this fashion is basically four fold, nervous management, accentuate a point, try not to put the Commission Panel to sleep while I am talking, and if appropriate seek clarification, by asking a specific question that may require the panel to suspend the oral presentation while they discuss a technical point, or respond with a point of guidance, or issue a point of order, as examples of my presentation style.

Another key element to a full open unrestrictive Procedural Conference is how Allwest also broadcasts proceedings via conference links to other interveners, presenters, interested parties in this application, unable to stand before the Commission Panel. The restrictions set forth by Ms. Ross letter cripples this functionality. Although the conference can still be heard, the potential for interaction by remote participants is greatly hampered by virtue of the broadcast links, and now these further restrictions and limits given by Ms. Ross.

I'm not going to be their regardless of this letter, or any outcomes from Mr. Weisberg or Mr. Seaborn letters, as October 28th is my wife's birthday. "Happy Wife, happy Life" and I know everyone can relate to that.

On the next page is my input to the draft regulatory timetable:

Essentially I will be submitting a second round of information requests (already started writing them), I have prepared a report that will be submitted in part with other evidence, and finally I expect to prepare a final argument. None of which I expect will be constrained in their contents by the Commission Panel. As I expect the BCUC to conduct a fair and open hearing, as all the above is expected to contribute to the Commission Panels, knowledge, understanding and general guidance, ahead of their deliberations and determination of their final decision.

I object to Ms. Ross letter, wherein, quote:

> "the procedural conference will deal with procedural matters only. Substantive matters, including procedural scoping decisions, will not be discussed"

This is not conducive to fair and open hearings, and has as mentioned caused me a great deal of concern as to the functionality / impartiality of the BCUC to conduct fair and open hearings.

Respectfully,

Richard T. Landale
Intervener C2

The following modified (in yellow hi-light) Draft Regulatory Timetable is submitted to the Two Panel Commissioners at the October 28th 2016 Procedural Conference for their consideration by this intervener.

ICBC 2016 Revenue Requirements Application

Commission Staff Draft Regulatory Timetable Options for further process

MODIFIED BY INTERVENER C2 DRAFT REGULATORY TIMETABLE OPTIONS

Action	Option A – Full Written	Option B – Oral Hearing	
IR No. 2 to ICBC	Thursday, November 24, 2016 I will submitt		Thursday, November 24, 2016
PACA Budget	Thursday, December 1, 2016 I will submitt	Wednesday, November 16, 2016	Thursday, December 1, 2016
ICBC IR No. 2 Response	Thursday, December 15,2016		Thursday, December 15, 2016
Intervener Evidence (if any)	Wednesday, January 11, 2017 I will submitt	Tuesday, November 22, 2016	Wednesday, January 11, 2017
IR on Intervener Evidence (if any)	Wednesday, January 25, 2017	Wednesday, November 30,2016	Wednesday, January 25, 2017
IR Response on Intervener Evidence (if any)	Wednesday, February 8, 2017	Thursday, December 8, 2016	Wednesday, February 8, 2017
ICBC Rebuttal Evidence (if any)	Wednesday, February 22, 2017	Friday, December 16, 2016	Wednesday, February 22, 2017
ORAL HEARING		Week of Jan 16-20, 2017	Week of March 6-10, 2017 If selected I will participate
ICBC Final Argument (Written)	Wednesday, March 8, 2017	Wednesday February 8, 2017	Monday, March 27, 2017
Intervener Final Argument (Written)	Wednesday, March 22, 2017 I will submitt	Thursday, February 23, 2017	Monday, April 10, 2017
ICBC Reply Argument (Written)	Wednesday, April 5, 2017	Thursday, March 9, 2017	Monday, April 24, 2017

NOTES TO COMMISSION PANEL (2) AT THE PROCEDURAL CONFERENCE OCTOBER 28TH 2016

1: CHANGED DATES TO MATCH "OPTION A" TIMELINE. IF "OPTION A" IS A WORKABLE TIMELINE, THEN THE SAME TIME TIMELINE WORKS FOR "OPTION B" (LOGICAL AND REASONABLE).

2: ALL ELSE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION THIS INTERVENER SELECTS OPTION A. MAINLY BECAUSE THE INDICATED RATE CHANGE IS AFFIXED BY *SPECIAL DIRECTION IC2*, AND NOT THE BCUC.