

REQUESTOR NAME: **BCOAPO**  
INFORMATION REQUEST ROUND NO: **1**  
TO: **BRITISH COLUMBIA HYDRO & POWER  
AUTHORITY**  
DATE: **April 19, 2017**  
PROJECT NO: **3698907**  
APPLICATION NAME: **SALMON RIVER DIVERSION CEASING  
OF OPERATIONS APPLICATION**

---

**1.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 10, lines 1-2**

**Preamble:** The Application states: “although it would be possible to continue to operate the Dam on a ‘repair as needed’ basis, there was increasing risk of failure”.

1.1 Please outline the implications of such a failure in term of both the short-term and long-term consequences.

**2.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 13 (line 6) to page 14 (line 2)**

2.1 Please explain more fully why the condition of the diversion canal necessitated a reduction in the maximum flow and what specifically dictates/limits the maximum flow that can be used.

**3.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 14 (lines 4-24)**

3.1 Please explain more fully why the condition of the Patterson Creek flume necessitates a reduction in the maximum flow and what specifically dictates/limits the maximum flow that can be used.

**4.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 15 (lines 1-5)**

**Preamble:** BC Hydro states: “BC Hydro has proposed to the Comptroller that we observe the conditions in the pond for the first years after the decommissioning of the Diversion to determine what, if any, works might be necessary at this location”

4.1 Please outline was types of “works” might be necessitated, their likelihood and their approximate costs.

4.2 Was any allowance for these events and associated costs factored into the economic evaluation of the alternatives? If not, why not? If yes, how?

**5.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 15 (lines 12-14)**

5.1 Please outline the consequences for fish passage at the dam and fisheries performance that would occur as a result of a dam failure.

**6.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, pages 17-18**

6.1 It appears that the concerns regarding the fish screen are related to the functionality of the screen which would seem to be an issue with the

type/nature of the screen installed by the MoE. Would an alternative form of fish screen resolve the issues noted?

**7.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, pages 21-22**

7.1 What would be the energy contribution if the current operating constraints which limit diversion flows were not in effect?

**8.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, pages 22-23**

8.1 Please confirm that if the 20-year life extension to the Diversion is not undertaken then the future option of a rebuild (20 years hence) is not available to BC Hydro.

8.2 If confirmed, please indicate how this “lost opportunity” was factored into either: a) the value of the energy contribution or b) the evaluation of the alternatives.

**9.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 24 (lines 8-21)**

9.1 Are there not specific investments that BC Hydro could make under the Status Quo alternative to improve the upstream fish passage?

9.1.1 If yes, please outline what they are and why there were not considered as a way of enhancing the Status Quo alternative such that it would be viable option?

9.1.2 If not, why not?

9.2 Please outline more fully the issues associated with maintaining the status quo until the Dam fails and then ceasing operation of the Diversion and remediating the area. Why is this not a viable option, if combined with the investments described in response to 9.1.1?

**10.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, pages 26-27**

10.1 Does BC Hydro have any experience with the removal of facilities with creosote-treated sub-structures in other locations?

10.1.1 If yes, please comment on the extent of leaching that was found upon removal versus that evidenced during pre-removal sampling.

10.2 How much of the \$14.2 M is capital cost vs. operating costs, over what period will the cost be incurred, and for those cost that are considered capital, when would the costs enter rate base? Note: For purposes of responding to the last part of the question please assume that the BCUC does not grant approval for the associated cost to be recorded in a Dismantling Cost Regulatory Account or transferred to the Heritage Deferral Account.

**11.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 29**

11.1 Please compare the value of incremental energy that would be attained from higher water flows versus the higher cost for the fish screen and flume improvements.

**12.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 32**

12.1 Over what period will the capital cost be incurred and when would the project be in-service such that the capital costs are part of rate base?

12.2 Are there any operating costs incurred prior to the project being in-service? If so, how much and in what years?

**13.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 34**

13.1 Please outline from what critical capital projects resources would be diverted if the Rehabilitation option was pursued.

**14.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 37 (lines 2-13)**

14.1 Were any sustaining OM&A or capital expenditures related to the Salmon River Diversion included in the 2017-2019 RRA that would be avoided if the Application is approved?

14.1.1 If so, what are they and for what years were they planned?

14.1.2 If so, how would these costs be treated if cease operations and removals costs were: i) transferred to the Dismantling Cost Regulatory Account or ii) transferred to the Heritage Deferral Account?

14.2 Is the impact on BC Hydro's ability to maintain the 10-year Rate Plan and clear the Rate Smoothing Account during the Plan's tenure any different if the cease operations and removal costs are recorded in the Dismantling Cost Regulatory Account as opposed to transferred to the Heritage Deferral Account? Please fully explain.