

Box 444
Prince Rupert BC
V8J 3R4

June 2009

To the Chief Commissioner and Commissioners:

I would like the traditional greeting given last week.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond and comment to submissions made to the BC UC regarding the long term transmission lines.

A bit of my background: I have a Bachelors Degree with an Economics major and a Science Degree with Archaeology major. In addition I have completed course work towards a Master's Degree in Planning (Environmental Design). I have twenty years experience working in Economic Development including helping entrepreneurs establish and expand business with access to electricity and without access to electricity. My four decades of work experience includes working with four municipal governments and one provincial government as well as private industry.

In those capacities I've done research on wind energy, prepared briefing notes on carbon sequestration. In addition I've conducted a pre-feasibility analysis for the Palliser Dam concept, as an alternative to the proposed Meridian Dam on the South Saskatchewan River.

I've managed housing projects, logging operations, silviculture and assisted sawmill operations that did not utilize electricity. For Anspayaxw Developments I developed a value added mill proposal. I've organized and helped organize conferences and facilitated 400 participants providing feedback for future planning. My Master's Degree Project was on Success Factors in Development Planning. In regards to electricity usage I have installed and climbed utility poles to string lines and have dug ditches to bury cables.

That is some of my background for commenting on submissions. My comments are:

Regarding Guy Van Uytven's submission on HVDC

I appreciate that although this was considered a technical submission that it was shared with participants. It took me some effort to understand and appreciate the substance of Mr. Van Uytven's feedback (particularly the technical advantages) but once I had done some research I appreciated the significance and magnitude of the potential for HVDC to reduce costs and impacts. Although I do not concur that corridor selection be done immediately (consultation needs to be done at an acceptable pace) I hope the Commission will be able to take into account the option HVDC offers if that level of transmission is deemed required.

Regarding: Cloudworks submission

Does Cloudwork offer any suggestions as to how a large pumped storage facility might be achieved in the lower mainland? (i.e. to replace the Burrard Thermal benefits)

Regarding Horizon Technologies Submission

Page 3 of 9 - with reference to today resources – Alternative technologies are not free energy; they have the downsides been considered? Taking away energy from tidal motions are going to affect sea life - there may be certain levels of 'energy' in tidal motion that powers life cycles that might be affected due to limiting oxygen accumulation in coastal waters for instance that we don't know about. We may not be able to predict these affects accurately but at least we need to recognize (learn from past developments) that there is going to be a downside and to prepare for it. For example when hydro dams were planned and built they did not adequately consider impacts on fisheries. One television documentary on the Columbia River dams stated the loss in salmon fishing was worth far more than the electricity generated.

the same applies to wind and solar energy (Horizon mention on page 4 of 9 section 1.3) - there will be downsides - it won't all be benefits and although we may not accurately predict them cost-benefit analyses would do well to include a provision in the spreadsheets to take hidden costs into account which will provide for at least calculated break-even levels.

Also noted in section 1.2 is a request to use "In-stream" versus "older hydro technologies". Yes please may we have differentiating terminology because the term "run of the river" has been co-opted to include what are really hydro projects.

Regarding IPP (David Austen) Submission

Under Assessment of Demand point 2: It seems their question on "whether the additional 3,000 GWh additional supply had to be met before exports commence" is a good query. I am interested in the response. Thank you.

Regarding BCOAPA Submission from Leigha Worth

Page one - Assessment of Generation - BCOAPA says sufficiently detailed but it seems BC Hydro disagrees.

Page 2 - third paragraph - agree need at least one flat or very low economic growth and also suggest one negative growth scenario (for up to ten years) and that there be seven to nine scenarios (not just several).

Or if there are options to have multiples of 7 to the power of four - lets see them all - I'm a splitter rather than a lumpier (archaeology reference for categorizing data).

Page 3 - under First Nations issues: "...there may be suitable avenues for dealing with past infringements, such as treaty negotiations, court actions..." Court actions are not

suitable avenues! They have been 'last resort' ploys because other approaches do not respect indigenous rights and land title. Neither has Treaty Negotiations been conducive for resolving outstanding issues. They have been a means to stall. First Nations may do well to advocate "No Treaty, No Projects".

If First Nations wish to have past infringements addressed in this venue then their wishes deserve being respected. If past infringements have negatively impacted people and their lands it is difficult to see how future development and trust can be expected without resolving outstanding matters.

Regarding the BCSEA (Sustainable Energy Association) Submission from Bill Andrews
BC SEA advises they think the Staff Discussion Paper provides a useful framework; it seems BC Hydro does not agree.

Page 3 of 12 - third paragraph - yes the issue of exports in regards to "self-sufficiency with insurance" requirements needs addressing - this came up at the June 18 workshop.

Under the notion of considering imports as well as exports imply self-sufficiency won't exist at all times - thus it won't be. Can the province be self sufficient when it may import? Can the province expect to be able to export and not import. The Trans Canada submission suggests not: This provides a quandary deserving resolution. I'm not against imports and exports in regards to improving/devising efficient optimal operations but I find the term self-sufficient as restrictive. Could we be self-sufficient as long as our exports are surplus based and our imports are at our "leisure"? Perhaps it is only a matter of semantics?

Page 5 of 12 - renewable generation from wind, solar, wood waste or tidal resources and include geothermal - just wish to repeat my concern that there are downsides to all forms of energy tapping - geothermal issues include depleting/exhausting heat from the surface.

Page 10 of 12 - concur that the Discussion Paper "appears not to respond to the request that the inquiry address historical infringements."

Page 11 of 12 sixth bullets "Some generation options should be left out of the analysis..."
Who decides which ones should be left out?

Same page seventh bullet "Environmental set-asides should include protection of the wildlife habitat, fisheries, migration routes etc..." who decides?

Page 12 of 12 Conclusion:
Conclusion is not a conclusion - just a comment.

Regarding Coast Forest Products submission from Christine Kennedy

Page one - comment about 'recognizing interest in preserving parks but still think these sties may be the most feasible physical and economic choice' - misses the point that: not developing in parks and protected areas overrides economic and physical considerations.

Still page one, the feedback in the last paragraph page one - is almost amusing where although (previously) they don't think parks and protected areas should be protected they want harvestable land protected!

Page 2 of their submission

Not in Scope (top paragraph) comment: I concur that making determinations of specific routing could be under consideration.

I also agree that "... considering existing infrastructure..." deserves merit. These ties in with Mr. Van Uytven's submission regarding using DCVC lines to make existing AC lines available.

Re: Terasen Gas submission

- No comment to offer

Regarding British Columbia Power Corporation submission

Page 3 under Principles

1) Don't see that all forms of energy demand will increase over a thirty year study period - with new technologies and ecological concerns some may diminish as their point #3 makes (that fossil fuel drive markets will transition...)

page 4 - acknowledging EPV 's as 'wild card' yet encouraging how broad deployment of EPV's will affect transmission requirements - difficult to both consider and acknowledge it is difficult. Just the same a valid point perhaps with merit for looking at regional cases when those scenarios developed (i.e. it may be more appropriate for large urban centres or the other way around).

Page 4/5 Assessment of Transmission

Using the example of Bill 19 and Alberta's recent announced plans for \$14.5 billion transmission system. - Two comments

- Perhaps with Alberta building new infrastructure BC does not need to if imports are going to be considered

- if going to invite Alberta participants to comment then the Commission could consider inviting opponents of Bill 19 to participate as well. Joe Anglin may be reached at jvanglin@telus.net

Page 5 section V comment "recent experience leaves no doubt that transmission development may be vigorously opposed..." May and no doubt don't fit together. Either there is 'no doubt' or there may be doubt.

- Pedantic comment on my part

Regarding Commercial Energy Consumers

Page 3 - reference to certain risks (5th paragraph) - what might these risks be?

Page 4 - Run of River reference - is this true run of river or the co-opted meaning (where smaller (and not so small) dam projects are being called run of the river. Run of the River is when a generator is placed in the flow of water utilizing a small percentage (e.g. 10%) whereas projects that divert water (e.g. using a tunnel) are not run of the river.

I agree with many/most of the points of this submission and heartily agree that it is important (page 14) to hear directly from First Nations.

Regarding TransCanada submission from Gail Jones/Frank Karabetsos

Interesting query/clarification that TransCanada seeks/makes.

Can the province be self sufficient when it may import? Can the province expect to be able to export and not import. The Trans Canada submission suggests not: This provides a quandary deserving resolution. I'm not against imports and exports in regards to improving/devising efficient optimal operations but I find the term self-sufficient as restrictive. Could we be self-sufficient as long as our exports are surplus based and our imports are at our "leisure"?

Regarding BC Hydro's submission

page 3 (line2s 21-24) - suggest that an engagement session in July would not be sufficient time for participants. It seems BCHydro wants two months to incorporate such feedback but is allowing less than a month to receive it.

Page 4 - line 24 - will scenarios include price increases? Such that with prices going up demand will go down (i.e. to reduce consumption and hence reduce need/reliance on electricity). What about anticipated effects of conservation programs? Does BC Hydro have the benefit of Smart Power program effects on consumer use?

Page 5 line 17 BC Hydro believes that a detailed review of the Load Forecast is not required - who decides this question? Having such forecasts being scrutinized and revised makes sense when economic forecasts and climate factors are changing.

Page 6 line 15 > BC Hydro seems to want to restrict input from participants. I believe input should be accepted and considered without participants having to clear comments with BC Hydro in advance. The commission may decide which is relevant or pertinent.

Page 6 line 23 > who will provide the long term outlooks for forestry, mining and oil and gas industries? Will those industries be giving that feedback? Are there independent reviewers (e.g. economists) available to collaborate projections?

Page 7 lines 17 to 24 comes across as patronizing - starting with the word "troublesome" and claiming terminology is subjective when the word "reasonable" is equally undefined.

Page 8 line 16 - 22 - "The first stage of development ... BC Hydro intends to share its thinking..." This is Type Two Participation as noted in my presentation on Meaningful Participation. BC Hydro intends to tell what they think is good for the people and province rather than try to find out what may be beneficial from the First Nations perspective first.

Page 9 goes on to make value statements of BC Hydro and not the people of the province.

Line 5 attempts to restrict the commission's prerogative to address issues (e.g. past infringements) that may inhibit developing good long term solutions.

Line 22 -23"First Nations will have an opportunity to pursue their grievances with the Crown in other forums" Just what are these forums? Why haven't the grievances been addressed by now or before now? What assurances are there that they will ever be? If we can't fix what is broken already how can we move along?

Page 10 line 16 "BC Hydro prefers..." sounds like they consider themselves as a royal "majesty"

The BC Hydro submission is merely a submission and deserves no more regard than other submissions. It comes across as patronizing and condescending. If it they show such disrespect to the BC UC then how can it be expected that they conduct meaningful consultations?

It is recommended that BCUC conduct its own consultations with First Nations. They recommend outside consultants to do the export study; why not have outside consultants do the consultation. BC Hydro has neither the expertise nor qualifications to conduct meaningful consultation.

Regarding the Appendix and recommendation of retaining E3 as an expert may there be a Request for Proposals and E3 and Black & Veatch as well as others be invited to present proposals so that there might be at least three submissions for consideration?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Terry Vulcano