

From: Ilse C. Leis
Via e-mail
March 27th, 2012

Ms. Alana Gillis, Acting Secretary
British Columbia Utilities Commission
Sixth Floor, 900 Howe Street,
Vancouver, B.C. V6Z 2N3

Dear Ms. Gillis:

Re: Project No. 3698622 British Columbia Utilities Commission (BCUC) and BC Hydro's Amended F2012-F2014 Revenue Requirements Application, the April 30, 2012 Negotiated Settlement Process (NSP) and BC Hydro's March 26th, 2012 Letter to the BCUC

In her March 26th letter Ms. Janet Fraser, Chief Regulatory Officer, writes :

“.....one of the central issues in this proceeding is the tension between current and future rates (intergenerational equity and deferral account balances) ... BC Hydro agrees that a central issue in this proceeding is the tension between current and future rates,.....”

As a Residential Rate Payer I also see that as **one** important issue. My Grandchildren and their children shall be affected by these Deferral Accounts.

However, of equally serious concern is the **increasingly ENORMOUS AMOUNTS OF MONEY** BC Hydro spends – that is the **HUGE COSTS** BC Hydro incurs. For example, the **DSM COSTS** are **increasing at an alarming** rate from **\$46.4 Million in 2007 to \$137.9 Million in 2011** and are planned to be **\$236.3 MILLION by 2014**. What is interesting to note is that about **80% of these funds are incentives for AMCP and CEC ratepayers. Even more astounding is the fact 70% to 80% of these costs (the 80%) apparently are already committed.** In other words, **if my reading of BC Hydro information is correct, contracts are already in place.** Are there some conclusions one could come to?

Due to the serious economic downturn in 2008 and the subsequent economic outfall – the BC Government is still struggling with revenue issues - the **SMI** project should have been delayed until the economy **significantly improved**. After reviewing a significant portion of BC Hydro information and data I am seriously alarmed about BC Hydro financial decisions. I am quite aware political issues since early 2000 have been and are still involved. I was unaware of the degree.

On a **rather serious personal level**, I am **deeply disturbed** about Ms. Fraser's statement :

“Ms. Leis and Mr. Ruskin make submissions in the name of BC Hydro customers, and while both are individual residential customers, neither has any basis to claim a broader representative status.”
Speaking on my behalf, I have **honestly tried to be clear that I represent myself** as a Residential Rate Payer and do not claim “a broader representative status” Simply put, when I perceive something is wrong, I try to make it at least a little better.

The question of whether or not the interests of the BC Hydro Residential Customers are represented is up to the British Columbia Utilities Commission to decide.

Yours respectfully,
Ilse Leis

Addendum to my March 27th Letter to Ma. Alana Gillis, Acting Commission Secretary:

Actions fighting Corporations, Municipalities, the GVRD/ Metro Vancouver, the BC Government and other governments against proposals, initiatives, action, rules and regulations have been a rightful part of our Canadian Democratic process and the Canadian Constitution for decades.

In fact, I am quite certain that those individuals who opposed certain environmentally sensitive proposals and initiatives - people who occupied private or public lands or took more drastic actions at enormous personal costs and personal danger were never dismissed because they did not have the mandate of the entire British Columbian population. Yet, **in many cases these brave individuals proved to have significant positive results** and were able to stop imprudent decisions that would have been harmful to a large percentage of people other than themselves.

During any of my previous interventions either with the GVRD, Municipalities or BC Gas. No one ever stated that an intervener only counted **if he or she officially represented a certain group or an official documented majority of a group**. I have participated in probably hundreds of hours of meetings. **At no time**, did the presiding group state that participants were ranked and had only a marginal voice compared to more “officially” (legally) represented groups. Can anyone imagine what would happen in a Municipality if changes in a rezoning application, only the developers were counted as legitimate “negotiators”? In innumerable GVRD, municipal and other meetings I have attended, every one had an **equal opportunity to be heard in public**.

Decisions were **often made in favor of those who opposed an application, an initiative or large expense because it was not in the public interest. Yet the PUBLIC was only partially represented. Most of the Public was at home making dinner, looking after children, helping out with children’s sports activities, numerous other commitments and managing or coping with their immediate personal or family needs.**

In todays economic circumstances, where two incomes are required to maintain a family household, families are stressed to manage even a reasonable level of sheer survival – unlike the 37 POWEREX Executives who are earning between \$200 00 and over \$500 000 - a measly \$14,172, 611 Million Dollars between them. (I hope I counted that right). With Powerex Net Income for 2011 amounting to a paltry \$71.5 Million (amended F12-F14 Appendix A Schedule 1.0 p. 2 line 17) these executive earnings do appear to be out of proportion. No wonder BC Hydro is proposing to stop charging POWEREX transmission fees. That would appear to make POWEREX ‘s net income look a little more reasonable.

Does BC Hydro really expect 1.6 Million Residential Customers to be able to study the by now over 5 thousand pages of BC Hydro documents in order to understand and protest BC Hydro’s exorbitant expenditures that will impact them in the future?

Premier Christie Clark claims that her objective is looking after the interests of Families and Children. After extensive reviews of BC Hydro’s F2012-F2014 Application, BCUC and intervener Information Requests and B C Hydro’s replies and my on-going communication with the Premier and Mr. Coleman, Minister of Energy , I see no evidence that my interests as a Residential Rate Payer and part of a family, are protected.

Ilse Leis

Cc faxed to Premier Christie Clark