

C 20-3

January 19, 2016

Dear Ms. Hamilton,

Re: BC Hydro 2015 Rate Design
Application <http://www.bcuc.com/ApplicationView.aspx?ApplicationId=511>

I respectfully ask that the following will be read to and heard by the Commission Panel, the Applicant BC Hydro and all participating interveners:

1. Regrettable some interveners – who are BC Hydro ratepayers, including myself – are in the unfortunate unprepared situation now before and in the up-coming procedural hearing. That do mainly because of the complexity of, and technical language in, the voluminous application.

Some registered interveners have their intervener status rescinded. This is mainly caused due by innocence and having no former experience with previous hearings and hearing procedures.

Those rescinded interveners are just a little more than two hands-full out of how many thousands BC Hydro ratepayers who were prepared to take part in the subject hearing process.

However by unknowingly and unintentionally failing to follow certain procedures they have been "cut-off" from actively participating in the hearing.

The Commission received many emails in support of having Sharon Noble's intervener status reinstated.

I have been in contact and worked together with Sharon Noble, and I can attest that by now she has emerged as

an true unbiased expert in many facets of hydro utilities issues, thus I see her very much qualified to contribute to the subject and future hearings and presenting on behalf of thousands of "sleeping" (innocently, unexperienced as well as ignorant and indifferent) BC ratepayers.

Would there have been already a legal assistance for our group on hand, the lawyer acting on our behalf would have made the submissions and the responses in a correct fashion, without intervener risking their status being rescinded.

2. In response to the Commission's January 8, 2016, Request for Comments on Request made by Sharon Noble (A-9<http://www.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2016/DOC_45375_A-9-Comments-on-NobleRequest.pdf>) I again request and support, that Sharon

Noble will be reinstated as intervener as she would be the best person to represent the general innocent public directly and indirectly affected in the subject hearing.

3. It is to be noted, that until today, Monday, January 18, 2016, noon, for the fourth time a lawyer declined our request to have Sharon Noble and myself represented in addition in their group they are already representing. (By request, we will give details in a confidential email).

I strongly support Sharon Nobles request (ENCLOSURE below) that the Commission Panel is appointing a lawyer for a herself and myself in the whole subject hearing process. Sharon Noble referred to section 116 of the BC Utilities Act.

4. Furthermore, the Commission

Panel is respectfully asked to officially offer all rescinded interveners to join Sharon Noble and myself altogether in one group, and being represented by the to be appointed lawyer.

4.1. In the event a lawyer has been appointed for the group, that this lawyer please sends an immediate email to all mentioned in the CC list, so that the members of that group can still inform the lawyer about the concerning topics to be addressed in the ongoing procedural conference by way of return email.

4.2 The Commission Panel might please consider late submission into the procedural conference stage no later than Friday, January 22, 2016.

5. Sharon Noble's request for a concise summary of the application by the Applicant I also support herewith,

as this would then help innocent residential ratepayers find out whether they are positively and negatively affected by the application.

A summary in layman's language is the only and best way to attract ratepayers interest and that they get inclined to express their concerns or arguments.

The application is just too complex and hard to understand, with which I still have a problem as well.

6. In a following confidential email I provide the telephone number by which Sharon Noble can be reached between 9:00 – 12:00 a.m. today, should any party wish to contact her. Sharon Noble will also answer on my behalf, as I cannot communicate over the phone due to my hearing handicap.

Respectfully submitted,

Hans Karow, reg. intervener

ENCLOSURE

From: Dennis and Sharon Noble
[mailto:dsnoble@shaw.ca]
Sent: January-18-16 4:03 PM
To: 'Commission Secretary BCUC:EX'
Cc: Hans Karow
Subject: request for legal assistance

Dear Secretary Hamilton,

As per section 116, I am asking that those of us who wish to join together as interveners be allowed to have legal assistance and for legal representation. Without legal assistance we will be in an unfavourable position.

We will have an interim list of points and concerns that we wish to have addressed in the present application

process and will forward it for consideration tomorrow. We reserve the right to amend that list.

In consideration of the foregoing, sections 1-3 we ask that the regulatory timetable be adjusted.

Also we ask that BC Hydro supply, in layman's language, a concise summary of the application with regard to residential ratepayers. This would assist an appointed lawyer who might be new to the application.

Class representation

116 (1) The commission may appoint counsel to represent a class of persons interested in a matter for the purpose of instituting or attending on an application or hearing before the commission or another tribunal or authority.

(2) The commission may fix the costs of

the counsel and may order by whom
and in what amount or proportion they
be paid.

Respectfully,
Sharon Noble

From: Hans Karow
[mailto:hansk@telus.net]
Sent: January-15-16 12:36 PM
To: 'Commission Secretary BCUC:EX';
Cheng, Eileen BCUC:EX
(Eileen.Cheng@bcuc.com<mailto:Eileen.
Cheng@bcuc.com>)
Cc: 'Dennis and Sharon Noble';
'iknowjanis@shaw.ca';
bob@creativeharmonicsolutions.com<m
ailto:bob@creativeharmonicsolutions.co
m>; 's.ridout@shaw.ca';
'jaynepriest@gmail.com';
mildredl@telus.net<mailto:mildredl@tel
us.net>; 'roger.bryenton@earthlink.net';
emcinnnesrankin@yahoo.ca<mailto:emci

nnesrankin@yahoo.ca>;
jejaervin@telus.net<<mailto:jejaervin@telus.net>>;
cbefire@telus.net<<mailto:cbefire@telus.net>>;
dramage@shaw.ca<<mailto:dramage@shaw.ca>>; 'dramage@PSF.CA'

Subject: FW: Your email to the
Commission Secretary of BCUC dated
January 8, 2016 --- BC Hydro 2015 Rate
Design Application

Dear Ms. Hamilton and Mrs. Cheng,

1. Could your office please update the subject hearing's link with the Distribution List, as requested before in my Jan 14 email, cut/copied and pasted yellow highlighted below.

I am awaiting a response from the Commission whether we will be allowed to join another lawyer.
To find an overview of the lawyers

already “in” in the hearing and representing whom is the main reason why I am asking for the Distribution List, which is normally included in a hearing’s web site.

2. The Procedural Conference is scheduled to January 19.

I do not know how this date will negatively impact the position of individual residential –and mostly innocent/unexperienced – interveners, who are ratepayers, as we are desperately seeking the help of a lawyer representing us by way of joining already his/her group he/she is representing.

Joining other parties with similar concerns is a reasonable approach and has always been favored or requested by the Commission; that mainly for the sake of saving the PACA budget.

2.1 please inform whether

the Commission will approve our seeking a lawyer's help, as stated before; if the Commission does not approve, please the reasons provided.

2.2 if approved, would the Commission allow late submissions into the procedural hearing also at a later date until we have shared our points with the chosen lawyer to be presented into the procedural hearing.

2.3 When are the Information Requests expected to be submitted into the hearing?

Thank you very much in advance,

Yours truly,

Hans Karow

From: Hans Karow
[mailto:hansk@telus.net]
Sent: January-14-16 2:57 PM