

**Box 484, Kaslo
British Columbia, V0G 1M0**



**Phone: (250)353-7350
E-Mail: ashadra@telus.net**

August 4th, 2017

British Columbia Utilities Commission
Sixth Floor, 900 Howe Street, Box 250
Vancouver, B.C.
V6Z 2N3

Attention: Patrick Wruck, Commission Secretary

Dear Sir:

Re: FortisBC Inc. 2016 Long Term Electric Resource Plan (LTERP) and Long Term Demand Side Management Plan (LT DSM Plan) ~ Project No.3698896

Reply Submission

My decision to file a letter of objection to B-23 arose after FortisBC had filed both B-22 and B-23, in which I note that my only goal has been to file evidence so that a better discussion and a better decision can be reached.

In filing the material on July 7th I observed in a letter to the Commission that on that very morning I had become aware of the existence of the report, and yet FortisBC insinuated in B-22 that, because it was completed in December 2016, posted on the RDCK website April 21st, 2017, and because I was the former Electoral Area Director for D, I knew differently.

In B-23 FortisBC pushed the issue further by suggesting that I had purposely violated Rule 11.06 and misused Rule 11.08 and concluded by stating:

"Presently we are not seeking that the material be expunged from the record though reserve our right to do so based on further review."

C-10-8-1 was originally part of a batch of five letters, dated June 25th, sent by courier to the Commission on June 27th, with the understanding that Canada Post would deliver the material by June 29th. Prior to sending the material, I had previously had a conversation with Commission staff seeking guidance as to how it should be packaged and sent due to the somewhat personal nature of some of the correspondence.

The panel reviewed the material and decided that it needed to be in a different format than the one determined in the original discussion I had had with Commission staff, and even though I received the panel's directive a week late, I turned the material around and got it back to the Commission only four days after the original deadline set by the panel.

Upon reading B-22 and B-23, I experienced, and still do experience when reading them, a public reprimand from FortisBC, even though they admit that they would not have sent B-23 if they had had all of the facts now before them, which I believe could have been avoided if FBC had picked up the phone and talked to me in person or with the Commission.

In this context, I, as a customer of thirty years, with no staff and legal assistance in this hearing, have been struggling to follow all the rules and protocols, and twice sought guidance from the Commission and staff prior to June 25th, and then in a formal letter on July 7th.

While I agree that FortisBC has the right to express an opinion on the evidence placed before the Commission, and to express an opinion on any aspect of the process itself, I continue to object to FortisBC being allowed to keep on the record a document that falsely accuses me, or any other intervenor, of something that has not been done nor ever was intended to be done.

I also object to FortisBC berating the Commission as well, in a situation in which I, as a lay intervenor, was learning how things should be filed in certain situations, and they, the Commission, did absolutely nothing wrong, but rather gave me guiding instructions along the way.

If FortisBC had simply said: we are concerned that sections 11.06 and 11.08 are not being properly followed, that is one thing. However, B-23 is a follow up letter to B-22 that ends with a very real threat that FBC "*reserve our right to*" call for material to be expunged "*based on further review*".

I filed material and followed up on the filing of that material at the direction of the Commission and its staff, and did nothing wrong other than now acknowledging that the deadline of June 29th was missed by one day because I used postal courier rather than filing electronically, as I do not have the office capability in my home or in the community in which I live to do otherwise.

FortisBC therefore needs to stop making false accusations against customer-intervenors before it has corroborated the facts of the matter, and needs to reflect on the fact that making such statements and threats can be quite intimidating for the average customer.

In conclusion, I believe that it is the Commission's responsibility to determine if I have broken the rules of procedure, and to determine if any material should or should not be filed in a particular hearing and in what format, which is why I sought guidance from the Commission and its staff in the first place, and did not presume to inform either the applicant or the other intervenors as I did not believe it was my place to do so until the Commission had determined what should be done.

If there is a better way to file in-camera material and late material then I need to be informed on how to do so, so that this situation does not arise again, noting that I still believe, for all of the aforementioned reasons, that B-23 as an official letter should be withdrawn and that the Commission should so order it be expunged as FortisBC improperly sent it in the first place.

In conclusion I also wish to go on the record that I am also concerned that FortisBC has posted these two letters, B-22 and B-23, to its own website, as it often does with submissions to the BC Utilities Commission.

All of which is respectfully submitted,
Andy Shadrack