

**BRITISH COLUMBIA UTILITIES COMMISSION**  
**IN THE MATTER OF THE UTILITIES COMMISSION ACT**  
**R.S.B.C. 1996, CHAPTER 473**

**and**

**RE: British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority**  
**Waneta 2017 Transaction Application**  
**Project No. 158933**

**VANCOUVER, B.C.**  
**April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018**

---

**PROCEDURAL CONFERENCE**

---

**BEFORE:**

**A. Fung Q.C.,**

**Panel Chair**

**R. I. Mason,**

**Commissioner**

**VOLUME 3**

## APPEARANCES

L. BUSSOLI	Commission Counsel
J. CHRISTIAN	BC Hydro and Power Authority
D. AUSTIN	Clean Energy Association of British Columbia
W.A. ANDREWS	B.C. Sustainable Energy Association and Sierra Club of B.C.
C.P. WEAVER	Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia
L. HERBST Q.C.	FortisBC Inc.
A. BRADLEY	City of Trail
D. BOTH	Teck Resources Ltd.
J. QUAIL	Movement of United Professionals

**INDEX**

**PAGE**

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CHRISTIAN ..... 85

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. AUSTIN ..... 102

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ANDREWS ..... 108

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WEAVER ..... 110

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HERBST Q.C. .... 114

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BRADLEY ..... 115

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOTH ..... 116

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. QUAIL ..... 117

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BUSSOLI ..... 119

**VANCOUVER, B.C.**

**April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018**

**(PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 9:00 A.M.)**

1  
2  
3  
4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good morning, everyone, and thank you  
5 for your attendance this morning. In case you are  
6 wondering, I'm not Dave Morton. My name is Anna Fung,  
7 and I'm one of three Commissioners who have been  
8 appointed as the Panel to hear the application related  
9 to BC Hydro's proposed acquisition of the Waneta Dam,  
10 otherwise referred to as the Waneta 2017 transaction,  
11 or the application, in short.

12 I bring you sincere apologies from our  
13 Chair and the Chair of our Panel, Dave Morton, who is  
14 very sorry not to be able to join us this morning, due  
15 to an unavoidable scheduling conflict that has  
16 recently arisen. He's asked me to chair today's  
17 procedural conference in his absence, however, and I'm  
18 very pleased to have with me Commissioner Richard  
19 Mason to my left, who is the third member of our  
20 Panel.

21 By way of background reminder to everyone,  
22 the British Columbia Utilities Commission received  
23 this application on October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017. This is the  
24 second of the procedural conferences that have been  
25 ordered by the BCUC. The first was established by  
26 Order G-15-18 and heard on February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018.



1 billion dollar purchase price.

2 The second issue we wish to canvas is each  
3 party's availability for an oral hearing, if one is  
4 established for any one or more of the following dates  
5 in April. Saturday, April 7<sup>th</sup>, Wednesday April 11<sup>th</sup>,  
6 Sunday April 15<sup>th</sup>, Thursday April 19<sup>th</sup>, and Friday April  
7 20<sup>th</sup>.

8 The third issue we would like participants  
9 to canvas today is your views on whether or not we  
10 should be using a concurrent evidence approach,  
11 otherwise known as "hot-tubbing", for cross-  
12 examination of witnesses at the oral hearing if one is  
13 established, whereby witnesses would give evidence  
14 concurrently, and are available at the same time for  
15 cross-examination.

16 Now, if your submission is that no oral  
17 hearing is required, the panel would nonetheless like  
18 you to tell us whether you feel that additional  
19 evidence is nonetheless required in order to deal with  
20 the three sub-issues that were outlined under issue  
21 number one.

22 At this point, I would like to acknowledge  
23 and introduce some individuals from the BCUC who are  
24 here with us today. Ashita Anand Sanghera is the lead  
25 staff for the application. She is sitting in the  
26 front row on my right-hand side, and next to her is

1 Nicola Simone, director of facilities and  
2 infrastructure at the BCUC. We have as well, our BCUC  
3 counsel Lino Bussoli from Lundy Atmore, sitting at the  
4 front. And last, but certainly not least, Hal  
5 Bemister, our Hearing Officer and his able team to my  
6 right.

7 **Proceeding Time 9:06 a.m. T3**

8 Now, before I hand things over to Mr.  
9 Bussoli to call on our appearances today, I would like  
10 each of you to make sure that your submissions are  
11 directed to the three main issues that I have just  
12 outlined, together with any other issues that you, or  
13 any other participants today, wish to raise, and that  
14 the Panel accepts as appropriate to add to the agenda  
15 for this meeting.

16 In identifying individual issues, however,  
17 please bear in mind that it is not the purpose or the  
18 goal of this procedure conference to compare or  
19 discuss the particular merits of the application, but  
20 rather to address the three issues I have outlined.

21 In the Panel's views, these issues can most  
22 conveniently and efficiently be canvassed  
23 collectively, as opposed to issue by issue. But if  
24 you have an alternate view, we're happy to consider  
25 it. And please address this during your appearance.

26 After appearances, the order of submissions

1 from participants will be as follows. We will begin  
2 with the applicant, BC Hydro, followed by the order of  
3 appearance. Once we've reached the end of the list of  
4 interveners, beginning with the last intervener to  
5 speak, interveners will then have a right to reply to  
6 previous submissions in reverse order. BC Hydro will  
7 have the right of final reply.

8 Before asking Mr. Bussoli for appearances  
9 to be called, I would like to remind all of you that  
10 we are transcribing this proceeding here today, and  
11 for the benefit of our reporter, I ask that you please  
12 speak loudly and clearly into the microphone, so that  
13 your submissions can be properly and accurately  
14 recorded.

15 As you enter your appearance, please state  
16 and spell your name for the record, indicate the party  
17 whom you're representing, and identify any additional  
18 issues that you wish us to consider.

19 Mr. Bussoli, please proceed with your call  
20 for appearances. Thank you.

21 MR. BUSSOLI: Thank you, Madam Chair. The first in the  
22 order of appearances is British Columbia Hydro and  
23 Power Authority.

24 MR. CHRISTIAN: Good morning, Madam Chair and  
25 Commissioner Mason. Jeff Christian, C-H-R-I-S-T-I-A-  
26 N, appearing on behalf of BC Hydro and Power

1 Authority. We'll be addressing all the issues, of  
2 course, set out in the Commission's letter, Exhibit A-  
3 21, but our submissions, BC Hydro's submissions, are  
4 informed by discussions with counsel that have led to  
5 an alternate proposal, if you will, that I'll be also  
6 laying out when it comes time for me to speak in the  
7 matters that are before us today.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Christian.

9 MR. BUSSOLI: Next is the Clean Energy Association of  
10 British Columbia.

11 MR. AUSTIN: Good morning, Panel. David Austin, A-U-S-T-  
12 I-N, appearing on behalf of the Clean Energy  
13 Association of B.C. I just have one question. What  
14 happens if the two of you disagree on a matter? Who  
15 gets the casting vote?

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think we do it by arm-wrestling.

17 MR. AUSTIN: Okay, well, just do it behind closed doors,  
18 okay?

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Austin.

20 MR. BUSSOLI: British Columbia Sustainable Energy  
21 Association, and the Sierra Club of B.C.

22 MR. ANDREWS: Good morning, Commissioners. William  
23 Andrews appearing for the B.C. Sustainable Energy  
24 Association and the Sierra Club of B.C.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

26 MR. BUSSOLI: Commercial Energy Consumers Association of

1 British Columbia.

2 MR. WEAVER: Good morning, Madam Chair, Commissioner  
3 Mason. Chris Weaver, spelled W-E-A-F-E-R, appearing  
4 on behalf of the Commercial Energy Consumers  
5 Association of British Columbia, and we have no  
6 matters to add to the agenda.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

8 MR. BUSSOLI: Next is FortisBC Inc.

9 MS. HERBST: Good morning. For FortisBC Inc., I'm  
10 Ludmilla Herbst, H-E-R-B-S-T. And I have no items to  
11 add to the agenda, thank you.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

13 MR. BUSSOLI: The City of Trail.

14 MS. BRADLEY: Good morning. I'm Alyssa Bradley, B-R-A-D-  
15 L-E-Y, and I'm counsel for the City of Trail. And we  
16 have nothing to add to the agenda.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

18 MR. BUSSOLI: Next is Teck Resources Limited.

19 MR. BOTH: Good morning, panel. David Both, B-O-T-H, for  
20 Teck Resources, and we have nothing to add.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

22 MR. BUSSOLI: And finally the Movement of United  
23 Professionals.

24 MR. QUAIL: Good morning. Jim Quail, Q-U-A-I-L,  
25 appearing for, for short, MoveUP, which is the union  
26 that represents BC Hydro inside workers. And nothing

1 to add to the agenda, and content to proceed as  
2 proposed by the Panel.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Quail.

4 Okay, I think, Mr. Christian, you're up.

5 **Proceeding Time: 9:11 a.m. T4**

6 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CHRISTIAN:**

7 MR. CHRISTIAN: Thank you. So, as I mentioned, we are  
8 going to put a proposal forth. That proposal in  
9 informed by a discussions with counsel late last week,  
10 and to some extent over the weekend. Before I get  
11 into that, I'll just outline kind of BC Hydro's  
12 general perspective on issues raised by the Exhibit A-  
13 21 letter, and then I'll go into that proposal.

14 An oral evidentiary phase, that's what the  
15 topic of our discussion is today. In BC Hydro's  
16 submission an oral evidentiary phase is really about  
17 the cross-examinations, about the cross-examination of  
18 witnesses under oath. So, the question about an oral  
19 evidentiary phase has to be asked from the perspective  
20 of -- or considered from the perspective of, who has  
21 an interest in asking questions of the witnesses?  
22 Only BC Hydro and the Clean Energy Association have  
23 filed evidence, and so the cross-examination would  
24 only be of their witnesses.

25 BC Hydro does not have an interest  
26 particularly in cross-examining Clean Energy

1 Association's witnesses. We understand the Clean  
2 Energy Association does not similarly have a  
3 particularly strong, or any interest in cross-  
4 examining BC Hydro witnesses. I have not being able  
5 to canvass all counsel completely, but my  
6 understanding is generally there is a lack of desire  
7 to prepare for and attend at a cross-examination  
8 session.

9 And so, I think the general feeling has  
10 been, in my discussions, that an oral evidentiary  
11 phase may not be particularly helpful or desired at  
12 this time.

13 But I want to speak to BC Hydro's  
14 perspective now more specifically about the need for  
15 an oral evidentiary phase generally, and then in  
16 context of those three items that were identified in  
17 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c).

18 As BC Hydro submitted in the last  
19 procedural conference in February, in its view cross-  
20 examination of witnesses is primarily to elicit  
21 information that has not been able to be elicited  
22 through the IR process, the written IR process that  
23 precedes the oral phase. In this case, it's largely a  
24 commercial transaction. BC Hydro's analysis of the  
25 transaction is a quantitative analysis, and BC Hydro  
26 has received about 1500 IRs now, asking about that

1 analysis, and has done approximately 450 sensitivity  
2 analyses. Each one of the sensitivity analyses  
3 involves taking an input parameter into the  
4 quantitative model used to assess the transaction, and  
5 then modifying it. And so the spreadsheet, if the  
6 Commission Panel has had an opportunity to look at it,  
7 that contains all the different analyses with all the  
8 different assumptions and the sensitivity analysis, is  
9 getting quite large and cumbersome.

10 In BC Hydro's submission, it's difficult to  
11 see a lot of value in a cross-examination context to  
12 how that evidence might be further illuminated. A  
13 question might be asked, for example, of a witness,  
14 imagining a BC Hydro witnesses being asked a question  
15 about a sensitivity analysis that the questioner  
16 thinks may not have been run already by BC Hydro.  
17 We're at a number now that in fact it's going to be  
18 difficult for a witness to know exactly whether or not  
19 the sensitivity analysis has been run without going  
20 back and doing an undertaking and kind of discovering  
21 whether that has been done. Even if it has been done,  
22 even if the sensitivity analysis has been done,  
23 putting the context into it is not something that is  
24 readily amenable to oral testimony.

25 In particular, for example, if a different  
26 long-run marginal cost example is given, or hypothesis

1 or assumption is given, or a different financing  
2 assumption is given. That number by itself doesn't  
3 have a lot of meaning, unless it's run through the  
4 model to show what the effect of that assumption is on  
5 the cost effectiveness of the transaction.

6 And so, one of the overarching concerns  
7 that BC Hydro has with an oral evidentiary phase is,  
8 that we're going to get questions asked of the  
9 witnesses that they may not be able to answer without  
10 doing undertakings, which delays the process, or they  
11 are not give meaningful answers without running the  
12 model to see what the new assumption is, or the  
13 tweaked assumption is, and how that affects the cost  
14 effectiveness. And again, that leads to further  
15 undertakings and a further delay. So, the idea that  
16 it's a one day evidentiary process seems to be fraught  
17 with some risk, from BC Hydro's perspective, that is  
18 namely to risk of delaying the evidentiary phase  
19 further.

20 An additional -- and let me add one thing  
21 here to kind of give more colour to that submission.  
22 I mentioned that BC Hydro has been in discussions with  
23 interveners, primarily the Clean Energy Association,  
24 late last week and over the weekend. In the course of  
25 those discussions, three other sensitivity analyses  
26 were identified by the Clean Energy Association, and



1                   An additional consideration regarding an  
2                   oral evidentiary phase arises from the amount of  
3                   confidential information that's been put on the record  
4                   in this proceeding. So in Exhibit B-1-5 BC Hydro is  
5                   able to put on the public record of this proceeding a  
6                   fair bit of information that had previously been filed  
7                   in confidence. There was a number of confidential IRs  
8                   that were asked, where the information that was given  
9                   in response was not itself confidential, so BC Hydro  
10                  put that information on the public record. There was  
11                  a fair bit of information that was filed in confidence  
12                  that was no longer needed to be kept in confidence in  
13                  light of the agreement between BC Hydro and FortisBC,  
14                  and the agreement between them, which was Exhibit B-  
15                  17.

16                  So we put a bunch of confidential  
17                  information on the public record, but there still  
18                  remains quite a bit of confidential information on the  
19                  confidential record that isn't generally publically  
20                  available. The concern that BC Hydro has is that in  
21                  an oral hearing it's a little bit harder to control  
22                  how the process works. It's kind of real time. So  
23                  when the question comes that elicits an answer that  
24                  requires a disclosure of confidential information, the  
25                  witnesses need to be on the top of their game to be  
26                  able to not answer without thinking exactly whether

1           there's a confidential issue associated with that  
2           answer. Counsel need to be on the alert. To the  
3           extent that everybody is doing their job and they get  
4           it right, and the question is a fair question that the  
5           Commission wants an answer to, now we have a bit of a  
6           problem because this is a public hearing process and  
7           the answer that would be given to the question reveals  
8           confidential information and now we need some sort of  
9           confidential process within the process. I'm not  
10          saying that's necessarily going to happen. Clearly  
11          the three issues that the Commission has identified  
12          don't necessarily lead to the disclosure of  
13          confidential information, but they could, and if they  
14          do, there's a further process risk that I'm speaking  
15          of. How do you deal with an oral hearing where you  
16          need, on one hand, timeliness; on the other hand  
17          respect the confidentiality issues that have been  
18          raised by BC Hydro with respect to its evidence.

19                        These things are not insurmountable  
20          problems, of course. Confidential components of oral  
21          hearings happen all the time in commissions and this  
22          Commission in particular has established process to  
23          do it, but they do add further delay and complication.  
24          And so again, the idea that we have a one-day  
25          evidentiary phase without any hiccups and lead to a  
26          close of the evidence, seems to be somewhat risky to

1 BC Hydro and therefore compromises the ability of the  
2 Commission to look at the evidence and the arguments,  
3 and give the orders required by mid-July one way or  
4 another.

5 So that's where BC Hydro is coming from.  
6 In discussions with counsel for Clean Energy  
7 Association an alternate proposal was arrived at. The  
8 Commission will recall that there was some discussion  
9 in the February procedural conference about the  
10 distinction between an oral evidentiary phase and an  
11 oral argument phase. And it turns out, I think that  
12 as between at least BC Hydro and Clean Energy  
13 Association BC, we think that there is some value in  
14 having an oral argument phase instead of an oral  
15 evidentiary phase. And that oral argument phase would  
16 not be in replacement or in substitution of written  
17 argument, but would rather precede it. The prelude,  
18 if you will. The introduction.

19 The idea would be that parties would have  
20 an opportunity to outline their case in oral  
21 submissions made by counsel. One day would be more  
22 than sufficient, although I doubt it would take that  
23 long. BC Hydro would participate, Clean Energy  
24 Association of BC would participate. Other parties --  
25 other interveners, I should say, who would want to  
26 make a submission would have that opportunity to make

1           that oral submission.

2                         There would be no right of reply, so it  
3           wouldn't be argument in the traditional sense, but of  
4           course all the parties would be filing written  
5           argument afterwards. so that you get to hear each  
6           other's outline of their case, and respond in their  
7           written arguments in due course.

8                         Another advantage is that it allows the  
9           Commission Panel to hear the perspective of the  
10          commissions [*sic*] orally, before they file written  
11          argument, and perhaps even direct the parties to focus  
12          their attention on issues of argument that are of  
13          particular interest to the Commission Panel. And in  
14          that way -- well, in both those ways, I guess, both by  
15          informing the interveners of each other's positions  
16          and the Commission Panel hearing about the  
17          intervenors' positions, there is even a possibility of  
18          a somewhat more efficient written argument phase.

19                                 **Proceeding Time 9:21 a.m. T6**

20                         From BC Hydro's perspective, the biggest  
21          benefit of this is that it allows the evidence to be  
22          closed this week. Assuming BC Hydro files responses  
23          to the three IRs that we received from Clean Energy  
24          Association on the weekend, that would happen by the  
25          end of the week; the evidence would be closed and,  
26          from BC Hydro's perspective, once the evidence is

1 closed, process risk is largely eliminated. The stage  
2 is set, as it were, for the Commission Panel to direct  
3 an order of written argument that takes us to a time  
4 some time in June or July, necessary for the  
5 Commission to hear the evidence -- or, sorry, to hear  
6 the arguments -- read the arguments, I guess it would  
7 be, and then render a decision before mid-July.

8 So that's the proposal. Just check my  
9 notes to make sure I didn't miss anything in terms of  
10 what the substance of it was here. Yeah, and I guess  
11 the only thing I didn't mention was, it seems to me  
12 that the way it would work is that the presentations  
13 would be made, questions would be asked of counsel by  
14 the Panel, but there wouldn't be questions asked of  
15 counsel of each other. I wouldn't be asking David to  
16 clarify what he meant, and he wouldn't ask me. But of  
17 course questions from the Commission Panel to counsel  
18 on points of clarification would be more than  
19 appropriate.

20 And then -- so that's the proposal. And  
21 then with respect to the specific items now in the  
22 Commission's Exhibit A-21, so items 1(a), 1(b), and  
23 1(c) I think largely suffer in BC Hydro's submission  
24 from the issue that I described at the outset, when I  
25 talked about the issues of an oral evidentiary phase  
26 in this proceeding, namely, to the extent that BC

1 Hydro is asked questions about its load serving  
2 obligations 20 or 30 years from now, that's item 1(a),  
3 a meaningful answer is going to be difficult to come  
4 up with on the spot, without some sort of undertaking  
5 response, and putting it in the context of this  
6 transaction, this quantitative transaction, that is  
7 taking the questions, giving some meaning to it in the  
8 context of BC Hydro's assessment of the cost-  
9 effectiveness of the transaction, isn't something  
10 that's going to happen on the panel, or in the course  
11 of a hearing day. It's going to have to happen  
12 afterwards.

13 That's true for 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c). Each  
14 one of those topics raises a potential sensitivity  
15 analysis that requires a quantitative assessment to  
16 understand whether it matters from the perspective of  
17 the cost-effectiveness of the transaction.

18 The only additional item I'd say is on  
19 1(c), and this is where 1(c) maybe is a bit -- has one  
20 unique element, or one aspect of it that's a little  
21 bit different, is that the way the question is framed,  
22 the risks or benefits of BC Hydro's proposal to rely  
23 on debt financing raises a question in BC Hydro's mind  
24 about whether there is an assumption about BC Hydro's  
25 ability to issue equity financing, or engage in equity  
26 financing. BC Hydro is, of course, a Crown

1 corporation. It's an agent of the government, and  
2 it's no more able to engage in equity financing than  
3 the government itself is. It doesn't issue common  
4 shares, or of that sort. However, it's modeled the  
5 transaction on the assumption that it does. So it's  
6 financial malice. It assumes a debt/equity ratio and  
7 a cost of capital that's consistent with an equity  
8 financing arrangement, but it can't actually do it.  
9 And that was just a point of clarification. I'm not  
10 sure if that was relevant to the specific topic put  
11 forward at 1(c) or not.

12 With respect to availability, all the  
13 parties, I think, except for Mr. Weafer, his client,  
14 the Commercial Energy Consumers, were thinking April  
15 19<sup>th</sup> or 20<sup>th</sup> would work. It's a little early; it would  
16 be very difficult to come together for our proposed  
17 oral argument day. It turns out Mr. Weafer is not  
18 available that day. BC Hydro would be available any  
19 day the following week; that is the week of the 23<sup>rd</sup>.  
20 That, of course, may sound a little bit counter-  
21 intuitive. Why would we be proposing a later date?  
22 The answer is, from BC Hydro's perspective, the  
23 process risk arises from the evidentiary phase, and  
24 the possibility of further undertakings and further  
25 analysis. And so if the evidence is closed this week,  
26 we think we have benefitted significantly and the

1 incremental time to have an oral argument day in the  
2 week of the 23<sup>rd</sup> -- the cost of that is very modest.  
3 Small indeed.

4 So, that's on the timing. I think that  
5 addresses item 2. Item 3, the hot-tubbing proposal.  
6 In BC Hydro's submission, "hot-tubbing" refers to the  
7 idea of putting witnesses of parties who may be  
8 adverse, on the same witness panel to be cross-  
9 examined concurrently.

10 **Proceeding Time: 9:25 a.m. T7**

11 That raises in BC Hydro's mind, procedural fairness  
12 concerns. If David and I are both listening to our  
13 witnesses being cross-examined, it may be uncertain  
14 whether an objection lies or doesn't lie. In BC  
15 Hydro's submission, hot-tubbing happens, and is used  
16 really only when we have expert witness testimony to  
17 be elicited. Experts are meant to be unbiased, they  
18 are meant to help the decision makers, they are not  
19 meant to have a stake in the outcome, and therefore  
20 putting them on the panel at the same time can be  
21 valuable. It serves to identify points of common  
22 ground, and points of distinction, and that could be  
23 very helpful of our decision maker. Because they are  
24 meant to be unbiased, the procedural fairness concerns  
25 are reduced. Putting witnesses on, party witnesses on  
26 on the same examination table at the same time, to be

1 examined at the same time, raises procedural fairness  
2 concerns. So, BC Hydro is not in favour of the hot-  
3 tubbing approach, assuming that the Commission decides  
4 that it still wants to have an oral evidentiary day.

5 And then I think the only other thing I  
6 need to say is that of course this is a proposal from  
7 us, you get to hear from my friends. I think you'll  
8 hear support, but if the Commission decides no, it  
9 does want to have the oral evidentiary day, I just  
10 want to say despite my earlier comments about not  
11 having a particularly strong interest in cross-  
12 examining Clean Energy's witnesses, BC Hydro reserves  
13 the right, of course, to participate fully if there  
14 should be an evidentiary day. Okay.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Before Mr. Austin can -- I do have some  
16 questions, but I will defer to Commission Mason first.

17 COMMISSIONER MASON: No, you can go ahead.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Christian, I did ask parties to  
19 address a view -- if your submission is that no oral  
20 hearing, or no oral evidentiary hearing is required,  
21 whether or not you feel that additional evidence would  
22 be helpful to deal with the three main or three sub-  
23 issues?

24 MR. CHRISTIAN: You're right, and implicitly I meant to  
25 get that, but obviously only implicitly. But  
26 expressly, so that types of evidence that might still

1 be required, or rebuttal evidence from BC Hydro, BC  
2 Hydro does not seek the right to file rebuttal  
3 evidence. BC Hydro doesn't think that there is any  
4 more IRs out there being asked of it, or information  
5 that is being elicited with respect to it, other than  
6 the three IRs we got from Clean Energy Association.  
7 And from its perspective, it doesn't need anymore  
8 evidence from the Clean Energy Association. From our  
9 perspective, we don't need any more evidence from the  
10 one other party who has put evidence in, and we're not  
11 seeing any indication that more evidence is required  
12 from us. And our option to put in rebuttal evidence  
13 is being waived.

14 So, I think that covers the three areas of  
15 evidence that might still be elicited other than  
16 through the oral hearing process that is contemplated  
17 by A-21.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Christian. My second  
19 question, you referenced the request from Clean Energy  
20 for you to run three scenarios?

21 MR. CHRISTIAN: Mm-hmm.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: And you said you need a couple days at  
23 least -- first of all to verify that they haven't  
24 already been done.

25 MR. CHRISTIAN: Right.

26 THE CHAIRPERSON: Secondly if they haven't, then to

1           actually do them and provide them. I assume that if  
2           they are needed, and you are going to do them, that  
3           you will put them on the record?

4 MR. CHRISTIAN:   Of course, absolutely. And the idea  
5           would be that they would be put on the record, and  
6           from Hydro's perspective, assuming that the proposal  
7           is accepted by the Commission that Hydro has just put  
8           forward, that would close the evidence. And that  
9           would clear the decks, as it were, for the Commission  
10          to establish an order for argument, including the oral  
11          argument day that we've discussed, and written  
12          argument to follow.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON:   And now my third question, and you may  
14          want to think about this, or confer with your  
15          colleagues at BC Hydro before you answer this.  
16          Assuming the Panel agrees with the proposal to have an  
17          oral argument phase, what is your proposal for a date  
18          for that, and what would be the appropriate period  
19          between that and the filing of the final written  
20          argument?

21 MR. CHRISTIAN:   So, with respect to the first question,  
22          any day in the week of April 23<sup>rd</sup> works for BC Hydro.  
23          And we would suggest that it should be some day in  
24          that week. That's the earliest date that we can I  
25          think we can I think accommodate all counsel is my  
26          understanding right now. And we don't really -- the

1 earlier the better in that week. But it doesn't  
2 matter which day.

3 And with respect to the time between that  
4 oral argument day and the exchange of written  
5 argument, we don't have a proposal on written argument  
6 yet. I know that my friends have discussed some  
7 alternatives at the February procedural conference,  
8 and it seems to me that their interest may be driving  
9 the bus a little bit more in that regard. In the  
10 normal course, it would be BC Hydro argument,  
11 intervenor argument, and BC Hydro reply. But we've  
12 heard some enthusiasm, I guess, in February for  
13 something different that allows intervenors to respond  
14 to each other's arguments, and there is different ways  
15 that could be done.

16 **Proceeding Time 9:30 a.m. T8**

17 And so we don't have a proposal right now  
18 on what that looks like. But generally speaking, I  
19 would say if we had -- and this is just generally  
20 speaking -- if we had an oral argument day in the week  
21 of the 23<sup>rd</sup>, obviously we'd be preparing for that. I  
22 would have thought BC Hydro's first written  
23 submission, first oral -- sorry. First written  
24 argument could probably be two to three weeks after  
25 that. So we'd be looking at, you know, that would be  
26 mid -- 10<sup>th</sup> of May, roughly, somewhere in there.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Christian.

2 MR. CHRISTIAN: And let me add also that I think that's  
3 probably sooner than we're going to get to if we have  
4 an oral evidentiary phase, just because of the issues  
5 that I've addressed. So I think that kind of a first  
6 ten days of May timeline for the written argument to  
7 start is probably sooner than the alternative.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr. Austin?

9 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. AUSTIN:**

10 MR. AUSTIN: Needless to say, I agree with a lot of what  
11 Mr. Christian had to say. And this is in relation to  
12 the proposal, and I just emphasize it's a proposal, to  
13 have oral argument. Our view, in terms of the need  
14 for an oral hearing, is really predicated on the  
15 concept that most of the evidence is already in. And  
16 what we have now is just disagreement between the  
17 parties, meaning CABC and BC Hydro, in terms of the  
18 interpretation of that particular evidence.

19 And we think that the concept of oral  
20 argument and early argument at that, would assist the  
21 Commission in understanding the matters that are  
22 before it. Almost every application that comes before  
23 the B.C. Utilities Commission is complicated, but in  
24 this particular instance it's slightly more  
25 complicated than usual because, as Mr. Christian  
26 pointed out, the number of model runs. We're really

1 dealing with an analysis of a business case and that  
2 model runs, spreadsheets, whatever you want to call  
3 it, and the inputs into those spreadsheets determine  
4 the outputs. No surprise there. But there's  
5 disagreements between ourselves and BC Hydro with  
6 respect to the inputs. And if there's a disagreement  
7 with respect to the inputs, then clearly there's going  
8 to be a disagreement with respect to the outputs.

9 So we think that we can assist the  
10 Commission by having early oral argument, as opposed  
11 to a very brief oral hearing with cross-examination.  
12 It's our view that if you're going to have cross-  
13 examination, you're going to have to have model runs,  
14 and they can't be done instantly, we agree with that.  
15 There's no question about that.

16 So, in anticipation of the proposal to have  
17 early argument, we went through the record and  
18 determined that there were probably three model runs  
19 that still need to be done from the Clean Energy  
20 Association of B.C.'s perspective. We've given those  
21 over to BC Hydro, and I think to assist the Commission  
22 we can briefly read the Information Requests or model  
23 runs that we'd like into the record.

24 And the first one is, "Increase the  
25 discount rate of 6 percent as currently described in  
26 BC Hydro's response to BCUC IR 1.13.1 to 7 percent,



1                   So those are the requests that we're  
2                   making. We realize that there may be model runs that  
3                   already cover those points. If BC Hydro knows where  
4                   they are and would like to direct our attention to  
5                   them, that's fine too. Because as was pointed out by  
6                   Mr. Christian, there's an awful lot of model runs  
7                   right now.

8                   In response to the Commission's points in  
9                   Exhibit A-21, I think by coming up with a counter  
10                  proposal we've inherently responded to those  
11                  questions. If there's something specific that you  
12                  think should be addressed, I'd be more than happy to  
13                  do it. But we just don't think that in this  
14                  particular instance an oral evidentiary phase,  
15                  including cross-examination, would be terribly  
16                  helpful.

17                  In terms of availability, the Commission  
18                  can set the date and we'll be available.

19                  THE CHAIRPERSON: Do you have any views on hot-tubbing?

20                  MR. AUSTIN: I think it would be a good concept if we  
21                  weren't at such a technical level. The concept is  
22                  good in principle, especially in relation to, let's  
23                  say, broader policy issues or technical issues that  
24                  aren't as well defined and model driven as we have  
25                  now. It's something that I think could be used in the  
26                  future, but in this particular instance, unless we

1           have the modeller sitting right at the witness table  
2           with all the models fully loaded onto the computer and  
3           then we say, "Run this," then we're not really going  
4           to get that far. And I don't think any modeller wants  
5           to just take a number and put it into the model and  
6           then get an instant output. A lot of times the model  
7           doesn't cooperate instantaneously. There has to be  
8           some adjustments sometimes, some further thought  
9           analysis, and the modeller will always want to put  
10          everything into -- the output into context. And we  
11          appreciate that.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON:       Now, Mr. Austin, I take it you're not  
13          in favour of an oral evidentiary hearing. Do you feel  
14          that any additional evidence would be helpful to  
15          address the 1(a) through (c)? Or do you think --

16 MR. AUSTIN:       There's the three information requests, if  
17          you want to call them, we put to BC Hydro would  
18          satisfy our requirements, because we did go through  
19          the record and see where we thought the gaps still  
20          were in terms of information. We would have been  
21          pursuing those points through cross-examination should  
22          that be what the Commission decides. But we just  
23          don't think it's an efficient way to do it with  
24          respect to this particular process.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON:       Thank you. Commissioner Mason, do you  
26          have any questions for Mr. Austin?

1 COMMISSIONER MASON: Not a question for Mr. Austin, but  
2 more of an observation and a request for subsequent  
3 interveners. Just from a matter of procedural  
4 fairness, this, if I may call it, an unofficial IR  
5 round that you're engaging in, and I'm pleased to see  
6 that you're committing to put it on the record, I just  
7 want to make sure that other interveners feel that  
8 they are going to get every opportunity to ask their  
9 own questions, if they have any outstanding. I think  
10 it would be good to hear that explicitly please, from  
11 other interveners.

12 MR. AUSTIN: I certainly wouldn't disagree with that. I  
13 wouldn't really call it an information request round,  
14 it's more of a clean-up round.

15 There's been so many model runs and there's  
16 so much technical evidence on the record, to be fair  
17 to all parties, it's pretty darn difficult to ask  
18 every question about every model run early in the  
19 process, because it's not until you fully understand  
20 the business case that you understand the model runs  
21 that you think or your organization thinks should be  
22 run.

23 **Proceeding Time: 9:40 a.m. T10**

24 COMMISSIONER MASON: No, I agree, thanks for that. But I  
25 think the other intervenors may wish to have the same  
26 opportunity to dig deep that you've already taken,

1           thanks.

2   MR. AUSTIN:    I certainly don't disagree with that.  If  
3           there aren't any more questions, I'll sit down.

4   THE CHAIRPERSON:  Thank you, Mr. Austin.

5                    Mr. Andrews, you're next.

6   **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ANDREWS:**

7   MR. ANDREWS:    I support the proposal that BC Hydro and  
8           the Clean Energy B.C. have put together.  The key  
9           elements in my view being the oral argument, not a  
10          complete argument, that is in a sense that each party  
11          would make an oral submission, there would be no  
12          responses or replies, and this would be followed by a  
13          full written argument schedule.

14                   In response to the questions in Exhibit A-  
15          21, my clients don't have a need for further evidence  
16          on those three topics.  Those topics are important,  
17          but there is evidence already on the record, and they  
18          don't, to jump to Commissioner Mason's questions, they  
19          don't have a need for an additional round of  
20          supplementary questions to BC Hydro.

21                   In terms of availability, we would be  
22          available the week of April 23<sup>rd</sup>, if that was what was  
23          being proposed.

24                   And in terms of the hot-tubbing concept, I  
25          think it is an important concept to keep in mind.  It  
26          strikes me that this is probably not the most

1           opportune context to use it. For one thing, I think  
2           it has been determined that we don't need more  
3           evidentiary bases on the record. And I would add,  
4           echoing parts of what Mr. Christian and what Mr.  
5           Austin said, it seems to me that the hot-tubbing  
6           concept works best where you have experts -- at least  
7           one way in which it would work well, is when you have  
8           independent experts, not employees of the parties, who  
9           are providing unbiased information to the decision  
10          maker, and they have somewhat equivalent expertise  
11          that they can then share. And what makes the concept  
12          strong is that the experts are interacting with each  
13          other, not merely that they are both being asked  
14          questions at the same time by counsel. The idea, I  
15          think is in a large part to get counsel out of the  
16          equation, and have the experts address each other in  
17          terms of what they think are the strengths and  
18          weaknesses of their points of view.

19                 I would also agree with Mr. Austin, in this  
20          particular case the model itself, the spreadsheet  
21          model, is not the subject of dispute, and so it is the  
22          inputs and the outputs and the interpretation of them  
23          that are in dispute. And as I've said, I think here,  
24          there is sufficient evidence on those points.

25                 So, subject to any questions, those are my  
26          submissions.

1 COMMISSIONER MASON: You mentioned that you have some  
2 availability the week of April the 23<sup>rd</sup>, which has been  
3 suggested by some of your friends previously, but  
4 those weren't the dates that we suggested.

5 MR. ANDREWS: I am not available for the dates prior to  
6 April 18 and 19, but I am available on 18 and 19.

7 COMMISSIONER MASON: 18, 19, thank you.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Weafer [*sic*].

9 Next is Ms. Herbst. Oh, sorry, that was  
10 Mr. Andrews. My apologies. Mr. Weafer, you are next.

11 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WEAFER:**

12 MR. WEAFER: Thank you, Madam Chair, I'll deal with the  
13 A-21 before dealing with the proposal that we heard  
14 about this morning. The CEC has been consistent, and  
15 hasn't supported an oral hearing for this process. It  
16 is a technical proceeding. But that said, if the  
17 panel, which is really the party that wants to be  
18 satisfied you've got the proper evidentiary record, if  
19 the panel thinks it is necessary, the CEC would  
20 participate in an oral hearing. Although that doesn't  
21 seem to be the direction we're going.

22 **Proceeding Time 9:45 a.m. T11**

23 But just contextually would remind that  
24 this is a \$1.2 billion project. It's a big project.  
25 It's one of the biggest investments that the Panel's  
26 looked at in some time.

1                   So we respect the Commission looking  
2                   seriously, having as much process as needed but no  
3                   more than that. The CEC's position is that there is a  
4                   great deal of evidence on the record. It's a very  
5                   model-driven set of evidence. We're still processing  
6                   it, and while this isn't time for argument, to be  
7                   clear, we don't have a position on the project yet and  
8                   we're working to deal with the evidence that's already  
9                   on the record. So we're not convinced more is needed.

10                  With respect to the issues that the  
11                  Commission set out in A-21, we are reviewing the  
12                  evidence but are satisfied, based on what's there,  
13                  that there is enough on the record to be able to make  
14                  written submissions on those points. And we do think  
15                  they are key issues, so the Panel is certainly  
16                  identifying that as the things that we are concerned  
17                  with, that are processing in the evidentiary review.

18                  With respect to issue 2, I am not available  
19                  -- I think it's the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>. If I'm wrong, I have  
20                  18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup>, I'm not available. But I am available  
21                  any day the following week if that works, and it does  
22                  seem to work with most who have spoken so far.

23                  Turning to the hot-tubbing issue, they  
24                  don't generally align with the concerns around that  
25                  process, and that these aren't experts speaking to the  
26                  evidence but, that said, if the Commission was

1 inclined to use that approach, certainly testing the  
2 inputs, it is a topic that could be done through hot-  
3 tubbing. But we're not supportive of it. We think  
4 joining two issues that Mr. Christian identified, it's  
5 a little messy, and it's even more messy if you add  
6 the confidentiality issue that he also spoke to. If  
7 you put that into that mix, where you have witnesses  
8 of differing views potentially jumping on confidential  
9 issues -- we expect it would go more than a day to try  
10 to process the procedural issues that may arise.

11 Turning to the proposal that we heard about  
12 this morning, we think it's a good proposal. We think  
13 we'd like to add a couple of thoughts to process.  
14 Ultimately it's not about the evidence the interveners  
15 want to see, it's the evidence the Panel wants to see.  
16 And so two suggestions to process. Potentially if the  
17 Panel does have IRs, if there are issues that you're  
18 not satisfied the evidentiary record has dealt with,  
19 you have that right, ability, power. So have that in  
20 mind.

21 The second, which leads to, I think, a  
22 delay in the oral argument date, it would certainly be  
23 helpful to the CEC if the Panel had issues that they  
24 wanted addressed in that oral argument phase. So that  
25 the -- while we will argue what we choose to argue,  
26 that there are specific areas that the Panel is

1 interested in. If we had pre-notification of that, it  
2 might be a more efficient and effective oral argument  
3 day. And so that obviously involves a bit of work on  
4 behalf of the Panel, and having a bit more time, and  
5 moving to the week of the 22<sup>nd</sup> would also give us time  
6 to prepare oral argument that's useful to you and is  
7 not too broad-scoping if not needed.

8 Lastly, on process, we -- the CEC would  
9 like to reserve the right to change its mind. We  
10 haven't made a determination yet. We're going to come  
11 to that oral argument day, and we're going to hear  
12 what appear to be two strong views, in terms of Clean  
13 Energy and BC Hydro. We will hear Hydro's argument.  
14 We can anticipate it fairly well, but nonethelss we  
15 will commit to make oral argument which we will likely  
16 back in our written argument, but we may hear things  
17 that day that influence us. And as ratepayers, we'll  
18 try and keep our mind open and have a final written  
19 argument that really sets out the final view of the  
20 CEC.

21 **Proceeding Time 9:49 a.m. T12**

22 In terms of timing of written argument, we  
23 would see, I think, the normal course, two weeks for  
24 BC Hydro after the oral argument day; two weeks for  
25 interveners following that date; and then a week for  
26 reply from BC Hydro. I think that timing does give

1           the Panel sufficient time to make a decision in line  
2           with the timeline BC Hydro has asked for.

3                           Those are my submissions.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON:       Thank you, Mr. Weafer.     Thank you.

5 MR. WEAFER:            Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON:       Now, Ms. Herbst.     It is your turn.

7 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HERBST:**

8 MS. HERBST:            Thank you.     So just running through the  
9                           Commission's three questions, turning to the first:  
10                          FortisBC Inc. has continued to monitor the proceedings  
11                          and from its perspective it continues to support a  
12                          written evidentiary hearing for ease and efficiency.  
13                          FortisBC Inc. doesn't seek any further evidence on  
14                          items (a) to (c) within question 1, or any other  
15                          items.

16                           FortisBC Inc., just touching on BC Hydro's  
17                          proposal, is content to proceed in writing in all  
18                          respects, but given the discussions that have been  
19                          had, it doesn't object to the proposal for an oral  
20                          argument phase.

21                           On question 2, if there's an oral phase of  
22                          any sort, whether evidentiary – though FortisBC  
23                          doesn't support that – or argument, it could make  
24                          itself available on any of the dates in the  
25                          Commission's Exhibits A-21 and A-22. And while I  
26                          haven't had a chance to get instructions, I expect

1           that any date during the week of April 23<sup>rd</sup>, which is  
2           the current set of dates that have been canvassed,  
3           would be something that we could make work as well.

4                       And I don't have any position on the timing  
5           of written submissions which has been a topic that has  
6           been flowing as well.

7                       Turning to item 3, FortisBC Inc. doesn't  
8           have any position in this proceeding on the use of  
9           hot-tubbing if there is an oral evidentiary hearing.  
10          And subject to questions, those are my submissions.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON:     Thank you, Ms. Herbst. Commissioner  
12           Mason?

13                       Okay, thank you.

14 MS. HERBST:           Thank you. Thanks.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON:     Ms. Bradley.

16 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BRADLEY:**

17 MS. BRADLEY:         Good morning. I will be quick. The City  
18           of Trail with respect to Exhibit A-21 takes not  
19           position on whether an oral hearing is required. We  
20           don't anticipate any additional evidence is required  
21           but we are also still working through all of the  
22           evidence to date.

23                       As far as dates, we're not available on the  
24           dates in Exhibit A-22, but I am available April 19<sup>th</sup>  
25           and 20<sup>th</sup>, as well as the week after that.

26                       And with respect to the proposal that is

1           currently being circulated again, the city takes not  
2           position with respect to it.

3                           Subject to any questions, that's the city.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON:       Thank you, Ms. Bradley.

5                           Mr. Both.

6 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOTH:**

7 MR. BOTH:            Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll similarly be  
8           brief.

9                           With respect to the issues raised in  
10           Exhibit A-21, we've heard from the parties today that  
11           no one sees a need to see any additional evidence on  
12           those issues, or at least not in an oral setting. It  
13           seems like the CABC has satisfied itself by way of its  
14           IRs. Teck certainly doesn't have any need to see any  
15           additional evidence on those matters.

16                          With respect to the proposal from BC Hydro  
17           and CABC, Teck certainly doesn't object to the  
18           proposal. The only gentle submission I would make is  
19           that, as Mr. Christian suggested, having an oral  
20           argument phase may provide an opportunity for some  
21           efficiency to the written argument phase. And I don't  
22           have any particular submissions on that, but only that  
23           if we are looking at the week of April 23<sup>rd</sup> for oral  
24           submissions and then three weeks after that for  
25           written submissions as some of our friends have  
26           suggested That's a full six weeks from now, and that



1 ones that are addressed on today's agenda, as a matter  
2 of fact. But the union feels that in the balance it's  
3 in the interests of Hydro and its ratepayers that it  
4 be approved.

5 So I'm projecting a certain degree of  
6 ambivalence which informs our approach to these  
7 issues. The union isn't gunning hard for a particular  
8 outcome or a particular process to get there, so we're  
9 not expecting, or asking the Commission to sort of  
10 sculpt the process to accommodate the convenience of  
11 the union.

12 And that -- I'll come back to that in a  
13 moment. I want to echo the comments made by my  
14 various friends, particularly Mr. Christian and Mr.  
15 Austin and Mr. Weafer, and endorse the proposal that  
16 if there is an oral process, it be argument rather  
17 than an evidentiary hearing. My client is not seeking  
18 more evidence. There is already a large body of  
19 evidence on the record concerning all of the issues  
20 that are of particular concern to the union, and we're  
21 not seeking to cross-examine any witnesses for either  
22 Hydro or CEABC, and agree with the comments made  
23 regarding the issue of hot-tubbing.

24 We would be available any of the dates  
25 listed in the two letters. However, we're not  
26 available the week of April 23<sup>rd</sup>, but this is where I

1 get back to my opening comments. We would be content  
2 to rely on written argument if none of the proposed  
3 earlier dates will work. So we're not suggesting that  
4 the train be held up on our account.

5 Subject to any questions you might have,  
6 those are my submissions.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Quail.

8 I'm going to put Mr. Bussoli on the spot.  
9 You're not technically on the list, at least not on my  
10 list. But I welcome your submissions on behalf of the  
11 BCUC staff.

12 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BUSSOLI:**

13 MR. BUSSOLI: Thank you, Madam Chair. Staff does not  
14 think there's any need for further evidence to address  
15 the issues in Exhibit A-21. They do not have -- or  
16 therefore do not have a position on the oral hearing,  
17 and nor do they have a position on the current  
18 proposal being the oral submission phase.

19 Although with respect to dates and  
20 availability, all the dates proposed in Exhibit A-21,  
21 Staff are available. As well, they are also available  
22 the week of April 23<sup>rd</sup> as proposed by some of the  
23 parties here.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Bussoli.

25 Now, I'm going to do what I said I would  
26 do, which is go backwards and see if there is anything

1           that anybody wishes to say in response to other  
2           interveners, or submissions that they add to.

3                           So, Mr. Quail.

4 MR. QUAIL:   Not much of substance has occurred since I  
5           spoke last, so --

6 THE CHAIRPERSON:   Oh, I think I would be insulted, Mr.  
7           Bussoli.

8 MR. QUAIL:   We've been talking, but quantity rather than  
9           quality. Of course, every word my friend spoke was --

10 THE CHAIRPERSON:   Thank you.

11 MR. QUAIL:   -- important.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON:   Mr. Both?

13 MR. BOTH:   Nothing from me, Madam Chair, thank you.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON:   Thank you. Ms. Bradley?

15 MS. BRADLEY:   Nothing further.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON:   Thank you. Ms. Herbst?

17 MS. HERBST:   Nothing further, thank you.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON:   Thank you. Mr. Weafer?

19 MR. WEAFER:   Nothing further.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON:   Mr. Andrews.

21 MR. ANDREWS:   I have nothing to add.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON:   Thank you. Mr. Austin? I know you're  
23           going to have something further to say.

24 MR. AUSTIN:   No further comments.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON:   All right, thank you.

26 MR. AUSTIN:   I have lots to say.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Christian, would you like to --

2 MR. CHRISTIAN: I don't want to spoil the trend. BC  
3 Hydro has no further submissions as well. Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, thank you.

5 Well, I think this ends our procedural  
6 conference. If there is no further submissions, I  
7 will declare the conference adjourned. Thank you all.  
8 Enjoy the rest of the day.

9 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 9:58 A.M.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FORGOING  
is a true and accurate transcript of  
the recording provided to me, to the  
best of my skill and ability.



A.B. Lanigan, Transcriber

April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018