

1.0 Reference:

- 1.1.0 On the BC Hydro Internet web site at: <http://www.bchydro.bc.ca/news/2004/nov/release17642.html>, the following November 3, 2004 News Release contained the following sentence by BC Hydro's Senior Vice-President Distribution, Bev Van Ruyven:

“The new peak electricity demand set by Vancouver Island customers last January 5 demonstrated that we need more electricity than was previously thought ...”

Since the January 5th event was not one year long, not one month long, nor even one week long, but only occurred on January 5th, how long was it? Also, in addition to the duration, at what time did it occur? What magnitude was involved in this event? Over what extent of the system did it occur? What impact occurred to both the BC Hydro's system and its impact on the number and type of customers affected and their geographic distribution?

I justify this question on the basis of relevance to the noted “deficiency” assumed in the “peak demand forecast” stipulation specified under item number 2 of the Commission Panel's 2004 November 30th decision pertaining to the scope of the proceeding. [Transcript, Vol. 2, P. 311, Lines 11 through 26]

RESPONSE:

The F2004 Vancouver Island peak occurred on Sunday, 04 January 2004 during the hour ending 6:00 pm. The recorded peak value was 2,193 MW excluding the Gulf Islands load and 2,253 MW including Gulf Islands peak load. This was an instantaneous peak so that the concept of peak duration is not meaningful. The peak load for Vancouver Island on 04 January 2004 was about 24% of the recorded BC Hydro system peak on that day. BC Hydro was able to meet this peak by bringing on additional domestic and import resources.

2.0 Reference:

1.2.0 With regards to the same above BC Hydro Internet web site article, the following statement is made:

“Pristine Power Inc., headquartered in Calgary, Alberta, is an independent power development company established to pursue the development of projects utilizing leading edge, proven generation technologies ...”

My question here to BC Hydro is: “How does BC Hydro and/or Pristine Power Inc. define the above expression: “leading edge, proven technologies” ?”

I justify this question on the basis of relevance to the noted

- a) ‘appropriate next resource addition’
- b) ‘simplified NPV model’, and
- c) ‘capacity shortfall on Vancouver Island’

as specified under the ‘determinations from VIGP decision’ relevant to item number 1 of the Commission Panel’s 2004 November 30th decision pertaining to the scope of the proceeding. [Transcript, Vol. 2, P. 307, Lines 12, 20 and P.308, Line 3]

RESPONSE:

For the purpose of the CFT, the relevant technological criterion is the definition of “Proven Technology” found in the Call for Tenders document at Appendix 1, page 3, paragraph 48. All projects bid into the CFT had to satisfy this criterion. Please also see BC Hydro’s response to BCUC IR 1.19.1.

3.0 Reference:

1.3.0 With regards to the directive issued by Mr. Robert J. Pellatt, Commission Secretary, BCUC to BC Hydro (Exhibit No. A-7), under Appendix B to Order No. G-106-04 Page 2 of 2, why is it that the EPA filing and the CFT Report and supporting material located at the BC Hydro Head Office location (17th Floor. - 333 Dunsmuir Street, Vancouver, B.C., V6B – 5R3) are deficient? It was discovered today during a very brief examination of these documents that these following items are missing from the documentation:

- a) Applicant Documents Exhibit No. B-4 and B-5.
- b) Interested Party Documents Exhibit No. D-13 through D-19
- c) Letters of Comment:
 - i.) Exhibit No. E- 68 – Nov. 29/2004 response to Arlene Fehr from Premier Gordon Campbell.
 - ii.) Exhibit No. E-69 – Nov. 29/2004 response to Kathy Pearce from Premier Gordon Campbell.
 - iii.) Plus Exhibit No. E-70 through E-86.

(Side note from the writer regarding number i and ii above: The writer finds it hilarious that perhaps BC Hydro feels that Premier's statements are not worth recording! Enough said.)

RESPONSE:

Exhibits B-4 and B-5 have been filed with the Commission on a confidential basis. Therefore, the information contained in these exhibits is not available for intervenors or interested parties to view.

The interested party documents and letters of comment referenced in the question were filed with the Commission by those interested parties. BC Hydro was not copied to or served with any of these filings. The Commission assigns an exhibit number to each submission it receives and posts these documents on its website (www.bcuc.com).

Keith W. Steeves Information Request No. 1.3.0 (1.4.0) Dated: 07 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 21 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

4.0 Reference:

- 1.4.0 Further to the deficiencies listed above in Question No. Three (3), starting with Appendix 3 – Tariff, Part C – Post – COD Capacity and Energy Tariff (P.63), the index page numbers do not agree with the actual page numbers cited in the text. Please refer to Appendices N. Electricity Purchase Agreement (Revised Final Form) of the “Call for Tenders for Capacity and Associated Energy Supply on Vancouver Island (“CPT”)”, Report on the CFT Process Conducted by B.C. Hydro, November 19, 2004, as well as Exhibit No. B-1. Why is this? What other mistakes are there in these documents?

RESPONSE:

This question was incorrectly numbered as 3.0, and BC Hydro has changed the numbering to accord with the other numbers in this set of Information Requests.

The comment by the bidder relates to the pro-forma Final Form EPA rather than the final signed EPA. The item noted by the bidder is not material to the interpretation or enforcement of the contract.