

1 Q. Further to page 1 of Mr. Henderson supplementary evidence, provide details
2 of the responses (including copies of actual responses) to the survey
3 conducted on the use of hydrology data of other utilities. Include a listing of
4 the questions and the responses for each utility, the name of each utility
5 contacted, a name and telephone number for each utility representative
6 contacted.

7

8 A. The organizations contacted in the survey referenced in the supplementary
9 evidence were Hydro-Quebec, Ontario Power Generation, Manitoba Hydro,
10 SaskPower, Alcan (Quebec), Alcan (British Columbia), and BC Hydro. The
11 following individuals, all members of the CEA Technologies Inc. Hydraulic
12 Integrated Resource Management Interest Group, were contacted:

13

14

Name	Phone Number	Contact Information
Dave Dhaliwal	250-639-8611	Superintendent, Power Operations, Alcan Primary Metal - British Columbia
Brian Fast	604-528-2242	Manager, Hydrology & Technical Services, Power Supply, B.C.Hydro
Mark Peters	306-566-2993	Engineer II, Generation Modeling Dispatch, SaskPower
Harold Surminski	204-474-3170	Section Head, Generation System Studies Resource Planning and Market Analysis Dept., Power Planning and Operations Division, Manitoba Hydro
Don Ferko	416-592-4621	Engineer Water Resource Forecasting & Scheduling Dept, Ontario Power Generation

21

Luis Carballada	514-289-2211	Gestion de Systemes Hydriques Forecasting & Water Ressources Vice presidency Production Hydro Quebec
Roger Lambert	514-289-5846	Chef Planification et Commercialisation Direction Optimisation et Opérations D.P. Marchés de gros et Projets de developpement Groupe Production, Hydro Quebec
Louise Remillard	418-699-3860	Engineer/Analyst Hydraulic Resources Group Quebec Power Operations, Alcan Smelters and Chemical Ltd.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

Organizations have expressed concern in releasing details specific to their organization due to issues of confidentiality. Accordingly, details on individual responses cannot be released. However, the following is a synopsis of the questions posed, as well as a summary of the responses with references to individual organizations removed.

Questions

The primary questions posed to the representatives were:

- Does your organization develop average energy estimates for hydroelectric facilities?
- How are these estimates developed?
- Is your organization considering reducing its historical record to reflect the most recent 30-year period?
- For what purposes are average energy estimates developed?
What corporate functions use this information?

1 Depending upon the answers to these questions, follow-up questions were
2 asked. Follow-up questions that were asked to most, if not all respondents
3 were as follows:

- 4
- 5 • Why does your organization use the full historic record in
6 developing average (or median) energy estimates?
- 7 • Is the whole historic record used, or is a subset of the information
8 used?
- 9

10 **Responses**

11 No organization curtailed its hydrologic record to 30 years for the purposes of
12 rates, regulatory issues, forecasting, or budgeting. Furthermore, individual
13 years were not excluded from the methodology for determining average
14 energy, but rather the whole record was used. Of the seven organizations
15 contacted, five indicated that the basis for estimating average energy
16 capability for hydroelectric facilities was the maximum reliable hydrologic
17 record. A sixth respondent indicated that multiple average energy estimates
18 were developed, depending upon the purpose for the estimate. That
19 organization also relied upon the maximum reliable hydrologic record for
20 developing annual average energy estimates for the purposes of rates,
21 regulatory issues, forecasting, and budgeting. The final organization
22 contacted indicated that currently they develop their estimates based upon
23 snowpack conditions and the application of linear regression factors. This
24 last organization is in the process of studying the issues associated with
25 moving to a more comprehensive energy estimation approach.

26

27 Uses for the average or median energy estimate extended to a wide range of
28 activities, including planning, operations, budgeting, arranging purchase and
29 sale contracts, and forecasting. Respondents indicated that there were a

1 large number of functions that relied upon the information, ranging from
2 technical assessments to financial and business planning functions.

3

4 When asked why their individual organizations chose to use the full historic
5 record, respondents indicated that they wished to reflect the full range of
6 hydrologic experience to date in developing their estimates. When asked
7 about climate change and climactic trends, respondents indicated that there
8 was insufficient information at this time to warrant moving from their
9 established methodologies.