



ATCO Electric Ltd.

Eastern Alberta Transmission Line

Process Meetings

May 31, 2011



The Alberta Utilities Commission
Decision 2011-237: ATCO Electric Ltd.
Eastern Alberta Transmission Line
Process Meetings
Application No. 1607153
Proceeding ID No. 1069

May 31, 2011

Published by

The Alberta Utilities Commission
Fifth Avenue Place, Fourth Floor, 425 First Street S.W.
Calgary, Alberta
T2P 3L8

Telephone: 403-592-8845
Fax: 403-592-4406

Website: www.auc.ab.ca

Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Details of the application.....	1
1.2	Commission’s process.....	2
2	Legislative Framework.....	3
3	Issues	5
3.1	Issues for the hearing	5
3.2	Standing.....	5
3.2.1	Views of the applicant	7
3.2.2	Commission findings.....	7
3.2.2.1	Landowners or residents within 800 metres of a proposed right-of-way	7
3.2.2.2	Landowners or residents outside of 800 metres	7
3.2.2.3	Landowners with insufficient information.....	7
3.2.2.4	Landowner groups	8
3.2.2.5	Municipalities and Alberta Electric System Operator	8
3.2.2.6	Further written process to request standing	8
3.3	Hearing process, schedule and location	9
3.3.1	Views of the parties	9
3.3.2	Commission findings.....	10
3.3.2.1	Formal hearing	10
3.3.2.2	Written submissions and community sessions	11
3.3.2.3	Formal hearing location	11
	Schedule A-1 – May 7, 2011 Hanna process meeting participants.....	13
	Schedule A-2 – May 20, 2011 Tofield process meeting participants	14
	Schedule B – Persons within 800 metres with standing in accordance with the enhanced process	16
	Schedule C – Persons outside of 800 metres required to submit further information if they wish to apply for standing.....	23
	Schedule D – Persons that have provided insufficient information for the Commission to determine standing in accordance with the enhanced process	26
	Schedule E – Groups with members that have standing in accordance with the enhanced process	28
	Schedule H – Abbreviations.....	29

1 Introduction

1.1 Details of the application

1. ATCO Electric Ltd. (ATCO) filed an application with the Alberta Utilities Commission (AUC or the Commission), for approval from the Commission to construct and operate the proposed Eastern Alberta Transmission Line (EATL) project. The application was filed over several days resulting in a filing date of March 29, 2011. The proposed EATL project consists of three main components, namely:

- Construction of a 500-kilovolt (kV) alternating current (AC)/500-kV direct current (DC) converter station called Heathfield 2029S, in the Redwater-Gibbons area northeast of Edmonton, and more specifically in the southwest, southeast and northeast quarters of Section 21, Township 56, Range 22, west of the Fourth Meridian.
- Construction of a 500-kV AC/500-kV DC converter station called Newell 2075S in the Brooks area, and more specifically in the west half of Section 9, Township 18, Range 15, west of the Fourth Meridian.
- Construction of a 500-kV DC transmission line, called 13L50, connecting the proposed Heathfield 2029S converter station to the proposed Newell 2075S converter station.

2. The application identifies the proposed Heathfield 2029S and Newell 2075S converter stations, a preferred route for the proposed 500-kV DC transmission line 13L50, and alternative route segments. The alternative segments are located on the north portion of the proposed route alignment. There is only one route proposed from the Forestburg area south to the Brooks area.

3. The application proposes the construction of two 500-kV AC transmission lines, designated as 12L70 and 12L85, to connect the proposed Heathfield 2029S converter station to the proposed AltaLink Management Ltd. (AltaLink) Heartland 12S substation.¹ The Heartland 12S substation is proposed to be located northeast of Edmonton in the northeast quarter of Section 20, Township 56, Range 22, west of the Fourth Meridian.

4. The application further proposes the construction of 240-kV AC transmission lines to connect the Newell 2075S converter station to the Alberta electric system, specifically:

- Two 240-kV AC transmission lines, designated as 923L and 1087L, each approximately one kilometre in length. These two lines would be strung together on double-circuit, steel

¹ Proposed by AltaLink Management Ltd. in Application No. 1606609, filed on September 27, 2010.

lattice structures and would connect to AltaLink's existing 240-kV transmission line 923L between the Milo 356S substation and the proposed Cassils 324S substation.²

- Two 240-kV AC transmission lines designated as 1035L and 1088L. These two lines would be strung together on double-circuit, steel lattice structures and would connect to AltaLink's proposed 240-kV transmission line 1035L between the proposed Cassils 324S substation and Bowmanton 244S substations.³ Since transmission line 1035L and its route are still under consideration by the Commission, ATCO has presented two options for connection to transmission line 1035L in its application.

1.2 Commission's process

5. On February 10, 2011, the Commission issued Bulletin 2011-05,⁴ which described an enhanced process for the EATL project. The enhanced process includes the following components:

- Parties that own or reside on property located within 800 metres of the edge of the right-of-way (for the preferred route or alternative route segments) will be considered to have standing.
- All interested parties had the opportunity to pre-register in the proceeding, before the Commission received the application.
- All interveners with standing have three opportunities to participate which include providing the Commission with a written submission, making a brief oral submission at a community session or at the formal hearing, or full participation in the formal public hearing, which would include the potential to provide sworn evidence, expert evidence and conduct cross-examination.

6. The enhanced process also included five information sessions which were held in March 2011. The Commission held sessions in Lamont, Vegreville, Forestburg, Brooks and Hanna.

7. After receipt of the application, on March 29, 2011, the Commission issued a notice of application and process meetings (notice) on April 11, 2011. The notice was published in 38 weekly newspapers covering all areas along the proposed transmission line routes. The notice was mailed directly to all landowners, residents and other interested parties residing within 800 metres of the edge of the proposed transmission line rights-of-way for the preferred route and alternative route segments. The notice outlined dates, times and locations of the process meetings.

8. The first process meeting was held on May 7, 2011, at the Hanna Community Centre before a Commission panel comprised of Tudor Beattie, QC (Chair), Commission Member Neil Jamieson and Acting Commission Member Gwen Day. Those interested parties who appeared at the process meeting are set out in Schedule A-1 to this decision.

² Proposed by AltaLink Management Ltd. in Application No. 1606402, filed on July 27, 2010.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Bulletin 2011-05: Eastern Alberta Transmission Line AUC launched information sessions and opportunities for participation, February 10, 2011.

9. The second process meeting was held on May 20, 2011, at the Tofield Community Hall before a Commission panel comprised of Tudor Beattie, QC (Chair), Commission Member Neil Jamieson and Acting Commission Member Gwen Day. Those interested parties who appeared at the process meeting are set out in Schedule A-2 to this decision.

10. The goal of the process meetings was to establish a schedule and process for the fair and effective consideration of the EATL project. Interested parties were invited to make a brief appearance before the Commission to identify their interest in the application, their intended scope of participation, the issues relevant to the application and to comment on the preliminary process schedule.

11. In reaching the determinations set out in this decision, the Commission has considered the record of the process meeting and the submissions provided by each party, including those parties who filed written submissions. References in this decision to specific parts of the record are intended to assist in the understanding of the Commission's reasoning relating to a particular matter and should not be taken as an indication that the Commission did not consider all relevant portions of the record as it related to that matter.

2 Legislative Framework

12. The application for the EATL project was filed under sections 14, 15, and 18 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* which include, in part:

14(1) No person shall construct a transmission line or any part of a transmission line unless the person is the holder of a permit issued by the Commission.

15 No person shall operate a transmission line unless the person is the holder of a subsisting licence to operate the transmission line, issued by the Commission.

18(1) The owner or operator of a power plant, transmission line or electric distribution system shall not connect that power plant, transmission line or electric distribution system, or cause or permit it to be connected,

- (a) to any other power plant, transmission line or electric distribution system, unless the connection is in accordance with an order under this section, or
- (b) to any industrial system or other service where the connection may seriously affect the operation of an interconnected electric system or a communications system as prescribed in the regulations.

13. The EATL project is "critical transmission infrastructure" as defined in Section 13.1(1) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* and Section 1(1)(f.1) of the *Electric Utilities Act*:

13.1(1) In this section, "critical transmission infrastructure" means critical transmission infrastructure as defined in the *Electric Utilities Act*.

1 (1) (f.1) "critical transmission infrastructure" means a transmission facility designated under section 41.1 or the Schedule as critical transmission infrastructure.

14. The schedule to the *Electric Utilities Act* designates critical transmission infrastructure and describes the direct current critical infrastructure projects as follows:

1(1) Two high voltage direct current transmission facilities between the Edmonton and Calgary regions, with a minimum capacity of 2000 megawatts each, generally described as follows:

(a) one facility (the Western Alberta Transmission Line), with a northern terminal in the vicinity of the existing Keephills - Genesee generating units and the southern terminal at or in the vicinity of the existing Langdon 102S substation, and

(b) one facility (the Eastern Alberta Transmission Line), located east of the facility described in clause (a) and geographically separated from that facility for the purposes of ensuring reliability of the transmission system, with a northern terminal at or in the vicinity of a new substation to be built in the Gibbons - Redwater region and a southern terminal

(i) at or in the vicinity of the existing West Brooks 28S substation, or

(ii) at or in the vicinity of a new substation to be located in the Raymond-Bow Island region.

(2) The terminals referred to in section 1(1)(a) and (b) shall have an initial capacity of at least 1000 megawatts each and be expandable to a minimum capacity of 2000 megawatts each in accordance with section 41.4(1) of this Act.

15. Section 13.1(2) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* states:

13.1(2) The construction, connection and operation of a transmission line or part of a transmission line that is designated as critical transmission infrastructure is required to meet the needs of Alberta and is in the public interest.

16. In addition, Section 19(1.1) of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* and Section 17 of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act* further describes the Commission's jurisdiction as it relates to critical transmission infrastructure. Those sections read as follows:

19(1.1) Notwithstanding subsection (1), the Commission shall not refuse an approval of a transmission line or part of a transmission line designated as critical transmission infrastructure as defined in the *Electric Utilities Act* on the basis that, in its opinion, it does not meet the needs of Alberta.

17(1) Where the Commission conducts a hearing or other proceeding on an application to construct or operate a hydro development, power plant or transmission line under the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act* or a gas utility pipeline under the *Gas Utilities Act*, it shall, in addition to any other matters it may or must consider in conducting the hearing or other proceeding, give consideration to whether construction or operation of the proposed hydro development, power plant, transmission line or gas utility pipeline is in the public interest, having regard to the social and economic effects of the development, plant, line or pipeline and the effects of the development, plant, line or pipeline on the environment.

17(2) The Commission shall not under subsection (1) give consideration to whether critical transmission infrastructure as defined in the *Electric Utilities Act* is required to meet the needs of Alberta.

3 Issues

3.1 Issues for the hearing

17. Participants at the process meetings stated that they intend to raise the following issues with respect to the EATL project:

- route selection
- human and animal health and safety
- property value
- impacts on the environment including but not limited to wildlife, wildlife habitat and river crossings
- social and economic impacts
- land use and visual impacts
- impacts on agricultural operations including potential spreading of weeds and diseases (in particular club root)
- impacts on existing business operations
- quality of public consultation
- what is the public interest
- socio-economic impacts
- noise
- liability concerns for damages

18. The Commission finds the issues listed above to be relevant for consideration at the public hearing in accordance with the public interest consideration identified under Section 17 of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*. The Commission does not consider this list to be exhaustive and does not preclude the consideration of other relevant issues at the hearing.

3.2 Standing

19. Participants, including individuals and corporations, who may be directly and adversely affected by the Commission's decision on the application are legally entitled to participate in a public hearing. Such persons are said to have standing to participate in the process.

20. Participants with standing are eligible to apply for cost recovery and will be able to fully participate in the public hearing, which includes submitting evidence, cross-examining witnesses, including those of the applicant and submitting final argument.

21. Participants without standing are not eligible for cost recovery; however, they may participate by filing a written submission, or by making a brief oral statement at either the hearing or at a community session.

22. Standing before the Commission is determined by subsection 9(2) of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act* which states:

(2) If it appears to the Commission that its decision or order on an application may directly and adversely affect the rights of a person, the Commission shall

- (a) give notice of the application in accordance with the Commission rules,
- (b) give the person a reasonable opportunity of learning the facts bearing on the application as presented to the Commission by the applicant and other parties to the application, and
- (c) hold a hearing.

23. In *Cheyne v. Alberta Utilities Commission*, the Alberta Court of Appeal characterized Section 9(2) as the equivalent of section 26(2) of the *Energy Resources Conservation Act* and confirmed that the two-part test for standing under Section 26(2) applies to subsection 9(2). The Court described that test as follows:⁵

...s. 26(2) has two branches. First is a legal test, and second is a factual one. The legal test asks whether the claim right or interest being asserted by the person is one known to the law. The second branch asks whether the Board has information which shows that the application before the Board may directly and adversely affect those interest or rights. The second test is factual.

24. In Bulletin 2011-05, which described the enhanced process for the EATL application, the Commission stated as follows with respect to standing:

The Commission considers that persons that own or reside on property located within 800 metres of the edge of the finalized rights-of-way (for the preferred or alternative route segments) will have rights that may be directly and adversely affected by its decision on the application. These persons will be legally entitled to participate in the process, subject to any objections from another party.

The Commission will also consider persons that own or reside on property located within 800 metres of the edge of the finalized rights-of-way (for the preferred or alternative route segments) to be local interveners, who qualify for intervener funding under the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*, subject to any objections from another party.

If there is an objection to a person's standing to participate or status as a local intervener, the Commission will make a decision on whether the person has standing or qualifies for local intervener costs.

Persons that do not own property or reside on property located within the 800-metre zone may apply to the Commission to participate in the public hearing process and for local intervener status. The Commission will make such determinations on a case-by-case basis.

⁵ *Cheyne v. Alberta (Utilities Commission)*, 2009 ABCA 94 (CanLII), at paragraph 13.

3.2.1 Views of the applicant

25. The applicant did not object to standing in this proceeding for interveners who own or reside on property within 800 metres of the edge of the rights-of-way for the preferred route or alternative route segments; nor did the applicant object to intervener groups participating in the proceeding provided that some members of the group are within the 800 metre boundary. The applicant requested the opportunity to respond to requests for standing from individuals, groups or others who do not own or reside upon property within 800 metres of the edge of any rights-of-way.

3.2.2 Commission findings

26. The Commission's findings for intervener standing are set out in the sections that follow.

3.2.2.1 Landowners or residents within 800 metres of a proposed right-of-way

27. The Commission finds that persons that own or reside on property within 800 metres of the edge of the rights-of-way on the preferred route or alternative route segments have standing to participate in this proceeding pursuant to Section 9 of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*. Persons falling into this category are set out in [Schedule B](#) to this decision.

3.2.2.2 Landowners or residents outside of 800 metres

28. At this time, persons do not have standing if they own or reside on property that is more than 800 metres from the edge of a proposed right-of-way. Based on the record, it is not clear to the Commission how these individuals may be directly and adversely affected by the Commission's decision on the application. Accordingly, the Commission cannot grant standing to these participants at this time; however, these participants can apply to the Commission for standing by demonstrating how they may be directly and adversely affected as outlined in Section 3.2.2.6 below. Persons that fall into this category are set out in [Schedule C](#) to this decision.

29. These persons may also participate in this proceeding without a further ruling on standing, by joining one of the groups identified in Section 3.2.2.4, subject to the limitations described in paragraph 36 of that section.

30. The Commission notes that some persons have in error identified themselves as owning or residing on property that is within the 800 metre zone, which may be due to differences between preliminary routing and the final applied-for routing. These persons are included in [Schedule C](#).

3.2.2.3 Landowners with insufficient information

31. Some persons who filed submissions to the proceeding did not indicate whether they own or reside on land that is within 800 metres of a right-of-way edge. The Commission has insufficient information to determine whether these parties may be directly or adversely affected by the Commission's decision on the EATL application. Accordingly, the Commission cannot grant standing to these participants at this time. These persons are set out in [Schedule D](#) to this decision.

32. Any person whose name appears in [Schedule D](#) and who wishes to assert standing should provide their legal land description and state whether they reside upon or own land within 800 metres of the edge of the preferred route or alternative segments' rights-of-way. In addition,

these potential participants should clarify their interest and concern with respect to the proceeding.

33. Persons in Schedule D may also participate in this proceeding without a further ruling on standing, by joining one of the groups identified in Section 3.2.2.4, subject to the limitations described in paragraph 36 of that section.

3.2.2.4 Landowner groups

34. Groups of individuals that are comprised of one or more persons with standing and persons who may not have standing may, at the discretion of the Commission, participate in this proceeding. The basis for these groups' participation is that one or more of its members have standing. Groups that fall into this category are set out in [Schedule E](#) to this decision.

35. It is the practice of the Commission to allow such groups to participate in Commission proceedings. However, please note that individuals who do not have standing on an individual basis, but belong to a group that does have standing, are not eligible to apply for cost recovery. For example, group members without standing (i.e. who reside more than 800 metres from the edge of a proposed right-of-way) will not be eligible to receive honoraria and reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incurred, nor will they be able to appear before the Commission to put their individual interests forward to any extent greater than that of an individual without standing who may participate by filing a written submission or making a brief oral statement.

36. The Commission requests that individuals wishing to participate in this proceeding, over and above their participation as members of a group, identify the scope of their individual participation.

3.2.2.5 Municipalities and Alberta Electric System Operator

37. Three municipalities have registered as participants in this proceeding. Since all three municipalities are located outside the 800 metre boundary, they do not have standing at this time. They have been included in Schedule C. As explained in Section 3.2.2.2 above, these municipalities can still apply for standing or join a group.

38. The Commission finds that the Alberta Electric System Operator (AESO) has standing to participate in this proceeding given the AESO's statutory responsibilities under the *Electric Utilities Act*.

39. The Commission finds that the Utilities Consumer Advocate (UCA) also has standing to participate in this proceeding based on its statutory mandate to represent residential, farm and small business customers of electricity in Commission proceedings in accordance with Section 2 of Schedule 13.1 of the *Government Organization Act*.

3.2.2.6 Further written process to request standing

40. Persons listed on Schedule C and Schedule D must provide further information to the Commission if they wish to request standing in this proceeding. Parties must explain to the Commission what rights they are claiming and how those rights may be directly and adversely affected by the Commission's decision on the application and, for those persons shown in Schedule D, information regarding their land location. Until the Commission receives this further information, parties listed in Schedule C and Schedule D do not have standing in this proceeding

but will still be eligible to submit a written statement or make a brief oral statement at either the formal hearing or a community session.

41. The Commission has established the following process schedule to receive requests for standing that contain the information mentioned above:

- 1) Written submissions requesting standing must be submitted to the Commission on or before **June 21, 2011**, to obtain standing in this proceeding.
- 2) The applicants may respond in writing to the submissions received on or before **July 5, 2011**.

3.3 Hearing process, schedule and location

42. The Commission included a draft process schedule in its notice and asked interested parties to comment on that process, schedule and location at the process meeting.

3.3.1 Views of the parties

43. The applicant's position with respect to the schedule is set out in its written submission (Exhibit 236.01.AE-1069), and was reiterated in its oral submission at the process meetings. The applicant has requested that the schedule be compressed and that the hearing be set to commence mid-October, 2011.

44. Several participants indicated that the schedule reflected a hearing date that is too soon for the following reasons:

- certain counsel will be engaged in the Western Alberta Transmission Line proceeding before the Commission and set to commence on November 7, 2011
- a hearing in October could interfere with harvesting activities
- the applicant has had years to prepare for the proceeding whereas the land owners are not being given enough time to prepare themselves
- ATCO is still consulting landowners on potential route amendments and alternatives
- that it could be seen as a breach of natural justice if landowners are not given more time to prepare or the time lines are seen to be unconscionable
- the current schedule is perceived to be "rushed"
- the hearing should occur after the end of October and in the winter months to accommodate agricultural activities

45. Certain landowners filed written submissions with respect to the hearing process, schedule and location. Those landowners raised the same issues as participants as listed above.

46. Regarding the hearing location, the individual participants and counsel present were very accommodating in this regard and provided the Commission with suggestions of Camrose and Stettler for formal hearing locations, and Hanna, Wetaskiwan and Vegreville as alternative locations.

47. Given the length of the transmission line, the individual participants were reasonable and understood that there could be some longer travelling times involved in participating in the full hearing process.

3.3.2 Commission findings

3.3.2.1 Formal hearing

48. In setting the schedule for the hearing, the Commission had regard for the following factors. First, the process and schedule must allow all participants sufficient time to prepare and review evidence or reply evidence, draft and respond to information requests, and prepare witnesses for the hearing. Second, the majority of the participants who gave oral or written submissions with respect to the timing of the hearing would like it to occur in the winter months, after November 1, 2011, to accommodate their agricultural activities. Third, there were no submissions in opposition to the process steps set out in the notice. Fourth, interveners will be able to review the Commission's information requests when preparing their own, thus reducing the potential for duplication of effort.

49. The Commission also took into account the enhanced process it established for this proceeding on February 17, 2011. The purpose of the enhanced process was to provide advance notice of the application and the Commission's hearing process in order to maximize the preparation time for parties that may be directly and adversely affected by the Commission's decision in this proceeding. As described earlier, the enhanced process included a comprehensive advance notice by newspaper and mail, five early information sessions along the route, a streamlined standing process, the opportunity to pre-register for participation in the hearing and three modes of hearing participation. As a result of the enhanced process, interested parties could, in some instances, commence preparation of their intervention prior to the filing of the application, or at the latest, immediately following the filing of the application. In this respect, the Commission notes that the application was filed on March 29, 2011.

50. The Commission is of the view that the following schedule establishes a process that is fair to all participants, maintains the winter hearing window and includes all of the contemplated process steps while providing interveners with some additional time to file their materials.

Date	Process step
June 24, 2011	Information requests from the Commission to applicant
July 15, 2011	Applicant responses to Commission information requests
August 5, 2011	Information requests from interveners to the applicant
August 26, 2011	Applicant responses to intervener information requests
November 1, 2011	Intervener evidence due
November 18, 2011	Information requests to interveners
December 9, 2011	Intervener responses to information requests
December 23, 2011	Reply evidence from applicant
January 16, 2012	Public hearing to commence

3.3.2.2 Written submissions and community sessions

51. As explained in Bulletin 2011-05, the notice of application and process meetings, parties that want to have an opportunity to express their view on the EATL project, but do not wish to participate in the formal hearing may file a written submission with the Commission or give a brief oral statement to the Commission at either a community session or at the formal hearing.

52. Written submissions may be filed at any time up until the close of the evidentiary portion of the hearing. As the Commission cannot predict when that might occur, it encourages parties to file their written submissions prior to November 1, 2011.

53. The Commission will advise parties of the location and dates of the community sessions in its notice of hearing once it has deemed the EATL application to be complete. **Any party that wishes to make an oral submission at a community session or at the formal hearing is required to pre-register no later than November 1, 2011.** The Commission will then circulate a timetable for presentations. Please be advised that if only a few parties register for a particular community session that that meeting may be cancelled or combined with another scheduled community session located as close as possible to that location.

3.3.2.3 Formal hearing location

54. Regarding the location of the formal hearing, the Commission concurs with those parties that proposed a central and neutral location that is easily accessible to interested parties on the preferred route and alternative route segments. The Commission also recognizes that the venue it chooses must have ample parking and accessible food services. The Commission will review the venues available that meet these criteria and will advise participants of the hearing location in the notice of hearing. It is the preference of the Commission to hold the formal hearing at one location. In the Commission's view, most of the potentially affected parties reside within a few hours drive of either Stettler or Camrose. In addition, having to move the amount of materials, supplies and equipment required for the formal hearing from place to place would unnecessarily complicate the conduct of the hearing and cause unnecessary delay. Further, the Commission is prepared to be accommodating with respect to community sessions in locations along the route alignment.

Dated on May 31, 2011.

The Alberta Utilities Commission

(original signed by)

Tudor Beattie, QC
Panel Chair

(original signed by)

Neil Jamieson
Commission Member

(original signed by)

Gwen Day
Acting Commission Member

Schedule A-1 – May 7, 2011 Hanna process meeting participants

Name of Party or Organization Counsel or Representative
ATCO Electric Ltd. L. Keough S. Munro
Canadian Association of Energy and Pipeline Landowners J. Ness
S. M. Hart
Samson Cree Nation N. Saddleback
Siksika Nation D. Lafond (as agent for R. Jeerakathil)

The Alberta Utilities Commission
Commission Panel Tudor Beattie, QC, Panel Chair Neil Jamieson, Commission Member Gwen Day, Acting Commission Member
Commission Staff Indra Maharaj (Commission Counsel) Danielle Glover Trevor Richards Amanda Brinker Dylan Davis

Schedule A-2 – May 20, 2011 Tofield process meeting participants

Name of Party or Organization Counsel or Representative
855 Landowners' Rights Group: O. Korpan, E. and D. Korpan, S. Tymchak D. Mallon, QC
Alberta Direct Connect Consumer Association, C. and B. Clifton, G. Frey, D. Hopkins, and G. Serink R. Secord
ATCO Electric Ltd. S. Munro
Battleford Trail Surface Rights Association T. Nahimiak
North West Redwater Partnership D. Bertsch
Powerless Group: L. Baier, J. and M. Charpentier, M. Fenske, G. and T. Jensen, J. and C. Jensen, B. and J. Kushnerick, J. Kushnerick, M. Kushnerick, J. Lusk W. L. McElhanney
Range Road 162 and 161 Landowners Rights Group: B. and K. Sawatsky, W. and H. Moroziuk, and D. Bilyk D. Pylypchan
B. Bilyk (also on behalf of J. Bilyk)
S. Bohaychuk
R. Boyko
R. Coppock
S. Dembicki
D. Fenske
A. Kshyk
D. Maruszczyka

Name of Party or Organization Counsel or Representative
A. Micklich
R. Motkoski
O. Nelsen
J. Semotiuk
E. Sherry
Henryk Farms Ltd., V. and E. Lesperance, J. S. and B. Shaw, K. S. K. and E. Shaw, R. Shaw K. Wilson
P. and W. Woolsey

<p>The Alberta Utilities Commission</p> <p>Commission Panel Tudor Beattie, QC, Panel Chair Neil Jamieson, Commission Member Gwen Day, Acting Commission Member</p> <p>Commission Staff Indra Maharaj (Commission Counsel) Danielle Glover Amanda Brinker Jim Law Sarah Grieve Alessandra Tiberi Leah Howard</p>

Schedule B – Persons within 800 metres with standing in accordance with the enhanced process

Name of Party or Organization within 800 metres Counsel or Representative
Agrium Products Inc. S. Finlay
AKORP DEVELOPMENTS INC. G. Ulveland
R. and H. Anaka
L. Baier W. L. McElhanney
J. Banman
V. and S. Bohaychuk
R. Boyko
J. Bryks and C. Nemirsky
D. Bryks
J. and M. Charpantier W. L. McElhanney
R. Cheremshynski
L. Chrapko
C. and B. Clifton R. Secord
R. Coppock
D. and J. Erickson

Name of Party or Organization within 800 metres Counsel or Representative
D. Fairless
G. Farion
M. Fenske W. L. McElhanney
G. Frey R. Secord
M. Greenslade J. Ness
Groot Farms J.J. Klimek
D. and J. Guhle
M. Hansen
S. Hart
J. Hebert
D. and B. Hein
Henryk Farms Ltd.
D. Hopkins R. Secord
J. and L. Hrdlicka
O. Hrynyk
L. Hunt A. Petzold

Name of Party or Organization within 800 metres Counsel or Representative
J. and C. Jensen W. L. McElhanney
G. and T. Jensen W. L. McElhanney
J. and D. Kirk
J. Kornicki
E. J. Korpan
D. Korpan
E. Korpan
O. and Y. Korpan
D. Kroetseh
J. Kubin D. Mallow
J. Kubin D. Mallow
H. O. Kucher
M. Kushnerick W. L. McElhanney
B. and J. Kushnerick W. L. McElhanney
J. Kushnerick W. L. McElhanney
M. Lacoursiere

Name of Party or Organization within 800 metres Counsel or Representative
M. Lansing
L. Luchka
D. Lundy
J. Lusk W. L. McElhanney
D. and W. Mar R. B. Baba
R. and W. Marcinkoski
D. Maruszczyka W. L. McElhanney
D. and K. Maschmeyer
B. and M. Matthiessen
C. Matthiessen
B. and E. Matthews
C. McRae
P. Micklich
A. Micklich
P. and D. Miller
C. Moroziuk

Name of Party or Organization within 800 metres Counsel or Representative
R. Motkoski
C. Nelsen
O. Nelsen
A. Nichols
North West Redwater Partnership D. Bertsch
A. N. Olinyk
G. and B. Percy J. J. Klimek
R. Prochnau W. L. McElhanney
D. Pylypchan
T. and L. Pyzik
D. Sanford
G. Serink R. Secord
K., S., K., and E. Shaw K. Wilson
Shell Canada Energy D. Crowe
E. Sherry
H. and S. Shield

Name of Party or Organization within 800 metres Counsel or Representative
M. and J. Shield
Siksika Nation R. Jeerakathil
V. Smith and D. Mclure
Stokowski Farms Ltd.
K. and G. Stokowski
B. Sunderman
D. Sunderman
E. Thomas
W. P. Tichkowsky
Total E&P Canada S. N. Finlay
S. Tymchak
D. Tymchak
L. Walter
M. and R. Webb
R. Webb
R. Welsh

Name of Party or Organization within 800 metres Counsel or Representative
D. Woloshniuk
P. and W. Woolsey
A. Yaniv
T. and C. Zwack

Schedule C – Persons outside of 800 metres required to submit further information if they wish to apply for standing

Name of Party or Organization outside of 800 metres Counsel or Representative
T. and B. Blake
D. R. Booth
J. Boulter
Canadian Heartland Real Estate Ltd. R. Secord
Capital Power Corporation S. Pillott
Town of Daysland
S. Dembicki
A. J. Dilworth
Enmax Corporation D. Emes
K. and D. Faryna
T. Guhle
J. Harasymchuk
Village of Heisler S. Maciborski
G. and H. Helzner
Village of Holden K. Whiteside

Name of Party or Organization outside of 800 metres Counsel or Representative
A. and P. Kshyk
V. and E. Lesperance K. Wilson
T. Nahimiak
M. and R. Oslund
D. Pyzik
J. Rossler
J. Semotiuk
J., S., and B. Shaw K. Wilson
R. Shaw K. Wilson
B. Spady
L. Suchy
P. Syroid
A. Thomas
P. Tucker
T. Urichuk
F. Uskiw

Name of Party or Organization outside of 800 metres Counsel or Representative
--

B. and L. Zimmer S. Farnham

Schedule D – Persons that have provided insufficient information for the Commission to determine standing in accordance with the enhanced process

Name of Party or Organization or Group (abbreviation) Counsel or Representative
Alberta Direct Connect Consumers Association (ADC) R. Secord
Battleford Trail Surface Rights Association (BTSRA) T. Nahimiak
D. Bilyk
B. Bilyk
J. Bilyk
Capital Power Corporation (CPC)
Daysland Agricultural Society
Enmax Corporation (ENMAX)
D. Fenske
R. Gubersky
J. and H. Hrdlicka
Lakeland Rural Electrification Association Limited
Mountain / ASINI WACHI Cree Band J. Fromhold
W. and H. Moroziuk
Samson Cree Nation R. Jeerakathil

Name of Party or Organization or Group (abbreviation) Counsel or Representative
B. and K. Sawatsky

Schedule E – Groups with members that have standing in accordance with the enhanced process

Group (abbreviation)
855 Landowners' Rights Group (855 LRG) D. Mallon, QC
Canadian Association of Energy and Pipeline Landowner Associations (CAEPLA) J. Ness
Powerless Group (PWRLESS) W. L. McElhanney
Range Road 162/161 Landowners Group (RR162161)

Schedule H – Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Name in full
AC	Alternating current
AESO	Alberta Electric System Operator
ATCO	ATCO Electric Ltd.
AUC	Alberta Utilities Commission
DC	Direct current
EATL	Eastern Alberta Transmission Line
kV	Kilovolt