



AltaLink Management Ltd.

Transmission Line 423L

Costs Award

March 15, 2016

Alberta Utilities Commission

Decision 20926-D01-2016: AltaLink Management Ltd.

Transmission Line 423L

Costs Award

Proceeding 20926

March 15, 2016

Published by

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	3
2	Commission’s authority to award costs	5
3	The cost claims	5
3.1	Hainsworth group	5
3.1.1	McLennan Ross LLP	5
3.1.2	Safe Engineering Services & Technologies Ltd.	6
3.1.3	Honorarium	6
3.1.4	AltaLink submission	6
3.1.5	Hainsworth group’s response	6
3.1.6	Commission findings	7
3.2	Hughes Group	8
3.2.1	Carscallen LLP	8
3.2.2	Nican International Consulting Ltd.	9
3.2.3	Honorarium	9
3.2.4	AltaLink submission	9
3.2.5	Hughes Group response	9
3.2.6	Commission findings	10
3.3	Viking Projects	11
3.3.1	Langford Law	11
3.3.2	Rod English	11
3.3.3	AltaLink submission	11
3.3.4	Viking Projects response	12
3.3.5	Commission findings	12
3.4	Iron Rail Business Park	12
3.4.1	AltaLink submission	13
3.4.2	Iron Rail Business Park’s response	13
3.4.3	Commission findings	13
4	GST	14
5	Order	14

1 Introduction

1. AltaLink Management Ltd. (AltaLink) filed an application with the Alberta Utilities Commission, pursuant to sections 14, 15 and 21 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*, seeking approval to construct and operate a new single-circuit 138-kilovolt (kV) transmission line to be designated as 423L (transmission line 423L or the project), from the existing Lacombe 212S substation to the existing Ellis 332S substation, a distance of approximately 16 kilometers. AltaLink's application was considered in Proceeding 3450.

2. A number of interested parties who own, reside or have an interest in land within the vicinity of transmission line 423L participated in Proceeding 3450:

- The Hainsworth group
 - Robert (Bob) and Maureen Pocock
 - Denis and Doreen Hainsworth
 - Jim and Jan Pocock
 - Ronald and Roberta Biel
- The Hughes group
 - David and Marcy Hughes
 - Archie Werner and Clem Werner
 - Darrell and Donna Hicks
 - Elaine and Derek Werner
 - Jacob and Nicole Devrij
- The Wescott Consulting group
 - Iron Rail Business Park Ltd. (Iron Rail Business Park)
 - Arclan Holdings Ltd.
- Viking Projects Ltd. (Viking Projects)
- Lacombe County
- Ray Wiersma
- Donald and Shirley Parker
- Tom Denis
- Llew Werner
- Philip Wierenga

3. As a result, the Commission held a public hearing in Red Deer from June 23 to June 25, 2015, and in Calgary on August 20, 21 and 27, 2015. Parties filed written argument following the close of the oral hearing.
4. The Commission considered the close of record for Proceeding 3450 to be September 28, 2015, when AltaLink filed its reply argument.
5. On October 16, 2015, McLennan Ross LLP submitted a costs claim application on behalf of the Hainsworth group. The Commission assigned Proceeding 20926 and Application 20926-A001 to the costs claim application.
6. On October 19, 2015, the Commission circulated correspondence to all interested parties providing a summary of costs being claimed. Parties were advised that any comments regarding the figures listed in the summary, or merits of the costs being claimed, were to be filed by November 2, 2015.
7. On October 27, 2015, Iron Rail Business Park, Viking Projects and the Hughes Group submitted costs claim applications. The costs claims were assigned Application 20926-A002, Application 20926-A003 and Application 20926-A004 within Proceeding 20926 respectively.
8. A revised summary of the costs claimed and request for comments was circulated by the Commission on October 28, 2015. The Commission requested comments on costs claimed on or before November 11, 2015.
9. On November 10, 2015, the Commission received comments from AltaLink regarding the costs claims submitted by the Hainsworth Group, the Hughes group, Iron Rail Business Park Ltd., and Viking Projects.
10. The Commission received comments from the following parties replying to AltaLink's submission:
 - Viking Projects on November 16, 2015
 - Hainsworth group on November 16, 2015
 - Iron Rail Business Park on November 19, 2015
 - Hughes group on November 23, 2015
11. On November 27, 2015, the Commission issued Decision 3450-D01-2015¹ approving AltaLink's application to construct and operate transmission line 423L.
12. On December 18, 2015, the Commission received a supplemental costs claim from the Hainsworth group to include transcript costs.

¹ Decision 3450-D01-2015: AltaLink Management Ltd. Transmission Line 423L, Proceeding 3450, Application 1610897-1, November 27, 2015.

13. The Commission considers the close of record for this costs claim proceeding to be December 18, 2015.

2 Commission's authority to award costs

14. When assessing costs claims pursuant to Section 21 of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*, SA 2007, c. A-37.2, the Commission applies Rule 009: *Rules on Local Intervener Costs* (Rule 009). Appendix A of Rule 009 also prescribes a *Scale of Costs* applicable to all costs claimed.

15. In exercising its discretion to award costs, the Commission will, in accordance with Section 7 of Rule 009, consider whether an eligible participant's costs are reasonable and directly and necessarily related to the proceeding, and whether the eligible participant acted responsibly in the proceeding and contributed to a better understanding of the issues before the Commission. The Commission will be mindful of a participant's willingness to co-operate with the Commission and other participants to promote an efficient and cost-effective proceeding.

16. As the costs of a utility proceeding are generally passed on to customers, it is the Commission's duty to ensure that the customers receive fair value for a party's contribution. The Commission only approves those costs that are reasonable and directly and necessarily related to the party's participation in the proceeding.

3 The cost claims

3.1 Hainsworth group

17. McLennan Ross LLP submitted a costs claim on behalf of the Hainsworth group totalling \$191,083. The claim requested approval of the following costs:

- \$78,190.79 for McLennan Ross LLP, comprised of legal fees of \$70,307.00, disbursements of \$5,899.71, and GST of \$3,808.81.
- \$112,162.83 for Safe Engineering Services & Technologies Ltd. (SES Technologies) comprising consulting fees of \$103,680.00, disbursements of \$3,152.65 and GST of \$5,330.18.
- Attendance honoraria for six individuals totalling \$450.00, as well as disbursements of \$274.90 and GST of \$5.35.

3.1.1 McLennan Ross LLP

18. The costs claim for McLennan Ross LPP relates to 209.80 hours of legal services performed by Mr. Gavin Fitch, Ms. Andrea MacLean, and Ms. Jennifer Davis. A further 0.6 hours was claimed for support services provided by Ms. Joanne Jahraus. The hours claimed for Mr. Gavin Fitch relate to 119.40 hours of preparation, 46.20 hours for attendance of both oral hearings, and 28.70 hours for the preparation of written argument. A further 3.0 hours for travel was charged at half of Mr. Fitch's professional rate. The hours claimed for Ms. Andrea MacLean relate to 7.90 hours for preparation. The hours claimed for Ms. Jennifer Davis relate to 4.60 hours for preparation. The duties performed by the three counsel include review of the

application, preparation of information requests (IR) and review of IR responses, drafting IR responses, consulting with retained experts, preparation of written submissions, review of evidence and reply evidence, analysing law regarding hearsay evidence, and preparing for the hearing.

19. Disbursements totalling \$5,899.71 were claimed for accommodation, meals, transcript costs, postage, phone charges, photocopies, and Quicklaw searches.

3.1.2 Safe Engineering Services & Technologies Ltd.

20. The costs claim for SES Technologies relates to 384 hours of consulting services performed by Dr. Yexu Li, Dr. Farid Dawalibi, and Mr. Robert Southey. The hours claimed for Mr. Southey relate to two hours for creation and administration of the consulting project. The hours claimed for Dr. Li relate to 46.50 hours for right-of-way simulations and preparation and review of IRs, and one hour for argument. The hours claimed for Dr. Dawalibi relate to 308.50 hours for review of the application, preparing computer simulations, preparation of the electromagnetic interference study report, preparation of IRs and review of IR responses, review of AltaLink's reply evidence, and preparation for the hearing, as well as 20 hours for attendance at the oral hearing, and 6.0 hours for preparation and review of written argument.

21. A disbursement of \$3,152.65 was claimed for airfare from Montreal to Calgary for attendance of the hearing, accommodation, meals and taxi charges.

3.1.3 Honorarium

22. The costs claim also requested attendance honorarium for Mr. Ron Biel, Mr. Denis Hainsworth, Ms. Jan Pocock, Mr. Jim Pocock, Ms. Maureen Pocock and Mr. Robert Pocock in the total of \$450. The claim also requested approval for disbursements for food and mileage of \$274.90 and GST of \$5.35.

3.1.4 AltaLink submission

23. In its submission, AltaLink raised concerns with respect to the costs claimed by the Hainsworth group's experts. AltaLink argued that Dr. Farid Dawalibi combined his travel time with review of documents, which was charged at his professional rate of \$270.00 an hour, where the *Scale of Costs* allows travel expenses at half the hourly rate. They submitted that the travel time should be accounted separately.

24. AltaLink further submitted that SES Technologies invoice entitled 309-02 lacked any description of work undertaken by Dr. Yexu Li on April 20 and April 23, 2015.

25. Finally, AltaLink submitted that the personal disbursements for accommodations and meals submitted by Dr. Dawalibi exceeded the amount allowed by the *Scale of Costs*.

3.1.5 Hainsworth group's response

26. In its response to AltaLink's submission, the Hainsworth group argued that Dr. Dawalibi was only charging for the work done during the hours claimed, and that the totals did not include travel time. The Hainsworth group advised that if it was to include the travel time during which Dr. Dawalibi was not working they would have to add 13 more hours to the costs claimed. The Hainsworth group advised that Dr. Dawalibi would not make a claim for the additional travel time.

27. In its submission, the Hainsworth group also included a description of the work undertaken by Mr. Yexu Li in the six hours docketed on SES Technologies invoice 309-02. The Hainsworth group advised that for the three hours docketed on April 20, 2015, Dr. Li was “doing modeling in right-of-way Pro and MultiFields in order to assess correctly the interference level for different routes.” The activity undertaken on April 23, 2015 by Dr. Li was “review and verification of computation results for Dr. Dawalibi to prepare expert report.”²

28. Finally, the Hainsworth group submitted that the meal receipts provided by Dr. Dawalibi pertain to meals purchased for both Dr. Dawalibi and Mr. Fitch. The Hainsworth Group noted that Mr. Fitch did not claim any meal disbursements for August 19 or August 20 as a result.

3.1.6 Commission findings

29. The Commission has assessed the costs claim for legal services provided by McLennan Ross LLP and finds that the tasks described and hours claimed are reasonable, directly and necessarily related to the proceeding and are in accordance with the *Scale of Costs*. The Commission has also reviewed the disbursements claimed for accommodation, meals, transcripts, postage, phone charges, photocopies, and finds them to be reasonable and in accordance with the *Scale of Costs*.

30. The Commission, therefore, approves recovery of costs for McLennan Ross LLP in the total amount of \$78,190.79, which is composed of \$70,307.00 in legal fees, \$5,899.71 in disbursements, and \$3,808.81 in GST.

31. The Commission has assessed the costs for consulting services provided by SES Technologies and notes that 384 hours were claimed for its involvement in Proceeding 3450. The Commission is not convinced that the hours claimed were reasonable given the nature of the evidence filed and the work completed in support of this evidence. Accordingly, the Commission has reduced the consulting fees claimed by 30 per cent.

32. The Commission has reviewed the disbursements claimed for SES Technologies and notes that not all the claims for recovery of disbursements are in accordance with the *Scale of Costs*. The claims made for accommodation by Dr. Dawalibi exceed the rates permitted by the *Scale of Costs*. The Commission has therefore determined that a reduction in the daily rate for accommodation is warranted in this instance from the claimed rate of \$324.04 to \$140.00 for a period of two days only. The claim for airfare is also above what is allowed by the *Scale of Costs* and has been reduced by 70 per cent.

33. The Commission approves the remaining claims for disbursements for meals and taxi fares in the amount of \$443.06. Consequently, the Commission approves total disbursements for SES Technologies in the amount of \$1,341.51.

34. The Commission, therefore, approves recovery of costs for SES Technologies in the total amount of \$77,613.39, which is composed of consulting fees of \$72,576.00, disbursements of \$1,341.51, and GST of \$3,695.88.

² Exhibit 20926-X0048

35. The honorarium claims for the Hainsworth Group members are in accordance with Section 7 of Rule 009 and the Commission's *Scale of Costs*. The disbursements for meals and mileage are likewise in accordance with the scale. The Commission, therefore, approves the total costs of \$730.25, composed of \$100 each for Mr. Ron Biel, Mr. Denis Hainsworth and Mr. Robert Pocock, \$50 each for Ms. Maureen Pocock, Mr. Jim Pocock, and Ms. Jan Pocock, disbursements of \$274.90, and GST of \$5.35.

36. Accordingly, the Commission approves recovery of costs for the Hughes group in the amount of \$158,359.16, which is composed of legal fees of \$70,307.00, consulting fees of \$72,576.00, honorarium of \$450, disbursements of \$7,516.12, and GST of \$7,510.04.

3.2 Hughes Group

37. Carscallen LLP submitted a costs claim on behalf of the Hughes group totalling \$98,896.30. The claim requested approval of the following costs:

- \$81,372.55 for Carscallen LLP, consisting of legal fees of \$72,649.35, disbursements of \$4,847.34 and GST of \$3,875.66
- \$16,773.75 for Nican International Consulting Ltd., consisting of consulting fees of \$15,975.00 and GST of \$798.75.
- Honorarium for Mr. David Hughes, Ms. Elaine Werner, and Mr. Darrel Hicks totalling \$750, which is composed of \$500 for forming a group and \$250 for attendance at the oral hearing.

3.2.1 Carscallen LLP

38. The costs claim for Carscallen LLP relates to 251.90 hours of legal services performed by Mr. Michael Niven, Mr. Nicholas Ramessar, and Mr. Ryan Barata. The hours claimed include 214.20 hours for preparation, 23.40 hours for attendance at the hearing, and 14.30 hours for drafting the closing argument. The duties performed by the three legal counsel relate to:

- Reviewing AltaLink's facility application
- Preparing and reviewing information requests and responses
- Meeting with their clients and other affected landowners
- Consulting with other lawyers representing affected landowners on the application
- Consulting with Nican Consulting Ltd.
- Preparing intervener evidence on behalf of the Hughes Group
- Responding to information requests
- Preparation for, and attendance at, the oral hearing which included cross-examination of AltaLink, and

- Preparing the final argument on behalf of the Hughes Group.

39. Disbursements of \$4,847.34 were also claimed for accommodation during the oral hearing, meals, mileage, internal photocopying, and transcript costs.

3.2.2 Nican International Consulting Ltd.

40. The costs claim for Nican relates to 71 hours of consulting services performed by Mr. Pablo Argenal. The duties performed by Mr. Argenal include review of the application, researching the proposed electromagnetic interference mitigation options, drafting IR requests, and reviewing counsel's cross-examination document.

3.2.3 Honorarium

41. The costs claim also requested attendance honorarium for Mr. David Hughes, Ms. Elaine Werner, and Mr. Darrel Hicks totalling \$250, as well as \$500 for Mr. David Hughes for forming a group.

3.2.4 AltaLink submission

42. In its submission, AltaLink raised concerns with respect to the costs claimed by the Hughes' group expert, Nican International Consulting Ltd. (Nican). AltaLink noted that the Hughes Group did not identify the involvement of Nican as its expert at any time during Proceeding 3450, nor did it provide any evidence to substantiate the claim that Nican has expertise in transmission line routing.

43. AltaLink also submitted that there is no objective evidence that demonstrates how the work done by Nican influenced the evidence, cross-examination, or argument of the Hughes group, or how it assisted the Commission's understanding of the issues relevant to Proceeding 3450. AltaLink specifically noted that no documentary or testimonial evidence was presented by Nican on behalf of the Hughes group, Mr. Argenal did not attend the hearing to assist in the cross-examination of the AltaLink witness panel, and that the timesheet accompanying the Nican invoice does not refer to the provision of the assistance with the argument.

44. AltaLink also raised concerns with respect to the personal disbursements claimed by the Hughes group. AltaLink noted that a receipt submitted for June 22, 2015, included an alcoholic beverage, and that a receipt submitted for "dinner at hearing" on June 23, 2015 does not show whether any of the costs claimed are in respect of alcoholic beverages.

3.2.5 Hughes Group response

45. In its response to AltaLink's submission, the Hughes group agreed with the comments regarding the personal disbursements and noted they could be removed from the Hughes group cost claim if the Commission deemed it appropriate.

46. In responding to AltaLink's comments regarding the participation of Nican, the Hughes Group noted that Nican has been qualified as routing experts before the Commission in previous decisions.³

47. The Hughes group also noted that sometimes consultations with experts retained to provide additional expertise and understanding of an application do not always result in a report, but instead provide guidance in identifying issues in dispute or technical deficiencies in an application.

48. The Hughes group further argued that Section 7.2.7 of Rule 009 only requires that technical assistance be rendered to an intervener in order to allow the Commission to award costs to that intervener, and that it does not require the expert to file a report or be qualified as an expert by the Commission at the public hearing.

3.2.6 Commission findings

49. The Commission has assessed the costs claim for legal services provided by Carscallen LLP and finds that the tasks described and hours claimed are reasonable, directly and necessarily related to the proceeding and are in accordance with the *Scale of Costs*.

50. The Commission has also reviewed the disbursements claimed for accommodation, meals, transcripts, postage, phone charges, photocopies, and, with the exception of the two meals noted above, finds them to be reasonable and in accordance with the *Scale of Costs*. The Commission has disallowed the claims for two meals as they are not in accordance with the *Scale of Costs*.

51. The Commission, therefore, approves recovery of costs for Carscallen LLP in the total amount of \$77,662.86, which is composed of \$72,649.35 in legal fees, \$4,781.43 in disbursements, and \$1,030.83 in GST.

52. The Commission has assessed the costs claim for consulting services provided by Nican and finds that based on the nature the assistance rendered a reduction of 70 per cent is warranted in the circumstances. The Commission notes that Nican did not file a report or present evidence at the hearing. Taking into account the nature of the information requests, questioning and argument made in Proceeding 3450, the Commission is not persuaded that the 71 hours claimed accurately reflect the value of the work performed.

53. The Commission, therefore, approves recovery of costs for Nican in the total amount of \$5,032.13, which is composed of consulting fees of \$4,792.50 and GST of \$239.63.

54. The honoraria claimed by Mr. David Hughes for forming a group is in accordance with Appendix A of Rule 009. Similarly, the attendance honorarium of \$250 for Mr. David Hughes, Ms. Elaine Werner, and Mr. Darrel Hicks is in accordance with the Commission's *Scale of Costs*.

³ Decision 2014-219: AltaLink Management Ltd. Red Deer Area Transmission Development, Proceeding 2669, Application 1609677-1, July 29, 2014. The Hughes Group specifically referenced the Hazelwood Substation component of the Red Deer Area Transmission Development Project.

55. The Commission, therefore, approves the claim for honorarium in the total of \$750, which is composed of \$500 for Mr. David Hughes for forming a group and \$250 for Mr. David Hughes, Ms. Elain Werner, and Mr. Darrel Hicks for attendance at the oral hearing.

56. Accordingly, the Commission approves recovery of costs for the Hughes Groups in the amount of \$83,444.99, which is composed of legal fees of \$72,649.35, consulting fees of \$4,792.50, honorarium of \$750, disbursements of \$4,781.43, and GST of \$471.71.

3.3 Viking Projects

57. Langford Law Office submitted a costs claim on behalf of Viking Projects totalling \$19,436.75. The claim requested approval of the following costs:

- \$17,192.25 for Langford Law comprised of legal fees of \$14,121.25, disbursements of \$2,253.04, and GST of \$817.96.
- \$2,194.50 for consulting services provided by Rod English, comprised of consulting fees of \$2,090.00 and GST of \$104.50.
- Attendance honoraria of \$50.00 for Mr. Rob Wilson.

3.3.1 Langford Law

58. The costs claim for the Langford Law Office relates to 42.95 hours of legal services performed by Ms. Gayle Langford. The hours claim include 19.85 hours for review of the application, meeting with retained consultants, review of evidence, site visits, and preparation of Viking Project's opening statement, 18 hours for attendance at the oral hearing, and 5.10 hours for drafting Viking Project's final argument and review of AltaLink's argument and reply argument. A further hour of travel time was claimed at half of Ms. Langford's professional rate.

59. A disbursement of \$2,253.04 was claimed for mileage, internal photocopying, and transcript costs.

3.3.2 Rod English

60. The costs claim for Rod English relates to 19 hours of consulting services performed by Mr. English. The hours claimed relate to 6.5 hours for review of the application, review of AltaLink's proposed route, and preparation for the hearing, and 12.50 hours for attendance at the oral hearing.

3.3.3 AltaLink submission

61. AltaLink raised concerns with the consultant used by Viking Projects. AltaLink questioned the expertise of Mr. English, noting that he is not an electrical engineer or an appraiser. AltaLink also noted that Mr. English was unfamiliar with the documents filed by Viking Projects relating to electric and magnetic fields (EMF), repeatedly referred to evidence that had not previously been filed with the Commission, resulting in the Commission having to adjourn Proceeding 3450 twice, and referred to documents that were not particularly applicable to the application before the Commission.

3.3.4 Viking Projects response

62. In its response to AltaLink's submission, Viking Projects submitted that Mr. English never held himself out to be an expert on EMF, but did rely on his hands-on experience working and supervising workers on and near high voltage transmission lines. Viking Projects also argued that Mr. English brought forth documents not previously filed with the intention of trying to provide the Commission with information that would assist in explaining the issues that working near transmission lines with oil and gas operation involved.

3.3.5 Commission findings

63. The Commission has assessed the costs claim for legal services provided by the Langford Law Office and finds that the tasks described and hours claimed are reasonable, directly and necessarily related to the proceeding and are in accordance with the *Scale of Costs*. The Commission has also reviewed the disbursements claimed for mileage, internal photocopying, and transcript costs, and finds them to be reasonable and in accordance with the *Scale of Costs*.

64. The Commission, therefore, approves the claim for legal services in the total amount of \$17,192.25, which is composed of legal fees of \$14,121.24, disbursements of \$2,253.04 and GST of \$817.96.

65. The Commission has assessed the costs claim for consulting services provided by Mr. English and finds that Mr. English added some value to the issues raised in Proceeding 3450. However, given Mr. English's relative experience and education, and taking account the evidence presented during the hearing, the Commission finds that a reduction of 40 per cent is warranted in the circumstances.

66. The Commission, therefore, approves the claim for consulting services in the total amount of \$1,316.70, which is composed of consulting fees of \$1,254.00, and GST of \$62.70.

67. The honoraria claimed in the amount of \$50 for Mr. Wilson is in accordance with the Commission's *Scale of Costs* and is approved.

68. Accordingly, the Commission approves recovery of costs for Viking Projects in the total amount of \$18,558.95, which is composed of legal fees of \$14,121.25, consulting fees of \$1,254.00, honorarium of \$50, disbursements of \$2,253.04, and GST of \$880.66.

3.4 Iron Rail Business Park

69. Iron Rail Business Parks Ltd. submitted a costs claim totalling \$12,446.37. The claim requested approval of consulting fees for the Wescott Consulting Group of \$11,664.00, disbursements of \$189.69, and GST of \$592.68.

70. The costs claim for the Wescott Consulting Group relates to 45.2 hours of consulting services provided by Mr. Robert Wescott. The hours claimed include 16 hours for review of AltaLink's application and preparation of evidence, 18 hours for attendance at the hearing, and 7.2 hours for preparation of reply argument. A further 4 hours for travel was claimed at half of Mr. Wescott's professional rate.

71. Disbursements of \$189.69 were claimed for meals and mileage.

3.4.1 AltaLink submission

72. AltaLink raised concerns with the consultant used by Iron Rail Business Parks. AltaLink noted that Mr. Wescott is not a disinterested external consultant, but that he is a principal of Iron Rail Business Park Ltd and therefore has a vested interest in the proceeding. AltaLink further noted its consultations with Iron Rail Business Park were with Mr. Wescott, and that he acknowledged that he was a witness in the proceeding because he is an owner, a principal, and a director at Iron Rail Business Park.

73. AltaLink also submitted that Mr. Wescott also personally represented the Iron Rail Business Park in the legal proceeding and carried out activities that might otherwise have been carried out by a lawyers, such as preparing written evidence, conducting cross-examination, and preparing written argument.

74. AltaLink argued that Mr. Wescott, as the owner of the company intervening, ought not to qualify for cost recovery as a consultant for Iron Rail Business Park and hiring himself to carry out work that a diligent unrepresented individual or group would do. AltaLink submitted that his costs should be considered in terms of preparation and attendance honoraria under Rule 009.

3.4.2 Iron Rail Business Park's response

75. In its response to AltaLink's submission, Iron Rail Business Park confirmed that Mr. Wescott had a minority interest holding in the firm and served as director of the company. Iron Rail Business Park also confirmed that Mr. Wescott has served as the primary contact in respect to AltaLink and the various iterations of its proposed transmission line options over the past several years.

76. Iron Rail Business Park maintained that Mr. Wescott was the appropriate individual to represent the interests of Iron Rail Business Park given his 39 years of experience as a professionally accredited and certified Land Use Planner.

3.4.3 Commission findings

77. The Commission has assessed the costs claim for consulting services provided by Mr. Wescott. The Commission finds that an hourly rate as an expert is not appropriate given Mr. Westcott's role in the proceeding and affiliation with Iron Rail Business Park. The Commission nonetheless recognizes that Mr. Westcott was primarily responsible for Iron Rail Business Park's intervention. In this circumstance, the Commission finds that it is reasonable that Mr. Westcott be awarded a preparation honorarium of \$2,500 for the preparation and presentation of Iron Rail Business Park's intervention. The Commission also awards Mr. Westcott an attendance honorarium of \$600.

78. The disbursements of \$189.69 for meals and mileage are in accordance with the *Scale of Costs* and are approved.

79. Accordingly, the Commission approves recovery of costs for Iron Rail Business Park in the amount of \$3,299.17, which is composed of preparation honorarium of \$2,500, attendance honorarium of \$600, disbursements of \$189.69 and GST of \$9.48.

4 GST

80. In accordance with the Commission's treatment of GST on cost awards, AltaLink is required to pay only that portion of GST paid by interveners that may not be recoverable through the GST credit mechanism. Accordingly, the Commission approves the eligible GST in the amount of \$8,881.37.

81. The Commission emphasizes that its treatment of the GST claimed in no way relieves participants or their consultants from their GST obligations pursuant to the *Excise Tax Act*, RSC 1985, c. E-15.

5 Order

82. It is hereby ordered that:

- 1) AltaLink Management Ltd. shall pay intervener costs to the Hainsworth Group in the amount of \$158,359.16
- 2) AltaLink Management Ltd. shall pay intervener costs to the Hughes Group in the amount of \$83,444.99
- 3) AltaLink Management Ltd. shall pay intervener costs to Viking Development in the amount of \$18,758.12.
- 4) AltaLink Management Ltd. shall pay intervener costs to Iron Rail Business Park in the amount of \$3,299.17.

Dated on March 15, 2016.

Alberta Utilities Commission

(original signed by)

Tudor Beattie, QC
Panel Chair

(original signed by)

Neil Jamieson
Commission Member

(original signed by)

Ian Harvie
Acting Commission Member