



**Alberta Electric System Operator
Needs Identification Document Application**

**AltaLink Management Ltd.
Facility Applications**

Provost Reliability Upgrade Project

Costs Award

March 13, 2019

Alberta Utilities Commission

Decision 24083-D01-2019

Alberta Electric System Operator Needs Identification Document Application

AltaLink Management Ltd. Facility Applications

Provost Reliability Upgrade Project

Costs Award

Proceeding 24083

March 13, 2019

Published by

Alberta Utilities Commission

Eau Claire Tower, 1400, 600 Third Avenue S.W.

Calgary, Alberta

T2P 0G5

Telephone: 403-592-8845

Fax: 403-592-4406

Website: www.auc.ab.ca

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Commission’s authority to award costs and intervener eligibility	2
3	The 899 Group	4
3.1	Comments from AltaLink	4
3.2	Reply from the 899 Group	4
3.3	Commission findings	4
3.3.1	Carscallen LLP.....	4
3.3.2	Total awarded to the 899 Group	6
4	The Miller Group	7
4.1	Commission findings	7
4.1.1	Carscallen LLP.....	7
4.1.2	JetPro Consultants Inc.....	8
4.1.3	Total awarded to the Miller Group	8
5	The Consumers’ Coalition of Alberta	8
5.1	Comments from the AESO	9
5.2	Comments from AltaLink	9
5.3	Reply from the CCA	9
5.4	Commission findings	9
5.4.1	Wachowich & Company.....	9
5.4.2	Nicholas Bryanskiy.....	10
5.4.3	Bema Enterprises Ltd.....	10
5.4.4	Total awarded to the CCA	10
6	Order	11

Alberta Utilities Commission
Calgary, Alberta

Alberta Electric System Operator
Needs Identification Document Application
AltaLink Management Ltd. Facility Applications
Provost Reliability Upgrade Project
Costs Award

Decision 24083-D01-2019
Proceeding 24083

1 Introduction

1. In this decision, the Alberta Utilities Commission considers applications by the 899 Group, the Miller Group and the Consumers' Coalition of Alberta (CCA) for approval and payment of their costs of participation in Proceeding 23339¹ (the original proceeding).

2. The following table sets out the costs claimed and the amounts awarded:

Claimant	Total Fees Claimed	Total Disbursements Claimed	Total GST Claimed	Total Amount Claimed	Total Fees Awarded	Total Disbursements Awarded	Total GST Awarded	Total Amount Awarded
899 Group								
Carscallen LLP	\$38,192.00	\$9,724.99	\$2,395.86	\$50,312.85	\$36,274.00	\$8,772.89	\$2,275.44	\$47,322.33
Miller Group								
Carscallen LLP	\$21,595.00	\$1,214.82	\$1,175.50	\$23,985.32	\$20,573.00	\$1,154.82	\$1,086.39	\$22,814.21
JetPro Consultants Inc.	\$3,600.00	\$0.00	\$180.00	\$3,780.00	\$3,600.00	\$0.00	\$180.00	\$3,780.00
Total	\$25,195.00	\$1,214.82	\$1,355.50	\$27,765.32	\$24,173.00	\$1,154.82	\$1,266.39	\$26,594.21
CCA								
Wachowich & Company	\$5,530.00	\$0.00	\$276.50	\$5,806.50	\$5,530.00	\$0.00	\$276.50	\$5,806.50
Nicholas Bryanskiy	\$11,424.00	\$0.00	\$571.20	\$11,995.20	\$11,424.00	\$0.00	\$571.20	\$11,995.20
Bema Enterprises Ltd.	\$24,557.50	\$0.00	\$1,227.88	\$25,785.38	\$24,557.50	\$0.00	\$1,227.88	\$25,785.38
Total	\$41,511.50	\$0.00	\$2,075.58	\$43,587.08	\$41,511.50	\$0.00	\$2,075.58	\$43,587.08
Total of all amounts claimed and awarded				\$121,665.25				\$117,503.62

3. The Commission has awarded reduced costs to the 899 Group and the Miller Group for the reasons set out below.

4. The original proceeding was convened by the Commission to consider the needs identification document (NID) application by the Alberta Electric System Operator (AESO) and the facility applications by AltaLink Management Ltd. to alter three specific substations and to construct and operate an interconnected transmission line (collectively, the Provost Reliability Upgrade Project or the project). The original proceeding included information requests (IRs),

¹ Proceeding 23339: Alberta Electric System Operator Needs Identification Document Application, AltaLink Management Ltd. Facility Applications, Provost Reliability Upgrade Project.

responses to IRs, an oral hearing (commencing on October 1, 2018, in Provost and continuing on October 4, 2018, in Calgary), and written argument and reply argument. The close of record for the original proceeding was October 24, 2018, and Decision 23339-D01-2019 was issued January 22, 2019.²

5. The CCA submitted its costs claim application on November 23, 2018, within the 30 day timeline permitted by the Commission's rules. Carscallen LLP filed costs claim applications on behalf of the 899 Group and the Miller Group on November 29, 2018, outside of the timeline permitted under section 5.2.1 of Rule 009: *Rules on Local Intervener Costs*. The Commission used its discretion in this case to accept the late filing, given the relatively brief delay, because it did not consider that any party to this proceeding would be prejudiced as a result.

6. The Commission assigned Proceeding 24083 and Applications 24083-A001 and 24083-A002 to the CCA's costs claim and to the claims filed by Carscallen, respectively. Although a single application number was assigned to the 899 Group's and the Miller Group's costs claims, the Commission recognizes two separate interventions were conducted and has treated the costs claim applications separately.

7. On November 30, 2018, the AESO submitted comments on the CCA's costs claim, to which the CCA responded on December 7, 2018. Also on December 7, AltaLink filed comments on the costs claims of the CCA, the 899 Group and the Miller Group. Reply comments were filed by Carscallen on behalf of the latter two groups on December 13, 2018, the date the Commission considers to be the close of record for this proceeding.

2 Commission's authority to award costs and intervener eligibility

8. The Commission's authority to award costs is found in sections 21 and 22 of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*. When assessing a costs claim pursuant to Section 21 of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*, the Commission applies Rule 022: *Rules on Costs in Utility Rate Proceedings* or Rule 009: *Rules on Local Intervener Costs*.

9. Rule 022 applies to proceedings for rate applications of utilities under the jurisdiction of the Commission, or those related to rate applications. When an intervention on a facility NID application is premised upon the potential effects of a proposed project on rates, the Commission has generally applied Rule 022 to the intervener's costs claim. This rule allows the Commission to consider, among other things, whether the costs claimed are reasonable and directly and necessarily related to the original proceeding, and whether the participants acted responsibly and contributed to a better understanding of the issues before the Commission. Appendix A of Rule 022 prescribes a Scale of Costs applicable to all costs considered under this rule. This approach is consistent with the Commission's broad statutory authority under Section 21(1) of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*.

² Decision 23339-D01-2019: Alberta Electric System Operator Needs Identification Document Application, AltaLink Management Ltd. Facility Applications, Provost Reliability Upgrade Project, Proceeding 23339, January 22, 2019.

10. Rule 009 ordinarily applies to costs claims related to facilities proceedings. When considering a claim for costs for a facilities proceeding, the Commission is guided by the factors set out in Section 7 of Rule 009 and the scale of costs found in Appendix A of Rule 009.
11. Section 7 of Rule 009 provides that the Commission may award costs, in accordance with the scale of costs, to a “local intervener” if the Commission is of the opinion that:
- 7.1.1 the costs are reasonable and directly and necessarily related to the hearing or other proceeding, and
 - 7.1.2 the local intervener acted responsibly in the hearing or other proceeding and contributed to a better understanding of the issues before the Commission.
12. Section 22 of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act* defines “local intervener” as follows:
- 22(1) For purposes of this section, “local intervener” means a person or group or association of persons who, in the opinion of the Commission,
- (a) has an interest in, and
 - (b) is in actual occupation of or is entitled to occupy
- land that is or may be directly and adversely affected by a decision or order of the Commission in or as a result of a hearing or other proceeding of the Commission 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, but unless otherwise authorized by the Commission does not include a person or group or association of persons whose business interest may include a hydro development, power plant or transmission line or a gas utility pipeline.
13. In the Commission’s rulings on standing in the original proceeding,³ the Commission granted standing to the landowners that formed the 899 Group, Dave Miller, Cliff Paulgaard, Freda Wright and the Municipal District (MD) of Provost.
14. The 899 Group was made up of landowners located within the vicinity of a 10-mile stretch of the proposed transmission line where the preferred route paralleled Highway 899. It consisted of 14 members.⁴ Mr. Miller owns land along a section of the proposed transmission line where no alternate route was proposed by AltaLink.⁵ Both the 899 Group and the Miller Group⁶ were represented by Carscallen. The Commission considers the 899 Group and the Miller Group to be eligible for costs as local interveners and has applied Rule 009 to their costs applications.
15. The CCA raised concerns with the impacts of the AESO’s NID application on ratepayers. The Commission limited the CCA’s standing to the AESO’s NID application because the CCA did not show that its members would be directly and adversely affected by the Commission’s

³ Exhibit 23339-X0064 and Exhibit 23339-X0078.

⁴ Decision 23339-D01-2019, paragraph 20.

⁵ Exhibit 23339-X0214, Final Argument Miller, PDF page 3.

⁶ The Miller Group consisted of Dave Miller. They are referred to interchangeably in this decision.

decision on the proposed facility applications.⁷ The Commission has applied Rule 022 to the costs application of the CCA.

16. The MD of Provost had concerns regarding the proximity of the proposed transmission line to the Provost Airport. The reply evidence filed by AltaLink appeared to resolve the MD of Provost's concerns;⁸ the MD of Provost did not attend the hearing or participate further in the original proceeding. The MD of Provost, Mr. Paulgaard and Ms. Wright did not file costs claim applications.

3 The 899 Group

17. The following table summarizes the 899 Group's costs claim:

Claimant	Hours			Fees	Disbursements	GST	Total
	Preparation	Attendance	Argument				
899 Group							
Carscallen LLP	101.80	6.80	30.60	\$38,192.00	\$9,724.99	\$2,395.86	\$50,312.85

18. The Commission finds that the 899 Group acted responsibly in the original proceeding and contributed to the Commission's understanding of the relevant issues. However, the Commission is unable to approve the full amount of the costs claimed in respect of the services performed by Carscallen for the reasons set out below.

3.1 Comments from AltaLink

19. AltaLink submitted that because the drone video was submitted late and the 899 Group did not seek leave to file it late, other parties were not provided with advance notice of the filing. In these circumstances, the Commission should consider a reduction or disallowance of the costs claimed for the drone video in light of section 7.2.5 of Rule 009.⁹

3.2 Reply from the 899 Group

20. The 899 Group replied that the drone video was a useful aid to the Commission, and because submitting the video after the intervener evidence deadline did not create prejudice to AltaLink, the drone video disbursement was appropriately claimed.

3.3 Commission findings

3.3.1 Carscallen LLP

21. The 899 Group was represented by Carscallen in the original proceeding. The fees claimed by the 899 Group for the legal services provided by Michael Niven and Ryan Barata relate to reviewing the applications, organizing the group, preparing intervener evidence, preparing responses to IRs, preparing direct evidence, preparing an expert report, presenting direct evidence, cross-examining AltaLink, participating at the oral hearing, and preparing

⁷ Exhibit 23339-X0064, AUC ruling on standing, PDF pages 3 and 4, paragraphs 17 to 19 and Exhibit 23339-X0066, Second ruling on standing.

⁸ Exhibit 23339-X0179, Letter to AUC Sept. 26/18.

⁹ The drone video charges totaling \$7,258.39 for services provided by Veritas were included in the 899 Group's costs claim application.

written argument and reply argument. Carscallen also retained Veritas Litigation Support to perform consulting services, as discussed below.

22. The Commission finds that the services performed by Carscallen were directly and necessarily related to the 899 Group's participation in the original proceeding, and that the majority of the fees that were claimed in accordance with the scale of costs for those services were reasonable.

23. However, the Commission finds that not all fees were claimed in accordance with the scale of costs. The Commission observes that under the scale of costs, travel time may only be claimed in connection with attendance at a hearing. Therefore, the Commission disallows 4.0 hours for Mr. Niven and 6.3 hours for Mr. Barata for travel time on August 28, 2018.¹⁰ In addition, the Commission notes hours claimed for Mr. Barata include references to preparation of costs claims on October 17, 23 and 25, 2018.¹¹ The Commission does not permit the recovery of costs incurred in the preparation of costs claims because these costs do not contribute to a better understanding of the issues before the Commission in the original proceeding. Since these time entries also include activities related to the original proceeding, the Commission has reduced the total time for the three dates by 50 percent to 1.2 hours for Mr. Barata. Accordingly, the Commission approves the 899 Group's claim for legal fees for Carscallen in the amount of \$36,274.00.

24. The disbursements claimed for Carscallen were not all claimed in accordance with the scale of costs. The claim made for Mr. Barata for \$462.00 for mileage on August 28, 2018, is denied, as mileage may only be claimed in connection with attendance at a hearing. The Commission also notes that the claim made for accommodation for Mr. Niven was not at the rate permitted in the scale of costs; the hotel rate claimed was \$154.00 per day whereas the scale of costs limits recovery of accommodation to a rate of \$140.00 per day. However, as noted in the preamble to Appendix A, the scale of costs in Rule 009, where the applicant is able to demonstrate that the scale is inadequate, the Commission may award an amount greater than that stated in the scale to address unique circumstances. The Commission notes that the original proceeding took place in rural Alberta and that there were limited options available for accommodation in proximity to the hearing location. Further, the amount claimed in excess of the scale of costs is a total of \$14.00 per day. Given the above, and taking into account that the amount claimed is a relatively minor overage compared to the limit prescribed in the scale of costs, the Commission finds that in these specific circumstances it is reasonable to award the \$154.00 per day rate claimed.

25. In addition, the 899 Group included a miscellaneous disbursement for "LTO – Other Services" in the amount of \$490.00. The costs claim does not include a description of the disbursement. Without an explanation of what this disbursement entailed, the Commission cannot conclude that it was reasonable and directly and necessarily related to the hearing or other proceeding. The Commission therefore disallows the \$490.00 claimed for LTO Services. The Commission approves the remaining disbursements for accommodation, mileage, transcripts, courier fees and photocopying in the amount of \$1,860.14.

¹⁰ Exhibit 24083-X0004, 899 and Miller Costs Claims, PDF page 28.

¹¹ Exhibit 24083-X0004, 899 and Miller Costs Claims, PDF pages 10 and 11.

Veritas Litigation Support

26. The 899 Group's "Form U4 – Summary of Disbursements Claimed"¹² includes a disbursement for Veritas in the amount of \$6,912.75. Carscallen retained Veritas to prepare drone videos of the preferred and alternate routes for presentation at the oral hearing. A review of the supporting documentation shows that this amount includes fees for services, charges for equipment rental and disbursements.

27. The fees for Veritas relate to pre-flight planning, drone operations, travel to Provost, assessment of video production, evidence filing and display assistance. The Commission acknowledges AltaLink's argument that the Commission may consider compliance with its directions when assessing costs, and that the drone video was filed late without the Commission's permission, more than one month after written evidence was due. The Commission wishes to emphasize the importance of parties adhering to its stated process and considers that such a late filing should have been accompanied by a motion to allow such a filing to occur. However, the Commission also notes that no party objected to its filing in the original proceeding, and the Commission does not consider that prejudice resulted to any party as a result of the drone video being filed prior to the start of the oral hearing. As a result, the Commission will not disallow costs in relation to the drone video on the basis of this procedural defect. The Commission finds the services performed by Veritas were directly and necessarily related to the 899 Group's participation in the original proceeding, and that the fees that were claimed in accordance with the scale of costs for those services were reasonable.

28. The Commission notes that the claim made for accommodation for Mr. Wilson was not at the rate permitted in the scale of costs. However, as noted above, the Commission has discretion to award amounts in excess of the scale of costs, and consistent with its reasons above with respect to Mr. Niven's accommodation, considers it reasonable in these specific circumstances to award the claimed hotel rate of \$154.00 per day. The Commission approves the remaining disbursements for Veritas for equipment rental, mileage, meals, courier fees and USB sticks. Consequently, the Commission approves the fees and disbursements as claimed for Veritas in the total amount of \$6,912.75.

3.3.2 Total awarded to the 899 Group

29. For the reasons provided above, the Commission approves the 899 Group's claim for recovery of costs in the total amount of \$47,322.33. This amount is composed of legal fees of \$36,274.00, total disbursements of \$8,772.89 and goods and services tax (GST) of \$2,275.44.

¹² Exhibit 24083-X0004, 899 and Miller Costs Claims, PDF page 5.

4 The Miller Group

30. The following table summarizes the Miller Group’s costs claim:

Claimant	Hours			Fees	Disbursements	GST	Total
	Preparation	Attendance	Argument				
Miller Group							
Carscallen LLP	58.10	7.60	7.40	\$21,595.00	\$1,214.82	\$1,175.50	\$23,985.32
JetPro Consultants Inc.	18.00	0.00	0.00	\$3,600.00	\$0.00	\$180.00	\$3,780.00
Total	76.10	7.60	7.40	\$25,195.00	\$1,214.82	\$1,355.50	\$27,765.32

31. The Commission finds that the Miller Group acted responsibly in the original proceeding and contributed to the Commission’s understanding of the relevant issues. However, the Commission is unable to approve the full amount of the costs claimed in respect of the services performed by Carscallen for the reasons set out below.

4.1 Commission findings

4.1.1 Carscallen LLP

32. The Miller Group was represented by Carscallen in the original proceeding. The fees claimed by the Miller Group for the legal services provided by Mr. Niven and Mr. Barata relate to reviewing the applications, preparing intervenor evidence, preparing responses to IRs, preparing direct evidence, preparing an expert report, presenting direct evidence, cross-examining AltaLink, participating at the oral hearing, and preparing written argument and reply argument.

33. The Commission finds that the services performed by Carscallen were directly and necessarily related to the Miller Group’s participation in the original proceeding, and that the majority of the fees that were claimed in accordance with the scale of costs for those services were reasonable.

34. However, the Commission finds that not all fees were claimed in accordance with the scale of costs. The Commission observes that under the scale of costs, travel time may only be claimed in connection with attendance at a hearing. Therefore, the Commission disallows 6.3 hours for Mr. Barata for travel time on August 28, 2018.¹³ In addition, the Commission notes hours claimed for Mr. Barata include references to preparation of costs claims on October 17, October 30 and November 7, 2018.¹⁴ The Commission does not permit the recovery of costs incurred in the preparation of costs claims because these costs do not contribute to a better understanding of the issues before the Commission in the original proceeding. Since the time entry for October 17 also includes activities related to the original proceeding, the Commission has reduced the allowed time for this date by 50 percent to 0.3 hours and has disallowed the 0.1 hour time entry for October 30 and the 0.1 hour time entry for November 7. In total, the Commission has reduced Mr. Barata’s time by 6.8 hours (6.3 hours at the travel time rate and 0.5 hours at the full rate allowed in the scale of costs). Accordingly, the Commission approves the Miller Group’s claim for legal fees for Carscallen in the amount of \$20,573.00.

¹³ Exhibit 24083-X0004, 899 and Miller Costs Claims, PDF page 42.

¹⁴ Exhibit 24083-X0004, 899 and Miller Costs Claims, PDF page 35.

35. The disbursements claimed for Carscallen were not all claimed in accordance with the scale of costs. The Commission notes that the claim made for accommodation for Mr. Barata to attend the hearing in Provost is not in accordance with the rate permitted in the scale of costs. However, as noted above, the Commission has discretion to award amounts in excess of the scale of costs, and consistent with its reasons above with respect to Mr. Niven’s accommodation, considers it reasonable in these specific circumstances to award the claimed hotel rate of \$154.00 per day.

36. In addition, the Miller Group included a miscellaneous disbursement for “LTO – Other Services” in the amount of \$60.00. The costs claim does not include a description of the disbursement. Without an explanation of what this disbursement entailed, the Commission cannot conclude that it was reasonable and directly and necessarily related to the hearing or other proceeding. The Commission therefore disallows the \$60.00 claimed for LTO Services. The remaining disbursements for the Miller Group for accommodation, mileage and photocopying are approved.

37. For the reasons set out above, the Commission approves the Miller Group’s claim for legal fees for Carscallen in the amount of \$20,573.00, disbursements of \$1,154.82 and GST of \$1,086.39 for a total of \$22,814.21.

4.1.2 JetPro Consultants Inc.

38. JetPro was retained by Carscallen on behalf of the Miller Group to perform consulting services in the original proceeding. The fees claimed by the Miller Group for the consulting services provided by Ed McDonald relate to reviewing the Provost Airport in light of the project, mapping development, and providing a JetPro Analysis Report.

39. The Commission finds that the services performed by JetPro were directly and necessarily related to the Miller Group’s participation in the original proceeding, and that the fees, which were claimed in accordance with the scale of costs for those services, are reasonable. Accordingly, the Commission approves the Miller Group’s claim for consulting fees for JetPro in the amount of \$3,600.00 and GST of \$180.00 for a total of \$3,780.00.

4.1.3 Total awarded to the Miller Group

40. For the reasons provided above, the Commission approves the Miller Group’s claim for recovery of costs in the total amount of \$26,594.21. This amount is composed of legal fees of \$20,573.00, consulting fees of \$3,600.00, disbursements of \$1,154.82 and GST of \$1,266.39.

5 The Consumers’ Coalition of Alberta

41. The following table summarizes the CCA’s costs claim:

Claimant	Hours			Fees	Disbursements	GST	Total
	Preparation	Attendance	Argument				
CCA							
Wachowich & Company	9.55	0.00	6.25	\$5,530.00	\$0.00	\$276.50	\$5,806.50
Nicholas Bryanskiy	0.00	0.00	35.70	\$11,424.00	\$0.00	\$571.20	\$11,995.20
Bema Enterprises Ltd.	64.05	0.00	38.60	\$24,557.50	\$0.00	\$1,227.88	\$25,785.38
Total	73.60	0.00	80.55	\$41,511.50	\$0.00	\$2,075.58	\$43,587.08

42. The Commission finds that the CCA acted responsibly in the original proceeding and contributed to the Commission's understanding of the relevant issues.

5.1 Comments from the AESO

43. The AESO submitted the CCA's costs claim should be significantly reduced because it exceeded the CCA's original budget by \$13,534, despite the CCA's limited participation in the original proceeding; the CCA caused unnecessary delays; and the CCA made a limited contribution.

44. The AESO noted that unnecessary delays were created by the CCA's request for additional time to file argument and reply argument, by its failure to monitor the oral hearing, and by its lateness in ordering transcripts.

45. The AESO submitted that by raising several policy-level and out-of-scope issues, by filing unrelated NID applications and by repeatedly requesting supply-related costs information, the CCA caused regulatory inefficiency and detracted from the main issues before the Commission.

5.2 Comments from AltaLink

46. AltaLink noted that the CCA is not a "local intervener" as defined in Rule 009 and, accordingly, is not eligible to recover costs related to AltaLink's application.

5.3 Reply from the CCA

47. The CCA replied that its costs exceeded the budget estimates because the AESO did not provide full and complete responses to its IRs and because the set of issues of importance to the CCA was expanded as a result of the cross-examination of the AESO at the hearing. The CCA noted its costs claim application was \$17,388 less than the budget estimate for its full participation in the original proceeding.¹⁵

48. The CCA noted its request for a time extension was minimal, was fully approved by the Commission, and was necessary in order for the CCA to effectively participate in the original proceeding. The CCA submitted no disallowance to its costs is warranted as a result of the minimal delay.

49. The CCA did not respond to AltaLink's comments.

5.4 Commission findings

5.4.1 Wachowich & Company

50. The CCA was represented by Wachowich & Company in the original proceeding. James Wachowich and Nicholas Bryanskiy acted as co-counsel on the original proceeding. The fees claimed by the CCA for the legal services provided by Mr. Wachowich relate to reviewing the application, providing legal support to the CCA's technical consultants, reviewing drafts of IRs, responses to IRs, argument and reply argument.

¹⁵ Exhibit 23339-X0069, CCA Budget - 23339.

51. The Commission finds that that the services performed by Wachowich & Company were directly and necessarily related to the CCA's participation in the original proceeding, and that the fees, claimed in accordance with the scale of costs for those services, were reasonable. The Commission is not convinced by the AESO's submissions that the CCA created unnecessary delays or caused regulatory inefficiency; the Commission considers that the CCA's limited participation in the original proceeding was reasonable and relevant to the issues before the Commission. The Commission also acknowledges that the CCA's claimed costs exceeded the budget provided in advance, however given the scope of the issues and the substance of the CCA's participation, the Commission considers that the fees claimed are reasonable. Accordingly, the Commission approves the CCA's claim for legal fees for Wachowich & Company in the amount of \$5,530.00 and GST of \$276.50 for a total of \$5,806.50.

5.4.2 Nicholas Bryanskiy

52. The CCA was co-represented by Mr. Bryanskiy in the original proceeding. The fees claimed by the CCA for the legal services provided by Mr. Bryanskiy relate to reviewing the application, providing legal support to the CCA's technical consultants, reviewing responses to IRs, evidence, motions and other written submissions, reviewing transcripts of the oral hearing, and drafting and revising argument and reply argument.

53. The Commission finds that the services performed by Nicholas Bryanskiy were directly and necessarily related to the CCA's participation in the original proceeding, and that the fees, claimed in accordance with the scale of costs for those services, were reasonable. Accordingly, the Commission approves the CCA's claim for legal fees for Nicholas Bryanskiy in the amount of \$11,424.00 and GST of \$571.20 for a total of \$11,995.20.

5.4.3 Bema Enterprises Ltd.

54. Bema was retained by the CCA to perform consulting services in the original proceeding. The fees claimed by the CCA for the consulting services provided by Dan Levson, Dustin Madsen and Chris Codd relate to reviewing the application, drafting and submitting IRs, reviewing responses to IRs, drafting and submitting correspondence and motions, and reviewing argument and reply argument. Mr. Codd completed the majority of the work, with review of the work conducted by Mr. Levson and Mr. Madsen.¹⁶

55. The Commission finds that the services performed by Bema were directly and necessarily related to the CCA's participation in the original proceeding, and that the fees, which were claimed in accordance with the scale of costs for those services, are reasonable. Accordingly, the Commission approves the CCA's claim for consulting fees for Bema in the amount of \$24,557.50 and GST of \$1,227.88 for a total of \$25,785.38.

5.4.4 Total awarded to the CCA

56. For the reasons provided above, the Commission approves the CCA's claim for recovery of costs in the total amount of \$43,587.08. This amount is composed of legal fees of \$16,954.00, consulting fees of \$24,557.50 and GST of \$2,075.58.

¹⁶ Exhibit 24083-X0001, 23339 – Provost Reliability Upgrade – CCA Cost Claim, paragraph 38.

6 Order

57. It is hereby ordered that:

- 1) AltaLink Management Ltd. shall pay intervener costs to the 899 Group in the amount of \$47,322.33. Payment shall be made to Carscallen LLP.
- 2) AltaLink Management Ltd. shall pay intervener costs to the Miller Group in the amount of \$26,594.21. Payment shall be made to Carscallen LLP.
- 3) AltaLink Management Ltd. shall record in its Hearing Cost Reserve Account approved intervener costs in the amount of \$73,916.54.
- 4) The Alberta Electric System Operator shall pay intervener costs to the Consumers' Coalition of Alberta in the amount of \$43,587.08.

Dated on March 13, 2019.

Alberta Utilities Commission

(original signed by)

Anne Michaud
Vice-Chair

(original signed by)

Neil Jamieson
Commission Member

(original signed by)

Joanne Phillips
Commission Member