



Stirling Wind Project Ltd.
Stirling Wind Project

Alberta Electric System Operator
Stirling Wind Project Connection
Needs Identification Document

AltaLink Management Ltd.
Stirling Wind Project Connection
Facility Applications

Costs Award

June 21, 2019

Alberta Utilities Commission

Decision 24433-D01-2019

Stirling Wind Project Ltd.

Stirling Wind Project

Alberta Electric System Operator

Stirling Wind Project Connection Needs Identification Document

AltaLink Management Ltd.

Stirling Wind Project Connection Facility Applications

Costs Award

Proceeding 24433

June 21, 2019

Published by the:

Alberta Utilities Commission

Eau Claire Tower

1400, 600 Third Avenue S.W.

Calgary, Alberta T2P 0G5

Telephone: 310-4AUC (310-4282 in Alberta)

1-833-511-4AUC (1-833-511-4282 outside Alberta)

Email: info@auc.ab.ca

Website: www.auc.ab.ca

The Commission may, within 30 days of the date of this decision and without notice, correct typographical, spelling and calculation errors and other similar types of errors and post the corrected decision on its website.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2 | Commission’s authority to award costs and intervener eligibility | 2 |
| 3 | Comments on the costs claim application | 3 |
| 3.1 | Comments from Stirling..... | 3 |
| 3.2 | Comments from the AESO | 3 |
| 3.3 | Comments from AltaLink | 3 |
| 3.4 | Reply comments from the SL Group | 3 |
| 4 | Stirling Landowner Group | 4 |
| 4.1 | Commission findings | 5 |
| 4.1.1 | My Landman Group, Inc..... | 5 |
| 4.1.2 | Cottonwood Consultants Ltd. | 7 |
| 4.1.3 | Ken Orich..... | 8 |
| 4.1.4 | SL Group Honoraria | 8 |
| 4.1.5 | Total awarded to the SL Group..... | 9 |
| 4.1.6 | Allocation of the SL Group’s costs..... | 9 |
| 5 | Order | 11 |

Stirling Wind Project Ltd.
Stirling Wind Project
Alberta Electric System Operator
Stirling Wind Project Connection Needs Identification Document
AltaLink Management Ltd.
Stirling Wind Project Connection Facility Applications
Costs Award

Decision 24433-D01-2019
Proceeding 24433

1 Introduction

1. In this decision the Alberta Utilities Commission considers the costs claim application by the Stirling Landowner Group (SL Group) for approval and payment of its costs of participation in Proceeding 22546¹ (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 |
|--------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Stirling Landowner Group | | | | | | | | |
| My Landman Group | \$57,807.00 | \$2,005.03 | \$2,990.10 | \$62,802.13 | \$41,451.75 | \$1,532.15 | \$2,143.64 | \$45,127.54 |
| Cottonwood Consultants | \$20,047.50 | \$413.63 | \$1,022.41 | \$21,483.54 | \$20,047.50 | \$413.63 | \$1,022.41 | \$21,483.54 |
| Ken Orich | \$24,696.00 | \$1,150.92 | \$0.00 | \$25,846.92 | \$22,226.40 | \$1,150.92 | \$0.00 | \$23,377.32 |
| SL Group Honoraria | \$2,360.89 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$2,360.89 | \$1,250.00 | \$200.85 | \$10.04 | \$1,460.89 |
| Total | \$104,911.39 | \$3,569.58 | \$4,012.51 | \$112,493.48 | \$84,975.65 | \$3,297.55 | \$3,176.09 | \$91,449.29 |

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

4. The original proceeding was convened by the Commission to consider: Stirling Wind Project Ltd.'s application to construct and operate a wind power project and a collector substation in the Lethbridge area; the Alberta Electric System Operator (AESO)'s needs identification document application; and AltaLink Management Ltd.'s facility application to provide transmission system access to the project.

5. The allocation of the total cost claim amongst these parties is discussed in Section 4.1.6.

6. The original proceeding included several rounds of information requests (IRs) and responses to IRs, evidence and rebuttal evidence, an oral hearing and written argument and reply

¹ Proceeding 22546: Stirling Wind Project Ltd. Stirling Wind Project, Alberta Electric System Operator Stirling Wind Project Connection Needs Identification Document, AltaLink Management Ltd. Stirling Wind Project Connection Facility Applications.

argument. The close of record for the original proceeding was February 20, 2019, and the Commission issued Decision 22546-D01-2019² on April 26, 2019.

7. The SL Group submitted its costs claim application on March 22, 2019, within the 30-day timeline permitted by the Commission's rules. The Commission assigned Proceeding 24433 and Application 24433-A001 to the costs claim application.

8. On March 29, 2019, Stirling, the AESO and AltaLink filed comments on the SL Group's costs claim application. On April 5, 2019, the SL Group filed its reply comments. The Commission considers the close of record for this proceeding to be April 5, 2019.

2 Commission's authority to award costs and intervener eligibility

9. Only "local interveners" are eligible to claim costs in facility related applications. The Commission's authority to award costs for the participation of a local intervener in 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*, is found in sections 21 and 22 of the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*. When considering a claim for costs for a facilities proceeding, the Commission is also guided by the factors set out in Section 7 of Rule 009: *Rules on Local Intervener Costs* and the scale of costs found in Appendix A of Rule 009.

10. 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.

11. 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

² Decision 22546-D01-2019: Stirling Wind Project Ltd. Stirling Wind Project, Alberta Electric System Operator Stirling Wind Project Connection Needs Identification Document, AltaLink Management Ltd. Stirling Wind Project Connection Facility Applications, Proceeding 22546, April 26, 2019.

or association of persons whose business interest may include a hydro development, power plant or transmission line or a gas utility pipeline.

12. Based on the record of the original proceeding, the Commission is satisfied that the members of the SL Group in the original proceeding fall within the definition of “local intervener” in the *Alberta Utilities Commission Act*.³ Although AltaLink submitted in this proceeding that George and Margaret Stanko were located over a kilometre from its proposed facilities, these individuals were given standing in relation to all of the applications and the Commission is satisfied that they are eligible to claim costs in relation to their participation in the original proceeding.

3 Comments on the costs claim application

3.1 Comments from Stirling

13. Stirling raised a number of general objections to the costs claim’s reasonableness, as well as specific concerns with the costs claimed for Ken Orich and Daryl Bennett.

14. Stirling argued in favour of a global reduction in costs, as the SL Group’s objections to its power plant application were chiefly assigned to Brad Cox and Lorraine Thomson who withdrew their objections prior to the hearing. Stirling also submitted that it incurred substantial costs to address the SL Group’s improper conduct during the proceeding, such as repeated disclosure of confidential business information and allegations that Stirling’s settlements were improper (such commercial arrangements are reasonable, proper and fully within Stirling’s legal rights to undertake).

3.2 Comments from the AESO

15. The AESO submitted that the claim relating to its application should be reduced because the SL Group spent unnecessary time continuing to question the AESO’s evaluation of the 240-kV Montana-Alberta transmission line (MATL) connection alternative after the AESO provided its initial IR responses.

3.3 Comments from AltaLink

16. AltaLink disputed the allocation of costs in relation to its application on the basis that the majority of the costs claimed are for the activities performed by Cliff Wallis and Mr. Orich, which were directed to the wind project and not to AltaLink’s transmission system access to the project. Further, the SL Group indicated that one of the reasons it participated in relation to AltaLink’s application was the proposed relocation of the FortisAlberta Inc. distribution line in the area. However, AltaLink provided Robin Conrad and her representative with a map and written description of the options FortisAlberta was considering for the relocation and it filed that information in reply evidence in an effort to narrow the issues being considered.

3.4 Reply comments from the SL Group

17. The SL Group submitted that its evidence contributed to a better understanding of the issues before the Commission, including facilitating an accurate assessment of the adverse

³ See Decision 22546-D01-2019, paragraph 18.

effects of the wind project and associated transmission lines. It stated that costs awards should not be solely based on the interveners' level of success in the proceeding, and that it could not predict how the proceeding would progress, with respect to the activities conducted by Mr. Wallis and Mr. Orich as they related to the different applicants' projects.

18. The SL Group also disputed the AESO's claim that it had provided sufficient information on the MATL alternative in its IR responses, and asserted that the SL Group had the right to seek clarification, which was not provided until the AESO submitted reply evidence and testified at the hearing.

19. With respect to Stirling's comments, the SL Group submitted that Mr. Orich is well qualified to conduct bird surveys and to identify birds, and his information was key to understanding what avian species were present in the area. The SL Group disputed that it had subsequently re-disclosed confidential information after the Commission ruled to the contrary, because the Commission did not give such direction until after the decision was issued.⁴ With respect to the global reduction requested, the SL Group submitted that the Commission had ruled that the SL Group retained the right to object to all six applications notwithstanding the withdrawal of Mr. Cox and Ms. Thomson from the proceeding, and the Commission granted standing to Joe and Whitney Buntyn who objected to the wind project applications.⁵ The SL Group submitted that when the Commission ruled on retaining the expert evidence, it presumably also granted the SL Group permission to give voice to that evidence, making it reasonable for the SL Group to proceed as it did. Further, it contended that the Commission's instructions indicated that the SL Group continued to have the right to raise the issues that it did.

4 Stirling Landowner Group

20. The following table summarizes the SL Group's costs claimed:

| Claimant | Hours | | | Fees | Disbursements | GST | Total |
|--------------------------|-------------|------------|----------|--------------|---------------|------------|--------------|
| | Preparation | Attendance | Argument | | | | |
| Stirling Landowner Group | | | | | | | |
| My Landman Group | 184.75 | 10.00 | 25.75 | \$57,807.00 | \$2,005.03 | \$2,990.10 | \$62,802.13 |
| Cottonwood Consultants | 66.00 | 9.75 | 0.75 | \$20,047.50 | \$413.63 | \$1,022.41 | \$21,483.54 |
| Ken Orich | 209.60 | 3.00 | 0.00 | \$24,696.00 | \$1,150.92 | \$0.00 | \$25,846.92 |
| SL Group Honoraria | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | \$2,360.89 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$2,360.89 |
| Total | 460.35 | 22.75 | 26.50 | \$104,911.39 | \$3,569.58 | \$4,012.51 | \$112,493.48 |

21. The Commission finds that the SL 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 My Landman Group and Mr. Orich for the reasons set out below.

⁴ Exhibit 24433-X0013, SLG cost response to Proceeding 24433, PDF page 20.

⁵ Referring to Exhibit 22546-X0271, AUC ruling on request to withdraw evidence and motions filed by the SL Group.

4.1 Commission findings

22. The Commission rejects Stirling’s argument that the SL Group’s costs relating to objections to the power plant application should be globally reduced because those objections were chiefly assigned to Mr. Cox and Ms. Thomson, who withdrew their objections prior to the hearing.

23. Although the other members of the SL Group did not specifically object to Stirling’s application, they were granted standing in relation to all of the applications, including Stirling’s wind project, and the Commission is satisfied that they qualify as local interveners who are eligible for costs. Moreover, Mr. Cox and Ms. Thomson withdrew from the proceeding at a relatively late stage (shortly before the hearing), and the SL Group incurred a relatively large portion of its expert costs prior to their withdrawal. The Commission does not consider, in any event, that it would be reasonable to disallow such costs incurred prior to the withdrawal based on the occurrence of an event that the SL Group could not have predicted from the outset of the proceeding.

24. Further, the Commission denied the request to withdraw all of the evidence attributable to Mr. Cox and Ms. Thomson at the time of their withdrawal from the proceeding on the basis that it was “satisfied that such evidence is relevant to the applications before the Commission.”⁶ At that time, the Commission also commented specifically on the expert reports prepared by Mr. Wallis and Mr. Orich and stated that it was “satisfied that those reports were produced at the request of the SL Group and not specifically for Cox/Thomson,” that the reports were part of the SL Group’s evidence, and that the SL Group was “entitled to rely on those expert reports.”⁷

25. For all of the above reasons as well as the Commission’s reliance on the SL Group’s evidence in the original proceeding, and in particular, the expert reports which form a significant portion of the SL Group’s costs claim, the Commission does not consider it appropriate to globally reduce the SL Group’s costs on the basis asserted by Stirling.

26. The Commission has also considered the AESO’s argument for a general reduction in costs as a result of the pursuit of information relating to the MATL alternative. The Commission does not agree with the AESO that the SL Group’s pursuit of the issue resulted in unnecessary costs. To the contrary, the Commission is of the opinion that if the AESO had provided necessary additional information in its initial response, costs may have been saved. The Commission accordingly will not reduce the SL Group’s costs claimed in relation to the AESO’s application on that basis.

27. However, the Commission has determined that other specific reductions to the costs claimed by the SL Group are warranted, as set out below.

4.1.1 My Landman Group, Inc.

28. The SL Group was represented by Mr. Bennett of My Landman Group in the original proceeding. The fees claimed by the SL Group for the consulting services provided by Mr.

⁶ Exhibit 22546-X0271, AUC ruling on request to withdraw evidence and motions filed by the SL Group in response, paragraph 6.

⁷ Exhibit 22546-X0271, AUC ruling on request to withdraw evidence and motions filed by the SL Group in response, paragraph 7.

Bennett relate to reviewing the applications, overseeing the SL Group's intervention, retaining two experts, corresponding with the Commission, handling procedural issues, assisting with the compilation of evidence, reviewing the applicants' evidence, submitting IRs and responses to IRs, attending the oral hearing, reviewing and submitting argument and reply argument and compiling the SL Group's costs claim.

29. While the Commission finds that the services performed by My Landman Group were directly and necessarily related to the SL Group's participation in the original proceeding, it finds that some of the fees claimed for these services were unreasonable.

30. As reflected in the table above, Mr. Bennett claimed a total of 220.5⁸ hours relating to preparation, attendance and argument. The hours initially claimed as part of the costs submission include 4.0 hours for preparing the costs claim⁹ and 12.8 hours for travel time.¹⁰ At the end of the SL Group's reply submissions in this proceeding, Mr. Bennett also requested recovery of an additional 4.0 hours for the purpose of preparing those reply submissions;¹¹ these additional 4.0 hours for reply were not included in the initial claim and are therefore not reflected in the tables above.

31. The Commission finds that not all fees were claimed in accordance with the scale of costs. 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. Therefore, the Commission disallows the 4.0 hours claimed for preparing the costs claim, as well as the additional 4.0 hours requested for preparing reply submissions in the costs proceeding. In addition, 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 10.8 of the 12.8¹² travel hours claimed. Mr. Bennett's total hours after the reductions described in this paragraph are 203.7 hours for consulting activities at \$270.00 per hour and 2.0 hours for travel time at \$135.00 per hour.

32. The disbursement for mileage was also not claimed in accordance with the scale of costs. Under the scale of costs, mileage may only be claimed in connection with attendance at a hearing and at the allowed rate of 46 cents per kilometer, inclusive of GST. The claim made for Mr. Bennett for pre-hearing trips totalling 1,248 kilometers is reduced to 220 kilometers for the two trips to attend the oral hearing. Accordingly, mileage is awarded in the amount of \$101.20. This amount is inclusive of GST. The Commission approves the remaining disbursements for transcripts, photocopying, and title search in the amount of \$1,430.95.

33. In addition to the reductions described above, the Commission has determined that an overall reduction in Mr. Bennett's costs is warranted in the circumstances, for the reasons that follow.

⁸ 184.75 (Preparation) hours + 10.0 (Attendance) hours + 25.75 (Argument) hours = 220.5 hours.

⁹ Exhibit 24433-X0003, PDF page 24.

¹⁰ Exhibit 24433-X0003, Form U2, My Landman Group, Inc.

¹¹ Exhibit 24433-X0013, SLG cost response to Proceeding 24433, PDF page 23.

34. Stirling submitted that the SL Group's representative engaged in conduct that added unnecessary costs to the proceeding or that was otherwise inappropriate, including the disclosure of confidential leases that the Commission held to be of limited relevance to the issues before it. In the original proceeding, the SL Group filed leases on the public record, respecting which Stirling filed a motion to strike for confidentiality. The Commission issued a process letter, which temporarily voided the leases from the public record due to the nature of the motion, and the SL Group's reply submissions on the motion re-disclosed specific information on the terms of the lease agreements. The Commission then held that most of the lease information was confidential, and in its ruling voided the originally filed leases as well as redacted those portions of the SL Group's submissions that reproduced the lease information.

35. The Commission finds that the repeated disclosure of the lease information was unnecessary and did not contribute to its understanding of the relevant issues. The Commission also finds that My Landman Group devoted unnecessary time and resources to making accusations against Stirling that were irrelevant to the issues before the Commission, primarily relating to the fairness and legality of the private contractual agreements between the SL Group members and Stirling,¹³ which the Commission had previously stated in the original proceeding were matters outside of its jurisdiction.¹⁴

36. In sum, My Landman Group engaged in conduct which, cumulatively, lengthened the proceeding while failing to contribute to a better understanding of the issues before the Commission. As a result, the Commission finds that a 25 per cent reduction in the remaining consulting fees is warranted (after the reductions based on the scale of costs set out in paragraph 31). Accordingly, the Commission approves the SL Group's claim for consulting fees for My Landman Group in the reduced amount of \$41,451.75 and GST of \$2,072.59.

37. Accordingly, the Commission approves the SL Group's claim for consulting fees for My Landman Group, Inc. in the amount of \$41,451.75, disbursements of \$1,532.15 and GST of \$2,143.64 for a total of \$45,127.54.

4.1.2 Cottonwood Consultants Ltd.

38. Cottonwood Consultants was retained by the SL Group to perform consulting services in the original proceeding. The fees claimed by the SL Group for the consulting services provided by Mr. Wallis of Cottonwood Consultants relate to reviewing the applications, reviewing environmental evidence, drafting an expert report, assisting with responses to IRs, drafting cross-examination and preparing for and attending the oral hearing.

39. The Commission finds that the services performed by Cottonwood Consultants were directly and necessarily related to the SL Group's participation in the original proceeding, and that the fees and disbursements claimed in accordance with the scale of costs for those services were reasonable. Accordingly, the Commission approves the claim for consulting fees for

¹³ Exhibit 22546-X0271, AUC ruling on request to withdraw evidence and motions filed by the SL Group, paragraph 13.

¹⁴ Exhibit 22546-X0222, AUC ruling on the motion of Stirling Wind Project Ltd. to strike lease proposals from the record, paragraphs 21 and 22.

Cottonwood Consultants Ltd. in the amount of \$20,047.50, disbursements for accommodation and mileage of \$413.63 and GST of \$1,022.41 for a total of \$21,483.54.

4.1.3 Ken Orich

40. Mr. Orich was retained by the SL Group to perform consulting services in the original proceeding. The fees claimed by the SL Group for the consulting services provided Mr. Orich relate to reviewing the applications, conducting bird surveys, reviewing the bird surveys provided by Stirling, drafting an expert report, assisting with responses to IRs, drafting cross-examination and preparing for and attending the oral hearing.

41. While the Commission finds that the services performed by Mr. Orich were directly and necessarily related to the SL Group's participation in the original proceeding, it finds that the fees claimed for these services were disproportionate to the extent to which his evidence contributed to a better understanding of the issues before the Commission.

42. Stirling submitted in the original proceeding that Mr. Orich's bird survey program used non-standardized search methods designed to count as many birds as possible. In the original decision, the Commission commented that "it agrees with Stirling that the bird survey results can not be compared with Mr. Orich's observations given the differences in their methods."¹⁵ Given that Mr. Orich's evidence was largely dependant on the results of his surveys, and his methodology was difficult to verify or compare due to lack of standardization, the Commission considers that a reduction in Mr. Orich's fees of 10 per cent is appropriate.

43. Finally, the Commission notes that the mileage expenses claimed for numerous pre-hearing trips to the project area are not explicitly allowed within the scale of costs but were claimed in accordance with the rates permitted by the scale of costs. Notwithstanding, the Commission finds that it is reasonable that a consultant preparing a bird survey could not prepare the survey without travel to the project area. As a result, the Commission will exercise its discretion to allow Mr. Orich to recover the costs of his pre-hearing travel as claimed in the costs application.

44. Accordingly, the Commission approves the claim for consulting fees for Mr. Orich in the reduced amount of \$22,226.40 and disbursements for mileage of \$1,150.92 for a total of \$23,377.32.

4.1.4 SL Group Honoraria

45. The SL Group's costs claim included a claim for attendance honoraria for Ms. Conrad, Rod Conrad, George Stanko, Margaret Stanko and Alana Stanko. With the exception of Alana Stanko, these individuals were all members of the SL Group and were granted standing in the original proceeding. Alana Stanko appeared as a witness at the hearing and spoke on behalf of her parents, George and Margaret Stanko. Attendance honoraria of \$150.00 for each (\$50 per half day for three half days) was claimed, for a total of \$750.00. Although Alana Stanko was not granted standing in the original proceeding, she appeared on behalf of her parents (who were described as severely stressed) and she represented their concerns before the Commission by testifying at the hearing. Given the specific circumstances in this proceeding, the Commission

¹⁵ Decision 22546-D01-2019, paragraph 153.

considers it reasonable to award Alana Stanko an attendance honoraria. The Commission finds that all of the claims for attendance honoraria are within the scale of costs and are approved.

46. The SL Group claimed preparation honoraria in the amount of \$300.00 for each of Mr. Conrad, Ms. Conrad and Alana Stanko. As described in the scale of costs under Rule 009, a preparation honorarium may be claimed by a local intervener who personally prepares a submission without expert help. The SL Group was represented by Mr. Bennett in the original proceeding, and the costs of his representation were claimed as professional fees under the scale of costs. As a result, the Commission denies the claims for three preparation honoraria.

47. In addition, a \$500.00 honorarium for Ms. Conrad was claimed, for forming the group, organizing group meetings and telephone conference calls and submitting the SL Group's filings to the Commission's eFiling system. A disbursement of \$210.89 (\$200.85 plus \$10.04 GST) for telephone conference call charges was also claimed by Ms. Conrad. The scale of costs provides that an honorarium for forming a group may be claimed by organizers in an amount of up to \$500.00, as Rule 009 recognizes that organizing a group of local interveners may require time, effort or expense. The Commission finds the claim for honorarium for forming the group is reasonable and within the scale of costs and is approved. In addition, the disbursement for conference calls is within the scale of costs and is approved.

48. Accordingly, the Commission approves the claim for intervener costs in the total amount of \$1,460.89. This amount is composed of honoraria of \$1,250.00, disbursements of \$200.85 and GST of \$10.04.

4.1.5 Total awarded to the SL Group

49. For the reasons provided above, the Commission approves the SL Group's claim for recovery of costs in the total amount of \$91,449.29. This amount is composed of consulting fees of \$84,975.65, disbursements of \$3,297.55 and GST of \$3,176.09.

4.1.6 Allocation of the SL Group's costs

50. In its costs claim application, the SL Group submitted its costs claimed for consultants and honoraria be allocated among Stirling, the AESO and AltaLink as follows:

| Claimant | Stirling | AESO | AltaLink |
|------------------------|----------|--------|----------|
| My Landman Group | 60% | 15% | 25% |
| Cottonwood Consultants | 85% | 0% | 15% |
| Ken Orich | 75% | 0% | 25% |
| SL Group Honoraria | 33.33% | 33.33% | 33.33% |

51. As previously summarized, AltaLink argued that although the SL Group seeks to recover a significant portion of the fees incurred by Mr. Wallis and Mr. Orich, Mr. Wallis expressly stated in his report that he was not providing an opinion on AltaLink's application, and neither expert specifically addressed the AltaLink facilities at the hearing. AltaLink did not propose an alternative allocation amount.

52. The SL Group submitted in reply argument that it retained its experts prior to the applicants' responses to IRs and reply evidence, and could not predict how the hearing would proceed in advance. The SL Group listed the activities which Mr. Wallis and Mr. Orich conducted in relation to AltaLink's application, including the preparation of IRs, support for cross-examination, and completion of avian surveys near the proposed transmission routes.

53. The AESO submitted that it generally agrees with the SL Group's approach to cost allocation as the SL Group spent less time on its application compared to the other applications. However, as earlier stated, the AESO argued that a costs reduction was appropriate on the basis of time spent on the MATL issue. The Commission considers that the AESO's submissions on the MATL issue speak to the reasonableness of the SL Group's costs, discussed above, but do not affect the overall percentage allocations awarded here.

54. Finally, while Stirling made a number of submissions in favour of a global costs reduction against the SL Group, which are discussed above, it did not specifically argue that the percentages allocated to each applicant were disproportionate to the relative time spent on each application.

55. The Commission has considered the percentage allocations provided by the SL Group in view of the time spent on the various issues before it in the original proceeding, and considers that its assessment of the relative costs attributable to the three applicants is reasonable. Taking into account the various reductions in costs awarded in previous sections, the Commission has applied those percentage allocations to the amounts awarded for each of the consultants and for honoraria. This results in total amounts to be paid by Stirling of \$63,357.49, the AESO of \$7,256.09 and AltaLink of \$20,835.71, as detailed in the table below:

| Claimant | Total Awarded Amount | Allocation of Total Awarded Amount to Stirling | Allocation of Total Awarded Amount to AESO | Allocation of Total Awarded Amount to AltaLink |
|--|----------------------|--|--|--|
| My Landman Group (60% Stirling, 15% AESO, 25% AltaLink) | \$45,127.54 | \$27,076.52 | \$6,769.13 | \$11,281.89 |
| Cottonwood Consultants (85% Stirling, 0% AESO, 15% AltaLink) | \$21,483.54 | \$18,261.01 | \$0.00 | \$3,222.53 |
| Ken Orich (75% Stirling, 0% AESO, 25% AltaLink) | \$23,377.32 | \$17,532.99 | \$0.00 | \$5,844.33 |
| SL Group Honoraria (33.33% Stirling, AESO, AltaLink) | \$1,460.89 | \$486.96 | \$486.96 | \$486.96 |
| Total Payable Amount | \$91,449.29 | \$63,357.49 | \$7,256.09 | \$20,835.71 |

5 Order

56. It is hereby ordered that:

- 1) Stirling Wind Project Ltd. shall pay intervener costs to the Stirling Landowner Group in the total amount of \$63,357.49. Payment shall be made to My Landman Group, Inc. for distribution to the Stirling Landowner Group in accordance with this decision.
- 2) The Alberta Electric System Operator shall pay intervener costs to the Stirling Landowner Group in the total amount of \$7,256.09. Payment shall be made to My Landman Group, Inc. for distribution to the Stirling Landowner Group in accordance with this decision.
- 3) AltaLink Management Ltd. shall pay intervener costs to the Stirling Landowner Group in the amount of \$20,835.71. Payment shall be made to My Landman Group, Inc. for distribution to the Stirling Landowner Group in accordance with this decision.
- 4) AltaLink Management Ltd. shall record in its Hearing Cost Reserve account approved intervener costs in the amount of \$20,835.71.

Dated on June 21, 2019.

Alberta Utilities Commission

(original signed by)

Neil Jamieson
Commission Member

(original signed by)

Carolyn Hutniak
Commission Member

(original signed by)

Joanne Phillips
Commission Member