

From: [RogerBryenton](#)
To: [Commission Secretary BCUC:EX](#); [RogerBryenton](#)
Subject: BCUC Site C Report Review by Deloitte
Date: Thursday, September 14, 2017 7:20:55 AM
Attachments: [2016-2036-Forecast-w-Revised-Trade-BCUC-RB-Sep8.xlsx](#)

Dear Mr. Wruck

Regarding the Deloitte Report on Site C

Would it be possible, and advantageous to use the Deloitte model of BC's electricity demand and supply to run

another couple of options for "sensitivity analysis"? My concern is that with a substantial portion of new supply from geothermal, BC Hydro may push back very hard on "unproven technology, unknown cost, and unknown risk" aspects. My idea would be to increase the DSM, wind and solar.

Another run would be a "what-if" the self sufficiency and Exclusion of Burrard thermal were relaxed. Columbia Treaty power can add 4,400 GWh/yr and Burrard thermal can fill in the capacity need for a few hours a year. An additional factor on the second run would be to add the "trade" power now exported, which averages 3,730 GWh/yr over the past 3 years. In my spreadsheet, I used an assumption of electric vehicles and LNG loads, to prevent undue criticism of unrealistic loads or lack of load. Attached is my spreadsheet, but having Deloitte do a "sensitivity analysis" would carry much more weight. I avoided geothermal, focussing on DSM, Columbia, and trade power which gets us past 2036 easily.

I am awaiting your Sep 20th report with great interest. I would also like to see a recommendation to halt or pause the project immediately, to save the roughly \$2 million per day.

Thank you. Sincerely,

Roger Bryenton, P. Eng (former), MBA,
Energy Systems Consultant,
Suzuki and SPEC Elder [REDACTED]

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>