

**Reference:** May 11, 2004 Transcript – Page 5362

**Undertaking MC-82:** Inquire of Ms. Hickson if she reviewed seven items and provide results of review.

**Answer:**

My assignment was to determine if the Need For and Alternatives to the Wuskwatim Project submission was sufficient to be considered by the Clean Environment Commission and the participants through the public hearing process.

I reviewed the filed material and determined additional information to be considered for supplementary filing. The results of my review and comments were outlined in my letter dated June 27, 2003 submitted to Mr. Trent Hreno and filed in the public registry.

The sufficiency of the following items was reviewed:

- Operation, design and location
- Transmission, design, routing
- Capital and production costs
- Projected export revenues
- Alternative analysis including wind, DSM, natural gas, coal, imports and others
- Impact of the project on financial stability of Hydro and impact of project on Hydro's existing ratepayers

The sufficiency review was undertaken within the context of the specific terms of reference for the scope of review for the justification, need for and alternatives to the Wuskwatim proposals component of the hearings and The Operational Policy Statement, October 1998 Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency Guidance – Addressing “Need for” “Purpose of” “Alternatives to” and “Alternative Means” under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act.

I reviewed the supplementary information filed by Hydro and found that this information, combined with outstanding items that were to be filed at a later date, should provide adequate information for review by the Panel and participants. This was outlined in a memo dated August 11, 2004 to Mr. Trent Hreno.

May 25, 2004