

**ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD**

APPLICATION OF GOLDCORP CANADA LTD. and GOLDCORP INC.  
for leave to construct a 115 kV Electricity Transmission Line,  
and for Ancillary Orders

File No. EB-2011-0106

**INTERROGATORIES OF LAC SEUL FIRST NATION TO GOLDCORP**

*Administration*

**1. Application and Evidentiary Amendments**

Question:

Please provide a detailed list of any and all amendments/additions that have been made to the application, or that the proponent intends to make, and/or to any evidence that has been filed in support of the application. Please include the previous statement/evidence followed by the amended version in a distinguishable format on the list.

*Project Need & Consideration of Alternatives*

**2. Project Need (A)**

Preamble:

On Exh. A/T 1/S 1/p. 2 and 3, Goldcorp references the IESO's "18 Month Outlook" and quotes that the area served by the Ear Falls TS is identified as having "no margin to support expected load growth."

Goldcorp's proposed project will tap into the E2R line between Ear Falls TS and Red Lake TS and presumably add additional load on the Ear Falls TS.

Further, in the IESO's System Impact Assessment Report dated January 21, 2011, the IESO states on page (i) that "GoldCorp Canada Ltd. has advised that it requires between 11.2 MW and 12 MW of initial supply at the new Balmer substation. GoldCorp Canada Ltd. acknowledges and accepts that: (a) there are existing grid limitations in the Ear Falls area which may result in available supply to the new Balmer substation that is less than the applicant's required initial supply; (b) the applicant will accept the available supply and make up the balance through other means, including from generators, not connected to the IESO controlled-grid."

Questions:

- a) Please reconcile how adding additional load to the Ear Falls TS can be accommodated when the IESO states that the area served by the Ear Falls TS has “no margin to support expected load growth.”
- b) Even if the proposed project moves ahead, will Goldcorp be installing additional diesel or other generators as referenced by part (b) of the statement from the IESO in their SIA which states that Goldcorp will be making up the additional supply from “generators, not connected to the IESO controlled-grid”?
- c) If the answer to part (b) above is yes, please reconcile with the dismissal of “Temporary Use of Diesel Fired Generation” under “Alternatives Considered” under Exh. B/T 3/S 1/ p. 1.

**3. Project Need (B)**

Preamble:

On Exh. B/T 1/S 1/p. 3, Goldcorp states that “Supplying these loads off HONI’s M6 line could be achieved if Goldcorp off-loads some of its electricity supply requirements from HONI’s M6 onto its proposed new facilities, *provided they can be commissioned by Q4 2011.*” (emphasis added)

Questions:

- a) Please provide a detailed explanation as to why HONI’s M6 cannot supply these other loads once Goldcorp’s proposed facilities are commissioned, even if that commissioning occurs later than Q4 2011.
- b) Does Goldcorp plan on disconnecting (i) the Cochenour complex, (ii) Campbell complex, Red Lake complex and (iii) Balmer complex from the M6 / M3 lines if the proposed facilities are installed?

**4. Rubicon Minerals Load Requirements**

Preamble:

On Exh. A/T 2/S 1/p. 2, Goldcorp indicates that “Rubicon Minerals has indicated to Goldcorp and HONI that it would like to utilize any capacity at the Red Lake TS freed up by Gold Corp’s (sic) utilization of the proposed facilities.”

Question:

- a) Please provide any details that Goldcorp may have in relation to how Rubicon Minerals plans to utilize any freed up capacity at Red Lake TS.
- b) Given the stated requirements of Rubicon Minerals, have any alternative options been considered which would meet the objectives of both Goldcorp and Rubicon? For example, a transmission line which services both parties.

## **5. Alternatives Considered**

Preamble:

On Exh. B/T 3/S 1/ p. 1-2, Goldcorp states that many of the alternatives are not feasible given that they would not be in service by Q4 2011.

Question:

If the proposed facilities are not able to be in service by Q4 2011, does this change the evaluation of any of the alternatives? For example, will natural gas fired generation or diesel generators become a more viable alternative if the proposed facilities are not in-service by Q4 2011?

## **6. Load Forecast**

Preamble:

In Exh. B/T 6/S 4, Goldcorp provides a load forecast for Red Lake which indicates an over 50% increase in load between 2010 and 2015.

Questions:

- a) Please explain how this load growth can be accommodated with the proposed facilities.
- b) Will additional facilities need to be constructed in order to accommodate this load growth?

## **7. Regional Planning (A)**

### Preamble:

On Exh. B/T 1/S 3/p. 3, Goldcorp states that “Two other parties, Rubicon Minerals Corporation and Pikangikum First Nations, both propose to increase their loads and want to take service from the M6 feeder line.”

### Questions:

- a) Has Goldcorp approached Rubicon Minerals Corporation or Pikangikum First Nations regarding a coordinated approach to the region’s energy needs that may, among other things, minimize land use impacts and reduce overall costs?
- b) If the answer to (a) is yes, what options were considered and what were the outcomes of these discussions?

## **8. Regional Planning (B)**

### Preamble:

On May 31, 2011, the Ontario Power Authority (“OPA”) held a stakeholder consultation session related to their Integrated Power System Plan 2011. On page 35 of the presentation on transmission entitled “IPSP 2011 Stakeholder Consultation: Transmission Planning” (available on the OPA’s website), the OPA makes reference to “Red Lake options” being considered which include: (1) Upgrade existing 115 kV lines; (2) New 115 kV lines; (3) Demand Response.

We note that the OPA is **not** listed as a party that Goldcorp had identified as a stakeholder that may have an interest in the proposed transmission facilities under Exh. B/T 6/S 6/ pp. 1 – 3.

### Questions:

- a) Has Goldcorp held discussions with the OPA with respect to the proposed facilities and the larger plan that the OPA is drafting?
- b) If the answer to (a) is no, why did Goldcorp not believe it necessary to consult with the OPA who is the system planner?
- c) If the answer to (a) is yes, what were the outcomes of those discussions?

- d) Further, if the answer to (a) is yes, is the OPA supportive of the proposed facilities?
- e) If the answer to (a) is yes, why was the OPA not listed under Exh. B/T 6/S 6?

### ***Permits & Approvals***

## **9. Permits and Approvals**

### Preamble:

On Exh. A/T 1/S 1/ p. 3, Goldcorp states that “Final approval under the Class EA for Resource Stewardship and Facility Development and all permits are expected by April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2011.”

Further reference can be found in the Affidavit of Angela Brooks under paragraph 11 which states: “I have been informed by officials in the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) that MNR will sign off on Goldcorp’s Environmental Study Report in respect of the Class Environmental Assessment for Resource Stewardship and Facility Development and issue all MNR permits respecting Goldcorp’s proposed facilities by approximately April 26, 2011.”

### Questions:

- a) Please provide details on which permits are being requested from MNR.
- b) Please provide details on which permits are requested from any other provincial or federal agency, board, or ministry.
- c) Please provide an update on the status of all outstanding permits and if they have not yet been received, their anticipated date of receipt.

### ***Stakeholder Issues***

## **10. Ongoing Stakeholder Consultations**

### Preamble:

On Exh. A/T 1/S 1/p. 3, Goldcorp states “Goldcorp has and will ensure stakeholders’ issues are addressed.”

Question:

Please provide details with respect to Goldcorp's plan to address stakeholder concerns and issues with particular reference to Aboriginal concerns.

## **11. Stakeholder Opposition**

Preamble:

On Exh. A/T 2/S 1/ p. 5, Goldcorp states that "... no one has expressed any concern about the construction of either the Balmer Complex TS or the proposed 115 kV line."

Question:

Please provide any supporting evidence on which Goldcorp relies to make this assertion.

## **12. Stakeholder Consultations**

Preamble:

On Exh. B/T 6/S 6/p. 4, Goldcorp states that:

"(d) Reasonable and ongoing efforts will be made to identify and engage potentially affected stakeholders to facilitate incorporating their input into the decision-making process, including the analysis of alternatives, route selection, design, mitigation and monitoring.

(e) Stakeholder input to be considered in the context of other considerations, including legislative and permitting requirements, environmental, technical, safety and cost-effectiveness considerations".

Question:

Please reconcile the above the statement included in the Leave to Construct application with the failure to address the concerns of the Lac Seul First Nation.

### ***Possible Rate Impacts***

#### **13. Possible Ratepayer Impacts**

##### Preamble:

On Exh. A/T 2/S 1/ p. 2, Goldcorp states “All Project costs will be funded by Goldcorp from internally generated funds.”

However, the IESO’s SIA on page (ii) indicates that additional reactive compensation or a load rejection may be necessary under certain circumstances. The IESO goes on to state that circumstances above 73 MVA may require “upgrading the existing circuits, installing new transmission circuits or installing additional (drought independent) generation.”

We also note that in Goldcorp’s load forecast filed under Exh. B/T 6/S 4, a load exceeding 73 MVA will be reached in 2014.

##### Questions:

- a) Will there be any impacts on electricity rates due to the project (*e.g.*, increased OM&A for HONI, additional upgrades required by HONI)?
- b) If so, please provide a breakdown and details with respect to what the impact on electricity rates will be.
- c) If installation of additional equipment (not covered by this Leave to Construct application) is required, please provide details as to what equipment is necessary, its location and who will be responsible for its installation and the associated costs.

### ***Other***

#### **14. Transfer to Hydro One**

##### Preamble:

On Exh. A/T 1/S 1/ p. 4, Goldcorp indicates, “Goldcorp and HONI are working together on the transfer arrangements and on the preparation of Construction Cost Recovery Agreements.”

Questions:

- a) What is the status of these discussions?
- b) If these discussions have been finalized, please provide copies of the Construction Cost Recovery Agreements and any other relevant agreement between HONI and Goldcorp with respect to this project.

**15. Agreements with Rubicon**

Preamble:

In the letter of endorsement of the project from Rubicon Minerals Corporation, filed under Exh. B/T 6/S 2, Darryl Boyd of Rubicon Minerals Corporation notes "... we look forward to finalizing our legal agreement to formalize our collaboration on this important project."

Questions:

- a) What is the nature of this legal agreement?
- b) Please file a copy of the agreement if finalized or the latest draft copy if not yet finalized.

**16. Benefits of Goldcorp's Proposal (A)**

Preamble:

On Exh. B/T 1/S 3/ p. 3, Goldcorp states that "Failure to realize its Mine Development Plan will result would restrict Goldcorp's mining operations, would result in certain and significant job losses in the Red Lake area, and certainly would not create any new jobs."

Question:

- a) Please provide an estimate as to how many jobs would be lost if Goldcorp was not able to realize upon its Mine Development Plan.
- b) Could significant job losses be avoided, if the project is not serviceable by Q4 2011, through the use of alternatives in the interim?
- c) Please provide a copy of Goldcorp's Mine Development Plan.



## **17. Benefits of Goldcorp's Proposal (B)**

### Preamble:

On Exh. B/T 1/S 3/ p. 3, Goldcorp states, "At present, when Goldcorp turns on its heavy mining hoists, there is a needle like increase in demand and everyone in the Red Lake area notices that their lights dim or TV's darken."

### Question:

Are there alternatives – either other equipment or operating practices – which Goldcorp could install/implement (apart from this project) which would reduce Goldcorp's current negative impact on electricity quality in the Red Lake area?