BEFORE THE ADDITIONAL FACILITY OF THE

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR SETTLEMENT OF INVESTMENT DISPUTE (ICSID)

BETWE	EN:
	MERCER INTERNATIONAL INC.
	Claimant
AND:	
	GOVERNMENT OF CANADA
	Respondent
	ICSID CASE NO. ARB(AF)/12/3
	SECOND WITNESS STATEMENT OF PIERRE LAMARCHE
	23 March 2015

I, Pierre Lamarche, declare as follo

1. This second witness statement responds to certain assertions that are made in the
Claimant's Reply and its accompanying expert reports. In particular, I will address the
Claimant's allegations as to how we arrived at a MW threshold for Howe Sound
in the 2001 Consent Agreement. I will then discuss the
Consent Agreement.
2. As I explained in my first witness statement, Howe Sound in the fall of 2000. ² This was because
The effect of these
higher natural gas prices
Nevertheless,
These factors came to a head in October 2000.
3. Between October 2000 and February 2001, Howe Sound
$>^3$
These generation levels
4

¹ Consent and Electricity Purchase and Sale Agreement between HSPP, Powerex and BC Hydro, 12 April 2001, **R-85**; Purchase Transaction Enabling Agreement between Powerex Corp and Howe Sound, 12 April 2001, **R-84**.

² Pierre Lamarche Statement I, ¶¶ 23-26.

³ Pierre Lamarche Statement I, ¶ 25.

⁴ *See* Pierre Lamarche Statement I, ¶ 26.

4. The Claimant writes in its Reply that "no one can replicate, much less validate
the derivation of Howe Sound's 2001 MW GBL." As I previously testified, to
arrive at MW, Howe Sound used
> ⁶ My colleague
Jerry Peet, representatives from the Technical Department, and I compiled this detailed
information, which Mr. Peet presented to, and discussed with, BC Hydro along with ou
proposal. Mr. Peet and Craig Folkestad, Howe Sound's Key Account Manager at the
time, had thorough discussions about the data before BC Hydro agreed to the threshold.
was kept up to date on these discussions by Mr. Peet, and provided input throughout the
process.
5. The data from these
To illustrate this point,
have gathered averages of Howe Sound's hourly generation from the period
The averages were calculated by dividing Howe Sound's total
generation in these months ⁷
a sales agreement— by the total number of hours in each month
Including the month
8 the straight average hourly generation at Howe Sound
was MW. If we were to month
the straight average was MW:
⁵ Claimant's Reply, ¶ 268.
⁶ See Pierre Lamarche Statement I, ¶ 37. To reproduce the precise calculations we made at the time would
require
As this was almost fifteen years ago, the mill no longer has this detailed information available. 7 See Pierre Lements Statement Left 24.
⁷ See Pierre Lamarche Statement I, ¶ 24. ⁸ See Pierre Lamarche Statement I, fn 7
See Fight Lamarche Statement 1, 111 /

Average
Hourly
Generation
(MW)

b. If we had adopted a more aggressive position, we would have proposed a
threshold of MW, or even MW. But that would have been contrary
to our mill's principles and gave us concern that interveners might feel we were gaming
the system by using data from days where the mill was not operating at design. We
understood that it was incumbent on us to run our mill at design, which is what we
endeavoured to do. The Claimant infers that the GBL was lower than it should have been.
But by taking only the days, we proposed and ultimately
agreed with BC Hydro to a
7. The term of the April 2001 Consent Agreement was Howe Sound
and BC Hydro
9
Our forecasts showed the price of natural gas escalating into the
foreseeable future, and that is in fact what happened. 10

⁹ See, for example, Letter from Pierre Lamarche to Lester Dyck, 17 March 2004, at 134936 and 134937, **R-396**.

 $^{^{10}}$ See Pöyry Expert Report I, Figure 6, at 19; National Energy Board, Energy Facts, October 2011, Figure 6 at 4, **C-047**.

8. The Claimant suggests in its Reply that natural gas prices had fallen back to their pre-crisis levels and remained low through mid-2002. On this basis, they suggest that "there would have been every reason to believe that it would have been economical for Howe Sound to resume burning natural gas and generating electricity at pre-2000 levels, without the incentive of its market price arrangement with Powerex."

9. As I previously mentioned, Howe Sound had been
Based on my review of the data below
and my recollection of the mill's operations at that time, I believe the approximate price
at which it would have become uneconomic for the mill to buy natural gas
delivered to the mill. As I recall, prices for natural gas were well
below this price in the early to mid-1990s.

10. The Sumas Hub is a trading hub for natural gas used in BC, and is located on the US side of the Canada-US border near Vancouver. I note that the prices in the chart below do not represent what Howe Sound would actually have been paying at the mill; we also had transportation costs. Because of its location, Howe Sound had to use one of the more expensive pipelines in the Province to transport natural gas from the hub to the Howe Sound mill.¹² The prices we were paying at the mill were therefore higher than the prices shown in the following chart for 2002:¹³

<<Natural Gas Prices at Sumas Hub – 2002>> (US\$/MMBtu)

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec

¹¹ Claimant's Reply, ¶ 342.

¹² As I recall, we were paying roughly in transportation costs.

¹³ I understand that the data in this chart was provided as Exhibit **R-439**, appended to the Witness Statement of Michael MacDougall.

11. I note that the price of natural gas	s in January ar	nd February 2002, when we would						
have been discussing the renewal of the to	erm of the agr	reement for the first time, was right						
around before delivery to the mill. Accounting for the exchange rate								
and the delivery cost, I calculated that the								
•	-							
in the months of January and Fe	ebruary 2002	delivered to the mill, was						
>14								
Even so, the dip still								
By the time the Consent Agr	eement's tern	n began,						
natural gas prices were up even higher,	around	before delivery to the						
mill, the same price that they were at in m	nid-2000.							
*	*	*						
12. I affirm that the information provi	ded above is t	rue and correct.						
13. I affirm this witness statement in	support of Ca	anada's Rejoinder Memorial in the						
Mercer International Inc. v. Governme	nt of Canada	a NAFTA arbitration and for no						
improper purpose.								
AFFIRMED BEFORE ME)							
at the City of Chille Columbia	,)							
in the Province of British Columbia, this day of A 2015.)							
)							
)	D. //	,					
A Commissioner for taking Affidavits for	· , —	PIERRE L'AMARCHE						
British Columbia)							
Notary Public)							
9086 Young Road Chilliwack, BC V2P 4R5								
PERMANENT COMMISSION								
¹⁴ To be conservative, I calculated this figure usin US\$1 US = CA\$1.5885: see R-439 . (the	g the lowest daily e lowest price of	y exchange rate in those two months: rnatural gas in those two months) x						
\$1.5885 = Adding in the tr	ansportation cost							
12 above), I arrived at Consent and Electricity Purchase and Sale Agree	eement between I	HSPP, Powerex and BC Hydro, 28						
February 2002, s. 6, at 021715, R-160 .		•						