

November 28 Stream Summary Report - Streams in the Provincial Offer to the SLRD.

Stream Name	Application	Date	Proponent	Project Size	Comments
Ashlu Creek	Yes	25-Oct-89	Ledcor	Originally 43 MW, increased to 49 MW, 29 CMS	Project re-zoning denied after long and highly controversial review process.
Birkenhead	Yes	2-Feb-01	Ledcor passed this to Creekside Resources (Mount Currie Band) in the last year	7 MW, 15 CMS	Stream is very high value for fish, relatively low gradient, and low head. <b>Not the best project</b> due to volume, head, and gradient, plus other issues.
Callaghan Creek	Yes	21-Mar-01	Ledcor	9.9 MW, 13.7 CMS	A <b>controversial project</b> due to high rec (instream and out) values in drainage, proximity to Whistler, tourism, etc. Uncertainty due to Olympics means the LRMP deferred this to another processes.
Elaho River	No	<b>Dropped in last 18 months</b>	n/a	n/a	Proponent dropped storage and generation project; <b>unlikely to proceed</b> as the distance to connection is large, head is low, and storage raise multiple concerns.
Pemberton Creek	No	<b>Has never had one</b>	n/a	n/a	Small volume stream with difficulties situating powerhouse, due to location of the community. Likely significant concern from Pemberton.
Poole Creek	No	<b>Has never had one</b>	n/a	n/a	Small volume stream <b>unlikely to ever support a project</b> - named in LRMP to protect fish values
Ryan River	Yes	12-Jan-89	Ryan River Power (Summit Power Group & Regional Power)	49 MW (25 CMS), increased to 85 MW	<b>Controversial project.</b> Ryan allocated to preserve Grizzlies by compromises from nearly all sectors in the LRMP. Transmission is a huge impediment to this project proceeding.
Sigurd Creek	No	<b>Dropped August 2, 2004</b>	Ledcor withdrew this during the Ashlu review.	Was for 9 MW, 2.5 CMS	<b>Proponent dropped project.</b> Likely due to high construction costs. Also significant concerns from a number of sectors.
Sims Creek	No	<b>Has never had one</b>	n/a	n/a	Extremely long distance to interconnect a project on this stream. <b>Unlikely to be viable.</b>
Sloquet (north fork)	Yes	14-Dec-01	Northwest Cascade Power ( <b>Note:</b> located at same mailing address as Ledcor)	4.2 MW, 2.5 CMS	Small volume tributary separated from other tribs by 1-3 km interconnection. <b>Low probability of proceeding</b> due to interconnection costs, project size, and cost, aside from issues with other values in the area. <b>Outside of SLRD boundary.</b>
Sloquet (south fork)	Yes	14-Dec-01	Northwest Cascade Power ( <b>Note:</b> located at same mailing address as Ledcor)	3.7 MW, 2.5 CMS	Small volume tributary separated from other tribs by 2-5 km interconnection. <b>Low probability of proceeding</b> due to interconnection costs, project size, and cost, aside from issues with other values in the area. <b>Outside of SLRD boundary.</b>
Sloquet Creek	Yes	14-Dec-01	Northwest Cascade Power ( <b>Note:</b> located at same mailing address as Ledcor)	4.9 MW, 13.7 CMS	<b>Highly unlikely to proceed</b> without integration with other projects due to transmission issues. Also very high fish values, small volumes in all tributaries, and very low gradient on mainstem Sloquet. 5-8 km interconnection distance. Without a tap, this would require a substation - prohibitively expensive. <b>Outside of SLRD boundary.</b>
Soo River (above the current project)	No	<b>Has never had one</b>	n/a	n/a	No application in the past. Relatively low-gradient, with a long interconnect (15+ km even with highway interconnect); otherwise would require substation or interconnection extension all the way to Whistler (Sixteen Mile watershed would be the choice) and relatively low head. A project here would likely have a <b>low probability</b> of occurring.
Squamish (upper)	No	<b>Has never had one</b>	n/a	n/a	<b>Very unlikely to have a project</b> due to the transmission difficulties (25+ km interconnect), and relatively small project, low head in lower drainage. Unlikely to see a project developed on this stream.