



IN THE MATTER OF

FORTISBC INC.

AND

**AN APPLICATION FOR A
CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY
FOR THE BENVOULIN SUBSTATION PROJECT**

DECISION

January 20, 2009

BEFORE:

**Liisa A. O'Hara, Panel Chair & Commissioner
Dennis A. Cote, Commissioner
Peter E. Vivian, Commissioner**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
1.0 BACKGROUND AND REGULATORY PROCESS	1
2.0 THE APPLICATION	2
2.1 Project Description	2
2.1.1 Transmission and Substation	2
2.1.2 Distribution	3
2.1.3 Summary of Cost and Schedule	4
2.2 Engineering Design and Capacity	4
3.0 JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROJECT	4
3.1 Load Forecast	4
3.2 Technical Alternatives	6
3.3 FortisBC Argument	8
3.4 Intervenor Submissions	8
3.5 FortisBC Reply	9
3.6 Commission Determination	9
4.0 SUBSTATION LOCATION	10
4.1 Site Selection, Consultation Process and Evaluation	10
4.2 Aesthetics	12
4.3 Land Acquisition	13
4.4 EMF	13
4.5 Cost Differential Between Sites	13
4.6 FortisBC Argument	14
4.7 Intervenor Submissions	15
4.8 FortisBC Reply	16

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
4.9 Commission Determination	17
5.0 DISTRIBUTION LINE ROUTING	18
5.1 Line Routing and Consultation Process	18
5.2 Alternative Routing	20
5.3 FortisBC Argument	21
5.4 Intervenor Submissions	22
5.5 FortisBC Reply	22
5.6 EMF	22
5.7 Commission Determination	22
6.0 PROJECT COSTING	23
6.1 General	23
6.2 The Revisited Project Costs and the Economic Downturn	25
6.3 Commission Determination	25
6.4 Project Reporting	26

COMMISSION ORDER C-1-09

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Reporting Format
APPENDIX B	List of Appearances
APPENDIX C	List of Exhibits

1.0 BACKGROUND AND REGULATORY PROCESS

On September 24, 2008 FortisBC Inc. ("FortisBC", the "Company") applied to the BC Utilities Commission (the "Commission") pursuant to sections 45 and 46 of the Utilities Commission Act for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity ("CPCN") for the Benvoulin Substation Project (the "Project") at a cost of approximately \$17.7 million (the "Application"). The Project consists of a new 138/13kV, 32 MVA distribution source substation in Kelowna on Casorso Road. The Application states that the Project is required to accommodate load growth and meet back-up criteria in the central/south Kelowna area (Exhibit B-1, p. 7).

FortisBC proposed that the Application be handled by way of a written hearing. By Order G-146-08, the Commission ordered that a Procedural Conference regarding the regulatory process for the review of the Project be held on Tuesday, October 28, 2008 in Kelowna, BC (Exhibit A-1).

During the Procedural Conference the Panel Chair received submissions on the format for the Hearing, the Hearing Issues List and the Regulatory Timetable. In addition, submissions were made with regard to the thoroughness of the public consultation process undertaken by FortisBC to determine the optimum site selection for the Project. These submissions were further underlined by the positive comments from one of the Intervenor who participated in the Procedural Conference (T1:11). As a result of those submissions, on November 3, 2008, the Commission issued Order G-161-08 establishing the Regulatory Timetable for a Written Public Hearing to review the Application.

Order G-161-08 also established the Schedule for a Community Input Session to be held on Tuesday, December 2, 2008 in Kelowna. It was felt that such a forum would provide local residents, who were not registered Intervenor, an opportunity to express their views without being compelled to prepare a formal written submission. Holding the session was predicated upon a minimum of 10 presentations being scheduled by November 25, 2008. Failure to achieve this number would result in cancellation. The session was subsequently cancelled as only two individuals had registered by the due date.

2.0 THE APPLICATION

2.1 Project Description

2.1.1 Transmission and Substation

The Project consists of a new substation equipped with a single 138kV/13kV 32 MVA transformer with four feeder terminations. Feeder ties to the substation will be constructed to connect it to the central and south Kelowna areas. One feeder will support the Hollywood substation, one will support both the Hollywood and the OK Mission substations, one will support the OK Mission substation and one will support the DG Bell Terminal substation. The proposed Benvoulin substation will be located in south Kelowna on Casorso Road, southeast of the intersection of Swamp Road and Casorso Road. Once complete, it will support south/central Kelowna area growth and alleviate the need for multiple individual substation capacity upgrades.

FortisBC states that the Project is planned for 2009/2010 and consists of the following components:

- The acquisition of approximately 5 acres of land;
- Construction of a new substation with one 32 MVA distribution transformer, two 138kV breakers, attachment structures, control building, ground grid/gravel and fencing. In addition, there will be space to accommodate the installation of two additional 32 MVA distribution transformers and eight 13 kV feeder breakers for future expansion;
- A short 138 kV transmission line to and from the new substation;
- Four 13 kV distribution egress cables out of the substation and a new 13 kV overhead and underground distribution line to connect to the existing distribution network; and
- The installation of additional underground ducts for future feeders.

(Exhibit B-1, p. 22)

2.1.2 Distribution

FortisBC further states that the proposed substation will tie into the existing distribution network with the following additions:

- Installation of six new overhead 13 kV gang operated load switches;
- Construction of an underground duct bank which will run along Casorso Road and eliminate the need for additional overhead lines. These will be approximately 1.6 kilometers in length and will serve to accommodate feeders egressing the substation;
- Rebuilding the existing distribution circuit along Benvoulin Road (between Casorso and KLO Road) to accommodate a new 13 kV double circuit overhead line (approximately 1.6 kilometers); and
- Rebuilding the existing distribution circuit along DeHart Road between Casorso and Gordon Roads (approximately 2.4 kilometers).

(Exhibit B-1, p. 30)

The proposed feeder alignment would be as follows:

- Feeder 1: South on Casorso Road heading west on DeHart Road and north and south on Gordon Road;
- Feeder 2: North on Casorso and Benvoulin Roads terminating at Springfield Road;
- Feeder 3: North on Casorso and Benvoulin Roads and then heading east on KLO Road; and
- Feeder 4: North on Casorso Road, heading up Gordon then east onto KLO Road and then north on Burtch Road with a small section heading west on Springfield Road.

(Exhibit B-1, p. 32)

2.1.3 Summary of Cost and Schedule

FortisBC submits that the cost of the Project based on the proposed site selection is \$17.68 million with an estimated accuracy of +/- 11 percent (Exhibit B-3, BCUC Table A28.1). Preparation for the Project will begin early in 2009 with construction being initiated early in 2010 with an expected date of service late in 2010 (Exhibit B-1, p. 54).

2.2 Engineering Design and Capacity

The proposed Benvoulin Substation will include the following:

- Installation of a single 138/13kV, 32MVA transformer complete with an oil On Load Tap Changer with +/- 10 percent regulation and surge arrestors;
- Installation of two 138 kV, SF6 Dead Tank, 1200A breakers with associated line protection and control;
- Outdoor rated circuit breakers – One main breaker, 15 kV, 2000A, SF6/Vacuum, four feeder breakers, 15 kV, 600A, SF6/Vacuum; and
- Mobile transformer access bay with isolation switches.

(Exhibit B-1, p. 28)

3.0 JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROJECT

3.1 Load Forecast

FortisBC states that in recent years the central/south area of Kelowna has been experiencing strong customer growth, which has resulted in increased load at the substations supplying the area. This growth is primarily due to a combination of new commercial development and high density housing projects. FortisBC further notes that through discussions with City of Kelowna planners and developers it has determined that projects either underway or in the pending stage will result in substantial load growth in the coming years (Exhibit B-1, pp. 16-17). While FortisBC

has admitted that there will likely be some slowdown in development due to changing economic conditions, it argues that this has been included in its revised load forecast and will not have a material affect on the need or timing for the Benvoulin Project. FortisBC notes that to date only two projects, Stellar Booster Pumps and Mission Creek Towers, have announced they will fail to move forward with their previously planned initiative (Exhibit B-4, p. 16). These will have limited impact on load requirement estimates (Exhibit B-4, p. 17).

FortisBC submits the south/central area of Kelowna is served primarily by two substations; the Hollywood substation, located in the east near the intersection of Hollywood Road and Springfield Road, and the OK Mission substation, which is located at the intersection of Lakeshore Road and Richter Street. The DG Bell Terminal Station serves the needs of south Kelowna although in cases of emergency it receives some backup from the OK Mission feeders. The Hollywood substation consists of two Transformers, No. 1 and No. 3 with winter peak capacities of 31.8 MVA and 32 MVA respectively, and a summer peak capacity of 28 MVA for both. The 2007 summer peaks on the transformers were 20.8 MVA and 27.3 MVA respectively. The OK Mission substation also has two transformers, No 1 and No 2 with winter peak capacities of 31.5 MVA and 32 MVA respectively, and a summer peak capacity of 28 MVA for each. The 2007 summer peaks on the transformers were 22.4 MVA and 13.1 MVA respectively. Based on the forecast for the distribution feeders, the peak load would reach summer capacity of Hollywood's Transformer 3 in the summer of 2008 (this peak is be reduced over the next two years by moving 2.7 MVA of distribution load to the Glenmore substation). The peak load for the area served by the OK Mission is forecast to exceed summer capacity of Transformer 1 in 2010 and winter capacity in 2011/2012 (Exhibit B-1, pp. 10-14).

FortisBC states that the size and configuration of the existing transformers and the distribution system in central/south Kelowna are a key factor in FortisBC's backup planning criteria for single transformer failure not being met. The maximum available backup capacity at both Hollywood and OK Mission is less than 65 percent during peak periods, which is well short of the 100 percent Company backup planning guideline for a two transformer substation. Moreover, the

ability to backup DG Bell Terminal station is currently 55 percent, which is below the FortisBC minimum requirement of 80 percent for a single transformer substation (Exhibit B-1, Appendix C. The continued growth in the region will only serve to worsen the situation and increase the potential for unacceptably long outages (Exhibit B-1, pp. 10, 21).

While not necessarily impacting the need for the Benvoulin substation, the current economic conditions could potentially impact the timing of the Project. The situation is somewhat fluid and therefore difficult to pin down, but current forecasts from a variety of sources as reported by FortisBC predict a slowdown in GDP for 2009 followed by a period of recovery in 2010. Construction activity follows a similar pattern with a sharp decline in activity in 2009 with this moderating somewhat in 2010 (Exhibit B-4, p. 18). FortisBC states that its load forecast is based on known load requirements and the in-service date requirement for the Benvoulin substation remains the same.

3.2 Technical Alternatives

FortisBC notes that one option would be to make the necessary changes, which would allow the transformers at both the Hollywood and OK Mission substations to run in parallel. However, the configuration of both substations is such that the installation of the fault limiting reactors needed to accomplish this would not be possible without purchasing additional land or, in the case of OK Mission, using the adjacent land which is currently owned. FortisBC has expressed concerns that in the case of the Hollywood substation such a move would have a number of problems including the following:

- Aesthetic and property value concerns from the closest remaining perimeter row of housing when the current buffer is removed;
- Because the substation is located on Mission Creek the location of additional oil filled equipment at this location is an unnecessary risk; and
- Rutland Waterworks District has a water well and submersible pump installation on a registered right of way on the north east corner of the property.

(Exhibit B-1, pp. 12-14; Exhibit B-4, pp. 2-5)

FortisBC also explained that using the adjacent property at OK Mission would mean that the reactors would have to be installed beneath the existing transmission line, which is less desirable than installing them in an open space. Moreover, it is expected there will be strong public opposition to such a move. Purchasing the land would involve significant cost and further require FortisBC to acquire road/lane allowances from local government, which can be a time consuming process. The cost of purchasing the land and installing the reactor banks at Hollywood and OK Mission would be \$8.59 million. However, this would only provide acceptable load management until 2012 as the summer peak for the Hollywood substation would be exceeded in the summer of 2013. The solution at that point would be to complete construction of the Benvoulin substation as proposed (Exhibit B-4, pp. 4-6).

As an alternative to building a new Benvoulin substation another option was reviewed by FortisBC. This involves increasing the capacity of both the Hollywood and OK Mission substations through transformer additions. An examination of this alternative demonstrated that this was not an acceptable solution. Some of the concerns raised were as follows:

- It would be more expensive to add a transformer and four additional feeders to the existing substations than to build a new one. Cost estimates totaled \$69.69 million;
- Because all existing feeders were overhead, it would require additional feeders to egress underground for a minimum of 1 kilometer each (typically four);
- The location of the Hollywood Substation adjacent to Mission Creek would be undertaking unnecessary environmental risk; and
- All transformers would be on a single 138 kV bus system, which would have a significant impact on customer and system reliability.

(Exhibit B-1, pp. 62, 63; Exhibit B-3, BCUC A38.3)

3.3 FortisBC Argument

FortisBC considers that the Project will meet system needs in the following areas:

- It will support anticipated load growth in the central/south Kelowna area;
- It will alleviate the need for capacity upgrades to other substations in the region; and
- It will provide required back-up support to the region, including back-up for the DG Bell Terminal station.

FortisBC states that, notwithstanding the economic downturn, load growth is still positive and contributing to an imminent overload at the Hollywood substation, so that it is not prudent to delay the Project (FortisBC Argument, pp. 5, 6).

3.4 Intervenor Submissions

British Columbia Old Age Pensioners' Organization et al. ("BCOAPO") expressed concern that FortisBC had not specified the dates of the forecasts from the various sources found in BCUC Table 48.1a and 48.1b. They contend that had the tables predated November 2008, then the possibility existed the forecasts provided by those sources may have been revised further downward in light of further deterioration of the economy. The basis for the raised concern lies in whether a continued deterioration of the economy will have a direct impact on the need for the Benvoulin substation at this time (BCOAPO Submission, p. 3).

No further evidence was introduced by any other Intervenor questioning the justification and the need for the Project.

3.5 FortisBC Reply

The information provided by FortisBC in response to the issue raised by BCOAPO indicates that most of the submitted information listed in the tables is from a period prior to November 2008, although a number of sources are being quoted on information released in late October.

FortisBC acknowledges that the expected load growth, which was originally submitted is likely to be less than originally thought, a fact which was underlined in its response to BCUC IR 2.48.3 on November 12, 2008. However, it contends that the Benvoulin substation is still required by the proposed in-service date in 2010. FortisBC further contends that the Kelowna-area load is sensitive to temperature, and argues that weather extremes may have a bigger impact on area loads than factors related to the current economic slowdown. To illustrate the point, the Company points to the cold snap experienced throughout the Province in December 2008. In addition, on December 15, 2008 the FortisBC system experienced a record peak load of 723 MW and both Hollywood and OK Mission substations were operating at maximum capacity (FortisBC Reply, p. 2).

3.6 Commission Determination

The Commission Panel concludes that:

- i) FortisBC's load forecast is a satisfactory basis on which to proceed with a load upgrade project.
- ii) The concerns raised by BCOAPO with respect to the economy and the resultant impact on demand are worthy of consideration. However, the number of commercial and residential projects currently underway indicates there will be increasing demand on load capacity and approving the Project to begin immediately is prudent.
- iii) Of the alternatives, the construction of a new substation in central/south Kelowna is the optimum solution from an economic, technical and environmental perspective.

The Commission Panel accepts the projection of load growth for the area and determines that a new substation with the configuration of the proposed Benvoulin substation should be built in the area in a timely fashion.

4.0 SUBSTATION LOCATION

4.1 Site Selection, Consultation Process and Evaluation

FortisBC acknowledges the importance of public consultation as a means of creating balance between a solution which is technically sound and cost effective, while taking into account the interests of stakeholders and the community at large. In keeping with this, it utilized what is referred to as a two-tier, multi stage process to capture the maximum amount of input to aid in the decision-making process. First tier meetings were held with local government and key stakeholders with the purpose of educating them as to the project need, the project options (alternatives and potential locations) and the planned public consultation process. Groups contacted for meetings included the following: City of Kelowna Administration; City of Kelowna Planning Department; The Regional District of Central Okanagan; Astral Media; Eaglequest Golf range; Westbank First Nations and Friends of Mission Creek. The meetings provided ample opportunity for participants to provide feedback on the project plan. FortisBC reports they received a number of alternate site suggestions and that no objections were raised with respect to the need for the Project (Exhibit B-1, pp. 36, 37).

The second tier or step in the consultative process utilized by FortisBC involved a series of open houses to communicate with the general public. The first of these was held on November 27, 2007 and focused on introducing the Project to the general public and obtaining feedback on potential sites that had the potential to be technically suitable. In this first session, residents and interested parties were clear in their desire to locate a new substation as far south as was possible removing it from the proximity of local schools and residential areas. Of the potential sites presented, site 2A/2B was most preferred (Exhibit B-1, Figure 5.5, p. 38). Based on detailed analysis performed by FortisBC and feedback to date, this was chosen to be the preferred site for presentation at a

second open house that was held early in 2008. In addition, two new sites were introduced based on previous feedback; Site 7, the Gravel Pit and Site 11 (currently a Driving Range). The introduction of Site 7 resulted in significant discussion but FortisBC acknowledged the need for further investigation prior to making a judgment on both sites. Subsequently, Sites 2A/2B were removed from consideration and replaced with a new option, Site 2, which was adjacent and offered all the benefits of the other preferred site but at a lower cost (Exhibit B-1, pp. 39-43).

Over this period FortisBC conducted a non-financial comparative review of all of the 17 sites which had received consideration (Exhibit B-1, Table 5.5, p. 38). Twelve criteria were reviewed and weighted. Key in terms of the weighting placed on them were the following criteria: reliability, operations and safety, public health, risk of delay, and flexibility for future growth. FortisBC reports that the results of this comparison were most favorable for Site 7 (465 Weighted Rank Total) and Site 2 (450 Weighted Rank Total). Of the highest weighted criteria, Site 2 held an advantage on reliability due to there being significantly less underground distribution than Site 7, which would be reflected in less repair time in the event of a problem (Exhibit B-4, p. 31). Site 7 held a similar advantage on operations and safety. Of the medium weighted criteria, Site 7 holds a significant advantage with respect to risk of delay due to the fact that Site 2, like Site 7, is part of the Agricultural Land Reserve ("ALR") but is perceived to be at greater risk to be returned to active agricultural use. Site 7 being a gravel pit is seen as having little potential to be useful for farming and because of this, FortisBC sees less risk of delay with respect to rezoning approval and removal from the ALR. With respect to effects during construction, Site 2 was more favorably rated due to significant roadwork being required during the construction of the underground duct bank planned in conjunction with Site 7 (Exhibit B-1, pp. 44-50).

FortisBC comments that there was initial concern raised by Stakeholders with respect to Site 2 and Site 2A/2B that focused on the residential nature of the neighborhood, aesthetics and land use planning with emphasis on the fact that they were in the ALR. FortisBC further reports that opposition to these sites is strong, due to the ALR and potential return to agricultural use and, in addition, concerns were being raised as to the visual nature of the sites with erection of a barrier

being strongly recommended. A move to Site 7 was generally seen as being positive due to its distance from populated areas and high traffic corridors.

Coincidentally, FortisBC reports working through the detailed design stages for both sites. In doing so, a number of design issues related to Site 2 arose which had not been previously identified. Issues related to soil stability due to proximity of a creek, visual barriers and radio tower noise mitigation became more problematic as the process progressed. In addition, FortisBC completed the cost analysis and determined that the two sites had project cost estimates which were within 10 percent of each other (Exhibit B-1, pp. 44, 50).

Given the reduction in delay risk and what FortisBC describes as the convergence of public opinion and support, the Company decided that Site 7 was the best choice for presentation in the CPCN as the preferred site. FortisBC contacted the immediate neighbors and communicated this decision to all stakeholders on record as a result of consultations. In addition, a third open house was held on April 9, 2008, to ensure all interested parties were aware of the decision and to complete the public consultation process. FortisBC reports that “to date, no feedback has been received expressing any opposition to the Gravel Pit – Site7” (Exhibit B-1, p. 44). FortisBC also states that consultation with the Westbank First Nation is ongoing and through discussion it understands that no objections have been raised (Exhibit B-3, BCUC 1.18.1).

4.2 Aesthetics

Site 2 is quite visible from the adjacent Casorso Road. FortisBC reports that this was raised as a concern during the Public Consultation process and a visual barrier was strongly recommended. By contrast, Site 7 is located in a depression and is not visible from the adjacent Casorso Road. FortisBC notes the following: “the steep slopes on the east and west side of the station location which together with the tree line effectively creates a visual buffer which shields the site from nearby residents and approaching traffic. The topographical depression by itself is in excess of 20 meters below the road with the tallest structure being approximately 10 meters in height”

(Exhibit B-1, p. 26). Worthy of note is the fact a concern was raised by a local resident with respect to the visual impact on traffic approaching the site. FortisBC has had further discussions with the individual and reports they have successfully resolved the concern (Exhibit B-1, pp. 43, 44).

4.3 Land Acquisition

FortisBC reports that both Site 2 and Site 7 have willing sellers. Site 7 is a 5 acre site with a cost of \$989,000 while Site 2 is approximately 3 acres with a cost of \$1,663,000. FortisBC affirms that prices are based on options to purchase which are in place (Exhibit B-4, p. 25).

4.4 EMF

FortisBC states that while they are aware of concerns from some of its customers, that all of the sites under consideration meet the World Health Organization and International Council on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection reference levels (Exhibit B-1, p. 35).

4.5 Cost Differential Between Sites

The cost estimates prepared by FortisBC indicate a total cost for Site 2 to be \$16.9 million and Site 7 to be slightly higher at \$17.7 million. The most significant difference in costs is in the design and construction of connections to local 13kV distribution feeders. The Site 7 estimate is \$5.4 million while the Site 2 estimate is \$2.6 million (Exhibit B-1, pp. 51, 52). Much of this differential can be explained by the \$2.9 million cost of the underground duct banks planned for Site 7 (Exhibit B-4, pp. 12, 13).

FortisBC contends that while the actual cost of Site 7 is greater, proceeding with this site is more cost effective. It contends that "FortisBC's objective is to put forward a project solution that best balances safety, the environment, social and economic impacts, constructability, long term operations and customer rates". FortisBC states that in its opinion the choice of Site 7 is

warranted given the risk of delay due to City rezoning and the ALR non farm use process as well as the positive public sentiment in favor of the site in spite of the incremental increase in project cost (Exhibit B-1, p. 52).

4.6 FortisBC Argument

FortisBC reiterated that over the period of public consultation it investigated 17 sites as potential locations for the new substation. The Company states that taking into account the consultation with stakeholders and two open houses with the public, it selected Site 7 as the best location for the Project. A third open house was held to provide all interested parties the opportunity to “be informed and comment upon the selection of Site 7 for the Project” (Fortis Argument, p. 8).

FortisBC states that during the public consultation process Site 7 and Site 2 received the greatest support, with distance from populated areas cited as the primary reason. The Company acknowledges the cost for Site 7 is estimated to be slightly higher than Site 2 but submits that the benefits of the natural topography and the lower agricultural value of the site make it the most cost effective location for the Project (Fortis Argument, p. 8).

FortisBC submits that the evidence shows that Site 7 has the least visual impact arising from the substation. Specifically, it states that “Site 7 is bounded by steep slopes on its east and west, which, together with the tree line creates a buffer effectively shielding the site from neighboring residents and approaching traffic”. Moreover, it is noted that “Site 7 is located 20 meters below Casorso Road, and the tallest structure at the site will be approximately 10 meters” (FortisBC Argument, p. 9, para. 41). FortisBC further states that Site 2 is adjacent to a busy road and would be more visible (FortisBC Argument, p. 9).

FortisBC comments upon the fact that Tantalus Vineyards, as an Intervenor, raised concerns with respect to the aesthetic impact of the proposed substations on its plan to expand its business in proximity to Site 7. FortisBC responds that it believes “its response (per Exhibit B-4) and the site plan as proposed address Tantalus’ concerns regarding maintenance of visual aesthetics”

(FortisBC Argument, p. 9, para. 43). FortisBC closes by stating “it is submitted there is no need for any mitigation measures beyond what is contemplated in the Application” (Fortis Argument, p. 10, para. 47).

FortisBC holds that while both Site 7 and Site 2 face risk because they are currently zoned “Agricultural” and are within the ALR, Site 7 has a far better chance of being successful in an Application to the Agricultural Land Commission for non-farm use and are confident that rezoning for use as a substation will not prove to be a problem. The reasoning for this lies in the fact that Site 7 is currently a gravel pit and has much less remaining agricultural potential relative to Site 2. By contrast, FortisBC ranked the risk associated with the ALR process for Site 2 to be high because of its having greater potential to be returned to agricultural use (FortisBC Argument, p. 10).

4.7 Intervenor Submissions

BCOAPO is generally in support of Site 7 as the location of the Benvoulin substation. However, it notes that while the risk associated with removal from the ALR is low, it is not guaranteed and could potentially result in project delays and associated cost changes. BCOAPO would like to ensure that in the event the Site 7 is not removed from the ALR, the residential ratepayers do not end up incurring the Project costs. In addition, they cite the need for City rezoning and the risk of delays to the Project related to this. BCOAPO states that if FortisBC were to address the shielding of residential ratepayers from Project costs in the event Site 7 is not removed from the ALR, they would be in support of it (BCOAPO Argument, pp. 4, 5).

Tantalus Vineyards in its Submission noted that the forested buffer between Casorso Road and the proposed substation site currently provides a natural visual barrier between the gravel pit and people traveling along the road. It argued that because the winery entrance is located within 600 meters of the proposed substation and this could impact visitor perception, the buffer should be maintained to the current standard. In keeping with this, Tantalus Vineyards asked that FortisBC respond to the following:

1. “A commitment to cut only those trees in the buffer where the location of the tree is in direct conflict with the placement of a power pole.
2. Topping rather than removing the trees under and around transmission lines in the forested buffer.
3. Mitigate sight line gaps and openings that are a result of FortisBC’s site alterations or Pine beetle kill within the forested buffer, by replacing with appropriate Pine beetle resistant and drought tolerant tree species i.e. Douglas Fir.
4. Insure Pine trees affected by the Pine beetle will not be removed until they show red foliar casting. (confirmed mortality)”

(Exhibit C4-4)

4.8 FortisBC Reply

FortisBC acknowledges BCOAPO’s request that residential ratepayers do not incur any costs should the ALR approval for the substation not occur. The Company, however, takes the position that all costs prudently expended should be recoverable through rates. It further submits that it was unlikely an alternative site, whether on ALR or non ALR land, with the characteristics of the proposed site could have been found. Because of this, FortisBC argues the opinion that the characteristics of the site are cost-mitigating and accordingly submits “it has acted reasonably and prudently to secure a suitable substation site” (FortisBC Reply, pp. 2, 3).

As to Tantalus Vineyard’s Submission with respect to the visual buffer, FortisBC confirms that it plans to minimize the visual impact of the substation site as much as possible. The Company notes that it expects tree removal to be minimal during construction but it cannot be specified until final pole placement has been determined. It further states that re-vegetation, if necessary, will utilize indigenous shrubs. FortisBC notes in its reply “tree removal versus topping, and the removal of dead trees, will be subject to the Company’s Right-of-Way maintenance requirements”. FortisBC further reports that it has met with Tantalus Vineyards to discuss raised concerns and to specifically “explain its construction and Right-of-Way management practices, and to review the

environmental provisions that form part of the rezoning application”. In summation, FortisBC notes that it understands “Tantalus is satisfied with those provisions” (FortisBC Reply, p. 4).

4.9 Commission Determination

The Commission Panel recognizes the support for Site 7 as the location of the Benvoulin substation. It further recognizes and appreciates that this support has been a result in part due to the consultation process undertaken by FortisBC prior to preparation of the formal Application. FortisBC, the property owners, the stakeholders and the Registered Intervenors all deserve special recognition for their engagement in this process.

The Commission Panel recognizes there are a number of key drivers in determining an appropriate site selection for the Project. They are as follows:

- **Support of the Community**

An extensive consultation process combined with a detailed FortisBC investigation of 17 potential sites was instrumental in reducing the list down to two; Site 7 and Site 2. Of these two, the evidence suggests that both were acceptable due to their distance from populated areas but there seemed to be a preference for Site 7 due to more favorable visual and administrative aspects.

- **Visual Impact**

As noted previously, FortisBC reports that “Site 7 is bounded by steep slopes on its east and west, which, together with the tree line creates a buffer effectively shielding the site from neighboring residents and approaching traffic” and “Site 7 is located 20 meters below Casorso Road, and the tallest structure at the site will be approximately 10 meters”. Notwithstanding concerns raised by Tantalus Vineyards, which FortisBC reports have been resolved, the evidence suggests that Site 7 is far and away the optimum site in terms of aesthetics and general visual impact to area residents and passers-by.

- **Rezoning/ALR Issues**

A major concern raised throughout the process is the requirement that both of the alternatives would require City rezoning and removal from the ALR. The fact that Site 7 is currently a gravel pit with little potential to be returned to agricultural use weighed heavily in the determination of an optimum site. To define a site and subsequently have an application for rezoning or removal from the ALR rejected or delayed would have a significant impact on the ratepayers with respect to cost.

Site 7, while the outcome is not guaranteed, on the basis of evidence has the greatest likelihood of succeeding.

- **Cost Differential**

There is a cost differential between the two sites favoring Site 2 by slightly more than \$700,000 or less than 5 percent. Taking into account the aforementioned drivers, it can be stated that there is a value in terms of cost having a community in support of the Project and there are significant potential cost impacts if problems related to removal from the ALR and rezoning were to occur. The evidence suggests there is much more risk if Site 2 were pursued.

Based on this the Commission Panel concludes that:

- i) The choice of Site 7 is optimum and even though it is a higher cost than other options, it represents a cost effective solution.
- ii) The concerns raised by BCOAPO with respect to the residential ratepayers not bearing the additional project costs in the event of failure to remove Site 7 from the ALR are not supported. FortisBC has demonstrated the Company as being extremely sensitive to this issue and has taken prudent steps to mitigate the potential for it occurring.
- iii) Tantalus Vineyards and FortisBC appear to have reached an accord with respect to visual aesthetics, which is supported by both parties and the matter has been laid to rest.

Accordingly, the Commission Panel accepts the recommendation that the optimum location for the Benvoulin substation is Site 7.

5.0 DISTRIBUTION LINE ROUTING

5.1 Line Routing and Consultation Process

As described in the Application, the Benvoulin substation will tie into the existing network and require a number of additions in order to complete the future distribution network. FortisBC states that in addition to the installation of six new overhead 13kV load break switches, there will be three major changes to the existing network which will be required:

i) Underground Duct Bank

FortisBC states that the Casorso Road distribution circuits cannot accommodate any additional lines. Because of this, the Application calls for the construction of an underground duct bank which will run along Casorso Road for 1.6 kilometers. This will accommodate new feeders for this route which will egress the substation (Exhibit B-1, p. 30). Horizontal Directional Drilling will be used to install the duct bank under Mission Creek (Exhibit B-4, BCUC 2.45.1)

ii) Rebuilding Lines on Benvoulin

FortisBC will rebuild the existing distribution circuit running on Benvoulin Road from Casorso Road to KLO Road (1.6 kilometers). The new circuit will expand the current single circuit 13kV line to a double circuit 13 kV line (Exhibit B-1, pp. 30, 31).

iii) Rebuilding the Distribution Circuit on DeHart Road

The Application states that FortisBC will rebuild the existing overhead distribution circuit along DeHart Road between Casorso and Gordon Roads (approximately 2.4 kilometers). The existing 13 kV single phase overhead line will be rebuilt to one which is three phase (Exhibit B-3, p. 4).

FortisBC states that the feeder alignment would be as follows. Feeder 1 would go south on Casorso Road on the same poles as the 138kV transmission line, before heading west on DeHart Road and north and south on Gordon Road. Feeders 2 and 3 would utilize the newly constructed duct bank heading north along Casorso Road before going overhead along Benvoulin Road. Feeder 2 would terminate at Springfield Road while Feeder 3 would head east on KLO Road. Feeder 4 would also head north on Casorso Road utilizing the same poles as the 138kV existing transmission line, then go up Gordon Road before heading east onto KLO Road and then north on Burtch Road with a small section heading west on Springfield Road (Exhibit B-1, p. 32; Exhibit B-4, p. 12).

FortisBC reports that a new right of way ("ROW") will be required for the 1.6 kilometer duct bank on Casorso Road although the Company states it will use the existing transmission ROW where it is practical. In addition, it will require a new section of approximately 350 meters for the overhead line on DeHart Road. Finally, FortisBC anticipates a requirement for widening the existing ROW on DeHart Road for approximately 1.95 kilometers to upgrade the existing single phase overhead line to three-phase. The Company reports it has "a defined process with the City of Kelowna when

upgrading or building new electrical infrastructure within its road allowances. FortisBC anticipates that the right of way changes or additions beyond this would be restricted to anchor easements which cannot be the subject of negotiation until final design identifies the exact locations” (Exhibit B-3, pp. 3, 4).

As noted previously, FortisBC held a number of Open Houses throughout late 2007 and early 2008 to obtain feedback from the public on the Project. From the lack of evidence presented it appears discussion in these sessions focused on the location of the substation with little, if any, information being presented or discussed on the proposed feeder routings (Exhibit B-1, pp. 36-50).

At the Procedural Conference, Mr. Dill, a representative from Friends of Mission Creek posed a series of questions regarding the proposed transmission lines and the impact to the Mission Creek Greenway, the Casorso wetland and the appropriateness of building a path over the proposed underground cable. In addition, Ms. Hatch, a representative from Tantalus Vineyards, raised a number of questions with regard to power lines and whether they would be installed above or below ground. A representative from FortisBC offered to meet with Mr. Dill and Ms. Hatch following the Procedural Conference to determine whether the questions were most appropriately dealt through the Information Request (“IR”) process or whether they could be answered quickly. Subsequently, Tantalus Vineyards submitted a series of questions via the IR process which were answered by FortisBC.

5.2 Alternative Routing

In response to the Commission’s IR 2.45.9 (Exhibit B-4, p. 13) questioning how the two feeders that are proposed to be in the duct bank could be routed overhead, FortisBC provided evidence that the two feeders would require a new double circuit overhead line running from the proposed substation to the intersection of Casorso and Benvoulin Roads. The Company states: “the existing transmission line and distribution underbuild would have to be relocated and rebuilt as a consequence”. The cost of building this is \$1,854,000 as opposed to the \$2,924,000 estimate for

the construction of the duct bank. FortisBC states they do not believe that routing the feeders overhead is satisfactory for the following reasons:

- If future distribution feeders were to be added it would necessitate the construction of a duct bank as outlined in the original Application. The Application calls for additional ducts to be installed to handle future expansion.
- Routing all feeders overhead would require three distribution feeders and one transmission line to run down Casorso Road. This would require having distribution circuits on both sides of the road and raise the risk for motor vehicle accidents.
- The steepness of grade, prevailing windy conditions and the marshy conditions near the creek would make anchoring difficult between the substation and Mission Creek on Casorso Road.
- The City of Kelowna Community Plan calls for the widening of Casorso Road which could necessitate relocation of the circuits.

(Exhibit B-4, pp. 12-14)

5.3 FortisBC Argument

FortisBC states that it believes the query with respect to running all four feeders egressing the Benvoulin substation by overhead lines, as an alternative to utilizing underground duct banks, has been satisfactorily addressed. The Company notes the requirement for more distribution feeders in the future will require construction of duct banks as proposed in the Application. It argues that it is both prudent and cost effective to address this with the current Application. In addition, it notes the Intervenor Tantalus Vineyards in its Information Request No. 1 (Exhibit C4-2, Q 5 and Q 9) has indicated concerns with the visual appearance of overhead lines. FortisBC argues this is best handled through underground ducting (FortisBC Argument, p. 11).

5.4 Intervenor Submissions

BCOAPO notes that the cost of running two underground feeders as proposed in the Application is more expensive than if all four feeders were installed overhead. However, it has recognized that FortisBC provides a number of reasons that the overhead option is not a satisfactory one. BCOAPO further notes that the undergrounding of feeders addresses the concerns of Tantalus Vineyards (BCOAPO Argument, p. 4).

No further evidence was introduced by any other Intervenor with respect to the distribution routing of power lines.

5.5 FortisBC Reply

FortisBC issues no specific reply to BCOAPO's comments but in its Conclusion notes "the evidence filed in this proceeding and the submissions of FortisBC and the Intervenors demonstrates that the local community supports the Benvoulin Project and the recommended site" (FortisBC Reply, p. 4).

5.6 EMF

FortisBC states that all facilities associated with this Project meet the World Health Organization and International Council on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection reference levels (Exhibit B-1, p. 35).

5.7 Commission Determination

The Commission Panel appreciates the work that FortisBC and the Intervenors did to overcome issues related to line routing. The Commission Panel notes that while there was little, if any, supportive evidence presented on behalf of the general public with respect to this issue, it recognizes there was also none presented, which would suggest a lack of support.

With respect to the issue related to the cost of the duct banks as opposed to overhead lines, the Commission Panel is in support of the FortisBC contention that this is the best solution. While there are certainly higher costs, it remediates many of the visual and safety concerns and leaves open the option of further expansion as required.

The Commission Panel approves the distribution line routing as proposed by FortisBC in the Application.

6.0 PROJECT COSTING

6.1 General

The projected cost for the Project in nominal dollars is \$17.7 million (Exhibit B-1, p. 23; Fortis Argument, p. 2). The Net Present Value of incremental revenue requirements is \$1.3 million and rate impact is 0.05 percent. A summary of the cost components is presented in Table 6.1 of Exhibit B-1 and for convenience, is reproduced below.

Table 6.1 Summary of Cost – Site 7

	Scope Item	2007	2008	2009	2010	TOTAL
		(\$000s)				
1	Design and construct distribution substation with one 138/13 kV 32 MVA transformer and egress for four feeders	-	197.1	871.3	7,948.8	9,017.2
2	Design and construct connections transmission lines	-	-	-	515.2	515.2
3	Design and construct connections to local 13 kV distribution feeders	-	-	1,320.2	4,120.9	5,441.1
4	Planning / Pre Engineering / Regulatory Costs	83.5	450.4	378.0	105.9	1,017.7
5	Land Acquisition and Assessments	-	96.4	871.7	20.6	988.7
	SUBTOTAL	83.5	743.8	3,441.2	12,711.5	16,979.9
6	AFUDC		3.4	109.9	589.1	702.5
	TOTAL CAPITAL COST	83.5	747.2	3,551.1	13,300.6	17,682.4
7	Net Present Value	1,312.4				
8	One Time Equivalent Rate Impact	0.05%				

FortisBC stated that the accuracy of the cost estimates is +/- 11 percent (Exhibit B-3, BCUC 1.28.1). The cost assumptions were presented in response to BCUC 2.53.1 and included reliance on previous experience and no payment of premiums for labour. The total projected costs include a contingency amount of \$1.4 million (Exhibit B-4, BCUC 2.55.1).

The inflation rate used to calculate the Project costs was 5 percent, being the mid-point of the range specified in the MMK Report, 16 May 2008, as discussed in BCUC 2.54.1 (Exhibit B-4).

The Project does not include the capacity upgrades to the Hollywood substation or the OK Mission capacity upgrade projects that were outlined in the FortisBC 2005 System Development Plan ("SDP") and set out in subsections 3.1.4.7 and 3.1.4.9 of the 2005 SDP, and the related Fault Level Reduction work (subsection 3.1.4.4 of the 2005 SDP) at the two substations. However, the Project does address the issues raised (Exhibit B-3, BCUC 1.40.1).

FortisBC stated that an additional cost-related consideration was the potential ability to postpone a proposed new Braeloch substation in the south Kelowna area for a period of one to three years Exhibit B-1, p. 63; Fortis Argument, p. 7. This was not priced into the Project justification analysis.

While not the "lowest cost" of the various alternatives considered by FortisBC, the Company, as previously noted, is of the view that the site selected is the most "cost effective". The Application cites in particular, the public sentiment in favour of the preferred location (Site 7) and the better chances of avoiding delay risk associated with the required rezoning by the City of Kelowna and removal of the preferred site from the ALR. Reference is made to Commission policy in this area as enunciated in the Vancouver Island Gas Pipeline Decision, page 77 and the Vancouver Island Transmission Reinforcement Project Decision, page 15. In any event, the site that was considered to be a viable second alternative (Site 2) was only marginally less costly at \$16.9 million.

The Commission Panel recognizes that the choice of the Site 7 location will result in slightly higher distribution system line losses, but as with the capital cost of the Project, the Commission Panel concludes that the Project as proposed in the Application is overall the most cost effective selection.

6.2 The Revisited Project Costs and the Economic Downturn

During the second round of IRs, the Company revisited the Project costing using construction cost factors that were released in October 2008 and concluded that they did not differ from those employed in the Application (Exhibit B-4, BCUC 2.54.2).

The chosen inflation rate (5 percent) was reviewed in light of the current economic downturn but was still considered a reasonable estimate of expected conditions over the life of the Project. The inflation rate of 5 percent is also consistent with the rate selected for the FortisBC 2009/10 Capital Expenditure Plan (Exhibit B-3, BCUC 1.28.5).

6.3 Commission Determination

The Commission Panel, having reviewed the cost estimates as presented, concludes that they are reasonable, that the alternatives have been explored and rejected for good and sufficient reasons and, as a result, grants a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the project as set out in the Application.

As always, the Company must ensure that in proceeding with the Project, that it take all reasonable care to reduce costs to a minimum, and be aware that all expenditures will be subject to a prudence test review.

6.4 Project Reporting

Fortis is directed to provide the Commission with a quarterly report as to the progress of the Project Implementation. Quarterly reporting should follow the outline attached as Appendix A to this Decision.

DATED at the City of Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, this 20th day of January 2009.

Original signed by:

LIISA A. O'HARA
PANEL CHAIR AND COMMISSIONER

Original signed by:

DENNIS A. COTE
COMMISSIONER

Original signed by:

PETER E. VIVIAN
COMMISSIONER

**BRITISH COLUMBIA
UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**ORDER
NUMBER C-1-09**

SIXTH FLOOR, 900 HOWE STREET, BOX 250
VANCOUVER, B.C. V6Z 2N3 CANADA
web site: <http://www.bcuc.com>

TELEPHONE: (604) 660-4700
BC TOLL FREE: 1-800-663-1385
FACSIMILE: (604) 660-1102



**IN THE MATTER OF
the Utilities Commission Act, R.S.B.C. 1996, Chapter 473**

and

**An Application by FortisBC Inc.
for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity
for the Benvoulin Substation Project**

BEFORE: L.A. O'Hara, Commissioner and Panel Chair
D.A. Cote, Commissioner January 20, 2009
P.E. Vivian, Commissioner

O R D E R

WHEREAS:

- A. On September 24, 2008 FortisBC Inc. ("FortisBC") applied (the "Application") to the British Columbia Utilities Commission (the "Commission") for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity ("CPCN") for the Benvoulin Substation Project (the "Project"); and
- B. FortisBC is proposing the Project as the preferred solution to meet load growth and relieve capacity constraints in the south/central Kelowna area; and
- C. The Project has an estimated capital cost of approximately \$17.7 million and includes the construction of a new substation and the transmission and distribution egress necessary to connect the substation into the existing network; and
- D. The Project is scheduled to commence in the first quarter of 2009 and to be completed by the end of 2010; and
- E. By Order G-146-08 dated September 26, 2008, the Commission ordered a Procedural Conference in Kelowna on October 28, 2008, and established an initial Regulatory Timetable; and
- F. The Procedural Conference was held on October 28, 2008 to consider certain procedural matters and to discuss a Regulatory Timetable for the review of the Application; and
- G. By Order G-161-08 dated November 3, 2008, the Commission established a Written Public Hearing and Regulatory Timetable for the regulatory review of the Application; and

**BRITISH COLUMBIA
UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**ORDER
NUMBER** C-1-09

2

- H. The Regulatory Timetable included a Community Input Session in Kelowna on December 2, 2008, providing at least 10 parties registered to make presentations to the Commission; and
- I. By letter dated November 27, 2008, the Commission cancelled the Community Input Session as only two parties registered to make presentations; and
- J. Submissions in the proceeding concluded with the Reply Submission of FortisBC on December 19, 2008; and
- K. The Commission Panel has considered the Application and the evidence and submissions in the proceeding and has determined that the Project is in the public interest and that a CPCN should be issued to FortisBC for the Project as set forth in the Decision that accompanies this Order.

NOW THEREFORE pursuant to Sections 45 and 46 of the Act the Commission orders as follows:

- 1. A CPCN is granted to FortisBC for construction and operation of the Benvoulin Substation Project as set out in the Application.
- 2. FortisBC shall comply with directions of the Commission Panel in the Decision that accompanies this Order.
- 3. FortisBC shall file with the Commission Quarterly Progress Reports on the Project showing planned versus actual schedule, planned versus actual costs, and any variances or difficulties that the Project may be encountering. The Quarterly Progress Reports will be filed within 30 days of the end of each reporting period and will be generally as set out in Appendix A to the Decision.
- 4. FortisBC shall file with the Commission a Final Report, within six months of the end or substantial completion of the Project, that provides a complete breakdown of the final costs of the Project, compares these costs to the updated cost estimate, and provides a detailed explanation and justification of all material cost variances.
- 5. Subject to paragraphs 3 and 4 of this Order, the format and content of the Progress Reports and the Final Report will be determined by FortisBC in consultation with Commission staff, or by determination of the Commission.

DATED at the City of Vancouver, in the Province of British Columbia, this 20th day of January 2009.

BY ORDER

Original signed by:

Liisa A. O'Hara
Commissioner and Panel Chair

An Application by FortisBC Inc.
for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity
for the Benvoulin Substation Project

Table of Contents of Quarterly Progress Report

1. Project Status

- 1.1.1 General Project Status
- 1.1.2 Major Accomplishments, Work Completed and Key Decisions Made
- 1.1.3 Project Challenges and Issues; Issues Currently Open, Date Opened, Dated Closed, Those Issues that are Past Due
- 1.1.4 Plans for Next Period
- 1.1.5 Site Photographs

2. Project Schedule and Cost

- 2.1.1 Project "S" Curve and schedule showing the budget at completion, actual cost to date, estimate to completion, estimate at completion, cost variance between estimated and budgeted cost at completion, schedule variance, percent budget spent, and percent complete. All values are to be shown in each report throughout the duration of the project.

3. Project Schedule

- 3.1.1 Milestone Summary with the planned finish date, actual finish date, variance in days, status
- 3.1.2 Procurement Summary with the planned finish date, actual finish date, variance in days, status
- 3.1.3 Contract Summary with the planned finish date, actual finish date, variance in days, status
- 3.1.4 Current Schedule
- 3.1.5 Schedule Summary
 - 3.1.5.1 Schedule Performance to Date
 - 3.1.5.2 Schedule Projection Going Forward
 - 3.1.5.3 Schedule Difficulties and Variances
- 3.1.6 Design Scope Change Summary with Description of Request, Explanation for Request, Request Amount, Approved Amount, Deferred Amount, Reject Amount, Under Investigation Amount.
- 3.1.7 Construction Scope Change Summary with Description of Request, Explanation for Request, Request Amount, Approved Amount, Deferred Amount, Reject Amount, Under Investigation Amount.

4. Project Costs

- 4.1.1 Project Cost Summary including explanation of variances using the cost estimate in the Application as a budget. For each cost category as set out in BCUC Table A28.1 in Exhibit B-3, the report should show “amount in capital budget”, “spent to date”, “estimate to complete”, “forecast total to complete”, and “variance”.
- 4.1.2 A Cost Report on Stakeholder, First Nations and other costs using the cost estimate in the Application as a budget. For each cost category as set out in BCUC Table A28.1 in Exhibit B-3, the report should show “amount in capital budget”, “spent to date”, “estimate to complete”, “forecast total to complete”, and “variance”.
- 4.1.3 Financial Summary including explanation of variances for the total project costs.
- 4.1.4 Summary of Individual Contracts (Construction and Procurement) Exceeding \$2 million with Budget Amount, Award Amount, Approved Change Orders

5. Project Resource Management

- 5.1.1 Engineering Resources (Man-hours, Planned vs. Actual – non- cumulative) both in chart and table format. Provide explanation for variance and corrective action taken.
- 5.1.2 Construction Resources (Man-hours, Planned vs. Actual – non-cumulative) both in chart and table format. Provide explanation for variance and corrective action taken.

6. Project Risks

- 6.1.1 Current Project Risks.
- 6.1.2 Risks Going Forward.

7. Stakeholder or First Nations Issues

- 7.1.1 An ongoing report on the status of all existing and new issues, and an explanation of any new issues.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Project Milestones
Table 2	Project Expenditure Summary, Table & Chart of Cumulative Capital Expenditure showing an Updated Cost Estimate, Upper Bound (Cost Estimate), Current Forecast to Complete, Spent to Date (Escalation and Contingency are to be identified separately).
Table 3	Summary of Variances Greater than \$2 million
Table 4	Summary of Contracts exceeding \$2 million
Table 5	Summary of Outstanding Claims greater than \$2 million
Table 6	Table of Project Risks including Risk Description & Explanation, Date Risk Originated, Date Risk Last Reviewed, Level/Severity of Risk, Mitigation Plan, Contingency Plan, Mitigation Cost Amount (including schedule delay), Contingency Reserve Amount Required, Total Contingency Reserve Required to Date, Contingency Reserve Remaining.

LIST OF APPEARANCES

G.A. FULTON, Q.C.	Commission Counsel
R.J. McDONELL	FortisBC Inc.
J. MARTIN	
D. SWANSON	
D. RAMPONE	Rampone Farms
S. KHAN	BC Old Age Pensioners Organization <i>et al.</i> (BCOAPO)
D. SWANZEY	Friends of Mission Creek
P. DILL	
J. HATCH	Tantalus Holdings Limited Partnership; Tantalus Vineyards

J.B. Williston	Commission Staff
P. Nakoneshny	
T. Roberts	
R. Stubbings	Contract Staff
Allwest Reporting Ltd.	Court Reporters

IN THE MATTER OF
the Utilities Commission Act, R.S.B.C. 1996, Chapter 473

and

FortisBC Inc.

Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Benvoulin Substation Project

EXHIBIT LIST

Exhibit No.	Description
<i>COMMISSION DOCUMENTS</i>	
A-1	Letter dated September 26, 2008 issuing Order No. G-146-08 establishing a Procedural Conference and Regulatory Timetable
A-2	Letter dated October 15, 2008 issuing Commission Information Request No. 1
A-3	Letter dated November 3, 2008 and Order G-161-08 establishing a Regulatory Timetable and Notice of Community Input Session
A-4	Letter dated November 5, 2008 establishing the Commission Panel for review of the FortisBC Benvoulin Substation Project
A-5	Letter dated November 12, 2008 issuing Information Request No. 2 to FortisBC
A-6	Letter dated November 27, 2008 cancelling the Community Input Session in Kelowna and issuing deadline for comments
<i>APPLICANT DOCUMENTS</i>	
B-1	FortisBC Inc. Application dated September 24, 2008 for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the for the Benvoulin Substation Project
B-2	RE-ISSUED FROM B-1-1 TO B-2 Letter dated October 29, 2008 filing Errata to the Benvoulin Substation Project CPCN Application
B-3	RE-ISSUED FROM B-2 TO B-3 Letter dated October 2, 2008 filing responses to Commission Information Request No. 1

Exhibit No.	Description
B-4	Letter dated November 26, 2008 filing responses to the Commissions' Information Request No. 2 and responses to BCOAPO's and Tantalus Vineyard's Information Request No. 1

INTERVENOR DOCUMENTS

C1-1	RAMPONE FARMS – Online web registration received October 2, 2008 from Domenic Rampone requesting Intervenor status
C1-2	Letter dated October 23, 2008 filing comments on the application and process
C2-1	BRITISH COLUMBIA OLD AGE PENSIONER'S ORGANIZATION (BCOAPO) – Letter dated October 16, 2008, filing request for Registered Intervenor status for Sarah Khan and on behalf of Bill Harper of Econalysis Consulting
C2-2	Letter dated November 12, 2008 filing Information Request No. 1 to FortisBC
C3-1	FRIENDS OF MISSION CREEK – Online web registration received October 17, 2008 from Kathie Jones requesting Intervenor status
C4-1	TANTALUS HOLDINGS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP/TANTALUS VINEYARDS – Online web registration received October 17, 2008 from Jane Hatch requesting Intervenor status
C4-2	Letter dated November 12, 2008 filing Information Request No. 1 to FortisBC with comments
C4-3	Email dated November 25, 2008 filing Notice of Attendance for the Community Input Session
C4-4	Letter dated December 9, 2008 filing Information Request No. 2 to FortisBC

INTERESTED PARTY DOCUMENTS

D-1	REGIONAL PARKS SERVICES – REGIONAL DISTRICT OF CENTRAL OKANAGAN – Online web registration received October 17, 2008 from Murray Kopp requesting Interested Party status
-----	--