2022 Long Term Gas Resource Plan (LTGRP)

Resource Plan Advisory Group (RPAG) Session
Final Wrap-up Session

RPAG Virtual Session held on February 10, 2022

The following notes from the February 10 RPAG session should be reviewed in conjunction with the slides, as the speaking points of the FortisBC presenters are not captured in these notes. The presentation slide deck was sent to attendees prior to the session. Please note that questions and answers have been numbered for ease of reference in ongoing communications.

1. Welcome, Introductions & Session Overview

Presenters for FortisBC:

Paul Chernikhowsky, Directory of Regulatory Projects and Resource Planning

- Welcome, acknowledgement and FortisBC guiding principles

Ken Ross, Manager, Integrated Resource Planning and DSM Reporting

- Review session objectives and introductions
- Summary of RPAG Feedback and Discussions
- Discuss the Diversified Energy Scenario – FEI's Planning Scenario

Tania Specogna, Director, Resource Development

- Discuss the Regional Gas Supply Diversity Project

Ken Ross

- Reminder to please send FEI any feedback on 2022 LTGRP prior to filing

2. Status Update on Resource Planning Process and Summary of RPAG Feedback and Discussions

Please refer to Slides 14 to 18 for the following discussion:

2.1 RPAG Member: In terms of RPAG Feedback and Discussion, how are the summary statements determined? Is this format based on qualitative discussions with the group or are they results of quantitative analysis? Is this RPAG feedback or feedback from others as well?

i. *FortisBC:* These summary statements are based on reviewing and summarizing the notes from prior RPAG sessions as well as incorporating some background received from other engagement sessions.

2.2 RPAG Member: How will the information be used? How do we comment on this feedback – if things are missing or disagreement?

i. *FortisBC:* We distribute the notes after each session for feedback from participants and ask that they let us know if we have missed any key discussion points or misinterpreted the discussions. We then edit the notes or add the additional feedback to the final version that is posted on FortisBC.com.

ii. *Post-meeting information to participants:* Prior presentations and notes from RPAG Meetings can be found on FortisBC.com at the following URL. This URL was emailed to the group after the meeting: *https://www.fortisbc.com/about-us/projects-planning/natural-gas-projects-planning/natural-gas-planning-stakeholder-engagement*

2.3 RPAG Member: In terms of the blue- bolded highlights (on slides 14-18), they may be over-generalizations however, I understand this is difficult, to consolidate all the feedback that has been received.

i. *FortisBC:* We do our best to capture the meeting discussions as accurately as we can.

2.4 RPAG Member: Please comment on the statement "the right fuel for the right use at the right time" Where do we get the best use of energy to prioritize decarbonization? How do we understand different customers and what do they need? How should we allocate the renewable fuels?

i. *FortisBC:* This is a complicated question. For each end use, the full and long term cost implications of all the different pathways needs to be carefully and completely examined. FortisBC is doing its best to understand these costs and the work we have done so far indicates that deep electrification of the built environment is more costly than a diversified energy future that relies on both the electricity and gas systems.

2.5 RPAG Member: In terms of the point on slide 14 "Recognition that both renewable natural gas and clean electricity are finite resources in BC" may overlook the substantial solar, wind and geothermal options.

i. *FortisBC:* It will be good if these resources can be developed, as more electricity is going to be needed for a diversified energy future. However, in a deep electrification scenario the ability of these resources to meet firm peak electricity demand needs to be taken into consideration and the full and complete costing of doing so needs to be fully examined in considering alternative pathways forward. The work the FortisBC has done to date shows the long term costs of deep electrification are higher than that of a diversified future, and we are doing our best to understand this better.

2.6 RPAG Member: In terms of the point on slide 18 "with RNG projects 13 in BC and 14 outside the province", what are the volumes of within BC and out of province RG percentage at this time?

i. *FortisBC:* The proportion of RNG delivery from projects within BC versus percentage volume from outside BC, is an important consideration. We have been asked this question before and though I don't know the exact amounts off the top of my head, the answer I would have given during the previous RPAG session would have already changed by this RPAG session. This is how quickly our renewable gas supply picture is changing. Currently, a larger proportion is procured outside the province, for the following reasons:

- It can take longer to procure BC-based projects
- This is an aggressive target to bring on this much supply. To meet these targets we also need to rely on projects outside BC. However, we understand that we want to help grow and develop BC projects. We also need to recognize that BC based supply is available on the open market to other customers, in addition to FEI.
- FEI has to be mindful of costs that we pass on to our customers and this needs to be considered in procuring supply.

ii. *FortisBC:* We are ramping up significantly and have signed up 10% of our current supply under RG contracts. We are excited about the rate that we have been able to bring on this supply through our decarbonization strategy. Both in and out of province projects are important to our goal.

3. Overview of the Diversified Energy Scenario – FEI's Planning Scenario

3.1 RPAG Member: In reference to Slide 27, where you demonstrate the load forecast in relation to the 2030 CleanBC Roadmap' GHG Cap. I believe the number is an absolute cap rather than an intensity cap.

i. *FortisBC:* We are still determining exactly what all is involved in this cap and how it lands in actual regulation. We will be discussing this further in another slide.

ii. *FortisBC:* We are still in early days of discussions with the Province to understand exactly how to interpret this GHG cap and how it impacts us. We need to move forward with what we know today as we do not yet have the final clarity for our planning scenario.

3.2 RPAG Member: In reference to Slide 20, presenting annual demand, will this be modified over time?

i. *FortisBC:* The supply will become decarbonized, with GHG emissions targets in mind. There should be no need to amend this forecast before the 2022 LTGRP is submitted. There will however, be customer trends and other factors that need to be updated in the next LTGRP.

ii. *FortisBC:* What you are seeing is a number of drivers in the demand curve. This includes the LNG demand for transportation.

3.3 RPAG Member: Is the Conservation Potential Review (CPR) available for public review? Is there a date when it will be publically released?

i. *FortisBC:* The CPR will be included as an appendix in this LTGRP submission (about March 31, 2022).

3.4 RPAG Member: Can we further assess the "Lower Bound" in terms of suggesting this is "not a very good scenario". Is there a strategy that could avoid this outcome as being "not very good" and how could FEI facilitate this as being a good option?

i. *FortisBC:* FEI has characterized the Lower Bound scenario as "not a very good scenario" because it includes multiple compounding factors, one of which is that it represents an undesirable poor economic situation for the province overall. In addition, it would suggest that the province is relying heavily on one energy delivery system – which FEI's analysis shows would be very expensive and may have capacity and resiliency issues. If you refer back to Slide 23, we demonstrate the relative peak hour demand for BC Hydro versus FortisBC. This highlights the extensive challenge of electrifying and the energy needed to meet these cold days to service today's current customer load. This does not even include demand that needs to be met through the electrification of transportation.

3.5 RPAG Member: We understand this lower bound would be a challenge to meet. Thank you for explaining further.

i. *FortisBC:* The Peak Hour Demand illustrated on Slide 23 demonstrates the challenge ahead. We need both systems to work together to handle these cold snaps. There is a huge opportunity to decarbonize the gas supply. We have 50,000 kms of pipeline that can be used in the energy transition and we must keep resiliency top of mind. Over time, the gas system can become even more efficient at delivering energy.

3.6 RPAG Member: In Slide 25 –Demand Side Management Annual Savings - Are you treating hybrid gas electric heat pumps in this graph as DSM or as energy load reduction (electrification)?

i. *Posterity:* Hybrid heating systems are treated as a DSM measure in the CPR. Hybrids were not forecasted to have a major impact at the time we were developing the CPR. Overall, air source heat pumps are considered to be part of the electrification scenario rather than a hybrid DSM measure, so there is a confounding interactive effect to consider in the DSM presentation graph.

3.6.1 RPAG Member: So hybrids and the gas heat pump systems have not been assigned a big portion of the savings in this chart?

i. *Posterity:* Not to a large extent. We developed the CPR based on the policy in place at that time (2019) so we did not give the hybrid systems as much prominence as they may turn out to be. There may be more potential for GHG reductions that we can address in the next LTGRP.

3.7 RPAG Member: In Slide 26, referring to the Renewable and Low Carbon Gas Outlook in reference to reaching the CleanBC Road Map targets with renewable and low carbon gas targets:

3.7.1 RPAG member: Are Carbon Capture Utilization and Sequestration opportunities covered in the slide?

i. *FortisBC:* Yes, it is included on the chart with a conservative estimate, with the understanding that there still needs to be more development on this technology, but we recognize the opportunity.

3.7.2 RPAG member: In the 2030 target, how is price affected?

i. *FortisBC*: Our goal is to decarbonize the gas supply easily and affordably. We are trying to procure the best supply we can. As a reminder, including carbon taxes, we are comparing to a commodity cost plus carbon tax of $8 by 2030. But we emphasize, that we want to be able to get as much supply as we can, as affordably as we can. We are just starting to understand the market in BC. The scale-up is rapid and we have the momentum to meet this 2030 target.
In terms of the longer range price forecasts, we are doing our best to develop the longer range view on costs and we are starting to see an economy of scale – similar to what we see with wind and solar, that costs are coming down. We will see more of this pricing analysis in the next resource plan. When we look at the market for electricity, natural gas and renewables, we will see how this transforms into a North American market. It will be interesting to see how this unfolds.

3.7.3 How many years are the RNG contract? How certain is the supply?

i. *FortisBC*: Most are longer term contracts of around 20 years, although not in every case. With increased competition, costs could move upward, but the increased competition will also help in developing the supply. We are seeing hydrogen costs really coming down and syngas and lignin are becoming more available.

ii. *FortisBC*: The BC Renewable and Low Carbon Gas Supply Potential Study was sponsored by FortisBC, the Province (Energy, Mines and Low Carbon Innovation) and the BC Bioenergy Network. This study will soon become publicly available.

3.8 RPAG member: In referring to slide 27 which displays GHG Emissions in the Built Environment, based on the steepness of the downward curve for GHG emissions, how does

this impact FEI's ability to add more gas connections? Is this economically beneficial when trying to meet the CleanBC emissions cap?

i. *FortisBC:* Yes, adding new connections continues to be beneficial to FEI in the Diversified Energy scenario. It will be beneficial to add more customers to share in the costs of decarbonization over a broader customer base and to ensure the financial health of the utility to continue to make low carbon investments. Remember that electrification will also come with increased costs and we still do not have access to electrification costs. A lot of the growth in the demand forecast charts showing increased demand is in the transportation sector. Customer growth in the built environment is more modest and by incorporating energy efficiency in a diverse, integrated energy future we will be able to bring on these new customers as the importance of maintaining both energy systems is realized.

3.8.1 RPAG Member: In terms of best use for the renewable resource – in light of heat pumps being effective for residential use, why not focus renewables on industrial use and electrify residential?

i. *FortisBC:* The BC Hydro IRP suggests that we will be in a capacity shortfall before 2030. So the highest and best use of clean energy goes both ways. Do we preserve precious clean electricity? Or do we preserve renewable and low carbon gas? This is the question facing long range energy planning in BC.

3.9 RPAG Member: We look forward to receiving the RNG Potential study to better understand the availability of local supply.

i. *FortisBC:* With regards to electrification, generation capacity surplus is one issue and the ability to move the power into the demand areas is an additional factor to consider. New infrastructure is likely needed. In terms of handling peaks, it is not just about batteries, how do we move the generation into load centres? This is a critical barrier.

3.10 RPAG member: What will work to bring the price of RNG down over time?

i. *FortisBC:* We will see economies of scale, larger projects, and the advancement of technology improve over time.

3.11 RPAG member: Over what timeframe would you expect to see the prices decline?

i. *FortisBC:* Our sense is that we are starting to already see the prices coming down. We have been conservative in our plan to hold the prices steady, but we assume there will be a more optimistic actual scenario over time. The hydrogen outlook is looking very favourable, as we gain more knowledge about market opportunities.

3.12 RPAG Member: How does FEI/ FBC reconcile electrification – the right fuel for the right use at the right time in the shared service territory? We are looking at areas of electrification in

our system. How will the diversified future play out in FBC? How can renewables such as wind and solar be factored in?

i. *FortisBC:* The Long Range Marginal Cost of wind is one factor; the firmness is another. Solar and wind can't likely meet the peaking service without storage and energy delivery upgrades. It is not a simple calculation to describe this interactivity. This requires a long term view of the implications and further understanding over time.

3.13 RPAG Member: I understand that FEI's perspective is that significant new customer connections including residential connections are required to financially support RG development and decarbonization. If FEI cannot get significant new connections, the business model becomes seriously challenged. Is this interpretation correct?

i. *FortisBC:* This interpretation is not correct. We need to keep this in context and remember that the rates per customer goes down with additional customers sharing fixed costs across the system. It's important to remember that there will be increased rates and costs on both energy systems as we transition to a low carbon future. Over the long term, electrification as a decarbonisation strategy would put increased cost pressures on both electricity and natural gas customers. This is a complex issue that needs to be addressed broadly to get the full extent of all the considerations for this discussion. This is why an average resident in BC may not necessarily engage in this discussion. We must not over-simplify this line of thinking.

ii. *FortisBC:* This is a great question. Fundamentally, we need to ask, "Do we think the gas system is important?" If so, we need to keep the system available, functioning, and of course, financially viable in the long term. As a province, we need to make the investments in decarbonisation. Will the built environment continue to be part of the future for the gas system? Then new connections are important to keep this system healthy. We need to think broadly and we need to be cautious about how we approach these early stage considerations, as there could be unintended consequences to the longer term vision of a Diversified Energy Future. Imposing early limitations could impact the ability for BC to fulfill future capacity requirements, especially in the long term.

3.13.1 RPAG Member: This is an important discussion because maintaining the financial health of the gas system can be a double-edged sword if consequent rate increases impact customers' willingness to pay for it.

3.14 RPAG Member: Is there any seasonality in the volumes of renewable gas produced, ie times of year when more biogenic feedstock is available?

i. *FortisBC:* RNG sources are comprised mostly of landfill, waste streams, forest products – these will be available year round. We foresee the supply as being fairly consistent. Hydrogen should also be consistent as well throughout the year. As the diversity of

supply contracts increases over time, FEI anticipates that the overall firmness of renewable gas supply will also grow over time, through the seasons.

3.15 RPAG Member: Can you refresh our understanding as to how conventional gas has much lower GHG emissions than modern internal combustion gasoline and diesel use? Isn't a similar GHG level related to the carbon use per kilometer, thus methane vs liquid fuels would have similar GHGs? *Attendees: Note this discussion took place in the Teams chat function.*

i. *Posterity:* Octane has the formula C8H18, so nearly a third of its molecules are carbon. Methane has the formula CH4, so only a fifth of its molecules are carbon. That means, assuming the same engine efficiency, you'd get lower carbon emissions (and more water vapour) from burning methane than you would from burning octane.

3.15.1 RPAG Member: But the energy density of methane is far less, thus don't we need roughly the same amount of carbon per km?

i. *Posterity:* Yes, you would need a larger volume of methane than the volume of gasoline, certainly. But it still takes the same number of GJ to move the car, and if more of those GJ come from burning hydrogen than burning carbon, the carbon emissions will still go down. The carbon chains in diesel, on average, are longer than in gasoline, so the change from diesel to natural gas would provide slightly more reduction than for gasoline to NG. I believe bunker is even more carbon-intensive than #2 diesel.

3.15.2 RPAG Member: Regarding GHG transport reductions with LNG/CNG. A study showed 15% reductions with "neutral grade route" but a 12% increase on a "hi engine load route", possibly mountainous? I do not know if they looked at black carbon and ozone impacts, but to me, it seems there is not a compelling case for methane, other than former "lower cost", a present differential, which may change substantially with a tax of $170/T on both fuels. An interesting topic for further discussion.

i. *Posterity:* These are fair points. The basic chemistry seems encouraging, but it's important to look at the life-cycle emissions of each fuel.

4. Regional Gas Supply Diversity (RGSD) Project Concept

Please refer to slides 36 to 44 for the RGSD discussion.

The following presentation will focus on how the Regional Gas Supply Diversity Project (RGSD) will fit in the Diversified Energy Future and how this system will include bringing on renewables. Enbridge has announced its intention to expand T-South to increase upstream capacity. FEI agrees that an expansion of supply is necessary and we have addressed this in recent BCUC applications. However, the Enbridge T-

South expansion, will result in additional costs to FEI customers without providing the added benefits of resiliency, renewables and other benefits. FEI will be reliant on this system, incurring additional costs for customers, without bringing on supply diversity. The Enbridge option will not provide a clear path for FEI's Clean Growth targets.

FEI's RGSD proposal is a whole new path forward for British Columbians that will provide a preferable option for FEI and the region. We know that renewable and low carbon gases are key to FEI's plans and provincial GHG emission reduction goals. Renewable gas is a drop-in replacement for our existing system. We already have 18PJs under contract and the momentum for sourcing supply is growing. These 18PJs will provide the energy equivalents of a Site C and enough energy to supply about 300,000 homes. Hydrogen is also expected to displace conventional gas and will be able to keep costs lower. The BC Hydrogen Strategy was highlighted in BC's throne speech February 8, 2022, and FEI is excited to be a key part of building the hydrogen economy in BC.

FEI needs additional capacity to transport Hydrogen. We are looking at cost competitive opportunities for hydrogen injection as a critical component of decarbonization. FEI's assets include 50,000 kms of pipeline that can be used to advance BC's climate goals. In summary, FEI believes that the RGSD is the right project for FEI customers and the region.

Discussion:

4.1 RPAG member: What does hydrogen-ready mean in comparison to existing pipelines? Does hydrogen-ready imply that the metallurgy of the pipeline be different? Does this plan provide greater access to hydrogen for the RGSD project?

i. *FortisBC:* Currently there is some blending enabled in hydrogen pipelines but there needs to be updates to allow 100% hydrogen. We are exploring how much we can blend at this time. Enbridge is also evaluating what percentage they can safely flow on T-South but we don't know the results at this time.

ii. *FortisBC:* Our RGSD application is designed for a 2050 horizon to ensure the system is built to be hydrogen enabled and able to connect to regional supply hubs that will be built over time.

4.2 RPAG Member: What changes are to be made for 100% hydrogen (H2)?

i. *FortisBC:* Hydrogen ready means we are considering that the design (material and capacity) of the pipeline is compatible with increasing percentages of H2 over the life of the asset. In the early days we will blend in some portion, but hydrogen enabled pipelines will require different levels of metallurgy. We also need to understand how to upgrade compressors. It is the base metallurgy of the pipeline that is critical. This research will be aligned with the BC Hydrogen Strategy. Our system will be able to pick up different types of renewables along the way, such as solar farms producing hydrogen in partnership with Indigenous communities as one example of the future vision.

4.3 What is the magnitude of the costs to make something hydrogen ready?

i. *FortisBC:* This is the type of research that is under way as we develop the business case. A preliminary number is 10% higher, but we will get back to the group in future RPAG sessions when we have a more firm number.

4.4 RPAG member: Will the new compressor stations be electrified?

i. *FortisBC:* Yes, potentially, we are looking at many different options including electric systems.

4.5 RPAG Member: Are the Renewable Gas projects outside of the province?

i. *FortisBC:* We have current projects within BC and a portion of our projects are outside of the province. We refer to this as displacement. We contract for this RG and apply the attributes to the gas we are supplying. This is a very similar system to how currently both natural gas and clean electricity are traded throughout North America. In order for us to meet these escalated targets, we need to look to these sources. Over time we will continue to develop local projects. We need to spur the market in BC. We also need to recognize that affordability and pricing is key.

4.6 RPAG Member: In terms of Slide 41, Net Zero by 2050 Challenge, demonstrating the renewable and low carbon gas outlook– what portion is renewable?

i. *FortisBC:* Net Zero can mean a lot of things. There are a range of options to meet Net Zero targets required for BC. At this point in time, it is not possible to know what portion of gases will be renewable in 2050.

ii. *FortisBC:* We understand that there will be a lot of work. RG and hydrogen is the future and we want to be ready for it. There will be blends of different sources and this proportion will change over time. DSM will also be critical to GHG reduction over time.

iii. *FortisBC:* If we take the carbon reduction trajectory shown at 2042 and extrapolate out to 2050 we will get close. The targets are within reach but of course there are uncertainties along the way in the longer term projection.

4.7 RPAG Member: Will an approval of the Enbridge T-South expansion prevent approval of the FEI RGSD application?

i. *FortisBC:* The proposed T-South expansion is a different regulatory model so it is not as straightforward as that. Our plan is to demonstrate that our request is a better option both for the region and for FEI customers.

4.8 RPAG Member: What other options than RGSD have been considered by FEI to achieve the same levels of resiliency?

i. *FortisBC:* We have considered a number of options including how we can interconnect with other systems. However, we believe the best option is to connect directly through Huntingdon to have security of supply in the Lower Mainland area.

4.9 RPAG Member: in terms of hydrogen injection in the Interior for example. Are the pipes plastic? How much can we inject?

i. *FortisBC:* Each of the distribution systems have different metallurgy. The systems are a mix of plastic and steel. Plastic was first introduced in 1982 so all pre-existing system was steel. We are looking at how and where we can inject. We are building our vision to 2050 to supply energy so this work is critical.

ii. *FortisBC:* We are working on a study across our system to determine hydrogen ready attributes. We have experts around the world providing input. Europe is ahead of us. In the Interior system, low to medium blends will be acceptable. This question is asset specific. Also need to look at compressor systems, plastic attributes for each system.

4.10 RPAG Member: Is most of the pipe fed from Savona steel?

i. *FortisBC:* This is a steel pipe into the Okanagan and then there is more polyethylene. All aspects need to be considered, steel grade, pressure, temperature and many other factors.

4.11 RPAG Member: When will these studies be ready to be viewed?

i. *FortisBC:* We think 18 months to 2 years to cover off all the specifics.

4.12 RPAG Member: So does this not change our approach to hydrogen readiness? Is there ability to plug in with minor blends sooner?

i. *FortisBC:* You are correct, but TransCanada has to determine what amounts they can blend. Europe has a head start on this work. Some systems are able to use 100% hydrogen even though the systems are old. We need to see the results from our study to see what is cost effective and further develop our approach. Our BC hydrogen opportunities may be in the Interior. But we need all transmission systems on board to provide blends in the near future.

ii. *FortisBC:* A reminder that there are different kinds of hydrogen sources:

- Green hydrogen can be generated from wind and solar projects that can be injected
- Both Blue and Turquoise hydrogen use natural gas as a feedstock and capture the carbon content
- Blue hydrogen is more common and may be in consideration for T-South blends

We are developing a plan as to how we can we take these various sources on system and how to keep it affordable as we do see costs coming down. But we need to start today to build the infrastructure for the future.

4.13 RPAG Member: What carbon intensity of hydrogen is being envisioned as a source to the pipeline? *Attendees: This question was raised in the Teams chat function and was not answered during the session but response added to these notes.*

i. *FortisBC:* The emission factor we have used to analyze hydrogen in the LTGRP is 0.02 tCO2e/GJ. The LTGRP will discuss the different ways in which the benefits of hydrogen can be brought to customers.

4.14 RPAG Member: In order to obtain hydrogen, Alberta would need to make its pipelines hydrogen-ready. Have you considered building a pipeline from northern BC instead, given BC's more supportive climate policy framework?

i. *FortisBC:* FEI is open to acquiring hydrogen produced in northern BC or in Alberta, though currently there are promising developments in Alberta and they are participating in the Canadian Hydrogen Project. Irrespective of Alberta's climate policy framework, there is great economic opportunity for hydrogen production there.

4.15 RPAG Member: Is there an FEI Resiliency Plan contained in a single document that can be shared? I would like more detail to understand what is going on.

i. *FortisBC:* FEI's Resiliency Plan evolves over time. Currently, primary aspects of the plan are presented in various applications before the BCUC. We are planning to bring these aspects together in the LTGRP. The plan is based on a set of resiliency principles – diverse supply and pipelines, load control and ample storage. Aspects of FEI's resiliency plan have been / will be presented in FEI's:

- Annual Contracting Plan Filing in 2020;
- Tilbury LNG Storage Expansion CPCN application (and will be restated in the LTGRP);
- Advanced Metering Infrastructure CPCN application; and
- The upcoming RGSD application will offer a suite of solutions to FEI's resiliency plan.

We will take this question under consideration as we finalize the LTGRP.

4.16 RPAG Member: Are the BC Hydro diesel communities along the coast an opportunity for LNG/CNG replacement? *Attendees: This question was raised in the Teams chat function and was not answered during the session but response added to these notes.*

i. *FortisBC:* Under certain circumstances, these communities could offer an opportunity for an LNG/CNG or potentially a renewable gas solution, but this would depend on the site-specific details and such a location may also be a good opportunity for renewable electricity solutions. FortisBC is certainly interested in exploring such opportunities.

5. LTGRP Draft Action Items

Please refer to slides 47 to 49 for a review of the preliminary draft action items for LTGRP submission.

Reminder: We are developing a four year action plan. This is a time of great change and therefore the next LTGRP may not be as far into the future due to the evolving dynamics of FEI's accelerating

decarbonization initiatives and evolving CleanBC policies. We have considered the feedback that we have received to date from RPAG in helping us develop these draft action plan items. It is difficult to point out individual recommendations and exactly where they are referred to in the plan, but we appreciate all the guidance you have given us to help us develop the overall plan and the action items.

5.1 RPAG Member: When will the DSM expenditures plan be filed for approval?

i. *FortisBC:* We are currently looking to file the application in Q2 but we do not have an exact date, as we would like to incorporate DSM Regulations updates that are under discussion at this time. We are developing the plan further and then it has to be presented to the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Advisory Group for their review prior to filing.

5.2 RPAG Member: Are you still on track to file for the March 31st deadline?

i. *FortisBC:* We are on track, but there has been some new information that has come in, and we are doing our best to bring this information into our models. If we cannot meet the March 31st deadline, we will need BCUC approval to extend, but would only be seeking for a very short extension.

5.3 RPAG Member: We acknowledge that you have a complex task with so many uncertainties and pieces still in motion.

i. *FortisBC:* This is a snapshot in time, or in other words, we need to align our 20 year outlook to the best of our ability and knowledge at the time of submission, knowing that uncertainties will remain and information will be evolving.

5.4 RPAG Member: If you need an extension of time, I expect you would receive intervener support under the circumstances.

5.5 RPAG Member: Good to see the collaboration efforts with BC Hydro through the BCUC scenarios request.

6. Wrap-up & Next Steps

Please reach out to us with additional questions and comments on what was presented and we will address as we are able. We would take your comments as additional feedback to the session date notes. If we get your comments in the next few weeks we may be able to incorporate into this plan or save the feedback for incorporation into the next plan as FEI's resource planning consultation process is ongoing.

Thank you for great discussions and your forward-thinking insights.
The session was drawn to a close.