



Sarah Walsh
Director, Regulatory Affairs

Gas Regulatory Affairs Correspondence
Email: gas.regulatory.affairs@fortisbc.com

Electric Regulatory Affairs Correspondence
Email: electricity.regulatory.affairs@fortisbc.com

FortisBC
16705 Fraser Highway
Surrey, B.C. V4N 0E8
Tel: (778) 578-3861
Cell: (604) 230-7874
Fax: (604) 576-7074
www.fortisbc.com

May 23, 2024

British Columbia Utilities Commission
Suite 410, 900 Howe Street
Vancouver, BC
V6Z 2N3

Attention: Patrick Wruck, Commission Secretary

Dear Patrick Wruck:

Re: FortisBC Inc. (FBC) Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for Approval of the Fruitvale Substation Project (Fruitvale Project or the Project) (Application)

Erratum to Appendix B

On February 29, 2024, FBC filed the Application referenced above. In accordance with the amended regulatory timetable established in BCUC Order G-100-24 for the review of the Application, on May 23, 2024, FBC filed its responses to round one information requests (IR No. 1). During the course of responding to IR No. 1, FBC has identified corrections required to Appendix B (Land Evaluation Criteria and Scoring) to the Application, as discussed in the responses to BCUC IR1 5.6 and 6.2.

When responding to these IRs, FBC discovered three corrections required to the Land Evaluation Criteria with respect to the Visual & Noise Impact rating. These three corrections are as follows:

1. The Atco Wood Products – Property A was rated Low whereas it should have been rated as High due to the visual impact resulting from the approximately 7.4 km of triple circuit infrastructure that would be required if the FRU substation were located on this property.
2. The former Atco Wood Products Property was rated Low whereas it should have been rated as High due to the visual impact resulting from the approximately 7.4 km of triple circuit infrastructure that would be required if the FRU substation were located on this property.
3. The Highway 3B – Property B was rated Low whereas it should have been rated as Medium due to the visual impact resulting from the approximately 1.5 km of triple circuit

line infrastructure that would be required if the FRU substation were located on this property.

FBC has attached a corrected Appendix B as part of this Erratum filing to the Application.

If further information is required, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

FORTISBC INC.

Original signed:

Sarah Walsh

Attachment

cc (email only): Registered Interveners

New Fruitvale Substation Land Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

Impact Evaluation

Low and/or meets criteria

Medium

High

Highest

| Site | Location Name | Landownership & Use | | | | | Environmental, Archeological, and Hazards | | | | Technical | | | | | Community & Stakeholder Relations | | | | Relative Capital Cost ¹⁴ |
|------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | Landowner Receptive to Sell | Land Vacant ¹ | Property Rezoning ² | Indigenous Reserve Lands ³ | Agricultural Land Reserve ³ | Floodplain ^{3,4} | Critical Habit for Species at Risk ² | Archaeological Site within 250m ^{3,5} | EMF Impact ⁶ | Parcel Size (m ²) ⁷ | Transmission Extension Complexity | Distribution Reconfiguration Complexity | Constructability Complexity ⁸ | Operations Accessibility ⁹ | Visual & Noise Impact ¹⁰ | Community Land Use Impact ¹¹ | Indigenous Consultation Requirements ¹² | Customer Reliability Impact ¹³ | |
| 1 | Atco Wood Products – Property A | Yes | Yes | Utilities permitted | No | Partially | Partially | No | No | Low | 679,720 | Low | Highest | Highest | Low | High | Low | Low | High | Highest |
| 2 | Former Atco Wood Products Property | Landowner not approached | Yes | Utilities permitted | No | Partially | No | No | No | Low | 198,164 | Low | Highest | Highest | Low | High | Low | Low | High | Highest |
| 3 | Hepburn Road | Landowner not approached | Yes | Utilities permitted | No | No | Entirely within floodplain | No | No | Low | 5,934 | Medium | Medium | Medium | Low | Medium | Low | Low | Low | Medium |
| 4 | Atco Wood Products – Property B | Yes | Yes | Utilities permitted | No | No | Vacant land within floodplain | No | No | Low | 121,083 | Medium | Medium | Medium | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low | Medium |
| 5 | Old Salmo Road | Yes | Partially | Utilities permitted | No | No | Partially | No | No | Low | 29,075 (portion of property offered by landowner too small given ravine) | Medium | Medium | Highest | Medium | Low | Low | Low | Low | Not scored due to unresolvable land constraint |
| 6 | Highway 3B – Property A | Landowner not approached | Yes | Utilities permitted | No | No | No | No | No | Low | 89,904 | High | High | Highest | High | Medium | Low | High | Medium | High |
| 7 | Atco Wood Products – Property C | Yes | Yes | Utilities permitted | No | No | No | No | No | Low | 72,600 | High | High | Highest | High | Medium | Low | Low | Medium | High |
| 8 | Highway 3B – Property B | Yes | Partially | Utilities permitted | No | No | Partially within floodplain and impacted by spring runoff | No | No | Low | 72,600 | Low | High | Medium | Low | Medium | Low | Low | Medium | Medium |
| 9 | 2064 Grieve Rd | Yes | Partially | Utilities permitted | No | No | No | No | No | Low | 40,510 | Medium | Low | Medium | Low | Medium | Low | Low | Low | Low |

NOTES

1 - Land that is not vacant may require structure(s) to be demolished potentially adding liability to the project.

2 - Considers potential impact related to rezoning parcel to allow for utility use.

3 - Considers impact to new station, transmission, and/or distribution infrastructure.

4 - Identifies whether a property is entirely within the floodplain, partially within the floodplain, or entirely outside of the floodplain. It also considers whether property is within areas where overland flooding is a known issue.

5 - A distance of 250m from an archaeological site based on review conducted 2 February 2024. The distance of 250m was used to identify at a screening level if there were known resources that could require management if the site was chosen.

6 - Considers the impact of electric and magnetic fields from substation and transmission lines.

7 - The standard station footprint for a two transformer station is typically 4736 m² (61.5m x 77m), the minimum size is typically 2500 m² (50m x 50m).

8 - Considers aggregate challenges of terrain, subsurface conditions, available construction footprint, requirement of specialized crews and equipment, construction related outages, underground facilities, etc.

9 - Considers the accessibility of the facilities during construction and afterwards by FBC employees and contractors.

10 - Considers the visual and noise impact on the community from the new station, transmission, and/or distribution infrastructure.

11 - Considers the impact of the proposed facilities on the current land use by the community (i.e. community activities, parking lot, etc.).

12 - Indigenous consultation requirements as per internal and external guidelines.

13 - Options located further from the load centre are considered to have a lower reliability benefit.

14 - Relative to the other alternative locations, and considers the Transmission Extension Complexity, Distribution Reconfiguration Complexity and Constructability Complexity. No estimating completed.