

load over the next forty years?

4.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 14 (lines 3-11)

Preamble: “During seasonal peaks, both lines must operate in parallel to meet the load requirements in the event of an outage or failure to GFT T1. However, mountainous terrain, particularly in winter, can make it impossible to operate 9L and 10L in parallel since the lines traverse the Rossland Mountain Range, restricting physical access and making it extremely difficult to visually assess and rehabilitate 10L before it can be energized. As such, 9L and 10L are not a reliable secondary 63 kV supply for the Grand Forks area”.

- 4.1** Please confirm that the “seasonal peaks” occur in the winter time.
- 4.2** Please confirm that currently 9L and 10L can operate in parallel but that since 10L is normally de-energized between CHR tap and CSC substation it must be visually assessed and rehabilitated to minimum operating standards before it can be energized. If not confirmed, please clarify.
- 4.3** Please also confirm that the reliability issue with respect to supply using 9L and 10L arises from the fact that, during the winter months, it can be extremely difficult to access L10 so as to carry out the necessary visual inspection and any required rehabilitation. If not confirmed, please clarify.

5.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 15 (lines 7-24) and Appendix B, page 19

- 5.1** Is GFT T1 fully depreciated? If not, what is its remaining (accounting) life?
- 5.2** The ABB Report (Appendix B, page 19) suggests that GFT T1 has been lightly loaded during its lifetime. To what extent do loading levels impact the expected 40 year lifespan of a transformer?

6.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 15 (line 26) to page 16 (line 11); page 21 (lines 5-21); page 22 (lines 7-16); page 23 (lines 2-21); page 33 (lines 6-27) and Appendix D, page 6

- 6.1** Was the work identified in Appendix D undertaken and OLI T1 refurbished following the ABB assessment in 2013?
 - 6.1.1** If not, is the refurbishment included in the scope of Alternative A as described at page 21? If not included in the scope, please explain why?
 - 6.1.2** If not, is the refurbishment included in the scope of Alternative B as described at pages 22 and 33? If not included in the scope, please explain why?
 - 6.1.3** If not, is the refurbishment included in the scope of Alternative C as described at page 23? If not included in the scope, please explain why?

7.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 18 (lines 2-5) and page 44 (lines 4-12)

7.1 For what transmission facilities (e.g. voltage levels) do the (N-0) and (N-1) criteria apply?

8.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 21 (line 22) and page 22 (line 16)

8.1 Please explain why, when Alternative B involves the purchasing and installing a new transformer as opposed to Alternative A where an existing on-site transformer (OLI T1) is being installed, the capital cost of Alternative B is only \$0.9 M higher than that for Alternative A? (Note: to the extent possible, please respond without reference to details that are confidential)

9.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 20 (lines 20-26); page 26 (Project Risk) and page 28 (lines 1-6)

9.1 Will the re-purposed portions of lines 9L and 10L under Alternatives A and B use the same ROW as the existing 9L and 10L lines?

9.1.1 If the ROW will change, please explain why?

9.2 In Table 3-3, the discussion of Project Risk under Alternative A and B makes reference to confirming the distribution ROW for the portion of 9L and 10L that will be repurposed for distribution. Please explain what is meant by “confirm” and why there is a risk associated with it.

9.3 If the ROW will not change, please explain why the ROW needs to be confirmed

10.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 23 (lines 29-30) and page 16 (lines 7-11)

10.1 Please explain more fully why, under Alternative C, there is only a limited reduction in transmission outages when GFT T1 is out of service, since both 9L and 10L will be energized and known to be operational at the time of an outage to GFT T1.

10.2 Could preparatory work be undertaken at GFT that would shorten the time required to install OLI T1 and/or reduce the likely of damage in the process of installing it in the event of an outage?

10.2.1 If so, what type of work would be involved and what would be the cost?

11.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 21 (lines 1-3); page 21 (line 22); page 23 (line 21) and page 39 (lines 19-21)

Preamble: The Application states that cost estimates were developed to an AACE14 Class 3 definition for all three alternatives. The accuracy range for Alternative B is Low: -10% to -20% and High: +10% to +20%.

11.1 Is the accuracy range the same for all three alternatives?

11.1.1 If not, what is the accuracy range for the other two alternatives?

11.1.2 If yes, please explain how this can be the case when Alternative

B involves the purchase of a new transformer that is yet to be procured while Alternative A does not involve a similar purchase.

12.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 43 (lines 3-10)

12.1 Please clarify whether the \$3.22 M represents the gross book value or the net book value for the portion of the 9L and 10L transmission lines that will be removed.

12.1.1 If it is the gross book value, please provide the net book value.

13.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 30 (lines 21-31); page 31 (lines 1-27) and Appendix D

13.1 Please confirm whether FortisBC held any meetings with Indigenous communities whose territory is located along the transmission line route other than a meeting with the Osoyoos Indian Band (OIB) on July 4, 2018.

13.1.1 If yes, please provide the details of these meetings.

13.2 Please confirm whether subsequent to filing any responses or inquiries were received from the letters sent to Indigenous communities on July 13, 2018.

13.2.1 If yes, please provide the details of these responses and inquiries.

13.3 Please provide mapping that has been attached to the letters sent to Indigenous communities on July 13, 2018.

13.4 Has FortisBC completed its field pole assessment and identified the poles that need replacement?

13.4.1 If yes, have Shapefiles and Keyhole Markup language Zipped (KMZ) files of the poles that need replacement been prepared and provided to Indigenous communities?

13.4.2 If not, what is estimated time of completion of the assessment?

14.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 31 (lines 28-31) and Exhibits E-1, E-2, E-3, E-4, E-5, E-6

14.1 Has FortisBC changed its position about necessity of public consultation in light of six letters of comments from the residents concerned about any increase in the noise and light level caused by the Project,

14.1.1 If yes, please provide the details.