

1 **Q1. Give detailed estimated costs for the construction of a 63kv transmission line along**
2 **Arawana Road.**

3 A1. Please refer to the response to BCUC IR1 Q2.5.6.
4

5 **Q2. Give a detailed map of the route of the 63kv line along Arawana road.**

6 A2. Please refer to the maps in BCUC Appendix A6.1.
7

8 **Q3. Give engineering concerns for the 63kv Arawana Road route.**

9 A3. Please refer to the response to NAFS IR1 Question 1.57.1(d).
10

11 **Q4. Give safety issues for the 63kv Arawana Road route.**

12 A4. Please refer to the response to NAFS IR1 Question 1.57.1(e).
13

14 **Q5. Give reliability issues for the 63kv Arawana Road route.**

15 A5. Please refer to the response to NAFS IR1 Question 1.57.1(f).
16

17 **Q6. Give FortisBC's estimate of the aesthetic impact of the 63kv Arawana Road route.**

18 A6. Please refer to the response to NAFS IR1 Question 1.57.1(g).
19

20 **Q7. Give detailed estimated cost for the construction of a 63kv transmission line through**
21 **agricultural land owned by Andrew, Thompson, and Wright.**

22 A7. Please refer to the response to Q1 above.
23

24 **Q8. Give a detailed map of the route for the 63kv line through the agricultural land.**

25 A8. Please refer to BCUC Appendix A6.1.
26

27 **Q9. Give engineering concerns for the 63kv agricultural route.**

28 A9. Engineering for this option presents no concerns as discussed in the response to Q1.
29

30 **Q10. Give safety issues for the 63kv agricultural route.**

31 A10. Please refer to the response to NAFS IR1 Question 1.57.1(e).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Q11. Give reliability issues for the 63kv agricultural route.

A11. Please refer to the response to NAFS IR1 Question 1.57.1(f).

Q12. Give FortisBC's estimate of the aesthetic impact of the 63kv agricultural route.

A12. Please refer to the response to NAFS IR1 Question 1.57.1(g).

Q13. Market value of farmland in the Okanagan does not reflect its farm income-producing potential, but is now more of a reflection of life-style choices where aesthetics play a major role. How does FortisBC compensate for this fact in ROW acquisitions on small agricultural holdings where such actions have such a major impact on the appearance of the land and its future development use, in general?

A13. FortisBC attempts to fairly compensate landowners for any land rights needed to supply the community, and uses accredited appraisers when determining land values.

Q14. Is FortisBC planning to run a 63kv line on the agricultural lands of Wright, Thompson, and Andrew?

A14. At this time, the "direct cross country route" is one of several options being evaluated by FortisBC. This line route has been identified as the preferred option based on technical merits.

Q15. How does FortisBC plan to compensate Andrew, Thompson, and Wright for a ROW on their small agricultural holdings keeping in mind present and future uses by the owners?

A15. It is FortisBC's preference to successfully negotiate a fair settlement with affected landowners based upon market values provided by qualified appraisers.

Q16. In submissions to the BCUC, FortisBC repeatedly mentioned abandoning possible substation sites because owners or neighbours of these sites did not want a substation on their land or in their neighbourhood. Why does FortisBC now ignore these same protestations of the Arawana neighbourhood, a more populated area,

1 **and specifically threatens expropriation of agricultural land to service the off the**
2 **utility corridor site?**

3 A16. FortisBC is not ignoring protestations of the Arawana neighborhood. All aspects of using
4 the Arawana site have been investigated including initial discussions and primary
5 negotiations with those landowners directly impacted by the proposed greenway statutory
6 right of way. At least two on site meetings and verbal discussions took place between
7 FortisBC's contract land agent and the landowners in 2006, and two Public Information
8 meetings also took place. It is FortisBC's preference to successfully negotiate a fair
9 settlement with affected landowners, but it is noted that FortisBC does have expropriation
10 rights.

11
12 **Q17. Why has FortisBC not informed Andrew, Thompson, and Wright in writing of its**
13 **possible intentions for their respective lands over the time from May 2006?**

14 A17. FortisBC has held initial discussions with Andrew, Thompson and Wright but at this
15 point in time has not received CPCN approval of the site. To initiate more formal
16 acquisition procedures before BCUC approval is received would be premature.

17
18 **Q18. Please give detail of the construction of the transmission line across the**
19 **“crosscountry” route, such as number and placement of poles, anchoring, and the**
20 **number of wires carried by the poles.**

21 A18. Please see the response to BCUC IR1 Q6.1.

22
23 **Q19. How wide will the ROW be on each of the respective properties?**

24 A19. The total width of the right of way will be approximately 10 meters.

25
26 **Q20. Will the construction footprint ever be outside the ROW?**

27 A20. The construction footprint may at times be outside of the right of way.

28
29 **Q21. If grapevines inside and outside of the ROW are impacted by transmission line**
30 **construction how will David Andrew be compensated for his present financial loss**

1 **and for loss of production in ensuing years until the vines mature to the same level**
2 **as those unaffected by FortisBC's intrusion?**

3 A21. The landowner will be compensated fairly with an amount to be determined during
4 negotiations.

5

6 **Q22. If peach trees inside and outside of the ROW are impacted by transmission line**
7 **construction how will Howard Wright be compensated for his present financial loss**
8 **and for loss of production in ensuing years until the trees mature to the same level**
9 **as those unaffected by FortisBC's intrusion?**

10 A22. The landowner will be compensated fairly with an amount to be determined during
11 negotiations.

12

13 **Q23. Line Rights of Way (page 2 FortisBC submission to the BCUC 30-05-07)**

14 - **To what ROWs does this term refer?**

15 - **Detail the \$300 000 figure.**

16 A23. The response is referencing the April 30, 2007 submission. The rights of way referred to
17 are the greenway corridor that would be required between 45 Line on Naramata Road and
18 the Arawana Substation Site. The \$300,000 consists of appraisal fees, landowner
19 compensation, expropriation costs if required, land agent fees, miscellaneous and
20 contingency.