

Diane Roy

Vice President, Regulatory Affairs

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

Electric Regulatory Affairs Correspondence Email: <u>electricity.regulatory.affairs@fortisbc.com</u> **FortisBC**

16705 Fraser Highway Surrey, B.C. V4N 0E8 Tel: (604) 576-7349 Cell: (604) 908-2790 Fax: (604) 576-7074

Email: diane.roy@fortisbc.com

www.fortisbc.com

November 15, 2018

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

Attention: Mr. Patrick Wruck, Commission Secretary and Manager, Regulatory Support

Dear Mr. Wruck:

Re: FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI)

Application for Use of Lands under Sections 32 and 33 of the *Utilities Commission Act* (UCA) in the City of Coquitlam for the Lower Mainland Intermediate Pressure (IP) System Upgrade (LMIPSU) Projects – Coquitlam Gate IP Project (Project) (the Application)

FEI Information Requests (IR) to the City of Coquitlam on Phase Two Evidence

On June 28, 2018, FEI filed the Application noted above. In accordance with British Columbia Utilities Commission Order G-190-18 establishing the regulatory timetable for Phase Two of the proceeding, attached please find FEI's IRs to the City of Coquitlam on Phase Two Evidence.

If further information is required, please contact IIva Bevacqua at 604-592-7664.

Sincerely,

FORTISBC ENERGY INC.

Original signed:

Diane Roy

Attachments

cc (email only): Registered Parties



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI) Application for Use of Lands under Sections 32 and 33 of the *Utilities Commission Act* in the City of Coquitlam for the Lower Mainland Intermediate Pressure System Upgrade (LMIPSU) Projects ~ Project No. 1598963 (the Application)

Submission Date: November 15, 2018

FEI Information Request (IR) No. 1 to City of Coquitlam (City) on Phase Two Evidence

Page 1

1.0 Reference: Exhibit B-12, FEI Evidence

On page 20 FEI states:

FEI has previously indicated its willingness to remove the 380 metres of the abandoned NPS 20 IP gas line. However, FEI has not agreed to the City's proposal that FEI bear the entire cost of this removal. In the City's letter dated September 20, 2018, the City suggests that FEI should remove the entire 5.5 kilometre length of the NPS 20 IP gas line in the future. FEI is prepared to undertake the removal of any portion of the NPS 20 IP gas line, including either 380 metres or 5.5 kilometres in accordance with the Operating Agreement if the City exercises its rights under the Operating Agreement and requests such a removal.

The Operating Agreement gives the City the right to request that FEI remove abandoned pipe but also contains an allocation methodology that makes the City responsible for a portion of those removal costs.

On page 36 FEI states:

FEI is prepared to remove all or portions of the NPS 20 IP gas line if the City exercises its rights under the Operating Agreement to request such a removal, which has not occurred.

- 1.1 Has the City requested that FEI remove 380 metres of the NPS 20 IP gas line under the Operating Agreement?
- 1.2 Has the City requested that FEI remove 5.5 kilometres of the NPS 20 IP gas line under the Operating Agreement?

2.0 Reference: Exhibit C1-8, City Evidence

On page 6 the City states:

The National Guide to Sustainable Municipal Infrastructure published a paper that surveyed practices that exist across the country for coordinating infrastructure works. A copy of this paper is attached at Appendix D. The paper highlights the problems associated with the waste and inefficiency where a road is dug up and repaved, only to be dug up again a short time later, and emphasizes a coordinated approach. The net effect of improved coordination



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI) Application for Use of Lands under Sections 32 and 33 of the *Utilities Commission Act* in the City of Coquitlam for the Lower Mainland Intermediate Pressure System Upgrade (LMIPSU) Projects ~ Project No. 1598963 (the Application)

Submission Date: November 15, 2018

FEI Information Request (IR) No. 1 to City of Coquitlam (City) on Phase Two Evidence

Page 2

includes reduced project costs through efficiencies of scale and avoidance of repeat repair costs (e.g. repeated pavement repair).

The City believes that sooner or later FEI will have to remove the entire approximately 5.5 km of NPS 20 Pipeline to make space for other utility projects that support the public interest (e.g., water mains, sewers, electrical conduits for street lighting and traffic signals, telecommunications, etc.). Coquitlam is one of the fastest growing municipalities in greater Vancouver. The projected rapid growth and development in Coquitlam, in particular in the Burquitlam area, will only increase the need for underground space for additional utilities to serve this growth.

On page 7 the City states:

The City believes that the preferred and most cost-effective approach is for FEI to remove the entire 5.5 km of NPS 20 Pipeline as soon as possible (i.e., when the NPS 30 Pipeline is in service), rather than fill it with concrete and then remove it separately in the future.

- 2.1 Has the City considered whether the space left by the suggested removal of the NPS 20 IP gas line, or portions thereof, would be negatively impacted or unfeasible for use due to excessive depth, or insufficient spacing or offset to other adjacent utilities?
- 2.2 In what year(s) does the City anticipate requiring the use of the entire 5.5 kilometre NPS IP 20 route?
- 2.3 Please describe the works for which the City requires use of the entire 5.5 kilometre NPS IP 20 route.
- 2.4 What other alternatives and alternative routes were considered by the City for these works?
 - 2.4.1 When were these alternatives and alternative routes considered?
- 2.5 Please provide copies of any alternatives analysis conducted by the City.
- 28 2.6 Is it possible for the City to proceed with some or all of the works without relocating the NPS 20 IP gas line in some or all of the locations along the 5.5 kilometre route?
 - 2.7 At what stage are the City's plans for these works?



Submission Date: November 15, 2018

FEI Information Request (IR) No. 1 to City of Coquitlam (City) on Phase Two Evidence

1		2.7.1 Has the budget for this work been approved?
2		2.7.1.1 If not, why?
3 4		2.7.2 Has a request for proposals or tendering for this work been initiated by the City?
5 6 7 8 9	2.8	If it is not the City's intent to use this space immediately after the suggested removal of the NPS 20 IP gas line, how would the City mitigate the "problems associated with the waste and inefficiency where a road is dug up and repaved, only to be dug up again a short time later" that are mentioned in the National Guide to Sustainable Municipal Infrastructure's paper?
10 11 12 13 14	2.9	Does the City agree that if it does not intend to use the space immediately after the suggested removal of the NPS IP 20 gas line, or ends up utilizing a different location along the Como Lake Avenue corridor, that traffic and community impacts would be significantly greater as compared to if the City and FEI adopted a coordinated and concurrent approach to the suggested removal of the NPS 20 IP gas line and the City's potential future municipal utility infrastructure plans?
16		2.9.1 If not, why?
17 18 19	2.10	Does the City agree that there would be fewer traffic impacts and impacts to the community if the suggested removal of the NPS 20 IP gas line occurred at the same time as the City's proposed works?
20		2.10.1 If not, why?
21 22 23 24	2.11	Does the City agree that a more cost-effective approach would be to abandon the NPS 20 IP gas line in place, rather than removing the entire 5.5 kilometres of NPS 20 IP gas line as soon as possible after installation of the NPS 30 IP gas line?
25		2.11.1 If not, why?
26 27	2.12	Does the City see value in coordinating a concurrent approach to the suggested removal of the NPS 20 IP gas line and its municipal utility infrastructure plans?
28		2.12.1.1 If not, why?



1

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI) Application for Use of Lands under Sections 32 and 33 of the *Utilities Commission Act* in the City of Coquitlam for the Lower Mainland Intermediate Pressure System Upgrade (LMIPSU) Projects ~ Project No. 1598963 (the Application)

Submission Date: November 15, 2018

FEI Information Request (IR) No. 1 to City of Coquitlam (City) on Phase Two Evidence

2	3.0	Reference:		Exhibit C1-8, City Evidence			
3		On pa	page 2 the City states:				
4 5 6			and 4	50mm sa	eeded by the City for the installation of its new 250mm water main nitary sewer, which the City has deferred the installation of to relocate the NPS 20 Pipeline while it remains in service.		
7 8		3.1	What other alternatives and alternative routes were considered by the City for installation of the proposed 250 mm water main and 450 mm sanitary sewer				
9			3.1.1	When we	ere these alternatives and alternative routes considered?		
10 11			3.1.2		describe the technical, cost and schedule differences between es and alternative routes.		
12			3.1.3	Please p	rovide copies of any alternatives analysis conducted by the City.		
13 14		3.2	•		the City to proceed with installation of a 250 mm water main and sewer without relocating or removing the NPS 20 IP gas line?		
15			3.2.1	If not, wh	ny?		
16 17		3.3		at year(s) o nm sanitary	does the City anticipate installing its new 250 mm water main and y sewer?		
18			3.3.1	At what s	stage are the City's plans for this work?		
19				3.3.1.1	Has the budget for this work been approved? If not, why?		
20 21				3.3.1.2	Has a request for proposals or tendering for this work been initiated by the City?		
22							
23	4.0	Refer	ence:	Exhibit (C1-8, City Evidence		
24		On page 9 the City states:					
25 26		The City believes that FEI's position does not have due regard to the following causes of damage to the Como Lake Avenue curb lanes:					



Submission Date: November 15, 2018

FEI Information Request (IR) No. 1 to City of Coquitlam (City) on Phase Two Evidence

1 2				merous lateral cuts for relocation of many of the more than 800 lateral ities and other services that cross the Project route (as described above);	
3 4		4.1	By "Project route", does the City mean Como Lake Avenue or the trench for the NPS 30 IP gas line?		
5		4.2	What o	does the City mean by "cuts for relocation"?	
6 7		4.3		the City agree that the trench for the NPS 30 IP gas line will not cross all the lateral utilities and other services?	
8			4.3.1	If not, why?	
9 10		4.4		he City agree that not all of the lateral utilities and other services crossed trench for the NPS 30 IP gas line will need to be cut?	
11			4.4.1	If not, why?	
12 13		4.5	Is it the City's standard practice to conduct curb to curb paving its own latera utility or service cuts?		
14			4.5.1	If yes, please provide the standard.	
15 16			4.5.2	If yes, please provide evidence where this standard has been applied consistently.	
17 18		4.6		e City's standard practice to require other third party utilities to undertake curb paving following lateral utility or service cuts?	
19			4.6.1	If yes, please provide the standard.	
20 21			4.6.2	If yes, please provide details about where such curb to curb paving has been required and how often is has been the case.	
22					
23	5.0	Refer	ence:	Exhibit B-12, FEI Phase 2 Additional Evidence, Appendix B	
24		On pa	ge 9 the	WSP Report states:	
25 26 27			of serv	ding on these factors, the distresses evident in a pavement, and the level vice expectations of the municipality, the typical service life of a municipal pavement in the Lower Mainland region can likely range between 12 to	



Submission Date: November 15, 2018

FEI Information Request (IR) No. 1 to City of Coquitlam (City) on Phase Two Evidence

1 2			-	s years, with many arterial pavements typically seeing rehabilitation cycles range of 20 to 30 years.	
3 4		5.1	Does the City agree that this is an accurate description of the service life arterial pavement in the Lower Mainland?		
5			5.1.1	If not, why?	
6		5.2	Does t	he City agree that this description would apply to Como Lake Avenue?	
7			5.2.1	If not, why?	
8 9 10 11		5.3	Does the City agree that the WSP Report will help clarify whether any post-construction pavement damage was likely a result of FEI construction activities related to pre-existing conditions within the Project work area on Como I Avenue?		
12			5.3.1	If not, why?	
13 14 15			5.3.2	If the City does not agree, what additional information should be gathered or provided to access the pre-utility construction condition of Como Lake Avenue?	
17	6.0	Refer	ence:	Exhibit B-12, FEI Phase 2 Additional Evidence, Appendix B	
18		On pa	In our opinion, based on the observed surface conditions of the pavement including the type, severity, and scope of distresses observed along Como Lak Avenue and Spuraway Ave, several sections of these roadways will likely need full width rehabilitation treatment or extensive repairs within the next five to to years.		
19 20 21 22 23					
24 25		6.1	Does the City agree that this is an accurate assessment of the surface condition of Como Lake Avenue?		
26			6.1.1	If not, why?	
27 28		6.2		ne City conducted any assessments regarding the surface condition of Lake Avenue roadway?	
29			6.2.1	If yes, please provide copies of the assessments.	



Submission Date: November 15, 2018

FEI Information Request (IR) No. 1 to City of Coquitlam (City) on Phase Two Evidence

Page 7

1	6.3	Has the City prepared any rehabilitation plans with respect to the Como Lake
2		Avenue roadway?

6.3.1 If yes, please provide the City's plans and schedule for rehabilitation by section of road along Como Lake Avenue to address current assessed condition.

6

3

4

5