



AUC

Alberta Utilities Commission

AltaLink Management Ltd. and EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc.

**Heartland Amendment Application
Structure 175 and 176 Repositioning**

March 27, 2013



The Alberta Utilities Commission

Decision 2013-119: AltaLink Management Ltd. and EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc.
Heartland Amendment Application
Structure 175 and 176 Repositioning
Application No. 1608631
Proceeding ID No. 2007

March 27, 2013

Published by

The Alberta Utilities Commission
Fifth Avenue Place, Fourth Floor, 425 First Street S.W.
Calgary, Alberta
T2P 3L8

Telephone: 403-592-8845
Fax: 403-592-4406

Website: www.auc.ab.ca

Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Background	2
2.1	The Heartland application	2
2.2	Groot Farms Ltd.	3
2.3	Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin.....	3
2.4	The amendment application	4
2.5	Process steps and hearing for the amendment application.....	4
3	Was the consultation on the amendment application adequate in the circumstances? .	4
3.1	The Heartland applicants.....	4
3.2	Groot Farms Ltd.	5
3.3	William Procinsky and Beverly Durnin	6
3.4	Commission findings	7
4	Is approval of the new locations for towers 175 and 176 in the public interest?	8
4.1	The Heartland applicants.....	8
4.2	Groot Farms Ltd.	9
4.3	William Procinsky and Beverly Durnin	10
4.4	Commission findings	10
5	Decision	11
	Appendix 1 – Proceeding participants,	13
	Appendix 2 – Oral hearing – registered appearances	14

**AltaLink Management Ltd. and
EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc.**

**Heartland Amendment Application
Structure 175 and 176 Repositioning**

**Decision 2013-119
Application No. 1608631
Proceeding ID No. 2007**

1 Introduction

1. In this decision the Alberta Utilities Commission (AUC or the Commission) decides whether to approve an application by AltaLink Management Ltd. and EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc. (the Heartland applicants) to amend the location of two transmission towers on the Heartland transmission line. Specifically, the Heartland applicants sought approval to change the locations of towers 175 and 176 of the Heartland transmission line.

2. Tower 176 is located on the southeast quarter of Section 5, Township 56, Range 22, west of the fourth Meridian (SE 5-56-22 W4M). The owners of this quarter section did not object to the application. However, this quarter section is leased by Groot Farms Ltd. (Groot Farms) for potato seed production. Groot Farms objected to the amendment application because it considered the consultation for the amendment to be inadequate and it continued to have concerns about the impact of the amended location on its farming operations.

3. Tower 175 is located on the northeast quarter of Section 32, Township 55, Range 22, west of the fourth Meridian (NE 32-55-22 W4M). This quarter section, and the quarter section to the south (SE 32-55-22 W4M), are owned by Mr. William Procinsky and Ms. Beverly Durnin. Four other towers (towers 171-174) will also be located on the lands owned by Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin. These interveners objected to the new location for Tower 175 proposed in the amendment application because of concerns about consultation and impacts to future farming operations.

4. The following map shows the area of application, including the original and proposed locations for towers 175 and 176.

8. The preferred east route was approved on November 1, 2011, in Decision 2011-436¹ (the Heartland decision). The Commission attached six conditions to its approval of the Heartland application. Condition 6 related specifically to Tower 176 and reads as follows:

6. The applicants work with Groot Farms Ltd., the relevant municipal authorities and Suncor Energy Inc. to further explore the possibility of moving structure T176 as proposed in SE 5-56-22-W4 further into the southeast corner, without encroaching on the expansion plans for Highway 825 or significantly impacting the industrial yard site owned by Suncor Energy Inc. If structure T176 can be repositioned to the satisfaction of Groot Farms Ltd., the relevant municipal authorities and Suncor Energy Inc., the applicants must file an amendment that shows the repositioning of structure T176. If structure T176 cannot be repositioned, the applicants must provide an account of its consultations with the parties and the reasons why it could not be repositioned.²

2.2 Groot Farms Ltd.

9. Groot Farms was a registered participant in the Heartland hearing. It was part of a group of farmers who farmed lands affected by the Heartland project known in the Heartland hearing as the “potato producers”. The potato producers supported the preferred route applied for in the Heartland application. They participated in the hearing to protect their interests given the existence of an alternate route (Segment option 8-1) that had been the original preferred route for the transmission line and could, if it had been approved, have a significantly greater impact upon their collective farming operations than the final preferred route filed by the applicants.

10. At the Heartland hearing Mr. Groot (of Groot Farms) raised a concern about the impact of Tower 176 on his farming operations. In response, the Commission directed the Heartland applicants to work with Groot Farms and other parties to determine if Tower 176 could be repositioned to decrease the impact on farming operations. That direction was made a condition of the Commission’s approval of the Heartland application (Condition 6).

2.3 Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin

11. Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin were also registered participants in the Heartland proceeding; however, prior to the commencement of that hearing, they signed right-of-way agreements with the Heartland applicants that allowed towers 171 to 175 to be placed on their lands.³ While Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin attended parts of the Heartland hearing they did not file evidence or argument.

12. Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin asked the Commission to review and vary the Heartland decision after it had been issued. In the review proceeding, Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin, who referred to themselves as “Aspen Valley Farms”, expressed concern about the approved route across their farm and the impacts that the approved route will have on their agricultural operations. The Commission held a public hearing to consider six separate review requests,

¹ Decision 2011-436: AltaLink Management Ltd. and EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc. Heartland Transmission Project, Application No. 1606609, Proceeding ID No. 457, November 1, 2011.

² Decision 2011-436, page 273.

³ This is the existing right of way on Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin’s lands. Although the parties discussed re-negotiating these agreements in 2011, that did not occur.

including the request of Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin. The Commission denied all of the requests and provided its reasons in Decision [2012-124](#).⁴

2.4 The amendment application

13. The Heartland applicants propose to move the location for construction of Tower 176 47 metres south and 23 metres east (See Figure 1). They advise that there were two constraints limiting their ability to move the location for Tower 176 closer into the southeast corner of the quarter. The first constraint is a Pembina Pipeline Corporation's (Pembina) pipeline which is south of the structure. The second constraint is Highway 825 to the east.

14. The proposed change to the location of Tower 176 also requires a change to the location of Tower 175 by seven metres to the east to avoid a change in tower type and an increase in tower size at that location. The revised location for Tower 175 remains in the right-of-way on Mr. Procinsky's and Ms. Durnin's lands.

2.5 Process steps and hearing for the amendment application

15. The process steps taken for this proceedings were as follows:

- The Heartland applicants filed the amendment application, Application No. 1608631, on July 10, 2012.
- The Commission issued information requests to the Heartland applicants on August 29, 2012. AltaLink responded to the information request on September 12, 2012.
- The Commission issued a notice of application on October 5, 2012, with a deadline to file submissions on or before October 26, 2012.
- The Commission issued a notice of hearing on December 20, 2012, with a hearing date of February 13, 2013. That hearing date was later rescheduled to February 28, 2013.
- The Commission held a hearing in Edmonton, Alberta on February 28, 2013, to consider the amendment application.

3 Was the consultation on the amendment application adequate in the circumstances?

3.1 The Heartland applicants

16. The Heartland applicants stated that they consulted with all of the parties potentially affected by their proposed amendments. They reported that both Pembina and Alberta Transportation agreed to the proposed changes and noted that the repositioning of Tower 176 would not impact Suncor Energy Inc.'s (Suncor) yard site across from that tower.

17. The Heartland applicants filed a letter summarizing their communication with Mr. Groot. That communication took place by telephone, email and in person. They noted that it was Mr. Groot's preference that the structure be removed entirely from the SE 5-56-22-W4M or, in

⁴ Decision 2012-124: AltaLink Management Ltd. and EPCOR Distribution & Transmission Inc. Decision on Request for Review and Variance of AUC Decision 2011-436 – Heartland Transmission Project, Applications No. 1607924, No. 1607942, No. 1607994, No. 1608030 and No. 1608033, Proceeding ID No. 1592, May 10, 2012.

the alternative, that it be moved as close to the southeast corner of the quarter as possible. If the structure was to remain on the quarter, Mr. Groot asked for winter construction and the use of rig matting to preserve soil.

18. The Heartland applicants explained that they were unsuccessful in setting up a meeting with all of the potentially affected stakeholders after Mr. Groot asked them to do so. It was their evidence that Alberta Transportation would not agree to attend such a meeting.

19. The Heartland applicants stated that they filed the amendment application in July 2012 using the AUC proceeding number for the original Heartland hearing (Proceeding ID No. 457). It was their expectation that notice of the amendment application would then be sent to interested parties through the AUC's Electronic Proceeding System. The Heartland applicants stated that it was not until counsel for Groot Farms contacted them in September 2012 that they realized the amendment application had been assigned a new proceeding number and that interested parties had not been notified by the Commission's Electronic Proceeding System through Proceeding ID No. 457.

20. The Heartland applicants acknowledged that they had committed to Mr. Groot to hold off on the construction of Tower 177 until Condition 6 had been satisfied; however, they explained at the hearing that they began construction on Tower 177 in September 2012 because by that time the issue of Condition 6 had been brought forward to the Commission in the amendment application.

21. The Heartland applicants included in their reply evidence a detailed history of their consultation with Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin. They explained that they originally believed that they would require a new right-of-way to accommodate the relocation of Tower 175. However, they later determined that their existing right-of-way could accommodate the seven metre shift in location necessary to accommodate the re-positioning of Tower 176.

3.2 Groot Farms Ltd.

22. Mr. Groot was not satisfied with the consultation efforts of the Heartland applicants. He submitted that the consultation was not in good faith and only occurred because he initiated contact with them. He explained that he took this step after he was contacted by land agents acting on the Heartland applicants' behalf who were unaware of Condition 6.

23. Mr. Groot submitted that he read Condition 6 as requiring the Heartland applicants to consult with all of the affected stakeholders at the same time rather than individually. He stated that joint consultation would have been "the best way to understand everyone's side of the story and come up with a possible compromise".⁵ Mr. Groot reported that when he approached the Heartland applicants in May 2012 to set up such a meeting he was told that Alberta Transportation "had no desire" to meet with him.⁶

24. Mr. Groot submitted that the Heartland applicants agreed to look at options for moving Tower 176 farther into the southwest corner of the quarter or off the quarter entirely. He explained that when the Heartland applicants got back to him they had been able to move the tower further into the corner but would not consider moving it off the quarter. He stated that in

⁵ Transcript, Volume 1, page 70.

⁶ Transcript, Volume 1, page 71.

subsequent conversations with the Heartland applicants they discussed potential mitigation to the impacts on the quarter such as winter construction and the use of rig matting.

25. Mr. Groot stated that after the discussions on mitigation, he heard nothing further from the Heartland applicants. He stated that he tried to contact them when construction began on Tower 177 in September 2012, but his two phone calls were not returned. He then instructed his lawyer to contact the Heartland applicants directly and it was at that time that he learned that the amendment application had been filed in July.

26. Mr. Groot later contacted Alberta Transportation and was told by an Operations Supervisor in that government department that they would have no problems meeting with him to discuss the issue. They also told him that they did not have an issue with transmission lines crossing more than one road, which, in Mr. Groot's recollection was contrary to what the Heartland applicants had told him.

27. Mr. Groot emphasized that he did not believe that the Heartland applicants had fulfilled Condition 6 and stated that he would not have participated in the hearing if they had respectfully consulted with him.

3.3 William Procinsky and Beverly Durnin

28. Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin asserted that the Heartland applicants did not work with them to address their concerns with respect to the placement of towers on their lands.

29. Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin expressed specific concerns about the Heartland applicants failure to address their concerns about what they described as an "orphaned parcel" surrounding Tower 171. They explained that this parcel was located on the south side of the Sturgeon River and was separated from the rest of the land they owned. They stated that they had no access to that parcel and that, as part of their negotiations with the Heartland applicants to move Tower 175, they had also discussed the sale of the orphaned parcel to the Heartland applicants. In the alternative, Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin stated that they asked the Heartland applicants for an access agreement on their right-of-way so they could access the orphaned parcel. However, Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin stated that they did not get a response to this proposal from the Heartland applicants.

30. Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin explained that their concern about how the orphaned parcel relates to their responsibility under their right-of-way agreement to do weed control there. They stated that the orphaned parcel is currently farmed by a neighbour and so weed control is not necessary at this time; however, they submitted that once Tower 171 goes up, that area will not be cultivated and they will have no access to do the required weed control.

31. Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin explained that they had been approached by the Heartland applicants in August 2011 to see if they wanted to re-negotiate their right-of-way agreements. Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin stated that they chose not to re-negotiate those agreements at that time because the Heartland applicants told them that they would lose \$100,000.00 if they terminated the existing agreements.

32. Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin also expressed concern that the Heartland applicants were relying on outdated information for their route planning. Specifically, they observed that the two

residences that the Heartland applicants stated they were trying to avoid on the Suncor lands had been torn down some time ago.

33. Another concern raised by Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin was their belief that the Heartland applicants encouraged them not to involve their lawyer in the re-negotiation of the right-of-way agreement to allow the re-positioning of Tower 175.

3.4 Commission findings

34. The Commission described the purposes of a consultation program in the original Heartland decision as follows:

To some degree, consultation is an extension and enhancement of the requirement to notify parties that may be directly and adversely affected by the Commission's decision on an application. In the Commission's view, effective consultation achieves three purposes. First, it allows parties to understand the nature of a proposed project. Second, it allows the applicant and the intervener to identify areas of concern. Third, it provides a reasonable opportunity for the parties to engage in meaningful dialogue and discussion with the goal of eliminating or mitigating to an acceptable degree the affected parties concerns about the project.⁷

35. In this case, the Commission considers Condition 6 to be the starting point for its consideration of the adequacy of the Heartland applicants' consultation for the amendment application.

36. Condition 6 required the Heartland applicants to consult with specific parties with the express goal of moving the location for Tower 176 further into the southeast corner of SE 5-56-22 W4M. Condition 6 is silent as to whether that consultation was to take place jointly, as proposed by Mr. Groot, or separately, as was done by the Heartland applicants.

37. The Commission finds that the consultation conducted by the Heartland applicants for the amendment application generally achieved the purposes described in the passage above. The evidence reveals that the Heartland applicants presented their first proposal to Mr. Groot on May 17, 2012, in which they proposed to move the location of Tower 176 south of its approved location. In response to Mr. Groot's continued concerns about the tower's location, the Heartland applicants further revised the proposed location by moving it to the east as well. The evidence also establishes that the Heartland applicants agreed to other mitigation measures to address Mr. Groot's concerns about the impacts of constructing Tower 176 on his farming operation.

38. Similarly, the Commission concludes that the Heartland applicants' consultation with Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin also met the purposes described in Decision 2011-436. The evidence shows that the Heartland applicants explained the amendment project to Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin and took into account their concerns about the amendment by continuing to use a tangent tower on their lands and by minimizing the change in location of Tower 175 to a seven metre shift to the east.

39. The Commission also finds that it was not unreasonable for the Heartland applicants to approach Pembina and Alberta Transportation to discuss the relocation of Tower 176 before discussing the matter with Mr. Groot. Highway 825 and the Pembina Pipeline imposed material

⁷ Supra note 1 at paragraph 283, page 57.

limitations on the Heartland applicants ability to move Tower 176 further into the corner. In the Commission's view it made sense for the Heartland applicants to determine just how far to the south and the east they could move the tower before presenting an option to Mr. Groot.

40. While the Commission considers that the Heartland applicants' consultation generally achieved the purposes of a consultation program, as described in Decision 2011-435, it is of the view that the Heartland applicants' communications with Mr. Groot, Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin could have been better in some circumstances.

41. The Commission's first concern is that the Heartland applicants did not initiate consultation with Mr. Groot on Condition 6 until prompted to do so by Mr. Groot. Second, the Commission finds that the Heartland applicants failed to "close the loop" with Mr. Groot with respect to their amendment application as required by AUC Rule 007: *Applications for Power Plants, Substations, Transmission Lines, and Industrial System Designations*. While the Commission understands that the Heartland applicants believed that Mr. Groot would have been notified automatically through the AUC's Electronic Proceeding System, given that Condition 6 was imposed specifically to optimize the placement of Tower 176 for the benefit of Mr. Groot, the Commission would have expected the Heartland applicants to personally notify Mr. Groot of its intention to file the amendment application before the application was filed.

42. A third concern the Commission has with the consultation is the number of instances where the accounts of various conversations between the Heartland applicants and Mr. Groot, Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin differed drastically. A good example of this is Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin's claim that the Heartland applicants discouraged them from consulting with their lawyer and the Heartland applicants' counter-claim that they had in fact encouraged them to consult their lawyer. While the Commission need not make a determination on this issue in this instance, it does highlight the need for clear communication between applicants and interveners. One possible solution to such confusion in the future may be to circulate meeting minutes for all participants to sign-off on as was the customary practice for consultations on the Heartland project.

43. Having regard to the foregoing, the Commission concludes that the Heartland applicants consultation on the amendment application was adequate. However, the Commission expects that the Heartland applicants will review their processes with respect to closing the loop on consultation to avoid similar confusion in the future. The Commission also encourages the Heartland applicants to continue to work with Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin with the goal of some form of access agreement that will allow Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin to access the orphaned parcel so that they may effectively fulfill their weed control obligations.

4 Is approval of the new locations for towers 175 and 176 in the public interest?

4.1 The Heartland applicants

44. The Heartland applicants stated that that the purpose of the amendment was to move the location for Tower 176 as far as they reasonably could into the southeast corner of the SE 5-56-22-W4M. They explained that there were two physical limitations in that corner. First, Pembina's pipeline runs beside the south boundary of the quarter section; second, Highway 825 is located immediately to the east of the quarter section.

45. The Heartland applicants stated that given these two limitations the most they could move Tower 176 was 47 metres south and 23 metres east. They explained that the net effect was to reduce the amount of stranded acreage on the quarter section from 5.3 acres to 3.6 acres. They stated that this move would allow for future expansion of Highway 825 and would ensure sufficient separation from Pembina's pipeline to allow for the safe construction and operation of the tower and any necessary work on the pipeline.

46. The Heartland applicants also described a third, engineering-related predicament. Specifically, they explained that if they moved Tower 176 any further to the east, they would have to use a larger "c-type angle structure" at Tower 175 to accommodate the change in deflection. They stated that the larger tower would be more expensive and have a larger footprint. They submitted that the extra expense and impacts associated with the larger tower were not worth the additional five to seven metres they might gain by moving Tower 176 further east.

47. At the hearing, the Heartland applicants emphasized that, regardless of its final location, Tower 176 will be one of the largest and most expensive towers used for the Heartland project. They stated that a primary consideration for them was avoiding the potential for its future relocation, either because of a widening of Highway 825 or to accommodate work on Pembina's pipeline.

48. The Heartland applicants reported that they never considered removing Tower 176 entirely from the SE 5-56-22-W4M, as suggested by Mr. Groot, because that would have been inconsistent with the express wording of Condition 6.

49. The Heartland applicants argued that the changes to towers 175 and 176 proposed in the application were consistent with Condition 6 and that approval of the application was in the public interest. They concluded that the new location responds to Mr. Groot's concerns without imposing an unreasonable impact on Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin.

4.2 Groot Farms Ltd.

50. Mr. Groot explained that his concern with regard to the location of Tower 176 related to the limitations it imposed upon his ability to protect his crops from disease. His primary concern was a disease called "late blight" which, he said, can "decimate fields in a matter of days if not controlled".⁸ Mr. Groot stated that his normal practice is to spray fungicide on crops from ground rigs. However, when the ground is too wet to use ground rigs it is necessary to spray these crops aerially. He stated that with towers and wires in the way the corners and headlands of a field cannot be sprayed and can become havens for the late blight.

51. Mr. Groot agreed that the proposed location for Tower 176 was better than the current location which will allow him better, more productive use of the land he leases. However, Mr. Groot believed that the location could be further improved.

52. Mr. Groot argued that it was unlikely that Highway 825 would be expanded because Highway 28, which is nearby, is going to be expanded. He also noted that the Heartland applicants conceded at the hearing that it was possible to move Tower 176 further to the east. Mr. Groot submitted that there was no documentary evidence to support the Heartland

⁸ Transcript, Volume 1, pages 68 to 69.

applicant's contention that there was an engineering-related design constraint that prevented a move further to the east.

53. Mr. Groot emphasized that the SE 5-56-22-W4M is the highest rated agricultural land in the county and that his goal in participating in the proceeding was to preserve as much of that land as possible. Mr. Groot argued that Condition 6 had not been met by the Heartland applicants. He submitted that the Heartland applicants should be required to further investigate moving the tower to the east and asked that additional meetings between all of the affected parties, including Alberta Transportation, take place.

4.3 William Procinsky and Beverly Durnin

54. Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin told the Commission that the new location for Tower 175 would increase the impacts upon them more than the original location would have and they asked the Commission to deny the amendment application. Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin explained that the approved location for Tower 175 is on sloped land whereas the proposed location, seven metres to the east, is on flatter land which is better for farming. They also explained that if they ever extended their existing shelterbelt along the eastern boundary of their property they would be unable to move machinery between the extended shelterbelt and Tower 175.

55. Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin argued that the Heartland applicants had not demonstrated that there is a need to change the current locations of towers 175 and 176. However, it was their position that if the Commission decided to change the location of Tower 176, then their clear preference would be the approval of the existing tower type at the amended location as opposed to a larger tower type to accommodate any further movement to the east of Tower 176.

4.4 Commission findings

56. The Commission finds that it is in the public interest to approve the amendment application filed by the Heartland applicants. In the Commission's view, the proposed amendment is consistent with the Commission's direction in Condition 6. Specifically, the Commission finds that the revised location of Tower 176 reduces, to the degree possible, the impacts on the farming operations of Mr. Groot while maintaining the necessary separation from the Pembina pipeline and Highway 825. When arriving at this conclusion, the Commission had specific regard for Mr. Groot's evidence that the SE 5-56-22-W4M is the highest rated agricultural land in the County. In the Commission's view, the Heartland applicants have optimized this agricultural resource to the extent possible by changing the location of Tower 176 at the proposed site.

57. The Commission recognizes that approving the amendment application may result in a slight increase in the impacts experienced by Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin. However, the Commission observes that the seven metre change in location of Tower 175 is within the right-of-way that these interveners negotiated with the Heartland applicants. To the degree that future farming operations on the property may be impacted by the slight shift of Tower 175, the Commission considers that those impacts will be mitigated by the compensation paid to Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin under their right-of-way agreement with the Heartland applicants.

58. The Commission finds that it would not be prudent to locate Tower 176 any further to the east as suggested by Mr. Groot for two reasons. First, the Commission accepts the evidence of the Heartland applicants that while the tower could be moved further to the east by five to seven metres, that change would require the use of a larger, more expensive tower structure at Tower 175. This was the sworn evidence of Mr. Watson, the Heartland applicants' witness and was consistent with the tolerances for deflection of the various tower types shown in Exhibit 22.⁹ This evidence was uncontroverted. In the Commission's view, any benefit associated with the seven metres gained by the move is far outweighed by the extra expense and the incremental impacts to Mr. Procinsky and Ms. Durnin associated with the need for a larger structure at Tower 175.

59. The second reason that the Commission considers it imprudent to move Tower 176 any further to the east is the prospect of widening Highway 825 sometime during the life of the project. While the Commission recognizes that there are no immediate plans reflected in the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan¹⁰ to expand Highway 825, that does not preclude the possibility of such expansion in the future. Given the considerable time, effort and expense that may be required to move this tower, the Commission considers it reasonable to approve a location that could accommodate a future widening of the highway.

60. Having regard to the foregoing, the Commission concludes that is in the public interest to approve Application No. 1608631.

5 Decision

61. After careful consideration of the record of this proceeding, and for the reasons provided elsewhere in this decision, the Commission finds that the Heartland applicants consultation for the amendment application was adequate in the circumstances and that approval of the amendment application is in the public interest having regard to the social and economic effects of the project and its effects on the environment.

62. Due to the minor nature of the amendments approved in this decision the Commission finds it unnecessary to amend the associated permits and licenses.

⁹ Exhibit 22.01, Reply Evidence of the applicants, Appendix C, PDF page 13.

¹⁰ Capital Region Board Integrated Regional Master Plan July, 2011.

Dated on March 27, 2013.

The Alberta Utilities Commission

(original signed by)

Willie Grieve
Chair

(original signed by)

Gwen Day
Acting Commission Member

(original signed by)

Clifford Goerz
Acting Commission Member

Appendix 1 – Proceeding participants

Name of organization (abbreviation) counsel or representative
AltaLink Management Ltd. P. Feldberg
W. Groot D. Bishop
W. Procinsky B. Durnin A. Lawson

The Alberta Utilities Commission
Commission Panel W. Grieve, Chair G. Day C. Goerz
Commission Staff JP. Mousseau (Commission counsel) T. Chan K. Taylor

Appendix 2 – Oral hearing – registered appearances

Name of organization (abbreviation) counsel or representative	Witnesses
AltaLink Management Ltd. P. Feldberg	D. Watson K. Klages
W. Groot D. Bishop	W. Groot
W. Procinsky B. Durnin A. Lawson	W. Procinsky