



Alberta Electric System Operator

Beartrap 940S Substation Needs Identification Document

June 20, 2013

The Alberta Utilities Commission

Decision 2013-240: Alberta Electric System Operator

Beartrap 940S Substation

Application No. 1608930

Proceeding ID No. 2196

June 20, 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

1 Introduction and background

1. On October 19, 2012, the Alberta Electric System Operator (AESO) filed an application, registered as Application No. 1608930, with the Alberta Utilities Commission (AUC or the Commission) seeking approval of the needs identification document (NID) for the construction of a new point-of-delivery substation, designated as Beartrap 940S substation and a new 144-kilovolt (kV) transmission line to connect the proposed Beartrap 940S substation to the existing 144-kV transmission line 7L24 using a T-tap configuration.
2. On November 23, 2012, ATCO Electric Ltd. (ATCO) filed an application, registered as Application No. 1609059, with the AUC pursuant to sections 14 and 15 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*, requesting approval to construct and operate the facilities identified in the AESO's NID application.
3. In accordance with Section 15.4 of the *Hydro and Electric Energy Act*, the AESO and ATCO requested that the two applications be considered together. The Commission combined these applications under Proceeding ID No. 2196.
4. The Commission issued a notice of applications and hearing on March 8, 2013, with a deadline to file submissions by April 5, 2013. The Commission re-issued the notice on April 4, 2013, after concerns were raised that the notice was not received by some stakeholders. The deadline to file submissions was extended to May 3, 2013. Nine parties filed submissions by the deadline date, or shortly thereafter, in response to the notice of applications and hearing, with another submission received a month later. None of the submissions expressed concerns with the NID application.

2 Discussion

5. The AESO, in accordance with its responsibilities pursuant to Section 29 of the *Electric Utilities Act*, must provide system access service on the transmission system in a manner that provides market participants with a reasonable opportunity to exchange electricity. The NID was prepared in response to a request by Enbridge Pipeline (Athabasca) Inc. (Enbridge) for a new point-of-delivery substation to serve its proposed pump station in the area.
6. The transmission facilities proposed to meet the need to serve Enbridge's pump station (the substation) would be constructed in two stages. The first stage would consist of a new substation, designated as Beartrap 940S substation and a 144-kV single-circuit transmission line, to be designated as 7LA24, to connect the Beartrap 940S substation to the existing 144-kV transmission line 7L24. The new substation would contain one 144/4.16-kV transformer rated at approximately 15/20/25-megavolt-amperes (MVA). The new transmission line would be used to

connect the substation to transmission line 7L24 using a T-tap configuration. The second stage would consist of adding a second 144/4.16-kV 15/20/25-MVA transformer to the substation.

7. No alternate transmission developments were considered as the closest existing distribution facility, Bonnyville 700S substation, could not be upgraded in a way to reliably supply Enbridge's pump station.

8. The AESO directed ATCO to conduct, on its behalf, a participant involvement program with respect to the NID application in accordance with AUC Rule 007: *Applications for Power Plants, Substations, Transmission Lines, and Industrial System Designations* (AUC Rule 007).

9. ATCO conducted a participant involvement program for its facility application and for the NID application on behalf of the AESO. ATCO directed mail-outs to all landowners, residents and occupants within 800 metres of the proposed developments as well as to government agencies, organizations, First Nations, and industry companies. The AESO advertised its intention to file the proposed NID in the Bonnyville Nouvelle newspaper on October 2, 2012.

10. The AESO submitted that the first stage of the development would cost \$29,865,213 (+20/-10%) with the customer portion estimated to be \$28,983,129, and the system portion estimated to be \$882,084. The second stage of the development is estimated to cost \$6,950,819 (+20/-10%) with the entire cost allocated to the customer.

11. On May 8, 2013, the Commission received a letter from the AESO requesting approval of the NID application prior to the hearing. To support its request, the AESO submitted that of the nine submissions the Commission had received, one was in support of both the NID and facility applications, one did not specify any concerns with either application and requested that a hearing not be held, three related only to ATCO's facility application, two inserted question marks next to the box titled "Both the NID and facility applications" but only raised routing-related concerns, and two referenced the NID application number, but did not raise concerns with the need for the proposed development. The AESO submitted that the objections were related to ATCO's related facility Application No. 1608930 and that it was clear that the submissions did not relate to the determination of the need for the project.

12. The Commission responded to the AESO in its May 17, 2013 letter. The Commission stated that the two submissions with question marks written next to the statement asking if the Commission should hold a hearing on both the need and facility applications, and the fact that one intervener filed a submission on the form for a need application suggested to the Commission that these interveners may not have fully understood the difference between the need and facility applications. The Commission advised that it intended to wait and see if any intervener filed evidence related to the need of the proposed project before making a determination on the AESO's request for approval of the NID application.

13. The AESO submitted another letter to the Commission on June 10, 2013, after the deadline for submitting intervener evidence, requesting the NID application be approved. The AESO stated that the interveners, who had placed question marks beside the NID application checkbox, are members of the Red Route Group, which stated in its evidence that it was concerned with the routing of the proposed transmission line, not the NID application. The

intervener who submitted a statement of intent to participate on the form for a need application did not file further submissions.

14. On June 4, 2013, the Commission received another statement of intent to participate, but this submission did not indicate any concerns with AESO's NID application.

3 Findings

15. The Commission has reviewed the NID application and has determined that it contains the information required by the *Electric Utilities Act*, the *Transmission Regulation*, and AUC Rule 007.

16. Since no interested party has asserted that the AESO's assessment of need was technically deficient or that approval of the NID is not in the public interest, pursuant to Section 38(e) of the *Transmission Regulation*, the Commission must consider the AESO's assessment of the need for the project to be correct.

4 Decision

17. Pursuant to Section 34 of the *Electric Utilities Act*, the Commission approves the NID for the project and grants the AESO the approval set out in Appendix 1 – Beartrap 940S Substation Needs Identification Document – Approval No. U2013-302 – June 20, 2013 (Appendix 1 will be distributed separately).

Dated on June 20, 2013.

The Alberta Utilities Commission

(original signed by)

Tudor Beattie, QC
Panel Chair

(original signed by)

Kay Holgate
Commission Member

(original signed by)

Patrick Brennan
Acting Commission Member