## Site C Review - Responses to questions raised by Deloitte August 16th, 2017

## **CONFIDENTIAL**

	Date/Source of Question: Follow up from August 16, 2017 at 10:23am)  Response provided by:				
Respo					
Funct	tional Approver:				
Ques	tion: Requested da	ita on current facilities an	d contracts - Capac	ity factors?	
Respo	onse:				
	to the table below fo	or the requested information	on the capacity facto	r at BC Hydro's largest	seven
-	Our forecast capa expected changes  o For examat the pradditions o Note tha not curre planning o Other po Capacity	pple, the forecast Mica capac oject (units 5 and 6), while the s. t Revelstoke Unit 6 is not inc ently committed (although it	ect committed planned city factor would reflect the current capacity fact cluded in the forecast is expected to be con capacity identified by Replacement, are also	ed upgrades at facilities of the recent addition of ctor would not reflect to capacity factor as that structed at some point of BC Hydro, e.g. GMS U	of capac these resourc in our 1-5
		Plant Capacity (MW) (Current)	Capacity Factor (Current)	Capacity Factor (Forecast)	
GM	Shrum (GMS)	2,730	55%	52%	
	ce Canyon (PCN)	694	51%	48%	
Mica (MCA)		2,318	35%	29%	
	elstoke (REV)	2,480	36%	36%	
Koot	enay Canal (KCL)	583	62%	62%	
Seve	n Mile (SEV)	805	44%	43%	
Bridg	ge River (BRR)	478	59%	59%	

We offer caution on the use of the above data to determine potential for expansion of generating capacity at a facility. In BC Hydro's experience the potential to increase generating capacity at a hydro facility is highly dependent on the specific facility conditions, including site geology/topography, the dam type, and local hydrology.