



**Diane Roy**  
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs

**Gas Regulatory Affairs Correspondence**  
Email: [gas.regulatory.affairs@fortisbc.com](mailto:gas.regulatory.affairs@fortisbc.com)

**Electric Regulatory Affairs Correspondence**  
Email: [electricity.regulatory.affairs@fortisbc.com](mailto:electricity.regulatory.affairs@fortisbc.com)

**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](mailto:diane.roy@fortisbc.com)  
[www.fortisbc.com](http://www.fortisbc.com)

June 8, 2017

B.C. Sustainable Energy Association  
c/o William J. Andrews, Barrister & Solicitor  
1958 Parkside Lane  
North Vancouver, B.C.  
V7G 1X5

Attention: Mr. William J. Andrews

Dear Mr. Andrews:

**Re: FortisBC Inc. (FBC)**  
**Project No. 3698896**

**2016 Long Term Electric Resource Plan (LTERP) and Long Term Demand Side Management Plan (LT DSM Plan)**

**FBC Information Request (IR) No. 1 on Intervener Evidence from B.C. Sustainable Energy Association and Sierra Club of British Columbia (BCSEA)**

---

In accordance with the Regulatory Timetable set by the British Columbia Utilities Commission Order G-197-16, attached is FBC IR No. 1 on the Intervener Evidence filed by BCSEA on the above noted Application.

If further information is required, please contact Joyce Martin at 250-368-0319.

Sincerely,

**FORTISBC INC.**

***Original signed:***

Diane Roy

Attachments

cc (email only): Commission Secretary  
Registered Parties

FortisBC Inc. (FBC or the Company) 2016 Long Term Electric Resource Plan (LTERP) and Long Term Demand Side Management (LT DSM) Plan	Submission Date: June 8, 2017
FBC Information Request (IR) No. 1 to B.C. Sustainable Energy Association and Sierra Club of British Columbia (BCSEA)	Page 1

## **1.0 Reference: Jurisdictional Comparisons**

### **Exhibit C5-5, page 4, footnote 3**

#### **The 2016 State Energy Efficiency Scorecard (2016 ACEEE State Scorecard)**

2016 ACEEE State Scorecard, p. 21: “There are some other possible metrics we do not use for scoring. We do not attempt to include program cost effectiveness or level of spending per unit of energy savings. All states have cost-effectiveness requirements for energy efficiency programs. However the wide diversity of measurement approaches across states makes comparison less than straightforward”.

- 1.1 Please confirm that the 2016 ACEEE State Scorecard, which is the basis for the electricity conservation information in the United States at p. 4 of Exhibit C5-5, does not provide data or information on the cost effectiveness of the electricity conservation spending and savings reported.
  - 1.1.1 If confirmed, please also confirm that the statements at p. 4 of Exhibit C5-5 regarding the DSM “savings goals” in other North American jurisdiction that are “often considerably larger than those contemplated by Fortis” do not account for the cost-effectiveness of the conservation measures being pursued in those other North American jurisdictions.
- 1.2 Please confirm that, according to the 2016 ACEEE State Scorecard, the total of all electricity savings as a percentage of sales in the U.S. in 2015 was 0.71%.
- 1.3 Please confirm that, according to the 2016 ACEEE State Scorecard, the median electricity savings as a percentage of sales in the U.S. in 2015 was 0.61%.
- 1.4 Please confirm that, according to the 2016 ACEEE State Scorecard, (i) there were 19 states in the U.S. that achieved electricity savings of 0.8% or greater of sales in 2015, and (ii) 32 states (including the District of Columbia) achieved electricity savings of less than 0.8% of sales in 2015.