

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: <u>diane.roy@fortisbc.com</u> www.fortisbc.com

February 28, 2018

British Columbia Public Interest Advocacy Centre Suite 208 – 1090 West Pender Street Vancouver, B.C. V6E 2N7

Attention: Ms. Leigha Worth, Executive Director

Dear Ms. Worth:

Re: FortisBC Inc. (FBC)

Project No. 1598934

Application for Approval of 2018 Demand-Side Management (DSM) Expenditures (the Application)

Response to the British Columbia Public Interest Advocacy Centre representing the British Columbia Old Age Pensioners' Organization, Disability Alliance BC, Council of Senior Citizens' Organizations of BC, and the Tenant Resource and Advisory Centre *et al.* (BCOAPO) Information Request (IR) No. 1

On November 15, 2017, FBC filed the Application referenced above. In accordance with the British Columbia Utilities Commission Order G-21-18 setting out the Regulatory Timetable for the review of the Application, FBC respectfully submits the attached response to BCOAPO IR No. 1.

If further information is required, please contact Sarah Wagner at (250) 469-6081.

Sincerely,

FORTISBC INC.

Original signed:

Diane Roy

Attachment

cc (email only): Commission Secretary Registered Parties



3

4

1 **1.0** Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 4

1.1 Please provide a schedule comparing the 2017 approved and actual results (spending and savings) at the same level of detail as Table 1.

5 **Response:**

6 The 2017 Approved and Preliminary Actual results are shown, by sector, in the table below. The

7 2017 Preliminary Actuals shown in the table below are still subject to final review before they

8 are finalized for filing in the 2017 Annual DSM Report that will be filed at the end of March 2018.

	2017 Ap	2017 Actual 2017 Approved (Preliminary)		
Sector	Savings MWh	Cost (\$000s)	Savings MWh	Cost (\$000s)
Residential	10,493	2,718	10,650	1,891
Commercial	13,666	3,131	16,127	4,023
Industrial	1,556	309	886	206
Subtotal	25,715	6,158	27,663	6,120
Supporting Initiatives		674		595
Portfolio		777		994
Subtotal Total Portfolio	25,715	7,609	27,663	7,709
Partners' Co-funding				400
Net Portfolio	25,715	7,609	27,663	7,309

- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 17
- 15

1.2 Where the variance between approved and actual is greater than 5% (spending or savings), please provide an explanation.

16 **Response:**

17 The Residential programs were within 1.5 percent of 2017 Plan savings and were underspent 18 by 30 percent. This was because the Residential Lighting program, which is the most cost 19 effective program, produced a higher percentage of the savings than was in the Plan. The Low 20 Income program, which is the largest proportion of the Residential program, achieved less than 21 30 percent of its savings targets and spending was less than 50 percent of Plan. The variance 22 is primarily due to the growth budgeted for in the 2017 Plan after the strong performance in 23 2016. However, FBC now believes that the strong 2016 performance was because 2016 was



- 1 the first full year of the Energy Conservation Assistance Program (ECAP) and it was received
- 2 well by an underserved market. In 2017 demand and participation in the program dropped off
- 3 creating the above stated variance. The 2018 Plan takes these experiences into consideration.
- 4 The Commercial sector overachieved on both savings (by 18 percent) and costs (by 28 percent). The Commercial Lighting Program was the primary reason for this success.
- 6 The Industrial sector is characterized by large projects undertaken by a small number of high-7 consuming customers that involve a higher investment by the customer than other projects and 8 by longer periods of time to implement and verify. It is therefore more difficult to forecast the 9 timing and size accurately. This was the cause of the Industrial sector underperforming by 10 43 percent in savings and 33 percent in costs.
- Expenditures on Supporting Initiatives were 12 percent below Plan because one project, a First
 Nation energy plan, was delayed and may be cancelled, and a second project, a behavioural
 campaign, was cancelled by the participant due to internal restructuring.
- After taking into account the \$208,000 in co-funding provided by project partners for Pilot projects (which is included in the \$400,000 in the Partners' Co-Funding line), the Portfolio expenditure was within one percent of Plan.

FORTIS BC^{**}

1 2.0 Reference: Exhibit B-2, Attachment 1.1, page14 (line 28) to

page 15 (line 11)

2 3

7

Exhibit B-2, Attachment 1.1, Appendix A, page A5

4 2.1 With respect to Table A2-1, for those initiatives where the DSM Regulation
5 requires/provides for the use of an alternative cost-effectiveness test to the TRC,
6 please provide the 2018 values using the alternative "test".

8 **Response:**

- 9 Only the Heat Pump and Customer Engagement Tools meet the criteria for the use of the
- 10 mTRC ratio (alternative "test"), which are shown in the table below. If the question is also
- 11 referring to the Utility Cost Test, all of the programs in the 2018 DSM Plan have a benefit cost
- 12 ratio greater than one (see Table A8-1).

Program		2017		2018			
		Appro	oved	Plan			
		Savings, system MWh	Cost (\$000s)	Savings , system MWh	Cost (\$000s)	TRC, net B/C ratio	mTRC, net B/C ratio
1	Home Renovation						
2	Home Renovation	364	206	1,203	300	1.1	n/a
3	Heat Pumps	781	253	395	167	0.9	1.0
4	Lighting	2,735	153	3,337	202	1.8	n/a
5	Appliances	126	71	215	159	2.1	n/a
6	Water Heating	17	28	38	25	1.8	n/a
7	New Home						
8	New Home	126	52	169	76	1.3	n/a
9	Income Qualified & Rentals						
10	Low Income	3,247	1,265	1,229	731	2.0	n/a
11	Rentals	0	0	306	53	3.4	n/a
12	Customer Engagement Tools	3,097	200	240	165	0.7	0.8
13	Non-program specific expenses		491		610		
14	Total	10,493	2,718	7,132	2,486	1.4	1.5



Advisory Centre (BCOAPO) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 4

1 3.0 **Reference:** Exhibit B-1, page 4 (Table 1) 2 Exhibit B-2, Attachment 1.1, page 7 3 Exhibit B-2, Attachment 1.1, Appendix A, pages A5 and A8 4 **Preamble:** FBC notes (page A8) that the lower 2018 budget proposed for low income 5 programs is reflective of the lower participation rates seen in 2017. 6 3.1 Please provide both budgeted/planned and actual low income program 7 participation rates for 2015, 2016 and 2017. In terms of participation rates, for 8 each year please provide: i) the number of ESKs distributed, ii) the number low 9 income dwellings receiving the basic ECAP service and iii) the number of 10 dwellings where the energy assessment performed under the ECAP program led to additional DSM measures being implemented. 11 12

13 Response:

14 The following table shows the budgeted/planned and actual low income program participation

15 rates for 2015, 2016 and 2017.

	# Participants - Plan			# Participants - Actual		
Low Income Program	2015	2016	2017	2015	2016	2017
ESK	1,000	1,000	750	779	1,362	819
ECAP	-*	2,650	1,862	_	1,062	804
ECAP Additional Measures	_*	150	38	-	15	2

16 *ECAP launched in 2016

17

18

- 19
- 20 In those cases where the ECAP energy assessment identifies that additional 3.2 21 DSM measures that could be undertaken, are there special low income programs 22 available to assist with the implementation of these measures (over and above 23 the DSM programs available to all residential customers)?
- 24

25 **Response:**

26 The ECAP energy assessment does not have a goal of identifying additional DSM measures 27 that could be undertaken. Thus, there are no special low income programs available to assist 28 with the implementation of additional DSM measures over and above the residential DSM 29 programs. The ECAP energy assessment focuses on searching for opportunities to install the



1 free measures that are included in that program as well as education on additional savings that 2 are possible through behavioral changes. 3 4 5 6 3.2.1 If yes, what are they and why is FBC not offering such programs? In 7 responding, please address the cost-effectiveness of such programs 8 within in the context of the DSM Regulation. 9 10 **Response:** 11 Please refer to the response to BCOAPO IR 1.3.2. 12 13 14 15 3.3 Has FBC undertaken any assessment or investigation as to why 2017 16 participation rates were lower than expected? 17 18 Response: 19 Please refer to the response to BCOAPO IR 1.1.2. A formal assessment has not been 20 conducted. The steps that FBC is taking to increase awareness and participation in the 21 program in 2018 are identified in the response to BCSEA IR 1.2.2. 22 23 24 25 3.3.1 If yes, what were the reasons? 26 27 **Response:** 28 Please refer to the response to BCOAPO IR 1.3.3. 29 30 31 32 3.4 FBC makes specific reference (page A8) to having made past efforts to 33 strengthen its outreach efforts regarding low income programs. Please describe 34 what there initiatives were and how successful they were.



2 Response:

Past efforts to strengthen outreach for low income programs beyond mass marketing effortsinclude:

- Outreach to local governments and MLA's offices to have them recommend ECAP and
 other FBC low income programs to their stakeholders' organizations (affordable housing
 committees, local community social service organizations (CSSOs), etc.);
- Direct marketing (presentations and collateral distribution) to CSSOs and non-profit
 housing societies; and
- Funding for Energy Managers for organizations working with non-profit housing societies (BCNPHA, BC Housing).
- 12

In an effort to further improve marketing efficacy, in mid-2017 FBC conducted an honoraria pilot project for CSSOs that provided them with financial support to promote ECAP and assist their clients with the application process. The pilot project was deemed successful and the honoraria program is being expanded beyond the pilot phase in 2018.

- These efforts resulted in modest increases in program participation in the last quarter of 2017.
 FBC intends to continue with its outreach with CSSOs and partner and governmental
 organizations and believes participation rates will further improve over time.
- 20
- 21
- 22 23

24

25

3.5 FBC also makes specific reference (page A8) to further strengthening its outreach efforts regarding low income programs. Please describe what new initiatives are planned for 2018.

26 27 **Response:**

- FBC has a number of initiatives planned to further strengthen its outreach efforts regarding low income programs, including:
- Expansion of its community social service organizations (CSSOs) honoraria pilot project to provide CSSOs an honorarium to complete the ECAP application on behalf of any clients that face challenges in completing the application independently. The project financially supports CSSOs to market ECAP through their existing marketing channels.
- Collaborated efforts with local governments to promote ECAP:

FORTIS BC		FortisBC Inc. (FBC or the Company) Application for Acceptance of 2018 Demand-Side Management (DS (the Application)	SM) Expenditures	Submission Date: February 28, 2018	
		Response to British Columbia Old Age Pensioner's Organization, Dis Council of Senior Citizen's Organizations of BC, and the Tenant Advisory Centre (BCOAPO) Information Request (IR) I	Resources and	Page 7	
1	C	Marketing through their existing communication c	hannels;		
2 3	C	ECAP program presentations to Affordable Ho committees; and	ousing and Po	overty Prevention	
4	C	Introductions to local CSSOs.			
5	• ECA	and low-income program presentations to additior	nal CSSOs.		
6 7 8 9 10	to pi	and sustained personalized (face-to-face) outreach omote low-income programs, as well as new cust eral to enhance promotional outreach, including vid	tomizable, cultu	urally appropriate	
11 12 13 14	123.6Are there additional activities/initiatives that FBC could undertake to increase13participation in the low income program?				
15	Response:				
16 17 18 19 20 21	program design, implementation and marketing. It is now acting upon the directions provided from that consultation and engaging in multiple communication and marketing efforts as discussed in the responses to BCSEA IR 1.2.2 and BCOAPO 1.3.5. No additional marketing activities/initiatives have been identified for FBC to undertake in 2018 and the Low Income				
22 23 24	efforts are effective in the marketplace and provides direction for continual evolution of FB			•	
25 26					
27 28 29 30 31	Response:	3.6.1 If yes, please identify what they are and within the context of the DSM Regulation		cost-effectiveness	
32		to the response to BCOAPO IR 1.3.6.			
33					

FORTIS BC^{**}

Response to British Columbia Old Age Pensioner's Organization, Disability Alliance BC, Council of Senior Citizen's Organizations of BC, and the Tenant Resources and Advisory Centre (BCOAPO) Information Request (IR) No. 1

Page 8

Submission Date:

February 28, 2018

Reference: Exhibit B-2, Attachment 1.1, Appendix A, pages A5 & A8-A9 1 4.0

4.1 At page A8 FBC states that the Rental Apartment Program will continue to be offered in collaboration with FEI. However, Table A2-1 on page A5 does not show any approved spending or savings for Rental Program in 2017. Please reconcile.

5 6

2

3 4

7 Response:

8 The 2017 DSM Plan combined "Low Income" with "Rentals", the total of which is shown in line 9 10 of Table A2-1. The Low Income and Rental budget and savings are provided separately in 10 the 2018 DSM Plan. Please refer to the response to BCOAPO IR 1.4.2 for the 2017 preliminary 11 actual spending and savings for the Rental program.

- 12
- 13

14 15

- 4.2 If there was Rental Program activity in 2017 please provide a schedule comparing the 2017 spending and savings with those planned for 2018.
- 16 17

18 **Response:**

19 The 2017 preliminary results for the Rental Program are shown along with the 2018 Plan, in the 20 table below:

	2018 Plan		2017 Actual (Preliminary)	
	Savings	Cost	Savings	Cost
Program	MWh	(\$000s)	MWh	(\$000s)
Rental	306	53	295	77

21

22 Note: The 2017 Preliminary Actuals are still subject to final review before they are finalized for filing in the

23 2017 Annual DSM Report that will be filed at the end of March 2018. FORTIS BC^{**}

5.0

1

2

3

4

Council of Senior Citizen's Organizations of BC, and the Tenant Resources and Page 9 Advisory Centre (BCOAPO) Information Request (IR) No. 1 **Reference:** Exhibit B-2, Attachment 1.1, Appendix A, pages A5 & A9

- 5.1 Please explain what the sources of the 2017 approved savings were expected to be from the Customer Engagement Tools.
- 5 **Response:**
- 6 Please refer to the response to BCUC IR 2.8.3.
- 7 8 9
- 10 5.2 Please provide details regarding the actual Customer Engagement Tools 11 employed in 2017 and the results achieved. 12
- 13 Response:
- 14 Please refer to the response to BCUC IR 2.8.3.
- 15
- 16

- 17 18 5.3 Please explain what specific Customer Engagement Tools are planned for 2018 19 and why the expected savings are significantly less than those approved for 2017.
- 20 21

22 Response:

- 23 Please refer to the response to BCUC IR 2.8.3.
- 24 25 26 27 5.4 Are there additional Customer Engagement Tools that could be deployed in 2018 28 that would be cost-effective (per the DSM Regulation)? 29 30 Response:
- 31 FBC did not identify any additional Customer Engagement Tools that could be deployed for the
- 32 2018 DSM Plan but is considering whether additional cost-effective tools may be available for
- 33 the 2019 Multi-Year DSM Expenditure Plan.



2	FortisBC Inc. (FBC or the Company) Application for Acceptance of 2018 Demand-Side Management (DSM) Expenditures (the Application)	Submission Date: February 28, 2018
	Response to British Columbia Old Age Pensioner's Organization, Disability Alliance BC, Council of Senior Citizen's Organizations of BC, and the Tenant Resources and Advisory Centre (BCOAPO) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 10

- 1 2 3 4 5.4.1 If yes, what are they and why is FBC not planning to implement them in 2018? 6 7 <u>Response:</u>
 - 8 Please refer to the response to BCOAPO IR 1.5.4.



6.0 Reference: Exhibit B-2, Attachment 1.1, Appendix A, pages A5 &

2 3

1

A18-A19

- 6.1 Please provide the 2017 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (equivalent to Table A6-2) as submitted for approval.
- 4 5

6 Response:

The 2017 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Expenditures were filed in Appendix A of the 2017
DSM Plan application, on page A14. The table is reproduced below.

9

Table A5-2: Monitoring & Evaluation Expenditures

	2017			
Sector/Program	Study Type	Plan (\$000s)		
Residential				
EnergyStar for New Homes	Process	8		
Low Income ECAP	Impact	4		
Behavioral	Baseline study	10		
Rental	Survey	2		
Commercial/Industrial				
Commercial Lighting	Comprehensive	60		
New Construction Commercial and Industrial	Process, Impact & Case Study	50		
Business Direct install	Process & Impact	35		
MURB	Process	10		
Allowance for unplanned EM&V		7		
Sub-Total		186		
EM&V Staffing		189		
Total 375				

10

- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14 15
- 16
- 6.2 Please provide a schedule that sets out the actual M&E studies completed in 2017 and, if any of the studies planned for 2017 were not undertaken/completed, please explain why.
- 17



1 <u>Response:</u>

2017 Monitoring & Evaluation Completed Studies					
Sector/Program	Study Type				
Residential					
Heat Pumps	Comprehensive				
Low Income ECAP	Process and Impact				
Low Income ECAP	Quality Assurance reviews				
Rental	Process and Impact				
Commercial/Industrial					
Custom Commercial/Industrial	Comprehensive				

2

3 Two evaluation studies planned for 2016, Residential Heat Pumps and Custom Commercial

4 Program, were delayed due to increased due-diligence of vendors for privacy policy compliance,

5 and were completed instead in 2017. This timing shift caused changes in the other studies

6 undertaken, due to resource constraints.

7 Regarding the 2017 planned monitoring & evaluation expenditures, which are shown in the

8 response to BCOAPO IR 1.6.1, the New Homes process evaluation was not completed, as past

9 participation was low and the program is being revamped to align with the British Columbia

10 Energy Step Code.

The Behavioral Baseline study was not completed as the launch of the Customer EngagementTool was delayed.

The Rental evaluation was a comprehensive evaluation undertaken jointly with FEI, rather thana survey.

The MURB process review was not completed, as there were only two projects completed in2017.

Custom Commercial Lighting was part of the Custom Commercial Program comprehensiveevaluation completed in 2017. The prescriptive lighting portion of Commercial Lighting will be

19 evaluated in 2018.

20 An evaluation of the Business Direct Install Program was not undertaken, as it was decided to

21 discontinue the program and roll it into existing programs.