



**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)

March 20, 2018

Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia  
c/o Owen Bird Law Corporation  
P.O. Box 49130  
Three Bentall Centre  
2900 – 595 Burrard Street  
Vancouver, BC  
V7X 1J5

Attention: Mr. Christopher P. Weafer

Dear Mr. Weafer:

**Re: FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI)**

**Project No. 3698899**

**2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)**

**Response to the Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British  
Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3**

---

On December 19, 2016, FEI filed the Application referenced above. In accordance with the British Columbia Utilities Commission Order G-5-18 setting out the remainder of the Regulatory Timetable for the review of the Application, FEI respectfully submits the attached response to CEC IR No. 3.

If further information is required, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

**FORTISBC ENERGY INC.**

***Original signed:***

Diane Roy

Attachments

cc (email only): Commission Secretary  
Registered Parties

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 1

1    **90.    Reference: BCUC Order G-4-18 page 35 and 38**

*Commission determination*

**The Panel directs FEI to use an R:C ratio range of reasonableness of 95 percent to 105 percent to inform rate design and rebalancing proposals in the current Application. FEI is directed to file updates to the Application in response to the findings and directives in this order with Reasons, in accordance with a procedural order to be issued subsequent to this order. The electronic versions of the updates should include both a blacklined version and a clean version.**

          For the reasons outlined above, the Panel considers it appropriate to reduce FEI’s current R:C ratio range of reasonableness of 90 percent to 110 percent to an R:C ratio range of reasonableness of 95 percent to 105 percent. This range is to be used to inform rate design and rebalancing proposals in the current Application. Since other considerations are made in rate design and rebalancing, FEI is free to propose whether or not they will rebalance rates.

          90.1    Please confirm that the range of reasonableness of 95% to 105% represents a maximum threshold for a given rate class for to depart from unity in its calculated revenue to cost ratios.

**Response:**

          Not confirmed.

          The range of reasonableness is a guideline,<sup>1</sup> in that the Commission may determine that rebalancing may not be required even if the R:C ratio is outside the range of reasonableness.<sup>2</sup> This was stated by the Commission in its Decision in Order G-4-18 at page 38:

          For the reasons outlined above, the Panel considers it appropriate to reduce FEI’s current R:C ratio range of reasonableness of 90 percent to 110 percent to an R:C ratio range of reasonableness of 95 percent to 105 percent. This range is to be used to inform rate design and rebalancing proposals in the current Application. Since other considerations are made in rate design and rebalancing, FEI is free to propose whether or not they will rebalance rates. [underlining added.]

          The Commission is clear that the range of reasonableness is not the only factor in deciding whether rates should be rebalanced.

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Exhibit B-5, BCUC-FEI IR 1.53.1.

<sup>2</sup> As noted by Elenchus, “R:C (or M:C) ratio is only one factor that that influence rate design results and there are other considerations (e.g. rate impact, policy concern) that will lead to the final rates.” Exhibit A2-13, BCOAPO-Elenchus IR 2.11.4. Also see testimony of Ms. Tabone at Transcript Volume 5, pp. 490-491.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 2

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

90.1.1 If not confirmed, please explain why not.

**Response:**

Please refer to the response to CEC-FEI IR 3.90.1.

90.2 Please confirm that the Commission did not provide direction as to the target for rebalancing, such that rate schedules could be rebalanced to unity or another revenue to cost ratio within the 95% to 105%.

**Response:**

Please refer to the response to CEC-FEI IR 3.91.1.

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 3

1 **91. Reference: Exhibit B-1-4 page**

originally designed, FEI is proposing to update the multiplier in the peak day demand formula from 1.25 to 1.1 (the multiplier estimates the peak day demand from the average peak Monthly demand). As a result of the above change, FEI is also proposing to raise the Demand Charge for RS 5 and RS 25 by \$3.00/GJ/Month to continue to provide a price signal for only high load factor customers to take General Firm Service. As the R:C ratio before rebalancing is 106%, FEI proposes to shift \$1.093 million of revenue responsibility to RS 1 as explained in section 12.2.2. The R:C ratio after rebalancing is 105%, which is within the range of reasonableness directed by Order G-4-18. FEI is proposing to reduce the revenue responsibility of RS 5/25 by decreasing the Basic Charge by \$118 per month.

2

3 91.1 Please explain why FEI limited its rebalancing to 105%, instead of reducing to  
4 unity or another revenue to cost ratio within the 95% to 105% threshold.

5

6 **Response:**

7 FEI limited its rebalancing of RS 5/25 to 105 percent, which is consistent with the 95 percent to  
8 105 percent range of reasonableness that the Commission directed<sup>3</sup> FEI to use to inform rate  
9 design and rebalancing proposals for FEI and Fort Nelson.

10 An R:C ratio within the range of reasonableness indicates that a rate schedule is recovering its  
11 fair share of costs, and therefore there is no reason to rebalance to unity or to any other R:C  
12 ratio. As explained by FEI in its final argument on COSA and R:C ratios<sup>4</sup>, if rebalancing is  
13 determined to be appropriate, it should be to the nearest boundary of the range of  
14 reasonableness. The COSA results provide no evidence to justify further rebalancing.<sup>5</sup>  
15 Therefore, rebalancing of RS 5/25 to 105 percent is appropriate and there is no evidence to  
16 justify adjusting rate schedules that are within the range of reasonableness.

17

18

19

20 91.2 Could FEI have adjusted other rate classes which were not outside the range of  
21 reasonableness to unity or another revenue to cost ratio within the 95% to 105%  
22 thresholds? Please explain why or why not.

23

<sup>3</sup> Page 2 of BCUC Order G-4-18 dated January 9, 2018.

<sup>4</sup> Page 17 of FEI Final Argument on COSA and revenue to cost ratios

<sup>5</sup> Exhibit A2-8, CEC-Elenchus IR 1.2.2: "Rebalancing should be undertaken to move all classes that are outside the approved range to the nearest boundary"; also see Transcript Volume 5, p. 479, ll. 20-26.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 4

1 **Response:**

2 There is no evidence to justify adjusting rate classes that are within the range of  
3 reasonableness. Please refer to the response to CEC-FEI IR 3.91.1.

4

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 5

1 **92. Reference: Exhibit B-1-4 page 2-2 and 2-3**

2 FEI has a number of tariff supplements, including bypass agreements. These tariff supplements  
3 are negotiated agreements and are approved separately by the Commission and, as such, FEI  
4 is not proposing any changes to existing tariff supplements in this Application. The exception to  
5 this is the proposed cancellation effective Q4 of 2018, of FEI Tariff Supplement G-21 between  
6 Creative Energy and FEI. Please refer to Section 9.8 of the Application for more information.

7  
8  
9 92.1 Why has FEI changed the date of the proposed tariff cancellation to Q4 2018?

10 **Response:**

11 FEI originally proposed a June 1, 2018 implementation date for all proposals in the Rate Design  
12 Application, including the proposed tariff amendments and the cancellation of FEI Tariff  
13 Supplement G-21<sup>6</sup>. However, a June 1, 2018 implementation date is no longer possible given  
14 the Regulatory Timetable established by Order G-5-18. As a result, in FEI's Compliance Filing  
15 for Order G-4-18, dated February 6, 2018 (Exhibit B-1-5), FEI proposed an implementation date  
16 for its rate design proposals (including the proposed cancellation of FEI Tariff Supplement G-21)  
17 during the fourth quarter of 2018.

18 Please also refer to the response to BCUC-FEI IR 3.91.1 where FEI further discusses  
19 implementation dates.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

---

<sup>6</sup> Application, Section 2.2 Approvals Sought, pages 2-3 to 2-5. Section 2.3 Implementation, pages 2-5 to 2-6.

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 6

1 **93. Reference: Exhibit B-1-4 page 12-6**

2 **12.2.2 Rebalancing of RS 5/25 to be within the Range of Reasonableness**

3 After Rate Design proposals, the R:C ratio for RS 5/25 is 106.3%, which is outside the range of  
4 reasonableness established by Order G-4-18. To rebalance within the range of reasonableness,  
5 FEI proposes for the following reasons to decrease RS 5/25 revenues by reducing the basic  
6 charge:

- 7 • By decreasing the basic charge for RS 5/25, FEI's proposals for RS 7, RS 27 and RS 4  
8 remain unchanged and there will be no additional revenue shift from RS 7, RS 27 and  
9 RS 4 to RS 1.
- 10 • Changing only the basic charge, and not the demand or delivery charge, supports rates  
11 that continue to attract customers with at least a 40% Load Factor. With the proposed  
12 rates, including rebalancing, a customer in RS 5/25 consuming 15,000 GJ would need to  
13 have a load factor of approximately 40% to be better off (when compared to RS 3 and  
14 RS 23), which is the intent of the General Firm Service offering.

15 FEI is therefore proposing to decrease the RS 5/25 Basic Charge by \$118 per month to \$469  
16 per month.

17 Decreasing the basic charge by \$118 per month creates a revenue responsibility decrease of  
18 \$1.093 million for RS 5/25. Recognizing that RS 1 is within the approved range of  
19 reasonableness, but at the lower bound, FEI proposes to shift this revenue responsibility to RS  
20 1, which results in an annual average bill impact for all RS 1 of approximately 0.15%.

2  
3 93.1 To the extent that RS 5/25 costs are primarily fixed costs does the reduction to  
4 the basic charge reflect greater alignment with cost causation than would a  
5 reduction to the delivery charge. Please explain why or why not.  
6

7 **Response:**

8 Although adjusting the Basic Charge does not reflect greater alignment with cost causation, it is  
9 supported by the rate design principles of rate and revenue stability. As explained in Section  
10 12.2.2 of the updated Application, in response to the findings and directives of Commission  
11 Order G-4-18, changing the Basic Charge and not the Demand or Delivery Charge to rebalance  
12 revenues for RS 5/25:

- 13 • Ensures that FEI's proposals for RS 7, RS 27 and RS 4 remain unchanged and that  
14 there will be no additional revenue shift from RS 7 and RS 27 to RS 1.
- 15 • Supports rates for RS 5 and RS 25 that continue to attract customers with at least a 40%  
16 Load Factor.

17 Please also refer to the responses to ICG-FEI IR 3.2.4 and 3.2.5.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 7

1           93.2   Please confirm that the reduction in the Basic charge will mean that the  
2                   'reduction' is applied equally amongst all RS5/25 customers.

3  
4    **Response:**

5    Confirmed.

6  
7

8  
9           93.2.1   If confirmed, does this equitable distribution have a 'fairness' value, or  
10                   would it have been equally fair to apply the reduction to the demand or  
11                   delivery charge. Please discuss.

12  
13   **Response:**

14   Please refer to the response to ICG-FEI IR 3.2.5.

15



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 8

1   **94.   Reference: Exhibit B-1-4 page 12-7**

To set the R:C ratio for RS 6/RS 6P within the range of reasonableness, FEI is proposing a reduction of \$75.9 thousand in the revenue required from RS 6/RS 6P by decreasing the Delivery Charge by \$1.622/GJ. FEI is proposing to reduce the revenue to bring the R:C ratio in alignment with the upper end of the range of reasonableness and decrease the Delivery Charge to match the reduction in revenue.

The decrease to the Delivery Charge supports the government's policy goal of reducing GHG emissions by making natural gas more affordable as a vehicle fuel substituting for gasoline or diesel for those members of the public and fleets that are using the RS 6/RS 6P stations. After the proposed adjustment, RS 6/RS 6P will have an R:C ratio of 105% and RS 6 customers will experience approximately a 20% decrease in their annual bills from this adjustment. As RS 6P is for public natural gas vehicle fueling stations, it is not possible for FEI to calculate an annual bill impact for customers using RS 6P because the volume by customer using the public fueling station is not tracked. As RS 1 is the only rate schedule with an R:C ratio of less than 100%, FEI proposes to shift the \$75.9 thousand deficit to RS 1. The shift represents an approximate annual bill impact of 0.01% (rounding to 0.0%) for RS 1 customers.

RS 6P for CNG fueling services to customers at FEI's Surrey Operations Centre was approved by Order G-165-11A. The Delivery Charge for RS 6P was set equal to the Delivery Charge of RS 6 and was intended to remain equal to the RS 6 Delivery Charge over time. Since the approval of RS 6P, however, the Delivery Charge for RS 6P and RS 6 are no longer equal with the RS 6P Delivery Charge being \$0.022/GJ less than that of RS 6. As a housekeeping amendment, FEI proposes to set the Delivery Charge for RS 6P equal to the Delivery Charge of RS 6 after all other rate design proposals and rebalancing are effected. This proposal is included in the rebalancing results for RS 6 below.

2

3           94.1   Why did FEI choose to reduce the Delivery Charge only, as opposed to a  
4                   reduction in the Basic Charge or in some combination of the Delivery Charge and  
5                   the Basic Charge. Please explain.

6

7   **Response:**

8   Reducing the Delivery Charge only, instead of a reduction to the Basic Charge or some  
9   combination of Delivery and Basic Charge, sends the appropriate price signal by making natural  
10   gas for vehicles more affordable on a per GJ basis as a substitute for gasoline or diesel, thereby  
11   supporting government's policy of reducing GHG emissions. Additionally, the proportion of fixed  
12   cost recovery is improved, increasing the percentage of fixed revenues recovering fixed costs.

13

14

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 9

1  
2           94.2    Will FEI continue to set the Delivery Charge for RS 6P equal to the proposed RS  
3                    Delivery Charge?  
4

5    **Response:**

6    Confirmed. FEI proposes to set the Delivery Charge for RS 6P equal to the proposed RS 6  
7    Delivery Charge.

8  
9

10  
11                    94.2.1    If not, why not?  
12

13   **Response:**

14    Please refer to the response to CEC-FEI IR 3.94.2.

15

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 10

1 **95. Reference: Exhibit B-1-4 page 12-8**

**Table 12-3: R:C and M:C Results after Rate Design Proposals and Rebalancing**

Rate Schedule	COSA after Rate Design Proposals		Rebalance Amount (\$000)	Approximate Annual Bill Change	COSA after Rate Design Proposals and Rebalancing	
	R:C	M:C			R:C	M:C
<b>Rate Schedule 1</b> <i>Residential Service</i>	96.4%	94.6%	1,214.4	0.2%	96.6%	94.6%
<b>Rate Schedule 2</b> <i>Small Commercial Service</i>	102.2%	104.1%			102.2%	104.1%
<b>Rate Schedule 3/23</b> <i>Large Commercial Sales and Transportation Service</i>	103.6%	107.6%			103.6%	107.6%
<b>Rate Schedule 5/25</b> <i>General Firm Sales and Transportation Service</i>	106.3%	112.6%	(1,138.5)	-1.2%	105.0%	112.6%
<b>Rate Schedule 6/6P</b> <i>Natural Gas Vehicle Service</i>	131.7%	160.4%	(75.9)	-20.3%	105.0%	109.5%
<b>Rate Schedule 22A</b> <i>Transportation Service (Closed) Inland Service Area</i>	113.0%	113.4%			113.0%	113.4%
<b>Rate Schedule 22B</b> <i>Transportation Service (Closed) Columbia Service Area</i>	103.1%	103.1%			103.1%	103.1%
<b>Rate Schedule 22</b> <i>Large Volume Transportation Service</i>	100.0%	100.0%			100.0%	100.0%

  

Rate Schedule <i>(rates not set using allocated costs)</i>	COSA after Rate Design Proposals		Rebalance Amount (\$000)	Approximate Annual Bill Change	COSA after Rate Design Proposals and Rebalancing	
	R:C	M:C			R:C	M:C
<b>Rate Schedule 4</b> <i>Seasonal Firm Gas Service</i>	150.2%	578.3%			150.2%	578.3%
<b>Rate Schedule 7/27</b> <i>General Interruptible Sales and Transportation Service</i>	139.3%	713.6%			139.3%	713.6%

2

3

95.1 Please briefly explain why FEI did not rebalance Rate Schedule 22A.

4

5

**Response:**

6

FEI did not propose to rebalance RS 22A as this is a closed rate schedule. RS 22A and RS 22B are not allocated costs in a postage stamp manner in the COSA as they are not allocated a full share of FEI's distribution system costs. FEI has continued to allocate costs to RS 22A and RS 22B in a manner consistent with past practice and the grandfathered status of these rate schedules. As a result, the rates for RS 22A and RS 22B are lower than other industrial

10



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 11

- 1 customers under the existing RS 22, or under FEI's proposed RS 22.<sup>7</sup> Rebalancing the charges
- 2 under RS 22A would be inconsistent with continuing to grandfather the terms and conditions of
- 3 service under this rate schedule.
  
- 4 Since RS 22 is available for all large industrial customers, grandfathered RS 22A (and RS 22B)
- 5 customers may elect this rate schedule as an alternative.
  
- 6

---

<sup>7</sup> Transcript Volume 5, p. 487-488.

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 12

1    **96.    Reference: Exhibit B-1-4, page 13-51**

2    For Rate 2.1 and Rate 2.2, FEI adjusted rates to account for the decrease in revenue  
 3    responsibility of \$35.0 thousand and \$37.2 thousand, respectively. This adjustment was made  
 4    to maintain an economic breakeven threshold of 2,000 GJ /year as discussed in section

5    13.5.5.4, to align the basic charge of both Rate 2.1 and Rate 2.2 proportionally to the customer  
 6    classified costs from the COSA model, and to limit any individual customer's annual bill impact.

7    The following table shows the rates for the daily Basic Charge and the volumetric Delivery  
 8    Charge for Rate 2.1 and 2.2.

9    **Table 13-28: Rate 2.1 and 2.2 Charges after all Rate Design Proposals**

	Rate 2.1	Rate 2.2
Daily Basic Charge (\$/Day)	<u>1.2151</u>	<u>3.6845</u>
Delivery Charge (\$/GJ)	<u>3.781</u>	<u>3.330</u>

10    96.1    Are there other combinations of adjustments that would have achieved the same  
 11    conditions? Please elaborate on FEI's rationale for adjusting both the Daily  
 12    Basic Charge and the Delivery Charge and the levels by which they were each  
 13    adjusted.

14    **Response:**

15    This information request refers to the proposed RS 2 and RS 3 charges for Fort Nelson.

16    FEI's proposals were designed to meet multiple objectives: minimizing any one customer's rate  
 17    increase to a maximum of 5 percent; retaining the relationship in the Basic Charge between RS  
 18    2 and RS 3 of approximately 300 percent (RS 3 Basic Charge / RS 2 Basic Charge);  
 19    accommodating the rebalancing amounts; retaining a 2,000 GJ economic cross-over; and  
 ensuring the appropriate level of revenue is collected from each rate schedule. FEI's proposal  
 is the optimal solution to meet these objectives, as derived by the Excel Solver function  
 performing a Linear Programming analysis and included in Table 13-28.

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 13

1   **97.   Reference: Exhibit B-1-4, page 13-55**

For Rate Schedule 25, FEI adjusted the Demand Charge to account for the increase in revenue responsibility of \$5.7 thousand. FEI increased the demand charge per month per GJ of daily demand from \$28.727 to \$30.350 resulting in an annual bill increase of approximately 4%.

2

3           97.1   Why did FEI choose to adjust the Demand charge instead of the Basic Charge,  
4                    Delivery Charge, Administration charge or some combination thereof? Please  
5                    discuss the advantages and disadvantages of adjusting the Demand Charge.

6

7   **Response:**

8   This IR refers to FEI's proposed RS 25 charges for Fort Nelson.

9   FEI chose to increase the Demand Charge to achieve the R:C ratio of 95 percent for the  
10 following reasons:

- 11           1. the Commission's Decision directed FEI to use a Load Factor that was the average  
12                    actual Load Factor of 27 percent in place of a deemed load factor of 40 percent.
- 13           2. The change in load factor results in an increase in the demand-related allocated cost for  
14                    RS 25.
- 15           3. Increasing the Demand Charge provides recovery of the increased allocated fixed  
16                    demand-related cost and the amount needed for rebalancing.

17

18   FEI chose not to apply the increase to other RS 25 charges for the following reasons:

- 19           1. Applying the increase to the Delivery Charge, which is a volumetric charge, provides  
20                    less certainty in the recovery of the fixed incremental demand-related cost because the  
21                    annual volumes are uncertain due to variation in the weather conditions and the  
22                    uncertain timing of a decision by the customer to cease service as an RS 25 customer.
- 23           2. While increasing the Basic Charge increases fixed revenue for the recovery of increased  
24                    customer-related costs, the primary driver to the increased allocated cost was the  
25                    change to the load factor which affects the allocated demand-related costs and not the  
26                    customer-related costs that the Basic Charge is normally associated with.
- 27           3. The monthly Administration Charge is a cost recovery mechanism of utility internal costs  
28                    related to Transportation Service activities. This is why there is no Administration Charge  
29                    for sales service. (See Section 11 of the Application). The rate proposed for RS 25 is  
30                    equal to that proposed for all other transportation service customers of FEI. It would be  
31                    inappropriate to adjust the Monthly Administration Charge because the cause of the cost



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: March 20, 2018
Response to Commercial Energy Consumers Association of British Columbia (CEC) Information Request (IR) No. 3	Page 14

1            increase is related to the delivery service for any General Firm sales or transport  
2            customer.

3  
4            For these reasons, increasing the Demand Charge as the cost recovery mechanism for the  
5            increased demand-related costs and rebalancing to achieve a 95 percent R:C ratio is an  
6            appropriate and reasonable approach that is consistent with rate design principles.

7