

25th Floor
700 W Georgia St

Vancouver, BC
Canada V7Y 1B3

Tel 604 684 9151
Fax 604 661 9349

www.farris.com

Reply Attention of: Ludmila B. Herbst, Q.C.
Direct Dial Number: (604) 661-1722
Email Address: lherbst@farris.com

Our File No.: 05497-0240

May 24, 2018

BY EMAIL

British Columbia Utilities Commission
410 – 900 Howe Street
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2N3

Attention: Patrick Wruck

Dear Mr. Wruck:

**Re: FortisBC Inc. Self-Generation Policy Stage II Application
(the “SGPA II”)
Project No. 1598895**

We write on behalf of FortisBC Inc. (“**FBC**”) in response to Exhibit A-11 in the above-noted proceeding. In Exhibit A-11, the Panel invited the parties to provide their views as to whether (1) a further round of information requests is required; (2) the proceeding should go directly to final argument; or (3) an alternate procedural process should be considered by the Panel.

On April 21, 2017 and March 16, 2018, FBC submitted its responses to information requests in the SPGA II proceeding. The information requests had come from the British Columbia Utilities Commission (responded to in Ex. B-2, B-6, B-6-1), British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority (responded to in Ex. B-7), the British Columbia Municipal Electrical Utilities (responded to in Ex. B-8), the British Columbia Old Age Pensioners Organization et al. (responded to in Ex. B-9), the British Columbia Sustainable Energy Association and Sierra Club of B.C. (responded to in Ex. B-10), the Commercial Electrical Consumers Association (responded to in Ex. B-11) and Zellstoff Celgar Limited Partnership (responded to in Ex. B-12).

The questions and answers in the SGPA II proceeding have been wide-ranging and thorough. Further, the above filings followed several years of consideration of these and related issues both in the present SGPA II proceeding and in earlier processes involving the same parties. FBC respectfully submits that no further evidence need be filed before resolution of the SGPA II proceeding.

This leads to the question of how the SGPA II proceeding should be resolved.

FBC would be content to proceed directly to final argument based on the comprehensive evidentiary record presently before the Commission.

May 24, 2018

- 2 -

F A R R I S

However, FBC is also mindful that various of the issues associated with the SGPA II proceeding have been persistent themes in Commission proceedings and that past attempts to arrive at resolution through ordinary adjudication have not been regarded by all parties as achieving the necessary finality, certainty and clarity. In the circumstances, FBC's *preferred* process for concluding the SGPA II proceeding would be a negotiated settlement process ("NSP"). If an NSP were to be held in the SGPA II proceeding, FBC would encourage an active role by a Commission facilitator and Commission staff, within the parameters of the NSP guidelines. The objective would be to arrive at a resolution that is both resilient and workable from the perspective of stakeholders including the Commission.

If a resolution is not reached through the NSP, or if the Panel requires further information before determining whether to accept the settlement that has been reached, written arguments could be filed.

Yours truly,

FARRIS, VAUGHAN, WILLS & MURPHY LLP

Per:

Ludmila B. Herbst, Q.C.

LBH/trw

c.c.: Registered interveners
client