



Diane Roy
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs

Gas Regulatory Affairs Correspondence
Email: gas.regulatory.affairs@fortisbc.com

Electric Regulatory Affairs Correspondence
Email: 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
www.fortisbc.com

May 17, 2018

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. 1598939
2017 Cost of Service Analysis and Rate Design Application (the Application)
Erratum to the Response to the B.C. Sustainable Energy Association and Sierra Club of British Columbia (BCSEA) Information Request (IR) No. 1 (Exhibit B-12) Question 22.5

On May 8, 2018, FBC filed its responses to BCSEA IR No. 1 in the Application referenced above. It has come to FBC's attention that a reference in the response to BCSEA IR 1.22.5 needs to be corrected to refer to BCOAPO IR 1.46.4 rather than BCUC IR 1.46.4.

FBC respectfully submits the attached Erratum to the response to BCSEA IR 1.22.5.

If further information is required, please contact Corey Sinclair at (250) 469-8038.

Sincerely,

FORTISBC INC.

Original signed:

Diane Roy

Attachment

cc (email only): Commission Secretary
Registered Parties



FortisBC Inc. (FBC or the Company) 2017 Cost of Service Analysis and Rate Design Application (the Application)	Erratum Dated: May 17, 2018
Response to BC Sustainable Energy Association and Sierra Club BC (BCSEA) Information Request (IR) No. 1, Question 22.5	Page 1

1 **22.0 Topic: Default Residential Rate Recommendation**
2 **Reference: Exhibit B-1, section 6.1.5, page 73, Table 6-10**

3 Citation:

4 Residential customers are likely to be divided on the issue of how to restructure
5 the residential rate based on their own consumption levels. Clearly, those with
6 higher-than-average consumption are unhappy with the current rate RCR rate
7 structure and have made their voices heard through a number of channels,
8 including the consultation phase of this proceeding. A return to a residential rate
9 that is more aligned with cost causation, a rate with a higher fixed cost and a
10 without a tiered consumption charge, is the most logical and defensible manner
11 of addressing these legitimate concerns.

12 22.5 Please explain FBC's basis for concluding that a residential rate without a tiered
13 consumption charge is more aligned with cost causation than a RIB rate. In
14 FBC's view, is a flat rate more aligned with cost causation than a rate with a
15 tiered consumption charge?
16

17 **Response:**

18 Please refer to the response to [BCOAPQ IR 1.46.4](#).

Deleted: BCUC

Deleted: .1